



Meeting Notes

August 5, 2011

Attendees	
Members: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bill Kaage – NWCG <input type="checkbox"/> Douglas MacDonald – I-Chiefs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Elizabeth Strobridge - NGA <input type="checkbox"/> Glenn Gaines - DHS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jim Erickson - ITC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jim Karels - NASF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kirk Rowdabaugh - DOI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mary Jacobs – NLC <input type="checkbox"/> Ryan Yates – NACo <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tom Harbour – USFS	Support Staff: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Roy Johnson – DFO – OWFC <input type="checkbox"/> Shari Shetler – Alternate DFO – OWFC Others: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Patti Blankenship – DHS/USFA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ann Walker – WGA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gus Smith – OWFC <input type="checkbox"/>

Meeting was called to order at 10:00 by Tom Harbour, WFEC Chair

#	Topic
1	Meeting was called to order at 10:00 by Tom Harbour, WFEC Chair
2	Meeting Objectives & Expectations <u>Description:</u> Outline the objectives and expectations of this meeting. <u>Outcome:</u> 1. Understanding of what we need to accomplish today <u>Reference Material:</u> 1. Final Agenda <u>Key Points:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None <u>Decisions:</u> None <u>Actions:</u> None
3	CS Sub-Committee reports <u>Description:</u> Sub-Committees will report on the following: 1. Identify actions, milestones and deliverables that were to be accomplished between the June 3 WFEC meeting and now. 2. Report on actual accomplishments during that time period. 3. Identify actions, milestones and deliverables planned to be completed between now and the July 1 WFEC meeting. 4. Identify any issues or barriers that need to be resolved. 5. Identify what, if anything is needed from WFEC. <u>Outcome:</u> 1. Understanding of the activities of each sub-committee. 2. Agreement on any modifications to deliverables or timelines 3. Identify of next steps to resolve any pending issues and/or barriers 4. Approval of the CSSC Roles and Responsibilities <u>Reference Material:</u> 1. Sub-Committee Status Reports (6/17/2011 and 7/1/2011) 2. CSSC Roles and Responsibilities



Meeting Notes

August 5, 2011

#	Topic
	<p><u>Key Points:</u> SE Report: Jim Karels reported that the Southeast region finished all of their outreach. Two meetings (face-to-face and call in) and 400 comments from the website. Working group met for the past two days 3-4 August.</p> <p>NE Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tom and Gus reported that the Northeast has completed two virtual forums and has two scheduled next week. • The comment form has been open on the website for two weeks and the draft assessment is posted there as well for comments. • NE has an RSC meeting September 7-9 to finalize the alternatives and working group will complete the draft assessment once the content analysis is completed by METI. <p>CSSC Report: (Gus reporting for Kirk)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSSC has been working on the podcast scripts and working with the Enterprise group to record the podcasts. • Also working on drafting roles and responsibilities to better guide them through the end of Phase II and Phase III. • Gus requested that the WFEC provide CSSC with some clarity on what they expect from the final, combined report, so CSSC could work out a timeline one Regions turn in their assessments. <p>West Report: (Bill Kaage presented for Mac)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working group has been meeting every other day to pull together comments for draft assessment. • Meeting in Denver with working group for three days and Strategy committee for three days (day of overlap). • Bill mentioned Joe Stutler's comments on communication strategy and thought it had some merits, but overall Bill feels the group is working well and though he hears that some people are not feeling heard, that he has heard that others feel like they have been pulled in. • Mary asked if the group was balanced with Gov't and non-gov't. • Anne said more Federal side because of their overwhelming willingness to step up. • But there has also been good dialogue with all participants. • Someone mentioned that there were 800 affiliations represented in the comments they received in the West. <p><u>Decisions:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unanimous decision to approve the CSSC roles and responsibilities with amendments – no reason to return this to WFEC 2. We need to address getting some information/vision to the regional strategy committees on phase 3 <p><u>Actions:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update roles and responsibilities document and send to Shari for the record
4	<p>Regional Strategy Report Format</p> <p><u>Description:</u> During the July 15 meeting WFEC was presented with the proposed format that the Regional Strategy Committees will use for their Cohesive Strategy Phase 2 deliverables. Review comments from the Subcommittees and NSAT will be discussed.</p>



Meeting Notes

August 5, 2011

#	Topic
	<p><u>Outcome:</u> Agreement on Phase 2 deliverable format</p> <p><u>Reference Material:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regional Strategy Report Format 2. Proposal for acceptance of the format <p><u>Key Points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bill said that RSCs didn't raise a stink. • Jim E. said he was good with it, and a format is needed. • Mary said not a perfect format but unique issues will come out. • Anne said CSSC did discuss and leadership received it but members didn't weigh in on the template. • Roy asked if there was enough information to create quality documents and is there enough information contained in it to move to phase III. • Tom is convinced that general framework is ok <p>Discussion of CSSC's request for more information on the final report to WFEC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mary said some sort of connection of common features and themes combined and uniqueness highlighted. • Jim K. thinks there should be a very good summary and include individual unique differences. • Executive summary with commonalities and unique issues. • Jim E. Tremendous amount of info. • What do we need for the time we have. • Question about timeline and lack of clarity about dates. • Tom explained that there is no lack of clarity. • 30 September is when the regional reports are due. • And WFEC presents the final report to WFLC in November. • Have the report ready for WFLC at end of October (ed. added October 26th). • Anne: Asked what the role of CSSC in the process. • Beth: no comment • Bill said he thought there would be far more commonalities than differences. Executive summary is the commonalities. • Mary thought 3-4 page executive summary and then the regional differences. • Tom asked CSSC to help WFEC figure out how to pull report together. (Task) • Hill need contract complete by 30 September 2012. • Have final Phase III to WFLC by then in great shape . • Ask CSSC to frame up the document so WFEC can create report. • Give WFEC the input. • Senior level: They don't want just 3 reports but how they need to have information on how they weigh in on it. • Tom wanted to utilize CSSC without WFEC turning over their work to them. • Each keep to their lanes. <p><u>Decisions:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Propose that WFEC accept the regional template with the note that unique issues will be inserted (contained therein). <p><u>Actions:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CSSC will identify the format for the final Phase 2 report and help WFEC figure out how to pull it all together.



Meeting Notes

August 5, 2011

#	Topic
5	<p>Cohesive Strategy Communication Support</p> <p><u>Description:</u> Introduction to the Communication Strategy Group and discussion on priorities and next steps.</p> <p><u>Outcome:</u> 1. Gain a common understanding of the priorities and next steps.</p> <p><u>Reference Material:</u> Communication Strategy Briefing Paper</p> <p><u>Key Points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roberta D'Amico on a 120 day detail from NPS, thanks to Bill Kaage for making her available • Roberta will talk to Joe Stutler directly about his comments and concerns. • She mentioned the need to better connect with committee members, groups and RSCs. • Also with measurable outcomes for communication. • Regions have done a good job outreaching, she just wants to capitalize on it and keep it going through the end. • Timeliness was brought up as an issue. • We've taken a long time to move from recognizing the need for better communication to actually communicating. • Someone mentioned we need to get moving with communication , don't wait for WFEC approval because we're behind the 8 ball. • Anne Walker offered up Cheryl Renner for the group. • She mentioned concerns about not communicating with the non-feds like TNC and Wilderness Society. • Tom said important that Federal members are knowledgeable and engaged, but also non-Feds. • Mary mentioned a range of audiences we need to engage from Congressional to those involved in fire response and the public. • Message will be crafted differently for different audiences but have a unified theme and message with different tools to deliver differently. • Mary is designated liaison. • Tom asked how we use the help that Anne offered (Task) • Tom asked Roberta and Mary how to digest Joe Stutler's comments (Mary call Joe directly) • Roberta and Mary will identify key questions from the regions. (Task) • Patty Blankenship was offered up by her boss to help with the report. • WFEC will check in on these tasks next meeting. <p><u>Decisions:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mary is designated liaison 2. Cheryl Renner and Patti Blankenship have been identified to help with this effort <p><u>Actions:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Roberta and Mary will talk to Joe Stutler directly about his comments and concerns 2. Roberta and Mary will identify key questions from the regions
8	<p>Round Table Discussion</p> <p><u>Description:</u> WFEC members have the opportunity to share information with the committee and identify issues that may result in potential future agenda items.</p> <p><u>Outcome:</u> 1. Understanding of activities within the members' organizations.</p> <p><u>Reference Material:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Each member prepare a paragraph or two to address their organization's relevant activities,



Meeting Notes

August 5, 2011

#	Topic
	<p>issues, etc</p> <p><u>Key Points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kaage presented the guide on serious accident investigation guide. • Also presented IT management, streamline for NWCG and Fire programs. • Architecture for IT management – budget is forcing a streamlining of IT. • Jim Erikson talked about Intertribal Forest Act and how to improve implementation • Patty reported a great trip to Boise where she had a great experience <p><u>Decisions:</u> None</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> None</p>
9	<p>Public Comments</p> <p><u>Description:</u> Time for WFEC to hear from the public. Specific topics to be determined</p> <p><u>Outcome:</u> 2. Awareness of public opinions related to WFEC activities</p> <p><u>Reference Material:</u> 1. TBD</p> <p><u>Key Points:</u> None</p> <p><u>Decisions:</u> None</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> None</p>
10	<p>Closeout</p> <p><u>Description:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review the outcomes of this meeting 2. Review decision and actions 3. Identify potential agenda items for September 2 4. Schedule an administrative meeting to discuss the October face to face WFEC meeting. <p><u>Outcome:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agreement on decisions and actions 2. Agreement on focus for next meeting 3. Agreement on date for administrative meeting
	<p>The meeting was adjourned by Tom Harbour, WFEC Chair.</p>