

**MINUTES FROM THE
NWCG WILDLAND URBAN INTERFACE WORKING TEAM MEETING
Boise, Idaho
June 28-30, 2005**

ATTENDANCE ROSTER

Working Team Members Present:

Sam Scranton, (US DOI/Bureau of Indian Affairs) - Chair
Ginny Desautels, (DHS/FEMA Federal Insurance & Mitigation Administration) – Vice-Chair
Jack Cohen (USDA Forest Service)
Alan Dozier (Georgia Forestry Commission)
Pamela Jakes (USDA Forest Service)
Brian Johnson, (International Assoc. of Fire Chiefs)
Kelly Hawk (US DOI/Bureau of Land Management)
Jim Smalley (National Fire Protection Association)
Lew Southard (USDA Forest Service)
Ron Stoffel (Minnesota Division of Forestry – alternate for Olin Phillips)
Kim Zagaris (National Emergency Management Association)

Working Team Members Not Present:

Wayne Ching, Hawaii Division of Forestry & Wildlife
Frank Richardson, US Fire Administration

Staff and Guests:

Dan Bailey, International Code Council
Cheryl Blake, National Fire Protection Association
Patricia Cohn, Washington State University
Dennis Dupuis, USDOJ/Bureau of Indian Affairs
Peter Lahm, USDA Forest Service
Sarah McCaffrey, USDA Forest Service
Tim Melchert, USDA Forest Service
Amy Schneider, Fleishman-Hillard, Inc.
John Segar, USDOJ/Fish & Wildlife Service
Kim Van Hemelryck, USDOJ/Fish & Wildlife Service

Facilitator:

Barbara Kennedy, USDA Forest Service

Recorder:

Michele Steinberg, National Fire Protection Association

Opening:

Chairman Sam Scranton opened the meeting at 8:30 a.m. and reviewed the agenda. He asked that discussion of future meeting schedules be included in the agenda. He provided an overview of the history of the National Wildland/Urban Interface Fire Program and the role of the NWCG WUI Working Team.

Presentations

A series of presentations were made to the WUI Working Team. These included:

- Dan Bailey, International Code Council – Wildland fire activities of the International Code Council
- Sarah McCaffrey, USDA Forest Service, North Central Research Station – Social Research on public views of fuels management
- Patricia Cohn, Washington State University – Social Research on gauging acceptability of smoke from prescribed burning in the northern inland west
- Peter Lahm, USDA Forest Service, Fire & Aviation Management – Community smoke management

A summary of each presentation is included in Appendix A.

Old Business

Review of past meeting minutes – The group reviewed the February 2005 meeting minutes and moved to accept them. Minutes were approved unanimously.

New Business

Update on insurance trends - Kelly Hawk provided an update on insurance trends as requested from a prior meeting. After asking state contacts to collect information about insurance companies and possible incentives for wildfire mitigation, findings included:

- Companies are more active when there have been significant wildfire loss claims
- Companies are involved in various ways related to wildfire – educational efforts, punitive efforts, others.
- Companies view wildfire loss claims as a low priority in relation to other insured losses.
- The California 2003 wildfires led to such actions as a major insurer looking to recoup expenses from the city and county of San Diego, saying many claims were a result of lack of fire department response.
- The National Association of Insurance Commissioners resolved to address wildfire mitigation.
- Some companies are sending letters to policyholders telling them to clear brush around homes.

There was some discussion among Working Team members regarding how insurers spread their risk and the reasons for lack of discounts for wildfire mitigation, as well as how wildfire mitigation might or might not affect a fire department's rating from the Insurance Services Office. It was suggested that an ISO or insurance company representative be invited to a future meeting if the Working Team wants to learn more.

Discussion – Evacuation and Shelter in Place - Janet Anderson led the discussion by conference call. She asked the Working Team to consider the concepts of shelter-in-place as a logical extension of Firewise Communities or in the context of Firewise Communities/USA. The concept is being used successfully in Australia and New Zealand.

Jack Cohen provided context on an earlier discussion of this issue – in 2002 the Working Team was asked to make strong recommendations for communities to adopt shelter-in-place strategies or to endorse such strategies. At that time, Working Team members felt it was premature in terms of our ability to recognize locations that would be ready for this and the experience of local jurisdictions in controlling panic. The first steps would be to put together guidelines on educating people on where and how to stay in the home. However, Jack stated that shelter-in-place is the logical extension of WUI fire protection - if your home

does not ignite, why not stay there? There is evidence that people die outside the house, not in it, during WUI fires. A shelter-in-place strategy would give the nation the opportunity to save lives and avoid evacuations – taking the emergency out of wildfire in regard to houses.

Janet noted that in visiting neighborhoods in Canberra (Australia) where homes were lost, they found that no homes where people stayed were lost, and no-one died in the homes. Jack said that he has discussed the social context of sheltering in place with a risk analyst for the (Australian) Country Fire Authority. Janet said that in New South Wales and Victoria, the alternative is early evacuation.

Kim Zagaris said that from a standpoint of representing local government as part of NEMA, most evacuation orders are where the Incident Commander gets the request and makes a decision to do it. The request is made to law enforcement. He stated that this issue would require a lot more deliberation with some of our counterparts before we take a stance. We have to be careful as it is a local issue when we're talking evacuation. Collaboration among state, local, and federal authorities would be critical.

Pam Jakes asked about whether WT members have you looked at cultural context in which this shelter-in-place is succeeding. She noted that in Australia, residents have a history of self-sufficiency in WUI fires. Shelter-in-place would be a new mindset for the U.S. and would take a long time to be successful.

Jim Smalley noted that this would not be a Working Team decision that would result in telling locals what to do. He urged the Working Team to begin discussing the concepts, airing issues, and making some recommendations on what to do. He noted that many others are discussing the issue and that the topic led interest in concurrent sessions at the November 2004 "Backyards and Beyond" conference. In addition, last October, the NFPA Wildland Fire Management Section came out with a white paper, based on a panel discussion at the NFPA 2004 annual meeting, inviting the Working Team to join in framing a national level discussion. The NFPA Section is going to promote more discussion on various aspects of the topic at the next NFPA Annual Meeting in June 2006 in Orlando.

Pam noted that it would be interesting to have a list of criteria and indicators that would help homeowners, communities, fire professionals understand under what conditions it is safe to stay or necessary to go. Patricia Cohn added that some research showed unwillingness on the part of residents to evacuate after they had already done it once. Jack noted that evacuation is not mandatory, though authorities can keep residents from returning; and they can get disabled out. It takes a declaration of martial law to get the able-bodied out, but the perception of residents is that they must leave. There is a general lack of understanding of the entire context of evacuation. Jack also noted that liability – when the recommendations of evacuation get folks in trouble – is an important issue. It was noted that the Public Entity Risk Institute (PERI) could be a help in looking at liability.

Brian Johnson reiterated that the Working Team did not want to create a policy but should start to set out criteria for shelter-in-place vs. evacuation, working with law enforcement and the community. Alan Dozier agreed that while shelter-in-place falls right in line with Firewise ideas, it would be critical to work with local law enforcement and emergency managers on the issue.

Janet stated that her proposal is only to explore how we can approach the shelter-in-place concept and build it into Firewise education. Kim suggested putting the issue on the agenda of different stakeholders at their meetings or conferences, including IAFC, NEMA, IAWF and NFPA. Brian felt this discussion is timely as there is a trend of emphasizing personal responsibility for disaster safety. Pam added that the topic could be surfaced at the International Symposium on Society and Resource Management in Vancouver in 2006. Jack agreed that the Working Team could put together a technical presentation on the issue. He felt the focus for this issue must be on agencies as much if not more than on the public.

Barbara Kennedy suggested that the topic be part of the 2006 program of work. Janet said she would frame any recommendation for action to include exploring the issues with federal agencies and local law enforcement. She also stated she would like Phil Gil with the Bureau of Land Management in Montana to be part of any task group that emerges.

DECISION: WUI Working Team to put together a technical presentation on the shelter-in-place issue.

Updates – New Publications – Jim Smalley provided an update on new publications on wildfire, both from the program and other partners. These included:

- NFPA's new book, *Protecting Life and Property from Wildfire*, released this spring and available for purchase from NFPA. 388 pages.
- *Planning for Wildfires*, a Planning Advisory Service report in book form from the American Planning Association. This product was a joint effort of APA and the National WUI Fire Program. The book was published in March and immediately distributed to 1,400 professional planners who subscribe the Planning Advisory Service. 124 pages.
- In the last six months, the National WUI Fire Program has also published *American Perspectives on the Wildland Urban Interface*, a collection of essays from diverse authors, as well as a new video titled *Using Water Effectively*. Both items are available on the Firewise web catalog.

There was discussion on the status of Firewise and National WUI Fire Program publications that are still stored in the NIFC cache. Cheryl Blake met with Cindy Wolfe, who operates the cache and who had asked if they could discontinue storage/distribution of these materials. The Working Team reviewed the list of items requested for removal, including:

- *Focus on Wildland Fire Prevention* video
- *Developing a Cooperative Approach to Wildfire Prevention* - video and pamphlet
- *Planning for Water Supply and Distribution in the Wildland/Urban Interface: Operation Water* - video and pamphlet
- *Building a Firewise Home* video
- *Making Your Home Firewise* video
- *Firewise Landscaping Parts I-III* video
- *Firewise Landscaping Part III in Spanish* video

Brian Johnson made a motion to move all documents under the National WUI Fire Program purview to the NFPA warehouse for distribution per the existing system. Jack Cohen seconded the motion. Sam asked for discussion. Hearing none, the motion went to a vote and carried unanimously. Sam asked staff to prepare a letter to Cindy Wolfe to communicate the decision.

DECISION: All documents as requested to be moved under the National WUI Fire Program for distribution per the existing system (Firewise catalog), with written decision to Cindy Wolfe.

The Working Team discussed the feasibility and desirability of reproducing the Firewise Communications Guide on CD and making it available on the Firewise Web Catalog. Amy Schneider indicated that the materials are available for download on the web now, but she and staff had had requests to make the CD itself available. The cost of duplication is about \$1.50 per CD. Cheryl asked about updates; Amy indicated that new or revised material could be posted to the website until the next reprint was needed.

Regional WUI Fire Councils and State Forestry Agencies – Alan Dozier noted that the NASF Fire Committee will hold a meeting of chiefs, managers and supervisors for all 50 states during the week of

January 6, 2006, in the Tampa area. He suggested that if Working Team members wished, he could work with the coordinator to get a presentation on the shelter-in-place issue on the agenda.

Alan is also the liaison between the Southern Wildland/Urban Interface Council and the WUI Working Team. The Council includes the state university system and focuses on issues other than fire that affect the WUI. Alan also noted that a "Fire in the South" booklet is forthcoming as the first deliverable from the southern states wildfire risk assessment project.

Ron Stoffel said that Olin Phillips has indicated that NASF has agreed to add additional funding for the Firewise project in 2006.

Communications Task Group Report - Amy Schneider explained that the Communications Task Group is responsible for developing and coordinating key messages and helping get the messages out to target audiences. She covered the following items in her report:

- Community Support/Media Relations
 - The Firewise Newsroom went online in April (www.firewise.org/newsroom). The page includes the latest news and headlines, as well as FAQs, messages, fact sheets, and links to public service announcements. The Firewise Communications Guide is now posted there and available for download. The area and products have received some good feedback. The emails that WT members sent to their colleagues helped to get the word out. Staff and communications contact information is on the website for the news media and communities looking for ideas on communication planning.
 - Articles authored or edited have included the North American Precipitation Syndicate (NAPS) pieces for small newspapers; *NVFC Dispatch*; and *Home & Fire* magazine. The program used the community organizer in Wisconsin to author the NVFC article to boost credibility and buy-in. The Weather Channel's writers contacted the program through FH and staff were able to supply them with high quality video at cost of duplication. Amy noted that an updated b-roll of WUI fire and mitigation footage would help us turn such requests around faster.
 - Recent news releases included information on the Firewise Challenge product; the new APA Planning for Wildfires book (we worked collaboratively with APA on their release); and a Wildfire Resource Advisory for media that included messages about what homeowners can do.

WUI Team Agency Support – FH is assembling a list of agency communicators from Working Team members. We would like to proactively reach out to agencies to offer communications tools, collect and share best practices, and develop products with their input. It was noted that the National Fire Plan website is being revised and that this would be a good way to reach agency and nonagency people alike.

Grassroots Outreach

Wisconsin was able to begin working with a Community Organizer and accomplish some activities. During this year, they are presenting Firewise information at fire department open houses, county fire and emergency associations; local fairs and festivals; lake associations; and with realtors, landscapers and contractors. **Alabama** has put out a second request for proposals for community organizers, resulting in the selection of Kellie Johnston with the Cawaco Resource Conservation & Development Council. The proposed grassroots outreach will cover Jefferson, Shelby, and Walker Counties. **New Mexico** has had to re-post the position of community organizer and must award a contract by September 1.

Stakeholders

Fleishman-Hillard developed a comprehensive online database to help track advocates and stakeholders; staff were trained on its use earlier this year and are uploading separate databases of contacts from

stakeholder lists, workshop participants, conference participants, etc. The database will make it easier to identify and work with key stakeholders. FH and staff are still working on strategic relationship letters to help keep track of commitments and keep lines of communication open.

Discussion with DOI Fuels Group – Sam Scranton introduced Dennis Dupuis with BIA’s interagency fuels coordination group and John Seager, the fuels coordinator for the Fish and Wildlife Service. Their role involves providing the Department of Interior portion of the funding for the National WUI Fire Program. Sam provided a presentation on the history of the program and highlighted accomplishments.

Sam reviewed the program’s five-year strategic plan and how it connected with the five-year cooperative agreement and yearly work plans. There was discussion about how the strategic plan and objectives might connect to the Community Wildfire Protection Plans, particularly Goal 2. Most agreed that Firewise concepts and the action plan requirement of the Firewise Communities/USA communities were compatible with the CWPP requirements, though the scale of each is different. Brian Johnson noted that there would be more discussion on CWPPs later, including a new guide coming from IAFC, NASF and The Wilderness Society as a tool for communities. Discussion on Goal 3 focused on the need for internal communications and for agencies to carry common messages to field staff and community residents.

The group also discussed the Five-Year Cooperative Agreement and how it works as the funding instrument for the national program. It connects the strategic plan to how funding is applied to yearly activities. There was explanation of the five core activities forming the basis of the 2005 workplan, as well as staffing and program management by NFPA.

There was extensive discussion about how the program evaluates progress. One example is the tracking of the Firewise Communities/USA Recognition Program – at the end of 2004, the program documented that 95,000 people are engaged in activities at the local level, and that during 2003-2004, nearly \$5 million was invested in local projects by 98 communities. There was concern expressed that what the funding agencies want to count or measure are things that don’t relate to the goal of behavior change toward reducing home loss in the interface. John Seager indicated that we need to consider how we provide some sort of measure to demonstrate success of the programs on a national basis; otherwise, the resources continue to roll toward programs that count acres rather than those that create behavioral change. Kim Zagaris noted that the trend is toward measuring performance and outcome. He felt we need to help educate the Office of Management and Budget and the federal decision-makers. Alan Dozier suggested the Working Team come up with ways for the agencies to measure success. John agreed that the Working Team’s diversity would help the message get through to agencies. He felt that this is an opportune time to revisit the measurement issue and affect the performance measures. It’s not just about treating acres – we have to work with communities and push personal responsibility.

Sam concluded his presentation by discussing present and future challenges including the balance of supply and demand for products and programs; the shifting Working Team membership; how to continue the development and support of partners and alliances; and how to move ahead with initiatives. Emerging issues that were identified included preparing residents for wildfire; guidance for disabled Americans in the interface; and completion of a WUI videotape series with new products and updates.

There was additional discussion about funding trends from the DOI Fuels Group and for WUI issues. Dennis and John indicated that the DOI budget is not increasing for key activities and that competition for limited funding is growing. Generally speaking, most programs will be level-funded in the coming year. John stated his appreciation for the presentation to understand more about how the National WUI Fire Program operates and to understand what the funding agencies are getting for their investment. He asked the group to think about what the focus would be if funding begins to decline. He also emphasized the need to work more at the national level to provide leadership and information. John acknowledged the

positive benefits of reaching communities, but felt that information also had to reach higher levels nationally to help leaders make better decisions, including members of Congress. Some of the difficulty with the mission of reducing home losses in wildfire events is that the agencies are largely not fire agencies but resource management agencies.

Dennis emphasized the need to define outcomes and to better communicate how the Program has done a good job in the home ignition zone. Program funders also need to see that there is no duplication of effort with other programs. He requested that Sam and Kelly meet with him and John throughout the year. Sam agreed and invited Dennis and John to attend future meetings. There was brief discussion on how to better transmit information to decision-makers.

Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPP) Task Group Report - Brian Johnson reminded the Team that the Task Group was formed to look at whether the National WUI Fire Program should get involved in the CWPP issue. He explained that the initial CWPP guidance document came out in March 2004 and there was a lot of discussion about whether it provided enough information. IAFC representatives had not been involved in the development of the initial guidance but wanted to take a role. IAFC partnered with NASF and The Wilderness Society on a new 22-page document, "Community Wildfire Protection Plan Leaders Guide Supplement: Recommendations for 'LEADERS by LEADERS' Toward Implementing the Steps Outlined in the Leaders Guide". Brian indicated the content reflected much of what was done in the Firewise Communities Workshops on how to conduct collaborative planning. The document references Firewise throughout, including the website URL, and has been tested with local governments. Brian said that while he, Kelly and Janet had not much opportunity to discuss recommendations as a group, he would not suggest that the Working Team be involved in CWPP issues, as other mechanisms and groups exist to deal with it.

Discussion ensued on whether there was a need to better define the role of Firewise concepts in CWPPs. Some felt the existing guidance already incorporates Firewise and that the actual plans being done incorporate Firewise concepts. Kelly noted that she and Pat Durland had worked several years ago on community wildfire plan guidance and how to assess wildfire risks prior to the formal development of CWPPs, and that the information was used by NASF and others as they created CWPP guidance. She felt the new document is helping fill the gaps. Brian felt that because the CWPPs are mandated and have funding associated with them, we should make sure the link with Firewise concepts is easy to make. Dennis asked whether the NWCG or the WUI Working Team needed to endorse the guidance document as a good resource. Others agreed; Brian recommended that Working Team members first review the document and provide any comments, particularly in terms of information or resources that could be referenced. Jack felt that the Working Team's role regarding this document was to review it, comment on any technical inconsistencies, and point out any place that CWPP and the Firewise Communities/USA Recognition Program connect. Brian agreed to email the document to the Working Team members and to the DOI Fuels Group representatives. Sam asked the group to review it within 30 days (July 29) and provide feedback to Michele and Jim. If needed, staff can facilitate a conference call based on the comments.

DECISION: Working Team will review the current CWPP guidance document and comment on any technical inconsistencies; will also point out any place that CWPP and Firewise Communities/USA Recognition Program connect.

P-110 Course Revision Task Group Report – Cheryl Blake reported that the new working title for the course is now "Assessment in the Home Ignition Zone". The Task Group met in May and consists of Jim Harrell (FL), Jolene Ackerman (WI), Ethan Foote (CA), Steve Niccolai (State Farm Insurance), Hank Blackwell (NM), Claudia Standish (USFS), and Sam Scranton, with additional input from Vern Northrup (BIA/Fond du Lac tribe). The meeting resulted in substantial feedback and staff are currently working on

a second draft. The course is being developed following the NWCG training format in case they decide to pick it up. Task group members are working on the glossary of terms and the reference section. The group hopes to use the course in a pilot in spring 2006 and to include the course on the Firewise University area of the website. The next meeting of the Task Group will be in Salt Lake City in August.

Firewise Communities/USA Recognition Program Task Group Report – Alan Dozier described the progress of the Firewise Leadership Awards idea. The awards would fill a gap where Firewise efforts that don't "fit" other awards (such as the Smokey Bear Award) could be celebrated. In addition, it would help acknowledge the efforts of non-community entities (those that do not fit the criteria for recognition under the national Firewise Communities/USA Recognition Program) for carrying out Firewise activities. Alan provided a draft of the award criteria (see Appendix B) for the group to review. He felt that by granting these awards at NASF meetings, it would help raise the prestige of Firewise concepts among state forestry agencies.

The draft criteria included a maximum of two awards yearly for regional levels, three to state levels, and three to community levels. The awards are intended for organizations or individuals that use Firewise concepts that impact these various geographic levels. At the community level, the intent is to identify those organizations and individuals who advocate and lead for at least one year.

There was discussion about whether any candidates might fit a national award level – there may be organizations or individuals who impact Firewise activity on a national level, such as a national nonprofit or private organization. Some felt they would already be recognized by the National Fire Plan.

Sam asked for a motion to pursue establishing a Firewise award at community, state and regional levels and to accept the recommendations of an awards task group. Jim made the motion, Jack seconded the motion. Sam called for discussion.

Members discussed the venue and timing of the award. Possible venues for presenting the awards included:

- NASF meetings
- IAFC conferences
- National Fire Plan conference
- Congressional Fire Service Institute annual conference
- 2006 National WUI Fire Education Conference (Backyards and Beyond)

Alan noted that not all 8 possible awards would necessarily be granted each year. Michele noted that if we wanted awardees to attend a venue, we would need to budget that travel cost in each year. Alan suggested we accept awards by January 31 of each year. Lew suggested awards could be accepted year-round, though a series of reminders and a deadline were still needed. Lew and Alan both indicated they would like Fleishman-Hillard involved in the design of the award and on the review committee for awards.

There was also discussion about sharing the applications that did not "fit" the criteria or were not chosen for a Firewise award on to the National Fire Plan awards organizers, as some of these may fit the NFP criteria. We could encourage NFP organizers and Smokey Bear Award organizers to share potential candidates for Firewise Leadership Awards with us as well. There is also a new NFPA Wildfire Management Section award that could be reviewed for potential candidates. Jim suggested that the awards be presented at a single venue such as the Congressional Fire Services Institute conference and that ads in other conference programs (NFP, NFPA, IAFC, etc.) could list the awardees.

Sam called for a vote to accept the motion. The motion carried with one opposed (Brian Johnson).

Sam asked for a task group to decide on the process and timeline and to review the nominations. The design will be accomplished by program staff and Fleishman-Hillard. The Firewise Leadership Awards Task Group now consists of Alan Dozier, Lew Southard, Amy Schneider, Kelly Hawk and Ginny Desautels, along with staff support.

DECISION: Create Firewise Leadership Awards and establish a process and timeline for nominations and review.

Lew asked to defer the issue of the size of Firewise Communities/USA sites until the next meeting. He has spoken to all of the originators of the program but has not yet had the opportunity to talk with the individuals who raised concerns about the size issue.

Mid-Year Budget Overview and 2006 Forecast

Jim Smalley reviewed the mid-year budget for 2005, including line items for staff, travel, supplies, committed contracts, postage, printing, meeting expenses, miscellaneous, and general and administrative costs (G&A). He explained that the G&A rate is approved by the USDA Forest Service and covers the support NFPA provides in legal services, accounting, and technical support of other kinds. NFPA matches six percent of the total provided by USFS and DOI. Jim reviewed the budget as of May 28 in terms of committed contracts and actual expenses. He indicated that the program would receive a financial site visit July 21-22 as a pre-audit, a standard requirement of the agreement. USFS audits the program regularly and NFPA conducts its internal audit. Program staff meet monthly with NFPA financial staff on the program budget. The 2005 budget is slightly more than \$2.1 million - \$1.25 million from USFS, \$740,000 from DOI, and the additional six percent from NFPA.

The 2006 budget forecast includes a USFS projection of \$1.3 million, a \$50,000 increase over 2005 that was recommended by the NASF Fire Committee. In terms of expenses, Jim indicated that the budget for Communications (primarily the Fleishman-Hillard contract) will decrease slightly from 2005; that website expenses might increase slightly; and that the 2006 conference would be accounted for in program support. The 2006 budget will have a line for income from the conference. Sam asked Jim to provide a cost-estimate for work to make the Firewise website compliant with Section 508 (ADA compliance) and to provide it at the October meeting. Jim will also investigate whether NFPA/Firewise might be exempt from compliance requirements.

Discussion of 2006 Workplan and Proposals

Presentation on Proposed Use of National Park Service “WHAM” Module - Staff of the National Park Service have developed an automated method of collecting and disseminating wildfire risk information based on the NFPA 1144 Standard for Protection of Life and Property from Wildfire, referring to it as Wildland Hazard Assessment Methodology or WHAM. They have used it in a few locations over the past few years and have discussed with Firewise program staff the possible expanded uses for the module, including sharing it with states and communities.

Roberta D’Amico of the National Park Service, Fire Communications and Education, facilitated a presentation about the WHAM module led via conference call by Barb Stewart, National Park Service NER/NCR Fire Education, Prevention and Information Specialist; and Dan Hurlbert, GIS Specialist, Shenandoah National Park. Dan explained that they were currently training field staff to assess buildings using the module. Dan described the module as a new approach to using NFPA 1144 that supports fire education and prevention for homeowners and provides a planning tool for communities and local fire departments. It also creates a storehouse of data on wildland fuel conditions, provides information on

values at risk of an approaching wildfire, aids the burn planning process by identifying high risk properties near proposed burn sites, and supports funding requests for fuels reduction projects.

Dan demonstrated the WHAM interface and how a hand-held unit can be used to survey individual properties. The elements of the survey are based on NFPA 1144. One product is a take-away for the homeowner that includes a rating and a set of recommendations specific to each element. Because WHAM is integrated with GIS, it provides a good planning tool for local fire departments. It documents access and egress concerns, water issues, etc. WHAM's database is a storehouse of data on wildland fuels. It uses forest type, forest community and fire return interval to come up with a condition class layer. The feedback from this ground survey helps improve FARSITE models and thus enhances the data in park management plans. The module uses off the shelf software, so there is no "startup cost" to users. Next desired steps for the module development are to automate field collection using PDA technology and to develop a Structures Hazard Assessment component (SHAM).

Working Team members asked a number of questions about the planned use of this tool. Dan mentioned work with the Fish & Wildlife Service and work with state forestry agencies in Maine and West Virginia. He would like to see the rest of the National Park Service using the tool. Mike Price (Firewise contractor who was participating in the training with Dan and Barb) commented that the developers did a good job of integrating GIS technology with NFPA 1144 and that the map and informational products coming out of the module's use were good. They are discussing deploying the tool in ArcGIS 9 (currently using ArcView 3). Jim Smalley asked what would happen if NFPA 1144 changed significantly in the next edition. Mike felt the weightings for various elements could be changed or criteria removed or added easily. Jim felt this tool might have implications to the "Assessment in the Home Ignition Zone" course that the National WUI Fire Program is developing.

Pam Jakes asked if the tool has been used to support development of CWPPs. Barb said it had not been used directly on CWPPs, but that resulting data was integrated into the Shenandoah National Park management plan; and in Missouri, the park staff has given the data to local fire departments. Lew asked about training and supporting materials. Dan described how the training covers ArcView, GPS and data basics, how to do assessments, data processing and reporting. The training also covers suggestions for how assessors might approach homeowners and the types of outreach found to be successful. Sam asked about the anticipated outcome from these assessments and how it would affect change. Barb responded that the program is designed to have the data rest with local fire departments, not with federal agencies. Any data used for fire management plans has been stripped of private information. When the assessors leave, they provide homeowners specific suggestions for what to do to be safer, and that the activity is building relationships between Park fire staff and homeowners. Sam asked if there has been any measurement of success. Barb indicated that a full performance measurement has not yet been conducted.

Ginny asked who was being trained to deliver the assessments. Right now, it is Student Conservation Association interns primarily, along with a few paid seasonal staff. Dan and Alan Williams provide technical support in troubleshooting software issues and field questions. Roberta indicated that the need for technical assistance is why they were presenting this information to the WUI Working Team. Others are asking the National Park Service for the tool and for technical assistance. NPS would like to share the tool but doesn't know how it can be supported. Roberta asked Mike if would be possible to train people to support the module. Mike said yes and ESRI could get involved. Lew asked if the training provided students with background on wildfire behavior. Mike said that it did. Alan Dozier asked if the deployments of the tool thus far had involved state forestry agencies. Dan said they were not involved in development of the module, but they had been hearing from the state of Virginia that they were interested. Roberta said there were other areas that have worked with states.

Sam asked if NPS was looking for technical support and how to share the module with others. Roberta said yes and expressed her appreciation for Mike Price's participation in their current training.

Following the formal presentation, Sam asked the Working Team for a response to the request for technical support to expand the program and offer it to others. Several Working Team members indicated they would not support funding this effort for various reasons, including the lack of state involvement and the complexity of the methodology. Brian noted that the Working Team had decided last year that outside proposals must be submitted formally using our format. Sam asked for a motion. Kelly moved that we advise the WHAM group that we are not able to provide support for the project as it's not in our workplan and we have technical issues with the methodology. Lew seconded the motion. Discussion – Jim indicated that we need to tell the WHAM group what the issue is with the methodology. Kelly felt that the pending changes to the NFPA standard would be a problem. Motion passed unanimously. Sam will respond to the group in writing.

Wildfire Hazard Assessment Methodology Booklet Revision – Sam indicated that the NASF Fire Committee wants the program to conduct this revision as soon as possible. Jim estimated a cost of \$30,000 including staff time, travel, meetings and printing. Jack asked if it should be tied in with the “Assessing the Home Ignition Zone” course under development. He was concerned that this product be consistent with the other things that we are doing and that the focus should be on home ignitability. Lew made a motion to include the project in 2006 budget. Brian seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion carried unanimously.

DECISION: Revision of the Wildfire Hazard Assessment Methodology booklet to take place in 2006.

Firewise Leadership Awards - The assigned task group will need to work on the budget items for this, particularly for additional work by Fleishman-Hillard, the cost of designing and purchasing the physical award items, and the travel for awardees to receive their award. Jim estimated that the cost would be somewhere between \$20,000 and \$35,000.

Reprint of Existing Publications Jim noted that there will be an impact for reprinting existing publications as NWCG has directed that the NASF logo and name from all publications due to a pending lawsuit. Any items that the Program would have reprinted “as is” will now have to be edited first to remove the logo and/or name. Team members asked Jim to provide a list of what publications were coming up for reprint or duplication (audiovisual items) and a cost estimate for the changes.

Proposal for Defining the WUI Problem for a National Dialogue – Jack stated he would like to provide some research and state some findings in order to eliminate some of the myths about the WUI problem and identify the key issues in addressing the problem. Outcome would be a white paper, small pamphlet and/or Powerpoint presentation. Material could be used in Journal of Forestry article or other outreach. Jack indicated cost might include a small amount of travel if the group enlisted some additional assistance from outside the Working Team. Sam appointed Pam and Jack as a small task group who agreed to start discussing how to formulate the statement of finding.

2006 National WUI Fire Education Conference - Cheryl Blake provided a summary of the research she had done on locations for the conference to the Working Team. Based on available dates, adequate meeting space and room rates, she recommended to the Working Team that the 2006 conference be held at the Denver Doubletree, the same location as 2004.

Program staff proposed some changes to the 2004 format, including holding a two-day Hazard Assessment Training just ahead of the three-day full conference. The educational tracks will include

Tools and Techniques (focus on GIS technologies); Firewise Communities/USA; Media & Communications; Research; Planning & Mitigation; and Fire & Emergency Operations. Staff are exploring how to offer Continuing Education credits for the whole conference. Pam Jakes suggested making Continuing Education Credits available via the Society of American Foresters.

Cheryl suggested sending out a call for presentations to solicit speakers for the sessions covering the six tracks. She reviewed a suggested session schedule with the Working Team. She suggested planning to allow sponsors to have exhibit space. Jack recommended avoiding the traditional vendors of gels, foams, and sprinklers. Cheryl noted that one issue from the 2004 conference evaluations was that state liaisons don't know each other nor do they know the Working Team representatives. Staff suggested a social event to allow liaisons to meet Working Team members and one another.

Jim indicated that the conference budget is around \$220,000, including things that we do during 2005 to prepare and advertise. The impact to the 2006 budget would be about \$200,000. In 2004, we broke even on expenses and conference income.

Alan made a motion to accept the Denver Doubletree as the location for 2006 conference. Kelly seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

The group agreed that the best dates for the conference would be October 31-November 4, 2006. (October 31-November 1 would be Hazard Assessment Training; November 2-4 would be full conference). Jack moved to accept these dates; Lew seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

DECISION: 2006 Conference to take place in Denver, Colorado, October 31-November 4.

Jim said he would provide a final budget for the Working Team soon. Brian asked that it show the net cost of the conference for the agencies, to include an estimate of the income stream. Sam asked that the costs be itemized. Brian added that the 2004 conference was the best for reaching out to the people that we don't normally reach out to. He said that he was really pleased that we weren't talking to the same people that we always do.

Barbara asked about planning for 2008. Cheryl said that because of the difficulties in obtaining the right mix of room rates, space and desired dates, she would like to start searching earlier for 2008. In order to lock in a desirable location, a hotel contract must be signed; we would have to honor the contract or pay significant penalties. Brian noted that the IAFC does its conference planning 18 months out, but that dates are booked out to 2009 and current negotiations go from 2010 to 2015. He said that for a conference of 500 people of the length we are planning, a cancellation could carry a penalty upward of \$50,000, even if the hotel can rebook the rooms.

Working Team members agreed that since the every-other-year conference is part of the plan for the foreseeable future, staff should be directed to search for a facility for the 2008 conference. Cheryl will provide findings at the October meeting.

Review of 2006 program of work – ongoing activities – Jim provided an overview of the core items in the 2005 workplan that he expected would continue during 2006 and highlighted potential changes as follows:

Firewise Communities/USA Recognition Program – We anticipate additional communities to join the program during 2006 and the numbers will impact the budget. There will be some minor changes to recognition materials and plaques. There have been a number of site visits conducted by staff/contractors in 2005, primarily to support California's new liaison with establishing the program there. Lew asked how staff receives requests and prioritizes visits. Jim indicated state liaisons are the ones to approach staff

for assistance. Lew suggested maintaining a certain amount of budget for site visits where a targeted area visit would have a significant impact. He suggested increasing the budget line item for this.

For 2006, the added task of designing the Firewise Leadership Award would be an additional budget item.

Firewise Website - New items would include web design modifications and the possible phase-in of Section 508 compliance. Some of the modifications will be adding a conference page for 2006. Brian asked if the modifications would include links to planning and CWPP information. Jim felt this would be included. Items that would continue include the Newsroom area of the site, the online database, and the Firewise University area (launching later in 2005 due to delays).

Sam asked about putting the Firewise Communications CD into the online catalog. We will need to know the costs of reprinting and how it is to be distributed. Brian suggested that a couple thousand be duplicated and that they ought to be distributed at the Wildland Fire conference and National WUI Fire Education conference next year. Jim said we have print money this year to make this happen. Lew made a motion to ask the staff to duplicate adequate numbers to distribute as suggested. Brian seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Jim noted that the staff is exploring ways to get more material into the hands of those needing large quantities. We plan to increase the number of copies of popular items that can be ordered by Firewise State Liaisons. We're also looking at a print-on-demand function via website. A company we found will take a PDF print file and do mass quantity pricing and printing. We'll explore this over next few weeks and let you know more.

National Communications Plan – There would be additional funds in this area to manage the Firewise Leadership Award program with staff and Task Group assistance.

WUI Information Resources

- *Exhibits* - The current plan is to have staff and displays at the NFPA Annual Meeting, the National Fire Plan conference and the APA national conference.
- *Materials for Special Needs Groups* - Jim asked whether the Working Team was interested in creating materials addressing special needs groups during 2006. Alan noted this activity was discussed last year and given a low priority. Jack was concerned that this issue is serious and needs attention. Jim noted that the NFPA Wildfire Management Section is going to look at the issue during a forum at the annual meeting in June 2006. Areas covered will include problems of the disabled living in the WUI; the frequency and severity of fires and how they impact evacuation; how successful Firewise communities might mean in future for WUI fires. Discussion ensued about how to tackle the related issues of individuals with disabilities and the shelter-in-place vs evacuation debate. Working Team members want to investigate the issues but are not prepared to start developing outreach materials. Lew suggested a Working Team member attend the NFPA session and report back to the team to start dialogue. Sam asked for a task group that would address these issues and also develop a panel discussion for the 2006 National WUI Fire Education Conference. Lew moved to form a task group. Alan seconded. Task Group members will be Brian, Kelly, Jack, Pam and Jim. Motion passed unanimously.

WUI Program Support – Jim indicated there would be no significant changes to this element. Course testing of new P-110. We will look for opportunities to do that at existing conferences. For example, Wildfire Conference, NFPA Conference – offer it as is.

Program Income – Jim estimates that program income could be up to \$90,000 for national conference registrations. Brian asked him to include the sponsorships in income.

Firewise TV Media Plan – Jim noted we are going to delay this. The firewise.tv URL has expired. The plan was to put streaming video on this area to make it easier to access.

The budget discussion concluded with some debate about how to approach future budget issues. Sam indicated that the program should set aside funding for future opportunities that come up and put a limit on the large program areas. Jim urged the group to focus on the programmatic issues and let staff work out the details of line item budgeting. Jack asked whether there are expenditures that stand out as not following our strategic plan or not meeting our goals. Kelly urged the group to look for where funds could be cut back but also to market the program better to help agencies understand the benefit of how the funds are spent. Brian expressed concern that by trying to establish a “maintenance mode” for the program we put ourselves in a bind as certain aspects of the program (such as community participation in the Recognition Program) expand. He also emphasized the need to come up with our own performance measures. Pam added that those measures should not be dollars and cents only but to report accomplishments that will make a difference for the agencies. Michele noted that within the strategic planning process that the Working Team used, we were provided benchmarking guides but didn’t actually take the steps of establishing benchmarks. This could be something we do at an upcoming meeting. Ron and Jack both emphasized a serious need for the Working Team to come up with our own benchmarks and define the problem adequately.

Sam asked for a process change for future meetings. He wants to have a standard format, and asked that for the October meeting, we have no presenters. We need as much time as possible to discuss budget and cover the important issues.

Sam shared an email from the National Association of Counties (NACo) that included a March 2005 resolution from its Public Lands Steering Committee and Environment, Energy and Land Use Steering Committee on wildland/urban interface fire.

Agenda, Location and Schedule for Next Meetings – The next meeting will be held October 4-6, 2005 at the NFPA offices in Quincy, Massachusetts. In addition to completing review and approval of items for inclusion in the 2006 workplan, specific information will be provided regarding the status of the Firewise website compliance with Section 508 (ADA), the progress of design and advertising of a Firewise Leadership Award, and details on a search for the 2008 conference site.

There was discussion about where and how to incorporate more key players into meetings to try to educate them about our mission and activities, including coordination with other meetings such as the NWCG fall, winter and spring meetings.

The winter meeting was tentatively slated for the Tampa area for late January/early February. (Final dates decided by email input are January 31-February 2, 2006; location changed to Salt Lake City, Utah via email following the meeting). The Wildland Fire Education Working Team wants to meet simultaneously with them for this timeframe. Staff and Chairman will organize the logistics.

For future planning, it was noted that the next three NWCG meetings will take place on Oct 18-20, 2005 in Gettysburg; Jan 24-26, 2006 in Florida; and May 9-11, 2006 in Boise. NWCG will hold all of its future spring meetings in May in Boise with joint WT chairs meeting included.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m., Thursday, June 30.

Appendix A Presentations to WUI Working Team

Presentation on International Code Council and Wildfire Issues

Dan Bailey presented information on the International Code Council, its vision, mission and organization; its International Urban Wildland Interface Code; and an overview of ICC's partnerships and alliances.

Vision, Mission and Values Vision: Protecting the health, safety and welfare of people by creating better buildings and safer communities. ICC is a 50,000-member organization established in 1994 as a nonprofit. The founders are BOCA, ICBO, SBCCI. It is dedicated to developing a single set of comprehensive and coordinated national model construction codes. ICC has 340 employees, and a national office in Falls Church, VA, as well as field offices in Chicago, Los Angeles (Whittier), Birmingham. James Lee Witt is the CEO. Witt is pushing wildland interest in ICC programs. Membership includes state, county and municipal code enforcement and fire officials, architects, engineers, contractors, elected officials, manufacturers and others in construction industry. ICC has nearly 300 chapters. I-Codes provide minimum safeguards for people at home, at school and in the workplace. They are a complete set of comprehensive, coordinated building safety and fire prevention codes. Building codes benefit public safety and support the industry's need for one set of codes without regional limitations.

ICC provides technical support for free code interpretations. ICC Evaluation Services evaluates building products for compliance with code. International Accreditation Services provides wide range of accreditation services, including accreditation of testing laboratories, calibration laboratories, inspection and quality control, etc. ICC provides certification for code enforcement and construction.

Statistics: 48 states plus the District of Columbia and Department of Defense use the International Building Code; 45 states plus District of Columbia use the International Residential Code; 36 states plus District of Columbia use International Fire Code; 38 states and Department of Defense use the International UWI Code. Stakeholder organizations include AIA, ASLA, APA, ANSI, AIBD, ARC, American Seniors Housing Assoc.

ICC's new emphasis in wildland fire includes promoting the International UWI code and its new 2006 revision. 38 states are currently utilizing the code, including 18,000+ communities, cities and towns, 6000+ international communities, cities and towns. Over the past two months, ICC has provided free copies of the code on DVD to all state foresters, federal agencies, and 1000 communities. This fall, ICC will conduct a series of International UWI Code Review and update workshops, including Sept 8 in Seattle, Sept 20 in Phoenix, Sept 22 in Atlanta, as well as Oct/Nov 2005 international workshops in Spain, Brazil, Russia and Australia. The 2006 revision of the code will include more focus on planning guidelines for communities. It needs to be more than the NACO/SAF guidance on CWPP. Dan said there seems to be a little bit of friction between fire marshals and wildland organizations on who is doing what.

ICC is participating with fire services and wildland organizations in better coordination of ICC efforts, including NVFC, IAFC, NWCG. ICC recently sent a letter asking NWCG to have ICC participate on both the WUI and Wildland Fire Education Working Teams. Beginning in 2006, ICC will begin efforts in Community Planning training including codes and standards. They will be partnering in these efforts with Home Depot, NVFC, Fire Corps and national RC&D Council org. Dan said that Home Depot will be funding a lot of the training efforts. At the beginning of 2004, Home Depot changed their emphasis on grants, agreements – it now supports Healthy Forests and safe communities.

ICC is also working on an alliance promoting living safe in fireprone environments. Partners include the National Association of Resource Conservation & Development Councils, which has 30,000 volunteers within councils throughout U.S. Other partners we're looking at include NVFC, NAHB, Fire Corps. Fire Corps is a relatively new organization that provides volunteer assistance to local fire departments. The US Chamber of Commerce has been active and interested in promoting to business community what's happening with wildland fire. They want to work on something where we provide people to talk to major areas where people would benefit from codes and standards and community planning. Keep America Beautiful is doing a lot of things at community level. ICC is working with them to focus message. Congressional Fire Service Institute – Dan said that one of the things he does in his new job is spend a lot of time with members of Congress, talking to them about codes and standards and WUI problems. There's a lot of interest in the political arena. Izaak Walton League of America wants to help get the message out. The Home Safety Council (used to be Lowe's Foundation) deals with home safety, home education. Meri-K Appy is now the president of that organization. The Nature Conservancy has been involved in getting the message out. National Association of Counties (NACo) is interested in codes and standards process. Others include the American Red Cross; the United Nations (WUI is international code); Entertainment Industry Foundation; World Bank – providing funding for workshops dealing with wildfire. Dan stated that PBS has an unbelievable network of community-based organizations; interested in using that network and providing help in getting message out to people living in wildfire prone areas. Dan said that the Wildland Fire Education Working Team would be a great place to link these people together. This alliance represents the nontypical organizations out there doing a lot of different things yet it doesn't have a lot of coordination. We're excited there is interest and that these organizations want to upfront money.

Pam Jakes asked Dan if he has been working with the American Planning Association at all or if ICC is tied in with their efforts to train folks in the WUI. Dan said that ICC had worked with APA in past, and from Firewise we know they have been working on things. He said it's one of the areas that's important – don't want to take away anything anybody's doing, just trying to find out what they are doing. So many organizations are trying to get communities doing things, maybe not as effective as if they got together and coordinated.

Amy Schneider asked Dan what he envisioned this group or alliance actually doing. Dan said the alliance will deal with codes and standards and planning training, as well as a source for general information. He stated that going through these organizations with large memberships creates a built-in network. Amy asked if the alliance would be funding workshops and training. Dan said that it would.

Jack Cohen said that some of this concerns him about the perception of the problem of homes burning down in the interface. The list of alliance members does not seem to relate to any incentive to solving the problem. Jack felt that if homeowners could start conducting mitigation they would make WUI fire a non-disaster. In that case, the problem will go away and the need for the alliance goes away. Jack said that the great majority of what people need to do cannot be covered by a code. You're never going to have a code that makes people clean their yard twice a year. Kim Zagaris said that part of the issue is the need to build a better community - building and design need to be better to help solve the problem. Part of what we're going to do in building construction is build better communities; then we have to look at existing communities and provide incentives for retrofit. Not just one solution is going to resolve problems; but the education of building officials and those in building industry is where it needs to go. Otherwise we continue to spend too much on suppression costs. Kim said he doesn't care which code communities use, he just wants to see better construction and infrastructure long-term. Jack gave the example of communities in the 2003 California fire where older communities that have good construction still lose homes because vegetation grows over the years and there is a lot of time for debris and vegetation to accumulate. Jack felt that where we should be focusing is not on corporate stakeholders but on how we can get homeowners engaged. The history of problem has been institutionalizing something that

fundamentally occurs at the homeowner level. Kelly Hawk said she agrees with Jack and was not clear on the reason for all of the organizations in the alliance as it gave the appearance of creating another bureaucracy. Dan said it was not another bureaucracy but all the organizations who are dealing with our communities; the desire is to coordinate messages and prevent inundation of the public with lots of information. Sarah McCaffrey said that one important point of the alliance is that if you want to get change, you have to have consistent messages and they have to come from many different sources – focusing on consistent message with multi sources is important. Education is necessary but not sufficient alone – part of what changes behavior is the consistency.

Presentations on Social Science Research on Perceptions of Prescribed Burning

Pam Jakes introduced two colleagues to present on the topic, which was raised at the February WUI Working Team meeting. Sarah McCaffrey will discuss public views of fuels management. Patricia Cohn from Washington State University will focus more on prescribed burn issues.

Sarah said that the underlying goal of the research is how to foster behavior change. To do that, researchers need to understand how key publics are behaving. Research started in 2001 with Joint Fire Science Program grants. Additional sites were added from 2002 to 2004, covering most of the US. The research focused on preferred landscapes and learning about the key values and priorities that shape attitudes toward vegetation modification. Findings on key values included privacy; the ability to see and attract wildlife; recreation; naturalness; aesthetics. Many individuals try to balance risk reduction with aesthetics.

In regard to acceptability of thinning and prescribed burning methods of fuel reduction, the research found that roughly 80% see these as appropriate management tools; thinning has a higher rating.

In regard to defensible space, 65-75% said they had removed vegetation on their properties. Research examined influences on homeowners implementing defensible space. Beliefs about the direct advantages of the practice were influential. The most credible influences convincing individuals about the need for defensible space were the local fire department, the USFS or immediate family. Conformity with community values was very important to those surveyed. The strongest pattern found was that familiarity breeds acceptance – there is a strong link between knowledge and support for a treatment method.

In Minnesota, Wisconsin and Michigan, greater resource knowledge led to greater support for treatment methods, greater support and confidence in the USFS. In Massachusetts, those with some knowledge of prescribed burning were less likely to think it was dangerous, less likely to be concerned about prescribed burns, less concerned about smoke, appearance, its effects on wildlife and wildlife habitat.

Sarah described her colleague's focus groups in California, Florida and Michigan. There are different dynamics among the three states. California has strong defensible space regulations that are well accepted and being implemented; Florida is very active in prescribed burns and has better acceptance of this technique. Michigan has a historical issue of the Stephens Bridge fire that included firefighter death, so there is less acceptance for burning.

A survey about trusted sources in Minnesota, Wisconsin and Michigan found that family and friends were most trustworthy regarding general information. Among the preferred public agency information sources, interactive communication is high on the list for behavior change.

Non-fire concerns are important to individuals. Researchers found that defensible space often exists for reasons not associated with fire, such as recreation, hurricane or wind safety, or aesthetics/cleanliness

reasons. Fuels management: forest health and wildfire habitat were more important to people than fire risk, particularly in Colorado and Minnesota.

Researchers also held a series of focus groups to talk about risk perception. What does “high fire risk” mean to the residents? The first thing people talked about was the environmental factors – wind, weather, topography. The second was ignition sources. The third was impact – human – homes, lives, health – and environmental impacts. General risk – clear pattern of residents in the general vicinity having a higher risk perception than interface and intermix; self-selection, balancing benefits. If you have a high benefit perception, you have lower risk perception. To help change behavior, practitioners may need to show how reducing fire risk increases other benefits.

Sarah warned about preconceptions. Researchers found no consistent evidence that seasonal homeowners are less likely to understand fire risk than permanent residents; or that longer term residents are more aware and/or active in relation to fire mitigation. In addition, there is no evidence that rural residents have different views than urban residents, and no evidence that experience has a positive effect on behavior change.

Other findings included attitudes about post-fire rehabilitation and salvage logging. Local residents generally consider leaving the dead trees standing to be a waste of resources. Why cut green forests elsewhere? Local residents wanted dead trees removed in scenic/tourist areas. There was strong support for stabilizing soils, as well as concern about post-fire seeding and non-native species.

Research still in progress includes media analysis (how fire is portrayed and how it affects perceptions); a longitudinal analysis of beliefs and understanding and conducting defensible space work; and a review of voluntary vs. involuntary activity and activities with incentives vs. no incentives.

Jack Cohen stated that you seem to be starting on an effort to distinguish perception vs. acceptance. Our agencies often cop out based on idea that public will not accept. But you show that the public accepts when agencies tell them/work with them. He asked if, in the research questions, whether people recognize the difference between controlled fire and prescribed fire.

Kim Zagaris suggested it would be interesting to know whether secondary homeowners might accept more that they lose a secondary home vs primary residence. Sarah indicated additional findings included that TV was negatively associated with doing defensible space; there was no difference in perceptions/acceptance among income levels; and in fact there was no consistent demographic factor with a significant difference. Pam and Sarah suggested ways to personalize communication and to leverage the one-on-one contact that is so effective in changing perceptions, acceptance and ultimately behavior.

Jack added that we’re talking about perception, asking what the residents care about; he feels they are being told it’s a problem when they don’t see it as a problem. He stated that the problem is being manufactured by people wanting something to do with the problem. If we decided today that it’s not a problem – it has no other impact on society or infrastructure. The problem is important because it is influencing, indirectly, land management. It is a cognitive dissonance - ecological benefits vs. what we do with fire suppression or exclusion. Jack felt the studies should enlighten us about what the problem is. We have actions, tactics, assumptions, perceptions. Sarah responded that to some degree a neat definition of the problem is difficult because there are layers and aspects of problem. We don’t have good definition of it – maybe issue is definition for this committee.

Patricia Cohn presented on a study on Gauging Acceptability of Smoke from Prescribed Burning in the Northern Inland West (WA, OR, ID, MT) that was conducted by several researchers. Smoke is a barrier to prescribed burning, due to population growth in the interface, air quality regulations, and health

concerns. There is a growing body of research on social acceptability of prescribed burning. Researches used focus groups to ask whether the origin of smoke affects acceptability. The groups came from five different population sectors – urban, anti-smoke, rural, Native Americans, and those who recently experienced a wildfire. Focus groups were conducted between October 2003 and January 2004.

Topics included the quality of life in the area, forest conditions, fire risk, prescribed burning, and acceptability of smoke. Knowledge of prescribed burning varied. Tribes were very familiar with it, while most in the other groups were not. Most people realized we can't expect to live smoke-free. When asked about whether it made a difference where smoke sources come from, some people accepted sources such as agricultural field burning as a way of life and a sign of a good local economy. Prescribed fire had a perception of a broader societal benefit than agricultural burning. In regard to how smoke occurs and is managed, there were similarities in responses across groups - smoke from prescribed burns was more acceptable than agricultural burning. People wanted prescribed fire AWAY from homes.

Jack Cohen asked if the people in the focus groups had experienced prescribed fire. Sarah said they all had experienced forest fire smoke but was not sure how much they had experienced prescribed fire. They didn't necessarily distinguish between wildfire and prescribed fire.

Pete Lahm asked about the issue of escaped fire, which seemed to be a larger issue than the smoke itself. Patricia said people wanted to know more about prescribed burning and how smoke management is done. Jack asked whether within urban vs. rural groups, was there a distinction between those who just happened to live in rural settings and folks who have had burning on their property. He felt that the difference between Native Americans and rural groups was more of a difference between fire-users and non-fire-users. Another Team member asked if people will tolerate smoke from prescribed broadcast burning if such burning would be a beneficial tool for forest restoration. Jack asked whether group's objections to smoke were actually motivated by other issues, and if so do researchers attempt to distinguish where the opinion is coming from or a hidden agenda. Patricia indicated that focus groups uncovered such agendas. Sarah pointed out that surveys would not reveal a motive or context, but focus groups would help reveal this information. Surveys are sometimes the vocal minority view.

Pam noted that all of the focus group participants had experienced smoke – the question was, did the smoke source make a difference to them? Patricia noted results from other research and focus groups. She said that Bill Robinson worked on a lot of these and came up with some recommendations for managers (some of what Sarah covered). Messages for managers include that smoke is tolerable; tolerance increases with education and information; managers must bridge the “expert”-public gap on the acceptability of smoke. Research recommends standardizing the terminology – what's a forest? What is prescribed burning? Sarah noted that the term “defensible space” is not that well-recognized and that people didn't like it (found it “too militaristic”). Patricia noted that research finds proper terminology should be succinct, easily understandable, not confusing. These and further recommendations are in a report that will be out soon. The *Journal of Forestry* will have an article with the recommendations coming in the next few months. *Society and Natural Resources* is another journal source.

Presentation on Community Smoke Management

Pete Lahm with the US Forest Service presented community smoke management as an emerging issue we need to look at if we're going to succeed in fuels management initiatives in the interface. The federal and state agencies must address fuels and part of that is prescribed burning. Because of WUI development, there is more smoke exposure of more people than ever before. Challenges include current state/local smoke management programs; state/local air quality regulations; non-attainment areas – competition for the air resource; growing and transient populations; retirement populations; wildfire protection

expectation; aesthetic expectations/nuisance concerns; increase in smoke-sensitive facilities and populations.

Smoke Impacts

- Burns from fire adjacent to community – local coordination
- Long range smoke transport to communities – no CWPP reference – a local plan; different communication needed.
- Monitoring of air quality?
 - General information
 - Public complaints
 - Health information

Smoke Coordination Approaches

- How much treatment – who, when & where
 - Past/present
 - Annual Plan
 - Weekly Projection
 - Daily??
- Broadcast the Treatment Plans in Advance – helps let people prepare
- Coordinate Locally among Fire Agencies
 - Create a Community Smoke Management Plan
 - Create a Consistent Point of Contact for Information
 - Create a Community Smoke Message
 - If smoke coordinated and considered...then inform the public.

Methods

- Coordinate and meet with smoke affected public
 - Include long-range impact communities
- Inter-agency coordination INCLUDING SMOKE
 - Local health departments and government
 - Join Public Outreach – Assign a lead PIO
 - Internet – not enough – phone trees for sensitive groups
 - Radio, newspaper, advertising
 - 800 number for prescribed fire activity
 - Smoke coordination meetings
 - Emergency smoke response numbers (Lung Assoc, City Health)
 - Joint Outreach with Local Health Departments!
- Pre-plan the adverse smoke impact – it will happen!

PM2.5 and Ozone SIP Issues

- State and local government driven
- EPA delegation for SIPs
 - States, Counties, Metro Areas]
 - Highly variable by area
 - AZ state, Maricopa, Pima and Pinal Counties
- SIP Schedules – ALL BY 2008!
 - Highly variable by area
 - Legislature, agency, authority, EPA review.

SIP Process: Who Reviews This

- Emission Inventories – need for info is coming down to daily records.
 - 2002, current, future projection
 - Prescribed Fire/Mechanical Treatment – mechanical treatment seen as the “non impact” alternative. Jack asked whether the carbon dioxide issue being concerned in mechanical treatment (no).
 - FLMs, other Fire Managers and Sources
- Model Sources/Source Apportionment
 - WHO contributes to the problem
 - Local versus regional
- Control Strategies
 - Source Contributors
 - EPA Source Checklists/Controls
 - EPA Implementation Guidance Documents

PM2.5 and Ozone SIPs

PM2.5 – fire must be assessed; EPA guidance pending; RACM; SMP required; conformity. Ozone – fire not named, not in guidance; still being tagged; conformity.

Regional Haze Rule

- Fire required to be assessed
- Fire present = fire controlled
- Same schedule and process
- Regional transport is assumed
- Longer term goal
- Formal FLM consultation process
 - Driven by FLM Class 1 Protection of Visibility
 - Air Program role
- Same 2008 Deadlines

Pete showed a map of regional planning organizations. The Western Regional Air Partnership has done a lot with fire, lots of guidelines. Moving east, fire not included as much, but is starting to rise in importance. Southeast is working more on regional haze issues and including fire. Agencies are trying to determine who tracks SIP process, who represents fire programs on the issues, where the resources and training might come from. They are trying to determine lessons learned from regional haze effort. Pete noted that the NIFC Interagency Fuels website has a smoke management page coming; this will pick up old Smoke Signals site.

BlueSky RAINS – Peter explained that BlueSky is a system that links data and computer models of fuel load and condition fire behavior, fuel consumption weather and smoke dispersion into one system for predicting downwind impacts of fire. RAINS stands for Rapid Access Information System - a system that uses GIS technology to overlay data layers of interest that is accessible via the internet and a web browser. Developed by EPA as a Graphic User Interface to look at where smoke is going and what it is impacting.

BlueSky RAINS allows smoke predictions, hourly ground level PM2.5 concentrations, smoke trajectories, may allow us to burn and avoid AQ problems, may allow us to burn more safely.

BSRWest -1 year demo project – <http://fireweatherinfo.com>

- FS, DOI and EPA joint effort
- WFLC endorsed
- Western US Smoke predications
- ICS 209 Wildfire and WFU incidents only
- Ground level PM2.5 concentrations
- Smoke trajectories
- No prescribed fire to avoid politics

BSR West – evaluators of the system needed; training in usage – wildfire, wildfire use, prescribed fire; feedback; guidance on future development or assessing the value. Questions concern whether it will be useful westwide or whether it should grow to become a national smoke tool. Want to find out who uses it, who evaluates it and what other needs might be. EPA BlueSky Rains Southeast Project (BSR-SE) – goal is to bring information to Southern Fire Council.

Jack asked, with regard to how we seem to be constructing conflicting needs/desires, whether anybody is looking at this on the social side for expectations? For example, one of the things we do implicitly is to let large nonattainment areas off the hook regarding economic impacts. We are not considering smoke in all this. Pete said that there is a need to track the factors and make it clear that we are doing these tradeoffs. Need to make sure fire is included in pollution expectations or baselines. Wildfire is included as natural, not manmade problem.

Alan said the real problem for nonattainment in Atlanta is too many cars and trucks; the other problem is coalburning generation plants. Outdoor burning only generates 0.5 % of the problem. But we still have to show EPA that we are making progress. This work could give us negotiation ability for burning by communicating. Pete said there is the cost of learning curve, spending time on it. Community smoke management is part of the solution – the focus is in people’s backyards. Alan said the smoke issue needs to be addressed outside CWPPs since lots of places don’t have them.

Appendix B
Draft Criteria – Firewise Leadership Awards

DRAFT

FIREWISE AWARDS- NATIONAL/REGIONAL/STATE/COMMUNITY

The NWCG Wildland Urban Interface Working Team and NFPA sponsor the annual Firewise awards program. The Firewise awards program intent is to support Firewise efforts at all levels by recognizing individuals and organizations that show exceptional effort in this program.

Nominations for awards will be solicited in November with a deadline for nominations received January 31. Awards will be presented in Spring or Summer utilizing opportune gatherings such as regional meetings, etc.

There are 6 awards to be given to organizations that promote and support Firewise and 2 awards to be given to communities who show exceptional Firewise leadership.

Organizations or individuals may receive awards at the National level (1 per year), at the geographic region level (2 per year) and at the State level (3 per year).

National level awards(may apply some name synonymous to gold, silver, bronze) are given for organizations or individuals that have worked on a broad level to make significant impact on the Firewise program beyond the regional geographic level and preferably causing National impact on the program. Sustained outstanding service is preferred. A maximum of one award is given per year.

Regional geographical awards are given for organizations or individuals that worked within their geographical area to make a significant impact across boundaries of more than one state or causing favorable impact on Firewise over a geographic region. Service to the Firewise program for two or more years is preferred for nominees in this category. A maximum of 2 awards are given per year.

State Firewise awards are given to organizations or individuals who provide outstanding service with significant impact within a state with sustained service for more than a year. A maximum of 3 awards are given per year.

Community Firewise awards are given to organizations or individuals within a community who show leadership, not just practicing Firewise principles, but advocating and providing guidance and leadership to others. A maximum of 3 awards are given per year.

Eligibility:

Eligible Firewise efforts are not limited to any particular activities but may include efforts and or innovations in engineering, program communications and advertising, exhibits and other informational programs, success in involving communities, collaboration across agency jurisdictions, special partnerships, and promotion of Firewise programs.

Firewise awards must relate to wildland fire mitigation activities. Credit will not be given for provision of suppression equipment, fire suppression training, etc. Efforts must relate to mitigating the effects of a wildfire on a community or communities.

Fire prevention in its purest sense does not qualify for Firewise awards nor do fire management activities relating to fire suppression or preparedness.

In order to be awarded, activities must be out of the planning stage and in process of execution or completed.

Organizations, agencies, and individuals are eligible to receive Firewise awards.

Award Standards:

Nominees may receive more than one Firewise award over the course of several years but only one award will be provided for each particular effort. The scope of an effort may increase from local to regional to national with appropriate awards of scope being offered. Unsuccessful nominees may be resubmitted.

A nominee may receive both a Smokey Bear award and a Firewise award for the same effort if both programs make the award.

Firewise efforts, in order to be awardable, must be directed to the general public, communities, or key audiences. Measurable success contributing to the Firewise program as well as innovation and ability to duplicate are important attributes for success of an effort.

Criteria:

The following criteria will be used to rate all nominations. Exceptional efforts, unexpected from the normal scope of an agency or individual's job should be part of the focus for the nomination. Only criteria applicable to each individual nomination should be addressed.

General Applicability:

- Does the effort synergize or multiply causing other efforts to be more successful?
- Does the effort tie into and support the National Firewise effort?
- Does the effort utilize the National Firewise Program products (brochures, web site, logo, Firewise Communities USA, etc.) properly?
- Will the effort have a lasting impact?

Impact:

- How did the effort impact Firewise as a program?
- Did Firewise receive media coverage as a result of the effort and at what level?
- Was the effort recognized by others such as an agency, community, etc.?

- Was there a plan for the effort, was the plan followed, and were the results measured? Explain.
- Were the costs of the effort commensurate with the benefits?
- What was the scale of the effort?
- Is the effort durable, long lasting?
- Was the effort beyond the normal scope of the nominee's regular programs?
- Did the project involve cultural diversity or outreach to underserved individuals?

Collaboration:

- Were partners used to extend the effectiveness of the effort?
- Have any agencies or organizations become supporters of Firewise because of the effort?

Special Values:

- Was this effort a result of leadership, innovation, creativity or extra effort by the nominee?
- Did the effort cause spin offs or synergy or was the effort a catalyst for additional efforts?

- Was the effort original; something new that is not already being done elsewhere but could be and would be worth replicating?
- How was the effort funded?
- Has the effort been tested by wildfire?