

GRANT COUNTY, OREGON

Community Wildfire Protection Plan



Prepared for:

Grant County
201 S. Humboldt Street, Box 280
Canyon City, OR 97820

Prepared by:

Irene K. Jerome
Jerome Natural Resource Consultants, Inc.
408 SE Hillcrest Rd.
John Day, OR 97845

www.grantcountycwpp.com

GRANT COUNTY
Community Wildfire Protection Plan

Table of Contents

- 1.0 Introduction..... 1**
 - 1.1 CWPP Purpose and Process..... 1**
 - 1.2 CWPP History..... 2**
 - 1.3 Need for Updated Plan..... 2**
 - 1.4 Introduction to Wildfire.....4**
 - 1.5 Missions, Goals & Objectives.....6**

- 2.0 Grant County Profile..... 9**
 - 2.1 History & General Information.....9**
 - 2.2 Existing Conditions.....11**
 - 2.3 Agency Protection Roles.....14**
 - 2.4 Emergency Management.....15**
 - 2.5 County Fire Districts.....16**
 - 2.6 Biomass Utilization & Economic Development.....26**
 - 2.7 CWPP Zones.....27**

- 3.0 Legislation, Policies, and Programs.....35**

- 4.0 Wildfire Risk Assessment.....41**
 - 4.1 Statewide Risk Assessment.....41**
 - 4.2 CWPP Risk Assessment Method.....41**
 - 4.3 CAR Risk Assessment.....44**
 - 4.4 County CWPP Zone Risk Assessment.....48**

- 5.0 Wildfire Mitigation Strategy.....52**
 - 5.1 Prioritization of WUI.....52**
 - 5.2 County Wide Strategy52**
 - 5.3 Strategy by Zone.....56**
 - 5.4 Obstacles Identified.....56**
 - 5.5 Continuing Actions.....59**

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 CWPP Purpose and Process

The Healthy Forests Restoration Act (HFRA) of 2003 provides the impetus for wildfire risk assessment and planning at the county and community level and specifically refers to communities that are at risk of fire coming off of Federal Lands. HFRA refers to this level of planning as Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPP). The purpose of the CWPP is for communities to take full responsibility and advantage of wildland fire and hazardous fuel management opportunities offered under HFRA legislation. The CWPP provides for the US Forest Service (USFS), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and other federal agencies to give consideration to the priorities of local communities for forest and rangeland management as well as hazardous fuel reduction projects.

As stated throughout this plan, the process of revising and updating the CWPP will help Grant County clarify and refine its priorities for the protection of life, property, critical infrastructure, significant recreation and scenic areas, and landscapes of historical, economic, or cultural value in the Wildland Urban Interface/Intermix (WUI).

The CWPP allows a community to evaluate its current situation with regards to wildfire risk and plan ways to reduce risk for protection of human welfare and other important economic, social or ecological values. The CWPP may address issues such as community wildfire risk, structure flammability, hazardous fuels and non-fuels mitigation, community preparedness, and emergency procedures. The CWPP should be tailored to meet the needs of the community. The CWPP process consists of the following steps:

- Organize the CWPP Committee – The committee should consist of local government, local fire authority, and state agencies responsible for forest management.
- Federal Agency Involvement – Representatives from the USFS and the BLM should be engaged in the CWPP process as consultants.
- Community Interested Parties – The CWPP committee must involve interested community members, private landowners, business, stakeholders, and interest groups in the planning process.
- Community Base Map – A community base map should be developed that may illustrate important features such as landownership, structures, roads, surface water, fire districts, or major utility corridors. The map's importance is that it illustrates community values from which recommendations concerning wildfire planning can occur.
- Develop a Community Wildfire Risk Assessment – The risk assessment will provide critical information to the CWPP committee to make informed decisions. Members should be actively involved in this step. Items that may be addressed include such things as risk of wildfire occurrence, structure hazard and risk, economic, social and ecological values at risk, local fire authority, preparedness and capability, and hazardous fuels.

- Hazard Reduction Priorities and Recommendations to Reduce Structure Flammability – Mitigation projects are identified and designed to reduce the risk of wildfire loss to the community and other values. Mitigation projects should be prioritized and may include such things as hazardous fuels management, improving the wildfire suppression capability of the local fire authority, developing a permanent water supply, reducing structure flammability, improving emergency procedures, and increasing public education.
- Develop an Action Plan and Assessment Strategy – The action plan should identify who will do what by when. Identify areas of concern and integrate common values. Community funds for hazard reduction projects through grants need to be obtained. The finished CWPP is essential for seeking grant money. Also, an assessment strategy needs to be in place to insure that the CWPP remains current and relevant for future years.
- Finalize the CWPP – The committee needs to agree and approve the CWPP and make sure that the recommend actions are implemented in timely manner.

1.2 Community Wildfire Plan History

The original Grant County Community Fire Protection Plan (GCCFPP) was prepared in 2004 and 2005. The Grant County Court adopted this hallmark plan, one of the first completed in the state of Oregon, on July 6, 2005. The GCCFPP was the result of a county wide effort initiated to reduce forest fire risk to citizens, to the environment, and to the quality of life within Grant County. Citizens, fire districts, elected officials, and state and federal agency representatives worked together to create a plan that would be successful in implementing fuels reduction projects, in promoting fire prevention education campaigns and in other fire-related programs. The 2005 GCCFPP was used as a template by several other counties in eastern Oregon.

1.3 Grant County Need for Updated CWPP

The GCCFPP has been in effect for the past six years. A look back at those years provides insight on the approach that will best utilize the strengths in the original plan as well as addressing areas that would benefit from improvement in the updated plan.

The strengths and successes of the 2005 plan include a significant number of acres that received fuels reduction treatments on both federal and private lands. In conjunction with the GCCFPP and the implementation of the HFRA, collaboration of various stakeholders has become extremely successful in the county. The Blue Mountains Forest Partners is a collaborative group that has been recognized statewide for its effectiveness and success. This partnership resulted form an earlier collaborative effort for a fuels reduction project on Canyon Creek. A biomass plant in the form of a compressed pellet facility was installed at a local facility in John Day.

Areas that were less successful pivot around the lack of a coordinator or specific individual responsible for coordinating and monitoring the implementation of the plan. Annual meetings were not conducted, data was not documented and kept up to date, changes to the WUI that were made at the county level were approved but documentation was not archived with the CWPP.

Areas for improvement based on the “lessons learned” from implementation of the 2005 GCCFP occur throughout this document.

The updated Grant County CWPP will be an umbrella plan that will provide information and support local-level CWPPs while utilizing the original 2005 community wildfire plan as a foundation. The revised Grant County CWPP will include a county-wide wildfire hazard assessment, county-wide community base map, and a discussion of the county’s wildfire suppression situation. Communities will be strongly encouraged to develop a CWPP at the local level to provide site specific information and to prioritize hazard analysis, fuels reduction projects, community values at risk, etc.


CWPPs help protect and prepare communities in the event of a wildfire. If your community resides in the WUI and you believe there is a risk of wildfire, a CWPP can be excellent tool to gain community support to raise awareness about wildfire threat and to gain support to mitigate hazards. The most successful CWPPs are those with grass roots efforts.

- Communities benefit from a CWPP by being more prepared for a wildfire.
- A CWPP can influence where and how federal monies are spent on hazardous fuels reduction.
- Communities with CWPPs can compete competitively for public funding to implement hazardous fuels reduction projects.
- Communities can work cooperatively with technical and public safety experts to reduce vulnerability to wildfire hazards in their communities.
- Communities can take ownership of efforts to reduce wildfire hazards in their communities.

Stakeholder input is the best method to achieve the best products, local knowledge, and community input. Stakeholder input will identify and address specific needs presented by the communities.

The focus of the 2012 Grant County CWPP is on a sub-watershed basis with emphasis on “zones” defined by the communities of Dayville, Dale, Austin/Bates, Canyon City, Fox, Granite, Kimberly, John Day, Long Creek, Monument, Mt. Vernon, Prairie City, Seneca, the Lower Middle Fork John Day area, the Upper Middle Fork John Day area, and the numerous rural residences scattered throughout the county.

Wildland fire is a common occurrence in Grant County. Historic fire occurrence was a major ecological influence in shaping the natural vegetation. The threat of wildfire continues today. However, wildfire risk to human welfare and economic, social and ecological values is more serious today than in the past because of the buildup of hazardous fuels, construction of houses in proximity to forests and rangelands, increased outdoor recreation, and a lack of public appreciation of wildfire. Lightning-caused fires have been the dominant ignition source for hundreds of years and continue to be the main cause of fire. However, human-caused fires have occurred and their frequency will likely become more numerous as the County’s population grows and outdoor recreation increases.



Natural resource management policy and changing ecological conditions have interacted in ways that resulted in hazardous fuel situations throughout the County. These forces include historic fire suppression policy, juniper and pine invasion into meadows, sagebrush and grasslands, invasive weeds, and changing climate patterns. The accumulation of hazardous fuels may set

the stage for catastrophic wildfire occurrence in the County, resulting in the loss of important economic and ecological values. There are varieties of fuels around communities, ranches, and structures that create problems for fire protection. Fuels include ponderosa pine and juniper forests, sagebrush habitat, grasslands, and weed fields. Many of these fuels such as dried grass and weeds are highly flammable, burn rapidly, and resist control. A coordinated effort among all fire authorities and private landowners in the County is needed to manage hazardous fuels and reduce the risk of wildfire.

Currently, fire suppression authorities include the rural/city fire protection districts/departments for John Day, Mt. Vernon, Prairie City, Canyon City, Dayville, Long Creek, Granite, and Monument; the Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) Central Oregon Forest Protection District; the USFS; and the BLM. Mutual Aid Agreements exist among the fire authorities for mutual aid and support in the event of a wildfire incident. However, each fire authority operates under regulations that dictate their area of responsibility and specify limitations. The CWPP provides the means to identify wildfire risk, prioritize mitigation projects, improve public awareness, and improve fire authority coordination to better manage wildfire.

1.4 Introduction to Wildfire

Wildland fire, defined as any non-structure fire occurring in the wildland, includes prescribed fire, wildland fire use, and wildfire. Prescribed fires are planned fires ignited by land managers to accomplish resource objectives. Fires that occur from natural causes, such as lightning, that are then used to achieve management purposes under carefully controlled conditions with minimal suppression costs is known as wildland fire use (WFU). Wildfires are unwanted and unplanned fires that result from natural ignition, unauthorized human-caused fire, escaped WFU, or escaped prescribed fire.

Prescribed fire in Grant County could be used to accomplish a number of resource management purposes, such as reducing the amount of hazardous fuels, improving plant species diversity,

increasing livestock forage production, abating noxious and invasive weeds, and improving wildlife habitat. Multiple resource management objectives are often achieved concurrently.

Prescribed fire could occur either in a defined area or in localized burn piles. Prescribed fires are used to burn vegetation in place over the landscape and can vary in the number of acres burned. Burn piles are heaps of woody fuel that are accumulated after a mechanical treatment. Consistency with Oregon State fire and air pollution laws and BLM would occur. ODF and County policy would be maintained during prescribed fires. Acceptable burn days would be determined in consultation with ODF and local agencies.

Fire risk is the probability that wildfire will start from natural or human-caused ignitions. Fire hazard is the presence of ignitable fuel coupled with the influences of terrain and weather. The nature of fuels, terrain, and weather conditions combine to dictate fire behavior, rate of spread, and intensity. Wildland fuel attributes refer to both dead and live vegetation and include such factors as density, fuel depth, continuity, loading, vertical arrangement, and moisture content. Structures are also a fuel source. Fire tends to burn more rapidly and intensely upslope than on level terrain. However, evening sundowner winds may rapidly drive wildfire downslope.

Weather conditions such as high ambient temperatures, low relative humidity, and windy conditions favor fire ignition and erratic fire behavior. Natural and human-caused fire has long been an integral part of vegetation communities in the County. Lightning-ignited fire is a natural component of Grant County ecosystems, and its occurrence is important to maintaining the health of forest and rangeland ecosystems. Native Americans used fire for such things as hunting, improving wildlife habitat, and land clearing. As such, many of the plant species and communities are adapted to recurring fire through phenological, physiological, or anatomical attributes. Some plants such as lodge pole pine and western wheatgrass require reoccurring fire to persist.

Fuels affect fire behavior and are the one element that can be manipulated. Wildland fire authorities refer to fuels in terms of Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC).

| Fire Regime Description | Code |
|--|-------------|
| Less than 35 year fire return interval, low severity, usually non-lethal | I |
| Less than 35 year fire return interval, stand replacement severity | II |
| 35 – 100 year fire return interval, mixed severity | III |

Condition Class 1: Fire frequencies are within or near the historical range, and have departed from historical frequencies by *no more than one return interval*.

Condition Class 2: Fire frequencies and vegetation attributes have been moderately altered from the historical range, and fire frequencies have departed from historical frequencies by *more than one return interval*.

Condition Class 3: Fire frequencies and vegetation attributes have been significantly altered from the historical range, and fire frequencies have departed from historical frequencies by *multiple return intervals*. The risk of losing key ecosystem components is high.

European settlers, land use policy, and changing ecosystems have altered fire behavior and fuels accumulation from their historic setting. European settlers into Grant County changed the natural fire regime in several interrelated ways. The nature of vegetation (fuel) changed due to land use practices such as homesteading, livestock grazing, agriculture, water development, and road construction. Livestock grazing reduced the amount of fine fuels such as grasses and forbs, which carried low-intensity fire across the landscape. In addition, continuous stretches of forest and rangeland fuels were broken-up by land-clearing activities. In many instances the removal of the natural vegetation allowed introduced weedy plants to colonize and occupy large expanses of land. The establishment of cheatgrass and other annual weeds are examples. Many of these weedy plants become flashy fuels as they age, causing fires to burn faster and hotter than with normal wildland fuels. The invasion of western juniper into big sagebrush stands and grasslands has also increased fuel loads and changed the nature of fire in these ecosystems. In addition, more than a century of fire-suppression policy has resulted in an unusually large accumulation of hazardous fuels such as big sagebrush and western juniper in many forest and rangeland ecosystems. The presence of flashy fuels coupled with the large accumulation of naturally occurring fuels has created hazardous situations for public safety and fire management.

Modern-day land managers continue the use of fire by using prescribed fire as a tool to improve livestock grazing, wildlife habitat, control noxious weeds, or to reduce hazardous fuels. Their primary efforts in managing fuels and fire are to protect human life, economic values, and ecological values. Proactive and vigilant fire and fuels management is necessary to protect human welfare, as well as economic and ecological values from fire loss.

Wildfire behavior and severity are dictated by fuel type, weather conditions, and terrain. Fuel is the only variable that can easily be managed by reducing such attributes as load, continuity, or size class distribution. Such things as fuelbreaks, tree and shrub thinnings, defensible space, grass mowing or grazing, and green strips are ways to manipulate fuels to reduce the chances of fire occurrence or limit its severity. The CWPP focuses on fuel management on both private and public lands as a means to reduce its risk throughout Grant County.

1.5 Mission, Goals, and Objectives

The mission, goals and objectives for the revised Grant County CWPP were developed in response to input from county, state and federal officials; input from the Grant County Communications Task Force; and input gathered from community meetings and absentee landowner outreach. The mission statement in the 2005 GCCWP was updated and expanded to better reflect the current needs of the county.

Mission

Reduce the risk from wildfire to life, property and natural resources and assist with resource management of lands within Grant County in a manner that benefits the local economy and maintains and enhances natural resources.

Goals and Objectives

Protect against potential losses to life, property and natural resources from forest fire by

- Establishing and maintaining escape route and adjacent corridors.
- Identifying areas at risk and hazards.
- Reducing wildfire risk to identified areas.
- Developing and utilizing widespread partnerships between citizens, agencies and stakeholders.

Build and maintain active participation from each Fire Protection District by

- Identifying actions for fire protection.
- Improving pre-suppression planning in the event of a wildfire.
- Identifying equipment and training needs.

Identify incentives for fire protection and community participation by

- Accessing and utilizing federal and other grant dollars

Monitor the changing conditions of forest fire risk and citizen action over time by

- Establishing and maintaining a monitoring and evaluation process.

Institutionalize fire-related programs and sustain community efforts for fire protection by

- Establishing and maintaining a nonprofit “fire safe council”.
- Holding an annual meeting to review progress and plan new projects.

Improve community safety through continued wildland fire education and awareness by

- Setting realistic expectations for reducing forest fire risk.
- Promoting visible projects and program successes.
- Developing strategies for increasing citizen awareness and action for fire and outreach prevention.

Preserve and promote the custom, culture and economic health of Grant County by

- Identifying economic developments and networking opportunities regarding fuel reduction and biomass utilization enterprises.

Engage the local workforce in work related to wildfire prevention and protection, and restoration of lands in Grant County by

- Hiring the local workforce for projects.


Strengthen emergency management in Grant County by

- Improving coordination between county government, fire protection districts, and state and federal agencies.

COMMUNITY WILDFIRE PROTECTION PLAN

Grant County

Fire Regime Condition Class (Stratum Scale)



1 inch = 10 miles



Legend

- Fire Regime Condition Class I
- Fire Regime Condition Class II
- Fire Regime Condition Class III

 **Grant Soil and Water Conservation District**
721 South Canyon Boulevard John Day, Oregon 97845
Phone: (541) 575-0135 Fax: (541) 575-0848
Serving the Citizens of Grant County for over 50 Years!

December 12, 2012

2.0 GRANT COUNTY PROFILE

2.1 History and General Information

Grant County, named for Ulysses S. Grant, is located in the northeastern part of Oregon and was created from portions of Wasco and Umatilla counties. Grant County is the seventh largest county in Oregon and shares boundaries with eight other counties, more than any other county in Oregon. The total area of Grant County is approximately 2,897,238 acres, of which about 1,111,279 acres is privately owned and about 1,756,883 acres is managed by federal, state, and county agencies for the public good.

The economy of Grant County historically has been mainly forest products, agriculture and livestock, hunting, and recreation. Since the original GCCFPP was written in 2005, there has been a significant decline in the forest products infrastructure in the county due primarily to the lack of consistent and stable supply of suitable raw materials. Two sawmill facilities have closed and utilization of noncommercial material for clean chips and/or hog fuel is inconsistent. Reductions in federal forest grazing permits acres, due to changes in management direction and litigation, have also influenced the local livestock industry as well.

The 2000 Census listed 7935 people residing in Grant County. The 2010 census revealed that the population in the county had declined to 7445 people with 613 of those individuals less than 18 years of age and 305 of those individuals between 18 and 64 years of age. The population of individuals 65 years and older increased by 430. Grant County is losing its workforce.


Management Acres

Private Lands (Residential, Ranches, Timber Companies, etc.) 1,111,279
US Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management 171,481
US Department of Interior, National Park Service 6,688
US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service 1,578,714
 Malheur NF 1,128,931
 Ochoco NF 57,805
 Umatilla NF 309,144
 Wallowa-Whitman NF 82,834
Grant County 800
Baker County 5
Hood River County 14,064
State of Oregon, Division of State Lands & Dept of Fish & Wildlife 29,076
Total Acres = 2,897,238

COMMUNITY WILDFIRE PROTECTION PLAN

Grant County

Location of Federal Land Ownerships



1 inch = 10 miles



 **Grant Soil and Water Conservation District**
721 South Canyon Boulevard John Day, Oregon 97845
Phone: (541) 575-0135 Fax: (541) 575-0848
Serving the Citizens of Grant County for over 50 Years!

Legend

- National Park Service
- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
- Bureau of Land Management**
 - Burns District
 - Prineville District
 - Vale District
- U.S. National Forest**
 - Malheur National Forest
 - Ochoco National Forest
 - Umatilla National Forest
 - Wallowa Whitman National Forest

December 12, 2012

2.2 Existing Conditions

The topography in Grant County is diverse ranging from flat grassy plateaus to steep rocky canyons to mountain peaks. The elevation of the county varies from 1,820 feet on the John Day River near Kimberly, to 9,038 feet at the summit of Strawberry Mountain.

The John Day River system represents the major watershed in the county with most of the county drained by the four forks of the John Day River, all of which have their headwaters in the county. The John Day River system drains some 7,900 square miles is the third longest free-flowing river in the “lower 48” and has more miles of federal “Wild and Scenic River” designation than any other river in the United States. From Grant County, the lower John Day River flows 184 miles to its confluence with the Columbia River. The southeastern corner of the county includes the headwaters of the Malheur and Little Malheur rivers, which eventually flow into the Snake River. The southern part of Grant County includes the northern-most reaches of the Great Basin including the Silvies River watershed which flows south into Harney Lake in the High Desert of Eastern Oregon. A small area in the southwestern corner of Grant County is in the Crooked River and Deschutes River watersheds. (Wikipedia 2009)

Grant County is an arid to temperate region, with average annual precipitation ranging from 9 inches near Picture Gorge, to over 40 inches in the Strawberry Mountains. Annual precipitation in the valleys averages between 12 and 14 inches, while the uplands or highlands of the county average between 16 and 24 inches. A great deal of the county’s precipitation comes in the form of winter snow in the mountains. This snow pack is vital to recharge aquifers, resulting in spring run-off, and in-stream flows of water throughout the year.


Average temperatures in the county range from the warmest community, Monument, with average daily highs/lows of 90°/50 °F in July and 42°/22 °F in January; to the coolest community, Seneca, with average daily highs/lows of 80°/38 °F in July and 33°/8 °F in January. Extreme temperatures in the county show 30-year highs/lows of: 103°/-37 °F at Austin; 112°/-23 °F at John Day; 108°/-25 °F at Long Creek; 112°/-26 °F at Monument; and 100°/-48 °F at Seneca. (Wikipedia 2009)

Vegetation in Grant County varies from rangelands characterized by sagebrush and grasses to heavily forested areas. Forests in the southern part of the county generally consist of vast stands of ponderosa pine while areas in the northern portion of the county are represented by more mesic species that densely cover mountain slopes. The topography is quite varied characterized by valley bottoms and high elevation steppes and meadows; gentle rolling hills to deeply dissected canyons with significant rimrock to the Strawberry Mountains, a subchain of the Blue Mountains.

COMMUNITY WILDFIRE PROTECTION PLAN

Grant County

Fire Occurrence (prior to 1980)



1 inch = 10 miles



 **Grant Soil and Water Conservation District**
721 South Canyon Boulevard John Day, Oregon 97845
Phone: (541) 575-0135 Fax: (541) 575-0848
Serving the Citizens of Grant County for over 50 Years!

Legend

- Fire Locations 1980 thru 2011

Landownership


- United States Forest Service
- Private
- National Park Service
- Bureau of Land Management
- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
- Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
- State of Oregon

December 12, 2012

COMMUNITY WILDFIRE PROTECTION PLAN

Grant County

Large Fire Occurrence 1980 to 2011



1 inch = 10 miles



 **Grant Soil and Water Conservation District**
721 South Canyon Boulevard John Day, Oregon 97845
Phone: (541) 575-0135 Fax: (541) 575-0848
Serving the Citizens of Grant County for over 50 Years!

Legend

- Large Fire 1980 to 2011
- Landownership**
 - United States Forest Service
 - Private
 - National Park Service
 - Bureau of Land Management
 - Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
 - Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
 - State of Oregon

December 12, 2012

2.3 Agency Wildfire Protection Roles

2.31 Oregon Department of Forestry

ODF's "Protection From Fire" Division's main purpose is to protect private forestland from fire. This includes the acres in the 'wildland-urban interface', which are forest lands with residences and other structures within the reach of wildfire in that area. This is done through a complete and coordinated system of fire prevention, suppression and fuels management.

The goal of the program is to create and use environmentally sound and economically efficient strategies which minimize the total cost to protect Oregon's timber and other forest values from wildfire while also minimizing wildfire damage to protected resources. Grant County is the only county in the state that has complete protection from wildland fire. Further, the county has more timbered acres and grazing acres than any other county in COD as well as being the only county that has Zone 1 acres. COD protects almost a 1,000,000 acres from wildland fire in Grant County.

The Central Oregon District (COD) often has the highest fire load in the state, primarily due to dry lightning events that result in multiple fire starts over short periods of time. While most fires are effectively suppressed, occasionally one escapes initial attack due to lack of resources. Landowners in COD generally pay the highest forest patrol assessment rates in the state. Information the fire patrol assessment and current rates can be accessed at <http://www.oregon.gov/ODF/centraloregon/Pages/index.aspx>

Oregon forest landowners with "improved lots" pay a surcharge in addition to the forestland assessment, which helps to offset the higher cost of protecting structures within the forest. This does not mean that homes and other buildings receive structural fire protection from ODF. The improved lot surcharge reflects the higher costs involved associated with protecting improvements when wildfire is a threat. In the absence of structures and other improvements, ODF can utilize tactics that minimize acres burned and hold down costs. When structures are present, traditional wildland fire suppression techniques are compromised, driving up the costs of fire fighting.

2.32 United States Forest Service

One of the missions of the USFS is to provide wildland fire fighting services on federal lands. The USFS does not fight structural fires. The USFS also implements prescribed fires. A prescribed fire is any fire intentionally ignited to meet specific land management objectives such as reduction of flammable fuels on the forest floor, or to help restore ecosystem health. Prescribed fires are preplanned ignitions, with predetermined boundaries. They are conducted only under certain weather conditions during periods of low wind when flames length and heat can be controlled.

2.33 Bureau of Land Management

One of the missions of the BLM is to provide wildland fire fighting services on federal lands. The BLM does not fight structural fires. The BLM also implements prescribed fires. A

prescribed fire is any fire intentionally ignited to meet specific land management objectives such as reduction of flammable fuels on the forest floor, or to help restore ecosystem health. Prescribed fires are preplanned ignitions, with predetermined boundaries. They are conducted only under certain weather conditions during periods of low wind when flames length and heat can be controlled.

2.34 Rural Fire Departments

Rural fire departments provide a combination of structural and wildland firefighting services in rural areas. As such, they have the appropriate equipment and training to safely fight structure fires and wildland fires.

2.35 Office of the State Fire Marshal

The mission of the Oregon State Fire Marshal's office is "Protecting citizens, their property, and the environment from fire and hazardous materials". This mission is accomplished through a variety of programs and services including Fire and Life Safety Education, Emergency Response, Local Emergency Training, Codes and Technical Services, and Youth Fire Prevention and Intervention. The Fire Marshal is responsible for code enforcement and fire investigation. The role in wildfire protection of the representative from the State Fire Marshal serving Grant County is to coordinate with the County Court and the various fire departments when the Conflagration Act is invoked and to assist with fire district development and training needs. Information on the State Fire Marshal's Office is available at:

<http://www.oregon.gov/OSP/SFM/Pages/index.aspx>

2.4 Grant County Emergency Operations Management

2.41 Grant County Emergency Operations Plan

The Grant county Emergency Operations Plan is an all-hazard plan that describes how Grant County will organize and respond to emergencies and disasters in the community. It is based on, and is consistent with Federal, State of Oregon, and other applicable laws, regulations, plans and policies, including the National Response Framework and the State of Oregon Emergency Operations Plan.

The Emergency Operations Plan is designed to be all inclusive in combining the four phases of emergency management, which are:

- **Mitigation:** activities that eliminate or reduce the probability of disaster.
- **Preparedness:** activities that governments, organizations, and individuals develop to save lives and minimize damage.
- **Response:** activities that prevent loss of lives and property and provide emergency assistance.
- **Recovery:** short-and long-term activities that return all systems to normal or improved standards.

The County views emergency management planning as a continuous process that is linked closely with training and exercises to establish a comprehensive preparedness agenda and organizational culture that prioritizes increased disaster resiliency.

The Northeast Oregon Multi-Jurisdictional Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan identifies activities that assist the County in reducing risk and preventing loss from future natural hazard events.

CWPP Recommendations:

- Emergency management entities should work closely with Grant County Planning Department to promote safety in the WUI
- Community strategy under this CWPP should utilize 3 pronged approach WUI areas by blending 1) fuels treatment, 2) emergency management, and 3) fire prevention.

2.42 Grant County Communications Task Force

The Grant County Communications Task Force is represented by all the municipal fire departments, Oregon State Fire Marshal's office, Rural Fire Protection Districts, US Forest Service, Grant County Fire Prevention Co-op, National Park Service, Blue Mountain Ambulance, Red Cross, Grant County Court, Grant County Sheriff's Department, Grant County Dispatch, Grant County Planning Commission, Oregon Department of Forestry, and Grant County Emergency Management. The Grant County Communications Task force meets monthly to ensure accurate, reliable, and consistent communications takes place between the represented agencies. Meetings are regularly attended by representatives of the State Fire Marshal's Office, the Oregon State Police Arson Investigator's Office, and the Oregon Department of Safety Standards

2.43 Grant County Fire Defense Board

The Grant County Fire Defense Board consists of representatives from all municipal and rural fire protection districts in Grant County. This group meets formally twice a year, in the spring and in the fall in conjunction with the communications task force, as required by Oregon State Fire Marshal's Office.

2.44 Grant-Harney County Fire Prevention Cooperative

The Grant-Harney Fire Prevention Co-Op, was formed in the early 1980's to help coordinate fire prevention efforts in the two counties. The cooperative facilitates interagency coordination in mass-media, information and education programs and participation in county fairs. All general fire prevention is coordinated through this group.

Fire Apparatus:

2.5 Grant County Fire Districts

2.51 Canyon City Fire Department Summary- 2013:

Canyon City Fire Department is a municipal fire organization located in Canyon City, Oregon and covers 4 square miles. The department is all volunteer. The department provides structural for the city. The department has mutual aid agreements with the city of John Day, John Day Rural and ODF. Canyon City has a solid cadre of volunteer firefighters.

Personnel:

Chief - Matt Turner

24 Hr Contact: 541-575-0030

Email: MDEnterprizes@centurytel.net

Assistant Chiefs – Charlie Caughlin

24 Hr Contact: 541-575-0030

Email: caughlindrc@hotmail.com

Volunteer Firefighters - 9

Engine – Type I 26,000 GVW w/1000 gal tank & 1250 gpm pump

Engine – Type II 28,000 GVW w/1000 gal tank & 1000 gpm pump

Water Resources:

Canyon City – Good

Surrounding Area – NA

Fire Department Needs:

AEDs on both trucks

New tires on one truck

New Fire Station

2.52 Dayville City Fire Department Summary – 2013:

Dayville City Fire Department is a municipal fire organization located in Dayville, Oregon. The department is all volunteer. The department provides structural for the city of Dayville; ; east to Marks Creek (Mt. Vernon Rural boundary); south up South Fork John Day River to first bridge (ODFW boundary). The department has mutual aid agreements with the Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) and with the National Park Service (NPS). Dayville has a solid cadre of volunteer firefighters who are especially skilled at wildland firefighting and skilled at working fires in the rural and intermix areas. A majority of the volunteers make their living as wildland firefighters which can leave the force depleted during the summer months if extensive wildland fires are burning across the west.

Personnel:

Chief - Jake Streeter

Cell Phone: 541-620-4766

Email: JAYCOB541@yahoo.com

Assistant Chiefs - None

Volunteer Firefighters - 7

Fire Apparatus:

Engine – Type I w/Pump & Roll

Engine – Type II w/Pump & Roll

Engine – Type IV w/Pump & Roll and Plumbed Foam/ Diesel on 4x4 Chassis

Water Resources:

City of Dayville – Adequate

Surrounding Area – Limited due to lack of good draft points

Fire Department Needs:

PPEs – New turnouts

Generator

Water Tender – to compensate for lack of draft points in rural areas

Ponds and Water Sources strategically located out of town

New Building – Need to house all trucks inside

2.53 Granite Fire Department Summary – 2013:

The Granite Volunteer Fire Department is located in the city of Granite and provides structural protection for the city and some of the area around the city when possible. The department is all volunteer with the recruitment and retention of volunteers being a huge obstacle. As with all of Grant County, Granite is losing population. The general population that remains generally consists of retirees. The recruitment and retention of volunteers is extremely difficult. Citizens in the city are aware of their vulnerability, however the excessive and rigorous training requirements by the state of Oregon drives away volunteers.

Personnel:

Chief - None

Phone: 541-755-5151

Email: granitecity@pinetel.com

Assistant Chiefs - None

Volunteer Firefighters - None

Fire Apparatus:

Engine – 1980 International w/500 gallon tank and high pressure pump

Water Tender – 4000 gallon

Water Resources:

The city of Granite is having problems with water system at this time. Opportunities for updating the water system are being explored.

Fire Department Needs:

Volunteers

New Portable Radios

Fire Siren
Cell Tower

2.54 John Day Rural Fire Department Summary – 2013:

John Day Rural Fire Department provides structural and wildland fire protection for the area outside of the city limits of John Day and up Canyon Creek to junction of Forest Road 15. The department has a mutual aid agreement with the Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF). John Day Rural covers areas directly around the city of John Day. This is a vigorous fire department.

Personnel:

Chief - Ron Smith

Cell: 541-620-0049

Email: ronsmith5201@yahoo.com

Assistant Chief – Don Gabbard

Cell: 541-620-4037

Email: Gabbardd@hotmail.com

Volunteer Firefighters – 12

Fire Apparatus:

Engine – Type 1 750 gallon tank w/1000 gpm pump w/foam

Engine – Brush rig 300 gallon tank w/100 gpm pump w/foam 4x4 diesel chassis

Water Tender – 2000 gallon

Water Resources:

Water resources are adequate, however in this semi-arid region additional resources are always needed.

Fire Department Needs:

Need new building.

2.55 John Day City Fire Department Summary – 2013:

John Day City Fire Department provides structural and fire protection for the city of John Day. While the fire fighters and the fire station are the same as those listed under the John Day Rural, these are actually considered two separate fire departments.

Personnel:

Chief - Ron Smith

Cell: 541-620-0049

Email: ronsmith5201@yahoo.com

Assistant Chief – Don Gabbard

Cell: 541-620-4037

Email: Gabbardd@hotmail.com

Volunteer Firefighters – 12

Fire Apparatus:

Engine – Type 1 1000 gallon tank w/1250 gpm pump w/foam

Engine - Type 1 500 gallon tank w/500 gpm pump

Engine – Type IV 150 gallon tank w/15-20 gpm pump 4x4 gas 1 Ton chassis

Water Resources:

Good

Fire Department Needs:

The John Day fire station is too small and poorly located. The department has been researching ways to get a larger facility and a location has been identified, however the poor economy in the county is making this endeavor difficult.

2.56 Long Creek City Fire Department Summary – 2013:

Long Creek Fire Department is a municipal fire organization located in Long Creek, Oregon. The department is staffed entirely with volunteers. The department provides structural fire response for the city of Long Creek, approximately 200 acres. As with all of Grant County, Long Creek is losing population. The general population that remains is aging, making the recruitment and retention of volunteers increasingly difficult. This is further exacerbated by the excessive and rigorous training standards required by DPSST.

Personnel:

Chief - Don Porter

Phone: 541-421-5200

Cell Phone:

Email: ddporter@ortelco.net

Assistant Chief – Denise Porter

Volunteer Firefighters - 8

Fire Apparatus:

Engine – Type II w/750 gallon tank & 750 gpm pump

Engine – Type III w/750 gallon tank & 750 gpm pump

Water Resources:

City of Long Creek – Adequate

Improved draft points and additional water sources are needed in this area.

Fire Department Needs:

New Pumper

New Command Truck

2.57 Monument City Fire Department Summary – 2013:

Monument City Fire Department is a municipal fire organization located in Monument, Oregon.

The department is composed entirely of volunteers. The department provides structural for the city of Monument and in the surrounding area when possible. This department has four

committed volunteers that are fit and consistently available. However, the population of Monument is growing older consistent with the rest of Grant County. Meeting the maintenance hours for certifications required by DPSST is impossible for all volunteers and the chief

Personnel

Chief - Jeremy Boyer

Phone: 541-934-2061

Email: Boyer737@hotmail.com

Assistant Chiefs - None

Volunteer Firefighters – 4 consistently

Fire Apparatus:

Engine – Type 1 1000 gallon w/1500 gpm pump Diesel

Engine – Type 1 500 gallon w/1250 gpm pump Diesel

Water Resources:

City of Monument– Problems seasonally due to river levels

Surrounding Area – Limited due to lack of good draft points/ponds/permanent water sources

Fire Department Needs:

Extrication Tools VERY old & need to be replaced

Need updated PPEs

Portable Radios

Nozzles – 1.5” (at least 2)

Generator

Sawsall

FIT devices – critical for rural areas w/limited structural fire protection

2.58 Monument Rural Fire District Summary – 2013:

Monument Rural Fire District received final approval and was implemented by the county on November 21, 2012. The rural is based out of Monument on Top Road. The department is composed entirely of volunteers. The department provides structural and wildland protection for landowner and homeowners in the area that have chosen to join the rural. The rural will respond to calls for those citizens who have joined the rural fire department as identified by their tax lots. The rural covers 40 square miles at this time. The department has a mutual aid agreement with the Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF). The Monument Rural has the potential to grow significantly in the surrounding area and to expand into the neighboring counties. At this time it appears that the rural area around Ritter, the community of Spray in Wheeler County, and the area south of Battle Mountain in Umatilla County may become part of the Monument Rural Fire Department. A fire hall/building to meet in and store equipment is badly needed.

Personnel:

Chief - Jeremy Boyer

Phone: 541-934-2061

Email: Boyer737@hotmail.com
Assistant Chiefs -
Volunteer Firefighters – 8

Fire Apparatus:

Engine – 4/Type 1
Engine – 4/Type 2
Engine – 1/Type 6
WT - 2

Water Resources:

There is consistently a problem with adequate water resources in the rural areas, especially during the dry season and during the winter months with freezing weather.

Fire Department Needs:

Training
Training facilities for area/county wide use
Winterized water storage in rural area
Need updated PPEs

2.59 Mt. Vernon Rural Fire District Summary – 2013:

Mt. Vernon Rural Fire Department is located in Mt. Vernon, Oregon and provides structural fire response for the city of Mt. Vernon and structural and wildland response for 640,000 acres in the surrounding area. The department is composed entirely of volunteers. The department has mutual aid agreements with the Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF), Dayville Fire Department, John Day City and Rural Fire Departments, and Canyon City Fire Department.

The Mt. Vernon Rural, the largest rural in Grant County, has been very successful. However, as the population of the wildland urban intermix continues to grow issues such as adequate road access, adequately brushed roads, appropriately sized bridges to safely hold fire equipment, and adequately prepared homeowners and landowners continue to arise.

Personnel:

Chief - Bill Cearns
Cell: 541-792-0727
Email: Cearns88@hotmail.com
Assistant Chiefs – Dave Dorchner
Volunteer Firefighters – 21

Mt. Vernon Station

Fire Apparatus:

Engine – Type 1
Engine – Type 2
Engine – Type 4
Engine – 2 /Type 6
WT – 1/Type 1

WT – 1/Type 2
WT – 1/Type 3

Widows Creek Station

Fire Apparatus:

Engine – 1/Type 4 w/800 gal tank and 180 gpm pump
4x4 diesel w/pump&roll/plumbed foam (5 gal Class B)

Water Resources:

There is consistently a problem with adequate water resources in the rural areas, especially during the dry season and during the winter months with freezing weather.

Fire Department Needs:

10 Ton Truck w/Flat Bed
D-4 Cat
Updated Type 6 Engine
New WUI Engine
New Fire Station

2.511 Prairie City Rural Fire District Summary – 2013:

Prairie City Rural Fire Department provides structural fire protection for the city of Prairie City and structural and wildland fire protection for a significant surrounding area. The department has a mutual aid agreement with the Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF). Prairie has a vital department, however these rural areas are always in need of more volunteers.

Personnel:

Chief - Dean Hicks
Cell: 541-620-0658
Email: db-hicks@hotmail
Assistant Chief – Eddy Negus
Volunteer Firefighters – 22

Fire Apparatus:

Structural Engine – Type 1 w/1000 gallon tank w/1250 gpm pump with deck gun
Structural Engine – Type 1 w/1000 gallon tank w/1250 gpm pump
Wildland Engine – 450 gallon tank w/250 gpm pump 4x4 chassis
Wildland Engine – 800 gallon tank w/250 gpm pump 6x6 chassis
Water Tender – 3000 gallon w/vacuum pump
Water Tender – 3800 gallon w/PTO distribution pump

Water Resources:

Good in Prairie City. Outside of town additional ponds and water sources are needed. Water sources also need to be identified on map as “year round”, early season, etc. In Grant County there is consistently a problem with adequate water resources in the rural areas, especially during the dry season and during the winter months with freezing weather.

Fire Department Needs:

Winterized water storage in rural areas

Larger building or more buildings for truck storage – currently one truck is stored outside.



2.512 Seneca Volunteer Fire Department Summary - 2013

The fire department in Seneca is defunct at this time and is not recognized by the Oregon State Fire Marshal's Office as an active department. There are no volunteers and the city has an aging population. Trucks receive very limited maintenance. Citizens in the city are aware of their vulnerability, however excessive and rigorous training requirements by the state of Oregon drive away volunteers.

Personnel

Chief - None

Cell Phone:

Email:

Assistant Chiefs - None

Volunteer Firefighters - None

Fire Apparatus:


Engine – 1 w/1000 gpm pump

Engine – 1 w/1600 gpm pump

COMMUNITY WILDFIRE PROTECTION PLAN

Grant County

Rural Fire Districts



1 inch = 10 miles



 **Grant Soil and Water Conservation District**
721 South Canyon Boulevard John Day, Oregon 97845
Phone: (541) 575-0135 Fax: (541) 575-0848
Serving the Citizens of Grant County for over 50 Years!

Legend

Rural Fire District

- Monument RFD (Pending)
- John Day RFD
- Mt Vernon RFD
- Praire City RFD

December 12, 2012

2.6 Biomass Utilization and Economic Development

Grant County has experienced the development of a pelletized fuel plant at Malheur Lumber Company in John Day. The Blue Mountain Hospital, the Grant County Airport, Grant Union High School, and Prairie City Schools have all installed pellet-fired boilers to heat their facilities. This form of heating is extremely cost efficient and allow for reduced heating bills after the capital investment of installing the boilers is amortized. Malheur Lumber Company purchases material for the pellet plant in the form of logs delivered by truck however the price is often low enough that it doesn't pay for the transportation. Prairie Wood Products often buys hog fuel for the co-generation facility in Prairie City but once again the purchase price often does not pay for the cost of transportation.

Notwithstanding the above, progress is slowly being made toward the effective utilization of biomass. The vast supply of this extremely low value (arguably no value) material on federal lands complicates the utilization of this type of material off private lands, especially on small scale projects such as fuel reduction projects in WUI areas. Prairie Wood Products curtailed sawmilling operations a number of years ago and along with that the co-gen plant. Occasionally material is taken for the co-gen plant that dramatically assists in the utilization of biomass in the county. Ideally the Prairie Wood Products facility will reopen in the near future.

County and community groups continue to search for ways to utilize biomass off all lands in a cost-effective manner. Unfortunately some tax credits offered by the Oregon Department of Revenue have been changed to the point where they are marginally effective in assisting landowners in removing materials for renewable energy purposes.

Other opportunities for economic development may be present in the form a regional training center for structural fire fighters. Department of Public Safety training and maintenance requirements are extremely rigorous and volunteer fire departments have extreme difficulty in keeping up with these requirements. A regional training center for rural fire districts and rangeland fire associations would work well in Grant County.

2.7 Grant County Zones

Grant County has been divided into nine separate “zones” for the purposes of the revised CWPP. This methodology was devised to better recognize differences in topography, vegetation, fire prevention resources and communities throughout the county. Each zone within the county will be encouraged to develop a local CWPP reflecting specific needs and hazards for that area. Each zone will have the opportunity to implement the Firewise Communities USA program.

2.71 Dayville Zone:

The Dayville Zone is located on the west side of the county north of the Seneca Zone and south of the Monument/Long Creek Zone. The city of Dayville is located in the center of the zone. The population of Dayville increased by 11 people, from 138 to 149, between the 2000 and the 2010 census evaluations. Nonetheless, the economy of the area remains distressed. The Dayville Zone contains the largest number of different public land holdings within its boundaries. These are lands owned by the BLM, the NPS, the USFS (the Ochoco and the Malheur National Forests), the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW), and the state of Oregon.

Historically Dayville was a vigorous center for lumber and agriculture. Incorporated in 1913, the town is named after the John Day River. The topography and vegetation in the area is varied although it is generally characterized by grasslands, sagebrush and juniper. Some dry site timber stands are present in the higher elevations. The gentle slopes along the main stem of the John Day River transition into steep canyons and rimrocks in some areas. The South Fork of the John Day River tends to be a narrow canyon with steep rocky walls.



The city of Dayville provides structural fire protection for the city and has a mutual aid agreement with the other fire departments in the county as well as with ODF. Although there is no formal rural fire district the city fire department will respond to both structural and wildland fires outside of the city limits.

Dayville is identified as a community-at-risk in the Oregon Statewide Risk assessment.

2.72 Granite Zone

The Granite Zone encompasses the northeast corner of the county and the city of Granite located at

an elevation of 4660 feet. This area is somewhat isolated from the rest of the county with the major access road traveling from Highway 7 through the city of Sumpter in Baker County. The topography of this area is rugged and winters can be severe with deep snow accumulations. Vegetation is mixed, however the area supports significantly more lodgepole pine, grand fir, and



Engelmann spruce indicating a more mesic climate than much of the county.

Granite is a historic mining town with a rich history. As of the 2010 census, there were 14 full time residents in the city, down from 24 in 2000. Residents are primarily retirees and positions within city government are often difficult to fill. The volunteer fire department for the city struggles to keep volunteers and currently the fire chief represents the entire department.

Granite is a “community at risk” as defined by the state Oregon.

The area outside of the city is characterized by parcels of private land interspersed within and adjacent both the Wallowa Whitman and the Umatilla National Forests. Numerous cabins and homes are situated on the private lands and forested vegetation is generally very dense in the area. Homes in the wildland urban interface are extremely vulnerable to wildfire.

2.73 John Day Zone

The John Day Zone consists of the area that surrounds the cities of John Day and Canyon City. The zone runs east and west on both sides of Highway 26 and the John Day River and south on both sides of Highway 395 and Canyon Creek to the Malheur National Forest Boundary.

John Day and Canyon City form the most significant population center of the county, house the county seat, have a hospital, a shopping district, the Malheur National Forest Supervisor’s Office, the John Day Unit of the Oregon Department of Forestry, and various other agencies. In 2010 the population of Canyon City was 703 up from 669 in 2000. As of 2010 John Day has a population of 1744 down from 1821 in 2000. The area around each town outside of the city limits is fairly heavily populated as well.

The first homestead staked in Grant County (what was then Wasco County), in 1862 by B. C. Trowbridge, was within the limits of the present city of John Day. The Eastern Oregon community was not as quick to grow as neighboring Canyon City, which was the county seat and center of the bustling mining industry in the area. Incrementally, local merchants and residents began relocating to John Day—primarily each time after severe fires in Canyon City: the Grant County Courthouse burned in 1870, Chinatown burned in years earlier, many of whom were displaced by the 1885 fire in Canyon City. A trading post built in the area in the 1860s along The

Dalles Military Road was purchased in 1887 by two Chinese immigrants, Lung On and Ing Hay. It is now operated in conjunction with the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department and is one of the premier surviving examples of a nineteenth century Chinese apothecary shop. It was designated a National Historic Landmark in 2005.

John Day has both city and rural fire departments that provide structural and wildland fire protection in and around the city of John Day. Canyon City has a city fire department that provides structural fire protection for Canyon City. The John Day rural fire district covers a “T” shaped area east and west of John Day and south to where County Road 15 egresses.

The John Day Zone is characterized by relatively narrow valleys surrounded by steep hills covered with juniper and sage on the north end around John Day and transitioning into pine and fir on the south end along Canyon Creek. John Day and Canyon City are both included as communities-at-risk in the statewide assessment.

2.74 Monument/Long Creek Zone

The Monument/Long Creek zone is large in size encompassing the communities of Kimberly, Fox, and Long Creek as well as the city of Monument. Much of the topography is very rugged. Vegetation is a combination of rangelands with sagebrush and juniper, dry site ponderosa pine with inclusions of Douglas-fir, and some more of the more mesic areas on the Umatilla National Forest. This zone includes lands managed by the Malheur National Forest, the Umatilla National Forest, the BLM, and the FERC as well as the largest percentage of privately owned lands of all of the zones.

Settlers began arriving in Long Creek Valley in the mid-1870s. With abundant water, the valley was a livestock owner's paradise, and early settlers were small-scale homesteaders with herds of cattle and bands of sheep. The settlement suffered a temporary setback during the Bannock Indian War of 1878. As the Indians moved through the valley, with the U.S. Army in pursuit, the settlers built a fort and avoided an attack. By 1880, there was a store, a saloon, and a post office in town, and 150 people lived in the valley.

The *Blue Mountain Eagle*, the oldest continuously published weekly newspaper in Oregon, started in Long



Historic community church in the community of Fox Valley.





Creek in 1886 and was published there until 1900, when owners moved it to Canyon City.

Three fire departments are present in this zone, one in the city of Long Creek, one in the city of Monument and the newly approved Monument Rural. The fire department for Long Creek provides structural protection for the city. The fire department for the city of Monument provides structural fire protection for the city of Monument and will respond outside the city limits if called. The Monument Rural provides structural and wildland fire protection *only* for those property owners who have elected to join the rural. Both Monument and Long Creek are considered communities-at-risk in the statewide assessment.

2.75 Mt. Vernon Zone

The Mt. Vernon Zone borders the John Day Zone on the west side and is generally represented by the area covered by the Mt. Vernon Rural Fire Department. The city of Mt. Vernon is located on the east side of this zone and has a population of 527 as of the 2010 census down from 595 in 2000.



The Mt. Vernon fire department provides structural fire protection for the city of Mt. Vernon and structural and rural fire protection for a large area west down the John Day River Valley to about Marks Creek. The rural extends north and south toward the Malheur National Forest. In some areas the rural and national forest have contiguous boundaries, in other areas

there are private lands protected by ODF. The Mt. Vernon Rural is the largest fire department in the county at this time. The lands covered by this rural are primarily range lands covered with various grasses, juniper and sage brush. Some pine forests occupy the higher elevations. A significant number of landowners have homes and buildings scattered throughout this area as seen in the two photos above. Mt. Vernon is identified as a community-at-risk in the statewide assessment.

2.76 Prairie Zone

The Prairie Zone is located in the southeast corner of the county and encompasses the city of Prairie City. Prairie City is situated on U.S. 26, the main east-west travel way through the county and the upper end of the John Day Valley. The valley is broad at this point with meadows stretching along the south edge of town. Strawberry Mountain looms south of town and Dixie Mountain rises to northeast. This is a full service community and a “community at risk” as defined by the 2001 notice in the Federal Register and by the 2006 Oregon Statewide Assessment. Data from the 2010 census indicates that 909 residents currently reside in the city,

down from 1080 in 2000. Prairie Wood Products, a sawmilling and cogeneration facility, was in operation when the 2005 fire plan was implemented, however that plant is currently sitting idle.

Prairie City grew out of the former mining camp of Dixie, established in the summer of 1862 and was a short distance up Dixie Creek. Prairie City was the western terminus of the Sumpter Valley Railroad, which extended over Dixie Summit and Tipton to Sumpter and then to Baker City; passenger train service was discontinued in 1937. Freight service continued through World War II, but the line was abandoned in 1947.

Prairie City has a vigorous fire department which provides structural protection for the city and structural and wildland fire protection for much of the outlying rural area. A broad mix of vegetation conditions occur around this district, ranging from relatively cool moist forests to the southeast to dry




ponderosa pine forests to the north. The Strawberry Mountain Wilderness area lies south of the city. This wilderness area is long and narrow and bordered by private lands on the north edge. Much of the wilderness is characterized by very heavy fuel loads with the potential to burn extremely hot. The Malheur National Forest borders this area on three sides to the north, east, and south.

2.77 Ritter/Dale Zone

This zone is located on the north edge in the middle of Grant County. There are no incorporated cities within its boundaries although numerous residences are scattered throughout the area. The topography is varied and generally very rugged characterized by steep canyons and rocky outcrops along the Middle Fork of the John Day River. In these areas vegetation is sage brush, juniper, and ponderosa pine. The northeast portion of this zone, where the community of Dale is located, has much more mesic conditions and more productive forests in many areas. Hood River County owns a significant portion of land, formerly Kinzua Corporation lands, in this area as well.

The Ritter/Dale Zone is extremely vulnerable to fire. At this time there is no structural protection available to the residents. Citizens in the Dale area have been saving money to purchase a fire truck. Citizens in the Ritter area have banded together and taken fire training and currently have a “foam” trailer.

In 2010 the Ritter community wrote to a fire district within the city of Portland requesting assistance with procuring a fire truck for structural protection. A few years earlier a home and all its contents were lost to fire and the family left the community. Approximately 54 residences are located with the Ritter zone in the area west of Highway 395.



A view of the Ritter community

2.78 Seneca Zone

The south zone covers the southern portion of the county and includes the town of Seneca and the communities of Izee and Silvies. This is a large area that is virtually without structural fire protection. Seneca has a population of 199 down from 223 in 2000. Recently the Silvies Valley Ranch has been expanding and providing additional employment opportunity for the area.

Seneca is located in a high elevation valley surrounded by mountains and the Malheur National Forest. The area surrounding the town is grasslands that transition into the forest which are predominantly pine in this area. Silvies Valley, located about 10 miles south of Seneca, runs north and south into Harney County and transitions into the mountains on the east and west sides of the valley. Izee is located in the rangelands on the west side of the county near the headwaters of the South Fork of the John Day River. This Seneca Zone is sparsely populated with cattle, horses, deer and elk vastly out numbering the human population. The Malheur National Forest covers much of this area and parcels of private land are interspersed in some areas.



The Seneca post office was established in 1895 and named by postmaster Minnie Southworth for her brother-in-law, prominent Portland judge Seneca Smith. While early homesteaders moved into the valley in the late 1800s, Seneca only began growing in the 1929 when it became the northern terminus of the now-vacated Oregon and Northwestern Railroad, owned by the Edward Hines Lumber Company, which extended south to Burns. In 1940 Seneca's population was 275. Logging in the

area began to decline in the 1970s, and the Hines company ceased operations of its lumber mills and railroad in 1984. The town was incorporated as a city in 1970 as lumber company control began to wane.

At this time, structural fire protection does not exist in the Seneca Zone. While Seneca has a fire truck there are no volunteers to operate it. Maintenance is a continual problem as is freezing during the winter months in this valley with its elevation of 4690 feet. When a fire occurs the city manager gives the key to the fire truck to those willing to help fight the fire. The Silvies Valley Ranch has some wildland fire fighting equipment.

2.79 Upper Middle Fork Zone

Austin was named for Minot and Linda Austin, early settlers of the area. The Austins operated a small store and hotel, Austin House. The tracks of the Sumpter Valley Railway reached Austin in 1905. The railway was built by Oregon Lumber Company and Austin became an important railroad logging community. Austin was the hub of the area until Bates, a company town of the Oregon Lumber Company was built one mile to the west. Austin was also a supply depot for local mining towns, including Susanville and Galena. Austin sawmills supplied lumber for places such as Greenhorn and the Bonanza Mine, higher up in the Blue Mountains. At its height, the population was about 500 (some estimates say it was high as 5000) and the community had three sawmills.




Very little evidence of either of the mining or the lumber industry remains in the area. Numerous homes and cabins are located throughout the area. The Umatilla National Forest borders this area to the north and the Malheur borders it on the south. Adjacent to Greenhorn, the Malheur, Umatilla, and Wallowa Whitman forests converge. The topography is very rugged in some areas with a variety of different vegetative zones

present. Vegetation is generally very dense and homes are vulnerable to wildfire. A number of severe wildfires have occurred in this area and landowners remain very concerned about the potential for future fires.

COMMUNITY WILDFIRE PROTECTION PLAN

Grant County

Project Zones



1 inch = 10 miles



Grant Soil and Water Conservation District
 721 South Canyon Boulevard John Day, Oregon 97845
 Phone: (541) 575-0135 Fax: (541) 575-0848
Serving the Citizens of Grant County for over 50 Years!

Legend

Landownership

- United States Forest Service
- Private
- National Park Service
- Bureau of Land Management
- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
- Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
- State of Oregon

December 12, 2012

3.0 LEGISLATION, POLICY, AND PROGRAMS

In 1985 a particularly severe national fire season resulted in 400 homes being burned in one day when fire protection resources were unable to keep up with the threat. In 1986 a cooperative agreement between the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) and the USFS was formed along with the U.S. Department of the Interior (USDI) and the National Association of State Foresters (NASF) as partners. This agreement marked the beginning of a nationally heightened awareness of wildfire threats in the WUI and a series of legislation and policies.

3.1 Oregon Senate Bill - 360

The Oregon Forestland-Urban Interface Fire Protection Act of 1997 (SB-360) is the State of Oregon's response to several escalating wildland fire problems. Wildfires are burning homes in the interface and firefighters are working in increasingly hazardous situations. Fire suppression costs are increasing significantly in Oregon. Fire fighting resources are limited and in some cases emergency service agencies cannot provide equipment and personnel to all structures threatened by a wildfire. SB-360 addresses these concerns and enlists the aid of the only people who can make fuel reduction changes to residential property: the landowners themselves.

The vegetation treatment prescription found in the act is derived from research conducted at the Rocky Mountain Research Station in Missoula, Montana (Cohen and Saveland , 1996). The measures are simple and easy to apply and include:

- Removing pine needles and leaves from the roof.
- Pruning limbs from trees, keeping trees healthy.
- Removing shrubs near the home and close to trees.
- Mowing dead grass near the home.
- Storing firewood and other flammable material at least 20 feet from the home (during fire season).
- Removing tree limbs within 10 feet of a chimney opening.
- Maintaining a shaded fuel break near the house and in some cases around the property line.
- Maintaining driveways that are over 150 feet long clear of branches and trees that could prevent emergency vehicles from gaining access to the structure.

The act applies to lands protected by the Oregon Department of Forestry and does not apply to other properties outside of ODF protection. Each county will establish a classification committee that will identify the hazard class of each area affected by the act. Once classified, landowners are provided a certification package and given two years to certify that their lands meet the standards. The Central Oregon District of the Oregon Department of Forestry will work closely with local emergency management personnel, conduct public meetings, hearings and community workshops along with providing onsite consultation for landowners affected by the act.

The Forestland-Urban Interface Fire Protection Act of 1997 is intended to be both voluntary and self certifying by the homeowner. By design, the Oregon Department of Forestry developed a program that recruits the assistance of each homeowner, offers

defensible space prescriptions and allows affected homeowners the option of certifying their property or not. The act contains no statutory provisions, homeowners will not be cited or required to appear in court if they choose not to participate. The act does contain a potential civil liability if the homeowner does not certify their property in two years after notification. If a fire originates on that property and spreads through the area that should be treated and the Oregon Department of Forestry must utilize extraordinary suppression efforts to contain that fire, a home owner could be liable for up to one hundred thousand dollars of suppression costs.

3.2 Emergency Conflagration Act

Under circumstances when wildfires create a serious threat to life and property, the Governor of Oregon may invoke the Emergency Conflagration Act. Once invoked, the Act authorizes the Governor to use the resources of any county, city, or district fire suppression organization to assist fire-fighting efforts anywhere in the state. The Act requires the state to reimburse the political subdivision for costs in providing such fire suppression assistance. The Governor can also declare a “state of emergency” authorizing the participation of all public agency personnel and equipment, including the Oregon National Guard, to assist in the battle against wildfires. During a Governor declared “state of emergency,” the Oregon State Police coordinates National Guard resources through the Office of Emergency Management and structural fire fighting resources through the Office of the State Fire Marshal. The Oregon Military Department also provides both staff and equipment for emergency fire fighting needs.

Under this law, only the Governor *may* invoke the Act to mobilize fire suppression resources from the across the state, but only if local resources, including what is available under mutual aid agreements, have first been fully committed. The increasing frequency of *Conflagration Act* utilization has caused funding concerns and challenges because no dedicated funds are set aside for this purpose. Especially troubling is the increasing frequency and public expectation to use the Act to protect structures in communities having minimal or nonexistent structural protection.

3.3 Federal Emergency Management Act (FEMA) Eligibility

Federal fire management financial assistance is provided through the President’s Disaster Relief Fund and made available by FEMA. Only fires involving structures or homes can be declared eligible for FEMA reimbursement. *Cost reimbursement can only occur if the Governor invokes the Emergency Conflagration Act* and the Office of Emergency Management requests assistance and provides information on the estimated amount and severity of the threat to structures or homes through the FEMA Region 10 office. Each incident requires separate approval. After validating the nature and extent of the threat, the FEMA regional office requests approval by the FEMA director in Washington, D.C. Once approved, subsequent fire fighting costs on all FEMA approved fires are eligible for approximately 70% cost reimbursement under an approved grant for managing, mitigating, and controlling designated fires during the incident time period as established by FEMA.

The following fires (8 out of 9) in the 2002 fire season were approved by FEMA and

were eligible for cost reimbursement:
Cache Mountain Fire Deschutes County
Biscuit (Florence) Fire Josephine County
Timbered Rock Fire Jackson County
Sheldon Ridge Fire Wasco County
Flagtail Fire Grant County
Squire Peak Fire Jackson County
Winter Fire Lake County
Eyerly Fire Jefferson County

3.4 Healthy Forest Restoration Act (HFRA)

The November 2003, Healthy Forest Restoration Act (HFRA) offers new tools and additional authorities for treating more acres in a timely fashion to meet forest restoration goals. It provides new authorities to treat fuels on federal land that require NEPA at the EA or EIS level. HFRA strengthens public participation by providing incentives for the local communities to develop their own community wildfire protection plans. It limits the complexities of Environmental Analyses for hazard reduction projects. It provides a more effective appeal process and instructs the Courts to balance short-term affects of implementing projects against the harm caused by delay and long-term benefits of a restored forest.

HFRA Title I addresses vegetation treatments on National Forest System and Bureau of Land Management lands that are at risk of wildland fire or insect and disease epidemics (emphasis is on Fire Regime I, II, and III in Condition Class 2 & 3). Title II encourages each community to develop their own CWPP and to designate their own specific WUIs where restoration projects might occur. Half of all fuel reduction projects under the HFRA must occur in the community protection zone as defined by HFRA. It also encourages biomass energy production through grants and assistance to local communities to help create market incentives for the removal of otherwise valueless forest material.

3.5 National Fire Plan (NFP)

Following the explosive fire season of 2000, the National Fire Plan was established to respond to severe wildland fires and their impacts to communities. It is an umbrella term that covers a variety of government programs and ideas addressing wildland fire issues. The NFP is a long-term investment that will help protect human lives, communities, and natural resources, while fostering cooperation and communication among federal, state, and local governments, tribes, and interested publics. Federal fire agencies worked closely with these partners, and the Western Governor's Association to complete a 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy in August 2001. An Implementation Plan was developed in May 2002 to provide consistent and standard direction for implementing the NFP and the Strategy.

The NFP is focused on firefighting, rehabilitation, hazardous fuels reduction, community assistance, and accountability. The guiding principle for dealing with fire risks is the reduction of hazardous fuel loads threatening communities and wildland

ecosystems. The NFP offers grant opportunities for hazard fuel reduction, wildfire planning, wildfire prevention, and fuel utilization. Most NFP funding in Oregon goes to wildfire preparedness and hazardous fuel treatment projects.

3.6 Oregon Statewide Land Use Planning Goals

Since 1973, Oregon has maintained a strong statewide program for land use planning. The foundation of that program is a set of nineteen statewide planning goals. The goals express the state's policies on land use and related topics. The program is administered through the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD), and Oregon's cities and counties. Cities and counties implement the requirements of the statewide planning goals through state-approved local comprehensive land use programs. Planning goals related to WUI fire hazards are Goal 4 – Forest Lands, Goal 7 – Natural Hazards, and Goal 14 – Urbanization. Goal 4 requires local governments to minimize risks associated with wildfire when new dwellings or other structures are allowed in forestlands. Goal 7 requires local governments to develop programs to reduce risks to people and property from a variety of natural hazards, including wildfire. Goal 14 mandates that cities have urban growth boundaries (UGBs) to provide for urban uses and limit urban-type development on rural resource lands outside of UGBs.

3.7 FLAME Act – Federal Land Assistance, Management, and Enhancement Act of 2009

On October 29, 2009, the House and the Senate passed the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010, which included Title V – The FLAME Act of 2009. President Obama signed this bill into law on October 30, 2009. Many Congressional champions and organizations interested in solving the ongoing, and increasing, problems with wildfire suppression emergency costs have been pushing for the FLAME Act to be enacted.

The FLAME Act of 2009 establishes two FLAME Funds in the Department of Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2010; one for the Department of the Interior funded at \$61 million and one for the Forest Service funded at \$413 million in FY2010. The Funds address the impacts of increasing wildfire suppression costs and their effects on other agency programs. These funds are subject to normal appropriations for funding from year-to-year. The funding levels for FY2010 are not intended to represent a final method for calculating FLAME Fund budget requests in future years. Furthermore, agencies are expected to develop new methods for formulating fire suppression funding estimates for Wildland Fire Management (WFM) and the FLAME Funds. Furthermore, Congress stated that the use of “the 10-year rolling average has failed to keep pace with actual funding requirements and has led to significant disruptions as agencies borrow from nonfire programs accounts when funds are exhausted” (p.72). In future years, the WFM and FLAME Fund accounts “**should fully anticipate wildland fire requirements and prevent future borrowing from non-fire programs**” (p.72, emphasis added). These two funds will reduce the need for agencies to transfer funds to wildfire suppression from other agency programs, which have historically led to considerable disruptions to important program functions. The Flame Act of 2009 retains the provision that requires the secretaries to notify Congress when 60 days of funds remain in the respective Flame funds. The funds can only be used

after a secretarial declaration that a fire is large or complex or if annual suppression accounts are depleted. The conferees are expected to develop a streamlined declaration process to ensure funds are made available in the most efficient manner.

Congress further expects the administration to keep their commitment to appropriately and fully estimate suppression costs, but not at the expense of other agency programs.

3.8 National Cohesive Wildland Fire Management Strategy

In response to requirements of the Federal Land Assistance, Management, and Enhancement (FLAME) Act of 2009, the Wildland Fire Leadership Council (WFLC) directed the development of the **National Cohesive Wildland Fire Management Strategy (Cohesive Strategy)**. The Cohesive Strategy is a collaborative process with active involvement of all levels of government and non-governmental organizations, as well as the public, to seek national, all-lands solutions to wildland fire management issues.

3.9 Oregon's *Communities At Risk* Assessment

Oregon natural resource agencies, fire service professionals, and communities facing the threat of wildfires recognize the need for risk assessment. Many local communities and counties throughout Oregon have developed local risk assessments using a variety of methods. A statewide task force was formed in February 2004 as part of the Oregon Department of Forestry's Fire Program Review to develop a statewide assessment of *Communities At Risk*. This supports fulfillment of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the National Association of State Foresters (NASF) and federal agencies as well as Task E in Goal 4 of the *Implementation Plan for the 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy*. The task force brought together a number of stakeholder organizations outside of those involved in the MOU. The statewide *Communities At Risk* assessment also provides guidance for communities in the process of developing or updating local risk assessments to align with the state methodology. The task force approved the methodology and initial statewide assessment. This assessment identifies communities and assigns each a *low*, *moderate*, or *high* risk rating for *Risk*, *Hazard*, *Protection Capability*, *Value*, and *Overall*. Because the definition of *community* within the federal legislation referenced above includes verbiage about populated areas "within or adjacent to federal lands", this assessment also identifies those listed communities in proximity to federal or tribal lands. A local, collaborative review of the initial assessment followed during the winter of 2006, thus completing the final step in the assessment process. Local tax lot data was used from 25 counties to improve identifying the location of dwellings at risk in those areas; community (jurisdiction) names were updated; the fuel hazard rating was increased for certain agricultural vegetation classifications in eastern Oregon; and all related layers were updated to reflect the changes. Unlike the previous *Communities At Risk* list from the 2001 federal register, this risk assessment will be dynamic and maintained by the Oregon Department of Forestry. It will replace the listing in the federal register.

3.11 Fire Adapted Communities

The Fire Adapted Community uses tools, supported by federal and state agencies, to prepare its homes, neighborhoods, businesses, infrastructure, natural areas, and surrounding landscape for wildfire but it's up to you and your local jurisdiction to take the necessary actions. At a minimum, your community's fire adapted actions should include the following plans and programs.

A Community Wildfire Protection Plan is a collaborative plan created by the fire department, state and local forestry staff, land managers, community leaders, and the public. The planning process maps values at risk, including neighborhoods, infrastructure, and natural areas vulnerable to wildfire then takes action to reduce risk, such as prescribed burning, Firewise, or other measures that adapt a community to fire.

Firewise Communities USA provides steps for homeowners to take on their property to create defensible space, reduce wildfire threat to their homes and neighborhoods. Once the neighborhood has met specific criteria, they can apply for national Firewise recognition.

Ready, Set, Go! engages local fire departments who deliver the fire adapted communities message using Firewise, wildfire situational awareness, and safe evacuation planning and execution. The program educates both the public and fire departments in preparing a community for wildfire.

3.12 Firewise Communities USA

Brush, grass or forest fires don't have to be disasters. The National Fire Protection Association's (NFPA) Firewise Communities program encourages local solutions for wildfire safety by involving homeowners, community leaders, planners, developers, firefighters, and others in the effort to protect people and property from wildfire risks.

The program is co-sponsored by the USDA Forest Service, the US Department of the Interior, and the National Association of State Foresters.

To save lives and property from wildfire, NFPA's Firewise Communities program teaches people how to adapt to living with wildfire and encourages neighbors to work together and take action now to prevent losses. We all have a role to play in protecting ourselves and each other from the risk of wildfire.

4.0 WILDFIRE RISK ASSESSMENT

4.1 Grant County Communities at Risk – Statewide Assessment

A statewide task force was formed in February 2004 as part of the Oregon Department of Forestry’s Fire Program Review to develop a statewide assessment of *Communities At Risk*. This supports fulfillment of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the NASF and federal agencies as well as Task E in Goal 4 of the *Implementation Plan for the 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy*. The task force brought together a number of stakeholder organizations outside of those involved in the MOU. The statewide *Communities At Risk* assessment also provides guidance for communities in the process of developing or updating local risk assessments to align with the state methodology. The statewide *Communities At Risk* assessment also provides guidance for communities in the process of developing or updating local risk assessments to align with the state methodology. This risk assessment replaces the original list in the Federal Register in 2001. The following communities in Grant County are identified as communities at risk in the statewide assessment.

| Community at Risk | Risk | Hazard | Protection | Value | Overall | Federal/ Tribal Lands |
|-------------------|------|--------|------------|-------|---------|-----------------------------|
| Canyon City | H | H | M | L | H | Y |
| Dayville | M | H | M | L | M | Y |
| Granite | H | H | M | M | H | Y |
| John Day | H | H | M | L | H | Y |
| Long Creek | H | H | M | L | H | Y |
| Monument | H | H | M | L | M | Y |
| Mt. Vernon | H | H | M | L | H | Y |
| Prairie City | L | H | M | L | H | Y |
| Seneca | H | H | M | L | H | Y |

The *Communities At Risk* assessment was used to develop a statewide fuels strategy and to help set large-scale priorities across geographic areas (watersheds, multi-county coordination areas, etc). The task group developed the methodology using national guidance. At this scale, available data must be applied consistently statewide for relative comparisons. Community and local priorities, including prioritization of projects, will be determined through community wildfire protection plans and local assessments using more refined local data. Important factors that need to be considered in assessment of individual lots and neighborhoods, such as roof type, defensible space, and access, are not considered at the statewide scale and will not be part of the statewide assessment at this time.

4.2 Grant County Risk Assessment Methodology

The assessment of wildfire risk in Grant County was completed at the zone level. The risk level for individual communities was also addressed.

A Wildfire Risk Assessment was completed for the nine zones in the county with the assessment resulting in each zone receiving a rating of Low, Moderate, High, or Extreme Overall Risk. Fiver

factors were considered: 1) Ignition risk, 2) Hazard, 3) Values at Risk, 4) Protection Capability, and 5) Structural Vulnerability. Ratings were based on scores assigned to four risk factors (Structural Vulnerability was not included in the rating as the home-site surveys will be completed during the next phase of the CWPP). Each of the four scoring factors has from two to five criteria designed to better describe the factor. These criteria were given weighted scores established by ODF. Criteria scores were added giving a total score for the factor. The scores for the factors were added up and used to establish the overall rating factor.

The scoring system for the four factors used to rate the zones and communities is as follows:

Ignition Risk is the likelihood of a wildfire occurring. There are three criteria used for assessment of Ignition Risk: 1) historic fire occurrence (number of fires per 1000 acres per 10 years), 2) home density per 10 acres, 3) other risk factors (such as powerlines, highways, off road vehicle use, etc.)

- **Historic Fire Occurrence:** Historic fire locations from were used to generate Risk Rating. The density of fire starts per 1000 acres per 10 years was then determined. This layer is used to indicate a *low*, *moderate*, or *high* likelihood of a fire occurring, based upon historic fire occurrence.

| Historic Fire Occurrence Fire occurrence – per 1000 acres per 10 years | Rating Points |
|--|----------------------|
| Low 0- .11 | 5 points |
| Moderate 0.1 – 1.12 | 10 points |
| High 1.1 + 3 | 20 points |

- **Home Density:** The density of homes per 10 acres.

| Home Density Per 10 Acres | Rating Points |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 0 - .9 – Rural | 0 points |
| 1 – 5 – Suburban | 5 points |
| 5.1 + -Urban | 10 points |

- **Other Ignition Risk Factors Present in the Vicinity** include transmission power lines, power substations, active logging, construction, debris burning, slash burning, mining, dispersed or developed camping, hunting, off road vehicle use, highways, woodcutting, ranches, or lightning prone areas.

| Other Ignition Risk Factors Present in Vicinity | Rating Points |
|--|----------------------|
| < 8 factors present | 0 points |
| 8 – 15 present | 5 points |
| > 15 present | 10 points |

Ignition Risk Factor Rating is the cumulative score of the three criteria:

- 0-13 Low
- 14-27 Moderate
- 28-40 High

Hazard

Hazard is defined as resistance to control once a wildfire starts. Hazard is influenced by weather, topography and fuels that adversely affect suppression efforts. Hazard is used to indicate a *low*, *moderate*, or *high* resistance to control once a wildfire starts. The rating is based upon a composite of weather (25%), slope (4%), aspect (6%), elevation (2%) and fuel (30%), insect/disease mortality (20%), and crown fire potential (13%).

Weather factor value is the number of days per season that forest fuels are capable of producing a significant fire event. All of eastern Oregon is classified as *high* with the maximum score of 40 points assigned.

- **Slope**

| Percent Slope | Rating Points |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| 0 – 25% | 0 points |
| 26 – 40% | 2 points |
| > 40% | 3 points |

- **Aspect**

| Aspect | Rating Points |
|---------------|----------------------|
| N, NW, NE | 0 points |
| W, E | 3 points |

| | |
|-----------|-----------------|
| S, SW, SE | 5 points |
|-----------|-----------------|

- **Elevation**

| Elevation | Rating Points |
|------------------|----------------------|
| 5001+ feet | 0 points |
| 3501- 5000 feet | 1 points |
| 0 – 3500 feet | 2 points |

- **Surface Fuels** are based on Fire Behavior Fuel Models. Hazard Value 1 (HV1) produces flame lengths up to 5 feet with little spotting, torching or crowning. HV2 has flame lengths from 5 to 8 feet with sporadic spotting, torching or crowning. HV3 has flame lengths over 8 feet with frequent spotting, torching and crowning.

| Surface Fuels | Rating Points |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| Non- forest | 0 points |
| HV1 | 5 points |
| HV2 | 10 points |
| HV3 | 30 points |

- **Crown Fire Potential (Aerial Fuels)**

| Crown Fire Potential | Rating Points |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| Passive – Low | 0 points |
| Active – Moderate | 5 points |
| Independent | 10 points |

The Hazard Factor Rating is the cumulative score of the six criteria:

- 0-9 Low
- 10-40 Moderate
- 41-60 High
- 61-80 Extreme

Values Protected

Values Protected are the human and economic values associated with communities or landscapes. Protection of life is the number one priority with all agencies and is measured by the density of homes. The presence of community infrastructure such as power substations and corridors, transportation corridors, manufacturing and utilities facilities, municipal watersheds, water storage and distribution, fuel storage facilities, hospitals, schools, churches, community centers and stores are other considerations.

- **Home Density:** The density of homes per 10 acres.

| Home Density Per 10 Acres | Rating Points |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 0 - .9 – Rural | 2 points |
| 1 – 5 – Suburban | 15 points |
| 5.1 + -Urban | 30 points |

- **Community Infrastructure**

| Community Infrastructure | Rating Points |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| None present | 0 points |
| One present | 10 points |
| More than one present | 20 points |

Values Protected Rating is the cumulative score of the two criteria:

- 0-14 Low
- 16-30 Moderate
- 31-50 High

Protection Capability

Protection Capability is the capacity and resources to undertake fire suppression and prevention activities. It involves a combination of capacities of fire protection agencies, local government and community organizations. A high score represents a high risk and a low protection capability.

- **Fire Response**

| Fire Response Capacity | Rating Points |
|--|----------------------|
| Organized structural response < 10 minutes | 0 points |
| Inside fire district, but structural response > 10 minutes | 8 points |
| No structural protection, wildland response < 20 minutes | 15 points |
| No structural response & wildland protection > 20 minutes | 36 points |

- **Community Preparedness** refers to effective mitigation efforts by the community that will help make fire response successful.

| Community Preparedness | Rating Points |
|---|----------------------|
| Organized stakeholder groups, Firewise communities, phone trees, etc. | 0 points |
| Primarily agency efforts | 2 points |
| No effort | 4 points |

Protection Capability Rating is the cumulative score of the two criteria:

0-9 Low
 10-16 Moderate
 17-40 High

Structural Vulnerability is the likelihood that a structure will be destroyed during a wildfire event. The practices controlled by the landowner within the home ignition zone account for 90% of the likelihood of a wildfire threatening a structure. The three primary criteria involved are roofing assembly, defensible space, and presence of suppression action (access).

Grant County will complete an assessment of Structural Vulnerability through on site visits. Assessments will be completed in conjunction with educating and assisting communities in participating in the *Firewise Communities USA* program.

4.3 Grant County CAR – Wildfire Risk Assessment

In Grant County, a *community-at-risk (CAR)* is defined as a group of homes or other structures with basic infrastructure (such as shared transportation routes) and services within or near federal land. A *wildland-urban interface (WUI)* area surrounds a community-at-risk, including that community’s infrastructure or water source, and may extend 1 ½ miles or more beyond that community. This boundary depends on topography and geographic features that could influence

wildfire, the location of an effective firebreak, or Condition Class 3 lands. Major evacuation routes in the county are part of the WUI as well.

The cities of Seneca and Granite rated out with the highest wildfire risk in the assessment. Although the Seneca Zone rated as “moderate” risk, the city of Seneca has no fire department which raised the risk rating to the highest level for the county. Seneca is very vulnerable with regard to structural fire in the city. During the winter months this area is very cold and virtually all of the residents burn wood as their main heat source. Incidents such as chimney fires can be potentially devastating in this area.

The city of Granite has a fire department and a truck that is kept in a heated building during the winter months. However, the trained fire department consists entirely of the fire chief. The area around Granite is at very high risk from wildfire due to extremely heavy fuel loads. The Umatilla and the Wallowa Whitman National Forests are currently planning a fuels reduction project in the Granite area.

Prairie City, John Day, and Monument received the number of points rating them in the high range. John Day received the high risk rating due to the most critical infrastructure in the county including the hospital, the county courthouse, several schools, and the major business district in the county. Both Monument and Prairie City are more vulnerable to wildfire due to the surrounding topography and vegetation. The area around Monument has been subject to numerous severe complex fires in the last two decades. Prairie City north of Highway 26 is characterized by dense vegetation and steep slopes up Dixie Creek. While only part of the area is within the city limits, the area is contiguous.

4.4 Grant County Zones – Wildfire Risk Assessment

Due to the variability in topography, aspect, elevation and vegetation that may exist within an individual zone a certain amount of professional judgment was used in applying the individual ratings during the assessment process for each of the zones. The complete record of the minutes for all the community meetings can be found in the Appendix.

4.41 Dayville Zone

The Dayville zone rated out as a “medium” hazard relative to the rest of the county. The characteristics of the topography in combination with the type of vegetation mitigated the risks somewhat compared to other areas. While the city of Dayville Fire Department will respond to structure fires outside of the city limits there are risks associated with this strategy such as the vulnerability of the homes in the city of Dayville if the fire department is responding to a structure fire outside of the city. The community meeting for the Dayville zone was held on May 3, 2012. The following recommendations were made by the public attending this meeting:

- During wildfire events the community should appoint a liaison with fire overhead to obtain information for the community.
- During wildfire events an “organizational” chart should be provided to the community.

4.42 Granite Zone

The Granite zone rated out as a “high” hazard for wildfire risk. This zone is extremely vulnerable to wildfire due to the location, the vegetation type, the topography, the communications structure, and the limited structural fire protection available. Although the city of Granite has a fire department the recruitment and retention of volunteers has become virtually impossible and the fire chief is the only available member. This area has numerous absentee landowners who visit their respective properties sporadically throughout the year. The community meeting for the Granite Zone was held on March 29, 2012. The following recommendations were made by the public attending this meeting:

- Access roads must be adequate
- Forest Service should consider stationing engine at the Powerhouse or Boundary Guard Station during high fire risk
- Actively seek establishment of cell tower to service Granite and the surrounding area
- Improve 73 road as this is heavily used by the public and is the major evacuation route. This road is in very poor condition at this time and presents a significant safety risk
- The City of Granite needs county support

4.43 John Day Zone

The John Day Zone rated as “high” for risk from wildfire. Although there is a vital fire department both in the city and for the surrounding rural area, this zone has a higher density of homes in the WUI than some other areas in the county as well as a greater number of improvements and “values at risk” such as cell phone towers, schools, hospital, etc. The

community meeting for this zone was held on April 26, 2012. No specific recommendations were made at the meeting although a variety of values, issues and concerns were brought up.

4.44 Monument/Long Creek Zone

The Monument/Long Creek Zone is rated as “high” for risk from wildfire. This is a large zone and the area around Monument has been subject to numerous significantly sized complex fires within the last two decades. Much of the fuel in this area is “flashy” and dries out early in the season and temperatures in much of this zone can be quite warm. As with all areas in Grant County, the population within the cities is declining while the number of homes and residents in the range and forest lands is increasing. The cities of Long Creek and Monument have fire departments and the Monument area also has the newly approved Monument Rural Fire Department. Two community outreach meetings were held in this zone, one in Long Creek on April 23 and a second in Monument on April 25, 2012. Below are the composite recommendations from these meetings:

- Ask Grant County to enforce planning requirements in forestlands for roads, bridges, turnouts, etc.
- Create a detailed inventory of houses, improvements and other pertinent information such as children, propane tanks, fuel tanks, etc. in the area
- Create a county GIS system to manage data for the CWPP and Firewise projects
- Include Hood River County Lands in northern Grant County in WUI
- Have Grant County building department require latitudes and longitudes on building permits
- Make Indian Creek on 24 road high priority for fuel reduction
- Make JV Ranch, now owned by the BLM, a high priority for fuel reduction (dead trees/ heavy grass with no grazing for 5 years, etc.)

4.45 Mt. Vernon Zone

The Mt. Vernon Zone rated as “high” for risk from wildfire. The Mt. Vernon fire department rural provides structural fire protection for the city of Mt. Vernon and the surrounding area. This fire department is the largest rural in the county and a vital fire department. This zone has a higher density of homes in the WUI than some other areas in the county as well as a greater number of improvements and “values at risk”. The community meeting for this zone was held on April 24, 2012. Recommendations made at that meeting are below:

- Make the north boundary of the Malheur NF, on the south side of the John Day Valley (e.g. above Laycock Creek), the highest priority for fuels treatment as there are many homes and improvements in this area
- Make the entire Malheur NF boundary along John Day Valley from Prairie City to Dayville on both sides of Highway 26 a high priority
- Find a way to improve rural roads in this area to better allow ingress and egress of emergency vehicles. Many roads need brushing, grade realignment, curve widening, turnouts, bridge improvement, etc.

4.46 Prairie City Zone

The Prairie City Zone is rated as “high” for risk from wildfire. The Prairie Fire Department rural provides structural fire protection for the city of Mt. Vernon and the surrounding area. This fire department is the largest rural in the county and a vital fire department. This zone has a higher density of homes in the WUI than some other areas in the county as well as a greater number of improvements and “values at risk”. The community meeting for this zone was held on April 24, 2012. Recommendations made at that meeting are below:

- Identify and develop more/existing water sources
- Prioritize and keep open roads on the Malheur NF for safety reasons – these should be identified in travel management plan
- Emphasize more cooperation between public and private land
- Develop system to provide pumper trucks for isolated or hard to reach areas

4.47 Ritter/Dale Zone

The Ritter/Dale Zone rated out as a “high” hazard for wildfire risk. This zone is extremely vulnerable to wildfire due to the location, the vegetation type, the topography, the communications structure, and the complete absence of structural fire protection in the area. Further the area is remote, especially west of Highway 395 around Ritter. The county road east to Highway 395 provides the only evacuation route since the road to the west has been locked by a private landowner. Two community meetings were held in this zone one in Ritter on July 25 and one in Dale on August 24, 2012. The following recommendations were made by the public attending this meeting:

- Need cell tower for communications (Verizon preferably)
- Community should consider organized structural fire protection Need county records on line
- Need county GIS system
- Improve ingress/egress for evacuation in this area – road to Monument has been locked and no longer is available for travel – locked gates in other areas
- Look for opportunities to improve emergency services response in this area

4.48 Seneca Zone

The Seneca Zone rated out as a “medium” hazard relative to the rest of the county. The characteristics of the topography in combination with the type of vegetation mitigated the risks somewhat compared to other areas. State and federal government agencies have invested a significant amount of cost-share money into the Bear Valley area in this zone over the last several years. There is no structural fire protection in this zone as the Seneca City fire department is not longer active. For this reason it is important to note that while Seneca rated out as a “medium” hazard at the zone level it rated out very high at the Seneca community level. Two meetings were held in Seneca, one on April 5 and one on August 14, 2012. The following recommendations were made by the public attending those meetings

- Actively seek input and cooperation with the Silvies Valley Ranch
- Implement Senate Bill 360 county wide
- Investigate the possibility of a rural fire truck located in Seneca

4.49 Upper Middle Fork Zone

The Upper Middle Fork Zone rated out as a “high” hazard for wildfire risk. This zone is extremely vulnerable to wildfire due to the location, the vegetation type, the topography, the communications structure, and the complete absence of structural fire protection in the area. Further the area is remote and generally accessed from the west at the junction of Highway 395 and the Ritter Bridge and from the east at the junction of Highway 7 where the old community of Bates was located. A community meeting was held at the Sunshine Guard Station on April 28, 2012. The following recommendations were made by the public attending this meeting:

- Get information on local areas to lookouts (cabins/homes/people/stock/etc.)
- Implement a GIS system in the county with various overlays and information to assist with data management and tracking progress of the CWPP and the Firewise program
- Develop water sources in Middle Fork area
- Identify locations of ponds and water sources by GPS and put on overlay
- Clean out ponds in area

5.0 WILDFIRE MITIGATION STRATEGY

5.1 Prioritization of WUI Areas in Grant County

The WUI boundaries were drawn to capture the overall limitations of each fire protection district, fuel hazard, CAR's, and values-at-risk. Logical anchor points on the landscape were used to designate WUI boundaries, including natural fuel breaks, ridgelines, roads, and local of the area. A map is provided with approximately WUI boundaries delineated, however actual boundaries will be determined on the ground as dictated by site specific conditions.

This section establishes a strategy designed to mitigate the wildfire risk concerns in Grant County. It presents some projects which should be implemented throughout the county and some which apply to specific zones. The strategy establishes the priority of each project as High, Moderate, or Low. It also gives the time frame in which it should be implemented (immediate, mid-term, and long-term) and the agency responsible for doing so. Some of the projects may require grant funding in order to be successful.

5.2 Strategy for Entire County

1. Assign a County Wildfire Coordinator to represent Grant County in matters pertaining to the county and the implementation of this CWPP. Update the CWPP as needed.

Priority – High

Time Frame – immediate and ongoing

Responsibility – Grant County Court

2. Implement geographical information system (GIS) system in the county. Grant County currently does not support any type of county wide GIS. GIS is needed to capture, store, manipulate, analyze, manage, and present all types of geographical data associated with the CWPP and to merge cartography, statistical analysis, and database technology. GIS capability is needed for emergency services personnel, for combining data provided by various federal and state agencies, for tracking landowners in the WUI, and for easily locating structures in the WUI. Consequently, a GIS database is currently being developed as a result of and in conjunction with the development of the revised Grant County CWPP.

Priority – High

Time Frame – immediate and ongoing

Responsibility – County Wildfire Coordinator

3. Implement CWPPs at the Zone level. These CWPPs will provide information and impetus to establish Firewise Communities USA program in the zones.

Priority – High

Time Frame – immediate and ongoing

Responsibility – County Wildfire Coordinator

4. Evaluate and update the county emergency management system county wide.

Priority – High

Time Frame – Mid term

Responsibility – Grant County Communications Task Force

5. Complete a road hazard assessment to address existing road situations which could result in problems for evacuation of residents and limit fire apparatus response during a wildfire situation. Priority areas include:

1. Areas covered by Mt. Vernon rural fire department
2. Areas covered by John Day rural fire department
3. Areas covered by Prairie City rural fire department
4. Areas covered by Monument rural fire department

Priority – High

Time Frame – Immediate and ongoing

Responsibility – Rural Fire Districts, Grant County Sheriff's Office, ODF

6. Consider adoption of SB-360 classification standards county wide

Priority – High

Time Frame - Mid Term

Responsibility – ODF, County Planning Department, County Wildfire Coordinator

7. Assist Rural Fire Districts in upgrading their firefighting equipment, facilities and training as needed.

Priority – High

Time Frame – Immediate and continuing

Responsibility – ODF, Fire Chiefs, Forest Service, BLM, Grant County

8. Encourage and support collaborative efforts between the Forest Service, BLM and communities at risk from wildfires. Help identify needed hazard fuel reduction work on federal lands within the WUI.

Priority - High

Time Frame – Immediate and continuing

Responsibility – Forest Service, BLM

9. Continue county-wide wildfire education and prevention efforts as described in the 2005 CWPP

Priority – High


Time Frame – Immediate and continuing

Responsibility – ODF, Forest Service, Fire Chiefs, BLM, Grant County, Grant-Harney Fire Prevention Coop., County Wildfire Coordinator


COMMUNITY WILDFIRE PROTECTION PLAN

Grant County

Wildlands Urban Interface / Intermix Zone



1 inch = 10 miles



NOTE: WUI Boundary is approximate; local topography and site conditions will be considered for the final placement.

 **Grant Soil and Water Conservation District**
721 South Canyon Boulevard John Day, Oregon 97845
Phone: (541) 575-0135 Fax: (541) 575-0646
Serving the Citizens of Grant County for over 50 Years!

Legend


- Approximate WUI Boundaries
- Landownership**
 - United States Forest Service
 - Private
 - National Park Service
 - Bureau of Land Management
 - Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
 - Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
 - State of Oregon

August 26, 2013


COMMUNITY WILDFIRE PROTECTION PLAN

Grant County

Locations of Cellular Telephone Towers



1 inch = 10 miles



 **Grant Soil and Water Conservation District**
721 South Canyon Boulevard John Day, Oregon 97845
Phone: (541) 575-0135 Fax: (541) 575-0848
Serving the Citizens of Grant County for over 50 Years!

Legend

- Cell Towers
- Landownership**
 - United States Forest Service
 - Private
 - National Park Service
 - Bureau of Land Management
 - Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
 - Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
 - State of Oregon

December 12, 2012

5.3 Strategy by Zones

The strategy by zones will be developed in conjunction with the development of the zone level CWPPs and the implementation of the Firewise Communities USA program.

5.4 Obstacles Identified

The following obstacles were identified by communities and stakeholders to keep the county safer from wildfire. These obstacles were recognized both through the community meeting input gathered as part of the CWPP planning process and input from various emergency services personnel that serve in Grant County. The obstacles that were identified are:

1. Hazard Awareness
2. Developing Approved Local-Level Community Wildfire Protection Plans
3. Coordinating and Tracking Fuel Treatment Accomplishments
4. Disposal of Treated Vegetation
5. Funding
6. Technical Assistance

5.41 Obstacle 1-Hazard Awareness

Landowners are often unaware that wildfire could threaten their community or area of interest. This results, in part, because landowners relocate to Grant County from geographic areas where wildfires are not a common occurrence. Some who are aware of a potential threat become complacent if a substantial period of time has passed since the last significant wildfire event. In addition, high homeowner turnover rate contributes to the need for ongoing education. Studies have shown that some are aware that wildfire could be a threat to their community, but choose to accept the risk (McCaffery, 2006). It is common knowledge among wildfire professionals that public interest regarding community safety increases in the wake of significant wildfire events. If individuals and communities are unaware or complacent about the fact that their community could be threatened by a wildfire, it is unlikely that they will take action to reduce the existing hazard before the threat occurs. Many individuals do not have an understanding of why fuel treatments are completed on tracts of lands in certain areas.

5.42 Obstacle 2-Developing Local-Level Community Wildfire Protection Plans

The zone-level CWPP is a plan that enables community stakeholders to work together with wildfire professionals to develop a strategy for reducing the community's wildfire hazard and risk. Local-level CWPPs identify a community's specific wildfire situation and hazards and prioritize actions for reducing hazards and risks to the community. The planning area of a local-level CWPP is typically a neighborhood, homeowner's association, or development boundary. Nonetheless, as with all CWPPs, a community can define its boundary however its stakeholders deem the most appropriate. Local-level CWPPs are the most specific and effective documents for community stakeholders to work in concert toward making a community safer from wildfire. As with all CWPPs, these plans are not legally binding nor are they a policy document. Accordingly, for a plan to be effective it requires broad-based support from within the community and should be taken with a grass-roots approach. ODF and local fire protection

districts should be involved in the planning process from the beginning. Property owners, easement holders, subject matter experts from municipal, county and federal agencies, and other applicable entities should also be included in the local-level CWPP planning process.

5.43 Obstacle 3- Coordinating and Tracking Fuel Treatment Accomplishments

Understanding where fuel treatments have been successfully accomplished is valuable to CWPP core teams, land management agencies, fire suppression personnel, technical service providers, and other interested stakeholders. From a planning standpoint, understanding where treatments have occurred is critical for strategizing and determining future priority treatment areas. Treatments are most effective across large acreages. Connecting treatments across the landscape increases the effectiveness of each individual effort. Coordinated individual treatments cause a landscape scale effect that is effective in reducing fire behavior. Within Grant County, landscape scale treatments are challenging to achieve due to the diversity of ownerships across the county and policy constraints. By knowing where work has been accomplished, land managers, core teams, and other planning teams can gain an understanding of which areas will be the most effective for creating a landscape effect.

5.44 Obstacle 4-Disposal of Treated Vegetation

Disposing of treated vegetation (aka slash) resulting from hazardous fuel reduction treatments is a common problem throughout Grant County. The issue is not unique to Grant County and is prevalent throughout Oregon and the West. Appropriate slash disposal is an important part of effective fuels reduction treatments. Treated vegetation that is stockpiled onsite can increase wildfire hazards. Improperly disposed of vegetation can also attract insects including ips beetle and mountain pine beetle, which weaken trees and cause mortality to standing trees and increases fuel available for wildfires. There are a variety of effective practices for slash disposal that can be divided into two categories: remove-from-site and remain on-site. Remove from site practices typically include utilizing woody vegetation for wood products and relocating woody vegetation to disposal sites. Common remain on-site practices include on-site chipping, mastication, tub grinding, lop and scatter, and controlled burning.

From a financial perspective, a highly preferred method of slash disposal is converting treated woody vegetation to merchantable wood products. This practice removes slash from the project site and the sale of material works to offset project costs. Conversion to wood products is generally not an option for most hazardous fuels reduction projects within Grant County and in most areas of Oregon due to weak or nonexistent markets for products both locally and nationally. Additionally, for projects to be cost effective, a quantity threshold of merchantable material is usually necessary, something that most communities are unable to provide. Firewood is sometimes utilized as a product from hazardous fuel reduction projects, especially in communities where wood stoves are used for heating. Firewood is often provided for free with the intent of removing fuel from the site. Chips for mulch can sometimes be used locally within communities or be given or sold to wholesale chip and mulch providers. Local chip supply is usually high

as local slash mulch programs provide this product for free.

In some areas of Oregon it is common to remove slash to a disposal site where it is mulched and stored in a place where it will not pose a wildfire hazard or threaten the health of surrounding forests. These operations, better known as slash mulch programs, often provide free mulch. Currently, this is not an option in Grant County however the potential development of this type of option is reasonable. The practice of relocating slash can be costly and labor intensive to community members depending on the amount of material to be relocated, access to hauling equipment such as pickups or trailers, and distance to the nearest disposal site. This practice is generally only an option for small projects with quantities and sizes of woody vegetation that is manageable and economical for hauling.

Another common “remain on-site practice” is to chip slash and redistribute it evenly back onto the site or masticate the standing vegetation in place. This practice can incur higher costs as it requires specialized equipment such as chippers, masticators, and tub-grinders plus skilled operators. This equipment is not generally readily available to the common property owner and usually has to be rented or the work must be contracted, causing an increase in overall project costs. From a hazardous fuels reduction standpoint, mastication treatments are effective in reducing crown and ladder fuels and breaking up contiguous stands of oak while reducing the amount of hand labor needed. Although there is a temporary increase in fuel loading on the ground until the mulch breaks down the fuels have been converted from aerial fuels (standing) to ground fuel which will decrease the fire behavior and ladder fuel situation.

5.45 Obstacle 5- Funding

Reducing wildfire hazards on private property is the responsibility of the property owner. However, project expenses often dissuade or prevent stakeholders from taking action to improve their own and their community’s wildfire safety. Expenses are sometimes incurred during planning, but project implementation usually requires the greatest expenditures. Grant funding can be utilized to leverage existing funds to implement projects. Projects can range greatly in nature, however most grant funding available is for forest management, (for example thinning trees), and fuel reduction activities. Common project types include forest management, defensible space, road construction or improvement for ingress/egress, retrofitting structures to fire resistant construction materials, improving water availability, improving education and outreach programs, securing equipment for fire departments to improve firefighting capabilities, or providing specialized training to fire suppression personnel.

5.46 Obstacle 6-Technical Assistance

Technical assistance is the guidance, support, and information directly or indirectly provided from subject matter experts to accomplish wildfire mitigation activities. Communities who are aware of their wildfire hazard are often unsure of the steps to take to reduce their hazard or where to seek the information. Several local subject matter experts are available as technical service providers for use by Grant County residents and stakeholders. Additionally there are several publications available to stakeholders for self-education regarding technical information. The availability of these resources is not

always well known throughout the county.


5.5 Continuing Actions

The Grant County Wildfire Coordinator will be responsible for keeping this CWPP up to date. The coordinator will maintain a Steering Committee with representatives from the various agencies involved with wildfire protection. Periodic meetings will be held to address wildfire hazards and concerns. Efforts will be made to revise the CWPP as needed. Mitigation projects as listed in the CWPP will be evaluated and updated as needed. Decisions as to project priority for grant application will be made by the steering committee. As new projects are identified they will be added to the CWPP as an addendum, completed projects will be deleted from the plan. The County Wildfire Coordinator will keep notes of steering committee meetings and distribute them to the steering committee members and the County Court. Since this is a working document it is expected that any minor additions or changes will not require the plan to be re-signed unless those changes result in significant adjustments or changes in the overall philosophy of the plan.


COMMUNITY WILDFIRE PROTECTION PLAN

Grant County

Residential Address Locations



1 inch = 10 miles



 **Grant Soil and Water Conservation District**
721 South Canyon Boulevard John Day, Oregon 97845
Phone: (541) 575-0135 Fax: (541) 575-0848
Serving the Citizens of Grant County for over 50 Years!

Legend

- Residential Address Locations
- Local Roads

Landownership

- United States Forest Service
- Private
- National Park Service
- Bureau of Land Management
- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
- Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
- State of Oregon

December 12, 2012

GRANT COUNTY COMMUNITIES AT RISK – WILDFIRE RISK ASSESSMENT

| County Zone | Canyon City | Dayville | Granite | John Day | Long Creek | Monument | Mt. Vernon | Prairie City | Seneca |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| RISK | | | | | | | | | |
| Fire Occurrence | | | | | | | | | |
| 0-.1 5 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| .1-1.1 10 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1+ 20 pts | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Home Density | | | | | | | | | |
| 0-0.9 Rural 0 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-5 Suburban 5 pt | | | | | | | | | |
| 5+ Urban 10 pts | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Other Factors | | | | | | | | | |
| < 1/3 0 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| 1/3 -2/3 5 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| >2/3 10 pts | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Risk Category Rating | 40-H | 40-H | 40-H | 40-H | 40-H | 40-H | 40-H | 40-H | 40-H |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| HAZARD | | | | | | | | | |
| Weather | | | | | | | | | |
| Zone 3 40 pts | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

GRANT COUNTY COMMUNITIES AT RISK – WILDFIRE RISK ASSESSMENT

| County Zone | Canyon City | Dayville | Granite | John Day | Long Creek | Monument | Mt. Vernon | Prairie City | Seneca |
|-------------------|-------------|----------|---------|----------|------------|----------|------------|--------------|--------|
| HAZARD | | | | | | | | | |
| Slope | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 – 25% 0 pts | | | | | 0 | | | | 0 |
| 26-40% 2 pts | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | |
| 41%+ 3 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| Aspect | | | | | | | | | |
| N,NW,NE 0 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| W,E 3 pts | 3 | 3 | | | 3 | | | | 3 |
| S,SW,SE 5 pts | | | 5 | 5 | | 5 | 5 | 5 | |
| Elevation | | | | | | | | | |
| 5,001+ 0 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| 3,500-5000 1 pts | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| 0-3,500 2 pts | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | |
| Vegetation | | | | | | | | | |
| Non-forest 0 pts | | | | | 0 | | | | 0 |
| HV-1 5 pts | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | | 5 | 5 | 5 | |
| HV-2 15 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| HV-3 20 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

GRANT COUNTY COMMUNITIES AT RISK – WILDFIRE RISK ASSESSMENT

| County Zone | Canyon City | Dayville | Granite | John Day | Long Creek | Monument | Mt. Vernon | Prairie City | Seneca |
|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| HAZARD | | | | | | | | | |
| Crown Fire Potential | | | | | | | | | |
| Low 0 pts | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Moderate 5 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| High 10 pts | | | 10 | | | | | | |
| Hazard Rating | 52-H | 52-E | 63-H | 54-H | 44-H | 54-H | 54-H | 54-H | 44 -E |
| VALUES PROTECTED | | | | | | | | | |
| Home Density Per 10 acres | | | | | | | | | |
| .1-.9 2 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| 1-5.0 15 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.1+ 30 pts | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| Infrastructure | | | | | | | | | |
| None 0 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| One 10 pts | | | 10 | | | | | | |
| >One 20 pts | 20 | 20 | | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Values Protected Rating | 50-H | 50-H | 40-H | 50-H | 50-H | 50-H | 50-H | 50-H | 50-H |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

GRANT COUNTY COMMUNITIES AT RISK – WILDFIRE RISK ASSESSMENT

| County Zone | Canyon City | Dayville | Granite | John Day | Long Creek | Monument | Mt. Vernon | Prairie City | Seneca |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| PROTECTION CAPABILITIES | | | | | | | | | |
| Fire Response | | | | | | | | | |
| Structure<10 min 0 pt | | | | | | | | | |
| Protection>10 min 8 pt | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | |
| Wildland Only 15 pt | | | | | | | | | |
| No Protection 30 pt | | | | | | | | | 30 |
| Community Preparedness | | | | | | | | | |
| Prepared 0 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| Mainly agency 2 pts | 2 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | |
| No effort 4 pts | | | 4 | | | | | | 4 |
| Protection Capability Rating | 10-M | 10-M | 12-M | 10-M | 10-M | 10-M | 10-M | 10-M | 34-H |
| TOTAL RISK RATING | 152-H | 152-H | 155-H | 154-H | 144-H | 154-H | 122-H | 154-H | 168-H |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

GRANT COUNTY CWPP ZONES – WILDFIRE RISK ASSESSMENT

| County Zone | Dayville | Granite | John Day | Monument/ Long Creek | Mt. Vernon | Prairie City | Ritter/Dale | Seneca | Upper Middle Fork |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|
| RISK | | | | | | | | | |
| Fire Occurrence | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 -.1 5 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| .1-1.1 10 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1+ 20 pts | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Home Density | | | | | | | | | |
| 0-0.9 Rural 0 pts | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1-5 Suburban 5 pt | | | | | | | | | |
| 5+ Urban 10 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Factors | | | | | | | | | |
| < 1/3 0 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| 1/3 -2/3 5 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| >2/3 10 pts | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Risk Category Rating | 30 H | 30 H | 30 H | 30 H | 30 H | 30 H | 30 H | 30 H | 30 H |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| HAZARD | | | | | | | | | |
| Weather | | | | | | | | | |
| Zone 3 40 pts | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Table 1 – Zone Wildfire Risk Assessment
Page 1 of 4

GRANT COUNTY CWPP ZONES – WILDFIRE RISK ASSESSMENT

| County Zone | Dayville | Granite | John Day | Monument/ Long Creek | Mt. Vernon | Prairie City | Ritter/Dale | Seneca | Upper Middle Fork |
|-------------------|----------|---------|----------|-------------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|--------|----------------------|
| HAZARD | | | | | | | | | |
| Slope | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 – 25% 0 pts | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | |
| 26-40% 2 pts | | 2 | | 2 | | | 2 | | 2 |
| 41%+ 3 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| Aspect | | | | | | | | | |
| N,NW,NE 0 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| W,E 3 pts | | | 3 | | | | 3 | 3 | |
| S,SW,SE 5 pts | 5 | 5 | | 5 | 5 | 5 | | | 5 |
| Elevation | | | | | | | | | |
| 5,001+ 0 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| 3,500-5000 1 pts | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 0-3,500 2 pts | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | 2 | | | |
| Vegetation | | | | | | | | | |
| Non-forest 0 pts | | | | | | | | 0 | |
| HV-1 5 pts | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | | 5 |
| HV-2 15 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| HV-3 20 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Table 1 – Zone Wildfire Risk Assessment
Page 2 of 4

GRANT COUNTY CWPP ZONES – WILDFIRE RISK ASSESSMENT

| County Zone | Dayville | Granite | John Day | Monument/ Long Creek | Mt. Vernon | Prairie City | Ritter/Dale | Seneca | Upper Middle Fork |
|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|
| HAZARD | | | | | | | | | |
| Crown Fire Potential | | | | | | | | | |
| Low 0 pts | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | |
| Moderate 5 pts | | | | 2 | | | | | |
| High 10 pts | | 10 | | | | | 10 | | 10 |
| Hazard Rating | 52-H | 63-E | 50-H | 55-H | 52-H | 52-H | 63-H | 44-H | 63 -E |
| VALUES PROTECTED | | | | | | | | | |
| Home Density Per 10 acres | | | | | | | | | |
| .1-.9 2 pts | 2 | 2 | | 2 | | | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 1-5.0 15 pts | | | 15 | | 15 | 15 | | | |
| 5.1+ 30 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| Infrastructure | | | | | | | | | |
| None 0 pts | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| One 10 pts | 10 | 10 | | | | | 10 | 10 | |
| >One 20 pts | | | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | | | |
| Values Protected Rating | 12-L | 12-L | 35-H | 22-M | 35-H | 35-H | 12-L | 12-L | 10-L |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

GRANT COUNTY CWPP ZONES – WILDFIRE RISK ASSESSMENT

| County Zone | Dayville | Granite | John Day | Monument/ Long Creek | Mt. Vernon | Prairie City | Ritter/Dale | Seneca | Upper Middle Fork |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------------|
| PROTECTION CAPABILITIES | | | | | | | | | |
| Fire Response | | | | | | | | | |
| Structure<10 min 0 pt | | | | | | | | | |
| Protection>10 min 8 pt | | | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | | | |
| Wildland Only 15 pt | 15 | 15 | | | | | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| No Protection 30 pt | | | | | | | | | |
| Community Preparedness | | | | | | | | | |
| Prepared 0 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| Mainly agency 2 pts | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| No effort 4 pts | | | | | | | | | |
| Protection Capability Rating | 17-M | 17-M | 10-M | 10-M | 10-M | 10-M | 17-M | 17-M | 17-M |
| TOTAL RISK RATING | 111-M | 122-H | 125-H | 117-H | 127-H | 127-H | 122-H | 103-M | 120-H |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Table 1 – Zone Wildfire Risk Assessment
Page 4 of 4

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Healthy Forests Restoration Act (HFRA) of 2003 provides the impetus for wildfire risk assessment and planning at the county and community level specifically identifying “Wildland Urban Interface Communities Within the Vicinity of Federal Lands That are at High Risk From Wildfire” (H.R. 1904-3 Sec. 101, (1) (A) (i)). HFRA refers to this level of planning as Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPP). The CWPP allows a community to evaluate its current situation with regards to wildfire risk and to devise ways to reduce risk for protection of human welfare and other important economic, social or ecological values. The CWPP may address issues such as community wildfire risk, structure flammability, hazardous fuels and non-fuels mitigation, community values, community preparedness, and emergency procedures. The Cooperating Group provides oversight to the development and implementation of the CWPP in Grant County.

The primary focus of the Grant County CWPP is the numerous improvements and homes that occur throughout the Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI). A significant portion of Grant County consists of “Intermix Communities” where structures are scattered throughout the wildland area with no clear line of demarcation and wildland fuels are continuous within and outside of the developed area. The county has been divided into nine different zones for purposes of this wildfire plan. Human life and welfare are values at risk to wildfire because of the buildup of hazardous fuels around communities and structures, poor emergency vehicle ingress and egress, lack of communications, inadequately trained and/or equipped fire suppression authorities, or complete absence of structural fire suppression authorities. Throughout the county there are scattered small communities and ranches with no structural fire protection because they are outside an organized fire district. Other economic values at risk include businesses, timberland, farmland, ranchland, hunting and other recreational land, historic and cultural sites, and critical infrastructure.

Wildland fire is a common occurrence in Grant County and lightning causes the large majority of those fires. Several wildland fire fighting agencies are present in the county and are very effective at putting out fires rapidly. However, the demographics of Grant County continue to shift and while the net population dropped between the 2000 and the 2010 census takings, the number of structures in the WUI has increased. As structures and improvements in the WUI increase so does the cost of fire fighting since protecting improvements from wildfire is more costly. The increasing number of residences in the WUI are often retirement homes. At the same time family wage jobs in the county are declining further shifting the demographics toward an older population. The number of volunteers for emergency services is declining.

Natural resource management policy and changing ecological conditions have interacted in ways that have resulted in hazardous fuel situations throughout Grant County. These hazardous fuel conditions are the result of historic fire suppression policy, juniper invasion into sagebrush, grasslands and timberlands, changing climatic patterns, and lack forest management activity on federal lands. The large accumulation of fuels has made most areas in the county very vulnerable to potentially catastrophic wildfire with the resulting loss of important economic, social and ecological values.

A variety of fuels around communities, ranches, and structures create problems for fire protection including but not limited to ponderosa pine and juniper forests, sagebrush, grasslands, and weed fields. Many of these fuels, such as dried grass, sagebrush and weeds, are highly flammable, burn rapidly, and resist control. A coordinated effort among all fire authorities and private landowners in the county is needed to manage hazardous fuels and reduce the risk of wildfire.

Currently, wildfire suppression authorities in the Grant County include the Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF), the United States Forest Service (USFS), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Prairie City Rural Fire Department, the John Day Rural Fire Department, the Mt. Vernon Rural Fire Department, and the Monument Rural Fire Department. Mutual Aid Agreements exist among the fire authorities for mutual aid and support in the event of a wildfire incident. However, each fire authority operates under regulations that dictate their specific area of responsibility.

Public outreach for the CWPP revision consisted of several articles in *The Blue Mountain Eagle*, a series of public meetings held around the county from March through August 2012, and a mailing to absentee landowners explaining the CWPP. The meetings and the mailing consisted of a survey, information on community wildfire planning, and information on the importance of community input in developing the revised plan.

The level of risk and hazard to individual homes will be assessed in the future in conjunction with the implementation of the Firewise Communities program. This evaluation will consist of rating attributes such as means of access, surrounding vegetation (fuels), presence of defensible space, topography, roofing and other construction materials, available fire protection, and placement of utilities.

Based on the interviews with the Coordinating Group, fire authority officials, field observations, and public meetings the following recommendations and mitigation actions are proposed to reduce their risk of wildfire on a county wide basis:


- Assign a wildfire coordinator to manage the CWPP
- Implement *Firewise Communities USA* program in Grant County
- Integrate Firewise building practices into Grant County building standards in the WUI
- Consider adoption of SB-360 classification standards across the county
- Encourage outlying communities to participate in basic wildland fire fighting training courses annually
- Implement a county wide GIS system to manage this CWPP
- Actively seek opportunities for establishment of cell towers in remote areas without cell coverage such as Granite, Dale, Ritter, Monument and Austin
- Require latitude and longitude on land use plans and building permits outside of municipal areas
- Improve coordination and documentation between the various emergency response agencies and systems in the county

- Work closely with USFS and BLM officials to create fuel breaks next to private lands and to minimize hazardous fuels on federal lands
- Increase water sources around county
- Complete a road hazard assessment to address and identify potential problems for evacuation and fire apparatus response during a wildfire situation and actively seek opportunities to implement improvements to rural roads
- Develop County strategy under this CWPP that utilizes a three pronged approach in WUI areas by blending 1) fuels treatment, 2) emergency management, and 3) fire prevention
- Increase outreach and education efforts to all county landowners
- Seek cost efficient methods and outlets for disposal of fuels generated from hazardous fuels reduction projects
- Identify needs and assist with fulfillment of those needs for local fire districts

COMMUNITY WILDFIRE PROTECTION PLAN

Grant County

Project Area



1 inch = 10 miles



Grant Soil and Water Conservation District
 721 South Canyon Boulevard John Day, Oregon 97845
 Phone: (541) 575-0135 Fax: (541) 575-0946
Serving the Citizens of Grant County for over 50 Years!

Legend

Landownership

- United States Forest Service
- Private
- National Park Service
- Bureau of Land Management
- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
- Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
- State of Oregon

December 12, 2012

GLOSSARY

Biomass: quantity of biological matter of one or more species present on a unit area.

Condition Class: qualitative measure of degree of departure from historical ecosystem components such as species composition, structural stage, stand age, canopy closure, and fuel loadings.

Conflagration Act: state legal authority established as a civil defense measure to mobilize structural fire suppression resources for massive urban fires. It was first used in 1951 to coordinate aid to an explosion and fire in downtown Roseburg. The Act was not invoked again until 1972, when a wildland fire in Yamhill County threatened homes in what is now known as the wildland-urban interface. The Conflagration Act must be authorized by the Governor. The Act includes authorization for OSFM to assign firefighting forces and equipment beyond mutual aid agreements. It also designates reimbursement for aid to those departments participating.

Consequence: values at-risk from a fire occurring in a specific geographic location.

Community at-risk: (in Grant County) a group of homes or other structures with basic infrastructure (such as shared transportation routes) and services within or near federal land.

Defensible Space: the zone, typically a width of 30 feet or more, between an improved property and a potential wildfire where the combustibles have been removed or modified. It is recommended, depending on slope and fuels surrounding the home, that radius of defensible space could be closer to 100 feet.

Fire Adapted Communities: The Fire Adapted Community uses tools, supported by federal and state agencies, to prepare its homes, neighborhoods, businesses, infrastructure, natural areas, and surrounding landscape for wildfire. It's up to homeowners and the local jurisdiction to take the necessary actions.

Fire regime: qualitative measure describing the degree of departure from historical fire regimes, where fire frequency has deviated from normal intervals.

Flame length: the distance measured from the tip of the flame to the middle of the flaming zone at base of the fire. It is measured on a slant when the flames are tilted due to effects of wind and slope.

Fuel: non-decomposed material, living or dead, derived from herbaceous plants.

Fuel Break: an area, strategically located for fighting anticipated fires, where the native vegetation has been permanently modified or replaced so that fires

burning into it can be more easily controlled. Fuel breaks divide fire-prone areas into smaller areas for easier fire control and to provide access for fire fighting.

Fuel Hazard: a fuel complex defined by kind, arrangement, volume, condition, and location that forms a special threat of ignition or of suppression difficulty.

Fuel Loading: the volume of fuel in a given area generally expressed in tons per acre.

Fuel Model: a simulated fuel complex for which all fuel descriptors required by the mathematical fire spread model have been supplied.

Fuel Reduction: the planned manipulation of living or dead forest fuels for forest management and other land-use objectives.

Green Space: see Defensible Space.

Hazard (as it relates to wildfire): hazardous conditions like fuel, topography, weather, etc. that contributes to fire spread.

Home Ignition Zone:

Initial Attack: the actions taken by the first resources to arrive at a wildfire to protect lives and property, and prevent further extension of the fire.

Ladder fuel: fuels that provide vertical continuity allowing fire to carry from surface fuels into the crowns of trees or shrubs with relative ease.

Mutual Aid Agreement: agreement in place between wildland and structural fire protection agencies that allows for either fire protection agency to help the other in a wildfire event.

Prescribed Fire: the controlled application of fire to wildland fuels in either their natural or modified state, under such conditions of weather, fuel moisture, soil moisture, etc. as allow the fire to be confined to a predetermined area and at the same time to produce the intensity of heat and rate of spread required to further certain planned objectives of silviculture, wildlife management, grazing, hazard reduction, etc. The intention is to employ fire scientifically so as to realize maximum net benefits with minimum damage and at acceptable cost.

Rate of Spread: the relative activity of a fire in extending its horizontal dimensions. It is expressed as rate of increase of the total perimeter of the fire; or as rate of forward-spread of the fire front; or as rate of increase in area, depending on the intended use of the information. Usually its (forward) rate of spread is expressed in chains or acres per hour.

Risk (as it relates to wildfire): the likelihood of a fire occurring.

Roof Class: can be either A, B, C, or non-rated. Roof class is a determination of flame resistance. Class A is rated for more flame resistant building materials than Class C.

Seral: of, like, or pertaining to the development of like ecological communities.

Silviculture: manipulation of forest vegetation to accomplish a specified set of objectives; controlling forest establishment, composition, and growth.

Structural Fire Protection: The protection of a structure from interior and exterior fire ignition sources. This fire protection service is normally provided by municipal fire departments, with trained and equipped personnel. In northeastern Oregon, rural and volunteer fire departments are relied upon heavily to also provide this type of protection. After life safety, the agency's priority is to keep the fire from leaving the structure of origin and to protect the structure from an advancing wildland fire. (The equipment and training required to conduct structural fire protection is not normally provided to the wildland firefighter.) Various taxing authorities fund this service.

Structural Ignitability: a term that relates cause of a home igniting during a wildfire to building materials. Cause could be attributed to the building materials used for the home or the amount of combustible materials around the home.

Structural Vulnerability: a term that relates factors contributing to how and why a home is vulnerable to wildfire. Examples of factors that contribute to vulnerability are type of access to the home, ladder fuels and vegetation with the landscape of a home, and whether or not fire protection is available.

Survivable Space: see Defensible Space.

Triage (as it relates to structures in a wildfire event): the sorting and prioritizing of structures requiring protection from wildfire based upon an educated assessment designed to maximize the number of structures saved.

Wildland Fire Protection: the protection of natural resources and watersheds from damage by wildland fires. State and Federal forestry or land management agencies normally provide wildland fire protection with trained and equipped personnel. The structural firefighter may also be trained and equipped to aid the wildland agency in a wildland fire event. Various taxing authorities and fees fund this service.

Wildland Fire Use: is the management of naturally ignited wildland fires to achieve forest health and resource management objectives.

Wildland-Urban Interface: (in Grant County) an area that surrounds a

community or values of a community, including that community's infrastructure or water source, and may extend 1 1/2 miles or more beyond that community. The boundary of a wildland-urban interface area depends on topographic and geographic features that could influence wildfire, the location of an effective fuelbreak, or Condition Class 3 lands.

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|--------------|---|
| BLM | Bureau of Land Management |
| CWPP | Community Wildfire Protection Plan |
| FEMA | Federal Emergency Management Agency |
| FEPP | Federal Excess Personal Property |
| FERC | Federal Emergency Regulatory Commission |
| FRCC | Fire Regime Condition Class |
| GIS | Geographic Information System |
| HFRA | Healthy Forests Restoration Act |
| NFPA | National Fire Protection Association |
| NPS | National Park Service |
| ODF | Oregon Department of Forestry |
| USFS | US Forest Service |
| USFWS | US Fish and Wildlife Service |
| WFU | Wildland Fire Use |
| WUI | Wildland Urban Interface/Intermix |

Signature Page

The contents of this document have been agreed upon and endorsed by the Grant County Court, the District Forester of the Central Oregon District for Oregon Department of Forestry, and the Grant County Fire Defense Board Chief. This plan is not legally binding as it does not create or place mandates or requirements on individual jurisdictions. It is intended to serve as a planning tool for the fire, emergency, and land managers of Grant County. The Grant County Community Wildfire Protection Plan is designed to provide a framework for those local agencies associated with wildfire suppression and protection services, to help assess the risks and hazards associated with wildland urban interface areas, and to identify strategies for reducing those risks. This is a working document to be reviewed by members of the Coordinating Committee and updated as necessary.

Scott W. Myers 8/28/13
Scott W. Myers, Grant County Judge Date

Boyd Britton 8/28/13
Boyd Britton, Grant County Commissioner Date

Chris B. Labhart 8/28/13
Chris Labhart, Grant County Commissioner Date

George W. Ponte 8/28/13
George W. Ponte, Oregon Department of Forestry, District Forester Date

Ron Smith 8/28/13
Ron Smith, Grant County Fire Defense Board Chief Date