

Key Questions About the Scoping Study and Follow-up thereto:

- A. Do we have enough evidence in this study to get the money needed to do this work?
- B. What is the project template to convert a given treatment zone into a funded project?
- C. Did Kellyx/RCD get what they need to go forward?
- D. Does Kellyx want the MCC to help with or endorse something? Perhaps a budget allocation to hire a grant writer?
- E. Do we need further study/simulation to justify ROI on where/how to spend the money?
- F. Per study: *"there is no requirement for any party to implement any of the identified actions"* - Identify what would make it a requirement to implement the actions below.
- G. What would the full costs required be, and could grants cover those costs?. The costs provided in the Study are noted as lacking: *"The cost estimates provided below do not include environmental compliance, project management, permitting, or post-project maintenance costs, which will increase the overall project cost."* Add costs for obtaining the grants and disposing of the debris.
- H. What organization structure will best coordinate stakeholders to obtain results, and how does that structure assign and report on: project definition, funding, legal issues, task progress/completion, and auditing outcomes and ROI?
- I. Do the priorities identified in the study remain valid if only isolated treatment zones are addressed?
 - a. Do the model results for treatment effectiveness assume ALL zones were treated or untreated in each model run? In other words, could effectiveness be determined within each zone in isolation, or did the resulting beneficial outcomes in one zone depend on treatments performed in adjacent zones?
 - b. Is there a critical mass or network of dependency among some treatment zones such that they should or must be combined for action in order to achieve the desired effect?, or can each 'project'/zone be done in isolation? If the latter, how are HVRA's and homes affected by different fire scenarios?
 - c. What does the study tell us about the value of only treating a given zone, and none of the others, in affecting outcome metrics in EG?
- J. Can we bundle some actions/projects/treatment zones together for more rapid and/or efficient resolution?
- K. Questions re this quote: *"where the weights were determined by overlaying the fire perimeter outputs from each scenario across the structures within El Granada and calculating the cumulative number of structures impacted by each scenario. This resulted in a peak fire weather scenario weight of 52,467 structures affected and extreme Diablo fire scenario weight of 169,549 structures affected, representing an approximate ratio of 1:3 favoring the more extreme fire behavior experienced under Diablo conditions."* If the study didn't simulate structure conflagration, how did it estimate this? Further, there are only < 3,000 houses in EG; where did the rest of those structures come from?
- L. pg 24 fig 13 : How is treatment effectiveness calculated and what are the implications of the various scores?
- M. Where were eucalyptus removal together with revegetation considered, as a more permanent solution? Revegetation IS mentioned as a remedy but only for ground disturbance.

- N. All Scoping Study 'projects' are defined by broad treatment zones. Will a specific grant request have a more specific boundary definition than the Scoping Study Treatment Zones?
- O. The Scoping Study ranks Treatment Zones from 1 - 17; is it reasonable to assume that for immediate action primary attention will be given to Treatment Zones 1-3?
- P. The Scoping Study addresses only vegetation areas; residences are outside the scope. The MCC has received a presentation concerning establishing Firewise Communities. If El Granada becomes a Firewise Community, what role would Firewise El Granada, working in concert with Fire Marshalls, have in coordinating with RCD on wildfire grant application efforts?
- Q. At our last meeting Lena Silberman mentioned that Don Horsley has set aside funding for wildfire projects and connected with you RCD working on fire definition projects. Can you provide a preliminary take on how RCD would take on this request?
- R. Continuing the previous points, will RCD-defined projects have elements that impact firewise residential areas?

Potential Follow-Up Actions the MCC Could Request or Undertake

1. For the questions here that RCD cannot answer, identify a permanent County point of contact to answer the above questions, and coordinate and communicate on the actions listed below, and on other wildfire issues the MCC has identified.
2. Perform wildfire reduction actions in top priority treatment zones.
3. Develop a multi-year plan to treat and maintain the wildfire hazard areas in the Study.
4. Install a wind meter near Quarry Park.
5. Provide grant writing resources to help fund agreed priorities.
6. Explore formation of FireWise group.
7. Clear cars parked on EG Blvd. to enable evacuation (street markings & enforcement).
8. Reinstate National Weather Service "Fire Snooper" fire forecast sites for northern California.