



# Asotin County, Washington

## Community Wildfire Protection Plan

**Public Review Draft**

**October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2007**

---

***Vision:*** Institutionalize and promote a countywide wildfire hazard mitigation ethic through leadership, professionalism, and excellence, leading the way to a safe, sustainable Asotin County.

---



*Rockpile Fire July 2007*

---

This plan was developed by the Asotin County Community Wildfire Protection Plan Planning committee in cooperation with Northwest Management, Inc., 233 E. Palouse River Dr., P.O. Box 9748, Moscow, ID, 83843, Tel: 208-883-4488, [www.Consulting-Foresters.com](http://www.Consulting-Foresters.com)

# Acknowledgments

This Community Wildfire Protection Plan represents the efforts and cooperation of a number of organizations and agencies; through the commitment of people working together to improve the preparedness for hazard events while reducing factors of risk.



Asotin County Commissioners  
and the employees of Asotin County



WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF  
**Natural Resources**

Washington State Department of Natural Resources



Asotin County Conservation District



USDA Forest Service



USDI Fish & Wildlife Service



Asotin County Fire District #1



City of Asotin Fire Department



City of Clarkston Fire Department



U.S. Army Corps of Engineers



USDI Bureau of Land Management

City of Asotin

Town of Anatone



City of Clarkston



Blue Mountain Resource Conservation & Development Council

&

Local Businesses and Citizens of Asotin County

To obtain copies of this plan contact:

Asotin County Courthouse  
135 2<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Asotin, Washington 99402

Phone: 509-243-2060  
Fax: 509-243-2005  
Website: [www.co.asotin.wa.us](http://www.co.asotin.wa.us)

# Table of Contents

<b>CHAPTER I</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>1 OVERVIEW OF THIS PLAN AND ITS DEVELOPMENT</b> .....	<b>6</b>
1.1 GOALS AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES.....	6
1.1.1 <i>Federal Emergency Management Agency Philosophy</i> .....	6
1.1.2 <i>United States Government Accounting Office (GAO)</i> .....	7
1.1.3 <i>Additional State and Federal Guidelines Adopted</i> .....	8
1.1.3.1 National Fire Plan.....	9
1.1.3.2 Washington Statewide Implementation Strategy.....	10
1.1.3.2.1 County Wildland Fire Interagency Group.....	10
1.1.3.3 National Association of State Foresters.....	11
1.1.3.3.1 Identifying and Prioritizing Communities at Risk.....	11
1.1.3.3.2 Conceptual Approach.....	12
1.1.3.4 Healthy Forests Restoration Act.....	13
1.1.4 <i>Planning Philosophy and Goals</i> .....	14
1.1.4.1 Asotin County Fire Mitigation Planning Effort and Philosophy.....	14
1.1.4.1.1 Mission Statement.....	14
1.1.4.1.2 Vision Statement.....	14
1.1.4.1.3 Goals.....	14
1.1.5 <i>Integration with Other Planning Efforts</i> .....	15
1.1.5.1 Asotin County Comprehensive Plan – 1999.....	15
1.1.5.2 Asotin County Zoning Ordinance – April 2001.....	15
<b>CHAPTER 2</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>2 DOCUMENTING THE PLANNING PROCESS</b> .....	<b>17</b>
2.1 DESCRIPTION OF THE PLANNING PROCESS.....	17
2.2 THE PLANNING TEAM.....	17
2.2.1 <i>Multi-Jurisdictional Participation</i> .....	18
2.3 PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETINGS.....	19
2.3.1.1 Committee Meeting Minutes.....	20
2.3.1.1.1 March 29 <sup>th</sup> , 2007 – Asotin County Aquatic Center.....	20
2.3.1.1.2 May 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 2007 – Asotin County Aquatic Center.....	22
2.3.1.1.3 June 7 <sup>th</sup> , 2007 – Asotin County Aquatic Center.....	24
2.3.1.1.4 July 11 <sup>th</sup> , 2007 – Asotin County Fire District #1 Station.....	25
2.3.1.1.5 August 15 <sup>th</sup> , 2007 – Asotin County Fire District #1 Station.....	26
2.3.1.1.6 September 19 <sup>th</sup> , 2007 – Asotin County Fire District #1 Station.....	27
2.4 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT.....	28
2.4.1 <i>News Releases</i> .....	28
2.4.2 <i>Public Mail Survey</i> .....	28
2.4.2.1 Survey Results.....	29
2.4.3 <i>Public Meetings</i> .....	31
2.4.4 <i>Documented Review Process</i> .....	34
2.4.5 <i>Continued Public Involvement</i> .....	35
<b>CHAPTER 3</b> .....	<b>36</b>
<b>3 ASOTIN COUNTY CHARACTERISTICS</b> .....	<b>36</b>
3.1 DEMOGRAPHICS.....	36
3.2 SOCIOECONOMICS.....	37
3.2.1 <i>Description of Asotin County</i> .....	39
3.2.1.1 Land Use.....	39
3.3 CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	40
3.3.1 <i>National Register of Historic Places</i> .....	40
3.4 TRANSPORTATION & INFRASTRUCTURE.....	40
3.4.1 <i>Communication Sites and Lookouts</i> .....	41

3.5	VEGETATION & CLIMATE .....	41
3.5.1	<i>Monthly Climate Summaries in Asotin County</i> .....	42
3.5.1.1	Asotin, Washington.....	42
3.5.1.2	Anatone, Washington.....	42
3.6	ECOSYSTEMS .....	43
3.7	HYDROLOGY .....	43
3.8	AIR QUALITY .....	45
3.8.1	<i>Washington State Smoke Management Plan</i> .....	45
<b>CHAPTER 4.....</b>		<b>48</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>RISK AND PREPAREDNESS ASSESSMENTS.....</b>	<b>48</b>
4.1	WILDLAND FIRE CHARACTERISTICS .....	48
4.1.1	<i>Weather</i> .....	48
4.1.2	<i>Topography</i> .....	48
4.1.3	<i>Fuels</i> .....	49
4.2	WILDFIRE HAZARDS .....	49
4.2.1	<i>Wildfire Ignition Profile</i> .....	49
4.2.1.1	Washington Department of Natural Resources .....	50
4.2.1.2	U.S. Forest Service .....	51
4.2.2	<i>Wildfire Extent Profile</i> .....	52
4.3	WILDFIRE HAZARD ASSESSMENT .....	55
4.3.1	<i>Fire Prone Landscapes</i> .....	55
4.3.2	<i>Historic Fire Regime</i> .....	58
4.3.2.1	Historic Fire Function .....	58
4.3.2.2	General Limitations.....	59
4.3.3	<i>Fire Regime Condition Class</i> .....	60
4.4	ASOTIN COUNTY CONDITIONS .....	62
4.5	ASOTIN COUNTY’S WILDLAND-URBAN INTERFACE .....	64
4.5.1	<i>Potential WUI Treatments</i> .....	68
4.6	ASOTIN COUNTY COMMUNITIES AT RISK.....	68
4.7	COMMUNITIES AND PLACES IN ASOTIN COUNTY .....	69
4.7.1	<i>Overall Fuels Assessment</i> .....	70
4.7.2	<i>Overall Mitigation Activities</i> .....	71
4.7.3	<i>Incorporated Cities</i> .....	74
4.7.3.1	Clarkston.....	74
4.7.3.1.1	Fuels Assessment .....	74
4.7.3.1.2	Ingress-Egress .....	75
4.7.3.1.3	Infrastructure .....	75
4.7.3.1.4	Fire Protection.....	75
4.7.3.1.5	Potential Mitigation Activities .....	75
4.7.3.2	Asotin.....	75
4.7.3.2.1	Fuels Assessment .....	76
4.7.3.2.2	Ingress-Egress .....	76
4.7.3.2.3	Infrastructure .....	76
4.7.3.2.4	Fire Protection.....	77
4.7.3.2.5	Potential Mitigation Activities .....	77
4.7.4	<i>Towns</i> .....	77
4.7.4.1	Anatone.....	77
4.7.4.1.1	Fuels Assessment .....	78
4.7.4.1.2	Ingress-Egress .....	78
4.7.4.1.3	Infrastructure.....	78
4.7.4.1.4	Fire Protection.....	79
4.7.4.1.5	Potential Mitigation Activities .....	79
4.7.4.2	Rogersburg.....	79
4.7.4.2.1	Fuels Assessment .....	80
4.7.4.2.2	Ingress-Egress .....	80
4.7.4.2.3	Infrastructure .....	80
4.7.4.2.4	Fire Protection.....	80

4.7.4.2.5	Potential Mitigation Activities .....	81
4.7.5	<i>Communities in Rangeland / Agricultural Environments</i> .....	81
4.7.6	<i>Communities in Woodland / Forest Environments</i> .....	81
4.8	FIREFIGHTING RESOURCES AND CAPABILITIES .....	82
4.8.1	<i>Asotin County Fire District #1</i> .....	82
4.8.2	<i>City of Clarkston Fire Department</i> .....	85
4.8.3	<i>City of Asotin Fire Department</i> .....	87
4.9	WILDLAND FIRE DISTRICTS .....	88
4.9.1	<i>Fields Spring State Park</i> .....	88
4.9.2	<i>Washington Department of Natural Resources</i> .....	88
4.9.3	<i>USDA Forest Service</i> .....	90
4.10	ISSUES FACING ASOTIN COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION .....	93
4.10.1	<i>Fuels Risk in Populated Areas</i> .....	93
4.10.2	<i>Accessibility</i> .....	93
4.10.3	<i>Fires in Conservation Reserve Program Fields</i> .....	94
4.10.4	<i>Lack of Fire Protection in Rural Areas</i> .....	94
4.10.5	<i>Firefighting Agency to Landowner Communications</i> .....	95
4.10.6	<i>Landowner Equipment Contracting</i> .....	96
4.10.7	<i>Access to Private Property During Wildfires</i> .....	96
4.10.8	<i>Road Signage and Rural Addressing</i> .....	97
4.11	CURRENT WILDFIRE MITIGATION ACTIVITIES IN ASOTIN COUNTY .....	97
4.11.1	<i>Multi-Jurisdictional Mutual Aid Agreements</i> .....	97
<b>CHAPTER 5</b> .....		<b>98</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>ADMINISTRATION &amp; ACTION ITEMS .....</b>	<b>98</b>
5.1	PRIORITIZATION OF MITIGATION ACTIVITIES.....	98
5.1.1	<i>Prioritization Scheme</i> .....	99
5.1.1.1	Benefit / Cost (BC) .....	100
5.1.1.2	Population Benefit .....	100
5.1.1.3	Property Benefit .....	101
5.1.1.4	Economic Benefit.....	101
5.1.1.5	Vulnerability of the Community .....	101
5.1.1.6	Project Feasibility (Environmentally, Politically & Socially) .....	101
5.1.1.7	Hazard Magnitude/Frequency .....	101
5.1.1.8	Potential for repetitive loss reduction.....	102
5.1.1.9	Potential to mitigate hazards to future development .....	102
5.1.1.10	Potential project effectiveness and sustainability .....	102
5.1.1.11	Final ranking.....	102
5.2	POSSIBLE WILDFIRE MITIGATION ACTIVITIES .....	102
5.3	SAFETY & POLICY .....	103
5.4	PEOPLE AND STRUCTURES .....	106
5.5	INFRASTRUCTURE .....	110
5.6	RESOURCE AND CAPABILITY ENHANCEMENTS .....	113
5.7	PROPOSED PROJECT AREAS .....	116
5.7.1	<i>Proposed Home Defensible Space Projects</i> .....	116
5.7.2	<i>Proposed Community Defensible Zone Projects</i> .....	118
5.7.3	<i>Proposed Fuels Reduction Projects</i> .....	120
5.7.4	<i>Proposed Roadside Fuels Treatment Projects</i> .....	122
5.8	REGIONAL LAND MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS.....	124
5.8.1	<i>Conservation Reserve Program</i> .....	124
5.8.2	<i>USDA Forest Service Projects</i> .....	126
<b>CHAPTER 6</b> .....		<b>129</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>SUPPORTING INFORMATION.....</b>	<b>129</b>
6.1	LIST OF TABLES .....	129
6.2	LIST OF FIGURES .....	130

6.3 SIGNATURE PAGES .....131  
6.3.1 *Local Government* .....131  
6.3.2 *Signatures of Participation by Asotin County Fire District and Departments* .....132  
6.3.3 *Signatures of Participation by other Asotin County Entities* .....133  
6.4 LITERATURE CITED .....134

# Chapter I

## 1 Overview of this Plan and its Development

This Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) for Asotin County, Washington, is the result of analyses, professional cooperation and collaboration, assessments of wildfire risks and other factors considered with the intent to reduce the potential for wildfires to threaten people, structures, infrastructure, and unique ecosystems in Asotin County, Washington. The planning committee responsible for implementing this project was led by the Asotin County Commissioners. Agencies and organizations that participated in the planning process included:

- Asotin County Commissioners and County Departments
- City of Asotin
- City of Clarkston
- Asotin County Fire Districts
- City of Asotin Fire Department
- City of Clarkston Fire Department
- Washington Department of Natural Resources
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- Bennett Lumber Company
- Clearwater Power
- Bonneville Power Administration
- Washington Parks and Recreation
- USDI Bureau of Land Management
- Asotin County Conservation District
- Blue Mountain Resource Conservation and Development Council
- USDA Forest Service
- Northwest Management, Inc.

The Asotin County planning committee met regularly during 2007 to establish the committee structure, goals, and strategies. In December and January 2006 - 07, Asotin County in conjunction with neighboring Columbia County and Garfield County solicited competitive bids from companies to provide the service of leading the assessment, developing the data, and writing the **Asotin County Community Wildfire Protection Plan**. Northwest Management, Inc. was selected to provide this service to the Tri – County area. Northwest Management, Inc. (NMI) is a professional natural resources consulting firm located in Moscow, Idaho. Established in 1984, NMI provides natural resource management services across the USA. The Project Co-Managers from Northwest Management, Inc. were Mr. Vaiden Bloch and Mrs. Tera R. King.

### 1.1 *Goals and Guiding Principles*

#### 1.1.1 **Federal Emergency Management Agency Philosophy**

Effective November 1, 2004, a Hazard Mitigation Plan approved by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is required for Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) and

Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program (PDM) eligibility. The HMGP and PDM program provide funding, through state emergency management agencies, to support local mitigation planning and projects to reduce potential disaster damages.

The local Hazard Mitigation Plan requirements for HMGP and PDM eligibility are based on the Disaster Mitigation Act (DMA) of 2000, which amended the Stafford Disaster Relief Act to promote an integrated, cost effective approach to mitigation. Local Hazard Mitigation Plans must meet the minimum requirements of the Stafford Act-Section 322, as outlined in the criteria contained in 44 CFR Part 201. The plan criteria cover the planning process, risk assessment, mitigation strategy, plan maintenance, and adoption requirements.

FEMA only reviews a local Hazard Mitigation Plan submitted through the appropriate State Hazard Mitigation Officer (SHMO). Draft versions of local Hazard Mitigation Plans are not reviewed by FEMA. FEMA reviews the final version of a plan prior to local adoption to determine if the plan meets the criteria, but FEMA will not approve it prior to adoption.

A FEMA designed plan is evaluated on its adherence to a variety of criteria.

- Adoption by the Local Governing Body
- Multi-jurisdictional Plan Adoption
- Multi-jurisdictional Planning Participation
- Documentation of Planning Process
- Identifying Hazards
- Profiling Hazard Events
- Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Assets
- Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses
- Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends
- Multi-jurisdictional Risk Assessment
- Local Hazard Mitigation Goals
- Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Measures
- Implementation of Mitigation Measures
- Multi-jurisdictional Mitigation Strategy
- Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan
- Implementation Through Existing Programs
- Continued Public Involvement

In Washington the SHMO is:

Mark Stewart  
Washington Military Department  
Emergency Management Division  
Building 20, M/S: TA-20  
Camp Murray, WA 98430-5122

The Asotin County Community Wildfire Protection Plan fulfills all of the requirements for a wildfire chapter of a local hazard mitigation plan.

### **1.1.2 United States Government Accounting Office (GAO)**

Since 1984, wildland fires have burned an average of more than 850 homes each year in the United States and, because more people are moving into fire-prone areas bordering wildlands, the number of homes at risk is likely to grow. The primary responsibility for ensuring that preventative steps are taken to protect homes lies with homeowners and state and local governments, not the federal government. Although losses from wildland fires made up only 2

percent of all insured catastrophic losses from 1983 to 2002, fires can result in billions of dollars in damages.

Once a wildland fire starts, various parties can be mobilized to fight it including federal, state, local, and tribal firefighting agencies and, in some cases, the military. The ability to communicate among all parties - known as interoperability - is essential but, as GAO reported previously, is hampered because different public safety agencies operate on different radio frequencies or use incompatible communications equipment (GAO 2005).

GAO was asked to assess, among other issues, (1) measures that can help protect structures from wildland fires, (2) factors affecting use of protective measures, and (3) the role technology plays in improving firefighting agencies' ability to communicate during wildland fires.

The two most effective measures for protecting structures from wildland fires are: (1) creating and maintaining a buffer, called defensible space, from 30 to 100 feet wide around a structure, where vegetation and other flammable objects are reduced or eliminated; and (2) using fire-resistant roofs and vents. In addition to roofs and vents, other technologies – such as fire-resistant windows and building materials, chemical agents, sprinklers, and geographic information systems mapping – can help in protecting structures and communities, but they play a secondary role.

Although protective measures are available, many property owners have not adopted them because of the time or expense involved, competing concerns such as aesthetics or privacy, misperceptions about wildland fire risks, and lack of awareness of their shared responsibility for fire protection. Federal, state, and local governments, as well as other organizations, are attempting to increase property owners' use of protective measures through education, direct monetary assistance, and laws requiring such measures. In addition, some insurance companies have begun to direct property owners in high risk areas to take protective steps.

Existing technologies, such as audio switches, can help link incompatible communication systems, and new technologies, such as software-defined radios, are being developed following common standards or with enhanced capabilities to overcome incompatibility barriers. Technology alone, however, cannot solve communications problems for those responding to wildland fires. Rather, planning and coordination among federal, state, and local public safety agencies is needed to resolve issues such as which technologies to adopt, cost sharing, operating procedures, training, and maintenance. The Department of Homeland Security is leading federal efforts to improve communications interoperability across all levels of government. In addition to federal efforts, several states and local jurisdictions are pursuing initiatives to improve communications interoperability.

### **1.1.3 Additional State and Federal Guidelines Adopted**

This Community Wildfire Protection Plan will include compatibility with the guidelines proposed in the National Fire Plan, the Washington Statewide Implementation Plan, and the Healthy Forests Restoration Act (2004). This Community Wildfire Protection Plan has been prepared in compliance with:

- The National Fire Plan; A Collaborative Approach for Reducing Wildland Fire Risks to Communities and the Environment 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan–May 2002.
- The Washington Statewide Implementation Strategy for the National Fire Plan–July 2002.
- Healthy Forests Restoration Act (2004)

***“When implemented, the 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy will contribute to reducing the risks of wildfire to communities and the environment by building collaboration at all levels of government.”***

**- The NFP 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy August 2001**

The objective of combining these three complimentary guidelines is to facilitate an integrated wildland fire risk assessment, identify pre-hazard mitigation activities, and prioritize activities and efforts to achieve the protection of people, structures, the environment, and significant infrastructure in Asotin County while facilitating new opportunities for pre-disaster mitigation funding and cooperation.

### **1.1.3.1 National Fire Plan**

The goals of this Community Wildfire Protection Plan include:

1. Improve Fire Prevention and Suppression
2. Reduce Hazardous Fuels
3. Restore Fire-Adapted Ecosystems
4. Promote Community Assistance

Its three guiding principles are:

1. Priority setting that emphasizes the protection of communities and important watersheds at-risk.
2. Collaboration among governments and broadly representative stakeholders
3. Accountability through performance measures and monitoring for results.

This Community Wildfire Protection Plan fulfills the National Fire Plan’s 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy and the Washington Statewide Implementation Strategy for the National Fire Plan. The projects and activities recommended under this plan are in addition to other Federal, state, and private / corporate forest and rangeland management activities. The implementation plan does not alter, diminish, or expand the existing jurisdiction, statutory and regulatory responsibilities and authorities or budget processes of participating Federal, State, and tribal agencies.

By endorsing this implementation plan, all signed parties agree that reducing the threat of wildland fire to people, communities, and ecosystems will require:

- Firefighter and public safety continuing as the highest priority.
- A sustained, long-term and cost-effective investment of resources by all public and private parties, recognizing overall budget parameters affecting Federal, State, Tribal, and local governments.
- A unified effort to implement the collaborative framework called for in the Strategy in a manner that ensures timely decisions at each level.
- Accountability for measuring and monitoring performance and outcomes, and a commitment to factoring findings into future decision making activities.
- The achievement of national goals through action at the local level with particular attention on the unique needs of cross-boundary efforts and the importance of funding on-the-ground activities.
- Communities and individuals in the wildland-urban interface to initiate personal stewardship and volunteer actions that will reduce wildland fire risks.

- Management activities, both in the wildland-urban interface and in at-risk areas across the broader landscape.
- Active forestland and rangeland management, including thinning that produces commercial or pre-commercial products, biomass removal and utilization, prescribed fire and other fuels reduction tools to simultaneously meet long-term ecological, economic, and community objectives.

The National Fire Plan identifies a three-tiered organization structure including 1) the local level, 2) state/regional and tribal level, and 3) the national level. This plan adheres to the collaboration and outcomes consistent with a local level plan. Local level collaboration involves participants with direct responsibility for management decisions affecting public and/or private land and resources, fire protection responsibilities, or good working knowledge and interest in local resources. Participants in this planning process include Tribal representatives, local representatives from Federal and State agencies, local governments, landowners and other stakeholders, and community-based groups with a demonstrated commitment to achieving the strategy's four goals. Existing resource advisory committees, watershed councils, or other collaborative entities may serve to achieve coordination at this level. Local involvement, expected to be broadly representative, is a primary source of planning, project prioritization, and resource allocation and coordination at the local level. The role of the private citizen is not to be underestimated, as their input and contribution to all phases of risk assessments, mitigation activities, and project implementation is greatly facilitated by their involvement.

### **1.1.3.2 Washington Statewide Implementation Strategy**

The Strategy adopted by the State of Washington is to provide a framework for an organized and coordinated approach to the implementation of the National Fire Plan, specifically the national "10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan".

Emphasis is on a collaborative approach at the following levels:

- County
- State

Within the State of Washington, the counties, with the assistance of State and Federal agencies and local expert advice, will develop a risk assessment and mitigation plan to identify local vulnerabilities to wildland fire. A Statewide group will provide oversight and prioritization as needed on a statewide scale.

This strategy is not intended to circumvent any work done to date and individual counties should not delay implementing any National Fire Plan projects to develop this county plan. Rather, counties are encouraged to identify priority needs quickly and begin whatever actions necessary to mitigate those vulnerabilities.

It is recognized that implementation activities such as; hazardous fuel treatment, equipment purchases, training, home owner education, community wildland fire mitigation planning, and other activities, will be occurring concurrently with this countywide planning effort.

#### **1.1.3.2.1 County Wildland Fire Interagency Group**

Each county within the State has been requested to write a Wildland Fire Mitigation Plan. These plans should contain at least the following five elements:

- 1) Documentation of the process used to develop the mitigation plan. How the plan was developed, who was involved and how the public was involved.

- 2) A risk assessment to identify vulnerabilities to wildfire in the wildland-urban interface (WUI).
- 3) A prioritized mitigation strategy that addresses each of the risks. Examples of these strategies could be: training for fire departments, public education, hazardous fuel treatments, equipment, communications, additional planning, new facilities, infrastructure improvements, code and/or ordinance revision, volunteer efforts, evacuation plans, etc.
- 4) A process for maintenance of the plan which will include monitoring and evaluation of mitigation activities
- 5) Documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the involved agencies. Basically a signature page of all involved officials.

This five-element plan is an abbreviated version of the FEMA mitigation plan and will begin to meet the requirements for that plan.

### **1.1.3.3 National Association of State Foresters**

#### **1.1.3.3.1 Identifying and Prioritizing Communities at Risk**

This plan is written with the intent to provide the information necessary for decision makers (elected officials) to make informed decisions in order to prioritize projects across the entire county. These decisions may be made from within the council of Commissioners, or through the recommendations of ad hoc groups tasked with making prioritized lists of projects. It is not necessary to rank projects numerically, although that is one approach, rather it may be possible to rank them categorically (high priority set, medium priority set, and so forth) and still accomplish the goals and objectives set forth in this planning document.

The following was prepared by the National Association of State Foresters (NASF), June 27, 2003, and is included here as a reference for the identification of prioritizing treatments between communities.

**Purpose:** To provide national, uniform guidance for implementing the provisions of the “Collaborative Fuels Treatment” MOU, and to satisfy the requirements of Task e, Goal 4 of the Implementation Plan for the 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy.

**Intent:** The intent is to establish broad, nationally compatible standards for identifying and prioritizing communities at risk, while allowing for maximum flexibility at the state and regional level. Three basic premises are:

- Include all lands and all ownerships.
- Use a collaborative process that is consistent with the complexity of land ownership patterns, resource management issues, and the number of interested stakeholders.
- Set priorities by evaluating projects, not by ranking communities.

The National Association of State Foresters (NASF) set forth the following guidelines in the Final Draft Concept Paper; Communities at Risk, December 2, 2002.

**Task:** Develop a definition for “communities at risk” and a process for prioritizing them, per the Implementation Plan for the 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy (Goal 4.e.). In addition, this definition will form the foundation for the NASF commitment to annually identify priority fuels reduction and ecosystem restoration projects in the proposed MOU with the federal agencies (section C.2 (b)).

### 1.1.3.3.2 Conceptual Approach

1. NASF fully supports the definition of the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) previously published in the Federal Register. Further, proximity to federal lands should not be a consideration. The WUI is a set of conditions that exists on, or near, areas of wildland fuels nation-wide, regardless of land ownership.
2. Communities at risk (or, alternately, landscapes of similar risk) should be identified on a state-by-state basis with the involvement of all agencies with wildland fire protection responsibilities: state, local, tribal, and federal.
3. It is neither reasonable nor feasible to attempt to prioritize communities on a rank order basis. Rather, communities (or landscapes) should be sorted into three, broad categories or zones of risk: high, medium, and low. Each state, in collaboration with its local partners, will develop the specific criteria it will use to sort communities or landscapes into the three categories. NASF recommends using the publication “Wildland/Urban Interface Fire Hazard Assessment Methodology” developed by the National Wildland/Urban Interface Fire Protection Program (circa 1998) as a reference guide. (This program, which has since evolved into the Firewise Program, is under the oversight of the National Wildfire Coordinating Group (NWCG)). At minimum, states should consider the following factors when assessing the relative degree of exposure each community (landscape) faces.
  - **Risk:** Using historic fire occurrence records and other factors, assess the anticipated probability of a wildfire ignition.
  - **Hazard:** Assess the fuel conditions surrounding the community using a methodology such as fire condition class, or [other] process.
  - **Values Protected:** Evaluate the human values associated with the community or landscape, such as homes, businesses, and community infrastructure (e.g. water systems, utilities, transportation systems, critical care facilities, schools, manufacturing and industrial sites, and high value commercial timber lands).
  - **Protection Capabilities:** Assess the wildland fire protection capabilities of the agencies and local fire departments with jurisdiction.
4. Prioritize by project not by community. Annually prioritize projects within each state using the collaborative process defined in the national, interagency MOU “For the Development of a Collaborative Fuels Treatment Program”. Assign the highest priorities to projects that will provide the greatest benefits either on the landscape or to communities. Attempt to properly sequence treatments on the landscape by working first around and within communities, and then moving further out into the surrounding landscape. This will require:
  - First, focus on the zone of highest overall risk but consider projects in all zones. Identify a set of projects that will effectively reduce the level of risk to communities within the zone.
  - Second, determining the community’s willingness and readiness to actively participate in an identified project.
  - Third, determining the willingness and ability of the owner of the surrounding land to undertake, and maintain, a complementary project.

- Last, set priorities by looking for projects that best meet the three criteria above. It is important to note that projects with the greatest potential to reduce risk to communities and the landscape may not be those in the highest risk zone, particularly if either the community or the surrounding landowner is not willing or able to actively participate.
5. It is important, and necessary, that we be able to demonstrate a level of accomplishment that justifies to Congress the value of continuing the current level of appropriations for the National Fire Plan. Although appealing to appropriators and others, it is not likely that many communities (if any) will ever be removed from the list of communities at risk. Even after treatment, all communities will remain at some, albeit reduced, level of risk. However, by using a science-based system for measuring relative risk, we can likely show that, after treatment (or a series of treatments); communities are at “*reduced risk*”.

Similarly, scattered, individual homes that complete projects to create defensible space could be “counted” as “households at reduced risk”. This would be a way to report progress in reducing risk to scattered homes in areas of low priority for large-scale fuels treatment projects.

Using the concept described above, the NASF believes it is possible to accurately assess the relative risk that communities face from wildland fire. Recognizing that the condition of the vegetation (fuel) on the landscape is dynamic, assessments and re-assessments must be done on a state-by-state basis, using a process that allows for the integration of local knowledge, conditions, and circumstances, with science-based national guidelines. We must remember that it is not only important to lower the risk to communities, but once the risk has been reduced, to maintain those communities at a reduced risk.

Further, it is essential that both the assessment process and the prioritization of projects be done collaboratively, with all local agencies with fire protection jurisdiction – federal, state, local, and tribal – taking an active role.

#### **1.1.3.4 Healthy Forests Restoration Act**

On December 3, 2003, President Bush signed into law the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to reduce the threat of destructive wildfires while upholding environmental standards and encouraging early public input during review and planning processes. The legislation is based on sound science and helps further the President's Healthy Forests Initiative pledge to care for America's forests and rangelands, reduce the risk of catastrophic fire to communities, help save the lives of firefighters and citizens, and protect threatened and endangered species.

Among other things the Healthy Forests Restoration Act (HFRA):

- Strengthens public participation in developing high priority projects;
- Reduces the complexity of environmental analysis allowing federal land agencies to use the best science available to actively manage land under their protection;
- Creates a pre-decisional objections process encouraging early public participation in project planning; and
- Issues clear guidance for court action challenging HFRA projects.

The Asotin County Community Wildfire Protection Plan is developed to adhere to the principles of the HFRA while providing recommendations consistent with the policy document which should assist the federal land management agencies (US Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management) with implementing wildfire mitigation projects in Asotin County that incorporate

public involvement and the input from a wide spectrum of fire and emergency services providers in the region.

## **1.1.4 Planning Philosophy and Goals**

### **1.1.4.1 Asotin County Fire Mitigation Planning Effort and Philosophy**

The goals of this planning process include the integration of the National Fire Plan, the Washington Statewide Implementation Strategy, and the Healthy Forests Restoration Act. This effort will utilize the best and most appropriate science from all partners and integrate local and regional knowledge about wildfire risks and fire behavior while meeting the needs of local citizens, the regional economy, and the significance of this region to the rest of Washington and the Inland West.

#### **1.1.4.1.1 Mission Statement**

To make Asotin County residents, communities, state agencies, local governments, and businesses less vulnerable to the negative effects of wildland fires through the effective administration of wildfire hazard mitigation grant programs, hazard risk assessments, wise and efficient fuels treatments, and a coordinated approach to mitigation policy through federal, state, regional, and local planning efforts. Our combined prioritization will be the protection of people, structures, infrastructure, and unique ecosystems that contribute to our way of life and the sustainability of the local and regional economy.

#### **1.1.4.1.2 Vision Statement**

Institutionalize and promote a countywide wildfire hazard mitigation ethic through leadership, professionalism, and excellence, leading the way to a safe, sustainable Asotin County.

#### **1.1.4.1.3 Goals**

- Identify and map Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) boundaries for communities adjacent to forest lands
- To reduce the area of WUI land burned and losses experienced because of wildfires where these fires threaten communities in the wildland-urban interface
- Prioritize the protection of people, structures, infrastructure, natural resources, and unique ecosystems that contribute to our way of life and the sustainability of the local and regional economy
- To provide a plan that will not diminish the private property rights of landowners in Asotin County
- Educate communities about the unique challenges of wildfire in the wildland-urban interface (WUI)
- Recommend additional strategies for private, state, and federal lands to reduce hazardous fuel conditions and lessen the life safety and property damage risks from wildfires
- Improve fire agency's awareness of wildland fire threats, vulnerabilities, and mitigation opportunities or options
- Address structural ignitability and recommend measures that homeowners and communities can take to reduce the ignitability of structures

- Identify and evaluate hazardous fuel conditions with an emphasis near communities adjacent to forest lands, prioritize areas for hazardous fuel reduction treatments, and recommend the types and methods of treatment to protect the communities
- Provide opportunities for meaningful discussions among community members and local, state, and federal government representatives regarding their priorities for local fire protection and forest management
- Improve county and local fire agency's eligibility for funding assistance (National Fire Plan, Healthy Forest Restoration Act, FEMA, and other sources) to reduce wildfire hazards, prepare residents for wildfire situations, and enhance response capabilities
- Meet or exceed the requirements of the National Fire Plan and FEMA for a County level Community Wildfire Protection Plan

### **1.1.5 Integration with Other Planning Efforts**

During development of this Community Wildfire Protection Plan, several planning and management documents were reviewed in order to avoid conflicting goals and objectives. Existing programs and policies were reviewed in order to identify those that may weaken or enhance the mitigation objectives outlined in this document. The following sections identify and briefly describe some of the existing Asotin County planning documents and ordinances considered during development of this plan.

#### **1.1.5.1 Asotin County Comprehensive Plan – 1999**

With continued growth and change expected in the Asotin County region, it is important that the County formulate a clear vision for its future. The Comprehensive Plan provides the County with an opportunity to articulate that vision into reality. The citizens of Asotin County envision a community that respects and preserves its historical and cultural resources and provides an effective stewardship of its outstanding scenic and natural features; a community that maintains its historic rural identity while encouraging a balanced, cohesive yet diverse community as it grows, a community that continues to thrive in its location where residents' various physical, educational, economic, and social activities can be pursued in a safe, attractive, and healthy environment; and finally, a community that has an adequate tax base to provide a high level of service to its residents. The Plan represents the community's policy plan for growth over the next 20 years.

It is anticipated that the Community Wildfire Protection Plan will dovetail with the County Comprehensive Plan. Many of the wildfire assessments, goals, and projects as outlined by the CWPP planning committee will be considered as the Comprehensive Plan is updated.

#### **1.1.5.2 Asotin County Zoning Ordinance – April 2001**

The purpose of the Asotin County Zoning Ordinance is to promote the orderly development of the city according to a comprehensive plan; to reserve and stabilize the value of property; to encourage protection of critical areas of the environment; to protect the character and peculiar qualities of scenic areas and places of historic interest; to promote measures which preserve or improve the County's quality of life; and otherwise to promote the public health, safety, and general welfare.

It is anticipated that the Community Wildfire Protection Plan will assist local decision-makers by providing information on wildfire occurrence in Asotin County, which can be used to address zoning issues in high risk wildfire areas. Additionally, many of the wildfire assessments, goals,

and projects as outlined by the CWPP planning committee will be considered as the Comprehensive Plan is updated.