

Washakie County

Community Wildfire Protection Plan 2017

Update

December 15, 2017



Washakie County, Wyoming



This plan developed by the Washakie County CWPP Operating Group in cooperation with:

Technical Forestry Services, LLC
6628 W Riverside Drive
Casper, Wyoming 82604
www.wytfss.com

This Page Left Intentionally Blank

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2.0 INTRODUCTION	4
2.1 BACKGROUND	11
2.1.1 <i>Public Outreach in Washakie County</i>	11
2.1.2 <i>Emergency Management Capabilities</i>	12
2.2 DEFINITIONS.....	12
2.2.1 <i>Wildland-Urban Interface</i>	12
2.2.2 <i>Other Values at-risk</i>	15
2.2.3 <i>Fuels Hazard</i>	15
2.2.4 <i>Fuels</i>	15
2.3 INSECT AND DISEASES (FOREST HEALTH)	15
2.4 FIRE REGIME AND CONDITION CLASS	18
2.5 RELEVANT FIRE POLICIES.....	23
2.5.1 <i>State Policies</i>	23
2.5.2 <i>Federal Policies</i>	24
2.5.3 <i>Other Policies and Coordinating Groups</i>	26
2.5.4 <i>Guidance Documents</i>	26
3.0 COMMUNITY DESCRIPTION.....	28
3.1 “AT-RISK” COMMUNITY (CAR) DELINEATION PROCESS.....	28
3.2 COMMUNITY DESCRIPTION	29
4.0 COMMUNITY ASSESSMENT	31
4.1 2017 WCCWPP FINAL WUI RATING	32
4.1.1 <i>Fire Behavior Modeling</i>	32
4.1.2 <i>Community Rating Analysis</i>	33
4.1.3 <i>Values-at-risk</i>	38
4.2.1 <i>2017 WCCWPP Final WUI Rating Map</i>	41
5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REDUCING RISK OF CATASTROPHIC FIRE.....	42
5.1 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LAND TREATMENTS	42
5.1.1 <i>Shaded fuel breaks</i>	43

5.1.2	Selective Tree Harvest:	46
5.1.3	Clearcut/Patch Cuts/Group Selection	47
5.1.4	Aspen Release.....	48
5.1.5	Pre-commercial/Commercial/Brush Reduction/Hand Thinning:	49
5.1.6	Prescribed Fire	49
5.1.7	Riparian Area Fuels Modifications.....	50
	Best Management Practices	50
5.1.8	Miscellaneous.....	50
5.2	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REDUCING STRUCTURAL IGNITABILITY.....	51
5.3	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROMOTING PUBLIC OUTREACH.....	51
5.4	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SERVICES	52
5.5	ENCOURAGE LOCAL WOOD PRODUCTS INDUSTRY	52
5.6	MISCELLANEOUS.....	53
6.0	MONITORING AND ASSESSING FOREST AND RANGELAND HEALTH	53
7.0	DECLARATION OF AGREEMENT AND CONCURRENCE	54
8.0	LITERATURE CITED.....	56
9.0	APPENDIXES.....	57

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1. Ten Sleep Fish Hatchery.....	3
Figure 1-2. View of structures (at photo center in canyon bottom) in the Otter Creek (OTCR) Community ...	3
Figure 2-1. Area Map	5
Figure 2-2. 2017 WCCWPP Base Map.....	7
Figure 2-3. Structure within the Tensleep Canyon (TSCA) at-risk community	13
Figure 2-4. The town of Ten Sleep Wyoming is considered an “Interface Community”.....	14
Figure 2-5. Vegetation Condition Class analysis for Washakie County (2014 data).....	20
Figure 3-1. Home located in the community-at-risk (CAR) of Canyon Creek Country	29
Figure 3-2. The 2016 Hatchery Creek Fire in Washakie County, Wyoming.....	30
Figure 4-1. At-risk Community Analysis Process.....	31
Figure 4-2. 2012 South Flat Fire in Washakie County, Wyoming.....	34
Figure 4-3. Wildfire activity in Washakie County 1980 – 2016	35
Figure 4-4. Figure 4-4. Community Fire Risk Rating Map.....	37
Figure 4-5. Elk calf. TFS photo.....	38
Figure 4-6. Sage Grouse Core Areas version 4	39
Figure 4-7. Male Greater Sage grouse during courtship display.....	40
Figure 4-8. Federally listed Species for Washakie and Big Horn Counties	40
Figure 4-9. Bald eagle	41
Figure 5-1. Shaded fuel break.	44
Figure 5-2. Selective tree harvest	46
Figure 5-3. Aspen stand with encroaching conifers	48

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4-1. 2017 WCCWPP Final WUI Priority Rating	36
--	----

Acknowledgements

The development of this plan relied on efforts from the following individuals: Chris Kocher , Washakie County Fire Warden; Erich Berryman, Worland Fire; Troy Nelson, Worland Fire; Norman Mullis, Ten Sleep Fire; Shane Starbuck, Washakie County Fire, Ten Sleep Fire; CJ Grimes, Ten Sleep Fire; Mary Grace Strauch, Washakie County; Tori Dietz, Washakie County Conservation District, Resource Coordinator; Karen Fenton, Washakie County Conservation District, Assistant District Coordinator; Laura Galloway, Natural Resources Conservation District, District Conservationist; Jerry Glanz, Washakie County Weed & Pest Director; Bart Kroger, Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Wildlife Biologist; Reed Oldenburg, Wyoming State Forestry Division, Senior Fuels Manager; Paul Morency, WSFD (ret.); Curtis Rasmuson, USDA Forest Service; Jon Warder, USDA Forest Service FMO; Eve Warren, WRBB Bureau of Land Management; Josh Shroyer, District Forester, Wyoming State Forestry Division; Brian Russell, Wyoming State Forestry Division; Steve Scharosch, Abacus Enterprises, Inc, Forester; Jeff Schweighart, County Office of Homeland Security, Emergency Management Coordinator; Kathy Treanor, Washakie County Assessor/GIS; Jim Andersen, Fire Behavior Specialist; George Wynn, Technical Forestry Services, LLC Forester; Chris Weydeveld, Technical Forestry Services, LLC, Project Manager/Forester



Washakie Co CWPP Operating Group members

1.0 Executive Summary

This document is an update to the 2005 Washakie County Community Wildfire Protection Plan ([2005 Washakie Co CWPP](#)). The 2005 CWPP analysis was developed to provide for wildfire protection planning for forty (40) at-risk communities in Washakie County. Funding for this 2017 update has come in the form of a grant through the National Fire Plan (Federal Grant No. 12-DG-11020000-031 CFDA 10.664). The grant was awarded to Washakie County and is administered by the Wyoming State Forestry Division (WSFD). A portion of this grant funding has been used to contract Technical Forestry Services, LLC (TFS) to develop this 2017 Update. A digital version of this plan is available for download and printing at the Wyoming State Forestry Fuels Mitigation web page at: (<https://sites.google.com/a/wyo.gov/forestry/fire-management/fire-grants-assistance/fuels-mitigation>).

This document addresses “at-risk” communities in Washakie County as defined by the Washakie County CWPP Operating Group (OG). The purpose of this document, which is entitled *Washakie County Community Wildfire Protection Plan 2017 Update* (2017 WCCWPP), is to identify at-risk communities, prioritize these communities on the basis of fire risk, and make recommendations for reducing the impacts of catastrophic fire threatening these communities. Federal and state funding sources consider an approved CWPP when appropriating monies for fuels reduction and other wildfire preparedness projects. This document will help coordinate activities across jurisdictions and ownerships through the CWPP process **before** an emergency occurs in order to reduce the chance of loss of life, and damage to infrastructure, homes, and natural resources as a result of unforeseen and catastrophic wildfire. The 2017 WCCWPP further addresses a need for the restoration of fire-adapted ecosystems, and improved forest and rangeland health.

Using the CWPP guidelines, an Operating Group was formed made up of representatives from local governments, local firefighting agencies, and state, county, municipal, and federal agencies. A list of Operating Group members can be seen in Appendix 2. The 2017 WCCWPP Update has been developed through the collaborative efforts of this group.

This Operating Group has completed the following activities to date:

- Review of previously completed documents analyzing the at-risk communities in Washakie County.

- Development of a working Base Map (Fig. 2-2) of the overall assessment area.
- Use of spatial data and fire modeling programs to assess fire behavior and determine risk ratings.
- Field site visits by professional foresters, fire behavior analysts, and structure ignitability specialists to gather site data on at-risk communities.
- Analysis of road access, road characteristics, building construction, utilities, water supplies, local firefighting capabilities, historical fire occurrence, topography, and emergency response times within the at-risk communities.

Information generated through the four Operating Group meetings in Worland, Wyoming, on 4/10/14, 4/9/15, 12/13/16, and 3/14/17, and through electronic communication throughout the spring and summer of 2017, forms the basis of this document.

Section 2.0 provides a description of the CWPP project area and includes an Area Map (Figure 2-1) and the CWPP Base Map (Figure 2-2). Section 2.0 also provides background on the CWPP process in Washakie County, definitions of terms used in this document, a summary of insect and disease concerns, a description of Fire Regimes and Vegetation Condition Class (VCC), and relevant state, county, and federal policies relevant to this process.

Section 3.0 describes the project area in general, the specific at-risk communities within Washakie County, and the process used in delineating those communities.

Section 4.0 describes the at-risk community assessment process for prioritizing communities on the basis of risk from wildfire and provides a table (Table 4-1), and map (Figure 4-4) of prioritized communities.

Recommendations for reducing the risk of devastating wildfire within at-risk communities are given in Section 5.0. Recommendations address the following considerations: structural ignitability, public outreach, fire suppression, training, emergency equipment needs, response times, wildland fuels treatments (prescribed fire, fuels treatments and slash disposal), defensible space, and planning and zoning.



Figure 1-1. Ten Sleep Fish Hatchery located in the Ten Sleep Canyon (TSCA) Community at-risk. July 2017 TFS photo.



Figure 1-2. View of structures (at photo center in canyon bottom) in the Otter Creek (OTCR) Community at-risk. TFS photo July 2017.

Introduction

The Washakie County Community Wildfire Protection Plan Update (2017 WCCWPP) is an analysis of the threat of wildfire to at-risk communities in Washakie County, Wyoming. Washakie County is in the north central portion of Wyoming (see Area Map Figure 2-1). It is the intent of Washakie County and the 2017 WCCWPP cooperators to continue the work toward achieving the goals of the [\(2005 Washakie Co CWPP\)](#). Further, the 2017 WCCWPP serves to identify newly recognized at-risk communities and evaluate and classify these communities on the basis of overall risk of catastrophic fire destroying structures, natural resources, wildlife habitat, critical infrastructure, municipal watersheds, and human welfare, including loss of life. Applying a collaborative process, at-risk communities were identified, then prioritized based on a risk analysis, in order of need to initiate fuels reduction treatments to reduce fire risk.

The Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 ([HFRA](#)) legislation established incentives for communities to develop comprehensive wildfire protection plans in collaboration with local governments, local firefighting authorities, and state, county, municipal, and federal agencies. Furthermore, this legislation gives direction to the Department of the Interior and Department of Agriculture to address community priorities for fuel reduction treatments on federal and non-federal lands.

Washakie County supports the tenants of the National Cohesive Strategy which establishes a national vision for wildland fire management, defines national goals, describes the wildland fire challenges, identifies opportunities to reduce wildfire risks, and establishes national priorities focused on achieving the national goals. The National Cohesive Strategy identifies three primary factors as presenting the greatest challenges and opportunities in addressing wildland fire:

1. Restoring and maintaining resilient landscapes
2. Creating fire-adapted communities
3. Responding to wildfires



Forty (40) communities were identified as being “at-risk” from wildfire, and are identified on the 2017 WCCWPP Base Map (see Figure 2-2).


The process used to classify these communities involved a *relative comparison* assigning risk ratings of high, moderate, and low. A final priority list of at-risk communities (Table 4-1) is ultimately produced for use in scheduling effective fuels reduction projects. Classification criterion includes: wildland fire hazard and risk, structure ignitability, and community layout.

Ten (10) of the identified at-risk communities are within or adjacent to the Bighorn National Forest. The remaining thirty (30) at-risk communities are within or adjacent to Bureau of Land Management administered lands. The Bighorn National Forest lies in north central Wyoming. The Forest includes approximately 1.1 million acres. All of the Bighorn National Forest is mountainous. Elevation rises from approximately 4,000 feet above sea level at the north county line where the Big Horn River flows out to 9,400 a.s.l. feet at the point Highway 16 leaves the county at the extreme northeast corner.


Recognizing that the condition of the vegetation (fuel) on the landscape is dynamic, and that the resilience of communities to wildfires varies widely and changes over time, it is not only important and necessary to complete community assessments, but also to periodically complete re-assessments. Finally, it is worthy to note that it is not only important to lower the risk to communities, but once the risk has been reduced, to maintain those communities at a reduced risk over time.


This 2017 WCCWPP, though providing general recommendations for reducing risk of catastrophic fire, is not a mitigation plan. *This plan does not include any strategic operational objectives or tactics to protect communities.* Following the implementation of the CWPP, the next step in the process toward reducing risk in the at-risk communities is the development of mitigation plans. These mitigation plans should each recommend specific actions that will reduce the risk of wildfire to communities.

Figure 2-2. 2017 WCCWPP Base Map









2.1 Background

The 2005 Community Wildfire Protection Plan ([2005 Washakie Co CWPP](#)) was developed by the private consulting company, Greystone Environmental Consultants, Inc. This document is a good analysis of WUI areas in the Bighorn Mountain and Bighorn Basin lowlands, and provides recommendations for reducing the threat of catastrophic wildfire destroying life and property. This document is still relevant for the communities addressed, and may be utilized during planning efforts, and can be found as a pdf file at the Wyoming State Forestry Division website ([Wyoming CWPPs](#)).¹ Mitigation planning and fuels treatment projects have already taken place for many of the communities in the assessment area, including work by the USFS, BLM, Conservation Districts, and the County through the ongoing Firewise Program.

Washakie County was awarded a Western States WUI Grant (12-DG-11020000-031) in 2012 and again in 2017 (17-DG-11020000-040). Funding from these grants is used to administer a Firewise Program ([Bighorn Basin Firewise](#)) including public outreach, wildfire mitigation planning to address hazardous fuel loading in the WUI, and cost/share funding for the implementation of hazardous fuels projects. Additional funding was added to the grant in the summer of 2017 to develop this CWPP Update and to conduct a Structure Ignitability Assessment of the homes and cabins in the mountain areas of the County. Also in 2017, Washakie County was awarded a Community Wildfire Protection Program Grant (Region Two – CAFA). Funds will go towards the implementation of a 100 acre fuels treatment project on private land adjacent to the at-risk community of Canyon Creek Country.

2.1.1 Public Outreach in Washakie County

Washakie County has an ongoing Firewise program aimed at educating residents about protecting their homes and property from wildland fire, and facilitating the layout, implementation, and inspection of defensible space projects around homes and cabins within the at-risk communities. National Fire Plan

¹ Find the 2005 Washakie County CWPP at: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0BxgGvgRMOUrUR3F0RIB3elp3MzQ/view>

Western States WUI Grant funding has allowed cost/share funding to assist in this effort. The Wyoming State Forestry District and local Conservation Districts have also been active in public outreach.

2.1.2 Emergency Management Capabilities

Washakie County has a strong volunteer fire force with a capable emergency management infrastructure. The county consists of Worland Fire Protection District #1 and the Ten Sleep Rural Fire District. The County shares mutual aid agreements with state and federal partners and neighboring counties. The county has access to all available resources including air tankers, helicopters, engines, crews, and incident management teams.

2.2 Definitions

Definitions vary when describing fire and fuels risk analysis and can mislead the reviewer in some cases. For purposes of this document, 2017 WCCWPP at-risk communities (CARs) are adjacent to federal lands, and are consistent with the commonly used definitions of an intermix, interface, or occluded community associated with a “wildland-urban interface” (WUI). At-risk communities may also include other values at-risk, as defined by the Washakie County CWPP Operating Group (OG). Other values at-risk may include Wildland-Industrial Interface (WII), municipal watersheds, and natural resources, (wildlife and threatened, endangered, and sensitive habitats, rehabilitated and restored forests), Research Natural Areas (RNA)², and cultural or archaeological sites.

2.2.1 Wildland-Urban Interface

The WUI is defined in: *Wildland Urban Interface Communities Within the Vicinity of Federal Lands That Are at High Risk From Wildfire*, issued by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with Title IV of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (114 Stat. 1009) (66 Fed. Reg. 753, January 4, 2001). The WUI is commonly described as the zone where structures and other features of human development meet and intermingle

² A Research Natural Area (RNA) is any tract of land or water which supports high quality examples of terrestrial or aquatic ecosystems, habitats, and populations of rare or endangered plant or animal species, or unique geological study of the features, and is managed in a way that allows **natural** processes to predominate. There are no RNAs in Washakie County though the Forest Plan identified a potential RNA up Leigh Canyon.

with undeveloped wildland or vegetative fuels, in which conditions are conducive to a large-scale wildland fire disturbance event; and for which a significant threat to human life or property exists as a result of a wildland fire disturbance event. Communities within the WUI face risk to life, property, and infrastructure and are commonly categorized as:

- The **Intermix Community** exists where structures are scattered throughout a wildland area. There is no clear line of demarcation; wildland fuels are continuous outside of and within the developed area. The developed density in the intermix community, ranges from structures very close together to one structure per forty acres. Local fire departments normally provide life and property fire protection and may also have wildland fire protection responsibilities.³



Figure 2-3. Structure within the Tensleep Canyon (TSCA) at-risk community in Washakie County, Wyoming. This structure occurs in what is described here as an “intermix” community.

³ Forest recreation “cabin leases” are privately owned cabins located within the National Forest. Protection of structures from wildfire is the responsibility of county and state emergency management resources. Federal wildland firefighters are not trained in structure protection and are not responsible for protection of these values.

- The **Interface Community** exists where structures directly abut wildland fuels. There is a clear line of demarcation between wildland fuels and residential, business, and public structures. Wildland fuels do not generally continue into the developed area. The development density for an interface community is usually three or more structures per acre, with shared municipal services. Fire protection is generally provided by a local fire department with the responsibility to protect the structure from both an interior fire and an advancing wildfire.



Figure 2-4. The town of Ten Sleep Wyoming is considered an “Interface Community”. The town abuts wildland fuels consisting of riparian vegetation along Tensleep Creek as well as juniper and sagebrush vegetation communities in all directions surrounding the town. TFS photo July 2017.

- **Occluded communities** generally exist in a situation, often within a city, where structures abut an island of wildland fuels (e.g. park or open space). There is a clear line of demarcation between structures and wildland fuels. The development density for an occluded community is usually similar to those found in the interface community, but the occluded area is usually less than one thousand acres in size. Fire protection is normally provided by local fire departments.⁴

⁴ An example of an occluded community in Washakie County would be the Bighorn River corridor as it passes through residential areas within the town of Worland, Wyoming.

2.2.2 Other Values at-risk

Other values at-risk may include Wildland-Industrial Interface (WII), municipal watersheds, and natural resources, (wildlife and threatened, endangered, and sensitive habitats, rehabilitated and restored forests), Research Natural Areas (RNA), and cultural or archaeological sites.



Example of Wildland-Industrial Interface (WII) in Washakie County. BLM Photo.

2.2.3 Fuels Hazard

Fuels Hazard is defined herein as the existence of a fuel complex that constitutes a threat of wildland fire ignition, unacceptable fire behavior and severity, or suppression difficulty.

2.2.4 Fuels

Fuels include dead or down wood, live vegetation, and human developments when those developments are capable of ignition and arranged in a manner that will affect fire behavior and severity.

2.3 Insect and Diseases (Forest Health)

Years of hot, dry summers, and above-normal winter temperatures over the past two decades, and densely stocked forest stands throughout much of the western United States and Rocky Mountain region, have combined to result in stressed forest conditions across the landscape. Stressed forest

stands favor buildup of forest pathogens and insects above endemic levels and often results in the increase of available fuel in forest stands. In general, the Bighorn National Forest has fared better than other forests in the Rocky Mountains.

Wyoming's 2016 forest health Aerial Detection Survey (ADS) as well as some preliminary results of the 2017 survey revealed few current insect and disease concerns.⁵ For Big Horn and Washakie counties, the treed areas surveyed by the ADS program were confined to the western slope of the Bighorn Mountains. Small clumps of declining subalpine fir were frequently mapped in eastern Big Horn and Washakie counties. Single trees and small groups of Douglas- fir trees affected by Douglas- fir beetle were occasionally mapped in eastern Big Horn and Washakie counties. Infrequent aspen discoloration and defoliation was mapped in eastern Big Horn and Washakie counties. Limber pine affected by mountain pine beetle was infrequently mapped in southeastern Washakie County. Douglas- fir affected by Western spruce budworm was infrequently mapped in southeastern Washakie County. Between 2015-2016 and 2016-2017, mapped acres affected by some damage agents, including mountain pine beetle, Douglas-fir beetle, Western balsam bark beetle (subalpine fir decline), Western spruce budworm, and aspen defoliation/decline may have slightly increased. However, it is important to note that any recent short-term slight increases are following significant long-term decreases in pest populations. In addition, all acreages and damage agents are currently minor and fluctuations from year to year are to be expected. Overall, forests of the Bighorn Mountains are among the healthiest in Wyoming (Ryan DeSantis, WSFD. Pers. Comm. 9/15/2017).

Bark beetles

Bark beetles can act as a stand replacement process similar to fire, but at times may occur at low “endemic” levels that affect small groups of trees and influence within stand structure more than landscape structure. Changes in stand composition and structure can be changed relatively rapidly by insect attacks. Insects, along with fire, have been an important influence on the patch and landscape structure of the forest environment.

⁵ ADS has been used for over 70 years to detect broad-scale forest health. Trained surveyors fly over forest land, noting the location of forest damage as well as the damage size, tree type, damage agent, approximate percent of tree and trees affected.

Bark beetles found in the Bighorn Mountains include: **Western balsam bark beetle** (*Dryocoetes confuses*) affects subalpine fir, other true firs, and very rarely, Engelmann spruce and lodgepole pine. According to 2016 ADS reports, the balsam bark beetle killed subalpine fir over approximately 4,000 acres, but subalpine fir decline complex, which includes *Armillaria* root disease, was not found in Bighorns.⁶ **Mountain pine beetle** (*Dendroctonus ponderosae*) affects pine species primarily. Acres affected actually increased from 80 to 580 acres from 2015 to 2016, at least half of which was in lodgepole pine.⁷ **Spruce beetle** (*Dendroctonus rufipennis*) affects Engelmann and blue spruce, and, during very large outbreaks, has also attacked lodgepole pine, though such occurrences are not common.⁸ Acres affected increased, but only from 70 to 160 from 2015 to 2016. Field observations in high-elevation spruce stands during the summer of 2017 noted very active spruce beetle activity (Brian Russell, WSFD, pers. Comm., 10/26/2017). **Douglas-fir beetle** (*Dendroctonus pseudotsugae*) affects the Douglas-fir tree and shows very low mortality levels in recent surveys, only six acres detected.

Other insect pests

Western spruce budworm (*Choristoneura occidentalis*), attacks spruce and Douglas-fir trees. The insect, which eventually transforms to a gray moth, is native to Wyoming and about every 20 years appears in epidemic proportions. The 2016 surveys found that most budworm activity was in southwestern Johnson County, but activity remains low.

Diseases

Diseases mostly operate within stands and influence growth and structure of individual trees. **Dwarf mistletoe** is noted for reducing tree growth and ultimately the supply of forest products. Dwarf mistletoe frequently works more slowly than insects, and may take decades to change forest stand composition or structure. Infections occur primarily on unharvested stands or stands which were

⁶ The code used by ADS program for the subalpine fir decline in this instance is WBBB (Western balsam bark beetle). Other pathogens are likely involved but, without more ground checking, it's not possible to be certain of the exact cause of the mortality observed. "SFD" (subalpine fir decline) may be a better way to describe the decline seen in the subalpine fir. In some places it could be entirely WBBB, in others *Armillaria* could be involved, and it is also possible Balsam wooly adelgid could be a factor, although it has still not been positively identified within Wyoming.

⁷ However, it is important to note that any recent short-term slight increases are following significant long-term decreases in pest populations. In addition, all acreages and damage agents are currently minor and fluctuations from year to year are to be expected.

⁸ This has been recently documented quite a bit in Colorado.

selectively cut. Recent surveys show Mistletoe is problematic in lodgepole pine but forest treatments are slowly improving conditions. No ADS acreage number available from the 2016 survey.

White pine blister rust, caused by the fungus (*Cronartium ribicola*), is an exotic disease introduced from Eurasia around 1910. White pine blister rust has spread across the forests of the west and probably has the most potential to continue to infect trees on the forests. Five-needle pine populations (limber and white bark pine in Wyoming) are not widespread on the forest and therefore the impact of the disease on those populations could be significant. No ADS acreage number available from the 2016 survey. **Sudden Aspen Decline** (SAD) continues to occur but ADS surveys show only a small area affected.

2.4 Fire Regime and Condition Class

The historical role of fire in the assessment area is best described in terms of its fire regime. A natural fire regime is a general classification of the role fire would play across a landscape in the absence of modern human mechanical intervention, but including the influence of aboriginal burning (Agee 1993, Brown 1995). The five natural (historical) fire regimes are classified based on average number of years between fires (fire frequency) combined with the severity (amount of stand replacement) of the fire on the dominant overstory vegetation. The table below describes the fire regimes (taken from [Interagency Fire Regime Condition Class Guidebook September 2010](#)).

Group	Frequency	Severity	Severity description
I	0 – 35 years	Low / mixed	Generally low-severity fires replacing less than 25% of the dominant overstory vegetation; can include mixed-severity fires that replace up to 75% of the overstory
II	0 – 35 years	Replacement	High-severity fires replacing greater than 75% of the dominant overstory vegetation
III	35 – 200 years	Mixed / low	Generally mixed-severity; can also include low-severity fires
IV	35 – 200 years	Replacement	High-severity fires
V	200+ years	Replacement / any severity	Generally replacement-severity; can include any severity type in this frequency range

Note: These regime groups have been modified slightly from earlier versions (Hardy and others 2001; Schmidt and others 2002; FRCC Guidebook Version 1.2.0) to remain consistent with the ongoing LANDFIRE Project (specifically, Fire Regime III now includes low-severity fires and Fire Regime V includes fires of any severity type).

The vegetation condition class (VCC) of wildland habitats describes the degree to which the current fire regime has been altered from its historical range, the risk of losing key ecosystem components, and the vegetative attribute changes from historical conditions. There are three VCCs, which are classified according to degree of departure from the historical fire regime: low departure (VCC 1), moderate departure (VCC 2), and high departure (VCC 3). VCC is calculated based on changes to vegetation composition, structural stage, and canopy closure using methods described in the [Interagency Fire Regime Condition Class Guidebook September 2010](#).



Wyoming big sagebrush community in a pristine condition. BLM photo.




Figure 2-5. Vegetation Condition Class analysis for Washakie County (2014 data).

LANDFIRE VCC is based on departure of current vegetation conditions from reference vegetation conditions only, whereas the Fire Regime Guidebook approach includes departure of current fire regimes from those of the reference period. Data obtained from LANDFIRE.gov ([LANDFIRE](http://LANDFIRE.gov), accessed August 2017) simulates historical vegetation reference conditions using the Vegetation Dynamics Development Tool, which is a vegetation and disturbance dynamics model. A current vegetation condition is then derived from a classification of existing vegetation type, cover, and height and is current to the vegetative landcover that existed on the landscape in 2014.⁹

Vegetation Condition Class (VCC) represents a simple categorization of the associated Vegetation Departure (VDEP) layer and indicates the general level to which current vegetation is different from the simulated historical vegetation reference conditions. VDEP and VCC are based upon methods originally described in [Interagency Fire Regime Condition Class Guidebook September 2010](#), but are not identical to those methods. Full descriptions of the methods used can be found in the VDEP product description.

In LANDFIRE 2012 (LF 2012), the original three VCC classes were divided in half to create six VCC classes to provide additional precision. The table describes the classes:

LF 2012	LF 2001 National, LF 2001, LF 2008
VCC Ia: Very Low, VDEP 0 - 16	VCC I: Low departure, VDEP 0 - 33
VCC Ib: Low, VDEP 17 - 33	
VCC IIa: Moderate to Low, VDEP 34 - 50	VCC II: Moderate departure, VDEP 34 - 66
VCC IIb: Moderate to High, VDEP 51 - 66	
VCC IIIa: High, VDEP 67 - 83	VCC III: High departure, VDEP 67 - 100
VCC IIIb: Very High, VDEP 84 - 100	

⁹ 2014 data are the most current available at time of analysis for this report.

Condition Class

Condition Class 1

Within the natural (historical) range of variability of vegetation characteristics; fuel composition; fire frequency, severity and pattern; and other associated disturbances

Condition Class 2

(A) fire regimes on the land have been moderately altered from historical ranges;

(B) there exists a moderate risk of losing key ecosystem components from fire;

(C) fire frequencies have increased or decreased from historical frequencies by 1 or more return intervals, resulting in moderate changes to--

(i) the size, frequency, intensity, or severity of fires; or

(ii) landscape patterns; and

(D) vegetation attributes have been moderately altered from the historical range of the attributes.

Condition Class 3

(A) fire regimes on land have been significantly altered from historical ranges;

(B) there exists a high risk of losing key ecosystem components from fire;

(C) fire frequencies have departed from historical frequencies by multiple return intervals, resulting in dramatic changes to--

(i) the size, frequency, intensity, or severity of fires; or

(ii) landscape patterns; and

(D) vegetation attributes have been significantly altered from the historical range of the attributes.

2.5 Relevant Fire Policies

2.5.1 State Policies

2.5.1.1 Wildland Fire Management Annual Operating Plan for Washakie, Big Horn, Park, Hot Springs, and Fremont, Counties (WSFD, District 3)

Each year an Interagency Group convenes to review and develop this document which provides an annual update of policies governing wildland fires in WSFD District which includes Washakie County. The Annual Operating Plan is available by contacting the Wyoming State Forestry Division at (307) 777-7586.¹⁰ Initial suppression action on State land will be taken by the Fire Districts within their capability. This initial action will be reported to the Wyoming State Forestry Division.

2.5.1.2 Forest Action Plan

The Statewide Assessment of Forest Resources identifies important forest landscapes across all ownerships based on an analysis of key data layers.¹¹ Products of the Assessment include a map of important forest landscapes and a description of the threats and priorities for those areas. The Assessment identifies 15 threats/priorities including forest health, wildfire management, the need for a viable forest products industry, the decline of riparian forests, the challenge of community forestry in Wyoming, protection of water quality and quantity, and more.

The Statewide Resource Strategy describes the strategies and tactics that can be used by landowners and land managers to address the threats and priorities identified by the Assessment.¹² The Strategy also identifies stakeholders, partners, and resources needed for implementation. The Strategy provides management direction that should help land managers plan activities and allocate limited state, private, and federal resources.

¹⁰ <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B8XeycIbVsLRYXFGaVdLbE5GR0E/view>

¹¹ <http://slf-web.state.wy.us/forestrydivision/StatewideAssessment.pdf>

¹² http://slf-web.state.wy.us/forestrydivision/Resource_Strategy.pdf

2.5.2 Federal Policies

2.5.2.1 Bighorn National Forest Revised Land & Resource Management Plan 2005

The current land management guiding documentation is the Bighorn National Forest Revised Land & Resource Management Plan 2005 ([BNF 2005 LRMP](#)) and Final Environmental Impact Statement.¹³ Further revisions are not likely until perhaps 2027. The planning summarizes the reasons for choosing the Selected Alternative as the basis for the Revised Forest Plan. The long-term environmental consequences contained in the Final Environmental Impact Statement are considered in this decision.

2.5.2.2 Bighorn National Forest 2015 Fire Management Plan ([BNF Fire Plan 2015](#))¹⁴

National Forest Fire Plans had traditionally been updated on a yearly basis. Forests have since adopted a “spatial” approach to fire management planning and changes to planning are now made in the Wildland Fire Decision and Support System ([WFDSS](#)).

2.5.2.3 Wildland Fire Use

In 2009 the Forest Service and the other Federal Fire Agencies implemented changes to the Implementation Guidance for the Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy and wildland fire decision processes. NOTE: This policy has had changes and could change in the future.

2.5.2.4 National Fire Plan

The National Fire Plan was funded by the U.S. Congress in 2001 to reduce hazardous fuels and restore the ecological health of forests and rangeland. In response, the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior, along with Western Governors and other interested parties, developed a 10-year strategy and implementation plan for protecting communities and the environment ([NFP](#)). The NFP, coupled with the Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy (2001), forms a framework for Federal agencies, States, Tribes, local governments, and communities to reduce the threat of fire, improve the condition of the land, restore forest and rangeland health, and reduce risk to communities.

¹³ https://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/bighorn/landmanagement/planning/?cid=fswdev3_009165

¹⁴ https://gacc.nifc.gov/rmcc/dispatch_centers/r2cdc/predictive/fuels_fire_danger/BHF%20FMP/BighornNF_2015_FMP.pdf

Since the inception of the NFP, administrative procedures and processes governing preparation of projects to reduce hazardous fuel and restore healthy ecological conditions on Federal land have undergone many changes. Many of these changes have occurred as a result of directives stated in the Healthy Forests Initiative (HFI) launched in 2002, and the Healthy Forests Restoration Act (HFRA) passed in December 2003. The HFRA provides improved statutory processes for hazardous-fuel reduction projects on certain types of at-risk National Forest System (NFS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) lands and also provides other authorities and direction to help reduce hazardous fuel and restore healthy forest and rangeland conditions on lands of all ownerships (USDA Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management 2004).

The four components of the HFI and HFRA which help to implement fire protection projects at the local level are:

1. On lands in or adjacent to the wildland-urban interfaces of at-risk communities and other at-risk federal lands, work in collaboration with communities in setting priorities and, as appropriate, in developing Community Wildfire Protection Plans;
2. Develop the project information needed to determine whether proposed projects can use the improved HFI and HFRA authorities;
3. Use the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) process identified for HFI and HFRA projects; and
4. Fund, implement, and monitor the HFI and HFRA projects.

2.5.2.5 National Forest Landscapes for Priority Attention

The Agriculture Act of 2014, commonly referred to as the “Farm Bill,” sets forth a process where the Governor of a state may nominate area landscapes that are impacted by insects and disease, to the Secretary of Agriculture. If those landscapes are then designated by the Secretary, forest management in those areas will be pursuant to an efficient and prioritized planning process, with rigorous science and allowing for full public involvement. Only those areas characterized by declining forest health, a risk of

substantially increased tree mortality, or an imminent risk to public infrastructure, health, or safety, may be nominated.

The 2017 CWPP will satisfy the first of the above four components and provide guidance for accomplishing the final three with the overall goals of 1) reducing risk of catastrophic fire destroying life and property, and 2) the restoration of forest health.

2.5.2.6 Bureau of Land Management Resource Management Plan

In May 2015 the Bureau of Land Management signed the Bighorn Basin Resource Management Plan Revision Project [RMP](#) for the area administered by the Worland Field Office, including Washakie County.¹⁵

2.5.3 Other Policies and Coordinating Groups

Other policies and groups include: the Wyoming Interagency Cooperative Fire Protection Agreement, Wyoming Interagency Fire Restriction Plan, and the Wyoming State Forestry Division *Mini Fire Mobilization Plan 2017* ([2017 Mini Mob Guide](#)).¹⁶

2.5.4 Guidance Documents

Early guidance documents, following the 2001 National Fire Plan and 2003 HFRA, were referenced in the development of the 2017 WCCWPP. Guidance documents that have assisted development of this CWPP include:

- *Preparing a Community Wildfire Protection Plan: A Handbook for Wildland-Urban Interface Communities* (Communities Committee, Society of American Foresters, National Association of Counties, and National Association of State Foresters 2004).

¹⁵ https://eplanning.blm.gov/epl-front-office/projects/lup/9506/58518/63310/BB_PRMP_FEIS.pdf

¹⁶ https://gacc.nifc.gov/rmcc/dispatch_centers/r2rwc/Administrative/Plans_Guides/2017%20WY%20State%20Forestry%20Mob%20Guide.pdf

- *The Healthy Forests Initiative and Healthy Forests Restoration Act Interim Field Guide* (USDA Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management 2004).
- Field Guidance. *Identifying and Prioritizing Communities at Risk*, National Association of State Foresters, 2003.

As additional guidance documents become available, any changes or amendments will be incorporated into this CWPP.

During analyses for the update of the [\(2005 Washakie Co CWPP\)](#) the Operating Group recognized that, in addition to guidance documents utilized during development of the [\(2005 Washakie Co CWPP\)](#), advancements in wildfire fire risk assessments, responses and public education have been made. The Operating Group has therefore reviewed the following documents as part of updating and revising the 2005 CWPP):

- *A National Cohesive Wildland Fire Management Strategy-Final Phase National Report* (WFLC 2012). [WFLC 2014](#).
- *Community Guide to Preparing and Implementing a Community Wildfire Protection Plan. A supplemental guide to Preparing a Community Wildfire Protection Plan: A Handbook for Wildland-Urban Interface Communities* (Communities Committee et al. 2008) [2008 CWPP Guidance Report](#)
- *A Collaborative Approach for Reducing Wildland Fire Risks to Communities and the Environment 10-Year Strategy Implementation Plan, December 2006* ([10-yearstrategyfinal_dec2006.pdf](#)).
- Fire Adapted Communities (FAC) Toolkit (International Association of Fire Chiefs, <http://www.iafc.org/facToolkit>).
- Ready, Set, Go! (RSG) Program (International Association of Fire Chiefs, <http://www.wildlandfirersg.org/>)
- National Fire Protection Association Firewise Communities (<http://www.firewise.org>)
- Fire Adapted Communities (<http://www.fireadapted.org/>)
- Fire Adapted Communities Learning Network (<http://www.wildlandfirersg.org/>)

3.0 Community Description

The assessment area is contained entirely in Washakie County, Wyoming. High elevation forests consist of lodgepole pine, Engelmann spruce and subalpine fir. Low elevation forests consist of woodlands and savannas composed of ponderosa pine, limber pine and Douglas-fir. In these lower areas, when trees grow densely enough to be considered forests, the stands are small and located in ravines or on north slopes. In general, lowlands include a mixture of salt desert shrubland, short grass prairie, sagebrush shrubland, juniper woodland and riparian area vegetation communities. Russian olive and tamarisk have invaded and become well established in most of the lower elevation riparian areas of Washakie County. These Russian olive and tamarisk stands are rapidly pushing out native vegetation and greatly complicate the wildland fire and fuels complex. Aspen stands are older than was typical of the past, and increased amounts of conifer species have invaded the stands. Montane riparian areas have less aspen as a result of being crowded out by conifers. Understory herbaceous vegetation is reduced in stands encroached on by conifers, because of the increase in canopy cover.

3.1 “At-risk” Community (CAR) Delineation Process

Wildland-urban interface areas and other values-at-risk, were determined using criteria specified in the 2003 Healthy Forest Restoration Act ([HFRA](#)). After areas were identified, boundaries around these areas were established based generally on topographic and vegetative features considered capable of affecting fire behavior. The process of delineating CAR boundaries involved collaboration between the Washakie County Fire Warden and local fire officials, USFS and BLM fire specialists, the Wyoming State Forestry Division (WSFD), planners, and natural resource specialists. The resulting Base Map underwent revisions by the Operating Group (OG) before the final draft was adopted. The guiding document for determination of at-risk communities and the consequent prioritization process is titled: Field Guidance. Identifying and Prioritizing Communities at Risk, prepared by the National Association of State Foresters, July 27, 2003 ([CAR Field Guidance](#)). Boundaries were adjusted as needed in response to direction from the Operating Group.




Figure 3-1. Home located in the community-at-risk (CAR) of Canyon Creek Country (CACC). Funded by the National Fire Plan Authority, the Washakie County Firewise Coordinator develops defensible space plans and provides cost-share assistance for implementing fuels treatments in the Home Ignition Zone (HIZ). These efforts have resulted in numerous ownerships, including the one pictured, improving chances of surviving potential wildfire.

3.2 Community Description

The assessment area contains 40 communities and comprises approximately 159,217 acres (see Table 4-1). A complete description of each community is beyond the scope of this document. During the development of the 2017 WCCWPP, Operating Group members conducted a combination of site visits and aerial photo interpretation for each of the 40 communities (see section 4.1.2). Additionally, the Washakie County Firewise Coordinator made separate site visits to a subset of the at-risk communities conducting **Structure Ignitability Assessments** with funding through the USDA Forest Service Region 2, Cooperative Forestry Act of 1978 (grant number: 12-DG-11020000-031 CFDA # 10.664). The assessment criteria can be seen in Appendix 3. Historical weather data for the area can be found at the Western Regional Climate Center website: www.wrcc.dri.edu.

The 2017 WCCWPP identifies the at-risk communities in Washakie County (Figure 2-2). Using HFRA criteria and guidance published in the Federal Register, these communities are all considered at-risk. The current surrounding land conditions are conducive to a large-scale wildland fire, and such a wildfire in their vicinity could threaten human life and property or other values-at-risk.




Figure 3-2. The 2016 Hatchery Creek Fire in Washakie County, Wyoming. A combination of dense forest conditions, insect and disease mortality, and hot and dry conditions complicate fire suppression activities, contribute to intense fire behavior, and pose risk to values existing there.

4.0 Community Assessment

The purpose of the 2017 WCCWPP is to identify at-risk communities, prioritize these communities for hazardous fuels reduction treatments, and make recommendations for reducing the chances of catastrophic fire. As described above in Section 2.0, a total of 40 at-risk communities were identified in the 2017 WCCWPP assessment area. The communities underwent an analysis process to set priorities for hazardous fuels reduction treatments. This analysis process is illustrated in Figure 4-1. It is important to note that the 40 communities underwent a *relative comparison* process to classify them into a roughly equal distribution of low, moderate and high fire risk

Figure 4-1. At-risk Community Analysis Process



4.1 2017 WCCWPP Final WUI Rating

Fire behavior modeling, Community Layout analysis, Structure Ignitability Assessments¹⁷ and Operating Group input were the parameters used to determine a Final WUI Rating of the 40 at-risk communities in the 2017 WCCWPP assessment area (Table 4-1). This Final WUI Rating will serve as a priority list for addressing hazardous fuels conditions and administer fuels treatments aimed at reducing those hazards and the risk of catastrophic fire. The method used for determining the Final WUI Rating is described below. The 40 communities identified in the assessment area are classified as low, moderate, or high fire risk, and appear as green, yellow, and red respectively on the 2017 WCCWPP Risk Rating Map (See Fig. 4-4).

The method for prioritizing communities involved Operating Group discussions of the at-risk communities, combined with the ratings derived from the fire behavior modeling of the communities.

4.1.1 Fire Behavior Modeling

The fire behavior modeling uses the following tools: ArcMap 10.5.2 Geographic Information Systems technology (GIS), fire behavior modeling software including [FlamMap](#) (Stratton 2004), and the geospatial land data product [LANDFIRE](#)¹⁸. A “virtual” wildfire was simulated through each of the 40 communities-at-risk. The impacts of wildfire on the landscape within these communities were then analyzed to assist in prioritizing communities on the basis of risk from wildfire.

FlamMap is a fire behavior mapping and analysis program that computes potential fire behavior characteristics (spread rate, flame length, fireline intensity, and burn severity) over an entire landscape. Weather and fuel moisture conditions are set as constants in this model. Additionally, there is no temporal (time) component in FlamMap. The model uses information on topography and fuels to calculate fire behavior characteristics at one instant in time.

¹⁷ The majority of Structure Ignitability Assessments occurred concurrently with the Operating Group meetings and analysis of CARs risk. Due to an incomplete dataset, Structure Ignitability ratings did not weigh heavy in the overall risk rating analysis.

¹⁸LANDFIRE, http://www.landfire.gov/documents/LF_Data_Product_Descriptions_2016.pdf

LANDFIRE, also known as the Landscape Fire and Resource Management Planning Tools Project, contains data products including layers of topographic characteristics (slope, aspect, elevation), vegetation composition and structure, surface and canopy fuel characteristics,¹⁹ and historical fire regimes. A principle purpose of LANDFIRE data is to: “*Supplement and assist prioritization of national hazardous fuel reduction projects.*” The LANDFIRE data set used for the 2017 WCCWPP was the latest version available. The associated metadata has a publication date of 12/9/2016, and indicates it uses data from 2014. The FlamMap model was applied to predict fire behavior in the at-risk communities using LANDFIRE data as the existing conditions.

4.1.2 Community Rating Analysis

The Operating Group evaluated the 40 communities using the following analysis criteria: means of access, road characteristics, bridge weight limits, topographical characteristics, water sources, defensible space characteristics, placement of utilities, building construction, roofing assembly, available fire protection, and historical fire occurrence. Low, moderate, and high classifications were then assigned by using the score to divide the communities into thirds using the Equal Interval classification method.

“It is essential that both the assessment process and the prioritization of projects be done collaboratively, with all agencies with fire protection jurisdiction – federal, state, local, and tribal – and interested stakeholders, taking an active role.” Field Guidance. Identifying and Prioritizing Communities at Risk, prepared by the National Association of State Foresters, July 27, 2003 (See Appendix 1).

¹⁹The 40 Scott and Burgan Fire Behavior Fuel Models were used in this analysis. This recently developed set of standard fire behavior fuel models represents more fuel models in every fuel type (grass, shrub, timber, and slash) than does Anderson's set of 13 fuel models. The main objective in creating the 40 Scott and Burgan Fire Behavior Fuel Models (FBFM40) is to increase the ability to illustrate the effects of fuel treatments using fire behavior modeling. The FBFM40 can serve as input to the FARSITE fire growth simulation model (Finney 1998), FlamMap fire potential simulator (Stratton 2004), BehavePlus fire behavior model (Andrews and others 2005), NEXUS crown fire potential model (Scott 2003), and FFE-FVS forest stand simulator (Reinhardt and Crookston 2003).

Fire occurrence within the at-risk communities was considered in the overall risk rating process. Data were obtained from the Federal Fire Occurrence Website, an official government website that provides users with the ability to query, research and download wildland fire occurrence data. The data available through this website contains over 726,888 fire records collected by Federal land management agencies for wildfires that occurred from 1980 through 2015 in the United States ([Fire Occurrence 1980 - 2015](#)).



Figure 4-2. 2012 South Flat Fire in Washakie County, Wyoming.

Fire occurrence data goes back to the 1980 for federal lands. A lack of State and county fire occurrence data, including fires occurring on private land, lends some bias to fire occurrence ratings for the 2017 WCCWPP assessment area (Figure 4-3).

Figure 4-3. Wildfire activity in Washakie County 1980 – 2016





Table 4-1. 2017 WCCWPP Final WUI Priority Rating (Red = High Risk; Yellow = Moderate Risk; Green = Low Risk)

Number	Community at-risk (CAR)	CAR Code	Area acres	Risk
1	Upper MFPR	UPMF	1,619	3
2	Onion Gulch	ONGU	1,672	3
3	Canyon Creek Country	CACC	3,032	3
4	Nature Conservancy	NACO	2,759	3
5	Spring Creek Road	SPCR	986	3
6	Cherry Creek Road	CHCR	6,557	3
7	North Fork Otter Creek	NFOC	349	3
8	Canyon Creek Village	CACV	2,074	3
9	North River	NORI	16,449	3
10	South River	SORI	15,085	3
11	Post Draw	PODR	6,841	3
12	Tensleep Watershed	TSWA	27,361	3
13	Meadowlark Ski Lodge	MESK	565	2
14	Boulder Park	BOPA	525	2
15	Mary's Creek	MACR	744	2
16	Bantry Bay-Middle Fork CG	BABA	1,124	2
17	Nowood	NOWO	4,208	2
18	Crooked Creek	CRCR	290	2
19	Big Trails	BITR	1,333	2
20	Woods Gulch	WOGU	1,598	2
21	Landfill	LAND	452	2
22	Tensleep Canyon	TSCA	3,719	2
23	Worland	WORL	12,974	2
24	Cottonwood Creek	COCR	7,344	2
25	Winchester	WINC	4,235	2
26	Gooseberry Creek	GOCR	17,729	2
27	Salt Trough	SATR	1,171	2
28	Bar C	BARC	35	2
29	Indian Creek	INCR	114	2
30	South Fork Ferris Creek	SFFC	621	1
31	Willow Creek	WICR	351	1
32	Arrowhead	ARRO	44	1
33	Otter Creek	OTCR	700	1
34	Taylor Draw	TADR	1,850	1
35	Ten Sleep City Limits	TSCL	107	1
36	Blue Ridge	BLRI	1,922	1
37	Brokenback Creek	BROK	933	1
38	Smith Lake	SMLA	1,096	1
39	Outer Ten Sleep	OUTS	3,492	1
40	Bluff Canal	BLCA	5,159	1
Total area of Communities at-risk			159,219	

Figure 4-4. Figure 4-4. Community Fire Risk Rating Map



4.1.3 Values-at-risk

While determining priorities the Operating Group considered values such as Wildland-Industrial Interface (WII), municipal watersheds, natural resources, including wildlife and Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive habitats, and rehabilitated and restored forests. The importance of these values within the at-risk community boundaries was evaluated in the at-risk community prioritization process.

4.1.3.1 Wildlife habitat

Critical big game winter range is considered a valued resource and occurs within the project area. Sage grouse core areas are present within some at-risk communities (see Figure 4-6). While wildfire is generally beneficial to most wildlife species in the long term, negative impacts can occur where significant areas of sagebrush are burned within crucial mule deer or elk winter range and sage-grouse breeding and winter habitats. Crucial big game migration routes are also considered.



Figure 4-5. Elk calf. TFS photo.




Figure 4-6. Sage Grouse Core Areas version 4 (current at time of printing). Sage grouse habitat occurs primarily outside of forested areas. Core areas do overlap some of the identified at-risk communities in the 2017 WCCWPP project area.

4.2 Identification of important wildlife, fish, and rare plant habitats can enable informed decision making to avoid unnecessary impacts to these resources during wildfire suppression activities and planned fuel reduction projects. Federally listed Species for Washakie and Big Horn Counties include the Canada Lynx and the rare plant Ute Ladies—tresses (*Spiranthes diluvialis*). Federally listed *Species of Concern* include the Bald Eagle, Mountain Plover, Greater Sage Grouse and White-tailed Prairie Dog (https://www.fws.gov/wyominges/species_WYESlist.php). In all cases, human and community safety come first during the management of active fire events.



Figure 4-7. Male Greater Sage grouse during courtship display.



Figure 4-8. Federally listed Species for Washakie and Big Horn Counties include the rare plant Ute Ladies—tresses (*Spiranthes diluvialis*).



Figure 4-9. Bald eagle (Photo credit Jeramie Prine).

4.2.1 2017 WCCWPP Final WUI Rating Map

The methodology described above served to generate the final rating in which each of the 40 communities receives a rating of low, moderate, or high overall fire risk. This overall rating is a product of the combined ratings of each of the two methods of analysis. The final rating was accepted by the Operating Group and became the 2017 WCCWPP Final WUI Rating (Table 4-1).



2017 West River Fire.
Washakie County, Wyoming

5.0 Recommendations for Reducing Risk of Catastrophic Fire

Sections 2.0 and 3.0 provide a Base Map and list of at-risk communities for the area assessed in this CWPP Update. Section 3.0 outlines the process used for delineating the at-risk communities. Section 4.0 defines the analysis process used to assess overall fire risk, and from that analysis, sets priorities for hazardous fuels reduction treatments. The current section 5.0 recommends fuels treatments, administrative actions, policy changes, and other management considerations aimed at mitigating the potential for catastrophic wildland fire within the WUI.

5.1 Recommendations for Land Treatments

All fuels reduction projects will be designed and implemented in accordance with section 102 of HFRA. The HFRA requires authorized projects to be planned and conducted consistent with resource management plans and other relevant administrative policies and decisions that apply to the federal lands covered by the project (Section 102(b)). The HFRA also prohibits projects in wilderness areas, formal wilderness study areas, and Federal lands where an act of Congress or Presidential proclamation prohibits or restricts removal of vegetation (section 102(d)).

The Forest Service is required by laws, regulations, and policies to assess potential effects of proposed activities on National Forest land for all resources, including wildlife, fish, rare plants, and cultural resources. This includes wildfire suppression activities. As Washakie County works with the Forest Service to propose and design fuel reduction projects, an interdisciplinary team will provide guidance and recommendations to minimize impacts to resources, and look for opportunities to enhance resource conditions. Federal fire managers should discuss risk-based decision making with local fire managers prior to the beginning of fire season. During wildfire events, a Wildland Fire Decision Support System (WFDSS) team will usually have a Resource Advisor to identify resource values and make recommendations to protect and minimize impacts to these resource values. Before implementing land treatments on private land, it is recommended that landowners consult with the following entities:

- Wyoming Game and Fish regarding wildlife habitat impacts.
- US Fish and Wildlife Service regarding wetlands and threatened, endangered and sensitive species.

- State Historical Preservation Office (SHPO) regarding any known cultural resource sites in the planned treatment area.

For most rare species and many other more common species, the local Forest Service district biologists and botanists can identify potential habitats in advance of site-specific proposed fuel reduction projects. For several species, habitats have been mapped across the Bighorn National Forest by Forest Service biologists, Wyoming Game and Fish Department ([WGFD](#)), and the Wyoming Natural Diversity Data Base ([WYNDD](#)). This includes habitats for Canada lynx, greater sage grouse, bighorn sheep, and other big game species. Habitats mapped by WGFD and WYNDD extend across land ownerships and also include state and private lands. Site-specific locations of some species such as rare plants and raptor breeding sites can be obtained from WYNDD across multiple land ownerships. Such site specific information is considered sensitive and locations are usually buffered to avoid the potential for disturbance to rare species and private land owners.

Fuels Treatments

Appendix 5 of this document provides a table of recommended fuels treatment projects in Washakie County. This table is meant to guide County Firewise mitigation efforts in the coming years and will be updated and amended as needed.

The following fuels treatment recommendations are presented as examples of possible treatments to be considered when developing a mitigation plan and site-specific project plans for the at-risk communities. In all treatments some basic guidelines apply. Most down and dead woody material should be disposed of so it does not remain as surface fuels. When practical, trees should be pruned so that the bottom one-quarter of limbs are removed. Other ladder fuels, in the form of young tree regeneration, should be removed or reduced to decrease chance of surface fire transitioning into the crowns. Removal of young trees especially benefits ponderosa pine ecosystems. Trees containing nests and snags with apparent cavity nesters would be retained.

5.1.1 Shaded fuel breaks

The objective of this treatment is to reduce fuels by thinning trees and brush along roads and ridges to improve the fuel break function already present in these areas. Fuels treatments in these areas would have the greatest effect on preventing fire spread and intensity and would maintain the primary

ingress/egress and escape routes. Trees on both sides of roads and ridges would be thinned by hand or mechanically so that trees are separated by no less than ten feet between crowns. Crown spacing should be dependent on topography, fuels, and other natural and or manmade features. In addition, trees in this zone should have all limbs removed (pruning) in the lower 25 percent of total tree height.



Figure 5-1. Shaded fuel break.

The total width of the shaded fuel break would vary depending on fuels, topography, and other natural and or man-made features such as roads or rock features. In general, the center of the fuel break would be approximately 100 feet in width and would resemble a shaded open park-like environment. Tree thinning in the center of the fuel break would be greatest resulting in a final spacing of about 30 trees per acre. Beyond this central area, tree removal would incrementally be reduced in both directions so that spacing between trees would be feathered back to the current forest density.

In conformance with section 102(e) of HFRA, specifying that treatments will be designed to “contribute toward the restoration of the structure and composition of old growth stands and retaining the large trees contributing to old-growth structure,” large, healthy trees (generally greater than 16 inches in diameter at breast height (DBH)) would not generally be removed in the shaded fuel breaks, and trees scheduled for harvest would be marked with paint for sale preparation (cut-tree marked). All

trees infected with bark beetles would be removed in the shaded fuel breaks, as would trees with poor form or low vigor, or tree species not present in their historical range of variability (for example juniper encroachment). All woody surface materials and ladder fuels would be cleared within the fuel breaks. It should be noted, the removal of too many trees during one harvest entry may result in tree blowdown, particularly in lodgepole pine and spruce forest stands. Harvest design may include a series of entries over a 10 to 30 year period, allowing a time between entries for residual trees to become windfirm.

Shrubs that were not removed would be thinned, in most cases by hand, at ground level so that crowns are separated by at least two crown widths (at the widest part of the crown). As a whole, these actions would aid in forcing potential crown fires to drop to the ground as surface fires, would slow fire spread, and would enable the roads and ridges to serve as major lines of defense against wildfires.

Harvested trees would be skidded to landing sites along the roads using tracked equipment, rubber-tired skidders, or short-span skyline systems. Trees would be limbed and bucked at the landing sites. Slash (including pruned shrubs) would be piled in openings or near the landing sites, for burning, chipping, or utilized as an economic product if feasible. **No slash would remain within fuel breaks.** Slash piles would be positioned wherever possible so that the prevailing winds would not force flames into surrounding tree canopies when piles are burned. In smaller openings, piles would be kept small to minimize flame lengths. Piles would be burned under favorable conditions after the treatment is complete (generally one to two years after harvest). Scarifying the soil in burn pile areas in early spring and seeding with an appropriate native seed mixture would minimize the potential for noxious weed establishment.

To remain effective, fuel breaks would undergo periodic maintenance about every five years to clear understory woody species as well as any down and dead material. Removal of dying trees and recruitment of younger trees would also occur as needed to maintain the functionality of the fuel breaks. Once created, prescribed fire may be used to help maintain the shaded fuel breaks.

Finally, an inventory and analysis of existing secondary roads could be used to develop a matrix of firebreaks designed to aid suppression forces in the advent of a wildfire.

5.1.2 Selective Tree Harvest:

Forested areas that would undergo selective timber harvest would generally consist of mature stands of conifer trees with heavy fuel loads and densities as high as 300 mature trees per acre. Stands currently infected with insects and/or diseases and those stands that are over-mature and at risk of disease and insect infestation are high priorities for a selective timber harvest prescription. In addition, forest stands outside of their historical range of variability, would be assessed for to develop a management regime aimed at increasing overall forest health through management.

The objective of the harvest in these areas is to reduce very high fuel loads by removing trees in each stand so that the final density of trees is between 60 and 150 trees per acre, depending on initial density. Due to the inherent wind-throw hazard to dense forests that are thinned, the desired future condition might not be achievable with a single harvest entry. Therefore, the initial entry for selective harvest represents the first step in a process. Mature stands of trees would be thinned in a series of ongoing cuts (approximately one harvest every 10 years). Regeneration of each successive stand would occur under the cover of a partial forest canopy, or “shelterwood”. Keeping up this prescription would reduce hazardous fuels and significantly improve forest health by maintaining less dense stands of young to mid-aged trees. Furthermore, by providing a continuous cover of trees during ongoing treatments, the regenerating trees would have an advantage over undesired competing vegetation.



Figure 5-2. Selective tree harvest was used in this example of a defensible space for a cabin. The treatment has greatly improved conditions for making this cabin defensible in the event of a threat from unplanned wildfire.

All trees infested with insect and disease problems would be removed in these treatment areas, as would trees that have poor form or low vigor, or species that are outside the normal historical range of variability. If present, a minimum of three snags per acre would be left for cavity nesters and birds of prey, and any tree with an active nest site would be retained and buffered according to existing management plans.

5.1.3 Clearcut/Patch Cuts/Group Selection

Silvicultural treatments in which all overstory trees are removed are sometimes needed in the following circumstances:

- A shade intolerant species, such as lodgepole pine, requires full sunlight for the regeneration of young trees. Cone serotiny, a condition in which cones are opened to release seed only after being subjected to intense heat, is often present in lodgepole pine trees. Lodgepole pine forests are considered “fire dependent” and succumb to stand replacing fire every 100 years or so in general. Clearcuts are a common treatment in lodgepole forests because the openings created serve to “mimic” openings created by fire.
- Insect and disease outbreaks are sometimes controlled by the complete removal of all the overstory trees. Sanitation harvests of this sort are sometimes prescribed to halt the spread of insect and disease epidemics by removing all infected trees.
- In situations where management is directed toward forest product utilization, forest stands that have reached a condition of over-maturity and are at risk of loss to fire, disease, or insect infestation may be suited for clearcutting as the appropriate tool to improve overall forest health.
- In areas where conifer encroachment has obliterated meadows and other natural openings, clearcuts are a tool for reestablishing these openings and maintaining essential fragmentation features critical to wildlife habitat and forest health.
- A landscape mosaic, as discussed earlier, serves to “break up” homogeneity in vegetation and provide natural fire breaks that slow fire spread and aid in decreasing the chance and impacts of the “Yellowstone-size” fires seen the past few decades.

5.1.4 Aspen Release

In stands of healthy, vigorous aspen, all conifers within, and one tree length in distance from, the aspen clones could be removed to encourage aspen growth and clone spread. Prescribed fire would be used as necessary to stimulate regeneration of the aspen. In the past, fencing of aspen treatments has reduced the detrimental effects of browsing animals on young aspen shoots. Fencing, however, can be expensive and can be counterproductive (animals can be trapped within a fenced area if the fence is compromised). Instead, consider making aspen treatments large enough to spread out browsing of aspen shoots.



Figure 5-3. Aspen stand with encroaching conifers. Aspen can serve as a natural fuel break that can aid in slowing the progress of wildfire. Without the removal of conifer encroachment into aspen stands, these stands can be at risk of type conversion into a conifer community.

Once an aspen stand has become decadent, dead or burned, trees can be cut and stacked in a crisscross pattern in areas of young shoots to help deter browsing in the area. This practice helps deter wildlife and livestock from browsing the shoots. This does, however, lead to a buildup of ground fuels and the increased surface fire potential should be considered when implementing this practice.

5.1.5 Pre-commercial/Commercial/Brush Reduction/Hand Thinning:

This treatment would be prescribed for the 100 feet zone around structures known as the “home ignition zone” ([Defensible Space Guidelines](#)). In these areas defensible space would be improved with the help of hand crews cutting and removing sapling size trees, which are generally those below five inches DBH and less than 12 feet in height, and pole size trees, which are generally trees between five and seven inches DBH. The objective in these stands is to leave a mature forest with a thinned understory that has a residual density of 130-220 trees per acre.

To lessen the fuel buildup in the largely non-forested areas around communities, thick stands of juniper, and/or sagebrush would be thinned so that the residual trees and shrubs are separated by at least two crown widths in distance, and greater distances on steep slopes. Trees and shrubs would be piled and burned when conditions are favorable or used as an economic product if feasible. Scarifying the soil in burn pile areas in early spring and seeding with an appropriate native seed mixture would minimize the potential for noxious weed establishment, and stabilize soils.

5.1.6 Prescribed Fire

Prescribed fire is defined as management ignited fire that is used to alter, maintain, or restore vegetative communities to achieve desired resource conditions. It is also used to protect life, property, and values that would be degraded by wildland fire (USDI BLM, 2000).



Bureau of Land Management, Cody Field Office area watershed enhancement/fuel reduction work. The photos show before prescribed fire (left) and after fire and vegetation re-growth (right). BLM Photos.

Prescribed fire can be beneficial in a fire adapted ecosystem where fire has been absent or suppressed. Prescribed fire aids in natural succession, and reduces uncharacteristic fuel loading. Prescribed fire is an especially useful tool for removing conifer encroachment (particularly ponderosa pine and juniper) into sagebrush and grassland communities. This is important for maintaining wildlife habitat and livestock forage.

Prescribed fire plans are prepared prior to the project to identify site-specific treatment objectives and how those objectives are to be met through the use of fire. With the oversight of qualified fire specialists, prescribed fire, mechanical, and chemical treatments can be used to reduce hazardous fuels, and improve forest and rangeland health. Prescribed fire is generally cheaper than any other treatment and is the only treatment that returns nutrients into the soil immediately.

5.1.7 Riparian Area Fuels Modifications

Riparian vegetation in those communities with river bottoms should be assessed for treatments to reduce fire hazard by removing introduced species and fuel ladders of live and dead vegetation. As a cautionary note, removing or crushing vegetation, and disturbing soils in riparian areas can increase erosion if stream banks are exposed. Soft hydric soils are easily compacted by machinery. Soil compaction can alter vegetation dynamics and may interrupt hydrologic functions.

Best Management Practices

The Wyoming State Forestry Division has developed a set of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to be followed when conducting forest management practices. Copies of these BMPs can be obtained by contacting WSFD in Cheyenne at (307) 777-7586.

5.1.8 Miscellaneous

Grazing of fine fuels by wildlife and livestock reduces surface fire spread and intensity. Encourage grazing in areas around structures only if forage production is adequate to maintain rangeland health.

5.2 Recommendations for Reducing Structural Ignitability

Discourage building homes in fire prone areas.

Implement Firewise recommended practices to reduce structural ignitability in the Home Ignition Zone. Firewise practices are defined in detail on the Firewise website at: www.firewise.org.

If a dependable water source is available, evaluate the possibilities for installing sprinkler systems around structures as an option open to home owners in areas with limited options for reducing structure ignitability.

The Washakie County Fire Warden, local Fire District staff, or WSFD personnel can assist with recommendations for reducing structure ignitability.

5.3 Recommendations for Promoting Public Outreach

- Education programs for home owners
 - Forest health, the natural role of fire, and insect and disease issues.
 - The importance of creating defensible space around structures and the various incentives available to landowners to accomplish these goals.
 - Formation of community Firewise action groups.
- Work with local, state and federal agencies to support the growth of forest industry and forest products to ensure infrastructure and funding is in place to conduct landscape level forest restoration and help achieve community wildfire preparedness objectives.
- Outreach to power and pipeline companies.
- Assist the local Conservation Districts in the dissemination of accurate information on the WUI and related topics.
- Establish and promote a countywide public emergency mass notification system.
- Place fire-danger information signs on major access roads throughout the WUI. Community bulletins and other public service announcements concerning wildfire threat and preparedness should be developed with assistance from WSFD.

5.4 Recommendations for Emergency Management Services

Fire suppression

- Develop Pre-suppression Community Wildfire Mitigation Plans for each of the Communities-at-risk (see example in Appendix 4).
- Update mapping capabilities of local fire departments and districts.
- Encourage fire departments and districts to participate in annual multiagency wildfire safety training before the fire season.
- Acquire GIS and GPS (Global Positioning System) software and laptops to update mapping capabilities of local fire departments.
- Maps showing locations of water sources accessible to draft water, and helicopter dip sites.

Training

- Continue the aggressive training program in wildland firefighting principles. Encourage interagency fire training and communication.
- Develop a pre-suppression plan with local fire departments along the community WUI boundaries.

Emergency Equipment

- Strategically locate additional water-storage tanks, wells, or other water sources for tender filling and helicopter dip sites throughout the fire departments and districts.

5.5 Encourage Local Wood Products Industry

The economic downturn beginning during the last years of the 2000 – 2010 decade had a significant impact on the wood products industry in Wyoming. Sawmills, both large and small, were unable to survive the hardships and were forced to close. Washakie County encourages the participation of local contractors in fire mitigation work and the extraction of saleable materials from fuel reduction projects. Reducing the risk of catastrophic fires through utilization of woody biomass is supported. This plan also encourages the development of markets and industries that will utilize all size-classes of wood products resulting from hazardous fuel reduction activities. Examples of possible income generating

products/projects include but are not limited to: biomass utilization (including co-generation capabilities), house logs, post and poles, firewood, pellets, and mulch.

The 2017 WCCWPP encourages the participation of local contractors in fire mitigation work and the extraction of saleable materials from fuel reduction projects. Reducing the risk of catastrophic fires through utilization of woody biomass is supported. This plan also encourages the development of markets and industries that will utilize all size-classes of wood products resulting from hazardous fuel reduction activities. Opportunities that would sustain private contractors participating in fuels reduction activities while generating an income from the sale of products are encouraged.

5.6 Miscellaneous

Planning and Zoning

Develop and promote planning recommendations for new home construction in the WUI based on National Fire Protection Association Standards and the International Fire Code. Consult with the County Fire Warden and local Fire Chiefs for guidance on planning and zoning or development standards.

Funding Opportunities

- Work with elected officials to develop opportunities for enhanced funding through national, state and local sources for implementing the action recommendations of the 2017 CWPP.

6.0 MONITORING AND ASSESSING FOREST AND RANGELAND HEALTH


Monitoring is critical to ensure that 2017 WCCWPP goals are accomplished. The HFRA states, in section 102.g.5, that communities will participate in multiparty monitoring to assess progress toward meeting the CWPP goals ([HFRA](#)).

The 2017 WCCWPP should be periodically reviewed and updated as needed. Successful implementation of this plan will require a collaborative process among multiple layers of government as well as a broad range of special interests.

1.0 Declaration of Agreement and Concurrence

The following partners in the development of this Washakie County 2017 Community Wildfire Protection Plan Update have reviewed and do mutually agree or concur with its contents:

Agreement



Chris Kocher, Washakie County Fire Warden

12/4/2017

Date



Shane Starbuck, Ten Sleep Fire

11/4/18

Date



Terry Wolf, Washakie County Commissioner/Chairman

19 DEC 17


Date



Tori Dietz, Washakie County Conservation District

12/18/17

Date



Josh Shroyer, Wyoming State Forestry Division

12/4/17

Date



Brian Russell, Wyoming State Forestry Division

12/04/17

Date

Concurrence




Curtis Rasmuson, USDA United State Forest Service, Bighorn NF

12/4/2017

Date

Eve Warren, PhD

12/06/2017



Jeff Schweighart, Office of Homeland Security

12-11-17

Date

Laura L Galloway, DC

Laura Galloway, USDA Natural Resources Conservation District

12-4-17

Date

8.0 Literature Cited

Agee, J.K. 1993. Fire ecology of Pacific Northwest forests. Island Press. Washington, D.C. 493 pp.

Brown, Richard T., James K. Agee, Jerry F. Franklin. 1995. Forest Restoration and Fire: Principles in the Context of Place.

Johnson, D.W. and F.G. Hawksworth. 1978. An evaluation survey procedure for proposed thinning projects in lodgepole pine stands infested with dwarf mistletoe. USDA For. Serv., For. Insect and Disease Mngt., Methods Application Group, Davis, CA. Rep. 78-1. 6pp.

Schmidt, K.M., Menakis, J.P. Hardy, C.C., Hann, W.J., Bunnell, D.L. 2002. *Development of Coarse-scale Spatial Data for Wildland Fire and Fuel Management*. General Technical Report, RMRS-GTR-87, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fort Collins, CO.

Stratton, R. D. 2004. Assessing the Effectiveness of Landscape Fuel Treatments on Fire Growth and Behavior. *Journal of Forestry*. 102(7): 32 - 40.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, and U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management. 2004. *The Healthy Forests Initiative and Healthy Forests Restoration Act: Interim Field Guide*. FS-799. Washington, D.C. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Wildland Fire Policy, 2001. <http://www.fs.fed.us/fire/management/policy.html>.



Elk herd in Washakie County, Wyoming. BLM photo.

9.0 Appendixes

Appendix 1. Field Guidance. Identifying and Prioritizing Communities at Risk.

FIELD GUIDANCE

Identifying and Prioritizing Communities at Risk

Prepared by: National Association of State Foresters

June 27, 2003

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

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

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

References:

1. *A Collaborative Approach for Reducing Wildland Fire Risks to Communities and the Environment. 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan.* May 2002. (Goal 4 Task e: “Develop nationally comparable definitions for identifying at-risk wildland urban interface communities and a process for prioritizing communities within State and tribal jurisdiction.”) (Available at: <http://www.fireplan.gov/reports>).

2. *Memorandum of Understanding for the Development of a Collaborative Fuels Treatment Program*. January 13, 2003. (Available at: <http://www.fireplan.gov/reports>).
3. *Concept Paper: Communities at Risk*. National Association of State Foresters (NASF), December 2, 2002. (Available at: <http://www.stateforesters.org/reports>).
4. *Wildland/Urban Interface Fire Hazard Assessment Methodology*. NWCG, undated (circa 1997). (Available through the NWCG Publications Management System (PMS), NIFC Catalog number NFES 1597.)

Definition – Community at Risk: For the purpose of this document, a community is defined as “a group of people living in the same locality and under the same government” (*The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, 1969). A community is considered at risk from wildland fire if it lies within the wildland/urban interface as defined in the federal register (*FR Vol. 66, No. 3, Pages 751-754, January 4, 2001*).

Approach:

1. Identify communities at risk (or alternately, landscapes of similar risk) on a state-by-state basis with the involvement of all organizations with wildland fire protection responsibilities (State, local, tribal, and federal) along with other interested cooperators, partners, and stakeholders. Alternately, in some locations this may be more easily done on a geographic basis through the already existing Geographic Area Coordinating Groups.
 - Using the 2000 census data (or other suitable means) identify all communities in the state that are in the wildland-urban interface and that are at risk from wildland fire, regardless of their proximity to federal lands. Ideally, the results of this effort would be displayed on a map or series of maps.
 - Develop state-specific criteria for sorting communities (or landscapes) into three, broad categories (or zones) of relative risk, using the methodology described in the following section. You also may want to include a fourth category denoting little, or no significant risk.
 - Prioritize the categories/zones as high, medium, and low. Alternately, a classification of very high, high, and moderate may be more appropriate depending upon fuel types.

Again, you may have a fourth category/zone that you would prioritize as having little, or no significant risk.

- Using the identified criteria, sort communities (or landscapes) into each of the three categories or zones of risk. The product may be map-based with lines or colors depicting the three zones on a map or series of maps. In this case, all communities that fall within the same zone would be classified as having an equivalent degree of relative risk. Alternately, in some states cooperators may choose to use a written document to display how communities have been classified, such as a simple spreadsheet or table. In this case, individual communities would be listed by name under one of the three previously identified categories of risk.
 - If there are land ownerships that cross state lines (for example Indian Reservations or single, National Forests), it is important to coordinate the risk assessment process with neighboring state(s) to ensure consistency in classification.
 - After completing the assessment process for a specific community, strongly encourage the development of a mitigation plan to reduce the identified risks to the community, particularly for communities in the higher risk categories.
2. Annually, using available mitigation plans or another similar analysis process, federal agencies, state agencies, and tribes will each examine the lands under its own ownership or jurisdiction and, with the involvement of all interested parties, identify high priority fuels reduction and ecosystem restoration projects which have the potential to reduce the risk to a specific community or communities.
 3. Prior to May 1 of each year (beginning in 2004) state, federal, local, and tribal partners and interested stakeholders should meet to complete a joint program of work for the upcoming federal fiscal year. Jointly prioritize projects within each state using the collaborative process defined in the national, interagency MOU *“For the Development of a Collaborative Fuels Treatment Program”*. Assign the highest priorities to projects that will provide the greatest benefits either on the landscape or to communities. Attempt to properly sequence treatments on the landscape by working first around and within communities, and then moving further out into the surrounding landscape.

[Note: In some of the larger states, this process may have to be initiated at the sub-state level first. The resulting lists of prioritized projects would then be reviewed by a state level collaborative group, who would develop the final, joint program of work.]

- First, focus on the category/zone of highest overall risk but consider projects in all categories/zones. Identify a set of projects that will effectively reduce the level of risk to communities within the category/zone.
- Second, determining the community's willingness and readiness to actively participate in each identified project.
- Third, for each potential project, determining the willingness and ability of the owner of the land surrounding the community to undertake, and maintain, a complementary project.
- Last, set priorities by looking for projects that best meet the three criteria above. In other words, assign a higher priority to those projects with the greatest potential to achieve a proper sequencing of treatments. Assign lower priority to projects where either the community or the surrounding landowner is unwilling or unable to actively participate. However, do not overlook opportunities around isolated, rural communities which may be at high risk, but not be organized well enough to effectively advocate on their own behalf.
- Note: One reason for the collaborative priority setting process is the opportunity to identify complementary projects on adjoining ownerships which, if implemented, would provide a greater benefit to communities than if only a single project was implemented. However, nothing in this document is intended to prevent non-public landowners (such as Indian tribes) from implementing any project on their own lands, regardless of overall priority.

4. Annually document accomplishments both quantitatively and qualitatively.

- Quantitative measures. Document accomplishments in accordance with the performance measures identified under Goal 4 in the *10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan* (page 15). However, the single, most important quantitative

reporting element is the number of implemented projects that result in a significant and measurable reduction of risk to the communities and landscapes within the project area. In the longer term, it is important to document situations where a wildfire burned through an implemented project area, and determine how the treatment affected fire behavior.

- Qualitative measures. Document examples of successfully implemented projects using the guidelines previously distributed by federal agencies and the NASF for “success stories”. These “success stories” will then be placed on both the NASF and the National Fire Plan websites as examples how we collectively are reducing risks to communities.

Methodology:

Although there is no uniform, national hazard or risk assessment process, there are a number of valid assessment processes that may work well in individual states or regions. In developing a risk assessment process for communities, use the NWCG publication “*Wildland/Urban Interface Fire Hazard Assessment Methodology*” as a reference guide. At minimum, consider the following factors when assessing the relative degree of exposure each community (landscape) faces. One effective approach is to map the four factors below using adjective ratings (high, medium, and low) and then overlay the maps to determine geographic areas of highest hazard, highest probability of fire occurrence, highest values being protected, and lowest protection capability.

- Fire Occurrence. Using historic fire occurrence records and other factors, assess the anticipated probability of a wildfire ignition in the vicinity of each community (or identified landscape) using an adjective rating system, such as high, medium, and low.
- Hazard. Assess the fuel conditions on the landscape and surrounding the community using a GIS mid-level mapping tool (if available) or other similar process. Again, apply an adjective rating to each specific area.
- Values Protected. Evaluate the human and economic values associated with the community or landscape, such as homes, businesses, community infrastructure (e.g. water systems, utilities, transportation systems, critical care facilities, schools, manufacturing and

industrial sites, etc.) as well as high value commercial timber lands, municipal watersheds, and areas of high historical, cultural, and spiritual significance. As with the other factors, apply an appropriate adjective rating to each community or identified landscape.

- Protection Capabilities. Assess the wildland fire protection capabilities, including the capacity and resources to undertake fire prevention measures, of all agencies or organizations with jurisdiction: federal, state, tribal, and local. Again, apply an appropriate adjective rating. Consider using the Insurance Services Organization (ISO) rating for the community as an indicator.

SUMMARY:

Using the process described above, it is possible to assess the level of relative risk that communities in the wildland urban interface face from wildland fire. This can then lead to an efficient process for prioritizing and scheduling effective, fuel reduction projects. However, recognizing that the condition of the vegetation (fuel) on the landscape is dynamic, and that the resilience of communities to wildfire loss varies widely and changes over time, it is not only important and necessary to complete community assessments, but also to periodically complete re-assessments. The frequency of re-assessments, however, will vary considerably across the country depending upon fuel types and climate. We must remember that it is not only important to lower the risk to communities, but once the risk has been reduced, to maintain those communities at a reduced risk.

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

Appendix 2. WCCWPP Operating Group

First Name	Last Name	Agency/Organization	Job Title	Business Address	Business Phone	Cell Phone	Email
Jim	Andersen	Independent	Fire Behavior Specialist	1214 Circle Road Worldand WY 82401	307-347-6550	(307) 431-0144	jimandersen@bresnen.net
Erich	Berrynan	Worldand Fire	Fireman	200 S. 5th Street P. O. Box 504 Worldand WY 82401	307-347-6379		eberryman@worldandfire.org
Tori	Dietz	Washakie County Conservation District	District Resource Coordinator	208 Shiloh Road Worldand WY 82401	(307) 347-2456		wcccd@itconnect.net
Karen	Fenton	Washakie County Conservation District	Assistant District Coordinator	208 Shiloh Road Worldand WY 82401	(307) 347-2456 ex 121		wcccd2@itconnect.net
Laura	Galloway	Natural Resources Conservation District	District Conservationist	208 Shiloh Road Worldand WY 82401	307-347-2456 ex 107		laura.galloway@wy.usda.gov
Jerry	Glanz	Washakie County Weed & Pest	Weed & Pest Director	161 Rodeo Dr Worldand WY 82401	(307) 347-8582		wccwp@itconnect.net
CJ	Grimes	Ten Sleep Fire Department	Fireman	PO Box 554 Ten Sleep WY 82442	(307) 431-0864		cgrimes@hotmail.com
Chris	Kocher	Washakie County	County Fire Warden	200 S. 5th Street P. O. Box 504 Worldand WY 82401	(307) 347-6379	(307) 431-2675	ckocher@worldandfire.org
Bart	Kroger	Wyoming Game and Fish Department	Wildlife Biologist	404 Bridge Ave. Worldand WY 82401	(307) 347-3650		Bart.Kroger@wyo.gov
Troy	Nelson	Worldand Fire	Fireman	200 S. 5th Street P. O. Box 504 Worldand WY 82401	307-347-6379		tnelson@worldandfire.org
Reed	Oldenburg	Wyoming State Forestry Division	Senior Fuels Manager	5500 Bishop Blvd, Cheyenne, WY 82002	(307) 777-6137	(307) 630-2001	reed.oldenburg@wyo.gov
Curtis	Rasmuson	USDA Forest Service	FMO	1415 Fort Street Buffalo, WY 82834	307-684-4644	307-763-0474	crasmuson@fs.fed.us
Brian	Russell	Wyoming State Forestry Division	District 3 Forester	2500 Academy Court Riverton WY 82501	(307) 856-8655	(307) 714-1977	brian.russell@wyo.gov
Steve	Scharosch	Abacus Enterprises, Inc	Forester	P.O. Box 157 Akova WY 82620	(307) 235-1829		Abacus@tribespo.com
Jeff	Schweigart	County Office of Homeland Security	Emergency Mng Coordinator	501 15 Mile Road Worldand, WY 82401	(307) 347-3331		jeff.schweigart@washakiecountyny.net
Shane	Starbuck	Washakie County	Ten Sleep Fire Department	417 5th St Ten Sleep, WY 82442	(307) 366-2468	(307) 388-1144	starbuck@tctwest.net
Mary Grace	Strauch	Washakie County	County Clerk	P.O. Box 260 Worldand, WY. 82401	307-347-3131		clerk@washakiecountyny.net
Kathy	Trenor	Washakie County	Washakie County Assessor/GIS	1001 Big Horn Ave. Ste. 104 Worldand, WY. 82401	307-347-2831	307-347-9366	assessor@washakiecountyny.net
Eve	Warren	WRBB BLM	District Fire	101 S. 23rd St. Worldand WY 82401	(307) 347-5109	(307) 431-4431	eve_warren@blm.gov
Chris	Weydeveld	Technical Forestry Services, LLC	Project Manager/Forester	6628 W. Riverside Dr. Casper, WY 82604	(307) 333-1098	(307) 272-9533	cweydeveld@wvrfis.com
George	Wynn	Technical Forestry Services, LLC	Forester	824 Country Club Casper WY 82609	(307) 333-2887	(307) 921-2847	gwynn@wvrfis.com

Appendix 3. Structure Ignitability Assessment Form

Big Horn and Washakie County 2017 CWPP Update Structure Assessment Form

Date: _____ **County:** **Big Horn** **Washakie**

Physical Address: _____

Photo Number: _____ **GPS Coordinates: Lat.** _____ **Long.** _____

Property Owner: _____

Mailing Address: _____

Email: _____ **Phone:** _____

Type of Structure: Primary Seasonal Outbuilding Care Facility Hotel/Lodge/Camp Public Facility Other

Number of Occupants: _____ **# of Additional Structures & Types:** _____

Responding Fire Department: _____ **Phone:** _____

Assessor: _____ **Phone:** _____

Email: _____ **Wildfire Mitigation Plan:** _____

Notes: _____

Wildfire mitigation is intended to reduce risk, not eliminate the risk of wildfire. It is important to note that wildfire is a natural and inevitable phenomenon in Wyoming. It is a dynamic event influenced by several factors including weather (winds, temperature, relative humidity), topography (steepness of slope, the direction that slope faces, and terrain features such as canyons and saddles), and fuels (light or heavy loading, height, continuity, and volatility) as well as human activity, response times, and seasonal trends. *There will always be some risk of wildfire, regardless of mitigation efforts and structural characteristics.*


This assessment is designed to identify vulnerabilities around the home, and offer recommendations for improvement.

In a wildfire situation, home ignitions can occur in multiple ways, including:

In a wildfire situation, home ignitions can occur in multiple ways including:

1. **Firebrands or ember-wash** – This is the most common way that homes ignite during wildfire. Wildfires may produce high winds that loft burning fuel particles up to a mile ahead of a fire. This often explains how fires grow so quickly. Closer to the fire, small embers swirl around like a blizzard, and accumulate in corners and crevices. These may ignite combustible materials such as tree needles, leaves, wooden decks, siding, or enter through gaps, cracks, or vents in an attic, soffit, or crawlspace to ignite combustible materials within.
2. **Radiant & convective heat** – When intense enough, heat produced by a fire will ignite the home, or preheat siding and other materials which then ignite more readily when in direct contact with flames or embers.
3. **Direct flame** – Vegetation or fuels near the home ignite, subsequently igniting the home.


Provide a sketch or photo of the home and property. Include distinguishing features, vegetation, firewood, topography, predominant wind direction, water sources, propane tank, parking area and access route.



Topography and Terrain	
Slope within 150 feet of structure: 0-20% 21-40% > 40% Structure setback from the edge of the slope: Adequate > 150 feet Inadequate < 150 feet	Position of structure on the slope: Valley bottom or lower slope Mid-slope Upper-slope Ridge top/chimney
Roof Assembly	
Material: Metal or tile Asphalt/composition shingles Other noncombustible material Untreated wood shakes	Cleanliness: No combustible material Scattered combustible material < .5 in. depth Clogged gutter, combustible material > .5 in. depth
Eaves	
Type: Bowed-in or fire-treated Non-bowed and not treated	
Exterior Walls & Siding	
Material: Noncombustible or metal Log or heavy timber Smooth wood or vinyl siding Wood shake or ember receptive siding	
Vents	
All structure vents have: Noncombustible $\frac{1}{4}$ - $\frac{1}{2}$ inch protective screen Noncombustible screen > $\frac{1}{4}$ inch No screens	
Attached Combustibles:	
Attached combustibles are: Not present or clear of receptive fuel Have receptive fuel adjacent Have receptive fuel below	

Vegetation	
Ember resistant zone within 3 feet of structure: Y or N Y or N	Propane clearance: Yes or not present No
Position of structure on the slope: Valley bottom or lower slope Mid-slope Upper-slope Ridge top/chimney	Combustibles 0-30 feet from structure: None Light Moderate Heavy
Tree canopy 0-30 feet from structure: None Deciduous - good separation Deciduous - continuous Mixed - good separation Mixed - continuous Coniferous - good separation Coniferous - continuous	Surface fuels 0-30 feet from structure: Lawn, mowed or no material Tall grass, not mowed or cut Brush/light dead wood material Heavy down woody material
Ladder fuels 0-30 feet from structure: Absent Scattered Abundant	Tree canopy 30-100 feet from structure: None Deciduous - good separation Deciduous - continuous Mixed - good separation Mixed - continuous Coniferous - good separation Coniferous - continuous
Combustibles 30-100 feet from structure: None Light Moderate Heavy	Ladder fuels 30-100 feet from structure: Absent Scattered Abundant
Surface fuels 30-100 feet from structure: Lawn, mowed or no material Tall grass, not mowed or cut Brush/light dead wood material Heavy down woody material	Heavy and/or continuous conifer trees 100-200 feet from structure: Y or N

Water Source	
Onsite water: Pressurized hydrant Dry hydrants Creek/pond/lake Accessible swimming pool None or not sufficient	
Access	
Address visible: Y or N	Adequate turnaround: Y or N
Locked gate blocking access: No Yes and fire dept has access Yes and fire dept does not have access	Bridge weight limits: Y or N Unknown Not applicable
Community Ingress/Egress: Two or more roads in/out One road in/out	Length of driveway: Inaccessible < 50 feet 50 to 150 feet 150 to 500 feet 500 feet or more
Width of driveway: Inaccessible 12 feet or less 13 feet or more	
Risk to Firefighters	
Access: Y or N	Propane or gas: Y or N
Overhead powerlines: Y or N	Animals: Y or N
Septic: Y or N	HazMat: Y or N
Poor Escape: Y or N	



Appendix 5 – Washakie County Firewise Project Table

Project Name	Target	Lat/Lon (dec deg)	Projected Start Date	Actual Start Date	Projected End Date	Actual End Date	CAR
Wildfire Mitigation Plans (WMPs) (in addition to below)	11 plans	TBD	Spring 2018	TBD	9/30/20	TBD	TBD
D-Space Treatments (7) (in addition to below)	7 ac	TBD	Spring 2018	TBD	9/30/20	TBD	TBD
Forest Management Plan (Tensleep Nature Preserve)	9,132 ac	43.99/-107.22	Spring 2018	TBD	9/30/20	TBD	NACO
WMP (Murphy Road Hazardous Fuels Treatment)	1 plan	43.99/-107.22	Spring 2018	TBD	9/30/20	TBD	NACO
Hazardous Fuels Treatment (Murphy Road TNP)	135 ac	43.99/-107.22	Spring 2018	TBD	9/30/20	TBD	NACO
Forest Management Plan (Hobby Horse LLC)	4,776 ac	44.02/-107.28	Spring 2018	TBD	9/30/20	TBD	CACV
WMP (Hobby Horse LLC)	2 plans	44.02/-107.28	Spring 2018	TBD	9/30/20	TBD	CACV
D-Space Treatments (2) (Hobby Horse LLC)	2 ac	44.02/-107.28	Spring 2018	TBD	9/30/20	TBD	CACV
WMP (Bantry Bay)	1 plan	43.56/-107.15	Spring 2018	TBD	9/30/20	TBD	BABA
Forest Management Plan (Bantry Bay)	1,413 ac	43.56/-107.15	Spring 2018	TBD	9/30/20	TBD	BABA
Forest Management Plan (Tolman Sheep Co)	2,796 ac	44.06/-107.15	Spring 2018	TBD	9/30/20	TBD	ONGU/CACV
Forest Products Sale (Tolman Sheep Co)	40.5 ac	44.06/-107.15	Spring 2018	TBD	10/30/18	TBD	CACV
Hazardous Fuels Treatment (Tolman Sheep Co)	87.5 ac	44.06/-107.15	Spring 2018	TBD	10/30/19	TBD	CACV
Shaded Fuel Break (Tolman Sheep Co)	9.5 ac	44.06/-107.15	Spring 2018	TBD	10/30/19	TBD	CACV
D-Space Treatment (Lonna Huss)	1 ac	44.02/-107.28	Spring 2018	TBD	9/30/20	TBD	MFPR

Hazardous Fuels Treatment (North River)	25 ac	44.09/-107.94	Spring 2018	TBD	9/30/20	TBD	NORI
Shaded Fuel Break (North River)	15 ac	44.09/-107.94	Spring 2018	TBD	9/30/20	TBD	NORI
Forest Products Sale (Box Canyon) State Land	65 ac	43.87/-107.2	Summer 2018	TBD	Fall 2020	TBD	NA
Forest Management Plan (Redland Family Trust)	500 ac	43.85/-107.18	Summer 2018	TBD	Fall 2018	TBD	NA
Forest Products Sale (Redland Family Trust)	200 ac	43.85/-107.18	Fall 2019	TBD	Fall 2022	TBD	NA