BEFORE THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF LANE COUNTY, OREGON

ORDER AND RESOLUTION
NO: 20-08-25-04

In the matter of adopting an updated Community Wildfire Protection Plan for Lane County

WHEREAS, the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 was signed into law to reduce the risk of catastrophic fire to communities, help save the lives of firefighters and citizens, and protect threatened and endangered species; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners passed a resolution and order to adopt the Lane County Community Wildfire protection Plan on July 12, 2005; and

WHEREAS, updating the Lane County Community Wildfire Protection Plan will maintain Lane County’s qualification for funding of hazardous fuels reduction projects under the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners has reviewed the draft update of Lane County’s Community Wildfire Protection Plan and found that the updated Plan reflects the intent of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Board of County Commissioners of Lane County ORDERS and RESOLVES as follows:

The Lane County Board of County Commissioners concurs with and adopts the updated Lane County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (July 2020) attached hereto and incorporated by this reference.

ADOPTED this 25th day of August, 2020.

Heather Buch, Chair
Lane County Board of Commissioners
Lane County, Oregon
COMMUNITY WILDFIRE PROTECTION PLAN

Adopted on July __, 2020
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**Lane County Wildfire Risk Assessment:**

Information for most maps in this plan were derived from Pyrologix’s 2017 Northwest Quantitative Wildfire Risk Assessment, using layers available from the free wildfire mapping tool, “Oregon Wildfire Risk Explorer” developed by Oregon State University and the Oregon Department of Forestry. Care was taken in the creation of these maps but are provided “as is” using the “best available” data, displayed to better inform local decision making. Lane County cannot accept any responsibility for any errors, omissions, or positional accuracy, and therefore, there are no warranties that accompany these products (the maps). Although information from Land Surveys may have been used in the creation of these products, in no way does this product represent or constitute a Land Survey. Users are cautioned to field verify information on this product before making any decisions.
Executive Summary

The Lane County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) seeks to identify mitigation strategies and priorities to reduce impacts of wildfires throughout Lane County, while providing a foundation for collaboration across boundaries, industries and values towards improved social, ecological and economic resilience. The plan identifies general areas with high wildfire risk and provides a framework of technical support and guidance to assist local communities in developing and refining their own community wildfire mitigation strategies. The CWPP is not a regulatory document and does not have authority over incorporated communities within Lane County, but rather seeks to develop strategies to align, collaborate and coordinate efforts for sharing information and resources across jurisdictional boundaries.

The CWPP includes a Risk Assessment for identifying areas of Lane County susceptible to wildfire risk, a Community Outreach and Collaboration section that evaluates input regarding wildfire gathered through a community survey, an Action Plan section which identifies future efforts for wildfire planning and mitigation, and a Plan Implementation and Maintenance section.

The CWPP Action Plan section identifies 24 Action Items that reflect the Goals and Objectives of the plan as identified by the CWPP Steering Committee. The following five Action Items are identified as priorities for wildfire planning in Lane County.

**Action Item 2.1.1** Review and develop recommendations to the Lane County Board of Commissioners for revisions to land use regulations, such as: Implementation of fire safety standards within rural residential zoning districts; Distribution of educational materials at the outset of the building permit review process; and Outreach services with neighborhood organizations and special interest groups.

**Action Item 2.1.3** Identify and prioritize areas for local evacuation plan development across Lane County's Rural Fire Protection District, potentially including data from the CWPP Rural Response: Priorities for Fuel Reduction Map.

**Action Item 2.3.1** Utilize maps in the CWPP risk assessment to guide and identify new partners and opportunities for cross-boundary collaboration. Coordinate the implementation of landscape scale hazardous fuel projects.

**Action Item 3.1.1** Develop a coordinated multi-agency seasonal outreach campaign that includes county-specific educational materials to promote effective risk reduction practices and communicate landowner assistance programs in the wildland/urban interface.
Action Item 3.2.1 Implement landowner assistance for fuel reduction projects including cost-share incentives. Increase local capacity, establish incentive programs to support yard debris disposal to assist landowners with hazardous fuels removal. Create disposal opportunities using alternative methods to burning.

The priority Action Items are intended to be the primary focus for the next implementation term of the plan and will be reevaluated by the Steering Committee during future plan updates.
Section 1 Introduction

Plan Purpose

The Lane County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) is a collaborative agreement between the Oregon Department of Forestry, Lane County, and Federal partners. This document strives to:

- Provide countywide leadership through partnerships to implement wildland-urban interface fire mitigation strategies in Lane County.
- Improve community strategies for reducing the impacts of wildland-urban interface fires.
- Promote wildfire risk reduction activities for private and public lands in Lane County.

The CWPP is non-regulatory in nature, meaning that it does not set forth any new policy. The CWPP is designed to be an action plan and depends upon people and partnerships to carry it forward. The guiding principles of the plan include:

- A foundation to help improve cross-boundary coordination between agencies to reduce negative wildfire impacts through the pursuit of fire resilient landscapes and communities in Lane County.
- Identification and prioritization of areas for hazardous fuel reduction and wildfire resilience projects through the creation of county-level risk maps.
- Landowner resources for understanding wildfire risk in our community, including maps and recommended actions homeowners and local communities can take to help reduce their structure's exposure to wildfire risk (structural ignitability).
- A way to meet federal and state planning requirements and qualify for assistance programs.

Importance of Developing a CWPP

The increase of structures in and near forestlands exposes greater numbers of people and property to the wildfire hazard. According to the State Natural Hazards Risk Assessment, Lane County has a high probability of and vulnerability to wildland-urban interface fires\(^1\). Wildfire Suppression Costs in Oregon set consecutive records in 2017 and 2018 with over 500 million dollars spent statewide in 2018.\(^2\) The Governor's Council on Wildfire reminds Oregonians the true cost of wildfire, from suppression to recovery, can be 11 times greater than the cost of suppression, potentially costing the state several billions of dollars in just one fire season.\(^3\) The effect poor air quality has on residents and local business is an example of these added costs. In 2017 Oregon experienced 160 days of unhealthy air quality related to wildfire smoke\(^4\),
with the Eugene-Springfield area experiencing unhealthy air quality for approximately two months⁵.

The destruction caused by recent fire seasons illustrates that fire response and emergency management efforts alone are not enough to prevent losses. Reducing a community’s risk to wildfire is a shared responsibility that includes the participation of federal, state, and local government agencies, the private sector, and citizens. Risk reduction strategies are typically most effective when organized at the local level.

The Lane County CWPP focuses on achieving the three minimum requirements for community wildfire protection plans described by the Healthy Forest Restoration Act (HFRA):

1. **Collaboration:** A CWPP must be collaboratively developed by local and state government representatives, in consultation with federal agencies and other interested parties.

2. **Prioritized Fuel Reduction:** A CWPP must identify and prioritize areas for hazardous fuel 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.

### Area Covered

Lane County covers 2.9 million acres, stretching from the Pacific Ocean to the crest of the Cascade Mountains. Nearly 90% of Lane County is forestlands. Lane County is made up of three distinct ecoregions with differing vegetative, geographic, and fire regime characteristics.⁶ These ecoregions are described below:

**Willamette Valley:** The valley landforms include floodplains and terraces interlaced with surrounding rolling hills. The natural vegetation includes a mix of oak prairies and hardwood forests composed of oak, cottonwood, alder, Oregon ash, and big leaf maple. Douglas-fir, ponderosa pine, grand fir, incense-cedar, and western red cedar occur in moister areas. The valley has lower precipitation, warmer temperatures, and historic fire regimes of higher frequency and lower severity than adjacent Cascades or coast range.⁷

**Coast Range:** This ecoregion is characterized by steep, highly dissected slopes with narrow ridges. The natural vegetation includes forests of Douglas-fir, western hemlock, western red cedar, and Sitka spruce. The coast range historically experienced lower frequency, higher severity fires when compared to both the Willamette Valley and Western Cascades.⁸

**Cascades:** This ecoregion is characterized by ridge crests at similar elevations, separated by steep valleys. The natural vegetation consists of forests of Douglas-fir, western red cedar, and western hemlock at lower elevations and silver fir and mountain hemlock at higher elevations.⁹ The Cascade region typically sees more fire than the coast range, at mixed to high severities due to more natural ignitions via lightning events.
Wildfire History

Wildfire plays a critical ecological role in many ecosystems across the country, including those in Lane County. Native Americans annually burned large areas of the Willamette Valley and coastal valleys to help maintain grasslands and savannahs. Forest fires were relatively infrequent, although their size and severity were often large. Between 1846 and 1853, a series of large fires burned over 800,000 acres in the central Oregon coast range. The disruption of natural fire cycles over the last century has created dangerous vegetative fuel loads and made forests vulnerable to catastrophic wildfires. Logging came to the region in the early twentieth century, combining with fire to change the landscape of the coast range and western Cascades. During and after World War II, an emphasis on better wildland fire suppression and fire prevention dramatically reduced damage caused by wildfires. More people moved into suburban areas during this same period, enlarging the wildland-urban interface.

There are many examples of disastrous fires, both in Lane County and in surrounding counties that share similar landscape characteristics. In 1910, the Nelson Mountain Fire burned many areas that are now state forestlands in Lane County. Large fires burned again in western Lane County in 1917, 1922, and 1929. The 1966 Oxbow Fire, started by a faulty spark arrester, burned 44,000 acres in Lane County. To the north of Lane County, the 1933-1951 Tillamook Burn fires consumed a combined 355,000 acres.
Forest Characteristics

Historic wildfire regimes played a predominant role in the development of Lane County forests. Natural cycles of fire disturbance influence all facets of ecosystem dynamics from structure and composition to wildlife habitat and nutrient cycling. Fire suppression, timber harvesting, the introduction of exotic species, and other human factors have disrupted natural fire cycles. West of the Cascade Mountains, fire frequency and severity depend upon environmental variables, such as temperature, moisture, ignitions, and broad, fire-driving winds.16

Throughout Lane County, Douglas-fir and Western Hemlock climax is the most predominant forest type.17 Fire regimes in moist Douglas-fir habitat types are mixed, ranging from low to moderate severity surface fires at relatively frequent intervals (7 to 20 years) to severe crown fires at long intervals (50 to 400 years).18 Significant annual precipitation and historically low occurrence of lightning throughout much of Lane County contribute to a low probability of natural fire ignitions in many areas. However, the high vegetative fuel loads are vulnerable to catastrophic fire once ignited. Catastrophic fires are those that “burn more intensely than the natural or historical range of variability, thereby fundamentally changing the ecosystem, destroying communities and/or rare or threatened species/habitat, or causing unacceptable erosion” (National Fire Plan, 2001).19

Current Wildfire Protection Framework

Several agencies share responsibility for fire protection in Lane County; these roles are described in the Lane County Emergency Operations Plan.

The City of Eugene and City of Springfield Fire Departments provide emergency fire services to the most densely populated and developed areas of Lane County. Much of the remainder of the County’s fire protection lies within the jurisdictions of the agencies that make up the Lane County Fire Defense Board. The Oregon Department of Forestry is responsible for wildfire protection on all state-owned forestland, privately owned rural lands, and Bureau of Land Management lands. The U.S. Forest Service is responsible for national forest lands.

The Oregon Department of Forestry administers hazardous fuel mitigation funding via the Western States Fire Managers and Community Assistance grants through the National Fire Plan (NFP). Lane County utilizes Title III funds to implement the Firewise Communities program, which provides numerous wildland-urban interface resources for firefighting safety, community planning, landscaping, construction, and maintenance to lower the structural ignitability of rural homes and properties. Federal agencies utilize various methods and funding avenues to reduce wildfire risk on federal lands, with a focus on designing and prioritizing fuel treatments to reduce fire intensity, structure ignition and extent. A brief explanation of these roles and responsibilities is outlined below.
Federal

US Forest Service (USFS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM):

- Manages the majority of Lane County’s 2.5 million acres of F1 zoned forestlands;
- USFS participates in fire response and co-op agreements with Oregon Department of Forestry;
- BLM agreement with Oregon Department of Forestry for wildland fire protection on lands within ODF district boundaries.

State

Oregon Department of Forestry:

- Provides wildland fire protection on 1.2 million acres in Lane County on state owned and state protected lands within district boundaries;
- Contracts with private lands to provide wildland fire protection outside of district boundaries;
- Participates in first-response agreements with all adjoining counties and with co-op agreements with USFS;
- Provides protection to BLM lands within district boundaries by agreement;
- Promotes education, outreach, and prevention activities.

Oregon State Fire Marshal:

- Provides technical assistance to local fire departments and unprotected areas;
- Promotes education and outreach in the wildland-urban interface;
- Adopted the Oregon Fire Service Mobilization Plan, which is reviewed annually and updated as needed.

County

Rural Fire Districts:

- 20 Rural Fire Districts within Lane County;
- Provide all hazard response in their districts, including structural fire protection within district boundaries throughout Lane County.
Lane County Fire Defense Board:

- There is a countywide mutual aid agreement to which all local fire protection agencies in Lane County and the Oregon Department of Forestry are signers;

- Focuses on the coordination and preparedness of structural fire districts on wildfire topics ranging from prevention and education, initial attack, mutual aid agreements and local conflagration planning in Lane County.

Lane Fire Prevention Co-op

- Facilitates interagency cooperation in the local delivery of wildfire fire prevention messages and materials;

- Includes Lane County Fire Defense Board, OSFM ODF, USFS and BLM representatives.

Municipal

City Fire Departments provide structural fire protection within city limits, often respond during initial attack of vegetation fires within city limits.

Existing Plans and Policies

The CWPP works in conjunction with other plans, policies, and programs. More information regarding these relationships can be found on Table 1.1 below.
### Table 1.1 Existing Plans and Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Policy</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>How the CWPP Addresses Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Healthy Forests Restoration Act (HFRA):</strong> Congress adopted HFRA in 2003 to assist community, state, and federal land managers in the prevention of catastrophic wildfire on public lands through fuels reduction activities. The Act requires 50% of appropriated fuel treatment funding through HFRA is to be used in the wildland-urban interface protection zone and give priority funding to communities with a community wildfire protection plan in place.</td>
<td>(1) Collaboration: A CWPP must be collaboratively developed by local and state government representatives, in consultation with federal agencies and other interested parties. (2) Prioritized Fuel Reduction: A CWPP must identify and prioritize areas for hazardous fuel 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. (4) Three entities must mutually agree to the final contents of a CWPP: the applicable local government; the local fire departments; and the state entity responsible for forest management.</td>
<td>(1) The CWPP was collaboratively developed by a Steering Committee representing local, state, and federal agencies. The plan conducted outreach activities to gain input from public and private stakeholders. (2) The CWPP includes an assessment of wildfire risk in Lane County and a process for prioritizing fuel reduction projects. The plan also includes a table identifying appropriate fuel treatment methods for Lane County. (3) The CWPP recommends actions for promoting risk reduction activities on private and public lands in Lane County. (4) The Lane County Board of Commissioners, the Lane County Fire Defense Board, and the Oregon Department of Forestry approved the Lane County CWPP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **National Fire Plan 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy:** The National Fire Plan was developed in 2000, following a landmark wildfire season, to actively respond to severe wildfires and their impacts to communities while ensuring sufficient firefighting capacity for the future. | The National Fire Plan addresses five key points: (1) Firefighting (2) Rehabilitation (3) Hazardous Fuels Reduction (4) Community Assistance Accountability | The CWPP will aid in effectively implementing National Fire Plan goals by providing a collaborative framework reducing wildfire risk to communities in Lane County. The advisory committee responsible for coordinating the CWPP will also serve as the local coordinating body for National Fire Plan projects. |
## Table 1.1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Policy</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>How the CWPP Addresses Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000:</strong> The Act emphasizes mitigation planning and establishes a pre-disaster hazard mitigation program.</td>
<td>Requires state and local governments to have an approved natural hazard mitigation plan in place to qualify for post-disaster Hazard Mitigation Grant Program funds.</td>
<td>The CWPP currently serves as the Wildfire Annex for the 2018 Lane County Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Land Assistance, Management, and Enhancement (FLAME) Act 2009</strong></td>
<td>Directed the Departments of Agriculture and Interior to develop a cohesive wildland fire management strategy (Cohesive Strategy). The strategy is a framework to coordinate multiple agency and homeowner efforts toward three goals: - Restore and maintain landscapes - Create fire-adapted communities - Improve fire response</td>
<td>The CWPP provides a framework to coordinate a multi-agency and stakeholder approach to fire planning and response across Lane County.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Policy</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>How the CWPP Addresses Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oregon Statewide Land Use Goal 7: Areas Subject to Natural Hazards:</strong> Goal seven requires local governments to adopt measures in their comprehensive plan to reduce risk to people and property from natural hazards.</td>
<td>The Goal requires local governments, federal and state land managers to complete natural hazard inventories, and local land managers alter land use designations to minimize risk to people and property from natural hazards.</td>
<td>The CWPP includes a wildfire risk assessment for Lane County, which may be used as new wildfire hazard inventory information in the Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Oregon Forestland Dwelling Units Statute, ORS 215.730:** The statute provides criteria for approving dwellings located on lands zoned for forest and mixed agriculture/forest use. | The Statute directs county governments to require, as a condition of approval, that single family dwellings on lands zoned as forestland meets requirements for construction materials, fuel breaks, water supply, and location in fire protection districts. | The Lane County Code and Rural Comprehensive Plan currently meet requirements of the state statute for dwellings on lands zoned forestlands. The Hazardous Fuel Subcommittee drafted suggested revisions to County Code.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Policy</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>How the CWPP Addresses Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Forestland-Urban Interface Fire Protection Act (Oregon Defensible Space Law): Promotes the creation of a comprehensive wildland-urban interface fire protection system in Oregon.</td>
<td>The Act contains provisions for county governing bodies to: -Establish a forestland-urban interface classification committee -Establish a forestland-urban interface criteria and classification program -Encourage landowner forestland-urban interface fire mitigation actions</td>
<td>The advisory committee convened to coordinate the CWPP may also serve as the forestland-urban interface classification committee. The CWPP includes a risk assessment and designates a wildland-urban interface in Lane County that may be used in the criteria and classification program required by Oregon Defensible Space Law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan 2020</td>
<td>“Create a disaster-resilient state of Oregon such that natural hazard events result in no loss of life, minimal property damage, and limited long-term impacts to the economy.”</td>
<td>The CWPP includes a wildfire risk assessment for Lane County, which may be used as wildfire hazard inventory and will inform strategies/future projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Plan 2020</td>
<td>Provides a prioritized framework for opportunities, strategies and actions regarding forest restoration in Oregon, including how and where funding for fuels reduction and restoration work will be most effective. Identifies potential funding needs for each opportunity. Fulfill requirements of the 2008 Farm Bill</td>
<td>The CWPP Risk Assessment Includes communities at risk and identifies local actions to reduce community and risk from wildfire. The Hazardous Fuel subcommittee identified treatment strategies for fuels reduction and forest restoration. Action Items provide local opportunities for implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Plans</th>
<th>Plan Objective</th>
<th>How the CWPP works towards objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Lane County Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan 2018: Intended to assist in reducing Lane County risk from natural hazards. | (1) Meet the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000, requirements for mitigation planning.  
(2) Identify resources, information, partnerships, and strategies for risk reduction.                                                                 | The CWPP will begin to serve as the wildfire annex for the County’s Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan. The CWPP includes a wildfire risk assessment for Lane County, which may be used as wildfire hazard inventory. |
| Lane County Rural Comprehensive Plan Contains a natural hazards inventory to meet the requirements of Oregon State Planning Goal 7: Areas Subject to Natural Hazards. | Addresses Oregon State Planning Goals and sets forth policy to address each Goal for the purpose of guiding future growth and development in unincorporated areas of Lane County. | The wildfire risk assessment in the CWPP could be used to update the Natural Hazards Inventory for Lane County to identify wildfire as a hazard and implement land use regulations to address this hazard |
| Lane County Emergency Operations Plan Establishes guidelines regarding the management of disasters. | Create a safer community through planning.                                                                                                                                                                | The CWPP builds upon this document to facilitate effective pre-incident coordination and planning to future wildfire emergencies.                                                                                     |
| Lane County Parks and Open Space Plan 2018 “Provides realistic guidance for managing existing assets and providing well-maintained parks and open spaces.” | (1) “Identifies where strategic improvements, community collaborations and partnerships will help position County Parks to more strongly support outdoor recreation and a vibrant local economy.”  
(2) “Presents an investment strategy for enhancing parks and open space.” | The wildfire risk assessment in the CWPP helped identify the wildfire risk in or near parks and will continue to prioritize fuels reduction projects countywide.                                                                 |
Summary

As human development continues to spread into forestlands, the risk of wildland–urban interface fire escalates. The diverse geography, population, and land ownership patterns in Lane County create further challenges to reducing Lane County’s risk of wildfire. Many entities and programs aimed at wildfire risk response, reduction, and education exist, but capacity to integrate resources and information are limited. The risk assessment and action plan of the Lane County CWPP strives to create opportunities to improve collaboration, enhance wildfire mitigation efforts, and reduce Lane County’s overall risk to wildfire.
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Section 2 Risk Assessment

Introduction

A primary component of the Lane County CWPP is the Wildfire Risk Assessment, which evaluates the potential loss of lives, property, and essential infrastructure in the event of a wildland-urban interface fire. This assessment provides a local perspective on wildfire risk and broadly identifies communities and areas within Lane County that are at risk. It does not replace regional, statewide, or national data. Rather, it has been updated to better understand wildfire risk at a scale useful for local county-level decision making and should be used in conjunction with other wildfire assessment tools and data when appropriate. Information gathered through this assessment is intended to help emergency managers and fire-fighting professionals prioritize areas of concern for further analysis and mitigation activities.

The CWPP Steering Committee updated the risk assessment using current wildfire data from the Oregon Wildfire Risk Explorer (OWRE), compiled and published by Oregon Department of Forestry and US Forest Service, as well as a wide variety of stakeholders throughout Oregon. This data is the most up to date, quantitative fire risk data available at this time. The 2005 Risk Assessment included in-depth analysis done at that time which provides important details regarding Lane County’s wildfire risk. Specifically, the 2005 Risk Assessment evaluated wildfire risk at a finer scale as compared to the data from the OWRE, which provides wildfire risk data for the state. Refer to the 2005 CWPP for more information.

The specific goals of updating the assessment are to:

1. Incorporate the most current wildfire risk data into the CWPP in order to determine the potential risk from interface fires for Lane County communities;
2. Establish updated community base maps for overall wildfire risk and for the wildland-urban interface;
3. Identify areas for refined analysis, potentially through community or neighborhood level assessments;
4. Provide insight for the prioritization of hazardous fuel treatment projects.

The updated Risk Assessment Section provides a discussion of the scale at which wildfire risk was assessed in Lane County and the approach of the assessment. The section evaluates maps demonstrating wildfire risk, wildland-urban interface areas, potential impact of wildfire, and communities at risk. The final part of this section explains limitations of the assessment and provides general assessment findings. Appendix C of the CWPP provides a more in-depth explanation of the data sources and methods utilized in this Risk Assessment.
Assessment Areas and Approach

In order to present mapped findings at a meaningful scale, the updated maps have been divided into assessment areas that align with Lane County’s ecoregions: the Coast Range, Willamette Valley, and the Cascades. Ecoregions were chosen as the assessment level to accommodate the scale provided by the OWRE, as well as reflect the dominant fire regimes in Lane County. The watershed level assessment areas from the 2005 plan were not utilized in the updated maps because the watershed assessment level represented Lane County at a scale not compatible with data from the OWRE.

Figure 2.1: Assessment Areas

The ecoregions utilized in the updated maps are defined as Level III by the United States Environmental Protection Agency, where the ecoregion data was sourced. Ecoregions are areas where ecosystems, including the type, quality, and quantity of environmental resources are generally similar. At Level III, the continental United States is divided into 105 ecoregions, three of which fall within the boundaries of Lane County. The following maps are presented at a countywide and ecoregion level.

Map Discussion and Findings

The following section includes analysis of the maps generated for the updated risk assessment. The maps displayed below were generated using data from the OWRE, a statewide tool that provides wildfire data to communities across Oregon for the purpose of aiding the development of community wildfire protection plans. The CWPP Steering Committee identified new overall wildfire risk and wild-land urban interface (WUI) maps as being the most critical maps to update. This assessment also includes analysis of the potential impact of wildfire
and a map depicting priority areas for fuel reduction. The risk assessment maps are important aspect of the CWPP because they inform areas of wildfire risk related to resources and development. The following maps are presented and discussed in this section.

- Overall Wildfire Risk
- Overall Wildfire Risk: Coast Range Ecoregion
- Overall Wildfire Risk: Willamette Valley Ecoregion
- Overall Wildfire Risk: Cascades Ecoregion
- Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) Map
- WUI: Coast Range Ecoregion
- WUI: Willamette Valley Ecoregion
- WUI: Cascades Ecoregion
- Wildfire Potential Impact
- Wildfire Potential Impact: Coast Range Ecoregion
- Wildfire Potential Impact: Willamette Valley Ecoregion
- Wildfire Potential Impact: Cascades Ecoregion
- Rural Response: Priorities for Fuel Reduction Map
- Communities at Risk

**Overall Wildfire Risk Map**
The Lane County Overall Wildfire Risk Map presents modified wildfire risk data from the OWRE. This data is the product of the likelihood and consequence of wildfire on all mapped highly valued resources and assets combined: critical infrastructure, developed recreation, housing unit density, seed orchards, sawmills, historic structures, timber, municipal watersheds, vegetation condition, and terrestrial and aquatic wildlife habitat. Risk categories from OWRE data were consolidated to better inform local decision making. See Appendix C for a description of how overall wildfire risk data and display was changed to reflect local considerations. The dataset considers the likelihood of wildfire greater than 250 acres (likelihood of burning), the susceptibility of resources and assets to wildfire of different intensities, and the likelihood of those intensities. The data values reflect a range of impacts from a very high negative value, where wildfire is detrimental to one or more resources or assets (for example, structures, infrastructure, early seral stage and/or sensitive forests), to positive, where wildfire will produce an overall benefit (for example, vegetation condition/forest health, and wildlife habitat).

It should be noted that specific conditions can vary widely with local topography, fuels, and weather, especially local winds. In all areas, under warm, dry, windy, and drought conditions, higher likelihood of fire starts, higher flame lengths/fire intensities, more ember activity, a wildfire more difficult to control, and more severe fire effects and impacts should be expected.

The wildfire risk identified throughout Lane County is classified as high, moderate, and low risk. These classifications are defined below:
**High Risk:** Wildfire risk is very high or high for all mapped resources and assets combined: critical infrastructure, developed recreation, housing unit density, seed orchards, sawmills, historic structures, timber, municipal watersheds, vegetation condition, and terrestrial and aquatic wildlife habitat. High represents the 80th to 100th percentile of values across the landscape.

**Moderate Risk:** Wildfire risk is moderate or low for all mapped resources and assets combined: critical infrastructure, developed recreation, housing unit density, seed orchards, sawmills, historic structures, timber, municipal watersheds, vegetation condition, and terrestrial and aquatic wildlife habitat. Moderate represents the 29th to 80th percentile of values across the landscape.

**Low Risk:** Wildfire risk is very low or could be beneficial for mapped resources and assets combined (for example, the cumulative value is positive, typically due to beneficial effects on forest health/vegetation condition and/or wildlife habitat). Low risk represents 0-29th percentile of values on the landscape.

**Figure 2.2: Overall Wildfire Risk**

Overall, the County is mainly characterized by high and moderate wildfire risk. The high risk exists primarily in the Cascades Ecoregion while the Willamette Valley and Coast Range Ecoregions contain moderate risk. The wildfire risk for each ecoregion is described in the following sections.
Overall Wildfire Risk – Coast Range Ecoregion Map

The Coast Range Wildfire Risk Map shows primarily moderate risk with some areas of low risk. There are small areas of high risk along Highway 126, near Mapleton, and along East Mapleton Road. As compared to the other ecoregions, wildfire risk in the Coast Range can be characterized as moderate.

Figure 2.3: Overall Wildfire Risk – Coast Range Ecoregion
Overall Wildfire Risk – Willamette Valley Ecoregion Map

The Willamette Valley ecoregion contains the Eugene-Springfield metro area, the largest urbanized area in Lane County. This ecoregion is characterized as intermingled areas of moderate and low wildfire risk. However, there are pockets of high wildfire risk within the ecoregion. These areas are mainly found at the urban fringe, where urban and suburban level development meets forestlands.

Areas identified as high wildfire risk are the south hills of Eugene, southeast Springfield, Marcola, Dexter, along Lost Creek Road (south of Dexter), south of Creswell, west of Cottage Grove, and along Mosby Creek Road (southeast of Cottage Grove). Although, the Willamette Valley Ecoregion does not have wide swaths of high wildfire risk, areas of high risk exist and are concerning due to the residential development close to and intermixed with forestlands.

Figure 2.4: Overall Wildfire Risk – Willamette Valley Ecoregion
Overall Wildfire Risk – Cascades Ecoregion Map
The Cascades ecoregion contains a majority of Lane County’s high wildfire risk because the area is mainly forested lands with mountainous topography, frequent lightning events, and less development. There are several communities within the Cascades ecoregion that contain, or are near high wildfire risk areas, including Westfir, Oakridge, Dorena, Blue River, and McKenzie Bridge. Generally, wildfire risk in the Cascades ecoregion can be characterized as high.

Figure 2.5: Overall Wildfire Risk – Cascades Ecoregion
Wildland Urban Interface Map
The wildland-urban interface (WUI) is the area where houses meet or intermingle with undeveloped wildland vegetation. This makes the WUI a focal area for human-environment conflicts such as wildland fires, habitat fragmentation, invasive species, and biodiversity decline. Using geographic information systems (GIS), the Oregon Wildfire Risk Explorer integrated U.S. Census and United States Geological Survey National Land Cover Data, to map the Federal Register definition of WUI (Federal Register 66:751, 2001) for the conterminous United States from 1990-2010. This WUI layer was clipped to the boundaries of Lane County and further separated into Lane County’s ecoregions as the assessment areas.

The Lane County WUI is large, approximately 1,481,400 acres or 2,315 square miles. This WUI is over 1,000 square miles less than the WUI defined in the 2005 CWPP. The reduction in WUI area presents more specificity regarding where development meets and intermingles with forestlands, which allows a more precise identification of communities that may be at risk.

Although the WUI has decreased in size with this assessment compared to the 2005 assessment, the updated WUI still extends east to west across Lane County – from the Western Cascades, well up the McKenzie and Middle Fork Willamette watersheds, down through the Willamette Valley foothills and floor, across the coastal lowlands and mountains to the Pacific Ocean. The size of Lane County’s wildland-urban interface is the result of a dispersed population in close proximity to abundant vegetative fuels. Nearly 90% of Lane County is forestland and nearly 2.5 million of the county’s 2.9 million acres are zoned F-1, non-impacted forestland. The U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management own and manage the majority of the F1 zoned property. These forestlands contain extensive fuels comprised of flammable grasses, brush, slash and timber. Excluding the population of Eugene/Springfield metro area, nearly 100,000 Lane County residents live throughout or adjacent to these forestlands. The majority of these residents live in rural population centers along the I-5 corridor and other major transportation routes, including Highways 126, 101, 58, and 36. In addition, substantial pockets of residential development exist in the Mohawk Valley, Wolf Creek, Deadwood Creek, Row River Road, Mosby Creek Road, Lost Creek Road, High Prairie Road, and the North Fork Siuslaw Road areas.

The OWRE WUI map has been simplified to display three categories of wildland-urban interface: interface, medium density intermix and low density intermix. Generally, interface areas are defined as urban or suburban development that exists adjacent to forestlands while intermix areas are characterized as suburban or rural development within forestlands. The specific classifications are defined below.

**Interface: High and Low Density:** The WUI in these areas contains varying densities of urban and suburban residential development that are adjacent to forestlands.
Intermix: Medium Density: The WUI in these areas contains suburban residential development that is within forestlands.

Intermix: Low Density: The WUI in these areas contains rural residential development within forestlands.

These categories are displayed on the following map for the entire county.

Figure 2.6: Wildland Urban Interface
Wildland Urban Interface - Coast Range Ecoregion Map

The Coast Range ecoregion WUI is generally characterized by low density intermix with some areas of medium density intermix throughout the ecoregion. Areas of high and low density interface are minimal in this ecoregion and are primarily found around and within the City of Florence. Notable areas of medium density intermix and low density interface are: Dunes City, north of Florence city limits, areas around Mercer and Sutton Lake, Highway 126 between Florence and Mapleton, Mapleton, Swisshome, Deadwood, Triangle Lake, High Pass Road, and Walton.

Figure 2.7: Wildland Urban Interface - Coast Range Ecoregion
Wildland Urban Interface - Willamette Valley Ecoregion Map
The majority of the Willamette Valley ecoregion is classified as WUI, extending primarily from the Eugene-Springfield metro area. Notable corridors include Marcola Road, McKenzie Highway, Highway 58, and Interstate 5. Notable areas include Veneta, Elmira, north of Fern Ridge Reservoir, Crow, Lorane, Lowell, Pleasant Hill, the south and southwest hills of Eugene, and Coburg. These corridors and areas are almost exclusively classified as WUI areas.

Figure 2.8: Wildland Urban Interface - Willamette Valley Ecoregion
Wildland Urban Interface - Cascades Ecoregion Map
The Cascades ecoregion WUI is generally characterized by primarily low density intermix with some areas of medium density intermix throughout the ecoregion. Notable corridors include the eastern portions of McKenzie Highway, Row River Road and Hwy 58. Notable areas include: Leaburg, Vida, Blue River, McKenzie Bridge, Westfir, Oakridge, London and Dorena. These communities are interface and intermix WUI areas.

Figure 2.9: Wildland Urban Interface - Cascades Ecoregion
Overall Wildfire Potential Impact Map

The Lane County Overall Wildfire Potential Impact map presents data from the OWRE showing the impact that wildfire can have on a certain area. Overall, potential impact represents the consequence of a potential wildfire on all mapped highly valued assets and resources combined: critical infrastructure, developed recreation, housing unit density, seed orchards, sawmills, historic structures, timber, municipal watersheds, vegetation condition, and terrestrial and aquatic wildlife habitat. This data layer does not include the likelihood of an area burning, but it shows potential impact only to characterize exposure to wildfire risk. The values reflect a range of impacts from a smaller negative rating, where wildfire is detrimental (for example, to structures, infrastructure, and early seral stage and sensitive forests), to a larger number, where wildfire has limited negative effects and/or produces an overall benefit (for example, to improve vegetation condition or wildlife habitat). See the next page for a countywide map.

The CWPP Steering Committee labeled potential impacts as high, moderate, and low impact. These classifications are further defined below.

High Impact: The consequence, or potential effect of wildfire to mapped timber resources is high or very high. Wildfire is highly detrimental to timber values. Very high represents the top 20 percent of negatively-impacted values across the landscape.

Moderate Impact: The consequence, or potential effect of wildfire to mapped timber resources is moderate to low. Wildfire is damaging to timber values. Moderate represents the 29th to 80th percentile of values across the landscape.

Low Impact: The consequence, or potential effect of wildfire to mapped timber resources is very low (e.g. reduced hazardous fuel, and reduced, forest health/vegetation condition), producing a "fuel treatment effect" at very low flame lengths. Low impact and benefit represents 0-29th percentile of values on the landscape.

Figure 2.10: Overall Wildfire Potential Impact
Wildfire Potential Impact - Coast Range Ecoregion Map
The Coast Range ecoregion is primarily characterized by high potential impact from wildfire. The reason for such a high potential impact in this ecoregion is the existence of valuable timber resources within an ecosystem that historically experiences infrequent fires and results in high fuel loading.

Figure 2.11: Wildfire Potential Impact - Coast Range Ecoregion
Wildfire Potential Impact – Willamette Valley Ecoregion Map

The potential impact from wildfire in the Willamette Valley Ecoregion varies greatly from the Coast Range to the Cascades because there are fewer timber resources in the valley. However, there are still sporadic areas of high potential impact due to other types of assets found in this ecoregion. The main assets in this area are infrastructure, housing, and recreation. These assets are clustered around larger cities and developed corridors, such as Eugene/Springfield, Cottage Grove and Veneta, given the housing density associated with these areas.

Figure 2.12: Wildfire Potential Impact – Willamette Valley Ecoregion
Wildfire Potential Impact – Cascades Ecoregion Map
The potential wildfire impact for the Cascades ecoregion is similar to that of the Coast Range due to the availability of timber resources and limited access for firefighting resources. These coupled with steep topography increase potential impacts.

Figure 2.13: Wildfire Potential Impact – Cascades Ecoregion
Rural Response: Priorities for Fuel Reduction Map
This map is a combination of the Potential Impact to Infrastructure layer from OWRE as well as concern areas identified by local fire response agencies. The Potential Impact to Infrastructure layer from the OWRE was simplified to display linear resources, such as roads, transmission lines and railways, without regard to level of risk. This map may be used in the future to refine concern areas, develop evacuation strategies, and/or inform countywide hazardous fuel priority treatment areas.

Areas of concern were identified by the following departments and agencies: United States Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, Oregon Department of Forestry, and the Lane Fire Defense Board (Lane County Fire Departments and Districts). The listed agencies coordinated with local government and stakeholders to identify and map concern areas. Identified areas were selected using a range of categorical attributes with concerns categorized by fuel type and loading, community attributes, access, critical infrastructure, and cultural resources. See Appendix C for an expanded discussion of category descriptions. These categories are not displayed in the map, but are listed attributes in GIS Data.

Figure 2.14: Rural Response: Priorities for Fuel Reduction

Communities At Risk Map
A key output of the risk assessment is an understanding of the hazards that wildfires pose to Lane County communities. For the purpose of this plan, Communities At Risk (CAR) have been identified using the 2020 Oregon Department of Forestry CAR Report that identifies communities at risk for all of Oregon. The report identifies 508 CAR in Oregon, 29 of which are in Lane County. Communities are identified by community names by relying on the quantitative wildfire risk assessment and WUI data from the OWRE. The report
categorizes each community by its wildfire risk, which is based on number of structures, exposure, burn probability and hazard.

The 2005 Lane County risk assessment identified communities at risk exclusively by their fire protection district service boundaries, which was consistent with statewide methodologies at the time. However, the 2020 CAR report utilizes the Quantitative Wildfire Risk Assessment (USFS) community names to identify at-risk areas and a watershed model to identify community risk and WUI data. This methodology produces a more specific community format for identifying CAR.

- Pleasant Hill
- Cottage Grove
- Creswell
- Dexter
- Hazeldell
- Lowell
- Coburg
- Deadwood
- Dunes City
- Eugene
- Glenwood
- Goshen
- Junction City
- Lorane
- Mapleton
- Lower McKenzie
- Oakridge
- Upper McKenzie
- Walker
- Westfir
- McKenzie
- Mohawk
- Rainbow
- Santa Clara, Eugene
- Siuslaw
- Springfield
- Swisshome
- Veneta
- Willakenzie
The CAR map identifies communities at risk with points that represent the fire district or community, and displays the WUI boundary and priority areas for fuel reduction activities layer discussed above. The WUI and priority areas are included on this map to demonstrate areas within the CAR that may contain development that is near or located within forest lands or are areas of significance for fire districts.

It should be noted that the 2020 report in which these CAR were identified pertains to the entire state, meaning that data was collected and analyzed at the statewide level. The implication of this is that the ODF report does not capture smaller nuances of wildfire risk at the local level. The CAR data is highly valuable, but the WUI and Rural Response: Priorities for Fuel Reduction maps generated specifically for Lane County are useful when considering the identified communities at risk.

![Figure 2.15: Communities At Risk](image)

**Risk Assessment Limitations**

Wildland fires are complex events: their behavior and the potential damage they may cause are affected by several variables. The Steering Committee made every attempt to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the assessment. However, limitations in data and resources made it impossible to comprehensively assess every factor affecting wildland fires countywide. Ideally, periodic updates and data enhancements resulting from state and local community assessments can address these challenges. Future local community assessments can add value to the CWPP through performing more in-depth neighborhood or parcel-level risk evaluations for areas identified as high wildfire risk or WUI. These local community assessments may help further refine and update the countywide assessment.
Summary of Key Findings

Maintenance
The Lane County CWPP and its components, especially the risk assessment, require long term maintenance to continue to effectively support Lane County. Institutionalizing this long-term process and assigning maintenance responsibilities to oversee long term maintenance can help ensure that the plan continues to be a functional document.

Risk Assessment
Overall, Lane County has a moderate risk to wildland-urban interface fire, but high-risk areas do exist throughout Lane County. The risk assessment can be shared with local communities and used as a decision-making tool to help prioritize fuels reduction projects. However, to ensure long term viability, the risk assessment should be updated and enhanced with more precise data from the local community level.

Community Planning
Because of Lane County’s scale, the countywide risk assessment could not assess the structural ignitability of every structure located in the wildland-urban interface. Local planning efforts in small communities and neighborhoods should collect more refined, site specific data required to address the structural ignitability component of the risk assessment. Local community planning efforts are vital because as site specific data is gathered at the micro level, it can be fed back into the countywide risk assessment. The incorporation of this refined local data into the countywide assessment will help to provide a better picture of overall risk in Lane County.

Collaboration
The risk assessment draws upon a wide variety of data sources. As a result, it will be important to maintain collaborative approaches to identifying, acquiring, and utilizing data layers among data users and providers. Because of the importance that local refined data play in community planning efforts, collaboration among the county and local communities will also be important.


Section 3 Community Outreach and Collaboration

A key element in community fire planning is the meaningful discussion it promotes among community members. The success of the Lane County CWPP is dependent on the involvement and input of local stakeholders. A plan that accurately reflects the community’s interests and priorities will have greater legitimacy and success in implementing the recommended actions. A Lane County Landowner Survey was done to identify these needs.

Purpose

To gather input on attitudes and opinions regarding wildfire, the CWPP Steering Committee developed and administered a mail and online outreach survey for rural landowners in Lane County. The purpose of the landowner survey was to gain information about how landowners in rural and wildland-urban interface areas of Lane County perceive the potential risk of wildfire and their attitudes towards risk reduction and preparedness strategies. The survey results may be used to focus public outreach activities aimed at wildfire risk reduction and loss prevention. Additional benefits of the survey include; educating and informing the public, incorporating public values into decision-making, improving the quality of decisions, and building trust in this planning process.

Methodology

The survey questions included five main themes:

- **Characteristics of Survey Respondents**: This section reports information about respondent characteristics including: educational attainment, home ownership, age, and household income.

- **Wildland Fire Risk Awareness and Communication**: This section presents information about respondents’ understanding of personal property, neighborhood, and community risk awareness. The survey also asked questions about how respondents receive information pertaining to wildland fire.

- **Fire Protection and Preparedness**: This section presents the results of questions about fire protection services and level of preparedness for a wildland fire emergency.

- **Reducing Property Risk to Wildland Fire**: This section identifies actions landowners would be willing to take in the future to protect their property from wildland fire.

- **Reducing Community Risk to Wildland Fire**: This section presents landowners’ opinions about protecting the greater community from wildland fire.
Survey questions were mostly repeated from the 2005 Landowner Survey questions which were developed from two primary sources: social science research studies supported by the National Fire Plan, and all hazard risk perception household survey administered by the Oregon Natural Hazards Workgroup in 2002.

The survey was mailed to a random sample of landowners selected from the Regional Land Information Database.

The sample frame (e.g., the list that the sample was drawn from) included landowners with property in the Impacted Forest Lands and Rural Residential zones. The sample frame also included lands, regardless of zone designation, determined to be in wildland-urban interface areas using the wildland-urban interface map on page 32. Public lands, low risk inner city lands under 5 acres, and industrial and commercial zoned lands were not included in the sample frame.

The survey was administered to 5,125 randomly selected landowners during July and August of 2019. The process included the mailing of a postcard telling landowners to expect the paper survey via mail and where to take it online. About one week later, the survey packet was mailed. The survey packet included: a cover letter explaining the purpose of the survey, a paper survey, a postage paid return envelope, and information regarding the Firewise program, in which Lane County is a participating community (see Appendix F under Firewise USA Communities and Firewise USA Communities, Lane County for a link to more information).

The survey was also advertised through Lane County’s social media channels, such as Facebook and with a press release.

The CWPP Steering Committee received 1,550 valid survey responses yielding a 23% response rate.

**Limitations of Sampling Methodology**

A key limitation of any random sample survey is non-response bias. If one were to assume that the sample was perfectly random and that there was no response bias, then this survey would have a margin of error of ±3% at the 95% confidence level based on the sample size relative to the sample population. This means that if the survey were conducted 100 times, the results would end up within three percent of those presented in this report.

Non-response bias is an issue in all surveys, but is particularly important in mailed surveys due to response rates. The landowner survey received a 23% response rate which is average for mailed surveys. The 23% includes those that responded via paper and online. The Steering Committee was unable to calculate a response rate for those that responded as a result of the social media outreach. The survey results should not be considered representative of all Lane County residents, nor was it intended to be. The survey was intended to identify attitudes and opinions of landowners in the rural and wildland-urban interface areas. Thus, the scope of the survey was intentionally limited. The unique nature of the sample and a lack of phone numbers (to complete a non-response bias analysis) makes it difficult to determine areas of potential response bias. Despite
the potential for response bias, our assessment is that the results provide an accurate representation of the attitudes and opinions of landowners in wildland-urban interface areas of Lane County in 2019. It is also important to note that the following responses were given by rural and wildland-urban interface residents and it should not be assumed landowners are fire professionals.

**Organization of Results**

The survey results are organized into sections following the five survey themes listed above.

Tables and figures are used to display the data when possible. Tables and figures are titled and linked to the corresponding question number from the survey. If there was a noticeable change in response from the 2005 survey, it is noted in the description.

See Appendix E to view the 2019 paper surveys which includes the questions asked in the survey and the responses completed by landowners. See Appendix H for 2005 survey information. The response percentages are documented in the survey attachment. This section also documents written comments provided by respondents of the survey.

**Findings**

**Characteristics of Survey Respondents**

The survey instrument asked landowners to answer key demographic questions in order to help define the characteristics of the respondents. Specifically, the questions asked about age, educational attainment, household income, and information about the respondents’ property and household. Because this survey targeted a unique population, landowners in the wildland-urban interface, it was not possible to obtain comparative census data.

The average age of respondents was 62 years old; respondents ranged from 20 to 94 years of age.

Seventy percent of the respondents had an average household income above $50,000 in 2018 (Figure 3.1).
Figure 3.1: Household Income in 2018 (Q-22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 or more</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $24,999</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $14,999</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 - $9,999</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than $5,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OSU/Landowner Survey 2020

Figure 3.2: Level of Educational Attainment (Q-23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postcollege degree</td>
<td>27.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree</td>
<td>33.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college/trade school</td>
<td>24.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate/GED</td>
<td>12.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade School/no schooling</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OSU/Landowner Survey 2020

Figure 3.2 illustrates the educational attainment of respondents. Eighty-five percent have attained some college education, a college degree, or a post-college degree. Persons with a high school degree or less are underrepresented among survey respondents.

The survey asked general questions about respondents’ properties, including ownership and use of property. The majority of respondents indicate they owned their home (94%) and were year-round residents of Lane County (95%). The average length of landownership was 19 years; length of ownership ranged from
2 months to 114 years (inferred to be a result of multigenerational ownership). Five percent of the respondents primarily used their property for business purposes; of these respondents, 62% indicated that they used the property for agricultural and forest industries. Figure 3.3 shows the types of businesses located on the property if the property was used primarily as a business. To see a list of the business identified in the “other” category visit Appendix H.

**Figure 3.3: Types of Business Use of Property (Q-18.1)**

*Source: OSU/Landowner Survey 2020*

**Wildland Fire Risk Awareness and Communication**

To better understand perceptions of risk, the survey included several questions about wildland fire risk on respondents’ property, in their neighborhoods and around their communities. Figure 3.4 shows respondents’ perceptions of wildfire risk. Over half (77%) of respondents perceived their property as medium to high risk for wildland fires. This is consistent with local wildfire risk data that describes approximately half of Lane County residents live in medium to high risk areas. However, when compared to national wildfire risk data, overall Lane County residents live in medium-low to low risk areas.

Respondents perceived their neighbors’ properties to have a slightly higher risk than their own (85%) and their communities to have a medium to low risk compared to their personal property (59%).
The perception of risk identified by landowners in 2019 was notably different than those in 2005. In 2005, 80% of landowners perceived their property and neighborhoods to be low to medium risk for wildfire.

**Figure 3.4: 2005 and 2019 Perceptions of Wildland Fire Risk (Q-1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Experience</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents with wildfire experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Witnesses wildfire or observed smoke or other effects</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No experience with wildfire</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffered property damage from a wildfire</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evacuated home due to a wildfire</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OSU/Landowner Survey 2020

**Personal Experience with Wildland Fire**

The survey asked landowners about their personal experiences with wildland fire. Figure Table 3.1 shows the types of experience respondents have had with wildland fire. Thirty-six percent reported that they had no previous experience with wildland fire. Just above half (63%), reported that they had witnessed a wildfire, smoke and other effects of wildfire, but few (10%) had actually evacuated their home or sustained property damage.

**Table 3.1: Personal Experience with Wildland Fire (Q-2)**

Sources of Information About Protecting Property

An important component of the landowner survey was gathering data on effective means of wildland fire information dispersal. The survey asked respondents how they received information about property protection in the past, as well as preferences for receiving information in the future.
Figure 3.5 shows how respondents received information in the past about protecting their property against losses from wildland fire. The top resources included the news media (52%), fact sheets/brochures (38%), and local fire departments or districts (33%). Survey respondents reported that they did not widely use neighborhood/community groups or the Internet to gather information about protecting property from wildland fire. Information availability for protecting property from wildland fire is increasing in Lane County. The 2005 survey revealed that 27% of participants had not received any information, but that number decreased to 19% for the 2019 survey.

**Figure 3.5: Past Sources of Information About Protecting Property from Wildland Fire (Q-3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News media (radio, newspaper, TV)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact sheet/brochure</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local fire department or district</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, friends, or neighbors</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have not received information</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public meeting or workshop</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood or community group</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey gathered information about effective means of future correspondence relating to wildland fire property protection (Figure 3.6). Respondents’ identified mail (59%), fact sheets/brochures (46%), internet (45%), and fire departments (30%) as the top four preferred methods to receive information. Internet and fire departments moving ahead of newspaper and television which were identified in the top four preferred methods in 2005.
Figure 3.6: Preferred Sources of Receiving Information About Protecting Property from Wildland Fire (Q-4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact sheet/brochure</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire department/rescue</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public workshop/meetings</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Extension Service</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OSU/Landowner Survey 2020 OSU/CPW 2020

Fire Protection Services and Wildland Fire Preparation

The survey gathered information about landowners’ knowledge of their fire protection service providers. The survey also asked landowners about emergency preparedness, including evacuation procedures and insurance coverage.

Table 3.2 shows that 53% of respondents receive fire protection services from a rural fire district. Seven percent of respondents reported that they did not know if their property was protected by a fire protection service.

Table 3.2: Fire Protection Services (Q-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire Protection Service Provider</th>
<th>% Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Fire Protection District</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Serviced by a Fire Department or District</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OSU/Landowner Survey 2020

Figure Table 3.3 illustrates respondents’ answers to questions about wildland fire preparedness and insurance coverage. The majority (88%) of the respondents did not know, or had not received information about community evacuation procedures. Fifty-nine percent of respondents indicated that they did not have personal household evacuation procedures in the case of a wildland fire emergency. While fifty-nine percent is a significant amount of respondents not having an evacuation plan, this is an eight percent decrease from the 2005 survey results.
One half (51%) of survey respondents reported that their insurance policies covered losses or structural damage incurred from wildland fire. However, 45% did not know if their insurance policies would protect their properties from damages or losses from wildland fire.

**Table 3.3: Wildland Fire Evacuation Procedures and Insurance Coverage (Q-6)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has your community informed you of their wildland fire evacuation procedures?</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your household have a wildland fire evacuation plan?</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your homeowners or business insurance policy include coverage in the event of structural damage or loss due to wildland fire?</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OSU/Landowner Survey 2020

**Reducing Property Risk to Wildland Fire**

The survey gathered information from landowners about measures they have implemented to reduce the risk of wildland fire on their property. This section asked about specific risk reduction strategies.

The majority (89%) of respondents indicated that they have taken measures to reduce losses associated with wildland fire. Figure 3.7 shows the types of risk reduction measures taken by respondents. The most frequently reported measures were reducing vegetation near structures and clearing roof/gutters of debris. Fewer landowners reported implementing the measures that required higher financial investment.

**Figure 3.7: Actions Taken to Reduce the Potential Losses from Wildland Fire (Q-7)**

Source: OSU/Landowner Survey 2020
Preferred Risk Reduction Actions and Incentives

The survey asked landowners about their willingness to take specific actions to reduce the potential impacts of wildland fire on their property. Table 3.4 shows the likelihood of respondents to take different risk reduction actions. The majority of respondents indicated they are very likely to reduce vegetation and debris (79%) and create defensible zones around structures (65%). Respondents were less likely to improve emergency access or use fire-resistant building materials.

### Table 3.4: Risk Reduction Actions Most Likely to Take (Q-8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Reduction Action</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Not Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce debris and vegetation on property</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear a defensible zone around the property</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve emergency access to property</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use fire resistant building materials</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OSU/Landowner Survey 2020

The survey asked landowners which incentives, if any, would motivate them to take additional steps to protect their properties from wildland fire (Table 3.5). The highest percentage of respondents indicated that insurance discounts (70%) or tax breaks/incentives (69%) would motivate them to implement risk reduction steps. About half of respondents indicated that grant programs would encourage better protection measures, double the numbers from the 2005 survey.

### Table 3.5: Preferred Incentives to Better Protect Property (Q-9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Incentive</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Discounts</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Break or Incentive</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Program</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the Above</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OSU/Landowner Survey 2020

Local government and federal agencies provide a number of landowner assistance and recognition programs. The survey asked respondents to describe their familiarity with these programs (Table 3.6). Landowners were overwhelmingly unfamiliar with all available programs. Of the five programs respondents were least familiar with the fuels reduction cost share grants through Natural Resource Conservation Service (90%), Fire adaptive communities (89%), and Lane County Firewise Grant Program (84%). Nearly three and a half percent of landowners have participated in the Lane County Grant Program (3.4%), Firewise Communities (3.3%), and Oregon Department of Forestry Fuels Reduction Program (3.2%).
Table 3.6: Familiarity with Existing Incentive and Recognition Programs. (Q-10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Incentive</th>
<th>Percent participation in program</th>
<th>Percent Familiar</th>
<th>Percent Unfamiliar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fuels Reduction Cost Share Grants Through the Natural Resources Conservation</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (NRCS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firewise Communities</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Adaptive Communities</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Department of Forestry Fuels Reduction Program</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane County Firewise Grant Program</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OSU/Landowner Survey 2020

Reducing Community Risk to Wildland Fire
The survey asked respondents their opinions and preferences for different strategies to reduce community risk to wildfire. Communities may take a variety of approaches to wildland fire mitigation. The questions in this section help to inform policy decisions by providing better understanding of the level of landowner support for different approaches.

Hazardous Fuels Treatment
Respondents indicated their levels of support for four methods of hazardous fuels treatments in their communities (Table 3.7). The treatments included: no action, chemical treatment, prescribed burning, and mechanical thinning. Of the four, the two preferred methods were mechanical thinning (93%) and prescribed burning (73%). Respondents were divided over chemical treatment, with a 32% response in support of chemical treatment.

Table 3.7: Support for Hazardous Fuels Treatments (Q-11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Treatment</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
<th>Neither supportive nor unsupportive</th>
<th>Unsupportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Action</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Treatment</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescribed Burning</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Thinning</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OSU/Landowner Survey 2020
Landowner Priorities for Future Wildland Fire Planning

The survey asked landowners about their opinions on the importance of different planning priorities for wildland fire. Figure 3.8 shows the level of importance placed on different planning priorities by respondents. The majority of respondents indicated that each of the planning priorities listed were very or somewhat important. Protecting critical infrastructure, reducing damage to utilities, educating landowners, and protecting private property were the priorities ranked with highest importance. Of the priorities listed, respondents indicated that restoring forests to natural conditions and protecting historical and cultural landmarks were the least important.

Figure 3.8: Priorities for Wildland Fire Planning (Q-12)

![Figure 3.8: Priorities for Wildland Fire Planning (Q-12)](source: OSU/Landowner Survey 2020)
Figure 3.9 shows respondents’ opinions on responsibility for protecting property against wildland fire. The majority (96%) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the responsibility for protecting property is shared between private landowners, local, state and federal agencies. Eighty-five percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that landowners who manage the forest are responsible for wildland fire protection. Fewer respondents agreed that the Oregon Department of Forestry or the community fire department is solely responsible.

**Figure 3.9: Responsibility for Protecting Private Property from Wildland Fire (Q-13)**

| Protecting property from wildland fires is a shared responsibility | 
|---|---|---|
| The property owner that manages the forest | 
| Private property owners | 
| The Oregon Department of Forestry | 
| The community fire department | 

Source: OSU/Landowner Survey 2020
There are a number of regulatory and non-regulatory activities that communities can implement to reduce wildland fire risk. Figure 3.10 shows respondents' levels of support for different risk reduction strategies. Respondents indicated the highest level of support for a public information strategy; 95% were very or somewhat supportive. Eighty-two percent or more of respondents were very or somewhat supportive of four out of five of the regulatory strategies listed. These four include access/roadway guidelines (92%) and access/roadway guidelines for new development in high hazards areas (89%). Of the risk reduction strategies listed in the survey, respondents indicated the least support for requiring that new rural residential developments be within rural fire protection district boundaries (60%), public acquisition of land in high hazard areas for open space (58%), and development of a tax service district to fund preventative wildfire reduction work and education (50%).

Figure 3.10: Regulatory and Non-Regulatory Strategies for Wildland Fire Risk Reduction (Q-14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public information</th>
<th>Access/roadway guidelines</th>
<th>Developer and builder educational programs</th>
<th>Building construction standards for new development</th>
<th>Wildland fire mitigation checklist for development</th>
<th>Vegetation management requirements</th>
<th>Public purchase of land</th>
<th>New rural developments within rural fire districts</th>
<th>Tax service district for preventative and education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions drawn from the landowner survey have been synthesized with the other outreach activities that were conducted in 2005 including the Stakeholder interviews detailed in Appendix H.
Summary of Key Findings
Several common themes emerged from the landowner survey, the stakeholder interviews, and the Firewise Workshop. The section below summarizes these common themes into eight key findings, which are depicted in Figure 3.11.

Figure 3.11. Lane County CWPP Key Findings

Risk Assessment
Overall, Lane County has a moderate risk to wildland-urban interface fire, but high-risk areas exist throughout the county. The wildfire risk assessment should be used as a decision-making tool to help prioritize fuels reduction projects.

Information in the risk assessment should be shared with local communities and updated and enhanced over time with local data.

Community Planning
Information sharing with local communities is especially important due to the large scale of Lane County. The ability of the CWPP to address structural ignitability issues is limited at the countywide level due to the lack of site-specific data. The Lane County CWPP should encourage the development of more refined community fire plans in local communities and neighborhoods through the development of partnerships and resource sharing.
Education
Although fire prevention education programs exist, one-fifth of landowners surveyed indicated that they are not receiving any information. Community outreach results identified a need for improved coordination and dissemination of educational activities regarding wildland fire risk. Educational messages should come from trusted sources, such as Oregon State University Extension, fire protection districts, and Oregon Department of Forestry. Information should be distributed through the preferred methods identified in the landowner survey, including mail, fact sheets/brochures, internet, and television.

Incentives
Many stakeholders expressed support for incentive programs, such as tax breaks and insurance benefits, as effective non-regulatory approaches to increasing participation in wildfire mitigation activities. Two-thirds of landowner survey respondents indicated that tax and/or insurance incentives would motivate them to take additional steps towards reducing risk to their property.

Lane Code
Multiple sources in the stakeholder interviews and Firewise Workshop identified the need to update the Lane Code to require wildfire safety measures in rural residential zones similar to those required in areas zoned as forestlands. Most new development occurs in rural residential areas. The landowner survey results indicate that the majority of landowners are supportive of requiring standards for building materials, emergency access, and vegetation management for new development in wildfire hazard areas. To this end, the CWPP committee conducted a review and suggested revisions to Lane County’s fuel break standards. The fuel break standards require vegetation management surrounding homes in areas zoned as forestland. See Appendix F which includes a letter of support to update vegetative management strategies in Lane County.

Treatment Types
Community outreach results indicate high levels of support for reducing hazardous vegetative fuels in Lane County. Which treatment methods are most appropriate vary based on environmental and health concerns, the range of forest types and topography and the treatment objectives. See Appendix D, Fuel Treatment Types for a list of possible hazardous vegetative fuel treatments. See Appendix F for a literature review of defensible space treatments most likely to reduce wildfire impacts to homes in Lane County and fire modeling results.

Maintenance
The Lane County CWPP and its components require long-term maintenance to continue to effectively support efforts to protect people and property from wildfire. See Appendix B, Plan Implementation and Maintenance for further details. Stakeholders identified the need to institutionalize a process and establish a coordinator position to facilitate ongoing planning and coordination of wildfire mitigation activities in Lane County. This will help to ensure that the CWPP remains a functional document.
Collaboration

Stakeholders and community members within Lane County recognize that reducing risk to wildfire is a shared responsibility and requires collaboration between citizens, non-profit organizations, agencies, and the business community. Collaboration creates opportunities to develop better solutions, share resources, and more efficiently utilize limited funding. The Lane County CWPP can help initiate improved coordination and establish a process for ongoing collaboration.
Section 4 Action Plan

Action Plan Framework

Action Plan Methods
This section includes two subsections Goals and Objectives, and Action Items. The previous 2005 Action Plan was developed through an analysis of the issues identified in the risk assessment, the landowner survey, stakeholder interviews and the Firewise Workshop. In 2020, background research on community wildfire planning, including a review of other community wildfire protection plans was conducted. The 2020 risk assessment and landowner survey data informed a systematic review of 2005 Action Items. The Steering Committee updated Action Items and reaffirmed standing Goals and Objectives. Committee members were assigned responsibility for the coordination of individual Action Items.

Goals and Objectives

The Goals and Objectives link the Action Items to one or more of the Healthy Forest Restoration Act (HFRA) requirements addressed: collaboration, prioritized fuel reduction, and/or treatment of structural ignitability. Each Action Item has a corresponding Action Item worksheet, located in Appendix A – Action Item Worksheets.

Goals
The plan goals help to guide the direction of future activities aimed at reducing risk and preventing losses from wildfire. The goals serve as guiding principles for agencies and organizations regarding the implementation of Action Items.

GOAL 1: Provide countywide leadership through partnerships to implement wildland-urban interface fire mitigation strategies in Lane County.

GOAL 2: Improve community strategies for reducing the impacts of wildland-urban interface fires.

GOAL 3: Promote wildfire risk reduction activities for private and public lands in Lane County.

Objectives
The objectives connect the goals and Action Items and help organize the action plan for efficient implementation and evaluation.

OBJECTIVE 1.1: Establish and maintain a structure and methods for coordinating the implementation of the Lane County CWPP.
OBJECTIVE 1.2: Strengthen communication and coordination among local districts, county, state, and federal agencies to effectively deliver wildland-urban interface risk reduction programs and messages.

OBJECTIVE 2.1: Review existing policies and regulations to reduce the impact of wildland-urban interface fires.

OBJECTIVE 2.2: Enhance the Lane County Wildland-Urban Interface Risk Assessment.

OBJECTIVE 2.3: Support and prioritize fuels reduction projects by watershed.

OBJECTIVE 3.1: Increase individual awareness and promote risk reduction activities through education and outreach.

OBJECTIVE 3.2: Promote the use of non-regulatory incentives to reduce structural ignitability.

Action Items

Action Items have been identified through a collaborative process and a variety of mechanisms. Action Items were informed by and tied directly to issues or needs identified throughout the planning process. Action Items were developed from several sources including but not limited to: participants of the planning process, noted deficiencies in local capability, and/or issues identified through the risk assessment. To facilitate implementation, Action Items include information on key issues addressed, coordinating organizations, potential partners, and target timeframes.

Action Items carried forward from 2005 received committee review, including accomplishments, suggestions moving forward, lessons learned and target timeframes. This information is housed within Action Item Review Forms, see Table 4.1 for the form template. Review forms for each Action Item listed in the matrix are also located in Appendix A. For a complete list of 2020 Action Items, see Table 4.2, the Lane County Community Wildfire Protection Plan Matrix.

Priority Action Items

The 2020 Steering Committee identified five priority Action Items for the next implementation term. The five priority actions are intended to guide highest need actions and be updated periodically as needed and during plan updates. The Top five priority actions are as follows:

Action Item 2.1.1 Review and develop recommendations to the Lane County Board of Commissioners for revisions to land use regulations, such as: Implementation of fire safety standards within rural residential zoning districts; Distribution of educational materials at the outset of the building permit review process; and Outreach services with neighborhood organizations and special interest groups. Purpose/Rational: HFRA, Stakeholder Phone Interviews, Firewise Workshop Feedback- Identified the use of regulatory policies to reduce WUI wildfire risk.

Coordinating Organization: Lane County Land Management Division

Target Time Frame: Target Completion 2022.
Action Item 2.1.3 Identify and prioritize areas for local evacuation plan development across Lane County’s Rural Fire Protection District, potentially including data from the CWPP Rural Response: Priorities for Fuel Reduction Map. **Purpose/Rational:** Assess, evaluate, test, and deploy area specific emergency evacuation plans (including shelter in place options) for priority areas in Lane County. Secondary benefits of this project will include informing local stakeholders (in every Fire District) about mitigation efforts (e.g. fuels reduction projects), critical infrastructure impacts, and emergency and evacuation preparedness steps.

**Coordinating Organization:** Lane County Emergency Management

**Status/Target Time Frame:** Ongoing

Action Item 2.3.1 Utilize maps in the CWPP risk assessment to guide and identify new partners and opportunities for cross-boundary collaboration. Coordinate the implementation of landscape scale hazardous fuel projects.

**Purpose/Rational:** HFRA- collaboration and reduction of hazardous fuels, Stakeholder Phone Interviews and the Landowner Survey- Identified a need for the prioritization of fuels reduction.

**Coordinating Organization:** Hazardous Fuel Subcommittee

**Target Time Frame:** Ongoing

Action Item 3.1.1 Develop a coordinated multi-agency seasonal outreach campaign that includes county-specific educational materials to promote effective risk reduction practices and communicate landowner assistance programs in the wildland/urban interface.

**Purpose/Rational:** HFRA- collaboration, reduction of hazardous fuels, and reduction of structural ignitability.

**Coordinating Organization:** Lane County Emergency Management with support from the Lane County Fire Prevention Co-Op

**Target Time Frame:** Target Completion 2022.

Action Item 3.2.1 Implement landowner assistance for fuel reduction projects including cost-share incentives. Increase local capacity, establish incentive programs to support yard debris disposal to assist landowners with hazardous fuels removal. Create disposal opportunities using alternative methods to burning.

**Purpose/Rational:** Landowner Survey Results and Stakeholder Phone Interviews Identified a need for the prioritization of fuels reduction.

**Coordinating Organization:** Oregon Department of Forestry

**Target Time Frame:** Ongoing
New Action Items
Notable changes made from the 2005 Action Items during the 2020 review process include three additional Action Items which are listed below. For a complete list of Action Items see Table 4.2.

2.1.3: Identify and prioritize areas for local evacuation plan development across Lane County’s Rural Fire Protection District, potentially including data from the CWPP Rural Response: Priorities for Fuel Reduction Map.

2.1.4: Develop Community Response Plans for dealing with wildfire and prescribed fire smoke impacts in Lane County.

2.3.3: Prescribed Fire: Increase local capacity, coordination and explore policy improvements to increase the pace and scale of prescribed fire as a cross-boundary tool to reduce wildfire risk on tribal, public and private properties.

Removed Action Items
Three Action Items were removed from the 2005 CWPP. These Action Items are displayed in red in the Action Item Matrix. Removed Action Items are listed below with justifications for their removal.

1.2.1: Develop formal agreements with municipalities and special districts.
Justification: Formal agreements for coordination and communication continue to occur between ODF the Fire Defense Board, USFS, BLM, OSFM and OEM. These agreements are typically formalized at state and regional levels.

2.2.6: Obtain LiDAR data for high risk areas to enhance Lane County’s Wildland-Urban Interface Risk Assessment.
Justification: No longer applicable. New wildfire risk data available since the last update includes WUI data. This data has been included in this update and can be found in the Risk Assessment, Section 2. Collecting local data including community assessments of structural ignitability is a listed Action Item (2.2.4) and can be used to inform finer scale analysis of existing WUI data.

2.3.2: Review fuels treatment method matrix for future Lane County fuel reduction projects.
Justification: This matrix provides high level guidance for partners exploring methods for fuel reduction projects. More detailed analysis should be conducted on a project basis to inform individual projects.
### Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Action Item Title/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose/Rational**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status/Target timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coordinating Organization:**

**Partners Involved**

**Action Item Review Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s) Taken/Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What Went Well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons learned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestions for moving forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of action</th>
<th>Funding Source(s) used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 4.2: Action Item Matrix Goal 1

**GOAL 1: Provide countywide leadership through partnerships to implement wildland-urban interface fire mitigation strategies in Lane County**

**Objective 1.1. Establish and maintain a structure and methods for coordinating the implementation of the Lane County Community Wildfire Protection Plan.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Timeframe</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Coordinating Organization</th>
<th>Priority Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete, review during next update (2023)</td>
<td><strong>Action 1.1.1.</strong> Maintain a Lane County CWPP Advisory Committee to oversee implementation, identify and coordinate funding opportunities, and sustain the Lane County Community Wildfire Protection Plan.</td>
<td>Lane County Emergency Management</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td><strong>Action 1.1.2.</strong> Maintain a sub-committee to coordinate with the CWPP Core Committee to sustain effective countywide public education and outreach activities through the support of the Lane Fire Prevention Co-op and other programs.</td>
<td>Lane Fire Prevention Cooperative</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete, review during next update (2023)</td>
<td><strong>Action 1.1.3.</strong> Maintain the Hazardous Fuel Subcommittee to address fuel reduction and countywide coordination among agencies, programs and partnerships.</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Forestry</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 1.2. Strengthen communication and coordination among Local Fire Districts, County, State, and Federal agencies to effectively deliver wildland-urban interface risk reduction programs and messages.**

| Removed          | **Action 1.2.1.** Develop formal agreements with municipalities and special districts. | Lane County Land Management                      | High           |
| Ongoing          | **Action 1.2.2.** Establish a consistent communication strategy among intergovernmental partners using appropriate conduits and delivery mechanisms. | Oregon Department of Forestry                     | High           |
### Table 4.3: Action Item Matrix Goal 2

**GOAL 2: Improve community strategies for reducing the impacts of wildland-urban interface fires**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 2.1. Review existing policies and regulations to reduce the impact of wildland-urban interface fires.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Timeframe</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing, Target Completion 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing, Target Completion 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing, Target Completion 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective 2.2. Enhance the Lane County Wildland-Urban Interface Risk Assessment.

<p>| | <strong>Action 2.2.1.</strong> Incorporate BLM/USFS critical road and response infrastructure into the Lane County Wildland-Urban Interface Risk Assessment. See “Rural Response: Priorities for Fuel Reduction” Map in Section 2, Risk Assessment. | Hazardous Fuel Subcommittee | Medium |
| Complete, review during next update (2023) | <strong>Action 2.2.2.</strong> Maintain and update fire district boundary data. | Lane County Land Management | Medium |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Timeframe</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Coordinating Organization</th>
<th>Priority Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete, review during next update (2023)</td>
<td><strong>Action 2.2.3.</strong> Incorporate, maintain, and update Lane County's Wildland-Urban Interface Risk Assessment GIS data elements as new data becomes available.</td>
<td>Lane County Land Management</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing, Target Completion 2023</td>
<td><strong>Action 2.2.4.</strong> Expand &quot;Rural Response: Priorities for Fuel Reduction&quot; Map to include additional local information, structural vulnerability assessments and updated hazardous fuel treatment maps for example.</td>
<td>Fire Defense Board &amp; Hazardous Fuel Subcommittee</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td><strong>Action 2.2.5.</strong> Update rural addressing data collection project for county.</td>
<td>Lane County Land Management</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removed</td>
<td><strong>Action 2.2.6.</strong> Obtain LiDAR data for high risk areas to enhance Lane County’s Wildland-Urban Interface Risk Assessment.</td>
<td>Lane County Public Works GIS</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 2.3. Support and prioritize fuels reduction projects by watershed.**

| Ongoing | **Action 2.3.1.** Utilize maps in the CWPP risk assessment to guide and identify new partners and opportunities for cross-boundary collaboration. Coordinate the implementation of landscape scale hazardous fuel projects. | Hazardous Fuel Subcommittee | Top 5          |
| Removed | **Action 2.3.2.** Review fuels treatment method matrix for future Lane County fuel reduction projects. | Lane County Land Management | High           |
| Ongoing | **Action 2.3.3.** Prescribed Fire: Increase local capacity, coordination and explore policy improvements to increase the pace and scale of prescribed fire as a cross-boundary tool to reduce wildfire risk on tribal, public and private properties. | Hazardous Fuel Subcommittee | Medium         |
| Ongoing, Target Completion 2022         | **Action 2.3.4.** Complete 2 cross-boundary fuels reduction projects that leverage partners and programs identified from Action Item 2.3.1. | Hazardous Fuel Subcommittee | High           |
### Table 4.4: Action Item Matrix Goal 3

**GOAL 3: Promote wildfire risk reduction activities for private and public lands in Lane County**

| Objective 3.1. Increase individual awareness and promote risk reduction activities through education and outreach. |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Target Timeframe** | **Action Item** | **Coordinating Organization** | **Priority Level** |
| Ongoing, Target Completion 2022 | **Action 3.1.1** Develop a coordinated multi-agency seasonal outreach campaign that includes county-specific educational materials to promote effective risk reduction practices and communicate landowner assistance programs in the wildland/urban interface. | Lane Fire Prevention Cooperative & Lane County Emergency Management | Top 5 |
| Ongoing, Target Completion 2022 | **Action 3.1.2** Establish a communication strategy that utilizes existing stakeholder channels to disseminate risk reduction messages. | Lane County Emergency Management | High |
| Ongoing, Target Completion 2020 | **Action 3.1.3** Create and maintain a website including county specific wildfire risk reduction and preparedness resources for residents and stakeholders. | Lane County Land & Emergency Management Divisions | High |

| Objective 3.2. Promote the use of non-regulatory incentives to reduce structural ignitability. |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Ongoing** | **Action 3.2.1** Implement landowner assistance for fuel reduction projects including cost-share incentives. Increase local capacity, establish incentive programs to support yard debris disposal to assist landowners with hazardous fuels removal. Create disposal opportunities using alternative methods to burning. | Oregon Department of Forestry | Top 5 |
| Ongoing, Target Completion 2023 | **Action 3.2.2** Use the 2019 Governor’s Council on Wildfire Response to guide future CWPP projects. | Office of State Fire Marshal & Oregon Department of Forestry | High |
Section 5 Plan Implementation and Maintenance

Overview

The plan Implementation and Maintenance Section strives to ensure that the Lane County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) remains an active and relevant document. This section provides the foundation for the formation of the Lane County CWPP Advisory Committee, hereby referred to as the Committee. This section outlines suggestions for how the Committee should prioritize community wildfire protection projects and includes a schedule for maintaining and updating the plan.

The plan’s format allows the Committee to review and update sections as new data becomes available. New data can be easily incorporated, resulting in a CWPP that remains current and relevant to Lane County and all of its respective partners. The benefits of a current and relevant CWPP include:

- Allowing communities to identify local priorities and shape management decisions on surrounding public lands;
- Building community partnerships and collaboration between fire districts, fire departments, local/state/federal governments, and private landowners;
- Making available a variety of funding sources and opportunities to communities;
- Facilitating fuel reduction projects and forest health treatments across the landscapes, in accordance with the Healthy Forest Restoration Act (HFRA) and Healthy Forests Initiative goals.¹

Plan Implementation

HFRA requires that three entities must mutually agree to the final contents of a CWPP:

- Lane County Board of Commissioners
- Lane County Fire Defense Board
- Oregon Department of Forestry

The Lane County CWPP is a shared plan that was developed and implemented based upon a collaborative process. The plan will be adopted by order and resolution by the Lane County Board of Commissioners and acknowledged by the Lane County Fire Defense Board and Oregon Department of Forestry in order to meet HFRA and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Pre-Disaster Mitigation requirements. The CWPP is non-regulatory in nature, so the effectiveness of the plan will be contingent upon the implementation of the Action
Items identified therein. The Action Items provide a framework for building and sustaining partnerships to support wildfire risk reduction projects.

**Advisory Committee**

In accordance with Action Item 1.1.1, the plan development Steering Committee should become the advisory committee (the Committee), and should: oversee implementation, identify and coordinate funding opportunities, and sustain the CWPP. The Committee should act as the coordinating body and serve as a centralized resource for wildfire risk reduction and wildland-urban interface issues in Lane County. Additional roles and responsibilities of the Committee include:

- Serving as the local committee to coordinate projects to be submitted for wildfire funding programs such as National Fire Plan grants, Senate Bill 360, and the Pre-Disaster Mitigation program;
- Developing and coordinating ad hoc and/or standing subcommittees as needed;
- Prioritizing and recommending funding for wildfire risk reduction projects;
- Documenting successes and lessons learned;
- Evaluating and updating the CWPP in accordance with the prescribed maintenance schedule.

**Co-Conveners**

Lane County Emergency Management and Oregon Department of Forestry should serve as co-conveners to oversee the plan's implementation and maintenance. They should co-chair the CWPP advisory committee and fulfill the chair responsibilities. These two entities should be responsible for calling meetings to order at scheduled times or when issues arise (e.g., when funding becomes available or following a major wildfire event).

**Members**

The following organizations were represented and served on committees during the development of the CWPP. These groups should continue to be members of the Committee in the implementation and maintenance phases of the CWPP.

- Lane County Emergency Management
- Lane County Land Management
- Oregon Department of Forestry - Eastern Lane and Western Lane
- Lane County Fire Defense Board
- United States Forest Service
- Bureau of Land Management
- Oregon State University Extension Service - Lane County
Wildfire mitigation is a shared responsibility among numerous diverse stakeholders. For this reason, it is important that the CWPP planning process be collaborative in nature. The Committee may look to expand the current membership in to include other organizations such as:

- Upper Willamette Soil and Water Conservation District
- Siuslaw, Long Tom, McKenzie, Coast Fork Willamette and Middle Fork Willamette Watershed Councils
- Eugene Water and Electric Board, as well as other utilities
- Home Builders Association
- Local elected officials
- Oregon Small Woodlands Association (non-industrial forest landowners) and Lane County Tax Equalization Group (industrial forest landowners)

**Plan Maintenance**

Plan maintenance is a critical component of the CWPP. Proper maintenance should ensure that this plan will benefit Lane County's efforts to reduce risk in the wildland-urban interface. Lane County and CWPP partners have developed a method to ensure that a regular review and update of the CWPP occurs. The Committee is responsible for maintaining and updating the CWPP through a series of meetings outlined in the maintenance schedule below. Periodic annual meetings may be called as needs arise.

**Table 5.1: Plan Maintenance Meeting Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Annual Meeting</th>
<th>Annual Meeting</th>
<th>Five-Year Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review current actions</td>
<td>Update risk assessment data and findings</td>
<td>Evaluate and update CWPP and integrate it into the Lane County Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan Wildfire Annex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify new issues and needs</td>
<td>Update on local planning efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize potential projects</td>
<td>Discussion of continued public involvement methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documenting success and lessons learned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The process the Committee should use to prioritize all projects, including fuel reduction projects, is detailed in the section below.
Project Prioritization Process

The requirements of HFRA state that the CWPP Advisory Committee will establish community hazard reduction priorities for projects. In accordance with Objective 2.3, the CWPP Advisory Committee should support and prioritize wildfire risk reduction projects within Lane County.

The 2020 Committee reviewed all 2005 Action Items and provided completed review forms for each Action Item listed in the Action Item Matrix. The Committee also identified a list of “Top 5 Actions”, reviewed and adjusted all Action Items priority levels, as well as assigned target completion dates to many high priority Actions. This review and ranking process was based on the Risk Assessment (Section 2), Community Outreach results (Section 3), known gaps in wildfire planning and prevention at the county level, a review of best practices for reducing wildfire risk at the community level as well as incorporating planned actions at the county level. Pairing existing capacity with identified Action Items is an effective method to ensure the CWPP is a “living document” and increases partner participation and buy in at the local level.

Depending on the intent of a potential project and its implementation methods, several funding sources may be appropriate. Examples of wildfire mitigation funding sources include: National Fire Plan, Title II funds, Title III funds and Pre-Disaster Mitigation grants. To ensure limited funding for wildfire risk mitigation and planning projects is spent efficiently, grant applications in Lane County aimed at mitigating wildfire risk and improving community resilience should address one of the listed Action Items and specify how their project addresses Plan Goals and Objectives.

Existing and future projects which address one or more of the listed Goals, Objectives and/or Action Items need not be confirmed by the committee, but should be tracked by the committee during plan maintenance. The CWPP Committee should provide support and guidance to internal and external partners as requested to increase an all hands, all lands approach to wildfire mitigation.

Projects that are presented to the CWPP Advisory Committee will often come from a variety of sources; therefore, the project prioritization processes should be flexible. If a wildfire risk mitigation project requesting federal funding does not address a listed Action Item, the applicant should contact the CWPP Steering Committee early in the application process. Semi-Annual Committee meetings provide an opportunity to review current actions and identify new projects. The applicant should be ready to demonstrate how their potential project will help reduce wildfire risk in Lane County.

Annual Meeting

The Committee should meet annually to review updates of the Risk Assessment data and findings, get updates on local CWPP planning efforts, discuss methods of continued public involvement, and document successes and lessons learned from the past year.

On an annual basis, Lane County Emergency Management (EM) and Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) may complete the following tasks in an effort to
incorporate, maintain, and update Lane County's Wildland-Urban Interface Risk Assessment GIS data elements (Action 2.2.3).

- Update the Risk Assessment GIS data layers on a timely basis as new Oregon Department of Forestry, U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management studies or assessments are available.

- Create a standardized format for local communities to use in submitting risk assessment data to supplement the CWPP GIS layers.

- Integrate local CWPP assessments and mapping when available into the Lane County CWPP.

- Update local and regional CWPP websites with information provided by the Lane County Fire Cooperative and Fire Defense Board.

- Support community efforts in the drafting of local CWPPs by providing access to the Risk Assessment GIS data.

- Assist local community efforts in identifying potential fuels reduction projects and drafting of Title II Secure Rural Schools, Resource Advisory Committee grant applications.

- Coordinate with local community partners, to include/involve in local fuels reduction projects.

EM will be responsible for documenting the outcomes of the annual meetings in Appendix B: Implementation and Maintenance Documentation.

FIVE-YEAR REVIEW OF PLAN
For the 2023 Plan Update, the intent is for the CWPP to become a wildfire annex to the Lane County Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan. Complete plan updates should be set for five-year intervals to meet the requirements of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000. Lane County Emergency Management should be responsible for documenting the outcomes of the five-year plan review in the Appendix B: Implementation and Maintenance Documentation. Figure 5.2 provides a list of questions that can be used by the Committee to update the CWPP.
Table 5.2: Five-Year Plan Review Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>5-Year Plan Review Questions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background Data – Section 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Has the wildfire protection framework at the local, state, or federal level changed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have the responsibilities of partner organizations changed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has recent fire occurrence been accurately reflected in the plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk Assessment Data – Section 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Has the wildfire risk across the county changed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have new tools emerged to better evaluate the wildfire hazard?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Have local communities developed plans and implemented activities that might change the county’s overall risk?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outreach Data – Section 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Are there new players that should be brought to the table?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Plan Data – Section 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Do the CWPP goals, objectives, and actions address current or expected conditions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have identified Action Items been effectively implemented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are there new funding sources available for the mitigation of wildfire hazards?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are there new Action Items that should be added to the Action Item Matrix?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan Implementation Data – Section 5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Are the structures and methods established for implementing the plan still relevant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have there been any lessons learned documented from significant wildfires in other parts of the state may be applicable to Lane County?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has implementation occurred as anticipated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are there obstacles and challenges that have arisen that may have prevented or delayed implementation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ONHW/CPW, 2005

Appendix A Action Item Worksheets & Matrix

This appendix includes the Action Item Matrix, and completed Action Item Worksheets describing each Action Item identified during the CWPP update process. The Action Item Matrix houses all active action and removed Action Items, organized by plan goals and objectives. The plan identifies Action Items developed through various plan inputs, data collection and research. CWPP Action Items and associated activities may be considered for funding through state and federal grant programs, including the National Fire Plan or Title II/Title III funding, see Appendix B Plan Implementation and Maintenance for more information.

To facilitate implementation, each Action Item was described in a worksheet, which includes a purpose/rational, priority level, status/timeline, a coordinating organization and partners involved. In addition, a 2020 Review Form includes actions taken, what went well, lessons learned, suggestions moving forward, estimated cost, and funding source(s) used.

**Action Item Worksheets**

**Purpose/Rational**
Each Action Item includes a listed purpose or rational for why the action was selected. Action Items are fact based and tied directly to issues or needs identified throughout the planning process. Action Items were developed from a number of sources including participants of the planning process, noted deficiencies in local capability, or issues identified through the risk assessment.

**Coordinating Organization**
The coordinating organization is the organization that is willing and able to organize resources, find appropriate funding and oversee activity implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

**Partners Involved**
Listed partners can be either potential partners identified since the last update, or existing partners utilized since the last update. The coordinating organization should serve as a central contact point for identified and/or interested partner organizations to see if they are capable of and interested in participation. This initial contact is also to gain a commitment of time and or resources towards completion of the Action Items.

**Actions Taken/Accomplishments**
This content details a high-level overview of the status and/or accomplishments to date. It may include an example project, program or process developed since the last plan update in 2005. These accomplishments should be examples of successful approaches taken within Lane County and need not be taken by the listed coordinating organization.
What Went Well
This content is meant to showcase positive outcomes in process, project and/or program that may be beneficial for future use. The intent is to showcase successful strategies that may be beneficial to continue in further efforts.

Lessons Learned
This content should showcase ideas for positive growth based on noted struggles in process, project and/or program. It is an opportunity to bring forward ideas for improvement.

Suggestions Moving Forward
Each Action Item includes ideas for implementation and potential resources. These suggestions serve as a continuation point for Action Items. This component of the Action Items is dynamic as some ideas may be not feasible and new ideas can be added during the plan maintenance process. For more information on how this plan will be implemented and evaluated, refer to Section 5 of the CWPP.

Status/Timeline
This cell includes one of three designations: Ongoing, Target Completion, and Complete with an anticipated review date. Ongoing Action Items are activities that receive continual improvements and those which are not intended to stop. For example, reducing hazardous fuel is an ongoing effort. Target Completion dates are an intended completion date set by the CWPP Committee. These dates are goals and are intended to both add additional prioritization metrics and improve progress towards Action Items. Target Completion dates were identified by reviewing current and planned activities identified during the review process. Complete with anticipated review were applied to Action Items which are currently complete but will benefit from periodic review.

The following pages include Action Item Worksheets for 2020 Action Items which include information for each of the subsections listed above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Action Item Title/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>Maintain a Lane County CWPP Advisory Committee to oversee implementation, identify and coordinate funding opportunities, and sustain the Lane County Community Wildfire Protection Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose/Rational**

The 2005 CWPP, was put into place without a formal Steering Committee to oversee the implementation and coordination of the plan goals. The 2020 CWPP Committee will be responsible for overseeing this plan, convening to report updates/progress toward completing Action Items, and preparing for plan updates.

**Priority** | **Status/Target timeframe**  
--- | ---  
High | Complete, review during next update (2023)  

**Coordinating Organization:**  
Lane County Emergency Management  

**Partners Involved**  
ODF, OSFM, FDB, LMD, USFS, BLM  

**Review Form**

**Action(s) Taken/Accomplishments**

- Updated Section 5 and Appendix B in the 2020 CWPP to provide a framework for CWPP plan maintenance and implementation.
- **What Went Well**
  - Support from ODF.
- **Lessons learned**
  - Emerging incidents can strain partner involvement, COVID 19 for example.
- **Suggestions for moving forward**
  - See Section 5 and Appendix B, Implementation and Maintenance

**Dates of action** | **Funding Source(s) used**  
--- | ---  
2020 |  

### Table A.2: Worksheet 1.1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Action Item Title/Description</th>
<th>Purpose/Rational</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status/Target timeframe</th>
<th>Coordinating Organization:</th>
<th>Partners Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2</td>
<td>Maintain sub-committee to coordinate with CWPP Committee and sustain effective countywide public education and outreach activities.</td>
<td>Stakeholder Phone Interviews, Firewise Workshop - Identified an opportunity to increase education and wildland-urban interface fire awareness of residents of Lane County to increase public involvement in wildfire risk reduction activities.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Complete, review during next update (2023)</td>
<td>Lane Fire Prevention Cooperative</td>
<td>ODF, OSFM, USFS, BLM, Keep Oregon Green, Lane County Fire Defense Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Review Form

**Action(s) Taken/Accomplishments**

Staffing a booth at the Lane County Home and Garden Show, local parades, fairs and other community events to deliver wildfire prevention and preparedness material. Working with partners to deliver a wildfire preparedness campaign.

**What Went Well**

With the cooperation of all of the partners we have been able to maintain an ongoing prevention campaign since 2005.

**Lessons learned**

Based on 2020 survey results 19.3% of landowners have not received information on protecting their home from wildfire.

**Suggestions for moving forward**

Develop new methods for delivery of educational materials to expand outreach to more landowners. An example would be creating a one page brochure and giving to rural fire departments for dissemination. Brochures and rural fire departments are a preferred conduit for educational material based on the landowner survey.

**Dates of action**

- 2005-2020

**Funding Source(s) used**

- Lane County Fire Defense Board, National Fire Plan, Title III
### Table A.3: Worksheet 1.1.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Action Item Title/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3</td>
<td>Maintain the Hazardous Fuel Subcommittee to address fuel reduction and countywide coordination among agencies, programs and partnerships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Purpose/Rational

**Stakeholder Phone Interviews, Firewise Workshop** – A committee is needed to prioritize and set guidelines for the implementation of prioritized fuel reduction projects. A committee is also needed to collaboratively decide the best method of treatment to be used during fuel reduction projects.

#### Priority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status/Target timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete, review during next update (2023)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Coordinating Organization:

Oregon Department of Forestry

#### Partners Involved

USFS, BLM, OSFM, OSU Extension Services, TNC, Friends of Buford Park, Lane County Parks and Lane County Fire Defense Board.

#### Action(s) Taken/Accomplishments

Hazardous fuels sub-committee formed to make recommendations to Lane County fire siting standards.

#### What Went Well

The committee worked together to develop new siting standards using the latest science and knowledge of local fire behavior.

#### Lessons learned

There is a need for an update county wide hazardous fuels treatment map that includes fire organizations and restoration group accomplishments.

#### Suggestions for moving forward

The siting standards will need to be updated as the environment and latest scientific findings change.

#### Dates of action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source(s) used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM Community Assistance Funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A.4: Worksheet 1.2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Action Item Title/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2</td>
<td>Establish a consistent communication strategy among intergovernmental partners using appropriate conduits and delivery mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose/Rational**

Stakeholder Phone Interviews, Firewise Workshop Feedback - Identified a lack of communication of information and a need to compile and consolidate information regarding wildland-urban interface issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status/Target timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coordinating Organization:**

Oregon Department of Forestry

**Partners Involved**

USFS, BLM, Lane County Fire Defense Board, EM & Lane County Fire Prevention Coop.

**Review Form**

**Action(s) Taken/Accomplishments**

The communication plan provides a list of the agencies that would be involved in the event of a wildland urban interface fire. Additionally, ODF has an annual mobilization guide with updated contacts and radio frequencies that are distributed among intergovernmental partners before fire season each year.

**What Went Well**

The communication plan allows for initial attack personnel to reach the other agencies or districts it would potentially interact with.

**Lessons learned**

Technology constantly changes and with that there can be communication hurdles, especially when multiple agencies are responding to wildland fires. That is why it is imperative that there is good communication between agencies when changes are made to protocols or equipment. Interagency preseason trainings are also very important.

**Suggestions for moving forward**

Annual updates to the communication plan are needed to ensure all changes across agencies have been communicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of action</th>
<th>Funding Source(s) used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing since 2005</td>
<td>Title III &amp; National Fire Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A.5: Worksheet 2.1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Action Item Title/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action 2.1.1.</td>
<td>Review and develop recommendations to the Lane County Board of Commissioners for revisions to land use regulations, such as: Implementation of fire safety standards within rural residential zoning districts; Distribution of educational materials at the outset of the building permit review process; and outreach services with neighborhood organizations and special interest groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Purpose/Rationale

Stakeholder Phone Interviews, Firewise Workshop Feedback - Identified the use of regulatory policies to reduce WUI wildfire risk.

**Example Programs:**
- Ashland, Oregon Fire Plan - Has building codes that require development standards regarding the reduction of structural ignitability and vegetation management
- Florida Wildfire Mitigation Handbook - Discusses the use of land development regulations to reduce WUI wildfire risk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status/Target timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 5</td>
<td>Ongoing, Target Completion 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coordinating Organization:**
Lane County Land Management Division

**Partners Involved**
ODF / Rural Fire Protection Districts

#### Review Form

**Action(s) Taken/Accomplishments**
Recommendation from fire professionals via the Hazardous Fuels Subcommittee regarding fuel break standards to be adopted into Lane Code.

**What Went Well**
The hazardous fuels subcommittee created a new recommended set of fire siting standard for Lane County. The new standards take in local risk analysis and are believed to be both more effective and flexible than the previous standards. Fire managers and a member of the Lane County Planning Commission were involved in the development of these standards to ensure they are both effective and implementable, and will be proposed for adoption in June of 2020.

**Lessons learned**
While progress is being made on siting standards, and additional work remains to be done in the area of general public outreach and information sharing.

**Suggestions for moving forward**
Continue to develop recommendations for updating land use regulations for better protection of life and property from wildland fire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of action</th>
<th>Funding Source(s) used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A.6: Worksheet 2.1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Action Item Title/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>Review and enhance the Lane County building permit process within the wildland urban interface.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose/Rational**

- **Firewise Workshop Feedback** - Identified a need to streamline the permit process to remove inefficiencies.
- **2020 Landowner Survey** – Identified an interest in incentives for wildfire mitigation strategies and in land use regulations pertaining to wildfire safety measures.

**Priority** | **Status/Target timeframe**
---|---
High | Ongoing

**Coordinating Organization:**

Lane County Land Management Division

**Partners Involved**

LMD Building Program; Rural Fire Protection Districts; ODF

**Review Form**

**Action(s) Taken/Accomplishments**

There is a process in place for fire district review of access to vacant properties proposed for development. The permit review process for forestland development includes review of fuel breaks.

**What Went Well**

Forms and informational materials for property owners were developed. Lane County adopted R327 of Oregon Residential Specialty Code 2017 for wildfire hazard.

**Lessons learned**

Can do more to promote voluntary wildfire safety measures.

**Suggestions for moving forward**

Continue to work on providing the public with wildfire safety information; promote wildfire safety incentive programs and work to update land use regulations pertaining to wildfire.

**Dates of action** | **Funding Source(s) used**
---|---
2005-2020 | Permit fees; LMD long range planning funds
Table A.7: Worksheet 2.1.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Action Item Title/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>Identify and prioritize areas for local evacuation plan development across Lane County's Rural Fire Protection District potentially including data from the CWPP Rural Response: Priorities for Fuel Reduction map.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose/Rational**

Assess, evaluate, test, and deploy area specific emergency evacuation plans (including shelter in place options) for priority areas in Lane County. Secondary benefits of this project will include informing local stakeholders (in every Fire District) about mitigation efforts (e.g. fuels reduction projects), critical infrastructure impacts, and emergency and evacuation preparedness steps.

**Priority**

| Status/Target timeframe | Top 5 | 2-3 Years |

**Coordinating Organization:**

Lane County- Emergency Management; Search and Rescue; GIS Staff

**Partners Involved**

ODF, Lane Fire Defense Board, Lane County Search & Rescue, Lane County GIS, University of Oregon, State of Oregon Hazard Mitigation Office

**Action Item Review Form**

**Action(s) Taken/Accomplishments**

Applied for Hazard Mitigation Assistance Funding, to fund planning project. Application being submitted 7/1, project scope will include producing final product for emergency evacuation plans in high hazard areas. Completed a pilot planning project with local Fire District on evacuation area, potentially high risk with limited egress options, determining solid base plan to utilize in future planning efforts with additional Fire Districts.

**What Went Well**

Lessons learned

**Suggestions for moving forward**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of action</th>
<th>Funding Source(s) used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Hazard Mitigation Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID#</td>
<td>Action Item Title/Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4</td>
<td>Develop Community Response Plans for dealing with wildfire and prescribed fire smoke impacts in Lane County.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose/Rational**

Having a response plan for reducing harm to landowners from smoke impacts in a community will allow more prescribed fire treatments and reduce negative impacts when wildfire smoke is present. The increase in treatments will lower fire danger in and adjacent to the WUI in Lane County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status/Target timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Ongoing, Target Completion by 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coordinating Organization:**

Hazardous Fuels Subcommittee

**Partners Involved**

ODF, USFS, LRAPA, DEQ, Lane Fire Defense Board, Lane County EM, Lane County Public Health, University of Oregon Partnership for Disaster Resilience, Southern Willamette Forest Collaborative

**Action Item Review Form**

**Action(s) Taken/Accomplishments**

**What Went Well**

**Lessons learned**

**Suggestions for moving forward**

Track the 2020 Oakridge smoke mitigation project closely for lessons learned and possibly use as template for countywide strategies and plan(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of action</th>
<th>Funding Source(s) used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A.9: Worksheet 2.2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Action Item Title/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action 2.2.1</td>
<td>Incorporate BLM/USFS critical road and response infrastructure into the Lane County Wildland-Urban Interface Risk Assessment. See “Rural Response: Priorities for Fuel Reduction” Map in Section 2, Risk Assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Purpose/Rational

**Landowner Survey**  
Protecting critical infrastructure was a top priority for wildfire planning from survey respondents, with the majority of landowners indicating it was very important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status/Target timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Complete, review during next update (2023)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Coordinating Organization:

Hazardous Fuel Subcommittee

#### Partners Involved

LMD & LC Parks and Recreation; USFS/BLM, ODF, Friends of Buford Park and Mt. Pisgah, OSFM

#### Review Form

**Action(s) Taken/Accomplishments**

Between the fall of 2019 and the spring of 2020 representatives from fire response agencies including USFS, BLM, ODF, and the Lane Fire Defense board identified priorities for fuel reduction along roads and in communities. Over 400 miles of roads were identified on USFS or BLM lands as a priority for evacuation and response. This data is displayed as Figure 2.14 in Section 2 of the CWPP.

**What Went Well**

Representatives were established fire response personnel with decades of local knowledge of their districts. This allow for rapid identification of concern areas.

**Lessons learned**

Coordinating with over 20 districts and digitizing hard copy map data was a time-consuming process. Starting the process at least 6-8 months in advance would have provided more time for a detailed review from partners.

**Suggestions for moving forward**

Start the process 6-8 months in advance. Use existing maps to make refinements. The current map does not display categorical data describing the concern area. Consider performing this function to better display and distinguish roads of concern and safety/evacuation routes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of action</th>
<th>Funding Source(s) used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/12/2019</td>
<td>ODF and partner staff time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table A.10: Worksheet 2.2.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Action Item Title/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action 2.2.2</td>
<td>Maintain and update fire district boundary data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose/Rational**

*Risk assessment team request* - The CWPP has value primarily as a shared information record utilized by all of the implementing partners on a weekly, monthly and annual basis as the need arises. Risk assessment information provided by fire districts is an essential part of that record. By digitizing district input the data is in a format that can be made widely available to all those who need it. Currently, there are discrepancies between fire district boundaries recorded by LCOG and the information provided by the fire protection districts surveys.

2020 Update: This Action Item is being maintained as a best practice.

**Priority** | **Status/Target timeframe**  
Medium | Review during next update (2023)

**Coordinating Organization:**
Lane County Land Management

**Partners Involved**
Lane County Public Works GIS; Rural Fire Protection Districts (rural fire districts), Municipalities (City – Fire Districts), LCOG

**Action(s) Taken/Accomplishments**
LMD and LCOG Fire district boundary maps are consistent. LMD GIS has a fire district layer boundary.

**What Went Well**
There is a process in place for updating the map with properties annexed into the fire district service boundary.

**Lessons learned**
Ensure that there is a process for updating LMD and LCOG maps so that they are consistent with one another.

**Suggestions for moving forward**
Continue to update all fire district boundary maps with the most up to date boundary information. Stay up to date on fire district annexations.

| Dates of action | Funding Source(s) used  
2005-2020 | Title II funds and permit frees |
### Table A.11: Worksheet 2.2.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Action Item Title/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action 2.2.3</td>
<td>Incorporate, maintain, and update Lane County's Wildland-Urban Interface Risk Assessment GIS data elements as new data becomes available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Purpose/Rational

**Stakeholder Phone Interviews** - Identified the use of GIS and local communities’ risk assessments to update the county’s risk assessment

**Example Programs:**
- California State Fire Plan - Uses community information regarding GIS overlays of different wildfire factors to prioritize pre-fire management projects
- Idaho State Fire Plan - Identified the use of GIS to develop “National Fire Plan related projects”
- Josephine County Integrated Fire Plan - Uses GIS to develop and maintain Josephine County’s risk assessment

2020 Update: This Action Item is being maintained as a best practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status/Target timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Review during next update (2023)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Coordinating Organization:
Lane County Land Management Division

#### Partners Involved
Lane County Public Works GIS; ODF, Rural Fire Protection Districts, Municipalities, Utilities

#### Review Form

**Action(s) Taken/Accomplishments**
The WUI was updated with the 2020 CWPP update and is a useable GIS layer.

**What Went Well**
The map was updated with the most current available WUI data.

**Lessons learned**
Recognize the different scale in datasets used for updating the WUI layer.

**Suggestions for moving forward**
Keep this Action Item for maintenance of the layer with future plan updates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of action</th>
<th>Funding Source(s) used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2020</td>
<td>Title II and LMD long range planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID#</td>
<td>Action Item Title/Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4</td>
<td>Expand &quot;Rural Response: Priorities for Fuel Reduction&quot; Map to include additional local information, structural vulnerability assessments and updated hazardous fuel treatment maps for example.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Purpose/Rational

**Landowner Survey**
- Protecting Critical Infrastructure was the top priority for wildfire planning, with the majority of landowners indicating it was very important.

**Wildfire Mitigation Best Practices**
- Understanding where past fuel reduction work has occurred, as well as community level information including structural vulnerability assessments improves efficient use of limited wildfire prevention and planning resources.

### Priority | Status/Target timeframe
---|---
Medium | Ongoing, Target Completion 2023

**Coordinating Organization:**
Fire Defense Board & Hazardous Fuel Subcommittee

**Partners Involved**
ODF, USFS, BLM, EM

### Review Form

**Action(s) Taken/Accomplishments**
Between the Fall of 2019 and the spring of 2020 representatives from fire response agencies including USFS, BLM, ODF, and the Lane Fire Defense board identified priorities areas for fuel reduction across Lane County. Some of these priority areas are based on qualitative community assessments.

**What Went Well**
Having a designated Fire Defense Board Representative to communicate needs aided coordination with structural protection districts.

**Lessons learned**
Begin the process early, preferably a year before the target completion date. Utilize existing cooperatives, boards and committees to disseminate data collection work. The Rivers to Ridges Partnership, Lane Fire Defense Board, and LCOG are likely participants which should be engaged early and often.

**Suggestions for moving forward**
Using Figure 2.14 as a base map, create local assessment area (coast, W. Valley, Cascades) maps including hazardous fuel treatment areas and structural vulnerability assessments by community. Use meta-data from Figure 2.14. Consider including restoration treatment areas to better understand where fuels reduction is occurring on a landscape level.

### Dates of action | Funding Source(s) used
---|---
Fall 2019 | Staff Time, WSFM Grants
Table A.13: Worksheet 2.2.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Action Item Title/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action 2.2.5</td>
<td>Update rural addressing data collection project for county.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose/Rational**

Lane County Public Works currently is developing the Rural Addressing Project.
- The project would refine current information to a point layer for structural locations.
- The project will improve emergency response times, providing benefits to multiple objectives.
- The information will improve the accuracy of the wildland-urban interface boundary by refining the density layer.
- Public Works indicates that this project is only about 18% complete and that there are 44,000 addresses to map.

2020 Update: This Action Item is being maintained as a best practice.

**Priority**  Status/Target timeframe

| Medium | Ongoing |

**Coordinating Organization:**

Lane County Land Management Division

**Partners Involved**

Lane County Public Works GIS

**Review Form**

**Action(s) Taken/Accomplishments**

Current addresses have been mapped and a process is in place for mapping new addresses.

**What Went Well**

The project was completed with the mapping of 44,000 addresses.

**Lessons learned**

Good communication between LMD and GIS is essential to ensure new addresses get mapped.

**Suggestions for moving forward**

Continue the current process for tracking and mapping new addresses.

**Dates of action**  **Funding Source(s) used**

| 2005-2020 | Permit fees |

---
### Table A.14: Worksheet 2.3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Action Item Title/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action 2.3.1</td>
<td>Utilize maps in the CWPP risk assessment to guide and identify new partners and opportunities for cross-boundary collaboration. Coordinate the implementation of landscape scale hazardous fuel projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose/Rational**

HFRA Goals, Stakeholder Phone Interviews, Firewise Workshop Feedback - Identified a need for the prioritization of fuels reduction projects. This will also continue to help leverage funding sources from multiple agencies and land ownerships to complete work that is deemed high priority for Lane County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status/Target timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 5</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coordinating Organization:**

Hazardous Fuel Subcommittee

**Partners Involved**

Lane County Fire Chiefs, Lane County EM, Board of Commissioners, owners of sites identified for potential projects, ODF, USFS, BLM

**Review Form**

**Action(s) Taken/Accomplishments**

Multiple projects have been accomplished within areas identified in the Lane County CWPP risk assessment to date with additional projects planned. Examples include:

**BLM Community Assistant Grant Projects** - These projects have reduced hazardous fuels on City or Eugene, Lane County Parks, and Willamalane managed lands along strategic property boundaries.

**Oakridge Westfir Fuels Reduction Project** - This project is reducing hazardous fuels on Forest Service managed lands adjacent to the communities of Oakridge and Westfir.

**What Went Well**

Numerous projects have been completed on multiple ownerships within Lane County’s WUI areas. Project specifications have been tailored to the local ownership and community’s needs, resulting in a range of implementation tools from prescribed under-burning to alternatives to burning such as chipping and mulching.

**Lessons learned**

Smoke management limitations are a challenge whenever burning adjacent to communities. Windows for conducting prescribed burns were hard to predict, and some units in the Oakridge Westfir project were modified from under burning to hand piling and burning to take advantage of more predictable opportunities to burn piles during the fall and winter.

**Suggestions for moving forward**

Land managers from all agencies within the county will need to continue the collaboration and communication that has already been established to take advantage of funding mechanisms, appropriate project design, new partners, and prescribed fire implementation opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of action</th>
<th>Funding Source(s) used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Table A.15: Worksheet 2.3.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Action Item Title/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action 2.3.3</td>
<td>Prescribed Fire: Increase local capacity, coordination and explore policy improvements to increase the pace and scale of prescribed fire as a cross-boundary tool to reduce wildfire risk on tribal, public and private properties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Purpose/Rational

**Landowner Survey:**
- 73% of residents indicated they were supportive of prescribed fire as a means to treat hazardous fuel.

**Success of the Rivers to Ridges Controlled Ecological Burn Program:**
- Over 30 years providing safe ecological burns in the southern Willamette Valley with various partners, resources and providing opportunities for training and capacity building. Predominantly in and around Eugene’s West Eugene Wetlands and Fern Ridge Reservoir, as well as City of Eugene and Lane County parks.

#### Priority Status/Target timeframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status/Target timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Coordinating Organization:

Hazardous Fuels Subcommittee (with support from the Rivers to Ridges Partnership)

#### Partners Involved


#### Review Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s) Taken/Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Average of 256 acres broadcast burning annually for a total of 139 units and 3988 acres since 2005 in Rivers to Ridges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 13 coordinating and regulatory organizations listed as active participants in the Rivers to Ridges Ecological Burn Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Large percentage of burns in the WUI adjacent to private land, within Eugene Urban Growth Boundary and/or City Limits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunities for municipal firefighters to train in the wildland environment, and for all firefighters to experience and train with live fire.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### What Went Well

Coordinating before, during, and after fall burn season with partners to ensure that everyone was on the same page going in, knew what one another were doing on burn days, and were able to reflect on what happened to improve moving forward.

#### Lessons learned

Coordinate with LRAPA in advance and let them know if any issues with operating within their permit are encountered. Over communicate with partners and fire districts about plans to burn to ensure that all who need to know have been informed.

#### Suggestions for moving forward

Engage on the front end of projects with Grand Ronde and Siletz tribes. Support grant opportunities to fund work on private lands. Continue to engage with LRAPA and ODF collaboratively. Review and incorporate improvements from Action Item 2.1.4: community response plans for dealing with wildfire and prescribed fire smoke impacts in Lane County. Include prescribed fire treatments and opportunities in Figure 2.14.

#### Dates of action Funding Source(s) used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of action</th>
<th>Funding Source(s) used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2020</td>
<td>OWEB, USFWS Partners Program, City of Eugene,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A.16: Worksheet 2.3.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ID#</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose/Rational**

- **Stakeholder Phone Interviews, Firewise Workshop Feedback** - Identified a need for the prioritization of fuels reduction

**Example Projects:**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Priority</strong></th>
<th><strong>Status/Target timeframe</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Ongoing, Target Completion 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coordinating Organization:**

Hazardous Fuels Subcommittee, Oregon Department of Forestry

**Partners Involved**

City of Eugene, The Northwest Youth Corps, Eugene Parks and Open Spaces, Eugene Springfield Fire Department, Lane County Public Works and the Long Tom Watershed Council

**Review Form**

**Action(s) Taken/Accomplishments**

Dead-end roads have been prioritized for Firewise Community outreach and establishment. Non-federal hazardous fuel funding from the City of Eugene focused on treating 1) roadways in the South Hills of Eugene 2) dead-end Firewise communities and 3) public properties adjacent to private residence.

**What Went Well**

Interagency Collaboration, selecting and treating highly visible areas to demonstrate fuels reduction.

**Lessons learned**

Increased time and resources needed for planning. Inclusion of more non-governmental partners would be helpful. Including non-fire messaging and augmenting treatment prescriptions i.e. habitat restoration increased participation from private landowners.

**Suggestions for moving forward**

Included countywide organization to help replicate and organize these types of projects across the county. Ideas for future partners include the Fire Prevention Co-Op, the Upper Willamette Soil and Water Conservation District, Local Watershed Councils, Other Municipalities, USFS, BLM, Parks and Recreation Departments and Neighborhood Associations and Organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Dates of Action</strong></th>
<th><strong>Funding Source(s) used</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>City of Eugene Wildfire Mitigation Funding, BLM WUI Assistance Funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A.17: Worksheet 3.1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Action Item Title/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1</td>
<td>Develop a coordinated multi-agency seasonal outreach campaign that includes county-specific educational materials to promote effective risk reduction practices and communicate landowner assistance programs in the wildland/urban interface.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Purpose/Rational

- **HFRA Goals** - collaboration, reduction of hazardous fuels, and reduction of structural ignitability.
- **Stakeholder interviews, Firewise workshop** - Identified an opportunity to develop a “model” home or property recognition program to encourage greater participation by homeowners in risk reduction projects. Identified an opportunity to educate the public and dispel negative perceptions about the aesthetics of fuel reduction and defensible space. Seasonal community events such as “free chipping or dump days” encourages public participation in fuels reduction projects as well as provides a venue for disseminating information about wildfire risk reduction.

#### Priority | Status/Target timeframe
---|---
Top 5 | Ongoing, Target Completion 2022

#### Coordinating Organization:
Lane County Emergency Management with support from the Lane County Fire Prevention Co-Op.

#### Partners Involved
ODF, OSFM, USFS, BLM, Keep Oregon Green & Lane County Fire Defense Board

#### Review Form

#### Action(s) Taken/Accomplishments

Staffing of Lane County Home and Garden Show in the spring to distribute risk reduction material. Radio campaign starting in May with wildfire preparedness message.

#### What Went Well

The landowner survey showed that 51.6% of people had received info about protecting their property from wildland fire through: News media (radio, newspaper, TV)

#### Lessons learned

There is still a portion (19.3%) of landowners in the county that haven’t received information on risk reduction strategies.

#### Suggestions for moving forward

There is a need to continue to develop new cost-effective ways to distribute risk reduction messaging in Lane County. Mail, Fact Sheet/Brochure and Internet are landowners preferred ways of delivery.

#### Dates of action | Funding Source(s) used
---|---
Ongoing Since 2005 | Lane County Fire Defense Board, National Fire Plan
Table A.18: Worksheet 3.1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Action Item Title/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2</td>
<td>Establish a communication strategy that utilizes existing stakeholder channels to disseminate risk reduction messages.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose/Rational**
Stakeholders currently promote risk reduction information at an organizational level. By creating a more collaborative campaign, stakeholders can amplify the same message.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status/Target timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Ongoing, Target Completion 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coordinating Organization:**
Lane County Emergency Management

**Partners Involved**
ODF, LCFDB, LC Land Management

**Review Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s) Taken/Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What Went Well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions for moving forward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of action</th>
<th>Funding Source(s) used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Table A.19: Worksheet 3.1.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Action Item Title/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action 3.1.3</td>
<td>Create and maintain a website including county specific wildfire risk reduction and preparedness resources for residents and stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Purpose/Rational

**Stakeholder interviews, Firewise workshop** - Identified a need to make information more accessible to the public. A website would be a good central place to promote educational efforts and provide tips on how to reduce wildfire risk.

**Example Programs** -
- Douglas Forest Protective Association, OR - Has a website with information on their fire prevention programs
- Spokane County, WA - “FireSafe Spokane” website contains information on how to create defensible space around a home and remove other hazards. The website gives an email address and a phone number where homeowners can sign-up for free inspections.

2020 Update: This Action Item is being maintained as a best practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status/Target timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Ongoing, Target completion 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Coordinating Organization:
Lane County Land Management Division and Emergency Management

#### Partners Involved
US Forest Service, Rural Fire Protection Districts

#### Review Form

**Action(s) Taken/Accomplishments**
CWPP has a webpage for downloading the plan. There is a project webpage for updating the CWPP, also containing information about wildfire protection measures.

**What Went Well**
The plan is published online and the plan update is advertised

**Lessons learned**
Should have a “one-stop-shop” for all things wildfire

**Suggestions for moving forward**
LMD and Emergency Management should collaborate to create an all-encompassing website for wildfire hazard, mitigation and response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of action</th>
<th>Funding Source(s) used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2020</td>
<td>Title III funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A.20: Worksheet 3.2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Action Item Title/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>Implement landowner assistance for fuel reduction projects including cost-share incentives. Increase local capacity, establish incentive programs to support yard debris disposal to assist landowners with hazardous fuels removal. Create disposal opportunities using alternative methods to burning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Purpose/Rational

**Landowner Survey Results and Stakeholder Phone Interviews** Identified a need for the prioritization of fuels reduction

**Example Projects:**
- Western States Fire Manager’s Grant Program, BLM WUI Assistance. See review form below for more information.

#### Priority/Status/Target timeframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Status/Target timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 5</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Coordinating Organization:

Oregon Department of Forestry

#### Partners Involved

Private Landowners, Long Tom Watershed Council, County, Municipal and Rural Fire Districts

---

### Review Form

#### Action(s) Taken/Accomplishments

- Over 5 million in Federal Grant Funding for hazardous fuel treatment and planning has been awarded in Lane County since the early 2000’s through 2 full-time Fire Planners and 2 seasonal ODF Fuels Reduction Crews.
- ~50,000 landowners have received informational mailings regarding hazardous fuel treatments and risk reduction actions through these federal awards
- ~20,000 landowners have received hazardous fuel inspections
- ~5,000 private properties have been treated for hazardous fuels to improve defensible space and fire response access

#### What Went Well

ODF Fuels Crews, Cost Share Programs, Identifying self-motivated communities to expand program impact through the establishment of Firewise Communities.

#### Lessons learned

Tax Incentives have not proceeded at the same pace or scale as cost-share incentives. Improvements to Oregon’s Defensible Space law and the 2019 Governor’s Council on Wildfire may offer improved tax incentive and policy pathways. Disposal of cut fuel remains a challenge for private property owners. Consider using this as a tax-incentive or rebate program for county refuse as well as exploring alternative methods of disposal.

#### Suggestions for moving forward

Continue prioritizing federal risk reduction funding and cost-share incentives for private properties. Partner with watershed enhancement organizations including local Watershed Councils to further increase pace and scale of private property hazardous fuel removal and disposal. Equipment purchase remains a challenge, consider alternative sources to purchase large equipment, industrial chippers for example, to improve program efficiency.

#### Dates of action | Funding Source(s) used
---|---
2003-2020 | National Fire Plan primarily through Western States Fire Managers and BLM WUI Assistance Grant funding.
### Table A.21: Worksheet 3.2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Action Item Title/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2</td>
<td>Use the 2019 Governor’s Council on Wildfire Response to guide future CWPP projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose/Rational**
Ensures the Lane County CWPP incorporates and aligns with state directed policies, funding opportunities, and a cohesive wildfire response framework in Oregon.

**Priority** | **Status/Target timeframe**  
High          | Ongoing

**Coordinating Organization:**
Office of the State Fire Marshal and Oregon Department of Forestry

**Partners Involved**
ODF, LMD, EM, OEM

**Review Form**

**Action(s) Taken/Accomplishments**
Review of the 2019 Report

**What Went Well**
TBD

**Lessons learned**
See the Governor’s Council on Wildfire Response Report, TBD

**Suggestions for moving forward**
Maintain close communication with state executive staff on upcoming implementation timelines and strategies as they develop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of action</th>
<th>Funding Source(s) used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Implementation and Maintenance

This appendix serves as documentation for the implementation and maintenance of the Lane County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP). The primary purpose of this appendix is to document the Steering Committee’s efforts to implement and maintain the plan including; the 2020 update process, 2020 plan maintenance and the anticipated 2023 update process.

2020 Update Process

The Steering Committee convened in September of 2018 to begin the update process. Between 2018 and spring of 2019 project scoping was conducted which included:

1) The identification and formalization of Core Committee and members
2) Review of the 2005 plan
3) Identifying potential update components and defining roles and responsibilities to committee members and agencies
4) Inclusion of additional partners and sub-committee members and defining additional roles
5) Updating the Lane County Board of Commissioners on the intent to update the plan

The CWPP committee meetings were conducted bi-monthly to review updated sections, items, and vote-in the final Steering Committee member. The CWPP Steering Committee submitted the 2020 CWPP Plan update to the Board of County Commissioners for County adoption on July 7th 2020. See Table B.1 “2020 Update Components” for a list of major updates made to the 2005 CWPP.

2020 Plan Maintenance

Plan maintenance is a critical component of the CWPP plan. Proper maintenance of this plan should improve Lane County’s efforts to reduce risk in the wildland-urban interface. Lane County, with help from ODF and the 2020 CWPP Steering Committee have developed a method to ensure a regular review and update of the CWPP occurs. The Committee will be responsible for maintaining and updating the CWPP through a series of meetings outlined in the Maintenance Schedules Table 5.1 on page 63.

2023 Plan Update Process (Anticipated)

The intent of the 2020 Steering Committee is for the next CWPP revision to include the plan’s incorporation into Lane County’s Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan (NHMP) as either the Wildfire Hazard Section or Annex. The year 2023
was selected by the Steering Committee for the next update to coincide with the NHMP update timeline. Represented agencies on the 2020 CWPP Steering Committee will participate as CWPP Committee members for the next plan update, although representative person(s) may change. Natural hazards share overlapping boundaries, concerns, and often Action Items. Incorporating the CWPP into the NHMP should improve cross-boundary communication and collaboration, a key goal of the CWPP.

Table B.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020 Update Components</th>
<th>Committee Vote carried by</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2020 CWPP Update Table</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Records plan update components</td>
<td>FDB, EM, LMD, OSU, ODF, USFS &amp; BLM</td>
<td>6/09/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Drafted and added</td>
<td>EM, LMD, OSU, ODF, USFS &amp; BLM</td>
<td>5/11/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 1: Introduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduced redundancy</td>
<td>EM, LMD, FDB &amp; ODF</td>
<td>1/22/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 2: Risk Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changed Assessment scale from 5th level watershed to 3rd level watershed</td>
<td>EM, LMD, FDB &amp; ODF</td>
<td>1/22/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Completely new data source (USFS/Pyrologix 2017 Quantitative Wildfire Risk Data)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Maps</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2 Community At Risk (CARs) Maps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Display communities listed in a recent ODF 2020 CARs Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rural Response: Priorities for Fuel Reduction Map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Displays response concern areas identified at the local level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes to Existing Maps</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wildland Urban Interface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Now includes quantitative boundaries &amp; types of WUI.</td>
<td>EM, LMD, OSU &amp; ODF</td>
<td>5/18/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Impact Map</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Replaces the 2005 “Wildfire Hazards” Map</td>
<td>EM, LMD, OSU &amp; ODF</td>
<td>5/18/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B.1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020 Update Components</th>
<th>Committee Vote carried by</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 3: Community Outreach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conducted a 2020 Community Survey largely following the 2005 survey</td>
<td>EM, LMD OSU &amp; ODF</td>
<td>3/25/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comparison of notable changes from the 2005 &amp; 2020 Landowner responses were made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 4: Action Items</strong></td>
<td>EM, LMD, FDB &amp; ODF</td>
<td>6/02/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review and reprioritization of Action Items (matrix)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Top 5 Actions identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Listed Removed Action Items with justification</td>
<td>EM, LMD, OSU &amp; ODF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New Action Item Review Form created</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals and Objectives</strong></td>
<td>FDB, EM, LMD &amp; ODF</td>
<td>11/01/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unchanged</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Item Matrix</strong></td>
<td>EM, LMD, OSU &amp; ODF</td>
<td>5/18/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A review of all 2005 Action Items occurred.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Changed ranking to be either Top 5, High, or Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Added 2.1.3, 2.1.4 &amp; 2.3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Removed 1.2.1, 2.2.6, &amp; 2.3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 5: Plan Implementation and Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>FDB, EM, LMD, ODF, USFS &amp; BLM</td>
<td>6/02/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Co-conveners changed from EM &amp; LMD to EM and ODF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Core Committee Members: ODF, EM, LMD, LC FDB, USFS &amp; BLM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix A: Action Items Worksheets &amp; Matrix</strong></td>
<td>EM, LMD, OSU, ODF, USFS &amp; BLM</td>
<td>5/11/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New format now captures ongoing nature of Action Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Review Subsection includes Accomplishments, Lessons Learned &amp; Suggestions Moving Forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix B: Implementation and Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>FDB, EM, LMD, ODF, USFS &amp; BLM</td>
<td>6/02/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reworked narrative to include actions taken to update plan from 2005 version to 2020 plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identified staff responsible for updating documents, and, outlined the process utilized to update the plans and final disposition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix C: Risk Assessment Methods</strong></td>
<td>EM, LMD, OSU &amp; ODF</td>
<td>5/18/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Included OWRE data methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data collection and priority identification methodology for Rural Response: Priorities for Fuel Reduction Map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B.1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020 Update Components</th>
<th>Committee Vote carried by</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix D: Fuel Treatment Types</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Matrix was consolidated to remove ecoregions</td>
<td>EM, LMD, ODF, USFS, &amp; BLM</td>
<td>3/25/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Removed Action Item 2.2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix E: Landowner Survey Summary Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Summary data and landowner responses from the 2019 Landowner Survey is included.</td>
<td>EM, LMD, FDB, OSU, ODF, USFS, &amp; BLM</td>
<td>6/02/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix F: Wildfire Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Updated Plans and Policies subsection</td>
<td>EM, LMD, FDB, OSU, ODF, USFS, &amp; BLM</td>
<td>6/09/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Added Fire Siting Recommendations subsection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Updated wildfire resources subsection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plans and Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Updated contact information</td>
<td>EM, LMD, FDB, OSU, ODF, USFS, &amp; BLM</td>
<td>6/09/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Includes 2019 Governor’s Council on Wildfire Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Siting Recommendations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Subcommittee’s recommended changes to Lane County’s Fuel Break Standards</td>
<td>EM, LMD, FDB, ODF, USFS, &amp; BLM</td>
<td>6/09/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fire modeling scenarios were run to inform suggested revisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conducted &amp; provided literature review to inform code changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Undesirable planting list added</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wildfire Educational Resources</strong></td>
<td>EM, LMD, FDB, ODF, USFS, &amp; BLM</td>
<td>6/09/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lane County Defensible Space Flyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Oregon’s Defensible Space Act: Homeowner self-certification checklist for “high” risk areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ember Aware Poster: Tips for home hardening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix G: Contact Information</strong></td>
<td>EM, LMD, OSU, ODF, USFS, &amp; BLM</td>
<td>5/11/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agency contacts organized by topic and function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix H: 2005 Firewise Stakeholder Survey</strong></td>
<td>EM, LMD, FDB, ODF, USFS, &amp; BLM</td>
<td>6/09/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2005 CWPP data referenced in 2020 plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appendix I: Acronyms and Glossary of terms</strong></td>
<td>EM, LMD, OSU, ODF, USFS, &amp; BLM</td>
<td>5/11/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Updated to reflect 2020 Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C
Risk Assessment Methods

This appendix outlines the specific methods, data, and values used to evaluate wildfire risk in Lane County.

Mapping Methods

The updated Lane County Risk Assessment primarily relies on the Oregon Wildfire Risk Explorer (OWRE). From the OWRE:

“The Oregon Wildfire Risk Explorer is designed to increase wildfire awareness, give a comprehensive view of wildfire risk and local fire history, and educate users about wildfire prevention and mitigation resources. The site provides decision support for homeowners, communities, and professionals to identify and prioritize local fire prevention and mitigation efforts.

This Advanced Wildfire Risk Explorer serves professional planners to inform updates to Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPP) and Natural Hazard Mitigation Plans (NHMP), with extensive data resources, detailed summaries, and full wildfire risk inventory report.”

Lane County has utilized the OWRE for its intended purpose, to update the local CWPP with the most current wildfire risk data.

The specific methods involved gathering data in the form of GIS layers from the OWRE for the subject area of this plan and displaying that data to depict wildfire risk, the wildland-urban interface (WUI) and potential wildfire impact on resources and assets. These layers were clipped from a state-wide view down to the boundaries of Lane County. Wildfire risk, WUI, and potential impact layers are displayed on a single map and have corresponding maps that break Lane County into the assessment areas (ecoregions). The display of the data was altered for each map to accurately demonstrate the values.

Overall Wildfire Risk Maps

The data layer from the OWRE organized wildfire risk into the following 6 categories; very high, high, moderate, low, low benefit, and benefit. To simplify the data and more clearly show areas of wildfire risk, the categories were condensed into just high, moderate and low risk. The categories were grouped as shown in Table C1.
Table C1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OWRE Categories</th>
<th>CWPP Map Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High and High</td>
<td>High Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate and Low</td>
<td>Moderate Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Benefit and Benefit</td>
<td>Low Risk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wildland Urban Interface Maps

The OWRE WUI layer presented the data in 13 categories. The Steering Committee distilled the categories to just three based on local knowledge of development and fuel loads in Lane County. The categories were grouped as illustrated in Table C2.

Table C2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OWRE Categories</th>
<th>CWPP Map Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High, Medium &amp; Low Density Interface</td>
<td>Interface: High &amp; Low Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High and Medium Density Intermix</td>
<td>Intermix: Medium Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Intermix and Very Low Density Veg*</td>
<td>Intermix: Low Density</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High, Medium, Low and Very Low Density No Veg, and Uninhabited No Veg and Uninhabited Veg were not included on the map.

*Veg stands for vegetation

Overall Wildfire Potential Impact Maps:

This data layer is similar to the Overall Wildfire Risk layer, as the OWRE organized wildfire impact into categories of very high, high, moderate, low, low benefit and benefit. The CWPP map condensed those into high, moderate and low impact, as shown in Table C3.

Table C3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OWRE Categories</th>
<th>CWPP Map Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High and High</td>
<td>High Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate and Low</td>
<td>Moderate Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Benefit and Benefit</td>
<td>Low Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source

The data used in this analysis can be viewed and downloaded with the Advanced Oregon Wildfire Risk Explorer, which can be accessed at the following link: https://tools.oregonexplorer.info/OE_HtmlViewer/index.html?viewer=wildfireplanning
Communities at Risk

The risk assessment also includes a section identifying communities at risk. This section utilized the Oregon Department of Forestry’s 2020 Communities at Risk Report. The risk assessment adopted the communities identified in this report as Lane County’s communities at risk. The Communities at Risk Map utilizes the WUI data layer and a fire district boundary and points layer sourced from Lane County Public Works GIS. The full 2020 ODF Communities at Risk Report can be accessed here: [https://www.oregon.gov/odf/Pages/Reports.aspx](https://www.oregon.gov/odf/Pages/Reports.aspx)

Rural Response: Priority Areas for Fuel Reduction

Figure 2.14 is a combination of the Potential Impact to Infrastructure layer from OWRE as well as concern area identification by local fire response agencies. OWRE layer “Potential Impact to Infrastructure” was simplified to display line resources (roads, transmission lines and railways) without regard to level of risk. See OWRE data link on the previous page for more detail on how the “Potential Impact to Infrastructure” layer was developed.

In the winter of 2019, the following departments and agencies reviewed roads and communities within their jurisdiction for potential wildfire hazards: USFS, BLM, ODF and the Lane Fire Defense Board (Lane County Structure and Rural Fire Departments). The listed agencies coordinated with local government and stakeholders to identify and map concern areas.

Identified areas were selected using a range of categorical attributes, see Table C4 for a list of attributes. Because these attributes are not displayed in the “Rural Response: Priority Areas for Fuel Reduction” map, meta-data has not been included in this plan. Attribute data is captured in GIS layer information and may therefore be useful in the future to refine concern areas, potentially informing countywide evacuation planning and/or hazardous fuel priority treatment areas. For example a road may have: dense fuel along roadsides (1c), distance to water concern (2a) on a steep grade (3c), dead end road (3b) with a long response time (3a), resulting in a description of 1c, 2a & 3abc. Roads and Areas identified on the “Rural Response: Priorities for Fuel Reduction” Map are displayed because one or more of the hazard categories in Table C4 were identified. This data is not displayed by category, more in-depth analysis should be conducted, with results displayed at a finer scale, perhaps by Assessment Area (ecoregion).
### Table C4

Attributes for Rural Response Priority Mapping Exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Fuel Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>High fuel loading (storm damage for example)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>High fuel flammability (gorse, scotch broom, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Dense fuel along roadsides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Distance to water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Firewise USA site or proactive community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>High housing density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. ACCESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Response time concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Dead-end road(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Steep grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Bridge restrictions and/or clearance issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Critical Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Highway/major access road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Utility-communication tower(s) water supply, dam, transmission lines, waste treatment, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Cultural</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>High ignition incidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Unsafe conditions for first responders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Protected areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Other Concerns not captured in Categories 1-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Credits**

Primary data contact: Alex Rahmlow, Fire Planning Coordinator, Oregon Department of Forestry, Western Lane District. Alex.J.Rahmlow@oregon.gov. Work organized by Alex Rahmlow. Priority Areas identified by various structural fire departments and natural resource agencies in Lane County, OR. Digitized by AJ Corwin, Oregon Department of Forestry Western Lane District.
Appendix D
Fuel Treatment Types

One of the minimum requirements for a CWPP as described by the Healthy Forests Restoration Act is the identification of prioritized fuel reduction projects. A CWPP must identify and prioritize areas for hazardous fuel reduction treatments, as well as recommend appropriate treatment methods. Due to the diverse topography and ecoregions present in Lane County, the appropriate treatment methods vary considerably by vegetation type, annual precipitation, slope, aspect, and elevation.

The following tables (D.1-D.3) provide information on the advantages, concerns, seasonality, application in the wildland-urban interface, and maintenance and scheduling for prescribed fire, mechanized thinning, and manual treatments across Lane County. Additionally, prescribed fire involves some risk of liability and varying restrictions based on treatment type. It is important to check with local fire and smoke management agencies before burning. The tables only provide a general framework. Individual projects will need to be tailored to the conditions present in the local area. Local fuels specialists should be consulted to determine the most feasible array of fuels treatment options for a given geographical area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table D.1: Prescribed Fire Treatment Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prescribed Fire Treatment Method (including broadcast, understory, or pile burning)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantages</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourages herbaceous growth and supports native species and ecosystems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cost effective fuels treatment method in most cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concerns</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Broadcast &amp; understory burning requires skilled application and involves some risk of liability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must invest time in informing and educating the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May require additional costs if mop-up or post-burn monitoring of site is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multiple entries may be required to achieve objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Re-burn potential in areas of heavy fuels or duff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seasonality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Broadcast &amp; understory burning constrained by weather, fuel characteristics, and smoke management constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pile burning may be conducted under a broader range of conditions (i.e. less constraints)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low elevation seasonal inversions and valley fog may affect burning opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application in WUI</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Burning may be effective within or adjacent to WUI, either as a stand-alone treatment or in conjunction with mechanized or manual vegetation treatment methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Most burning opportunities will exist along outer perimeters of urban areas/boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance &amp; Scheduling</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timing for subsequent treatments dependent upon condition class goals and degree of change made via initial treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recreation and other high use areas may be evaluated annually as part of a fire prevention and fuels maintenance program planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D2: Mechanized Treatment Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanized (i.e. large equipment) Treatment Method (including thinning pruning, lop and scatter, mowing, crushing, chipping, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantages</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Large local labor and contract pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cost effective over larger areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Most methods reduce fire risk by getting fuels on ground (accelerating decomposition rates) or by removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can be followed by prescribed fire where needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunities may exist for public to readily utilize material (i.e. chips, firewood, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concerns</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Large equipment limited to gentler slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential “product” may be market dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May be less economically feasible on small sites due to move-in/move-out costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May create short-term increase in fire risk especially in high-use recreation areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In high use areas, if site precludes prescribed fire as a follow-up treatment, fuels removal or increased fire prevention patrols may be warranted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seasonality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May require shut-down periods on some sites due to soils conditions or seasonal wildlife concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May be constrained by fire season requirements in summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application in WUI</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can be very effective within or adjacent to WUI, either as a stand-alone treatment or in conjunction with follow-up prescribed fire treatment methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proximity to private residences may limit mechanical use due to noise concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance &amp; Scheduling</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timing for subsequent treatments dependent upon condition class goals and degree of change made via initial treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Re-entry into thinning areas may be scheduled using standard silvicultural practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recreation and other high use areas may be scheduled for annual mechanized treatments (i.e. mowing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Private landowners and homeowners may be advised as to recommended maintenance by fire protection experts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table D3: Manual Treatment Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manual (i.e. hand) Treatment (including thinning, pruning, hand piling, raking, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advantages</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Large local labor and contract pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunities for volunteers, partnerships, stewardships, or homeowner involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can treat areas that cannot be treated by prescribed fire or mechanical means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concerns</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More labor intensive; may not be cost effective in areas of heavy fuels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May require more than one entry to achieve initial objectives for site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seasonality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work can usually be conducted year-round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chainsaw use may be constrained by fire season requirements in summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application in WUI</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can be very effective within or adjacent to WUI, either as a stand-alone treatment or in conjunction with follow-up fuels treatment methods (i.e. removal or burning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance &amp; Scheduling</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timing for subsequent treatments dependent upon condition class goals and degree of change made via initial treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Re-entry into thinning areas may be scheduled using standard silvicultural practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Private landowners and homeowners may be advised as to recommended maintenance by fire protection experts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E
Landowner Survey Data

The purpose of the landowner survey was to gain information about how landowners in Lane County perceive the potential risk of wildfire and their attitudes towards risk reduction and preparedness strategies. This appendix shows the landowner survey questions and the data associated with those questions.

Responses to Open-Ended Questions

The Lane County Landowner Survey included a number of open-ended (e.g., fill in the blank) questions. The opened data can be found in a summarized format in Section 3, in relationship with the overall analysis of the data.

2005 LANDOWNER SURVEY DATA

Instructions: This survey focuses on wildland fire risk awareness, preparedness, and the risk reduction activities of property owners. The estimated time for completing the survey is fifteen to twenty minutes. It should be completed by an adult, preferably the head of the household. Please return the survey in the enclosed postage paid envelope by March 21, 2005. All responses are kept confidential.

Your participation is voluntary. If you have any questions regarding the survey, please contact Julie Baxter at the University of Oregon (541-346-3651). If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact the Office of Human Subjects Compliance call (541) 346-2510. Please mail completed surveys to CPW, 1209 University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403.

WILDLAND FIRE RISK AWARENESS AND COMMUNICATION

The term property is used throughout this survey; please interpret this as including both land and structures such as homes.

1. Please check the box that represents your opinion on the level of risk at each of the three areas listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do you rate your property’s risk to wildland fire?</td>
<td>16.7 %</td>
<td>44.1 %</td>
<td>36.3 %</td>
<td>2.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you rate the risk of the properties in your neighborhood or area?</td>
<td>24.4 %</td>
<td>50.7 %</td>
<td>23.3 %</td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you rate your community’s (e.g. roads, schools, hospitals, shopping centers, historic landmarks) risk to wildland fire?</td>
<td>6.4 %</td>
<td>37.0 %</td>
<td>50.9 %</td>
<td>5.7 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Have you or someone in your household personally experienced a wildland fire? (Please check all that apply.)
   - 45.6% No experience with wildland fire
   - 57.0% Witnessed wildland fire or observed smoke or other effects of wildland fire
   - 3.5% Evacuated home due to a wildland fire
   - 3.5% Suffered property damage from a wildland fire

3. How have you received information in the past about protecting your property from wildland fire? (Please check all that apply.)
   - 27.1% I have not received information
   - 2.0% Public meeting or workshop
   - 59.3% News media (radio, newspaper, TV)
   - 17.2% Family, friends, or neighbors
   - 20.9% Fact sheet/brochure
   - 28.2% Local fire department or district
   - 3.3% Internet
   - 9.0% Other (specify):____________________
   - 5.1% Neighborhood or community group, (specify):_________

4. What is your preferred method for receiving information about protecting your property from wildland fire? (Please check all that apply.)
   - 48.8% Newspaper
   - 30.0% Fire department/rescue
   - 24.3% Radio
   - 5.1% Schools
   - 42.2% Television
   - 41.5% Fact sheet/brochure
   - 59.4% Mail
   - 11.3% Public workshop/meetings
   - 13.0% Internet
   - 12.1% Agricultural extension service
   - 1.8% Other (specify):_______________

FIRE PROTECTION AND PREPAREDNESS

5. Do you know if your property is serviced by a fire department or rural fire protection district? (Please check only one.)
   - 19.9% Fire department
   - 70.4% Rural fire protection district
   - 3.8% Not serviced by a fire department or district
   - 5.9% Don’t know

6. Please answer the following fire protection and preparedness questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Have you received information about wildland fire evacuation procedures for your community?</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Does your household have a wildland fire evacuation plan?</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Does your homeowner or business insurance policy include coverage in the event of structural damage or loss due to wildland fire?</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REDUCING PROPERTY RISK TO WILDLAND FIRE

Property owners can take a number of actions to reduce the potential for property damage due to wildland fire. For instance, an owner can significantly reduce the chances of structures igniting during a wildland fire by creating and maintaining a defensible space around structures on their property. Defensible space is a fire-safe zone created by reducing flammable vegetation around a structure.

7. Please indicate if you have taken any actions to reduce the potential for fire losses on your property?
   - 89.9 % Yes
   - 10.1 % No (IF NO, Skip to Question 8)

7.1 If YES, which of the following actions have you taken on your property? (Please check all that apply.)
   - 85.9 % Regularly clear roof/gutters of debris
   - 87.9 % Reduced vegetation near structures (buildings) on property
   - 66.3 % Reduced vegetation on other areas of property
   - 23.5 % Planted native vegetation (plants)
   - 23.8 % Invested in fire resistant building materials
   - 29.6 % Installed a chimney spark arrester
   - 32.8 % Installed a water source
   - 9.0 % Invested in a sprinkler system
   - 40.9 % Improved address signage for better visibility
   - 16.7 % Widened the road leading to the property
   - 10.0 % Other (specify): ________________________

8. Please indicate how likely you are to take the following actions to reduce the potential impacts of wildland fire to your property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Reduction Action</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely</th>
<th>Not Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Reduce debris and vegetation on property</td>
<td>78.5 %</td>
<td>15.2 %</td>
<td>6.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Create defensible zones around structures</td>
<td>64.9 %</td>
<td>25.2 %</td>
<td>9.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Improve emergency access to property</td>
<td>35.1 %</td>
<td>20.1 %</td>
<td>44.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Use fire resistant building materials</td>
<td>32.8 %</td>
<td>33.9 %</td>
<td>33.3 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Which of the following incentives, if any, would motivate you to take additional steps to better protect your property from wildland fire?
   - 69.7 % Insurance discount
   - 29.2 % Grant program
   - 68.6 % Tax break or incentive
   - 12.2 % None of the above
   - 5.6 % Other (specify): ________________________

REDUCING COMMUNITY RISK TO WILDLAND FIRE

10. Developed public and private lands can create a wildland fire risk when trees and underbrush grow densely near structures. Several methods can be used to maintain trees and underbrush to reduce the potential for wildland fire impacts. Mechanical thinning involves the use of chainsaws, brush mowers, or other specialized machines to reduce the number of shrubs and small trees, thus
reducing the potential for nearby structures to ignite. Prescribed burning involves controlling naturally caused fires or intentionally setting fires to burn under close and careful watch. Chemical treatment involves the application of chemical agents to prevent or restrict the growth of existing vegetation. Please indicate how supportive you are of each of the following methods.

Table E4 Support for Hazardous Fuel Treatment Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Method</th>
<th>Very Supportive</th>
<th>Somewhat Supportive</th>
<th>Neither Supportive nor Unsupportive</th>
<th>Somewhat Unsupportive</th>
<th>Very Unsupportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. No Action</td>
<td>6.2 %</td>
<td>4.5 %</td>
<td>20.5 %</td>
<td>15.4 %</td>
<td>53.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Mechanical Thinning</td>
<td>68.6 %</td>
<td>24.5 %</td>
<td>3.7 %</td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Prescribed Burning</td>
<td>39.0 %</td>
<td>34.7 %</td>
<td>12.1 %</td>
<td>7.4 %</td>
<td>6.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Chemical Treatment</td>
<td>24.7 %</td>
<td>22.6 %</td>
<td>10.0 %</td>
<td>13.5 %</td>
<td>29.2 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Wildland fire can have a significant impact on a community but planning for its occurrence can help lessen the impacts. The following statements will help determine landowner priorities for planning for wildland fire. Please tell us how important each one is to you.

**Table E5 Importance of Wildfire Planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Neither Important nor Unimportant</th>
<th>Somewhat Unimportant</th>
<th>Very Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Protecting critical infrastructure (e.g. roads, hospital, schools)</td>
<td>80.2 %</td>
<td>14.9 %</td>
<td>3.1 %</td>
<td>1.3 %</td>
<td>0.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Protecting private property</td>
<td>66.3 %</td>
<td>28.3 %</td>
<td>4.5 %</td>
<td>0.9 %</td>
<td>0.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Preventing or regulating development in hazard areas</td>
<td>46.1 %</td>
<td>34.1 %</td>
<td>11.4 %</td>
<td>3.9 %</td>
<td>4.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Restoring forests to natural conditions</td>
<td>38.4 %</td>
<td>30.8 %</td>
<td>16.2 %</td>
<td>8.7 %</td>
<td>5.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Protecting historical and cultural landmarks</td>
<td>34.3 %</td>
<td>42.6 %</td>
<td>16.6 %</td>
<td>3.8 %</td>
<td>2.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Promoting cooperation among public agencies, citizens, non-profit groups, and businesses</td>
<td>52.1 %</td>
<td>36.2 %</td>
<td>8.5 %</td>
<td>1.3 %</td>
<td>1.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Reducing damage to utilities</td>
<td>62.0 %</td>
<td>31.1 %</td>
<td>6.3 %</td>
<td>0.4 %</td>
<td>0.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Strengthening emergency services (e.g. police, fire)</td>
<td>56.0 %</td>
<td>35.5 %</td>
<td>6.5 %</td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
<td>0.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Educating landowners on wildland fire</td>
<td>65.2 %</td>
<td>31.3 %</td>
<td>2.6 %</td>
<td>0.4 %</td>
<td>0.4 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Please indicate your opinion on each of the following statements about responsibility for protecting property from wildland fire.

Table E6 Opinion on Wildfire Protection Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Private property owners are responsible for protecting their property from wildland fire.</td>
<td>42.5 %</td>
<td>41.6 %</td>
<td>9.6 %</td>
<td>5.4 %</td>
<td>0.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. The community fire department is responsible for protecting property from wildland fire.</td>
<td>16.6 %</td>
<td>55.7 %</td>
<td>17.7 %</td>
<td>8.2 %</td>
<td>1.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The property owner (including federal, state, local, and private) that manages the forest is responsible for protecting property from wildland fire.</td>
<td>32.7 %</td>
<td>51.2 %</td>
<td>14.1 %</td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
<td>0.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The Oregon Department of Forestry is responsible for protecting property from wildland fire.</td>
<td>17.4 %</td>
<td>45.8 %</td>
<td>25.6 %</td>
<td>8.5 %</td>
<td>2.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Protecting property from wildland fires is a shared responsibility between private landowners, local, state, and federal government agencies.</td>
<td>65.1 %</td>
<td>28.6 %</td>
<td>4.6 %</td>
<td>0.4 %</td>
<td>1.3 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. A number of activities can reduce your community’s risk to wildland fire. These activities can be both regulatory and non-regulatory. An example of a regulatory activity would be a policy that requires the review of development plans to meet certain criteria in known wildland fire hazard areas. An example of a non-regulatory activity would be to develop a public education program to demonstrate steps citizens can take to make their property safer from wildland fire. Please check the box that best represents your support of the following strategies to reduce the risks posed by wildland fire.

**Table E7 Support for Risk Reduction activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Reduction Strategy</th>
<th>Very Supportive</th>
<th>Somewhat Supportive</th>
<th>Neither Supportive nor Unsupportive</th>
<th>Somewhat Unsupportive</th>
<th>Very Unsupportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Public information to increase citizen action in reducing risk</td>
<td>97.3 %</td>
<td>28.4 %</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
<td>0.4 %</td>
<td>0.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Requirements for vegetation management around structures located in high hazard areas</td>
<td>38.7 %</td>
<td>40.0 %</td>
<td>10.4 %</td>
<td>6.2 %</td>
<td>4.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Building construction standards for new development in high hazard areas</td>
<td>49.6 %</td>
<td>33.6 %</td>
<td>9.3 %</td>
<td>5.6 %</td>
<td>2.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Access/roadway guidelines for new development in high hazards areas</td>
<td>52.9 %</td>
<td>35.1 %</td>
<td>8.7 %</td>
<td>1.8 %</td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Developer and builder educational programs</td>
<td>48.5 %</td>
<td>38.0 %</td>
<td>11.4 %</td>
<td>0.7 %</td>
<td>1.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Wildland fire mitigation checklist for development review process in high hazard areas</td>
<td>41.9 %</td>
<td>39.7 %</td>
<td>13.5 %</td>
<td>3.6 %</td>
<td>1.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Public purchase of land in high hazard areas for open space</td>
<td>19.7 %</td>
<td>26.5 %</td>
<td>30.9 %</td>
<td>10.3 %</td>
<td>12.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Require new rural residential developments be within rural fire protection district boundaries</td>
<td>24.3 %</td>
<td>25.9 %</td>
<td>22.8 %</td>
<td>13.2 %</td>
<td>13.8 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GENERAL LANDOWNER INFORMATION

14. How long have you owned the property to which this survey is addressed? Average 19.3 Years

15. What is your zip code?

16. Is this property primarily used as a business?
   8.2% Yes
   91.6% No (IF NO, Skip to Question 17)

16.1. What type of business is it?
   43.9% Agricultural
   24.4% Forest Resources
   2.4% Industrial
   9.8% Commercial
   19.5% Other (specify): ______________________

17. Do you rent or own the home in which you live?
   0.4% Rent
   97.6% Own (or am buying)
   1.8% Occupy without payment or rent

18. Do you live in the home where you received this survey year round or seasonally?
   93.0% Year round
   6.1% Seasonal

19. What is your age? Average 59 Years

20. Please estimate your total household income in 2004 before taxes.
   0.8% Less than $5,000
   11.9% $15,000-$24,999
   13.7% $75,000-$99,999
   2.6% $5,000-$9,999
   24.9% $25,000-$49,999
   8.0% $100,000-$149,999
   4.4% $10,000-$14,999
   25.1% $50,000-$74,999
   8.5% $150,000 or more

21. Please indicate your level of education.
   1.1% Grade school/no schooling
   24.9% College degree
   2.7% Some high school
   35.8% Some college/trade school
   15.2% Postcollege degree
   16.6% High school graduate/GED
   1.1% Other (Please specify) ______________________

Please feel free to provide any additional comments in the space provided below.
THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR PROVIDING THIS INFORMATION
The Oregon Natural Hazards Workgroup at the University of Oregon’s Community Service Center prepared this survey. For more information, please contact Oregon Natural Hazards Workgroup at 1209 University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403-1209, call (541) 346-3653, or visit http://www.OregonShowcase.org

2019 LANDOWNER SURVEY RESULTS

Instructions: This survey focuses on wildland fire risk awareness, preparedness, and the risk reduction activities of property owners. The estimated time for completing the survey is fifteen to twenty minutes. It should be completed by an adult, preferably the head of the household. Please return the survey in the enclosed postage paid envelope by August 21, 2019. If you have filled out this survey online, thank you! You do not need to fill it out again. All responses are kept confidential.

Your participation is voluntary. If you have any questions regarding the survey, please contact Lauren Grand at Oregon State University (541-344-5859).

WILDLAND FIRE RISK AWARENESS AND COMMUNICATION
The term property is used throughout this survey; please interpret this as including both land and structures such as homes.

1. Please check the box that represents your opinion on the level of risk at each of the three areas listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do you rate your property’s risk to wildland fire?</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you rate the risk of the properties in your neighborhood or area?</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>4.24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you rate your community’s (e.g. Roads, schools, hospitals, shopping centers, historic landmarks) risk to wildland fire?</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Have you or someone in your household personally experienced a wildland fire? (check all that apply)
   - 35.8% No experience with wildland fire
   - 62.5% Witnessed wildland fire or observed smoke or other effects of wildland fire
   - 7.01% Evacuated home due to a wildland fire
   - 3.4% Suffered property damage from a wildland fire
3. How have you received information in the past about protecting your property from wildland fire? (check all that apply)

- 19.3% I have not received information
- 14.9% Public meeting or workshop
- 51.6% News media (radio, newspaper, TV)
- 25.1% Family, friends, or neighbors
- 37.7% Fact sheet/brochure
- 33.1% Local fire department or district
- 11.4% Internet (specify): ____________________________
- 11.25% Neighborhood or community group (specify): ______________
- 10.6% Other (specify): ____________________________

4. What is your preferred method for receiving information about protecting your property from wildland fire? (check all that apply)

- 21.2% Newspaper
- 30.3% Fire department/rescue
- 17.9% Radio
- 3.3% Schools
- 26.3% Television
- 46.2% Fact sheet/brochure
- 58.6% Mail
- 21% Public workshop/meetings
- 44.5% Internet
- 18.2% Oregon State University Extension Service
- 7.32% Other (specify): ____________________________

FIRE PROTECTION AND PREPAREDNESS

5. Do you know if your property is serviced by a fire department or rural fire protection district? (check only one.)

- 37.8% Fire department
- 52.9% Rural fire protection district
- 2.2% Not serviced by a fire dept or district
- 7% Don’t know

6. Please answer the following fire protection and preparedness questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you received information about wildland fire evacuation procedures for your community?</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your household have a wildland fire evacuation plan?</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your homeowner or business insurance policy include coverage in the event of structural damage or loss due to wildland fire?</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REDUCING PROPERTY RISK TO WILDLAND FIRE
Property owners can take a number of actions to reduce the potential for property damage due to wildland fire. For instance, an owner can significantly reduce the chances of structures igniting during a wildland fire by creating and maintaining a
defensible space around structures on their property. Defensible space is a fire-safe zone created by reducing flammable vegetation around a structure.

7. Have you taken any actions to reduce the potential for fire losses on your property?
   88.7% Yes
   No (IF NO, Skip to Question 8)

7.1 If YES, which of the following actions have you taken on your property? (check all that apply.)
   86.9% Regularly clear roof/gutters of debris
   87.8% Reduced vegetation near structures (buildings) on property
   65.4% Reduced vegetation on other areas of property
   33.1% Planted native vegetation (plants)
   31.9% Invested in fire resistant building materials
   27.2% Installed a chimney spark arrester
   29.8% Installed a water source
   18.2% Invested in a sprinkler system
   38.0% Improved address signage for better visibility
   15.6% Widened the road leading to the property
   9.3% Other (specify):

8. Please indicate how likely you are to take the following actions to reduce the potential impacts of wildland fire to your property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk reduction action</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Somewhat likely</th>
<th>Not likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce debris and vegetation on property</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create defensible zones around structures</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve emergency access to property</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use fire resistant building materials</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Which of the following incentives, if any, would motivate you to take additional steps to better protect your property from wildland fire? (check all that apply)
   69.5% Insurance discount
   54.4% Grant program
   69.5% Tax break or incentive
   9.4% None of the above
   11.6% Other (specify):

10. Local Government and Federal Agencies provide a number of landowner assistance and recognition programs. How familiar are you with the available programs?

**Table E8 Familiarity with Landowner Assistance Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>I've participated in this program</th>
<th>Very familiar</th>
<th>Some-what familiar</th>
<th>Not familiar At all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fuels reduction cost share grants through the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firewise Communities</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Adaptive Communities</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Department of Forestry Fuels Reduction Program</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane County Firewise Grant Program</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REDUCING COMMUNITY RISK TO WILDLAND FIRE

11. Developed public and private lands can create a wildland fire risk when trees and underbrush grow densely near structures. Several methods can be used to maintain trees and underbrush to reduce the potential for wildland fire impacts. Mechanical thinning involves the use of chainsaws, brush mowers, or other specialized machines to reduce the number of shrubs and small trees, thus reducing the potential for nearby structures to ignite. Prescribed burning involves controlling naturally caused fires or intentionally setting fires to burn under close and careful watch. Chemical treatment involves the application of chemical agents to prevent or restrict the growth of existing vegetation. Please indicate how supportive you are of each of the following methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment method</th>
<th>Very supportive</th>
<th>Somewhat supportive</th>
<th>Neither supportive nor unsupportive</th>
<th>Somewhat unsupportive</th>
<th>Very unsupportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Action</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Thinning</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescribed Burning</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Treatment</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Wildland fire can have a significant impact on a community but planning for its occurrence can help lessen the impacts. The following statements will help determine landowner priorities for planning for wildland fire. Please tell us how important each one is to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Neither important nor unimportant</th>
<th>Somewhat unimportant</th>
<th>Very unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protecting critical infrastructure (e.g. roads, hospitals, schools)</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting private property</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing or regulating development</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoring forests to natural Conditions</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting historical and cultural Landmarks</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting cooperation among public agencies, citizens, nonprofits, &amp; businesses</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing damage to utilities</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening emergency services (e.g. Police, fire)</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educating landowners on wildland Fire</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Please indicate your opinion on each of the following statements about responsibility for protecting property from wildland fire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private property owners are responsible for protecting their property from wildland fire.</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community fire department is responsible for protecting property from wildland fire.</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The property owner (including federal, state, local, and private) that manages the forest is responsible for protecting property from wildland fire.</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Oregon Department of Forestry is responsible for protecting property from wildland fire.</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting property from wildland fires is a shared responsibility between private landowners, local, state, and federal government agencies.</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. A number of activities can reduce your community’s risk to wildland fire. These activities can be both regulatory and non-regulatory. An example of a regulatory activity would be a policy that requires the review of development plans to meet certain criteria in known wildland fire hazard areas. An example of a non-regulatory activity would be to develop a public education program to demonstrate steps citizens can take to make their property safer from wildland fire. Please check the box that best represents your support of the following strategies to reduce the risks posed by wildland fire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Reduction Strategy</th>
<th>Very supportive</th>
<th>Somewhat supportive</th>
<th>Neither supportive nor unsupportive</th>
<th>Somewhat unsupportive</th>
<th>Very unsupportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public information to increase citizen action in reducing risk</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements for vegetation management around structures located in high hazard areas</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building construction standards for new development in high hazard areas</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access/roadway guidelines for new development in high hazards areas</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer and builder educational programs</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildland fire mitigation checklist for development review process in high hazard areas</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public purchase of land in high hazard areas for open space</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>26.24%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require new rural residential developments be within rural fire protection district boundaries</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a tax service district to fund preventative wildfire reduction work and education</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL LANDOWNER INFORMATION**

15. How long have you owned your property? 19 Years

16. In which fire district is your property located? (There is a fire district map at the end of this packet.) ____________________________
17. What is your street address? Your address will remain confidential and will not be used for anything other than this survey.

18. Is this property primarily used as a business?
   4.6% yes
   95.4% no
   (IF NO, Skip to question 19)

18.1 If YES, what type of business is it?
   51.5% Agricultural
   10.3% Forest Resources
   0.0% Industrial
   7.4% Commercial
   30.9% Other: (specify)

19. Do you rent or own the home in which you live?
   3.4% Rent
   94.4% own (or am buying)
   2.2% Occupy without payment or rent

20. Do you live in the home where you received this survey year round or seasonally?
   95% Year round
   5% Seasonal

21. What is your age? 62 Years

22. Please estimate your total household income in 2018 before taxes.
   1.4% Less than $5,000
   1.6% $5,000-$9,999
   1.9% $10,000-$14,999
   6.9% $15,000-$24,999
   18.6% $25,000-$49,999
   22.4% $50,000-$74,999
   17.6% $75,000-$99,999
   29.7% $100,000- or more

23. Please indicate your level of education.
   0.1% Grade school/no schooling
   33.5% College degree
   0.3% Some high school
   27.5% Postcollege degree
   12.3% High school graduate/GED
   21% Other (please specify):
   24.2% Some college/trade school

24. Please feel free to provide any additional comments in the space provided below.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR PROVIDING THIS INFORMATION
For more information, please contact Lauren Grand, Oregon State University, 541-344-5859
Fire Districts* in Lane County

* Various types of fire protection providers are shown on the map. Most are either RFPDs or Water Districts. The cities of Eugene and Springfield jointly provide fire protection service inside their combined city limits, as well as for the Eugene Airport (AIR) and several contract districts in and around the Eugene-Springfield area (BAS, ZUM, RIR, EU1, GLW, WLE, WLS, and RAB). The cities of Oakridge and Westfir provide fire protection through contract with HDF. Small private contract areas are not shown on the map. Some Lane County districts extend into adjacent counties, while the Monroe district extends into Lane County from Benton County.
Appendix F
Wildfire Resources

This section covers eight topics:

- Policies
- Fire Siting Recommendations
  - Recommendations for fire siting standards in Lane County
  - Undesirable plants list for Lane County
- Wildfire Mitigation: Educational Resources
  - Survivable Space Poster
  - Oregon Forestland Dwelling Statute: Self-Certification Checklist
  - Ember Awareness Checklist Poster

These resources are intended to help local stakeholders, members of the public, landowners, and communities take proactive steps and learn more about pathways to reduce wildland urban interface fire risk.

Policies

Policies are often created at the federal and state level that affect how agencies, businesses, and residents can work individually and collaboratively to reduce communities’ risk to wildfire. The following resources provide information on existing federal and state policies regarding wildfire risk reduction.

Healthy Forests Initiative and Healthy Forest Restoration Act
https://www.fs.fed.us/projects/hfi/field-guide/web/page03.php

National Fire Plan 10 Year Comprehensive Strategy

FLAME Act of 2009 (Federal Land Assistance, Management and Enhancement)

Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000

Oregon Statewide Land Use Planning Goal 7: Areas Subject to Natural Hazards
https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/OP/Pages/Goal-7.aspx

Oregon Forestland Dwelling Units Statute, ORS 215.730
https://www.oregonlaws.org/ors/215.501

Oregon Forestland-Urban Interface Fire Protection Act of 1997 (Oregon’s Defensible Space Law)
https://oregonexplorer.info/content/oregon-forestland-urban-interface-fire-protection-act?topic=ptopic
Governor’s Council on Wildfire Response 2019
https://www.oregon.gov/gov/policy/Pages/wildfirecouncil.aspx

Fire Siting Recommendations
The following content was developed by the Hazardous Fuel Subcommittee. The Subcommittee was formed to help guide recommendations for an update to Fire Siting Standards in Lane County. The Committee was composed of members from: Lane County Fire Defense Board, Oregon Department of Forestry, Oregon Office of State Fire Marshals, BLM, USFS, The Nature Conservancy, Friends of Buford Park and Mt. Pisgah, and Lane County Parks and Open Spaces.

The recommendations were formed during six meetings from October 2019-March 2020 in an effort to inform recommended changes to current fire siting standards with a combination of literature review, expert opinion, and fuels and fire behavior modeling (Action item 2.3.1 in the CWPP). The following are the codes the subcommittee addressed; Lane Code: 16.210(7)(c) Non-Impacted Forest Lands Zone (F-1), Fire Siting Standards and 16.211(8)(c), Impacted Forest Lands Zone (F-2), and Fire Siting Standards.

The following content is non-regulatory and was developed by the Hazardous Fuels Subcommittee to inform policy makers, stakeholders, and future land use regulations. To view current fire siting regulations in Lane County visit: www.lanecounty.org/lanecode.

Fire Siting Recommendations and Fuels and Fire Behavior Modeling
The best long-term solution to avoid structure loss during a wildfire event is a combination of defensible space treatments, building design, education, and proactive land-use planning that limits exposure.¹ Defensible space can be defined as a given proximity within structures in which fuel treatments are conducted to alter fire behavior which in turn reduces the risk of a structure ignition during a wildfire event.

In California (a much higher risk area than Lane County) researchers found that, “The most effective treatment distance varied between 5 and 20 m (16–58 ft.) from the structure, but distances larger than 30 m (100 ft.) did not provide additional protection, even for structures located on steep slopes. The most effective actions were reducing woody cover up to 40% immediately adjacent to structures and ensuring that vegetation does not overhang or touch the structure. Multiple-regression models showed landscape-scale factors, including low housing density and distances to major roads, were more important in explaining structure destruction.” ²

Fuels and fire behavior in Lane County vary considerably depending upon aspect, elevation, soil type, and vegetation.³ Historical wildland fire frequencies based on both natural ignitions from lightning and indigenous burning practices range from every six to once every thousand years.⁴ When considering the availability of fuels to burn, it is helpful to identify the most common fuel types for modeling and planning purposes.
Figure F 1: Willamette Valley, Presumed Historic Mean Fire Return Intervals

Lane County Fire Behavior and Model Design
The height of fire season in Lane County has historically occurred in late summer and early fall, when dry climate, available fuels, and easterly winds combine to create conditions for rapid fire growth. While the time of year during which conditions enabling wildfire growth is relatively short compared with other parts of the state such as the Rogue Basin and Central Oregon, the hazard potential associated with wildfire during those times is equally significant.

For the purposes of modeling potential fire behavior impacts to recommended buffers around structures, we identified the four most common fuel types as
described by Scott and Burgan found in Lane County: compact timber litter associated with closed canopy Douglas-fir dominated forests (timber litter), broadleaf and long-needle pine litter associated with oak, madrone, maple, and Ponderosa pine woodlands (broadleaf litter), grasses most commonly found in valley bottom prairies and upland savannas (grass), and shrubs such as blackberry and rose intermixed with grasses found in prairie, savanna, and disturbed forests where the forest canopy has been removed (grass/shrub) were chosen as representative.

Based on fire behavior modeling of the four fuel types described above, under three slope scenarios (0-9%, 10-24%, and 25-40%), and two weather scenarios (hot/dry and cool/wet). It is evident that shading, wind obstruction, increased crown base height with pruning limbs to 8 ft., and fuel arrangement in timber litter has the effect of reducing surface fire behavior (flame lengths and rates of spread) as well as crown fire potential. The highest potential for problematic surface fire and crown fire is found in grass/shrub. Maintenance of fuels that fall within this category including mowing and burning significantly reduces potential wildfire hazards and is recommended in the absence of canopy limiting growth of surface vegetation that inevitably becomes fuel for fire.

Recommendations for safe distances between surface and crown fuels to limit crown fire potential are based on best available science and associated modeling coupled with local fire management expertise. Studies and research looking at the effectiveness of fuel breaks generally focus on dry forests known for high historical fire frequency with low severity where canopy spacing reduces crown fire potential without increasing surface fuel loading to the extent that it does in Lane County. The Willamette Valley also has a more complex fire history of both higher and lower frequency fires of varying severities, occurring during late summer and early fall. Lower frequency of fire return is associated with canopy closure, with higher fire frequency occurring in unshaded areas such as prairie and savanna.

Modeling Implications
Main text results of modeling fuels and fire behavior confirmed what Lane County fire managers know, that maintaining a canopy adequately disconnected from surface fuels is the most effective long-term forest management action in an environment where vigorous vegetative growth occurs when light reaches the forest floor. The current code increases surface and ladder fuel growth by allowing light to penetrate the forest canopy through the requirement for canopy spacing to reduce crown fire potential. Model results as outlined in Figure 2 indicates that under very dry, hot, and windy conditions in open canopy with grass and shrub, flame lengths from Douglas fir trees torching would be 41 feet. Compared with just 14 feet under the same conditions in a closed canopy forest where trees have been pruned to 8 feet from the ground.

Buffers between structures and fuels alone are not sufficient to prevent embers from causing homes to ignite. Home hardening has been shown to be of equal importance in protecting homes from ignitions during wildfire events. Ignitions from flame radiation are unlikely to occur from burning vegetation beyond 120 feet of a structure, and thinning vegetation within 120 feet has a significant ignition mitigation effect.
Figure F 2: Lane County CWPP Fire Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel Model and Environmental Conditions</th>
<th>Head Fire ROS (ft/hr)</th>
<th>Head Fire Surface flame Length (ft)</th>
<th>Crown Fire Type</th>
<th>Active Crown Fire Rate of Spread (ft/hr)</th>
<th>Active Crown Fire Rate of Spread (ft/hr)</th>
<th>Passive Crown Fire Rate of Spread (ft/hr)</th>
<th>Passive Crown Fire Rate of Spread (ft/hr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1 Compact Timber Uitter Hot</td>
<td>0.9% 1.0-1.2</td>
<td>0.9% 1.0-1.2</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>0.9% 2.5-30</td>
<td>0.9% 3.2-14</td>
<td>0.9% 2.4-14</td>
<td>0.9% 2.4-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 Compact Timber Uitter Cool</td>
<td>0.9% 1.0-1.2</td>
<td>0.9% 1.0-1.2</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>0.9% 2.5-30</td>
<td>0.9% 3.2-14</td>
<td>0.9% 2.4-14</td>
<td>0.9% 2.4-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T19 Very High Load Broadleaf Hot</td>
<td>0.9% 1.0-1.2</td>
<td>0.9% 1.0-1.2</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>0.9% 2.5-30</td>
<td>0.9% 3.2-14</td>
<td>0.9% 2.4-14</td>
<td>0.9% 2.4-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T19 Very High Load Broadleaf Cool</td>
<td>0.9% 1.0-1.2</td>
<td>0.9% 1.0-1.2</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>0.9% 2.5-30</td>
<td>0.9% 3.2-14</td>
<td>0.9% 2.4-14</td>
<td>0.9% 2.4-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G43/SH High Load Shrub/Graz Hot</td>
<td>0.9% 1.0-1.2</td>
<td>0.9% 1.0-1.2</td>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>0.9% 2.5-30</td>
<td>0.9% 3.2-14</td>
<td>0.9% 2.4-14</td>
<td>0.9% 2.4-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Generated by Amanda Rau using Behave 6.0.0 Modeling Program Beta 3 (https://www.frames.gov/catalog/57066)

Behave 6.0.0 runs assumes maximum effective wind speed limit is imposed, two fuel model weighting method is based on two dimensional spread, fire spread as a head fire, wind is blowing upslope, wind and spread directions are degrees clockwise from upslope, and direction of the wind vector is the direction the wind is pushing the fire. 2020.

Voluntary Compliance
Defensible space can be enforced with adequate funding for annual maintenance and inspections. This often means enforcement is not feasible due the cost of site inspections even with grants for fuels reduction and other programs to help landowners. Many communities elect for education and technical support as a means to increase voluntary compliance. Compliance for defensible space is related to feasibility.\(^\text{10}\) Homeowners are more accepting of policies perceived as fair and part of a more comprehensive risk reduction strategy.\(^\text{11}\)

In Lane County many landowners echo research indicating that the choice to participate in strategies for wildfire hazard mitigation hinges on consideration of homeowners’ feelings of connectedness to nature as impacted by vegetation management, the cost of mitigation activities, as well as emotional drivers like fear and sense of responsibility.\(^\text{12}\) The willingness to implement defensible space was predicted by the perceived effectiveness of, and attitude toward defensible space.\(^\text{13}\)

As the referenced material, and model results indicate, treatments within 60 feet are the most important and treatments beyond 100 feet do not provide additional
protection, even on steep slopes (Figure 2). Fuels reduction should be focused on ladder fuel reduction within a closer distance to the home while eliminating requirements for canopy spacing in areas where it would not have a beneficial impact. Landowners who choose an open canopy fuel break should be made aware of the need for maintenance in reducing wildfire risk over time.

Recommendations for Fire Siting Standards in Lane County

Primary Fuel Break
The primary fuel break is measured from the edge of the structure footprint, defined as the structure and attached accessories, such as decks, carports and any other building material attached to structure.

The Primary Fuel Break includes the Structure Ignition Zone; 0-5 Feet from the structure and an additional 25 feet of managed landscaping.

Immediate Zone 0-5 Feet
A 5 foot non-combustible perimeter is required, measured from structure perimeter outwards. Non-combustible is defined as material incapable of burning during sustained convection and radiant heat. Non-combustible is also defined as material unable to combust under extreme heat and extended flame contact, rock or mineral soil for example. There shall be no tree trunks within this zone.

Intermediate Zone 5-30 Feet
Grass is maintained to no more than 4 inches above the ground and kept green if possible. Mature trees are pruned to a height of 10 feet from the ground (lowest point of branch), trees less than 20 feet tall are pruned between 1/3 and 1/2 of the trees height do not exceed 1/2 of the trees height to avoid damage from pruning. Prune trees as they grow until the branches reach 10 feet from the ground. No dead plant material is present. 3x vertical spacing is maintained between surface and canopy fuels. Surface fuels other than short maintained grass lawns shall not be growing or arranged in a continuous or otherwise connected fashion, nor in quantities nor densities known to sustain fire activity under extreme conditions.

Trees
There shall not be any tree branches within 15 feet of the structure footprint in any direction. Within 15 feet, tree trunks (defined as the main stem(s) of a large woody plant) are acceptable within this zone, as long as tree limbs have been pruned to allow 15 feet of clearance from the structure footprint. For example; a large conifer tree may be growing within 6 feet of a house, as long as the closest branches are at least 15 feet above and away from the structure in all directions.

Secondary Fuel Break

Extended Zone: 30-100 feet
All trees over 20 feet tall are pruned to a height of 10 feet from the ground (lowest point of branch), trees less than 20 feet tall are pruned between 1/3 and 1/2 of the trees height, not to exceed 1/2 of the trees height to avoid damage
from pruning. Prune trees as they grow until the branches reach 10 feet from ground. All dead plant material within 10 feet of the surface has been removed or mulched. Dead plant material includes but is not limited to sticks, limbs, leaves, branches and trunks. Maintain at least 2x vertical clearance between canopy layers and from the lowest canopy layer to the ground. This may be replicated for multiple canopy layers. For example surface vegetation may be 2 feet tall, with the understory canopy greater than 4 feet above the surface vegetation, and at least 2x lower than the height of the dominant canopy.

**Coarse Woody Debris (CWD) Exemption**

CWD can be defined as dead trees and remains of large branches on the ground in forests, rivers and wetlands. CWD is known to increase soil moisture and improve wildlife habitat, therefore a Limited Amount will be allowed within the secondary fuel break. In total no more than 200 linear feet will be allowed within the secondary fuel break. The diameter of all CWD must be a minimum of 9 inches. All CWD present must either be in contact with surface soil or within 6 inches of surface contact. For example you could have two 100 foot long downed trees 9 inches in diameter or larger as long as the fine fuels such as branches have been removed or mulched.

**Additional Slope restrictions:**

Sloping land within 100 feet of structures in which the majority of a quadrant has a greater than 10% grade will have additional primary fuel break distances. No matter the additional primary fuel break distance, the immediate zone will remain the same (0-5 feet non-combustible fuel break)

**0-9%**
The standard fuel breaks mentioned above shall be created (5-30 feet Intermediate Zone) and the Secondary Fuel Break (30-100 feet).

**10-24%**
Within 180° of the steepest downward slope the Primary Fuel Break shall extend an additional 10 feet, creating an Intermediate Zone from 5-40 feet. The Secondary Fuel Break (Extended Zone) shall be 40-100 feet.

**24-39%**
Within 180° of the steepest downward facing slope, the primary fuel break shall extend an additional 20 feet creating a 50 foot Intermediate Zone (5-50 feet) on the downslope half of the house/property. The Secondary Fuel Break shall extend from 50 feet to 100 feet.

**>40%**
We do not recommend allowing structures within 100 feet of slopes exceeding 39%. If additions occur on sites with slopes 40% or greater, the Primary Fuel Break shall extend an additional 30 feet (5-60 feet) from the structure on all sides. The Secondary Fuel Break shall extend from 60-100 feet from the structure.

The above specifications alone will not improve home survivability during wildfire events. Home hardening activities (fire resistant building material paired with annual fine fuel removal and maintenance) have a much larger impact on home
ignition risk than fuel breaks. Fuel breaks require annual maintenance. The above recommendations are an attempt to improve long term efficacy of fuel break codes by incorporating canopy shade as a significant maintenance tool for controlling surface fuels in Western Oregon.

The preceding recommendations were developed with input from the following entities: Oregon Department of Forestry, Oregon Office of State Fire Marshalls, United States Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, The Nature Conservancy, Friends of Buford Park and Lane County Parks to inform Lane County Code LC 16.210(7) (c) and 16.211(8) (c), generally referred to as Lane County Fire Siting Standards.

Conclusion

Fire managers are the architects of the suggested fire siting standard recommendations. Recommendations were informed by relevant scientific research, expert knowledge of social and wildfire factors influencing defensible space, as well as fire modeling research for Lane County vegetation types. The best long-term strategy to reduce structure loss includes a suite of prevention measures. We believe the suggested revisions to County Code 16.210(7)(c) and 16.211(8)(c) represents a commonsense approach in an environment notorious for vegetative growth that will reduce structure loss from wildfires in Lane County as much or better than current regulations. Fit with other county wildfire risk reduction measures including the CWPP, and improved voluntary landowner participation in fuel break maintenance.

Undesirable Planting List
Table 1 includes trees, shrubs, and ornamental grasses that are highly flammable and should be avoided when planting within the primary fuel break. The plants listed below are more susceptible to burning, due to rough or peeling bark, production of large amounts of litter, vegetation that contains oils, resin, wax, or pitch, large amounts of dead material in the plant, or plantings with a high dead to live fuel ratio. Note that this is not a complete list of flammable plants that can be grown in Lane County. Furthermore, all plants can increase fire behavior due to lack of maintenance, growth habit, and/or site conditions. Table 1 includes some species known to be a hazard, even under optimal growing conditions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Acacia</em> species</td>
<td>Acacias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Araucaria araucana</em></td>
<td>Monkey Puzzle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Arctostaphylos</em> species</td>
<td>Manzanita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bambusa</em> and related species</td>
<td>Bamboos (all)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Callistemon</em> species</td>
<td>Bottlebrush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Calocedrus decurrens</em></td>
<td>Incense Cedar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ceanothus</em> species</td>
<td>Ceanothus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cedrus</em> species</td>
<td>Cedars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chamaecyparis</em> species</td>
<td>False Cypress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cortaderia</em> species</td>
<td>Pampas Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cotoneaster</em> species</td>
<td>Cotoneasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cryptomeria japonica</em></td>
<td>Japanese Cryptomeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cupressus</em> species</td>
<td>Cypresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cytisus</em> species</td>
<td>Brooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Elaeagnus</em> species</td>
<td>Silverberry, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eucalyptus</em> species</td>
<td>Eucalyptus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Genista</em> species</td>
<td>Brooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Juniperus</em> species</td>
<td>Junipers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Picea</em> species</td>
<td>Spruce Trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pinus</em> species</td>
<td>Pines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Prunus laurocerasus</em></td>
<td>Cherry Laurel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pyracantha</em> species</td>
<td>Firethorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rosmarinus</em> species</td>
<td>Rosemary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rubus</em> species (<em>armeniacus, vestitus, etc.</em>)</td>
<td>Non-Native Invasive Blackberries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Spartium junceum</em></td>
<td>Spanish Broom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Taxodium</em> species</td>
<td>Bald Cypresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Taxus</em> species</td>
<td>Yews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Thuja</em> species</td>
<td>Arborvitae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Trachycarpus fortunei</em></td>
<td>Windmill Palm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ulex europea</em></td>
<td>Gorse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Umbellularia californica</em></td>
<td>California Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vaccinium ovatum</em></td>
<td>Evergreen Huckleberry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wildfire Mitigation: Educational Resources

Many programs currently exist to help mitigate communities’ risk to wildfire and to educate agencies, businesses, and residents on issues related to wildland-urban interface fire. The following resources provide links to educational information and programs regarding wildfire mitigation and community outreach:

IBHS Research Center
Contact: N/A
Address: N/A
Phone: N/A
https://ibhs.org/risk-research/wildfire/

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for Kids: Teaching Kids About Prescribed Fire
Contact: FEMA
Address: 500 C Street, Southwest Washington D.C. 20472
Phone: (202) 566-1600
https://www.ready.gov/kids

Fire Adapted Communities
Contact: National Wildfire Coordinating Group
Address: N/A
https://fireadapted.org/

Firewise USA Communities
A voluntary program that provides a framework to help neighbors get organized, find direction, and take action to increase the ignition resistance of their homes and community.
Contact: Firewise Communities
Address: N/A
Phone: N/A
http://www.firewise.org/

Firewise USA Communities, Lane County Program
Lane County offers financial grants to residents who are interested in making landscaping or structural improvements to their properties in order to help increase the survivability of their homes in the event of a wildfire.
Contact: Lane County Public Works Department: Land Management Division
Address: 3050 N Delta Hwy, Eugene, OR 97408
Phone: (541) 682-6522
https://lanecounty.org/government/county_departments/public_works/land_management_division/firewise

Keep Oregon Green
Contact: Keep Oregon Green Association Incorporated
Address: Salem, OR 97309
Phone: (503)-945-7498
https://keeporegongreen.org/
**Missoula FireLab**  
Contact: Missoula FireLab  
Address: PO Box 8089, 5775 West Highway, Missoula, MT 59807  
Phone: N/A  

**National Wildfire Coordinating Group**  
Contact: National Wildfire Coordinating Group  
Address: National Office of Fire and Aviation, Bureau of Land Management, National Interagency Fire Center  
Phone: (208)-387-5144  
[https://www.nwgc.gov/](https://www.nwgc.gov/)

**National Fire Protection Association**  
Contact: National Fire Protection Association  
Address: 1 Batterymarch Park, Quincy, MA 02169-7471  
Phone: (617) -770-3000  
[https://www.nfpa.org/](https://www.nfpa.org/)

**National Interagency Fire Center**  
Contact: NIFC  
Address: 3833 Development Avenue, Boise, ID 83705  
Phone: (208)-387-5512  
[https://www.nifc.gov/](https://www.nifc.gov/)

**Oregon Wildfire Risk Explorer**  
Contact: Oregon Department of Forestry  
Address: N/A  
Phone: N/A  
[https://tools.oregonexplorer.info/](https://tools.oregonexplorer.info/)

**Oregon Prescribed Fire Council**  
Contact: N/A  
Address: N/A  
Phone: N/A  
Website: [https://oregonrxfire.weebly.com/](https://oregonrxfire.weebly.com/)

**Ready, Set, Go! Program**  
Contact: N/A  
Address: N/A  
Phone: N/A  
Website: [https://www.wildlandfirersg.org](https://www.wildlandfirersg.org)

**Smokey Bear**  
Contact: Karen Curtiss  
Address: 63096 Deschutes Market Road, Bend, OR 97701  
Phone: (541)-383-5583  
Website: [https://smokeybear.com/en](https://smokeybear.com/en)
US Fire Administration: WUI fires
Contact: US Fire Administration
Address: 16825 South Seton Ave, Emmitsburg, MD, 21727
Phone: (301)-447-1853
Website: https://www.usfa.fema.gov/wui/wui_awareness_month.html

Figure F 3 Survivable Space Poster
The poster below was made for Lane County and details survivable space guidance on how to harden your home prior to wildfire season as well as evacuation levels used to notify landowners of impending incidents.
**Figure F 4 Oregon’s Forestland-Urban Interface Protection Act: Self-Certification Checklist**

The checklist below can be used by landowners to check if state required defensible space specifications are met prior to fire season. To learn more about Oregon’s Defensible Space Law, including a complete form to self-certify your compliance visit: [https://www.oregon.gov/ODF/Fire/Pages/UrbanInterface.aspx](https://www.oregon.gov/ODF/Fire/Pages/UrbanInterface.aspx).

---

### EVALUATION FORM FOR FORESTLAND URBAN INTERFACE PROPERTIES LOCATED IN AREAS CLASSIFIED AS HIGH.

Checking “Y” means “yes, the standard or step has been met or satisfied.” Checking “N/A” means the step or standard does not apply to this property or situation. No fuel-reduction treatment is required on a property where a structure does not exist. See reverse for additional guidance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. 30-FOOT PRIMARY FUEL BREAK: The intent of this fuel break is to reduce the intensity of a wildland fire, slow its rate of spread, and create an area in which fire suppression operations may more safely take place.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Is the area substantially composed of nonflammable ground cover?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. If dry grass is present, has it been mowed to a height of 4 inches or less?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Have continuous beds of fine fuel been eliminated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d. Are trees and shrubs maintained in a green condition?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e. Are trees and shrubs substantially free of dead plant material?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f. Have ladder fuels been removed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1g. Have trees and shrubs been thinned to discourage the transfer of fire from plant-to-plant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. SECONDARY FUEL BREAK: This fuel break is to increase the total size of the area around a structure in which a wildfire’s rate of spread will be reduced and fire-fighting operations may more safely occur. While recommended, a secondary fuel break is only required for structures with flammable roofing material. Check NA for all if this is the case.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a. Are trees and shrubs maintained in a green condition?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Are trees and shrubs substantially free of dead plant material?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. Have ladder fuels been removed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d. Have trees and shrubs been thinned to discourage the transfer of fire from plant-to-plant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. DRIVEWAY FUEL BREAK: This standard is to ensure that there is sufficient vertical and horizontal clearance alongside and above the driving surface for fire trucks, and to create areas adjacent to the driveway in which fire intensity will be reduced and fire suppression operations may more safely take place. Not required for driveways less than 150 feet long. Check NA for all if this is the case.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a. Is there at least 12 horizontal feet of clear space above the driving surface?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Within the 12-foot wide clearance area, is there at least 1 1/2 feet of vertical clearance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Have tree branches or other vegetation within 10 feet of a chimney or stovepipe been removed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are trees that overhang the structure substantially free of dead plant material?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is the area beneath a deck substantially free of flammables?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. During fire season, are there firewood or lumber piles on the property?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a. If “Y” is checked, has each pile been moved 20 feet or farther from the structure? OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. Has each pile been fully enclosed?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure F 5 Ember Awareness Checklist
The checklist below is intended to inform landowners of where embers often pose serious risk during wildfire events. The checklist provides actions homeowners can take to reduce this risk. To view and download a high resolution pdf version visit: http://azfac.org/2018/07/23/ember-aware-poster/
2 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
11 Ibid.
Appendix G
Local Contact Information

The resources below are organized into wildfire related functions: Law Enforcement, Evacuation Planning, Wildfire Restrictions, Smoke Management, Prevention Education and Funding, and Federal Lands.

*Note: Agencies are listed under sections which are most appropriate for their given function. Other listed agencies likely coordinate and support a number if not all listed functions.

Reporting a Wildfire: Dial 911

Law Enforcement
Learn about laws pertaining to fire or reporting suspicious activity (i.e. arson).

Oregon State Police (541) 726-2525
https://www.oregon.gov/OSP/Pages/index.aspx
3620 Gateway St., Springfield, OR 97477

Oregon State Fire Marshal (541) 726-2572
https://www.oregon.gov/osp/programs/sfm/Pages/default.aspx
3620 Gateway St, Springfield 97477

Lane County Sheriff’s Office (541) 682-4150
https://lanecounty.org/government/county_departments/sheriff_s_office
125 E. 8th Ave., Eugene, OR 97401

Emergency Evacuation, Disaster Preparedness and Recovery
The following contacts may provide local information for: all hazard preparedness, Lane County preparedness plans, post-wildfire recovery strategies and funding, and education on these topics.

Lane County Emergency Management (541) 682-6999
www.Lanecountyor.gov/prepare
3040 N Delta Hwy., Eugene, OR 97408

State and Federal Contacts
The agencies listed below coordinate with Lane County Emergency Management on state, regional, and nationwide planning and implementation strategies, educational resources, and preparedness plans.
Federal Emergency Management Administration
Disaster Preparedness, Responses and Recovery.
https://www.ready.gov/wildfires

Oregon Office of Emergency Management
https://www.oregon.gov/OEM/Pages/default.aspx

Wildfire Related Restrictions
Fire Danger Levels, public and industrial fire restrictions (on private lands), forestry related equipment inspections, and waivers for operations.

Oregon Department of Forestry
https://www.oregon.gov/odf/Pages/index.aspx

Western Lane District Office
(541) 935-2283
87950 Territorial Hwy., Veneta, OR 97487
https://www.facebook.com/ODFWesternLane

South Cascades Eastern Lane Unit Office
(541) 726-3588
3150 Main St., Springfield, OR 97478
https://www.facebook.com/odfscas

Smoke Management
Coordinate to mitigate planned smoke emitting activities in Lane County.

Lane Regional Air Protection Agency (LRAPA)
(541) 736-1056
Regulatory Agency for burning operations not related to forest or Agriculture.
http://www.lrapa.org/
1010 Main St., Springfield, OR 97477

Oregon Department of Forestry
Regulatory Agency for slash burning relating to forest operations
https://www.oregon.gov/odf/Pages/index.aspx

Western Lane
(541) 935-2283
87950 Territorial Hwy., Veneta, OR 97487

South Cascades Eastern Lane Unit
(541) 726-3588
3150 Main St., Springfield, OR 97478

Wildfire Prevention Education and Funding
Below are potential funding sources and local programs for treating hazardous fuel, education on wildfire, and county resources. For online educational resources see Appendix F, Wildfire Resources.
Oregon Department of Forestry
Defensible space education, inspections, funding, forest fuel treatments to reduce wildfire risk, Firewise Communities USA guidance and wildfire education presentations.

Western Lane Unit Office
87950 Territorial Hwy., Veneta, OR 97487
(541) 935-2283

South Cascades Eastern Lane Unit Office
3150 Main St., Springfield, OR 97478
(541) 726-3588

Oregon State Extension Service
Wildfire science, defensible space, fire resistant native plants, and landscape design.

Lane County Office
996 Jefferson St., Eugene, OR 97402
(541) 344-5859
https://extension.oregonstate.edu/lane

Lane County Emergency Management
All hazards community preparedness, evacuation kits and plans, and local contact for FEMA funding.
www.Lanecountyor.gov/prepare
3040 N Delta Hwy., Eugene, OR 97408
(541) 682-6999

Lane County Land Management
Code requirements, fuel break and driveway access requirements for new homes and additions, and cost-share funding for structural retrofits for homes and structures in Lane County.

Lane County Firewise Program
A cost-share funding program for structural retrofits for homes and structures in Lane County.

Firewise Communities
https://www.oregon.gov/odf/Pages/index.aspx

Lane County Firewise
www.lanecounty.org/firewise
firewiseprogram@lanecountyor.gov

Lane County CWPP

CWPP website
www.lanecounty.org/fireplan

Oregon Wildfire Risk Explorer:
https://oregonexplorer.info/topics/wildfire-risk?ptopic=62
Lane County Fire Defense Board Agencies

Structural ignitability, structure/home fire safety, emergency and wildfire preparedness, and evacuation. To find out which structural fire district you live in go to:

https://lanecounty.org/government/county_departments/lane_county_emergency_management/fire_departments_and_districts

Coburg Rural Fire Protection District (541) 686-1573
https://www.coburgoregon.org/community/page/coburg-rural-fire-district
91232 N Coburg Rd., Coburg, OR 97408

Dexter Rural Fire Protection District (541) 937-3045
https://dexterorfd.samariteam.com/
82781 Barbre Rd., Dexter, OR 97431

Lane Fire Authority (541) 935-2226
Includes Santa Clara Fire Department.
https://www.lanefire.org/
88050 Territorial Hwy., Veneta, OR 97487

Lowell Rural Fire Protection District (541) 937-3393
https://www.lowellfiredistrict.org/
389 Pioneer St., Lowell, OR 97452

McKenzie Fire & Rescue (541) 896-3311
https://www.mckenziefire.com/wordpress/
Station #3 McKenzie Hwy., Leaburg, OR 42870

Mohawk Valley Rural Fire Protection District (541) 933-2907
https://mohawkvalleyfire.com/
92058 Marcola Rd., Marcola, OR 97454

Oakridge Fire Department (541) 782-2416
Includes Oakridge Fire Department, Hazeldell and Westfir Rural Fire Protection Districts.
https://www.ci.oakridge.or.us/fire
47592 Hwy. 58, Oakridge, OR 97463

Pleasant Hill Goshen Fire & Rescue (541) 747-8016
Includes Pleasant Hill and Goshen Rural Fire Protection District.
https://www.goshenfd.net/
36024 Hwy. 58, Pleasant Hill, OR 97455

Eugene Springfield Fire (541) 682-5111
https://www.eugene-or.gov/120/Fire-and-Emergency-Medical-Services
1705 West 2nd Ave., Eugene, OR 97402
South Lane County Fire & Rescue
https://southlanefire.org/
233 Harrison Ave., Cottage Grove, OR 97424 (#1)

Upper McKenzie Rural Fire Protection District
https://www.uppermckenziefire.org/
56578 McKenzie Hwy., McKenzie Bridge OR 97413

Junction City Fire Department
Includes Junction Rural Fire Protection District.
https://sites.google.com/site/junctioncityfire/
1755 Juniper St., Junction City, OR 97448

Lake Creek Rural Fire Protection District
20451 Hwy. 36, Blachly, OR 97412

Siuslaw Valley Fire and Rescue
http://www.svfr.org/
2625 Hwy. 101 N, Florence, OR 97439

Lorane Rural Fire Protection District
https://loraneorfd.samariteam.com/
80287 Old Loraine Rd., Loraine, OR 97451

Swisshome Deadwood Rural Fire Protection District
(541) 268-1959
13283 Hwy. 36, Swisshome, OR 97480

Federal Lands
Contact information for local offices for Federal Agencies can be found below. These contacts can inform the public on wildfire danger levels on national lands, permits (i.e. collecting firewood, backcountry travel, etc.), closures, general recreation, and forest inquiries.

Bureau of Land Management (541) 683-6600 https://www.blm.gov/
3106 Pierce Parkway, Suite E., Springfield, OR 97447

Willamette National Forest
https://www.fs.usda.gov/willamette/

Supervisors Office (541) 225-6300
3106 Pierce Parkway, Suite D, Springfield, OR 97477

Middle Fork Ranger District (541) 782-2283
46375 Hwy 58, Westfir, OR 97492

McKenzie River Ranger District (541) 822-3381
57600 McKenzie Hwy, McKenzie Bridge, OR 97413
Umpqua National Forest
https://www.fs.usda.gov/umpqua

Supervisors Office
2900 Stewart Parkway, Roseburg, OR 97471
(541) 957-3200

Cottage Grove Ranger District
34963 Shoreview Dr, Cottage Grove, OR 97424
(541) 767-5000

Siuslaw National Forest
https://www.fs.usda.gov/siuslaw

Supervisors Office
3200 SW Jefferson Way, Corvallis, OR 97331
(541) 750-7000

Central Coast Ranger District
1130 Forestry Lane, Waldport, OR 97394
(541) 563-8400

Oregon Dunes Visitor Center
855 Hwy. 101, Reedsport, OR 97467
(541) 271-6000

U.S. Army Corp of Engineers
https://www.usace.army.mil/
211 E. 7th St., Eugene, OR 97401
(541) 684-4300
Appendix H
2005 Firewise Stakeholder Survey

This Appendix contains
- 2005 Stakeholder Interview Findings
- 2005 Firewise Workshop Summary
- Past Accomplishments: Lane County Firewise Program

2005 Stakeholder Interview Findings

The text below is sourced from a memo titled Stakeholder Interview Findings sent June 12, 2020 from the Oregon Natural Hazards Workshop at the University of Oregon to the Lane County CWPP Steering Committee. The purpose of this memo is to provide you with the findings of the Stakeholder Interviews conducted in conjunction with the development of the Lane County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP). The findings are summarized below and the entire Stakeholder Interview Appendix including the full interview transcriptions has been attached as well. Please review the summary below.

Background

Main text 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 A 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:

1) Current Activities
2) Key Issues Related to Hazardous Fuel Reduction
3) Key Issues Related to Structural Ignition
4) 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
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 Lane 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.

**Firewise Workshop Summary**

In conjunction with the development of the Lane County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP), Oregon Natural Hazards Workgroup (ONHW) and Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) conducted a Firewise Communities Workshop on April 5, 2005 at the University of Oregon for an invited group of diverse stakeholders. Participants in the workshop included representatives of federal and state fire and land management agencies, rural fire protection districts, local planning and emergency management departments, utility providers, the private forestry industry, the real estate industry, watershed councils, and elected officials, among others.

**Firewise Communities Workshop**

The National Wildland-Urban Interface Fire Protection Program developed Firewise Communities Workshops in 2000 to address the wildland-urban interface fire problem at a community level. The workshops have three main goals:

1) To improve safety in the wildland/urban interface by learning to share responsibility.

2) To create and nurture local partnerships for improved decisions in communities.

3) To encourage the integration of Firewise concepts into community and disaster mitigation planning.
The Firewise goals are consistent with Lane County Plan’s goals and emphasis on collaboration. Participants worked in small groups to learn Firewise concepts, completed interactive scenarios designed to assess and reduce the wildfire risk of a hypothetical community, and were asked to apply the lessons learned from the sessions to Lane County.

ONHW and ODF worked to prepare an agenda for the workshop that would engage and encourage communication between participants while providing them with information on current wildland-urban interface fire risk issues and mitigation efforts. In addition to the small group scenarios and a video, several key speakers addressed the wildland-urban interface issue from both the state and local perspectives. Speakers included Marvin Brown, Oregon State Forester; Faye Stewart, Lane County Commissioner and Linda Cook, Lane County Emergency Manager. A list of workshop participants and a copy of the workshop’s agenda can be found at the end of this appendix.

Opportunities and Obstacles in Lane County

Throughout the day facilitators asked participants to think about how Firewise concepts apply to issues in Lane County. ONHW created a worksheet for participants to identify opportunities and obstacles in Lane County for each of the three requirements of the CWPP - 1) reducing structural ignitability, 2) prioritizing fuel reduction projects, and 3) collaboration. Participants discussed their ideas in small groups and shared these results with the whole group at the end of the workshop. ONHW analyzed the completed worksheets to compile the opportunities and obstacles frequently identified by participants.

Treatment of Structural Ignitability

A CWPP must recommend measures that homeowners and communities can take to reduce the ignitability of structures. Workshop participants were asked to list opportunities and obstacles to implementing structural ignition reduction projects in Lane County. Participant’s responses are summarized below.

Opportunities

Education and outreach through various sources including media, town hall meetings, and publications such as the Oregon State University Extension Service newsletter

Incentive programs, especially the use of insurance incentives, to encourage participation in projects to reduce risk

Collaboration with community groups, developers, neighbors, fire agencies, and others to better educate residents and implement projects

Available grant money from the National Fire Plan and other sources for implementing projects to reduce structural ignitability

Updating or revising Lane County codes and ordinances to reduce structural ignitability
Obstacles
Lack of homeowner education and awareness regarding the true risk of wildfire in Lane County and how defensible space can reduce risk

Lack of funding to implement projects, along with the cost of fire resistant building materials for homeowners

Lack of collaboration and involvement among homeowners, agencies, and developers to implement projects

Lack of regulations to enforce the use of fire resistant building materials and practices within Lane County

Prioritized Fuel Reduction

A CWPP must identify and prioritize areas for hazardous fuel reduction treatments and recommend the types and methods of treatment that will protect one or more at-risk communities and essential infrastructure. Participants were asked to list opportunities and obstacles to implementing prioritized fuel reduction projects in Lane County. Participant’s responses are summarized below.

Opportunities
Education using community outreach, public forums, media and other sources emphasizing examples of fuel reduction projects and homes saved by defensible space

Incentive programs such as rebates or other support to help landowners with debris removal, as well as insurance or property tax incentives to encourage fuel reduction

Collaboration and participation to share costs, tools, and manpower to implement fuel reduction projects on a larger scale

Finding uses for the biomass generated from fuel reduction projects, such as selling the chips or using it as an energy source

Available grant money from the National Fire Plan and other sources to aid in implementation of fuel reduction projects

Obstacles
Debate surrounding the best method to conduct fuel reduction treatments on private and public lands based on differing topography, environmental issues, public perception, and cost

Long term maintenance of fuel reduction treatments

The size and scope of the county and the sheer volume of work that is needed to begin and maintain fuel reduction projects as the wildland-urban interface continues to increase
Public perception of low wildfire risk and that fuel reduction treatments are aesthetically unpleasant

The cost of implementing fuel reduction treatments on properties and removing debris

Special needs populations who require extra assistance with fuel reduction projects

**Collaboration**

A CWPP must be collaboratively developed by local and state government representatives, in consultation with federal agencies and other interested parties. Participants were asked to list opportunities and obstacles to collaborating on projects to reduce hazardous fuels and structural ignitability in Lane County. Participant’s responses are summarized below.

**Opportunities**
Brings people with diverse expertise together for better solutions to problems

Showing collaboration increases success with grant applications

Work with real estate agencies and other groups and businesses to raise awareness of wildland-urban interface wildfire issues

Use the media to capture public attention of current collaboration efforts and encourage future efforts

**Obstacles**
Differing priorities, values, and interests among partners

Lack of time and communication needed to foster working relationships among partners

“Turf battles” and conflicts over jurisdictional authority

Resistance or lack of interest in collaborating with others

**Conclusion**

The Firewise Communities Workshop brought together a diverse group of stakeholders to identify strategies for community planning and partnership building in order to reduce fire risk in the wildland-urban interface. The opportunities and obstacles identified by participants were used to develop the Action Items identified in the CWPP. A second forum will be held in late summer to present the final Community Wildfire Protection Plan to interested participants.
Appendix I
Glossary of Terms

Aquatic Species – A plant or animal that lives in water for the majority of its lifetime.

Canopy – The stratum containing the crowns of the tallest vegetation present (living or dead), usually above 20 feet.

Catastrophic fires – Those that burn more intensely than the natural or historical range of variability, thereby fundamentally changing the ecosystem, destroying communities and/or rare or threatened species/habitat, or causing unacceptable erosion.

Climax Species - Plant species which remain largely unchanged in terms of species composition for as long as the site remains undisturbed. Synonyms: late seral, late successional.

Combustible – Any material that, in the form in which it is used and under the conditions anticipated, will ignite and burn.

Coordinating Organization – An organization that is willing and able to organize resources, find appropriate funding, and oversee activity implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.

Crown Fire – A fire that advances from top to top of trees or shrubs more or less independent of a surface fire.

Debris Burning Fire – In fire suppression, a fire spreading from any fire originally ignited to clear land or burn rubbish, garbage, crop stubble, or meadows (excluding incendiary fires).

Defensible Space – An area, typically a width of 30 feet or more, between an improved property and a potential wildfire where the combustibles have been removed or modified.

Duff – The layer of decomposing organic materials lying below the litter layer of freshly fallen twigs, needles and leaves and immediately above the mineral soil.

Dwellings – A place of residence. A building or portion thereof which is occupied in whole or in part as a residence or sleeping place, either permanently or temporarily, but excluding hotels, motels, auto courts, mobile homes and camping vehicles.

Ecological – relating to or concerned with the relation of living organisms to one another and to their physical surroundings.

Eco-region – A major ecosystem defined by distinctive geography and receiving uniform solar radiation and moisture.

Endangered Species – A species that is very likely to become extinct in the near future, either worldwide or in a particular political jurisdiction.
**Escape Route** – Route leading away from dangerous areas on a fire; should be preplanned.

**Evacuation** – The temporary movement of people and their possessions from locations threatened by wildfire.

**Exposure** – 1: Property that may be endangered by a fire burning in another structure or by a wildfire. 2: Direction in which a slope faces, usually with respect to cardinal directions. 3: The general surroundings of a site with special reference to its openness to winds.

**External Partners** – Organizations that can assist the coordinating organization in implementing an action in various functions and may include local, regional, state, or federal agencies, as well as local and regional public and private sector organizations.

**Impacted Forest Lands Zone (F-2)** – A type of forest land zoning in Lane County pursuant to the land use regulations at Lane Code Chapter 16.211.

**Forest Land Zoning** – Forest land zoning is divided into two zones in Lane County, Non-impacted and Impacted. The purpose of these zones is to protect and maintain forest land for grazing, rangeland and forest use consistent with existing and future needs for agriculture and forest products.

**Fire Behavior** – The manner in which a fire reacts to the influences of fuel, weather, and topography.

**Fire Department** – Any regularly organized fire department, fire protection district or fire company regularly charged with the responsibility of providing fire protection to the jurisdiction.

**Fire Hazard** – A fuel complex, defined by volume, type condition, arrangement, and location, that determines the degree of ease of ignition and of resistance to control.

**Fire History** – The chronological record of the occurrence of fire in an ecosystem or at a specific site. The fire history of an area may inform planners and residents about the level of wildfire hazard in that area.

**Fire Prevention** – Activities, including education, engineering, enforcement, and administration, that are directed at reducing the number of wildfires, the costs of suppression, and fire-caused damage to resources and property.

**Fire-Proofing** – Removing or treating fuel with fire retardant to reduce the danger of fires igniting or spreading (e.g., fire-proofing roadsides, campsites, structural timber). Protection is relative, not absolute.

**Fire Protection** – The actions taken to limit the adverse environmental, social, political, and economical effects of fire.

**Fire Regime** – The pattern, frequency and intensity of wildfires that prevail in an area over long periods of time. Informs fire ecology of a given environment.

Fire Resistant Tree – A species with compact, resin-free, thick corky bark and less flammable foliage that has a relatively lower probability of being killed or scarred by a fire than a fire sensitive tree.

Fire Retardant – Any substance except plain water that by chemical or physical action reduces flammability of fuels or slows their rate of combustion.

Fire Triangle – Instructional aid in which the sides of a triangle are used to represent the three factors (oxygen, heat, and fuel) necessary for combustion and flame production; removal of any of the three factors causes flame production to cease.

Firebrands – 1: Any source of heat, natural or human made, capable of igniting wildland fuels. 2: Flaming or glowing fuel particles that can be carried naturally by wind, convection currents, or by gravity into unburned fuels. Examples include leaves, pinecones, glowing charcoal, and sparks.

Firefighter – A person who is trained and proficient in the components of structural or wildland fire.

Firewise Construction – The use of materials and systems in the design and construction of a building or structure to safeguard against the spread of fire within a building or structure and the spread of fire to or from buildings or structures to the wildland-urban interface area.

Firewise Landscaping – Vegetative management that removes flammable fuels from around a structure to reduce exposure to radiant heat. The flammable fuels may be replaced with green lawn, gardens, certain individually spaced green, ornamental shrubs, individually spaced and pruned trees, decorative stone or other non-flammable or flame-resistant materials.

Firewise USA – A voluntary program that provides a framework to help neighbors get organized, find direction, and take action to increase the ignition resistance of their homes and community.

Flammability – The relative ease with which fuels ignite and burn regardless of the quantity of the fuels.

Fuel(s) – All combustible material within the wildland-urban interface or intermix, including vegetation and structures.

Fuel Condition – Relative flammability of fuel as determined by fuel type and environmental conditions.

Fuel Loading – The volume of fuel in a given area generally expressed in tons per acre.

Fuel Management/Fuel Reduction – Manipulation or removal of fuels to reduce the likelihood of ignition and to reduce potential damage in case of a wildfire. Fuel reduction methods include prescribed fire, mechanical treatments (mowing,
chopping), herbicides, biomass removal (thinning or harvesting or trees, harvesting of pine straw), and grazing. Fuel management techniques may sometimes be combined for greater effect.

**Fuel Modification** – Any manipulation or removal of fuels to reduce the likelihood of ignition or the resistance to fire control.

**Ground Fuels** – All combustible materials such as grass, duff, loose surface litter, tree, or shrub roots, rotting wood, leaves, peat or sawdust that typically support combustion.

**Habitat** – The natural home or environment of an animal, plant, or other organism.

**Hazard** – The degree of flammability of the fuels once a fire starts. This includes the fuel (type, arrangement, volume, and condition), topography and weather.

**Hazardous Areas** – Those wildland areas where the combination of vegetation, topography, weather, and the threat of fire to life and property create difficult and dangerous problems.

**Hazard Reduction** – Any treatment of living and dead fuels that reduces the threat of ignition and spread of fire.

**Herbicide** – Any substance used to kill or slow the growth of unwanted plants.

**Human-caused Fire** – Any fire caused directly or indirectly by person(s).

**Human-caused Risk** – The probability of a fire ignition as a result of human activities.

**Ignitability** – 1: The condition of being able to burn (ignitable). 2: A measure of the extent to which something is able to burn (ignitable).

**Ignition Probability** – Chance that a firebrand will cause an ignition when it lands on receptive fuels.

**Infrastructure** – Man-made structures and/or facilities that support public and private operations including but not limited to distribution lines, streets, roads and highways, and telecommunication facilities.

**Initial Attack** – The actions taken by the first resources to arrive at a wildfire to protect lives and property and prevent further extension of the fire.

**Internal Partners** – Internal partners are within the CWPP advisory committee and may be able to assist in the implementation of Action Items by providing relevant resources to the coordinating organization.

**Ladder Fuels** – Fuels that provide vertical continuity allowing fire to carry from surface fuels into the crowns of trees or shrubs with relative ease.

**Mechanical Treatment(s)** – Ways to reduce hazardous fuels using tools, machinery, or physical labor for the purpose of wildfire prevention.

**Mitigation** – Action that moderates the severity of a fire hazard or risk.
Ecosystems – A community of living and non-living organisms, where each component interacts together as a unit through biological, physical, and chemical processes.

Non-Impacted Forest Lands Zone (F-1) – A type of forest land zoning in Lane County pursuant to the land use regulations at Lane Code Chapter 16.210.

Non-response bias – A type of bias that can occur when the people who do not respond to a survey differ to those that are willing to respond. These differences can be due to the person’s exposures or outcomes. As a result, mistakes in estimating population characteristics can occur based on the underrepresentation of this group of people.

Noncombustible – A material that, in the form in which it is used and under the conditions anticipated, will not aid combustion or add appreciable heat to an ambient fire.

Overstory – The highest layer of vegetation in a forest, trees which form the upper or uppermost layer of a forest canopy.

Peak Fire Season – That period of the fire season during which fires are expected to ignite most readily, to burn with greater than average intensity, and to create damages at an unacceptable level.

Statewide Land Use Planning Goals – These 19 goals express Oregon’s policies on land use and related topics, like citizen involvement, housing, and natural resources. The statewide goals are achieved through local jurisdiction’s adopted comprehensive plan, zoning and land-division ordinances.

Preparedness – 1: Condition or degree of being ready to cope with a potential fire situation. 2: Mental readiness to recognize changes in fire danger and act promptly when action is appropriate.

Prescribed Burning – Controlled application of fire to wildland fuels in either their natural or modified state, under specified environmental conditions, which allows the fire to be confined to a predetermined area, and to produce the fire behavior and fire characteristics required to attain planned fire treatment and resource management objectives.

Prescribed Fire – A fire burning within prescription. This fire may result from either planned or unplanned ignitions.

Property Protection – To protect structures from damage by fire, whether the fire is inside the structure, or is threatening the structure from an exterior source. The municipal firefighter is trained and equipped for this mission and not usually trained and equipped to suppress wildland fires. Wildland fire protection agencies are not normally trained or charged with the responsibility to provide structural fire protection but will act within their training and capabilities to safely prevent a wildland fire from igniting structures.

Protection Area – That area for which a particular fire protection organization has the primary responsibility for attacking an uncontrolled fire and for directing the suppression action. Such responsibility may develop through law, contract, or personal interest of the fire protection agent. Several agencies or entities may
have some basic responsibilities without being known as the fire organization having direct protection responsibility.

**Response** – Movement of an individual fire fighting resource from its assigned standby location to another location or to an incident in reaction to dispatch orders or to a reported alarm.

**Risk Assessment** – The process or method of identifying hazards that have the potential to cause harm, and evaluating the risk associated with the hazards.

**Rural Fire District (RFD)** – An organization established to provide fire protection to a designated geographic area outside or areas under municipal fire protection. Usually has some taxing authority and officials may be appointed or elected.

**Rural Fire Protection** – Fire protection and firefighting problems that are outside of areas under municipal fire prevention and building regulations and that are usually remote from public water supplies.

**Early Seral Stage** – The first stage in forest development following any disturbance, including wind, ice, fire or logging. This community is made up of the first colonizers of a forest opening: grasses, other herbaceous plants, broadleaf shrubs and tree seedlings along with remnants or legacy structures (snags, etc.) from the previous forest.

**Slash** – Debris left after logging, pruning, thinning, or brush cutting. Slash includes logs, chips, bark, branches, stumps, and broken trees or brush that may be fuel for a wildfire.

**Slope** – The variation of terrain from the horizontal; the number of feet rise or fall per 100 feet measured horizontally, expressed as a percentage.

**Smoke** – 1: The visible products of combustion rising above a fire. 2: Term used when reporting a fire or probable fire in its initial stages.

**Structure Fire** – Fire originating in and burning any part or all of any building, shelter, or other structure.

**Structural Fire Protection** – The protection of a structure from interior and exterior fire ignition sources. This fire protection service is normally provided by municipal fire departments, with trained and equipped personnel. After life safety, the agency’s priority is to keep the fire from leaving the structure of origin and to protect the structure from an advancing wildland fire. (The equipment and training required to conduct structural fire protection is not normally provided to the wildland firefighter.) Various taxing authorities fund this service.

**Suppression** – The most aggressive fire protection strategy, it leads to the total extinguishment of a fire.

**Surface Fire** – A fire that burns leaf litter, fallen branches and other surface fuels on the forest floor, as opposed to ground fire and crown fire.

**Surface Fuel** – Fuels lying on or near the surface of the ground, consisting of leaf and needle litter, dead branch material, downed logs, bark, tree cones, and low stature living plants.
Tree Crown – The primary and secondary branches growing out from the main stem, together with twigs and foliage.

Uncontrolled Fire – Any fire which threatens to destroy life, property, or natural resources, and (a) is not burning within the confines of firebreaks, or (b) is burning with such intensity that it could not be readily extinguished with ordinary, commonly available tools.

Understory – Low-growing vegetation (herbaceous, brush or reproduction) growing under a stand of trees. Also trees in a forest stand with their crowns growing below the dominant tree canopy (see overstory).

Urban Interface – Any area where wildland fuels threaten to ignite combustible homes and structures.

Volunteer Fire Department – A fire department of which some or all members are unpaid.

Watershed- A land area that channels rainfall and snowmelt to creeks, streams, and rivers, and eventually to outflow points such as reservoirs, bays, and the ocean.

Water Supply – A source of water for firefighting activities.

Wildfire Risk – The chance of a fire starting from any cause.

Wildfire – An unplanned and uncontrolled fire spreading through vegetative fuels, at times involving structures.

Wildland – An area in which development is essentially non-existent, except for roads, railroads, power lines, and similar transportation facilities. Structures, if any, are widely scattered.

Wildland Fire Protection – The protection of natural resources and watersheds from damage by wildland fires. State and Federal forestry or land management agencies normally provide wildland fire protection with trained and equipped personnel. The equipment and training required to conduct wildland fire protection is not normally provided to the structural fire protection firefighter. Various taxing authorities and fees fund this service.

Wildland-Urban Interface – 1: Any area where wildland fuels threaten to ignite combustible homes and structures. 2: The zone where structures and other human development meets or intermingles with undeveloped wildland fuels where natural vegetation is typically less than 50 percent of the land area.

Wildland-Urban Intermix – An area of suburban or rural development which extends into predominantly wildlands; typically having greater than 50 percent natural vegetation cover.
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