Chapter 2

2 Documenting the Planning Process

Documentation of the planning process, including public involvement, is required to meet FEMA’s DMA 2000 (44CFR§201.4(c)(1) and §201.6(c)(1)). This section includes a description of the planning process used to develop this plan, including how it was prepared, who was involved in the process, and how all of the involved agencies participated.

2.1 Description of the Planning Process

The Stevens County Community Wildfire Protection Plan was developed through a collaborative process involving all of the organizations and agencies detailed in Chapter 1 of this document. The planning process included five distinct phases which were in some cases sequential (step 1 then step 2) and in some cases intermixed (step 4 completed throughout the process):

1. **Collection of Data** about the extent and periodicity of hazards in and around Stevens County. This included areas encompassing Stevens, Ferry, and Pend Oreille County to ensure a robust dataset for making inferences about wildfires in Stevens County specifically.

2. **Field Observations and Estimations** about risks, juxtaposition of structures and infrastructure to risk areas, access, and potential treatments.

3. **Mapping** of data relevant to pre-disaster mitigation control and treatments, structures, resource values, infrastructure, risk assessments, and related data.

4. **Facilitation of Public Involvement** from the formation of the planning committee, to a public mail survey, news releases, public meetings, public review of draft documents, and acknowledgement of the final plan by the signatory representatives.

5. **Analysis and Drafting of the Report** to integrate the results of the planning process, providing ample review and integration of committee and public input, followed by signing of the final document.

2.2 The Planning Team

Leading planning efforts from Stevens County was Stevens County Land Director, Clay White. Northwest Management Project Co-Managers were Tera R. King, B.S. and Vaiden Bloch M.S. Mrs. King received a Bachelor of Science degree in natural resource management from the University of Idaho and Mr. Bloch has earned a Master of Science degree in forest products and a Bachelor of Science degree in forest management from the University of Idaho.

These individuals led a team of resource professionals that included Stevens County government, incorporated city officials, fire protection districts, law enforcement, Washington Department of Natural Resources, conservation districts, hospital and school district representatives, the US Forest Service, National Park Service, the Northeast Washington Forestry Coalition, resource management professionals, and hazard mitigation experts.

The planning team met with many residents of the County during inspections of the communities and infrastructure. This methodology, when coupled with the other approaches in this process, worked adequately to integrate a wide spectrum of observations and interpretations about the project.
The planning philosophy employed in this project included the open and free sharing of information with interested parties. Information from federal and state agencies was integrated into the database of knowledge used in this project. Meetings with the committee were held throughout the planning process to facilitate a sharing of information between cooperators.

When the public meetings were held, many of the committee members were in attendance and shared their support and experiences with the planning process and their interpretations of the results.

2.2.1 Multi-Jurisdictional Participation

CFR requirement §201.6(a)(3) calls for multi-jurisdictional planning in the development of Hazard Mitigation Plans which impact multiple jurisdictions. This Multi - Hazard Mitigation Plan is applicable to the following jurisdictions:

- Stevens County, Washington
- City of Chewelah
- City of Colville
- City of Kettle Falls
- Town of Marcus
- Town of Springdale
- Town of Northport

These jurisdictions were represented on the planning committee, in public meetings, and participated in the development of hazard profiles, risk assessments, and mitigation measures. The monthly planning committee meetings were the primary venue for authenticating the planning recoRoad However, additional input was gathered from each jurisdiction in a combination of the following ways:

- Planning committee leadership visits to scheduled municipality public meetings (e.g., County Commissioner meetings, City Hall meetings) where planning updates were provided and information was exchanged.
- One-on-one visits between the planning committee leadership and the representatives of the municipalities (e.g., meetings with County Commissioners, cities, fire districts, or communities).
- Special meetings at each jurisdiction by the planning committee leadership requested by the municipality involving elected officials (mayor and County Commissioners), appointed officials (e.g., County Assessor, Sheriff, City Police), municipality employees, local volunteers, business community representatives, and local citizenry.
- Written correspondence was provided monthly between the planning committee leadership and each municipality updating the cooperators in the planning process, making requests for information, and facilitating feedback.

Planning committee leadership (referenced above) included: Stevens County Land Services Director, Clay White, and Tera King, and Vaiden Bloch of Northwest Management, Inc.

Like other rural areas of Washington and the USA, Stevens County’s human resources have many demands put on them in terms of time and availability. Several of the elected officials (County Commissioners and City Mayors) do not serve in a full-time capacity; some of them have other employment and serve the community through a convention of community service. Recognizing this, many of the jurisdictions decided to identify a representative to cooperate on the planning committee and then report back to the remainder of their organization on the
process and serve as a conduit between the planning committee and the jurisdiction. In the case of the Stevens County Commissioners, Stevens County Land Services Director, Clay White, was a regular attendee of the planning committee meetings and reported to the Board on the progress of the Stevens County MHMP.

2.3 Planning Committee Meetings

The following list of people who participated in the planning committee meetings, volunteered time, or responded to elements of the Stevens County Community Wildfire Protection Plan's preparation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arne Johnson</td>
<td>Washington DNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Hinds</td>
<td>Washington DNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Garcia</td>
<td>Stevens County GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Kessler</td>
<td>County Conservation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay White</td>
<td>Stevens County Land Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Brauner</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Jenson</td>
<td>Town of Marcus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Dunton</td>
<td>Northeast Washington Forestry Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Strand</td>
<td>Washington DNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fran Bolt</td>
<td>Town of Marcus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Gifford</td>
<td>Washington DNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janean Creighton</td>
<td>WSU Stevens County Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Eminger</td>
<td>49 degrees Northwest Management, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Schneiter</td>
<td>Fire District #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd McGee</td>
<td>Vaagen Bros &amp; Northeast Washington Forestry Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Castle</td>
<td>Washington DNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Davenhauer</td>
<td>U.S. Forest Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Lee</td>
<td>City of Colville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill Ott</td>
<td>Stevens County Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Mace</td>
<td>Fire District #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Almas</td>
<td>U.S. Forest Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misty Seaboldt</td>
<td>USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Gray</td>
<td>Avista Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ Larson</td>
<td>Stevens County PLAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Harris</td>
<td>Washington DNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Rawlings</td>
<td>U.S. Forest Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tad Masterson</td>
<td>Fire District #11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Olson</td>
<td>Washington Department of Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tera King</td>
<td>Northwest Management, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiden Bloch</td>
<td>Northwest Management, Inc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.1.1 Committee Meeting Minutes

The planning committee began meeting in 2005 to lay the ground work for the Stevens County CWPP. Northwest Management, Inc. was hired and began attending regular planning committee meetings in May of 2007.


2.3.1.1  May 24th, 2007 – USDA Service Center

Agenda Item #1 – Introduction:

Clay called the meeting to order by making introductions and giving some background on the Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) project up to this point. Tera asked for a round table introduction to help her become more familiar with the committee. Tera explained how the CWPP will dovetail with the Multi – Hazard Mitigation Plan (MHMP) project. Both planning projects will be conducted concurrently with the CWPP committee meeting in the morning and the MHMP meeting in the afternoon. Many of the projects’ tasks will overlap; thus, it is hoped that both planning groups will be able to follow a similar timeline. This may mean that the CWPP group will not meet every month. Tera handed out the tentative timeline showing a completion date in either December or January.

Agenda Item #2 – Discuss Existing Mission, Vision, and Goals Statements:

Tera handed out copies of the Mission, Vision, and Goals statements already developed by the committee. She asked the committee to briefly review the statements. These items may be added to at any time during the planning process.

Agenda Item #3 – Public Survey and Press Release:

Rough drafts of the first press release and public survey were handed out. Tera would like to send the press release to local media outlets within the next two weeks; thus, any comments or suggestions should be sent to her immediately. Clay noted that he had a good working list of media contacts. He thought he may be able to improve the press release by adding a quote from the Commissioners.

Tera explained the intent of the public survey. This document as well as the press release were written to provide information for both the CWPP and the MHMP. The survey will be distributed to a random sample of the County based on an equal percentage from each of the three Commissioner’s districts. There will be a series of three mailings. Respondents will receive a free color aerial photograph of Stevens County. Clay agreed to provide the County’s letterhead and Commissioner’s signature. Tera asked that any revisions or suggestions to the survey be sent to her by the next committee meeting.

Agenda Item #4 – Fire Department Summaries:

Tera handed out and briefly reviewed the existing fire department summaries. She asked that each fire department and agency take a quick look at the summaries to make sure they are still accurate. She also noted that any department needs should be clearly listed.

Agenda Item #5 – SPA Risk Assessments:

Each Strategic Planning Zone in the existing CWPP has a 1 or 2 page risk assessment. Tera noted that the group may add information to these assessments at any time, but the current information was sufficient. Tera asked how the SPA boundaries were determined. In particular, how were the existing Kettle Falls Plan SPAs and Chewelah Plan SPAs incorporated? The committee noted that Dick Dunton had drawn most of the SPA boundaries on the map. Tera will work with Dick to come up with an accurate description of the methodology used.

Agenda Item #6 – Past, Ongoing, or Proposed Mitigation Activities:

Tera pointed out that it was important to discuss mitigation activities or programs already occurring in the County in the CWPP. Any information the committee has regarding recently past, ongoing, or planned mitigation projects (educational, fuels reduction, policy, existing CWPPs, etc) needs to be sent to NMI including timber sales, etc being conducted by agencies.
Agenda Item #7 – Wildland Urban Interface:
Referring to the wall maps, Tera asked the committee how the Wildland Urban Interface boundary had been determined. She then explained some of the other methodologies being used and the ramifications of each technique. Tera noted that the existing WUI boundary could be construed as biased and challenged in court; however, if this was the best way to represent wildland urban interface in Stevens County, the final decision is up to the committee. The group agreed they would like to revisit this issue at the next meeting with maps of the WUI methodology used in neighboring counties, which is solely population based.

Agenda Item #8 – Review Wall Maps:
Tera brought several wall maps including representations of land ownership, 2006 aerial photography, and fire prone landscapes. She asked that the committee take a minute to review the information on the maps for accuracy of names, roads, ownership, etc.

Agenda Item #9 – Open Discussion:
At the last CWPP meeting, the committee decided that the monthly meetings should be held on the 4th Thursday of each month. Tera explained that the public meetings would likely be scheduled for the first part of August.

Agenda Item #10 – Task List and Assignments:
**Information can be sent to Tera King at king@consulting-foresters.com.***
1. Send NMI info on existing mitigation programs, plans, etc – Committee
2. Reserve meeting room for June 28th – Clay
3. Review/send additions to Mission, Vision, and Goals Statements by next meeting – Committee
4. Review public survey and send edits to NMI by June 28th – Committee
5. Write description of SPA boundary methodology – Dick
6. Send committee all review materials electronically – Tera
7. Develop risk analysis maps - NMI
8. Bring maps of Pend Oreille and Ferry County WUI to next meeting - Tera
9. Send NMI revisions/edits to Fire Department summaries by June 28th – Fire Depts & Agencies
10. Send NMI organization logos by the next meeting - Committee

Agenda Item #11 – Adjournment:
Tera adjourned the meeting at approximately 11:15; however, she asked that the committee take a look at some of the wall maps before they leave.

Next Meeting: June 28th at 11:30 in the USDA Service Center (same location). Lunch will be provided.

2.3.1.1.2 June 28th, 2007 – USDA Service Center

Agenda Item #1 – Introduction:
Clay began the meeting by welcoming the attendees and passing around the sign in sheets. Tera thanked all the members for their continued participation

Agenda Item #2 – Housekeeping Items:
Tera briefly noted that there had been one question added to the public mail survey regarding the flooding hazaRoad She asked if the committee had any additional edits before the survey
was finalized and approved by the Commissioners. There was one additional change to the cover letter. Tad thought that the phrase “defensible” should be changed to “survivable” and the committee agreed. NMI was still waiting on the names and addresses database, but as soon as it is received, the survey will begin the first of three mailings. The committee also requested that the free map offered to respondents be zoomed in to the respective Commissioner’s district. Tera will check with Vaiden to make sure, but this shouldn’t be a problem.

Tera reiterated the importance of including information on current or ongoing mitigation projects in the plan. So far she has not received any project information. She asked that the committee please start sending this information as soon as possible.

**Agenda Item #3 – Wildland Urban Interface:**

During the discussion of the Wildland Urban Interface at the last meeting, Tera agreed to bring a draft population density map to be compared side-by-side with the current WUI designation boundary. With the two maps available, there was an in-depth discussion of the meaning of the WUI and how it would affect current projects if it were changed. Dick noted that except for the islands of non-WUI in the middle of the existing map, the population density model was actually fairly similar. Tera reiterated that changing the WUI boundary would not affect the Strategic Planning Area boundaries. The committee would like to see the SPA boundaries superimposed on the population density WUI model. There was also some discussion on how the WUI designation would affect Roadless Areas. Tera didn’t think that having WUI within a Roadless Area would be a problem because the CWPP doesn’t override any existing forest management policies. Steve Rawlings with the Forest Service was going to research the subject.

**Agenda Item #4 – Public Meetings:**

The public meeting dates have been set for August 7th through the 9th. After much discussion, the committee agreed the best locales for the evening meetings would be: Spokane Lake (Suncrest Middle School), Chewelah (City Hall), and Kettle Falls (American Legion). Two additional daytime meetings will be held in Onion Creek and Hunters. Clay and Janean were going to work on scheduling the venues and nailing down times. Tera handed out a draft flyer/press release. The committee liked the flyer, but agreed that it should have a wildfire picture as well.

**Agenda Item #5 – Project Mapping:**

After the remaining business had been discussed, Tera asked the committee to gather around the ownership map on the table and begin drawing in potential projects while they ate lunch. Projects ranged from home defensible space to roadside fuels management to general forest health. NMI will digitize and map the proposed projects. These projects will be presented at the public meetings in August.

**Agenda Item #6 – Task List and Assignments:**

**Information can be sent to Tera King at king@consulting-foresters.com.***

1. Send NMI info on existing mitigation programs, plans, etc – Committee
2. Confirm public meeting venues and times – Clay, Janean, and NMI
3. Finalize public meeting flyer – NMI
4. Send NMI names and address database for survey – Bruce
5. Digitize and map proposed projects - NMI
6. Develop WUI/SPA map - NMI
7. Send NMI organization logos by the next meeting - Committee

**Agenda Item #8 – Adjournment:**
Tera adjourned the meeting at approximately 1 pm. The committee will not meet in July.

Next Meeting: TBA

2.3.1.1.3 August 23rd, 2007 – USDA Service Center

Agenda Item #1 – Introduction:
Vaiden and Clay began the meeting by welcoming the committee members and passing around the sign in sheet. This is an joint meeting of the CWPP and MHMP committees with the main purpose of distributing rough draft documents completed to date.

Agenda Item #2 – Housekeeping Items:
For the most part, the public survey has been completed. Approximately 34% of the surveys were returned. Last week a final reminder was sent out to solicit the return of any outstanding surveys. Clay White indicated that he has talked to several people that received the survey and would be returning them. Vaiden also reviewed the map incentive, which is an aerial photograph of a particular Commissioner district of their choosing. The free maps will be sent out near the completion date of the plan.

The public meetings were held August 7-9 at 5 locations across the county. Tera King conducted the meetings with a short slide presentation and valuable assistance from several committee members. Clay White reported that attendance was mixed, but very good comments, ideas, treatment areas, and additional mitigation measures came out of the meetings. The public comments will be incorporated into the plan and discussed with the committee.

Agenda Item #3 – Community Wildfire Protection Plan:
Draft copies of the plan containing completed and near completed sections of the CWPP were handed out to the committee for review, edit, and comment. Vaiden reviewed and discusses specific sections of the draft that needed clarification or additional information. Portions of several chapters are currently being compiled. All committee edits and review comments need to be returned to Tera by September 19th in order for them to be incorporated into the committee review draft for the next meeting. The September committee meeting will be very important for all committee members to attend as Tera will have the draft plan completed as well as action items prioritized for discussion and refinement.

A question was asked if the County Highway Department Resources and Capabilities should be included in section 4.8 since the county plays a role in traffic control, etc. during a wildfire or other incident. It was the general consensus that this information be added to the plan. NMI will contact Jason Heart, County Road Department, for the information.

Agenda Item #4 – Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan:
Draft copies of the plan containing completed and near completed sections of the MHMP were handed out to the committee for review, edit, and comment. Vaiden reviewed and discusses specific sections of the draft that needed clarification or additional information. Portions of several chapters are currently being compiled. All committee edits and comments need to be returned to Tera by September 19th in order for them to be incorporated into the committee review draft for the next meeting. The September committee meeting will be very important for all committee members to attend as Tera will have the draft plan completed as well as action items prioritized for discussion and refinement.

Agenda Item #5 – Terrorism & Civil Unrest Worksheets:
Several of the TCU worksheets were incomplete or needed additional detail after the last meeting. Vaiden went through the incomplete stack to see if any of the additional attendees could assist with the completion of these forms. NMI will contact the remaining districts entities directly to obtain this information. A summary of completed Vulnerability Assessments from the last meeting was circulated for the committee to review. Once all the TUC worksheets are completed they will be summarized, presented to the committee, and incorporated into the plan.

**Agenda Item #6 – Project Chart:**

Vaiden presented a wall chart containing all the mitigation measures developed by the planning committee to date as well as measures identified at the public meetings. A copy of this chart will be sent out to all committee members with the meeting notes for further review.

**Agenda Item #7 – Adjournment:**

Copies of the draft plans will be made available to committee members that were unable to attend this meeting via the Northwest Management FTP site. Information for accessing the site will be provided via email. All comments and edits need to be sent to Tera by September 19th in order to be included in the committee draft. Please send edits via email, fax, or US Mail. If you wish to just describe the change in an email, please include the section and paragraph reference since page numbers often change as the document is revised. Vaiden adjourned the meeting at approximately 3 pm.

The next MHMP meeting will be held on September 27th at 1 pm at the USDA Service Center in Colville (same place).

**2.3.1.1.4 September 27th, 2007 – USDA Service Center**

**Agenda Item #1 – Introduction:**

Tera began the meeting by welcoming the committee members and passing around the sign in sheet and review materials.

**Agenda Item #2 – Community Wildfire Protection Plan Draft Review:**

Tera walked the committee through the new sections of the draft CWPP. At this point the document is fairly complete, so it is important that the committee begin providing comments as to the accuracy of the information compiled. Dick noted that there were several completed mitigation projects that should be highlighted in Chapter 4. Steve Harris should have information on these projects as well as new ones. Tera asked that the committee read through the hazard chapters and provide comments by October 19th.

Prioritization of the projects is a key component in the development of the CWPP. Tera provided an example of a numerical scoring system as one possible method. She also explained that it was the committee’s decision on how to go about prioritizing projects. After an in-depth discussion and working through a couple examples, the committee agreed that a numerical scoring system would be better than a more subjective method. Tera said she would work on prioritizing all of the projects for review at the October meeting.

Tera will also have the Appendices and Executive Summary prepared for review at the October meeting.

**Agenda Item #3 – Schedule:**

Tera explained that most of the information gathering phase was complete. It was now the committee’s job to review the document and provide edits. In order to complete the plan ahead
of the 2008 grant deadline, Tera explained that the committee would have to stick to a fairly tight schedule outlined as follows:

Committee Review Ends – October 25th
Public Review Phase – October 29th – November 23rd
Submit to EMD – December 1st

Agenda Item #4 – Adjournment:
The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3 pm.
The next MHMP meeting will be held on October 25th at 1 pm at the USDA Service Center in Colville (same place).
The next CWPP meeting will be held on October 25th at 10 am at the USDA Service Center in Colville (same place).

2.3.1.1.5 October 25th, 2007 – USDA Service Center

Agenda Item #1 – Introduction:
Tera began the meeting by welcoming the committee members and passing around the sign in sheet and review materials.

Agenda Item #2 – Community Wildfire Protection Plan Draft Review:
Tera walked through all of the new information in the draft plan since the last meeting. The biggest addition was the inclusion of the prioritization rankings and the completed Appendices containing all of the maps. Tera asked that the committee spend some time reviewing the projects and checking to see if they agree with the way they were ranked. All comments need to be sent to Tera immediately.

Agenda Item #3 – Public Review:
Tera reviewed the public review process and handed out a draft press release. The committee decided that hardcopies of the drafts would be sent to all of the county libraries as well as city halls and the County Land Services office. Clay will also be posting the documents on the county website. Tera and Clay will work on sending a letter to all of the original committee members letting them know that the public review phase has started and the documents are open for any comments. The letter will also contain information on how to obtain a copy if they wish to have their own.
Tera will revise the press release based on the committee’s comments and send it to Clay for distribution to all of the county media outlets.

Agenda Item #4 – Schedule:
The committee revised the completion schedule slightly to adjust for Thanksgiving and other meetings.
Committee Review Ends – October 25th
Public Review Phase – October 31st – November 30th
Submit to EMD – December 7th

Agenda Item #5 – Adjournment:
The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11am
The next meeting will occur jointly with the MHMP committee and will be held on December 5th at 1 pm at the USDA Service Center in Colville (same place).

2.4 Public Involvement

Public involvement in this plan was made a priority from the inception of the project. There were a number of ways that public involvement was sought and facilitated. In some cases this led to members of the public providing information and seeking an active role in protecting their own homes and businesses, while in other cases it led to the public becoming more aware of the process without becoming directly involved in the planning.

2.4.1 News Releases

Under the auspices of the Stevens County planning committee, news releases were submitted to the Deer Park Tribune, the Huckleberry Press, The Outpost, the Statesman Examiner, and The Independent. Informative flyers were also distributed around towns and to local offices within the communities.

Figure 2.1. Press Release sent on May 31st, 2007.

Stevens County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Project Underway!

The planning process has been launched to complete a Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan for Stevens County as part of the FEMA Pre-Disaster Mitigation program. The Stevens County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan will include risk analysis at the community level with predictive models for where disasters such as floods, landslides, wildfire, earthquakes, severe weather, and terrorism are likely to occur. The project, entirely funded by a grant from the State of Washington and FEMA, will enable Stevens County to be eligible for grant dollars in the future to implement projects and mitigation identified in the MHMP. The completion of this Plan will also enable the county and cities in Stevens County to be eligible for monies in the event of a disaster. Although not a regulatory document, it will provide valuable information as we plan for the future.

Northwest Management, Inc. has been retained by Stevens County to provide risk assessments, mapping, field inspections, interviews, and to collaborate with the committee to author the plan. The coordinating team includes fire districts, land managers, elected officials, county departments, local agencies, community members and others. Northwest Management will conduct analyses and work with the committee to formulate recommendations for potential treatments that will mitigate loss potential from various natural and man-made hazards.

One of the first steps in gathering information about risk in the county is to conduct a homeowner’s survey. The planning committee will be mailing a brief survey to randomly selected homeowners in the county seeking details about home construction and landscape materials, proximity to water sources, and past experiences with hazards in the county. This survey is very important to the success of the plan and will only be sent to a small sample of county residents. Those homes that receive a survey are asked to please take the time to complete it thereby benefiting the community overall.

The planning team will also be conducting public meetings to discuss preliminary findings and to seek public involvement in the planning process. For more information on the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan project in Stevens County contact Stevens County Land Services Director, Clay White, at (509) 684-8325.
2.4.2 Public Mail Survey

In order to collect a broad base of perceptions about a variety of hazards and individual risk factors of homeowners in Stevens County, a mail survey was conducted. This survey included wildland fire as well as flood, landslide, earthquake, severe weather, and terrorism. Approximately 264 residents of Stevens County were randomly selected to receive a mail survey.

The public mail survey developed for this project has been used in the past by Northwest Management, Inc., during the execution of other Mitigation Plans. The survey used The Total Design Method (Dillman 1978) as a model to schedule the timing and content of letters sent to the selected recipients. Copies of each cover letter, mail survey, and communication are included in Appendix II.

The first in the series of mailings was sent July 26, 2007, and included a cover letter, a survey, and an offer of receiving a custom GIS map of the area of their selection in Stevens County if they would complete and return the survey. The free map incentive was tied into assisting their community and helping their interests by participating in this process. Each letter also informed residents about the planning process. A return self-addressed envelope was included in each packet. A postcard reminder was sent to the non-respondents on August 7, 2007, encouraging their response. A final mailing, with a revised cover letter pleading with them to participate, was sent to non-respondents on August 15, 2007.

Surveys were returned during the months of July, August, and September. A total of 110 residents responded to the survey as of September 24, 2007. The effective response rate for this survey was 42%. Statistically, this response rate allows the interpretation of all of the response variables significantly at the 99% confidence level.

2.4.2.1 Survey Results

A summary of the survey’s results will be presented here and then referred back to during the ensuing discussions on the need for various treatments, education, and other information.

Of the 110 respondents in the survey, about 65% said their property in Stevens County was their primary residence. Approximately 20% of respondents were from the Suncrest area, 16% were from both Colville and Chewelah, 14% were from Loon Lake, 7% were from Kettle Falls, and 4% were from each of Tum Tum, Valley, Arden, and Ford with the remaining from other communities in Stevens County at a rate of approximately 1-2%.

The vast majority of the respondents (97%) correctly identified that they have emergency telephone 911 services in their area. Approximately 84% responded that their property is within a city or rural fire department, 4% said they were not protected by a fire department, and 12% said they didn’t know if they were or not.

The average driveway length of respondents to the survey was 1,279 feet long (0.2 miles). The longest reported was 6 miles. 62% of respondents said that they maintain a plowed driveway of an average width of 14.5 feet in the winter time. Of those respondents (32%) having a driveway with an overhead obstruction, the average height of the obstruction was approximately 17.4 feet. The lowest obstruction reported was 10 feet. 55% of respondents indicated that their driveways were mostly flat; however, 39% indicated a moderate grade and 6% said their driveway was steep enough to require 4-wheel drive during adverse conditions. Of those respondents (36%) with a driveway over a quarter of a mile long, 12% do not have turnouts allowing two vehicles to pass. When asked what type of surfacing material was on their driveways, 20% responded that their driveway was paved, 55% said gravel, and 25% indicated
Approximately 69% of the respondents indicated their address was clearly visible from the nearest public road and 13% said that they had a water source such as a pond or stream on their property.

Survey recipients were asked to report emergency services training received by members of the household. Their responses are summarized in Table 2.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Training</th>
<th>Percent of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wildland Firefighting</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or Rural Firefighting</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMT (Emergency Medical Technician)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic First Aid/ CPR</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search and Rescue</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked if their home, property, or business was located in a place that put it at risk to a hazard, 73% indicated that their property was at risk from wildfires, 7% were at risk from floods, 33% were at risk from earthquakes, 11% were at risk from landslides, 72% were at risk from severe weather, and 15% were at risk from terrorism or civil unrest. Several respondents also listed power lines, neighbors, train derailment, and trees as potential hazards. When asked if their property was in a FEMA designate Flood Hazard Area, only 2% of respondents said that it was.

Residents were asked to indicate which, if any, of the disasters listed in Table 2.2 have affected their home, property, or business within Stevens County during the past 10 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Percent of respondents reporting hazard occurrence during the period 1996-2006, near their home.</th>
<th>If YES, complete these questions...</th>
<th>Percent of respondents reporting damage to their home.</th>
<th>Percent of respondents reporting damage to their property.</th>
<th>Percent of respondents reporting damage to their business.</th>
<th>Approximate average damage caused by each hazard (during the period 1993-2003)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$1,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Weather</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$3,129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism / Civil Unrest</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked if their phone service was disabled, would they have an alternate form of communication; 69% said they did. Of those, 99% said they had cell phone, 11% had a satellite phone, 21% had a CB, and 30% had two radios. Additionally, respondents were asked if they had an alternate power source in the event that their electrical service was interrupted; 36% said they did.
When asked how long respondents expected emergency service to respond to their homes, the average response for medical services was 17 minutes, the average response time for fire protection services was 15 minutes, and the average response for law enforcement was 20 minutes.

Finally, respondents were asked “If offered in your area, would members of your household attend a free or low cost, one-day training seminar designed to share with homeowners how to reduce the potential for casualty loss surrounding your home?” Almost half, 49% of respondents indicated a desire to participate in this type of training with 54% preferring a weekday rather than a weekend.

Homeowners were also asked, “How Hazard Mitigation projects should be funded in the areas surrounding homes, communities, and infrastructure such as power lines and major roads?” Responses are summarized in Table 2.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>100% Public Funding</th>
<th>Cost-Share (Public &amp; Private)</th>
<th>Privately Funded (Owner or Company)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Defensibility Projects</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Defensibility Projects</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Projects Roads, Bridges, Power Lines, Etc.</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.4.3 Public Meetings

Public meetings were scheduled in a variety of communities in Stevens County during the hazard assessment phase of the planning process. Public meetings were scheduled to share information on the planning process, inform details of the hazard assessments, and discuss potential mitigation treatments. Attendees at the public meetings were asked to give their impressions of the accuracy of the information generated and provide their opinions of potential treatments.

The initial schedule of public meetings included five locations in the County and were attended by a number of individuals on the committee and from the general public. Total attendance was as follows: 4 at Hunters, 3 at Chewelah, 11 at Marble, 10 at Kettle Falls, and 10 at Clayton. The public meeting announcement was sent to the local newspapers and distributed by committee members. A sample of the flyer is included below in Figure 2.2.
Figure 2.2. Public meeting announcement for August 2007 meetings.

Stevens County, Washington
Multi - Hazard Mitigation Plan
Public Meetings!

August 7th: Hunters - Columbia School Cafeteria at 1 pm (4961 B Hunters Shop Road)
            Chewelah - City Hall at 6 pm (302 East Clay)

August 8th: Marble - Marble Community Church Building at 1 pm (3383 Highway 25 North)
            Kettle Falls - American Legion Hall at 6 pm (1057 Highway 395 North)

August 9th: Clayton - Fire District #1 Station at 6 pm (4532 Railroad Avenue)

The Stevens County Multi - Hazard Mitigation Plan steering committee is
holding public meetings throughout the County to obtain YOUR input and
knowledge about the potential risks of hazards that may affect your community.
This will aid in the County's effort to identify hazard mitigation treatments,
resource enhancement, and preparedness for disasters. In addition, the
meetings will include a slideshow presentation on the planning process and
identified hazards as well as one-on-one time with hazard mitigation specialists
and the committee members.

Each meeting will last approximately 1.5 hours.

Learn about the assessments of flood, landslides, earthquake, severe
weather, wildfire, and terrorism/civil unrest in Stevens County.
Discuss YOUR priorities for how our communities can best mitigate these
risks.

Strong public involvement will result in an
effective Stevens County Plan.
Please come and participate!

For more information on the Multi - Hazard Mitigation Plan project in Stevens County,
contact the Stevens County Land Services Director, Clay White, at (509) 684-8325 or
Tera King at Northwest Management, Inc. (208) 883-4488.
The following slideshow was presented at each of the public meetings by Tera King of Northwest Management, Inc. In addition, where possible, a fire district or other planning committee representative opened the meeting with a brief introduction.

Table 2.4. Public meeting slide show.
Slide 9

Cascadia earthquake sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Affected area</th>
<th>Max. Size</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subduction Zone</td>
<td>WA, OR, CA</td>
<td>M 9</td>
<td>500-600 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great American Plateau</td>
<td>WA, OR, CA</td>
<td>M 7+</td>
<td>300-400 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascadia Fault</td>
<td>WA, OR, CA</td>
<td>M 7+</td>
<td>Hundreds of yr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slide 10

Map of Washington showing the Colville and Spokane River basins.

Slide 11

Preparedness
- Emergency Services
- Fire Protection
- Weather Impacts
- Flood Protection Program
- Tornadoes
- Earthquakes
- Landslide Readiness
- Hospital Protection
- EAP Readiness

Slide 12

Graphs showing the Colville River data from 1920-2015 and the Spokane River data from 1940-2006.

Slide 13

Types of Projects
- E&I Features
  - Drainage improvements, construction projects, types of bridge, road, pipes, pump stations, monitoring, etc.
- Emergency Features
  - E&I improvements
    - Floodplains
    - Floodway capacity
  - Emergency Response Needs
    - Items: equipment, materials, staging, etc.
- Other Features
  - Parking
  - Indexing
  - Other features: pavers, public access, etc.

Slide 14

Traffic on a rural road with a sign indicating a bridge over a river.

Slide 15

Traffic on a rural road with a sign indicating a bridge over a river.

Slide 16

Public Involvement
- Press releases about planning efforts
- Informational sessions
- Public Mail Survey was sent to about 250 households in the county
- Public Meetings X5
- Public Review of the DRAFT Plan will be facilitated once all sections have been completed and reviewed by the committee.
2.4.4 Documented Review Process

Review and comment on this plan has been provided through a number of avenues for the committee members as well as the members of the general public.

During regularly scheduled committee meetings in 2007, the committee met to discuss findings, review mapping and analysis, and provide written comments on draft sections of the document. During the public meetings, attendees observed map analyses, photographic collections, discussed general findings from the community assessments, and made recommendations on potential project areas.

The first draft of the document was prepared after the public meetings and presented to the committee at the August 23\textsuperscript{rd}, 2007 meeting for full committee review. The completed draft document was released for public review on October 31\textsuperscript{st}, 2007. The public review period remained open until November 30\textsuperscript{th}, 2007.

2.4.5 Continued Public Involvement

Stevens County is dedicated to involving the public directly in review and updates of this Community Wildfire Protection Plan. The Stevens County Commissioners, through the CWPP Steering Committee, are responsible for the annual review and update of the plan as recommended in the “Administration and Implementation Strategy” section of this document.

The public will have the opportunity to provide feedback about the Plan annually on the anniversary of the adoption of this plan at a meeting of the County Commissioners. Copies of the Plan will be kept at the Stevens County Building Department. The Plan also includes the address and phone number of the County Land Services Director, responsible for keeping track of public comments on the Plan.

A public meeting will also be held as part of each annual evaluation or when deemed necessary by the Steering Committee. The meetings will provide the public a forum for which they can express concerns, opinions, or ideas about the Plan. The County Commissioner's Office will be responsible for using County resources to publicize the annual meetings and maintain public involvement through the County webpage and newspapers.