

SOFAR Landscape Group

Wednesday, June 28, 2017

1:15 PM

Attendance: Kendal Young, Kevin Vella, Dana Walsh, Becky Estes, Ben Solvesky, Brian Veerkamp, Mike Webb, Dan Corchran (EID), Kathie Smith, Richard Thornburgh, Mark Egbert, Pat Manley, Norma Santiago (phone)

Aim = to split into subgroups and work on tasks, but lack of attendance requires adjustment so have whole group work as possible

- Subgroup C has not met, is short on members today given ongoing fire training
- Subgroup B has made good progress thanks to Rob Scott, but Rob is away today
- Subgroup A has several members

Subgroup C:

- Initial/tentative aims was to find a (better) location for Type 1 ICC; ingress/egress; helipad locations; use of remote cameras for smoke detection adequate;
- Is there a need to reassess suppression tactics given large scale and intensity?
- Or should we focus on strategy and planning (fuel breaks, logistics)?
 - Request presentation at future meeting to introduce decision process and ICS, suppression planning
- Strategy of fuel breaks overlaps with subgroup B, will need to coordinate CalFire and the county has some of (a lot of) that info in their annual operations or in other records. Can be provided (get GIS folks together).
- More comprehensive evacuation planning would be beneficial (limited access; recreational areas).

Subgroup B:

SMUD and PG&E are doing risk mapping on transmission lines, have been invited to SOFAR field trip with aim of tying into this work. LiDAR coverage may be available for their lines.

Subgroup A:

- Becky summarized notes from last meeting.
- Need to insure all terms/definitions are consistent among small groups and the larger collaborative as we define the desired conditions and zones.
- How do we communicate our product to the general public (document, poster, etc.)?
- Potential red flag for draft landscape zones = implications of "managed fire zone" next to private landholdings (make it part of definition?)
- How do we define our landscape zones? Look to Sierra draft revised Forest Plan for possible starting point.
- CalFire Definitions = Wildland Interface = developed subdivision with fence; Intermix = larger parcels, scattered houses.
- What scale should we define these at? Large swaths or small polygons? This may become clear with mapping.
- Need to be sure the SOFAR zones match the revised ENF Forest Plan zones, etc., so that the collaborative is consistent with land management.
- Priority matrix of suppression vs. management activities provides insight into the interaction and relationship between a general fire threat and managed fire zone.
 - Need to consider including relative suppression vs. management in definitions to make clear to public.

Visualizing a "compartmentalization" of landscape into areas where fire may/not be allowed to burn, where ignitions must be stopped (edge of compartment) due to change in topography, land class, infrastructure, etc.

=Ridges, roads, and right-of-ways

Maintenance of these features is an expensive and never-ending challenge

Reviewed possible categories for desired conditions: (restrict definitions for wildfire zones or specify each veg type?); use visual examples (photos) for each to make it easily understandable and succinct.

Capture anticipated effects of climate change in desired conditions and management strategies (climate-related migration, change in resilience, public use)

-Watershed

-Terrestrial systems

All montane vegetation types

Upper montane vegetation types

Subalpine and Alpine vegetation types

Montane chaparral

-Wildlife- specific zones

(not supported by the group as did not want to slip towards single-species management)

-Invasive species

-Fire Protection Zones (as we have been discussing) (define or describe based on *undesired* veg types/species)

-Social/Economic issues

Desired conditions will depend on more factors than the wildfire zone (e.g. veg type, location on landscape, size of polygon); This process will be iterative - define, look, refine, review;

Start with Calfire hazard zone maps available on FRAPP

Goal: Draft version of zones to review next meeting by combining Calfire zones and (DRAFT) R5 Fire Management Zone

Define all desired conditions in context of 5-6 (a few) characteristics or themes, allowing comparison of zones (especially in table form) and provides guides for descriptions and contrasts. Include historical conditions and ecological processes as this will help public understand/accept desired conditions. Include reference to regulations and authorities for different landowners (forest plans, county building...) Also need management indicators to help define how we know if we are moving toward the desired condition

Discussing possible characteristics or themes: (capturing the three points of the cohesive strategy: 1-resilient landscape; 2-adapted communities; 3-fire response)

1-Vegetation structure: amount and distribution (1)

2-Fire behavior (fuel structure) and Fire effects (fire return interval, severity) (1)

3-Wildlife habitat and TES management (1)

4-Wildfire response (suppression vs management) (3)

5-Fire management infrastructure (fuel breaks, evacuation plans, incident management, etc.) (2,3)

6-Social and economic values and benefits (recreation, utilities) (3)

7-Watersheds (water quantity and quality) (soil stability and productivity) (1)

Next steps:

Draft desired conditions based on these seven themes by the ~~next~~ August landscape meeting

The availability of GIS data/map is our next limiting factor (get a draft map by mid-July) (need to define data layers)

County zoning map available thru EID (Dan)

Need transmission lines and other values at risk

Rob Scott's fuel break layers available?

Ultimate goal is to refine these to present to full SOFAR meeting in ~~August~~ September