



Status Report

Date: June 15, 2012

Subcommittee: Western RSC

Accomplishments Since Last Report:

The Western Region worked with the CSSC and other regions to develop the template for the Phase III report; additionally the preliminary alternatives and performance measures for the Phase III Analysis were vetted by the western groups and will be distributed to stakeholders in the west for comments/feedback. The Western Communications Strategy Group has produced and distributed the June update with success stories along with an outreach/feedback opportunity to stakeholders to provide comments on the preliminary alternatives and performance measures. Additionally the same group is conducting extensive outreach with both existing stakeholders and new voices with a variety of methodologies that will be helpful in shaping the alternatives, performance measures and ideas for the Implementation Plan.

Planned Activities for Next Reporting Period:

We will be gathering input on the Alternatives and Performance Measures, weekly CSSC calls and every two week Communications Strategy Group. The outreach will continue as well as documenting success stories. The West is on track with the Program of Work.

Issues Identified:

WFEC approval of the template for Phase III to begin completion of “boilerplate” sections of the report

WFEC Decisions/Approvals Needed:

.

References: Immediate Success example

Contact Information:

Joe Stutler, Alan Quan or Joe Freeland



Interior Redecorating: DOI's Fire Program Assessment 2012

Interior Fire Program Assessment 2012

Efficiency is the aim. Awareness of “*duplicative administrative management organizations*” in the Department of the Interior’s wildland fire programs, at multiple levels, is driving the July 19th report on the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill. The House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations directed the Department “to complete an assessment of these Wildland Fire programs in order to determine the most cost effective and efficient means of providing comprehensive fire management services in support of Departmental and bureau missions, and to better direct scarce resources from duplicative administrative management organizations to focus resources on protection of lives, property, and natural and cultural resources.”

The expected outcome of the Interior Fire Program Assessment 2012 (IFPA) includes:

- Affirming any efficiencies and effectiveness in the Department's wildland fire management organization/program.
- Identifying areas where additional efficiencies can be achieved and duplication of efforts eliminated, leading to more funding on the ground where it is most needed.

A report to Congress is due post Assessment. More information about IFPA can be found at <http://www.myfirecommunity.net/Neighborhood.aspx?ID=1054>.

National Science and Analysis Team Update

Regional Alternatives Development Workshop

Incorporating best available science and information is a critical part of Phase III of developing the National Wildfire Cohesive Strategy. On May 10-11, the National Science and Analysis Team met with the Western Regional Strategic Work Group to develop alternative investment strategies as part of their risk-analyses and to serve as a foundation for developing Regional action plans. During the two-day workshop data was shared and discussed surrounding critical success factors that may require additional consideration and analysis. The workshops was designed to allow a comprehensive view of the Cohesive Strategy; participants considered how prioritization, budgeting and policy choices may affect the fire community at large. Ultimately, information drawn from the workshops and Phase I and II reports will be described in the Phase III report.

A follow-up meeting is scheduled for July 17-18.

Give Your Feedback on the Latest CS Efforts!

From **June 11** through **June 29**, you can provide feedback on the preliminary alternatives and performance measures being developed by the Western RSC, at: <http://cohesivefire.nemac.org/webform/western-comment-form>



Western Regional Strategy Committee (WRSC) Update

WRSC Members Brief Forestry Leaders

On May 17, WRSC members Joe Stutler, Ann Walker, Sam Foster and Bob Harrington provided a briefing for the Western Forestry Leadership Coalition in Salt Lake City. The Western Forestry Leadership Coalition represents a unique partnership between state and federal government forestry leaders, and is comprised of 34 members from across the federal and state agencies of the West.

In his summary of the meeting Stutler reflected, "...How the Cohesive Strategy was indeed different than past efforts was a common theme... The universal response both days was that we're implementing a strategy and not a plan. That response really seemed to resonate well with people."

Joe continued "...On two occasions, with direct conversations with State Foresters and Regional Foresters, we talked through real life situations each were having in their respective states and gave several examples of how the goals of the Cohesive Strategy would work for them to resolve issues that were directly related to Cohesive Strategy implementation."

Engaging a wide variety of stakeholders is a high priority for the WRSC. Connecting with land managers at the leading edge of wildland fire management in the West during the WFLC meeting helped generate energy and attention for successful implementation of the Cohesive Strategy's three goals.

The fire adapted community website is now live! **Fireadapted.org**

Success Stories & Lessons Learned

This month we feature the Whitefish Area Fire Safe Council, and the Upper Deschutes River Coalition.

A major focus of Whitefish Area Fire Safe Council's activities since its formation has been the creation of continuous shaded fuelbreaks west and southwest of Whitefish. Yellow lines on the map show areas of completed work, and red lines denote areas planned for future implementation.

The Upper Deschutes River Coalition is an organization of 20 neighborhoods acting collectively on natural resource issues within



the region. Their fuels reduction for private landowners operates at no cost to the landowner, and treated 8,480 acres from 2004-2011.

Find success stories from Western stakeholders at:

<http://sites.nemac.org/westcohesiv/efire/about-you/>

See our national Partner Perspectives and Success Stories at: <http://forestsandrangelands.gov>

WRSC Lead Contact:

Joe Stutler
Deschutes County Forester
joest@co.deschutes.or.us
(541) 322-7117

Working Group Lead Contact:

Joe Freeland
BLM - Management & Program Analyst
jfreeland@blm.gov
(208) 387-5163



Status Report

Date: June 15, 2012

Subcommittee: Southern RSC

Accomplishments Since Last Report:

- Early development of outreach products to stakeholders
- Connecting with Ag Extension for lessons learned from post disaster response activities (non-fire) that may be transferable to longterm wildfires. Specifically how to better handle transition back to local community post fire.
- Begin social network mapping design
- Reconnected with Phase II stakeholders from PII national rollout

Planned Activities for Next Reporting Period:

- Input from WG to NSAT and CRAFT Process
- TG meeting scheduled to confirm performance measurers for June deadline
- Input from social network mapping into stakeholder engagement process
- Finalize full time lead with Southern Governors' Association
- Determining engagement points for stakeholders and building informal process for interested interest groups.

Issues Identified:

WFEC Decisions/Approvals Needed:

References:

Contact Information:

Mike Zupko
Southern Governors' Association
mike@zup-co-inc.com
770-267-9630



Proposal

Date: May 23, 2012

Subcommittee: Cohesive Strategy Sub-Committee

Description of Issue or Assignment:

The CSSC was tasked to create a list of barriers (things that must be removed or changed) and critical success factors (things that must be in place or continue) for the WFEC to consider addressing as part of the National Action Plan. Based on the collaborative discussions in Phase II, each region submitted to CSSC a list of items having the greatest impact to their success.

Discussion of Proposed Recommendation(s):

The CSSC reviewed the items submitted from the regions. The attached list (Attachment 1, highlighted in yellow) reflects the review, consideration, and amendment to the regional lists by the CSSC. The CSSC considered the possible approaches for next steps in evaluating each item and developed a subsequent list of options on a tasking and next steps.

Identify Considerations:

This assignment relates to the completion of the fifth element in the WFLC's Comprehensive Work Plan:

"The intent of the National Action Plan is to capture the national issues identified at the regional and local levels and determine a course of action to be taken to evaluate, address, and potentially resolve these issues. The National Action Plan will be limited to addressing the barriers and proposed solutions identified in the Phase II Report as well as the barrier identified in the Regional Assessments."

Rationale for Recommendation(s):

The WFEC approval and tasking on next steps for evaluating the items represents a critical milestone in moving forward on the development of the National Action Plan.

Recommendation(s):

The CSSC recommends that following process:

1. WFEC review of the barriers and critical success factors (Attachment 1, highlighted in yellow). Determine which items to further pursue.
2. WFEC determine appropriate staffing (subject matter experts, existing groups such as NWCG or others)
3. WFEC develop a tasking for assigned staff to complete for each item (such as evaluating the information provided by the regions, determining if the item is a valid national-level barrier, and recommending a course of action to resolve).



Proposal

4. Once WFEC receives the feedback from the assigned staff, WFEC should consider garnering additional feedback from member organizations, and implementing recommended course of action.

Decision Method used:

- Subcommittee Consensus
- Modified Consensus (explain, i.e. majority, super-majority)
- Chair Decision

Contact Information:

Jenna Sloan 202-606-5858

WFEC Decision:

- WFEC Approves
- WFEC Approves with Modifications (not required to resubmit for WFEC approval)
- Need More Information (required to come back to WFEC for approval)
- WFEC Does Not Approve

Roy Johnson, DFO

Date

Notes regarding decision:

	Landscapes	Fire-Adapted Communities	Response to Fire	Barrier	Critical Success Factor	Concise Description	What is the impact? What are the implications or what is the affect if the barrier was removed or the critical success factor was met?	Other Details Information and References	Existing Groups and Past Efforts Is there an existing group who could review and define a proposed actions to address the barrier or critical success factor? Has there been a past effort(s) to address the barrier, if so by whom?	Potential Action(s) to be Considered
1	x				x	Need additional options for long-term contracts and agreements.				1. Pursue permanent authorization of Stewardship End Result Contracting. 2. Emphasize benefit to local economies as a best value selection criteria.
2	x				x	Need new technologies and local infrastructure for biomass removal and utilization.				1. Identify new technologies, 2. Identify existing technologies which are unutilized. 3. Encourage incentives through existing legislation or enact new legislation such as Farm/Energy Bill incentives that address industry needs.
3	x				x	Need clear direction across the country on effective, consistent, and appropriate use of Categorical Exclusions (CE).				1. Determine and define CE use and limitations. Example: pine thinning for biomass removal/reduction of hazardous fuels in an established pine plantation is a great use. Conducting widespread logging operations under the CE of hazardous fuels reduction across a larger landscape is not. 2. Develop guidance for use of CEs.
4	x	x			x	Need increased collaboration and alternative dispute resolution, to reduce litigation.				1. Examine legislative barriers that are impeding project implementation. 2. Pursue reform of current legislation to create incentives for collaboration to resolve issues rather than litigation (e.g., Endangered Species Act, Equal Access to Justice Act). 3. Identify Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) programs, opportunities, and authorities. 4. Utilize existing ADR programs, opportunities and authorities.
5	x	x	x		x	Increase fuels management on private land. There is a need to increase private land management assistance to complement and implement broader fuel reduction-management objectives across fire prone landscapes. Incentives for private landowners are needed to increase the fuels management on private lands. Incentives may include providing cost share funds through current landowner assistance programs. There is a need to integrate federal and state level fuels and prevention programs and provide fuels management incentives to mitigate undesired fire effects and property loss.	Increasing incentives for private lands fuels mitigation will result in more acres being mitigated of undesired fire effects to the landscape/watershed and reducing the probability of fire damage/loss. It can also bring about multiple program integration to reach the same outcome on a larger portion of the landscape with more efficient leveraging of funding sources.	Could be integrated with various private and public land conservation and stewardship programs. Integration and coordination WUI planning with land management objectives. There is a need to integrate federal and state level fuels and prevention programs which integrate WUI protection planning with land management objectives and provide fuels management incentives to mitigate undesired fire effects and property loss.	The NRCS currently has the Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP), that covers many of the natural resource and fuels reduction needs addressed here. It is specifically geared to tribal and private agricultural lands and non-industrial private forest landowners. Additionally the USFS has the Forest Stewardship Program. This program has specifically been coordinated within the Northeastern and Midwestern US and addresses the very needs that the cohesive strategy seeks including; risk management, communication, natural resources and fuels treatments across this landscape area served by the Northeastern region.	1. Develop landowner incentives (e.g., tax breaks, free disposal of material, increased use of Wyden Amendment and other finance or cost-share authorities). 2. Integration of fuels reduction and defensible space principles with private land management programs.
6	x	x			x	Need consistent laws pertaining to prescribed (planned) fire across jurisdictions.				
7	x				x	Need state-specific regulations on lightning ignitions.			Due to the complexities of managing wildfires on private lands and the small percentage of wildfires on private lands caused by lightning there will be little or no support to address state regulations on managing lightning ignitions. There are numerous national documents that provide direction for collaboration and communication for managing wildfires: Federal Guidance on the Revised Implementation of Federal Fires, National Master Cooperative fire Agreement Template and Guiding Principles Phase I	
8	x				x	Need standardized fire effects monitoring data that is available for other units and nationally.			This will take some work to develop as there is broad discussion and varying agreement as to what needs to be monitored for wildfire and prescribed fire. We (FWS) are currently working with our National Inventory & Monitoring Branch to develop a standardized protocol to address these issues.	1. Standardize fire monitoring data collection. 2. Develop national database for reporting monitoring data. 3. Issue direction for data collection of fire effects. 4. Issue guidance for reporting of fire effects data.
9	x	x			x	Allow use of BAER and BAR funding to extend beyond non-federal risk reduction from natural disasters to public safety. Need funding to support BAER and BAR activities		The language is quite specific in the Interagency Burned Area Emergency Response that funds can be used on non-federal lands and that the BAER & BAR funding must reduce the risk of natural disaster to public safety. Authorities do not exist that extend beyond natural disasters. Available funding is limited for these activities.		1. Issue appropriate authorities to extend beyond natural disasters. 2. Pursue funding availability to support any BAER or BAR activities on nonfederal land.
10		x			x	Need adequate state and/or local ordinances related to wildfire prevention which are enforceable.				1. Determine use and effectiveness of existing state and/or local ordinances related to prevention. 2. Establish new state and/or local ordinances related to wildfire prevention. 3. Issue authorities to enforce state and/or local prevention ordinances.

11		x			x	New housing developments must provide adequate water supply, wildland fire mitigation plans, and consultation with appropriate wildland fire jurisdictions.					1. Engage elected officials at all levels – city, county, state, tribal, and federal.
12		x			x	Utilize FEMA pre-disaster mitigation program to maximize fuels reduction across the landscape with emphasis on private lands.	Currently FEMA has pre-disaster mitigation grants available but less than 1% of those funds go towards wildland fire mitigation. If those funds could be significantly increased, much more investments could go towards private lands.	Currently, although FEMA has the program, they do not have the expertise or staff to effectively implement the program. FEMA has very limited use of NEPA Category of Exclusions. Most projects funded by FEMA require then to go through an Environmental Assessment prior to award. Through their granting process FEMA will not fund prescribed fire or slash burning due to liability issues? It makes perfect sense for both existing and increases in this program to be "block grant" awarded to either federal or state agencies with expertise to complete the projects. Block grants to the states would eliminate the costly NEPA process of analyzing fuels reduction activities on private lands, and provide for the expertise that would allow other tools such as prescribed fire and slash pile burning.	This has never been attempted, so no previous action.		1. Expand FEMA pre-disaster mitigation and disaster assistance grant programs. 2. Consolidate FEMA assistance program with DOI or Forest Service programs, or 3. Provide "Block Grants" to State's.
13		x			x	Create WUI management areas on public lands within existing federal Land and Resource Management Plans are consistent with CWPP WUI boundaries.	This would positively reinforce utilizing existing authorities under HFRA and HFI; these WUI Management Areas would square up with WUI identified in CWPP's and significantly increase treatments.		None that I'm aware of, but this one could certainly build traction in a much needed area for both resilient landscapes and Fire adapted communities.		1. Evaluate existing plans to determine inconsistencies. 2. Develop a plan amendment schedule.
14		x			x	Need revised standardized guidance and direction for fuels treatments on federal land to enhance fire adapted communities and landscapes.	If barrier is removed, DOI agencies will be able to effectively target fuels treatment dollars to achieve integrated Cohesive Strategy goals for fire adapted communities and landscape resilience.	Currently guidance and direction comes from HFPAS and OMB, emphasis is to prioritize WUI treatments, with approximately 90% of the HFR funds going to this endeavor. However, a gap exists between the DOI agency missions, which are different for NPS, FWS, BLM and BIA, and the WUI emphasis. For example, spending HFR funds in Yosemite to reduce fuels around structures, in and adjacent to the park, does not fully advance the NPS mission, and in fact could have severe consequences if a large portion of the park burns in a mega-fire and the critical value of Yosemite (including the tourism economy) are lost.	PriceWatersCooper is including this issue in their review of DOI agencies.		1. An action can be to move from a national criteria based allocation model, to a process that considers the core principles of the Cohesive Strategy and funds the federal organizations at the regional levels and allows for management discretion at the local level that takes into account, priorities, capabilities, and the changes in individual project dynamics.
15		x			x	Need an effective CWPP implementation and monitoring process			This has been done. There is a CWPP guide for this that has been distributed and is available nationally		1. Develop a protocol for monitoring CWPP implementation and effectiveness.
16		x			x	Develop a common system to characterize and rate fire-adapted communities; to track individual community progress; to prioritize investment; and to allow for identification of trends across communities.	This would create a common understanding and mechanism for tracking progress in FAC in each region. The standards could also be used for investments from all stakeholders.	NFPA definition of Fire Adapted Communities.	Both NFPA, the FireWise Community Program along with IAFC Ready, Set, Go! Are all working toward this Goal		Utilize NFPA, IAFC, and other stakeholders to facilitate and devise this system.
17		x			x	Need to reduce the cost-recovery liability burden on individuals and communities that create defensible space.					1. Pursue related actions through local or state legislation (e.g., Oregon Forestland-Urban Interface Protection Act).
18		x			x	Determine the vulnerabilities of systems to secondary effects (e.g., flooding, debris-flows, sedimentation, ash build-up) recovery needs, and roles and responsibilities.					1. Develop and implement rapid assessment process
19		x			x	Need vegetation disposal for property owners (e.g., chipping, local disposal sites).					1. Create disposal systems where they do not exist. 2. Maintain disposal systems where they exist. 3. Conduct education to inform private landowners of the opportunities.
20		x			x	Need zoning laws that require defensible space prior to development.					
21		x			x	Need building codes for nonflammable materials.					
22		x			x	Need revised state or local level burning regulations.					
23			x		x	Need radio compatibility between digital, analog, narrowband, and wideband systems.					1. Identify all radio incompatibility issues to be resolved.
24						Resolve and simplify frequency use authorization and licensing processes for all agencies (local, state, federal and tribal).					
25			x		x	Need secure responder frequency spectrum.					1. Promote new federal legislation
26			x		x	Need to share funds, resources, authorities, and responsibilities for fire response.					1. Improve cooperation among agencies, fire departments, state, tribal, and other entities. 2. Develop new mechanisms for cost-sharing.
27			x		x	Need to track accidents, incidents, and "no fault" close calls to support a safety culture that effectively assess risks and offers acceptable safe practices.					1. Develop a national health and safety reporting system for all wildland agencies and jurisdictions.
28						Need an intergovernmental wildland fire governance structure to serve the needs of all jurisdictions in both wildland fire and all-risk incidents.	All stakeholders with wildland fire responsibilities would be represented by either NWCG or another entity who represents all interests.	NWCG does not satisfy this need fully, for example most municipalities are not represented by NWCG nor are the standards recognized.	Past efforts have only looked @ NWCG affiliation. Currently the RPL (recognition by prior learning) has been modeled in the south and sponsored by BLM, FEMA is now taking the model and expanding.		1. Expand scope of NWCG.

29	x			x	Allow new interpretation and engagement with key partners to take advantage of flexibility that currently exists, but may not be exercised for fear of litigation.	Landscape-scale restoration is often difficult to achieve due to complex process requirements of federal laws, rules, and policies; therefore landscape-scale restoration may not be achieved.			1. Encourage federal agencies to use authorities under the Healthy Forest Restoration Act (HFRA) and the Healthy Forest Initiative (HFI) to expedite the planning/collaboration process used to treat large landscapes.
30	x			x	Need flexibility for implementing actions following uncharacteristic wildland fire events.				1. Work with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Council of Environmental Quality to maximize flexibility for implementing actions following uncharacteristic wildland fire events..
31			x	x	Inefficiencies in the national qualification standards and procedures must be addressed to increase response capabilities. Develop one wildland fire qualification standard for the federal, state, tribal, and local wildfire community.	1. Responding to wildland fire events is a complex, interagency task. Many resources that would otherwise be available for mobilization are unavailable because of cumbersome qualification standards and procedures. As a result, resources are not available for mobilization. See Item 28. 2. A shorter time period to have more resources available for mobilization. Better coordination between and among local, state, tribal and federal agencies who are investing in training. A clear definition of position requirements for training and experience.	1. Responding to wildland fire events is a complex interagency task. Many resources that would otherwise be available for mobilization are unavailable due to cumbersome qualification standards and procedures. As a result, resources are not available for mobilization. 2. Build on existing success (e.g., IQCS, Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL), Service First). Should accept experience, training and qualification classes, nomenclature of DHS/NIMS as well as the National Fire Administration. 3. We have a national tracking system for resource mobilization which is ROSS. We need to shorten time for qualifications which is part of the NWCG Workforce Development Goal and IMT Succession Project so work is in progress	1. Past efforts have only looked @ NWCG affiliation. Currently the RPL (recognition by prior learning) has been modeled in the south and sponsored by BLM, FEMA is now taking the model and expanding. 2. The US Fire Administration has a fire crosswalk qualification system that is recognized by the NWCG and recognizes prior obtained skills of structure fire departments. This system has provided an avenue to incorporate fire personnel into interagency fire organizations where agencies have chosen to recognize them.	1. Build on existing success (e.g. Incident Qualification and Certification System (IQCS), Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL), and Service First to develop a national qualification system to track federal, tribal, local, state, and private community responders. 2. Incorporate the USFA crosswalk as a component of the National Wildland Qualification System.
32			x	x	Need universally available alternative wildfire management strategies such as managing lightning-caused fires.		There is an inability to manage for landscape resilience and resource benefit. Many states have laws that require all wildfires to be suppressed. Alternative wildfire management strategies such as managing lightning-caused fires are not universally available to all wildland fire management agencies, especially state agencies, which have responsibility for managing wildland fires on private lands.		1. Manage wildfire strategically to restore and maintain landscape resilience by addressing state-specific regulations on [managing] lightning ignitions. Further exploration may identify areas where compatible management objectives exist. Implementation strategies should be developed for when and where natural ignitions could be managed for landscape resilience and resource benefits.
33			x	x	Must be able to effectively and efficiently share resources. Need to remove policy barriers and process complexities which affect the ability to effectively and efficiently share resources, not only for wildfire, but for fuels and prescribed fire work.	1. Qualification standards pose barriers to sharing resources when the USDA Forest Service follows one set of rules, while all other state and federal agencies follow the Wildland Fire Qualification System Guide, PMS 310-1. 2. Budgeting policies limit the ability of agencies to share resources. Changes in the federal agencies fiscal policies have eliminated the ability of federal agencies to facilitate the movement of resources on non-federal fires. This will result in larger fires and greater losses.	As budgets decline and skill gaps grow, reliance on a mobile skilled workforce is one option, while local expertise is developed. One example is the new national template for cooperative fire agreements, which is designed so cooperators are responsible to bill the end user. Processes for updating and revising agreements are slow and cumbersome.	1. The guidance for cooperative fire agreements is currently under development and billing procedures have not yet changed. 2. The change in federal agency fiscal policy will adversely impact the availability of state resources and will dismantle the Interagency Wildfire Resource System.	1. Improve organizational efficiencies and wildfire response effectiveness. (consolidation, transfers of response responsibility where it makes sense, and similar solutions.) 2. Address preparedness strategically for greater efficiency and cost effectiveness. 3. Develop a flexible and mobile response capacity, given changing fire seasons and fuel events. 4. Identify and correct policy barriers that prevent the effective sharing of resources. 5. Identify complexities that need to be simplified in order to efficiently share resources.



Barriers and Critical Success Factors WFEC Review and General Prioritization

Name:

Reference Material:

Handout from 6/1/2012 WFEC meeting: 04-1 20120601 WFEC – Barriers.xlsx

The following questions are designed to document the comments/issues/thoughts related to the submitted barriers and critical success factors. Please fill in the appropriate information and get it back to Shari by Monday, June 11, 2012.

Item #5 – Increase Fuels Management

1. Is the description of the Barrier or CSF clear? If not, identify clarifying questions that would make the statement clear to whoever the audience might be.
 YES; NO – Please explain:
Additional Comments:
2. Is the impact clear? Does it describe clearly what will happen to our ability to meet the objectives of the Cohesive Strategy if the barrier is removed or the CSF put in place? If not, again, identify clarifying questions.
 YES; NO – Please explain:
Additional Comments:
3. Comments or questions related to Other Details?
 NO; YES – See Below
Additional Comments:
4. Comments or questions related to Existing Groups and Past Efforts?
 NO; YES – See Below
Additional Comments:
5. Are the potential actions clear? If the action is implemented, will the barrier be mitigated or the critical success factor met? If not, what is missing?
 YES; NO – Please explain:
Additional Comments:
6. How does this item impact being able to achieve the objectives of the Cohesive Strategy?
 High; Medium; Low
7. What is the probability of success in addressing this item? H/M/L
 High; Medium; Low

8. Is the effort (time, money, political capital) worth the potential outcome? H/M/L
 High; Medium; Low
9. Any other comment?

Item #10 – Enforceable Ordinances

1. Is the description of the Barrier or CSF clear? If not, identify clarifying questions that would make the statement clear to whoever the audience might be.
 YES; NO – Please explain:
Additional Comments:
2. Is the impact clear? Does it describe clearly what will happen to our ability to meet the objectives of the Cohesive Strategy if the barrier is removed or the CSF put in place? If not, again, identify clarifying questions.
 YES; NO – Please explain:
Additional Comments:
3. Comments or questions related to Other Details?
 NO; YES – See Below
Additional Comments:
4. Comments or questions related to Existing Groups and Past Efforts?
 NO; YES – See Below
Additional Comments:
5. Are the potential actions clear? If the action is implemented, will the barrier be mitigated or the critical success factor met? If not, what is missing?
 YES; NO – Please explain:
Additional Comments:
6. How does this item impact being able to achieve the objectives of the Cohesive Strategy?
 High; Medium; Low
7. What is the probability of success in addressing this item? H/M/L
 High; Medium; Low
8. Is the effort (time, money, political capital) worth the potential outcome? H/M/L
 High; Medium; Low
9. Any other comment?

Item #12 – FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program

1. Is the description of the Barrier or CSF clear? If not, identify clarifying questions that would make the statement clear to whoever the audience might be.
 YES; NO – Please explain:
Additional Comments:

2. Is the impact clear? Does it describe clearly what will happen to our ability to meet the objectives of the Cohesive Strategy is the barrier is removed or the CSF put in place? If not, again, identify clarifying questions.
 YES; NO – Please explain:
 Additional Comments:
3. Comments or questions related to Other Details?
 NO; YES – See Below
 Additional Comments:
4. Comments of questions related to Existing Groups and Past Efforts?
 NO; YES – See Below
 Additional Comments:
5. Are the potential actions clear? If the action is implemented, will the barrier be mitigated or the critical success factor met? If not, what is missing?
 YES; NO – Please explain:
 Additional Comments:
6. How does this item impact being able to achieve the objectives of the Cohesive Strategy?
 High; Medium; Low
7. What is the probability of success in addressing this item? H/M/L
 High; Medium; Low
8. Is the effort (time, money, political capital) worth the potential outcome? H/M/L
 High; Medium; Low
9. Any other comment?

Item #14 – Revised Standard Guidance for Fuels Reduction

1. Is the description of the Barrier or CSF clear? If not, identify clarifying questions that would make the statement clear to whoever the audience might be.
 YES; NO – Please explain:
 Additional Comments:
2. Is the impact clear? Does it describe clearly what will happen to our ability to meet the objectives of the Cohesive Strategy is the barrier is removed or the CSF put in place? If not, again, identify clarifying questions.
 YES; NO – Please explain:
 Additional Comments:
3. Comments or questions related to Other Details?
 NO; YES – See Below
 Additional Comments:

4. Comments of questions related to Existing Groups and Past Efforts?
 NO; YES – See Below
 Additional Comments:
5. Are the potential actions clear? If the action is implemented, will the barrier be mitigated or the critical success factor met? If not, what is missing?
 YES; NO – Please explain:
 Additional Comments:
6. How does this item impact being able to achieve the objectives of the Cohesive Strategy?
 High; Medium; Low
7. What is the probability of success in addressing this item? H/M/L
 High; Medium; Low
8. Is the effort (time, money, political capital) worth the potential outcome? H/M/L
 High; Medium; Low
9. Any other comment?

Item #16 – Common System to Characterize and Rate Fire-Adapted Communities

1. Is the description of the Barrier or CSF clear? If not, identify clarifying questions that would make the statement clear to whoever the audience might be.
 YES; NO – Please explain:
 Additional Comments:
2. Is the impact clear? Does it describe clearly what will happen to our ability to meet the objectives of the Cohesive Strategy if the barrier is removed or the CSF put in place? If not, again, identify clarifying questions.
 YES; NO – Please explain:
 Additional Comments:
3. Comments or questions related to Other Details?
 NO; YES – See Below
 Additional Comments:
4. Comments of questions related to Existing Groups and Past Efforts?
 NO; YES – See Below
 Additional Comments:
5. Are the potential actions clear? If the action is implemented, will the barrier be mitigated or the critical success factor met? If not, what is missing?
 YES; NO – Please explain:
 Additional Comments:
6. How does this item impact being able to achieve the objectives of the Cohesive Strategy?
 High; Medium; Low

7. What is the probability of success in addressing this item? H/M/L
 High; Medium; Low
8. Is the effort (time, money, political capital) worth the potential outcome? H/M/L
 High; Medium; Low
9. Any other comment?

Item #20 – Zoning Laws

1. Is the description of the Barrier or CSF clear? If not, identify clarifying questions that would make the statement clear to whoever the audience might be.
 YES; NO – Please explain:
Additional Comments:
2. Is the impact clear? Does it describe clearly what will happen to our ability to meet the objectives of the Cohesive Strategy if the barrier is removed or the CSF put in place? If not, again, identify clarifying questions.
 YES; NO – Please explain:
Additional Comments:
3. Comments or questions related to Other Details?
 NO; YES – See Below
Additional Comments:
4. Comments or questions related to Existing Groups and Past Efforts?
 NO; YES – See Below
Additional Comments:
5. Are the potential actions clear? If the action is implemented, will the barrier be mitigated or the critical success factor met? If not, what is missing?
 YES; NO – Please explain:
Additional Comments:
6. How does this item impact being able to achieve the objectives of the Cohesive Strategy?
 High; Medium; Low
7. What is the probability of success in addressing this item? H/M/L
 High; Medium; Low
8. Is the effort (time, money, political capital) worth the potential outcome? H/M/L
 High; Medium; Low
9. Any other comment?

Item #28 – Intergovernmental Wildland Fire Governance Structure

1. Is the description of the Barrier or CSF clear? If not, identify clarifying questions that would make the statement clear to whoever the audience might be.
 YES; NO – Please explain:
Additional Comments:
2. Is the impact clear? Does it describe clearly what will happen to our ability to meet the objectives of the Cohesive Strategy if the barrier is removed or the CSF put in place? If not, again, identify clarifying questions.
 YES; NO – Please explain:
Additional Comments:
3. Comments or questions related to Other Details?
 NO; YES – See Below
Additional Comments:
4. Comments or questions related to Existing Groups and Past Efforts?
 NO; YES – See Below
Additional Comments:
5. Are the potential actions clear? If the action is implemented, will the barrier be mitigated or the critical success factor met? If not, what is missing?
 YES; NO – Please explain:
Additional Comments:
6. How does this item impact being able to achieve the objectives of the Cohesive Strategy?
 High; Medium; Low
7. What is the probability of success in addressing this item? H/M/L
 High; Medium; Low
8. Is the effort (time, money, political capital) worth the potential outcome? H/M/L
 High; Medium; Low
9. Any other comment?

Item #31 – National Qualification Standards and Procedures

1. Is the description of the Barrier or CSF clear? If not, identify clarifying questions that would make the statement clear to whoever the audience might be.
 YES; NO – Please explain:
Additional Comments:
2. Is the impact clear? Does it describe clearly what will happen to our ability to meet the objectives of the Cohesive Strategy if the barrier is removed or the CSF put in place? If not, again, identify clarifying questions.

YES; NO – Please explain:

Additional Comments:

3. Comments or questions related to Other Details?

NO; YES – See Below

Additional Comments:

4. Comments of questions related to Existing Groups and Past Efforts?

NO; YES – See Below

Additional Comments:

5. Are the potential actions clear? If the action is implemented, will the barrier be mitigated or the critical success factor met? If not, what is missing?

YES; NO – Please explain:

Additional Comments:

6. How does this item impact being able to achieve the objectives of the Cohesive Strategy?

High; Medium; Low

7. What is the probability of success in addressing this item? H/M/L

High; Medium; Low

8. Is the effort (time, money, political capital) worth the potential outcome? H/M/L

High; Medium; Low

9. Any other comment?

Item #33 – Policies and Process Complexities Which Prevent Resource Sharing

1. Is the description of the Barrier or CSF clear? If not, identify clarifying questions that would make the statement clear to whoever the audience might be.

YES; NO – Please explain:

Additional Comments:

2. Is the impact clear? Does it describe clearly what will happen to our ability to meet the objectives of the Cohesive Strategy if the barrier is removed or the CSF put in place? If not, again, identify clarifying questions.

YES; NO – Please explain:

Additional Comments:

3. Comments or questions related to Other Details?

NO; YES – See Below

Additional Comments:

4. Comments of questions related to Existing Groups and Past Efforts?

NO; YES – See Below

Additional Comments:

5. Are the potential actions clear? If the action is implemented, will the barrier be mitigated or the critical success factor met? If not, what is missing?
 YES; NO – Please explain:
Additional Comments:
6. How does this item impact being able to achieve the objectives of the Cohesive Strategy?
 High; Medium; Low
7. What is the probability of success in addressing this item? H/M/L
 High; Medium; Low
8. Is the effort (time, money, political capital) worth the potential outcome? H/M/L
 High; Medium; Low
9. Any other comment?

Item #39 – Firefighting Workforce

1. Is the description of the Barrier or CSF clear? If not, identify clarifying questions that would make the statement clear to whoever the audience might be.
 YES; NO – Please explain:
Additional Comments:
2. Is the impact clear? Does it describe clearly what will happen to our ability to meet the objectives of the Cohesive Strategy if the barrier is removed or the CSF put in place? If not, again, identify clarifying questions.
 YES; NO – Please explain:
Additional Comments:
3. Comments or questions related to Other Details?
 NO; YES – See Below
Additional Comments:
4. Comments or questions related to Existing Groups and Past Efforts?
 NO; YES – See Below
Additional Comments:
5. Are the potential actions clear? If the action is implemented, will the barrier be mitigated or the critical success factor met? If not, what is missing?
 YES; NO – Please explain:
Additional Comments:
6. How does this item impact being able to achieve the objectives of the Cohesive Strategy?
 High; Medium; Low
7. What is the probability of success in addressing this item? H/M/L
 High; Medium; Low

8. Is the effort (time, money, political capital) worth the potential outcome? H/M/L
 High; Medium; Low
9. Any other comment?

Item #42 - Landfire

1. Is the description of the Barrier or CSF clear? If not, identify clarifying questions that would make the statement clear to whoever the audience might be.
 YES; NO – Please explain:
Additional Comments:
2. Is the impact clear? Does it describe clearly what will happen to our ability to meet the objectives of the Cohesive Strategy if the barrier is removed or the CSF put in place? If not, again, identify clarifying questions.
 YES; NO – Please explain:
Additional Comments:
3. Comments or questions related to Other Details?
 NO; YES – See Below
Additional Comments:
4. Comments or questions related to Existing Groups and Past Efforts?
 NO; YES – See Below
Additional Comments:
5. Are the potential actions clear? If the action is implemented, will the barrier be mitigated or the critical success factor met? If not, what is missing?
 YES; NO – Please explain:
Additional Comments:
6. How does this item impact being able to achieve the objectives of the Cohesive Strategy?
 High; Medium; Low
7. What is the probability of success in addressing this item? H/M/L
 High; Medium; Low
8. Is the effort (time, money, political capital) worth the potential outcome? H/M/L
 High; Medium; Low
9. Any other comment?

Finally, are there any barriers and critical success factors that you think should be included that were not identified by the RSCs or CSSC? If so, what are they?

NASF Discussion on Barriers and Critical Success Factors for the Cohesive Strategy

June 13, 2012

Barriers are listed in priority order with limited discussion on how to evaluate, validate and proceed with addressing the issues.

1. Landscape scale restoration is often difficult to achieve due to complex process requirements of federal laws, rules, and policies. New interpretation and engagement with key partners can take advantage of flexibility that currently exists, but may not be exercised for fear of litigation.

- Utilize HFRA and HFI to the fullest extent to treat large scale projects on federal lands
- Integrate various private and public land conservation and stewardship programs on private lands for fuel mitigation
- Integrate federal and state level fuel reduction and prevention programs
- Need revised standardized guidance and direction for fuels treatments on federal land to enhance fire adapted communities and landscapes

2. Must be able to effectively and efficiently share resources. Need to remove policy barriers process complexities which affect the ability to effectively and efficiently share resources

- Complete Master Cooperative Wildland Fire Management and Stafford Act Response Agreement
- Clarify authorities and role of USFS in mobilizing resources for national support of wildfire and non Stafford Act disasters
- Seek legislative authority to clarify roles of federal resources on non Stafford Act disasters

3. Inefficiencies in the national qualification standards and procedures must be addressed to increase response capabilities.

- Review NWCG IMT Succession Strategic Plan when complete
- Reduce the time to become qualified
- Request briefing paper from NWCG on total training efforts
- Implement a single qualification system

4. Need an intergovernmental wildfire governance structure to serve the needs of all jurisdictions in both wildland fire and all risk

- WFECC continue to work on governance tasking and evaluate, validate appropriate representatives for WFLC, WFECC and NWCG
- Validate current representative needs and representation at various levels including NWCG committee and sub committees.

5. Utilize FEMA pre-disaster mitigation program to maximize fuel reduction across the landscape with emphasis on private lands.

- Expand FEMA pre disaster mitigation and disaster assistance grant programs
- Provide block grants to states
- Eliminate NEPA requirements



Proposal

Date: June 11, 2012

Subcommittee: CSSC

Description of Issue or Assignment:

Cohesive Strategy Regional Report Template to be used in each of the regions.

Discussion of Proposed Recommendation(s):

The CSSC recommends that WFEC approve the format of the attached standard report template that will be used by each of the regions as they develop their CS Regional Reports. The template is designed to allow the regions flexibility to tell their story while also ensuring that all of the necessary information is included from each region. This will facilitate timely completion of Phase III and make it easier for CSSC and WFEC to assimilate the three regional assessments into the National Report.

Identify Considerations:

The attached draft has been discussed and edited over the past few weeks based on input from all CSSC members, RSC Chairs, science leads and staff closely involved in the process. It represents their collective thinking and a path forward that all are comfortable with and support pursuing.

Rationale for Recommendation(s):

See Discussion of Proposed Recommendations

Recommendation(s):

The CSSC recommends that WFEC approve the template to be used by each of the regions and in pulling together the National Report for Phase III.

Decision Method used:

- Subcommittee Consensus
- Modified Consensus (explain, i.e. majority, super-majority)
- Chair Decision

Contact Information:

Dan Smith at desmith@blm.gov or Sandy Cantler at scantler@fs.fed.us



Proposal

WFEC Decision:

- WFEC Approves
- WFEC Approves with Modifications (not required to resubmit for WFEC approval)
- Need More Information (required to come back to WFEC for approval)
- WFEC Does Not Approve

Roy Johnson, DFO

Date

Notes regarding decision:

Regional Risk Analysis Report Templates
Draft June 11, 2012

Executive Summary

The Executive Summary will include the highpoints of the report – the significant findings and conclusions.

A. Introduction

1. Cohesive Strategy vision, goals, performance measures and objectives as outlined in phase I as they relate to this regional risk analysis. Describe the framework and how these documents all fit together to portray the National Cohesive Strategy
2. Discussion that Phase III is not the end but a beginning including a brief discussion of the future expectations, why the Cohesive Strategy is important and how it can potentially impact future wildland fire management in the region. .
3. Discuss how science is being used to inform the CS through modeling and data analysis of actions under a range of alternatives.

B. Risk Analysis

The regional risk analysis will be told as a series of stories and will discuss the unique wildland fire issues in each region. A description of the data and modeling will be interwoven in the stories. Use graphics and charts as appropriate to illustrate the use of science in the planning and decision making process.

1. Key questions: Why is wildland fire an issue (why did we develop the CS)? How does wildland fire vary across the landscape? How can our management actions mitigate the impacts of wildland fire?
2. Describe comparative risk analyses, which include: characterization of risk, description of alternatives to address the risk.
3. Describe what was learned from the modeling results and describe the potential outcomes and trends as it relates to key findings on Alternatives (i.e. are there some actions that have significant benefits over others, and was it unexpected?).

C. Alternatives

1. Describe the range of feasible alternatives and key elements and emphasis actions, based on the actions described in Phase II.
2. Discuss the strengths and limitations of what can/can't be modeled at different levels, such as the local, county, state, and geographic area level throughout the Region.
3. Describe how decision-makers at various levels can use these alternatives and supporting information across the Region. This would include the combination of factors/data that might guide decision-makers at various levels to choose one action or activity under the Regional Alternatives.

4. Describe Tradeoff's illustrating strategic investment options of the Alternatives actions/activities that are the priority. List the investment costs necessary to implement the actions or activities within each Alternative.

D. Performance Measures

1. Discuss the National Performance Measures which are strategic, outcome oriented measures. All regions will use the National Performance Measures.
2. In addition, they may choose to develop specific regional performance measures to meet their needs. However, they must link to the national performance measures and goals. If regions develop performance measures they will:
 - a. Identify the Performance Measures for each goal and how PM's relate to the regional objectives identified in Phase II.
 - b. Briefly describe how these PMs will be monitored to ensure achievement of the goals.
 - c. Include information about how these PMs and actions in the regional action plan are connected.

This section will not get buried in the details – the details will be left for the implementation/action plans.

E. Conclusions

1. Describe the potential impact of the CS at all levels, how this information may be used and what decisions could be made from it. (Emphasis goes on strategy in this report, implementation will be described in regional action plans.)
2. Describe the desired future state of each region and how the CS will help achieve that vision.

F. Next Steps

1. Discussion of Post 2013 activities including the action plans and immediate next steps.
2. Set the stage for the reader to understand the Action Plans and the Communication activities.

Appendices

1. Glossary
2. Acronyms
3. References
4. Available Science/Models to better inform the decisions for implementing the Alternatives, monitoring data, and Performance Measures.
5. Stakeholder involvement
6. Communications activities
7. Links to the Phase I and II reports and other key national and regional documents
8. Graphics
9. Other pertinent regional information
10. Committee/Workgroup Members

SUCCESS STORIES FROM THE WESTERN REGION



Upper Deschutes River Coalition

The Upper Deschutes River Coalition (UDRC) vision is a community and partners aware of issues, engaged, collaborating and acting together to create and maintain a healthy, scenic and sustainable environment where everyone is able to live their core values. The Coalition's mission is "to protect Upper Deschutes River Communities by restoring and sustaining healthy fire-resistant forests, pure and abundant river flows and wildlife habitat".

The Coalition, established in 2004 as a 501 c 3, has invested over \$600,000 in South Deschutes County with \$574,172 in fuel reduction on 600 one-half acre private lots in 26 member communities plus educational outreach. From 2005 to 2011, seventy five percent of 6,286 lots or 8,480 acres meet the defensible space standards as defined by Oregon Senate Bill 360. There are six Firewise certified communities in the Coalition's CWPP. About 4,627 lots are green low risk, 610 yellow or medium risk and 1,049 are red high risk fire rated lots. The Coalition's total value of sweat equity and funded fuel reduction work is estimated at \$515,579.

The Coalition's web site www.udrc.org contains fuel hazard risk rating maps for the 26 communities, annual reports and the 2012 operations plan.

The Coalition's Board is composed of one representative from each of the 26 communities and Partners including the USFS, BLM, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Oregon Department of Forestry and Fish and Wildlife, Deschutes County Forestry, Project Wildfire, La Pine Rural Fire Protection District, Trout Unlimited, Sunriver Anglers, Deschutes County Commissioners and Planning staff. The Board and Partners meet ten times a year and produce an E News quarterly.

Our Mission:

- Ensure healthy, fire-resistant forests – UDRC neighborhoods are thick with lodgepole and ponderosa pine and heavy undergrowth of bitterbrush and Manzanita. These overgrown conditions allow for high intensity, catastrophic fires that can destroy neighborhoods, wildlife habitat, river banks and the forests itself. The UDRC's goal is to reduce that risk and preserve the health of our forest by reducing hazardous vegetation to promote a more fire-resistant forest and protect neighborhoods and wildlife.

- Promote clean & abundant river flows – four rivers – the Big and Little Deschutes, Fall and Spring rivers flow majestically through Coalition neighborhoods and provide important habitat for a variety of wildlife such as Brown and Rainbow trout, otters and osprey. They offer abundant recreational opportunities for residents and visitors. The UDRC's goal is to keep our rivers clean and healthy to sustain this resource for fish and wildlife, and recreation.
- Enhance beneficial wildlife habitat – healthy, fire-resistant forests and clean river flows come together to provide beneficial habitat for our community friends including elk, white tail deer, bald eagles, otters and osprey. The UDRC's goal is to bring together the diverse efforts of our neighborhood members to provide a balanced approach to sustaining these habitats.

2011 Accomplishments

- Updated the Strategic Vision and Plan
- Bylaws updated to reflect current operations and organization
- Issued the 2011 Annual Report
- Created the 2012 Operations Plan
- Created the River Stewardship Guide
- Managed the two year \$100,000 Deschutes County fuel reduction sweat equity program
- Completed the neighborhood/community physical property evaluation inventory and mapping of all 26 UDRC neighborhoods for compliance to Oregon Senate Bill 360/Defensible Space guidelines.
- UDRC's Executive Director coordinating recreational projects for submittal to U.S. Senator Wyden's Central Oregon Recreational Asset Committee, South Deschutes County Committee.
- UDRC's Executive Director appointed to the USFS's Provincial Advisory Committee, Deschutes National Forest.
- Friends and Board members volunteered 9,354 hours valued at \$173,507.
- Coordinated 5th annual river sweep with Stop Oregon Litter & Vandalism on four rivers
- Coordinated recreational projects and submitted to U.S. Senator Wyden's Central Oregon Recreational Asset Committee, South Deschutes County Committee.

Upper Deschutes River Coalition
P.O. Box 3042
Sunriver, OR 97707

Date:

Dear Property Owner,

Without cost to you, you have the opportunity to have your lot in the Deschutes River Recreational Homesites # 1 – 5 area treated to reduce hazardous fuels in accordance with the Oregon Forestland-Urban Interface Fire Protection Act (Senate Bill 360) standards.

The Upper Deschutes River Coalition is an organization of 20 neighborhoods acting collectively on natural resource issues within the region. The Coalition has received limited federal grant funding to perform hazardous fuels treatments to reduce wildfire risk for a limited number of private landowners in the area covered by the Coalition Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).



The photo on the left shows a lot in the DRRH 1-5 area that has not been thinned to reduce hazardous fuels. The photo on the right shows a lot that was treated by the Upper Deschutes River Coalition fuels reduction program. A wildfire entering a lot that has been thinned will usually drop to the ground reducing the risk of a crown fire. A properly thinned lot provides an area that can be used by firefighters to attack the spread of a wildfire and defensible space to protect homes.

The Coalition fuels reduction process includes thinning out the trees to a 10 - 12 ft distance between crowns favoring ponderosa pine; removing dying, dead, or diseased trees; thinning out smaller trees that rob nutrients from larger healthier trees; mulching slash and brush; cutting tall grass to 4 - 6"; and generally making the property owners' landscape healthier, aesthetically improved, and increasing the property value. Because the Coalition fuels reduction contract specifies a standard process, we cannot accommodate specific requests by the landowner.

If your property located at **16875 Glendale in DRRH # 1-5** were to be treated for fuel reduction by a commercial contractor, the cost would be an estimated \$2,000.00. Our service is at 'no charge' to you. However, based on our Coalition being a 501c3 non-profit organization and relying on donations for continued operation, a voluntary contribution would be very much appreciated and is tax deductible to you. **Attached is a donation form or visit www.udrc.org and use PayPal and a credit card.**

This free fuels reduction program is available for a limited time and applications will be accepted while funds are available. To apply for the **free fuels reduction program**, please read and sign the enclosed Access Permit and Release of Liability form and mail or fax back to us by **September 14, 2009**. Again, we would appreciate any voluntary tax deductible contribution.

If you own more than one property, please fill out only one Access Permit and Release of Liability for each property owned, and please be sure to write in the lot and block number for each individual property.

Please mail or fax to:

Upper Deschutes River Coalition (UDRC)
Attn: FUELS REDUCTION MANAGER
P.O. Box 3042
Sunriver, OR 97707

Sincerely,

Name???

Upper Deschutes River Coalition
Private Lands Committee
Fuels Reduction Grant Manager
Phone: (541)
Email:

Upper Deschutes River Coalition website:
<http://www.udrc.org>

Upper Deschutes Resource Coalition Revised Community Wildfire Protection Plan:
<http://www.udrc.org/cwpp/cwpp2007.pdf>

Oregon Forestland-Urban Interface Fire Protection Act Property Evaluation & Self-Certification Guide:
<http://www.oregon.gov/ODF/FIRE/SB360/sb360.shtml>