



To: Curry Wildfire Preparation Team
From: Kathy Lynn, Resource Innovations
Date: May 9, 2007
Re: Meeting Notes from the 5/3/07 CWPT Meeting

Curry County Wildfire Preparation Team Meeting Notes

Meeting Participants:

- Jeff Bonotto, Coos Forest Protective Association
- Michael Brace, Curry County Emergency Services Coordinator
- Toni Fisher, Curry County GIS Coordinator
- John Flannigan, Coos Forest Protective Association
- Roy Gilkey, Coos Forest Protective Association
- Megan Harper, Bureau of Land Management, Coos Bay District
- Kathy Lynn, Resource Innovations, University of Oregon
- Diane Morris, City of Brookings Planner
- Ryan Ojerio, Resource Innovations, University of Oregon
- Joanne Ruoff, Coos Forest Protective Association
- Bill Sharp, City of Brookings Fire Chief
- Jim Wolf, Wildfire Planning and Analysis

Upcoming Meetings/Events:

Event	Lead	Date/Time	Location
May CWPT Meeting	Kathy	Thursday, 5/31/07	Conference Call
June CWPT Meeting	Kathy	Thursday, 6/28/07	Gold Beach
July CWPT Meeting	Kathy	TBD	Conference Call?
Presentation to the Curry County Fire Chief's Association	Coordinate w/ Bill	TBD	TBD
Biomass forum	Kathy	TBD	TBD
Gold Beach Public Meeting	Kathy	Tuesday, 8/14/07	Gold Beach
Brookings Public Meeting	Kathy	Wednesday, 8/15/07	Brookings
Port Orford Public Meeting	Kathy	Thursday, 8/16/07	Port Orford

Updates

Kathy updated the group on efforts to reach out to stakeholders through letters and phone calls. The response has been positive and some expressed interest in the meetings and at least to be included on the email list. Stakeholder interviews will begin soon.

Earl Burke had expressed interest in continuing to participate in the group but would have to be involved as a volunteer. The group agreed that his participation would be valuable. Kathy and Megan agreed that they would talk with him about attending future meetings.

Goals and Objectives

The group reviewed the draft goals and objectives to make sure that important principles had been addressed. Kathy explained that the goals reflect the content and organization of the plan

and that one area that is not explicitly addressed in the goals is the structural vulnerability assessment.

The group discussed the fact that structural vulnerability is a thread that is woven throughout the goals and strategies and could be also reflected in the vision statement. The structural vulnerability information will be important in supporting grant applications and prioritizing implementation. It will also be important to bring to the public.

It is also important to ensure that these goals are congruent with the original intent of the grant. Kathy said that she would craft a vision statement, review the original grant, and incorporate structural vulnerability as a guiding principle. The group discussed the importance of making sure that the CWPP is consistent with other disaster planning documents and making those other documents accessible. Kathy mentioned that the implementation of the CWPP will support the preparation for all types of disasters, not just wildfire.

Planning and development is identified in one of the goals. The group discussed some of the issues with compliance, enforcement and funding. Kathy clarified that the CWPP would be a non-regulatory document, so there could be recommended actions and changes to codes, but it would be up to the appropriate decision makers to act on those recommendations.

In a comment passed on by Earl, he brought up the need to strengthen collaboration between landowners and between agencies as well as increasing defensibility and not just defensible space. Where the public is resistant to thinning, an adequate water supply is one possible action. Getting contractors to work with the landowners, especially the elderly is an effective action that was implemented after the Biscuit Fire, but that work needs to be revisited. Kathy commented that the special needs section of the plan will address these opportunities.

Next Steps

- Draft vision statement that includes the importance of structural vulnerability.
- Review the original grant to make sure that the goals meet the original intent of the funding.
- Highlight partnership with the County Assessors Office and County GIS in the plan.
- Follow up with Bill Sharp regarding his meeting with the County planning staff.

Issues to Address in the Future

- Some members of the public will be resistant to thinning
- Budget constraints in the wake of Secure Rural Schools funding gap
- Congruence in codes between County and City (urban side vs. the resource side?) Jim W. "Grants Pass is struggling with the same issues, County codes aren't as stringent, but City will at some point inherit that mess."

Potential Actions

- Create an internet site as a clearing house for information about related planning documents
- Create an internet site with evacuation information

Structural Vulnerability

Ryan presented the preliminary findings from the structural vulnerability assessment and the group discussed how the data could be analyzed to make it useful for the public, agencies and other stakeholders. Kathy cautioned that investing a lot of time in rating system may not be useful if we are not sure of how consistent or representative the data is. This could be particularly problematic as the analysis moves from the County level to the jurisdiction level. The group recommended three levels of analysis, at the county level, the zone level and by jurisdiction. At the jurisdiction level it will be useful to show each of the variables. At the zone and county level a rating system would be useful for the public to conceptual the broad issues that the county is faced with.

Jim discussed some of the science behind evaluating the relative weights of some of the variables and the group talked about how the variables could be combined to come up with an overall index of structural vulnerability. The group consensus was to develop an index composed of three groups of variables 1.) Structure ignitability 2.) Fuels and 3.) Defensibility. Jim talked about using the State Fire Marshal triage form and/or the NFPA methodology to develop a rating system. The group agreed that there was value in seeing how the County rated according to both methodologies. Jim also suggested that he could conduct the analysis based on the variables included in Senate Bill 360. The group also decided that the unit of analysis that is most practical is the lot rather than structures or houses.

The following table describes the audience and level of analysis for each of three geographic breakdowns.

	County	Zone	Jurisdiction
Audience	Commissioners, media, general public	Internal (CWPT and CFPA)	Information that will help the cities and fire districts with future planning
Factors to focus on	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Signage - Compare what is at risk with what can protect homes - Look at all of the things that can make something ignitable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Differences in data collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Worksheet with data on all variables - Compare with zoning codes - Identify actions for each fire district
Level of analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use NFPA, OSFM, and Senate Bill 360 rating systems - Provide analysis for each lot 	Frequencies	Frequencies

Next Steps

- Clarify data collection methods with the CFPA staff
- Apply the OSFM triage form criteria, NFPA methodology, and Senate Bill 360 criteria to the SVA data
- Present methodology and findings to the CWPT at the next meeting

Structural Vulnerability Data Collection Methods – (Lunch)

Ryan and Jim discussed the collection methods with each of the CFPA staff involved in the data collection and evaluation. Although there was some variation in the collection of a few variables, overall the evaluators' methods were consistent. Ryan and Jim will review the data set and recode some of the data to increase the validity of inter-zone comparisons and the countywide analysis.

Resource and Capability Assessment and County Profile

Ryan presented an outline of the Resource Capability Assessment findings and asked the group for their input on questions that came up during his research.

- Should the CWPP provide more detail about roles of members in an Emergency Operation Center?
No, the EOC structure is meant to be general and applicable to all types of disasters.
- What is the status of the call down system? Are there neighborhood phone trees in place?
There was some experimentation with a reverse 911 system, but it has not proven feasible. Agness and Winchuck have neighborhood phone tree systems and some rural areas may have informal social networks that serve this purpose.
- Are there barriers and limitations to Mutual Aid Agreements?
The agencies' ability to respond is a limitation. Agreements with private corporations are not formal and harder to keep up to date. The resource directory annex in the County EOP has a list of private companies that could provide resources in an emergency. The CFPA has some agreements with loggers.
- What information would we use to extract and summarize from the Mutual Aid Resource Directory? A reference to the Mutual Aid Resource Directory and Mutual Aid Agreements is all that is necessary.
- Is there a Fire Prevention Cooperative?
Yes, but it has not been as active as in the past. Forest Service staff who used to be involved are not active anymore.
- Which agencies are conducting Education and Outreach?
The OSU extension and the Curry Noxious Weed Group as well as the BLM are doing these types of activities.
- Has the CFPA received funds from the Western States Fire Managers WUI Grant Program? *No, just the NFP grant to do the structural vulnerability work.*
- What are some of the key challenges to capturing and administering grant funds?
The time and paperwork involved in application and administering is the biggest challenge. Often grants are not seen as a high priority. But with the eclipse of Secure Rural Schools Funding it will be a higher priority. The CFPA have used Title II and III

funds in the past and Chris Kline (sp?) with the Coos Bay BLM has also used these grant sources.

Public Outreach Strategy

Summary of Next Steps for the Public Outreach Strategy

- Resource Innovations will email a list of stakeholders to the CWPT so they can add to it.
- Resource Innovations will create a list of outreach outlets, newsletters, media, etc, as well as materials for the outreach process.
- Kathy circulated a press release on 5/7/07 about the planning process and the website for Wildfire Awareness week. Chief Sharp and Megan will integrate the release with broader press releases for the week.

Stakeholders

Stakeholders are people that would have an interest in the plan, but may not attend a public meeting. Kathy circulated a list of stakeholders and asked the group to write in additions. Megan suggested that the group find out how often these stakeholders want information and what format they would like it in. She also suggested that it would be useful to ask the stakeholders for contacts that are not currently on the list that should be included.

Public Meetings

The public meetings are an opportunity of people to learn about the issues, structural vulnerability findings, but also a chance for agency personnel to connect with the community. The group agreed that there should be three community events coinciding with the planning process in Gold Beach, Brookings, and Port Orford. The group agreed that the meetings could be held during the same week to piggy-back advertising efforts. The meetings should be after fire season begins in mid-June and after things slow down for the CFPA - typically the later part of July. The group agreed to tentatively plan the meetings for 8/14 – 8/16 in the evenings.

One challenge that the group identified was that some of the people in the outlying rural areas, may not attend a meeting in the city. Agness in particular is an isolated community, so having a meeting there would be beneficial. Communities to target outreach include Agness, Winchuck, Langlois, and Sixes. The group agreed that coordinating outreach efforts with existing events in these areas would be the best strategy. Venues suggested as possibilities for outreach included:

- County Fair (The CFPA will have a booth and can provide space to the CWPT)
- Community and fire district pancake feeds, BBQs, fish fry's, etc.
- The March Home Show in 2008.

Resource Innovations will generate a list of all summer community events; CWPT members will indicate which events they will be able to attend. Resource Innovations will also assemble an outreach kit(s) for CWPT members to use at these events.

Focus of the meetings

Megan raised the question about peoples' expectations of the public meetings. Are they thinking of coming out to learn about how to protect their homes, or are they coming out to comment and review the plan? Kathy posed these questions to the group: What is the objective of the public

meeting? What will make it useful for the agencies to implement the plan? The group agreed that both education and feedback on the plan would be helpful and they should happen at the same meeting. The group also agreed that the meeting should have some type of presentation and education component, but then switch to an open house format for dialogue. Other issues the group wants to address during the meetings include:

- Insurance issues
- Report on the CFPA assessments and what the ratings mean
- Information about the plan and education on what residents can do

Avenues for Publicity

- “Mom and Pop” email lists and newsletters. Example in Winchuck and Port Orford
- Local newsletters
- City website
- Northcurrycountynews.com
- Local cable access station

Risk Assessment

Jim presented his progress on the Risk Assessment. The comprehensive risk assessments, which is required in community wildfire protection plans will include five elements:

- Hazard (vegetation, climate, slope, aspect, topography, etc.)
- Risk (frequency of occurrence)
- Values
- Protection capability
- Structural vulnerability

Notes:

- Jim has created maps illustrating existing data; the maps can be downloaded from the website. These maps include WUI areas, poverty, fire management units, hazard information, historical fire occurrence, and protection capability.
- The state has defined a WUI zone using a broad assessment of the size of the community. The Southern Oregon Fire Management Plan established a WUI zone that is not as broad as the state assessment. For this plan, the committee will need to define the WUI.
- Jim suggested that the CWPT access the maps that he has put together on the website and provide him with feedback about how accurately the maps represent their knowledge of the areas that they are familiar with.

Biomass Utilization

Kathy talked about scheduling a presentation on Biomass Utilization. The Coquille Tribe is researching the feasibility of a biomass facility so they may be interested in coordinating with the CWPT. The City of Brookings also is interested in biomass and Glenn Harkleroad with the Coos Bay BLM is another stakeholder to coordinate with.

Agenda Items for Upcoming Meetings:

- Biomass Utilization
- Risk Assessment (specifically the fuels and protection capability layers)

- Structural Vulnerability Findings
- Presentation/dialogue with the Curry County Fire Chief's about the planning process (coordinate this presentation with Chief Sharp)