



NOTES

April 5: 1000 - 1300 (Eastern Time)

Welcome/Introductions

Jim Douglas called the meeting to order at 1000 and reviewed the agenda

Process and Expectations

WFEC reviewed the draft document that identified the activities and timeline necessary to complete the Cohesive Strategy to ensure that all the members had the same expectations.

The specific communication activities were not included in the document.

Jenna Sloan and Jim Douglas met with OMB yesterday. OMB is looking for deliverables by the fall (October/November). This needs to be reflected in the work plan.

Action:

CSSC will update the workplan (matrix) including communication activities and a revised proposal will be discussed by the WFEC on April 19 meeting. WFEC will have something from CSSC a day or 2 ahead of the meeting for distribution.

CSSC should indicate actions that must be done in a face-to-face meeting and those that can utilize other meeting technology. If there are a couple of high priorities activities that must be accomplished in a face-to-face meeting, we will figure out how to make this happen.

April 19 agenda items may include:

1. Approach to the trade off analysis (background for more discussion on May 3)
2. Cohesive Strategy schedule from CSSC for the rest of the year
3. Review pending WFEC topics: governance, barriers and critical success factors, WFEC list of priorities

May 3 agenda items may include:

1. Options for the trade-offs (scenarios) for WFEC review and feedback
Mary - would like to have summary information that would be easy for the WFEC to absorb and understand
Tom indicated that this is not a final report, but a discussion of the approach and plan to document the outcomes.

May 17 agenda items may include:

1. Follow up on barriers and critical success factors
2. Follow-up from fuels task group
3. Roles and responsibilities and the structure of the subcommittees

Regional Action Plans

Northeast Regional Strategy Committee Report

Key issues:

Identified a number of overarching issues including:

1. The need to sustain leadership within the NE,

2. Fixing LANDFIRE data - keep it accurate,
3. Incorporate actions,
4. Expand the use of resource management tools,
5. Continue the collaboration

Goal 1 - increase the use of prescribed fire for resource management

Goal 2 - CWPPS - need to focus on prevention programs and activities

Goal 3 - resolve a number of barriers and CSFs which are impeding our ability to respond, increasing local wildfire response capacity, improve interagency coordination and sharing of limited resources

Key outcomes:

1. Address the issues - re-establish the NERSC to continue providing leadership for implementing the action plan
2. Form a working group to work on the LANDFIRE issue identified in the action plan,
3. Guidance issues for all the partners for incorporating the cohesive strategy actions into their Land Use Plans,
4. Success stories as part of the communication strategies
5. Regional risk report - set of options
 - a. Goal 1 - increase fire independent ecosystems, increase use of Rx, process to prioritize
 - b. Goal 2 - provide support/toolbox, focus limited resources to directing haz fuels treatments to the WUI
 - c. Goal 3 - focus on improving organizational efficiency and effectiveness - involving local resources/fire departments - eliminating administrative barriers, increase the ability to share resources for extended attack.

Next steps:

This continues to be a work in progress:

1. Develop communication strategy,
2. Working with west and south to develop a tracking system for our actions,
3. Drafting agreement to establish ne as a more permanent entity,
4. Work with fuels group

Things for WFEC to think about

1. Help facilitate the messages to the organizational leaders
2. Get information out to staff
3. Include guidance for grants, etc.
4. Long term commitment articulated through regional strategy ccommittees,
5. Sub-options could be implemented differently in different sub regions

West Regional Strategy Committee Report

Key issues:

1. Large federal land base in the west
2. Significant tribal interests
3. Significant stakeholder group
4. Hold true to the comments submitted
5. Look at tables included in the west's report - see these action plans as very dynamic.
6. Need for involvement for non-traditional stakeholders: environmental protection laws, resilient landscapes.
7. Focus energies and actions to establish a coordinating type entity much like the NE.
8. Have a coordinator in place.

Key outcomes:

1. Regional organization established to focus on implementation of the action plan
2. Non-fed, fed and tribal representation on an executive board.

3. Build solid - have strong communication group
4. Make sure we keep that going.

Next steps:

1. Moving from planning to implementation
2. Will identify additional work groups
3. Been working on guidance document
4. Still need to get some additional comments
5. Communication challenges-contract expired
6. Concerned about some progress reporting in the future
7. Identify early on what WFEC expects as reporting

Things for WFEC to think about:

1. Need to make this cohesive strategy relevant for all the stakeholders.
2. Funding of coordinators

Discussion Items:

Tom Harbour and Jim Douglas - How do we take the best of these plans and move forward? Tried to identify a different set of actions to meet a very significant challenge with the climate and other social, environmental and political factors. Encouraged and looking forward to what we are going to do in the future.

Jim Karels: Page 55 - develop a new fire cause classification system - work with NASF, I-Chiefs, Page 51 - task 1. Jim indicated that some issues are not western in scope and should be discussed from a national level.

Southeast Regional Strategy Committee Report

Overview:

The Southeast looked at this as a suite of options and identified tasks that were relevant. During Phase II, we developed a draft list of actions, then used science to refine those actions. We engaged in extensive outreach - over 1000 people responded. We pared down the lists and prioritized those actions. Most of the plan focusses on working with non-traditional stakeholders. No one alternative is the best for each stakeholder

The Southeast grouped actions under the identified values. There were 6 overarching strategies with 29 tasks. We grouped recurring actions and tasks so they were not duplicative in the values We Created (page 64) a goal to value matrix. The number in the box represents the number of actions When you break them down it looks like a very manageable workload - state foresters have been identified as the lead for 30 to 40% of the tasks – all actions identified are not focused on fire staff.

Key issues:

1. Drive to implementation is not as apparent
2. Outreach is effective and is key for identifying "what it means to me" for the various stakeholders
3. Indirect strategies to influence those lands that are not in our direct control
4. How can the stakeholders leverage these activities for their benefit
5. Have one regional communication plan
6. Buy in from regional strategy committee leadership

Key Outcomes:

1. Joint communication/education strategy to reduce
2. Expanded network around fire and fuels management
3. Help understand that this is not just a fire problem (forest health)
4. Challenged some of the basic assumptions that we have made

Things for WFEC to think about:

1. Need to help institutionalize the CS and set the expectations along with WFLC

2. Enhanced timeline to address the barriers and critical success factors
3. Trade-off analysis is not going to make tough decision
4. Funding decisions will be tough
5. Make sure the data and tools that we rely on are up to date

Next steps:

1. Add members to the RSC - dod, etc.
2. Consistency in staff leadership,
3. Construction of mitigation process,
4. Action tracking,
5. Defining the performance measures
6. Update priorities based on trade-off analysis as we go.

Discussion Items:

- There are no fundamental conflicting issues between the three action plans.
- There are issues that WFEC will need to work through.
- There are many associations between the regional reports and expectations at the national level.
- WFEC should accept these action plans as the building blocks into the development of the national action plan.
- The action plans are important contributions to a set of national priorities, actions, etc.
- Questions remain regarding implementation.
- Until the federal agencies go through a review and acceptance process, we can't just say OK.
- The regions are in a position to implement what they are capable of implementing.
- The things that cannot be implemented right now, we will address those through our organization's processes.
- These are inputs and the regions should implement what they can implement. The national report will address additional issues.
- WFLC did develop a letter of support. We need to continue to have those tools of support.
- Regionally based agreements - RSC's have been tasked to develop these action plans for the regions. The regional representatives from the federal agencies have bought into these action plans and are committed to them.
- Still need to address some implementation questions. Some need to look at the leads for actions, etc. Some of those are incredible need for resources.
- These are living documents that will change over time. We must ask "what can we leverage?". How are we going to pay for all this? Don't want to discourage continuing with actions that are doable now.
- Focus on getting the product done and getting some work done on the ground. There is anxiety as well as excitement to get going.
- There were no concerns about having these plans publicly released.

Actions:

The Wildland Fire Executive Council (WFEC) accepts the regional action plans and agrees that the plans can be released publicly. WFEC tasks the Cohesive Strategy Sub-Committee (CSSC) to use the regional action plans to inform the development of the national action plan. The National Risk Analysis Report and National Action Plan will become WFEC recommendations to the Wildland Fire Leadership Council (WFLC) and ultimately Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture. The regional action plans reflect the regional perspective that is important in the development of that national-level recommendation. Implementation of actions identified in Regional Action Plans is the responsibility of the sponsoring organizations at the discretion of those organizations.

The language to go at the front of each Regional Action Plan:

The Wildland Fire Executive Council (WFEC) has accepted this plan for use in the development of the national action plan. The National Risk Analysis Report and National Action Plan will become WFEC recommendations to the Wildland Fire Leadership Council (WFLC) and ultimately Secretaries of the

Interior and Agriculture. This plan reflects the regional perspective that is important in the development of that national-level recommendation. Implementation of actions identified in this plan is the responsibility of the sponsoring organizations at the discretion of those organizations.

National Action Plan

CSSC will use the regional action plans as building blocks for the National Action Plans with the realization that the regional plans were developed with a totally regional focus

Actions:

1. Develop a status report to WFLC and modify some words to indicate that WFEC has reviewed the action plans and will use these to develop the National Action Plan.
2. Regional action plans will be used to develop that national action plans- will include a risk assessment and trade-off analysis. If national decisions are made, they can be included in the national action plan. Regions may then go back and modify their action plan based on the results of the National Action Plan
3. Need to incorporate the results of reviewing the barriers and critical success factors into the National Action Plan.
4. Agreement on the expectations that we know about today related to the development of the National Action Plan

Summary of Meeting Outcomes:

1. WFEC set their meeting schedule, topics, and specifically future interactions with the NSAT (my notes are consistent with what your notes say).
2. WFEC accepted the regional action plans as deliverables received from the subcommittees, and agreed the action plans can be made public.
3. WFEC will provide regions with a paragraph of specific language to include in each action plan to explain WFEC acceptance.
4. In addition to providing a status update to the WFLC on the acceptance of the RAPs, WFEC will recommend that the WFLC reaffirm commitment to completing and implementing the CS efforts.
5. WFEC tasked the CSSC to update the Work Plan for review and discussion/acceptance at the next WFEC meeting. The timeline for completing the Report and Action Plan should be centered around a deadline of September 2013.

Public Comments - NONE