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Executive summary

The Gippsland Strategic Bushfire Management Phase #2a Engage Victoria consultation was open from June 3rd to June 24th 2019.

The consultation was the second of two asking for public opinion about proposed fuel management strategies. The first of these Phase #2 asked for opinion about proposed strategies on public land across Gippsland. Phase #2a asked for community opinion about whether and how Priority Fuel Management Areas (PFMAs) should be identified on both private and public land in Gippsland.

PFMAs are areas where computer simulation indicates that fuel management would be most effective in reducing bushfire risk. PFMAs cover both public and private land and fuel management activities include a range of measures including slashing, grazing pasture and planned burning.

PFMAs are influenced by how much of the region will be covered by them, and the measures of risk used in identifying where fuel management should occur.

The Gippsland SBMP Phase #2a engagement sought community opinion on the coverage (10%, 20% or 30%) of Priority Fuel Management Areas in Gippsland and the relative importance of three measures of risk (dwelling loss, locality impacts and direct economic loss) that could be considered in developing those PFMAs.

- 159 people participated in the survey
- All municipalities were represented
- East Gippsland residents accounted for 40% (63) of responses.
- 68% of respondents supported at least one of the PFMA options.
- Of those who supported PFMAs, 40% preferred PFMAs over 30% of Gippsland, 27% preferred PFMAs over 20% of Gippsland and 33% supported them over 10% of Gippsland.
- 14% (15) of those who selected a preferred PFMA option for the whole of Gippsland selected a different option for their local area.
- 32% (51) of respondents did not support any of the PFMA options presented.
- 80% (41) of the 51 of respondents opposed to all the PFMA options cited opposition to planned burning as the reason for their opinions.
- 92% (146) of respondents provided a breakdown of the emphasis that should be given to different measures of risk in developing PFMAs.
- The average risk metric weighting was 45% dwelling loss, 33% locality impacts, and 22% economic loss.
- Demographic factors such as municipality of residence, experience of bushfire and main source of income were associated with some differences in both the preferred PFMAs and the weightings of measures of risk.

The results of the Phase #2a engagement are being considered in the development of the Gippsland Strategic Bushfire Management Plan.
Phase Two A Consultation Report

Background

The Gippsland region strategic bushfire management planning process has been informed by land and fire managers, local government, partner agencies, and stakeholder and community input. We have built on the extensive knowledge and experience that exists within bushfire management agencies and communities. Our engagement activities are testing what we know and are seeking new ideas from a range of stakeholders to understand how we can all work together to improve bushfire management on private and public land.

This document provides a summary of the community feedback received during Phase #2a of our engagement on the Engage Victoria website.

The summary of the feedback received in the phases #1 (fundamental values and objectives for bushfire risk reduction) and #2 (public land fuel management strategies) of the online consultation can be found at https://engage.vic.gov.au/bushfire-planning/gippsland.

Online Engagement Process

This is the third of four planned opportunities for the community to provide online feedback using the Engage Victoria website on elements of the Gippsland Strategic Bushfire Management Plan.

Table 1: Gippsland SBMP online engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>What needs protecting from bushfires</th>
<th>Fuel management strategies</th>
<th>Final strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary purpose</td>
<td>Fundamental values and objectives</td>
<td>Public land fuel management strategy</td>
<td>Priority Fuel Management Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Completed Human life, well-being, natural environment</td>
<td>Completed Strategy 3 preferred</td>
<td>Completed Range of opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There have been other engagement activities at key points in the planning process and an Expert Reference Group has been convened to review the planning process and provide more detailed input and feedback to the planning team.

Engagement Approach

The Phase #2a survey was developed to collect feedback from the community on possible Priority Fuel Management Areas (PFMAs) on both public and private land across Gippsland, including the extent of Gippsland that should be covered by these and the relative weighting of the different measures of risk that should be incorporated in them.

The Engage Victoria website is a way to give the widest possible opportunity for the community to have input into the planning process. Members of the public were given three weeks to complete the survey. Appendix 1 contains the full survey questions as shown on the Engage Victoria website.

Promotion

The Engage Victoria survey was promoted on the social media of partner agencies involved in the planning process such as DELWP, CFA, PV, and local government. Emails with links to the surveys were sent to previous participants in Phases #1 and #2a, to CFA Brigades and operational staff, known industry and community groups and to individuals with an interest in bushfire management. Emails were also sent from the MyCFA platform to its Gippsland membership. Advertisements were placed in local newspapers across the region and radio interviews were conducted on the two major radio stations in Gippsland. More information about activities to promote the survey are shown in Table 4 in Appendix 2. As with previous consultations, hardcopies of the survey were provided to people who were not able to participate in the online survey.

Participants were asked to select from a number of options how they found out about the survey. Figure 1 shows that social media and emails via the MyCFA platform or directly to stakeholders and participants in previous Engage Victoria opportunities were the most common sources of information.

![Figure 1: How people found out about the survey](image-url)
Many participants had multiple sources of information about the survey. This is illustrated in Figure 4 below which shows that while three quarters of respondents cited one main way of finding out about the survey, 25% had more than one source of information about it. Table 5 in Appendix 2 provides more detail for this information.

Figure 2: Number of sources of information about the survey
Summary of Results

Public participation

159 people participated in the survey. 86% (147) of participants said they were from Gippsland and all municipalities were represented. 7% (11) of participants said they were not from Gippsland and a further 7% (11) preferred not to say where they reside.

Respondents’ location of residence or property ownership

Table 2 below shows participants’ place of residence by municipality. As with previous Engage Victoria consultations the majority of respondents came from East Gippsland Shire. 101 of the 159 participants identified their place of residence. While there was a spread across Gippsland, those that were mentioned more than twice were Bairnsdale (7), Bruthen and Marlo (4) and Lakes Entrance, Longwarry, Mirboo North, Moe and Tyers (3).

Table 2: Participants’ place of residence by municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government Area of interest</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bass Coast</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baw Baw</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Gippsland</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrobe City</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gippsland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not from Gippsland</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred not to say</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>159</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic information relevant to the survey questions

As with the Phases #1 and #2 consultations, participants were asked several non-identifying but informative questions about aspects of their lives that might have some bearing on their responses. These questions included the main source of income, nature-related recreational past-times, previous direct and indirect experience of bushfire impacts, as well as experience in response and recovery.

Main source of income

Participants were asked to nominate their main source of income to determine if it might influence decisions. Retirement or government employment, with 30 people each, were the most common occupations or ‘main sources of income’ identified. These were followed by private business, education, dryland agriculture, healthcare and the timber industry.
PFMA preferences and measures of risk were further analysed to see if there was any variation in responses that might be attributable to the source of income. The results of that analysis are shown on page 17 and 20 of this report.

![Participants' main source of income](image)

**Figure 2: Main source of income**

**Recreational activities**

Respondents were also asked to select from several ‘nature-related’ activities they participate in regularly to determine if those activities might have a bearing on PFMA preferences and the weightings give to different measures of risk. Figure 3 below shows how many people participated in each of the activities.

97% (154) of respondents regularly participate in at least one of the nominated activities. 50% or more of the respondents enjoyed bushwalking, camping and day trips and more than 30% enjoyed four-wheel driving, firewood collection and natural history or conservation related activities. As with previous consultations more than 20% of participants are CFA/SES volunteers.

A number of people participated in multiple activities with more than 20% people saying they regularly take part in four or more nature related activities and more than 10% saying they participated in between 5 and 9 nature related activities on a regular basis.

Further analysis of the PFMA options and the weighting of measures of risk by recreational activities is provided in the ‘results’ section on pages 18 and 22 of this report.
Participants recreational activities (percentages)

- Other (15)
- None of the above (5)
- Prospecting (11)
- Hunting (19)
- Mountain Biking (22)
- Snow sports (26)
- Fishing (38)
- CFA / SES volunteer (38)
- Four-wheel driving (51)
- Firewood collection (59)
- Natural history (e.g. field naturalist) (64)
- Conservation or citizen science (68)
- Day trips (80)
- Camping (84)
- Bushwalking / hiking (104)

Figure 3: Recreational activities participants regularly engage in

Percentage of respondents who participate in one or more activities

- 0%
- 5%
- 10%
- 15%
- 20%
- 25%

Number of recreational activities people participate in regularly

Figure 4: Participation in recreational activities
Experience of bushfire

Figure 5 below illustrates respondents’ experience of bushfire. Only 6% (10) said they had had no direct or indirect experience. More than 20% (33) respondents said they had been directly affected by bushfire, through either personal loss or displacement, more than 60% (101) had been threatened without experiencing personal loss and 58% (92) had had their family or friends affected or threatened.

Amongst the respondents from Gippsland more than 60% of respondents from all of Gippsland’s municipal areas had had experience of being threatened by bushfire without suffering personal loss and, with the exception of respondents from South Gippsland, more than 40% had known friends and family to have been affected or threatened by bushfire.

The influence of experience of fire on preferred PFMA preferred and the relative weightings give to different measures of risk is considered in the results section of this report.

Response and recovery

Figure 6 shows respondents’ experience of response to and recovery from bushfire. 33% (53) respondents had been involved in emergency response on a volunteer basis and 27% (43) had been involved in response on a professional basis. 11% (18) respondents had experience in fire response in both a volunteer and a professional capacity. 38% (61) of respondents had assisted with community recovery from bushfires and 44% (70) had directly supported others who had been affected by bushfire.
Figure 6: Involvement in response and recovery

- Bass Coast (4)
- Baw Baw (21)
- East Gippsland (63)
- Latrobe City (24)
- South Gippsland (7)
- Wellington (18)
- I don't live in Gippsland (11)
- Prefer not to say (11)
- TOTALS (159)

- Response - volunteer (53)
- Response - professional (43)
- Community recovery - assisted (61)
- Supported others (70)
- None of above (32)
Priority Fuel Management Area Preferences

Participants were shown Priority Fuel Management Areas (PFMAs) covering 10%, 20% and 30% of both private and public land in Gippsland. These PFMAs had been developed using three measures of risk (dwelling loss, locality and direct economic impact) equally. Participants were asked to nominate their preferred Priority Fuel Management Area for both the whole of Gippsland and for their local area and were given the option of choosing none of the alternatives.

Figure 7 below shows the number of preferences for each of the PFMA options for both the whole of Gippsland and for the respondents’ local area.

![Proportion of Gippsland included in PFMAs (number of responses)](image)

68% (101) of the 159 respondents chose one of the PFMA options for the whole of Gippsland with Option C (30%) being the most popular. 15 people selected a different PFMA option for their local area with six choosing one with less coverage, five choosing one with more and four saying that none of the alternatives were suitable for their local area.

Comments received from the survey indicated that many respondents associated PFMAs with planned burning only as a form of fuel management, rather than alternatives such as slashing, and grazing on grasslands. 80% (41) of the 51 respondents who did not select any of the PFMAs expressed their concerns about the necessity and effectiveness of planned burning and its impact on the environment.

Despite the background documentation stating that PFMAs did not exclude fuel management in other areas, some people expressed concerns that the PFMAs could leave more remote locations, including those that have a history of bushfire, without adequate fuel management.
Whole of Gippsland

Figure 8 shows the preferences for each of the Priority Fuel Management Area options for the whole of Gippsland over the period of the consultation.

Whole of Gippsland PFMA preferences - number, percentage

Map A – (PFMAs cover 10% of Gippsland), 36, 23%
Map B – (PFMAs cover 20% of Gippsland), 29, 18%
Map C – (PFMAs cover 30% of Gippsland), 43, 27%
None of the above., 51, 32%

Figure 8: Whole of Gippsland PFMA preferences

While there was no discernible pattern in responses for the first 18 days of the survey, a marked increase in the response ‘none of the above’ over the last four days of the survey made it the overall preferred option. This was followed by PFMA coverage over 30% of Gippsland, then coverage over 10% and coverage over 20% being the least preferred option. Figure 8 below shows the responses per day over the consultation period.

Whole of Gippsland responses per day

Figure 9: Responses per day - whole of Gippsland
Social media was one of the main tools for informing people about the survey. Most partner agencies posted about the survey on at least one occasion throughout the consultation period. In addition three separate notices of the Phase #2a survey were posted on the Gippsland DELWP Facebook site and two of these were boosted on the 12th and 21st June to try to encourage a greater number of survey participants.

Figure 10 below shows the changes in proportions of preferences following each Gippsland DELWP Facebook post. In the period following the first post (June 3rd to June 11th) 89% of people chose one of the optional PFMA s, in the period following the second post (June 12th till June 20th) 84% of people chose one of the alternative PFMA s and in the period following the third Gippsland DELWP Facebook post the percentage of people opting for at least one of the options had dropped to 37%

As shown in Figure 11, the East Gippsland had the most respondents (25) over the period June 21st to June 24th. This was followed by those who preferred not to give their location (10).
Local area responses

Figure 11 below shows the overall result of the PFMA preferences for local areas. 15 people selected different options for their local area than for the whole of Gippsland with a relatively even split between the number of people wanting more coverage and those wanting less there was a slight increase in the number of people choosing ‘none of the above’ but little change in the overall allocation of PFMA preferences.

![Local area preferences chart](chart.png)

**Figure 12: PFMA preferences - Local area**

Figure 12 shows the Local Area PFMA preferences for each day of the survey. The pattern of responses is similar to those for the Whole of Gippsland with a marked increase in people choosing none of the options over the last four days of the survey.

![Local area preferences per day chart](chart.png)

**Figure 13: Local area PFMA preferences per day**
Demographics and PFMA preferences

The following charts show how preferences for PFMAs vary according to the demographic factors included in the survey.

Municipalities

Figures 14 and 15 show the number of PFMA preferences for both the whole of Gippsland for the local area on a municipality basis and figures 16 and 17 show this information in percentages.

![Whole of Gippsland PFMA preferences by municipality (numbers)](image1)

![Local area PFMA preferences by municipality (numbers)](image2)
Prefernces for different PFMA\s varied across those municipalities with the highest number of participants. While PFMA\s over 30% of Gippsland were preferred by most people from Baw Baw and Wellington Shires, those in Latrobe preferred PFMA\s over 20% of Gippsland followed closely by PFMA\s over 30%. On the other hand the 20% and 30% options were the least favoured by people from East Gippsland, where most people opted for either ‘none of the above’ or PFMA\s over 10% of Gippsland. The pattern of preferences was reflected in both the whole of Gippsland and for participants local areas.

**Whole of Gippsland (percentages) - Municipality**

![Whole of Gippsland PFMA preferences by municipality (percentages)](image)

**Local area - Municipality**

![Local area PFMA preferences by municipality (percentages)](image)
**Main source of income**

Figure 18 and 19 below show the PFMA preferences for the different income groups for both the whole of Gippsland and for local areas. In both cases, 30% coverage was the main preference of the private business, timber industry workers and retired people. People in dryland agriculture and the energy sectors were more likely to favour PFMAs covering 20% of Gippsland. The options chosen by Government workers were fairly evenly spread between the 10% and 20% coverage with a slight preference for the latter. In both cases those who preferred not to state their source of income or who said they were in the education and healthcare sectors were more likely to choose ‘none of the above’ as their preferred option.

The income groups showed some changes in the PFMA preferences for local areas with an increase in ‘none of the above’ for those who did not give their main source of income and from those whose main source of income was from private business or the health, and timber industries.

*Figure 18: Whole of Gippsland - main source of income and PFMAs*
Recreational activities

Figures 19 and 20 below show the PFMA preferences according to respondents’ recreational activities. Those participating regularly in bushwalking, camping, day trips and conservation or natural history tended to prefer either none of the PFMA options or the one with the least coverage across Gippsland. People who participated in firewood collection, four-wheel driving or who were CFA/SES volunteers were more likely to choose the PFMAs over 30% of Gippsland, whereas those who enjoyed fishing were more likely to choose PFMAs over only 10% of Gippsland.

There were some changes in preferences for PFMAs over local areas with an increase in the numbers of those selecting ‘none of the above’ for all groups except fishing. Reasons for the change in preferences varied and included concerns that the local areas that had a history of fire were not identified in the PFMAs and would not receive adequate fuel management.
Measures of risk

Respondents were asked their opinion on the emphasis that should be placed on three different measures of risk used in developing Priority Fuel Management Areas. The measures used were dwelling loss (which is linked to loss of human life), the number of localities impacted (regardless of the population in each locality) and the direct economic cost of assets burnt in bushfires.

146 respondents provided an opinion of the relative weighting of each measure. 9 of the 13 people who did not complete this question had chosen ‘none of the above’ in their responses to Questions 1 and 2. The remaining four had selected Map A – PFMA’s over 10% of Gippsland).

Figure 22 below shows the overall relative weighting given to each of the measures of risk by the 146 people who responded to this question.
PFMA preferences and measures of risk

The importance of the measures of risk varied according to the PFMA options selected by people, and across several demographic factors. Figure 23 shows that although the order of weighting was the same for each option, respondents who chose PFMA coverage over 30% of Gippsland placed greater emphasis on economic impacts than those who chose 10 and 20% while those who chose ‘none of the above’ placed more emphasis on human life and locality impacts and significantly less emphasis on the importance of economic impacts.

Demographic facts and measures of risk

Municipality of residence

As with the PFMA preferences there some variations in weightings of measures of risk between residents of local government areas with the highest number of respondents with Latrobe City residents placing considering the risk to dwellings and the direct economic cost of impacts more important than residents of other municipalities, while residents from Baw Baw placed a higher emphasis on locality impacts. Even though East Gippsland had more than three times as many participants as Wellington Shire, the weightings each municipality placed on the measures of risk was quite similar.
Experience of fire

While all groups had the same order of weighting of the three measures of risk, those who had had friends and family affected or threatened by fire rated loss of dwellings significantly higher, and locality impacts significantly lower than any of the other cohorts, including those who had been directly impacted by fire. Respondents who had never been directly or indirectly impacted by fire were the only cohort to give a greater weighting to locality impacts (38%) than to loss of dwellings (36%). That group also rated the direct economic costs of fire more highly than other respondents.
Experience of response and recovery

As shown in Figure 26 below, the order of measures of risk is the same across all cohorts, regardless of their experience of response and recovery. There are however some subtle differences with those who have responded to fire in both a professional and a voluntary capacity rating dwelling loss more highly and locality impacts lower than other cohorts. Although all groups rated direct economic impacts as less important than other measures of risk, those with no experience of either response or recovery it was rated lowest by those with no experience of either fire response, community recovery or direct support to those affected by bushfire.

![Figure 26: Measures of risk - experience of response and recovery](image)

Main source of income

Figure 27 shows the relative weighting of different measures of risk according to the main source of income. Retired people gave the same emphasis to dwelling loss and to locality impacts, while those working in the energy (6 people) and timber sectors (9 people) considered economic impacts of more importance than locality impacts. For all other groups the order of weighting for the measures of risk was dwelling loss, locality impacts and direct economic impacts however the relative importance of each varied between groups with those in education and healthcare placing much more importance on dwelling loss and much less importance on direct economic impacts than did the other groups.
Recreational activities

With the exception of fishing – where locality and economic impacts were weighted equally - the order of importance of the measures of risk was the same across all recreational groups, i.e. dwelling loss, locality impacts and direct economic impacts. Dwelling loss was rated at between 41% (four-wheel driving and camping) and 46% (conservation) by all groups. There were some variations in the emphasis given to each of the measures with those who participate in camping, day trips and conservation or natural history placing more importance on locality impacts than the other groups and less emphasis on direct economic impacts.

Recreational activities and measures of risk

Figure 27: Measures of risk - main source of income

Figure 28: Recreational activities and measures of risk
Next Steps

Phases #1, and #2 for strategic bushfire management planning provided a good understanding of what matters to people across Gippsland, insights into how agencies might better support communities and individuals in relation to managing their own risk from bushfire and the approaches that are believed to be the most effective for fuel management on public land and for improving bushfire prevention and suppression. Phase #2a gauged community opinion about prioritising fuel management on both public and private land to get the most effective reduction in bushfire risk and provided community feedback on the relative weighting that should be given to different measures of risk in fuel management planning and prioritisation.

The planning team are currently considering the feedback from these surveys together with the outcomes of land and fire management and partner agency workshops and feedback from the Expert Reference Group to produce a final plan, which will be submitted for public feedback during the Phase #3 round of online engagement.

The team will also be consulting partner agencies and with land and fire managers and operational staff across Gippsland in August to obtain further opinion about the operational ability of the Plan. The results of these internal and external consultations will inform the final plan which is to be released in September 2019.

Upcoming consultation:

Phase #3 consultation – the proposed final SBMP - will be open for public comment from July 29th to August 12th. Results of the consultation, along with those from interagency and partner workshops, will inform refinements to the proposed plan.

The Gippsland SBMP will be produced in September 2019.
Appendix 1: Survey

Phase Two-A Priority Fuel Management Areas

Overview

Bushfires in Gippsland pose a real threat to lives, homes, jobs, and the environment. Managing bushfire risk is an ongoing and shared responsibility - a partnership in which everyone has a role.

Safer Together is the Victorian government’s approach to reducing bushfire risk. In Gippsland all local governments, the CFA, Parks Victoria, EMV and DELWP are working together and with communities to develop a strategic fuel management strategy that will guide bushfire management on both public and private land into the future.

The Strategic Bushfire Management Planning (SBMP) process involves designing new strategies for bushfire management in Gippsland. By September 2019, a strategy will be produced with the following components:

- Public land fuel management strategy, including fire management zoning
- Priority fuel management areas on both private and public land
- Pilot strategies for bushfire prevention and suppression
- Risk-based prioritisation tools for use by staff from government agencies.

Section 1a: PFMA – area of Gippsland included

Bushfires occur across both public and private land, and fuel management is an important tool to reduce bushfire risk. This can include slashing, burning, physical removal, grazing and mulching.

Priority Fuel Management Areas (PFMAs) can help guide where fuel management on both private and public land would be most effective in reducing bushfire risk.

Considering both public and private land together gives fire agencies a better understanding of how to manage bushfire risk, to get the best risk-reduction outcomes.

It is important to note that PFMAs indicate where fuel management will be most effective in reducing bushfire risk at a regional scale, but they do not exclude fuel management from areas not in the PFMAs. In addition, while PFMAs can support agency and landholder decision-making, they do not impose any legal obligation for fuel management by private landholders.

Alternative PFMA configurations, shown as maps in this survey, indicate how PFMAs would look if a larger or smaller proportion of Gippsland is considered as a PFMA.

The maps provided are based on computer simulations of 13,750 bushfires throughout Gippsland. This involves considering fuels, past fire locations, and weather patterns across Gippsland, for both private and public land. Maps also show current Fire Management Zoning on public land.
By answering the following questions, you will help us understand the community’s views on PFMAs for our region.

First, please read the PFMAs Frequently Asked Questions document, which goes into much greater detail about PFMAs including frequency of treatments, regulations and legislation.

The maps below have been generated via computer bushfire simulations to identify potential Priority Fuel Management Areas (PFMAs). The three options differ in the percentage of the total area of Gippsland identified as PFMAs, ranging from 10%, to 20% and 30% of the total area of Gippsland. The maps show these areas overlaid on existing bushfire management zones for public land.
Map B - PFMA's cover 20% of Gippsland

Legend
- PFMA's cover 20% of Gippsland
- Current Fire Management Zones
  - Asset Protection Zone
  - Bushfire Moderation Zone
  - Landscape Management Zone
  - Planned Burning Exclusion Zone

Map C - PFMA's cover 30% of Gippsland

Legend
- PFMA's cover 30% of Gippsland
- Current Fire Management Zones
  - Asset Protection Zone
  - Bushfire Moderation Zone
  - Landscape Management Zone
  - Planned Burning Exclusion Zone
Restricting PFMAs to a lower percentage of Gippsland would focus fuel reduction efforts into a more targeted area, but would mean a reduced focus on other areas where effective risk reduction could still be achieved through fuel management. We have selected three thresholds (10% / 20% / 30% total area) that would produce reasonable PFMAs, but we are seeking feedback on which of these the community prefers.

The following two questions concern the whole of Gippsland (Q1a), as well as your local area (Q1b).

Please consider each separately when responding to the questions.

Q1a. Whole of Gippsland. Considering all of Gippsland, which map do you prefer? (Note that PFMAs will not exclude fuel management from other areas) Required
- Map A – (PFMAs cover 10% of Gippsland)
- Map B – (PFMAs cover 20% of Gippsland)
- Map C – (PFMAs cover 30% of Gippsland)
- None of the above.

Q1b. Your local area. Considering your local area, which map do you prefer? (Note that PFMAs will not exclude fuel management from other areas) Required
- Map A – (PFMAs cover 10% of Gippsland)
- Map B – (PFMAs cover 20% of Gippsland)
- Map C – (PFMAs cover 30% of Gippsland)
- None of the above.

Q2. Please comment on the reasons for your choices in questions 1a and 1b, particularly if your answers to each are different.
Section 1b: PFMAs – measures of risk

The term “bushfire risk” can mean many different things. For the maps in Question 1, three measures of risk were combined equally: the number of dwellings lost to bushfire (which is linked to human life loss), the number of localities impacted by bushfire (regardless of the population of each locality), and direct economic cost of assets burnt in bushfire.

How these measures are combined influences where fuel management occurs across Gippsland. For example, allocating treatments based purely on the objective of protecting human life would mean efforts are focused in areas of highest population. Less populated areas may receive less fuel management even if they experience more frequent bushfires.

There is no “correct” way to combine these three measures; people will have different opinions about how much emphasis should be placed on each measure. For this reason, we are seeking the community’s input on how much each individual measure of risk should contribute to the final PFMAs.

The three maps below show where fuel management would be most effective, if each risk measure was targeted individually. In each case 20% of Gippsland is identified.
Q3. Considering the maps above, please allocate a total of 10 points across the three measures of risk below. Each score can range from zero (e.g. this measure is of no importance to me) to ten (e.g. this is the only measure that matters to me). The total of all answers should be ten (10).

- **Dwelling loss** Required

- **Locality impacts** Required

- **Economic impacts** Required

Check point: Please ensure that your total points add up to 10.

### Part 2: Your background and experiences

Collecting a small amount of non-identifying information is valuable in helping us understand the perspectives of different groups of people.

Q4. Did you participate in Phase #1 of the Gippsland Strategic Bushfire Management Planning survey in September 2018? Required

- Yes
- No


- Yes
- No

Q6. Have you had personal experience of bushfire? Required

Select as many as apply

- [ ] I have been affected by bushfire (personal loss or displacement)
- [ ] I have been threatened by bushfire (but did not suffer personal loss)
- [ ] My family and/or friends have been affected or threatened by bushfire
- [ ] None of the above

Q7. Have you assisted with bushfire response or recovery? Required

Select as many as apply

- [ ] I have been part of an emergency response to bushfire as a volunteer
- [ ] I have been part of an emergency response to bushfire as a professional
- [ ] I have assisted with community recovery from bushfire
- [ ] I have directly supported others who have been affected by or responded to bushfire
- [ ] None of the above
Q8. Are you a Gippsland resident or land owner? Required

☐ I am a Gippsland resident
☐ I own property in Gippsland but do not currently reside in Gippsland
☐ I don’t live or own property in Gippsland

Q9. Which local government area (shire) in Gippsland do you live in? Required

☐ Bass Coast
☐ Bow Baw
☐ East Gippsland
☐ Latrobe City
☐ South Gippsland
☐ Wellington
☐ I don’t live in Gippsland
☐ Prefer not to say

Q10. What town or locality do you live in? (optional)

[Text field]

You have 253 characters left.

Q11. What is your main source of income? Required

☐ Agriculture – primarily dryland (e.g. beef cattle, sheep)
☐ Agriculture – primarily irrigation (e.g. dairy, horticulture)
☐ Apiculture
☐ Education
☐ Energy
☐ Government agency (employee)
☐ Healthcare
☐ Non-government organisation
☐ Private business (other)
☐ Retired
☐ Timber industry
☐ Tourism
☐ Winemaking
☐ Prefer not to say
☐ Other (please specify)
Q12. What activities do you regularly participate in? Required

Select as many as apply

- Bushwalking / hiking
- Camping
- Conservation or citizen science
- CPA / SES volunteer
- Day trips
- Firewood collection
- Fishing
- Four-wheel driving
- Hunting
- Mountain Biking
- Natural history (e.g. field naturalist or birdwatching)
- Prospecting
- Snow sports
- None of the above
- Other (please specify)

Q13. Is there anything else you would like to add?

You have 1,000 characters left.
Q14. How did you find out about this community consultation?

- [ ] Participated in Phase 1 (September 2018)
- [ ] Participated in Phase 2 (February – March 2019)
- [ ] Social media
- [ ] Regional media – newspaper or radio story
- [ ] Advertisement
- [ ] My CFA email
- [ ] Agency website (DELWP, CFA, Safer Together or local government)
- [ ] Word of mouth
- [ ] Email
- [ ] Other (please specify)

Optional: Please provide your email address if you would like to receive a direct copy of your submission

Submit

Privacy Collection Notice

The Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning is committed to protecting personal information provided by you in accordance with the principles of the Victorian privacy laws.

Purpose

This Privacy Collection Statement relates to all submissions collected in relation to the strategic bushfire management planning process being conducted across Victoria. Agencies involved in fire management across Victoria have been charged with undertaking a strategic planning process to guide bushfire management actions on public and private land into the future. The agencies involved in this process are Forest Fire Management Victoria (FFMVic), CFA, Local Government and Parks Victoria.

Forest Fire Management Victoria is providing administrative services to the consultation. FFMVic is part of the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning (the Department) and submissions will be managed in accordance with the Department’s Information Privacy Policy. The Department’s Information Privacy Policy can be viewed at www.delwp.vic.gov.au/privacy.
Use of your submission

The information you provide will be made available to the Strategic Bushfire Management Planning Teams involved in the planning process, including representatives from FFMVic, CFA, Local Government and Parks Victoria.

This consultation is intended to give the community an opportunity to be involved in the strategic bushfire management planning process by providing information that informs the development of bushfire management strategies across Victoria. The consultation will be conducted in three phases:

- Phase 1: Strategic planning objectives
- Phase 2: Fire management strategies and actions
- Phase 2A: PFMA strategy options
- Phase 3: Feedback on final results of planning process

If you freely and voluntarily provide any sensitive information under the Act in your submission DELWP will consider that provision to be consent to collect the information and will then protect it under the Information Privacy Principles in the Act. Sensitive information is information relating to racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, membership of a political association or trade association/union, religious or philosophical beliefs or affiliations, sexual preference or criminal record.

You have the right to access and correct your personal information about you that is held by DELWP. Requests for access should be sent to the Manager Privacy, P.O. Box 500 East Melbourne 3002.
## Appendix 2: Additional data

### Table 3: Promotion of the survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Social Media</th>
<th>Emails to CFA Brigades</th>
<th>Emails to stakeholders</th>
<th>My CFA Emails</th>
<th>Other media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31-May-2019</td>
<td>Phase 2 results and notice of Phase #2a</td>
<td>Expert Reference Group</td>
<td>CFA Eastern Region District Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-June-2019</td>
<td>Captains and Secretaries</td>
<td>Gippsland emergency management committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-June-2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community newsletters</td>
<td>Workshop participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-June-2019</td>
<td>Announcing Phase #2A</td>
<td>Captains and Secretaries</td>
<td>Previous Engage Victoria participants</td>
<td>Informing of consultation opportunity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-June-2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>Industry and interest groups</td>
<td>Community groups, etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-June-2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>Park Victoria Gippsland Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-June-2019</td>
<td>Fire knows no boundaries post</td>
<td>Newspaper ads</td>
<td>Radio interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-June-2019</td>
<td>Captains and secretaries</td>
<td>Previous Engage Victoria participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-18 June-2019</td>
<td>1st FB boost</td>
<td>Reminder of consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 June-2019</td>
<td>2nd FB boost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-June-2019</td>
<td>Last chance to have your say</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reminder of consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Detail of how people found out about the survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase #1 participation</th>
<th>Phase #2 participation</th>
<th>Social media</th>
<th>Region media</th>
<th>Advertisement</th>
<th>My CFA email</th>
<th>Agency website</th>
<th>Word of mouth</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 26 | 34 | 63 | 13 | 2 | 38 | 17 | 16 | 27 | 2 |