

**Community Wildfire Protection Plans
Enhancing collaboration and building community capacity
September 14, 2007 Workshop Proceedings**

Enhancing Collaboration and Building Community Capacity is a project funded by the Joint Fire Science Program (JFS) (www.firescience.gov) that includes case studies within thirteen communities on the role of collaboration during development of Community Wildfire Protection Plans. Project researchers conducted cases in several types and sizes of communities in California, Oregon, Montana, Colorado, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Virginia and Florida. Profiles of the case studies are available at: <http://jfsp.fortlewis.edu/communityProfiles.asp>

A key element of the JFS project is knowledge transfer. On September 14, 2007, the JFS team collaborated with Resource Innovations to facilitate the first of several knowledge transfer workshops to share some of these “lessons learned” about the contexts, processes and outcomes of collaboration. For this workshop, the focus was on how collaboration processes build community capacity resulting in more sustainable fuels reduction projects. The JFS research team anticipates that many of these lessons will assist communities in monitoring and strengthening existing CWPPs and help other communities as they get started with their CWPP efforts.

The workshop brought together twenty-one participants from organizational, community, governmental and non-profit groups from Oregon, Washington, and Northern California to share lessons from the JFS case studies and facilitate dialogue among participants on how to strengthen CWPP efforts. These notes are intended to highlight the participant discussion during the workshop. Narrative from the presentations and PowerPoint slides can be found on the workshop website at: <http://ri.uoregon.edu/programs/CCE/CWPPworkshop.html>.

Proceedings Table of Contents

Workshop Objectives	2
Homework	2
Presentations	2
Collaboration and Coordination: How People Come Together	2
Developing Capacity to Accomplish CWPP Goals: Community Capacity.....	4
Small Group Session.....	5
Group 1. Community and Neighborhood Safety	5
Group 2. Fuels Reduction	6
Group 3. Forest Restoration.....	6
Sustainability.....	8
Evaluations	9
Appendix A: Homework Themes	10
Appendix B: Small Group Notes	14
Appendix C: Evaluation Results	20

Workshop Objectives

The objective of this workshop was to share lessons learned from the Joint Fire Science research project and participant experiences. Additional objectives for the workshop identified by workshop participants include understanding:

- how CWPPs influence federal agency and long-term land management planning
- how to keep current and move forward with CWPP development and implementation, even facing limited federal and county financial support
- how to institutionalize collaborative efforts
- how to evaluate CWPPs
- how to build people's awareness of fire risk
- how to create synergy to move CWPPs forward
- how to develop and implement monitoring and evaluation strategies
- how to work with or involve all stakeholders
- how to strengthen partnerships

Homework

Prior to the workshop, the research team asked participants to complete a set of homework questions in an effort to help the researchers and facilitators get an early sense of participant perspectives on collaboration and capacity building in relation to their CWPPs. The research team used the homework in developing presentations that would be relevant to participants. Another goal of the homework was to help familiarize participants with the type of issues that would be discussed in the workshop. Individual homework was synthesized and sorted into themes shared across workshop participants. The results of the homework analysis are found in Appendix A of this document. The compilation of all homework responses can be found on the workshop website.

Presentations

Collaboration and Coordination: How People Come Together

(Presentation by Pamela Jakes, USDA Forest Service, Northern Research Station, St. Paul, MN)

Presentation Discussion: Questions and Answers

What additional benefits came as a result from collaboration in your CWPP?

- Collaboration is about coming together to solve a problem.
- People come to the CWPP process with different frames. For example, in Sisters, OR people had to collaborate as a result of a fire. When Black Butte Ranch was evacuated, the process was considered “flawless” because of relationships developed during the CWPP process— Search and Rescue, the fire department, and the Sheriff's office were all on the same page because of relationships had developed during the CWPP process.
- Communities developed woody-debris recycling. This has been offered as an alternative to burning debris.
- Property owner attitudes and behaviors have changed over time.
- The CWPP process changed the kind of impacts that resulted from fire in WUI.

How can the benefits of collaboration be made more visible and apparent?

- Homeowners expect coordination when disasters occur. If stakeholder groups have been involved in the development of a CWPP, efforts are likely to be coordinated.
- As CWPP groups continue implementing plans they need to tell their stories.

How do we measure or account for the impacts of collaboration?

- Measuring impacts across disciplines can be difficult (i.e. social versus bio-physical impacts). Although there may be some resistance, “bean counting” can be a useful way to measure impacts.
- Some levels of collaboration can be quantified and measured, for example, number of meetings, number of meeting attendees, number of newspaper articles reporting collaborative activities. What other kinds of “beans” are worth counting?
- It sometimes feels like funders are looking to give money based only on quantifiable impacts.
- There may not be enough opportunities to gather data and report non-quantifiable benefits of collaboration (i.e. lessons learned and experiences)—there are lots of benefits you can’t necessarily count.
- One idea for reporting non-quantifiable benefits is to develop a check-list of potential benefits and check off benefits realized. However, this approach makes it difficult to aggregate experiences across a region. Another idea is to write the story of collaboration. This raises policy issues – who will use this information? Is it useful to government/agency folks?
- More baseline data is needed to make comparisons, such as recording how things happened before the implementation of a CWPP.

What incentives could be used to increase involvement by agency leaders in collaborative planning and decision-making?

- Collaboration is supposed to be voluntary, but many agency leaders feel they are being forced to collaborate whether they want to or not.
- There is a need to provide agency leaders with more incentives. As long as target reporting doesn’t change, and leaders aren’t credited for collaborative activities, they won’t see benefits.
- There is a need to engage individual landowners and create a sense of ownership.
- Offering grant money to individuals as an incentive can work, but sometimes money (or the amount of money) is not enough of an incentive.
- Need to have discussions regarding responsibility for wildland fire and fuels management. Is it the government’s role to prevent wildfire? If landowners are offered an incentive is it sending the wrong message?
- Communities need to be a part of the collective action.
- Having a fire turns can be an incentive for action. For example, in one community the CWPP was being written as the fires occurred, resulting in neighbors being prepared and agencies getting together.
- Communities need to document and share experiences, but they may not have time to tell their story because they face multiple fires (too many disasters at one time).
- Fires change behaviors by instilling a sense of “*don’t know when it is coming, so be ready*”.
- Look for teachable moments amidst media blitz.

Developing Capacity to Accomplish CWPP Goals: Community Capacity (Presentation by Victoria Sturtevant)

Presentation Discussion: Questions and Answers

How do we bring larger scale CWPPs down to the community level?

- Use education to help public take ownership.
- Private landowners need to be an integral part of success on private lands.
- Fires can occur as a result of people doing fire prevention work (chainsaws, burning debris).
- What is a failure? If community doesn't take ownership that is failure—a community has to take ownership either through financial investment and/or actions.
- No particular frame is a silver bullet.
- In California requirements surrounding CWPPs are increasing. However requirements need to be flexible enough as to allow everyone to participate in different ways.
- Danger of excluding lower capacity communities.
- A streamlined model or template may not fit community needs or resources.

How do we coordinate community goals with agency plans?

- Get on council agendas.
- Agency capacity seems to be going down—agencies often not able to get work done and can't keep up with community needs. This ties into policy issues and fulfilling needs.
- What about economic development? Stewardship contracting can create work.
- What capacities are needed to develop economic opportunities and priorities? Biomass utilization is an economic opportunity.
- Collaborative aspects of making a fire program can create economic opportunities and provide new funding sources (circular linkages).
- Outcomes (both social and ecological) need to be monitored/measured.

How do we sustain CWPP collaborations?

- Education is the key to sustaining and developing capacity.
- How do you put a monetary value on raising awareness?
- Use conceptual model to sustain collaboration—make sure everything continues to flow.
- Have local coordination groups determine where priority areas are—they are key to keeping efforts alive.
- Use carrots—whatever carrot motivates the community or property owner.
- Engage people in granting/fundraising efforts.
- There is a problem when not enough work is done up-front and not enough is known about responsibilities and individual capacities.
- Work to develop a common language. There can be a problem with language, for example -- the word “*risk*”. Things often have different meanings for different agencies/organizations.
- Try to fit needs in with the context of what everyone is working towards.
- Develop a better understanding of stakeholder roles. Good for long-term sustainability.
- Institutionalizing the process can build sustainability. For example, a county ordinance has helped to establish and sustain Project Wildfire in Deschutes County.
- Next tier to keeping CWPPs sustainable is continuing to bring together multiple organizations.

Small Group Session

In the afternoon we broke out into small groups, and asked participants to discuss specific goals, influences, and successes and challenges they have faced in implementing CWPPs. Participants were assigned to one of the following three groups based on CWPP goals: Group 1 discussed community and neighborhood safety; Group 2 addressed fuel reduction; Group 3 discussed forest restoration. Within each group, the members:

1. identified goals related to the topic area,
2. discussed successes and challenges faced in accomplishing those goals,
3. identified what influenced successes and challenges in the context of collaboration and community capacity (examples include scale, framing, networks, and social learning).
4. discussed policies and programs that need to be changed to support CWPP efforts.

A summary of discussion points from the small group breakout sessions is provided below. Appendix A includes more detailed notes from each group.

Group 1. Community and Neighborhood Safety

CWPP Goals

- Community engagement (listen, support)
- Emergency communication
- Addressing structural ignitability and defensible space
- Evacuation
- Suppression
- Developing ordinances
- Community outreach

Successes and Challenges Faced in Reaching Goals

- Achieving consistent management across ownerships
- Building common understanding,
- Creating informed citizens

Influences on Successes and Challenges ... having:

- Common goals
- Leadership and technical assistance – ambassadors (master gardeners)
- Incentives (grant funding)
- Disincentives (fines)
- Education – build capacity for defensible space

Policy Needs

- Account for investment in people served, not just # of acres. Get back to something that means something
- Ordinances (i.e. building codes). Get them implemented and enforced

Group 2. Fuels Reduction

Goals

- Generate funding as a driver for developing and implementing the CWPP
- Control development in WUI areas
- Economic development –when related to fuels it blends doing work with an economic benefit back to community
- Fuels reduction—it can compete with other priorities, and it may be an agency goal but not necessarily a community goal (differences in frames – for communities it could safety)
- Identify the appropriate scale for planning (subdivision, private and federal land, landscape)
- Identify the appropriate types of projects (defensible space, access, landscape treatment)
- Community outreach

Successes and Challenges Faced in Reaching Goals

- Education (both a challenge and success)—a lot of info available that can increase awareness. However, building awareness must be on-going and it's difficult to sustain the activity over time
- Litigation and funding (challenges) – most projects get litigated.
- Funding is scarce and not necessarily geared to fuels reduction
- Relationships between stakeholder groups and individuals has been a success
- Private industrial landowner involvement has been a challenge – they can be difficult to engage

Influences on Successes and Challenges

- Litigation
- Funding
- Personnel changes (consistency and engagement)
- Point person –spark plug in the community needed to launch and help with momentum
- Relationships heavily influence success

Policy Needs

- Funding for education and outreach needs to be addressed
- Need increased funding for fuels reduction.
- Grant prioritization/coordination/timing and process needs to be simplified/mainstreamed/integrated timelines
- Weigh incentives to match priorities (there should be more credit for treating difficult WUI acres than easy wildland acres)

Group 3. Forest Restoration

Goals

- Address how restoration is similar to or different from fuels reduction (i.e. some counties brought partners to the table at the beginning to address restoration; in other counties, fuels reduction is the goal and there isn't a lot to talk about in terms of forest restoration)
- Forest restoration is more than fuels reduction (enhancing habitat, etc.), but fuels reduction can be linked to forest health
- Community outreach

Successes and Challenges Faced in Reaching Goals

- Lack of alignment between agencies – some alignment with agencies and CWPP
- Lack of federal budget – not dedicated to fed. Fuels money and timber sales
- Need more value places on federal WUI acres – what is the value of acres treated that saves a town or forest vs remote and/or flat acres easier to treat
- Success with categorical exclusions with HFRA – agencies want to reduce time and costs for fielding projects
- Categorical exclusions (CEs) have raised red flags in some places; and litigation has halted restoration projects
- Forests that need restoration are often mountainous and dissected
- What is restoration is and where to implement fuels reduction versus restoration practices? Definitions, motives and perceptions need to be clear
- Restoration doesn't always pay and it is difficult to fund
- Forest restoration not a priority on industrial lands – it's a crop, not a forest; many NIPF owners haven't managed for fire.
- In-migrants not knowledgeable about fire dependent ecosystems; want beauty of dense forest
- When get in WUI (1 ½ mi from residences) safety takes over from restoration goals

Influences on Successes and Challenges

- Political climate (past relationships, restoration projects, litigation, etc.) influences how restoration does and does not occur
- Alignment of priorities – when aligned the work is easier
- Where exactly do you draw WUI line – how that can be changed (e.g., topography, fuel loading, administrative needs, etc.) and how needs (e.g., restoration, prescribed burning, etc.) influence that process?
- Education and understanding influences success
- Partners - who was at the table influences processes and can help implement (e.g., RC&D)?
- High capacity and understanding – how much people understand, whether or not NGO's are in place, are people willing to take on leadership roles?
- If agencies are rewarded, WUI priorities could create alignment with CWPP groups
- Restoration emphasis brings support (buy-in) from environmental groups – can be a means towards an end
- Biomass emphasis might help get forest restoration funding and support
- CWPP can be used for scoping and project support – line officers tie into CWPP groups
- Past experiences in collaboration affect ability to work together on CWPPs – e.g., bioregional groups in California.
- Avoid moving to one size fits all – scale, capacity and framing different. Size of projects matter – big contracts keep acre price low, but may not have local capacity to do them.

Policy Needs

- Changes in performance measures
- Faster NEPA
- Institutionalize CWPPs at federal level. Should a CWPP be binding? Range of experiences with this across state of OR.

Sustainability

(Presentation by Sam Burns)

Presentation Discussion: Questions and Answers

How can research and lessons learned by research team be used in other contexts?

- CWPPs build capacity for a wide range of activities. For example, a snow storm in Colorado marooned ranchers. However, because community members were working together on a CWPP during storm, they were able to come together for search and rescue. This supports the notion that CWPPs are another form of community development. Community members seem to be getting more out of CWPPs than wildfire mitigation actions.
- Community-driven forest restoration also builds capacity and collaboration – it is an iterative cycle.

What steps has your community taken to sustain your CWPP?

- Committee meets annually, sees if CWPP is still relevant, see how it fits in with county CWPPs. CWPPs should be reviewed regularly (within a year) to reprioritize and ensure sustainability.
- Make a staff person responsible for overseeing CWPP. This may increase sustainability and success.
- Go after funding sources (FEMA, NFP, and other grant opportunities).
- Having a local coordination group that is committed to prioritizing projects is key.
- Get people on the same page. Establish an e-mail listserv for committees. Education committee and fire chief decided they wanted a monthly meeting – should be useful for creating sustainability.
- Firewise Communities USA is a ground-level example for changing behaviors – obvious next step for community involvement and money is available. However it doesn't always work.
- Josephine County set-up stewardship projects to bring in contractors and facilitated discussions about biomass – another avenue to collaborate and get more work done (another frame).
- Project Wildfire includes a lot of work on biomass and biomass utilization – putting natural resources back into the Oregon economy. Putting economic component back into equation may help with sustainable results.

What are the biggest challenges you face in sustaining your CWPP and how can those challenges be overcome?

- Some communities have been identified at risk because they aren't accessible or don't have water, etc. We need to address other issues like these.
- Biggest challenge is going to be funding.
- CWPPs become irrelevant or unused if they aren't incorporated into an organization that has staff or a specified point person. It makes a huge difference to have somebody to take the lead.
- Lack of engagement from agency and elected officials is problematic for oversight and implementation.

Proceedings

- Jurisdictional issues (multi-county plans) create political issues and concerns.
- Things that were thought of as challenges before now have become opportunities for creativity.
- CWPPs need to connect with other land use planning efforts.
- Right now the only data being collected is how many CWPPs have been completed in the state. Need to better evaluate CWPPs.

Evaluations and Wrap-Up

The meeting concluded with a thank-you to workshop participants from members of the research team and the staff at Resource Innovations. Participants completed evaluation forms (14 were completed and compiled – evaluation results are included in Appendix C of this document.)

Meeting materials will be made available on the following websites, along with more information about the Joint Fire Science research project:

- Resource Innovations - <http://ri.uoregon.edu/programs/CCE/CWPPworkshop.html>
- Joint Fire Science CWPP Project - <http://jfsp.fortlewis.edu/>

Appendix A: Homework Themes

Question 1: What are the most important goals you hope to accomplish through your CWPP?

Visioning/Mission

- Reduce wildfire risk
- Reestablish and/or create fire resilient landscape
- Protect social, economic and natural resources
- Meet or exceed the requirements of the National Fire Plan and FEMA
- Create sustainable economic opportunities connected to fire suppression and forest restoration

Relationships/Partnerships/Cooperation/ Collaborations

- Foster long-term relationships between private, public and non-profit sectors
- Increase cooperative efforts across agencies and organizations
- Continue to improve communication across stakeholder groups
- Streamline/incorporate fire plans and codes
- Develop social commitment for creating fire adaptive communities and reducing the risk of fire danger in WUI

Planning/Prioritization

- Determine and strategically locate priority areas
- Submit an alternative to a federal fuels management project in the WUI
- Recommend alternative treatment methods (i.e. brush density, herbicide treatments, fuel reduction techniques, and disposal or removal of treated fuels)

Safety and Protection

- Create wildfire evacuation plans

Engagement/Awareness/Involvement

- Create a sense of ownership and buy-in
- Develop interest in participation by agencies and communities
- Increase education and outreach efforts regarding wildfire prevention and what landowners can do
- Promote community involvement
- Develop a CWPP that accounts for private land rights

Resources

- Make resources (education materials) accessible
- Determine and pursue grants and other funding opportunities

Sustainability

- Complete CWPPs and assist communities in implementing action steps

Question 2: What have been the most significant accomplishments thus far?

Visioning/Mission

- Adoption and implementation of CWPPs

On-the-Ground Work

- Completed CWPPs
- Completed/implemented specific outlined tasks or objectives
- Provided assistance to landowners to help reduce wildfire risk
- Beginning stages of measuring results, assessing outcomes, evaluating effectiveness
- Implemented stewardship agreements and contracts
- Developed spatial data

Planning/Prioritization

- Developed prioritization strategies
- Shifting agency focus to WUI

Public Engagement /Buy-In/Education

- Engaged community members in or increased public awareness of wildfire reduction efforts
- Creation of defensible space by community members
- Increased public education and outreach and targeted education efforts
- Increased levels of local knowledge
- Potential recognition opportunities (i.e. Firewise Community)
- Increased communication

Partnerships/Relationships

- Developed new partnerships, collaborations, and coordinating activities
- Cross agency/sector involvement in CWPPs
- Strengthened partnerships and relations between stakeholder groups
- Creating committees and designating tasks

Resources

- Identified and/or garnered funds
- Made funds available to landowners
- Invested funds and created economic opportunities (i.e. capital investment for an integrated use biomass utilization facility)

Question 3: What factor(s) have been instrumental in achieving those goals?

Partnerships/ Collaborations/ Cooperation

- Increased collaborative opportunities and inclusion of more stakeholder groups

Communication/ Knowledge Exchange

- Making information available (i.e. list serves)
- Use of outside facilitators to assist with group development

Proceedings

Buy-In/Engagement/Leadership

- Pro-active approach by landowners to learn about and create defensible space
- Increased support by citizens, communities and agencies
- Increased leadership seen by committee members and agencies
- Creation of sub-committees to assist with implementation and follow through
- Greater involvement, commitment and accountability by agencies
- Increased interest expressed by stakeholder groups in taking the lead and helping to secure funding
- Involving individual citizens in reducing wildfire risks

Resources

- Access and utilization of outside funds (i.e. National Fire Plan grants, Forest Service Resource Advisory Council money)
- Identification of research and development opportunities (i.e. Watershed Center assistance with harvest and biomass utilization efforts)
- A point person to help organize and delegate

Wildfire Risk Awareness

- Increased recognition of wildfire threats to communities

Question 4: What goals are you still working on and/or struggling with?

Buy-in/Support/Momentum

- Instances of lack of buy-in and accountability of landowners to create defensible space
- Perception that some agency personnel have shifted priorities
- Changes in levels of stakeholder involvement
- Need for dynamic individuals to help maintain momentum
- Balancing concerns regarding private landowner rights with the needs to mitigate/reduce wildfire risk (i.e. changes to fire code)
- Questions regarding whose responsible for creating defensible space and how to create a sense of accountability

Education

- Developing a long-term, coordinated education plans

Partnerships

- Varying degrees of success in integrating additional stakeholders into the process (i.e. emergency management organizations)
- Need for consistent involvement by stakeholder groups

Long-Term Management and Implementation Efforts

- Struggles with how to implement objectives
- Concerns regarding how to effectively monitor projects
- Questions regarding how to reach long-term goals
- Struggles with how to apply objectives at a larger scale

Proceedings

- The need to develop prioritization criteria and processes
- The need to formally integrate residential fire codes into development ordinances
- The need to develop fire recovery plans
- Developing biomass utilization opportunities
- Applying skills and/or knowledge in different arenas

Funding

- Struggles with how to manage and implement objectives with limited or no outside funds
- The need for additional money in order to see projects through
- Finding funds for risk factors other than fuel loading (i.e. water supply for fire suppression)

Question 5: What kinds of community or organizational capacities are emerging through development and implementation of your CWPP?

Partnerships/Collaborations/Relationships

- Participants have gained insight into other organizations skills and capacities – creating greater understanding and forging stronger partnerships
- Increased partnerships across agencies in order to accomplish tasks
- Strengthened working relationships and bringing stakeholders together (i.e. fire prevention co-ops and neighborhood groups)

Leadership

- Increased interest and support by many agency and organization personnel
- Stronger role being played by fire districts and departments (i.e. creation of position in a fire department to work on WUI issues)
- Forest Service actively looking for funds and partners so fire danger can be better managed

Buy-In/Engagement /Awareness

- Creation of committees has helped with task designation and action-step completion
- Homeowner associations taking on “Firewise Community” status
- Improved knowledge regarding safety, emergency management and public land management
- Use of community safety infrastructure (i.e. emergency communications systems)
- Interest and participation by fire districts and landowners
- Working to overcome resistance expressed by some landowners and county officials
- Increased ownership and responsibility by agency and committee members to implement and manage projects

Resources

- Increased opportunities for funding opportunities for communities with CWPPs
- Instances of agencies providing matching funds
- Participation in CWPP may make organizations more competitive in funding solicitation
- CWPPs used as a resource by fire districts and other agencies for garnering funds, training, volunteer recruitment and education materials

Appendix B: Small Group Notes

Community and Neighborhood Safety	Fuels Reduction:	Forest Restoration
Neil Benson Carrie Ann Capp Dewaine Holster Ann Walker Angie Johnson Mike Simek Eileen Stein	Paul Galloway Mark Gray Katie Lighthall Carol Mack Doug Miller Sandy Shaffer Jim Wolf	Yvonne Everett Chris Chambers Lisa Clark Chris John Lee Vaughn Cindy Kolomechuk

Fuels Reduction

1) *What goals did your CWPP include in the relationship to the topic area?*

- Development as a driver for fuels reduction
- Fuels reduction was the driver needed to go after grant money
- Reduce fuels across all lands which may lead to increased stewardship and ethic as a result of fuel reduction efforts
- Fuels reduction used an economic opportunity - biomass not a goal but it could be as a result of fuels reduction
- *Example:* City of Ashland put together CWPP in response to safety/watershed concerns. Forest Service looking at forest health (HFRA) – therefore fuels reduction is framing fuels reduction
- *Example:* Deschutes County has a new County Forester; County owned land must include fuels reduction plan. Fuels reduction plans are intended to reduce catastrophe and increase community protection (both on public and private land).
- Establish WUI boundary to help Forest Service reduce fuels
- Jackson County WUI drafted fire management officers
- Fuels reduction influencing changes in WUI management/established lines
- Fuels reduction focus of federal land agencies but not necessarily important to community – framing issue
- Education of community about fuels reduction – relied on federal/ state agencies to be experts

2) *What successes and challenges did your community face in accomplishing these goals?*

Challenges

- Differences in land ownership created difference in understanding of living in forest (i.e. private vs. industrial). This raises a question of ‘what does a healthy forest look like?’ It is not a cookie-cutter issues because forests are complex.
- As demographics change, education efforts need to be renewed.
- Private industrial involvement low.

Proceedings

- Funding always a concern/issue.
- Litigation concerns – often by “environmentalists” that won’t come to the table due to their status as a volunteer and high turn-over rates within organizations. This can hinder forest service projects.
- Hard to get local contractors
- It is difficult to integrate fuels reduction efforts with other program areas (i.e. wildlife habitat, land owner education programs) – because methods are often contradictory
- Perceptions often skewed/negative regarding individual/organizational reasons or motives for fuels reduction
- Establishing credibility

Successes

- Successful education/outreach efforts to engage and create ownership
- Examples of County Forester and commissioner support leads to outreach
- Having a point person to take a leadership role
- Achieved interagency collaboration and cooperation
- Mutual aid agreements result in success for suppression and vegetation management
- Relationships developed during CWPP helped with fuels reduction success
- Utilizing local contractors for fuels reduction - economic opportunities

3) What influenced these successes and challenges?

- Litigation/funding issues – limits what can be done. How federal agencies reward fuels reduction do not seem in-line with efforts (a disincentive)
- Economics influenced by scale
- Personnel changes individual involvement
- NFP influences funding requirements - need to prioritize accordingly
- National policy and direction influences what is done and can be a challenge
- HFRA has been successful
- Project Wildfire has influenced successes – increased stakeholder involvement
- Having federal, state and county officials at the table influences success
- Point person/”spark plugs” needed for success – varies based on topic, neighborhood and landowner engagement
- Improved personal relationships have helped success

4) What policies and programs need to be changed to support CWPP efforts?

- Funding for fuels reduction education and outreach needs to increase
- Increased funding for fuels reduction needed
- Credibility for acres/ accomplishments reported – need better system in place. WUI acres should get more credit – thought that inappropriate measures are being used. This would be an incentive at the agency level. Weight incentives to match priorities
- Make decision-making process consistent

- Remove politics from Fuels Reduction
- Mainstream/simplify grant prioritization/coordination process – improve system to be more effective
- Improve timing of budgets (fiscal year) so to reduce overlaps due to delays

Forest Restoration

1) What goals did your CWPP include in the relationship to the topic area?

- In Clackamas County there are 5 topic areas but forest restoration is not a goal
- Projects are often far away from communities
- A goal is to align federal projects with CWPP priorities
- In Ashland a goal is to implement community restoration/fuels project but fire protection/emergency response less important.
- In Deschutes County, the focus is on restoration. Ponderosa pine and juniper fuels and restoration good match. Outside of WUI focus in on restoration – however lodge pole in not true restoration
- Goals on the South Coast are to integrate restoration and fuels reduction. They want more of both.
- In Trinity County, emphasis is on fuels reduction. Understanding of fire in ecosystem is high and restoration is a reason to buy in. Fuels reduction serves as both a means and end
- In Linn County, fuels reduction means forest health – but forest service project long ways off and forest health is minimized by private industry

2) What successes and challenges did your community face in accomplishing these goals?

- Forest Service lack of staff
- Aligning priorities
- BLM has no budget
- Trinity County is very mountainous and dissected. They can't use prescribed fire due to high cost and acres. They need to examine what is the value of the strategic acre.
- Deschutes County is having success with categorical exclusion, HFRA and environmental assessments. Litigation with larger projects with commercial trees.

Challenges:

- How to cover cost of extraction? Solution is to add value (biomass). Have model project developed and forum to discuss it.
- South Coast has big landowners that don't want to be told what to do
- Small lot owners respond very differently
- There is a public perception that there is a lack of understanding and capacity
- In some communities, there were challenges related to restoration and identifying diameter limits to reduce anxiety.
- Trinity County: Who pays for monitoring? Monitoring needs to include both implementation and effectiveness.

Proceedings

- Federal agencies don't have data that communities can always use; they have satellite data, but communities may want data that has been ground-truthed.
- Federal agencies may move slowly – lots of red tape
- Hard to get staff \$ - easier to get project \$

Success:

- Trinity County GIS database in place
- Success came with fewer turf wars – opportunities to case a big net and work together. Improved grant coordination and respect for roles and better division of labor.

3) What influenced these successes and challenges?

- BLM under lawsuit radar
- Policy changes – old policy was ecosystem management, new framework is to get the cut out which isn't conducive to collaboration.
- Forest Service brings in stakeholders early in decision making process in an effort to get something done
- CWPP groups scope and provide letters of support
- Good alignment with forest service, BLS and CWPP priorities
- Trinity County: high capacity to work together – built through previous collaboration
- Helps top have \$ available – but not enough
- Need to have NGO capacity
- Bioregional councils and AMA helped to bring additional forest service attention
- In Sweet Home, door-to-door outreach; collaboration with fire department and increased education. Development of ballot measure to address unprotected lands

4) What policies and programs need to be changed to support CWPP efforts?

- What is the value of the strategic action? How to do it?
- Change in performance measures – changes in \$ allocations
- Need to speed up NEPA
- CWPP not institutionalized
- Should CWPPs have standing – should they be binding?

Community and Neighborhood Safety

1) What goals did your CWPP include in the relationship to the topic area?

- Dynamic Process
- Get community buy-in and support
- Help communities understand fire risk
- Protect life and public safety – this resonates with citizens and police departments
- Education and prevention – tie into fire assignments
- Structural assessments and identification of highest risk communities

Proceedings

- Educate new residents and implement new re-education
- Home ignition zones – motivate to action
- Logging slash/risk
- Prioritize areas for fuels reduction
- Capitalize on teachable moments
- Template for what's next
- Recognition signs

2) *What successes and challenges did your community face in accomplishing these goals?*

- Consistent communication in emergency management situations
- 1st fire – lead to collaboration for CWPPs
- Success – coordination automatic in emergency situations
- GW fire evacuation worked!
- Partnerships carry to other issues – improved partnerships
- Community buy-in? No infrastructure/subdivisions, no community, isolated residents, unprotected areas – rangelands
- Challenge – people don't want government
- Instilling trust
- Must build report
- Find incentives that work
- Challenge: Get people to identify risk
- Use other “frames” (i.e. west side or east side)
- How to package ideas for landowners
- Success: Use survivable instead of defensible – helps build community understanding
- Help people understand terms and risk (shelter-in-place, use “burnt toast” image)
- Change behavior action
- Consistency in messaging (i.e. home assessment)
- Change how we do outreach (what gets attention, pull homeowner in process, on-site home assessments)
- Policy tools such as Oregon Senate Bill 360 (voluntary compliance, education)

3) *What influenced these successes and challenges?*

- Not necessarily money
- Leadership – champions and motivators (tenuous if loss of leadership)
- Education – homeowners can make informed decisions
- Incentives - \$, credibility/recognition (i.e. ambassadors), annual clean-up = fire free
- Technical assistance – capacity of agencies, staff needs grants, use co-op, lack of expertise/capacity, community perception of government, set standards for TA
- What do people see? Influences ability to be effective

Proceedings

- Poverty/capacity – ability to set and accomplish goals
- Agency capacity – training (create consistent messages, use partners with capacity), need to know who is doing outreach (setting internal stage and internal consistency)

4) What policies and programs need to be changed to support CWPP efforts?

- Oregon Forestland Urban Interface Act (Senate Bill 360)
- Use Master Gardeners (FireWise landscaping program, demonstration gardens)
- On-site assessments (Give landowners education and resources to act)
- Re-look at institutional approach (scale – landowner, neighborhood, community?)
- Reasonable set of goals
- Ordinances
- Dependence on NFP \$ = house of cards
- Get back to prevention and education
- Look at what's valued W congressional/national level – need different beans!
- What do we count? Not structures; numbers of hours with landowners
- Quality not quantity
- More emphasis on other risk factors (access, water)
- Building codes, ordinances – WUI codes
- Change in how feds do long range plan to ensure CWPP priorities in public land management

Appendix C: Evaluation Results

Twenty-one participants attended the Joint Fire Science Knowledge Transfer Workshop on Community Wildfire Protection Plans: Enhancing Collaboration and Building Community Capacity. The workshop took place on September 14, 2007 in Eugene, Oregon. Fourteen people (66% of workshop participants) completed and returned evaluations. Following is a draft summary of the results from the evaluation.

1. Overall, how was the meeting organized and facilitated?

Poor	Fair	Effective	Very Effective
0	0	3	11

2. Was the meeting structure and flow effective?

Yes	No
14	0

3. Were the homework questions helpful to you in preparing for the meeting?

Not helpful	Somewhat helpful	Helpful	Very Helpful
0	3	7	4

4. In general what worked best about the meeting?

Networking and learning

- Conversations and networking.
- Sharing from other CWPP groups - this is the first time I've had a chance to compare with others.
- It can be very isolated in rural communities and there has been no previous attempt to have discussions between groups. It was also great to hear about capacity building and positive results of CWPPs beyond the original goals, it's great to hear about positive unintended consequences; thanks for sharing the draft evaluation form - I wish we had more like it.
- Linking the presentation topics to the experiences of the group.
- The diversity of people here, the varied disciplines and perspectives.
- Timely topical information.
- Hearing issues addressed in different terms adds new dimensions to my understanding of these issues.
- Good networking opportunity.

Small Groups and Discussion Opportunities

- Fantastic interaction in small and larger groups
- Small group sessions and reports

Proceedings

- Good amount of time for discussion
- It was great to have both large and small groups
- Small groups

JFS Research

- Exposure to JFS work to date
- Appreciate reporting out from JFS team
- Structure and agenda well planned
- Framing next steps presentations
- Enjoyed Sam's sustainability workshop

Overall Workshop

- Good move to make us review plans and goals and collating responses
- Well organized workshop
- Kept things moving and great breaks, snacks and use of groups and lectures
- Came away with objectives met

5. What did not work so well?

- The disappearance of the coffee after lunch
- Needed more time to share success stories
- The work that still needs to be done seems daunting;
- Not clear if the purpose of the meeting was to share the results of the research project or to gather information from the project

6. Number of respondents that indicated that are likely to:

Share the proceedings form this meeting with other groups	14
Use tools developed through the Joint Fire Sciences Program?	9
Want to receive email exchanges with information resulting from the meeting	12

Other comments/Questions:

- [Very interested in tools related to] the ideas for evaluation.
- Conduct one more KT workshop like this to check and see what tools are being used that JFS has provided from the research. Maybe a year or so from now.
- How do institutional differences at state level (WA/OR/CA affect CWPP efforts?)
- I'd like to do the set of discussions on all 3 topics, not just one.

Proceedings