

**MINUTES FROM THE
NWCG WILDLAND URBAN INTERFACE WORKING TEAM MEETING
Phoenix, Arizona
January 31-February 2, 2006**

ATTENDANCE ROSTER

Working Team Members Present:

Sam Scranton, (US DOI/Bureau of Indian Affairs) -
Chair
Wayne Ching, (Hawaii Division of Forestry &
Wildlife)
Alan Dozier (Georgia Forestry Commission)
Tom Drayer (Alt. for Kim Zagaris, National
Emergency Management Association)
Kelly Hawk (US DOI/Bureau of Land Management)
Pam J. Jakes, Ph.D. (USDA Forest Service)
Brian Johnson (International Association of Fire
Chiefs)
Olin Phillips (Minnesota DNR Forestry)
Frank Richardson (US Fire Administration)
Jim Smalley (National Fire Protection Association)
Lew Southard (USDA Forest Service)

Working Team Members Not Present:

Jack Cohen (USDA Forest Service)
Rep., (Vacant), Federal Emergency Management
Agency
Rep., (Vacant), National Association of State Fire
Marshals

Staff and Guests:

Amy Schneider, Fleishman-Hillard, Inc.

Facilitator:

Barbara Kennedy, USDA Forest Service

Recorder:

Michele Steinberg, National Fire Protection
Association

Opening:

Chairman Sam Scranton called the meeting to order. Team members and alternates introduced themselves. The team reviewed the agenda items and schedule.

Old Business:

Minutes of last meeting:

DECISION ITEM: Olin Phillips moved to approve the October 2005 WUI Working Team meeting minutes. Jim Smalley seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Updates on Meetings and Conferences Attended:

Alan Dozier described the January 2006 meeting of state forestry chiefs, managers and supervisors in Orlando, Florida. Staff had prepared a presentation for him to provide but he did not have an opportunity to be on the agenda. The NASF Fire Committee decided at that meeting not to have an additional representative from their Committee to the WUI Working Team, as they are satisfied with the current representation. The WUI subcommittee of this group has also been dissolved. Meeting topics included a fire reporting system for states; surveys of the needs of rural and volunteer fire departments; and sharing aviation resources. The meeting also included presentations on LANDFIRE and the new budget system. There were individual meetings with Southern, Northeastern, and Western groups. Olin Phillips added that the meeting included discussions on issues not related to Firewise. The NASF structure for representation to the WUI Working Team has changed, so that there is no liaison to the NASF Fire Committee now. They dissolved the idea of an "oversight" to the Firewise program via a separate NASF WUI committee. This change represents their comfort with where program is heading. Brian Johnson noted this change was a compliment to Wayne Ching, Olin and Alan in communicating back to the NASF group. Olin agreed and said it also reflected the responsiveness of the WUI Working Team to the NASF meetings. Sam asked if NASF wanted another Working

Team representative at the next Fire Committee meeting. Kelly Hawk offered to attend the next meeting (in June) and will communicate with Don Artley as our official link to NASF. Sam asked that NFPA and Fleishman-Hillard staff assist Kelly with presentation information.

Upcoming meetings include:

- Southern Fire Prevention Exchange Workshop in February, which will mark the roll-out of the Southern States Wildfire Risk Assessment
- North Carolina WUI Symposium in Greensboro, Feb 28-Mar 2
- Wildland Fire 2006 in Phoenix, AZ, Mar 8-9
- Colorado Intergovernmental Risk Sharing Agency (CIRSA) Safety Committee Meeting in Northglenn, CO, Mar 24 – Michele Steinberg will present with Colorado fire staff
- IAWF Fuels Management and Fire Behavior conference, March 28-30, Portland, OR - Judith Leraas Cook and Sam Scranton are both attending.
- Wildfire Lessons Learned Center has invited Sam and Jim to meet with them in Tucson, AZ, on April 12
- IAWF Fire Safety Summit in Pasadena, CA, April 25-27. NFPA Wildland Fire Section members will attend. Kelly Hawk will be presenting information on the rural and volunteer training project(s).
- American Planning Association Annual Conference, April 22-26, San Antonio, TX – Firewise will have an exhibit there

Sam noted he met with the Fire Program Analysis (FPA) budgeting staff and that they will want to attend a WUI Working team in future. Sam will be meeting with them again February 21 and with the DOI Fuels Group next week. Sam has submitted the National WUI Program budget for 2007 to them along with an accomplishment report for 2005 (WT members were copied on the correspondence). Sam has also been appointed to a Budget Technology Transformation team (BTT) – all Chairs at NWCG are on this team. No meeting of this group has occurred yet. Sam added that the Wildland Fire Education Working Team is still interested in meeting together with the WUI Working Team.

Lew Southard is staffing an NWCG table at the Northwest Fire Prevention Workshop next week in Oregon. Organizers had asked Firewise and/or the Working Team to exhibit but Sam declined as there was no opportunity for presentation. Michele will send Firewise materials there for Lew to use at his exhibit.

Pam Jakes will be presenting at a session titled “Survival in Place” at the International Symposium on Society and Resource Management in Vancouver during the first week in June. It will be a 90-minute session with 5-minute presentations to spark dialogue regarding the social implications of policy relating to evacuation options in wildfire. Janet Anderson is presenting and there will be participants from Canada and New Zealand. Pam will report back to the group at the September meeting in Quincy. Kelly asked about adding a participant who is pro-Shelter-in-Place; Pam asked her to refer a name for this. Lew noted he would like to arrange to videotape the session.

New Business:

Review of WUI WT Notebook and Contents

There was a general discussion and agreement that the notebook is a good resource for Working Team members. The concern is how to keep it up to date. Staff agreed to place the most up-to-date materials on the Firewise FTP site in a folder for the Working Team. This can also include archived material such as minutes from past meetings. Brian Johnson suggested that a minimum, the following information be included in the notebook:

- Stakeholder information
- Guest speaker guidelines for Working Team meetings
- Work plan proposals form and guidelines for its use
- Leadership Award guidelines

- Firewise Communities/USA Recognition Program guidelines
- Funding matrix showing which agencies contribute to the program

There was discussion about updating the Working Team on a periodic basis regarding Team member and staff activities, possibly in a newsletter format. It was agreed that after each Working Team meeting, staff will provide a one-page summary meeting highlights. In addition, an executive summary will be provided as a first page to the regular quarterly reports. Jim will add these items to the Working Agreements (see below).

WUI Working Team Agreements Review and Revision – Sam indicated a need to establish protocol for membership on the Working Team. This can be accomplished within the Team’s working agreements. Participants agreed to add a review of the Working Team Charter to the next meeting agenda, to determine if any changes are needed.

The group reviewed the latest Working Team agreements, last edited in 2003. There was discussion that the group model is not really consensus as stated in the agreements, so the agreements should be changed to reflect reality. Meeting schedule and logistics information may also need editing. It was suggested that wording be changed to have participants inform the Chair whether they will attend meetings, rather than NFPA.

It was suggested that the language about guest presentations be replaced. Guest speakers need to go through the protocol using a form. The Working Team needs to have this information no less than 60 days before the meeting. There was discussion about making a state forestry representative invitation optional depending on the meeting. For meetings in states that the Team has not met in before, Olin felt it would be advisable to invite the state forester to sit in on the meeting and give a presentation on local issues. Alan suggested the Chair could provide invited state representatives with a template of what we want them to talk about. It was agreed that this invitation should be at the discretion of the Chair. Similarly, the Chair would have discretion on a field visit or ceremony in a venue where the Team wanted to recognize someone. Brian suggested adding this information under “Points to Consider” in coordinating the meeting.

Sam distributed a draft document on duties of the Chair and Vice Chair to Team members (see Appendix A for the text of what was submitted). Alan suggested that under the Vice Chair duties there should be language about the Vice Chair representing the Chair at required meetings, other than Working Team meetings, if needed. Jim suggested that the document also indicate that members’ travel must come from their respective organizations.

There was some discussion about the non-federal/non-state entities on the team and how their travel is covered. Brian suggested that those entities (IAFC, NEMA, NASFM) to provide their travel funds to NFPA in order to be called “sponsors” and have NFPA cover member travel that way (it would be a wash). Jim said that with written guidelines this could be handled through the program budget and the sponsor/non-sponsor question would become a non-issue. The state forestry representatives on the Team will approach Don Artley about the question of additional travel should one of them become Chair or Vice-Chair.

Additional suggested edits to Sam’s draft document included adding the length of term for officers on this page. Sam will edit the document and provide it as part of the notebook.

The group discussed the issue of absent members as described in the current agreements. Current language reads as follows:

Absent Members

1. Absent members will ensure that their agency or organization is represented by sending an alternate participant to the meeting or endorsing another Working Team member to represent them.

2. Absent members agree to support decisions made in their absence regardless of meeting participation.

Alan asked about adding information about providing a proxy to the first sentence; by adding, "...and/or provide a proxy vote to another Working Team member." This would ensure the person serving as alternate doesn't have the burden of proxy voting. There was some discussion about how many members and proxies would be allowed in a meeting in order to make a quorum. The group will need to decide on the quorum issue; should review Robert's Rules of Order.

Task Group duties were discussed, specifically whether timelines were attached to these groups when appointed. Sam indicated that some are ongoing, like the Communications Task Group; groups formed to deal with specific projects have an end date. The Team reviewed all Task Groups and confirmed status and membership (see Appendix B). These will be included in the notebooks. Sam added that Task Groups should be prepared to report at each meeting. Sam asked Michele to revise the Working Agreements and to provide a draft to the Team for a 30-day comment period.

Nomination and Election Protocol

Sam asked the group to consider protocol for nominations and elections to take place during this meeting. The current situation is new, since both a chair and vice-chair must be nominated and elected, as the current vice-chair has resigned. All members of the Working Team are eligible to be in either position.

Brian proposed the following procedure because of the unique situation of having no vice-chair:

1. Elect both Chair & Vice-chair positions at February 2006 meeting.
2. Ask Sam Scranton, as the current Chair, to stay as Chair through the end of the November 2006 national conference.
3. The elected Chair at the February 2006 meeting will function as the Vice-chair through the November conference and assume Chair duties immediately after that time.
4. The elected Vice-chair at the February 2006 meeting will become the Vice-chair after the November conference.
5. The term of office for both positions will end at the fall meeting in 2008

The proposal above was restated as a motion and was seconded. Discussion included a review of the responsibilities of the Chair and Vice-Chair. A vote was called and the motion carried unanimously.

Sam suggested that the elected chair and vice-chair participate in calls with Sam, Jim, Barbara and Michele on the agenda for September meeting. Kelly added that the Chair and Vice-Chair should have the prerogative to work amongst themselves to divide duties and have flexibility.

Presentation – NWCG Social Sciences Task Group

Lew introduced the participants via conference call: Ron Hodgson, Ed Smith and Aden Seidlitz (co-chair of Social Sciences Task Group).

The group reviewed the ten questions Jim Smalley had earlier provided to the Task Group as possible topics for further social science research (see Appendix C). At a meeting of the NWCG Working Team chairs two years ago, Sam met representatives of this Task Group and the follow-up has included Jim's submittal of ideas and other meetings.

Ron Hodgson said that the Social Science WT is trying to discover social science needs from other NWCG Working Teams and to find how they might assist. A current project is technology transfer for fire management. Ron passed along a document created by Linda Langner that summarizes current known research regarding each of the ten questions. Lew noted that Linda had also sent a more detailed document regarding measuring costs and benefits of Firewise. Lew asked how the questions would be addressed if the research is not being done by the Task Group. Ron noted one of the challenges for social science researchers is to get the results of research to users. The Task Group is reviewing parallel studies on how to get research out to the field, from medical research examples. They want to produce guidelines for techniques on doing this. Ron said he is working with the Kitzhaber Center on similar processes.

Pam said she recently met with Linda Langner and other social science researchers funded under the National Fire Plan. They discussed the need for a common location for the information, perhaps as part of the Social Science WT website. Ron said that could be done and would be similar to the existing technology transfer website. The site would enable systematic reviews and be open to users of the research. Ron mentioned a Society of American Foresters study in Florida that surveyed general forestry users about how they use science and where they get it. He is working with Pam on how to best communicate information out of the USFS North Central Research Station. Researchers increasingly need "just in time" information, which would make a central website very useful.

Lew asked about existing website infrastructure such as the Southern Research Station website database (www.wildfireprograms.com) and the Gainesville site (<http://www.interfacesouth.org/>) and whether they are being used this way. Ron added there are many others such as the Rocky Mountain Research station site, etc. The problem is that the information as posted is not necessarily readily useable by land managers. There needs to be a synthesis on all studies on a particular problem with critical assessment.

Ron provided the write-up by the Social Science Working Team in response to the ten questions sent on by Jim Smalley, which is a compilation of any relevant studies and where they were being done (but not a complete literature search). See Appendix D for this document.

There was more discussion about inventorying and publicizing existing research on key questions. There was also discussion about how to select or prioritize several problems we have given to the Social Science WT to do systematic reviews and synthesize what's been done to create guidelines. Alan said he would like a list of all the research that goes along with one of the questions, as well as an abstract of what the research means to a fire manager. Olin asked about having someone from the Social Science WT present a summary at our next meeting in the fall. Ron offered that a team member could do it, or a specific researcher, as we wish. Lew felt this would be helpful, to cover topics where the literature has been summarized. Lew asked Pam about the syntheses her group has been preparing. It took about 8 weeks to compile and publish these. Pam noted her team is still in the process of determining in what format or formats fire managers need and want to get information. Amy Schneider said that from a communications standpoint, summary sheets would be extremely useful.

Pam will send the published syntheses to the Working Team. The topics include collaboration, acceptance of fuels treatments, and aesthetics of fuels treatments. She will also send the land manager fact-sheets, which are in a one-page format.

Following the call, there was extensive discussion on what additional areas should be reviewed or researched by the Social Sciences Working Team. Some felt the list provided to summarize existing work on the ten questions was not useful, as much of the research is localized and not applicable nationally. Pam indicated we should come up

with two or three critical questions and ask for a synthesis of any research done on them. After extensive discussion and with the assistance of Barbara Kennedy as facilitator, the Working Team agreed that two important issues were being able to identify obstacles to mitigation (outcome or product would be guidance for communities how to review their codes, covenants and deed restrictions for potential obstacles to conducting Firewise practices), and what factors influence the adoption of Firewise activities across regions (outcome or product would be guidance for the Working Team, staff and agencies to recognize influences that help or hinder adoption of Firewise practices and to use this information to promote Firewise). Questions are phrased as follows:

- 1) What kind of Firewise landscaping ordinances and construction/design requirements are being accepted by homeowners associations into deed restrictions or CC&Rs? What are the obstacles to adoption of these rules in communities?
- 2) What are the ecological and social conditions that impact the adoption of Firewise principles resulting in a change of behavior at the resident level? How does the influence of these conditions or characteristics vary across regions?

Discussion and Decision Items for Core Program Areas:

1. Firewise Communities/USA Recognition Program

Michele Steinberg provided the following information about this program area:

New Communities and Renewals to Date

- ★ Renewing communities for 2005: 96 (out of 98)
- ★ New communities in 2005: 48
- ★ Current Total: 144 communities in 30 states

This represents a 98% retention rate for 2004 and a 49% growth rate from 2004 to 2005. The states with communities in 2005 that had not had recognized areas earlier are Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts and Montana.

Program staff are creating a written guide for State/Tribal Liaisons to the program. There will be a special reception for liaisons at the 2006 conference and a special session for directed at them about the recognition program. The conference will also provide opportunities for the recognized communities to exhibit information. Staff plans to use state Firewise logos during a Powerpoint presentation at the opening session of the conference.

Program staff are also developing "How-To Bulletins" for communities in the program. Michele distributed a sample to Team members. These would be published quarterly beginning this spring.

Firewise Communities/USA Recognition Program – *Decision Items*

Discussion- State Participation - Team members discussed how to encourage involvement by the ten states currently lacking a formal program liaison (Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Nebraska, Nevada, New York, Rhode Island and Vermont). Suggestions included sharing information on Firewise "saves" and to promote similar successes; exploring getting other agencies/entities involved, such as the American Red Cross chapters, Resource Conservation & Development Councils, local representatives of federal agencies, or Extension services; and encouraging states doing positive things in the northeast by nominating eligible candidates for the new Firewise Leadership Awards.

Decision - To help meet the goal of full state participation, Wayne Ching will reach out to Nebraska and Nevada and Olin Phillips will work with the remaining eight states. The Team will revisit this issue in September.

Discussion – Community Participation- Team members also discussed supporting and encouraging community participation in the 9 states that have identified a liaison but currently have no recognized communities (Alaska, Delaware, Kansas, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, North Dakota, New Hampshire and Oklahoma). Discussion included linking communities on a “sister city” basis; offering scholarships to liaisons to attend the conference.

Brian made a motion to provide up to 10 scholarships for staff of state forestry organizations in non-participating states and for up to 10 scholarships for communities in participating states that do not yet have recognized communities, with said scholarships covering travel, lodging and registration at a cost of approximately \$20,000. The motion was not seconded but discussion ensued. Jim noted that the current conference budget covers 40 scholarships for residents of recognized communities. The clear direction was to look at ways to also assist state liaisons in participating in the conference.

Decision - Jim agreed to explore ways of supporting state liaison conference participation within the existing budget. Pam Jakes offered funds from the North Central Research Station for 9 of the 10 up to \$4,500 (or \$500 each if all 9 accept a partial scholarship). Jim will work with her to create this partial scholarship.

Discussion –Renewal Incentives – Staff is looking for more ideas about incentives for community renewals in the recognition program, as sustained action is critical. Interest in tangible incentives (logo items, letters, etc.) varies widely among participants. Some ideas included special badges or certificates for 5-year members; incorporating the logos of the 12 initial communities in a certificate; running print or radio ads in local papers/radio stations about the success of renewing communities. There were 96 communities renewing in 2005. Pam raised the idea of exit interviews with community residents in sites that did not renew. Other ideas included spotlighting community renewals on the Firewise website; using news stories to focus on this angle; looking for more input on this issue with participants at the Denver conference

Decision – Pursue the print ads for the 96 renewal communities of 2005.

Firewise Communities/USA and Relationship to Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPP)

Discussion – Brian Johnson reminded the group that the original Task Group on this issue (Brian, Kelly and Janet Anderson) had already made a recommendation that the Working Team did not need to act on the criteria for CWPPs. He recommended that this Task Group be dissolved. Other general discussion noted that the Backyards and Beyond Conference will have several sessions covering the CWPP topic and that the Western Forestry Leadership Coalition is proposing a CWPP report for western states. There was further detailed discussion of the need for communication about how CWPPs can help generate Firewise Communities by integrating the concepts of the Firewise Communities/USA recognition program.

Decision: Staff and F-H will put together articles directed at National Association of Counties, International County Managers Association and similar audiences that explain how CWPPs can be a vehicle for community Firewise action and sustainability.

2. Firewise Website

Discussion: Jim provided an update on the website and explained it is undergoing a major revision for look and feel as well as usability. Michele demonstrated the new software that the web technicians are using to track website use. New features coming to the site include the Firewise Learning Center with online courses, a web log or “blog” area and a Google search bar. It was suggested that an area of the site show a map or depiction of Firewise partners and stakeholders. A usability study of the new site will also be conducted to ensure that the design and layout are meeting our goal of website user-friendliness.

Decision: At the September meeting, Team members requested a full website overview, including a demonstration by the web technicians.

3. Communications Plan

Logos and Style Guide - A new set of Firewise logos and a style guide have been completed. Amy will prepare a memo to the Team to formally introduce the new look.

Firewise Leadership Awards – The Team discussed the new awards, which will be announced shortly. Anyone can nominate a candidate; only Working Team members are ineligible to receive an award. Brian asked for the award decision time to be moved up two weeks to provide more time for winners to be able to arrange travel to the conference in November. Suggestion was made to think about where and when to conduct the 2007 awards. Venues could include NASF’s annual meeting, IAFC’s annual conference, the Congressional Fire Service Institute dinner, or an event we generate ourselves with legislators in Washington.

Decision: The Firewise Leadership Award Task Group was reshaped and will become a standing task group. It will include representation from the USDA Forest Service, BIA, Communications Staff, State Forestry, and one other organization represented on the Working Team. Current membership is Lew Southard, Sam Scranton, Amy Schneider, Wayne Ching and Jim Smalley.

Stakeholders – Sam asked that Amy and Michele provide the current list of stakeholders to the Working Team and include it in the update of the Working Team notebook. Sam would like to have Team members review for whether the stakeholders are active and decide on continuing relationships or reaching out to more/new stakeholders.

Community Organizers – Amy reported that Alabama is moving along and working with volunteer fire departments to assist with outreach. She is concerned that New Mexico is not going to be able to take action. Lew will investigate de-obligating the funds.

2006 Conference Involvement – Amy reported that FH staff will be leading a brainstorming session for communicators. FH will be on hand for media support as well.

Firewise Communications Guide – This produce is being updated, mostly for new logo and colors, and a few additional items. Amy asked for guidance on whether we can use the NASF name in our materials.

Communications among agencies: Amy described working with Southern region PIOs at a recent meeting. Some feedback they had was to include more images of “average” homes in our Firewise examples rather than expensive-looking properties. FH is making an increased effort to educate government officials as directed by the Working Team.

Other activities – FH is also working with staff on a State Liaison guide; a summary of the Social Science Task Group findings regarding factors that motivate behavioral change related to WUI issues; and a crisis communication plan. Amy briefly described some of the actions taken after the Texas and Oklahoma fires with assistance from state PIOs. The recent news summaries show that our past work is of benefit, as people are using our messages and verbiage widely.

Shelter in Place Task Group

Discussion – There was extensive discussion about what the intended product or outcome is for this Task Group. Team members want to gather and correlate information about shelter in place and alternatives to evacuation during wildfire and open dialogue about it. One product would be a short paper describing the issues and providing a list of considerations for decision makers dealing with the issue of whether to evacuate during wildfire events. It would also help agency heads understand what we are trying to do by opening dialogue on this issue. Jim, Pam and Jack are in a separate, smaller group to produce a paper on “Defining the Wildland/Urban Interface” that should

correspond with some of the Shelter in Place issues. Pam can provide a transcript from the International Symposium session in June to supplement information for the Task Group's work.

Decision – The Team affirmed that the Shelter in Place Task Group will be ad hoc and will consist of Jim Smalley, Kelly Hawk, Jack Cohen, Pam Jakes, Amy Schneider, Olin Phillips and Brian Johnson. Jim will also invite individuals outside the group to participate, including Keith Harrap, Roger Kennedy, Ethan Foote, Tom Cova and Mike Collins. The Team agreed that the first task is to produce a short position paper on Shelter in Place. Brian recommended development of a matrix of issues as a next step to review and determine what expertise is needed. Finally, this group is also tasked with developing a presentation for the Backyards and Beyond conference. Group should have a meeting or conference call by the end of May.

Standards Task Group

Discussion - Jim described the initial meeting of this Task Group at the June 2005 meeting in Boise. Kelly, Jack and Olin's designee (Ron Stoffel) met and came up with suggestions on NFPA 1141 and 1144 (Standard for Fire Protection in Planned Building Groups and Standard for Protection of Life and Property from Wildfire). They suggested a major restructuring of the documents to use 1141 to focus on infrastructure and 1144 to focus on individual buildings. Jim has redrafted 1144 and showed it to NFPA's Forest and Rural Technical Committee Task Group on 1144. They have made some changes but want to keep the assessment form in the document. Jim explained that in mid-February, proposed revisions will be reviewed by the full committee. He felt that the rewrite of 1144 would serve to codify the process that Jack Cohen has laid out to assess risk for individual WUI properties.

The revision of 1141 is going to address the issue of building and planning in rural areas. It will add some standards for WUI risk where it exists. The new standards would become effective in 2007. A report on proposals will be issued and the public will have 60-90 days to comment. Jim asked that the Working Team review these and comment. The next meeting on the standards will be in October; all comments will be reviewed at that time and reported out in the spring of 2007. Then the standards go before the full NFPA membership at its annual meeting in June 2007. Jim asked the Working Team to consider making their comments collectively.

4. Information Resources

Course Development and Testing - "Assessing the Home Ignition Zone" - Jim described the progress of this project, which started as a revision of NWCG Course P-110 and is now left to the Working Team to direct in terms of content, scope and delivery. Staff and the Task Group working on the course have developed a draft student guide; an instructor's guide is underway. The course should be finalized within 6-8 weeks. Staff is deciding on a format for packaging (print or CD or some combination).

Staff developed a proposal for a Train the Trainer series for this course (See Appendix E). The idea is to pilot test it mid-year of 2006, to train 35-40 instructors. An end-user training would take place at the November conference. The objectives include disseminating home ignition zone assessment skills to practitioners at all levels; supporting state/tribal Firewise liaisons; and stimulate growth in the Firewise Communities/USA program. Because there are questions at the state and local levels of "who is doing the home assessments?" this training program would help to maintain uniformity of course materials and quality of delivery.

Jim described the proposal further. The train-the-trainer would produce a selected trained cadre of instructors. These instructors would move around country conducting selected courses on specific schedule. The costs are based on a registration fee for 50 participants per course. We can look at charging break-even costs or subsidized costs. Subsidizing the costs would help maintain some control over the program. For individuals unable to participate in the scheduled trainings or wanting to bring more training to their area, the program could the list of trained instructors and the cost estimate. The program would acknowledge the training with a certificate of attendance. For the initial instructor cadre – the instructors who will train other trainers - staff would like to select or recruit people with fire protection backgrounds, ideally Fire Protection Engineers or similar. The people they train become the cadre to train end-users.

Discussion - There was extensive discussion on the proposal. Jim clarified that end-users will be a diverse group – from local fire departments to state forestry staffs. The new course will go into NWCG’s PMS system but will not be a formal NWCG course. There was some concern that federal people would be unable to access the training if it was not formally in NWCG. Sam commented that he would hire a trained instructor to train his people. Jim noted there was flexibility when agencies or states would hire the instructors for training – the model using a hotel and the cost structure could vary. He did note that the 35-50 attendees is optimum class size because of the nature of the coursework. The course plan is a two-day training with a simulated field exercise, which keeps costs down.

Sam felt if we pursue this course there would be interest from the NWCG Training Working Team. Brian asked if the course would become a requirement of NFPA 1051. Jim said it would be a way to meet Chapter 10 of 1041, but would not be a requirement. Tom Drayer felt this course would be a great asset for local governments that don’t usually have access to this type of course. Jim agreed and said this course would help lay some basic knowledge for locals about the Firewise Communities/USA recognition process. Sam indicated we should keep the Wildland Fire Education Working Team in the loop on the project. Lew added that we should work with the Training Working Team on the alpha and beta test process in case they decide the course ought to be in the NWCG system. Kelly suggested providing a copy of the proposal and course products to Deb Epps. She was concerned if it becomes an NWCG course whether there would be a conflict with their standards for instructors. Jim said the material meets NFPA 1041 for instructor qualifications. Tom asked whether the course could become a National Fire Academy course. Jim felt that sending the course out could be problematic as we would lose control of the content, objectives, and methodology.

Brian recommended we ask the Wildland Fire Education Working Team to send a representative to the end-user training in Denver so they can review and assess the course. Sam added we should do the same for the Training Working Team. If there is going to be a recommendation to add this course to the training for the Prevention Teams, it should come from Maureen Brooks to the Training Working Team. Brian also recommended that no more than eight training sessions should take place before staff comes back to the Working Team for approval to continue. This will provide an opportunity to assess progress and see if states or other entities are picking it up on their own. There was more discussion about ensuring that instructor qualifications match (between NFPA 1041 and NWCG) as the assumption is that NWCG will eventually adopt the course and could make it a part of federal job requirements.

Decision – Sam and Lew will follow up with the Training Working Team and the Prevention Teams to get them to send representatives to the train-the-trainer and to the November end-user training. There was general consensus on the overall concept of the proposal. Jim will ask the Working Team to assist in selecting the initial instructors for the mid-year training. Jim was directed to formalize the proposal including specifics about a possible additional train-the-trainer session at the beginning of 2007, determine a budget, and provide it to the Working Team as a budget item for 2007 at the September meeting.

Wildfire Hazard Assessment Methodology booklet update – Jim indicated the 2006 workplan has this update as part of it; he needs to formalize the Task Group and get two meetings scheduled to get the work underway.

Decision – New Task Group was formed including Jim Smalley, Brian Johnson, Kim Zagaris, Sam Scranton or an alternate, and Chris White. Additional members to be requested include a representative with experience in GIS mapping; an ICC Fire Code Committee representative; and an NFPA Forest & Rural Technical Committee representative.

Spanish translations of selected products – There was a brief discussion of this issue but no specific decisions. Issues included translations on the new website (will be included in roll-out in the spring); revisiting the print publications to translate; considering other languages for translation; possibility of audio translation for a/v

products. Jim asked Working Team to provide feedback about what they want to have translated. Costs will need to be reviewed.

Community Solutions – This publication, replacing “Everyone’s Responsibility” is pending publication. The program will print about 10,000 copies and will produce it in a PDF version that will allow both downloading and professional printing. Working Team members received a review copy and were asked to have any comments back to staff by February 15.

5. Program Support

Exhibit Redesign – Staff and FH are working on a new design for our 10x20 trade show exhibit. The redesign will use the new Style Guide and logo for an updated look and feel, and will minimize text and enhance visual content. The design will also allow the exhibit to be used at the full size or in a 10x10 format. The 10x10 panel design will also be scaled to use for the tabletop exhibits used by state staffs in 20 areas around the country. State liaisons will be able to purchase the new panels.

Status of Kiosks - Sam asked about the status of the six Firewise kiosks. Staff has located several and are in progress of retrieving them from Montana and Oregon. Staff will track down the remainder and provide a status report to the Team by May 1.

2006 conference planning – Jim highlighted progress on the Backyards and Beyond conference. Online registration should be up by the end of the week. This gives us the database we need for profiling – occupation/background; how many will be at pre-con session, how many in computer rooms. The Conference brochure is nearly complete. We have the Blues Rangers from Mississippi (USDA Forest Service staff) for entertainment. There will be a special session for Firewise state/tribal liaisons. We will be able to provide continuing education units through both NFPA and Society of American Foresters. Exhibit space is limited to communities and sponsors. The conference had over 90 proposals for sessions and there will be 75 sessions presented. We expect to max out the hotel sleeping rooms. Upcoming Firewise newsletters will profile selected speakers and presentations. Pre-conference workshops include the Assessing the Home Ignition Zone course and a Firewise Planning Workshop. Jim asked that the Working Team members attend starting on the Wednesday evening (Nov. 1) reception with the state liaisons and asked that members try to stay for the duration. Members will need to register.

2008 and 2010 conference planning

Working Team has approved site selections of Tampa in 2008 and Portland (OR) in 2010.

Independent Evaluation of ArcView Firewise project – Michele explained this project – part of the grant from FEMA. The NFPA Fire Protection Research Foundation is overseeing this independent review, with the product to be a report and best-practices checklist for communities considering the use of GIS software for fire planning and mitigation. Other items under the FEMA grant include a review of the National Park Service “WHAM” project using hand-held units to map WUI risks; and a review of a land use planning decision tool for wildfire and development from the University of Colorado.

Benchmarking/measurements for strategic plan - The Team reviewed the Strategic Plan document for suggestions on how to benchmark or how to use indicators to measure impact or success of program actions. An example using Goal 1, Strategy 1.1 might be to look at the number of hits on website, the number of Firewise Communities/USA sites, the USA program retention rate, and community investment in the USA program. We could consider focus groups and surveys to see who knows about Firewise program and concepts. We could also capture stories/images of “saves” to show the impact of mitigation and conduct “exit interviews” with communities that do not renew participation in the USA program. Other suggestions included:

- Use the Strategic Plan format to create the Annual Report. This can show which areas are robust, which need work or revisiting.

- Review the idea of “WUI Advanced Warning System” in the Strategic Plan
- Jim will put his strategic plan matrix on the FTP site; we can review this yearly to see if we are hitting targets.
- Pull something simple and visual together to show progress and where we are with targets.
- Include this kind of progress report in speech by the Chair at the conference.
- Communicate this kind of progress with stakeholders.
- Suggest a media analysis going back in time (Pam) – use in conjunction with media updates.

Decision – Working Team members will submit their desired benchmarks to Staff by August 15. The September meeting will include sorting and deciding on these benchmarks as a group.

Task Group on How to Measure Success in the WUI

There was extensive discussion on defining success and measurements of success. Lew will send NFPA staff the information gathered by Linda Langner with the Social Science WT. This will be an agenda item for the September meeting.

Budget Information

Lew noted that the one-percent recession in USDA Forest Service budget did affect the program but that the fund manager (Sheila Walker) made up the difference with left over funding from her own program. Jim will provide this information to the NFPA grants management staff.

Nominations for Chair and Vice Chair for 2006-2008

The Working Team used the process as agreed to in earlier discussion (see Page 4). Nominees for the positions included Alan Dozier, Kelly Hawk, Lew Southard, Jim Smalley and Wayne Ching (Wayne indicated his nomination was only considered for vice chair).

Elections for Chair and Vice Chair for 2006-2008 – Elections were conducting using written ballots and were tallied by Barbara Kennedy. Chair-elect is Alan Dozier. Vice-Chair-elect is Kelly Hawk. Sam recommended that they both visit with NFPA staff at their earliest convenience to learn more about the details of the program.

Next Meeting Dates and Locations:

The next WUI Working Team meeting will take place at NFPA’s offices in Quincy, Massachusetts, from September 19 to 21, 2006.

Subsequent meetings will take place on May 1-3, 2007 in Atlanta, GA, and in September 18-20, 2007, in Quincy, MA. Olin registered his concern about a May time frame for meetings as it is in mid-fire season for his state.

Brian suggested conducting an informal half-day meeting in conjunction with the Backyards and Beyond Conference to take advantage of the opportunity to meet the “end users” of our work. Jim felt the Wednesday evening reception for state liaisons would be a good venue for this kind of meeting.

The Team discussed a tentative May 2008 meeting in Tampa which would allow members to see the hotel and facility for the 2008 conference. There was also discussion about holding a May meeting in Boise every other year.

Wrap Up:

Sam thanked Brian Johnson for his contributions to the team as he is leaving the team. IAFC will appoint a new representative, likely Chief Will May from Alachua County, Florida. Jim thanked Brian and IAFC for support.

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m. on February 2, 2006.

APPENDIX A

Duties and Responsibilities of Chair and Vice-Chair

WILDLAND/URBAN INTERFACE Fire Working Team

-Submitted as Draft Document by Sam Scranton, February 1, 2006 -

Chair

The Chair of the Wildland/Urban Interface Working Team assumes the following duties and responsibilities:

1. Conduct all meetings of the Working Team (regularly scheduled meetings, conference calls, and special sessions)
2. Represent the Working Team at all required NWCG meetings. This includes but is not limited to Annual Working Team Chair, NASF Fire Committee, Budget Transformation Team, participation on additional working teams as designated by the NWCG Chair.
3. Make assignments of other Working Team members to Task Groups and special projects
4. Keep and report attendance of Working Team members at each meeting
5. Facilitate development of working team meeting agendas with NFPA staff.

Vice-Chair

Although not recognized as official position by the NWCG Working Team structure, the WILDLAND/URBAN INTERFACE Working Team's Vice-Chair assumes the following duties and responsibilities:

1. Conduct WORKING TEAM meetings in absence of Chair
2. Manage Task Group assignments of WORKING TEAM members
3. Provide reports to WORKING TEAM from each Task Group at regular WORKING TEAM meetings or as requested by the Chair
4. Serve as Chair of the Communications Task Group

WORKING TEAM members

The Members of the Wildland/Urban Interface Working Team assume the following duties and responsibilities:

1. Provide long term direction and support to the Working Team and the National Wildland/Urban Interface Fire Program
2. Attend all Working Team meetings (non-attendance at three consecutive meetings will result in a request for replacement of representation by the respective organization)
3. Send an alternate in the case of not able to attend a meeting and or assign a proxy.
4. Attend and represent the Working Team at other meetings, as requested
5. Disseminate timely and accurately information through their respective agencies on projects and accomplishments of the National Wildland/Urban Interface Program
6. Serve on Working Team Task Groups as appointed by the Chair
7. Serve as the Working Team liaison to that Task Group, as appointed by the Chair, and in that capacity, report on the progress of that Task Group to the Vice Chair before each meeting of the Working Team

APPENDIX B
CURRENT TASK GROUP ASSIGNMENTS

1. Communications Task Group (standing) – Alan Dozier, Wayne Ching, Lew Southard, Amy Schneider, Jim Smalley, Kelly Hawk
2. Firewise Leadership Award Selection Committee (standing) – Lew Southard, Sam Scranton or designee (tribal), Amy Schneider, Wayne Ching, Jim Smalley
3. WHAM Book Revision Guide (ad hoc) – Jim Smalley, Brian Johnson, Sam Scranton or designee (tribal), Chris White, ArcView technical person; ICC Fire Code Committee representative; NFPA Forest and Rural Technical Committee representative.
4. Grassroots Pilot (ad hoc) – Lew Southard, Alan Dozier, Olin Phillips, Amy Schneider, Michele Steinberg, Jim Smalley
5. Stakeholder (standing) – Amy Schneider, Sam Scranton, Jim Smalley, Olin Phillips, Alan Dozier. Future membership at a minimum should include NFPA staff, Communications lead, WT Chair.
6. Shelter in Place (ad hoc) – Jim Smalley, Kelly Hawk, Jack Cohen, Pam Jakes, Amy Schneider, Olin Phillips, Brian Johnson; invite Keith Harrap, Roger Kennedy, Ethan Foote, Tom Cova, and Mike Collins.
7. Defining the WUI (ad hoc) – Jim Smalley, Pam Jakes, Jack Cohen
8. Charter/Administration Review (standing) – Chair, NFPA staff, state forestry representative, Vice-Chair (Sam Scranton, Jim Smalley, Wayne Ching, Kelly Hawk).

APPENDIX C
Questions for NWCG Social Science Task Group
(submitted by Jim Smalley on September 2, 2005)

1. How much fire ecology information is necessary before residents are willing to do mitigation? Does a resident need to know about the historical significance and scientific basis for fire on the land before he/she accepts or acts on mitigation recommendations? By analogy, how much should a person know about hydrology before they understand flood mitigation?
2. The APA research showed that the majority of 1999-2001 Firewise Workshop participants actually used and/or acted on the information they received in the workshops in a period of 6-18 months following the workshop. We would like to complete the study with those who attended 2002-04 workshops. The survey model is available but there might be other
3. Incentives for mitigation – what kind of incentives work best (financial, social, moral)? When and under what circumstances? Is there a process model for developing incentives and evaluating them before and after their application? What makes one incentive more preferable? Does the prospect of lower (or higher) insurance premium payments for interface residents result in more (less or different) mitigation than other incentives? How do incentives affect different social strata in the interface? Does the same incentive work for residents and response personnel? What incentives affect mitigation/change in fire personnel (not all do as they instruct others to do)?
4. What community CC&Rs preclude effective mitigation? For instance, some communities' covenants prohibit the cutting and/or removal of any vegetation (dead or alive) or noncombustible roofing. What would a model residential landscape (with the home ignition zone) look like and what might be effective incentives for homeowner associations to accept or modify their restrictions?
5. What are the key human behaviors in community evacuation? What can we learn from the New Orleans experience? Tom Cova (Univ of Utah) did a study on evacuation in the Oct03 fires in So CA, Dr John Bryan (Univ of MD) conducted several studies on human behavior in evacuation, etc. What do we know about human behavior under extreme evacuation circumstances and how might we apply that knowledge in the future designs of Firewise Communities (recommending the establishment of a central safety zone within the subdivision, etc.)?
6. What information in regards to the Firewise concepts and mitigation practices are of value to younger audiences (school education)? How much, what, and at what ages? This would help us design education programs for school teachers in appropriate grades for the next generation of interface residents.
7. Pam Jakes (and others) have done excellent research in related topics. How can the SSWT get these assembled and in the hands of others. Where is the application phase of this research? It seems to me (as I've spoken with Dave Cleaves – USDA- about this many times) there should be some mechanism to provide guidance on applying this really good research. We should be able to synthesize and promote the social research at least as much as we have Jack's physical research, don't you think? Providing those on the ground with key factors to consider when speaking about mitigation, working with interface residents, etc.
8. Given that when people understand there is something they can do they are more willing to act and that they consistently search out information to validate what they have heard (Natural Hazards Informer, 11/99), what are the most effective actions public agencies can take in supporting both a community's knowledge search and its decision to act? Once these actions are identified, how can they be effectively implemented at the federal, state, and local levels? The recognition program has some excellent success stories in the area of public agency involvement. These could be reviewed and documented. Conversely, it has met with lack of interest in some quarters. I would like to see that issue explored as well, with an eye to identifying ways to overcome agency stumbling blocks.
9. Why does it seem southeastern states adopting USA more readily/successfully?
10. How can we more effectively measure the impacts of the Firewise program, including economic costs and benefits?

APPENDIX D

Fire Social Science Research Summaries for NWCG WUIWG and WFEWG Document Created January 20, 2006

Introduction

Social scientists in FS R&D have addressed a broad group of topics related to fire. This document summarizes research that has been supported from both internal sources (e.g. NFP, base, NFS), and external sources (e.g. JFSP) that may provide useful information to the NWCG WUI Working Group and the NWCG Wildland Fire Education Working Group. This summary is not exhaustive, and is only an initial step in providing information on social science that may be useful for other Working Groups.

The summary is organized around a series of topics. The WUI WT sent a series of specific questions that have been inserted into the broader topics. Since I inadvertently deleted my electronic version of the WUI questions, they aren't transcribed exactly.

Homeowners and wildfire mitigation

WUIWT specific questions: 1) How much fire ecology information is necessary before residents are willing to do mitigation? Does a resident to know about the historic significance and scientific basis for fire on the land before accepting or acting upon mitigation recommendations?

Research that addresses this question is summarized in two sections. The first section addresses research on public perceptions and social acceptability of fire and fire management. Some of the studies focus of residents within WUI areas. In addition to the studies summarized below, a synthesis of research on assessing social acceptability of fuels treatments was recently published as a FS General Technical Report.

Studies on public perceptions and social acceptability:

Summary of Social acceptability Studies

A series of studies on social acceptability were conducted by the FS North Central Research Station, funded by the National Fire Plan. These studies covered all regions of the United States.

Key findings:

- 75-80% of respondents found thinning and prescribed fire at least somewhat acceptable management practice.
- Increased familiarity/understanding with a practice increases acceptance
- Forest health is more important than reducing fire risk
- Trust in the agency is a key predictor of acceptance
- No consistent demographic variables explain behavior/attitudes

Contact: Sarah McCaffrey, USDA Forest Service

A social assessment of public knowledge, attitudes, and values related to wildland fire, fire risk, and fire recovery.

This project used a national survey to help ascertain people's knowledge, attitudes, and preferences toward fire and fire management in wildland and wildland/urban interface areas. Using population weighted data descriptive statistics for all questions (including breakdowns of responses by gender, race, education, income, age, and spatial location) were generated. These data revealed that public opinions related to fire management practices on large forests or public lands are somewhat mixed. Nevertheless, the results did uncover a few basic themes related to prescribed fire, government fire management, and personal responsibility. Regression analysis also revealed that explanatory variables (such as gender, race, income, etc) significantly influenced people's attitudes, opinions, and preferences toward fire and fire management. Market segmentation analysis further revealed that respondents who were more knowledgeable about fire showed more confidence in forest professionals and trust in the government's ability to manage wildfires.

To conclude, the main implication of this research is that increasing public knowledge of wildfire and related issues will enhance support for science-based wildland fire management and practices.

Contact: Mike Bowker, USDA Forest Service

Southwesterners' opinions on fire and fire management

Objectives

- Examine residents' degree of concern and self-reported knowledge regarding fire and fire management in California, Arizona, New Mexico and Colorado.
- Explore the applicability of the salient values similarity model of trust related to fire and fire management.
- Examine perceptions of various fire management interventions, including those with a recreation-related focus.

Key findings

- Salient values and trust, along with concern about fire, are instrumental in understanding public reactions to fire and fire management.
- The majority trust the Forest Service in its fire management efforts.
- Communication and education play a key role in establishing and maintaining trust with publics.
- Diversity needs to be considered when constructing and delivering public information regarding fire management.

Contact: Pat Winter, USDA Forest Service (in collaboration with San Diego State University and with George Cvetkovich of Western Washington University)

Ongoing studies:

Perceptions of risk, trust, responsibility, and management preferences among fire-prone communities on the San Bernardino National Forest

Objectives

To examine:

- Personal experience with fire, including impacts on the individual and stresses associated with risk.
- Individual fire-related actions taken and perceived effectiveness.
- Fire management objectives, perceived alternatives to reach those objectives, and the concerns and risks associated with each alternative.
- Personal and public roles and responsibilities for fire management.
- Individual barriers to taking fire risk reduction actions.
- Value similarity and trust in the Forest Service to manage fires and fire risk.

Status: Ongoing (data collection will occur in Spring 2006, OMB approval was received)

Contact: Pat Winter (in collaboration with George Cvetkovich, Western Washington University)

Community Knowledge, Beliefs, Attitudes and Practices Concerning Fire and Fuels Management in Southwestern Ecosystems

Although fire is increasingly recommended as a vegetation management tool on both public and private lands, controversy often inhibits its use. A lack of communication and understanding between land managers and the public contributes to these difficulties. Researchers are gathering information on public knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, and practices related to fire use, fuels management, and the role of fire in Southwestern (New Mexico and Arizona) ecosystems. Researchers are also examining the factors contributing to successful public involvement approaches for fire and fuel management planning. Results will assist land managers in designing and implementing successful, socially acceptable, fire and fuels management policies and programs.

Objectives:

- Develop an understanding of public knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, and practices related to fire use, fuels management, and the role of fire in Southwestern ecosystems.
 - Include information gathered from a wide range of cultural groups with an interest in fire and fuels management.

- Include information gathered from homeowners in the WUI concerning attitudes and practices related to fire risk mitigation activities.
- Develop an understanding of successful public involvement approaches for fire and fuels management planning.
- Provide managers with an accurate, current body of information concerning public knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, and practices related to fire use and fuels management, as well as information on successful public involvement approaches. Provide these data in a user-friendly format.

Accomplishments/Status:

- The first phase of the project has been completed. Reports on this phase are now available to the general public on a website discussing the project, www.irsolutions.net/beta/.

Contact: Carol Raish, USDA Forest Service

Public perceptions of wildfire management within the southern California wildland-urban interface
Objectives

- Provide baseline data on residents' knowledge, understanding, and beliefs pertaining to forest and wildfire management within communities surrounding four Southern California National Forests.
- Explore factors that influence residents' knowledge, understanding, and beliefs.

Contact: Jim Absher, USDA Forest Service (in cooperation with Gerard Kyle, Texas A&M Univ.)

Studies on Incentives for homeowners

WUI WT question: 3) What types of incentives for mitigation work best (financial, social, moral)? When and under what circumstances? Is there a process model for developing incentives and evaluating their effectiveness before and after implementation? What makes one incentive preferable to another? Does the prospect of lower (or higher) insurance premium payments for interface residents result in more (less or different) mitigation than other incentives? How do incentives affect different social strata in the interface? Does the same incentive work for residents and response personnel? What incentives affect mitigation/change in fire personnel (not all do as they instruct others to do).

A number of fact sheets were developed as part of fuels synthesis project and can be found at the following web site:

http://www.fs.fed.us/fire/tech_transfer/synthesis/social_science_team/fact_sheet_ss.htm

Relevant fact sheets for this topic:

FACT SHEET #1 BUILDING A SUCCESSFUL PROGRAM TO ENGAGE PROPERTY OWNERS
FACT SHEET #2 TYPES OF INFORMATION TO ENCOURAGE PROACTIVE BEHAVIOR
FACT SHEET #3 MORE WAYS TO CATCH AND HOLD PEOPLES ATTENTION
FACT SHEET #4 THREE CRITICAL TOPICS TO COVER WHEN TALKING ABOUT WILDLAND FIRE HAZARDS

A synthesis of research on aesthetics and fuels management was published recently. Aesthetics often affects personal willingness to undertake mitigation on private property.

A series of studies on defensible space were conducted by the FS North Central Research Station, funded by the National Fire Plan.

Key findings

- Roughly ¾ of respondents had put in some defensible space practice
- Issues of privacy are the biggest factor shaping willingness to do defensible space – other concerns are around naturalness, aesthetics, wildlife, and recreation,
- Many people have defensible space for reasons other than fire.
- Risk perception is a tricky concept – it is a necessary but not sufficient condition for people to do something – they are balancing risk with perceived benefits. People (including experts) calculate risk differently and have different tolerance levels.

Contact: Sarah McCaffrey, USDA Forest Service

Recreation and fire in the wildland-urban interface: A study of year-round and seasonal homeowners

In an effort to better understand public attitudes about fire, a study was conducted via a mailed survey of residents within and proximate to the San Bernardino (California), the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, Gunnison (Colorado), and the Apalachicola National Forests (Florida). Year-round and seasonal homeowners, and special use permittees holding cabins on FS land participated.

The majority of respondents had observed effects of wildland fires on forests, and had personally witnessed a wildfire. More than half of all homeowners, with the exception of special use cabin permittees in Colorado, were very concerned about wildfires in their state. A similar level of concern was found for wildfires resulting in losses of home or lives.

Respondents from California were more likely to have implemented firewise characteristics on their homesites than were respondents from Colorado or Florida. Most respondents from California also had local or federal requirements for vegetation removal. Such requirements were rare among the other states' respondents.

Prescribed burns, mechanical fuel reduction, and defensible space were rated for general attitude and support or opposition as fuel management strategies. Florida respondents were most supportive of prescribed fire. Respondents from California were almost evenly divided in support, neutrality, and opposition of prescribed burns.

Hundreds of respondents provided open-ended comments. The majority of comments from California were negatively focused on prescribed fire escapes. Skepticism over the benefits of firewise practices were also common. In Colorado, the majority of comments were also focused on escape of prescribed fire. In contrast, the most common comment from Florida was support for prescribed fire.

Realtors, local officials, teachers, developers, builders, landscape contractors, demonstration sites, and the insurance industry all have important and often complementary roles in public education about wildfire and firewise behavior.

Contact: Pat Winter, USDA Forest Service

Several studies have examined the linkages between housing prices and wildfire risk:

The impact of wildfire risk on housing price: a case study from Colorado Springs

This study involved a unique opportunity in Colorado Springs to analyze the effect of wildfire risk on property values. The conventional wisdom among some realtors and many homeowners is that actions on private property to mitigate wildfire risk will decrease property values. Some anecdotal evidence suggested this conventional wisdom to be false but no formal analysis had ever been conducted. One reason no one has looked at this issue in a hedonic property model framework is that the necessary parcel level wildfire risk rating data were not available. The [Colorado Springs Fire Department](#) compiled the requisite data and made it publicly available on their website. The scientist, Dr. Geoffrey Donovan, [Pacific Northwest Research Station](#), and Dr. David Butry, [Southern Research Station](#), were able to use these data to look at how the variables that comprise the overall wildfire risk rating affect property values before and after this information was made publicly available on the website. We learned that variables that measure increases in wildfire risk had a positive and significant effect on housing prices before the website. This may seem counterintuitive, but while risk factors such as living on a ridge increase the wildfire risk rating of a parcel, they offer great views. After the website, the relationship between wildfire risk rating and housing price was insignificant. After parcel level information was made publicly available on the website, wildfire risk variables such as having flammable roofing materials were found to have a negative impact on housing values. This information is particularly useful for the Colorado Springs Fire Department for evaluating and promoting their wildfire program.

As an extension of the previous study, the Colorado Springs Fire Department will survey individuals living in the study area to learn more about their knowledge and perceptions of wildfire risk and how that affected

their home purchase decision. Such information has never been collected before and the results of our study will be very useful to organizations, such as the Colorado Springs Fire Department, that implement community based wildfire programs.

Contact: Geoffrey Donovan, Patricia Champ, or David Butry, USDA Forest Service

Wildfire and Property Markets

Objectives

- Identify effects of fire risk and wildland fire occurrence on property values in Chelan County, WA.

Key Findings

- The fires produced a short run shock to the overall price level of housing in Chelan.
- The willingness to pay near the burned area declined shortly after the fire.
- The marginal implicit price of a fire-resistant roof increased following the fires, reflecting changes in risk perceptions or a relatively inelastic supply of roofing material and/or construction capacity.

Contact: Robert Huggett, Jr., USDA Forest Service

Institutional Arrangements and Incentives for Homeowners to Mitigate Wildfire Risk

Objective

- Understand the impact of institutional incentives in homeowner decision making regarding wildfire mitigation on their private property.

Key Findings

- Institutional factors (e.g. incentives from insurance companies) play a partial role, but are part of a complex decision-making process.
- While abundant information is available, homeowners often find it difficult to find a “starting point” for action.
- Information tailored to individual property is more likely to result in homeowner action than general information such as pamphlets and town meeting presentations.
- Homeowners clearly understand that wildfire risk does not occur at the individual property scale, which may motivate some individuals to participate in community actions.

Contact: Patty Champ, USDA Forest Service

Ongoing studies

The effects of perceived wildfire risk, values, and information on residents’ behaviors regarding the creation of defensible space in the wildland- urban interface

Objectives

- Examine public perceptions of the role of fire and fire management in ecosystems as related to defensible space, firewise construction, prescribed fire and fuels treatment programs.
- Compare the antecedents of wildland fire policy support or personal risk/safety behaviors.
- Examine the moderating effects of perceived wildfire risks and values on the influence of information on perceptions of and intentions to do defensible space activities.

Contact: Jim Absher, USDA Forest Service (in cooperation with Jerry Vaske, et al., Colorado State Univ.)

Joint Understanding and Consensus on Fire Management Strategies

Objectives

- Understand links between homeowner risk perceptions and beliefs and risk reduction strategies and risk communication strategies used by the USDA Forest Service related to wildfire threat associated with public land management.
- Use knowledge of homeowner risk perceptions and behaviors to understand why risk reduction actions are taken or not.
- Understand the link between risk reduction messages, homeowner risk reduction behaviors, and changes in their risk perceptions and beliefs.

Contact: Brian Kent, USDA Forest Service

Individual response to voluntary and involuntary incentives to mitigate fire hazard: what works and what doesn't?

Effective WUI risk management requires action by local communities and individual property owners. Recently enacted federal and state policies provide some strong incentives for local jurisdictions to manage the risks associated with wildland fire. This has led to an array of policies, laws, and programs targeted at local communities and their residents. Attention needs to be paid to assessing the effectiveness of these different policies and programs in order to help communities better choose, monitor, and support among structural responses. This project will employ a combination of qualitative and quantitative research methods to answer several research questions, including: "To what extent are WUI residents motivated to comply with voluntary versus involuntary policies? And To what extent are incentives necessary to ensure compliance?" This project will develop a matrix of policy options that local policy makers can use as a decision support tool as they develop their own local programs. Such as matrix will include the following dimensions: voluntary/involuntary; incentives; success factors; barriers to successful implementation; public perceptions; compliance factors; and key public messages to encourage compliance.

Contact: Sarah McCaffrey

Status: Newly funded JFSP study

Collective action and wildfire mitigation

WUI WT question 4) What community CC&Rs preclude effective mitigation? What would a model residential landscape (with the home ignition zone) look like? What incentives might be effective for homeowner associations to accept or modify their restrictions?

Several studies have focused on collaboration and a synthesis of research on collaboration was recently published.

Community preparedness for wildland fire

Objectives

- Identify characteristics of a successful projects/programs for community preparedness for wildland fire.
- Identify social conditions necessary to support development and implementation of preparedness projects.
- Learn how community preparedness draws from and builds community capacity.

Key findings

We have identified several elements that are critical to developing community preparedness for wildfire, and four elements critical to sustaining community preparedness for wildland fire:

- **An understanding of the landscape, including:**
 1. landscape conditions (fire history and hazardous fuel levels);
 2. the impact of landscape on a community's perception of responsibility for wildfire preparedness;
 3. the importance of attraction to place; and
 4. natural capital—the environment's economic and cultural goods and services.
- Government involvement, which :
 1. provides the community access to funds, equipment, and talents that might not otherwise be found in the community;
 2. gives governmental agencies and communities something positive to work on together; and
 3. can provide the community with leaders to push wildfire preparedness.
- Human capital—the stock of health, nutrition, education, skills and knowledge or individuals, and also the local knowledge obtained from relatives, friends, or from interaction with others in the community—which:
 1. demonstrates the value of the individual to the overall process, and empowers others within the community to become involved; and
 2. gives the community a sense that something can be done to address the issue, and that they hold that power within their own ranks.

- Social capital, the cohesiveness of people in their communities, including:
 1. trust,
 2. social ties,
 3. cultural practices, and
 4. political contexts that motivate people to contribute to the common good.

Contact: Pam Jakes, USDA Forest Service

Collaborative Capacity in Community Wildfire Protection Planning

Objectives

- Improve the ability of agencies, organizations, communities, and citizens to work collaboratively to reduce the risks of wildland fire
- Enhance the long-term social capacity of communities to address wildfire risk by understanding how these planning activities overcome barriers and/or expand opportunities for planning and implementing fuel reduction projects.

Research will be conducted in five states: California , Colorado , Florida , Minnesota , and Oregon . This study is intended to last three years, beginning in the spring of 2005.

Project Objectives: (1) Assess ways to gauge the progress and outcomes of CWPPs by county in each state over 3 years; (2) Examine the local social context in which CWPPs have developed in 2 counties in each state, focusing on the factors that are important to enhancing collaboration and building and maintaining social capacity; (3): Develop a framework for monitoring CWPP processes and outcomes, and apply and evaluate the framework in the 5 study states; (4) Capture and share current local and programmatic “lessons learned” concerning CWPP processes and outcomes, and develop a system for continuously sharing new lessons as they emerge and (5): Develop and implement a technology and knowledge transfer program that provides important results, in a timely manner, throughout the life of the project.

Key Contacts: Daniel R. Williams, RMRS; Pamela Jakes, NCRS

Effectiveness of community wildfire protection planning

The development of Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPP) under the 2003 Healthy Forest Restoration Act has provided opportunities for rural communities in fire-adapted ecosystems to express their interests regarding methods to reduce risks to lives and properties from wildfires. Social science research has been initiated to understand the dynamics and effectiveness of these community planning efforts.

Objectives:

1. Understand the attitudes, values, and community norms regarding wildfire management and fuels treatments that are reflected in the Bitterroot CWPP.
2. Reveal the relative strengths of the communities’ self-identified “values at risk” as they are reflected within priorities for action in the Bitterroot CWPP.
3. Within the context of fire and fuels management, understand any special priorities for action or tradeoff evaluations that are attributed to the presence of Wilderness.

Key Outcomes:

- Research suggests that management of wildland use fires will be guided more by physiographic, weather, and demographic conditions than intensity of treatments in the wildland urban interface.
- There are practical limitations of government sponsored action in a location with fierce devotion to private property interests.
- Incentives and disincentives may be more effective methods of achieving fuel treatment objectives than government mandates on private land.

Contacts: Alan Watson & Carol Miller – USDA Forest Service

Cooperators: Jim Burchfield & Paul Lachapelle, The University of Montana

Economics of Prescribed Fire Cooperatives

Objectives

- Understand the potential gains from private cooperative landowner organizations related to other alternatives, such as contract burning.
- Understand the transferability of this type of management framework to forestland.
- Develop guidelines and suggestions for further development of cooperative prescribed fire management programs.

Contact: Terry Haines, USDA Forest Service

Community evacuation and communication

WUI WT questions: 5) What are the key human behaviors in community evacuation? What can we learn from the New Orleans experience? Tom Cova (U of UT) did a study on evacuation in the October 2003 fires in southern CA; John Bryan (U of MD) conducted several studies on human behavior in an evacuation. What do we know about human behavior under extreme evacuation circumstances and how might we apply that knowledge in the future designs of Firewise Communities?

There have been a number of studies addressing communication and wildfire events, although few are focused on the evacuation question. Several of the fact sheets (web address same as previously) also provide information on this topic:

[FACT SHEET #6 IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS FOR COMMUNICATING ABOUT HAZARDS](#)
[FACT SHEET #7 THE "LAWS" OF EFFECTIVE PUBLIC EDUCATION ABOUT FIRE HAZARDS](#)
[FACT SHEET #8 THE "GOLDEN RULE" AND OTHER LESSONS ON COMMUNICATING ABOUT HAZARDS](#)

Communication of fire messages and meanings

Kevin Larkin (White Mountain NF), Amanda Grau, & Dr. Joe Roggenbuck (Virginia Tech University), in cooperation with Dr. Jim Absher, investigated how people's fire management and prevention cognitions are acquired and/or negotiated. This study looked at the processes through which WUI residents receive, interpret, and reconstruct wildfire messages, especially with respect to educational programs such as Firewise or Smokey Bear. Using a symbolic interactionist perspective and a qualitative, in-depth interview methodology, 17 WUI homeowners and 15 agency representatives in northern Georgia and central Virginia were interviewed.

Different processes exist by which homeowners incorporate the threat of wildfire into their lives. Nearly all accepted the threat of wildfire in their area. They know that fires might burn their homes and significant areas nearby, but many have not chosen to act on that threat. The majority of interviewees had externalized the threat of wildfire, and many felt little responsibility for any aspect of vulnerability minimization and/or fire suppression. The data show, however, that some people reach a point where they internalize, rather than externalize, the fire threat.

In understanding how people come to internalize or externalize the threat, it was found that individual homeowner's perceptions of risk were often different from the risks conveyed by agency education programs, especially in three areas. Human Safety: In wildfire education programs, a homeowners' risk of being trapped without an evacuation route is commonly portrayed, but interviewees seldom brought up a closely related issue, the risk to firefighters' safety. Personal Property: Agency representatives typically make it clear that WUI homes are at risk to be burned. Interviewees accept this risk, but often speak of the contents of their homes. Natural Amenities: Amenity values such as trees, views, or wildlife were addressed by fire professionals. Based on the interviews, the idea of rebuilding a home in a burned-out landscape may be a significant issue.

In summary, having homeowners reach a point of internalizing the wildfire threat is an important step toward increasing Firewise behaviors. To do so, wildfire risk should be stated in terms that are relevant to those homeowners' lives. Although only two southeastern communities were studied and these results may not apply nationwide, these results enhance the existing literature on managing wildfire in the WUI and

point to the need for similar studies in order to improve program managers' effectiveness in achieving fire prevention and preparedness goals.

Contact: Jim Absher, USDA Forest Service

Rapid Response Research on Fire Communication With Wildland Interface Communities

The proximity of large wildfires to populated areas in recent years has demanded unprecedented levels of communication among agencies and between agencies and the general public. A study on wildfire communication in wildland interface communities was completed by Drs Jonathan Taylor and Shana Gillette (USGS), Dr. Ron Hodgson (BLM/USFS), Judith Taylor (USFS) in collaboration with Dr. Deborah Chavez. The objective of this study of two wildfire events in the San Bernardino mountains was to understand the communication needs of the public and to explore agency response to those needs.

The research team conducted the study in three stages before and after fires at the San Bernardino mountains. Rapid response research methods included informal discussions and focus groups, content analysis, and participant observation.

Following are some study results and management implications: (1) There is a need to provide real time information-residents of communities near wildfires feel an urgent need for timely and accurate fire information that will help them cope with the threat to their families, lives, safety, property, and interests. (2) Official communications should contain pertinent local information-residents found that official communications about the fires contained very little that was useful to them and that information releases were infrequent and public meetings were sometimes lacking in information of interest to residents. (3) News media information should be more accurate-residents expressed dissatisfaction with coverage by the regional broadcast media, which was believed to be inaccurate, emphasizing the sensational over the practical, and shifting to new topics before the local need for information was past. (4) Informal networks can be used to provide information-Wildland urban interface communities are served by relatively complex information networks that go well beyond the traditional media. Residents rely on these networks heavily during fires. (5) Prepare for reoccupation- reoccupation following evacuations needs to be planned for as carefully and completely as the evacuation is. A communication plan needs to be part of the reoccupation plan. (6) Mountain Area Safety Council (MAST) and Fire Safe Councils (FSCs) are important-communications among agencies and between agencies and residents in the mountain communities was substantially more effective during the fires as a result of preparations made by MAST and the FSCs prior to the events. (7) Plan for information flow during transition-when wildland fires change in status and scope - authority, function and personnel change as well, with the "new team in town" starting from scratch to try to build community information systems.

Ongoing studies

Communication strategies for post-fire environments

Objectives

- Examine agency constraints and opportunities for post-fire communication activities.
- Identify the public's information needs, expectations and perceptions of communicating in post-fire situations.
- Explore consistency of outcomes across selected study sites and suggest ways to assist agency personnel in crafting messages specific to their management context.

Contact: Jim Absher (in cooperation with Bruce Shindler, Oregon State Univ.)

Communication about wildland fire in the wildland-urban interface

Objectives

- Identify the fundamental meaning held by WUI residents relative to fire in the forest and the fire risk to their communities using a symbolic interactionist approach.
- Link individual's meanings to policy approaches and management actions that take into account the realities of day to day life in the WUI.

Contact: Jim Absher (in cooperation with Matt Carroll, Washington State Univ.)

Evaluating Program Success

What's the definition of success for firewise/WUI programs?

The same question is being asked of all fire management programs (and lots of other programs). What's the benefit of these programs? Federal and State agencies and their partners have focused considerable attention on initiatives aimed at reducing the risk of catastrophic fire to the increasing development in wildland environments.

The NFP funded the development of the National Wildfire Mitigation Database, which provides a source of data for assessing various mitigation programs.

National Wildfire Mitigation Database

Objectives

- Provide a user-friendly website where community officials, fire managers, and policy makers can learn about the strategies employed to reduce wildfire hazard.
- Provide data for analyzing wildfire mitigation policies and efforts.

Key Findings:

- Programs vary in scope and complexity from programs with a single objective, such as public education, to multi-faceted programs with several distinct components.
- Comprehensive programs are often initiated through a wildfire mitigation plan developed with the input of multiple stakeholders.

Contact: Terry Haines, USDA Forest Service

Evaluating State and Local Wildfire Risk Reduction Programs

Objective

- Create an evaluation framework that assesses managers' efforts to measure progress towards goals, the number and severity of perceived barriers to program success, and potential indicators of program effectiveness.

Key preliminary findings:

- Most managers surveyed are involved in public education, area-wide risk assessment, and vegetation removal assistance for property owners.
- About 88% of managers surveyed are involved in collaborative pre-fire planning.
- Major obstacles facing managers are budget constraints, public apathy, and property owners' resistance to fuel management.

Contact: Terry Haines, USDA Forest Service

Minority Landowner Response to State-Sponsored Wildfire Mitigation Policy in the Southern Black Belt

This project focuses on African American forestland owners in the Black Belt region of the South to assess their awareness and responsiveness to state-level wildfire mitigation policies and incentives. This is an underserved landowner group that federal and state agencies are striving to contact with outreach programs; but little information exists on these constituents. Personal interviews will be collected in contiguous Black Belt counties spanning nine states – Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia. Specific data elicited will be landowner knowledge of wildfire mitigation tactics, implementation of mitigation practices, and source of information about wildfire mitigation.

Contact: Cassandra Johnson

Status: New JFSP project, funded FY2005

Education

WUIWT Question 6) What information in regards to the Firewise concepts and mitigation practices are of value to younger audiences (school education)? How much, what, and at what ages? This would help us design education programs for school teachers in appropriate grades for the next generation of interface residents.

Science Application

WUI WT question – 7) How can the Social Science Task Group get the social science research assembled and in the hands of users? We need more synthesis and application.

Forest Service R&D is making a concerted effort to improve science application. The NWCG Fire Social Science Task Force is developing proposals for a number of systematic reviews on the following topics – incentives; public acceptability of wildland fire use and smoke; benefits, costs, and risks of wildland fire. We are also considering options to work with the Lessons Learned Center.

APPENDIX E
Assessing Wildfire Hazards in the Home Ignition Zone
Training Delivery Model

Objective(s):

1. To disseminate the HIZ skills to the practitioners of HIZ assessments in WUI areas
2. To support the FWC/USA State Liaisons and, in turn, stimulate growth and participation in the Recognition Program and Firewise practices
3. To help ensure the uniformity and quality of instruction and skills of individuals conducting hazard assessments

Description: The National WUI Program will maintain control of the training in a manner similar to the series of Firewise Communities/USA Hazard Assessment Training Sessions¹ produced and delivered to the state forestry staffs in 2003. This new series of workshops will be delivered with the expectations that the training received will not likely be nor can be accurately replicated locally by those attending the national sessions. These training sessions would be delivered under the following general points:

1. The Program would develop instructor qualifications, select and train a selected cadre of instructors who meet these special qualifications
2. The Program will offer and advertise quarterly training sessions in alternating regions of the US for 18 - 24 months.
3. Venues for the sessions will be hotels or conference centers (with meeting rooms, morning and afternoon breaks, A-V, as required)
4. Attendees will receive a continental breakfast and lunch and breaks but be on their own for dinner.
5. A detailed simulated walk around of two interface structures would be substituted for the field trip as included in earlier sessions. This reduces expenses and provides additional time for lectures and discussions.

Costs: Cost of the quarterly training sessions will be structured to offset at least 75% of the cost. In this way, the Program controls the quality and timing of training. An example for one such session is shown below:

Expenses:		Notes:
Contract Instructor	1600.00	(pay scale based on experience, etc.)
Instructor expenses (air, hotel, dinner, parking)	1100.00	Will vary per location
Meeting room in hotel (2 days)	600.00	
Food & Beverage (Continental Breakfast, Breaks, and Lunch, including estimated taxes/gratuities)	5200.00	Participants on own for dinner. Food and beverage service is recommended because we may be in locations where it is not easy or quick to get something to eat. Keeps them focused on getting back to class.
Student Materials	300.00	Includes reproduction
A-V (screen, power strips, video, audio)	350.00	Using our own projection equipment
Coordinator/Registrar Travel	1100.00	WUI Program staff would fill this role
Shipping	200.00	
Total	10,450.00	

Based on fifty (50) attendees per session, a breakeven cost per person would be approximately \$209, while a 75% cost would be \$157 pp, with the National WUI Program support of \$52 pp. Suggest deciding on “rounder” figure of \$160.00 pp for the two-day session.

Additional Opportunities for Training: If a state or local government agency or private organization desires to have a training session in their location for a particular venue, we would provide the list of our instructors with whom the agency or organization would contract to deliver the training session. We would recognize the training but would not be responsible for cost (other than the processing and mailing of a certificate of attendance).

Possible Timeline. The course and materials will be completed by spring '06. A pilot course will be held to make adjustments in the materials and presentations. A full course is planned for the November Conference in Denver. Therefore, 2007 and 2008 would be the ideal years to run this training around the US.

¹ Five (5) sessions were delivered in Florida, South Dakota, New Jersey, Arizona, and Idaho. State foresters were provided three free (3) registrations for each session in their region. Instructors for each session included Jack Cohen (US Forest Research), Judith Leraas Cook (Firewise Communities/USA), Pat Durland (BLM), and Dave Halstead (Chair of the WT). An additional session was offered at the 2004 National WUI Conference in Denver, CO.