



# **SEELEY-SWAN FIRE PLAN 2019 UPDATE**

**A COMPONENT OF THE  
MISSOULA COUNTY WILDFIRE PROTECTION PLAN**

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>                                     | <b>I</b>  |
| PROBLEM OVERVIEW .....   | I         |
| PROCESS OVERVIEW .....   | I         |
| OVERALL GOAL .....   | II        |
| METHODOLOGY .....  | II        |
| SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS .....                                     | III       |
| ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NEEDS .....                                 | III       |
| <b>1.0 INTRODUCTION .....</b>                                      | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1 BACKGROUND.....  | 1         |
| 1.2 CURRENT RELEVANT FIRE POLICIES .....                           | 2         |
| 1.2.1 <i>Federal Fire Policies</i> .....                           | 2         |
| 1.2.2 <i>State Fire Policies</i> .....                             | 8         |
| 1.2.3 <i>Local Fire Policies</i> .....                             | 11        |
| 1.3 PLANNING AREA BOUNDARIES .....                                 | 11        |
| 1.4 COMMUNITY LEGAL STRUCTURE.....                                 | 12        |
| 1.5 JURISDICTIONAL BOUNDARIES .....                                | 12        |
| 1.6 STRATEGIC GOALS .....  | 14        |
| <b>2.0 COMMUNITY DESCRIPTION .....</b>                             | <b>15</b> |
| 2.1 POPULATION, DEMOGRAPHICS .....                                 | 15        |
| 2.2 NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS, HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATIONS ..... | 17        |
| 2.3 EMERGENCY SERVICES.....  | 17        |
| 2.3.1 <i>Rural Fire Services</i> .....                             | 17        |
| 2.3.2 <i>Disaster Emergency Services</i> .....                     | 17        |
| 2.4 INFRASTRUCTURE.....  | 18        |
| 2.4.1 <i>Roads</i> .....   | 18        |
| 2.5 CRITICAL FACILITIES.....                                       | 19        |
| 2.5.1 <i>911 and Emergency Operations Centers</i> .....            | 19        |
| 2.5.2 <i>Utilities</i> .....                                       | 19        |
| 2.5.3 <i>Communications</i> .....                                  | 20        |
| 2.5.4 <i>Water Services</i> .....                                  | 20        |
| 2.5.5 <i>Public and Private Schools</i> .....                      | 20        |
| 2.5.6 <i>Community Medical Center</i> .....                        | 20        |
| 2.5.7 <i>Local Airports/Helipad Sites</i> .....                    | 21        |
| 2.6 INSURANCE RATINGS .....  | 21        |
| 2.7 LAND USE/DEVELOPMENT TRENDS .....                              | 22        |
| <b>3.0 GENERAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS.....</b>                   | <b>23</b> |
| 3.1 TOPOGRAPHY, SLOPE, ASPECT, ELEVATION .....                     | 23        |
| 3.2 CLIMATE.....   | 23        |
| 3.3 ECOLOGICAL SITES.....  | 23        |
| 3.4 LOCAL FIRE ECOLOGY AND HISTORIC FOREST CONDITIONS .....        | 26        |
| 3.4.1 <i>Historical Disturbance Regimes</i> .....                  | 26        |
| 3.4.2 <i>Historical Forest Conditions</i> .....                    | 30        |
| <b>4.0 GENERAL FIRE CONDITIONS .....</b>                           | <b>37</b> |
| 4.1 FIRE WEATHER.....  | 37        |

|            |  |           |
|------------|--|-----------|
| 4.2        | HAZARDOUS FUELS.....   | 37        |
| 4.2.1      | <i>Forest Cover Types and Fuels</i> .....                                      | 37        |
| 4.2.2      | <i>Natural Firebreaks</i> .....  | 37        |
| 4.3        | FIRE HISTORY.....  | 38        |
| 4.4        | FIRE IGNITION HISTORY.....   | 41        |
| <b>5.0</b> | <b>IDENTIFYING ASSETS AT RISK .....</b>  | <b>42</b> |
| 5.1        | STRUCTURES/DENSITY.....  | 42        |
| 5.2        | BUSINESSES/COMMERCIAL.....   | 42        |
| 5.3        | ECOSYSTEMS AND BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY.....                                       | 42        |
| 5.4        | WATER QUALITY AND WATERSHEDS.....  | 45        |
| 5.5        | AIR QUALITY.....   | 46        |
| 5.6        | RECREATION.....  | 46        |
| 5.7        | NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT .....  | 46        |
| 5.8        | CULTURAL RESOURCES .....   | 47        |
| <b>6.0</b> | <b>RISK EVALUATION: IDENTIFYING AREAS OF GREATEST THREAT.....</b>              | <b>48</b> |
| 6.1        | FUELS AND SLOPE .....  | 48        |
| 6.2        | STRUCTURE DENSITIES AND EVACUATION ROUTES.....                                 | 48        |
| 6.2.1      | <i>Wildland-Urban Interface</i> .....  | 48        |
| 6.3        | CUMULATIVE EFFECTS – FINAL RISK ASSESSMENT.....                                | 49        |
| <b>7.0</b> | <b>PREPAREDNESS: PLAN AND PRACTICE.....</b>                                    | <b>50</b> |
| 7.1        | BE PREPARED- IT’S YOUR RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT YOUR HOME FROM WILDFIRE!..... | 50        |
| 7.1.1      | <i>Defensible Space</i> .....  | 50        |
| 7.1.2      | <i>Burn Permits</i> .....  | 50        |
| 7.1.3      | <i>Evacuation Routes/Safety Zones</i> .....                                    | 53        |
| 7.1.4      | <i>Pets and Livestock - Evacuation</i> .....                                   | 53        |
| 7.1.5      | <i>Personal Tools, Equipment, Fire Protection Clothing</i> .....               | 53        |
| 7.2        | THE COMMUNITIES: FIRE PREPARATION .....  | 54        |
| 7.2.1      | <i>Evacuation Plans</i> .....  | 54        |
| 7.2.2      | <i>Fire Protection Response</i> .....  | 54        |
| 7.3        | EMERGENCY COMMUNICATION.....   | 55        |
| 7.4        | AGENCY FIRE PLANS.....   | 58        |
| <b>8.0</b> | <b>REGULATORY COMPLIANCE.....</b>  | <b>60</b> |
| 8.1        | ADMINISTRATIVE BARRIERS TO WILDFIRE MITIGATION .....                           | 60        |
| 8.1.1      | <i>Legal Mandates</i> .....  | 60        |
| 8.1.2      | <i>Fire and Building Codes</i> .....   | 63        |
| 8.1.3      | <i>Air Quality Regulations</i> .....   | 63        |
| 8.2        | ADMINISTRATIVE SOLUTIONS .....   | 65        |
| 8.2.1      | <i>Interagency Collaboration</i> .....   | 65        |
| 8.2.2      | <i>Coordinated Resource Management Plans</i> .....                             | 66        |
| <b>9.0</b> | <b>ACTION PLAN.....</b>  | <b>67</b> |
| 9.1        | DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS.....   | 67        |
| 9.2        | MITIGATION GOALS .....   | 67        |
| 9.2.1      | <i>High and Moderate Risk Fuels</i> .....                                      | 67        |
| 9.2.2      | <i>Ecological Restoration</i> .....  | 69        |
| 9.3        | MITIGATION GRANT OPPORTUNITIES .....   | 71        |

|                    |   |           |
|--------------------|---|-----------|
| 9.4                | FUEL MITIGATION PROJECTS.....   | 71        |
| 9.4.1              | US Forest Service.....  | 71        |
| 9.4.2              | Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation.....   | 73        |
| 9.5                | PRIORITIZATION PROCESS.....   | 73        |
| 9.6                | POSSIBLE ACTIONS.....   | 73        |
| 9.6.1              | Infrastructure Improvements.....  | 74        |
| 9.6.2              | Defensible Space.....   | 74        |
| 9.6.3              | Education.....  | 78        |
| 9.6.4              | Senior/Disabled Assistance.....   | 78        |
| 9.7                | PRIORITIZED ACTIONS, IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE.....   | 78        |
| 9.7.1              | Short Term (<1 year), Planning.....   | 78        |
| 9.7.2              | Medium Term (1-10 years), Fuel Hazard Reduction Treatments.....   | 78        |
| 9.7.3              | Long Term (10+ years), Treatment and Maintenance.....   | 79        |
| <b>10.0</b>        | <b>PLAN MONITORING AND PROGRESS REVIEW.....</b>   | <b>80</b> |
| 10.1               | PROCESS AND MEASURES.....   | 80        |
| 10.2               | MITIGATION TREATMENTS –PROGRESS REVIEW.....   | 80        |
| 10.2.1             | US Forest Service.....  | 84        |
| 10.2.2             | Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation.....   | 84        |
| <b>11.0</b>        | <b>ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NEEDS.....</b>  | <b>87</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX A.</b> | <b>LIST OF FIRE PLAN PARTICIPANTS.....</b>  | <b>88</b> |
|                    | SEELEY-SWAN FIRE PLAN PARTICIPANTS - 2019 REVISION.....   | 88        |
|                    | SEELEY-SWAN FIRE PLAN PARTICIPANTS - 2013 REVISION.....   | 89        |
|                    | SEELEY-SWAN FIRE PLAN PARTICIPANTS – 2008 UPDATE.....   | 90        |
|                    | SEELEY-SWAN FIRE PLAN PARTICIPANTS – 2004.....  | 91        |
| <b>APPENDIX B.</b> | <b>LIST OF GRANT SOURCES.....</b>   | <b>92</b> |
| <b>APPENDIX C.</b> | <b>CHARACTERIZING WILDFIRE RISK AND HAZARD IN LODGEPOLE PINE STANDS KILLED BY THE MOUNTAIN PINE BEETLE.....</b> | <b>93</b> |

---

## Executive Summary

---

### Problem Overview

---

The fire seasons of 2000, 2001, 2003, 2006, 2007, 2012, and 2017 had both direct and indirect impacts on the safety and well-being of the Seeley Lake and Condon, Montana communities. While wildfire hazard cannot be eliminated in this region, some of the risk and effects can be mitigated, particularly in the wildland/urban interface (WUI). The Seeley Lake Rural Fire District, working in conjunction with the Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, the U.S. Forest Service, and the Swan Valley Fire Service Area, prepared the first Seeley-Swan Fire Plan in 2004 to help guide and focus wildfire mitigation activities in the WUI. As per the performance measures identified in this plan, the 2004 Fire Plan was updated in 2008, with a substantial revision in 2013, and an update for 2019 with the results of that effort presented in this report. The goals of these updates and revisions are to incorporate new information and record progress toward the objectives of this Plan, such as:

- Mapping completed fuel mitigation projects
- Mapping areas affected by fire during this time period
- Updating contacts and related resources, and
- Updating important base-line data such as the fuels layer that are used to assess fire hazards in the area.

The area of the Fire Plan was also expanded in the 2008 update to include the entire Clearwater River watershed and expanded further north in the Swan River watershed. The WUI boundaries were adjusted with the 2013 update to conform to State law. All of these changes have resulted in changes to acreage estimates in the fire risk categories.

This Fire Plan identifies significant wildfire risks to the communities and outlines an action plan to reduce or eliminate fire impacts. The Fire Plan compiles available information of use in responding to fires or in reducing the risk of fires, furthering the existing coordination and cooperation of firefighting units in the Seeley-Swan Valley, and developing action steps for addressing fire risks and firefighting capabilities in the Valley. The Seeley-Swan Fire Plan includes resources and information to assist county residents, public and private organizations, local government, and others interested in planning for wildfire risk reduction, including a list of action steps that will assist both communities in reducing and preventing loss from future wildfire events.

---

### Process Overview

---

Information for the 2019 Seeley-Swan Fire Plan Update was gathered from members of the Seeley Swan Fuels Mitigation Task Force and developed using existing public and private information. Participants in

the Fire Plan Update included personnel from the Seeley Lake Rural Fire District, U.S. Forest Service, Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, Swan Valley Connections, Clearwater Resource Council, with technical support provided by the Ecosystem Management Research Institute. All Fire Plan updates and revisions have been undertaken by the Seeley Swan Fuels Mitigation Task Force, a cooperative group including representatives of the Clearwater Resource Council, Seeley Lake Rural Fire District, U.S. Forest Service, Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (DNRC), and Swan Valley Connections. This Task Force was formed to implement the objectives of the Fire Plan, and has functioned effectively for the past fifteen years. The Task Force was provided technical assistance from the Ecosystem Management Research Institute in completing previous versions of the plan as well as this update.

---

## Overall Goal

---

The goal of this document is to develop a cooperative and coordinated Fire Plan for the Seeley Lake and Condon communities-at-risk to wildfire. The objectives to accomplish this goal include:

- 1) Facilitate community planning and outline strategies for protecting community values,
- 2) Identify existing information and conduct a wildland-urban interface (WUI) risk assessment for the entire project area,
- 3) Identify pre-fire management risk/reduction actions and programs,
- 4) Develop a community Fire Plan that can be integrated with local comprehensive growth and development plans as well as broader landscape plans to ensure social, economic and ecological concerns are addressed at all levels, and
- 5) Develop a framework to ensure wildfire policy, prevention, suppression, and funding efforts are coordinated locally among stakeholders that include local communities, as well as private and public organizations.

This document will serve as a template and should be evaluated on an annual basis or as new information is gathered or developed, updated at 5 year intervals, and revised at 10 year intervals.

---

## Methodology

---

The Seeley-Swan Fire Plan was developed with 3 primary steps required to complete the overall process. Step 1 included the development of a GIS and Database Support System. Available information to support fire planning or response within the Fire Plan region was compiled and entered in a GIS and database system. Some examples of pertinent information include roads, utilities, ownership, locations of structures (partial), water drafting sites, communication facilities, historical fires, and forest conditions. Step 2 included using the information gathered in step 1 to conduct a risk assessment for the wildland/urban interface. The risk assessment used information on forest fuel loadings, slope, structure densities, and evacuation routes to identify areas of high, moderate, low, and very low risk to wildfire.

Step 3 used the information obtained in Step 1 and 2 to develop the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan that represents a cooperative and coordinated Fire Plan for the Seeley Lake and Condon communities-at-risk to wildfire.

---

## **Specific Recommendations**

---

The plan identifies the importance of maintaining the effective, cooperative working relationship among the different fire agencies in the plan area. It also identifies the importance in maintaining and improving public communication and educational programs. The plan compiled considerable data and maps to facilitate fire suppression activities and also identified high and moderate risk acres within the WUI of the Seeley and Swan Valleys. A goal of treating 80% of the treatable high-risk areas and additional moderate risk areas was identified. This will require obtaining additional resources to accomplish these goals. Frequent meetings of the cooperators through the Seeley Lake Fuels Mitigation Task Force have occurred and should continue to ensure effective and efficient suppression and pre-suppression coordination.

---

## **Additional Information Needs**

---

The plan identifies two remaining information needs that should be addressed as soon as practical. These remaining information needs are:

- Determining the accuracy of the LANDFIRE fuels map for the Swan and Clearwater Valleys,
- Determining policies and guidelines for incorporating additional ecological considerations, particularly as they relate to threatened and endangered species or species of concern, for fuel thinning within the WUI.

## 1.0 Introduction

A wildfire is defined as an unplanned fire be it human-caused or from natural origins, originating or spreading outside of the urban environment. For the past four decades, in response to climate change, the intensity of wildfires has been increasing throughout the western United States. In addition, the frequency of fires has been high due to the effects of several drought cycles, leading to dramatic increases in major fire incidents. In one fire alone, the Camp Fire, according to [Cal Fire statistics](#), killed 85 people. About 153,000 acres were burned and 18,800 structures were destroyed. The fire burned almost 14,000 residences and about 530 commercial structures. According to [The Balance \(https://www.thebalance.com/wildfires-economic-impact-4160764\)](https://www.thebalance.com/wildfires-economic-impact-4160764) “The frequency of western U.S. wildfires has increased by 400% since 1970.” Increasing frequency and intensity of wildfires has been observed in the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan region as well. Recent fire seasons have posed considerable threat to the Seeley Lake and Condon communities. In 2000, severe drought conditions lead to level III fire restrictions that closed state and federal forests. In addition to the fear and tension within the communities, the resulting loss of tourism and recreational income impacted many area businesses. In 2001, severe drought conditions resulted in 30 fire ignitions, with 2 major fire occurrences within the Fire Plan area. In 2003, severe drought and weather conditions contributed to 57 fire starts within the Fire Plan area, with 2 of those becoming major fire incidents that required considerable resources and money to overcome. In 2001, 2003, and 2007 the communities of Seeley Lake and Condon were impacted by Stage II fire restrictions as well as air quality problems resulting from smoke, and loss of income to some local businesses. In 2007, the Jocko Lakes Fire threatened the community of Seeley Lake, and resulted in the evacuation of large parts of the community for up to 2 weeks. Access to the community was restricted to local residents for a number of days, resulting in sizable losses to recreation-supported businesses. In 2017, Seeley Lake was impacted by two major fires, the Liberty Fire that burned 28,000 acres west of Placid Lake, and the Rice Ridge Fire that burned 160,000 ac east and south of Seeley Lake. Major portions of the community were evacuated for varying lengths of time. In addition, air quality became a significant concern, with PM 2.5 readings exceeding 1000ppm for many days.

The fire history of the Seeley/Swan Valley coupled with severe weather patterns and current forest conditions suggest that future wildfire events are inevitable and could result in considerable loss of property and natural resources, as well as threaten the lives and safety of firefighters and residents alike.

---

### 1.1 Background

---

The first version of the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan was completed in 2004 with funding from a grant received by the Seeley Lake Rural Fire District using U.S. Forest Service National Fire Plan funds and administered by the Montana Department of Commerce. Since that time, the Fire Plan has undergone an update in 2008, a revision in 2013, and an update, this document, in 2019. The goals of these updates and revisions are to incorporate new information and record progress toward the objectives of this Plan, such as:

- Mapping completed fuel mitigation projects



- Mapping areas affected by fire during this time period
- Updating contacts and related resources, and
- Updating important base-line data such as the fuels layer that are used to assess fire hazards in the area.

With the 2013 revision the area of the Fire Plan was expanded to include the entire Clearwater River watershed and expanded further north in the Swan River watershed. The WUI boundaries were also adjusted. All of these changes resulted in changes to acreage estimates in the fire risk categories moving forward.

For the most part, the organizations and individuals that have been involved in developing the Fire Plan have been consistent and dedicated to the objectives identified in the Plan, as well as ensuring the accuracy of the information. See Appendix A for a list of individuals involved in the process for all three versions of the Plan.

---

## 1.2 Current Relevant Fire Policies

---

### 1.2.1 Federal Fire Policies

#### 1.2.1.1 NATIONAL FIRE PLAN

The National Fire Plan was initiated as a result of the 2001 Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act (P.L. 106-291) and is a long-term investment that will help protect communities and natural resources, the lives of firefighters, and the public. It is a commitment based on cooperation and communication among federal agencies, states, local governments, tribes and interested publics. The federal wildfire management agencies worked closely with these partners to prepare a 10-year Comprehensive Strategy, completed in August 2001. The primary goals of the 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy were: 1) improve fire prevention and suppression, 2) reduce hazardous fuels, 3) restore fire-adapted ecosystems, and 4) promote community assistance. In May 2002, the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture worked with the Western Governors to develop “A Collaborative Approach for Reducing Wildfire Risks to Communities and the Environment – 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan”. See Western Governor’s section below, for a discussion of the Implementation Plan.

The National Fire Plan recognized the important role of state and local fire organizations, and of communities and individuals, in meeting the challenges of fire management across the landscape. The National Fire Plan includes a suite of programs that enable better fire planning and prevention, reducing fire risk in forests adjacent to communities, and strengthening state and local capabilities to supplement Federal fire management efforts. The following provides a brief discussion of these programs:

- Through Cooperative Fire Protection, State Fire Assistance and Volunteer Fire Assistance programs at the State and local level, the National Fire Plan provides resources to enhance local firefighting capabilities, improve preparedness of state and volunteer firefighting organizations,

and streamline communication and coordination across organizational boundaries to prevent, manage, and put out fire more effectively.

- Through the Community and Private Land Fire Assistance programs, the National Fire Plan promotes local action in impacted areas by increasing public understanding and providing tools to enhance local and individual responsibility and actions to reduce fire risk and prevent the outbreak of fire around homes and communities.
- Through Economic Action Programs, the National Fire Plan supports technology development and market expansion to stimulate local economies by diversifying jobs and business activities. The emphasis is on products generated from woody material removed from dense forest stands.
- These programs provide training, information, technical assistance and financial support to States, communities and local organizations, and individual landowners. Over the long-term, the National Fire Plan will reduce fire risk to communities and people, while offering economic growth opportunities that enable them to maintain their rural character and ties to the land.

#### 1.2.1.2 SAFETY

The following safety policies are accepted and endorsed by the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior. They provide consistent fire management practices among federal wildfire management agencies fire operations.

- Firefighter and public safety is the first priority. All Fire Management Plans (FMPs) and activities must reflect this commitment.
- All fire personnel will meet appropriate training, experience, and qualifications requirements for incident assignments (*See NWCG 310-1, DOI Incident Qualification and Certification System, and FSH 5109-17.*)
- All fire personnel will be equipped with approved personal protective equipment (PPE) appropriate to their position.
- All agency personnel assigned to fireline duties will complete annual refresher training.
- All wildfire entrapments and fatalities will be reported using the current National Wildfire Coordinating Group (NWCG) initial entrapment/fatality report form.
- All wildfire serious accidents will be investigated using the agency serious accident investigation procedures and interagency agreements as appropriate.
- Follow all safety policies, standards, and guidelines identified within the *Interagency Incident Business Management Handbook (IIBMH)*, *Fireline Handbook*, *Interagency Helicopter Operations Guide (IHOG)*, *Interagency Standards for Fire and Aviation Operations*, and *Incident Response Pocket Guide*.

#### 1.2.1.3 DISASTER MITIGATION ACT 2000

The Disaster Mitigation Act (DMA) of 2000 requires all local governments to have an approved pre-disaster mitigation plan (PDMP) in place to be eligible to receive Hazard Mitigation Grant Program project funding. Missoula County updated its Pre-Disaster Mitigation Plan in March 2017 (<https://www.missoulacounty.us/home/showdocument?id=25947>). The Seeley-Swan Fire Plan was incorporated as a component of the Missoula County Community Wildfire Protection Plan that was

developed in 2005 as an appendix to the County Pre-Disaster Mitigation Plan, with the Seeley/Swan Fire Plan being the Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) for these two areas of Missoula County (<https://www.missoulacounty.us/home/showdocument?id=30120>). The State Hazard Mitigation Officer submitted the county PMDF's with its CWPP appendix to the Federal Emergency Management Agency which accepted the Plan and made the Seeley-Swan region eligible for local wildfire mitigation project grants and post-disaster hazard mitigation grant projects.

DMA 2000 facilitates cooperation between state and local authorities, prompting them to work together. It encourages and rewards local and state pre-disaster planning, and promotes sustainability as a strategy for disaster resistance. This enhanced planning network will better enable local and state governments to articulate accurate needs for mitigation, resulting in faster allocation of funding and more effective risk reduction projects.

To implement the new DMA 2000 requirements, FEMA prepared an Interim Final Rule, published in the Federal Register on February 26, 2002, at CFR Parts 201 and 206, which established planning and funding criteria for states and local communities.

#### 1.2.1.4 NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) was one of the first laws ever written that establishes the broad national framework for protecting our environment. NEPA's basic policy is to assure that all branches of government give proper consideration to the environment prior to undertaking any major federal action that significantly affects the environment. NEPA exists to help preserve the health of the environment and the ecological integrity of federal landscapes. Any project on Federal land or funded with federal dollars is subject to NEPA. Although Fire Safe Councils and other community organizations are not considered public agencies, they may be responsible for compliance with these regulations when implementing community projects with federal funding.

#### 1.2.1.5 HEALTHY FOREST RESTORATION ACT 2003

The Healthy Forests Restoration Act (HFRA) was signed into law in December 2003. The 2018 Farm Bill (Agricultural Improvement Act of 2018) extends the HFRA until 2023. The legislation is intended to reduce the threat of destructive wildfires while upholding environmental standards and encouraging public input early in the planning process. The HFRA strengthens public participation in developing high priority areas, uses the best science available to actively manage public lands, allows for a pre-decisional objections process that encourages public participation early in the planning and issues clear guidance for court actions challenging HFRA projects. Language in the act regarding purposes is as follows:

“The purposes of this act are—

1. to reduce wildfire risk to communities, municipal water supplies, and other at-risk Federal land through a collaborative process of planning, prioritizing, and implementing hazardous fuel reduction projects;
2. to authorize grant programs to improve the commercial value of forest biomass (that otherwise contributes to the risk of catastrophic fire or insect or disease infestation) for producing electric

energy, useful heat, transportation fuel, and petroleum based product substitutes, and for other commercial purposes;

3. to enhance efforts to protect watersheds and address threats to forest and rangeland health, including catastrophic wildfire, across the landscape;
4. to promote systematic gathering of information to address the impact of insect and disease infestations and other damaging agents on forest and rangeland health;
5. to improve the capacity to detect insect and disease infestations at an early stage, particularly with respect to hardwood forests; and
6. to protect, restore, and enhance forest ecosystem components—
  - (A) to promote the recovery of threatened and endangered species;
  - (B) to improve biological diversity; and
  - (C) to enhance productivity and carbon sequestration.”

The entire Act H.R.1904 can be viewed at <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/BILLS-108hr1904enr/pdf/BILLS-108hr1904enr.pdf>

The HFRA focuses primarily on expedited hazardous-fuel treatment on some NFS and BLM lands at risk of wildland fire and insect or disease epidemics. These lands include areas where vegetation treatment will provide long-term benefits to threatened and endangered species. The act encourages Federal agencies to involve State and local governments and citizens when developing plans and projects for vegetation treatment on Federal and adjacent non-Federal lands. The HFRA is consistent with community-based wildland fire planning, watershed planning, and related ongoing efforts under the *National Fire Plan* (<https://www.forestsandrangelands.gov/resources/overview/>) and *A Collaborative Approach for Reducing Wildland Fire Risks to Communities and the Environment: 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan* (December 2006):

([https://www.forestsandrangelands.gov/documents/resources/plan/10-yearstrategyfinal\\_dec2006.pdf](https://www.forestsandrangelands.gov/documents/resources/plan/10-yearstrategyfinal_dec2006.pdf)).

The HFRA does not duplicate or replace these ongoing efforts.

Hazardous-fuel reduction projects on NFS and BLM lands in one or more of the following areas qualify for expedited NEPA review under the HFRA:

- WUIs of at-risk communities
- Municipal watersheds that are at risk from wildland fire
- Areas where wind throw, blowdown, ice storm damage, or the existence or imminent risk of an insect or disease epidemic significantly threatens ecosystem components or resource values
- Areas where wildland fire poses a threat to, and where the natural fire regimes are important for, threatened and endangered species or their habitat

The types of lands listed above define where the authorities of the HFRA can be used to expedite vegetation treatment, such as mechanical thinning or prescribed fire, on NFS and BLM lands.

The HFRA requires authorized projects to be planned and conducted consistent with resource management plans and other relevant administrative policies and decisions that apply to the Federal lands

covered by the project (Section 102(b)). The HFRA also prohibits authorized projects in wilderness areas, formal wilderness study areas, and Federal lands where an act of Congress or Presidential proclamation prohibits or restricts removal of vegetation (Section 102(d)).

#### Wildland-Urban Interfaces (WUIs) Within or Adjacent to At-Risk Communities

The HFRA provides improved administrative procedures for hazardous-fuel-reduction projects on NFS and BLM lands in the WUIs of at-risk communities. The act encourages the development of Community Wildfire Protection Plans under which communities will designate their WUIs, where HFRA projects may take place. The HFRA will greatly accelerate the interest of listed at-risk communities (FR 66 160 Aug. 17, 2001; <https://www.forestsandrangelands.gov/resources/reports/index.shtml>) in preparing wildland fire protection plans and designating their WUIs, as well as the interest of other communities in becoming listed as at-risk communities. Federal agencies and their State and local cooperators must be prepared to provide information and services to support these communities.

##### 1.2.1.6 THE FLAME ACT

Faced with increasing numbers of catastrophic, emergency wildland fires, the U.S. enacted the Federal Land Assistance, Management and Enhancement Act (FLAME) Act in 2008 to establish a new federal fund to cover the growing costs associated with fighting these fires.

#### **Western Region**

The FLAME Act also required a cohesive wildland fire management strategy. To achieve this, the U.S. was divided into three zones: west, southeast and northeast. Representatives from agencies, governments and other stakeholders in the 16 western states are working towards a cohesive strategy that will enable them to plan for and respond to wildland fires efficiently and strategically by restoring and maintaining resilient landscapes, creating fire adapted communities and encouraging jurisdictional collaboration.

Similar efforts have been underway for the last decade; however, the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture directed this to be the most all-inclusive effort ever attempted to develop a national wildfire management cohesive strategy. The goals of the National Cohesive Strategy are threefold:

1. **Restore and maintain resilient landscapes** – Landscapes across all jurisdictions become and remain resilient to fire-related disturbances in accordance with management objectives.
2. **Create fire-adapted communities** – Human populations and infrastructure will be able to withstand a wildfire without loss of life and property.
3. **Respond to wildfires** – All jurisdictions will participate in making and implementing safe, effective, efficient, risk-based wildfire management decisions.

The complete Western Region Cohesive Strategy Risk Assessment (updated in 2012) can be found at: <https://www.forestsandrangelands.gov/documents/strategy/reports/phase3/WesternRegionalRiskAnalysisReportNov2012.pdf>

##### 1.2.1.7 WESTERN GOVERNOR'S ASSOCIATION

Improving forest health and reducing the risk of wildfires were identified as top priorities for the Western Governors' Association (WGA). To that end, the WGA engaged in a multi-year effort working with regional stakeholders and the federal Wildfire Leadership Council to implement the 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy for Reducing Wildfire Risks. The Comprehensive Strategy utilized a community-based approach that recognizes that key decisions in setting restoration and fire and fuel management project priorities should be made at the local level. The Implementation Plan identifies the desired outcome to be achieved by each goal, measuring progress toward achieving the goals, and the specific steps that must be taken to realize measurable progress.

#### 1.2.1.8 FORESTS IN FOCUS 2.0

The Forests in Focus 2.0 initiative was launched in 2014 to address overwhelming forest health and wildland fire risk issues across the state. One driving force behind this effort was the passage of the 2014 Farm Bill, and the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2014 which provided authority for the Forest Service to enter into sole source contracts and Good Neighbor Authority (GNA) Agreements with state agencies to accomplish restoration services activities on and off federal lands. The GNA was further expanded with the passage of the 2018 Farm Bill. GNA's provide a flexible management tool to enable Montana and federal partners to collaborate more closely in carrying out critical forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration activities, as well as fuels reduction projects across boundaries. The Montana Department of Natural Resources and the Northern Region of the Forest Service signed a master Good Neighbor agreement in 2016 to allow for cooperative projects for forest, rangeland, and watershed restoration services. An update about recent work is found here:

[http://dnrc.mt.gov/divisions/forestry/docs/assistance/docs-gna/gna-update\\_octoberfinal.pdf](http://dnrc.mt.gov/divisions/forestry/docs/assistance/docs-gna/gna-update_octoberfinal.pdf)

#### 1.2.1.9 LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION OF FEDERAL FIRE POLICIES

The Lolo and Flathead National Forests derive their fire management direction from multiple plan and policy documents including each forest's respective Land Management Plan (1986), the Forest Service Manual 5100, the Federal Wildland and Prescribed Fire Management Policy (1995), the Thirtymile Hazard Abatement Plan (2003), the Fire and Aviation Operations Management 2003 Operations Action Plan and the Interagency Standards for Fire and Aviation Operations (2003). Each of the National Forests has a Forest Fire Management Team that establishes the annual program priorities based on National, Geographic, and Forest direction. In general, however, fire suppression actions are initiated on all unplanned ignitions. The appropriate response to each wildfire is commensurate with seasonal fire activity, resource availability, cost of suppression actions versus the potential environmental loss, and Land Management Plan direction. The appropriate response and subsequent suppression actions focus on the following priorities:

- Protection of human life, and firefighter, aviation, and public safety;
- Property, and natural and cultural resource protection decisions based on the cost investment, commensurate with benefits and values-to-be-protected; and
- Effectiveness and timeliness of planned actions to meet resource objectives.

Wildland fire is a general term describing any non-structure fire that occurs in vegetation and/or natural fuels including both prescribed fire and wildfire. They are categorized into two types - unplanned ignitions and planned ignitions. Response to wildland fire will be coordinated with all effected agencies/cooperators regardless of the jurisdiction at the ignition point. Fire as a critical natural process, will be integrated into land and resource management plans and activities on a landscape scale, and across agency boundaries. Management response to wildland fire on federal land is based on objectives established in the applicable land and resource management plan and fire management plan. A wildfire may be concurrently managed for more than one objective. Unplanned natural ignitions may be managed to achieve land and resource management plan and fire management plan objectives when risk is within acceptable limits. Initial response to human-caused fires will be to suppress the fire at the lowest cost with the fewest negative consequences with respect to firefighter and public safety. Response to wildland fire is based on ecological, social, and legal consequences of the fire. The appropriate response to the fire is dictated by: the circumstances under which the fire occurs, the likely consequences to firefighter/public safety and welfare, the natural/cultural resources values to be protected. <https://www.nifc.gov/PUBLICATIONS/redbook/2019/Chapter09.pdf>

Prescribed fire may be used to enhance resource values and reduce hazardous fuel accumulation. Fire Use also may be implemented, where there is an on-site specific plan, to enhance designated resource values and to allow fire to assume its natural ecological role." (Flathead National Forest LRMP narrative, chapter III)

The 2014 Farm Bill provided an opportunity for the Governors of every state with national forest system lands within their borders to recommend priority areas for treatment due to threats from forest insects and disease, wildfires, or both. Governor Bullock's nomination resulted in the designation of 5 million acres and includes lands in every national forest in Montana. Within the fire plan boundary, non-Wilderness lands in both the Lolo and Flathead National Forests were nominated by the governor as priority landscapes. These nominations provide focus and incentive to implement Farm Bill programs within the designated areas of these forests.

### **1.2.2 State Fire Policies**

A primary mission of the Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (DNRC) is the protection of the State's natural resources from wildfire. State fire Policy is defined in 76-13-115, which was annotated in 2019 by the Montana legislature.

76-13-115. State Fire Policy. The legislature finds and declares that:

- (1) the safety of the public and of firefighters is paramount in all wildfire suppression activities;
- (2) it is a priority to minimize property and resource loss resulting from wildfire and to minimize expense to Montana taxpayers, which is generally accomplished through an aggressive and rapid initial attack effort;
- (3) interagency cooperation and coordination among local, state, and federal agencies are intended and encouraged, including cooperation when restricting activity or closing areas to access becomes

necessary;

(4) fire prevention, hazard reduction, and loss mitigation are fundamental components of this policy;

(5) all property in Montana has wildfire protection from a recognized fire protection entity;

(6) all private property owners and federal and state public land management agencies have a responsibility to manage resources, mitigate fire hazards, and otherwise prevent fires on their property;

(7) sound forest management activities to reduce fire risk, such as thinning, prescribed burning, and insect and disease treatments, improve the overall diversity and vigor of forested landscapes and improve the condition of related water, wildlife, recreation, and aesthetic resources; and

(8) development of fire protection guidelines for the wildland-urban interface (WUI) is critical to improving public safety and for reducing risk and loss; and

(9) catastrophic wildland fire in wildland-urban interface areas resulting from inadequate federal land management activities to reduce fire risk has the potential to jeopardize Montanans' inalienable right to a clean and healthful environment guaranteed in Article II, section 3, of the Montana constitution.

Part 6 of the new State Fire Policy states that: "(6) all private property owners and federal and state public land management agencies have a responsibility to manage resources, mitigate fire hazards, and otherwise prevent fires on their property:

"Wildland fire protection is defined in 76-13-102(14):

"Wildland fire protection" means the work of prevention, detection, and suppression of wildland fires and includes training required to perform those functions. In addition, Montana State law requires that all privately owned forested lands in the State be provided with wildfire protection (76-13-201 MCA).

It is also the responsibility of the landowner to mitigate hazardous fuel conditions on their property by 76-13-212 - Duty of landowner to protect against fire:

(1) An owner of land shall protect against the starting or existence of fire and shall suppress the spread of fire on that land. This protection and suppression must be in conformity with reasonable rules and standards for adequate fire protection adopted by the department.

(2)(a) The provisions of 76-13-201 apply to an owner of land that is classified as forest land under 76-13-107 and that is within a wildland fire protection district.

(b) If an owner of land does not provide for protection against the starting or existence of fire and for fire suppression and the land does not meet the criteria in subsection (2)(a), the owner may request that the department provide protection as provided in 76-13-105.

This is accomplished through DNRC's Division of Forestry and includes those State and private classified forestlands lying within the protection boundaries, as well as areas not classified as forestland where agreements are in place. Large tracts of federal lands, within protection boundaries, are also being protected through contract or offset. The DNRC's current program direction is to take suppression actions that are both offensive and defensive on farm, range, forest, watershed, or other uncultivated lands in



private and public ownership. DNRC accomplishes its mission of protecting these private and public lands through a combination of three primary methods. These methods are labeled as direct, contract, and State/County cooperative fire protection. These methods are outlined as follows:

1. Direct Protection: This type of protection occurs within a Forest Fire Protection District or an Affidavit Unit, which are generally referred to as direct protection areas. Within these areas there is only one recognized agency assigned wildfire protection, usually the DNRC, USFS, BLM, or Salish and Kootenai Tribe. These are defined as forested lands and they are provided this protection based on an assessment for services rendered, paid through the county tax rolls to the State. Prevention, pre-suppression and suppression work is all considered DNRC direct fire protection responsibility. DNRC hires personnel and purchases equipment necessary to fulfill wildfire protection responsibilities for assigned lands. Assigned lands are within established wildfire protection districts or units.
2. Contract Protection: This is another type of direct protection provided to state, private and federal lands. A federal agency that has been recognized by the DNRC can protect state and private lands. Recognized federal fire protection agencies are required to provide protection at the same or higher level as they do on their own lands. DNRC may provide direct protection to federal lands. An offset acreage protection program exists within Montana to provide uniform fire protection areas and to avoid payments from one agency to another. Contracting by the offset method (the State provides fire protection on an approximately equal area of federal land) is how we currently operate in Montana. Contract protection may be by direct payment to the federal agency for their services or to the state for protection of federal acres.
3. State-County Cooperative Protection: The State and county cooperative fire program is a lower intensity fire protection than that of direct or contract protection but fully meets the legal requirements for protecting natural resources. The county provides the basic level of fire protection through a system of volunteers, county personnel, rural fire districts, etc. The county may be supported by the State in matters of organization, planning, prevention, equipment, training, and fire suppression. If a county reaches the point that it can no longer handle a wildfire situation it can call the DNRC for assistance. DNRC will then provide expertise and resources to handle the wildfire situation.

Also, Montana Code Annotated section 76-13-104(8) requires that the Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (DNRC) adopt administrative rules that address development within the wildland-urban interface (WUI). Specifically this includes, but is not limited to:

“best practices for development within the WUI and criteria for providing grant and loan assistance to local government entities to encourage them to adopt those practices.”

Guidelines were developed in 2009 (<http://dnrc.mt.gov/divisions/forestry/docs/fire-and-aviation/prevention/guidelinesfinal.pdf>) to address this requirement. The purpose of these guidelines are identified as:

“These Guidelines may be used by local government entities, fire protection agencies, planners, developers, and homeowners to improve protection of life, property, and resources from wildland fire.....Developments in science and technology, along with the adoption of new rules by the state of Montana and its counties governing construction and fuels mitigation in the WUI will present new ideas and direction for homeowners and other residents of the WUI.”

### 1.2.3 Local Fire Policies

The next level of wildfire protection occurs at the local or county level. Within the Fire Plan area there are two types of rural fire protection that include Rural Fire Districts (RFD) and Fire Service Areas (FSA). The Seeley Lake Rural Fire District is responsible for all fires occurring within their boundaries. There is no distinction in the law regarding what type of fire so all fires are included (structural, vehicle, and wildland). This applies regardless of the vegetative cover on the land so forested lands are also included even if these lands are already protected by a Recognized Wildland Protection Agency. It is these forested lands, lying within established rural fire districts that are referred to as having “overlapping jurisdiction.” (7-33-2202 MCA). Rural Fire Districts are supported through taxes paid on all property within their district. The Seeley Lake RFD has been in place since 1984.

The Swan Valley and Greenough/Potomac Fire Departments are organized as Fire Service Areas as defined in 7-33-2401 MCA. In Fire Service Areas, a fixed fee is established for residential and commercial structures within a designated area. Greenough/Potomac and Swan Valley Fire Departments are responsible for those structures and also have legal responsibility for wildland fire protection. The Greenough/Potomac Fire Service area was established in 1993 and the Swan Valley VFD was instituted in 2003.

## 1.3 Planning Area Boundaries

The Seeley-Swan Valley is located in northwest Montana and represents a land area of approximately 645,848 acres. The Fire Plan boundary spans 65 miles from north to south and 30 miles from east to west. Figure 1 identifies the actual boundary of the Fire Plan within Missoula, Lake and Powell Counties. There are 67.7% of the fire plan area in Missoula County, 27.1% in Lake County and 5.2% in Powell County. Two primary communities lie within the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan




Figure 1. Location of Seeley-Swan Fire Plan boundary within northwest Montana.

region; Seeley Lake in the south half of the project area and Condon in the north half. The northern boundary of the planning area coincides with the northern boundary of the Swan Unit DNRC fire protection area. There are

### 1.4 Community Legal Structure

The Seeley-Swan Fire Plan boundary encompasses the rural communities of Seeley Lake and Condon, Montana. These communities are unincorporated and reside within Missoula County. Missoula County is governed by the Board of County Commissioners. All legislative, executive and administrative powers and duties of the local government not specifically reserved by law or ordinance to other elected officials reside in the Commission (MCA-7-3-401). The Board of County Commissioners has jurisdiction and power to represent the County and has care of the County property and the management of the business and concerns of the County. However, the Seeley Lake Community Council and Condon Community Council, while not legally recognized governing bodies, were established, in part, to advance and promote the interests and welfare of the residents of Seeley Lake and Condon. They inform the Missoula County Commissioners and other County departments about issues within the Seeley Lake and Condon planning areas. The Councils work with permanent and part-time residents, state and federal agencies, property owners, and visitors to assist local government in making decisions that benefit the Seeley Lake and Condon areas.

### 1.5 Jurisdictional Boundaries

The primary wildfire protection system utilized in the Fire Plan area is the Forest Fire District. A Forest Fire District is an area authorized and established under 76-13-204 MCA, administered by the Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation for the protection of classified forestland from fire. Protection within a District is the most intensive form of forest fire protection provided within the state. District boundaries are established through a vote of the landowners. The DNRC assigns the protection for the state and private lands within the district to a recognized protection agency. All classified forestlands, whether state, private, or federal, within the district boundaries are normally under the protection of one recognized agency. Payment for protection is made by the private landowners through annual assessments which are charged up to the maximum as provided by law, based upon actual costs of protection. Payment for protection of another




Figure 2. Forest Fire Districts – jurisdictional boundaries.

agency’s lands within a district is handled on a direct billing basis. Fire prevention, detection, and suppression services are provided through the state in all districts. Most of the National Forests or certain portions have been formed into protection districts. All of the lands lying within the boundaries of the Lolo and Flathead National Forests are in a Forest Fire District.

Figure 2 identifies the Forest Fire Districts and responsible agencies within the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan area. The DNRC is the primary agency responsible for wildfire protection to state and private lands in the Fire Plan area. The Lolo and Flathead National Forests are the primary agencies responsible for wildfire protection on federal land. However, some jurisdictional boundaries have been delineated to maximize time and resource efficiencies and therefore may result in cross-responsibilities among agencies. Consequently, a fire originating within a designated forest fire district will be responded to by the agency identified in Figure 3.

It is important to note that the Seeley Lake and Swan Lake Rural Fire Districts, along with the Greenough/Potomac and Swan Valley Fire Service Areas have lead responsibilities for structural fire and emergency services within their respective jurisdictional zones (Figure 4). These fire departments within the Fire Plan area are available to provide initial attack wildfire suppression assistance within their




Figure 3. Forest fire – responding agency jurisdictional boundaries.




Figure 3. Structural fire – responding agency jurisdictional boundaries.

jurisdictional zones at the request of the wildland fire responding agency. The RFD's and FSA's will coordinate with the appropriate state and federal agencies to ensure a timely response and adequate resources are applied to a wildfire within their jurisdictional zones. Fire Service Areas are not responsible for wildland fires within their districts but may be called to assist in accordance with operating agreements with DNRC. Human safety and structure protection will be their primary responsibility within their jurisdictional zone. Structures located outside the Seeley Lake and Swan Lake Fire Districts or the Greenough/Potomac and Swan Valley Fire Service Areas are not protected. In the event of wildfire, state and federal agencies will attempt, where practical, to stop fires from reaching these structures. Wildfire firefighters are not trained for interior structural fire suppression.

---

## 1.6 Strategic Goals

---

The goal of this document is to develop a cooperative and coordinated fire management plan for the Seeley Lake and Condon communities-at-risk to wildfire. This plan includes five strategic objectives:

1. Facilitate community planning and outline strategies for protecting community values,
2. Identify existing information and conduct a risk assessment for the entire project area,
3. Identify pre-fire management risk/reduction actions and programs,
4. Develop a community Fire Plan that can be integrated with local comprehensive growth and development plans as well as broader landscape plans to ensure social, economic and ecological concerns are addressed at all levels, and
5. Develop a framework to ensure wildfire policy, prevention, attack, and funding efforts are coordinated locally among stakeholders that include local communities, as well as private and public organizations.

## 2.0 Community Description

### 2.1 Population, Demographics

Table 1 represents the estimated population of the Fire Plan area according to data acquired by the U.S. Census Bureau in 2010. While the census area boundaries did not precisely represent the Fire Plan boundaries, the data presented are believed to generally reflect the population estimates. Additional information is provided on housing units and types of occupancy to illustrate the level of seasonal, recreational, or occasional use within the planning area.

The Fire Plan area represents 645,848 acres. Figure 5 represents the primary ownership distribution within the Fire Plan area. Federal ownership comprises 63.2% of the land area, state of Montana ownership comprises 19.6%, The Nature Conservancy comprises 8.3%, and other private ownership comprises 8.2%. Lakes within the region comprise 1.5% of the total Fire Plan area.

Table 1. Estimated population of the Fire Plan area (Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2010).

|   | <b>Seeley Lake<br/>(59868)</b> | <b>Condon<br/>(59826)</b> |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Population</b>                           |                                |                           |
| Year-round occupants                        | 2054                           | 521                       |
| <b>Housing Units</b>                        |                                |                           |
| Occupied year-round                         | 957                            | 253                       |
| Seasonal, recreational<br>or occasional use | 950                            | 408                       |
| Vacant                                      | 84                             | 21                        |
| <b>Total Housing Units</b>                  | <b>1991</b>                    | <b>682</b>                |




Figure 4. Land ownership, maintained roads, primary lakes, and streams in the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan region.

---

## 2.2 Non-governmental Organizations, Homeowners' Associations

---

Several non-governmental organizations and homeowner's associations are present in the Fire Plan area that could provide support to fire planning and on-the-ground efforts to prepare for wildfire.

Non-governmental organizations include:

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Swan Valley Connections – Condon | Clearwater Resource Council – Seeley Lake             |
| Blackfoot Challenge – Ovando     | The Nature Conservancy – Ovando                       |
|                                  | Ecosystem Management Research Institute – Seeley Lake |

Homeowner's Associations include:

|                |                   |                            |
|----------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Double Arrow   | Lake Inez         | Big Sky Lake               |
| Placid Lake    | Eagle Point Ranch | Crescent Meadow            |
| Lindbergh Lake | Salmon Lake       | Seeley-Swan Forest Service |
|                | Cygnets Lake      | Leaseholders               |

---

## 2.3 Emergency Services

---

### 2.3.1 Rural Fire Services

The Seeley Lake Rural Fire District, along with the Greenough/Potomac and Swan Valley Fire Service Areas represent three of the six Rural Fire District within the overall Missoula (County) Rural Fire District. The Seeley Lake RFD, Greenough/Potomac and Swan Valley FSA's provide fire protection, emergency medical services, auto extrication, and special rescue response to the communities of Seeley Lake, Condon, and the surrounding areas. The Swan Valley FSA also provides emergency services in Lake County, along with the Swan Lake VFD. The Seeley Lake RFD emergency services are provided by 16 volunteers, as well as 2 full-time employees and 1 part-time employee. The Swan Valley and Greenough/Potomac FSA's emergency services are provided by 24 volunteers. The Swan Lake RFD has 10 volunteers providing emergency services.

|                  |   |   |
|------------------|---|---|
| <b>Contacts:</b> | Seeley Lake Rural Fire District         | 406-677-2400 (non-emergency)<br>911 (emergency) |
|                  | Swan Valley Volunteer Fire Service Area | 406-754-2870 (non-emergency)<br>911 (emergency) |
|                  | Greenough/Potomac Fire Service Area     | 406-244-5796 (non-emergency)<br>911 (emergency) |
|                  | Swan Lake Rural Fire District           | 406-886-2324 (non-emergency)<br>911 (emergency) |

### 2.3.2 Disaster Emergency Services



The Missoula County Office of Emergency Management (OEM) deals with “emergency management” which applies science, technology, planning, and management to deal with extreme events that can injure or kill large numbers of people, do extensive damage to property, and disrupt community life. OEM uses a variety of resources, techniques, and skills to reduce the probability and impact of extreme events and should a disaster occur, to ensure responsibility, authority, and channels of communication are clearly delineated. OEM is also responsible for cleanup and removal of hazardous materials that result from accidental spills. Lake County also has an Office of Emergency Management that serves the same role.

|                  |                     |                              |
|------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>Contacts:</b> | Missoula County OEM | 406-258-3632 (non-emergency) |
|                  |                     | 911 (emergency)              |
|                  | Lake County OEM     | 406-883-7253 (non-emergency) |
|                  |                     | 911 (emergency)              |

---

## 2.4 Infrastructure

---

### 2.4.1 Roads

The primary public road for ingress and egress to the Fire Plan area is Highway 83, which runs north and south through the center of the region. Highway 83 is maintained by the Montana Department of Transportation (MDT). Other secondary public roads identified as important for evacuation during the fire season include the Woodworth to Cottonwood Lakes loop, Placid Lake/Jocko Road, and the road to the Morrell Creek Trailhead. These secondary roads are maintained by the Missoula County Road Department except for the Morrell Creek road, which is maintained by the U.S. Forest Service.

Figure 5 also identifies the existing road system in terms of primary and secondary roads. Additional forest roads occur in the plan area. Many of these forest roads are maintained by individual agencies or landowners such as the U.S. Forest Service, DNRC, or The Nature Conservancy. These additional forest roads are not shown on this map as many are not actively maintained, and others have been gated or bermed to obstruct vehicle access or to meet the land management objectives of the individual landowner or agency.

|                  |  |              |
|------------------|--|--------------|
| <b>Contacts:</b> | State Highways - Montana Department of Transportation    | 406-677-2599 |
|                  | County Roads   |              |
|                  | Missoula County Road Department                          | 406-677-2222 |
|                  | Lake County Road Department                              | 406-883-7206 |
|                  | Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation |              |
|                  | Clearwater Office  | 406-244-5857 |
|                  | Swan River State Forest                                  | 406-754-2301 |
|                  | U.S. Forest Service                                      |              |
|                  | Seeley Lake Ranger District                              | 406-677-2233 |
|                  | Condon Work Center                                       | 406-754-2295 |
|                  | Swan Lake Ranger District                                | 406-837-7500 |

Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks  
The Nature Conservancy

406-542-5500  
406-793-0038

---

## 2.5 Critical Facilities

---

Critical facilities are defined as facilities critical to government response and recovery before, during or after a wildfire. Critical facilities for the Seeley Lake and Condon areas include emergency operations centers, fire stations, public works facilities, medical centers, and shelters. Critical facilities also include those that are essential to the continued delivery of community services such as the U.S. Postal Service facilities and public and private schools. In addition, the propane distribution facilities and the Condon Formulary contain hazardous materials that could jeopardize public safety in the event of a wildfire and therefore qualify as critical facilities.

### 2.5.1 911 and Emergency Operations Centers

Residents who wish to report a wildfire should call 911. Wildfires occurring within the Seeley Lake RFD jurisdiction or Swan Valley Fire Service Area jurisdiction are dispatched through the Missoula 911 system. The Missoula Interagency Dispatch Center in Missoula or the Kalispell Interagency Dispatch Center (KIC) currently dispatches U.S. Forest Service and DNRC Swan Unit resources, depending on the location of a wildfire within the Fire Plan area.

Operationally, Missoula Dispatch handles radio communication for initial attack fires, and supports firefighting agencies by ordering resources requested by the Incident Commanders. Missoula Dispatch also cooperates and coordinates with other volunteer fire departments around the area and coordinates to assist with initial attack support and resources sharing.

The Swan Valley FSA fire station serves as an emergency operations center during a wildfire event and the Seeley Lake Ranger District in Seeley Lake and the Swan Valley Work Center in Condon, serve as emergency operations centers for U.S. Forest Service and DNRC personnel. Swan Valley FSA also has a fire station in Salmon Prairie for Lake County fire protection. The Swan River State Forest also serves as an emergency operation center for the north end of the fire plan area.

### 2.5.2 Utilities

Most residences in the Fire Plan area use electric and/or propane to heat and operate their homes. Missoula Electric Cooperative is the only source of electricity to the area. It has a major distribution facility at the south end of Seeley Lake. Propane distribution facilities are maintained in the Seeley Lake and Condon communities by the vendors listed below. Energy Partners, LLC. has prepared a Disaster and Emergency Plan that contains contact and general information that would be useful to firefighting agencies in the event of a wildfire. The plan is on file with the Seeley Lake RFD.

|                  |  |              |
|------------------|--|--------------|
| <b>Contacts:</b> | Electric – Missoula Electric Cooperative                     | 800-352-5200 |
|                  | Propane – Energy Partners, LLC. (Cenex) – Seeley Lake/Condon | 406-677-3656 |

Amerigas

406-543-3598

### 2.5.3 Communications

Telephone services are the primary means of communication within the Fire Plan area. Blackfoot Telephone Company operates the landline communication grid as well as provides cellular and internet service to the area. Verizon Wireless and AT&T also provide cellular service to the region through towers near Placid Lake and Double Arrow Lookout, respectively. Most of the Condon area is without cell phone coverage. The location of critical communication equipment and radio towers are maintained in a Geographic Information System (GIS) and available to firefighting agencies in the event of a wildfire emergency.

|                  |                                     |              |
|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| <b>Contacts:</b> | Blackfoot Telephone Company         | 406-541-5000 |
|                  | Verizon Wireless – cellular service | 866-396-0403 |
|                  | AT&T – cellular service             | 800-331-0500 |

### 2.5.4 Water Services

Water services are provided to the central infrastructure of Seeley Lake through the Seeley Lake Water District. The Water District maintains a number of fire hydrants. The locations of the water district facility, existing fire hydrants and water draw sites are maintained in a GIS and available to firefighting agencies in the event of a wildfire emergency.

|                 |                            |              |
|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| <b>Contact:</b> | Seeley Lake Water District | 406-677-2039 |
|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------|

### 2.5.5 Public and Private Schools

Four public schools operate within the Fire Plan area. Two elementary schools are located in each of the Seeley Lake and Condon communities and an additional elementary school is located in Salmon Prairie. The Seeley-Swan High School is located in Seeley Lake and includes students from both the Seeley Lake and Condon communities. Enrollment numbers are from the 2019-2020 school year.

|                  |   |              |
|------------------|---|--------------|
| <b>Contacts:</b> | Seeley Lake Elementary (Pre-K to 8 <sup>th</sup> Grade) – enrollment: 185 | 406-677-2265 |
|                  | Swan Valley Elementary (Pre-K to 8 <sup>th</sup> Grade) – enrollment: 36  | 406-754-2320 |
|                  | Seeley-Swan High School – enrollment: 92                                  | 406-677-2224 |
|                  | Salmon Prairie School – enrollment: 3                                     | 406-754-2245 |

### 2.5.6 Community Medical Center

Medical care within the Fire Plan area is provided by the Seeley-Swan Medical Center located on Highway 83 at the south end of Seeley Lake. This health clinic is under the umbrella of the Partnership Health Center. The Partnership Health Center is a nonprofit 501(c)(3), administered through the Missoula City-County Health Department. The medical center also has a helipad site that is serviced by a variety of air ambulance service providers.

**Contact:** Seeley-Swan Medical Center

406-677-2277

### **2.5.7 Local Airports/Helipad Sites**

Two fixed-wing airstrips are located within the Fire Plan area. The Seeley Lake Airstrip is located on Airport Road on the northeast side of Seeley Lake. The Condon Airstrip is located across from the USFS Condon Work Center on the eastside of Highway 83 at mile marker 42.7.

Currently, the Lolo National Forest, Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, and the Montana Department of Transportation maintain an operating plan for the Seeley Lake Airstrip. Any incident requiring the use of this facility should consult this plan to ensure the consistent and safe management of aircraft during natural resource agency operations. Copies of this plan are available from either DNRC or the USFS.

Helipad sites used for emergency rescue and medical calls or by firefighting efforts are located and maintained throughout the Fire Plan area. Helipad locations continue to be identified and added each year. During a wildfire response, helipads are used to drop off the firefighting crew and deploy the water bucket to assist the initial attack crew with water. Because of the remoteness and limited road access this is an extremely valuable tool for firefighters. The locations of helipad sites are maintained in a GIS and available to firefighting agencies in the event of a wildfire.

---

## **2.6 Insurance Ratings**

---

Insurance Services Office, Inc. (ISO) identified the following criteria for determining fire insurance classification for calculation of property insurance premiums in the Seeley Lake RFD jurisdictional area:

“Class 7 applies to properties within 1,000 feet of a public hydrant, five (5) road miles or less of the responding fire station and with a needed water flow of 3,500 gpm or less. Class 8 applies to all dwelling properties within five (5) road miles of the responding fire station but beyond 1,000 feet of a fire hydrant. Class 9 applies to all other properties within five (5) miles of the responding fire station but beyond 1,000 feet of a fire hydrant. Class 10 applies to properties beyond five (5) road miles of a fire station. The private and public protection at properties with larger needed water flows, are individually evaluated, and may vary from the district classification.”

The ISO rating for fire insurance classification in the Swan Valley FSA jurisdictional area is Class 9. The Swan Lake VFD has a class 7 rating for the north end of the State Forest.

## 2.7 Land Use/Development Trends

---

Land uses of the Seeley Lake and Condon communities have historically been closely linked and very dependent upon the abundant natural resources of the Seeley-Swan Valley such as timber resources in the surrounding forests, summer cabins on the abundant lakes and streams, and hunting, fishing and other recreational opportunities in the Valley and adjacent National Forests and Wilderness Areas.

In 2008, The Nature Conservancy and The Trust for Public Lands initiated the Montana Legacy Project that consisted of purchasing 310,000 acres of Plum Creek Timber Company lands in northwestern Montana. Over the course of 3 years, these lands were transferred to primarily public ownership. Within the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan region, approximately 97,500 acres of Plum Creek Timber Company lands were transferred to federal, state, and private ownership; 66,000 acres occurring in the Swan Valley and 31,500 acres occurring in the Clearwater Valley. While this eliminated a great deal of the public vs. private checkerboard pattern in the Swan Valley and the northern half of the Clearwater Valley, the southern half of the Clearwater Valley still presents land management challenges due to the continuing checkerboard patterns. Lands that had previously been in Plum Creek ownership but were not transferred to federal ownership are now owned by The Nature Conservancy. These lands consist of approximately 53,400 acres in the Fire Plan region.

The Seeley Lake region has seen an increase in seasonal tourists and year-round residential development resulting from relocating retirees and work-at-home professionals, which has extended the need for wildfire protection from outside the historical Seeley Lake downtown area and the characteristic development bands surrounding the lake margins.

---

## 3.0 General Environmental Conditions

---

### 3.1 Topography, Slope, Aspect, Elevation

---

The Seeley-Swan valley was formed by continental glaciation when the Cordillerian ice sheet advanced through northern Montana. Smaller mountain glaciers formed in the Mission and Swan Mountain Ranges and moved along the Swan and Clearwater Valleys, as well. The Swan Mountain Range borders the east side of the plan area and the Mission Mountain Range borders the west side. Topography within the area is highly variable, ranging from relatively flat in the valley bottom to steep on the surrounding slopes. Elevation within the Fire Plan area ranges from 2,770 feet in the valley bottom to 9,795 feet on the surrounding peaks. Slopes within the plan area range from 0 to 76 degrees, with 43% of the area represented by slopes of 0 to 10 degrees, 28% by slopes of 10 to 20 degrees, 17% by slopes of 20 to 30 degrees, 9% by slopes of 30 to 40 degrees, and 3% by slopes of greater than 40 degrees. Approximately 0.5% of the plan area has 0 degree aspect or is flat. The remaining 99.5% of the plan area is nearly evenly distributed among north (23%), east (28%), south (23%) and west (25%) aspects.

---

### 3.2 Climate

---

The climate of the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan area is characterized as cool and temperate with minor maritime influences. However, large day-to-day temperature variations are not uncommon. Summers are dry with temperatures averaging between 42° F and 78° F. Winter temperatures average from 12° F to 33° F. Arctic air intrusions can also occur in winter. Precipitation ranges from 12 to 31 inches with most of the precipitation in fall, winter, and spring occurring as snow. Average rainfall in July and August is less than 2 inches. A snow pack of greater than 3 feet is typical for the area in winter. There is also a slight climatic gradient in the Fire Plan area with the middle of the Fire Plan area being slightly moister than the north or south ends due to the position of prevailing storm tracks and the rain shadow effect of the Mission Mountain range.

---

### 3.3 Ecological Sites

---

Ecological sites are a type of landscape classification system that identifies the different bio-physical conditions (e.g., soils, aspect, elevation, temperature, moisture, etc.) that influence disturbance patterns and the potential plant communities that can occur on a site. Nine terrestrial forested ecological sites have been identified for the Fire Plan area and are functionally similar to the habitat type groups currently being used by Region 1 of the US Forest Service. The methods used to map the ecological sites within the project area and a crosswalk to the USFS habitat type groups are provided in Mehl et al. (2012, Appendix 1). Figure 6 represents the map of ecological sites in the Fire Plan area. Table 2 identifies the number of acres for each the nine forested ecological sites in addition to riparian-wetland and grass-shrub ecological sites and water in the form of lakes. Note that a small portion of the Fire Plan area (southern tip), did not overlap with the Southwestern Crown of the Continent project boundary, and so ecological sites were not available for this area.

Table 2. Number of acres representing forested ecological sites and other systems within the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan region.

| <b>ECOLOGICAL SITE</b>        | <b>ACRES</b>   |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| Hot, Dry Forest               | 1,118          |
| Warm, Dry Forest              | 74,508         |
| Warm, Moist Forest            | 125,957        |
| Moderately, Warm Dry Forest   | 17,391         |
| Moderately, Warm Moist Forest | 53,518         |
| Cool, Dry Forest              | 121,242        |
| Cool, Moist Forest            | 125,546        |
| Cold, Dry Forest              | 55,243         |
| Cold, Moist Forest            | 16,153         |
| Grasslands/Shrublands         | 9,057          |
| Riparian/Wetland Systems      | 27,219         |
| Water                         | 12,372         |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                  | <b>639,324</b> |




Figure 6. Forested ecological sites of the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan region (adapted from Mehl et al. 2012).



---

## 3.4 Local Fire Ecology and Historic Forest Conditions

---

The following description of local fire ecology and historical disturbance regimes (Section 3.3.1) and historic forest ecological site and vegetation conditions (Section 3.3.2) are summarized from the Southwestern Crown (SW Crown) of the Continent Landscape Assessment (Mehl et al. 2012) that includes the Fire Plan area. This information is included to provide consistency in terminology and ecological site/forest descriptions between the Fire Plan and forest management collaborative efforts for ecological restoration. Please refer to the original report ([www.emri.org](http://www.emri.org)) for more information on the landscape assessment. References were not included in this summary but are available in the original report.

### 3.4.1 Historical Disturbance Regimes

Prior to Euro-American settlement, the primary historical disturbance regimes occurring in the SW Crown project area that had a profound influence on the species composition, structure, and processes of terrestrial forest communities, was fire. Native Americans also interacted and influenced ecosystem diversity for thousands of years in the SW Crown project area. Typically, their influence included using naturally occurring disturbance processes to benefit their subsistence strategies, such as using fire to create better wildlife habitat for hunted species or to open travel corridors. The influences of naturally occurring disturbance processes and their use by Native Americans on historical ecosystem diversity are incorporated in what is known as the historical reference.

Historical references are utilized in landscape assessments to help identify, describe and quantify the native ecosystem diversity that occurred in a region. For the purpose of this assessment, an historical reference is defined as the ecosystem diversity that resulted from both historical disturbance (i.e., fire, grazing, etc.) and human-influenced disturbance (i.e., Native American) that created the dynamic conditions that plant and animal species were adapted to and dependent upon. It is based on the assumption that native species evolved within a limited range of conditions that resulted from the natural and human-influenced disturbance regimes and processes operating in that landscape. Historical disturbance regimes are the patterns of frequency and intensity that can be quantified using ecological evidence. For example, fire regimes are frequently described relative to frequency of occurrence and relative intensity. The historical reference incorporates the influence of climate extremes for the time period of reference. Future climate change scenarios can be evaluated against the historical reference to better understand the implications of future projections and their influence on native ecosystem diversity and associated wildlife.

Another term often used in relation to historical reference is the historical range of variability. Historical range of variability is an important concept because it emphasizes that many ecosystems varied in amounts, compositions, and structures due to the interaction of site characteristics, climate, and random events that influenced historical disturbance regimes. For the purpose of evaluating today's ecosystem and habitat changes that have occurred in a given landscape, historical references are usually confined to a period less than 1000 years prior to Euro-American settlement, as these reflect the habitat conditions most relevant to the plant and animal species that are present today. Native ecosystems were not static

during any defined reference period. Species distributions were changing, disturbance regimes were changing, and species themselves were adjusting, usually slowly, to these changes through behavioral and genetic adaptations. However, developing an understanding of the ecosystem diversity that occurred during an identified timeframe prior to Euro-American settlement provides critical reference information for defining and quantifying a baseline of what should be considered “natural”, “native”, or “resilient” for an area, and is critical for ecological restoration efforts.

Relative to terrestrial ecosystems of the Northern Rockies, that includes the SW Crown project area, fire was the primary disturbance agent directly influencing terrestrial plant species composition, structure, and spatial distribution. While insects and disease were and continue to be important disturbance agents as well, their influences often precede and contribute to the occurrence and severity of fire as the end result. For the purposes of describing native ecosystem diversity in this landscape, we use fire as the primary historical driving force of large-scale disturbance and vegetation characteristics within this landscape.

Fire was a natural part of the Northern Rockies landscape for thousands of years and many species of plants and animals have become fire-adapted or even fire-dependent over time. Based on historical accounts and recent fire-scar studies, fire in the SW Crown project area was a relatively frequent disturbance event prior to Euro-American settlement. Many anecdotal and scientific reports have documented the widespread occurrence of fire throughout the region while the causes of these fires were both natural (i.e., lightning) and human-initiated (i.e., Native Americans). Fire-adapted plant species such as ponderosa pine and western larch have developed physical adaptations such as thick bark to protect larger trees from low severity fires. Fire-dependent species have developed life cycle strategies to take advantage of fire events such as the serotinous cones of lodgepole pine or rapid growth rates in western white pine.

The term “fire regime” is often used to describe the different ways that fire interacts with the land to influence the structure and species composition of vegetation, as well as vegetation patterns on the landscape. The term “fire severity” is used to refer to the degree of impact that fire has on vegetation species composition and structure, and is frequently described using the degree of overstory tree mortality in forested ecosystems. Fire regimes incorporate the various levels of fire severity and intensity across similar sites and their effects on the dominant vegetation. In the planning region, forest ecologists frequently describe the effects of fire using three broad classes of fire regimes: non-lethal, mixed-severity, and lethal. Primary factors that can influence fire regimes include climate, ecological site, and vegetation conditions. Trends in historical fire frequency and extent are related to climatic trends in temperature and precipitation with temperature trends affecting fire frequency and precipitation trends affecting fire extent. In general, more frequent fires occur on warmer sites and less frequent fires occur on cooler sites. Similarly, larger burn patches occur under dry conditions and smaller burn patches occur under moist conditions. In the planning region, non-lethal fire regimes are usually associated with low to moderate elevation warmer and drier sites, mixed-severity fire regimes are usually associated with mid- to high elevation warmer and moister sites as well as cooler and drier sites, and lethal fire regimes are usually associated with mid-to high elevation cooler and moister sites. Sites that are influenced by the non-lethal

and mixed-severity fire regimes are also frequently less steep (<20% slope) than those sites influenced by the lethal fire regime, except where rock formations may actually slow the spread of fire and contribute to mixed-severity conditions such as at high elevations. While these site characteristics are the more common drivers of fire regimes in this landscape, additional site influences such as frost pockets and proximity to adjacent fire regimes, can create exceptions to these general rules.

#### 3.4.1.1 NON-LETHAL FIRE REGIME

The non-lethal fire regime is usually described as having relatively frequent, low to moderate severity fires that burn along the surface of the ground and remain within the forest understory, thereby being relatively non-lethal to the older trees in the overstory. Mean fire return intervals for non-lethal fire regimes are usually less than 25 years for forests in the western United States. The frequency of these fires influence both the species composition and vegetation structure within these forests. Fire-adapted tree species become dominant in the overstory and bunchgrasses become dominant in the understory. Under drought conditions, fires can occur over larger areas but still are unlikely to kill more than a few overstory trees. The potential for insect or disease events are low and usually occur in small patches. The non-lethal fire regime contributes to the persistence of a multi-age stand, which in some cases may be composed of patches of even-aged groups. A wide range of age classes can occur, from saplings to old growth trees, but with relatively low numbers of trees per acre. However, when viewed at the stand level, forests influenced by a non-lethal regime typically have a clear presence of larger, older, fire-adapted trees in the overstory, even if their numbers are relatively low per acre (i.e., 8 to 30 tpa). For this reason, historical references to these forests often describe them as relatively “open and park-like”. Stand history studies conducted within forests historically influenced by the non-lethal fire regime demonstrate that they had relatively predictable species composition and structure as this fire regime appears to act as an agent of ecosystem stability. The result is a fairly uniform forest pattern at both the landscape (i.e., 100’s to 1000’s of acres) and stand levels (i.e., roughly 50 acres).

#### 3.4.1.2 LETHAL FIRE REGIME

The lethal fire regime is characterized by infrequent, high-severity fire that consumes most of the forest understory and overstory as it moves through a forest stand and across the landscape. Lethal fire regimes result in a stand replacing effect on forest conditions, in contrast to the persistent, yet less obvious effects of the non-lethal fire regime. The result of this impact is to set the forest back to an early seral stage and release fire-dependent species stimulated by severe fire events such as lodgepole pine. Mean fire return intervals under the lethal fire regime are frequently described as greater than 100 years for forests in the western United States. The forest then proceeds along an undisturbed successional trajectory for many years, depending on the ecological site. Tree densities are high and early seral conditions are usually dominated by single age-classes. Tree species that are susceptible to fire are a common component of the forest, particularly at late seral stages. Due to the higher densities of trees, the potential for insect and disease events is high. The resulting forest patterns are large patches of variable age-classes and seral stages at the landscape level but relatively uniform age-classes and conditions at the stand level.

#### 3.4.1.3 MIXED-SEVERITY FIRE REGIME

The mixed severity fire regime produces highly diverse forest conditions with elements of the non-lethal and lethal fire regimes occurring at a finer scale. It is described as having a complex mosaic of varying patch sizes of both the low severity and high severity fire effects. Some of these patches underburned as with a low severity fire and some had their overstory tree canopy mostly or completely killed as with a high severity fire. Within sites influenced by the mixed-severity fire regime, the amount of the low severity condition versus the high-severity condition is likely dependent on the site. Warmer and drier sites exhibit a higher percentage of low severity conditions while cooler and moister sites would exhibit a higher percentage of high severity conditions. Steeper sites exhibit the greatest fine-scale spatial variation in patchiness and age structures. Less steep sites exhibit less variation in patch sizes and age structures. Mean fire return intervals for mixed-severity fire regimes are frequently described as ranging from 25 to 100 years for forests of the western United States. The potential for insect or disease events are variable depending on tree densities. The resulting forest patterns are relatively uniform and stable at the landscape level but highly variable at the stand level.

A fire regime classification that is based on fire effects attempts to incorporate the physical attributes of the site and fire as well as the fire tolerance of the vegetation. While recognizing that fire severities, and thereby fire regimes, occur along an environmental gradient and may not be stable over space and time, a classification system can help to communicate and quantify the potential influences of different fire regimes on a landscape. To capture some of these influences and reduce some of the variability in the mixed-severity fire regimes of the planning region, we have further divided the mixed-severity fire regime into 2 classes; mixed-severity A and mixed-severity B. Figure 7 defines the resulting fire regime classification system relative to overstory tree mortality as used in this assessment.



Figure 7. Fire regime classes identified for the SW Crown project area relative to the gradient of average fire severity induced overstory tree canopy mortality.

In addition, relative to forest patterns, the mixed-severity A fire regime is differentiated from the mixed-severity B fire regime by the pattern of low to moderate severity fire conditions versus high severity conditions occurring at the stand level. The mixed-severity A fire regime is dominated by a matrix of low to moderate severity fire conditions and smaller inclusions of the high severity fire conditions. Whereas the mixed-severity B fire regime is dominated by a matrix of high severity fire conditions and smaller inclusions of low to moderate severity fire conditions. Figure 8 provides a visualization of the average fire severity patterns expected for each of the four fire regime classes as well as the expected percent composition of low to moderate (for simplicity, future reference to this condition will be condensed to low severity versus high severity fire influenced conditions occurring in the SW Crown project area, with the understanding that future references to low severity fire also include a range of low to moderate severity fire.




Figure 8. The average fire severity patterns expected to characterize the four fire regime classes of the SW Crown project area for stands of approximately 50 acres in size.

Since Euro-American settlement, many human activities and land uses have functionally suppressed, eliminated or changed many of the historical disturbance regimes throughout North America. The result has been changes to many native ecosystems and their associated biodiversity. For forest ecosystems in the SW Crown project area, the primary influence in this regard has been the harvest of timber and the reduced role of fire regimes for nearly 100 years. Land use and land management programs and policies that have functionally suppressed fire in the landscape have had profound effects on native ecosystem diversity, forest structures and patterns, ecosystem processes and resiliency, and the biodiversity dependent on the fire-influenced native condition. Understanding and quantifying these changes is critical to the success of ecosystem restoration programs that will ultimately benefit and support native biodiversity, as well as understanding and mitigating the future potential impact of climate change.

### 3.4.2 Historical Forest Conditions

The following sections summarize the information developed for nine terrestrial forest ecological sites and their disturbance states for the Fire Plan region using information developed for the SW Crown

Landscape Assessment (Mehl et al. 2012). For more detailed descriptions, please see the original document.

The following sections provide information on the expected distribution of these ecological sites relative to topographic and elevational positions in the landscape. Table 3 further summarizes the information on historical disturbance regimes for each of the ecological sites in terms of expected fire severity patterns, tree species, and historical stand structures. For more detailed discussions of the historical conditions on these ecological sites, please see the original SW Crown Landscape Assessment document.

#### 3.4.2.1 HOT-DRY ECOLOGICAL SITE

*Distribution:* This ecological site represents the hot and dry extreme of forest environments in the project area and typically represents the lower timberline conditions where they transition to grass-shrub ecosystems. Soils are typically characterized by droughty and shallow conditions. Grassy openings are frequently intermixed with the clumpy but relatively open distribution of trees. They occur most frequently on south and westerly aspects but may extend to mid-elevations on steep, warm, and very arid sites. Geology and terrain appear to be limiting factors only to the extent of retaining sufficient soil moisture, which is the controlling influence.

#### 3.4.2.2 WARM-MOIST ECOLOGICAL SITE

*Distribution:* This ecological site represents the warm and dry forest environments in the project area. It is a common forest ecological site occurring in the Fire Plan region. It occurs most commonly at low to mid-elevations. It is often intermixed with grassy openings and the forest canopy is often clumpy but with a relatively open distribution of trees. This ecological site frequently occurs at low elevations of the forest zone on warm-dry aspects.

#### 3.4.2.3 MODERATELY WARM-DRY ECOLOGICAL SITE

*Distribution:* This ecological site represents the moderately warm and dry forest environments. It is limited to the northern portion of the project area where the moderating effect of the Pacific-Maritime climate reaches its eastern limit in the inland Northwest. It is most common to the lower slopes benches and valley bottoms, where it occurs in the project area.

#### 3.4.2.4 MODERATELY WARM-MOIST ECOLOGICAL SITE

*Distribution:* This ecological site represents the moderately warm and moist forest environments. It is limited to the northern portion of the project area where the moderating effect of the Pacific-Maritime climate reaches its eastern limit in the inland Northwest. It is most common to the lower benches and valley bottoms on northerly aspects, where it occurs in the project area.

#### 3.4.2.5 COOL-DRY ECOLOGICAL SITE

*Distribution:* This ecological site represents the cool and dry forests in the project area. They are most common to the mid-elevation zone but at their lower limits may occur mainly on steep, northerly or easterly aspects but shift to southerly and westerly aspects at their upper limits.

#### 3.4.2.6 COOL-MOIST ECOLOGICAL SITE

*Distribution:* This ecological site represents the cool and moist forest environments in the planning region. They are most common to the mid-elevation zone but are most common to northwest and east facing slopes and moist frost pockets at lower elevations.


#### 3.4.2.7 COLD-DRY ECOLOGICAL SITE

*Distribution:* This ecological site represents the cold and dry forest environments in the project area. They are most common to the upper-elevation zone and are often transitional between the forest and the Krummholz or alpine communities. The climate is characterized by a short growing season with early summer frosts. Soils are frequently shallow and have limited soil moisture.

#### 3.4.2.8 COLD-MOIST ECOLOGICAL SITE

*Distribution:* This ecological site represents the cold and moist forest environments. They are most common to the upper-elevation zone and are often transitional between the forest and the krummholz or alpine communities. The climate is characterized by a short growing season with early summer frosts. Soils are frequently shallow and have limited soil moisture.

Table 3. Summary information on historical forest conditions and fire regime patterns for nine ecological sites within the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan region.



| Ecosite Fire Regimes |                            | Fire Severity      | Tree Species                                   | Historic Stand Structure - Description  | Historic Stand Structure - Mean Values   |
|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|--|---|--|
| WARM-DRY             | Non-Lethal and MS-A        | Low Severity Fire  | Ponderosa Pine<br>Douglas-fir<br>Western larch | <i>Disturbance State</i> - Late seral (oldest cohort >170 years)<br><i>Overstory</i> - clear dominance by large diameter, fire adapted trees; low density of trees overall; several age and sizeclasses<br><i>Understory</i> - open, park-like, dominated by bunchgrasses               | Overstory trees = 15 - 30 trees per acre<br>Basal Area = 60 - 100 sq. ft. per acre<br>Snags(>20"dbh) = 0.8 snags per acre<br>CWD = 5 to 9 tons per acre            |
|                      |                            | High Severity Fire | Ponderosa Pine<br>Douglas-fir<br>Western larch | <i>Disturbance State(s)</i> - Early seral (oldest cohort <50-100 yrs)<br><i>Variable</i> - ranges from regeneration post-fire to early seral (NL) or mid-seral (MSA/B); typically even-aged or single-storied<br><i>Understory</i> - mod dense; small trees, shrubs, forbs, grasses     | Trees = usually high densities<br>Basal Area = 0 - 200 sq. ft. per acre<br>Snags = high post-fire, low densities later<br>CWD = variable, depending on seral stage |
| WARM-MOIST           | Non-Lethal, MS-A, and MS-B | Low Severity Fire  | Ponderosa Pine<br>Douglas-fir<br>Western larch | <i>Disturbance State</i> - Late seral (oldest cohort >170 years)<br><i>Overstory</i> - clear dominance by large diameter, fire apated trees; low density of trees overall; several age and sizeclasses<br><i>Understory</i> - open, park-like, bunchgrasses and some small shrubs       | Overstory trees = 15 - 30 trees per acre<br>Basal Area = 80 - 120 sq. ft. per acre<br>Snags(>20"dbh) = 0.8 snags per acre<br>CWD = 10 to 20 tons per acre          |
|                      |                            | High Severity Fire | Ponderosa Pine<br>Douglas-fir<br>Western larch | <i>Disturbance State(s)</i> - Early/mid-seral (oldest cohort <50-150 yrs)<br><i>Variable</i> - ranges from regeneration post-fire to early seral (NL) or mid-seral (MSA/B); typically even-aged or single-storied<br><i>Understory</i> - mod dense; small trees, shrubs, forbs, grasses | Trees = usually high densities<br>Basal Area = 0 - 250 sq. ft. per acre<br>Snags = high post-fire, low densities later<br>CWD = variable, depending on seral stage |



Table 3. Continued

| Ecosite               | Fire Regimes                              | Fire Severity      | Tree Species  | Historic Stand Structure - Description  | Historic Stand Structure - Mean Values  |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------|---|---|---|
| <b>MOD WARM-DRY</b>   | <b>MS-A,<br/>MS-B,<br/>and<br/>Lethal</b> | Low Severity Fire  | Western larch<br>Douglas-fir<br><i>Western white pine</i>   | <i>Disturbance State</i> - Late seral (oldest cohort >180 years)<br><i>Overstory</i> - clear dominance by large diameter, fire adapted trees; low-mod density of trees overall; several age and sizeclasses<br><i>Understory</i> - open with grasses and some shrubs/small trees  | Overstory trees = 30 - 50 trees per acre<br>Basal Area = 150 - 200 sq. ft. per acre<br>Snags(>20"dbh) = 2.4 snags per acre<br>CWD = 15 to 30 tons per acre          |
|                       |   | High Severity Fire | Lodgepole pine<br>Douglas-fir<br>Western larch<br>Western red cedar<br>Western hemlock<br><i>Western white pine</i><br>Engelmann spruce<br>Grand fir<br><i>Ponderosa pine</i> | <i>Disturbance State(s)</i> - All<br><i>Variable</i> - ranges from regeneration post-fire to late seral; typically even-aged or single-storied; high density of trees overall; shade-intolerant dominate in early stages and intolerant spp in later stages; lodgepole pine can dominate to late seral state of 200 yrs or more on colder sites<br><i>Understory</i> - dense; small trees, shrubs, forbs, grasses | Trees = usually high densities<br>Basal Area = 0 - >250 sq. ft. per acre<br>Snags = high post-fire, low densities later<br>CWD = variable, depending on seral stage |
| <b>MOD WARM-MOIST</b> | <b>MS-A,<br/>MS-B,<br/>and<br/>Lethal</b> | Low Severity Fire  | Western larch<br>Douglas-fir<br><i>Western white pine</i>   | <i>Disturbance State</i> - Late seral (oldest cohort >180 years)<br><i>Overstory</i> - clear dominance by large diameter, fire adapted trees; low-mod density of trees overall; several age and sizeclasses<br><i>Understory</i> - open with grasses and some shrubs/small trees  | Overstory trees = 30 - 50 trees per acre<br>Basal Area = 150 - 200 sq. ft. per acre<br>Snags(>20"dbh) = 1.3 snags per acre<br>CWD = 15 to 32 tons per acre          |
|                       |   | High Severity Fire | Lodgepole pine<br>Douglas-fir<br>Western larch<br>Western red cedar<br>Western hemlock<br><i>Western white pine</i><br>Engelmann spruce<br>Grand fir<br><i>Ponderosa pine</i> | <i>Disturbance State(s)</i> - All<br><i>Variable</i> - ranges from regeneration post-fire to late seral; typically even-aged or single-storied; high density of trees overall; shade-intolerant dominate in early stages and intolerant spp in later stages; lodgepole pine can dominate to late seral state of 200 yrs or more on colder sites<br><i>Understory</i> - dense; small trees, shrubs, forbs, grasses | Trees = usually high densities<br>Basal Area = 0 - >250 sq. ft. per acre<br>Snags = high post-fire, low densities later<br>CWD = variable, depending on seral stage |

Table 3. Continued.

| Ecosite            | Fire Regimes                    | Fire Severity   | Tree Species  | Historic Stand Structure - Description  | Historic Stand Structure - Mean Values  |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| COOL-DRY           | MS-A,<br>MS-B,<br>and<br>Lethal | Low Severity Fire   | Western larch   | <i>Disturbance State</i> - Late seral (oldest cohort >180 years)  | Overstory trees = 30 - 50 trees per acre<br>Basal Area = 80 - 120 sq. ft. per acre<br>Snags(>20"dbh) = 0.8 snags per acre<br>CWD = 7 to 25 tons per acre            |
|                    |                                 |   | Douglas-fir   | <i>Overstory</i> - clear dominance by large diameter, fire adapted trees; low-mod density of trees overall; several age and sizeclasses |   |
|                    |                                 | High Severity Fire  | Western white pine                                      | <i>Understory</i> - open with grasses and some shrubs/small trees   | Trees = usually high densities<br>Basal Area = 0 - >200 sq. ft. per acre<br>Snags = high post-fire, low densities later<br>CWD = variable, depending on seral stage |
|                    |                                 |   | Lodgepole pine  | <i>Disturbance State(s)</i> - All   |   |
| COOL-MOIST         | MS-A,<br>MS-B,<br>and<br>Lethal | Low Severity Fire   | Douglas-fir   | <i>Disturbance State</i> - Late seral (oldest cohort >180 years)  | Overstory trees = 30 - 50 trees per acre<br>Basal Area = 80 - 120 sq. ft. per acre<br>Snags(>20"dbh) = 1.2 snags per acre<br>CWD = 7 to 25 tons per acre            |
|                    |                                 |   | Western larch   | <i>Overstory</i> - clear dominance by large diameter, fire adapted trees; low-mod density of trees overall; several age and sizeclasses |   |
|                    |                                 | High Severity Fire  | Western white pine                                      | <i>Understory</i> - open with grasses and some shrubs/small trees   | Trees = usually high densities<br>Basal Area = 0 - >200 sq. ft. per acre<br>Snags = high post-fire, low densities later<br>CWD = variable, depending on seral stage |
|                    |                                 |   | Lodgepole pine  | <i>Disturbance State(s)</i> - All   |   |
| High Severity Fire | Douglas-fir                     | <i>Overstory</i> - variable, ranges from regeneration post-fire to late seral; typically even-aged or single-storied; high density of trees overall; shade-intolerant dominate in early stages and intolerant spp in later stages; lodgepole pine can dominate to late seral state of 200 yrs or more on cold sites | Understory - dense; small trees, shrubs, forbs, grasses |   |   |
|                    | Western larch                   | <i>Overstory</i> - variable, ranges from regeneration post-fire to late seral; typically even-aged or single-storied; high density of trees overall; shade-intolerant dominate in early stages and intolerant spp in later stages; lodgepole pine can dominate to late seral state of 200 yrs or more on cold sites |   |   |   |
| High Severity Fire | Western white pine              | <i>Overstory</i> - variable, ranges from regeneration post-fire to late seral; typically even-aged or single-storied; high density of trees overall; shade-intolerant dominate in early stages and intolerant spp in later stages; lodgepole pine can dominate to late seral state of 200 yrs or more on cold sites | Understory - dense; small trees, shrubs, forbs, grasses |   |   |
|                    | Ponderosa pine                  | <i>Overstory</i> - variable, ranges from regeneration post-fire to late seral; typically even-aged or single-storied; high density of trees overall; shade-intolerant dominate in early stages and intolerant spp in later stages; lodgepole pine can dominate to late seral state of 200 yrs or more on cold sites |   |   |   |
| High Severity Fire | Engelmann Spruce                | <i>Overstory</i> - variable, ranges from regeneration post-fire to late seral; typically even-aged or single-storied; high density of trees overall; shade-intolerant dominate in early stages and intolerant spp in later stages; lodgepole pine can dominate to late seral state of 200 yrs or more on cold sites | Understory - dense; small trees, shrubs, forbs, grasses |   |   |
|                    | Subalpine fir                   | <i>Overstory</i> - variable, ranges from regeneration post-fire to late seral; typically even-aged or single-storied; high density of trees overall; shade-intolerant dominate in early stages and intolerant spp in later stages; lodgepole pine can dominate to late seral state of 200 yrs or more on cold sites |   |   |   |

Table 3. Continued

| Ecosite           | Fire Regimes                              | Fire Severity      | Tree Species  | Historic Stand Structure - Description   | Historic Stand Structure - Mean Values  |
|-------------------|---|--------------------|---|--|---|
| <b>COLD-DRY</b>   | <b>MS-A,<br/>MS-B,<br/>and<br/>Lethal</b> | Low Severity Fire  | Whitebark pine<br>Alpine larch  | <i>Disturbance State</i> - Late seral (oldest cohort >180 years)<br><i>Overstory</i> - clear dominance by larger diameter, fire adapted trees; low-mod density of trees overall; several age and sizeclasses<br><i>Understory</i> - open with grasses and small shrubs   | Overstory trees = unavailable<br>Basal Area = unavailable<br>Snags(>20"dbh) = 0.8 snags per acre<br>CWD = 11 tons per acre                            |
|                   |   | High Severity Fire | Whitebark pine<br>Lodgepole pine<br>Subalpine fir<br>Alpine larch<br>Engelmann Spruce | <i>Disturbance State(s)</i> - All<br><i>Overstory</i> - variable, ranges from regeneration post-fire to late seral; typically even-aged or single-storied; high density of trees overall; shade-intolerant dominate in early stages and intolerant spp in later stages<br><i>Understory</i> -moderately dense with grasses and small shrubs  | Trees = usually high densities<br>Basal Area = unavailable<br>Snags = high post-fire, low densities later<br>CWD = variable, depending on seral stage |
| <b>COLD-MOIST</b> | <b>MS-A,<br/>MS-B,<br/>and<br/>Lethal</b> | Low Severity Fire  | Whitebark pine<br>Alpine larch  | <i>Disturbance State</i> - Late seral (oldest cohort >180 years)<br><i>Overstory</i> - clear dominance by larger diameter, fire adapted trees; low-mod density of trees overall; several age and sizeclasses<br><i>Understory</i> - open with grasses and small shrubs   | Overstory trees = unavailable<br>Basal Area = unavailable<br>Snags(>20"dbh) = 0.8 snags per acre<br>CWD = 11 tons per acre                            |
|                   |   | High Severity Fire | Whitebark pine<br>Lodgepole pine<br>Subalpine fir<br>Alpine larch<br>Engelmann Spruce | <i>Disturbance State(s)</i> - All<br><i>Overstory</i> - variable, ranges from regeneration post-fire to late seral; typically even-aged or single-storied; high density of trees overall; shade-intolerant dominate in early stages and intolerant spp in later stages<br><i>Understory</i> - moderately dense with grasses and small shrubs | Trees = usually high densities<br>Basal Area = unavailable<br>Snags = high post-fire, low densities later<br>CWD = variable, depending on seral stage |

---

## 4.0 General Fire Conditions

---

### 4.1 Fire Weather

---

Critical fire weather is defined as conditions whose effects on fire behavior make control difficult and threaten firefighter and community safety. Weather patterns common to the Fire Plan area that contribute to critical fire weather include high afternoon temperatures (mid-80's to high-90's) coupled with low relative humidity (10 to 30%). If high temperatures and low relative humidity are further combined with afternoon and evening winds of 10 miles per hour or greater and if this weather pattern persists for several days or more, most forests will rapidly transition from moist fuel conditions to drought-like fuel conditions. During periods of unusually high temperatures, it is also not uncommon to experience thunderstorms that roll through the area with associated lightning and high winds, but very little rain.

---

### 4.2 Hazardous Fuels

---

#### 4.2.1 Forest Cover Types and Fuels

The map of forest cover types for the Fire Plan area was developed from satellite imagery landscape classification coverage obtained from LANDFIRE. This cover was based on Landsat imagery from 2013-2017. The coverage was classified by LANDFIRE using a fuel model classification used by all Fire Managers. The fuel models for calculating fire behavior are those used by Albini (1976) to develop the monograms published in his paper, "Estimating Wildfire Behavior Effects." There are 13 models, including 11 developed by Anderson and Brown and published by Rothermel (1972), a model for dead brush developed at the suggestion of Von Johnson, and a model for southern rough developed by Albini. These are called the "NFFL fuel models"; or "fire behavior models. Each fuel model was given the following rating: FM 1=1, FM 2=3, FM 3 = 4, FM 4=6, FM 5=7, FM 6=8, FM 7=4, FM 8=8, FM 9=7, FM 10=10. This information was used to develop a fuel hazard map for the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan region (Figure 10).

There are limitations with using satellite imagery for fuel hazard ranking that must be identified. Because satellite imagery classification is based primarily on the overstory vegetation, it is less dependable for identifying structure and understory conditions that heavily influence fuel hazard rankings. For this reason, classification of fuel model categories 8 and 10 were particularly difficult in the Fire Plan area. In addition, logging history was not available therefore fuel model categories 11, 12 and 13 were not included in the fuel hazard ranking for the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan region. Future efforts to map fuel hazards should strive to overcome these limitation and deficiencies in existing data.

#### 4.2.2 Natural Firebreaks

The occurrence of several large lakes represents the primary natural firebreaks within the Fire Plan area. The Clearwater and Swan Rivers and Highway 83 may also act as firebreaks during mild to moderate weather conditions. However, it is important to note that under more extreme or critical weather conditions (i.e., high temperatures, low humidity, and moderate to high winds), burning embers can be carried long distances and ignite fires on the other side of natural firebreaks such as large lakes. During

the Jocko Lakes fire of 2007, fire starts from wind carried embers were noted greater than 1 mile in front of the primary line of fire.

---

### 4.3 Fire History

---

Information on fire history for the Fire Plan area was obtained from the Flathead and Lolo National Forest. Figure 11 identifies the approximate boundaries and years of the historical fires in the region based on field surveys and local knowledge. The largest annual burn extent occurred in 1919 at nearly 135,000 acres, followed by 1910 with approximately 53,000 acres. More recent fires, such as Jocko Lakes in 2007 and Rice Ridge in 2017, have burned more than 30,000 acres each within the Fire Plan area. It is interesting to note the pattern of recurrence of fire in many of the previously burned areas.

Table 4 identifies the number of acres by landowner impacted by wildland fire since the release of the initial 2004 Fire Plan.

Table 4. Number of acres impacted by wildland fire for primary landowner groups in the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan region from 2003 to 2018.

| Landowner                        | Wildland Fire Acres |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Private                          | 1,030               |
| The Nature Conservancy           | 16,562              |
| MT DNRC-Swan Unit                | 975                 |
| US Forest Service-Swan Lake RD   | 18,405              |
| MT Fish, Wildlife, and Parks     | 4,137               |
| US Forest Service-Seeley Lake RD | 55,429              |
| MT DNRC-Clearwater Unit          | 2,174               |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                     | <b>98,712</b>       |



### Seeley-Swan Fire Plan - Hazardous Fuels




Figure 10. Hazardous fuels in the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan region, as classified using the 13 Anderson Fire Behavior Fuel Models. Source: LANDFIRE




Figure 11. The approximate date and extent of historical fires in the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan region. Source: U.S. Forest Service and MT DNRC

## 4.4 Fire Ignition History

Nearly 2500 wildfires were recorded in the Fire Plan area to date (Source: Lolo National Forest, Flathead National Forest, Montana DNRC records). Of these approximately 2500 fires, 60% were lightning caused fires and 40% were human-caused fires. Of the 786 fires recorded by the Lolo and Flathead National Forests, table 5 represents the percentage of fires occurring by month.

Table 5. Percentage of fires occurring by month in the Fire Plan area.

| Month     | % of Fires Occurring by Month |
|-----------|-------------------------------|
| April     | <1%                           |
| May       | 4%                            |
| June      | 8%                            |
| July      | 31%                           |
| August    | 41%                           |
| September | 12%                           |
| October   | 3%                            |
| November  | 1%                            |

Patterns of historical fire ignition densities indicate that most of the human-caused fires originated near the most densely populated areas and near high-use recreational areas. Lightning strikes occurred throughout the Fire Plan region.



---

## 5.0 Identifying Assets at Risk

Assessing risk requires an understanding of the importance of those assets that the community values. While the following sections provide a discussion of the assets identified as important to the community, for the purpose of the risk assessment only human safety and property were considered.

---

### 5.1 Structures/Density

---

Over 2400 housing units, both permanent and seasonal, are present in the Fire Plan area according to Missoula, Lake, and Powell county records. Figure 12 represents a map of structure densities for the Fire Plan area that was developed using county cadastral information from Missoula, Lake, and Powell counties. As evidenced by the density map, the majority of structures within the Fire Plan area are located near the communities of Seeley Lake and Condon as well as adjacent to the Highway 83 corridor and surrounding several of the major lakes within the region.

Using county tax information from 2019, the estimated taxable value of structures in the Fire Plan area was calculated at approximately \$462,427,579. The estimated value of private land without structures was \$747,646,601. In total, the value of privately held assets in the Fire Plan area was approximately \$1,210,074,180. This figure does not include the value of contents or intangibles that could also be lost to wildfire.

---

### 5.2 Businesses/Commercial

---

Local economic impacts from catastrophic wildfires include disruptions to both sale and production of local goods and services. Immediate effects may include decreased recreation/tourism and timber harvest in the fire region, as well as disruptions from evacuations and transportation delays. Increased use of local goods and services for fire protection also impacts local economies. Other effects include direct property losses (in the form of buildings, timber, livestock, and other capital), damage to human health, and possible changes in the long-term structure of the local economy.

Most businesses and commercial operations are clustered in the two communities of Seeley Lake and Condon. A few additional businesses and commercial operations occur in the plan, primarily at locations along Route 83. The Seeley/Swan Valley forest resources support a number of forest products companies in the region including Pyramid Mountain Lumber, Round Wood West, and Boise Inc. These companies provide a demand for timber or fiber that can help support fuel thinning programs in the Fire Plan region.

---

### 5.3 Ecosystems and Biological Diversity

---

The Fire Plan region has a conservation status that is among the highest in the U.S. The Fire Plan area lies within the southernmost portion of the Northern Continental Divide Ecoregion. This ecoregion contains some of the largest blocks of protected land in the U.S. The planning area supports a rich biodiversity of both plants and animals. This area has been identified as bioregionally outstanding, supporting some 2,203 terrestrial species including an estimated 48 endemics. It is particularly noted for its rich diversity of coniferous forest ecosystems. It also contains some of the most intact watersheds and aquatic ecosystems in the lower 48 states. The area is noteworthy for its populations of large carnivores including wolves, grizzly bears, wolverines, cougar, marten, fisher, and lynx, and is one of the few remaining strongholds for the threatened bull trout and the sensitive west-slope cutthroat trout.

Much of the biological distinctiveness of this region is due to the presence of protected lands. This region maintains populations of a number of species extirpated in most of their former ranges including the above-mentioned carnivores. This landscape also maintains healthy populations of a long list of additional plant and animal species. These species are supported by an array of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems that still maintain most of their historical ecological processes. This region provides a unique opportunity to maintain the full range of ecosystems and biodiversity that historically occurred in the area.

### Seeley-Swan Fire Plan - Density of Structures




Figure 12. Density of residences per square mile in the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan region.

In addition, this region has maintained relatively high landscape connectivity, which is a primary reason the populations of large carnivores still occur. Developing strategies to reduce the threat and impacts of wildfire on local communities while maintaining ecosystem integrity and biological diversity in this landscape will be critical to the persistence of grizzly bears, lynx, wolverines, and bull trout, as well as the functional ecosystems on which they depend.

The Southwestern Crown of the Continent Landscape Assessment (Mehl et al. 2012) also identified the following concerns relative to native ecosystem diversity and wildfire for the Fire Plan region:

*“Substantial changes in fire regimes were noted in comparisons of historical conditions to current conditions, with very large increases in lethal fire regimes occurring today. Historically common non-lethal and mixed-severity fire regimes have been greatly reduced in this landscape. Substantial shifts in forest disturbance states were also reported, however the limitations of the available data to describe current forest conditions were noted.*

*Of particular concern is the future representation and persistence of the low severity, fire maintained, late seral disturbance state in the SW Crown project area. The past targeted removal of the fire-adapted, large tree component has reduced this structure in the landscape relative to historical conditions. Where these fire-adapted, large trees still occur, they are now at increased risk to unprecedented high severity fires that may kill many of the overstory trees and further reduce their occurrence in the landscape. Past and current labeling by managers of “old-growth” conditions has exacerbated this problem by not differentiating the low severity versus high severity fire influenced late seral condition relative to species compositions, structures, and fire regime patterns for each ecological site. This, coupled with public concerns about past timber management practices that targeted the large trees has now resulted in a “do not touch” approach for the remaining old growth conditions that is prohibiting their restoration and future protection in the landscape. Reversing the continued loss of these historically common forest conditions will require the immediate reassessment of ecological restoration priorities and their associated restoration treatments, as well as developing public education programs to gain an understanding and appreciation of the variable “old growth” conditions produced under historical fire regimes and to garner public support for protecting these endangered native ecosystems.”*

---

## 5.4 Water Quality and Watersheds

---

The Fire Plan area represents two primary watersheds: the Clearwater River Basin in the south and the Swan River Basin in the north. The Clearwater River drains from north to south and is a tributary of the Blackfoot River system that flows southwest of the Fire Plan boundary. The north half of the Fire Plan area is the headwaters of the Swan River. It is a tributary of the Flathead River system. The Swan River begins in the Mission Mountains Wilderness and flows north into Swan Lake before flowing into Flathead Lake at Bigfork, Montana. The Mission Mountains cast a rain shadow making the upper valley somewhat drier than the lower valley.

The effects of wildfire on water quality and the watershed within the plan area will depend on several factors including the severity/intensity of the fire, post-fire precipitation, actions taken to control or suppress the fire, and the condition of the watershed pre-fire. Wildfire usually results in the loss of vegetation as well as the reduced capacity for soils to soak up rainwater and snow melt. The result is increased runoff and a greater volume of water reaching streams and lakes in a shorter period of time. Flash flooding is often a major concern following a significant wildfire event within a watershed. In addition, the loss of vegetation can result in increased sediment transport to streams and lakes due to soil erosion, reduced soil infiltration, and increased water volumes and overland flow rates. Water quality impacts frequently observed post-wildfire include increased transport of organic materials, nutrients and chemicals (i.e., fertilizers, herbicides) to surface waters, as well as increased turbidity (i.e., suspended particles) and water temperatures.

---

## 5.5 Air Quality

---

Wildfires are considered a natural source of air pollution and can sometimes cause severe short-term smoke impacts. These smoke impacts can pose a major health risk for some individuals. Symptoms from short-term smoke exposure range from stinging eyes, scratchy throat, cough, irritated sinuses, headaches, and runny nose. Individuals with pre-existing health conditions such as asthma, emphysema, congestive heart disease and other conditions can have serious reactions. The elderly and young children are considered high-risk groups for health complications due to smoke. In addition to smoke impacts caused by naturally occurring wildfires, air quality concerns can make it difficult to implement prescribed fires.

---

## 5.6 Recreation

---

In 2000 and 2003, closure of forest lands severely limited recreational activities in the Seeley/Swan Valleys. In 2003, closure of Plum Creek lands limited some recreational activities, while smoke and the threat of fire turned hundreds of campers and hikers away. In 2007, the entire area was closed for a number of days during the Jocko Lakes Fire to all non-residents and residents were limited to certain areas in the valley. In addition, several lakes were closed to use because of firefighting needs. Campgrounds were also closed during this time and recreational use of the area was stopped or reduced for most of August. In 2012, backcountry fires also resulted in trail and area closures. A very active fire season in 2017 with a major fire in close proximity to Seeley Lake resulted in the closure of multiple lakes and major trails in the area. Concerns over air quality also kept many recreationalists out of the area entirely. In general, severe fire seasons and fire risks can have a negative impact on recreational activities in the Fire Plan area.

---

## 5.7 Natural Resource Management

---

The Fire Plan area is predominantly managed as wildlands by the three public agencies (U.S. Forest Service, Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, and Montana Department of Natural Resources and

Conservation). Plum Creek Timber Company formerly managed its lands in the area primarily as working forest lands, but these lands have been conveyed into public ownership through the Montana Legacy Project, and a subsequent purchase by TNC in 2014 as previously discussed in section 2.7. The remaining lands in the Valley are primarily residential, although a few ranches that maintain horses or cattle are present. The U.S. Forest Service lands are administered in the Clearwater River Basin by the Seeley Lake Ranger District of the Lolo National Forest, and in the Swan River Basin by the Swan Lake Ranger District of the Flathead National Forest. These lands include substantial areas of designated wilderness, where management activities are very limited and primarily involve trail maintenance. Other areas of the National Forests are managed for multiple uses, and a substantial amount of timber and fuels management has occurred in the Swan River Basin in the last 15 years. State lands within the Clearwater River Basin are primarily managed by the Clearwater Unit of the Montana DNRC. Lands within the Blackfoot-Clearwater Wildlife Management Area are primarily managed by Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks. MT FW&P created the Marshall Creek Wildlife Management Area west and north of Seeley Lake from lands previously owned by Plum Creek Timber Company. State lands within the Swan River Basin are managed by the Swan Unit of the Montana DNRC. Montana DNRC manages its lands for timber production to produce income under its school trust responsibilities. The Blackfoot-Clearwater Wildlife Management Area is primarily managed to maintain its value as big game winter range while the Marshall Creek Wildlife Management Area supports populations of big game, Canada lynx, bull trout, grizzly bears, and other species. Regional land use plans for the Seeley Lake region and Swan Valley have identified the importance of minimizing the expansion of the wildland/urban interface. The Seeley-Swan Fire Plan will provide critical information for this and other land use planning efforts.

---

## 5.8 Cultural Resources

---

The Seeley/Swan Valley supported considerable use by Native Americans prior to Euro-American settlement in the late 1800's-early 1900's. In fact, understanding historical fire regimes in the Valley is also a function of understanding how Native Americans used fire to "manage" their environment for travel and hunting. No map of cultural sites was produced as part of this Fire Plan.

## 6.0 Risk Evaluation: Identifying Areas of Greatest Threat

A risk assessment was conducted to evaluate the risk of wildland fire to the communities of Seeley Lake and Condon, Montana. The goal of the risk assessment process is to determine what areas are cumulatively the most vulnerable to wildfire hazards. The risk assessment approach applied in this Fire Plan uses a Geographic Information System (GIS) and the relevant landscape data to evaluate the vulnerability of people, structures and community assets to potential wildfire. This type of analysis is dependent on the accuracy of the data used. To expedite completion of the plan and reduce overall costs, existing data were used to conduct the risk assessment. Accuracy assessments were not conducted on the existing data, including the new fuels layer developed from the LANDFIRE coverage.

---

### 6.1 Fuels and Slope

The fuel hazard ratings results discussed in Section 4.2.1 were further combined with 5 weighted categories of slope (0 to 10°=1, 10 to 20°=2, 20 to 30°=3, 30 to 40°=5, and greater than 40°=10) to assess the overall fuel hazard within the Fire Plan region. The overall fuel hazard rating was calculated by adding fuel hazard rating to one half the slope rating. Increasing slope can have a chimney effect that increases the overall fire intensity and spread rate within a forest stand.

---

### 6.2 Structure Densities and Evacuation Routes

Information on structure densities per square mile for the Fire Plan area was combined with information on primary evacuation routes to produce a weighting prioritizing the vulnerability of the communities to wildfire risk. Evacuation routes were based on a 1.5 mile buffer delineated on either side of Highway 83 and Highway 200. The primary highways were given weightings of 5 within 0.5 mile, 4 within 1.0 mile, and 3 within 1.5 miles. The structure densities per square mile were given weightings based on the following classes: 0=0, >0-1=1, >1-2=2, >2-5=3, >5-10=4, >10-25=5, >25-50=6, >50-100=7, >100-150=8, >150-200=9, >200=10.

#### 6.2.1 Wildland-Urban Interface

The wildland-urban interface is frequently defined as “the line, area, or zone where structures and other human development meet or intermingle with undeveloped wildland or vegetative fuel.” For the 2004 and 2008 versions of the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan, the WUI boundary was determined by the 1.5 mile buffer on the major highways and where structural densities were greater than >1 per square mile. In 2011, Montana state law (MCA 76-13-145) mandated a shift to a parcel based WUI designation for all Community Wildfire Protection Plans. Designations of these parcels were based on the same criteria used in the 2004/2008 version of the Fire Plan where it could be applied. The shift to parcel based designation did result in an increase of WUI acres mostly due to the size of the affected parcels within the fire plan area. Figure 13 identifies the change in the WUI in 2013 as compared to the boundary used in 2004 and 2008. The 2013 WUI represents 259,639 acres or 40.2% of the Fire Plan area. This is a gain of 47,918 acres over the 2004/2008 WUI that represented 211,721 acres or 32.8% of the Fire Plan area.

---

### 6.3 Cumulative Effects – Final Risk Assessment

---

The fuel hazards/slope information was combined with the structure densities/evacuation route information to produce a map of each stand's cumulative risk to human life or property. This map used the overall fuel hazard rating for each location that ranged from 1-15 based on the amount and type of fuels present as well as the slope. It then combined the fuel hazard with a structure density/evacuation route rating that ranged from 1-15, with 15 being the highest priority areas for human safety and evacuation areas and 1 being wildlands not in proximity to populated locations or evacuation routes. The fuel hazard rating and population/evacuation rating were combined using an 80%/20% split. This means 80% of the final score came from the fuels hazard/slope information and 20% of the final score came from the structure densities/evacuation route information. The resulting map (Figure 14) identifies the combined ratings and identifies forest stands that present the greatest risk to human life or property under their existing conditions. The stands with high ratings can be listed by ownership and prioritized for preventive actions, either by agency management or for possible funding support for fuel thinning on private lands.



---

## 7.0 Preparedness: Plan and Practice

---

### 7.1 Be Prepared- it's your responsibility to protect your home from wildfire!

---

#### 7.1.1 Defensible Space

Defensible space is often defined as an area around your home or outbuildings, where the flammable vegetation is modified and maintained to slow the rate and intensity of an advancing wildfire. This area would also provide room for firefighters to work to protect your structure from advancing wildfire as well as protect the forest from a structure fire. In practice, "defensible space" is defined as an area a minimum of 30 feet around a structure that is cleared of flammable brush or vegetation. There is considerable information available to help homeowners reduce the vulnerability of their homes and property to wildfire. Firewise ([www.firewise.org](http://www.firewise.org)) and Keep Montana Green (<http://www.keepgreen.org/>) are just a few of the many organizations offering information and resources to homeowners in the wildland/urban interface.

#### 7.1.2 Burn Permits

As required in MCA 76-13-121; it is a landowner's responsibility to obtain a burn permit from the appropriate local firefighting agency. Burn permits can be obtained online at <https://app.mt.gov/burnpermit/>. Burn permits are required from March 1 to November 30, each year. Burning is not allowed from December 1 to February 28 due to the frequency of associated air quality problems at this time of year. Burn permits may be temporarily suspended during high fire risk conditions. Before lighting your fire, you must activate your burn permit by going back on-line to enter the required information. A burn permit is not valid when air quality or fire hazard restrictions are in effect. No fire may be ignited before 9:00 AM or be allowed to burn after 4:00 PM unless an extension is authorized by the fire agency. In the case of logging slash piles that will continue to burn after 4:00 PM, the fire must be attended until it is out or until it no longer poses a threat. On many days afternoon winds are likely, use extra caution and watch wind conditions while burning. No fire may be ignited when wind or other weather conditions make it hazardous to burn. Before lighting your fire, you must take all measures necessary to prevent the fire from spreading and must have sufficient help and equipment at the site to prevent the fire from getting out of control (MCA 50-63-103). You may not burn any man-made materials, trade wastes, or other prohibited materials. Under Montana Law (MCA 76-13-122), the landowner or individual starting a fire is liable for all fire suppression costs and damages resulting from an escaped or uncontrolled fire. A permit must be in the possession of the permittee or his/her representative at the site of the fire at all times. Fire, health and law enforcement officials may access the site of the outdoor burning to ensure compliance with the outdoor burning regulations and permit conditions.

Seeley-Swan Fire Plan - Wildland/Urban Interface




Figure 13. Comparison between Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) boundary used in 2004/2008 plans and 2013/2019 plans.

Seeley-Swan Fire Plan - Risk Assessment




Figure 14. Results of the risk assessment identifying four priority levels for risk in the wildland/urban interface of the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan region.

### 7.1.3 Evacuation Routes/Safety Zones

Families should identify in advance, normal and alternate escape routes out of the Fire Plan area. In addition, they should also identify the locations of and routes to large areas with little or no vegetation or other fuels where they can ride out the fire if it's too late to evacuate. A rule of thumb for choosing a safety zone is the center of the zone should be more than 4 times the expected flame height from the edge of the forest.

### 7.1.4 Pets and Livestock - Evacuation

Seeley Lake and Condon are rural communities with a high number of associated pets and livestock. In addition, both communities have a large number of dog sled racing teams, each with a considerable number of dogs in their kennels. It is the pet and livestock owners' responsibility to be prepared for evacuation well in advance of a wildfire. If you must evacuate your home or property, it is the owner's responsibility to not leave pets and livestock behind. In addition to fighting a wildfire, firefighters should not be additionally burdened with trying to protect or evacuate abandoned pets or livestock.

For public health reasons, many emergency shelters cannot accept pets. Develop a plan in advance and have the necessary phone numbers, pet supplies, and medical records (many boarding facilities require evidence of vaccinations) on hand to take with you on short notice. Arrangements for evacuation of livestock, including routes and host sites, should also be made in advance. Alternate routes should be mapped out in case the planned route is inaccessible. All animals should have some form of identification that will help facilitate their return. If you have horses and are forced to evacuate without being able to transport the horses it is advised to open gates to let the horses be able to travel to avoid flames and ember wash.

### 7.1.5 Personal Tools, Equipment, Fire Protection Clothing

A homeowner should NEVER attempt to fight a wildfire to protect their home or property. However, in the event that you have time to prepare your house for a wildfire prior to evacuation, or there is simply no time to evacuate, there are several tools, equipment and clothing you can have on hand to help protect your family and your house from wildfire.

- Hoses and sprinklers can be used to reduce the risk of sparks and embers igniting surrounding vegetation or the roof of the house. If power is lost, however, a gas powered pump (fueled and ready) can be used to extract water from a nearby pond or stream. Pre-connect the hoses to the faucets or pumps.
- Have a ladder, shovels, rakes, chain-saws, and pick-ax on hand to help you reduce the vulnerability of your home to wildfire. However, it is important to note that developing defensible space around your home should be done long before a wildfire is threatening your home.
- Have one or more 5-pound multipurpose type fire extinguishers readily available.
- Protective clothing should be on hand for while you are working to prepare the house for a wildfire or for anyone who is unable to evacuate before the fire arrives. This includes a cotton long-sleeved shirt or jacket and trousers, a handkerchief to provide minimum protection for the lungs (avoid inhaling smoke or hot gases), leather boots, gloves, a helmet or other head covering,

and goggles. Cotton clothing is important as synthetic fabrics can melt onto your skin and cause serious burns.

---

## 7.2 The Communities: Fire Preparation

---

### 7.2.1 Evacuation Plans

An evacuation plan is in place for Missoula County. Local law enforcement agencies will be in charge of implementing the evacuation plan in the event of a wildfire that jeopardizes human safety. In general, the evacuation plan consists of six stages:

- 1) Pre-evacuation contacts and briefings – contact teams go door-to-door (if possible) to provide information about the emergency and determine any special needs of those contacted.
- 2) Evacuation warning – Residents notified of the high probability of the need to evacuate. Persons with special need will be evacuated at this time.
- 3) Evacuation request – residents of the affected area are asked to leave within a specified time frame by a pre-designated route (dependent on the emergency) and report to the evacuation center.
- 4) Evacuation order – emergency conditions present a clear threat to human safety and residents are ordered to leave.
- 5) Roadblocks – perimeter roadblocks are maintained and the evacuated area(s) are patrolled around the clock. Regular incident status briefings are provided for evacuees.
- 6) Evacuees are allowed to return according to conditions identified by the controlling agency.

### 7.2.2 Fire Protection Response

#### 7.2.2.1 IGNITION WORKLOAD ANALYSIS

The following table (table 6) represents the number of wildfires within the Fire Plan area that were responded to by firefighting agencies over the past five fire seasons. Data were obtained from Lolo National Forest, Flathead National Forest, and Montana DNRC.

The ratio of successful fire suppression in the Fire Plan area to the total fire workload during the last five-year period is 96%. The average number of fire responses in this five-year period decreased 38% over the previous five-year period.

#### 7.2.2.2 STRATEGIC FUEL BREAKS

There are several existing fuel breaks within the Fire Plan area that can serve as strategic fuel breaks for wildfire suppression including the Double Arrow Golf Course and the many large lakes and rivers that occur throughout the Fire Plan region. In addition, there are several large meadows, both wet and agricultural, that occur along Highway 83 that could also be used strategically to help suppress a wildfire.

Table 6. The number of wildfires within the Fire Plan area responded to by firefighting agencies that were suppressed or escaped initial attack, for the last 5 fire seasons.

| FIRE SEASON | SUPPRESSED | ESCAPED INITIAL ATTACK | TOTAL FIRES |
|-------------|------------|------------------------|-------------|
| 2018        | 21         | 0                      | 21          |
| 2017        | 21         | 3                      | 24          |
| 2016        | 30         | 1                      | 31          |
| 2015        | 73         | 3                      | 76          |
| 2014        | 48         | 2                      | 50          |

Primary lines of defense (PLOD) have been designated within the plan area. PLODs describe a predetermined boundary around a particular area of high values at risk such as residential, recreational or commercial structures. PLOD boundaries are determined by local fire suppression experts with consideration of tactical efficacy, accessibility, ease of identification from the ground or from the air and potential fire fighter safety. PLODs designated by MT DNRC and USFS in the Swan Valley and by the Seeley Lake Fuels Mitigation Task Force in the Clearwater Valley are shown in Figures 15 and 16.

#### 7.2.2.3 COMMUNITY SAFETY ZONES

Where necessary, a community safety zone will be identified by fire managers relative to the specifics of each wildfire's behavior and location in the landscape. Fire managers will ensure the designated location of each safety zone is publicized as appropriate.

#### 7.2.2.4 FIRE ENGINE PUMP/DRAFT SOURCE SITES

The Seeley/Swan Valley has a large number of natural lakes and streams as well as the water system in the Town of Seeley Lake. These provide a number of good sources of water for firefighting. The location and types of equipment that can be served at each draft site is maintained in a GIS and available to firefighting agencies.

---

## 7.3 Emergency Communication

---

The Seeley Lake RFD has established a website for dissemination of important information ([www.seeleyfire.org](http://www.seeleyfire.org)). Missoula County manages the Swan Valley Emergency Alert System (SEAS) for Condon area residents. The Lolo ([www.fs.fed.us/r1/lolo/fire](http://www.fs.fed.us/r1/lolo/fire)) and Flathead National Forests ([www.fs.fed.us/r1/flathead](http://www.fs.fed.us/r1/flathead)) maintain websites that also provide information on fires, and have links to national fire information centers. All of these can provide sources for emergency wildfire information.



Seeley-Swan Fire Plan  
Swan Valley




Figure 15. Overview of the Swan Valley with neighborhood boundaries.

Seeley-Swan Fire Plan - Clearwater Valley




Figure 16. Overview of the Clearwater Valley.



Since the 2008 Plan update both Missoula and Lake Counties have developed reverse 911 capabilities to communicate emergency information to the public Smart 911. You have to sign up for this service through [www.smart911.com](http://www.smart911.com).

The establishment of “phone trees”, a pre-established system for networking (telephone, e-mail, or other) between neighbors or within homeowners associations, is encouraged for emergency communication and evacuation purposes. The DNRC Swan Unit, working with community members has identified 10 neighborhoods in Lake County and 19 neighborhoods in Missoula County. Typically, these neighborhoods are characterized by similar access and egress routes for evacuation and phone trees provide an effective mechanism to ensure all residents are contacted in the event of an emergency. Pre-evacuation plans will be available for all homes within a neighborhood and maintained at Swan Valley Connections. Figure 15 shows the neighborhoods in the Swan Valley and Figure 16 provides an overview of Clearwater Valley. Within the Seeley Lake area, a phone tree is currently being developed for the Placid Lake Homeowners Association. Phone trees are particularly important for the elderly, small children or handicapped when planning an evacuation.

In the event phone lines are down and cellular service to the area is jammed, the Seeley Lake RFD, Swan Valley FSA, U.S. Forest Service and DNRC all have radio capability to communicate effectively throughout a wildfire emergency. These same agencies will then coordinate their efforts to ensure the general public is also kept informed of important or emergency information.

---

## 7.4 Agency Fire Plans

---

The DNRC Clearwater and Swan Units utilize Land Office Mobilization Plans to provide the necessary guidance to insure that state fire resources are in an appropriate state of readiness to deal with actual fire suppression situations and to guide the mobilization of additional resources to accomplish this task. The Mobilization Plan contains information on communications, fire mobilization, aircraft, manpower and equipment.

Seeley Lake and Condon support a number of companies that conduct work in logging and excavating. Each year the DNRC seeks contractors that would like to sign-up their equipment to be used in fire suppression efforts. This sign-up period is usually done in May before fire season. Once an Emergency Equipment Rental Agreement (EERA) is signed by a certified contracting officer, the copy of the EERA and the type of equipment is kept at the various dispatch centers in a Resource Ordering and Supply (ROSS) database so dispatch can mobilize equipment to the fire line when requested.

DNRC has the ability to utilize any resource necessary to aid in the suppression/rehabilitation of any fire on lands protected by the State of Montana. This includes, but is not limited to use of any resource from

the following sources: DNRC, other States and Federal agencies, local government fire forces, and private contract resources (including Competed Solicitation Resources and local EERAs). DNRC will order and utilize resources from the best, closest and most appropriate source as determined on the basis of urgency (date & time needed), availability, delivery time, reasonable cost, and operational impact on the agency & incident. This allows DNRC to select resources that will allow the fastest, most effective suppression of fires occurring under DNRC jurisdiction.

Each of the Lolo and Flathead National Forests prepare an annual Fire Management Plan that outlines programs to provide flexible wildfire preparedness, suppression, prevention and fire use options that meet interdisciplinary goals, objectives and move towards the desired conditions.

The Seeley Lake Fuels Mitigation Task Force was established in 2004 to implement the Seeley/Swan Fire Plan. The Task Force has acquired fuels mitigation funding for private landowners, and has hired a fuel mitigation coordinator through a cooperative arrangement with Bitter Root RC&D. The Task Force maintains a list of companies in the area that are available to assist landowners with fuel mitigation work.

---

## 8.0 Regulatory Compliance

---

### 8.1 Administrative Barriers to Wildfire Mitigation

---

#### 8.1.1 Legal Mandates

Potential legal barriers to implementing various aspects of wildfire mitigation plans on National Forest lands include National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) and Endangered Species Act (ESA) regulations and compliance issues, as well as potential citizen or organizational intervention (legal challenges) to proposed mitigation actions. Also, agency priorities for ongoing projects and potential agency funding restrictions for new projects have the potential to act as barriers to implementing mitigation actions identified and deemed necessary by the community.

At the federal level, NEPA concerns address threatened and endangered species and potential impacts that mitigation efforts will have on these. In the Seeley/Swan community Fire Plan area, existing threatened and endangered species include the grizzly bear, Canada lynx, and bull trout. All three species are listed as threatened under the ESA. Both state and federal land management is influenced by ESA.

It is recommended that policies and guidelines concerning considerations for threatened and endangered species and other species of concern be developed for fuel thinning projects occurring on Federal and State lands within the WUI. In particular, where such lands occur along the primary or secondary evacuation routes, with no structures close by, the level of fuel mitigation needed in proximity to the route could have some flexibility. Determining these policies and guidelines through a coordinated process prior to project implementation should produce better and more consistent implementation of fuel thinning for public lands, and be better understood and more defensible to the public.

Potential intervention in the form of legal challenges to fuels mitigation efforts are unlikely to come for lands administered by Montana Department of Natural Resources, Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks, the Nature Conservancy, and private lands. In contrast, fuels mitigation efforts on lands administered by federal agencies are likely to encounter legal challenges by environmental organizations. Mitigation efforts on federal lands that encounter legal challenges likely are delayed for up to several years and only implemented when legal challenges are resolved. Due to recent large wildfire events, community members have a heightened wildfire hazard awareness. As a result of this, there is overwhelming consensus among community members that mitigation action to reduce the threat of catastrophic losses due to wildfires is an urgent priority.

The Healthy Forest Restoration Act (HFRA) alleviates some potential barriers in the short term. Specifically, the HFRA has its own abbreviated appeal process and allows agencies to propose one alternative action treatment, as opposed to multiple alternatives. In the event of legal challenges to proposed actions, the HFRA also gives the courts direction as far as considering the effects and potential catastrophic outcomes of no action being taken.

In addition to the ESA, potential legal barriers to implementing various aspects of wildfire mitigation plans on state lands include the Federal Enabling Act of 1889 and the Montana Environmental Policy Act (MEPA). The Enabling Act granted sections 16 and 36 to the State of Montana and provided that proceeds from the sale and permanent disposition of any of the trust lands, or part thereof, shall constitute permanent funds for the support and maintenance of the public schools and the various state institutions for which the lands had been granted. The Montana Constitution provides that these permanent funds shall forever remain inviolate, guaranteed by the State of Montana against loss or diversion. The Trust Land Management Division of the Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (DNRC) is responsible for the management of these state trust lands. DNRC's responsibility is to obtain the greatest benefit for the school trusts. The greatest monetary return must be weighed against the long-term productivity of the land to ensure continued future returns to the trusts. In 1996, the State Land Board approved the Record of Decision (ROD) for the State Forest Land Management Plan (SFLMP). The SFLMP provides philosophical basis, consistent policy, technical rationale, and guidance for the management of forested state trust lands. The SFLMP is based on the philosophy that the best way to produce long-term income for the trust is to manage intensively for healthy and biologically diverse forests.

In 2003, the State Land Board approved DNRC's adoption of the Administrative Rules for Forest Management (Forest Management Rules; ARM 36.11.401 through 456). The Forest Management Rules are the specific legal resource management standards and measures under which DNRC implements the SFLMP and subsequently its forest management program. The Forest Management Rules establish guidelines on managing for biodiversity within forested stands, minimizing roads, retaining certain habitat attributes important to terrestrial and aquatic species (including threatened, endangered, and sensitive species), and minimizing impacts to watershed and soil resources.

In December 2011, the Land Board approved the Record of Decision (ROD) for the Montana Forested State Trust Lands Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). Approval of the ROD was followed by the issuance of an Incidental Take Permit (Permit) by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). The HCP is a required component of an application for a Permit which may be issued by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to state agencies or private citizens in situations where otherwise lawful activities might result in the incidental take of threatened or endangered species listed under the ESA. The HCP is the plan under which DNRC conducts forest management activities on select forested state trust lands while implementing specific mitigation requirements for managing the habitats of grizzly bear, Canada lynx, and three fish species: bull trout, westslope cutthroat trout, and Columbia redband trout. For lands covered by the Permit, the DNRC is responsible for implementing the commitments in the HCP in addition to those set forth in the Forest Management Rules.

The second legal mandate influencing fuels mitigation on state lands consists of the Montana Environmental Policy Act (MEPA). MEPA was enacted by the 1971 Legislature and provides a public process that assures Montana's citizens that before state government makes a decision that could have significant impacts on the human environment; a deliberate effort is made to identify those impacts. The concept is that the decision maker and the public should be well informed of the environmental impacts

of the decision before the decision is made. In order to learn the most about what the environmental impacts of a significant state action might be, agencies are directed to obtain the input of others. This is important because state government often makes decisions that can impact the environment or affect personal property rights or quality of life, and no one decision maker has all the answers.

There are two basic types of state government activities that most commonly require a MEPA review of possible impacts on the human environment. The first type of activity is an agency-sponsored proposal to implement a program or project or to undertake an activity on its own or in concert with other agencies. This may include local projects if they are funded by the state. Examples include timber sales on state lands or the construction of a road or a state recreation area. The second type of activity includes a decision by the state to grant to an applicant a license, permit, lease, or other state authorization to act. Examples of this type of action include permits for mines, air or water quality discharges, surface or ground water use, mineral leasing, and many others.

MEPA requires agencies to prepare a written environmental review that is available to the public. This review may be a simple checklist environmental assessment (EA), a more comprehensive EA, or a more detailed environmental impact statement (EIS). MEPA requires that the level of analysis and the degree of public involvement increase, depending on the significance of the potential or identified environmental impacts.

The following are laws applicable to forest harvest activities on private lands within the state of Montana:

1. Control of Timber Slash and Debris – a.k.a., “Slash Law” (76-13-401 to 76-13-415) MCA. Requires that a Hazard Reduction Agreement (HRA) be obtained and prescribes a treatment method that reduces the fire hazard, created by the slash from logging operation, to an acceptable state standard. The HRA is a legal contract and the person responsible for compliance with the slash law is the signatory on the Hazard Reduction Agreement. This may be the logger, landowner, sawmill, private consultant, or other third party. A performance bond is created as wood products are hauled to the mill, at the rate of \$6.00 per thousand board feet or equivalent measure for other products; a fee of \$0.75 is also collected for administrative costs. After DNRC certifies that state slash standards have been met, the performance bond is refunded to the person holding the HRA. The slash treatment prescribed in the HRA is intended to reduce the fire hazard to an acceptable level, but does not require total slash removal.
2. Streamside Management Zone Law (77-5-301 to 77-5-307 MCA). Also known as the “SMZ Law,” this law established minimum standards for forest practices adjacent to streams, lakes and other bodies of water in Montana. The law prohibits seven forest practice activities within the SMZ. There is the potential for penalties to be assessed if the law is violated. The landowner is responsible for violations of the SMZ Law, and the associated penalties, unless the responsibility for compliance with the SMZ Law is transferred to another party through a written contract. The HRA Agreement does not transfer this responsibility for SMZ law compliance.

DNRC Service Foresters are available to explain applicable laws and rules to you, and provide sample contract language to transfer responsibility. Following completion of harvest activities, DNRC foresters may inspect the site to ensure that these state laws and standards have been met.

### 8.1.2 Fire and Building Codes

Missoula County adopted building codes that apply to the Fire Plan area. While the Seeley Lake Rural Fire District has not “officially” adopted the International Fire Code, it is used as a reference during new building construction. Any new subdivision that is built in the plan area must adhere to the Missoula County subdivision regulations in which the state of Montana guidelines must be followed for fuel mitigation of the new subdivision. At present, fire prone materials are sometimes used on the exterior of residences in the wildland/urban interface, making them more susceptible to ignition by wildfires. Some homeowners associations in the area have specified fire resistant materials for some exterior materials. Another hindrance to reducing wildfire risk is the inclusion of restrictions on cutting trees in the covenants of some homeowner association’s deed restrictions. A number of these restrictions have been changed in recent years by some of the homeowner’s associations.

### 8.1.3 Air Quality Regulations

Airshed Zones are geographic areas in which atmospheric and meteorological characteristics are similar. The Airshed Zones are used to issue restrictions on prescribed fires (if necessary) in each airshed based on air quality and atmospheric dispersion conditions. The Fire Plan region lies within 3 airshed boundaries that include 2, 3A, and 3B, as identified in Figure 17.

Air Impact Zones are areas designated to be smoke sensitive and/or have an existing air quality problem. The Air Impact Zones are used to issue restrictions (if necessary) on prescribed fires in each Impact Zone based on air quality and atmospheric dispersion conditions. The Fire Plan region contains one Air Impact Zone for the Seeley Lake area, as identified in Figure 18.




Figure 17. Airshed Zones in the Seeley-Swan Fire plan area.




Figure 18. Seeley Lake designated Air Impact Zone.

Within the Fire Plan area, air quality regulations are administered by the Montana Department of Environmental Quality (MTDEQ) and the Missoula County Health Department (MCHD). North of MM 48 in the Swan Valley Lake County has no regulation on Air Quality for minor burners. The Missoula County Health Department maintains air quality monitors within the Seeley and Swan airsheds and regularly issues advisories and warnings based on current air pollution levels. For more information regarding air quality concerns please visit: <https://www.missoulacounty.us/government/health/health-department/home-environment/air-quality>

Anyone conducting open burning is required to comply with Best Available Control Technology (BACT) during ignition and/or throughout the duration of burning by employing such techniques and methods that may include:

- Only burning natural, approved materials as found in ARM 17.8.604
- Scheduling of burning during periods and seasons of good ventilation;
- Applying dispersion forecasts;
- Utilizing predictive modeling results;
- Limiting the amount of burning to be performed during any one time;
- Using ignition and burning techniques which minimize smoke production;
- Selecting fuel preparation methods that will minimize dirt and moisture content;
- Promoting fuel configurations which create an adequate air to fuel ratio;
- Prioritizing burning as to air quality impact and assigning control techniques accordingly;
- Promoting alternative treatments and uses of materials to be burned; and
- Selecting sites that will minimize smoke impacts.

Open burning by the average home/individual is defined by MTDEQ and MCHDs rules as “minor open burning.” In Montana, minor open burning may be conducted March 1 through November 30 of each year as allowed by local burning restrictions. The months of December, January and February are typically characterized by poor air dispersion and ventilation and, with very rare exceptions, minor open burning is prohibited during that time. Burners are responsible for obtaining the appropriate burn permit, determining when conditions are favorable and complying with local burning regulations.

The MTDEQ and MCHD issue special permits to burners who are classified as major open burners. A major open burner is any person, agency, institution, business, or industry conducting any open burning that will emit more than 500 tons per calendar year of carbon monoxide or 50 tons per calendar year of any

other pollutant regulated, except hydrocarbons (Administrative Rules of Montana, Chapter 17.8, Subchapter 6, rule 17.8.610)

All major open burners are required to submit proposed burns to the Monitoring Unit of the Montana/Idaho Airshed group in accordance with the Smoke Management Unit's Operations guide and all burns must be approved through the airshed process prior to ignition. Members of the Airshed Management Group include state and federal air quality regulators as well as state, federal and private land management agencies. As members submit lists of proposed burns to the monitoring unit, health officials and meteorologist forecast how well the smoke will disperse each day and decides whether to restrict burning. Restrictions may be imposed by airshed, elevation, or special impact zones around populated areas such as Seeley Lake. All open burning is subject to superseding local authority Missoula, Powell and Lake Counties. It is recommended that anyone conducting open burning, confer with county authorities when performing burning in their respective jurisdictions.

For more information regarding Air Quality/Smoke Management:

<https://deq.mt.gov/Air>

<https://www.missoulacounty.us/government/health/health-department/home-environment/air-quality>

<https://www.lakemt.gov/environmental/airquality.html>

<https://mi.airshedgroup.org>

[http://www.mcfpa.org/burn\\_permits.htm](http://www.mcfpa.org/burn_permits.htm)

---

## 8.2 Administrative Solutions

---

### 8.2.1 Interagency Collaboration

The Seeley Lake RFD, Swan Valley FSA, Lolo and Flathead National Forests, and DNRC Swan and Clearwater Units have worked together over the past 24 years to ensure interagency coordination and collaboration relative to wildfire prevention and suppression in the Fire Plan area. To aide in this regard, these agencies have developed agreements through the Montana Cooperative Fire Management and Stafford Act Response Agreement. They also revise operating plans with dispatch centers and county cooperative agreements on an annual basis. At the local level, the Missoula County Fire Protection Association, Blackfoot Fire Protection Association, and the Lake County Fire Association meet to discuss opportunities for improving coordination and collaboration. Interagency meetings will be scheduled for the spring (pre-season) and fall (post-season) to provide updates on new or on-going programs, introduce new personnel, discuss equipment needs and ways of obtaining new equipment, and discuss problems encountered during the previous fire season.

The ability to plan and implement mitigation treatments across jurisdictional boundaries will require close cooperation between the U.S. Forest Service, The Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, and affected private landowners. The Seeley-Swan Fuels Mitigation Task Force was established to help provide this cooperation and coordination. Addressing areas of multi-ownership will be addressed initially through public meetings, and public education efforts to identify and make known those priority areas identified by the community and in the Community Fire Plan. Consequent efforts



between the USFS and DNRC will require close interagency cooperation and coordination to implement mitigation project areas with joint boundaries. Both agencies are committed to work together to implement mitigation efforts identified by the community as priority areas.

### **8.2.2 Coordinated Resource Management Plans**

The Clearwater Resource Council has prepared a Landscape Assessment of the Clearwater Valley. This assessment pulls together ecological information for the Valley including distributions of various listed species, species of concern or special interest, riparian and wetland areas, and other data. This assessment has provided information for use in land use planning discussions. It would also provide information of use in designing fuel mitigation projects. It can be viewed at <http://www.crcmt.org>.

The Swan Valley Landscape Analysis is a coordinated resource management plan developed for the upper Swan Valley region. This community-based assessment crosses all land ownerships for an ecosystem view of the landscape. The assessment's maps and documents were developed to help the federal and state land managers, the timber industry, and private landowners better manage the natural resources of the Swan Valley. Copies of The Swan Valley Landscape Assessment are available by contacting Swan Valley Connections - <https://www.swanvalleyconnections.org/>. The Swan Valley Community Council has revised the Swan Comprehensive Growth Plan. See the following website for more details: <https://www.missoulacounty.us/community/community-councils/swan-valley-community-council>

---

## 9.0 Action Plan

---

### 9.1 Desired Future Conditions

---

The analyses conducted for this Fire Plan evaluates the fuel loadings within the wildland/urban interface and evacuation routes and identifies areas risk to wildfire. Areas with high fuel loadings occurring within this interface represent significant risk to human life and property. A first priority for desired future conditions is to reduce these fuel loadings to safer levels. This will be an on-going process, as the favorable forest productivity of the Seeley/Swan Valley means that additional fuels are added each year, and will accumulate to undesirable levels without continued fuel reduction programs. The following section identifies the goals.

---

### 9.2 Mitigation Goals

---

#### 9.2.1 High and Moderate Risk Fuels

The results of the updated 2019 Seeley-Swan Fire Plan risk assessment identified a total of 171,011 acres in the category of high or moderate risk fuels for the area. For the 2019 update, the Fire Plan team recognized the need to further categorize the high and moderate risk fuels by the cost associated with potential treatment of these acres. Two treatment categories were identified: low and high. Low cost treatments were identified as those sites with < 35% slope or located outside the streamside buffer of 150'. High cost treatments were sites with  $\geq 35\%$  or within the streamside buffer of 150'. High cost treatments would potentially require specialized logging practices or more detailed/intensive analysis of conditions to make treatment possible. To date most, if not all, of the acres treated were characterized by low cost treatment conditions. This trend is expected to continue with the fuels mitigation task force desire to treat as many of the priority acres as possible, with the least cost to the available programs. Table 7 identifies the number of high and moderate risk acres, by treatment category and landowner category within the WUI. High risk acres in the low-cost treatment category total 60,546 acres and moderate risk acres in the low treatment category total 77,809 acres. The number of high and moderate risk acres went up in the Fire Plan region due to two primary factors; 1) the removal of certain areas from the mitigated category due to the amount of time since harvest, and 2) recent updates to the LANDFIRE data increased the high and moderate fuel density categories in the area due to timber growth.

Table 7. Number of high and moderate risk fuels by treatment category and landowner type in the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan region.

| LANDOWNER                      | HIGH                      |                            | MODERATE                  |                            |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
|                                | <i>Low Cost Treatment</i> | <i>High Cost Treatment</i> | <i>Low Cost Treatment</i> | <i>High Cost Treatment</i> |
| US Forest Service              | 35,772                    | 9,827                      | 34,557                    | 8,152                      |
| Private                        | 9,070                     | 1,648                      | 13,113                    | 2,018                      |
| MT Dept. Natural Res. Conserv. | 10,097                    | 2,587                      | 13,627                    | 2,686                      |
| MT Fish, Wildlife, and Parks   | 2,979                     | 1,458                      | 8,175                     | 1,636                      |
| The Nature Conservancy         | 2,348                     | 677                        | 7,831                     | 1,350                      |
| Other Categories               | 133                       | 20                         | 208                       | 31                         |
| Bureau of Land Management      | 120                       | 336                        | 256                       | 139                        |
| Missoula County                | 26                        | 3                          | 28                        | 2                          |
| MT Dept. of Transportation     | 1                         | 0                          | 15                        | 0                          |
| <b>Total</b>                   | <b>60,546</b>             | <b>16,555</b>              | <b>77,809</b>             | <b>16,015</b>              |

In an effort to maintain consistency between collaborative efforts, mitigation goals developed for the 2019 Seeley-Swan Fire Plan have been updated to apply the same goals developed for the SW Crown of the Continent Prioritization Framework (Haufler et al. 2012) but as applied to the Fire Plan area. The prioritization framework targets treatment of 80% of the high risk, treatable acres in a 10 year time frame. Table 8 summarizes this goal for the project area.

Table 8. The acres representing treatment of 80% of the high risk, treatable stands through 2023, by landowner. Note 2019 represents treatable acres only.

|                 | 2019          | 2029<br>(80% goal acres treated) |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------------------------|
| USFS            | 35,772        | 28,618                           |
| PRIVATE         | 9,070         | 7,256                            |
| MT DNRC         | 10,097        | 8,078                            |
| MT FWP          | 2,979         | 2,383                            |
| TNC             | 2,348         | 1,878                            |
| OTHER           | 133           | 106                              |
| BLM             | 120           | 96                               |
| MISSOULA COUNTY | 26            | 21                               |
| MT DOT          | 1             | 1                                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>    | <b>60,546</b> | <b>48,437</b>                    |

### 9.2.2 Ecological Restoration

In addition to fuel mitigation objectives, another objective is to conduct ecological restoration of forest ecosystems in the Plan area. In some instances, restoration treatment may be fully compatible with a landowner objectives and vegetation conditions on an ecological site, to encourage treatments that can achieve both ecological restoration and fuels mitigation objectives. The 2004 and 2008 Seeley-Swan Fire Plans identified as a goal to “develop policies and guidelines for ecological considerations within the WUI.” The SW Crown Prioritization Framework (Haufler et al. 2012) helped provide information to incorporate ecological restoration objectives in fuels mitigation planning. The following is an excerpt from the assessment:

*“The landscape assessment identified and quantified that the most significant changes to native ecosystem diversity have occurred in forest structures, species compositions, and patterns associated with the historically common non-lethal and mixed-severity fire regimes. In particular, the pre-fire suppression old growth condition characterized in the landscape assessment as the low severity fire late seral forest condition which were historically common native ecosystems in this landscape occur in greatly reduced amounts today. Further, where these residual late seral structures and species composition remain in the landscape, fire suppression activities have facilitated their in-growth by high densities of younger trees that now put the stand at risk of high severity fire and competition for water and nutrients which may continue to reduce opportunities for restoring these historically important native conditions in this landscape. In fact, recent wildfires have demonstrated that these residual structures continue to be at high risk from stand replacing fire and require immediate protection where they still occur. Restoring the historical fire regimes and forest conditions in these high risk native ecosystems should be a high priority for land managers and is highly compatible with many of the objectives identified for the SW Crown project. Specifically, objectives identified in the SW Crown proposal include:*

- *Restore forest structure processes and resiliency, promote diversity, establish a mosaic pattern consistent with the mixed-severity fire regime that mimics historical and native landscape conditions, maximize retention of large trees, reintroduce low-severity and low-intensity fire on sites that historically burned in this manner to establish open stands consistent with historical conditions.*
- *Treatments outside of the WUI will be vegetative restoration projects intended to maximize retention of large trees while maintaining and restoring pre-fire suppression old growth conditions and a mosaic of size class distribution, and improving resiliency.*

*To accomplish these stated restoration objectives while also addressing the findings of the landscape assessment, the SW Crown collaborative has identified a recommended initial goal of restoring 10% of the mean historical range of variability (HRV) for the non-lethal and mixed-severity A fire regimes, using the coarse-filter framework. This strategy emphasizes providing representation of sufficient amounts of functionally similar ecosystems relative to what occurred historically across the SW Crown landscape.”*

Table 9 was developed (Mehl et al. 2012) to assist in determining where fuel mitigation and ecological restoration goals may be integrated on appropriate ecological sites.

Table 9. Desired conditions for fuel mitigation and possible integration with ecological restoration objectives within the WUI depending on distance to values at risk and existing vegetation conditions. NL refers to the non-lethal fire regime and MSA refers to the mixed severity A fire regime (As adapted from Mehl et al. 2012, see text for a description of terms).

| DISTANCE TO RESIDENCE/ ESCAPE ROUTE | PRIMARY OBJECTIVE  | TREES >15" dbh* | ECOLOGICAL SITES  |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------|---|--|
|                                     |  |                 | WARM DRY & WARM MOIST   | COOL DRY & COOL MOIST  |
| <120' (30 m)                        | Fuel reduction to move a crown fire to ground while maintaining or developing large trees                    | Present         | Fuel mitigation priority with restoration sometimes compatible (NL)           | Fuel mitigation priority with restoration sometimes compatible (MSA)                                   |
|                                     | Spacing of fuels a key consideration   | Absent          | Fuel mitigation priority  | Fuel mitigation priority   |
| >120' (30 m)                        | Fuel reduction to reduce crown fires and limit large fire growth while maintaining or developing large trees | Present         | Restoration (NL) & fuel mitigation compatible                                 | Fuel mitigation & restoration usually compatible<br><br>Pattern very important                         |
|                                     | Patterns key   | Absent          | Pattern important, including age class diversity and fuel loading patchiness. | Fuel mitigation & restoration sometimes compatible<br><br>Special consideration for dead LP may apply. |

---

\* >15" DBH is the largest dbh category used in VMAP. VMAP was used in the landscape assessment to determine today's vegetation structure for much of the SW Crown project area.

---

## 9.3 Mitigation Grant Opportunities

---

For landowners within the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan area there are three contacts for possible grants for fuel mitigation work around your home or forested ownership. All of these organizations work together to offer the best variety of possible grants, to meet a landowners individual needs. A professional forester will come and assess your property and help make recommendations to enhance the safety and health of your forest and home.

The Seeley Lake Fire Department has grant applications on their website:

[www.seeleyfire.org/index\\_files/mitigation.htm](http://www.seeleyfire.org/index_files/mitigation.htm)

The Clearwater Resource Council (CRC) also has grant applications available online through the Seeley Fuel Mitigation task force: <http://crcmt.org/fuels-task-force>. This grant program was initiated in 2004. Since 2013, this program has treated 846 acres of private land in the Clearwater Valley.

Swan Valley Connections (SVC) in the Swan Valley has a local fuel mitigation program that has been working for 17 years now. Through 2018, SVC has completed 257 projects on 2,582 acres. Since 2012 they have received \$917,865 in 8 different grants for private lands fuel reduction. The program is geared toward Forest Stewardship and landowner assistance. You can access grant applications on their website: <https://www.swanvalleyconnections.org/forest-stewardship>

---

## 9.4 Fuel Mitigation Projects

---

The Seeley Swan Fuels Mitigation Task Force and Swan Valley Connections continue to provide one-stop-shopping for landowners interested in funding support to conduct fuel mitigation on their property in the Fire Plan region. Both programs currently have grant dollars available to assist with private land fuel mitigation treatments, and more grant money will be sought in future years to continue efforts to meet the objectives of this plan.

In addition to private land projects, federal and state agencies will continue to plan and implement fuel mitigation and ecological restoration projects on their lands as well. The following sections describe some of the projects planned for the next several years by agency.

### 9.4.1 US Forest Service

#### 9.4.1.1 SWAN LAKE RANGER DISTRICT

*Proposed projects* – The Swan Lake Ranger District is currently implementing hazardous fuel reduction for the following project areas: Beaver Creek (3,644 acres), Cold Jim (978 acres), Glacier Loon (1,397 acres), and Swan Valley Bottom Maintenance Burning (1,874 acres). Projects include timber sale related activities, pre-commercial thinning, fuels reduction activities, and prescribed burning throughout the project areas. Planned NEPA analyses within Mid Swan Landscape Restoration and WUI project will provide hazardous fuel reduction projects over the next fifteen years. The primary focus for hazardous fuel reduction will occur within the WUI, but they will also treat vegetation outside the WUI for hazardous fuel reduction, wildlife benefits and ecological restoration. A combination of mechanical treatments and prescribed fire are the primary tools used to accomplish the objectives for these projects.

*Prescribed burning* - The Swan Lake Ranger District will continue to use ecosystem burning to reach mitigation goals. The mid to upper mountain slopes in the lower Swan Range have historically experienced infrequent mixed-severity natural fires, and forest ecosystems have adapted to that fire regime. However, modern-day fire suppression activities have prevented or minimized fires within these landscapes. For example, forests once dominated by fire-dependent open-grown stands of fire resistant species have now developed to forests dominated by dense, less fire resistant species. Fire suppression has caused a change in species composition as well as increased stress and disease levels, accumulations of woody material, and an increased risk of stand-replacing fires. Introduction of fire will improve forest health and reduce the likelihood of stand-replacing wildfire. Some of the decadent brush and understory conifers have been slashed to rearrange fuel components.

Additionally, the Swan Lake Ranger District will continue to use maintenance burning in previously treated areas to maintain desired conditions in the lower to mid elevations. These areas historically experienced frequent low to mixed severity fire regimes. However, these areas are within the WUI near values at risk and fire suppression will continue in the future. As a consequence, natural fire will not be allowed to play a role on the landscape in these areas. In order to maintain flame lengths and crown fire potential at desirable levels, prescribed fire will be ignited to reduce fuels, improve forest health, and improve wildlife habitat. In some areas, pre-treatment such as slashing understory vegetation and hand piling will occur prior to maintenance burning.

The objective of proposed prescribed burning on public lands is to re-introduce fire to stands which have experienced frequent to moderately frequent low-to-high elevation fires. These projects are designed to reduce hazardous fuels, change species composition to favor fire resistant trees, rejuvenate fire-dependent vegetation, improve wildlife habitat, and reduce long-term insect and disease risk.

#### 9.4.1.2 SEELEY LAKE RANGER DISTRICT

*Prescribed burning* - the Seeley Lake RD is aiming to treat fuels on approximately 1500 – 2000 acres per year. In 2019 the primary areas to work were Horseshoe West, Colt Summit, Auggie, and Swan Face.

*Proposed projects* - New projects include Westside bypass (approximately 3000 acres) and Kozy by the Fire (approximately 3000 acres).

## 9.4.2 Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation

*Prescribed burning* – DNRC does not currently have a prescribed burning program that targets restoration of natural fire regimes. Burning that occurs on DNRC land is generally “pile” burning. This burning includes landing piles, hand piles, and equipment piles within the treatment units. Due to major difference in personnel available, pile burning is easier to accomplish and can be done during times of the year that potential escape is minimized. Between 2013 and 2019 the Swan Unit has accomplished over 500 acres of broadcast burning, around 800 acres of excavator burning and around 800 acres of landing pile burning.

### 9.4.2.1 CLEARWATER UNIT

*Proposed projects* - The Clearwater Unit is working in several different areas to mitigate fuel hazards on state land adjacent to private property. Section 16 (just north of Seeley Lake), Drew Creek, and Morrell Creek are state lands expecting work in the next 5 years. In Seeley Lake, the “Good Neighbor” grant projects are getting underway to reduce fuel on state lands, creating fuel breaks between dense stands of timber and residential areas.

### 9.4.2.2 SWAN UNIT

*Proposed projects include:*

| Date |                | Volume (tons) | Acres |
|------|----------------|---------------|-------|
| 2020 |                |               |       |
|      | White Lion     | 12,500        | 340   |
|      | Lower Woodward | 16,000        | 380   |
|      | Bottom Wood    | 6,500         | 182   |
| 2021 |                |               |       |
|      | Low Lion       | 5,000         | 266   |
|      | Wood Lion      | 1,500         | 158   |

## 9.5 Prioritization Process

Federal and state agencies will use the results of the risk assessment to give highest priority to projects within the treatable sites of the high and moderate risk categories. All projects implemented to meet the objectives of the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan will be identified in public announcements and scoping documents.

Federal and state grant programs to assist fuel reduction actions on private lands will also give highest priority to projects within the treatable sites of the high and moderate risk categories of the risk assessment. However, all landowners are encouraged to conduct fuel mitigation work around their homes and other structures. The Seeley Swan Fuel Mitigation Task Force is seeking funds on a continuing basis, and allocating these funds to landowners who meet the requirement for each source. Landowners only need to complete an application to be considered for fuel mitigation assistance from the Task Force.

## 9.6 Possible Actions



### 9.6.1 Infrastructure Improvements

There are currently no immediate plans for infrastructure improvements in the fire plan region. The most recent infrastructure improvements include the construction of a new volunteer fire station in Salmon Prairie in 2008 and the purchase of the Plum Creek building located north of Seeley Lake in 2009 to serve as a second fire station for the Seeley Lake Rural Fire District.

### 9.6.2 Defensible Space

The following guidelines were adapted from the 1993 publication "Fire protection guidelines for wildland residential interface development" (MT Department of State Lands and MT Department of Justice). These guidelines apply to all development within the wildland/urban interface including residential, commercial, and recreational structures on private, State, and Federal lands. These guidelines should be used in conjunction with local fire authorities to safeguard homes and developments in a specific locale. These guidelines were also adopted by Missoula County in their new subdivision regulations.

#### 9.6.2.1 BUILDING MATERIALS/FIRE WISE CONSTRUCTION

- 1) Roofs should be constructed with only Class A or B fire-rated roofing materials and where practical, build all roofs with the minimum of a 4 in 12 pitch.
- 2) Protect the exposed underside of all eaves, balconies, and unenclosed roofs, decks, and floors with one-hour fire-resistant materials.
- 3) Protect all supporting beams and posts, in stilt or cantilevered construction, with one-hour fire-resistant materials.
- 4) Attic openings, soffit vents, foundation louvers, or other direct openings in outside walls, overhangs, or roofs should be no larger than 144 square inches.
- 5) Cover all openings in outside walls, overhangs, or roofs with a ¼-inch non-combustible, corrosion-resistant metal mesh.
- 6) Install only an approved spark arrester around the mouth of the chimney, stovepipe, or vent of any heater, stove, or fireplace.
- 7) Clean spark arrester regularly to remove deposits.
- 8) Build exterior walls out of one-hour fire-resistant materials. Do not use shingles, shakes, or rough-cut wood siding to sheath outside walls.
- 9) Close off the spaces between outside rafters, wall plates, and the underside of the roof sheathing with wood at least two inches thick or equivalent solid blocking.
- 10) Wildfire can radiate through windows, heating the interior of houses to combustion temperature. It can heat, crack, and break the windows, letting in burning particles.
  - a. Keep window surface area to a minimum. In particular, since fire usually travels uphill, minimize window surface area on downhill-facing walls.
  - b. Build several small windows instead of one large window, as large windows are more vulnerable to fire damage.
  - c. Screen all windows.

#### 9.6.2.2 ROADS AND DRIVEWAYS

In an emergency, all road systems should provide for unobstructed traffic circulation for residents, firefighters, and fire equipment. This requires wide, well-constructed roads with sufficient turnarounds to prevent getting stuck off the road, and to allow simultaneous access by emergency vehicles and escape by local residents. Turns must be designed and hill grades established with truck traffic in mind. Fire trucks must be able to drive close to residences. Narrow, private roads, while picturesque and inexpensive to build, reduce access and limit the ability of emergency vehicles to respond quickly or in some instances, at all.

Driveways should be constructed with a minimum unobstructed driving surface of 12 feet and a vertical clearance of 15 feet for driveways less than 300 feet and a 16 foot driving surface for any driveway over 300 feet. Maintain a minimum of a 4-foot wide zone of reduced vegetation on each side of the driveway surface. A turnaround space should be provided at all building or structure sites on driveways over 300 feet in length. A 90-foot diameter area is required as a turnaround for emergency vehicles. Driveways should not exceed grades of steeper than 10%.

#### 9.6.2.3 FIRE RESISTANT LANDSCAPING

Trees, brush, and dense undergrowth are primary fire hazards. This vegetation can ignite readily, burn with intense heat, and promote rapid spread of fire. Vegetation must be managed so as to reduce exposure of structures to flames and radiant heat during a wildfire. The reduction of flammable vegetation and other hazards around buildings provides a “defensible space” for firefighters and residents. As a minimum, landowners should:

- 1) Determine the slope of the building sites and use the following diagrams and guidelines to reduce and remove vegetation around each building according to the appropriate slope. Single ornamental trees need not be removed as long as all vegetation near them is reduced according to the guidelines. Ornamental trees and shrubs should not touch any buildings.
- 2) When planting, select trees, shrubs, and other vegetation that limit or retard fire spread.
- 3) Montana Fire Hazard Reduction Law requires that any person who creates a slash fire hazard as a result of logging or thinning must reduce or manage the hazard.

**Vegetation Reduction Guidelines - 0% to 10% Slope**

**A = 3 foot buffer**

- Maintain area of non-combustible material – flowers, plants, concrete, gravel, mineral soil, etc.

**B = 10 foot buffer**


- Remove all trees and downed woody fuels

**C = 20 foot buffer**

- Thin trees to 10 feet between crowns.
- Prune limbs of all remaining trees to 15 feet or one-third the total live crown height, whichever is less.
- Maintain surface vegetation at 3 inches or less.
- Remove all downed woody fuels.

**D = 70 foot buffer**

- Thin trees to 10 feet between crowns.
- Prune limbs of all remaining trees to 15 feet or one-third the total live crown height, whichever is less.
- Remove all downed woody fuels more than 3 inches in diameter.



**Vegetation Reduction Guidelines – 10% to 20% Slope**

**A = 3 foot buffer**

- Maintain area of non-combustible material – flowers, plants, concrete, gravel, mineral soil, etc.

**B = 15 foot buffer**


- Remove all trees and downed woody fuels

**C = 25 foot buffer**

- Thin trees to 10 feet between crowns.
- Prune limbs of all remaining trees to 15 feet or one-third the total live crown height, whichever is less.
- Maintain surface vegetation at 3 inches or less.
- Remove all downed woody fuels.

**D = 80 foot buffer**

- Thin trees to 10 feet between crowns.
- Prune limbs of all remaining trees to 15 feet or one-third the total live crown height, whichever is less.
- Remove all downed woody fuels more than 3 inches in diameter.



## Vegetation Reduction Guidelines – 20% to 30% Slope

### A = 3 foot buffer

- Maintain area of non-combustible material – flowers, plants, concrete, gravel, mineral soil, etc.

### B = 20 foot buffer


- Remove all trees and downed woody fuels

### C = 30 foot buffer


- Thin trees to 10 feet between crowns.
- Prune limbs of all remaining trees to 15 feet or one-third the total live crown height, whichever is less.
- Maintain surface vegetation at 3 inches or less.
- Remove all downed woody fuels.

### D = 100 foot buffer

- Thin trees to 10 feet between crowns.
- Prune limbs of all remaining trees to 15 feet or one-third the total live crown height, whichever is less.
- Remove all downed woody fuels more than 3 inches in diameter.



### Tree Crown Thinning and Pruning



- Thin trees to 10-15 feet between crowns.
- Prune limbs on all remaining trees to 15 feet or 1/3 of total crown height, whichever is less.
- Maintain surface vegetation at 3 to 12 inches.

#### 9.6.2.4 RELOCATION OF FLAMMABLE MATERIALS

- Dispose of all slash and debris left from thinning by chipping, hauling away or piling and burning.
- Stack firewood uphill or on a contour and at least 15 feet from your home.

- Clean roof and gutters of pine needles and leaves to eliminate an ignition source for firebrands, especially during the hot, dry weather of the fire season.
- Locate propane tanks a minimum of 15 feet from buildings or any flammable materials.

### 9.6.3 Education

The Seeley Lake RFD has produced a video using funds provided by a grant from Montana Department of Commerce that discusses the importance of reducing wildfire threats on property owned by absentee landowners.

Public education regarding wildfire risk is a high priority for all firefighting agencies within the Fire Plan region. Agency personnel provide presentations to local organizations and audiences when provided the opportunity and additional educational material and programs will be developed as resources become available.

### 9.6.4 Senior/Disabled Assistance

People with limited physical abilities, such as senior citizens and disabled persons, will need special attention and support when it comes to wildfire prevention and emergency response. They often will need assistance in creating defensible space around their homes and evacuating in the event of a wildfire. To help in that regard, Missoula Aging Services initiated a project in 2003 called Neighbor to Neighbor. Volunteers will locate and collect information from senior citizens and disabled persons that will be used by area emergency responders to help those in need. More information regarding this program can be obtained by contacting Missoula Aging Services at 1-406-728-7682 or visiting their website at <http://www.missoulaagingservices.org/>.

---

## 9.7 Prioritized Actions, Implementation Timeline

---

### 9.7.1 Short Term (<1 year), Planning

Over the next year, the Seeley Lake Fuels Mitigation Task Force will develop policies and guidelines for ecological considerations within the WUI. The purpose of this is to identify where within the WUI considerations for lynx habitat, grizzly bear habitat, bull trout habitat, linkage zones, and other such considerations should be factored into fuel mitigation plans, especially for state and Federal lands. These recommendations should allow future fuel mitigation planning and implementation to include these ecological considerations in an efficient and effective manner without potentially slowing up future fuel mitigation projects. Considering these needs up front, from a watershed perspective will reduce and improve the planning conducted at the project level.

### 9.7.2 Medium Term (1-10 years), Fuel Hazard Reduction Treatments

Fuel hazard reduction projects will be implemented over the next 10 years with the goal of reducing hazardous fuels by 80% in the treatable high-risk category. Collectively, the goal is to treat at least 3000 acres per year. For many lands, especially private lands around dwellings, fuels reduction may cost over \$1000 per acre. For private lands, the 80% goal would equate to roughly 800 acres per year at a cost of roughly \$800,000 per year. Additional acres within the moderate risk category should also be treated

where they intermingle with high risk acres, to improve cost efficiency of treatments. For this reason, the goal of acquiring \$1 million per year for the next ten years for fuel treatments on private lands seems appropriate.

### **9.7.3 Long Term (10+ years), Treatment and Maintenance**

Fuel hazard reduction will require a long-term commitment from landowners within the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan region. Those high and moderate risk forest stands that were not treated within the 10 year window will require emphasis in the next ten-year window. Forest stands that are currently categorized as low risk will be adding additional growth and fuels each year, and moving many low risk stands toward the moderate risk category and moderate risk stands that have not been treated toward the high risk category. The first 10 years of this process has also identified the need to differentiate between treatable and untreatable acres (see section 9.2.1) for planning and cost evaluation. Future plans will need to address how to bring the untreatable acres into the treatable category, both through new or recognized treatment options and how to obtain additional funds to off-set more expensive treatment options.

---

## 10.0 Plan Monitoring and Progress Review

---

### 10.1 Process and Measures

---

This plan has several components that should be reviewed and monitored on an annual basis. Considerable data and mapping information was compiled to facilitate firefighting capabilities as well as to identify and prioritize fire hazard areas for treatments. These data and information should be examined and updated on an annual basis. New houses need to be added to the database and maps. Roads, water sources, helipads, and hazard areas need to be reviewed and updated annually. Available contractors and equipment, as indicated in the plan, should be listed annually. Potential new information on fuel loadings should be incorporated as it becomes available. Thus, this plan should be viewed as a working document and associated data and maps, and should be updated in a systematic manner to maintain its currency and utility to fire prevention and firefighting capability.

The plan should be monitored in several ways. The Seeley Swan Fuel Mitigation Task Force should compile data and maps of treated areas to document accomplishments. The Task Force should also update the data base relative to information needed for effective fire suppression activities. In addition, periodic reports should be made to the community with each agency reporting on its accomplishments in the following:

- Equipment or infrastructure improvements acquired or completed,
- Funds or grants applied for/obtained for educational or home inspection activities,
- Funds or grants applied for/obtained for fuel thinning programs,
- Types and numbers of educational programs conducted,
- Treated acres for fuel reductions and their risk category,
- Improvements in agency coordination/cooperation,
- Public communication programs, and
- Fire response statistics.

This plan should be reviewed and updated no later than 5 years from this revision, or sooner if conditions or perceived needs indicate. This revision should involve revisiting and updating all aspects of the plan, including a critical look at the action steps and accomplishments.

---

### 10.2 Mitigation Treatments –Progress Review

---

The Seeley Swan Fuel Mitigation Task Force and Swan Valley Connections continue to provide professional advice and financial support to private landowners interested in conducting fuel mitigation and forest health improvement treatments on their property in the Fire Plan region. Since 2013, over 3,000 acres were treated in the Clearwater and Swan Valleys with grant assistance from multiple sources (Appendix B). In total, 19,210 acres of private land has been treated by landowners since the forming of the Fuels

Mitigation Task Force. Some of these projects received income from timber sale proceeds and may have provided funding to the landowner. Table 10 identifies the number of acres of fuel treatments completed since 2007 by landowners in the Fire Plan region to date. Figure 19 identifies the location of previous mitigation projects in the Clearwater Valley (south-end project area) and figure 20 mitigation projects occurring in the Swan Valley (north-end project area).

Table 10. Number of fuel treatment acres and wildland fire acres by landowner since 2007 in the Fire Plan region.

| <b>Landowner</b>                        | <b>Fuel Treatment Acres</b> | <b>Wildland Fire Acres</b> |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Private</b>                          | 19,210                      | 1,030                      |
| <b>MT DNRC-Swan Unit</b>                | 9,620                       | 975                        |
| <b>US Forest Service-Swan Lake RD</b>   | 20,123                      | 5,974                      |
| <b>MT Fish, Wildlife, and Parks</b>     | 0                           | 4,137                      |
| <b>US Forest Service-Seeley Lake RD</b> | 6,134                       | 53,954                     |
| <b>MT DNRC-Clearwater Unit</b>          | 8,579                       | 2,174                      |
| <b>The Nature Conservancy</b>           | 0                           | 15,731                     |
| <b>Other Landowners</b>                 | 112                         | 0                          |
| <b>Missoula County</b>                  | 90                          | 0                          |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                            | <b>63,868</b>               | <b>83,975</b>              |

Additional mitigation or other projects completed by local agencies since the last Fire Plan update, are summarized in the following sections.



**Seeley-Swan Fire Plan  
Completed Mitigation  
Clearwater Valley  
2007-2018**




Figure 19. Fuel mitigation projects completed in the Clearwater Valley of the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan area from 2007 to 2018.

**Seeley-Swan Fire Plan  
Completed Mitigation  
Swan Valley  
2007-2018**




Figure 20. Fuel mitigation projects completed in the Swan Valley of the Seeley-Swan Fire Plan area from 2007 to 2018.

**10.2.1 US Forest Service**

10.2.1.1 SWAN LAKE RANGER DISTRICT

The Swan Lake Ranger District has completed the following hazardous fuel reduction projects through its timber and fuels programs including:

|  |                                       |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| Holland Fuels – 2006-2009                    | 507 acres treated, 2.2 mmbf volume    |
| Meadow Smith – 2006-2010                     | 2,169 acres treated, 4.6 mmbf volume  |
| Holland Pierce – 2007-2012                   | 2000 acres treated, 5.5 mmbf volume   |
| Condon Fuels – 2007-2011                     | 249 acres treated, 2 mmbf volume      |
| Cooney McKay – 2008-2012                     | 2742 acres treated, 4.3 mmbf volume   |
| Hemlock Elk – 2008-2011                      | 498 acres treated, 2.2 mmbf volume    |
| Mid Swan Blow Down – 2009                    | 605 acres treated, 0.004 mmbf volume  |
| Summit Salvage – 2009-2013                   | 1309 acres treated, 12.3 mmbf volume  |
| Missin’ Dog – 2010-2012                      | 577 acres treated, 2.1 mmbf volume    |
| Lions Paw Stewardship– 2011-2012             | 250 acres treated, 0.0158 mmbf volume |
| Condon Work Center Salvage – 2012            | 54 acres treated, 0.004 mmbf volume   |
| Creedence Clearwater Stewardship – 2013-2015 | 110 acres treated, 0.0078 mmbf volume |
| Mission Upland Prescribed Burn – 2014        | 1036 acres treated                    |

10.2.1.2 SEELEY LAKE RANGER DISTRICT

The Seeley Lake Ranger District has completed the following hazardous fuel reduction projects:

| <u>Year</u> | <u>Total Treated Acres</u> | <u>Purchaser Completed Acres</u> | <u>Stewardship Acres</u> | <u>Rx and Other Acres</u> | <u>Fire Acres</u> |
|-------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| 2013        | 1456                       | 228                              |                          | 1228                      |                   |
| 2014        | 1901                       | 1052                             | 63                       | 786                       |                   |
| 2015        | 635                        |                                  | 163                      | 472                       |                   |
| 2016        | 1695                       | 67                               | 441                      | 436                       | 751               |
| 2017        | 607                        |                                  | 15                       | 592                       |                   |
| 2018        | 728                        | 17                               | 354                      | 357                       |                   |
| 2019        | 1529                       | 1084                             |                          | 444                       |                   |

**10.2.2 Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation**

10.2.2.1 CLEARWATER UNIT

The Montana DNRC - Clearwater Unit is responsible for management of Trust Lands within the Clearwater Valley. The general goal of the DNRC timber program is to make money to support the various School Trust beneficiaries and promote the growth of the forest stands. While not specifically identified by the Trust Lands mandate, DNRC personnel have found ways to include fuel mitigation as well as improvements to ingress and egress routes for nearby residences, in their management objectives. In all cases, the

created fuels are treated to protect long-term benefit. In most cases recently, the removal of “pulp” material has been included and has further reduced the stems that have been left onsite in the past.

From 2012-2018, DNRC – Clearwater Unit has sold and harvested 22.1 million board feet. These harvests generally keyed on removing stands infested with mountain pine beetle or salvaging fire damage on DNRC land. These sales and permits are described below:

|                       |           |            |
|-----------------------|-----------|------------|
| <b><u>2012</u></b>    |           |            |
| Elbow Lake TS         | 0.7 mmbf  | 160 acres  |
| Permits               | 1 mmbf    | 196 acres  |
| <b><u>2013</u></b>    |           |            |
| Good Shepherd TS      | 2 mmbf    | 728 acres  |
| Permits               | 0.2 mmbf  | 60 acres   |
| <b><u>2014</u></b>    |           |            |
| Game Time TS          | 4.8 mmbf  | 954 acres  |
| Permits               | 0 mmbf    | 0 acres    |
| <b><u>2015</u></b>    |           |            |
| Good Time TS          | 2.8 mmbf  | 682 acres  |
| Clear East TS         | 2.3 mmbf  | 592 acres  |
| Permits               | 0.03 mmbf | 7 acres    |
| <b><u>2016</u></b>    |           |            |
| Game Over TS          | 2.5 mmbf  | 675 acres  |
| Clearview TS          | 3.5 mmbf  | 707 acres  |
| Permits               | 0.2 mmbf  | 22 acres   |
| <b><u>2017</u></b>    |           |            |
| Permits               | 0.3 mmbf  | 165 acres  |
| <b><u>2018</u></b>    |           |            |
| Cottonwood Park TS    | 4.2 mmbf  | 1093 acres |
| Clear East TS         | 2.3 mmbf  | 592 acres  |
| Permits               | 0.1 mmbf  | 125 acres  |
| <b><u>2015</u></b>    |           |            |
| Seeley Airport        | N/A       | 100 acres  |
| <b><u>2018</u></b>    |           |            |
| Section 30<br>RX BURN | N/A       | 31 acres   |
| <b><u>2019</u></b>    |           |            |
| Horseshoe Hills       | N/A       | 24 acres   |

The DNRC also has a considerable forest improvement program. From 2015 to 2018, the Clearwater office has completed four pre-commercial thinning projects between the Airport and Woodworth Road. As of the fall of 2018, 131 acres had been thinned. Much of this included hand piling adjacent to roads and along areas between thinning units. This provides the larger areas that we have had thinned and potential fuel breaks if there is a wildfire within the area.

#### 10.2.2.2 SWAN UNIT

The Swan River State Forest has been harvesting timber under three large timber sale packages from 2014-2019 which encompasses 27 smaller timber sales. Five sales from Scout Lake were completed, 6 sales from the Cilly Cliff were completed and 5 Wood Lion Multiple Timber Sale packages have been sold. There are 5 more sales that are planned to be sold over the next two years. Various salvage harvests have been completed in addition to pre-commercial thinning. From 2013 to 2019 the Swan Unit has sold 285,275 tons of sawlog material from approximately 4699 acres on both sides of the forest. Volume and acres are listed below:

## Completed Sales

| <u>Sale Date</u>               | <u>Volume (tons)</u> | <u>Acres</u> |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| 2013                           |                      |              |
| Scout Lake 3                   | 10,525               | 216          |
| Scout Lake 4                   | 8,093                | 209          |
| Scout Lake 5                   | 8,392                | 149          |
| Scout Lake 6                   | 3,396                | 94           |
| 2014                           |                      |              |
| Cub Scout                      | 22,460               | 360          |
| Cilly Excaline                 | 22,400               | 340          |
| 2015                           |                      |              |
| West Side Fir Engraver Salvage | 18,395               | 118          |
| Fatty Restoration              | 2,979                | 117          |
| Cilly Cliff                    | 8,874                | 480          |
| Soup Salvage and Sanitation    | 13,092               | 14           |
| 2016                           |                      |              |
| Scout Lake OSR                 | 11,884               | 109          |
| Cilly Napa                     | 2,859                | 190          |
| Cilly North Soup               | 14,659               | 200          |
| Cilly Graves                   | 14,131               | 221          |
| 2017                           |                      |              |
| Cilly Ridge Salvage            | 11,842               | 12           |
| Cilly Sanitation               | 2,853                | 178          |
| Cilly 349                      | 14,659               | 238          |
| 2018                           |                      |              |
| Ten Lions                      | 14,131               | 327          |
| High Lion                      | 11,854               | 181          |

## 11.0 Additional Information Needs

As identified in this plan, two information needs have been identified and should be addressed as soon as practical. These information needs are:

- Determining the accuracy of the LANDFIRE fuels map for the Swan and Clearwater Valleys,
- Determining policies and guidelines for incorporating additional ecological considerations, particularly as they relate to threatened and endangered species or species of concern, for fuel thinning within the WUI.

The fuel layer developed for the 2013 Fire Plan was replaced by updated LANDFIRE information for this 2019 update. LANDFIRE is a remotely sensed and classified region-wide (Region 1 US Forest Service) GIS layer. It is used by the USFS and other agencies, so these agencies are familiar with the data in this coverage. This is important in fire suppression efforts, particularly if support teams from outside this area are brought in during a fire incident. These teams will be familiar with the LANDFIRE classification and data layers. Also, use of these data will be recognized and supported by any funding sources in seeking fuel mitigation funding. However, unlike the fuels layer in the 2004 Plan, the accuracy of the LANDFIRE data for this area has not been ground-truthed. It is recommended that these data be checked, so that confidence levels can be developed for the various fuel categories resulting from the LANDFIRE classification. As with all satellite imagery, understory fuels tend to be poorly assessed, so the extent of this problem for the LANDFIRE coverage for the plan area needs to be assessed.

As discussed previously, within the WUI, fuel mitigation treatments may overlap with ecosystem restoration goals in some areas, particularly in the low-severity, short fire-return interval areas of the plan area. In the mixed-severity and high-severity fire regimes, fuel mitigation may differ from historical stand conditions. In these areas, additional considerations may be required to provide for the habitat needs of various species of concern, in particular Canada lynx and grizzly bears. Policies and guidelines for fuel mitigation treatments in such areas should be developed. For example, policies might set distances from homes where fuel mitigation needs would override habitat concerns. But at some distance from existing residences, additional considerations for the habitat needs of species of concern could be applied. The specific guidelines as to what should be provided need to be determined, combining the input of fuel specialists, fire response personnel, and biologists. Setting up these criteria as a consistent set of policies and guidelines for the plan area could speed up the processing of individual projects by both the USFS and MT DNRC.

---

## APPENDIX A. List of Fire Plan Participants

---

### SEELEY-SWAN FIRE PLAN PARTICIPANTS - 2019 REVISION

---

#### Seeley Lake Rural Fire District

Dave Lane – Fire Chief, Fuels Task Force Member

#### Swan Valley Fire Service Area

John Tapp – President

#### Montana Department of Natural Resources

Nick Aschenwald – Swan Unit – Unit Manager, Fuels Task Force Member

Allen Branine – Swan Unit - Fire Management Office & Service Forester, Fuels Task Force Member

Clay Stephenson – Swan Unit – Forest Management Supervisor

Kristin Baker-Dickinson – Clearwater Unit – Unit Manager, Fuels Task Force Member

Joe Rediske – Clearwater Unit – Fire Operations Specialist, Fuels Task Force Member

Brad French – Clearwater Unit – Service Forester, Fuels Task Force Member

#### Clearwater Resource Council (CRC)

Jon Haufler, President, Fuels Task Force Chair

#### Swan Valley Connections

Mike Mayernik – Conservation and Stewardship Associate, Fuels Task Force Member

#### Seeley Lake Ranger District (USFS)

Quinn Carver - District Ranger, Fuels Task Force Member

Phil Shelmerdine – Fire Management Officer, Fuels Task Force Member

David Tingley – Assistant Fire Management Officer

#### Swan Lake Ranger District (USFS)

Christopher Dowling – District Ranger, Fuels Task Force Member

Brent Olson – Fire Management Officer, Fuels Task Force Member

Jacob Jerešek – Assistant Fire Management Officer, Fuels Task Force Member

#### Rocky Mountain Research Station (USFS)

Don Long – Fire Ecologist

#### Missoula County

Max Rebholz - Missoula County Wildfire Preparedness Coordinator

#### Ecosystem Management Research Institute

Jon Haufler – Executive Director, Fuels Task Force Member

Scott Yeats, Wildlife and GIS Analyst, Plan Update Coordinator and GIS Analyst

---

## SEELEY-SWAN FIRE PLAN PARTICIPANTS - 2013 REVISION

---

### Seeley Lake Rural Fire District

Frank Maradeo – Fire Chief, Fuels Task Force Member

### Swan Valley Fire Service Area

Tony Quadros – President

### Swan Ecosystem Center

Roger Marshall – Stewardship Forester, Fuels Task Force Chairman, Board Member CRC

### Clearwater Resource Council (CRC)

Matt Arno – Private Land Fuel Mitigation Specialist

### Montana Department of Natural Resources

Norm Fortunate – DNRC Clearwater Unit - Service Forester, Fuels Task Force Member

Allen Branine – DNRC Swan Unit - Fire Supervisor & Service Forester, Fuels Task Force Member

Cory Calnan - DNRC Clearwater Unit - Fire Supervisor, Fuels Task Force Member

Cindy Super – DNRC South West Land Office - Fire Prevention Specialist, Fuels Task Force Member

Dave Poukish – DNRC Clearwater Unit – Unit Manager

Dan Roberson – DNRC Swan Unit – Unit Manager

### Seeley Lake Ranger District

Tim Love – District Ranger, Fuels Task Force Member

Phil Shelmerdine – Fire Management Officer, Fuels Task Force Member

Rebecca White – Assistant Fire Management Officer, Fuels Task Force Member

### Swan Lake Ranger District

Richard Kehr – District Ranger, Fuels Task Force Member

Brad Gillespie – Fire Management Officer, Fuels Task Force Member

John Ingebretson – Assistant Fire Management Officer, Fuels Task Force Member

Andy Huntsberger – Assistant Fire Management Officer, Fuels Task Force Member

### Ecosystem Management Research Institute

Jon Haufler – Executive Director, Fuels Task Force Member

Carolyn Mehl – Ecosystem and Wildlife Ecologist

Scott Yeats – GIS Analyst

### Bitterroot RC&D

Colin Moon – Private Land Fuel Mitigation Specialist

### Double Arrow Landowners Association



---

Jim Normark – Fire Safe Committee Chairman

---

## SEELEY-SWAN FIRE PLAN PARTICIPANTS – 2008 UPDATE

---

### **Seeley Lake Rural Fire District**

Frank Maradeo – Fire Chief, Fuels Task Force Member

### **Swan Valley Fire Service Area**

Jim Daenzer – Fire Chief

### **Clearwater Resource Council (CRC)**

Jon Haufler – President, Fuels Task Force Chairman

Stan Nicholson – Board Member

### **Swan Ecosystem Center**

Kathy Koors – Private Land Fuel Mitigation Specialist

### **Montana Department of Natural Resources**

Allen Branine – DNRC Swan Unit - Fire Supervisor & Service Forester, Fuels Task Force Member

Howie Kent - DNRC Clearwater Unit - Fire Supervisor, Fuels Task Force Member

### **Seeley Lake Ranger District**

Tim Love – District Ranger, Fuels Task Force Member

Phil Shelmerdine – Fire Management Officer, Fuels Task Force Member

Rebecca White – Assistant Fire Management Officer, Fuels Task Force Member

Alison Kolbe – Fire Prevention Specialist, Fuels Task Force Member

### **Swan Lake Ranger District**

John Ingebretson – Assistant Fire Management Officer, Fuels Task Force Member

### **Ecosystem Management Research Institute**

Jon Haufler – Executive Director, Fuels Task Force Member

Scott Yeats – GIS Analyst

### **Bitterroot RC&D**

Colin Moon – Private Land Fuel Mitigation Specialist

### **Plum Creek Timber Company**

Roger Marshall – Forester, Fuels Task Force Member and Chairman

---

## SEELEY-SWAN FIRE PLAN PARTICIPANTS – 2004

---

### Seeley Lake Rural Fire District

Frank Maradeo – Fire Chief, Fuels Task Force Member

Jim White – firefighter

Tim Downey – firefighter

### Swan Valley Fire Service Area

Jack Novosel – President

### Clearwater Resource Council

Jon Haufler – President, Fuels Task Force Member

Stan Nicholson – Board Member, Fuels Task Force Member

### Montana Department of Natural Resources

Colin Moon – DNRC Clearwater Unit - Service Forester, Fuels Task Force Member

Allen Branine – DNRC Swan Unit - Fire Supervisor & Service Forester, Fuels Task Force Member

Howie Kent - DNRC Clearwater Unit - Fire Supervisor, Fuels Task Force Member

### Seeley Lake Ranger District

Tim Love – District Ranger, Fuels Task Force Member

Jon Agner – Fire Management Officer, Fuels Task Force Member

### Swan Lake Ranger District

John Ingebretson – Assistant Fire Management Officer, Fuels Task Force Member

### Ecosystem Management Research Institute

Jon Haufler – Executive Director, Fuels Task Force Member

Carolyn Mehl – Ecosystem Ecologist/GIS Analyst

### Plum Creek Timber Company

Roger Marshall – Forester, Fuels Task Force Member

## **APPENDIX B. List of Grant Sources**

American Reinvestment Recovery Act

Community Fire Protection (aka Stephens Funds)

Firewise Grant Program

Home Depot Foundation

Lake County Title III

Missoula County Title III

National Forest Foundation

State and Private Forestry Competitive Grants

Western States Wildland Urban Interface

Private landowner in-kind contributions and dollar match

## **APPENDIX C. Characterizing wildfire risk and hazard in lodgepole pine stands killed by the Mountain Pine Beetle**

Page, W.G, M.E. Alexander, and M.J. Jenkins. 2013. Wildfire's resistance to control in mountain pine beetle-attacked lodgepole pine forests. *The Forestry Chronicle*. 89(6): 783-794

[https://www.firescience.gov/projects/09-S-03-1/project/09-S-03-1\\_Page\\_Alexander\\_and\\_Jenkins\\_2013.pdf](https://www.firescience.gov/projects/09-S-03-1/project/09-S-03-1_Page_Alexander_and_Jenkins_2013.pdf)