Chapter 5: Treatment Recommendations

5 Administration & Implementation Strategy

Critical to the implementation of this Wildfire Mitigation Plan will be the identification of and implementation of, an integrated schedule of treatments targeted at achieving an elimination of the lives lost, and reduction in structures destroyed, infrastructure compromised, and unique ecosystems damaged that serve to sustain the way-of-life and economy of Idaho County and the region. Since there are many land management agencies and thousands of private landowners in Idaho County, it is reasonable to expect that differing schedules of adoption will be made and varying degrees of compliance will be observed across all ownerships.

Idaho County encourages the philosophy of instilling disaster resistance in normal day-to-day operations. By implementing plan activities through existing programs and resources, the cost of mitigation is often a small portion of the overall cost of a project's design or program.

The federal land management agencies in Idaho County, specifically the USDA Forest Service and USDI BLM, are participants in this planning process and have contributed to its development. Where available, their schedule of land treatments have been considered in this planning process to better facilitate a correlation between their identified planning efforts and the efforts of Idaho County.

All risk assessments were made based on the conditions existing during 2004-05, thus, the recommendations in this section have been made in light of those conditions. However, the components of risk and the preparedness of the county's resources are not static. It will be necessary to fine-tune this plan's recommendations annually to adjust for changes in the components of risk, population density changes, infrastructure modifications, and other factors.

As part of the Policy of Idaho County in relation to this planning document, this entire **Wildfire Mitigation Plan** should be reviewed annually at a special meeting of the Idaho County Commissioners, open to the public and involving all municipalities/jurisdictions, where action items, priorities, budgets, and modifications can be made or confirmed. A written review of the plan should be prepared (or arranged) by the Chairman of the County Commissioners, detailing plans for the year's activities, and made available to the general public ahead of the meeting (in accord with the Idaho Open Public Meeting Laws). Amendments to the plan should be detailed at this meeting, documented, and attached to the formal plan as an amendment to the Wildfire Mitigation Plan. Re-evaluation of this plan should be made on the 5th anniversary of its acceptance, and every 5-year period following.

5.1 Prioritization of Mitigation Activities

Prioritization of projects will occur at the County, City, agency, and private levels. Differing prioritization processes will occur, however, the county and cities will adopt the following prioritization process, as indicated through the adoption of this plan by each municipality.

The prioritization process will include a special emphasis on cost-benefit analysis review. The process will reflect that a key component in funding decision is a determination that the project will provide an equivalent or more in benefits over the life of the project when compared with the costs. Projects will be administered by county and local jurisdictions with overall coordination provided by the County Disaster Management Coordinator.

County Commissioners and the elected officials of all jurisdictions will evaluate opportunities and establish their own unique priorities to accomplish mitigation activities where existing funds and resources are available and there is community interest in implementing mitigation measures. If no federal funding is used in these situations, the prioritization process may be less formal. Often the types of projects that the County can afford to do on their own are in relation to improved codes and standards, department planning and preparedness, and education. These types of projects may not meet the traditional project model, selection criteria, and benefit-cost model. The County will consider all pre-disaster mitigation proposals brought before the County Commissioners by department heads, city officials, fire districts and local civic groups.

When federal or state funding is available for hazard mitigation, there are usually requirements that establish a rigorous benefit-cost analysis as a guiding criterion in establishing project priorities. The county will understand the basic federal grant program criteria which will drive the identification, selection, and funding of the most competitive and worthy mitigation projects. FEMA's three grant programs (the post-disaster Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, the pre-disaster Flood Mitigation Assistance and Pre-Disaster Mitigation grant programs) that offer federal mitigation funding to state and local governments all include the benefit-cost and repetitive loss selection criteria.

The prioritization of projects will occur annually and be facilitated by the County Disaster Management Coordinator and the County Wildfire Mitigation Coordinator to include the County Commissioner's Office, City Mayors and Councils, Fire District Chiefs and Commissioners, agency representatives (USFS, State Lands, etc.). The prioritization of projects will be based on the selection of projects which create a balanced approach to pre-disaster mitigation which recognizes the hierarchy of treating in order (highest first):

- People and Structures
- Infrastructure
- Local and Regional Economy
- Traditional Way of Life
- Ecosystems

5.1.1 Prioritization Scheme

A numerical scoring system is used to prioritize projects. This prioritization serves as a guide for the county when developing mitigation activities. This project prioritization scheme has been designed to rank projects on a case by case basis. In many cases, a very good project in a lower priority category could outrank a mediocre project in a higher priority. The county mitigation program does not want to restrict funding to only those projects that meet the high priorities because what may be a high priority for a specific community may not be a high priority at the county level. Regardless, the project may be just what the community needs to mitigate disaster. The flexibility to fund a variety of diverse projects based on varying reasons and criteria is a necessity for a functional mitigation program at the County and community level.

To implement this case by case concept, a more detailed process for evaluating and prioritizing projects has been developed. Any type of project, whether county or site specific, will be prioritized in this more formal manner.

To prioritize projects, a general scoring system has been developed. This prioritization scheme has been used in statewide all hazard mitigations plans. These factors range from cost-benefit ratios, to details on the hazard being mitigated, to environmental impacts.

Since planning projects are somewhat different than non-planning projects when it comes to reviewing them, different criteria will be considered, depending on the type of project.

The factors for the non-planning projects include:

- Cost/Benefit
- Population Benefit
- Property Benefit
- Economic Benefit
- Project Feasibility (environmentally, politically, socially)
- Hazard Magnitude/Frequency
- Potential for repetitive loss reduction
- Potential to mitigate hazards to future development
- Potential project effectiveness and sustainability

The factors for the planning projects include:

- Cost/Benefit
- Vulnerability of the community or communities
- Potential for repetitive loss reduction
- Potential to mitigate hazards to future development

Since some factors are considered more critical than others, two ranking scales have been developed. A scale of 1-10, 10 being the best, has been used for cost, population benefit, property benefit, economic benefit, and vulnerability of the community. Project feasibility, hazard magnitude/frequency, potential for repetitive loss reduction, potential to mitigate hazards to future development, and potential project effectiveness and sustainability are all rated on a 1-5 scale, with 5 being the best. The highest possible score for a non-planning project is 65 and for a planning project is 30.

The guidelines for each category are as follows:

5.1.1.1 Benefit / Cost

The analysis process will include summaries as appropriate for each project, but will include benefit / cost analysis results, Projects with a negative benefit / cost analysis result will be ranked as a 0. Projects with a positive Benefit / Cost analysis will receive a score equal to the projects Benefit / Cost Analysis results divided by 10. Therefore a project with a BC ratio of 50:1 would receive 5 points, a project with a BC ratio of 100:1 (or higher) would receive the maximum points of 10.

5.1.1.2 Population Benefit

Population Benefit relates to the ability of the project to prevent the loss of life or injuries. A ranking of 10 has the potential to impact over 3,000 people. A ranking of 5 has the potential to impact 100 people, and a ranking of 1 will not impact the population. In some cases, a project may not directly provide population benefits, but may lead to actions that do, such as in the case of a study. Those projects will not receive as high of a rating as one that directly affects the population, but should not be considered to have no population benefit.

5.1.1.3 Property Benefit

Property Benefit relates to the prevention of physical losses to structures, infrastructure, and personal property. These losses can be attributed to potential dollar losses. Similar to cost, a ranking of 10 has the potential to save over $1,000,000 in losses, a ranking of 5 has the potential to save roughly $100,000 in losses, and a ranking of 1 only has the potential to save less than $100 in losses. In some cases, a project may not directly provide property benefits, but may lead to actions that do, such as in the case of a study. Those projects will not receive as high of a rating as one that directly affects property, but should not be considered to have no property benefit.

5.1.1.4 Economic Benefit

Economic Benefit is related to the savings from mitigation to the economy. This benefit includes reduction of losses in revenues, jobs, and facility shut downs. Since this benefit can be difficult to evaluate, a ranking of 10 would prevent a total economic collapse, a ranking of 5 could prevent losses to about half the economy, and a ranking of 1 would not prevent any economic losses. In some cases, a project may not directly provide economic benefits, but may lead to actions that do, such as in the case of a study. Those projects will not receive as high of a rating as one that directly affects the economy, but should not be considered to have no economic benefit.

5.1.1.5 Vulnerability of the Community

For planning projects, the vulnerability of the community is considered. A community that has a high vulnerability with respect to other jurisdictions to the hazard or hazards being studied or planned for will receive a higher score. To promote planning participation by the smaller or less vulnerable communities in the state, the score will be based on the other communities being considered for planning grants. A community that is the most vulnerable will receive a score of 10, and one that is the least, a score of 1.

5.1.1.6 Project Feasibility (Environmentally, Politically & Socially)

Project Feasibility relates to the likelihood that such a project could be completed. Projects with low feasibility would include projects with significant environmental concerns or public opposition. A project with high feasibility has public and political support without environmental concerns. Those projects with very high feasibility would receive a ranking of 5 and those with very low would receive a ranking of 1.

5.1.1.7 Hazard Magnitude/Frequency

The Hazard Magnitude/Frequency rating is a combination of the recurrence period and magnitude of a hazard. The severity of the hazard being mitigated and the frequency of that event must both be considered. For example, a project mitigating a 10-year event that causes significant damage would receive a higher rating than one that mitigates a 500-year event that causes minimal damage. For a ranking of 5, the project mitigates a high frequency, high magnitude event. A 1 ranking is for a low frequency, low magnitude event. Note that only the damages being mitigated should be considered here, not the entire losses from that event.

5.1.1.8 Potential for repetitive loss reduction

Those projects that mitigate repetitive losses receive priority consideration here. Common sense dictates that losses that occur frequently will continue to do so until the hazard is mitigated. Projects that will reduce losses that have occurred more than three times receive a rating of 5. Those that do not address repetitive losses receive a rating of 1. Potential to mitigate hazards to future development Proposed actions that can have a direct impact on the vulnerability of future development are given additional consideration. If hazards can be mitigated on the onset of the development, the county will be less vulnerable in the future. Projects that will have a significant effect on all future development receive a rating of 5. Those that do not affect development should receive a rating of 1.

5.1.1.9 Potential project effectiveness and sustainability

Two important aspects of all projects are effectiveness and sustainability. For a project to be worthwhile, it needs to be effective and actually mitigate the hazard. A project that is questionable in its effectiveness will score lower in this category. Sustainability is the ability for the project to be maintained. Can the project sustain itself after grant funding is spent? Is maintenance required? If so, are or will the resources be in place to maintain the project. An action that is highly effective and sustainable will receive a ranking of 5. A project with effectiveness that is highly questionable and not easily sustained should receive a ranking of 1.

5.1.1.10 Final ranking

Upon ranking a project in each of these categories, a total score can be derived by adding together each of the scores. The project can then be ranking high, medium, or low based on the non-planning project thresholds of:

Project Ranking Priority Score

- High 40-65
- Medium 25-39
- Low 9-25

5.2 Possible Wildfire Mitigation Activities

As part of the implementation of wildfire mitigation activities in Idaho County, a variety of management tools may be used. Management tools include but are not limited to the following:

- Homeowner and landowner education
- Policy changes for structures and infrastructure in the WUI
- Homesite defensible zone through fuels modification
- Community defensible zone fuels alteration
- Access improvements
- Access creation
- Emergency response enhancements (training, equipment, locating new fire stations, new fire districts)
- Regional land management recommendations for private, state, and federal landowners

Maintaining private property rights will continue to be one of the guiding principles of this plan's implementation. Sound risk management is a foundation for all fire management activities. Risks and uncertainties relating to fire management activities must be understood, analyzed, communicated, and managed as they relate to the cost of either doing or not doing an activity. Net gains to the public benefit will be an important component of decisions.

5.3 WUI Safety & Policy

Wildfire mitigation efforts must be supported by a set of policies and regulations at the county level that maintain a solid foundation for safety and consistency. The recommendations enumerated here serve that purpose. Because these items are regulatory in nature, they will not necessarily be accompanied by cost estimates. These recommendations are policy related in nature and therefore are recommendations to the appropriate elected officials; debate and formulation of alternatives will serve to make these recommendations suitable and appropriate.

Table 5.1. WUI Action Items in Safety and Policy.

Action Item	Goals and Objectives	Responsible Organization	Action Items & Planning Horizon
5.1.a: Develop County policy concerning building materials used in high-risk WUI areas on existing structures and new construction (e.g., Clearwater, Kamiah, Kooskia, Lowell, Pollock, Stites, Warren, Burgdorf, Dixie, Elk City, Harpster, Lucile, Riggins, Slate Creek, White Bird, Woodland, and Syringa).	**Protection of people and structures** by reducing the risk of loss of life or property by preemptive actions.	County Commissioners Office and Rural Fire Departments	**Year 1 (2005) activity:** Consider and develop policy to address construction materials for homes and businesses located in high wildfire risk areas. Specifically, a County policy concerning wooden roofing materials and flammable siding, especially where juxtaposed near heavy wildland fuels.
5.1.b: Explore ways for the County to help not-for-profit fire department organizations gain insurance coverage.	**Protection of people and structures** by improving the safety of firefighters and their families and decreasing the personal liability of firefighting.	County Commissioners and all Not-for-profit fire departments.	**Year 1 (2005) activity**: Research different methods for the County to support and/or help departments in gaining coverage. **Year 2 (2006) activity:** Implement chosen alternative sensitive to each department.
5.1.c: Provide funding for a full-time Geographic Information System position at the Idaho County Courthouse.	**Protection of people and structures** by improving County maps and data systems used by emergency services personnel, highway districts and other officials.	**County Commissioners Office** and Planning and Zoning.	**Year 1 (2005) activity:** Seek funding for full-time GIS staff position. Post job listing for potential candidates.
5.1.d: Adoption of International Fire Code.	**Protection of people and structures** by reducing the risk of loss of life or property by preemptive actions.	County Commissioners Office and Rural Fire Departments.	**Year 1 (2005) activity:** Consider and develop policy to adopt the International Fire Code regulations adopted by the State of Idaho.

5.4 People and Structures

The protection of people and structures will be tied together closely as the loss of life in the event of a wildland fire is generally linked to a person who could not, or did not, flee a structure threatened by a wildfire. The other incident is a firefighter who suffers the loss of life during the combating of a fire. Many of the recommendations in this section will define a set of criteria for implementation while others will be rather specific in extent and application.

Many of the recommendations in this section involve education and increasing awareness of the residents of Idaho County. These recommendations stem from a variety of factors including items that became obvious during the analysis of the public surveys, discussions during public meetings, and observations about choices made by residents living in the Wildland-Urban Interface. Over and over, the common theme was present that pointed to a situation of landowners not recognizing risk factors:

- Fire District personnel pointed to numerous examples of inadequate access to homes of people who believe they have adequate ingress.
- Discussions with the general public indicated an awareness of wildland fire risk, but they could not generally identify risk factors.
- A large number of the respondents to the public mail survey (49%) indicated that they want to participate in educational opportunities focused on the WUI and what they can do to increase their home's chances of surviving a wildfire.

Residents and policy makers of Idaho County should recognize certain factors that exist today, that in their absence would lead to an increase in the risk factors associated with wildland fires in the WUI of Idaho County. These items listed below should be encouraged, acknowledged, and recognized for their contributions to the reduction of wildland fire risks:

- **Livestock Grazing** in and around the communities of Idaho County has led to a reduction of many of the fine fuels that would have been found in and around the communities and in the wildlands of Idaho County. Domestic livestock not only eat these grasses, forbs, and shrubs, but also trample certain fuels to the ground where decomposition rates may increase. Livestock ranchers tend their stock, placing additional sets of eyes into the forests and rangelands of the county where they may observe ignitions, or potentially risky activities. Livestock grazing in this region should be encouraged in the future as a low cost, positive tool of wildfire mitigation in the Wildland-Urban Interface and in the wildlands.
- **Forest Management** in Idaho County has been affected greatly by the reduction of operating sawmills in the region. However, the active forest management program of the U.S. Forest Service, Idaho Department of Lands, and many of the private and industrial forestland owners in the region has led to a significant reduction of wildland fuels where they are closest to homes and infrastructure. In addition, forest resource professionals managing these lands and the lands of the state and federal agencies, are generally trained in wildfire protection and recognize risk factors when they occur. One of the reasons that Idaho County forestlands have not been impacted by wildland fires to a greater degree historically, is the presence and activities related to active forest management.
- **Agriculture** is a significant component of Idaho County's economy. Much of the rangeland interface is made up of a mosaic of agricultural crops, even extending to the forestland interface. The original conversion of these lands to agriculture from rangeland and forestland was targeted at the most productive soils and juxtaposition to water.

Many of these productive rangeland ecosystems were consequently also at some of the highest risk to wildland fires because biomass accumulations increased in these productive landscapes. The result, today, is much of the landscape historically prone to frequent fires has been converted to agriculture, which is at a much lower risk than prior to its conversion. The preservation of a viable agricultural economy in Idaho County is integral to the continued management of wildfire risk in this region.

Table 5.2. WUI Action Items for People and Structures.

Action Item	Goals and Objectives	Responsible Organization	Action Items, Planning Horizon and Estimated Costs
5.2.a: Youth and Adult Wildfire Educational Programs.	**Protect people and structures** by increasing awareness of WUI risks, how to recognize risk factors, and how to modify those factors to reduce risk	Cooperative effort including: • University of Idaho Cooperative Extension • Idaho Department of Lands • State and Private Forestry Offices • Bureau of Land Management • USDA Forest Service • Local School Districts • Cities of Idaho County	To start immediately using existing educational program materials and staffing. Formal needs assessment should be responsibility of University of Idaho Cooperative Extension faculty and include the development of an integrated WUI educational series by year 2 (2006). Costs initially to be funded through existing budgets for these activities to be followed with grant monies to continue the programs as identified in the formal needs assessment.
5.2.b: Wildfire risk assessments of homes in identified communities.	**Protect people and structures** by increasing awareness of specific risk factors of individual homesites in the at-risk landscapes. Only after these are completed can homesite treatments follow.	To be implemented by **County Commissioners Office** in cooperation with the **Rural Fire Departments and Wildland Fire Protection Specialists, and every city municipality in the county**. Actual work may be completed by Wildfire Mitigation Consultants.	• **Cost:** Approximately $100 per homesite for inspection, written report, and discussions with the homeowners, for total of $1,270,300 (see summary below). • **Action Item:** Secure funding and contract to complete the inspections during years 1 & 2 (2005-06) • Homesite inspection reports and estimated budget for each homesite's treatments will be a requirement to receive funding for treatments through grants.
Home Site Inspections:	• Ridge Runners Volunteer Fire Department: *507 structures; estimate 100% receive Assessments- $50,700*		
	• Kooskia Volunteer Fire Department: *693 structures; estimate 100% receive Assessments- $69,300*		
	• Elk City Volunteer Fire Department: *601 structures; estimate 100% receive Assessments- $60,100*		
	• Riggins City Fire Department: *158 structures; estimate 100% receive Assessments- $15,800*		
	• BPC Volunteer Rural Fire Department: *527 structures; estimate 100% receive Assessments- $52,700*		
	• Carrot Ridge Volunteer Fire Department: *308 structures; estimate 100% receive Assessments- $30,800*		
	• Cottonwood Volunteer Fire Department: *1,404 structures; estimate 100% receive Assessments- $140,400*		
	• Dixie Volunteer Fire Department: *84 structures; estimate 100% receive Assessments- $8,400*		
	• Grangeville Rural Fire District : *1,237 structures; estimate 100% receive Assessments- $123,700*		
	• Harpster Volunteer Fire Association: *283 structures; estimate 100% receive Assessments- $28,300*		
	• Salmon River Volunteer Fire Department: *1,283 structures; estimate 100% receive Assessments- $128,300*		
	• White Bird Volunteer Fire Department: *60 structures; estimate 100% receive Assessments- $6,000*		
	• Kamiah Fire Department: *1,083 structures; estimate 100% receive Assessments- $108,300*		
	• Other rural structures: *4,475 structures; estimate 100% receive Assessments- $447,500*		

Table 5.2. WUI Action Items for People and Structures.

Action Item	Goals and Objectives	Responsible Organization	Action Items, Planning Horizon and Estimated Costs
5.2.c: Homesite WUI Treatments.	**Protect people, structures, and increase firefighter safety** by reducing the risk factors surrounding homes in the WUI of Idaho County	**County Commissioners** in cooperation with Cities, rural fire districts, Idaho Department of Lands, and USDA Forest Service *Complete concurrently with 5.4.b*	• Actual funding level will be based on the outcomes of the homesite assessments and cost estimates • **Estimate** that treatments in rangelands will cost approximately $850 per homesite for a defensible space of roughly 150'. • **Estimate** that treatments in forestland will cost roughly $1,000 per homesite for a defensible space of about 200'. • **Estimate** total cost (summarized below) of **$9,198,042** • Homesite treatments can begin with the securing of funding for the treatments and immediate implementation in 2005 and will continue from year 1 through 5 (2009).
Home Site Treatments:	• Ridge Runners Volunteer Fire Department: *507 structures; estimate 90% receive Treatment- $456,300*		
	• Kooskia Volunteer Fire Department: *693 structures; estimate 90% receive Treatment - $623,700*		
	• Elk City Volunteer Fire Department: *601 structures; estimate 70% receive Treatment - $420,700*		
	• Riggins City Fire Department: *158 structures; estimate 60% receive Treatment - $ 80,580*		
	• BPC Volunteer Rural Fire Department: *527 structures; estimate 90% receive Treatment - $ 474,300*		
	• Carrot Ridge Volunteer Fire Department: *308 structures; estimate 80% receive Treatment - $ 246,400*		
	• Cottonwood Volunteer Fire Department: *1,404 structures; estimate 80% receive Treatment - $ 1,123,200*		
	• Dixie Volunteer Fire Department: *84 structures; estimate 30% receive Treatment - $* 25,200		
	• Grangeville Rural Fire District : *1,237 structures; estimate 75% receive Treatment - $ 927,750*		
	• Harpster Volunteer Fire Association: *283 structures; estimate 60% receive Treatment - $ 169,800*		
	• Salmon River Volunteer Fire Department: *1,283 structures; estimate 75% receive Treatment - $ 817,912*		
	• White Bird Volunteer Fire Department: *60 structures; estimate 75% receive Treatment - $ 38,250*		
	• Kamiah Fire Department: *1,083 structures; estimate 90% receive Treatment - $ 974,700*		
	• Other rural structures: *4,475 structures; estimate 70% receive Treatment - $ 2,819,250*		

Table 5.2. WUI Action Items for People and Structures.

Action Item	Goals and Objectives	Responsible Organization	Action Items, Planning Horizon and Estimated Costs
5.2.d: Community Defensible Zone WUI Treatments	**Protect people, structures, and increase firefighter safety** by reducing the risk factors surrounding high risk communities in the WUI of Idaho County	**County Commissioners** in cooperation with the **Idaho Department of Lands** and the **BLM** to identify funding availability and project implementation opportunities.	• Actual funding level will be based on the outcomes of the homesite assessments and cost estimates. • **Years 2-5 (2006-09):** Treat high risk wildland fuels from homesite defensible space treatments to an area extending 400 feet to 750 feet beyond home defensible spaces, where steep slopes and high accumulations of risky fuels exist near homes and infrastructure. Should link together home treatment areas. Treatments target high risk concentrations of fuels and not 100% of the area identified. To be completed only after or during the creation of home defensible spaces have been implemented. • **Communities and areas to target:** Others based on additional assessments.
5.2.e: Maintenance of Homesite WUI Treatments	**Protect people, structures, and increase firefighter safety** by reducing the risk factors surrounding homes in the WUI of Idaho County	**County Commissioners Office** in cooperation with Rural Fire Departments and local home owners	• Homesite defensibility treatments must be maintained periodically to sustain benefits of the initial treatments. • Each site should be assessed 5 years following initial treatment • Estimated re-inspection cost will be $50 per homesite on all sites initially treated or recommended for future inspections • Follow-up inspection reports with treatments as recommended years 5 through 10.
5.2.f: Re-entry of Homesite WUI Treatments	**Protect people, structures, and increase firefighter safety** by reducing the risk factors surrounding homes in the WUI of Idaho County	**County Commissioners Office** in cooperation with Rural Fire Departments and local home owners	• Re-entry treatments will be needed periodically to maintain the benefits of the initial WUI home treatments. Each re-entry schedule should be based on the initial inspection report recommendations, observations, and changes in local conditions. Generally occurs every 5-10 years. • Retreatment 5 years after initial treatments: Elk City, beginning in 2008 - 30% Newsome, beginning in 2008 - 60% Orogrande, beginning in 2009 - 100% Dixie, beginning in 2007 - 67%

Table 5.2. WUI Action Items for People and Structures.

Action Item	Goals and Objectives	Responsible Organization	Action Items, Planning Horizon and Estimated Costs
5.2.g: Development of a community evacuation plan and alternate safety zones for the community of Elk City and other remote communities in Idaho County.	**Protect people, structures, and increase firefighter safety** by directly increasing the safety of residents and visitors during a wildfire evacuation situation.	**Rural Fire Departments in cooperation with community residents, BLM, and USFS.**	• Develop a safe evacuation plan for the community including alternate routes and safety zones (2005). • Send information to residents and hold a public meeting to inform communities.
5.2.h: Implement proposed home defensible space projects.	**Protect people, structures, and firefighter safety** by decreasing the fire risk around homes and communities.	**Rural Fire Departments, County Commissioners, area residents, and private contractor.**	• **Year 1 (2005):** Locate funding source and conduct homesite evaluations for structures in mapped project areas. Write project plans for individual landowners. • **Year 2 (2006):** Continue to work with landowners to implement agreed upon project plans.

Defensible Space Project Areas	Acres	Project Cost
American River Community Protection Area	4,577.5	$ 4,577,462
Burgdorf Defensible Space Treatment	4984.79	$4,984,787.89
Cedar Creek Defensible Space Treatment	3,124.7	$ 3,124,670
Clear Creek Road Defensible Space Treatment	1,275.8	$ 1,275,761
Clearwater Community Defensible Space Treatment	1,044.9	$ 1,044,890
Clearwater Community Defensible Space Treatment	854.1	$ 854,067
Cove Road Defensible Space Treatment Area	360.0	$ 360,027
Dixie Community Defensible Space Treatment	2,078.6	$ 2,078,595
Dutch Oven Community Protection Area	10,360.6	$10,360,637
Elk Creek Watershed Management Plan Area	14,149.9	$ 35,000
Fish Hatchery Defensible Space Treatment	378.8	$ 378,808
Grangeville-Salmon Road Community Defensible Space	1,836.6	$ 1,836,557
Harpster Community Defensible Space Treatment	2,086.6	$ 2,086,613
Harpster Community Defensible Space Treatment	308.4	$ 308,377
Harpster Community Defensible Space Treatment	254.9	$ 254,912
Hwy12 Kooskia-Kamiah Defensible Space Treatment	366.3	$ 366,263
Kidder Ridge E. Defensible Space Treatment	133.4	$ 133,415
Kidder Ridge W. Defensible Space Treatment	122.4	$ 122,371
Kooskia SE Defensible Space Fuels Treatment	67.9	$ 67,928

Table 5.2. WUI Action Items for People and Structures.

Action Item	Goals and Objectives	Responsible Organization	Action Items, Planning Horizon and Estimated Costs	
	Kooskia SW Defensible Space Fuels Treatment		67.9	$ 67,895
	Leitch Creek Defensible Space Treatment		363.8	$ 363,792
	Lowell Community Defensible Space Treatment		41.0	$ 40,978
	Lowell Community Defensible Space Treatment		23.9	$ 23,902
	Lowell Community Defensible Space Treatment		22.2	$ 22,225
	Old Whitebird Grade Community Protection Area		1,193.1	$ 1,193,105
	Red Pine Creek Defensible Space Treatment		2,178.6	$ 2,178,650
	Ridge Runner Defensible Space Treatment Area		912.33	$ 912,326.92
	Ridge Runner Defensible Space Treatment Area		199.77	$ 199,768.90
	Ridge Runner Defensible Space Treatment Area		4,236.93	$ 4,236,933.80
	Ridge Runner Defensible Space Treatment Area		3,174.02	$ 3,174,021.64
	Smith Creek Defensible Space Treatment		247.5	$ 247,525
	Stites Defensible Space Fuels Treatment		112.1	$ 112,087
	Tram Road Defensible Space Treatment		124.6	$ 124,610
	Wilson Creek Defensible Space Treatment		318.9	$ 318,857
5.2.i: Access improvements of bridges, cattle guards, culverts, and limiting road surfaces (e.g. Salmon River Road, Selway Falls Road, Pardee Road, Salmon River Road, Wilson Road, Forest Route 1858 to Newsome, Crooked River Road, Jack Mountain Road, Cove Road, Warren Wagon Road, and Forest Route 246).	**Protection of people, structures, infrastructure, and economy** by improving access for residents and fire fighting personnel in the event of a wildfire. Reduces the risk of a road failure that leads to the isolation of people or the limitation of emergency vehicle and personnel access during an emergency.	**Highway Districts** in cooperation with the BLM, State of Idaho (Lands and Transportation), USFS, and industrial forestland owners (e.g., Potlatch, Plum Creek).	• **Year 1 (2005):** Update existing assessment of travel surfaces, bridges, and cattle guards in Idaho County as to location. Secure funding for implementation of this project (grants) • **Year 2 (2006):** Conduct engineering assessment of limiting weight restrictions for all surfaces (e.g., bridge weight load maximums). Estimate cost of $100,000 which might be shared between County, BLM, USFS, State, and private based on landownership associated with road locations. • **Year 2 (2006):** Post weight restriction signs on all limiting crossings, copy information to rural fire districts and wildland fire protection agencies in affected areas. Estimate cost at roughly $15-$25,000 for signs and posting. • **Year 3 (2007):** Identify limiting road surfaces in need of improvements to support wildland fire fighting vehicles and other emergency equipment. Develop plan for improving limiting surfaces including budgets, timing, and resources to be protected for prioritization of projects (benefit/cost ratio analysis). Create budget based on full assessment.	

Table 5.2. WUI Action Items for People and Structures.

Action Item	Goals and Objectives	Responsible Organization	Action Items, Planning Horizon and Estimated Costs
5.2.j: Access improvements through road-side fuels management (e.g. State Highway 14, Forest Route 1858 to Newsome, Crooked River Road, Red River Road, Jack Mountain Road, Cove Road, Butcher Creek Road, Warren Wagon Road, Wilson Road, Red Fir Road, Crane Hill Road, Big Cedar Road, Long Bluff Road, Big Horse Canyon Road, Mulledy Road, Trenary Road, Harpster Grade/Mount Idaho Grade Loop, Grangeville/Salmon Road, Woodland Grade, Sally Ann Creek Road, Adams Grade, Forest Route 246, Tom Taha Grade, Beaver Slide, Kidder Ridge Road, Harris Ridge Road, Sutter Creek Road, Clear Creek Road, Leitch Creek Road, Pardee Corner Roads, Carrot Ridge Road, and Happy Hollow Road)	**Protection of people, structures, infrastructure, and economy** by improving access for residents and fire fighting personnel in the event of a wildfire. Allows for a road based defensible area that can be linked to a terrain based defensible areas.	**County Highway Districts** in cooperation with BLM, State of Idaho (Lands and Transportation), USFS, and industrial forestland owners.	• **Year 1 (2005):** Update existing assessment of roads in Idaho County as to location. Secure funding for implementation of this project (grants). • **Year 2 (2006):** Specifically address access issues to Clearwater, Kooskia, Stites, Warren, Burgdorf, Dixie, Elk City, Harpster, Woodland, Pardee, Caribel, Glenwood, and others identified in assessment, such as Selway Falls Road and the Highway 14 corridors. Identify forestland and rangeland fuels difficult to control during wildfire that would also respond well to thinning, pruning, and brush cutting (hand pile and burn or chip), while increasing ingress and egress use in wildfire emergencies. Target 100' on downhill side of roads and 75' on uphill side for estimated cost of $15,000 per mile of road treated. If 10 miles of roadway are prioritized for treatment (est.) **B/C Ratio of 14.7:1 is achieved**. This B/C ratio may be maintained in many rural treatment areas of the county. • **Year 3 (2007):** Secure funding and implement projects to treat road-side fuels.

Roadside Fuels Project	Miles	Acres	Project Cost
Mallard Creek Roadside Fuels Treatment Area	17.9	1,580.3	$1,185,258
Dixie Roadside Fuels Treatment Area	31.4	3,026.5	$2,269,840
RR Hot Springs Roadside Fuels Treatment Area	10.0	979.2	$734,372
Newsome Roadside Fuels Treatment Area	6.8	656.3	$492,197

Table 5.2. WUI Action Items for People and Structures.

Action Item	Goals and Objectives	Responsible Organization	Action Items, Planning Horizon and Estimated Costs		
		Elk City to Grangeville Roadside Treatment Area	34.4	3,338.5	$2,503,894
		Harpster Area Roadside Fuels Treatment Area	8.5	830.8	$623,127
		Mt. Idaho-Harpster Grade Roadside Treatment Area	19.1	1,855.9	$1,391,922
		French Creek-Warren Roadside Treatment Area	40.2	3,667.5	$2,750,590
		Adams Grade Roadside Treatment Area	3.8	368.8	$276,629
		Beaverslide Roadside Treatment Area	7.3	682.3	$511,712
		Clear Creek Roadside Treatment Area	10.8	1,057.5	$793,092
		Harris Ridge Roadside Treatment Area	12.8	1,207.4	$905,547
		Doughty Roadside Treatment Area	1.17	125.12	$93,841
		Kidder Ridge Roadside Treatment Area	11.0	1,036.5	$777,372
		Leitch Creek Roadside Treatment Area	4.7	464.0	$348,009
		Pardee Roadside Treatment Area	7.1	586.4	$439,805
		Sally Ann Creek Roadside Treatment Area	3.7	369.0	$276,738
		Sutter Creek Roadside Treatment Area	6.2	599.5	$449,589
		Wilson Roadside Treatment Area	2.38	245.45	$184,090
		Red Fir Roadside Treatment Area	5.38	535.95	$401,988
		Trenary Roadside Treatment Area	.96	107.69	$80764
		Crane Hill Roadside Treatment Area	2.72	278.02	$208,512
		Big Cedar Roadside Treatment Area	7.59	759.36	$569,521
		Big Horse Canyon Roadside Treatment Area	3.4	333.62	$250,214
		Long Bluff Roadside Treatment Area	1.15	125.9	$94,423
		Mulledy Roadside Treatment Area	1.91	198.7	$149,019
		Tom Taha Roadside Treatment Area	6.0	590.7	$443,007
		Wall Creek Roadside Treatment Area	4.7	445.4	$334,026
		Woodland Roadside Treatment Area	12.4	1,139.0	$854,259
		Woodland Grade Roadside Treatment Area	10.0	913.6	$ 685,205

Table 5.2. WUI Action Items for People and Structures.

Action Item	Goals and Objectives	Responsible Organization	Action Items, Planning Horizon and Estimated Costs
5.2.k: Development of "Community Emergency Response Team" program in communities.	**Protection of people, structures, infrastructure, and economy** by improving emergency response and recruiting more local residents for emergency response organizations (i.e. fire departments, ambulance, police departments)	**Idaho County Disaster Management** and community governments.	• **2005** develop team and objectives, implement program including emergency services personnel

5.5 Infrastructure

Significant infrastructure refers to the communications, transportation (road and rail networks), energy transport supply systems (gas and power lines), and water supply that service a region or a surrounding area. All of these components are important to the North Central Idaho Area, and to Idaho County specifically. These networks are by definition a part of the Wildland-Urban Interface in the protection of people, structures, **infrastructure**, and unique ecosystems. Without supporting infrastructure a community's structures may be protected, but the economy and way of life lost. As such, a variety of components will be considered here in terms of management philosophy, potential policy recommendations, and recommendations.

Communication Infrastructure: This component of the WUI seems to be diversified across the county with multiple source and destination points, and a spread-out support network. Currently; however, there is a nine mile gap in the phone system supplying the Riggins area. This results in failures to a large service areas due to a problem anywhere along this grid (i.e. transformer goes down in New Meadows causing Riggins to lose telephone service).

Transportation Infrastructure (road and rail networks): This component of the WUI has some significant potential limitations in Idaho County. U.S. Highway 95 is the primary maintained route linking north and south Idaho. Thus, most intrastate traffic flowing north to south or vice versa travels through the County. Also, State Highways 12, 13, and 14 connect the more remote communities with the commercial hubs of Grangeville and nearby Riggins and Kooskia. In many cases, these roads are the only primary route to and from the smaller Idaho County communities. In the event these highways are disabled, access or evacuation to some areas may become limited to seasonally maintained secondary roads or forest routes.

Other roads in the county have limiting characteristics, such as narrow travel surfaces, sharp turning radii, low load limit bridges and cattle guards, and heavy accumulations of fuels adjacent to, and overtopping some roads. Some of these roads access remote forestland and rangeland areas. While their improvements will facilitate access in the case of a wildfire, they are not the priority for treatments in the county. Roads that have these inferior characteristics and access homes and businesses are the priority for improvements in the county.

Energy Transport Supply Systems (gas and power lines): A number of power lines crisscross Idaho County. Unfortunately, many of these power lines cross over forestland ecosystems. When fires ignite in these vegetation types, the fires tend to be slower moving and burn at relatively high intensities. Additionally, there is a potential for high temperatures and low humidity with high winds to produce enough heat and smoke to threaten power line stability. Most power line corridors have been cleared of vegetation both near the wires and from the ground below. Observations across the county of these high tension power lines lead to the conclusion that current conditions coupled with urban developments have mitigated this potential substantially. It is the recommendation of this Wildfire Mitigation Plan that this situation be evaluated annually and monitored but that treatments not be specifically targeted at this time. The use of these areas as "fuel breaks" should be evaluated further, especially in light of the treatments enumerated in this plan (eg., intensive livestock grazing, mechanical treatments, and herbicide treatments).

Water Supply: In many of Idaho's communities, water is derived from surface flow that is treated and piped to homes and businesses. When wildfires burn a region, they threaten these watersheds by the removal of vegetation, creation of ash and sediment. As such, watersheds should be afforded the highest level of protection from catastrophic wildfire impacts. In Idaho County, water is supplied to many homes by single home or multiple home wells. However, the communities of Grangeville, Clearwater, and Elk City depend on the Three Mile Creek

Watershed, Wall Creek Watershed, and the Elk Creek Watershed, respectively, as their primary water source.

As a priority recommendation of this plan, it is strongly suggested that Watershed Management Plans for the Three Mile Creek Watershed, Wall Creek Watershed, and the Elk Creek Watershed be completed to plan for and implement a management program that specifically mitigates wildfire potential while managing the watersheds for sustained water flow that is clean and timed according to the needs of the community.

5.5.1 Proposed Activities

Table 5.3. Infrastructure Enhancements.

Action Item	Goals and Objectives	Responsible Organization	Action Items & Planning Horizon
5.3.a: Post FEMA "Emergency Evacuation Route" signs along the identified primary and secondary access routes in the county.	**Protection of people and structures by** informing residents and visitors of significant infrastructure in the county that will be maintained in the case of an emergency.	**County Commissioners** in cooperation with Rural Fire Districts and County Highway Districts.	• Purchase of signs (2005). • Posting roads and make information available to residents of the importance of Emergency Routes.
5.3.b: Update and replace road signs throughout the county and establish standards for establishment and visibility of house numbers.	**Protection of people and structures** by reducing confusion and improving response times of emergency personnel, especially to remote locations.	**County Commissioners in cooperation with County Highway Districts and Rural Fire Districts.**	• Inform homeowners of standardized size and acceptable locations for house numbers (2005). • Identify routes where new road signs need maintenance or replacement (2005). • Purchase and post signs (2005).
5.3.c: Improve phone communications to the Mount Idaho area.	**Protection of people and structures by** ensuring that adequate phone communications are available during an emergency situation.	**Phone companies and Mount Idaho residents.**	Year 1 & 2 (2005 – 2006): Identify problem areas and meet with phone companies to discuss possible solutions. Year 2 & 3 (2006 – 2007): Implement appropriate alternative.
5.3.d: Watershed Management Plan for the Wall Creek Watershed in Clearwater.	**Sustainability of Communities by** increasing the probability that communities will have safe drinking water following a wildfire that burns in the community watershed.	**Clearwater Community Council and USFS**	Identify landowners and seek funding to implement the planning process (2005). Implementation of projects based on results of watershed management plans.
5.3.e: Watershed Management Plan for the Elk Creek Watershed in Elk City.	**Sustainability of Communities by** increasing the probability that communities will have safe drinking water following a wildfire that burns in the community watershed.	**Elk City Water and Sewer, USFS, BLM**	Identify landowners and seek funding to implement the planning process (2005). Implementation of projects based on results of watershed management plans.

Table 5.3. Infrastructure Enhancements.

Action Item	Goals and Objectives	Responsible Organization	Action Items & Planning Horizon
5.3.f: South Fork Clearwater River Power Supply System upgrade	**Sustainability of Communities by** increasing the probability that communities will have electricity during and after wildfire events in and around the Elk City region.	**County Commissioners, Power Company, Area residents**	Long term: Convert wooden poles to elevated metal towers Fuels treatment under the powerlines
5.3.g: Establish Selway Falls Road as an alternate FEMA "Emergency Evacuation Route" for Elk City residents and visitors.	**Protection of people and structures** by providing an alternative, safe evacuation route from Elk City.	**County Commissioners in** cooperation with County Highway Districts, Rural Fire Districts, BLM, and USFS.	• Identify funding for road project (2005). • Create a fire safe roadway through surface maintenance and fuels mitigation (2006). • Post FEMA "Emergency Evacuation Route" signs and inform residents. • Set up program for regular maintenance.
5.3.h: Fuels reduction project for power line corridor between Grangeville and Elk City.	**Protection of people and structures by** reducing the potential risk of ignition associated with the power lines and creating a fuel break.	**Avista Utilities and the USFS.**	• Identify specific areas that are in need of fuels reduction and create a project plan (2005). • Obtain permission from the Forest Service and any other affected landowners to implement project plan on their lands (2005). • Begin implementation of fuels reduction project (2006).
5.3.i: Fuels mitigation of the FEMA "Emergency Evacuation Routes" in the county to insure these routes can be maintained in the case of an emergency.	**Protection of people and structures by** providing residents and visitors with ingress and egress that can be maintained during an emergency.	**County Commissioners** in cooperation with Rural Fire Districts and County Highway Districts.	• Full assessment of road defensibility and ownership participation (2005). • Implementation of projects (linked to item 5.2.g, 5.2.h, and 5.2.i.
5.3.j. Watershed Management Plan for the Three Mile Creek Watershed.	**Sustainability of Communities by** increasing the probability that communities will have safe drinking water following a wildfire that burns in the community watershed.	**Water Departments and City Government.**	• Identify landowners and seek funding to implement the planning process (2005). • Implementation of projects based on results of watershed management plans.

5.6 Resource and Capability Enhancements

There are a number of resource and capability enhancements identified by the rural and wildland fire fighting districts in Idaho County. All of the needs identified by the districts are in line with increasing the ability to respond to emergencies in the WUI and are fully supported by the planning committee.

Specific repeated themes of needed resources and capabilities include:

- Improved radio capabilities within each district and for mutual aid operations
- Retention and recruitment of volunteers
- Update firefighting equipment countywide
- Improved road and house number signage
- Training and development of rural firefighters in structure and wildland fire

Although additional, and specific, needs were enumerated by the districts in Idaho County, these items were identified by multiple districts and in the public meetings. The implementation of each issue will rely on either the isolated efforts of the rural fire districts or a concerted effort by the county to achieve equitable enhancements across all of the districts. Given historic trends, individual departments competing against neighboring departments for grant monies and equipment will not necessarily achieve countywide equity. However, the Clearwater Resource Conservation and Development Council, Inc., may be an organization uniquely suited to work with all of the districts in Idaho County and adjacent counties to assist in the prioritization of needs across district and even county lines. Once prioritized, the Clearwater RC&D is in a position to assist these districts with identifying, competing for, and obtaining grants and equipment to meet these needs.

Currently, only the Grangeville Rural Fire District, the Cottonwood Volunteer Fire Department, and the Kooskia Volunteer Fire Department are taxing districts under the subjugation of the Idaho County Commissioners. All other departments within Idaho County are 501c3 not-for-profit organizations that offer protection on a subscription basis. At this time, it is not the desire of the not-for-profit departments to become taxing districts; however, they would like to continue working cooperatively with the County fire departments and each other to provide the best possible service to their subscribers.

Table 5.4. WUI Action Items in Fire Fighting Resources and Capabilities.

Action Item	Goals and Objectives	Responsible Organization	Action Items & Planning Horizon
5.4.a: Enhance radio availability in each district, link in to existing dispatch, improve range within the region, and conversion to consistent standard of radio types	**Protection of people and structures** by direct fire fighting capability enhancements.	**Clearwater RC&D** in cooperation with rural and wildland fire districts, and Idaho County Commissioners.	• **Year 1 (2005):** Summarize existing two-way radio capabilities and limitations. Identify costs to upgrade existing equipment and locate funding opportunities. • **Year 2 (2006):** Acquire and install upgrades as needed.
5.4.b: Facility, land, and basic equipment for a substation of the Grangeville Rural Fire	Protection of people and structures by direct firefighting capability enhancements.	Grangeville Rural Fire District.	Year 1 (2005): Verify stated need still exists, develop budget, and locate funding and equipment

Table 5.4. WUI Action Items in Fire Fighting Resources and Capabilities.

Action Item	Goals and Objectives	Responsible Organization	Action Items & Planning Horizon
District in Mount Idaho.			(surplus) sources. Year 1 or 2 (2005-06): Acquire and deliver needed materials and equipment.
5.4.c: Tanker and 2-ton quick response structural engine for Grangeville Rural Fire District.	Protection of people and structures by direct firefighting capability enhancements.	Grangeville Rural Fire District.	Year 1 (2005): Verify stated need still exists, develop budget, and locate funding or equipment (surplus) sources. Year 1 or 2 (2005-06): Acquire and deliver needed equipment to stations based on prioritization by need and funding awards.
5.4.d: Structural engine, 4-wheel drive utility vehicles, portable pumps, handheld radios, personal protective equipment, and chainsaws for Ridge Runner Fire Department.	Protection of people and structures by direct fire fighting capability enhancements.	Ridge Runner Fire Department.	Year 1 (2005): Verify stated need still exists, develop budget, and locate funding or equipment (surplus) sources. Year 1 or 2 (2005-06): Acquire and deliver needed equipment to stations based on prioritization by need and funding awards
5.4.e: Expand Salmon River Rural Volunteer Fire Department to cover homes on the north side of the Salmon River Road.	Protection of people and structures by direct fire fighting capability enhancements.	Salmon River Rural Volunteer Fire Department.	Year 1 (2005): Identify area to be annexed into the department and inform landowners. Year 2 (2006): Formally annex the identified lands.
5.4.f: Annex lands between the Grangeville Rural Fire District and the Harpster Volunteer Fire Department to close the gap in the service area.	Protection of people and structures by direct fire fighting capability enhancements.	Grangeville Rural Fire Department and Harpster Volunteer Fire Department.	Year 1 (2005): Identify area to be annexed by each department and inform landowners. Year 2 (2006): Formally annex the lands into the respective department's coverage area.
5.4.g: Portable pump, hand tools, chainsaws, flares, and handheld radios for the Kooskia Volunteer Fire Department.	Protection of people and structures by direct fire fighting capability enhancements.	Kooskia Volunteer Fire Department.	Year 1 (2005): Verify stated need still exists, develop budget, and locate funding or equipment (surplus) sources. Year 1 or 2 (2005-06): Acquire and deliver needed equipment to stations based on prioritization by need and funding awards

Table 5.4. WUI Action Items in Fire Fighting Resources and Capabilities.

Action Item	Goals and Objectives	Responsible Organization	Action Items & Planning Horizon
5.4.h: Structural engine for Riggins City Fire Department.	Protection of people and structures by direct fire fighting capability enhancements.	Riggins City Fire Department.	Year 1 (2005): Verify stated need still exists, develop budget, and locate funding or equipment (surplus) sources. Year 1 or 2 (2005-06): Acquire and deliver needed equipment to stations based on prioritization by need and funding awards
5.4.i: Structural engine, wildland engine, water tender, hand tools, flares, portable pump, and foam unit for Harpster Volunteer Fire Department.	Protection of people and structures by direct fire fighting capability enhancements.	Harpster Volunteer Fire Department.	Year 1 (2005): Verify stated need still exists, develop budget, and locate funding or equipment (surplus) sources. Year 1 or 2 (2005-06): Acquire and deliver needed equipment to stations based on prioritization by need and funding awards
5.4.j: Construction materials for Elk City Volunteer Fire Department.	Protection of people and structures by direct fire fighting capability enhancements.	Elk City Volunteer Fire Department.	Year 1 (2005): Verify stated need still exists, develop budget, and locate funding or equipment (surplus) sources. Year 1 or 2 (2005-06): Acquire and deliver needed equipment to stations based on prioritization by need and funding awards
5.4.k: 6-wheel drive structural engine, drop tank, hoses, and a 500 gpm pump for Elk City Volunteer Fire Department.	Protection of people and structures by direct fire fighting capability enhancements.	Elk City Volunteer Fire Department.	Year 1 (2005): Verify stated need still exists, develop budget, and locate funding or equipment (surplus) sources. Year 1 or 2 (2005-06): Acquire and deliver needed equipment to stations based on prioritization by need and funding awards
5.4.l: Retention and recruitment of volunteer firefighters.	**Protection of people and structures** by direct fire fighting capability enhancements.	**Rural and Wildland Fire Districts** working with broad base of county citizenry to identify options, determine plan of action, and implement it.	• 5 Year Planning Horizon, extended planning time frame. • Target an increased recruitment (+10%) and retention (+20% longevity) of volunteers. • **Year 1 (2005):** Develop incentives program and implement it.

Table 5.4. WUI Action Items in Fire Fighting Resources and Capabilities.

Action Item	Goals and Objectives	Responsible Organization	Action Items & Planning Horizon
5.4.m: Increased training and capabilities of firefighters.	**Protection of people and structures** by direct fire fighting capability enhancements.	**Rural and Wildland Fire Districts** working with the **BLM and USFS** for wildland training opportunities and with the **State Fire Marshall's Office** for structural fire fighting training.	• **Year 1 (2005):** Develop a multi-county training schedule that extends 2 or 3 years in advance (continuously). • Identify funding and resources needed to carry out training opportunities and sources of each to acquire. • Year 1 (2005): Begin implementing training opportunities for volunteers.
5.4.n. Develop and update Mutual Aid Agreements between all Rural Fire Districts and the Federal and State wildfire fighting agencies working in and around Idaho County.	**Protection of people and structures** by direct fire fighting capability enhancements.	Rural and Wildland Fire Districts, BLM, USFS, BIA, IDL, State Fire Marshall's Office.	• 2005: Identify current mutual aid agreements and needed agreements. • Draft and implement agreements across the county.
5.4.o: Install a repeater on Sheriff's Point for better coverage.	**Protection of people and structures** by direct fire fighting capability enhancements.	County Commissioners and Rural Fire Departments	• **Year 1 (2005):** Develop a cost analysis and locate funding opportunities. • **Year 2 (2006):** Acquire necessary equipment and implement project.
5.4.p: Wildland engine,, hand tools, handheld radios, portable tank, portable pumps, blower fan, and flares for BPC Volunteer Rural Fire Department.	Protection of people and structures by direct fire fighting capability enhancements.	BPC Volunteer Rural Fire Department.	Year 1 (2005): Verify stated need still exists, develop budget, and locate funding or equipment (surplus) sources. Year 1 or 2 (2005-06): Acquire and deliver needed equipment to stations based on prioritization by need and funding awards
5.4.q: Hand tools, portable pump, and ATV for White Bird Volunteer Fire Department.	Protection of people and structures by direct fire fighting capability enhancements.	White Bird Volunteer Fire Department	Year 1 (2005): Verify stated need still exists, develop budget, and locate funding or equipment (surplus) sources. Year 1 or 2 (2005-06): Acquire and deliver needed equipment to stations based on prioritization by need and funding awards

Table 5.4. WUI Action Items in Fire Fighting Resources and Capabilities.

Action Item	Goals and Objectives	Responsible Organization	Action Items & Planning Horizon
5.4.r: Mobile radios, portable radios, base station, and dispatch for Dixie Volunteer Fire Department.	Protection of people and structures by direct fire fighting capability enhancements.	Dixie Volunteer Fire Department	Year 1 (2005): Verify stated need still exists, develop budget, and locate funding or equipment (surplus) sources. Year 1 or 2 (2005-06): Acquire and deliver needed equipment to stations based on prioritization by need and funding awards
5.4.s: Chainsaw for Cottonwood Volunteer Fire Department.	Protection of people and structures by direct fire fighting capability enhancements.	Cottonwood Volunteer Fire Department.	Year 1 (2005): Verify stated need still exists, develop budget, and locate funding or equipment (surplus) sources. Year 1 or 2 (2005-06): Acquire and deliver needed equipment to stations based on prioritization by need and funding awards
5.4.t: Establish and map onsite water sources such as dry hydrants or underground storage tanks for rural housing developments.	**Protection of people and structures** by direct fire fighting capability enhancements.	County Commissioners and Rural Fire Departments	• Identify populated areas lacking sufficient water supplies and develop project plans to develop fill or helicopter dipping sites. • Implement project plans.
5.4.u. Create South Fork Clearwater River Volunteer Fire Department, and develop training schedule and provide equipment (portable pump, hose, hand tools, sprinkler systems) for SFCR VFD.	Protection of people and structures by direct fire fighting capability enhancements.	County Commissioners, Clearwater RC&D, IDL, USDA Forest Service, BLM, and local citizens.	Year 1 & 2 create SFCR VFD Year 2 provide listed equipment and training Year 3 repeat training and develop multiple brigade training opportunities
5.4.v. Acquire and locate three 300 gallon slip tanks for the South Fork Clearwater River Volunteer Fire Department and provide training on its use	Protection of people and structures by direct fire fighting capability enhancements.	County Commissioners, Clearwater RC&D, IDL, USDA Forest Service, BLM, SFCR VFD, and local citizens.	Year 2 locate the equipment in suitable locations in Mallard Creek, Red River Hot Springs, and Orogrande
5.4.w. Acquire new heated building, pumper truck, and 3000 gallon water tender for Elk City Volunteer Fire Department.	Protection of people and structures by direct fire fighting capability enhancements.	County Commissioners, Elk City Council, Elk City Fire Department	Year 1-5 acquire needed building site, building, and equipment.

5.4.x: Purchase small boat for IDL.	Protection of people and structures by providing improved access to land along Clearwater River for fire fighting.	Maggie Creek FPD	• **Year 1 (2005):** Verify stated need still exists, develop budget, and locate funding or equipment (surplus) sources. • **Year 1 or 2 (2005-06):** Acquire and deliver needed equipment to districts based on prioritization by need and funding awards.
5.4.y: Improve safety equipment for all RFDs in Idaho County.	**Protection of people and structures** by direct fire fighting capability enhancements.	**Clearwater Resource Conservation and Development Council** in cooperation with County Commissioners and Rural Fire Districts.	Complete an inventory of all supplies held by the RFDs (boots, turnouts, Nomex, gloves, modern lighting, straps, and hardware), and complete a needs assessment matching expected replacement schedule. Develop countywide re-supply process for needed equipment.
5.4.z: Obtain mobile repeater stations with back up power source.	**Protection of people and structures** by direct fire fighting capability enhancements.	County Commissioners, Clearwater RC&D, IDL, USDA Forest Service, and local fire departments.	• **Year 1 (2005):** Verify stated need still exists, develop budget, and locate funding or equipment (surplus) sources. • **Year 1 or 2 (2005-06):** Acquire and deliver needed equipment to districts based on prioritization by need and funding awards.

5.7 Regional Land Management Recommendations

Reference has been given to the role that forestry, grazing and agriculture have in promoting wildfire mitigation services through active management. Idaho County is a rural county by any measure. It is dominated by wide expanses of forest and rangelands intermixed with communities and rural houses.

Wildfires will continue to ignite and burn depending on the weather conditions and other factors enumerated earlier. However, active land management that modifies fuels, promotes healthy range and forestland conditions, and promotes the use of these natural resources (consumptive and non-consumptive) will insure that these lands have value to society and the local region. We encourage the US Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Idaho Department of Lands, industrial forestland owners, private forestland owners, and all agricultural landowners in the region to actively manage their wildland-urban interface lands in a manner consistent with reducing fuels and risks in this zone.

5.7.1 Elk City Forest Health Issues

In the heart of Central Idaho's backcountry lies a single township, thirty-six square miles, surrounded by the Nez Perce National Forest. Once a center for mining, prospecting and the

businesses associated with those activities, the community of Elk City occupies perhaps a third of this township. One legacy of the area's history as a mining district is that the Bureau of Land Management now cares for the public lands within the township, managing approximately 12,500 acres. Another is that the rest of the area is in private ownership, the result of mining claims that were patented and thereby granted to individuals or mining companies.

Since the early 1980's, a major outbreak of mountain pine beetle has been progressing through forest lands surrounding the township and is now well established in the lodgepole within the township itself. The cycle in which older lodgepole pine are killed by beetles, replaced by fire, and the burned areas regenerated with more lodgepole is widely recognized.Each year, more and more trees die from the beetle attacks and the dead trees with their dry needles await only dry conditions and an ignition source to create serious wildfires that will be virtually impossible to control in some areas.

Unless there is an unusually cold winter or two, control of the beetle epidemic and mitigation of the fire hazard they create will be dependent upon human actions. Basically, control strategies boil down to logging lodgepole stands and disposing of the slash. Fortunately, the forests surrounding Elk City township have Douglas-fir, larch, ponderosa pine, and grand fir trees interspersed with lodgepole or adjoining lodgepole stands, so that the stands can often be selectively logged, with the resulting stand having a much greater component of beetle and fire resistant species and with enough trees in it to maintain aesthetic values.

History is confirmed by the preponderance of lodgepole and other early seral species that currently occupy the forested sites in a classic fire type pattern. On the ridges above the South Fork Clearwater River and in the southwest corner of the township, for example, lodgepole stands were found to be over 100 years old. Where past fires were most intense, nearly pure stands of lodgepole or, in some cases, western larch, occupy the land. Where the fires burned with lower severity, larger trees and those that are less fire resistant, for whatever reason, were spared the impact of the flames.

The nearly pure stands of lodgepole pine and its strong presence in mixed conifer stands are both a testament to the fire history of much of the township and an indicator of future fire occurrences. Recent fire suppression has been successful; there have been no significant fires within the township since 1940. However, it can be argued that suppression has merely postponed the inevitable. Fire suppression, along with timber harvest, have altered what would have been the historic mosaic of varying forest types, age classes and fire risk across the landscape. When fuels build up and when conditions allow, there will be high intensity fires that will defy control efforts. This should not be viewed as an aberration. This area has both lethal, mixed and even low frequency HFRs. Nevertheless, the norm may no longer be acceptable, given the level of human development within the landscape.

There is a dire need to find acceptable ways to mitigate unnaturally high fire hazards, particularly around populated areas and to productively include the local community and other stakeholders in deciding future management directions. As the Federal agencies move to implement recommendations of this Plan, it is critical that all stakeholders participate in the development process. Agencies, working with the county, tribe and other local governments, as well as the local community and preservation groups, can collaboratively strive to implement the goals ot this Plan and the NFP.

The challenge for land managers in the greater Elk City area is to pay heed to the fire history and to current vegetative conditions and fuel loads and then acceptably mitigate the unacceptably high fire risk. History acts as a credible predictor of fire occurrence, but the size and intensity, plus the risk that the inevitable fires pose to human values can be manageable.

5.7.2 USDA Forest Service Projects

5.7.2.1 Clearwater Ranger District

5.7.2.1.1 Blue Ridge

Use prescribed fire to reduce natural fuel accumulations in the Johns Creek and Otter Creek drainages. Gilmore Ranch and Sourdough LO are within or adjacent to the project area. Utilizing prescribed fire will reduce the severity of wildfire events when they occur.

Total area: 7500 acres. Project started in 2002 and will continue through 2008.

5.7.2.1.2 Hungry Mill

Use prescribed fire to reduce natural fuel accumulations on Hungry Ridge and the Mill Creek drainage. Utilizing prescribed fire will reduce the severity of wildfire events when they occur. Total area: 10,500 acres. Project started in 1994. Maintenance burns will occur over the next 5 years.

5.7.2.1.3 South Fork

Use prescribed fire to reduce natural fuel accumulations in the South Fork Clearwater drainage. Prescribed fire will reduce the effects of future fire events and reduce the risk to structures/private land within the corridor. Prescribed burning has been on-going and will continue over the next 10 years.

5.7.2.1.4 Lucky Marble

Project included 240 acres of commercial thinning, 240 acres of understory slashing and 500 acres of prescribed burning near Hungry Ridge. Commercial thinning and slashing have been completed. Approximately 100 acres of prescribed burning will occur over the next two years. Project was designed to restore historic forest structure and reduce the severity of future fire events.

5.7.2.1.5 2021

Project included 280 acres of commercial harvest, 24 acres of understory slashing and 2,240 acres of prescribed burning. One purpose of the project was to reduce the risk of catastrophic fire to the Cove area and other private inholdings. Harvest operations have been completed. Prescribed burning will occur over the next 3-5 years.

5.7.2.1.6 Pine Plantation Underburning

Treat by prescribed fire existing Ponderosa pine plantations District-wide that are at risk to crown fire due to buildup of ladder fuels. Primary purpose is to reduce natural fuel accumulations that consist of brush, grand fir and needle litter. Treatment will provide protection from wildfires by lessening the severity of those fires when they occur.

5.7.2.1.7 Meadow Face Stewardship and Yew Rock Timber Sale

The primary purpose of this project is to restore fire dependant ecosystems and reduce the potential for stand replacing fires. The project includes commercial harvest and 7,000 acres of prescribed burning. Units within the Yew Rock Timber Sale have been harvested. The project is currently in litigation.

5.7.2.1.8 Middle Fork

The project includes 809 acres of commercial harvest and 600 acres of prescribed burning. Some of the prescribed burn units are directly adjacent to private land. Harvest was completed in 2005. Prescribed burning will occur over the next 3-5 years.

5.7.2.1.9 Blacktail

The purpose of the project is to reduce the effects of wildfire to the town of Clearwater, its municipal watershed, and the adjacent South Fork community. The proposed project includes 800 acres of commercial harvest and 600 acres of prescribed burning. Treatments are primarily located along the boundary between Forest Service and private land. The project is currently in the planning phase. Expected implementation is late 2006.

5.7.2.1.10 Cove Fuel Break

The primary purpose of the project is to reduce fuel accumulations along the FS/Private boundary in the Cove area. Crews thinned/slashed approximately 2-3 miles along the FS/Private boundary in 2004. This project will continue through 2006.

5.7.2.1.11 Cove/Fish Interface

This project is in the conceptual phase at this time. The planning phase is expected to start in 2006 or 2007. This project will be designed to reduce the risk of catastrophic fire to the Cove, Fish Creek and rural Grangeville areas.

5.7.2.2 Moose Creek Ranger District

5.7.2.2.1 Selway Falls Prescribed Fire

The Moose Creek District proposes to reduce natural fuels in the immediate vicinity of the structures on the Selway Falls administrative site and on the slopes adjacent to the site. On the ridges and slopes above and to each side of the Selway Falls Cabin approximately 240 acres will be treated with fire to reduce levels of natural occurring fuel and to reduce the shrub and tree regeneration that has encroached into the Ponderosa pine and Douglas fir stands. This effort will reduce the intensity of future ground fire and eliminate a source of ladder fuels which can lift fire into the tree canopy. In addition the project will provide a natural barrier or fuel break where, if needed, a stand against an approaching wildland fire could be made.

5.7.2.2.2 Selway Community Protection Project

The Selway Community Protection Project is a joint effort by the Nez Perce National Forest (NPNF) and Idaho Department of Lands (IDL) to reduce the risk from fire to the homes along the lower Selway River. There are two parts to this project. The first part of this project focuses

on the wildland/urban interface (WUI) along the lower Selway River. This involves home hazard assessments with the homeowners, IDL and NPNF personnel to identify mitigation measures that homeowners can implement to lower their risk to loss from fire.

The second part of the project is an effort to reduce hazardous fuels in those areas identified in the Selway and Middle Fork Clearwater Rivers Subbasin Assessment, completed in 2001, as being outside their natural disturbance interval. The current vegetative condition within the analysis area, especially on south and west aspects, is an over story of ponderosa pine and douglas fir with an under story of 5-20 foot tall Douglas-fir. This project will be planned collaboratively with private citizens and federal, state and county agencies. The actual acres to be treated will be identified through this collaborative process.

5.7.2.2.3 East Meadow Prescribed Fire

The project is within the Meadow Creek drainage, a tributary of the Selway River. This area is adjacent to the Selway Bitterroot Wilderness. The total project is scheduled to burn 2000 acres per year for 4 years. The project is divided into 20 some burn blocks ranging in size from 50 acres to 500 acres, 4 or 5 of these blocks are planned for this season. Approximately 6200 acres remain to be burned.

5.7.2.2.4 O-Hara Forest Health Project

This project focuses on those areas that are outside their natural disturbance interval as identified in the Selway and Middle Fork Clearwater Rivers Subbasin Assessment, completed in 2001. There approximately 7800 acres of prescribed burning in this project. Fire suppression policies have resulted in greater accumulation of fuels, unnatural vegetative responses, more insect and disease concerns and reduction of habitat for some species. Restoring and maintaining natural processes and thus more natural ecological function is the primary objective for this area.

5.7.2.3 Red River Ranger District

5.7.2.3.1 Complete Projects

5.7.2.3.1.1 Dixie Fuelbreak

Mechanical reduction of natural fuels on 90 acres of National Forest land surrounding the community of Dixie, Idaho. The Dixie Fuelbreak project has improved firefighter safety, and reduced impacts to resources and threats to private property from wildland fire in the treatment area. This was accomplished by the thinning and pruning of vegetative fuels (trees and shrubs). Thinned material, such as tree branches and needles, was handpiled and burned to remove the fire risk. Project completed in 2003.

5.7.2.3.1.2 Mallard/Rhett Defensible Space

Mechanical reduction of natural fuels on 15 acres of National Forest land surrounding private in-holdings in the Mallard and Rhett Cr. drainages. The Mallard/Rhett Defensible Space Project has reduced fuel loads by removing brush and cutting trees to increase canopy spacing on Forest Service lands adjacent to private structures along Mallard Creek. By reducing fuel loads the project has reduced the potential and intensity of wildland fire and provide for firefighter and public safety in and around at risk private structures. Treatments consisted of; 1) cutting,

handpiling, burning, chipping, or scattering materials <3 inches in diameter. 2) Pruning limbs to approximately 18 feet above ground. 3) Felling pole to sawlog sized trees to separate tree crowns to a spacing of about 10 feet. Project completed in 2003.

5.7.2.3.1.3 Red River Defensible Space

Mechanical reduction of natural fuels on 37 acres of National Forest land surrounding private in-holdings and Forest Service facilities in the Red River Drainage. Project completed in 2003.

5.7.2.3.1.4 Newsome Defensible Space

The Newsome Defensible Space Project has reduced fuel loads by removing brush and cutting trees to increase canopy spacing on Forest Service lands adjacent to private structures in the Newsome watershed. By reducing fuel loads the project has reduced the potential and intensity of wildland fire and provided for firefighter and public safety in and around at risk private structures. Treatments consisted of; 1) cutting, handpiling, burning, chipping, or scattering materials <3 inches in diameter. 2) Pruning limbs to approximately 18 feet above ground. 3) Felling pole to sawlog sized trees to separate tree crowns to a spacing of about 10 feet.Project completed in 2005.

5.7.2.3.1.5 Crooked River Defensible Space

Mechanical reduction of natural fuels on 13 acres of National Forest land surrounding private in-holdings and Forest Service facilities in the Crooked River drainage. The Crooked River Defensible Space Project has reduced fuel loads by removing brush and cutting trees to increase canopy spacing on Forest Service lands adjacent to private structures in the Crooked River watershed. By reducing fuel loads the project has reduced the potential and intensity of wildland fire and provided for firefighter and public safety in and around at risk private structures. Treatments will consist of; 1) cutting, handpiling, burning, chipping, or scattering materials <3 inches in diameter. 2) Pruning limbs to approximately 18 feet above ground. 3) Felling pole to sawlog sized trees to separate tree crowns to a spacing of about 10 feet. Project completed in 2005.

5.7.2.3.2 On-Going Projects

5.7.2.3.2.1 Red Pines

Mechanical reduction of natural fuels followed by prescribed burning of activity fuels on 3,500 acres of National Forest land in the Red River drainage. The Red Pines project would treat existing and potential fuel loads in order to reduce the effects of potential large-scale wildland fire and improve the safety and effectiveness of firefighters during suppression activities. This will be accomplished by removing dead and dying trees which contribute to existing and future fuel loads, reduce stand densities, reduce ladder fuels that would produce crown fires, reduce the risk of high severity fires, and creating vegetative patterns to alter fire spread and increase effectiveness of suppression activities. NEPA completed, implementation has not started.

5.7.2.3.2.2 American and Crooked River Project

Mechanical reduction of natural fuels followed by prescribed burning of activity fuels on 1,800 acres of National Forest land in the Crooked and American River drainages. The American/Crooked project would treat existing and potential fuel loads in order to reduce the

effects of potential large-scale wildland fire and improve the safety and effectiveness of firefighters during suppression activities. This will be accomplished by removing dead and dying trees which contribute to existing and future fuel loads, reduce stand densities, reduce ladder fuels that would produce crown fires, reduce the risk of high severity fires, and creating vegetative patterns to alter fire spread and increase effectiveness of suppression activities. NEPA completed, currently implementing.

5.7.2.3.2.3 Elkhorn/Jersey

Reduction of natural fuels by prescribed burning in a project area of 21,000 acres in and adjacent to the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness in the Salmon River corridor. Implementation began in 2000 with the Rabbit Pt., Blowout Cr., Tepee Cr., and Jersey Cr. blocks burned for a total of 10,600 acres. The last block, Elkhorn Cr., is planned to be burned in 2006 for an additional 1,500 acres.

5.7.2.3.2.4 Blanco

Reduction of natural fuels by prescribed burning on 900 acres of National Forest land in the Red River drainage. The Blanco project will return vegetation conditions to a more historic condition, reduce fire hazard, and improve big game forage in the Red River watershed. Implementation is planned for late summer of 2005.

5.7.2.3.2.5 806

Reduction of natural fuels by prescribed burning on 160 acres of National Forest land in the 806 Timber sale Area. The 806 project will use prescribed fire in combination with timber harvest and watershed improvements to move the area toward the desired condition of a healthy ecosystem which supports a mosaic of different forest structures that would not only provide for the present and future needs of the different species in the ecosystem, but also reduce the risk of any single fire eliminating any one of the needed forest structures. Underburning would occur in 2 30+ year old ponderosa pine plantations to reduce fuel loadings, thin the canopy closure, and remove understory grand fir from the stands. Implementation planned for 2007.

5.7.2.3.2.6 Starbucky

Reduction of natural fuels by prescribed burning on 300 acres of National Forest land in the Starbucky Timber Sale Area. The Starbucky project will return and maintain the ecological structure and function of the area's vegetation to a natural, sustainable condition. Through the use of prescribed fire in the form of underburning, fuel loads and fire hazard will be reduced, and big game winter range will be rejuvenated. Implementation planned for 2008.

5.7.2.3.2.7 Chocolate Moose

Reduction of natural fuels by prescribed burning on 600 acres of National Forest land in the Chocolate Moose Timber Sale Area. The Chocolate Moose project will return and maintain the ecological structure and function of the area's vegetation to a natural, sustainable condition. Through the use of prescribed fire in the form of underburning, fuel loads, and fire hazard will be reduced and big game winter range will be rejuvenated. Implementation planned for 2008.

5.7.2.3.2.8 Motherlode

Reduction of natural fuels by prescribed burning on 20 acres of National Forest land adjacent to the Elk City township. The Motherlode project will return vegetation to a more historic condition in ponderosa pine and western larch through the use of precommercial thinning and underburning. Species in the undergrowth such as grand fir will be removed by thinning, and the fuel concentrations will be burned to reduce fuel loading and to stimulate woody shrubs for elk winter range. Implementation planned for 2008.

5.7.2.3.2.9 Red River Underburn

The Red River Underburn project will allow for firefighter and public safety in the interface zone by reducing activity fuels created through thinning and pruning activities for defensible space around the Red River Ranger Station compound. The use of fire in the form of underburning will reduce the fuel loading and kill the grand fir encroachment in the understory in areas that were not treated by thinning.

5.7.2.3.2.10 Red River PCT

The Red River PCT will utilize precommercial thinning to reduce fire risk by reducing crown density and ladder fuels, favor species that are more fire-, insect-, and disease-resistant, improve tree growth, and rejuvenate the understory shrubs that provide forage for big game.

5.7.2.3.3 Proposed Projects

5.7.2.3.3.1 Whitewater

Reduction of natural fuels by prescribed burning on 1,000 acres of National Forest land surrounding private in-holdings in the Salmon River corridor. The Salmon River Canyon project would reintroduce fire into areas where fire exclusion has altered vegetation densities and fuel accumulations beyond historic levels. This would reduce the potential for large-scale stand replacing fires in historically non-lethal fire regimes through the use of low intensity prescribed underburning in ponderosa pine and Douglas fir forest types. Ignition would be accomplished using hand-held and aerial ignition devices. NEPA started but not complete. Implementation is planned for 2006.

5.7.2.3.3.2 Crooked Cove

Reduction of natural fuels by prescribed burning of National Forest land surrounding private in-holdings. Project area is approximately 16,000 acres with actual burned acres to be 8,000-12,000 acres. NEPA not started, implementation planned for 2008.

5.7.2.3.4 Conceptual Projects

5.7.2.3.4.1 South Township

Mechanical reduction of natural fuels followed by prescribed burning on 200-300 acres of National Forest and Bureau of Land Management lands located along the southern boundary of the Elk City township.

5.7.2.4 Salmon River Ranger District

5.7.2.4.1 Current and On-Going Projects

5.7.2.4.1.1 Blue Mountain Fuels Reduction

8,000 acre project area. Non-lethal, mixed severity spring, summer and fall prescribed burns. Implementation will occur over an approximate 6 yr. period, starting in the fall of 2005, treating approximately 1,000 to 3,000 acres annually.

5.7.2.4.1.2 Hartman Creek Fuels Reduction

4,800 acre project area. Non-lethal, mixed severity spring prescribed burn. Implementation has occurred on this project in 2004 and an additional 2000 acres is scheduled for implementation in the spring of 2006.

5.7.2.4.1.3 Robbins Creek Fuels Reduction

3,020 acre project area. Non-lethal, mixed severity spring prescribed burn. Implementation has occurred on this project in 2003 and an additional 2000 acres is scheduled for implementation in the spring of 2006.

5.7.2.4.1.4 Van Ridge Fuels Reduction

1,070 acre project area. Non-lethal, mixed severity spring and fall prescribed burn. Implementation planned for spring 2007.

5.7.2.4.1.5 Allison Creek Fuels Reduction

9,820 acre project area. Non-lethal, mixed severity spring and fall prescribed burn. Implementation will occur over an approximate 6 yr. period, starting in the spring/fall of 2007, treating approximately 1,000 to 3,000 acres annually.

5.7.2.4.1.6 Fiddle Creek Fuels Reduction

1,950 acre project area. Non-lethal, mixed severity spring and fall prescribed burn. Implementation planned for spring/fall 2008.

5.7.2.4.1.7 Clean Slate

Landscape ecosystem management project. This project includes large amounts of restoration projects, approximately 18 mbf of timber, and 5,200 acres of fuels treatment (2700 acres natural fuels and 2500 acres activity fuels).

5.7.2.4.1.8 Adams Camp Defensible Space

600 acre project area. Defensible space project adjacent to private land located in the wildland urban interface near Adams Camp work center. Project consists of precommercial thinning, handpiling, burning handpiles, and prescribed burning. Project initiation began summer 2004.

5.7.2.4.1.9 Boufford Ridge Defensible Space

80 acre project area. Defensible space project adjacent to private land located in the wildland urban interface located in the Skookumchuck drainage near Boufford Ridge. Project consists of precommercial thinning, handpiling, burning handpiles, and prescribed burning. Project will begin fall 2005.

5.7.2.4.1.10 Mud Springs

129 acre project area. Non-lethal, mixed severity fall prescribed burn. This area consists of ponderosa pine plantations. Implementation planned for fall 2005.

5.7.2.4.2 Planned Projects

5.7.2.4.2.1 Kessler Fuels Reduction

8,000 acre project area. Non-lethal, mixed severity spring, summer and fall prescribed burns. Implementation will occur over a 3-5 year period, starting in the spring of 2006, treating approximately 1,000 to 3,000 acres annually.

5.7.2.4.3 Limited Timber Harvest Categorical Exclusions

5.7.2.4.3.1 John Boy Timber Sale

.7 mbf timber sale with 250 acres of activity fuels treatment.

5.7.2.4.3.2 Floor Bugs Timber Sale

.96 mbf timber sale with 70 acres of activity fuels treatment.

5.7.2.4.3.3 Morrison Mistletoe Timber Sale

1.2 mbf timber sale with 250 acres of activity fuels treatment.

5.7.2.5 Lochsa Ranger District

5.7.2.5.1 Current and On-Going Projects

5.7.2.5.1.1 Weitas Fuels

Mixed severity type, late summer burns. Contact: Chris Gauthier

2005 - Sand Creek unit: 2,000 of the 5,036 acres.

2006 - Guard Station unit: 4,537 ac. Weitas Creek unit: 2,956 ac.

2007 - Bugle Point unit: 3,381 ac. Johnagan Mtn. unit: 1,594 ac.

2008 - Flame Creek unit: 2,755 ac. (and of course any of the project acres that will get bumped back due to weather, smoke, etc.)

5.7.2.5.1.2 Lochsa Historical Station

Fuels Reduction project at FS facility. 50 acres of handpiling and underburning. (NFPORS) Contact: Chris Gauthier

(I've just become involved with this project and have discovered that reality is a 7 acre administrative area. We plan on proposing 150 - 200 acres of underburning adjacent to the facility. If we could get a small amount of funding we may be able to get a CE out by spring 2006.)

5.7.2.5.1.3 North Lochsa Face

Fuels reduction: 5,485 ac. Mixed Severity; 7,045 ac. Underburn. Contact: Rick Parker, Chris Gauthier. This project consists of 120 units located in the Clearwater NF Lochsa FMU and to the southwest along the breaks of the river to the Forest boundary. (Project is on hold due to litigation)

If the district is allowed to proceed with the prescribed burning we would look to accomplish about 1,000 - 2,000 acres per year. (This was an EIS.)

5.7.2.5.1.4 Syringa/Lowell

Interface Fuels - Wildland Urban Interface Project/Fuels Reduction. Contact: Rick Parker, Dave Johnson (AFMO detail.)

This project is in the initial NEPA phase and no specific treatments have been developed. This project will be an EA. Project is in collaboration with the State and local communities. Estimate signed decision by Winter/Spring 2007.

5.7.2.5.1.5 American/Crooked River

The Forest Supervisor's decision to implement the American and Crooked River Project was approved, with instruction, by the Appeal Deciding Officer on July 8, 2005. Implementation of this project is anticipated to begin in the Fall of 2005.

5.7.2.5.1.6 Red Pines Environmental Impact Statement

The Red Pines FEIS is completed and available for public review July 2005.

5.7.2.5.1.7 Newsome and Crooked River

Defensible Space: The two Framing Our Community defensible space projects will be completed in early summer 2005.

5.7.2.5.1.8 Whiskey South

The district court for the District of Idaho issued a permanent injunction against the Whiskey South Integrated Resource Project. The district court held that the discussion of cumulative impacts was not adequate to satisfy NEPA requirements. The court permanently enjoined the project pending compliance with NEPA and the court's order. The agencies initiated public scoping for the Whiskey South II project. The NEPA will incorporate the original Whiskey South information and address the areas found deficient by the District Court. Scoping was complete on Sept. 16, 2005 and the analysis is anticipated to be complete in the Spring 2006.

5.7.2.5.2 Conceptual Projects

5.7.2.5.2.1 Lochsa Corridor

Fuels Reduction. Mixed Severity and Underburning. Project area would consist of lands on both sides of the Lochsa River from Kooskia to Powell. Project will be designed in collaboration with the Powell district. No specific details have been developed at this time. I would consider the project on hold until Powell has a Fuels person.

5.7.2.5.2.2 Fire Creek

Fuels Reduction. Project area consists of lands adjacent to the Lochsa portion of the SBW. Mixed Severity and Underburning. No details have been developed at this time but a project proposal is underway. This project could be done with a CE and signed in 06 or 07.

5.7.2.6 Powell Ranger District

5.7.2.6.1 Current and On-Going Projects

5.7.2.6.1.1 Toboggan Ridge Fuels

Mixed severity type, late summer burns; approximatly 11,590 acres on both the Powell and North Fork Ranger Districts. To be implemented 2-4,000 acres/season over a 3-5 year timeframe. Change in condition class fuels project. Contact: Bob Lippincott

5.7.2.6.1.2 Jerry Johnson Fuels

Fuels reduction. Mixed severity type with underburning. Late summer/early fall burns. Approximately 700 acres. Contact: Bob Lippincott

5.7.2.6.1.3 Moose Whitebark Pine Restoration Project

Moose Lake area. Approximately 109 acre prescribed burn project to restore whitebark pine. Implement in 2005 and 2006.

5.7.2.6.1.4 Weir Fuels Project

Mixed severity type; late summer/early fall burns. Approximately 4200 acres. NEPA to be initiated Fall 2005. Change in condition class fuels project. Contact: Bob Lippincott or Rick Kusicko.

5.7.2.6.1.5 Beaver Triangle Vegetation Restoration Project

Timber harvest project that also includes one unit (21 acres) that will be prescribed burn only for whitebark pine restoration. Implementation either 2006 or 2007, after harvest activities are completed. Contact: Rick Kusicko.

5.7.2.6.2 Conceptual Projects

5.7.2.6.2.1 Winchester Fuels

Fuels reduction project that includes both a prescribed burn as well as a harvest component. Located in the Granite Creek area near Lolo Pass. Contact: Rick Kusicko.

5.7.2.6.2.2 Russian Pines

Old growth ponderosa pine restoration/perpetuation project using both prescribed burning and timber harvest. South side of Crooked Fork Creek, approximately 5 miles NE of Powell. Contact: Bob Lippincott or Rick Kusicko.

5.7.2.6.2.3 Lochsa Corridor

Fuels reduction. Mixed severity and underburning. Project area would consist of lands on both sides of the Lochsa River, from Kooskia to Powell. Project will be designed in collaboration with the Lochsa Ranger District. No specific details at this time. Contact: Bob Lippincott.

5.7.3 Bureau of Land Management Projects

5.7.3.1 East Township

On July 14, 2005, the BLM published a Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Eastside Township Fuels and Vegetation project near Elk City, Idaho. A public scoping meeting and field trip were held on August 4 and an additional informational tour was held on August 30, 2005. The public comments have been synthesized and the IDT is working to complete the Draft EIS in the fall of 2005

5.7.3.2 Transportation Corridors

The project was developed to reduce the risk to homeowners and visitors accessing or leaving the Elk City area during fire suppression activities and to provide a potential means of travel should a large scale fire occur. This proposal is consistent with that proposed by the Idaho County Commissioners and the homeowners of the American River Subdivision. Field Office staff have met with members of each and they strongly expressed their concern over risks associated with travel during a fire emergency and their desire that BLM (and Forest Service) take actions which would reduce potential risks.

The roads involved in this project are the BLM portion of the primary access routes for residents and visitors to the Elk City area. The project would create a shaded fuel break along Roads 443, 2547, 2515, and 2586A and remove surface and ladder fuels along Highway 14 and 222. This will include removing “Hazard trees” that may fall and block or restrict vehicle passage on the road. Fuel breaks will reduce ground, surface and aerial fuels for 200 feet on each side of the road. This would involve thinning the understory from below, and thinning the overstory sufficient that crown fire would not be supported (@15 feet between crowns). The retention trees would also be pruned up to 10 feet above the ground to insure limbs would not serve as ladder fuel. A variety of products would be available to offset a portion, if not all, of the service work. The existing fuels and slash generated would be available for biomass but, if a market is not available, they would be chipped or piled and burned.

5.7.3.3 Eastside Township Fuels and Vegetation

The project would entail changing the forest density and species composition to maintain and increase forest stand resistance to high intensity fire, insects, and disease. This would be achieved by applying various silvicultural prescriptions that include, timber harvests, biomass utilization, slash piling, and prescribed burns on about 1,300 acres. Road closures, road relocation, road decommissioning, and conversion of roads to trails, as well as riparian treatments (plantings and stabilization) and stream bank modification would also be completed.

The *Proposed Action* would create an area of reduced crown fire hazard and lower potential fire severity and intensity on approximately 1,289 acres of BLM lands around Elk City and the American River subdivisions, and additional private property within and adjacent to the project area. This would be accomplished using commercial timber harvest, understory thinning, prescribed burning, and hand or machine piling and burning, and biomass utilization. The proposed action would also include:

- *Vegetation and Fuels:* 459 acres of regeneration treatments that would reserve groups and single trees, 449 acres of seedtree/shelterwood treatments, 130 acres of commercial thin/salvage treatment, 110 acres of salvage/pre-commercial thin, 140 acres of slash and burn fuels treatments, requiring 13.2 miles of temporary roads. The Proposed Action would move the distribution of fuel conditions away from fuel model 10 that has the potential for very intense burning conditions. The Proposed Action would move the distribution of condition classes towards a 1 instead of the current 2 to 3 thereby decreasing high-intensity fire conditions. This action would entail changing forest conditions to maintain and increase forest stand resilience to high intensity fire, and insects and disease outbreaks by applying a prescription comprising regeneration harvests, salvage harvests, pre-commercial, and commercial thinning and prescribed burns. Slash would be treated with prescribed fire and grapple piling. The proposed action would increase the amount of forested area dominated by more fire-tolerant species, move forested vegetation closer towards desired future conditions, and would decrease the number of acres with potential for high-severity stand replacement fire. New and temporary road construction would be kept to a minimum, thus reducing the potential for harmful resource effects.
- *Riparian and Aquatic Restoration:* 4.8 miles of riparian tree and shrub planting, 1.2 miles of streambank re-contour and sediment mitigation, reconnect Queen Creek (a tributary stream) with main American River, replacing two river fords with ATV bridges, re-location of .6 miles of roads, 1.6 miles of roads to be converted from roads to ATV trails, and 1.9 miles of road decommissioning. The Proposed Action along with existing restoration efforts will support upward trends for riparian/aquatic habitats within the American River drainage. Existing riparian and aquatic habitats along some stream segments are currently in poor to fair condition. This Restoration action will support trends toward fair to good condition in the long term.

5.7.3.4 Whiskey South II

The Whiskey South II project would use timber harvest and precommercial thinning followed with machine piling or jackpot burning on approximately 270 acres to create a shaded fuel break; salvage, release, and commercial thinning followed with machine piling or jackpot burning would be implemented on approximately 475 acres to improve forest health and reduce fuel loading; and shelterwood harvest and underburning would be used to reduce fuels and improve elk winter forage on approximately 150 acres. Prescribed fire would be used to dispose of slash, alter the arrangement and continuity of fuels to create a fuel break mosaic and, in some cases, to improve production of wildlife forage. Road surfacing, decommissioning and

replacement of culverts which are barriers to fish passage would be implemented to continue an upward trend in degraded fish habitat.

5.7.3.5 Miscellaneous Small Fuels Projects

On the scattered parcels of BLM which adjoin private land, use timber harvest, thinning, and machine piling and burning or biomass utilization to reduce fuels and improve forest health. Examples currently being implemented are Tailings 40, Sultan 60, Borowicz 40, Mill Yard 20, Misc. Commercial Firewood (throughout township) and Swale Creek Salvage.

5.7.3.6 Whitebird, Copperville, Main Salmon River, Riggins, Blackhawk Bar and Billy Creek

The focus of these rojects is reducing the weed component in these rangeland areas near communities, subdivisions and scattered homes. The weed component results in high fire intensities and increased rates of spread as compared to historic.

5.7.3.7 Wet Gulch Timber Sale

This project is using commercial thinning and shelterwood harvest to improve forest health, regenerate vigorous early seral stands, and improve critical elk winter range. Two strategically located fuel breaks have been established on the primary ridges in the area. The fuel breaks were designed to enhance wildland fire control by separating BLM ownership into three compartments of approximately 1,000 acres each. The fuel breaks were not designed to stop a large high-intensity head fire, but to provide a containment opportunity of the lateral spread of a wild land fire. The fuel breaks would have hazard trees and shrubs removed to meet optimum fire control effect. Trees targeted for removal would be ponderosa pine <12" diameter breast height (DBH) and all other species <14" DBH. Development of the fuel break would require removal of larger trees to break the continuity of the tree crowns in timbered stands that are contiguous to the fuel breaks. Proposed fuel breaks are designed to meander down ridges taking advantage of natural openings (e.g. rock outcrops), and to accommodate wildlife and visual concerns. The resulting fuel breaks will have the canopy reduced by 60 - 70%. The objective is to reduce fuel loading, compactness, horizontal continuity, vertical arrangement, and availability sufficient on an area up to 300 feet in width to moderate fire behavior as it moves through the fuel break.

5.7.3.8 Bally Mountain Fuels and Forest Health

The project would entail changing the forest density and species composition to maintain and increase forest stand resistance to high intensity fire, insects, and disease. This would be achieved by applying various silvicultural prescriptions that include timber harvests, biomass utilization, slash piling, and prescribed burns, Road closures, road relocation, road decommissioning, as well as riparian treatments (plantings and stabilization) may also be included.

5.7.4 Other Treatment Projects

5.7.4.1 Elk City Region

The committee participants felt strongly that the proposed BLM and Forest Service projects were critical to their ability to sustain wildfire defense activities in the Elk City region. They expressed their overwhelming support for these projects to be implemented. The following summarizes their support for a variety of projects.

- High priority support for the 3 listed BLM projects
- High priority support for the Corridors Project by the BLM
- High priority support for the American / Crooked River Project by the USFS
- High priority support for the Red Pines project by the USFS
- High priority support for the Dixie Summit project by the USFS

Residents identified the need for a Forest Service fuel treatment project in the areas surrounding Dixie to build on the treatments completed by the Forest Service and area residents. This would be a mechanical treatment extending beyond the community borders to the ridge tops. These areas were marked on maps and will be included in the mapping section of the plan.

Residents also identified another Forest Service proposed treatment area northwest of Elk City along the Old Wagon Trail Road in the direction of Newsome. This area was identified as part of the Elk City Watershed and is currently experiencing mountain pine beetle losses. Mechanical treatments in this area combined with prescribed burning to achieve wildfire resilience and forest health was identified as a need by the community.

An area to the east and north of the Elk City Township that is currently a part of the roadless area was identified by residents, but not included as treatment area by the Forest Service. This region extends to the edge of the recent Slims Fire. Participants felt that mechanical treatments, which tie the recent burn edge to other treatments adjacent to the Elk City Township, are needed in order to provide protection in the case of a wildfire.