



**FIRE ADAPTED COMMUNITIES
LEARNING NETWORK**

Fire Adapted Communities Self-Assessment Tool

Created by the Fire Adapted Communities Learning Network
www.fireadaptednetwork.org

January 2016

If you would like to share this tool with others, please refer them to the website to ensure that they have access to the most recent version, and to support that can be found there.

<http://fireadaptednetwork.org/resources/fac-assessment-tool/>

This tool was developed by the Fire Adapted Communities Learning Network (FAC Net). The FAC Net would like to thank the following individuals who contributed significantly to the development and/or revision of the FAC SAT and the *User and Facilitator's Guide*: Molly Mowery, Sarah McCaffrey and Bruce Goldstein. In addition, we are grateful for all of the Network members who provided invaluable feedback during its pilot phase, including staff from: the Chumstick Wildfire Stewardship Coalition, Coalition for the Upper South Platte, Forest Stewards Guild, Greater Flagstaff Forests Partnership, Karuk Tribe, Project Wildfire, Southern Oregon Forest Restoration Collaborative and the Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team.

Additional feedback is always welcome. Any questions or feedback should be directed to info@fireadaptednetwork.org. The current version of the FAC SAT is available at <http://fireadaptednetwork.org/resources/fac-assessment-tool/>.

The Fire Adapted Communities Learning Network is supported by Promoting Ecosystem Resiliency through Collaboration: Landscapes, Learning and Restoration, a cooperative agreement between The Nature Conservancy, USDA Forest Service and agencies of the Department of the Interior. This project is subject to the terms of Cooperative Agreement #11-CA-11132543-158 with The Watershed Center.

In accordance with Federal law and U.S. Department of Agriculture policy, this institution is prohibited from discriminating on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, or disability. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.)

To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 1400 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call (202) 720-5964 (voice and TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Contents

Introduction to the Fire Adapted Communities Self-Assessment Tool.....	1
FAC SAT User & Facilitator’s Guide.....	1
STEP 1: Determine General Information	2
STEP 2: Complete the Fire Adapted Communities Self-Assessment.....	3
SECTION 1: Wildfire Hazard & Values at Risk.....	3
1.A. Wildfire Hazard and Response Capability	3
Summary: Wildfire Response Capabilities	5
1.B. Community Values At Risk.....	6
Summary: Community Values at Risk.....	7
1.C Residential and Commercial Properties at Risk	8
Summary: Residential and Commercial Properties at Risk.....	9
SECTION 2: Mitigation Plans, Activities & Resources.....	10
2.A. Community Plans and Regulations	10
Summary: Community Plans and Regulations.....	12
2.B. Wildfire Mitigation/ Risk Reduction Programs.....	13
Summary: Wildfire Mitigation/ Risk Reduction Programs	14
2.C. Resources and Funding.....	15
Summary: Resources and Funding	16
SECTION 3: Public Engagement & Partnerships	17
3.A. Public Outreach and Input.....	17
Summary: Public Outreach and Input.....	21
3.B. Landowners and Stakeholders.....	22
Summary: Landowners and Stakeholders.....	23
3.C. Additional FAC Partners	24
Summary: Additional FAC Partners	25
STEP 3: Prioritize Community Fire Adaptation Needs	26
STEP 4: Create Community Fire Adaptation Actions	28
Appendix A: Table of Programs.....	A-1



Introduction to the Fire Adapted Communities Self-Assessment Tool

The Fire Adapted Communities Self-Assessment Tool (FAC SAT) helps communities assess their level of fire adaptation and track their capacity to live safely with fire over time. FAC SAT is designed to help participants:

- Identify their community's values at risk;
- Identify their community's capacity to implement FAC activities;
- Assess any gaps or limitations in funding, resources, partnerships, and workforce/volunteers;
- Prioritize future fire adaptation activities;
- Complement other work plans; and
- Increase understanding of long-term community fire adaptation needs.

FAC SAT User & Facilitator's Guide

The FAC SAT User & Facilitator's Guide serves as a companion document to the FAC SAT. The guide provides background information on the FAC SAT, an explanation of each FAC SAT section, strategies for facilitating different approaches to the data-gathering and assessment processes, and tips and resources for long-term success. **It's highly recommended that anyone new to the FAC SAT first review the FAC SAT User & Facilitator's guide prior to using this tool.**

<http://fireadaptednetwork.org/resource/fire-adapted-communities-self-assessment-tool-user-and-facilitators-guide>



STEP 1: Determine General Information

1. List the names of people and entities participating in the FAC SAT. Note affiliations, contact information, and any specific roles in the self-assessment process (e.g., convener, facilitator, data gatherer, recorder). Add more lines as necessary.

Name	Affiliation	Contact Information	Role

2. Describe the “community” being assessed, including:

Name of community:

Type of community (e.g., neighborhood, fire protection district, town/municipality, county):

Land area/ size:

Community boundaries (e.g., county lines, fire protection district):

Population (specify both full-time and seasonal, if applicable):



STEP 2: Complete the Fire Adapted Communities Self-Assessment

Fill out each section in the following table. Each subsection has a summary question at the end, which gives you the opportunity to rate your community on different aspects of fire adaptation and preparedness.

SECTION 1: Wildfire Hazard & Values at Risk		
	1.A. Wildfire Hazard and Response Capability	Community Response
1	List those wildfires that have had significant impacts on the community (positive and negative). Include information such as when they occurred, size, and any social/ economic/ environmental impacts (if known).	Community's wildfire history:
2	Does your community have unique features that increase the wildfire threat (e.g., wind patterns, steep terrain, etc.)?	Community's unique features, if any:
3	The following questions address your community's wildfire response capabilities. How many fire departments serve your community?	Number of fire departments:
3a	What type(s) of departments are they (e.g., volunteer, combination, career)?	Type(s) of fire departments:
3b	How many of your fire departments are <i>trained</i> for wildland fire operations?	Training:
3c	How many of your fire departments are <i>equipped</i> for wildland fire operations?	Equipment:



3d	Have you identified gaps in wildfire response coverage and equipment, and if so, how is your community currently addressing gaps in wildfire response coverage and equipment?	<i>Gaps:</i>
3e	How much knowledge and experience does your community have with the Incident Command System (county, etc.)?	<i>ICS knowledge:</i>
3f	What mutual aid or protection/response agreements are in place, and are they effective?	<i>Mutual aid:</i>
3g	What is the relationship between the local fire departments and the state and federal cooperators?	<i>Relationships:</i>
4	Describe any local crews that are cross-trained to do wildfire response and prescribed fire and other integrated forest management activities?	<i>Cross-training:</i>
5	Are neighborhoods and communities aware of who will be responding to a wildfire in their local area?	<i>Public awareness of response:</i>



Summary: Wildfire Response Capabilities

Based on your responses above, what is your community's overall response capability relative to its wildfire risk? (Circle the response below that best fits your community):

VERY HIGH – Response capability for our community is in excellent shape. We understand our community's fire history and unique features, our fire departments are highly trained and prepared specifically for WUI fires, we've addressed any gaps in our response coverage and equipment needs, we are knowledgeable about ICS, mutual aid agreements are effective, and local crews are capable of performing other forest management activities.

HIGH – Response capability for our community is in pretty good shape but there are a few areas that require improvement to maximize our response before the next wildfire. These could include one or two of the following: increasing our level of WUI response training, meeting additional equipment needs, improving knowledge of ICS, implementing additional mutual aid agreements, increasing cross-training of local crews, and/or improving relationships between fire departments and local cooperators.

MEDIUM – Response capability is in fair shape. Some significant improvements are needed before the next wildfire, including addressing at least three of the following topics: increasing our level of WUI response training, meeting additional equipment needs, improving knowledge of ICS, implementing additional mutual aid agreements, increasing cross-training of local crews, and/or improving relationships between fire departments and local cooperators.

LOW – Response capability is low relative to our community's wildfire risk. We need to make a lot of improvements before the next wildfire. This means addressing at least four of the following topics: increasing our level of WUI response training, meeting additional equipment needs, improving knowledge of ICS, implementing additional mutual aid agreements, increasing cross-training of local crews, and/or improving relationships between fire departments and local cooperators.

VERY LOW – We have numerous and unknown gaps in our response coverage, capability and training;. Significant improvements are required in order to prepare for the next wildfire in our community. Our next step is to gather additional information so we can come up with a better plan to address our wildfire hazard and response.

Additional Notes/Comments:



	1.B. Community Values At Risk	Community Response
6	<p>There are many community values at risk that can be affected by wildfire. These values include both “tangible values” (i.e., those with measurable impacts from wildfire) and intangible values. Examples of both include disruption to communications and utilities, impacts to water quality, air quality, recreational areas, cultural sites, critical infrastructure, viewsheds and tourist sites, loss of security, fear of loss in property values and privacy, and the resulting economic impacts for these values.</p> <p>Excluding residential and commercial properties (which are addressed in the section below), list the community values at risk which need to be considered in your community’s wildfire planning.</p>	<p><i>List community values at risk:</i></p>
7	<p>For each community value listed above, indicate what action, if any, is being taken to better assess and mitigate the wildfire risk to that value.</p>	<p><i>Assessment and mitigation actions taken for community values at risk:</i></p>



Summary: Community Values at Risk

Based on your responses above, what is your community’s overall mitigation level regarding the identification and actions to address community values at risk (excluding residential values at risk, which are addressed below)? (Circle the response below that best fits your community):

VERY HIGH – Risks to all of our community’s values at risk have been identified and are being appropriately mitigated through current actions and plans, meaning that our community assets are generally very well prepared for the next wildfire and we anticipate minimal impacts.

HIGH – Risks to most of our community values at risk have been identified. Most will be addressed through current or future actions and plans as time and resources allow, meaning that our community assets are somewhat or very prepared for the next wildfire but there is still the potential for modest impacts with short-term consequences.

MEDIUM – Some community values at risk have been identified but we think more could be done to address these. Mitigation is likely needed but not always prioritized. Some planning is in place but more needs to occur to ensure mitigation takes place, meaning that our community assets are somewhat prepared for the next wildfire and we expect there will be some significant impacts with long-term consequences.

LOW – Many community values are at risk and require significant mitigation, or many community values at risk still require identification. Some planning is in place but much more needs to occur before mitigation can move forward, meaning that our community assets are not prepared for the next wildfire and we know there will be significant impacts with long-term consequences.

VERY LOW – Much more information is required before we can start identifying and addressing values at risk;. We are not doing any mitigation on these values at risk, meaning that our community assets are not prepared for the next wildfire and we know there will be significant impacts with long-term consequences.

Additional Notes/Comments:



1.C Residential and Commercial Properties at Risk		Community Response
8	To help identify the number of people and structures at risk to wildfire, has your community performed an assessment that identifies the type and extent of wildfire risk to residential and commercial properties?	<p><i>Circle all that apply:</i></p> <p>Residential: yes no</p> <p>Commercial: yes no</p>
8a	If yes to Q8, is there a means of tracking this information to determine the type and level of ongoing mitigation on individual properties at risk (e.g., vegetation management, structural hardening such as roof replacements and other repairs or upgrades)?	<p><i>Circle all that apply:</i></p> <p>Residential: yes no</p> <p>Commercial: yes no</p>
8b	If yes to Q8, how many properties are considered at risk to wildfire (including exposure to embers)?	<p><i>Number of properties at risk:</i></p> <p><i>(or circle the approximate percentage range below):</i></p> <p>75-100% 50-74% 25-49% 0-24%</p>
8c	If yes to Q8, of those properties at risk to wildfire, what percentage of property owners are actively engaged in wildfire risk reduction/ mitigation activities (e.g., vegetation management, roof replacement, and other repairs or upgrades)?	<p><i>Circle the approximate percentage range below:</i></p> <p>75-100% 50-74% 25-49% 0-24%</p>
9	<p>Different development factors may influence the type of wildland-urban interface fires that the community potentially faces. These factors include development densities, lot size, setbacks, proximity of development to slopes, and other topographical features.</p> <p>Has your community performed an analysis or assessment of the type of wildland-urban interface conditions to determine the type of fire threats (e.g. urban conflagrations)?</p>	<p><i>Circle one: yes no</i></p> <p><i>If yes, describe in more detail:</i></p>



Summary: Residential and Commercial Properties at Risk

Based on your responses above, what is the overall mitigation level for properties considered at risk? (Circle the response below that best fits your community):

VERY HIGH – more than 75% of our at-risk properties have implemented effective mitigation practices, such as vegetation management and roof replacements, meaning that nearly all applicable property owners are somewhat or very prepared for the next wildfire.

HIGH – about 50-75% of our at-risk properties have and maintain effective mitigation practices, meaning that a majority of applicable property owners are somewhat or very prepared for the next wildfire.

MEDIUM – somewhere around 50% of our at-risk properties, or less, have some level of mitigation in place, meaning that only about half or less than half of all applicable property owners are somewhat or very prepared for the next wildfire.

LOW – somewhere around 25% of our at-risk properties, or less, have some level of mitigation in place, meaning that only a small portion of applicable property owners are somewhat or very prepared for the next wildfire.

VERY LOW – only a small percentage of our properties, if known, have any mitigation in place, meaning that a very small number of our residential WUI areas (at best) have any level of preparation for the next wildfire.

Additional Notes/Comments:



SECTION 2: Mitigation Plans, Activities & Resources

	2.A. Community Plans and Regulations	Community Response
10	<p>There are many local and state plans that could include the topic of wildfire – both its potential ecological benefits as well as negative impacts on communities and ecosystems. Ensuring that wildfire is appropriately addressed in different plans can further a community’s wildfire risk reduction goals, potentially help access additional funding for mitigation, and ensure policies support other wildfire and forest management objectives.</p> <p>In the following list, determine if wildfire is adequately addressed in your community’s planning documents.</p>	<p><i>Circle yes/no if wildfire is included in each plan, when it was last updated, or N/A if there is no such plan in place</i></p> <p>Community Wildfire Protection Plan yes no last updated: N/A</p> <p>Local emergency management plan: yes no last updated: N/A</p> <p>State emergency management plan: yes no last updated: N/A</p> <p>Local hazard mitigation plan: yes no last updated: N/A</p> <p>State hazard mitigation plan: yes no last updated: N/A</p> <p>Comprehensive/Master/General Plan: yes no last updated: N/A</p> <p>Climate Adaptation/Action Plan: yes no last updated: N/A</p> <p>Sustainable Community Plan: yes no last updated: N/A</p> <p><i>List any other applicable community plan(s):</i></p>



10a	Does your community have a system in place for practitioners and the public to easily access information about local plans?	Circle one: <i>yes no</i> <i>If yes, describe in more detail:</i>
11	Does your community use any zoning ordinances, building codes, regulations or local rules (including HOA CC&Rs) to support/ foster wildfire risk reduction?	<i>List type of code(s), if any and note level of perceived effectiveness in addressing wildfire risk reduction:</i>
11a	If so, are these ordinances or codes enforced? If not, what are the enforcement limitations?	<i>Explain enforcement and limitations:</i>
11b	Are any of these ordinances or codes in conflict with other local codes and requirements (e.g., tree preservation ordinance)?	<i>Explain any known code conflicts:</i>
12	Is wildfire risk addressed or considered in future community growth planning?	<i>Circle the response below that best fits your community:</i> Our community has useful and strategic discussions within our land use, zoning, building, fire and other relevant departments to determine wildfire risk when approving new development. Our community has some, or limited, consideration for wildfire risk when approving new development. Our community does not consider wildfire risk as part of its growth planning.
13	Is post-wildfire recovery addressed or considered in any of community plans? If so, which ones and how?	<i>List how wildfire recovery is addressed in which plans:</i>



Summary: Community Plans and Regulations

Based on your responses above, to what extent is wildfire addressed in community plans and regulations?

(Circle the response below that best fits your community):

VERY HIGH – Wildfire is a key component and significantly addressed in all of our community’s emergency, wildfire and land use plans; our community is also very satisfied with the use and enforcement of regulations, if applicable; only minor improvements may be necessary.

HIGH – Wildfire is addressed in most, but not all, of our community’s emergency, wildfire and land use plans; we are generally satisfied with the use and enforcement of regulations, if applicable; we could benefit from some improvement in certain plans and/or regulations, and in the long-term this will be necessary.

MEDIUM – Wildfire could be addressed more thoroughly in our community’s emergency, wildfire and land use plans, and regulations, if applicable; improvements to our plans and/or regulations are needed.

LOW – Wildfire is poorly identified or inadequately represented in our community’s emergency, wildfire and land use plans, and regulations, if applicable; improvement is definitely needed to better address wildfire in our plans and/or regulations.

VERY LOW – We don’t know or we think that wildfire is absent from most or all of our community’s emergency, wildfire and land use plans; and our community is not satisfied with the way in which regulations are (or are not) being used as a means to address wildfire risk; better understanding and a lot of improvement is critical to ensure wildfire is included in future plans and/or regulations.

Additional Notes/Comments:



2.B. Wildfire Mitigation/ Risk Reduction Programs		Community Response
14	How many and what types of programs are utilized locally to reduce wildfire risk (e.g., Ready, Set, Go! Firewise, Fire Safe Councils, other local initiatives)?	<i>List of wildfire risk reduction programs: (See Appendix A for a sample worksheet)</i>
14a	For each program listed above, what does each of these programs target and achieve (e.g., number of chipping days each year, if match is required, whether homeowner- or business-oriented, etc.)?	<i>Program targets, goals, and achievements: (See Appendix A for a sample worksheet)</i>
14b	For each program listed above, who manages and promotes these programs?	<i>Program management and promotion: (See Appendix A for a sample worksheet)</i>
15	What other types of activities are being undertaken to reduce wildfire risk within and adjacent to the community (e.g., controlled burning, mechanical thinning, creation of fuel buffers, designation of internal safety zones, implementing collaborative forest and fire restoration plans), and are these projects being maintained?	<i>List any and all types of other wildfire risk reduction activities (not captured above):</i>
15a	Is the amount and location of controlled burning in your area appropriate and effective from a fuel reduction standpoint? Why or why not?	<i>Describe controlled burning activities in more detail:</i>



Summary: Wildfire Mitigation/ Risk Reduction Programs

Based on your responses above, what is your community’s overall approach regarding program implementation and effectiveness to reduce wildfire risk through mitigation? (Circle the response below that best fits your community):

VERY HIGH – Our community effectively uses a good mix of programs that engage multiple audiences to take part in reducing wildfire risk at all scales (lot, neighborhood, community-wide, landscape); programs have specific goals, targets and reporting to ensure risk reduction is occurring; no improvement is necessary.

HIGH – Our community effectively uses a good mix of programs that engage multiple audiences to take part in reducing wildfire risk and address most scales; most programs have specific goals and targets that are being met but we could benefit from improvement in certain program areas.

MEDIUM – Our community uses some programs with limited effectiveness to reduce wildfire risk; programs have some goals, targets and reporting more on an ad hoc basis); some improvement would definitely be helpful.

LOW – Our community uses few programs with limited effectiveness or no known results; we have few means of tracking results; improvement is definitely needed.

VERY LOW – Our community does not use, or know about, any programs to reduce wildfire risk; we do not track efforts on a regular basis; better understanding and a lot of improvement is critical.

Additional Notes/Comments:



2.C. Resources and Funding		Community Response
16	How many personnel (volunteer or paid staff) are dedicated to implementing wildfire mitigation plans and programs?	<i>List or approximate the number of personnel engaged in wildfire mitigation plans and programs (if applicable to your scale, distinguish between part-time, full-time, and/or volunteer or paid staff):</i>
16a	Is the current work force associated with wildfire mitigation plans and programs sufficient to accomplish community fire adaptation? If not, where are the shortfalls?	<i>Work force capacity for fire adapted community activities:</i>
17	What/who are your current funding sources for fire adapted community activities?	<i>List funding sources:</i>
17a	How predictable is each funding source, and what, if any, limitations exist?	<i>Level of predictability:</i>
17b	How much do current wildfire mitigation program activities rely on these funding sources?	<i>Level of reliance:</i>
17c	How might you improve funding sources for future development of fire adaptation programs?	<i>Funding improvement strategies:</i>



Summary: Resources and Funding

Based on your responses above, how well resourced are your fire adapted community efforts? (Circle the response below that best fits your community):

VERY HIGH – Our programs have dedicated personnel and predictable funding streams, with designated additional or separate emergency funding to support our mitigation efforts, should our current funding go away.

HIGH – Our programs have part-time or limited personnel, and most of our funding is reliable but we would benefit from increased staff and/or funding sources to support current and future mitigation activities.

MEDIUM – Our programs have part-time or limited personnel, with somewhat reliable funding streams; we need more staff and/or funding sources to support current and future mitigation activities.

LOW – We have very limited personnel and funding to support our programs; in addition, our mitigation activities would immediately end if we lost our current funding sources.

VERY LOW – We have no personnel or volunteers to support our mitigation activities; we have been unsuccessful in identifying funding to do our community’s planned mitigation activities.

Additional Notes/Comments:



SECTION 3: Public Engagement & Partnerships

	3.A. Public Outreach and Input	Community Response
18	<p>How well do community members understand the area’s wildfire risk (in terms of wildfire history, what causes risk, etc.)?</p>	<p><i>Circle the best answer:</i></p> <p><i>VERY HIGH – Based on current outreach and engagement efforts, we are confident that our community members understand the area’s wildfire risk and history.</i></p> <p><i>HIGH – we have done frequent surveys or other information gathering and are fairly confident that most community members understand the local fire history and risk (even if they aren’t engaged in mitigation).</i></p> <p><i>MEDIUM – we seem to have an engaged public but we aren’t certain how many people really understand the risk.</i></p> <p><i>LOW – a few groups may understand our area’s fire risk, but overall we have not spent enough time with the community to ensure that the public knows this information.</i></p> <p><i>VERY LOW – community members either don’t understand the risk or we don’t know this information.</i></p>
19	<p>How well do community members understand fire’s natural role, including cultural and ecological benefits?</p>	<p><i>Circle the best answer:</i></p> <p><i>VERY HIGH – Based on community interactions, public engagement, awareness and education campaigns, and more we are confident that our community members understand the natural role of fire in our local ecosystems.</i></p> <p><i>HIGH – we have done frequent surveys or other information gathering and are fairly confident that most community members generally understand the natural role of fire in our ecosystems.</i></p> <p><i>MEDIUM – we seem to have an educated public but we aren’t certain how many people really understand fire’s natural role in our ecosystems.</i></p> <p><i>LOW – a few groups may understand fire’s natural role, but overall we have not spent enough time with the community to ensure that the public knows this information.</i></p> <p><i>VERY LOW – community members either don’t understand fire’s natural role or we don’t know this information.</i></p>



20	<p>What kind of public outreach is being undertaken, and how interactive are these efforts (e.g., PSAs, public meetings, learning demonstration sites)?</p>	<p><i>List and describe public outreach efforts, noting their level of interactivity and engagement with public (e.g., how much comment, feedback and discussion is part of the outreach):</i></p> <p><i>PSAs:</i></p> <p><i>Brochures/ Information Packets:</i></p> <p><i>Public Meetings:</i></p> <p><i>Public Workshop:</i></p> <p><i>Learning Demonstration Sites:</i></p> <p><i>Training:</i></p> <p><i>Other:</i></p>
20a	<p>Is there a formal outreach plan in place, and if so is it up-to-date? Are you using it to measure effectiveness?</p>	<p><i>We have a formal outreach plan: yes no</i></p> <p><i>Was it collaboratively developed?</i></p> <p><i>Who provided comment and feedback on the plan?</i></p> <p><i>Who manages plan?</i></p>



	(20a, continued)	<p><i>When has it been last updated?</i></p> <p><i>How are outcomes measured?</i></p>
21	What was/is the level of public input provided for your Community Wildfire Protection Plan (and other applicable local wildfire plans)?	<i>Describe the level of public input:</i>
22	How many residential organizations, such as Homeowners Associations (HOAs), Property Owners Associations or Firewise Communities, are engaged in wildfire mitigation efforts?	<i>List the number of organized neighborhood associations engaged in wildfire efforts:</i>
23	What is your ability and capacity to communicate with the public (Twitter, etc.) - before, during and after a wildfire?	<i>List and describe communications:</i>
23a	Is there an emergency hotline for the public to call with questions or concerns about wildfire?	<i>Circle one: yes no</i>



24	<p>What types of connections exist between your community and neighboring communities or the larger region to help support your community's ability to plan, respond and recover from wildfire?</p>	<p><i>List and describe connections:</i></p>
25	<p>Are there specific vulnerable populations in the area (e.g., elderly, businesses dependent on tourism) or any that might be hard to reach (non-English speakers, off the grid) that may require additional consideration during planning, response and recovery phases?</p>	<p><i>List and describe vulnerable populations:</i></p>



Summary: Public Outreach and Input

Based on your responses above, what is your overall ability to engage the public in community fire adaptation work? (Circle the response below that best fits your community):

VERY HIGH – We engage all populations using interactive, hands-on approaches; the public has a high level of input and engagement in CWPP development and implementation, including ongoing contact regarding current issues and projects; communications are excellent during all disaster phases.

HIGH – We engage most populations in interactive approaches; public input and engagement is high; communications are effective; but we see a few areas that could be improved to take us to the next level.

MEDIUM – We could be doing more to engage with the public, including all populations; the public was somewhat engaged in CWPP development and implementation; our communications are not as effective as they could be during disaster phases.

LOW – We have identified some, but not many, vulnerable populations; we have had a few public meetings but turnout has been relatively poor; there are a few other types of input opportunities; our communications during a disaster have not yet been fully explored; overall there is significant room for improvement.

VERY LOW – We have not yet identified or done outreach with our vulnerable populations; we have few public meetings and/or the public does not show up; we have not explored other types of input from the public; we have not yet considered a process for communicating with the public during disaster phases.

Additional Notes/Comments:



	3.B. Landowners and Other Stakeholders	Community Response
26	<p>Landowner and stakeholder engagement is essential to fire adapted community efforts. List all public and private landowners or land managers (other than homeowners) contributing to your community’s wildfire risk within <u>5</u> miles who are currently and actively engaged in wildfire mitigation activities. (NOTE: adjust the perimeter to best fit your community’s size.)</p>	<p><i>List of engaged landowners:</i></p>
26a	<p>List all public and private landowners or land managers (other than homeowners) contributing to your community’s wildfire risk within <u>5</u> miles who are NOT currently engaged in wildfire mitigation activities but NEED to be involved.</p>	<p><i>List of non-engaged landowners:</i></p>
27	<p>List any other non-landowning stakeholders who could be affected by a wildfire in your community but are not currently engaged in wildfire mitigation efforts (e.g., non-governmental organizations, environmental groups, business owners, community and volunteer groups). If known, also list what particular value(s) may be of most concern to each stakeholder.</p>	<p><i>List of stakeholders (and key values of concern):</i></p>



Summary: Landowners and Other Stakeholders

Based on your responses above, what is the level of engagement from landowners, land managers and other stakeholders? (Circle the response below that best fits your community):

VERY HIGH – All of our landowners are engaged, they understand wildfire risk, and mitigation is occurring; all other stakeholders have been identified and their concerns are being included in the planning process.

HIGH – Most landowners are engaged, they understand wildfire risk, and mitigation is occurring; most other stakeholders are identified and their concerns are being included in the planning process.

MEDIUM – Some, but not all, of our landowners and stakeholders are engaged in wildfire planning and mitigation; more could be done to understand their risk and concerns.

LOW – Only a few of our landowners and stakeholders are engaged in wildfire planning and mitigation; a lot more could be done to understand their risk and concerns.

VERY LOW – Very few, if any, landowners and stakeholders are known, and wildfire risk is not understood and/or minimal mitigation is occurring.

Additional Notes/Comments:



	3.C. Additional FAC Partners	Community Response
28	<p>In addition to those stakeholders that were the focus of previous assessment questions, who else is involved in fire adapted communities activities (e.g., through existing collaboratives, pilot projects, FAC programs)?</p>	<p><i>List and describe each additional FAC partner role:</i></p>
29	<p>Characterize the strength of relationships among public agencies and the community in terms of level of trust, type of engagement and interactions, effectiveness of decision-making and track record for accomplishments?</p>	<p><i>List and describe relationships:</i></p>
30	<p>How does your community celebrate its FAC successes and share lessons learned with other organizations and communities (e.g., participation in a regional or national FAC network, conference attendance, contributions to journals)?</p>	<p><i>Describe how FAC success and lessons learned are shared:</i></p>



Summary: Additional FAC Partners

Based on your responses above, do you have the right mix of partners and are they working together effectively? *(Circle the response below that best fits your community):*

VERY HIGH – We engage all types of partners at all levels, and have strong connections and benefit from a high level of trust during the planning process; we belong and are active participants in a FAC learning network.

HIGH – We engage with most partners at various levels, and have a high level of trust but see some opportunities for improvement; we share our lessons learned and FAC successes when funds and capacity exist.

MEDIUM – We engage some, but not all, of the potential partners during the planning process; our level of trust could be higher; we encourage participation in opportunities to share and learn with others.

LOW – We have not yet identified all of our partners, or we do not have good enough relationships with partners to work together on mutual outcomes and wildfire risk reduction efforts; we don't yet have the capacity to share lessons learned or FAC successes.

VERY LOW – We have not yet identified our partners, or have had unproductive relationships in the past that has resulted in mistrust and a process at odds with finding mutually beneficial outcomes.

Additional Notes/Comments:



STEP 3: Prioritize Community Fire Adaptation Needs

Fill out the following table to help you identify priority community fire adaptation actions. See User and Facilitator’s Guide for additional information and strategies.

1. **Summary Rating:** Copy your responses from each summary question above.
2. **Trending:** Circle which direction this section is trending: maintaining, improving or declining.
3. **Prioritization:** Discuss each rating and trend. Prioritize your FAC efforts through either a numerical or simple ranking system.
4. **Additional Notes:** Add additional notes to help you prioritize or consider other aspects of the rating for future needs.

SECTION	Summary Rating (circle one)	Trending (circle one)	Prioritization	Additional Notes
1: Wildfire Hazard & Values at Risk				
1.A: Wildfire Hazard and Response Capability	Very High High Medium Low Very Low	Maintaining Improving Declining		
1.B: Community Values at Risk	Very High High Medium Low Very Low	Maintaining Improving Declining		
1.C: Residential and Commercial Properties at Risk	Very High High Medium Low Very Low	Maintaining Improving Declining		



2: Mitigation Plans, Activities & Resources				
2.A: Community Plans and Regulations	Very High High Medium Low Very Low	Maintaining Improving Declining		
2.B: Wildfire Mitigation / Risk Reduction Programs	Very High High Medium Low Very Low	Maintaining Improving Declining		
2.C: Resources and Funding	Very High High Medium Low Very Low	Maintaining Improving Declining		
3: Public Engagement & Partnerships				
3.A: Public Outreach and Input	Very High High Medium Low Very Low	Maintaining Improving Declining		
3.B: Landowners and Stakeholders	Very High High Medium Low Very Low	Maintaining Improving Declining		
3.B: Additional FAC Partners	Very High High Medium Low Very Low	Maintaining Improving Declining		



STEP 4: Create a Community Fire Adaptation Action Plan

Congratulations! If you've made it to this step you are already well on your way to increasing community fire adaptation. This table ensures actions, partners and resources are in place to move forward. Fill out the following table as follows:

1. **Priority:** Copy the summary rating and priority from the table in Step 3 (for easy reference).
2. **Actions:** Determine specific actions that your community could take to address this topic, both in the short- and long-term.
3. **Assigned To:** List who is responsible for implementing each action.
4. **Partners/Resources:** List potential partners and resources to support each action.
5. **Progress:** Add notes, updates and other information to help track progress on each action.

SECTION	Priority	Actions (short & long-term)	Assigned To:	Additional Partners & Resources	Progress
1: Wildfire Hazard & Values at Risk					
1.A: Wildfire Hazard and Response Capability					
1.B: Community Values at Risk					
1.C: Residential and Commercial Properties at Risk					



SECTION	Priority	Actions (short & long-term)	Assigned To:	Additional Partners & Resources	Progress
2: Mitigation Plans, Activities & Resources					
2.A: Community Plans and Regulations					
2.B: Wildfire Mitigation / Risk Reduction Programs					
2.C: Resources and Funding					



SECTION	Priority	Actions (short & long-term)	Assigned To:	Additional Partners & Resources	Progress
3: Public Engagement & Partnerships					
3.A: Public Outreach and Input					
3.B: Landowners and Stakeholders					
3.B: Additional FAC Partners					



Appendix A: Table of Programs

(From Section 2, Wildfire Mitigation/ Risk Reduction Programs – Questions related to 14, 14a, 14b)

Program Name	Description	Targets & Goals	Achievements	Management, Sponsorship & Promotion
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				

