

Wildfire Mitigation and Resiliency Standards Work Group

Summary of recommendation survey

Members = 15 respondents (consists of work group members + ex-officio named in [legislation](#))

Additional Participants = 13 respondents

Total = 28 responses

Key: Strong agreement, more than 80% = Green

Some agreement, 60%-79% = Blue

No agreement, less than 60% = Red

- Yes/No boxes include "other" that either trended yes/no or clearly stated yes/no
- Disclaimer: This summary identifies initial areas of consensus/non-consensus to inform work group discussion.

Question#	Members (named)	Members (additional)	Total
Wildfire property mitigation standards			
1	21%	53%	39%
3	47%	62%	53%
4	33%	31%	32%
Enhancing community mitigation			
5	87%	77%	82%
6	93%	79%	86%
7	87%	84%	86%
8	94%	92%	93%
Data and risk sharing within government			
9	73%	62%	68%
11	59%	75%	62%
12	87%	85%	86%
Wildfire risk transparency for insurance consumers			
13	57%	69%	64%
14	57%	62%	59%
Property mitigation retrofit grant program			
17	80%	92%	86%
19	87%	92%	89%

Section 1: Wildfire property mitigation standards

1 - Should the state attempt to develop and adopt a single wildfire property risk mitigation standard that is applicable for all uses?

	Yes (including "other" that trends "yes")	No (including "other" that trends "no")	Other that did not trend yes or no
Total	11	14	3
Members + Ex-officio	4	5 no + 5 other = 10	1
Additional Participants	6 yes + 1 other = 7	1 no + 3 other = 4	2

2 - If yes, which standard (note, some responses selected multiple options):

	IBHS	IWUI code / building codes	Both IBHS & IWUI	Other ('vegetation mgmt./Firewise')
Total	5	1	1	2
Members + Ex-officio	2	1	0	1
Additional Participants	3	1	1	1

3 - Should the state attempt to develop and adopt multiple wildfire risk mitigation standards that are applicable to various individual use cases?

	Yes (including "other" that trends "yes")	No (including "other" that trends "no")	Other that did not trend yes or no
Total	15	10	3
Members + Ex-officio	6 yes + 1 other = 7	4 no + 2 other = 6	2
Additional Participants	5 yes + 3 other = 8	3 no + 1 other = 4	1

4 - Should the development of property (structure) and community mitigation standards fall within the appropriate government entities who respond to fires in the built environment?

	Yes (including "other" that trends "yes")	No (including "other" that trends "no")	Other that did not trend yes or no
Total	9	16	3
Members + Ex-officio	3 yes+ 1 other = 4	4 no + 4 other = 8	0
Additional Participants	3 yes + 2 other = 5	4 no + 4 other = 8	3

Section 2: Community Mitigation

5 - Should a recommendation include expanding DNR's Wildfire Ready Neighbors program to support additional state-wide and locally coordinated campaigns to drive community engagement and adoption of a national recognized science-based, wildfire mitigation standard(s)?

	Yes (including "other" that trends "yes")	No (including "other" that trends "no")	Other that did not trend yes or no
Total	23	2	3
Members + Ex-officio	10 yes + 3 other = 13	1	1
Additional Participants	9 yes + 1 other = 10	1	2

6 - Should a recommendation include returning full funding to the community resilience investments portion of the wildfire response, forest restoration, and community resilience account (HB 1168)?

	Yes (including "other" that trends "yes")	No (including "other" that trends "no")	Other that did not trend yes or no
Total	24	1	3
Members + Ex-officio	9 yes + 4 other = 13	0	1
Additional Participants	9 yes + 1 other = 11	1	2

7 - Should a recommendation include increasing the funding to support community mitigation efforts from the community wildfire resilience investments program?

	Yes (including "other" that trends "yes")	No (including "other" that trends "no")	Other that did not trend yes or no
Total	24	2	2
Members + Ex-officio	10 yes + 3 other = 13	1	1
Additional Participants	9 yes + 2 other = 11	1	1

8 - Should a recommendation include building on existing efforts and to establish a formal policy framework that incentivizes and sustains local-level wildfire risk mitigation coordinating groups?

	Yes (including "other" that trends "yes")	No (including "other" that trends "no")	Other that did not trend yes or no
Total	26	1	1
Members + Ex-officio	13 yes + 1 other = 14	1	0
Additional Participants	11 yes + 1 other = 12	0	1

Section 3: Data and Risk Sharing within government

9 - Should a recommendation include the future development of a policy framework directing cross agency coordination of wildfire hazard and risk mitigation data sharing through the already existing Natural Hazards Data Portal managed by WaTech?

	Yes (including "other" that trends "yes")	No (including "other" that trends "no")	Other that did not trend yes or no
Total	19	3	6
Members + Ex-officio	7 yes + 4 other = 11	2 no + 1 other = 3	1
Additional Participants	7 yes + 1 other = 8	0	5

10 - If yes, should a recommendation include the legislature directing WaTech to develop an access point for local fire protection districts so they can review the wildfire related data in the portal?

	Yes (including "other" that trends "yes")	No (including "other" that trends "no")	Other that did not trend yes or no
Total	14	1	0
Members + Ex-officio	6 yes + 2 other = 8	0	0
Additional Participants	6 yes	1	0

11 - Should a recommendation include Washington state contracting with an existing entity with expertise in hazard and risk analytics to provide state agencies, local fire districts and Washington state residents with accurate and up to date wildfire hazard and risk assessments at the parcel level?

	Yes (including "other" that trends "yes")	No (including "other" that trends "no")	Other that did not trend yes or no
Total	16	2	8
Members + Ex-officio	6 yes + 1 other = 10	1	6
Additional Participants	9	1	2

12 - Should a recommendation include the legislature directing relevant agencies to develop a policy framework that would establish an information repository where property owners, local fire districts, state agencies, and communities can provide up-to-date wildfire risk mitigation efforts so risk assessing entities (insurance companies, state agencies, local fire districts, etc.) can have a better understanding of completed mitigation activities?

	Yes (including "other" that was "yes")	No (including "other" that was "no")	Other that did not trend yes or no
Total	24	1	3
Members + Ex-officio	10 yes + 3 other = 13	1	1
Additional Participants	10 yes + 1 other = 11	0	2

Section 4: Wildfire risk transparency for insurance consumers:

13 - Should a recommendation include requiring insurance companies to internally track when wildfire risk was used to determine eligibility or cost of insurance for a Washington state residential property so policymakers can know the actual number when requested?

	Yes (including "other" that was "yes")	No (including "other" that was "no")	Other that did not include yes or no
Total	18	5	5
Members + Ex-officio	8	4	2
Additional Participants	8 yes + 1 other = 9	1	3

14 - Should a recommendation include requiring insurance companies to disclose wildfire risk scores to consumers if used to determine eligibility and/or cost of insurance?

	Yes (including "other" that was "yes")	No (including "other" that was "no")	Other that did not include yes or no
Total	16	6	5
Members + Ex-officio	7 yes + 1 other = 8	1 no + 2 other = 3	3
Additional Participants	8	0 no + 3 other = 3	2

15 - If yes, what information should be included to the consumer?

	Total	Members + Ex-officio	Additional Participants
Name of model used to determine the wildfire risk score	13	6	7
The date the wildfire risk score was generated.	14	7	7
The range of scores available in the risk score model.	13	7	6
The range of scores that determine insurance eligibility	15	7	8
What mitigation measures the consumer could effect score	15	7	8

16 - Should the wildfire risk score disclosure be provided only by request of the consumer or without request and provided on all renewal, cancellation, nonrenewal notices?

	Total	Members + Ex-officio	Additional Participants
By request	1	1	0
Automatically provided when wildfire risk score is used	14	6	8

Section 5: Property mitigation retrofit grant program to reduce wildfire related nonrenewals and cancellations.

17 - Should a recommendation include a grant program using the IBHS standards for wildfire mitigation as the framework?

	Yes (including "other" that was "yes")	No (including "other" that was "no")	Other that did not include yes or no
Total	24	2	2
Members + Ex-officio	11 yes + 1 other = 12	2	1
Additional Participants	9 yes + 3 other = 12	0	1

18 - If no, what framework should be used to achieve the objectives of retrofitting residential property to resist loss and decreasing the number of nonrenewals of insurance?

Two response: Grants should be focused for entities that have existing structures in our state (i.e. Firewise, DNR, etc.). The other, homeowners should not have further regulations.

19 - Should a recommendation include a requirement the grant program collaborate with local fire districts as part of the program?

	Yes (including "other" that was "yes")	No (including "other" that was "no")	Other that did not include yes or no
Total	25	1	2
Members + Ex-officio	13	1	1
Additional Participants	10 yes + 2 other	0	1