

#	Topic
1	Introductions, Agenda Review, Meeting Protocols Meeting Rules Meeting Management KEY POINTS: • Shari covered meeting protocols for those in attendance in DC and those public members on the webinar. Need to stay on time so that the public comment time in the federal register is available to the public. • Roy: Been a lot of work done. Happy to have those here with us today. Great opportunity to share information. With Webinar will have people in and out throughout the day. • Intros were completed.
2	Cohesive Strategy Sub-Committee Presentation I (Phase 1) * Intro/background Phase I Lessons Learned Reference materials: 1. Phase I report (in binder) 2. Presentation (note format) 3. FLAME Act (available in room) 4. GAO Report (available in room) KEY POINTS: • Provided a briefing on Phase I—where we have been; into Phase II, wrap up of Phase II and then into where we are going with Phase III. • This presentation is available to WFEC if you are interested in using it. • Phase I: • Forums coupled with foundational documents formulated the vision. • WFLC defined three primary factors—restoring and maintaining resilient landscapes; creating fire-adaptive communities and responding to wildfires • National goals were established to address each of the primary factors—reviewed the goals. • Guiding principles (11) and core values were developed—reviewed each of the principles to move us toward the goals. • Everyone was at the table and agreed to the goals and principles. Was the basis/foundation of the work for Phase II. • Need to keep these in mind as we move forward into Phase III. • Need to work together to develop solutions. Goals and principles are what's new with the cohesive strategy. • WFLC approved and Secretaries signed the final versions of the reports in March 2011. • CSSC was formed for Phase II. Three principles—collaborative, rigorous and transparent, where established. • Information was posted timely by the federal agencies. RSC put a lot of effort into stakeholder engagement. • Actions (were or are to be approved by WFEC) - o Public outreach and education - o Develop RSC charters - o Drafted national report from 3 RSC assessments • Great that there was a non-federal writer/editor on the team. Provided consistency throughout the product. • Phase II report tiers off Phase I as will Phase III build off Phase II. • CSSC Expectation of WFEC: • CSSC is looking for clarification on what Phase III is and what it will produce.

3	Western Regional Strategy Committee Presentation KEY POINTS: • From West perspective, thanks to the groups who provided assistance. • Outline what went really well and what could have been better. • Values, strengths and risks • Goals and objectives (Freeland) • Meat for the west is in the sub-objectives • Management scenarios (Quigley) • WRSC and Working group member (Alan) • 16 members in the WRSC • 13 member working team • WRSC had face-to-face meetings twice and conference calls every two weeks. From June, weekly calls. • Reviewed what worked well and what didn't: - o METI contractor worked outstanding. - o METI compiled a communication plan and stuck with it. - o Solid conflict resolution process. - o Had work plan and stuck with it. - o CSSC and WFEC liaisons were great. - o Engagement of stakeholder—high expectations. - o CRAFT process worked well. • Didn't work well: - o Short timeframe - o Travel restrictions—limited interaction - o Technology over promises and under-delivers. - o Communication time delay between Phase I and II - o Communications to rank and file is lacking—NEED TO FIX THIS. • Outreach and Collaboration: - o relationships - o information (info resources—foundational documents, handbooks, etc) - o previous work - o contracted for communications work and outreach—neutrality was important and increased credibility - o three websites available to groups, depending on group - o focus group meetings - o webinars - o online form - o developed immediate successes—with no more money, no more policies, etc. - o Using “they said,” Western Fire Chiefs, etc., to distribute updates (q 2-3 weeks) - o There are legislative barriers to be considered for update. i.e., Equal Access to Justice Act, Endangered Species Act, NEPA - o Need for better, consistent communication. • Values, trends and risks. - o Tribal interests are BIG in the West. - o Social justice and how we deal with that—single wide trailer to million-dollar home. - o Respecting western culture. - o Vast, wide open landscapes. (dynamic and diverse habitat in the West) - o Water (quality and quantity) and air quality. - o Stewardship of public lands is important. - o Reviewed issues if a cohesive strategy is not implemented. - o Evolving agency and public expectations with regard to fire response - o Balance response all-hazard with wildfire response. - o Wildland fire is ripe for political fodder and is a growth industry! - o Risk management, conflict of perception between values to be protected and value at risk
---	--

	- o Values to be protected vs. values at risk is a big issue! • Goal 1: Maintain and Restore resilient landscapes - o Used the CRAFT model outline. Served the West well. - o Worked through each of the Goals: - o Key words: - o Actively managing the land . . . - o Protect landscapes . . . definite line between “wanted and unwanted” - o Improve stakeholder coordination - o Working together across jurisdictions - o Develop and maintain capacity - o Rely on market based solutions—vegetation management actions - o Fully use existing policies—have over complicated policies - o Increase public awareness—using fire for resource benefits - o ID and prepare for non-fire threats—invasive species • Goal 2: Fire-adaptive communities - o prevent unwanted human caused fires - o reduce hazardous fuels - o CWPPs or equivalent are effective to achieve the goals of the CS - o CWPP should also be based on the values that surround communities - o Self-sufficiency—encouragement for enhanced codes but realistically work together to make things happen - o Improve response - o Improve post-fire recovery, pre-planning and anticipate your potential problems so that you are more effective when it happens • Goal 3: Response to fire - o Safety of responders and public - o Involve everyone before, during and after the event - o Places who do good stakeholder work in advance are more effective and successful - o Improve efficiency and effectiveness of the wildland fire management organization - o Consider global interaction where we truly look at private, municipal and local capabilities - o Develop community-based strategies to deal with post-fire hazards • Management Scenarios - o Explore potential outcomes, evolving exercise - o Lays groundwork for Phase III - o Scenarios are not fully developed alternatives - o Attempt to understand “what if” - o Emphasizes specific set of actions and objectives - o Worked under assumption that there were no funding level increases ▪ Scenario #1: Emphasis on restoring landscapes—using use of wildfire, planned fire and mechanical mitigation. ▪ Scenario #2: Use planned fire to create fire-adapted communities—not just the residences but the natural resources that surround residences. ▪ Scenario #3: Remove barriers that allow communities to be more self-sufficient. Protecting their own values at risk. ▪ Scenario #4: Emphasis of effective fire response—across all jurisdictions. - o Take each scenario and assessing the likelihood that these would be implemented across jurisdictions. If support is there, more likely it will be implemented. - o How much support - o How likely implemented - o Without increased funding - o Some actions will actually roll forward without budget increases. - o Don't require new legislation or policies. - o Think that this leads to healthy discussion through Phase III. - o Having Science Team involved during Phase II should help us be successful in Phase III. - o Every RSC member has been involved. Joe was a great leader—great work done. - o Work group was defined. Strong FS representation, research, BIA, etc. involvement.
--	--

	Carol Daley (also represented the Western Governors) was extremely involved. Joe Freeland did a great job; Joe was on the work group. - o Joe Stutler has had more than 1,000 work hours during Phase II. - o Communication should be a national goal—WAS a regional goal. • Question: - o (Kaage) with development of management scenarios, was there good buy in on the management scenarios and full understanding of what they are? - o (Quigley) Didn't have as much discussion as it should have had—timeframe was not our friend. Group did struggle with the concept. They agreed it is only the beginning. Gave them comfort. Not sure everyone in the committee did. - o That was Bill's sense from Park Service Committee. Tom indicated it lays a good ground work for Phase III. - o Freeland: Tried to provide what we felt was the expectation of WFEC and WFLC. This was our attempt to provide what we felt we could with the limited timeframe. Feel it provides a good basis for the next phase. - o Look at the assessment and all the information to track the thinking. - o (Kirk) Stated this was the best that you could do with the timeframe given, it is the best you could do; can we build on it from here to where we need to go. - o (Joe) you can bet it is. Think of 1400 comments as 70 crews that we can either mobilize them or build on them in the future. We are to a spot where it can be moved on in the West. - o (Mac) Thank the group for what they've done. It is monumental. The group took on the issues and dynamics of the group. The group collaborated. Looked at the big picture and worked with that. Did it without much direction. Had authority to go where they needed to go. Lack of structure ended up being a benefit and led them to be able to go where they needed to go. Did a great job—lot left to do but did a lot. - o (Jim E.) Did a great job with stakeholder engagement. Keep the engagement and expand it in Phase III. Because we have so many jurisdictional issues, the post fire impacts on other ownerships are tremendous. Need to think about on the front end. Scenarios will be hard to apply because of the jurisdictional variations.
	Northeast Regional Strategy Committee Presentation <u>KEY POINTS:</u> • Thanked for the ability for USGS to be involved and participate. USGS will be involved in the WFLC meeting in November. Thank you to Gus, Maureen and Terry for all the work they did. • Provided an overview of the NE RSC membership. • In lieu of the working group, RSC had “other” team members. • Three face-to-face meetings. Virtual meetings and by-weekly conference calls until recently—weekly • RSC showed the diversity of the region. • R9 Forest Service provided staff for the RSC. • Outreach went well through networking and METI. • What didn't work: - o Required extensive periods of time. More than one day a week. - o Lacked consistency of membership and participation in the meeting. - o RSC no experience with Phase I. - o Lack of a full working group. - o Membership could have been tiered better to the proportional land ownership—very little federal land mass in the region. - o Short timeframe limited the collaboration, outreach and engagement. - o Western bias—goals of the cohesive strategy. - o Objective hierarchy was hard for group to understand—that it was a prioritization. - o Shift from filling the CRAFT form to development of objectives was difficult and unclear to the group. - o Lack of leadership from the Chairperson.

	- o AAR was completed by committee members. This is just a start. Timeframe limited the outcome. Could just provide “guide posts” for the next phase. Feel that involvement of the RSC in the next Phase is essential. As a result of Hurricane Irene, lost membership involvement. • Process overview - o Collaboration in the region was an asset. State compacts provided a great network. - o Question: Definition of State Compact - o Continue RSC involvement in the quantitative analysis. - o Regional uniqueness needs to remain intact. - o Need to be quantitative in performance measures. - o Increased, clear communication. - o Need better communication with WFEC. Clearer expectations from the group. • OUTREACH - o Short period. Committee members did a great job networking with their particular groups. - o Used METI resources—virtual forums, limited response to review of document. - o Policies, regulations, compacts, are unique to the region. • Policy/Regulation barriers: - o smoke and smoke management - o blow down issues - o Lack of MAC process - o Strong reliance on state and VFD for initial attack • Values: - o Public and FF safety - o Land and natural, cultural resources - o Private property and investment - o willingness to collaborate and create partnership - o FIREWISE type programs very important • Risks: • Trends: - o Need to increase public involvement - o Need to increase technology of biomass is critical. • Goals and Objectives: • Goal 1: - o event fuels = fuels created by non-fire events - o critical to use fire to manage fire - o Address land fragmentation through policy—share objectives. - o Use BAER and BAR on non-federal lands to improve landscapes. • Goal 2: - o Improve education and communication to mitigate the risk. - o Use and increase numbers of CWPPs • Goal 3: - o Need communication equipment that works across jurisdictions. - o Increase numbers of FF2 trained FF. - o Maintain FF capacity. - o Federal, state and local need to work on more cohesive approach. • Goal 4: - o Increase infrastructure that affect wildfire response. - o Capacity issues with wildfire and all-hazard response. - o Struggled with creating portfolios of actions. Limited by short timeframes and expertise of the group. Provide guide posts to use in Phase III. • Gave Science Team license to explore the suite of options. • Does not demonstrate a consensus of the group. These have not been vetted outside the group. The small group was comfortable with the options to explore. • These are areas to explore for reducing risk. • (Bill) have you considered the budget being flat?
--	--

	• (Gus) yes. Consider area by area—whether the investments will make a true difference. • (Kirk) Sounds like there is not a portfolio of activities from the NE. • (Gus) There are things that the NE can do immediately but they were not highlighted. • An implementation plan will identify those areas. • Need more efficient cost-sharing process. • Effectively reduce fragmentation. • Committee is very anxious to participate and complete the process in Phase III. • (Kirk) Relative to the western bias what more can we do to avoid that as we go forward. • (Mary) Is the western bias within the CRAFT process? • (Matt) No • Western bias is from the fact the land fragmentation was not considered that is in the northeast. • Resilient landscapes seem to be more western centric, where land fragmentation is more the NE land issue. • (Kirk) How do we mitigate that as we go forward? • (Matt) Could be experiences brought to the table by the committee members. • Fire resilient landscapes are hard to achieve in the areas. Fire might not be the biggest threat. There are a lot of other issues that are up there with fire—land ownership, boundaries and borders. • ID'd land ownership and what each wants to do with their land. • How does WFEC mitigate the “western centric” bias? • Kirk is asking for ideas to mitigate. • (Jim) Is there any reason why you didn't identify the problem resolving itself? Why isn't utilization of biomass identified? • (Gus) It is identified. What we gave you was the highest level of hierarchy. Under that you will see biomass utilization as part of that. Hierarchy is big issue to how you get it done. • (Ryan Yates) You addressed fuels treatments but need to address utilization as well. • (Gus) It's there. If you don't see it, raise your hand. • (Ann) Once the Phase I documents were released, met with the NE Governors representative. This is a cohesive fire strategy—fire is not the #1 issue in NE. Needs to be a land and fire strategy. • (Dan) Many of states the land is privately owned. That's where it makes it difficult to address on a landscape scale. • (Mac) Regardless of the perception, did it impact your report in any way? If it did, it goes back to process and we need to address that. • (Matt and Gus) No. Did not affect our report.
	Southeast Regional Strategy Committee Presentation <u>KEY POINTS:</u> • Good mix of folks for the RSC. 89% of land is privately held. Federal agencies stepped back; state agencies stepped up. • Heavily engaged. Some alternates represented. Working groups heavily engaged. First drafts were prepared by working groups. PMF from FS FAM did most of the writing—helped to carry the group. • Process overview. Diverse representation, including local county commissioner early on. Later, no contact. • Used existing documents rather than “recreating the wheel.” • South Forest Futures Project is a look forward 50 years of what the southern forests will be. Four main scenarios—use of wood, costs, and modeled multiple scenarios to project what things will look like 50 years from now—landowner motivations, biomass 50 years from now. • Outreach: - o 4 primary activities—review of foundational documents; forums; online comment form sent to over 1400 with 400 comments returned; conference calls and webinars. - o NST was great to work with—at all meetings, great reference. Need to use the

	information gained in Phase II in Phase III. Need the ability to modify what happened in Phase II in Phase III. - o Talked a lot about fire-prone areas. Need to take some time to look at not-so fire prone areas. - o Challenge of year round fire seasons. - o Move resources through compacts. • Barriers: - o Federal reimbursement for smaller fires. - o 4 values were identified in the South. • Trends: - o RFDs include VFDs. - o Biomass utilization has increased. - o Climate change and changes in the future will impact fire seasons. • Risk: - o Cross cutting actions and activities that crossed goals. - o conducting education and outreach to include all southern populations - o encourage standardization of fire reporting - o support for maintain service market in the South - o prescribed fire. • Goal 1: - o Objectives are very similar to other two groups. - o Challenges of land use policies and activities - o Challenge to continue with flat or decreasing budgets. - o Education component with the folks who haven't live in the south with fire. - o Issues with natural disasters and how they adversely affect wildfire. • Goal 2: - o see slides • Goal 3: - o Not much comment to increase ff and public safety by using risk management. - o Without capacity building, we have little possibility of success • Strategic opportunities: - o Assumed flat or decreased funding. - o Took actions and activities under each goal and grouped them in "buckets." - o Outreach and opportunities to landowners - o Build capacity and capabilities across agencies. - o Fuels mitigation techniques are important—planned fire is most cost-effective. - o Originally called, "policy opportunities," stepped back and talked about broader strategic opportunities. • Four alternatives: - o Present management - o Increase personal responsibility through outreach and education - o Increase FF and public safety through collaboration, training and capacity. - o Have science team model these things—if not this, how about that? - o Phase 2.5 - o Have opportunity to step back and look at Phase II (Phase 2.5) - o Very good broad based participation - o Need to re-engage county commissioners (local) - o Working group did a phenomenal job. - o Writers spent 40 hours a week. • Strong support team. THANK YOU! • QUESTIONS: - o Are there areas identified for immediate action? - o Had problems identifying activities that need future activity. We have ongoing process. - o In the upcoming weeks, we will look at what can be done within the next few weeks. - o CWPPs need to be a priority.
--	---

	- o (Jim) Do you have plans to exercise opportunities for future planning? Liability is also expensive. - o Potentially change liability legislations to allow more burning. - o Smoke issues and legislation are issues. - o Need incentives to keep land together. - o Explore land manager coops. - o Incentives to improve habitat. - o 14 % of comments were relative to “response to fire.” 70 % dealing with FAC. 40 % restore landscapes.
	National Science and Analysis Team Presentation <u>KEY POINTS:</u> • Recruited additional members. Organized by topics. • One member led the discussions. Each section had own report—not posted but incorporated into drafted report. • CRAFT was developed outside the CS process. • Phase II: • Specify objectives and design alternatives • Phase III: • ST will model. • Start with qualitative, conceptual models and move into quantitative modeling. • Didn't have work of RSC so it took some discussion and “guessing” about what the models will look like. • “takes a lickin’ and keeps on tic ken” = resiliency. • Is resiliency always positive?? NO. not always a friend. • Resiliency can apply to any landscape throughout the country. • Never going to be something where we treat all the lands—treat 8 million (of 500 million in the south). • Landowner objectives vs. others’ objectives need to be considered when fuels treatments are planned. What do we want to accomplish. • Wildfire suppression response. • What are reasonable assumptions as we move forward? • Pre-, during and post wildfire activities reviewed. • Conceptual modeling for FAHC both prior to, during and after incidents. • Firefighter safety. This part of the report is one of the most widely distributed. • Tom worked with the teams. Danny worked with what the teams produced to formulate the report. • TOM: • Conceptual way to move forward. translating those into quantitative models. • look at the data. • Walk through to make sure the models make sense. • Explore performance measures to use to measure models. • Interact with the three staff stuff how • Explore management scenarios to explore types of outcome that o • Phase 2.5 to develop actions to be used within alternatives. Do that interactively within the science team. When there is some agreement; then, to the alternatives recognizing that they have defined how it can work. • Conclusions: - o Bringing social aspects to the table and considering those - o Sometimes we cite the federal data; we understand that there is a different component as well. - o Not going to be easy - o There are some challenges ahead—it’s complicated. - o Don’t want to or plan to work in insulation.

	QUESTION: • (Kirk) Did we do what we were responsible for in phase 2. • (Danny) NO. Did not lay out alternatives. What do you think we could do? • Show you where prevention programs will be available. • In a good place to do the analysis (TomQ) • There was a lot of misunderstanding about people who were different • Change this slide! • (Tom H) do you have pretty good sense of where we are?) • Challenge: If there is a holding pattern once • Timeline will not work out to our favor if we don't keep moving • (Mac) Trouble getting the transfer from getting a picture of "all lands" what will occur for you to have • Each sub team was asked to highlight potential data. Pull those teams together and talk about the realities for what is available. • How you use data is always a challenge. We are going to try to general data. Use the best data available. Make inferences from that. • Cannot just use federal data. States have to step up and provide data. Feds need to ask if they don't have. • Two steps of validation in Phase III.
	BREAK
	Cohesive Strategy Sub-Committee Presentation 2 (Phase II Reflections/Thoughts) * Lessons Learned AAR - Strengths and Weaknesses National Report Presentation (Draft) KEY POINTS: Phase II Successes (slides) • Outreached to 4,000 people • Process continued to strengthen existing relationships and established new relationships • Science team support was beneficial • Sub-teams under science organization worked well and will continue to work well. • CRAFT process served us well. • Standardized templates • Diverse representation added value • Each region got to chart their own course. There were common themes among regions but unique factors within the regions. • Fire prevention • Active land management • Increase wildland urban interface • culture values • stewardship of public lands • Timelines were reviewed: - o WFEC 10/11 – 13 - o 10/14 – 21 CSSC/RSC modify report - o 10/21 – 25 Report back to WFEC - o 10/26 WFEC sends final draft to WFLC - o 11/9-10 WFLC meeting • Science Report: • CSSC didn't have the benefit of review of report before today. • Phase III: - o Objectives and Goals were identified in Phase II - o Conceptual models will be used.

	- o National trade-off analysis will be used to evaluate. - o National strategy will leverage regional objectives and goals - o Develop an implement plan - o Will be an iterative process with CSSC's continued involvement - o Communication framework and strategy will result in more outreach as we go forward - o Would be beneficial for CSSC to meet more frequently. - o Recognize the liaisons and lead to support the CSSC and RSCs. - o Writer/Editors did a fantastic job in a very short period of time. - o Thank you to the communication committee. - o Phase II has been looked at as an interim report. Phase II is a milestone and is a sizeable accomplishment. As we set forward to develop alternatives to meet the goals and objectives identified in Phase II there is more support for this national effort. - o Need to take advantage of this momentum and continue to move forward. • Questions: - o (Harbour) Northern CA Fire Safe Councils. There was so much energy in the room about the Cohesive Strategy. Many want to stay engage. They were to continue to work across boundaries and that was after I told them that there was going to be less money. Many focused and engaged and want to continue to be engage. - o Rowdabaugh. Has a tangible discrete product with a Phase III coming. Never thought it was an interim between Phase I and III. There have been significant contributions made over the past 12 months. We didn't just from here to there. A significant step forward has been made. We need to recognize it as that—a big step. - o Dan. Remarkable what the RSC were able to produce. - o Kirk. All 5 pieces, the RSC and the Science Team have been a significant accomplishment. - o Dan. The pieces of these RSC reports—good actions are contained within the reports that someone could start to get started on. - o Mary. This November 14 date is in question. Harbour indicated that WFLC would most likely go along with our recommendations. Will we be able to give the green light to move forward? Can we just go forward when we leave here on Thursday? Can we give marching orders from then until we pull you back? - o WFLC did approve a 3-step process. High level Executives on WFLC—need to give options. Have to be careful that we do not appear pre-decisional to WFLC. - o Kirk. Depending on how much we get done tomorrow, we need to pull together a phase II document for WFLC that hopefully will not be sent back by OMB. That, however, will not keep us from continuing to work on the next Phase. Need to be realistic tomorrow and identify those issues we might have with OMB. - o Needed the time delay between Phase I and II to realize the role of WFEC and how to move forward. Was a good investment of time? - o Joe Stutler. Tom heard the expectations of northern CA. West plans to continue to send out the updates. It is really important to honor those and figure out how to disseminate the information appropriately as we move forward. How do we consider that stakeholder information? Not slip backward. We need to recognize the staffing issue—like reporting to a fire without any resources. If there is an expectation from the WFLC or WFEC that the RSCs continue to work, we all have other jobs. There needs to be realistic expectations set and adequate support provided to do the job. We need “doers.” We need to stay at the 100K foot level. There are 3-4 things that need to go on without any additional funding. We need to identify those things that can happen now and make those happen. Learned that this is not a “quick fix” operation. There are some things that need to happen with the science team before other things can happen. We need some type of reality of things that need to happen and the staffing required to make it happen. - o We need to leave here with some authority to tell folks what has happened here this week. Tell me what to say or I will make it up. - o What type of time commitment will be required in Phase III? - o From the RSC perspective, those folks kept engaged as much as they could. The work group worked hard but those folks had other jobs. Don't sugarcoat what will be needed the
--	---

	next go around. - o Mary. Might need to get the Science Team's input on what type of commitment will be required before folks are asked to commit. - o Joe. As good as the effort was to do outreach, I'm sure there are folks we missed for many reasons. We recognize that 2012 is an election year. Need to be thinking about a strategy to deal with that. - o Roy. We heard some recommendation for governance. We talked about policy. There were some suggestions for stretching FEMA grants. Some areas of immediate success. We heard about Phase 2.5 which could mean that some folks aren't quite ready to transition out. - o Mary. Phase 2.5 rather than make the RSCs feel as though they were successful. We need to close out Phase II. Then, we are going to work Phase III in two separate steps. First, finish out what they don't feel got done in Phase II; then move to what was defined as Phase III. - o Matt R. that would be more than acceptable with NE RSC who felt that Phase II didn't get done. - o Phase II document should not identify that these are the sum total of the goals, objectives and actions. It is living document—we need to continue to revisit all these items. - o Jim E. We need to affirm our data—each region says they have the fastest growing WUI. - o Tom H. I don't know that we should be as concerned about Phase II or Phase I. I think about a year from now, Phase II will seem like a long time ago. We should be concerned about giving to WFLC and our constituents called a Cohesive Strategy 2012 that represents something substantive. What are we going to give them in 2013? We need to give them a document that is not static. It is going to be a cohesive strategy that takes the next step. - o Kirk. We have some real successes now for folks to see now that it is worth the time. - o Tom H. There are others who have not been engaged who want to be engaged. They want to help Phase III—how we get them engaged and keep them informed is a challenge. - o Bill K. We talk about building datasets that we can use across regions. I am interested in an analysis that we can use across platforms. e.g., Firefighter safety is being talked about across platforms—we need to look at it to serve multiple purposes. - o Tom Q. We are hoping for a common understanding that will bring together those with common interests that can be used across purposes. - o Danny L. We want to leverage the information from all the common groups and not reinvent the wheel. - o Need to look outside ourselves and involve those folks to avoid conflicts in datasets. - o Tom Q. I think we have been pretty successful in being inclusive and we will continue to reach out. We have reached out and folks don't come.
	Public Comment <u>KEY POINTS:</u> • Dick Bahr: What are the steps forward with the Phase II doc as you incorporate the three RSC reports to one? Is there a comment period. - o RSCs have been pulled into one draft report. WFEC will review tomorrow. T - o There is a comment period after WFEC approves the draft. Goes to WFLC for approval; then to OMB for approval before it goes to Congress. - o Two more bites at the apple for the public before it goes to OMB. See the slide for the "Path Forward." • Tom H. Do we have a good idea (WFEC) where we are headed the next few days? Yes. - o What are the expectations of the RSC members for the next few days? - o Need for clarification purposes if they'd like to be. • Mac: They are an invaluable resource to have in the room. - o Roy will double check the FACA rules to open the mike on a more frequent basis.

WFEC Deliberation on Phase 2 reports

- Actively facilitated discussion to keep folks moving (Dedicated facilitator)
- Identify questions that cannot be answered now
- Keeping track of process and progress so at the end of this they can hand it back to the CSSC / writer/editors
- Session format:
- Let's talk about what we've heard from W, NE, SE; then, the big picture.
- Do we have pre-formulated questions?
- Structured Q&As from CSSC (copy from Gus to Shari and Roberta)

KEY POINTS:

- Shari reviewed the WFLC meeting notes to ensure the WFEC has addressed WFLC expectations.
- Reviewed potential "red flags" for OMB.
- Reviewed expectations for today's session:
 - o Decision that the RSC's individual reports have been accepted by WFEC
 - o Review the Phase II report
 - o Develop recommendations for WFLC
 - o Have CSSC members join to provide a review of the report
- Recommendations:
 - o Remove Table 1—removed by OMB in Phase I. (Refer to the foundational documents in Phase I—use the "message" of the reports, not the names of the report.)

Decision: Remove the table, refer to Phase I document and insert a paragraph that describes the principals of the documents.

Executive Summary: Not sure the highlights are captured regarding what the RSCs did in Phase II. Are the key points captured? Is it informative enough? Lose some of the process and talk more about the outcomes. Executive Summary is more of an introduction than an Executive Summary.

DECISIONS:

- Edit the Executive Summary to be more clear, concise and descriptive of the common outcomes and uniqueness's identified of the RSC reports—not more than 2 pages.
- Introduction: Ensure the list of fires is representative of the entire nation. (Page 3, para 2)
- pg2, Collaboration paragraph, line 1, delete "all levels"
- Page 3, para 1: Emphasize both fire suppression and lack of active land management
- Page 4, top of the page: If we need reference, both state and federal costs . . And include reference to local government costs. Ensure figures are national costs.
- Throughout the document ensure reference to national, etc., are accurate descriptions.
- Values on page 2: reconsider the use of aesthetics, consider another word
- Objectives: include "wildlands" within the fourth bullet
- P4, para 3: Delete last two sentences and incorporate the risk component into the paragraph.
- P4, para 1: the first "federal" comprehensive look . . .
- Vision goes into the Executive Summary
- P8, first paragraph, first sentence: Need to reflect WFEC's role. Directed by WFEC and overseen by CSSC.
- P8, para 1, line 2: delete "land management"
- P8, paragraph 2, edit the last sentence to reflect Science Analysis team will work collaboratively with the RSCs and CSSC.
- P8, para 4, last sentence, remove "land management"
- P10, para 2, delete "During Phase II," edit as: The RSCs, in conjunction with the NSAT, embarked . . ."
- P9, para 2, "The RSCs *and* CSSC are chartered . . ." Revise the paragraph to accurately reflect which groups were chartered.

- Photos should reflect the nation.
- Need to highlight public involvement and engagement. Build some of the information on communication/ engagement incorporated into the Introduction section. The value needs to be included in the Executive Section.
- Collaboration results in “ah ha” moments that result in immediate successes. Build that into the introduction of the document.
- There is an expectation that solid work will be done in Phase III; how is it going to get done?
- Include expectations now that Phase II is completed.
- Add a paragraph to the Governance Section to more clearly describe the current governance roles—national, regional, local within their respective decision space, as we move into Phase III. (Ann and Caitlyn add a few sentences to the governance section)
- Number the figures appropriately. Figure 3 will be moved to p19. Insert a figure that highlights the uniqueness of each region. (Provided by each RSC)
- Global review of the document to ensure correct use of wildland fire and wildfire terminology.
- P11, last para, first sentence add “national goals” at the end of the sentence.
- With the help of test and analytical methods . . .
- Add information to the last paragraph that makes it clear that this is an iterative process that all actions are draft and not final.
- Global search for list of federal, state, . . . ensure tribal is included in the list
- Consolidate the Outreach and Collaboration section, removing the specific regions.
- Policy and Regulation. Consistent wording of the list of federal, state, tribal, etc.
- Policy and Regulations Section needs clarification and written at the higher level. What exactly do you want with this paragraph? (Ann and Caitlyn will rewrite the paragraph) Ensure examples used represent all regions.
- Values, trends and risks. Include a bullet “healthy and resilient landscapes.”
- RSC was afforded the opportunity for review and comment:
- p 19, add “and dynamic, diverse habitats” at the end of Enjoying vase, wlld open landscapes.
- p 20, 4th bullet, add “healthy forests and wildlands”
- p 20, second paragraph, first line, delete the word “actions”.
- Add paragraph to indicate where the actions can be found and that this is an iterative process
- p 20, Change the title to Objectives and Performance Measures
- Titles changed to “Shared Objectives,” text changed accordingly
- Objectives common rather than Objectives supporting
- Last bullet, add wildlands
- P 21 Regional Objectives and Actions will reflective of the changes
- Intros to each section are currently the same, revise to be appropriate to each goal.
- p 27, Initial Alternatives add fire adapted communities is missing from the initial list.
- Performance Measures
- West didn’t delineate performance measures—will do so during Phase III.
- Developing Alternatives for the section. Then, talk about where each region got.
- Gus will send CSSC a sentence to describe where the NE RSC got to relative to developing alternatives.
- Revise the section to reflect the conversation about alternatives.
- p 32, Strike the first sentence in the first paragraph. Add a sentence to p31 that speaks to the importance of complete, accessible data.
- There was a discussion about providing WFLC a set of alternative choices.
- Develop a set of choices for WFLC relative to the process used to go forward.
- Talk about an implementation plan for FY2013.
- Need to talk about implementation in Phase III. Implementation strategy developed in FY2013 will be revisited in FY2013.
- In Timeline section, talk about what we can do.
- Give Option A and Option B for the chart at the top of p34.
- Options with Pros and Cons.

	• One Option: • Here's the decision space, here are the possibilities, these are the budget implications. • Another option: • Here is what we think is best for the country. • delete Objectives • Flip flop timeline and outcomes • p 33 becomes the first part • Objectives title is removed and reworked with a – d. • Identify in the report. • 3 and 4 out to implementation • Mary will work with CSSC to rework the communication section of the document. The section will be renamed Importance of Communication • p 35, para 2, Delete the first sentence and the introductory phrase for sentence 2. • para 3, omit “based on proven science” in line two • para 3, last sentence, add WFEC to the list • para 5, second to the last line, “healthy, resilient landscapes” • Update the Appendices (submit updates to Appendices with comments) • Map of insect and disease. • Photos and graphics submitted with comments—identify location. <u>Decision:</u> Edits will be made by CSSC and both a tracked change document and clean document will be provided to WFEC for review and comment prior to the October 28 meeting.
	<u>Decision:</u> Schedule: Accepted the proposed calendar. If something was missed relative to the schedule outlined today, the WFEC body agrees that Kirk can make amend the schedule without having to come back to the full Council. <u>Decision:</u> A mock up report will be created in a Word Document by the writer/editor document. <u>Decision:</u> WFLC Agenda: - o Cohesive Strategy, Phase II - o CSSC Report - process - o RSC Individual Reports – Including non-traditional members - o Science Team Reports - o Public Comment - o Distribute the Draft Phase II Report - o WFEC Presentation for the Review of the Document (Kirk/Tom – 2hrs) - o Phase III (1 hour) - o LANDFIRE Charter Review - o WFEC Status Report - o Round Robin <u>Decision:</u> The following will be in attendance at the WFLC meeting: • Chairs of the Committee with non-traditional partners. • WFEC members • Members of CSSC with leadership role <u>Decision:</u> • No formal “Partner Presentation” period during the WFLC meeting this time • WFLC Meeting Desired Outcomes: - o Comfortable with Phase II - o Phase III Understanding and Decision on Process - o Sign LANDFIRE agenda <u>Actions:</u>

	1. Summarize recommendations and develop agenda for WFLC meeting 2. Outcome of Wednesday's meeting 3. Agenda for the WFLC meeting 4. WFEC makes presentation to WFLC
	Communication Framework Presentation KEY POINTS: Mary. PowerPoint presentation. • Roberta. Appreciation of the Communication Team. • Want to capitalize on your good relationships. Capitalize on our successes. • Reviewed the communication framework. • Decision: Branding/Logo • Kirk: Impressed by the amount of work completed. • How much time do we need on the WFLC agenda to talk about communication? • Decision: Expand the agenda by 30 minutes the first day and add the Communication Framework. • Vicki: There are many audiences where just telling them is enough. There are others that need a higher level of engagement from higher level folks. Different level of information from different level of folks. • There is need for a "call to action." • Joe Stutler: Likes what you've done. Missing leader's intent. Front of the document, "Purpose and Intent" the comm. strategy will provide timely information to update on the progress to enhance the understanding of the process. • Have a feedback process for what we are doing? • Mary: Cannot focus on a single type of information. We need to make sure we reach the entire spectrum. Consistent message is critical. • Roberta: Shared Google site that helps to share products and tools. • Decisions required from WFLC: 1. Request to staff out POCs; 2. more work to be done on branding and logos. • Do we need to identify implementation options? • There understanding that communication is a key process. Concurrence that WFEC will proceed with oversight for communication. • Action: • Communication group will develop options for WFLC's consideration relative to how WFEC proceeds with communication and collaboration. (Communication Working Group for the 10/28 WFEC meeting) • Mac. Right direction. Put in your presentation what you want then have WFEC tell WFLC what they need. Tom from WFEC identifies the needs. • Carol Daly. Rubber needs to meet the road with the local people. They need to be really involved at the local level. Needs to be more than 1-2 people. Need to expand outreach—early and often, during implementation. • Many local collaborative have day jobs—need support and resources. • Jim. How does that relate to the RSC outreach list? • Mary. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of every organization, etc. WFEC will direct that there are communication materials available, but it incumbent upon us all to ensure we involve our stakeholders. • Ann. In my mind, we need accountability to the implementation plan.
	Phase 3 Discussion KEY POINTS: • NSAT has conceptual models that provide them an idea of what they can realistically translate into quantitative models. • This process will begin soon and be built upon by RSC assessments, using LANDFIRE data.

	• Identify performance measures. How will they be used in the trade-off analysis process? • Validate that we have right measures and data available. Utilize consistency checks. • Look at the geographical variations. Possibly build off a core-structure. • Questions: • There was indicated last year an opportunity to investigate/test how robust certain portfolios of activities are. Does that possibility remain? • NSAT could do that if WFEC says that is something they'd like to see. • WFEC Decision: • Does the WFEC want the NSAT to look investigate the effectiveness of different portfolios of activities? • NSAT: What type of scenarios does WFEC want? • Put the big questions in front of the NSAT so that they can look at specifics. • Steer the NSAT toward the 2009 QFR and the findings. • Harbour: • Cannot come up with a portfolio activities unless you understand the mix of activities. • We have some performance measures in the 10-year strategy, we have gotten tied up with "values" and words like aesthetics. So when I look at the expectations, how have you considered the roadblocks in the past? • New and exciting ways to get us over the roadblocks? • Danny: Need to have the difficult conversations. Identify the specifics and the potential impacts to the issue. We won't be at the project level where we can say what the impact will be at that level. Strategic level. Frame the question so that realistically the issue can be evaluated. • Our experience shows us that there are performance measures that we can agree upon. You are saying that we can make progress on the measures already id'd and identify measures. Make informed decisions with delineation of values that we have used in the process. • Danny. We are not trying to reduce the values to a single number. Conceptually and analytically you can do that at a national scale you cannot do that. Show broad categories. We cannot say we have all the values and all the weights right. We can show the things you care about in a matrix and begin to see some threads • Harbour. There were some obvious commonalities. Have you seen enough in the three reports that there are some metrics that you can use: • Danny: FF safety, value of timber lands, etc. They have common things that they care about. There are some differences in the circumstances. Common values, just used differently. There are differences in what values are occurring. Differences have to be considered. What we anticipate is that we will not have an answer in a year. Can develop a framework that can be expanded upon as we move along. • Jim: Excellent dialog. Key points. We need better informed decisions—unique concerns. There are values that we cannot model. Hope is that we will have better information. Interesting information that we can use to make better decisions. • Kirk: Expectations, framework for finer detail to be done at the regions. Statement about time available to us. Timeframe is important. Reasonably get done in a reasonable amount of time. What are the expectations of Phase III? What needs to occur? We need to express this clearly. • Danny What is your decision space and what do you need information about. The information we need to provide needs to be good enough to inform the decisions y you need to make. All we need to get to is the better decision now than before you had the information. What is the national decision space? Lets spend time and energy to get that information in place. What is the national decision space vs regional decision space. Allow time for finer decision space. • At a national level = Scenarios. National alternatives can be = regional scenarios. All part of the structure to be built if you want to go there. Need to answer the question what do you want. • Harbour: Need time with Busch to set an expectation that we will not come out with a specific answer. WFLC needs to understand that we can develop a range of activities and alternatives
--	--

	for decisions. Problem is that we don't have that time with the mayors, governors, etc. Here is what we have in Phase II, but we need more time. We need to prepare WFLC and Congress that this won't be a definitive answer but a range of options. • Mary: She can bring the other mayors up to date but she is glazing over on the science thing. We have two very two audience—two categories PLU (people like us); then, there are the folks that need to be kept generally informed. Understand the outcome but have difficulty to express what's going on • Tom: How do we prepare WFLC? How do we engage People unlike us who when they look at the performance measures that will likely say, where was my value; where are my issues? If you aren't going to talk about my values/issues, then why should I get involved? • What type of portfolio can we give them now other than "trust us?" Is there some counsel for us for folks that we know that we'd like to bring into the fold, but that we know aren't here? • Tom Q. You should be shooting for is to be better informed as you make decisions. Cannot capture all the values but can have better insight as you make the next choices. There are external things that won't be identified. Should be better informed. • Management options and scenarios should be able to be identified that allows us to develop the analysis around that will allow you to be better informed. Then, make decisions and choices. • Won't resolve the issues but make you better informed. • Roy. Need to provide each member an opportunity to express what they'd like to see. • Need to take a look at the purpose—what are the expectations of the WFEC, WFLC, RSC, etc. What are the strategies that we need to see go forward relative to the "big" three. Is Phase III all about the science or about strategies that we can live with? • Maybe there is some time that all members can share their expectations. Not so much about the process but the expectations. • Joe Stutler. From the standpoint of what you want out of the meeting, have to have trust in the science folks. Something to consider, WFEC made a conscientious decisions to identify regions. Need to talk about what's similar and what's different. Need to tell WFLC what we want to see in the outlook. Personalize the message. Need to tell WFLC what you can do. Then, engage the conversation from WFLC and WFEC and get buy-in for Phase II before you go to Phase III. Values evolve, as we implement the CS. You will be wrestling with values forever. • Joe Freeland. This topic has come up two times. Bill Kaage and Mary have both asked how does this apply and how do we use it. There is a lot in these three reports. How and where under what conditions does the economy have to develop healthy landscapes. Evaluate what you have in the reports and how do you go from there. You have a great starting place through the three reports. Hate to think you need to create those questions when a lot could be already formulated. • Ann Walker. Suspect that when I update governor and we are listening to the science presentation. The question will be on the table—what are the federal agencies doing to help with larger scale forest restoration issue. Are we really going to be getting to the core issues of the policies? • Danny. There is a lot in the current reports. We have an intention to reframe the reports as far as how we interpret and can use the information in the reports; then get back to the RSCs. That's where we are headed. • Where are the real forks in the road and what are the consequences—that's what we are going to look at. Will that make a difference? Will the action have the long-term success you are looking for? • Mac. There are far more than two paths. Science folks have science expectations. We have expectations and objectives for Phase III and the CS. All great conversation but if we are focusing on what he needs for WFLC to determine expectations for the science side and if we need to get expectations to WFLC, which is it that your question is about? Back to your PLU comment which is very valid because if science comes up with the models, if we apply these things from the modern era in a scale situation in 1910 will the PLU's get a better idea, buy-in and insight. If the short answer is that we are building models to be able to make decisions
--	--

	and address the impacts of the models, we are not making decisions in Phase III. If that's our path, we need to stay on the path. If we deviate from the path, that's a problem. • Vicki. For one that's been involved and is now reengaged, few thoughts and principles: • Reminder that this is not an answer but a network of informed decisions. • First time that we are looking at a CS that is a cross section—across jurisdictions at multiple level decision space and levels. • Go back to the basics. Information piece that allows multiple trade-offs. • What NSAT is asking that they have more information from the Regions that should formulate the questions that represent a diverse group. Need to know the questions that will help develop the future. • NSAT will provide a reasonable sense of how this can be modeled. • End all be all is not that we got a national tradeoff analysis but it's the tangible issues that we've learned about. • Some of those need celebrated and articulated. Here is a good core basis that we can build upon. • Jim Karels. In international meeting talked about CS. Interest in setting path in this nation. Setting a future path in this country. Question was are you just going to ask for a lot of money to put fires out or are battle over letting them burn? • Think back on the past successes—don't build it on the debates. Set the path for the future. • We need to think about that as we go forward. Great opportunity to do something for the future. Phase III will really determine whether we succeed. We need the right amount of time to do this right. Need to make sure WFLC understands that! • Mary. If what the NSAT is looking for are questions to answer, we need to get to that at the WFLC meeting. Here are the preliminary questions we are recommending. Maybe the process is that we will come back to you have some preliminary time to considered. • Danny. Clarification. Suggestion. We are interested in the questions, but we don't need a clear piece of paper. We need to get them through the RSC reports. We need some validation from the WFLC and WFLC that we are on the right path. Do you trust us to go through the RSC reports or is WFLC going to do that? • Tom. That's why I am asking the question. Worried about what we are providing as a product when the question is asked about return on the investment. • Kirk. What I asked for is the fifth thing is to identify future scenario variations. • Danny. What you are asking is in the next four steps—management scenarios, etc. • We play with these four then bring it back to the first four. • Kirk. The intriguing part is to investigate future options. • Jim K. First four is how we get there; second four is the “buck” we throw on the floor. • Tom Q. At the end of the day, what we need to describe is what is this thing called a trade-off analysis. We need to understand the consequences and outcomes of these future scenarios. Then, provide trade-offs. Scenario based. • Tom. GAO wants those scenarios and outcomes laid out. • We have a process to allow both of us to understand the consequences of our actions. • Tom Qu. There is a whole cascade of decisions that need to be made. We will build a library of knowledge that will inform the discussion and decision. You will collectively gather the information that will inform the decisions. • Tom H. Cannot describe the process—just the outcome. • Mary. Understand the ultimate intent. Confusion was what we will present to WFLC; what do they need to understand; can we translate it to the lowest common denominator. • Tom. What we are struggling with is whether we have enough time built into the agenda for everyone to understand what we are going to do. • Danny. Don't ask NSAT about how we will do it? Process was very well thought out and why we adopted the CRAFT process. This process sets NSAT up to ask the right questions. We can use the answers to their respective questions in the process. Reminder is that the Phase II is a milestone process that sets us up for what we will do next. • Lynda. How we will be able to tie in management decisions that the bureaus make on other
--	---

pieces and parts of our lands?

- Danny. Think about it from constraining or enabling an action. We could specifically target the constraints and then, consider the decision space before we ask the question.
- Bill. Do you envision a county government to use the result of the scenarios in community planning?
- Danny. We could consider a step-down process.
- Mary. When we have the presentation with WFLC, the PowerPoint cannot have models. Words only. Talk about the types of products we are going to look at. Don't make it so detailed.
- Danny. Presentation needs to be balanced. Some WFLC members are interested in the graphics.
- Jim. Nervous that I am not seeing what I think Phase III is all about. Need to give them some background, but we have until November to define Phase III. Is there a certain outline we can give them something brief before the meeting?
- Tom Q. One of the things that we have been waiting for is a discussion of Phase III. What we have now is a better idea to do a better presentation.

WFEC member Expectations of Phase III:

- Mac. At the end of the report, there are outcomes. WFEC said outcomes are reasonable. We need to talk about bigger picture of Phase III to our WFLC members.
- Stick to the 11 Outcomes in the report.
- Bill. We need to talk in scenario planning.
- Kirk. Get a set of analytical models that will assist in evaluation of the utility of different actions and activities under different future scenarios.
- Mary. Don't need to know how the sausage is made but want to like the taste.
- Jim K. Want a range of scenarios but want to look at a combination of scenarios, as well. Think outside the box.
- Jim E. Need to emphasize the national decision space, there are reasonable variables that we want to evaluate. Need local decision space as well. Tradeoff analysis is not me vs Jim. It's about what options can work together. Would like a summary sheet. This is not as threatening as what we thought. It's not versus; it's how we work together. Need good information in Phase III to allow us to understand.

What are we going to tell the WFLC; how are we using the one and one-half period of time?

How are we going to prepare those WFLC members without representative in the room?

- Tom Q. Describe the outcome that you want as we understand it; then, describe the process we will need to use to get to that end product. Need you to clearly identify what you want. What are the choices that WFLC has?
- How much time for Phase III?

There is a short version or a longer, more detailed version.

- Describe what it would take the NSAT to get to the short version vs long version.
- WFLC needs to recognize the outcome of their choice.
- Gus. What would these decisions look like? What are the currencies that are the trade-offs? How do the models interact? Provide examples of how they work together?
- Illustration of what starts to knit the models together.
- Tom Q. Stay general enough to show the common but not too details.
- Kirk. NSAT has two opportunities.
- Tom Q. Generalize the models for Phase II. For Phase III we don't use models at all but to show the trends.
- Vicki. This is a trade-off analysis. If the language can change to describe that this is an investigation of the consequences and outcomes.
- Mary. Cannot use the term of tradeoff analysis with the lowest level of folks.
- Vicki. Trade off of suites of choices (scenarios).

Decision:

NSAT will provide a 30 minutes presentation. They will present a generalized set of models for Phase II and for Phase III, limited models that demonstrate potential scenarios and options.

Decision:

WFEC Chair will pose the important questions to clarify the decision WFLC needs to make and consequences of the decisions.

- One piece engages the scientist and the other engage the folks the scientists need to work with.
- Roy: WFLC needs to understand the next steps. We need to outline those steps, nationally, regionally and locally. Timelines, expected products. Science is how we are going to help WFEC and WFLC do what you want to do in Phase III.
- Kirk. We did that through expectation discussion. Need to tell them the purpose. Science piece helps to define those.

Action Item:

Create a purpose statement derived from the expectation statements of the WFEC.

- Joe Stutler. Sent note that he sees work coming down the road and asked for commitment from them. **County Commissioner in Idaho. No change for me. I will do whatever I can, whenever I can.**
- Question is . . . is that good enough. Use what you have and do the best job with what you have.
- Kirk. First priority is the Phase II report. Draft agenda will be sent.
- Sandy. **As long as start and end times don't change and the time for the public comment period doesn't change, the agenda can be revised.**

Action Item:

By October 20, RSC Chair's will provide Shari the names of those who will need invitational travel to the WFLC meeting. (RSC Chairs)

Action Item:

Ensure 1 ½ hour on agenda for the Phase II. (Sandy)

Ensure 1 ½ hour for the Phase III discussion. (Sandy)

- 3 components of work:
- NSAT will move forward with their 8 step process.
- Implementing components of the Communication Plan.
- WFEC and RSC will stay informed. Need to define the future role of the RSC?

Action Items:

The RSCs will identify the things that they can do now (over the next 12 months) that works toward the national goals and identify those prior to the WFEC. (RSC Chairs)

Mary. Will help to frame the communication piece for the Cohesive Strategy.

Action Item:

CSSC will identify the time and resource commitments and draft choices for WFLC consideration.

Present drafted choices to WFEC for acceptance on the October 28 meeting. (CSSC)

Proposed WFLC Packet: Agenda, National Report, RSC report, NSAT report, LANDFIRE Charter, Summation of WFEC accomplishments for the year and recommended resource choices.

WFLC needs to make the resource commitment; WFEC identifies resources to help.

Encourage some consistency of resources.

Action Item:

If there are other status reports to include in the briefing book, WFEC members will provide those documents to Sandy by October 26. (WFEC Members)

Decision:

Agenda as drafted is accepted.