

BLM
FIRE PLANNING,
FUELS MANAGEMENT,
AND
COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE

STATE

EVALUATION GUIDE

FEBRUARY 2014

(This page intentionally left blank)

Table of Contents

Purpose and Intent 5

Schedules and Cycles 6

 State Review Schedule 8

 Annual Evaluation Cycle..... 8

Roles and Responsibilities..... 9

 Evaluation Program Manager:..... 9

 Team Lead/Co-lead: 9

 State Liaison: 10

 Program Area Evaluators: 11

 Documentation Coordinator: 12

 Other Team Members:..... 12

Interview Process 13

Standards, Findings and Reports..... 13

Standards and Key Points 13

 Guidelines for Rating Standards (Findings)..... 13

Evaluation Report..... 14

 Comments on Standards/Findings 15

Guidance for State Response to Draft Report 15

Evaluation Standards and Key Points by Evaluation Area 16

 Fire Planning and Decision Support (FP/DS)..... 16

 Hazardous Fuels Management..... 21

 Prevention/Trespass..... 27

References..... 30

Attachment 1 – Information for State Liaison 31

Attachment 2 – Travel Schedule Example..... 33

Attachment 3 – Example of FRCC Tabular Format 34

Attachment 4 – Evaluation Checklists..... 35

(This page intentionally left blank)

Overview of the Evaluation Program

Purpose and Intent

The Fire and Aviation, Fire Planning and Fuels Management (FPFM) Division conducts annual evaluations of the Fire Planning, Fuels Management, and Community Assistance Programs in accordance with BLM 1240 - Evaluation Program (Note: the Community Assistance Program includes the functional areas of mitigation and education, prevention and trespass). Evaluation of the fire management programs is important to Congress, the Office of Management and Budget, the Department of the Interior (DOI), and Bureau of Land Management because of the high level of investment in projects and planning activities. The evaluations focus on how well the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) fire management program protects communities and their values, resources, comply with laws and regulations, produce reliable program and financial information for decision-making, and achieve program performance goals.

The evaluations assess program development and execution, including topics such as project prioritization, Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP), Fire Management Plan (FMP), and Land Use Plan (LUP) development, Geographical Information Systems (GIS), collaboration, integration of fire and resource programs, budget, performance, policy compliance, Wildland Fire Management Information (WFMI), Wildland Fire Decision Support System (WFDSS), Financial and Business Management System (FBMS), Performance Management Data System (PMDS), and National Fire Plan Operations and Reporting System (NFPORS) reporting and monitoring. Emphasis is placed on determining if adequate controls are in place to ensure policy is implemented effectively.

The hazardous fuels reduction, fire planning and community assistance (mitigation and education, prevention and trespass) programs are dynamic and complex with varying social, political and resource pressures at local, state, and national levels. Since the implementation of the National Fire Plan in 2001, policies, priorities, and processes have continued to evolve. The evaluation process provides an opportunity for direct exchange of information between the national and local/state offices. The identification of best management practices recognizes innovation within the programs and facilitates the exchange of ideas between states.

The evaluation objectives are met through a combination of data and document reviews, interviews, and discussions with appropriate stakeholders. These stakeholders include field/district managers, resource and/or fire planners, hazardous fuels specialists, mitigation, education and prevention specialists, resource specialists, community and interagency partners, and local and state managers.

The State Director may request the evaluation team provide additional information about specific aspects of the program, as time allows, and within the scope of the evaluation.

Recent Updates and Additional Information

- Evaluations primarily look at the three preceding years; however, in some instances, the team assesses how new policies are being implemented.

- 2010 was the first year that some State Director in-briefs were conducted via conference call.
 - All present felt this was an effective shift, as it allowed teams to maximize the time available in the field and reduced travel costs.
 - The state office leadership appeared satisfied with the conference call approach, as well. This does require the team to schedule time to meet with the state office staff prior to completing the evaluation.
- In 2011, due to a potential government shutdown, one scheduled in-state evaluation was cancelled. The evaluation was, subsequently, conducted via video teleconferencing and webinar. This new approach, while not as desirable as an in-person evaluation, was considered successful by all relevant parties. Due to sequestration impacts, this approach was used for all states in 2013 with mixed feedback; however, the consensus was that the reviews need to continue and if they can be conducted in-person that is the preferred method for a myriad of reasons. Therefore, all efforts will be made to conduct in-person, on-site evaluations based on the formatted presented in this document.
 - Review teams will be smaller in format with a Team Lead, and representation from Fuels Management, Fire Planning, Community Assistance, and Budget.
 - Reviews will be more focused with smaller teams and in most cases only able to see examples within a state vs, being able send the Evaluation Team throughout the entire state.
 - State can request to have a virtual evaluation.
- There is a need to tie to previous evaluations and the results. Teams need to dedicate time and effort toward determining if states implemented the actions identified.
- Site visits are and will continue to be an important part of the evaluation process, as they allow the field to showcase their work. Site visits provide opportunities for in-person conversations and direct access by the National Office to view on-the-ground program accomplishments. As previously mentioned, due to sequestration impacts, District/Field Offices will be encouraged to showcase their programs via webinar in 2013 as smaller review teams will not be able to visit entire state.
- This evaluation guide provides information about standard operating procedures so that team members and offices being evaluated know what to expect.
- This evaluation guide provides guidance on payment of costs. The National Office normally covers travel expenses for core team members, except for those participating from other National Office program staffs (e.g., WO resources staff) or additional team members from States intended to provide exposure to evaluation process and assist with the evaluation. State/local offices are responsible for all in-state labor costs. The National Office does not pay overtime for evaluation purposes, but may authorize compensatory time in-lieu of. The local/state offices are also responsible for any in-state compensatory time.

Schedules and Cycles

Evaluations are conducted on a rotating schedule, with three states being evaluated in a given year. Beginning in 2004, the FPFM office and BLM Operations have coordinated the FPFM and

preparedness reviews to reduce the annual impact on states. Each state's fuels/fire planning/community assistance programs will be evaluated every fourth year, based on the following table:

State Review Schedule

Preparedness	Com Assist / Fuels/ Planning						
2004		2005		2006		2007	
AK	CA	AZ	MT	ES	AZ	CO	AK
CA	NM	OR	OR	ID	CO	MT	ID
WY	UT	UT		NM	NV	NV	WY
				OF&A			
2008		2009		2010		2011	
AK	NM	AZ	CA	ES	AK	CO	AZ
CA	OR	OR	CO	ID	MT	MT	OR
WY	UT	UT	NV	NM	WY	NV	UT
				OF&A			
2012		2013		2014		2015	
AK	ES	AZ	CO	ES	AK	CO	AZ
CA	ID	OR	MT	ID	CA	MT	OR
WY	NM	UT	NV	NM	WY	NV	UT
				OF&A			
2016		2017		2018		2019	
AK	ES	AZ	CO	ES	AK	CO	AZ
CA	ID	OR	MT	ID	CA	MT	OR
WY	NM	UT	NV	NM	WY	NV	UT
				OF&A			

Annual Evaluation Cycle

The National Office initiates the evaluation process by working with the selected states to identify a week in the spring for the evaluation. This information is included in an information memorandum (IM) to the State Director.

The table below represents the approximate annual evaluation cycle. The actual date of the visit to each state will vary based on state and National Office schedules.

Jan	Send IM to State Fire Management Officer (FMO) and schedule evaluation
Feb - Mar	Provide the states with the list of required documents for assessment by the National Office program leads and evaluation team members
Mar - May	On-site visit
April - June	Draft report to state (30 days from visit)
May - July	State response to draft report (30 days from receipt) FPFM review of evaluation process, guidance and checklists
June - Aug	Final report from National Office (30 days from receipt)
Sept - Dec	Monitoring of state and FPFM action items

Recommended time lines for an individual state evaluation:

Eight weeks before	Teams are identified
Six weeks before	Team lead provides state with list of requested documents Team lead and state lead work out itinerary FPFM pull data from national systems of record
Four weeks before	All documents from the state have been received by the evaluation team
One week before	Final conference call with team/state lead
On-site visit	
Four weeks after	Draft report to state
Eight weeks after	State response to FPFM
Twelve weeks after	Final report to state

Roles and Responsibilities

Evaluation Program Manager:

FA-600, Fire Planning, Fuels and Community Assistance, is responsible for the State Evaluation Program. These responsibilities include:

- Coordinating with states for available dates for evaluation
- Issuing the IM to the State Directors
- Identifying state liaison
- Identifying team leads and team members
 - Ensure competence, consistency, impartiality and ethical practice of team members
 - Ensure team members have the appropriate skills and knowledge for the job
 - Coordinating Fire Director approval of teams
- Assisting the team leads with pre-evaluation assessments
- Consultation during evaluations
- Ensuring reports are completed in a timely manner

Team Lead:

The team lead is generally a FPFM staff member who is familiar with the goals and objectives of the evaluation program. This person may or may not be responsible for a program area checklist. Because of recent and continued reductions in travel budgets, smaller evaluation teams have been used and fewer field office on-site visits have been conducted. However, all offices within a state are assessed remotely using national-level information and information provided by state and field offices.

The team lead is responsible for coordinating the pre and post work. Prior to the evaluation, the team lead works with the state liaison to coordinate the pre-evaluation exchange of information and documents, and the logistics of the evaluation. This includes:

- Scheduling pre-evaluation conference calls with state and team members
- Determining which field offices will be visited

- Collecting state provided documentation
- Scheduling pre- and post-evaluation meetings with the State Director and/or FMO or their designee
- Identify staff, managers, and partners the team would like to meet with

During the evaluation, the team lead:

- Designates a co-lead for the second team, if utilized
- Provides background and intent to the State Director, state FMO, state fuels specialist, field office/district staff, interagency and community partners
- Conducts an in- and out-briefing with the State Director, state FMO, state fuels specialist, etc.
- Meets with the team each evening to review the days findings
 - For states with two evaluation teams, this will require conference calls
 - Resolves questions or confusion about the evaluation process
 - Assists team members with consolidating findings
- Ensures team members provide their write-ups to the team lead
- Assists the team with the preparation of the initial draft report
- Presents the results and draft report to the State Director and staff
 - Allows each area specialist to present their findings as appropriate
- Coordinates any specific requests by the State Director and provides feedback

After the evaluation, the team lead:

- Works with team members to finalize the initial findings report for the state
- Reviews the state's responses to recommendations
 - Coordinates with appropriate team members to ensure the response addresses the issues identified
 - Provides additional recommendations if necessary
 - Ensures the report is formatted correctly
- Coordinates National Office issues identified in the evaluation
 - Provides feedback to the appropriate program area
 - Coordinates the national response
 - Ensures this is documented in the final report
- Finalizes the report and routes it to the Deputy Assistant Director, NIFC, for signature
- Ensures the state and national action items are entered in the evaluation tracking log for review throughout the year

State Liaison:

The state liaison coordinates the schedule, travel, lodging, and meeting rooms for the evaluation team. Often this will be the state fuels lead or another state office staff member. The liaison is welcome to attend the in and out briefs, but attendance is not mandatory. During interviews with managers and staff, the liaison is generally not present. The goal is to insure managers and staffs feel free to discuss issues and if the liaison is present, it could hinder discussion. Based on individual situations, the evaluation team leader will decide whether the liaison can be present. The liaison will not be included in nightly team meetings.

The liaison may be asked to provide or arrange for the following (see Attachment 1):

- Secure government vehicles for transportation when possible
- Coordinate hotel reservations
- Provide detailed travel schedules and driving times/distances (see Attachment 2)
- Schedule conference/interview rooms in all offices visited
- Ensure appropriate staff, managers and partners are available in each office visited including but not limited to:
 - Fire planner and/or resource planner
 - Fuels
 - Resources
 - Fire Management Officer
 - Budget
 - Contracting / procurement
 - Managers
- Ensure identified documentation is available for review in each office visited
- Schedule interviews with outside contacts
- Coordinate project site visits where appropriate

Program Area Evaluators:

These are individuals with program area expertise who can:

- Evaluate the effectiveness of programs and processes
- Evaluate the completeness/accuracy of documentation
- Make recommendations for improvements
- Identify best management practices

During the evaluation, evaluators are responsible for:

- Conducting interviews and review of associated documents
- Documenting their findings for each office clearly so the results can be rolled up to the state level
- Documenting areas where national direction or guidance is lacking or unclear
- Assisting the documentation coordinator with the draft report
- Maintain a record of individuals interviewed/consulted

After the evaluation, evaluators are responsible for:

- Providing clarification or additional information for the initial report
- Reviewing the state's response to recommendations
- Providing feedback to the FPFM staff about the evaluation process and making recommendations for improvement

Documentation Coordinator:

It is helpful to have one person designated as the point of coordination for documentation during the evaluation. This person should be proficient with office applications to consolidate input from team members. Some familiarity with the programs being evaluated is helpful but not absolutely necessary. This role provides an excellent learning opportunity. This individual can attend interviews, field trips, and team conferences before, during, and after the evaluation. As the hub for documentation, he/she sees all the findings and should be encouraged to inquire about results and make suggestions to improve the quality of the report. The documentation coordinator may be a team member, may travel to meet the team the last day or two, or could be from a local/state office.

This person is responsible for:

- Consolidating findings
- Formatting the draft report for the out-brief
- Assisting team members, as needed

Other Team Members:

Additional team members may participate as a learning opportunity or to address a specific area of interest within a state's program. These team members may not have a specific checklist they are responsible for but can provide valuable information to the team, state and National Office to improve program effectiveness.

State Office Staff:

The state office staff will provide to the evaluation team the following:

- An overview of the fuels, community assistance, trespass, prevention, and fire planning within the state
- Any state-specific guidance and direction they have issued to field offices
- Procedures and controls in place to assure compliance with BLM procedures and policies
- Access to state office fire and resources staff involved in the fuels, planning, and community assistance programs (e.g., fuels specialists, resource specialists, etc.)
- Access to appropriate budget and finance documents

Field/District Office Staff:

Field/District office staff will provide to the evaluation team the following:

- Information requested ahead of time (National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents; copies of or electronic access to land use plans, FMPs, Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPP) and project-level plans, etc.)
- An overview of the fuels, fire planning, and community assistance programs within their office (this is often provided via a 30-45 minute power-point presentation of field office processes, organizational structure, and program activities and accomplishments)
- Access to fire and resources staff involved in the fuels, planning, and community assistance programs (e.g., fuels specialists, wildlife and range biologists, NEPA coordinators)

- Access any on-site documents needed by the evaluation team

Interview Process

In general, interviews will be conducted in a group setting with all evaluators present. This will facilitate group discussion and provide opportunities for evaluators to determine how the specific program area is incorporated into the business practices of the office.

There may be specific discussions that an evaluator will want to have outside of the group. This may become apparent as a result of group discussion. The evaluator should coordinate with the team/co-lead to ensure time is made available for individual discussions.

Standards, Findings and Reports

Standards and Key Points

The evaluation utilizes standards and key points to indicate program effectiveness. Ratings are provided at the standard level. Standards are based on policy and national guidance which represent basic components of the program. Key points provide criteria for assessment and/or specific areas or patterns to evaluate that help determine if a standard is met, partially met, or not met. In general, if all key points meet expectations, the standard is considered met.

Evaluation of standards and key points is inherently subjective. Each state has unique issues that affect their program and how it is implemented. Therefore, as a program is evaluated, team members should focus on understanding the processes in place within an office or state. This includes identifying the environmental, budgetary, social, and political influences that have shaped the processes. From this perspective, the evaluator can determine if the processes and controls effectively address national policy and guidance. Few processes are rigidly defined at a national level, however, where specific documents, systems or formats are required, compliance can be assessed.

Each state is requested to provide documentation prior to the team's arrival in-state. This information, along with data from national reporting systems, will be used to identify focus areas for the evaluation. Questions or concerns about the data or documentation provide opportunities for discussion between the evaluation team and the state/field office staff.

Checklists are used in each program area to assist during the evaluation. The checklist provides the standard, any key points, and an indicator for "Met," "Partially Met," and "Did Not Meet."

Guidelines for Rating Standards (Findings)

Findings should be reported in a manner that distinguishes objective findings, opinions, judgments, and speculation. Findings should be reporting clearly, completely, and fairly.

Findings within a field office/district:

- Met - all key points were met, or the office demonstrated compliance with the standard
- Partially Met - most key points were met, or some modifications would bring the office into compliance with the standard

- Did Not Meet - the majority (>50%) of key points were not met, or there were significant gaps that rendered a process ineffective

Evaluation checklists may be used to assist the evaluator in determining if the field/district office meets a standard.

Overall findings for the state:

- Met - all field/district offices evaluated met the standard
- Partially Met - some, but not all, field/district offices evaluated met the standard
- Did Not Meet - the majority (>50%) of field offices evaluated did not meet the standard

A finding of “Met” does not require any recommendations or a response from the state. However, an evaluator may include comments about his/her findings or “suggestions for enhancement,” if desired.

A finding of “Partially Met” or “Did Not Meet” must include recommendations from the evaluator to bring the standard into compliance.

Evaluation Report

The Evaluation Report is a three-phased process. Initially, a preliminary draft report is provided to the State Director at the on-site out brief. The National Office has 30-45 days to finalize the draft and formally transmit it to the state for response. Once the state receives the draft report, they have 30 days to respond to the recommendations. For recommendations “partially met”, or “not met,” the state normally identifies in their response to the draft report, actions (or an action plan) they will take to address program deficiencies.

The state returns the draft report to the National Office who reviews the state’s response. If necessary, the FPFM staff at the National Office will discuss the state’s responses for further clarification. If the state’s response and the actions proposed to address deficiencies are determined to be sufficient, the report is finalized and the state does not need to identify any additional actions to address deficiencies. If the state did not identify, in their response to the draft report, appropriate actions to address “partially met” or “not met” standards, they must do so following issuance of the final report. When the final report is issued by the National Office, the transmittal memo will identify whether the state needs to identify any additional actions to address program deficiencies.

The report has six segments:

- **Introduction:** Briefly explain the purpose and intent of the evaluation, the dates of the evaluation, and the offices visited.
- **Executive Summary:** A summarization of the findings includes a section for each major evaluation area.

- **Statewide Evaluation Findings and Recommendations:** A review of each standard with an indication of findings. Specific comments included here are defined below.
- **Associated Findings and Observations:** This area is available for additional comments that may general in nature or related to multiple standards.
- **National Office Follow-up Items:** Throughout the evaluation, state and district/field office staff may identify areas where national direction or processes are insufficient or outdated. These should be documented by the evaluation team and addressed by the National Office in the final report back to the state. These issues will be tracked in the evaluation tracking log to ensure the identified actions are completed. In addition, these items will be made available on the FPFM website for other states to review.
- **Team Members:** List of team members

Comments on Standards/Findings

Evaluators may provide comments on any standard, regardless of the finding. For standards that were identified as “Partially Met” or “Did Not Meet,” the evaluator must clearly and succinctly describe the issues that lead to the finding. Comments should be factual and describe what was observed.

- **Recommendations:** Recommendations must be made for each standard that is rated “Partially Met” or “Did Not Meet.” The evaluator should provide clear guidance for the state to bring the standard into compliance. When responding to the draft evaluation report, the state must provide a plan and timeframes to address the issues identified. This information will be tracked at the National Office and will be reviewed periodically for completion. These standards will be reviewed at the next state evaluation to determine the effectiveness of the state’s action.
- **Suggestions for Enhancement:** Regardless of the finding, evaluators may include Suggestions for Enhancement. These suggestions are intended to promote excellence, facilitate collaboration, or identify additional resources that may be of assistance. States are not required to respond to Suggestions for Enhancement, nor will the implementation of suggestions be tracked at a national level.
- **Best Management Practice:** Evaluators have the opportunity to identify practices, procedures or tools that exceed expectations and increase efficiencies or effectiveness. This recognizes the work of individuals or groups and provides a means of sharing these ideas throughout the program. These practices will be made available on the Fire and Aviation Directorate (FAD) website for other states to review.

Guidance for State Response to Draft Report

The state must respond to the Draft Evaluation Report in the following manner (see H-1240 BLM Evaluation Program, Illustration 3):

- **Agreement with finding and recommendation**
 - This is a clear statement that the state agrees with the finding and has or will take action. The state will identify what the action is, who will implement it, how it

will be done, and when it will be done. If the state believes the action is sufficient to close out the recommendation, they should state that.

- **Disagree with all or portions of the finding/recommendation and want to propose an alternative**
 - The state should explain what they agree with and what they disagree with, and why. The proposed alternative(s) should include the action, why, who will be responsible for implementing, and when it will be done. Also include the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed alternative compared to the recommendation.
- **Disagree with finding and/or recommendation**
 - The state must clearly explain why they disagree with and why they will not take the recommended action. Point out where facts, assumptions, etc., in the evaluation report are incorrect. If possible, the explanation should be supported with data and an explanation of the assumptions used to reach this conclusion.

Evaluation Standards and Key Points by Evaluation Area

Fire Planning and Decision Support (FP/DS)

Overview: Fire planning programs are expected to be organized and utilize an interdisciplinary, interagency approach that integrates land use and fire management plan objectives, adequately addresses NEPA on the appropriate scale, and guides wildland fire management responses and the development of hazardous fuels treatments. Offices should focus on collaboration with partners, both public and private; joint funding; and progress toward planning and completing landscape scale projects that address both ecosystem health issues (e.g., sage grouse habitat protection, widespread insect and disease outbreak, and species encroachment) and hazardous fuels reduction needs. Fire planners are critical to effective implementation of multiple decision support processes, applications, and models.

FP/DS Standard 1: Wildland fire management planning activities (FMP and LUP) comply with current land use, fire management planning, NEPA, NHPA, ESA and other appropriate regulations, policies and guidance.

References:

- ❖ M-9211 and H-9211-1 - Fire Planning Manual and Handbook (September 2012)
- ❖ H-1601-1 - Land Use Planning Handbook
- ❖ H-1740-2 - Integrated Vegetation Management Handbook
- ❖ FA IM-2009-011 - Modifications to Federal Wildland Fire Policy Implementation Strategy (2003)
- ❖ FA IM 2009-199 – Direction to discontinue use of Healthy Forests Initiative (HFI) Categorical Exclusion (CX) BLM-wide

- ❖ IM 2012-049 – Direction to discontinue use of Joint Counterpart Regulations
- ❖ The Healthy Forests Initiative and Healthy Forests Restoration Act – Interim Field Guide
- ❖ Instructions for Implementing the Herbicide Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (IM 2008-030)
- ❖ H-1790-1 – NEPA Handbook
- ❖ FA-2011-138 and Red Book Chapter 2 “Sage Grouse Conservation Related to Wildland Fire and Fuels Management” Sage Grouse Habitat Protection
- ❖ FA IM-2009-112 - Updated Guidance for Implementation of Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy

Desired Characteristics: Fire Management Plans (FMP) meet current content and format requirements and are updated or reviewed on an annual basis to address changes in conditions (e.g., large fire in the area, long term drought, etc.) and/or updates to policy (e.g., terminology, best management practices (BMP), etc.).

Resource and fire management objectives should be clearly defined and described in LUPs and FMPs. Objectives should be specific, measureable, and achievable; relate to land use plan goals; and have definite timeframes for achievement, monitoring, and evaluation. Evaluators should look for evidence that these objectives are used to guide wildland fire responses and hazardous fuels treatments. The fire management decision process should clearly reflect the identified resource objectives.

Each state has a unique set of LUP vegetation, fire/fuels, and resource management desired conditions with indicators which help measure attainment. These LUP goals should guide project design and planning processes. Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) is the primary fire ecology indicator of healthy landscapes and should be consistent with LUP vegetation management objectives. Because of this consistency, states are required to describe the fire regimes and condition classes of their lands in FMPs and, more generally, in Land Use Plans.

Offices are following current regulations, policy and guidance. Policy and guidance should be readily available. The staff should be able to explain how information is shared regarding new policy/guidance.

Offices are incorporating standard operating procedures from the Western States Herbicide EIS (June 2007) into project plans and NEPA documents for fuels treatments using herbicides. Offices have processes in place to facilitate timely and efficient State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and ESA consultations. Offices are designing fuels projects to protect existing sage grouse (SG) habitat.

Identification of the processes and disciplines involved shows intent to plan and implement interdisciplinary processes. Discussions with multiple disciplines (wildlife, range, watershed, fuels, etc.) should reveal a mutual understanding and identification of clear processes to ensure appropriate disciplines have input to the planning process. Appropriate funding is applied.

Evaluation Protocols:

- *Review current Land Use Plans (LUPs) and the Fire Management Plan(s) (FMP).*
- *The office will provide access to all supporting documentation related to the treatment(s) and fire(s) along with associated LUP and FMPs.*
- *Evaluators will inspect FMP, LMP to determine if a narrative discussion of FRCC or a tabular summary of FRCC is present. An example of a tabular summary of FRCC is provided in Attachment 3 and H-9211-1 (Fire Planning Handbook).*
- *Discussions of how new policy/guidance has been implemented in the past may indicate how effective processes are.*
- *Discussion of the latest policy/guidance will help determine how quickly information flows.*
- *Reviewers will request that offices explain their fire management strategies and identify what planning documents they reside in (FMP and/or LUP).*
- *The National Office will select at least one fuels project NEPA document, per field office, to review that proposes the use of chemicals to reduce hazardous fuels, has cultural resources that required SHPO consultation, has threatened and endangered species (TES) that required ESA consultation, and has SG habitat present(where applicable).*
- *Evaluators will assess whether the mitigation measures and standard operating procedures from the Herbicide EIS have been incorporated into chemical treatment NEPA documents and decisions (if applicable).*
- *Evaluators will ask field offices to describe their ESA and SHPO consultation processes.*
- *Evaluators will ask field offices to describe how they designed the project to protect SG habitat.*
- *Discussion with staff and management will indicate the role state and/or field level management play in integrating fire and resource programs.*
- *Staff should be able to describe the way management ensures coordination and cooperation is developed and continued between resources, MEP, fire, and fuels to provide fire management direction in LUPs and FMPs.*
- *Staff should be able to describe how LUP and FMP objectives are monitored.*
- *Staff should be able to describe the annual FMP review process and the necessary steps required, if the FMP needs to be amended.*

FP/DS Standard 2: Direction from LUPs and FMPs is accurately employed in WFDSS and applied during wildfire events, FMPs are reviewed and updated appropriately, wildfires are accurately being reported and units are cognizant of fire data/geospatial product importance and quality control.

References:

- ❖ FA IM-2009-021, FA IM-2010-019, FA IM-2011-021, and FA IM-2013-005 (Implementation and use of WFDSS in 2010 to present)
- ❖ 2012 Interagency Standards for Fire and Aviation Operations (Redbook)
- ❖ FA IM-2012-027 Fire Occurrence and History Perimeter: Daily and Final Perimeters Data Standard
- ❖ FA IM-2012-026 Fire Management Planning Areas and Units Data Standards
- ❖ Modifications to Federal Wildland Fire Policy Implementation Strategy (FA IM-2009-011)
- ❖ FA IM-2009-112 Updated Guidance for Implementing Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy
- ❖ FA IM-2010-006 Wildland Fire Accomplishment Reporting
- ❖ Fire Planning Handbook (H-9211-1, Chapter V.B., page 5-1)

Desired Characteristics: Knowledge and effective use of decision support models provides consistent processes for making decisions across the state, bureau and department. Office staff should be aware of these tools to the appropriate degree. The use of decision support systems is increasing and constantly evolving. Evaluators should not expect all staff members to be aware of all decision support tools. In some instances, it may be sufficient if the state office personnel are working with the National Office, and field offices are not extensively involved. However, staff and management should all be acutely aware of the need for quality data. Offices should be able to discuss how they ensure data is complete, accurate and timely in all national systems of record.

The LUPs and FMPs are used to guide the wildfire management response (e.g., suppression strategies are consistent with direction in the LUP/FMP; wildfires managed to achieve resource benefits tie back to resource objectives in the LUP/FMP).

Wildfire events are reported accurately in appropriate reporting systems (e.g., NFPORS, WFDSS).

Examples of decision support tools:

- Wildland Fire Decision Support System (WFDSS)
 - Most people should be familiar with the concept of WFDSS, but it will be most critical to fire planners, management, and operations.
 - For the FPFM state evaluations, reviewers will assess if offices have completed pre-work, which will allow units to use WFDSS for fire documentation.

Verifying the accuracy or completeness of WFDSS wildfire decisions published falls under the purview of the Operations Preparedness Reviews.

- Units must have completed the Data Manager tasks within the WFDSS. This system permission allows users to migrate objectives and constraints from LUPs and FMPs into the WFDSS application.
- Fire Planning Data (GIS and WFMI)
 - Ensure fire occurrence data is input into WFMI and is correct, accurate, and input in a timely manner.
 - Personnel responsible for fire planning activities are working with GIS specialists to create required fire planning GIS data layers (fire polygon, fire planning area, fire planning units).

Evaluation Protocols:

- *Prior to the evaluation, the National Office will examine the production side of the WFDSS application, and determine if data management tasks have been completed. Individual Management Requirements and Strategic Objectives should be entered in the WFDSS system for each FMU. If appropriate data is not in the WFDSS system, the evaluator will follow up with discussions at the FO level.*
- *Assess whether units are striving to meet fire planning GIS data standards.*
- *Assess whether data in source systems is complete, accurate and timely.*
 - *WFMI Fire Reporting*
 - *Does Fire Type/Protection Type (General Reporting Information) = Owner/Origin (Location Data)*
- *Determine whether processes are in place to monitor the response to wildfires; whether that response is consistent with LUPs and FMPs; updates to LUPs and FMPs are accurately documented, and all wildfires are accurately reported. Areas to review:*
 - *Staff should be able to describe and discuss the monitoring procedures used to determine:*
 - *If wildfire suppression responses followed LUP and/or FMP direction.*
 - *If triggers are established (e.g., local BMPs, state IMs, etc.) facilitating the opportunity to make necessary adjustments.*
 - *Whether feedback loops or process checks are in place allowing plans and processes to be modified, if necessary, to incorporate new information and experience.*
 - *Whether fire management responses (suppression, resource benefit actions) for individual FMUs are present in field office run cards or computer aided dispatch (CAD) systems. Reviewer will compare responses in FMP with those stated in run cards and CAD systems.*
 - *The evaluation team will assess:*

- *Whether wildfire events are reported appropriately in NFPORS and documented in WFDSS (e.g. based on post-fire evaluation).*

Hazardous Fuels Management

Overview: A hazardous fuels program should meet national standards, be diverse and robust, with the capacity to plan, implement, and monitor projects which meet BLM and Department priorities. Offices should be:

- Collaborating with partners, both internal and external, including developing projects through interdisciplinary coordination at the field/district office level and simultaneously meeting other resource program and fuels objectives where possible
- Seeking joint funding and planning/implementing projects at the landscape level, across multiple ownerships where wildfire risk is the highest to values
- Planning and completing fuels projects that reduce wildfire risk to communities and their values which include protecting ecosystem values, such as sage grouse habitat, healthy landscapes, and biomass
- Providing community assistance (CA) funding and expertise to high wildfire risk areas for planning (CWPPs), education, hazardous fuels reduction treatments on non-federal land, and other implementation actions aimed at reducing the threat and impact of wildfire.
- integrating resource management priorities with those identified in CWPPs.
- Designing projects that meet objectives and are planned in priority areas outlined by DOI HFPAS, CWPPs, FMPs, LUPs and resource staffs
- Ensuring workforce/skill mix is adequate to ensure interdisciplinary planning, implementation, and monitoring is occurring.

Hazardous Fuels Management Standard 1: Fuels projects are designed and implemented following DOI and BLM guidance and policies in an interdisciplinary/interagency environment.

References:

- ❖ FA IM-2010-012 – Hazardous Fuels and Community Assistance Fiscal Year 2011-2013 Three-Year Program of Work
- ❖ FA IM-2011-020, and Attachment – Office of Wildland Fire Policy Memorandum 2011-1 Department of the Interior Hazardous Fuels Prioritization and Allocation System
- ❖ FA IM-2011-025 – Hazardous Fuels and Community Assistance Fiscal Year 2012-2014 Three-Year Program of Work
- ❖ FA IM-2012-011 – Interim Guidance for Hazardous Fuels Reduction and Community Assistance Program of Work Development – National Fire Plan Operating and Reporting System (NFPORS) Preliminary Inputs Due from States for Fiscal Year (FY) 2013

- ❖ The Healthy Forests Initiative and Healthy Forests Restoration Act – Interim Field Guide (FS-799 February 2004)
- ❖ FA IM-2013-013 Program of Work Guidance
- ❖ Assistant Secretary’s Priority Memorandum – June 1, 2011
- ❖ Handbook – 1740 BLM Integrated Vegetation Management Handbook (Chapters 4-6, 9)
- ❖ Fire Planning Handbook Section 2.1
- ❖ Land Use Planning Handbook Chapter 5
- ❖ Annual Work Plan (AWP) Guidance for the Hazardous Fuels Program – FY2011, FY2012, FY2013
- ❖ WO IM 2010-149 and IM-2011-138 – Sage-grouse Conservation Related to Wildland Fire and Fuels Management
- ❖ FA IM-2010-006 – Wildland Fire Accomplishment Reporting
- ❖ WO IM-2011-115 - Vegetation Treatment Area Data Standard
- ❖ FA IM-2011-026 Implementation Vegetation Treatment Area Data Standards for Hazardous Fuels Treatments
- ❖ FA IM-2012-025 Implementation Vegetation Treatment Area Data Standards for Hazardous Fuels Treatments

Desired Characteristics: An integrated fuels program will reflect input from various resource programs within the Bureau, as well as input from interagency and external partners/stakeholders. Fuels, Fire and Resource staff are aware of BLM guidance and priorities relating to the HFR program.

The BLM Annual Work Plan (AWP) guidance and policies related to fuels management and community assistance, which are consistent with DOI priorities, are followed by units implementing the fuels program. Accomplishments meet targets established in the AWP and reported in NFPORS and PMDS, as required. If targets are not met, rationale is provided. The NFPORS and PMDS data indicates that units are implementing projects with the most current BLM and DOI priority attributes, as well as meeting targets established in the AWP.

Evaluation Protocols:

- *Discussion with fuels, resource staff, and management will indicate the level of interdisciplinary processes and approaches consistent with BLM guidance.*
- *Review of Program of Work (NFPORS data).*
- *The NFPORS and PMDS data will indicate the degree of emphasis on DOI and BLM priorities (see Excel spreadsheets) and determine whether DOI and AWP targets are met at the district and state level.*
- *Assess whether units are striving to meet the vegetation treatment GIS data standard. Staff should be able to describe the process they use to tie project/treatment level objectives to LUP and FMP objectives.*

Hazardous Fuels Management (Community Assistance) Standard 2: Community assistance projects and activities are included in the fuels budgeting process.

References:

- ❖ IM-2005-119 – Use of Federal Funds to Mitigate Wildfire Risks to Communities
- ❖ Annual POW and AWP guidance

Desired Characteristics: Community assistance is an important part of the fire management program and serves as one of the primary connections between the BLM fire management program and local communities. This program can provide a means to complete projects and activities on non-federal lands. Characteristics of a strong community assistance program include identification of state leads in the various sub program areas, state guidance or plans for those areas, and appropriate budgeting, tracking and documentation of funds. The BLM is collaborating with communities and is involved in community activities and projects, including participation on CWPP development. Community assistance projects and activities are identified in a CWPP, or through other collaborative processes.

This program covers a wide variety of sub-program elements. These elements can include a grants/agreements process to move funds to communities and other organizations for projects and activities, rural fire assistance and Ready Reserve programs, fire prevention, fire trespass, and fire education.

Community assistance is part of the overall fuels budgeting process, and community assistance projects/activities are included in the three-year program of work (POW). States and local units have a method for providing justifications for community assistance budgets. For 2009, 2010, and 2011, at least three percent of the states' total WUI fuels project dollars are dedicated to community assistance projects and activities. [Note: For 2012, the AWP guidance directs states to expend a minimum of three percent of each state's total hazardous fuels project dollars on non-treatment community assistance actions (CWPPs, education, etc.)]

Although a mitigation/education specialist is usually the lead for this program, in local or state offices some work elements may be part of "other duties as assigned" for staff in fuels, fire operations, business practices, external affairs or other program areas.

Community assistance activities should be tracked in NFPORS in accordance with the latest policy and guidance.

Evaluation Protocols:

- *Community assistance staff are part of the planning/outreach portion of fuels projects.*

- *A minimum of three percent of the state's total WUI Fuels Project Dollars are allocated toward community assistance activities.*
- *Assess the degree that the education and mitigation programs are integrated into the larger fire and fuels programs.*

Hazardous Fuels Management (Community Assistance) Standard 3: There is a community assistance program in place to work with communities to reduce the threat and impact of wildfire.

References:

- ❖ Annual Work Plan (AWP) Guidance for the Hazardous Fuels Program – FY2011, FY2012, FY2013
- ❖ IM FA-2011-003 – Using Hazardous Fuels Reduction Program Fuels Project Numbers
- ❖ IM FA-2010-018 – Guidance for Providing Assistance for Hazardous Fuels Reduction Activities

Desired Characteristics: As outlined in HFI and HFRA, a collaborative fuels treatment program outlines an interagency approach for prioritizing and selecting fuels projects and treatments at all levels of the organization. A strong program will utilize locally developed CWPPs, or equivalents, where CWPPs are complete. Local units are familiar with CWPPs where BLM lands are priority to treat. Though BLM does not have direct ownership of the CWPP process in most situations, local units are providing expertise and support to communities developing CWPPs, when requested. The WUI projects and community assistance actions are located in areas where CWPPs identify communities at risk, prioritize mitigation projects, and encourage the development of multi-year projects which cross ownership boundaries. Where CWPPs have not been completed, local units are working with their stakeholders to identify treatments in the highest priority areas through a risk assessment process.

Offices have a community assistance program in place that is providing funding and subject matter expertise to communities at risk from wildfire that are in the vicinity of DOI lands. Funding is provided through assistance agreements, contracts or participation in education, planning (CWPP), and mitigation activities by local or State Mitigation and Education specialists.

Areas of high wildfire risk have been identified and are receiving priority consideration for assistance, especially areas where BLM lands present the wildfire risk to a community. Activities identified in CWPPs, or equivalent, are given priority. These activities include education and outreach, planning, and hazardous fuels reduction treatments on non-federal land (mitigation), as well as other actions aimed at reducing the threat and impact of wildfire.

Evaluation Protocols:

- *There is a program/process in place to provide assistance to communities who request help to mitigate the risk and impact of wildfire.*
- *Assess whether community assistance projects and activities are identified in CWPPs, or through an interagency, collaborative effort at the state and/or district level.*
- *Community assistance staff serves as the coordinators for projects and activities on non-federal lands.*
- *Funding is provided to non-government organizations through Assistance Agreements, contracts, or other means for WUI risk reduction projects and activities.*
- *Assess the level of collaboration with local, state, and federal partners to provide assistance to local communities to plan and implement mitigation projects and activities.*

Hazardous Fuels Management Standard 4: Expenditures for the hazardous fuels program follow guidance and policies.

References:

- ❖ Annual Work Plan (AWP) Guidance for the Hazardous Fuels Program – FY 2011, FY 2012, FY 2013
- ❖ IM FA-2012-003 – Using Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project Numbers and Program Elements
- ❖ IM FA-2011-003 – Using Hazardous Fuels Reduction Program Fuels Project Numbers
- ❖ IM FA-2010-018 – Guidance for Providing Assistance for Hazardous Fuels Reduction Activities

Desired Characteristics: Offices have processes in place to ensure hazardous fuels treatments, planning activities, community assistance actions, and “base” is funded appropriately.

Expenditures at the office level follow BLM guidance. Offices are appropriately using project codes when conducting work related to individual projects, including planning and community assistance actions. Project codes PJ02, PJ04, PJ06, and PJ08 are being used appropriately.

Clear processes exist to ensure funds are utilized in accordance with established Bureau and Departmental policies and guidelines. State cost target allocations match those provided by the Bureau. At the NFPORS office level, project dollar allocation totals add up to the state’s total AWP project dollar (one-time) allocation. At year end, final obligations are within 98 percent of cost target allocations at the state level, on a consistent basis.

The FBMS reports show offices are planning to expend and are actually funding projects following guidance and policy. Planned Direct Costs (PDC) are entered in NFPORS during annual planning cycles, including planning activities and community assistance actions. Planned costs, associated with targets, are adequately estimated.

Line officers, budget, procurement, fuels, and resource staff understand the fuels budget allocation process, and clear communication and instructions are provided to those planning and implementing fuels projects. Budget information is clearly communicated in a timely fashion, with evidence of sufficient information flow between the local, state, and National Office.

Evaluation Protocol:

- *The FMBS expenditure reports and PDC in NFPORS show cost target allocations were met at the unit and state level.*
- *Discussion with staff responsible for allocating, procuring, and tracking fuels program expenditures will indicate if policies are being followed.*
- *State and local budget guidance should support national guidance and provide any additional state-specific guidance.*

Hazardous Fuels Management Standard 5: Prescribed fire Program meets Interagency and BLM requirements.

References:

- ❖ Interagency Prescribed Fire Handbook
- ❖ FA IM-2012-005 – Prescribed Fire Policy and Direction

Desired Characteristics: Prescribed fire plans are developed in accordance with the Interagency Prescribed Fire Planning and Implementation Procedures Guide (July 2008 RX Guide) and additional BLM supplemental requirements. Prescribed fire plan preparers, technical reviewers, and approvers are aware of the latest Interagency and BLM prescribed fire guidance.

Evaluation Protocols:

- *Staff interviews with those preparing, technically approving prescribed fire plans are aware of latest Interagency RX Fire Guide and BLM additional standards*
- *State, District and Field Offices have established a sound prescribed fire plan technical review process.*

Hazardous Fuels Management Standard 6: Field offices are completing hazardous fuels project monitoring.

References:

- ❖ M-9211 and H-9211-1 – Fire Planning Manual and Handbook
- ❖ FA IM-2012-021 Guidance for Documenting HFR Program Treatment Effectiveness
- ❖ H-1740-2 Integrated Vegetation Management Handbook (Chapters 4-6, 9)

Desired Characteristics: Processes are in place to provide hazardous fuels project monitoring. Monitoring procedures are in place to ensure projects are implemented as described in planning documents, and to determine if project goals or objectives were achieved. Monitoring is conducted through an interdisciplinary approach. Costs associated with monitoring are properly assessed between fuels and other benefiting activities. Field offices have monitoring programs and/or plans in place that will allow fire and resource managers to determine if the fuels treatment and resource objectives are being met. The timeframe for fire treatment objectives needs to be considered because they may be achieved immediately (i.e., during the course of the prescribed fire or mechanical treatment), or in the long-term (e.g., ecological succession state).

Evaluation Protocols:

- *Staff interviews should reveal that processes are in place to monitor fuels projects/treatment effectiveness to ensure fuels project objectives are being met.*
- *Staff should be able to indicate the funding sources used to monitoring treatments.*
- *Staff is aware of and utilizing Fuels Treatment Effectiveness Monitoring (FTEM) on-line. Evaluator will check the FTEM system to see if the state is utilizing FTEM system to document fuels treatment effectiveness. Protocols are established at the unit and state level for entering data in the future.*

Prevention/Trespass

Overview: Fire prevention is a critical part of the overall fire management program. Although funded out of preparedness dollars, it is included as part of Fuels/Planning/Mitigation review, because national oversight for the prevention program falls under this group. Fire trespass is a collective term used to describe the cost recovery efforts for human-caused fires caused by negligence or intent.

Prevention/Trespass Standard 1: There is a fire prevention program and plan in place to address human-caused fires

References:

- ❖ Interagency Standards for Fire and Aviation Operations (Red Book), Chapter 10 – Fire Prevention/Mitigation: “Fire Programs are required to fund and implement unit level Fire Prevention Plans by completing a wildland mitigation/prevention assessment. The purpose of this is to reduce undesirable human caused ignitions, to reduce damages and losses caused by unwanted wildland fires and to reduce the suppression costs of wildland fires.”
- ❖ Note: IM-2012-014 requires local units to prepare a Mitigation, Education and Prevention Plan by 12/31/12. (Reviewer may want to check if plans are now in place during FY13 review)

Desired Characteristics: A fire prevention program will reflect the human-caused fire issues in the state or local unit. Some units may have a relatively small human-caused fire problem and will have a correspondingly small prevention program.

As part of an effective prevention program, state and local units should have a process in place that ensures fire causes are identified and tracked, and prevention actions and strategies are in place to address these causes. As a foundation for the prevention program, the state and/or local units may have completed an analysis (Risk Assessment and Mitigation Strategies (RAMS) or other method methods) to identify risk (potential for starts), hazards (potential for spread) and values (potential for loss); along with prevention strategies and actions to address these issues. The CWPPs may also be part of the prevention analysis.

Evaluation Protocols:

- *The state has identified a lead for fire prevention (even if it is a collateral duty)*
 - *local units should also have prevention leads.*
- *The state/district has a prevention plan or process that identifies the areas and types of fires that are the cause for unwanted human ignitions.*
- *The plan describes, or the process identifies, the actions needed to address these issues*
- *The prevention program should fit the identified human-caused fire problem(s).*
- *The fire prevention program is included or referenced in the unit Fire Management Plan.*

Prevention/Trespass Standard 2: There is a fire investigation and trespass program in place where all human-caused fire are investigated and cost recovery is pursued, as appropriate.

References:

- ❖ Fire Trespass Handbook – BLM H-9238-1 (6/29/2000)
- ❖ Managing Fire Trespass and Protection Assistance Collections – FA IM-2011-014, Change 1
- ❖ Interagency Standards for Fire and Aviation Operations (Red Book), Chapter 18 – Fire Cause Determination and Trespass Investigation: “Agency policy requires any wildfire to be investigated to determine cause, origin, and responsibility...For all human fires where negligence can be determined, trespass actions are to be taken to recover cost of suppression activities, land rehabilitation, and damages to the resource and improvements.”

Desired Characteristics: The recovery of costs resulting from human-caused fires caused by negligence or intent can be accomplished through an administrative process, like trespass, through criminal charges, or through civil action taken by the U.S. Attorney’s Office. There are

many program areas that work together in fire trespass, including suppression, dispatch, cost and billings specialists, line managers, and law enforcement. Each local unit should have qualified fire investigators (INVF) available to respond to wildfires, or should be ordering them in if the workload overwhelms local resources.

The BLM policy requires all fires to be investigated to determine cause, origin, and, if possible, responsibility. When negligence or intent can be determined, BLM should be actively seeking cost recovery. Fire investigation cases, collections, and expenditures should be tracked according to BLM policy. Suppression crews should be trained to protect the general point of origin, and dispatchers should be trained to capture critical information from citizens calling in to report wildfires.

Evaluation Protocols:

- *The state has identified a lead for the fire trespass program*
 - *Local offices have identified trespass leads.*
- *Sufficient staff are trained as fire investigators to respond to fires in a timely manner*
 - *FI-210 is the base level training for fire investigators.*
- *Cases are moved forward for cost recovery when there is enough supporting evidence (i.e., suspect identified and evidence of negligence).*
- *The state has developed a fire trespass operations plan*
 - *Local units must also have fire trespass operations plans.*
- *The trespass operations plans identify roles and responsibilities within the fire trespass program, including work done by staff in fire management, law enforcement, business practices management, and other areas connected to trespass.*
- *Funds collected are deposited into the appropriate account, and charges to that account are tracked and expended according to BLM policy.*
- *Fire crews are receiving FI-110, Wildland Fire Observations, and Origin Scene Protection for First Responders.*

References

Core Documents:

These are policy documents or formats that generally do not change significantly from year to year.

- Implementation Guidance for National Fire Plan
- 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy
- A National Cohesive Wildland Fire Management Strategy
- BLM Manuals/Handbooks
 - BLM Manual H-1601-1 Land Use Planning Handbook, Wildland Fire Management
 - BLM Manual H-9211-1 Fire Planning Handbook (interim)
 - BLM Manual H-1790-1 National Environmental Policy Act Handbook
- The Healthy Forests Initiative and Healthy Forests Restoration Act – Interim Field Guide
- MOU for The Development of Collaborative Fuels Treatment Program
- Preparing a Community Wildfire protection Plan: A Handbook for Wildland-Urban Interface Communities, March 2004
- Community Guide to Preparing and Implementing a Community Wildfire Protection Plan – August 2008
- Fire Trespass Handbook – BLM Handbook H-9238-1

Annual Direction/Guidance:

- Annual Work Plan (AWP) for years being evaluated

Current Information Memorandums (IM) or Information Bulletins (IB):

- See reference section for individual program area standards

Additional Guidance/Material:

This may include IMs, policy or guidance that is no longer current but were applicable in the years being evaluated.

- IM OF&A 2004-031 – Wildland Fire Use Reporting

Attachment 1 – Information for State Liaison

State Liaison:

The state liaison coordinates the schedule, travel, lodging, and meeting rooms for the evaluation team. Often this will be the state fuels lead or another state office staff member. The liaison is welcome to attend the in- and out-briefs, but should not be present during interviews with managers and staff, or with the team during nightly meetings.

The following worksheet is intended to assist with the on-site visit planning. Some states will have two teams to plan for. You will want to coordinate with the evaluation team lead to determine which offices will be visited, who the team wants to meet with, and what documentation will be needed before hand or made available during the on-site visit. It is recommended that someone from the state accompany each team to coordinate field office visits. Normally, the state liaison serves this role for one of the teams.

Transportation:

Are government vehicles available for the evaluation team?

If yes, are there any specific local requirements the team should prepare for?

Lodging:

Date	City	Hotel	Phone Number	Govt. Rate	Hotel Rate

If any of the hotels will exceed the government per diem, please inform the team lead so an exception letter can be completed.

Office Visit Detail:

Requested Documents	Documents to be Sent/Posted to FPFM for Prior Review	Location of Document if Electronically Stored and Accessible to FPFM Staff	To be Available for On-Site Visit

Wildland Fires to be Reviewed:

Date	Field Office/District Offices/Partner:	Conference/Interview Room:	Staff/Managers/Partners to be Interviewed:
Project Site Visit: Y N		Project Name:	

Hazardous Fuels Treatments to be Reviewed:

Requested Documents	Documents to be Sent/Posted to FPFM for Prior Review	Location of Document if Electronically Stored and Accessible to FPFM Staff	To be Available for On-Site Visit

Attachment 2 – Travel Schedule Example

	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
0800-1200		In-Brief with SD/DSD State/District Orientation	Interviews with Staff and Interagency Partners @ Field Office A	Drive to Field Office B	Drive to Field Office C	Team Time @ Hotel
1200-1300		Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
1300-1700	Review Team Arrival in State	Interviews with Staff @ Field Office A	Visit Project Area	Interview Staff and Interagency Partners @ Field Office B	Interview Staff and Interagency Partners @ Field Office C	Out Brief with SD/DSD @ State Office

With two teams, the schedule will be more complex. The number of offices visited will also affect the complexity of the schedule. The actual format used is up to the state liaison and the evaluation team lead.

Attachment 3 – Example of FRCC Tabular Format

Example Format for Displaying FRCC in Land Use and Fire Management Plans

Badlands Resource Management Plan					
Biophysical Setting*	Historic Fire Regime (I-V)	Condition Class 1 (Acres)	Condition Class 2 (Acres)	Condition Class 3 (Acres)	Total Acres
Wyoming Big Sagebrush	IV	96,000	106,000	252,000	454,000
Salt-Desert Shrub	V	36,000	13,000	168,000	217,000
Pinyon-Juniper	IV	230,000	72,000	19,200	321,200
Mountain Shrub	II	53,000	101,000	35,000	189,000
Ponderosa Pine	I	124,000	83,000	289,000	496,000
White Fir, Mixed Conifer	III	22,000	17,000	149,000	188,000
Total Acres by Condition Class		561,000	392,000	912,200	1,865,200

Attachment 4 – Evaluation Checklists

The checklists on the following pages are used to assess program performance.

***Checklists are to be used by the evaluators for documentation purposes. Checklists are prepared for individual or group interviews and are consolidated into a single checklist or finding for each office visited. Each checklist has over-arching standards with associated sub-elements. Evaluators use individual sub-element office results (Y=Yes, office meets sub-standard; N=No, office does not meet sub-standard, P=office partially meets standard) to make a determination if the state meets the over-arching standard. Not intended to be included in final report.**

CHECKLIST REVISIONS

Proposed revisions to the checklists can be sent to the Fire Planning and Fuels Management Division. Comments should be captured in “track changes” or typed into the “remarks” section of the checklist proposed for change. These checklists can be sent electronically to the above address for consideration. Proposed changes need to reflect current national policy, can be quantified, and directly applies to the functional areas covered by this evaluation. The proposed revisions should include verbiage that is being proposed. Checklists are reviewed for compliance with agency policy and standards each January. Proposed changes will need to be submitted by the end of January for consideration that year.

Fire Planning / Decision Support (FP/DS) Evaluation Checklist

Evaluator: _____ **Date:** _____

Office / State Evaluated: _____

Individuals interviewed:

Standards 1: Ask these questions to field, district and state office personnel responsible for developing and reviewing FMPs, providing fire/fuels input to LUP, participating on fuels project FMP/LUP ID teams, writing fire/fuels sections of NEPA documents and site-specific fuels project plans. Identified positions to query include but are not limited to: FMOs, Managers, Fuels Specialists, Resource Staff, MEPs, and Fire Planners.

Standard 2: Ask these questions to field, district, and state office personnel responsible for preparing WFDSS decisions, entering data into WFMI and conducting quality control, and managing fire planning GIS data. Identified positions to query include but are not limited to: FMOs, Managers, Resource Staff, GIS Specialist, Fuels Specialists, MEPs, and Fire Planners.

Name	Position	Name	Position

FP/DS Standard 1: Wildland fire management planning activities (FMP and LUP) comply with current land use, fire management planning, NEPA, NHPA, ESA and other appropriate regulations, policies and guidance.

1	Objectives in both LUPs and FMPs are clearly identified and provide guidance for wildland fire responses and hazardous fuels treatments.	Y	N	P
2	Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) or another ecological indicator is summarized in LUPs and/or FMPs. (At a minimum, FRCC tables should be included in FMP and/or LUP.)	Y	N	P
3	LUPs and FMPs meet current content and format requirements. (Requirements for LUPS are found in H-1601-1 Appendix C and FP handbook H-9211-1 for FMPs which includes the Interagency FMP template and BLM Guidance as appendices).	Y	N	P
4	Guidance and processes are in place to ensure LUPs, FMPs and project plans are in compliance with appropriate environmental regulations.	Y	N	P
5	Implementation actions are in compliance with actions, mitigation measures and regulations identified in NEPA documents including timely and effective T&E species and SHPO consultations.	Y	N	P
6	For herbicide applications, offices are incorporating mitigation measures and SOPs from the Herbicide Programmatic EIS.	Y	N	P

FP/DS Standard 2: Direction from LUPs and FMPs is accurately employed in WFDSS and applied during wildfire events, FMPs are reviewed and updated appropriately, wildfires are accurately being reported and units are cognizant of fire data/geospatial product importance and quality control.

1	Unit personnel employ WFDSS to develop and document wildfire decisions. Strategic objectives (resources and fire) and management requirements (e.g., constraints) are clearly incorporated and applied with managers and fire personnel familiar with use and policy.	Y	N	P
2	Units are striving to meet fire planning data standards (WFMI fire reports, Fire Planning Areas, Fire Planning Units and Fire Polygons) consistent with policy and guidance, including making Sage-Grouse Habitat maps available for fire operations.	Y	N	P
3	Protocol exists allowing a unit to revise LUPs/FMPs based upon experience gained during fire management decisions and have processes in place to ensure fire management plans (FMPs) are updated and/or reviewed on an annual basis to address changes in conditions (e.g., vegetation changes resulting from extensive fires in an area).	Y	N	P
4	Unit personnel are aware and knowledgeable about the management responses that are allowed and described in LUPs and FMPs. Monitoring and assessment processes (e.g., triggers, check points, feedback loops, etc.) are in place to determine if the outcomes of wildfire events meet LUP and LUP goals and objectives.	Y	N	P

Hazardous Fuels and Community Assistance (CA) Program Evaluation Checklists

Evaluator: _____ **Date:** _____

Office/State Evaluated: _____

Individuals interviewed:

Standards 1, 2, and 3: Ask these questions to field, district, and state personnel responsible for designing HFR projects, inputting POW, and reporting accomplishments into NFPORS, ensuring PMDS is correct, managing HFR project files/data (fuel model layers, veg treatment polygons, etc.), prioritizing fuels and CA workload, preparing and administering contracts, grants agreements, implementing projects, and monitoring projects. Identified positions to query include but are not limited to: FMOs, Managers, MEPs, Resource Specialists, GMO/contracting specialists and Fuels Specialist.

Standard 4: Ask these questions to field, district, and state personnel responsible for managing the fuels budget, tracking expenditures, monitoring the use of WBS codes in FBMS, and updating Planned Direct Costs in NFPORS. Identified positions to query include but are not limited to: Fuels Specialists, MEPs, Budget Analysts, and Resource Coordinators.

Standard 5: Ask these questions to field, district, and state personnel responsible for preparing, reviewing and approving burn plans and implementing burn plans. Identified positions to query include but are not limited to: FMOs, Fuels Specialists, Fuels Technicians, AFMOs, and Managers.

Standard 6: Ask these questions to field, district, and state personnel responsible for developing fuels monitoring protocols and conducting fuels project inventory and monitoring. Identified positions to query include but are not limited to: Fuels Specialists, Resource Specialists, and Fuels Technicians.

Name	Position

Name	Position

Hazardous Fuels Standard 1: Fuels projects are designed and implemented following DOI and BLM guidance and policies.

1	The fuels program is fully integrated with fire management and resource programs within the agency. Managers, resource staff, and fire/fuels personnel work jointly to prioritize planning and implementation to ensure targets are met. Fuels, resources, and MEP staff are involved in NEPA document preparation.	Y	N	P
2	Offices are maximizing the use of joint and collaborative funding, contracts, grants, and agreements where efficiencies can be increased. The NFPORS data shows that units within the state have joint funded projects, multiple ownerships, grants, agreements, or contracts. If not, suitable rationale is provided.	Y	N	P
3	Fuels treatments are meeting objectives and either moving areas towards or maintaining desired conditions to meet DOI Strategic Plan performance measures (NFPORS excel spreadsheet).	Y	N	P
4	Planning, treatment, and community assistance targets and accomplishments are reported in PMDS and NFPORS accurately and comply with policy and guidance. The AM is used for CA. Planning activities are being accounted for in PMDS and NFPORS correctly.	Y	N	P
5	In the previous three years, annual acre accomplishments met or exceeded DOI and AWP targets as indicated in PMDS/NFPORS. If target was not met, provide rationale. Acre accomplishments are reported in NFPORS and PMDS and targets/accomplishments match in both systems.	Y	N	P
6	“Resource Benefit Fire” acres that meet goals and objectives from LUPs and FMPs are identified and reported in NFPORS following BLM policy. <i>NOTE: If opportunities to manage fire do not exist on the unit, this standard would be Not Applicable (NA.)</i>	Y	N	P
7	Fuels treatments are designed and implemented following sage grouse conservation IM and Red Book guidance, if applicable. <i>NOTE: If no sage grouse habitat exists on the unit, this standard would be Not Applicable (NA)</i>	Y	N	P
8	Units are striving to complete vegetation treatment polygon data consistent with policy and guidance, and other GIS data layers (i.e., fuels plot data, local fuel model layer, WUI map, etc.) needed to accurately plan and monitor hazardous fuels reduction projects.	Y	N	P

Remarks/Notes:

Hazardous Fuels Standard 2: Community assistance projects and activities are included in the fuels budgeting process.

1	Mitigation Treatments and activities are included in the program of work, entered into NFPORS, and comply with guidance. At least 3 percent of the state's total fuels project dollars are planned for community assistance actions.	Y	N	P
2	Community Assistance leads are involved in the development of an integrated POW.	Y	N	P

Remarks/Notes: Reviewer may also want to ensure community assistance projects and activities are identified in CWPPs.

Hazardous Fuels Standard 3: There is a community assistance program in place to work with communities to reduce the threat and impact of wildfire.

1	The state and/or local units have a program in place to provide funding and/or assistance to communities at risk from wildfire. How does a community/county or other entity get assistance from BLM in your State? What agreements do you have in place with partner organizations to fund mitigation and education projects identified in CWPPs?	Y	N	P
2	The State and/or local units have identified high risk areas and are targeting mitigation and education activities to these areas. Where are your high risk areas? What are you doing to assist these communities in your State?	Y	N	P
3	Education and outreach programs are conducted to inform communities on the most effective ways to protect their homes and values at risk from wildfire. What kind of fire education products, materials and initiatives are you conducting in your State? Explain how you conduct outreach and education in conjunction with Hazardous Fuel Reduction projects at the local level in your State.	Y	N	P

Remarks/Notes: Reviewer may want to ask how communities at risk from wildfire request and receive assistance.

Hazardous Fuels Standard 4: Expenditures for hazardous fuels program follow guidance and policies.

1	Final HFR obligations are within 98 percent of cost target allocations, on a consistent basis.	Y	N	P
2	The PJ codes are used and reported appropriately (PJXX codes), per IM instruction.	Y	N	P
3	Offices have a process in place to ensure indirect costs do not exceed 10 percent of base funding (PJ08).	Y	N	P

Remarks/Notes:

Hazardous Fuels Standard 5: Prescribed fire Program meets Interagency and BLM requirements.

1	A process is in place to review prescribed fire plans to ensure they meet standards identified in the current Interagency Prescribed Fire Guide and BLM additional standards. For example, offices are aware of the 2013 IA RX guide.	Y	N	P
2	Qualified personnel are available to plan, approve and implement the prescribed fire program.	Y	N	P

Remarks/Notes:

Fuels Project Monitoring Standard 6: Field offices are completing hazardous fuels project monitoring.

1	Monitoring is conducted through an interdisciplinary approach. Monitoring is joint-funded. Fuels/other veg. program monitoring protocols are integrated.	Y	N	P
2	Offices are aware of Fuels Treatment Effectiveness Monitoring (FTEM) and have processes in place to ensure data is input into system when wildfires intersect fuels treatments.	Y	N	P

Remarks/Notes:

Overall Comments/Remarks:

Prevention/Trespass Evaluation Checklist

Evaluator: _____ **Date:** _____

Office/State Evaluated: _____

Individuals interviewed:

Standard 1: Ask these questions to field, district, and state personnel responsible for preparing and implementing the prevention plan, and implementing fire closures when needed.

Standard 2: Ask these questions to field, district, and state personnel responsible for investigating and preparing case files and working with trespass fire cases.

Name	Position	Name	Position

Prevention/Trespass Standard 1: There is a fire prevention program and plan in place to address human-caused fires.

1	The state and local units have identified a fire prevention program lead.	Y	N	P
2	The local unit has a fire prevention plan in place.	Y	N	P
3	Fire prevention funding is provided to conduct fire prevention activities and programs (at both the state and local unit level).	Y	N	P
4	The district fire prevention plan has analyzed fire occurrence data and is targeting prevention activities to reduce human-caused wildfires.	Y	N	P
5	The fire prevention plan/program is included or referenced in the unit FMP.	Y	N	P

Remarks/Notes: Is the local unit/state office aware of their most common fire causes and targeting prevention activities towards reducing them?

Prevention/Trespass Standard 2: There is a fire investigation and trespass program in place where all human-caused fires are investigated and cost recovery is pursued, as appropriate.

1	The state and local units have identified a Fire Trespass program lead.	Y	N	P
2	The state and local units have developed a fire trespass operations plan that ensures fires are investigated appropriately.	Y	N	P
4	Funds collected are deposited into the appropriate account and charges to that account are appropriate and tracked according to BLM policy.	Y	N	P
5	Fire crews are receiving FI-110, Wildland Fire Observations and Origin Scene Protection for First Responders.	Y	N	P
6	Fire investigation and trespass case data is appropriately tracked at the both the unit and state level according to BLM policy.	Y	N	P

Remarks/Notes: Reviewer might consider pulling a couple fire investigation case files at random and ask questions as to the status of that particular case.