



Status Report

Date: 06 JULY 12

Subcommittee: WRSC

Accomplishments Since Last Report:

The Co-Chair vacancy created by Joe Stutler's resignation filled by MAC, redistribution of functions and roles/responsibilities also addressed, Quan, Freeland, Medema volunteered to take on additional responsibilities. Entire WRSC and WG's stepped up active participation, supported NSAT September closure/reports all regions and CSSC meeting idea, Joe F. briefed the Western Regional Partnership on CS, success feature for July was from the Karuk Tribe, Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Fire Program, and Ashland Forest Resiliency Stewardship Project at: <http://sites.nemac.org/westcohesivefire/about-you/> See our national Partner Perspectives and Success Stories at: <http://forestsandrangelands.gov>

Planned Activities for Next Reporting Period:

WRSCSWG will meet with the NSAT folks July 17&18 SLC for the purpose of solidifying WRSC Alternatives, mapping and modeling of Alternatives, discussion of stakeholder feedback on alternatives, strategize dissemination of WRSCSWG decisions to full WRSC, Writer/Editor interface relevant to P III report, stakeholder feedback report.

Issues Identified:

Process issues with travel, closure escalates tensions, procurements, commitment struggles, myopia forecasting(path forward), potential capitalization on political scene re: early and severe fire season rocky mountain states.

WFEC Decisions/Approvals Needed:

Concurrence from WFEC on the WRSC decision to appoint Douglas R. MacDonald, as WRSC Co-Chair until end of P III.

References:

Contact Information:

macdonald.dr@gmail.com



Status Report



Status Report

Date: July 6, 2012

Subcommittee: Northeast RSC

Accomplishments Since Last Report:

- ⤴ The NE RSC has finalized plans for a face-to-face meeting with the NSAT in Boston, July 10-11.
- ⤴ The NE RSC has established a communications and outreach work group, with a communications plan for the group, designated a leader, Maureen Brooks, and established a communications support contract with METI which is underway.
- ⤴ The NE RSC Chair and Coordinator, and several committee and working group members met with the Northeast State Fire Supervisors on June 19 in Connecticut to update these key stakeholders and received input on the Cohesive Strategy work to date.
- ⤴ The NE RSC communications working group leader recently submitted several success stories to the National Communications Steering Team at their request.

Planned Activities for Next Reporting Period:

- ⤴ Many Northeast RSC and working group members will be meeting with the NSAT in Boston, MA to work on alternatives, data gathered to date, and modeling information in preparation for developing the regional risk analysis report.
- ⤴ The Northeast RSC continues bi-weekly conference calls and continues participating in the CSSC and WFEC scheduled calls.
- ⤴ Once the Phase III Analysis Report template is finalized, the NE RSC Coordinator and Technical/Strategic Working Group will begin work on the "boilerplate" and alternatives portions of the report.
- ⤴ The NE RSC Coordinator has joined the National Writer/Editors team for coordination and sharing resources for preparing the regional risk analysis report.
- ⤴ Communications activities are expected to increase.

Issues Identified:

None

WFEC Decisions/Approvals Needed:

None

References:

Contact Information:

Brad Simpkins or Larry Mastic



Status Report

Date: July 6, 2012

Subcommittee: Southern RSC

Accomplishments Since Last Report:

- Technical Group meeting to discuss analysis report template, consider performance measurers and discuss barriers and communications needs.
- Developing internal timeline for SE risk analysis report development.
- RSC Call to discuss barriers, templates and planning for July discussions with NSAT.
- Discussions with insurance industry on potential products/incentives for enhanced mitigation activities.
- Development of immediate opportunities strategy – how to engage.

Planned Activities for Next Reporting Period:

- Input from WG to NSAT on preferred alternatives.
- WG call to discuss preferred alternatives and initialize risk analysis report.
- Input from social network mapping into stakeholder engagement process.
- Determining engagement points for stakeholders and building informal process for interested interest groups.
- Proposal for communications evaluation of regional communications strategies and campaigns.

Issues Identified:

WFEC Decisions/Approvals Needed: Timeline for inclusion of both science team input and stakeholder input unrealistic by September 30 with when analysis will be transmitted. Need to re-evaluate expectations.

References:

Barriers document with enhanced opportunities for national level engagement.

DRAFT Performance Measurers pending RSC decision for which alternatives to include in final recommendations and which PM are realistic to capture

Contact Information:

Mike Zupko
Southern Governors' Association
mike@zup-co-inc.com 770-267-9630

A National Cohesive Wildland Fire Strategy:

Southeastern Regional

DRAFT Performance Measures

June 29, 2012

Overview and explanation of the current selection of performance measures:

The following suggested performance measures were developed during phase II and have been reviewed over the past month by the Southern RSC, NSAT and the Southern Work Group. Part of the discussion pertained to the challenge of making performance measurers outcome based with results on the ground, part of the discussion dealt with making sure the measurers themselves were not too cumbersome where they would not be reported at all and part of the discussion centered around what might the NSAT be able to develop to “create” a new performance measure that has not yet been considered. To the last point, the other unknown at the moment is the challenge that the National performance measurers (listed below in the gray boxes) while seemingly well rounded, do not have any readily identified data sets (for the most part) that would allow for consistent reporting and tracking nationally, or even regionally.

Therefore, we submit the following performance measures from the South as **DRAFT** and respectfully retain the right to withdraw those that might create a cumbersome reporting process in the future or removing any that end up pertaining to a proposed alternative that might not be highly recommended or utilized.

We plan to utilize the phase II management scenarios as an early methodology for the NSAT to be able to model from, but as we move through the process will most likely create a list of alternatives that have more detail than the current alternatives, but still a level above specific actions (e.g. increase the use of prescribed burning might be an alternative while the actions would be work to decrease concern over liability, educate landowners on the benefits, training more practitioners, create insurance and/or incentive products to help additional burning etc etc.). In doing so, we might create a list of suggested alternatives that would allow managers (at the regional, sub-regional, state and local levels) to best determine their own suite of alternatives. The list of suggested alternatives could then be refined in the modeling process by NSAT and subsequently we may select to on create new performance measures for the suggested alternatives and/or utilize the national performance measurers if NSAT creates a methodology for which to track performance.

Respectfully submitted: Mike Zupko,

Co-Chair, Southern Regional Strategy Committee

Cohesive Wildland Fire Strategy

Southern Governors' Association Representative

June 29, 2012

DRAFT June 29, 2012

Restore and Maintain Landscapes

Landscapes across all jurisdictions are resilient to fire-related disturbances in accordance with management objectives.

National Outcome-based Performance Measures:

- Risk to Landscapes is diminished

Regional Goal 1: Restore and Maintain Landscapes- Landscapes across all jurisdictions are resilient to fire-related disturbances in accordance with management objectives

Objective 1.1: Build and maintain resiliency in Southeastern landscapes through strategic use of prescribed fire, mechanical treatments, grazing, etc, and manage wildfire where and when appropriate based on ownership and landscape context

POTENTIAL Performance Measurers:

- Acres burned or otherwise treated
- Acres under stewardship programs or equivalent certifications

Objective 1.2: Promote strategic interagency planning and policy development across agencies, organizations, and the public to more effectively integrate wildland fire planning into land-use planning and economic development

POTENTIAL Performance Measurers:

- Number of agreements to allow for shared resource use to conduct fuel treatments
- Number of integrated land-use and fire management plans in place
- Number of multi jurisdictional treatments planned and implemented

Objective 1.3: Develop and sustain capability and capacity required to plan and carry out landscape treatments, including prescribed fire

POTENTIAL Performance Measurers:

- Number of practitioners trained to plan and conduct prescribed burning

Objective 1.4: Encourage increased public awareness to ensure public acceptance and active participation in achieving landscape objectives

POTENTIAL Performance Measurers:

- Number of active fire councils

Objective 1.5: Mitigate environmental threats other than wildfire that reduce ecosystem vitality and increase its susceptibility to wildfire

POTENTIAL Performance Measurers:

- Number of acres treated

Fire Adapted Communities

Human populations and infrastructure can withstand a wildfire without loss of life and property

National Outcome-based Performance Measures:

- Risk of wildfire impacts to communities is diminished
- Individuals and communities accept and act upon their responsibility to prepare their properties for wildfire.
- Jurisdictions assess level of risk and establish roles and responsibilities for mitigating both the threat and the consequences of wildfire.
- Effectiveness of mitigation activities is monitored, collected and shared.

Regional Goal 2: Fire Adapted Human Communities – Human populations and infrastructure can withstand wildfire without loss of life or property

Objective 2.1: Support development of, and maintain engagement with communities by developing and leveraging partnerships through community wildfire planning for improved preparedness

POTENTIAL Performance Measurers:

- Number of communities-at-risk (CAR) covered by a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) or equivalent that are improving their wildland fire preparedness. Evidence that a community is improving its wildland fire preparedness can be represented by any of the following:
 - a) Adoption of “Firewise” or equivalent principles to safeguard homes
 - b) Adoption of “Ready, Set, Go!” or equivalent principles to prepare for fire and evacuation
 - c) Enaction of mitigation / fire prevention ordinances
 - d) High priority hazardous fuels identified in a CWPP or equivalent are reduced or appropriate fuel levels on such lands are maintained in accordance with a plan

Objective 2.2: Eliminate loss of life and minimize loss of structures

POTENTIAL Performance Measurers:

- Number of communities-at-risk that have reported an increase in local wildfire suppression capacity. This can be evidenced by any of the following:
 - a. An increasing number of trained and /or certified wildland fire fighters and crews
 - b. Upgraded or new fire suppression equipment obtained,
 - c. Formation of new or expansion of existing fire department involved in wildland fire fighting

Objective 2.3: Coordinate public policy and shared responsibility across jurisdictions

POTENTIAL Performance Measurers:

- Number of fire prevention programs and Firewise communities in place
- Number of Communities-at-risk (CAR) that have increased their preparedness and capacity through shared responsibility. This can be evidenced by the following:
 - a. Enacting mutual aid agreements
 - b. Forming or joining fire protection associations
 - c. Number of enhanced and/or improved agreements

Wildfire Response

All jurisdictions participate in making and implementing safe, effective, efficient risk-based wildfire management decisions.

National Outcome-based Performance Measures:

- Injuries and loss of life to the public and firefighters are diminished
- Response to shared-jurisdiction wildfire is efficient and effective.
- Pre-fire multi-jurisdictional planning occurs

Regional Goal 3: Response to Fire- All jurisdictions participate in developing and implementing safe, effective, and efficient risk-based wildfire management decisions

Objective 3.1: Increase firefighter safety by using risk management

POTENTIAL Performance Measurers:

- Trend change in number of firefighter injuries and firefighter fatalities during wildfire suppression activities compared to previous years

Objective 3.2: Increase and leverage resource capability and capacity. Streamline and support training across all areas to maximize effectiveness

POTENTIAL Performance Measurers:

- Percent increase in the number of firefighters receiving wildland fire training compared to previous years
- Percent change in homes, improved property, and forests lost and saved over time
- Percent increase in the number of states with statewide mutual aid agreements compared to prior years

Cross-Cutting Actions and Activities

Some actions and activities were found to be common to all of the Southeastern objectives. These Actions and Activities are listed at here, and should be considered to be part of each of the individual objectives, as they benefit all of the objectives and goals.

- Conduct education and outreach to incorporate all Southeastern residents as active participants in fire adapted communities and wildfire prevention, landscape restoration, including prescribed fire and fuels management
- Encourage the standardization of a simplified fire reporting system so that all fires, regardless of jurisdiction are captured
- Support for maintaining working forest and viable forest products markets
- Expand the use of prescribed burning

Management Scenarios

The following management scenarios were tentatively identified during phase II by the Southern Regional Strategy Committee as a way to group activities to achieve a common goal. During phase III, the South will most likely be developing more specific alternatives that will allow managers, whether at the regional, sub-regional, state or local level to select the best suite of alternatives to meet their specific challenges and situation. We are currently retaining the management scenarios from phase II to help the national science and analysis team in grouping/layering their models, but as we move through the process with the science team may re-evaluate how we project scenarios or alternatives, and to what level we specify each.

The goal of the Cohesive Strategy is to better address the growing wildland fire management challenges throughout the nation through collective action. In order to effectively and realistically plan for the future, the fire management community recognizes a need to anticipate and prepare for a variety of management scenarios. This may result in weighing various national and regional values and goals to strategically use available resources to greatest effect. The Southeast considered four potential Management Scenarios: **Present Management Situation; Increased Personal Responsibility and Action Through Outreach and Education; Increased Firefighter Safety and Wildfire Response Through Enhanced Collaboration, Training and Capacity; and Increased Proactive Fuels Mitigation Through all Management Techniques Including Prescribed Burning.** These Management Scenarios are described along with their potential consequences in the Management Scenarios that follow. Through the development of the four management scenarios, we started with describing the present situation broken down by each of our strategic opportunities. In Management Scenario A, we described nothing different with present day activity. In the following three scenarios, we increased one at a time each of our three strategic opportunities while leaving the other two static (or as described in the Present Management Situation – Scenario A). Thus, we did not rewrite the present management situations that remained static in management scenarios B, C, and D. The reader can refer back to the Present Management Situation as described in Management Scenario A for further explanation.

Our intent is to give managers within the fire management community across the Southeast an opportunity to compare what an increase in a certain area (as defined by each strategic opportunity) might look like. We also understand and do not intend to prescribe or even suggest simply increasing only one opportunity is the best method. This is a simple design to allow managers to compare trade-offs, using their local knowledge and awareness of challenges in making appropriate management decisions. We do not believe that management could or should be determined at the regional level and we recognize each

landscape encounters different environmental and societal pressures that must be appropriately addressed.

Management Scenario A: Present Management Situation

The first identified Management Scenario is one in which nothing is changed from the current situation, which includes **Personal Responsibility and Action Through Outreach and Education**. Some, but not all, landowners deliberately manage their lands (regardless of ownership objectives) and take action to mitigate fuels due to natural disturbances (i.e. storm damage, insect, and disease), but results are sporadic. Southeasterners participate in a variety of successful fuel management activities to effect fuel management on the landscape included but not limited to prescribed burning. A tremendous amount of prescribed burning is done in the Southeast. Some of it is done specifically for fuel reduction but much of it is done primarily for other reasons such as wildlife habitat improvement. Any prescribed burning has the effect of reducing wildland fuels but burning done for other purposes are not prioritized in the areas needed most for fuels mitigation. Landowners are encouraged to use prescribed burning and alternative fuels management techniques where prescribed burning is not appropriate or is limited by concerns about smoke and other liability issues. Removing barriers related to liability and smoke would likely significantly increase the amount of prescribed burning accomplished in the Southeast. Burning activities are not well coordinated with adjacent landowners, and alternative fuel mitigation options are limited due to cost. Not all homeowners in WUI areas are willing to tolerate smoke in order to reduce wildfire risk.

Communities and homeowners are encouraged to institute Firewise or equivalent practices. Under this scenario, some communities initiate and participate in Firewise activities, but large inputs of long-term agency assistance is required, limiting accomplishments. Fast growth in the WUI continues to strain agency resources available to work with communities. Developers and land planners are reluctant to include Firewise practices in the design of new communities due to concerns about increased cost.

Rural fire departments continue to play a vital role in wildfire suppression, but are less involved in wildfire prevention and mitigation due to continued budget and capacity limitations. Since people are the leading cause of wildfires in the Southeast, this highlights continued challenges with regard to wildfire prevention education and wildfire law enforcement. Wildland fire management agencies need additional agreements that allow for coordination and assisting each other in fuel mitigation activities.

In addition, Firefighter Safety and Wildfire Response Through Enhanced Collaboration, Training and Capacity planning efforts between wildland fire managers are not well coordinated which could lead to

confusion on the fire ground and compromise safety. The resulting outreach and work with communities forms a mosaic across the landscape rather than being prioritized in commonly defined high priority areas, which may not increase firefighter safety as much as it could. Fuel mitigation work takes place in locations where landowners are willing to participate and not necessarily prioritized in highest risk areas. The lack of markets limits removal of small diameter trees for fuel reduction. Prescribed burners continue to be trained, but many burn only on their own lands, limiting the number of acres burned. Prescribed Fire Councils and other NGOs have only limited success reaching large audiences with the message that prescribed burning is necessary and beneficial.

Fire resistant construction techniques, Community Wildfire Protection Plans, and Firewise principles are not in widespread use as rapid WUI development continues, which can create hazardous situations for firefighters. Decision makers such as county commissioners, community planners, and town councils need additional tools to assist in Firewise and similar planning programs. Additional coordination and planning between federal, state, and local wildland fire managers is needed annually prior to the fire season in order to ensure safe, effective multi-agency wildfire response.

Additional training and capacity is needed by federal, state, local and cooperating entities to ensure staffing levels meet operational needs, adequate training, resources and capacity are necessary for firefighter safety. Increased use of predictive services and spatial analysis tools are needed to mitigate risk to firefighters and evaluate strategies for response. Consistent training that meets NWCG standards is needed for all wildland fire responders. Training is currently limited due to cost and availability, particularly with rural fire departments. Additional specialized firefighting equipment is needed but is limited to budget constraints. Wildfires are usually contained quickly and efficiently, but in some cases lack of sufficient equipment, manpower, or inaccessible terrain allows large fires to develop. Statewide mutual aid agreements are needed among rural fire departments for wildland fire response, in order to provide adequate structure protection allowing wildland firefighters to concentrate on the wildland fire. Other capacity related issues that need additional support include Type 3 Incident Management Team development, for additional capacity and Cooperative Fire Agreement billing issues in order to provide seamless ordering and movement of wildland fire resources .

Finally, Proactive Fuels Mitigation Through all Management Techniques Including Prescribed Burning..

In this management scenario, fragmentation of ownership and lack of coordination makes it difficult to implement landscape scale fuels treatments. Southeast Regional Partnership for Planning and Sustainability (SERPPAS) efforts to increase prescribed burning for Longleaf Pine restoration leads to some increased burning, but financial incentives are needed to encourage more landowners to participate.

The use of prescribed fire is promoted by state and federal forestry agency personnel. Many landowners utilize prescribed burning, but it is often for reasons other than fuel reduction, such as wildlife management, which still provides fuel reduction benefits but does not necessarily occur in prioritized high risk areas. State and federal forestry agencies continue to work with EPA and state air quality agencies/entities to ensure that prescribed burning remains a viable fuels management tool. State and federal air quality agencies/entities agree that prescribed burning is more desirable than wildfires given that prescribed burning allows smoke reduction techniques to be utilized, and management actions to take place to direct smoke away from smoke sensitive areas. EPA is mandated to improve air quality based on research on air quality and human health. As a result, air quality regulations are likely to continue to become more restrictive. Prescribed burners continue to be trained in prescribed burning techniques and smoke management, but many burn only on their own lands. Concerns about liability and restrictions on burning in certain weather conditions may result in landowners not burning as much as they planned. Some landowners choose not to burn due to concerns about invasive species, some of which become more prolific following activities which remove competing vegetation. Financial incentives, which might encourage landowners to conduct increased burning activities are likely to have some impact, but are not currently in place in the Southeast.

Mechanical and other fuels mitigation activities are occurring but they are often sporadic and not strategic or coordinated. They tend to be focused where they are most cost effective and can often be cost prohibitive.

Support for and development of markets for forest products is provided by state and federal forestry agencies for the purpose of providing markets for material removed through fuel reduction treatments and timber harvesting. In general, this has the result of reducing fuel loading. Maintaining working forests is encouraged because active management usually involves forest management activities that reduce fuels.

Management Scenario B: Increased Personal Responsibility and Action Through Outreach and Education

In this scenario, resources would be focused in outreach, education, and prevention activities aimed at Southeastern residents to instill a sense of personal responsibility for preventing ignitions and actively preparing their homes and communities for wildfire. Firefighter safety and fuels mitigation remain static in this scenario.

The fire management community would collectively work to present a unified message in outreach, education, and prevention, coordinating activities utilizing a common prioritization of particularly high risk communities in Management Scenario B. This resource investment would encompass landowners,

residents, and visitors, recognizing everyone that lives, visits, or works in the Southeast as a stakeholder in wildfire risk abatement. The outreach effort would identify as a particular priority new and non-traditional residents in the South, including but not limited to non-traditional landowners, and older individuals new to the area.

The Southeast has one of the fastest growing populations in the nation, with many living in fire-prone WUI areas. Nearly sixty thousand communities in the Southeast are considered at risk of catastrophic wildfires that could take lives, destroy infrastructure and other values, and damage local economies. In this Scenario, well-coordinated education and outreach activities on the part of the fire management community in the Southeast catalyzes wide-spread development of awareness of wildfire risk. RFDs receive support and training from state and federal agencies to enable them to deliver timely, effective fire education messages coordinated throughout the region. At-risk communities are identified and prioritized for outreach by the fire management community. Planners, developers, and local governments utilize Firewise or similar program standards while planning and constructing developments. Insurers provide incentives to residents and homeowners for making their homes more fire safe, recognizing that even a small investment can leverage significant returns in homeowner activity. Residents in WUI areas, coordinating with Firewise or similar program coordinators, plan and implement fire risk abatement activities at the community level. Communities are prepared to mobilize and have plans in place guiding evacuation in the event of a wildfire. Individual residents and homeowners take personal responsibility for retrofitting their dwellings and preparing their property for wildfire. Better understanding wildfire risk and the effectiveness of prescribed burning as a risk abatement tool, Southeastern residents are supportive of prescribed burning as a tool and tolerant of smoke. Though fire management agencies support and maintain engagement with Firewise communities and similar programs, local residents take personal responsibility for their community fire risk abatement programs, proactively reaching out to new residents and remaining engaged in abatement activities. A multi-lateral fire prevention initiative, conducted in coordination with law enforcement agencies, increases awareness and enforcement of fire laws and has a substantial impact on rates of human-caused wildfires.

In this scenario, forest product markets remain at the same or similar levels, thus motivation and ability to engage in thinning activities remains static. An increase in outreach activities focused on landowners results in widespread understanding of the importance of deliberately managing land, regardless of ownership objective. Landowners, particularly new and non-traditional, are encouraged to participate in prescribed burning education which provides training on prescribed burning and reduces concerns about and liability. Educating homeowners and landowners about invasive species reduces their potential spread and harmful impacts. The fire management community works closely with the EPA and other similar air

quality management agencies/entities to increase understanding of and support for prescribed burning. As a consequence, more prescribed burns take place throughout the region with a significant increase in the number of acres treated. Land fragmentation and increased frequency of ownership turnover present a challenge in the Southeast region. However, in this Scenario, a long-term commitment throughout the fire management community to ongoing outreach and education of landowners will help mitigate this issue.

In this scenario, agencies and organizations in the fire management community work closely to coordinate fuels management activities. State, federal, and local wildland fire agencies as well as NGOs and other members of the fire management community develop and implement MOUs enabling them to assist each other in carrying out fuel treatment and reduction activities. Effective pre-planning at all levels throughout the region results in a well-coordinated, efficient response to fuels mitigation following natural disturbance events such as hurricane, insect, and disease. Potentially hazardous fuels are quickly and effectively removed.

Management Scenario C: Increased Firefighter Safety and Wildfire Response Through Enhanced Collaboration, Training and Capacity

In this Scenario, resources are focused on increasing the effectiveness of wildfire response through capacity-building, training, and enhanced collaboration between agencies and organizations in the wildland fire management community to improve safety. Personal responsibility and fuels mitigation remain static in this Scenario.

The Southeast relies on an extensive network of rural fire departments (RFDs) for a significant amount of wildfire response. RFDs are committed, however limited resources and frequent turnover of personnel hamper training. Safer response to fire depends on continuous interagency coordination and training. In this Scenario, the fire management community substantially invests in training and capacity-building for RFDs. Continual training is provided in order that RFD training meets NWCG standards.

Capacity-building takes place throughout the Southeastern region, resulting in more adequate staffing and available equipment to safely and effectively respond to wildfires. The wildland fire management community including federal, state, local agencies as well as NGOs works together to ensure that sufficient responders with appropriate training are available to safely respond to wildfires. Agencies and organizations working in wildland fire management, working together, develop and implement statewide mutual aid MOUs making it possible for federal, state, local, NGO and RFDs to assist each other in wildfire response and collaborate in suppression activities. Cooperative fire agreement billing policies are efficiently implemented region-wide allowing for the mobilization of all fire suppression resources as

needed. Additional Type 3 IMTs are developed and supported to assist in suppression efforts throughout the region. This reduces the demands on stressed resources, resulting in substantially increased firefighter safety in fire response and suppression activities. Collaboratively planned training efforts across agencies and jurisdictions result in better interagency understanding of response and enhanced communications. Predictive service tools are in more widespread use, and available to all responders, making wildland firefighting safer. Resources are provided to make certain equipment used in fire response by federal, state, local, NGOs and RFDs meets minimum safety standards. Where appropriate and necessary, equipment and resources are provided to RFDs and local responders, resulting in a safer response through use of appropriate PPE and functioning apparatus.

This Scenario sees an increase in the number of prescribed burns and acres treated in the Southeast. More people receive prescribed burning training, and more prescribed burns are accomplished, resulting in an overall reduction in hazardous fuels and increased firefighter safety by reducing fuels and decreasing fire intensity and rate of spread. Prescribed burning reduces the chance of wildfire spread which increases the safety of responders.

Management Scenario D: Increased Proactive Fuels Mitigation Through all Management Techniques Including Prescribed Burning

In this Scenario, resources are focused on expanding the breadth and quantity of hazardous fuel abatement activities within the Southeast region. Personal responsibility and firefighter safety remain static in this Scenario.

The Southeast is home to extensive fire adapted landscapes with an extremely high incidence of fire and short fire return interval. These ecosystems rely on regular wildland fires to restore and maintain characteristic ecosystem structure and prevent the buildup of hazardous fuels, which increase the risk, and severity of wildfires. Located adjacent to, and in many cases within these vegetated landscapes are human communities. These complexities require the use of a broad range of management techniques, including but not limited to managed wildfire, prescribed burning, grazing, and mechanical treatments. In this Scenario, multiple hazardous fuel mitigation techniques are promoted and used throughout the Southeast to restore and maintain landscapes. Agencies and organizations in the fire management community collaborate and conduct unified outreach in order to not only maintain but significantly expand the ability to tailor individual treatments to local circumstances based on ownership and landscape context. This initiative focuses on use of appropriate management techniques on the landscape to have the greatest impact on ecosystem health and wildfire risk in the safest and most cost-efficient manner.

The vast majority of lands in the Southeast are owned by private landowners. In order to effect landscape level fuel treatments and widespread hazardous fuel risk abatement, broad collaboration must take place between agencies, organizations, and landowners. A significant challenge in the Southeast is the fragmentation of ownership. Where fifty years ago a single landowner or entity might manage or own very large acreages, the trend today continues to expand a patchwork quilt of ownership where thousands of landowners might each own parcels of ten acres or less. Under this Scenario, extensive outreach by the fire management community as well as the provision of incentives for carrying out fuels treatments has resulted in landowner participation in land management activities for the purpose of landscape restoration and wildfire risk abatement. Unified education efforts have provided landowners and other stakeholders fuel treatment skills, including a practical understanding of prescribed fire. Landowners and other practitioners are taught prescribed burning techniques and trained in effective smoke management tactics. This familiarity with prescribed burning dramatically reduces landowner concerns about liability related to prescribed burning.

Extensive collaboration produces a prioritization of landscapes on which to preferentially implement fuels treatments based on wildfire risk and ecosystem restoration needs. All stakeholders involved in planning and carrying out fuel treatments coordinate their efforts, including local government, air quality agencies/entities, and landowners as well as federal and state agencies. The fire management community continues to proactively engage with state and federal air quality agencies/entities, with the effect of exempting prescribed burning from additional air quality regulations and creating widespread support for prescribed burning in the air quality community. Consequently, practitioners are able to implement more fuels treatments throughout the region for a significant increase in acres treated. The unified outreach and education effort results in widespread increase in the amount of prescribed burns taking place and reduced smoke impacts due to training on appropriate burning techniques and smoke management. This increase in prescribed burning serves to help restore and maintain the Southeast's fire adapted landscapes while reducing the risk of wildfire by reducing fuel loading. These treatments also serve as a management technique to curb some invasive species that are not native to Southeastern landscapes. These invasives can crowd out native species or even increase wildfire risk.

Under this Scenario, existing forest product markets remain healthy and strong, supporting and supported by the enhanced investment in fuel management activities. At the same time, economically sustainable new markets are created and develop to support efficient biomass removal, commercial timber harvests, and working forests. All of these markets support and increase the effectiveness of fuel management activities, reducing hazardous fuels and helping to restore and maintain Southeastern landscapes.

Southern input to “National” Barriers

To Cohesive Strategy

The intent of listing these as priority national barriers from the Southern perspective is the fact that they need to be addressed at the national level to be most effective.

First Tier:

5	Need incentives to increase fuels management on private land.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop landowner incentives (e.g., tax breaks, free disposal of material, increased use of Wyden Amendment and other finance or cost-share authorities). 2. Work with NRCS, FSA and other USDA agencies to better incorporate and/or incentivize prescribed burning on tribal and private lands. (e.g. Rx ranking for landowners wanting to use could be weighted higher) 3. Work with DOI to develop additional programs for fuels management on private lands in proximity to federal holdings. 4. Work with EPA to reduce restriction to use of prescribed fire due to Smoke tolerance and emissions (air quality) this is both for wildfires and prescribed fires. Part is education of the general public – the other part is education/science working with EPA on short-term effects v long-term impacts and extent of emissions. 5. Address the smoke and fire liability issue that is a hindrance to both landowner performing prescribed burns and practitioners in offering burning as a service. 6. Require federal lands to use the fire frequency as set in their approved management plans. Tie execution to performance evaluations. 7. Work with FEMA to maximize fuels reduction across the landscape.
10	Need adequate state and/or local ordinances related to wildfire prevention which are enforceable.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Determine use and effectiveness of existing state and/or local ordinances related to prevention. 2. Establish/coordinate new state and/or local ordinances (or nationally best practices) related to wildfire prevention. 3. Issue authorities (or incentivize the creation) to enforce state and/or local prevention ordinances. 4. Develop extensive listing of lessons learned and model ordinances that can be shared nationally. 5. Evaluate practices such as permanent fuel breaks, property edge setbacks, and access for emergency response resources as potential future BMPs to reduce the potential spread of wildfire.
20	Need growth management, land development, and zoning laws that require defensible space wildland fire risk reduction actions as communities develop, and the maintenance of wildland fire risk reduction practices. prior to development. ¹	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work with planners/developers to develop best practices at the national level (e.g. APA) 2. Work with insurance industry on products that motivate homeowners to create fire adapted homes 3. Create a model fire adapted community concept that can be replicated in planning and target in fire prone areas with reduced fees and higher ISO ratings (compared to locale). 4. Encourage and incentivize homeowners to create both managed natural and landscaped plantings, trees and shrubs on parcels, and build/retrofit the exterior of structures with fire resistive materials and protected ventilation openings resulting in greatly diminished risk from wildland fire through aggressive and long term sponsored education programs 5. Construct a federal incentive program to reimburse for the creation of fire adapted communities through CWPP's and other comprehensive community planning practices. 6. Work with States and local governments to require comparable fire response growth with Community growth. 7. At Federal Agency, State and local government level develop codes and standards for developing and maintaining Fire Adapted Communities reflecting regional and local wildland fire risks to Human Communities, including landscape and structure components/issues.
33	Must be able to effectively and efficiently share resources. Need to remove policy barriers and process complexities which affect the ability to effectively and efficiently share resources, not only for wildfire, but for fuels and prescribed fire work.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify policy barriers that prevent the effective sharing of resources – then change those policies at the national level. - such as FS cooperative fire billing agreements 2. Overcome barriers to qualification standard inconsistencies within federal agencies as well as between federal agencies and non-federal firefighters that pose challenges during the sharing of resources. Identify complexities that need to be simplified in order to efficiently share resources 3. Improve organizational efficiencies and wildfire response effectiveness. 4. Address preparedness strategically for greater efficiency and cost effectiveness. 5. Develop a flexible and mobile response capacity to better utilize local resources. 8. Create an improved process for the sharing of trained prescribed fire resources including, but not limited to, utilization of the national prescribed fire training center. (and make sure it is consistent among all federal agencies) 9. Interoperability radio issues (not sure if this ties to original intent of the barrier, but may be appropriate here as well)

1 – This barrier has been slightly altered to reflect the concern that “defensible space” does not adequately create a fire adapted human community. In order to be “fire adapted” it must also result in much more than solely defensible space.

Southern input to “National” Barriers

To Cohesive Strategy

The intent of listing these as priority national barriers from the Southern perspective is the fact that they need to be addressed at the national level to be most effective.

Second Tier:

2	x				x	Need new technologies and local infrastructure for biomass removal and utilization.			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify new technologies. 2. Identify existing technologies which are unutilized. 3. Encourage incentives through existing legislation or enact new legislation such as Farm/Energy Bill incentives that address industry needs.
11		x			x	New housing developments must provide adequate water supply, wildland fire mitigation plans, and consultation with appropriate wildland fire jurisdictions.			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Engage elected officials at all levels – city, county, state, tribal, and federal. 2. Actively encourage State, Tribal and local governments and officials to adopt WUI Codes, Growth Management Policy for the WUI, and associate Land Development Regulations, and enforcement of all. The Federal government must take a lead roll in this and all WUI and FAC endeavors. 3. State and local governments must implement increased response capability with every WUI develop plan approved to become available as 50% of the development is completed/occupied. 4. Increased social science research to learn more about WUI residents and potential new WUI residents and why they want to live in the WUI, and how to advise them to accept their share of the risk and mitigation of the risk.
31			x		x	Inefficiencies in the national qualification standards and procedures must be addressed to increase response capabilities.	<p>Responding to wildland fire events is a complex, interagency task. Many resources that would otherwise be available for mobilization are unavailable because of cumbersome qualification standards and procedures. As a result, resources are not available for mobilization.</p>	<p>Build on existing success (e.g., IQCS, Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL), Service First).</p> <p>We have a national tracking system for resource mobilization which is ROSS. We need to shorten time for qualifications which is part of the NWCG Workforce Development Goal and IMT Succession Project so work is in progress</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Build on existing success (e.g. Incident Qualification and Certification System (IQCS), Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL), and Service First to develop a national qualification system to track federal, tribal, local, state, and private community responders 2. Refine and implement Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) as a tool for assessing skills and knowledge associated with Position Task Books (PTB's); and to assess and recognize a FF's learned "competencies" for wildland fire positions 3. Expand the application of the Crosswalk for Wildland Fire, providing nationwide marketing to the structure fire community to expand the numbers of local responders qualified for wildland fire response assignment.



Proposal

Date: June 29, 2012

Description of Issue or Assignment:

At the March meeting of the WFLC, the WFEC was tasked with developing a contingency plan to prepare for continuation of the Cohesive Strategy through the summer 2012 fire season.

On May 18, the WFEC approved a tasking memorandum (see attached), and assigned the responsibility for developing the plan to members Bill Kaage and Mary Jacobs. The tasking included development of a contingency plan that accomplished two main tasks:

- Continued availability of sufficient staffing and resources necessary to remain on schedule for the Phase III process at both the national and regional levels in the event that key stakeholder contributors are pulled off of the process by their respective agencies as a result of an active fire season.
- Development of a plan of action to implement, if needed, should there be national pressure to escalate the Phase III schedule due to a severe fire season.

The CSSC had already given thorough consideration to continuation of work on the Cohesive Strategy. Bill Kaage refined that information through additional communications with key regional committee members, NSAT members, Communications Team members and others. Mary Jacobs worked with the Communications Team and other WFEC members to develop the communications strategy portion of the plan.

The draft plan was forwarded to all WFEC members on June 19, 2012 for comment, and those have been incorporated into the recommended plan.

Discussion of Proposed Recommendation(s):

The plan is ready for adoption by the WFEC, with concurrence of completing a few minor blanks left highlighted in the attached document. Discussion of the plan at the WFEC meeting of July 5 can make those last changes.

Identify Considerations:

The contingency plan is designed specifically for one situation, addressing pressure at the national level which may inadvertently derail completion of the Cohesive Strategy on its current course. The plan's messages are consistent with those already established, but refined to address specific audiences and situations. The fire season is already off to a challenging start, with Colorado recently announcing its worst fire season on record. Adoption of the contingency plan at the July 5 meeting is essential to insuring



Proposal

that the components of the plan can be immediately implemented in accordance with the schedule identified.

Rationale for Recommendation(s):

The WFEC approval of the contingency plan work plan will enable continued work on Phase III.

Recommendation(s):

The WFEC acceptance of the contingency plan.

Decision Method used:

- Subcommittee Consensus
- Modified Consensus (explain, i.e. majority, super-majority)
- Chair Decision

Contact Information:

Mary Jacobs, (520) 458-3315; Bill Kaage, (208) 866-5268

WFEC Decision:

- WFEC Approves
- WFEC Approves with Modifications (not required to resubmit for WFEC approval)
- Need More Information (required to come back to WFEC for approval)
- WFEC Does Not Approve

Roy Johnson, DFO

Date

Notes regarding decision:



TASKING MEMORANDUM

May 3, 2012

Subject: Development of a Contingency Plan to Prepare for Continuation of Cohesive Strategy through Summer 2012 Fire Season

Background:

Over the past two years, there has been significant progress in the development of a National Cohesive Wildland Fire Management Strategy. Considerable effort has been made both regionally and nationally to get input across a broad group of stakeholders. Phases I and II are now complete, and a detailed schedule of activities and deliverables have been developed for Phase III and are well underway.

As we approach the primary summer fire season, the WFLC has tasked the WFEC with developing a contingency plan that will help insure that the Cohesive Strategy remains on schedule, regardless of what may happen nationally in the wildland fire arena.

Tasking:

The WFEC will develop a contingency plan that will address two issues:

- Continued availability of sufficient staffing and resources necessary to remain on schedule for the Phase III process at both the national and regional levels in the event that key stakeholder contributors are pulled off of the process by their respective agencies as a result of an active fire season.
- Development of a plan of action to implement, if needed, should there be national pressure to escalate the Phase III schedule due to a severe fire season.

Outcome / Deliverables:

- A list of pre-designated staff who will be assigned responsibility to perform the work necessary, or obtain resources necessary, to keep the cohesive strategy process on schedule, both at the regional and national levels.
- A set of very concise key messages that could be utilized in communication efforts with policy makers, Administration officials, and media should a severe fire season threaten the completion of the cohesive strategy as planned. These messages should address, at a minimum:
 - What the cohesive strategy is, and what it is not.
 - The level of collaboration that has occurred, the accomplishments to date, and the timeline for completion.
 - The ramifications of pushing the schedule up, and how it would jeopardize the intent of the collaborative process, and ultimately, the implementation and acceptance of the national cohesive strategy.

- A pre-designated list of qualified spokespeople, representative of all of the stakeholder groups, who have been briefed and can effectively communicate the key messages developed as part of this contingency plan.

Timeline and Responsible Parties:

- A written plan will be developed by (who will be assigned) and distributed as a draft to WFEC members via e-mail by (date).
- WFEC members will have until (date) to provide written comments to (whomever is assigned).
- The plan will be placed on the (date) WFEC agenda for approval.
- The DFO will insure the plan is implemented accordingly, should it be necessary.

Approval:

This tasking is in effect on the date of approval (noted above) by the Designated Federal Official. This task shall sunset by October 1, 2012.

WFEC Contingency Plan for Insuring Completion of the Cohesive Strategy on Schedule

Background

On May 3, 2012 the WFEC voted to have a contingency plan developed that in the event of an active fire season would:

- 1) Assure the continuity of work being conducted on the Cohesive Strategy; and
- 2) Proactively ensure that WFLC, WFEC and its associated subcommittees are prepared to address political pressure to accelerate completion of the Cohesive Strategy.

The WFLC tasked WFEC with the development of a contingency plan at their April 2012 meeting.

1) Cohesive Strategy Continuity During 2012 Western Fire Season

If 2012 should have an active western fire season, adjustments may need to be made to the timelines established to produce the deliverables that we have committed to completing. We have a number of dedicated staff on each of the sub-committees that are assigned full-time to the Cohesive Strategy (CS) and who will not be diverted to fire assignments or other work assignments. The top row specifies full time staff assigned; bottom row those involved on a part time basis as members of various teams/committees.

National	NSAT	Regions	Communications
Sandy Cantler – FS Alan Quan – FS Jenna Sloan - DOI	Danny Lee – SRS Tom Quigley - contractor	 – West Mike Zupko – SE Larry Mastic - NE	Judith Downing – FS Erin Darboven - DOI
WFEC Members CSSC Members	Other Scientists	RSC Members Regional Strategic Teams Regional Technical Teams	Sarah McCreary – NASF Shawn Stokes - IAFC

National Level

As indicated in the chart, Sandy Cantler, Alan Quan and Jenna Sloan are full-time dedicated staff at the national level. Sandy, Jenna and Alan will not be taking any fire assignments or other assignments unless a suitable alternate is available to step in and continue the work. In addition, we have WFEC and CSSC members who may be diverted to deal with wildfires. WFEC and CSSC members will make every effort to remain engaged with the CS when these diversions occur.

NSAT

Danny Lee and Tom Quigley are the Science Team leads. They are fully funded to work on the CS and will not be assigned to any fires during Phase III. It is unknown if there is a chance that any of the scientists who will be putting any significant time toward the CS will be diverted to a fire assignment. If so, then an alternate will need to be named to ensure continuity.

Regions

Each of the regions has a fully funded, full-time lead position to ensure coordination and continued progress in completing the CS. As such, these leads will not be accepting any fire assignments or other assignments throughout Phase III unless a suitable alternative is available. [REDACTED] is the dedicated lead for the West. The Southeast dedicated lead is Mike Zupko. The Northeast dedicated lead is Larry Mastic.

In addition, the regions all have three committees/teams that are staffed with people who dedicate part of their time to the Cohesive Strategy including the Regional Strategy Committees, the Regional Strategic Teams and the Technical Teams. The people on these teams play a key role and will be making critical decisions at various points throughout Phase III. Therefore, the regions need to assess the membership and name alternates, as necessary, to ensure work continues uninterrupted.

Communications

Finally, we have two full-time staff on the Communications Team – Judith Downing and Erin Darboven. Judith is a member of a NIMO Team and may be called to fires for extensive periods of time. However, Erin is capable of handling the major communications work and assignments through the fire season if that were to happen, and she can tap into the full-time intern at the BLM office in Washington, D.C. who has been assigned to the Cohesive Strategy. The intern brings to the table a skill set that includes experience in social media, writing, editing, and other communications tasks.

2) Contingency Communications

An active fire season can bring about strong emotions from those affected personally, or whose communities and livelihoods are threatened. Regardless of the kind of progress being made in developing the Cohesive Strategy, these emotions can result in pressure to push things forward faster. It is critical that WFEC be prepared to manage such pressure.

Key Audiences

This contingency effort is geared toward the following key audiences:

- National, State and Local Elected Officials and their staff, particularly those whose districts or areas are being affected by wildland fire in the 2012 season.
- Administration Officials
- Media covering wildland fires
- Legislative Affairs personnel within agencies involved in wildland fire

Key Messages

Messages will explain why changing the path or schedule of the Cohesive Strategy development is counterproductive. General information about the Cohesive Strategy is available through other venues, and only the high-level issues are included within this plan's key messages.

- Fire Behavior has become more intense and fire effects more severe. As a result, solving our nation's wildfire problem is not something that will happen overnight. And the responsibility is a shared one.
- The Cohesive Strategy is in its third and final stage, with plans for completion in less than a year. Shortening the completion schedule will not only affect the quality of the final

outcome, but more importantly, would significantly set back the unprecedented collaboration among local, state, federal, tribal and non-governmental participants that has served as the foundation of this process.

- At a time in which it is often difficult to find common ground, the Cohesive Strategy process has made exceptional strides in getting stakeholders on the same page. Key within the plan's development is the universal agreement on a core list of guiding principles. Principles that incorporate critical values and set the tone for the future of wildland fire management in the United States. By continuing to work together on completing the Cohesive Strategy, we will enhance shared understandings already in place and lay the groundwork for the development of joint actions and policies that will be implemented at all levels of government and stakeholders in the future.
- Wildfire is more than a fire management issue – it's a larger land management, urban interface and societal issue. The Cohesive Strategy is an 'all-lands, all-hands' approach to improved wildland fire management, centered on working together. It doesn't start from scratch, but is building upon success. Key to its long-term sustainability is the strategy's ability to address the wide diversity of situations within our country, recognizing that a one-size-fits-all approach cannot work.
- Cohesive Strategy development and implementation rely on collaboration among a wide variety of stakeholders and across jurisdictions and landowners. Fire Management excels with cooperation among fire agencies. The development of the Cohesive Strategy has demonstrated that stakeholders from a wide variety of backgrounds and interests can come together in a common purpose and take joint actions to solve problems that none can achieve themselves.
- But there ARE things that can be done right now that can help prevent destructive fires from happening in the future.
 - Support Congressional action to continue efforts under the FLAME Act
 - For local governments, if your community is not Firewise, then go to www.firewise.org to find out how you can help protect your area.
 - Make sure your community has a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP). To find out how to develop one, go to www.westgov.org/initiatives/foresthealth.
 - Learn how your community can be a fire adapted community by going to www.fireadapted.org. Share information with your residents so they can take action personally that will help them in the event of a wildland fire.

Available Spokespersons

Pressure to push ahead more quickly with the Cohesive Strategy completion can come from a variety of people. To prepare, it is essential that there be a diversity of spokespersons to choose from among depending upon source of concern and intensity of criticism. Officials and representatives from federal agencies, NGO's participating in the process, local elected officials, local and state fire officials and others must be available, and "trained," to be ready to participate in this targeted communications effort. The following individuals will be available as spokespersons, on an as needed basis:

- ❖ Roy Johnson, title
- ❖ Tom Harbour, Forest Service National Fire and Aviation Director and WFEC Chair
- ❖ , WRSC Chair and title
- ❖ Mike Zupko, SERSC Chair and title

- ❖ Brad Simpkins, NERSC Chair and title
- ❖ Ryan Yates, WFEC member and title from National Association of Counties
- ❖ Bob Roper, I-Chief representative
- ❖ Mary Hamman-Roland, Mayor of Apple Valley, MN and member of WFLC
- ❖ ???
- ❖ ??? need remaining spokespersons identified...diverse, not just agency folks. Elected officials would be especially useful. From a county, state??

How It Will Work

In order to be in a position where concerns and challenges to the Cohesive Strategy development are identified proactively, engagement of key people must be planned, and steps taken to involve appropriate people in watching for potential situations that could require triggering implementation of this contingency plan.

Ear to the Ground

- Incident Information Officers and Public Affairs Officers are in unique positions to hear comments and be aware of media stories that could elevate emotions on wildfire policy. A webinar will be scheduled for the week of July 9 in which a short briefing of the Cohesive Strategy is presented, along with a request that these people communicate “up the chain” situations or comments that WFEC should be aware of for potential implementation of the contingency plan. The briefing will be conducted by Bill Kaage and Judith Downing.
- All RSC members should also be informed of the contingency effort and request that they communicate potential issues of concern to their respective regional chairs, who will filter appropriately to Tom Harbour.
- A memo will be drafted by Judith Downing for consideration by the U.S. Forest Service to send to its District Rangers and Forest Supervisors. The memo will briefly outline the intent of listening for concerns, specify who to share such concerns with, and include the Cohesive Strategy primer document developed by the Communications Subcommittee. Memo should be distributed by July 15.
- A similar memo will be drafted by Erin Darboven no later than July 1 for review by each agency, appropriately modified for their audience, including Legislative Affairs staff, with the same attachment. Memo should be distributed by July 15 and include the Cohesive Strategy primer document as background.
- NGO’s will be encouraged to send information to key personnel in their respective agencies. The Communications Team will work with any NGO who needs assistance in drafting such a memo for distribution.

Spokesperson Preparation

- The week of July 9, one or two conference calls or webinars will be scheduled with spokespersons identified in this plan in order to brief them on the contingency effort. The briefing will be conducted by Bill Kaage, Mary Jacobs, and Tom Harbour. The following briefing materials will be provided in advance:
 - Copy of this contingency plan
 - Cohesive Strategy primer

- Guiding Principles and Core Values of Cohesive Strategy
- Success Examples

Triggering Implementation of the Plan

It is difficult to determine exactly when consideration should be given to implementing the contingency plan. In general, the following things may warrant concern:

- Planning Level 4 or above
- Inquiries by Congressional or Administration staff/officials on progress toward Cohesive Strategy, or on wildland fire policy in general
- Repeated media calls about the Cohesive Strategy, fire management or fire policy
- News articles, local or national television stories as well as blogs or social media activity that have a negative tone or include negative quotes from citizens, elected officials or others on:
 - Fuels treatments
 - Air tankers
 - Environmental restrictions
 - Homes being burned
 - Taxpayer dollars being wasted on fire suppression
 - Etc.

The role of calling the contingency plan into action, and identifying which spokesperson is appropriate for the given situation will belong to Tom Harbour or Roy Johnson



Proposal

Date: July 6, 2012

Subcommittee: WFEC Governance Task Group

Description of Issue or Assignment:

WFLC Tasking – Wildland Fire Governance

Discussion of Proposed Recommendation(s):

At the April 17, 2012 meeting of the Wildland Fire Leadership Council (WFLC), the Wildland Fire Executive Council (WFEC) was requested to look at the wildland fire governance structure and develop a proposal for modifications.

Jim Karels, Jim Erickson, Douglas MacDonald, and Bill Kaage with assistance from Shari Eckhoff have been identified as the core group for this tasking.

Identify Considerations:

Comments received from WFLC at their last meeting indicated a few of the topics to be considered as we work through this task. See tasking memo for additional details.

Rationale for Recommendation(s):

Timeline was established in order to have a completed package for WFLC review and approval at their November, 2012 meeting prior to the change in administration.

Recommendation(s):

Approve the tasking as documented in the attached Wildland Fire Governance Tasking Memorandum.

Decision Method used:

- Subcommittee Consensus (WFEC Governance Task Group)
- Modified Consensus (explain, i.e. majority, super-majority)
- Chair Decision

Contact Information:

Bill Kaage
(208)387-5225



Proposal

WFEC Decision:

- WFEC Approves
- WFEC Approves with Modifications (not required to resubmit for WFEC approval)
- Need More Information (required to come back to WFEC for approval)
- WFEC Does Not Approve

Roy Johnson, DFO

Date

Notes regarding decision:



TASKING MEMORANDUM

July 6, 2012

Subject: Wildland Fire Governance

Background:

The Wildland Fire Governance document was originally presented to WFLC at their July, 2010 meeting in Reno, Nevada. The Council requested time to review and comment. Modifications to that document were made and we have been operating under that structure ever since. However, that document was never signed and formally adopted.

With the increase in the intergovernmental activities associated with the development and implementation of the Cohesive Strategy, along with the inevitable changes in scope and focus, it is time to review and improve wildland fire governance.

A few of the observations that WFLC shared include the following:

1. We have some redundancy and overlap in purpose, membership, etc.
2. Some organizations question their representation
3. There are some loose ends that should be addressed
4. There are opportunities to improve on the governance structure that we have
5. Want to put a permanent governance structure in place to transcend the transition to a new administration
6. It's not broken, but it's not perfect
7. Clearly define roles and responsibilities for each governance body
8. Make tweaks – and take advantage of the progress that has been made

Tasking:

At the April 17, 2012 meeting of the Wildland Fire Leadership Council (WFLC), the Wildland Fire Executive Council (WFEC) was requested to look at the intergovernmental wildland fire governance structure and develop a proposal for modifications.

Jim Karels, Jim Erickson, Douglas MacDonald, and Bill Kaage with assistance from Shari Eckhoff have been identified as the core group for this tasking.

They will conduct business via teleconference and/or video conference as necessary.

Outcome / Deliverables:

The outcome is to have a clear proposal for WFLC to consider at their November 2012 meeting. The package will include a formal proposal for any recommended changes with the identification of considerations and the rationale for the recommendations. Backup material will include:

1. Intergovernmental Wildland Fire Governance Diagram
2. Charters for each of the Wildland Fire Governance Entities which will include the following information :
 - a. Name
 - b. Authorities
 - c. Purpose/Mission/Scope
 - d. Functions/Products
 - e. Membership and Organization
 - i. Primary
 - ii. Alternates
 - iii. Subcommittees
 - f. Responsibilities
 - i. Chair
 - ii. Vice-Chair
 - iii. Executive Secretary
 - iv. Members
 - v. Meetings and Reports
 - g. Decision Making Roles and Processes
 - h. Relationships to other Wildland Fire Governance Groups and Organizations
3. Summary of the recommended changes and the implication of those changes
4. Formal WFLC Proposal

Timeline and Responsible Parties:

Task	Who	Start	End
Approval of Tasking	WFEC	7/6/2012	7/6/2012
Review and approval of Wildland Fire Governance Guiding Principles	WFEC	7/6/2012	7/6/2012
Task Team meet - Conceptual Intergovernmental Structure	WFEC Task Team	7/6/2012	7/13/2012
Review Conceptual Structure	WFEC	7/13/2012	7/20/2012
Draft Purpose, Roles & Responsibilities, Authorities	WFEC Task Team	7/20/2012	8/17/2012
Review	WFEC	8/17/2012	8/24/2012
Update and Draft Membership and Relationships	WFEC Task Team	8/24/2012	9/21/2012

Task	Who	Start	End
Review	WFEC	9/21/2012	9/28/2012
Update and Develop Package for WFLC – including the summary of recommended changes and the implication of those changes	WFEC Task Team	9/28/2012	10/19/2012
Review	WFEC	10/19/2012	10/26/2012
Finalize Package for WFLC including briefing material	WFEC Task Team	10/26/2012	11/2/2012



Wildland Fire Governance Guiding Principles

1. Governance Structure will promote an effective and efficient Wildland Fire Management Program.
2. Clear authorities with defined roles and responsibilities.
3. Limit overlap where we can; where overlap is inevitable, establish collaboration protocols.
4. Risk accountability determines appropriate decision maker.
5. Decisions made at the lowest appropriate and accountable level.
6. Timely decisions based on need and risk.
7. Closed loop governance, no loose ends.
8. Participation at the right level. Participation means active engagement.
9. FACA Compliant Governance
10. Enable well informed, sustainable, and timely decisions



Proposal

Date: June 22, 2012

Subcommittee: CSSC

Description of Issue or Assignment:

Cohesive Strategy National Report Template to be used to develop the National Report.

Discussion of Proposed Recommendation(s):

The CSSC recommends that WFEC approve the format of the attached standard report template that will be used as we develop the National Report. The template is designed to tie the work from all of the phases together and provide a clear picture of the desired future state of wildland fire management in the U.S. It will provide a national level perspective and make the regional information that is developed “cohesive”. The template will facilitate timely completion of Phase III and ensure the key topics are covered in the National Report and are supported by all the partners.

Identify Considerations:

The attached draft has been discussed and edited over the past few weeks based on input from all CSSC members, RSC Chairs, science leads and staff closely involved in the process. It represents their collective thinking and a path forward that all are comfortable with and support pursuing.

Rationale for Recommendation(s):

See Discussion of Proposed Recommendations

Recommendation(s):

The CSSC recommends that WFEC approve the template to be used to develop the National Report for Phase III.

Decision Method used:

- Subcommittee Consensus
- Modified Consensus (explain, i.e. majority, super-majority)
- Chair Decision

Contact Information:

Dan Smith at desmith@blm.gov or Sandy Cantler at scantler@fs.fed.us



Proposal

WFEC Decision:

- WFEC Approves
- WFEC Approves with Modifications (not required to resubmit for WFEC approval)
- Need More Information (required to come back to WFEC for approval)
- WFEC Does Not Approve

Roy Johnson, DFO

Date

Notes regarding decision:

Regional Risk Analysis Report Templates
Draft June 4-15, 2012

Executive Summary

The Executive Summary will include the highpoints of the report – the significant findings, [recommendations](#), and conclusions.

A. Introduction

1. Cohesive Strategy vision, goals, performance measures and objectives as outlined in phase I as they relate to this regional risk analysis. Describe the framework and how these documents all fit together to portray the National Cohesive Strategy
2. Discussion that Phase III is not the end but a beginning including a brief discussion of the future expectations, why the Cohesive Strategy is important and how it can potentially impact future wildland fire management in the region.
3. Discuss how science is being used to inform the CS through modeling and data analysis of actions under a range of alternatives.

B. Risk Analysis

The regional risk analysis will be told as a series of stories and will discuss the unique wildland fire issues in each region. A description of the data and modeling will be interwoven in the stories. Use graphics and charts as appropriate to illustrate the use of science in the planning and decision making process.

1. Key questions: Why is wildland fire an issue (why did we develop the CS)? How does wildland fire vary across the landscape? How can our management actions mitigate the impacts of wildland fire?
2. Describe comparative risk analyses, which include: characterization of risk, description of alternatives to address the risk, [and the region's investment options based on the analysis](#).
3. Describe what was learned from the modeling results and describe the potential outcomes, ~~and~~ trends, [and investment options](#) as it relates to key findings on Alternatives (i.e. are there some actions that have significant benefits over others, and was it unexpected?).

C. Alternatives

1. Describe the range of feasible alternatives and key elements and emphasis actions, based on the actions described in Phase II.
2. Discuss the strengths and limitations of what can/can't be modeled at different levels, such as the local, county, state, and geographic area level throughout the Region.
3. Describe how decision-makers at various levels can use these alternatives and supporting information across the Region [to select the best investment options](#). This would include the combination of factors/data that might guide decision-makers at various levels to choose one action or activity under the Regional Alternatives.

4. Describe Tradeoff's illustrating strategic investment options of the Alternatives actions/activities that are the priority. List the investment costs necessary to implement the actions or activities within each Alternative.

D. Performance Measures

1. Discuss the National Performance Measures which are strategic, outcome oriented measures. All regions will use the National Performance Measures.
2. In addition, they may choose to develop specific regional performance measures to meet their needs. However, they must link to the national performance measures and goals. If regions develop performance measures they will:
 - a. Identify the Performance Measures for each goal and how PM's relate to the regional objectives identified in Phase II.
 - b. Briefly describe how these PMs will be monitored to ensure achievement of the goals.
 - c. Include information about how these PMs and actions in the regional action plan are connected.

This section will not get buried in the details – the details will be left for the implementation/action plans.

E. Recommendations and Conclusions

1. Describe the potential impact of the CS at all levels, [recommendations on](#) how this information may be used and what decisions could be made from it. (Emphasis goes on strategy in this report; implementation will be described in regional action plans.)
2. Describe [recommendations on how to address or achieve the identified actions/activities](#), the desired future state of each region, and how the CS will help achieve that vision.

F. Next Steps

1. Discussion of Post 2013 activities including the action plans and immediate next steps.
2. Set the stage for the reader to understand the Action Plans and the Communication activities.

Appendices

1. Glossary
2. Acronyms
3. References
4. Available Science/Models to better inform the decisions for implementing the Alternatives, monitoring data, and Performance Measures.
5. Stakeholder involvement
6. Communications activities
7. Links to the Phase I and II reports and other key national and regional documents
8. Graphics
9. Other pertinent regional information
10. Committee/Workgroup Members

National Risk Analysis Report

Draft June 22, 2012

Executive Summary – The Executive Summary will include the highlights of the report – the significant findings, recommendations and conclusions.

A. Introduction

- a. Cohesive Strategy vision, goals, performance measures and objectives as outlined in Phase I. Describe the framework and how the three phases and key documents fit together to form the National Cohesive Wildland Fire Management Strategy.
- b. Discussion that Phase III is not the end but a beginning, including a brief discussion of future expectations, why the National Cohesive Strategy is important and how it can potentially impact future wildland fire management nationally.

B. Document the Risk Analysis Process Including an Explanation on Characterization of Risk

- a. Discuss how science has been used throughout the process to inform the CS.
- b. Describe the comparative risk analyses, including the characterization of risk and a description of alternatives to address risk.

C. Provide a National Perspective of the Regional Risk Analyses

- a. Key questions: Why is wildland fire an issue (why did we develop the CS?) How does wildland fire vary across the landscape and regions? How can our management actions mitigate the impacts of wildland fire nationally?
- b. Summarize the alternatives, key findings, trade-offs and potential outcomes identified in the regional analyses including regional commonalities and differences .
- c. Describe the National-level findings, trade-offs, investment options and potential outcomes across the nation based on the Regional Risk Analyses (address FLAME elements and GAO more completely than we did in Phase I).
- d. Provide a range of information and explanations of the National Risk Analysis, alternatives, findings and conclusions that decision-makers at the National level (Congress, OMB, Departments, NASF, NGA, etc.) can use to make more informed decisions.

D. Conclusions and Recommendations

- a. Describe the desired future state of the nation and how improvements identified in the National Risk Analysis can support the management of wildland fire.
- b. Draw conclusions based on the findings considering investment options and list recommendations that could be made based on the regional and national analyses.

E. Document the Next Steps for the Cohesive Strategy

- a. Discussion of key items in the National action plan and the results we expect to achieve by completing those actions. This will include the National Performance measures and objectives.
- b. Acknowledge the data gaps within the analysis and that this is an iterative process (will be done again in five years). Provide recommendations for improvements or refinements in the data and science.
- c. Outline approaches to barriers and critical success factors for the Cohesive Strategy
- d. Discuss future governance

F. Appendices

- a. Glossary
- b. Acronyms
- c. References
- d. Available Science/Models to better inform the decisions for implementing the Alternatives, monitoring data and Performance Measures
- e. Stakeholder Involvement
- f. Communications Activities
- g. References/links to Phase I and II Reports and other key national and regional documents
- h. Committee/Workgroup Members



TASKING MEMORANDUM

July 6, 2012

Subject: Barriers and Critical Success Factor Follow-up

Background:

The CSSC delivered the Barriers and Critical Success Factors spreadsheet to WFEC at the June 1 meeting. There was some discussion at the June 15 meeting which indicated that additional work was necessary to clarify the barrier or critical success factor and what the impact on meeting the objectives of the Cohesive Strategy would be if they are resolved.

Tasking:

The CSSC along with the RSC chairs are tasked to refine the barriers and critical success factor document. WFEC requests that the focus be on the highlighted items.

The WFEC members have been requested to provide input using the comments template to guide the work of this task team. The WFEC comments will identify those things that need additional clarity as well as questions that the WFEC members have related to the barriers and critical success factors.

Outcome / Deliverables:

Primary deliverable is an updated spreadsheet which includes the highlighted items from the original deliverable.

Timeline and Responsible Parties:

Task	Who	Start	End
Provide comments on Barriers Document using provided template	WFEC	7/6/2012	7/13/2012
Revise spreadsheet based on comments received	CSSC/RSC Chairs	7/6/2012	7/27/2012
Analyze the responses related to prioritization. Those questions that have H/M/L for an answer.	CSSC/RSC Chairs	7/6/2012	7/27/2012
Determine relative priority	CSSC/RSC Chairs	7/27/2012	8/3/2012
Update spreadsheet in priority order and deliver to WFEC	CSSC/RSC Chairs	7/27/2012	8/3/2012