



Meeting Notes

August 19, 2011

<i>Attendees</i>	
<p>Members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bill Kaage – NWCG <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ryan Yates – NACo <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tom Harbour – USFS 	<p>Support Staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Roy Johnson – DFO – OWFC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shari Shetler – Alternate DFO – OWFC <p>Others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Patti Blankenship – DHS/USFA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ann Walker – WGA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Roberta D’Amico – NPS <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	<p>Meeting Objectives & Expectations</p> <p><u>Description:</u> Outline the objectives and expectations of this meeting.</p> <p><u>Outcome:</u> 1. Understanding of what we need to accomplish today</p> <p><u>Reference Material:</u> 1. Final Agenda</p> <p><u>Key Points:</u> • None</p> <p><u>Decisions:</u> None</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> None</p>
3	<p>CS Sub-Committee reports</p> <p><u>Description:</u> Sub-Committees will report on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><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</p> <p><u>Reference Material:</u> 1. Sub-Committee Status Reports (6/17/2011 and 7/1/2011) 2. CSSC Roles and Responsibilities</p>



Meeting Notes

August 19, 2011

#	Topic
	<p><u>Key Points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to approve the roles and responsibilities • Reviewed the highlights of the proposal • Western RSC has been in Denver since Monday – changing of the baton on Wednesday afternoon – indicative of the struggles and intensity of what WFEC is going to feel. • Really impressed and very encouraged with what is going on in the Western Regional Strategy Committee and working group • Will have a product with no question that will bring what their challenge and mission was • Working group is asking about what phase 3 looks like • NE had three successful virtual forums • There was some concern about low attendance – final session had more than 25 people • Working on our objectives hierarchy • Also amazed on the collaborative ground up effort • Reviewed the SE status report – focused on their September 7-8 meeting in Asheville • Reviewed the roles and responsibilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mac – support ○ Jim Erickson – good ○ Ryan – good ○ Bill – supportive – would it be better to pick up the topic of implementation after October to ensure we adjust if necessary ○ Beth – great ○ Mary – great ○ Tom – the only sensitivity is the concern about the CSSC being the vehicle to get the documents to WFEC. • Amendments to the CSSC roles and responsibilities proposal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The RSCs will submit their products to WFEC ○ Edits to third bullet – add “that have been provided to the WFEC” ○ Edits to fifth bullet – “at the discretion of the WFEC” <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>Cohesive Strategy Communication Task Group – Status Report</p> <p><u>Description:</u></p> <p>Update on the progress on action items assigned at the August 5, WFEC meeting. These include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Address the Western Region’s communication concerns 2. Identify key questions and develop answers 3. Identify the support needs to finalize the report to WFEC <p><u>Outcome:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Understanding of accomplishments to date and remaining workload and timeframes <p><u>Reference Material:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Status Report



Meeting Notes

August 19, 2011

#	Topic
	<p><u>Key Points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working with Roberta and the other members of the Communication Workgroup • Great group – will wind up with a great document • Roberta brings a wonderful philosophy to this effort • Clearly everyone is concerned with communications and might be a bit behind in addressing this • This is not the group that will accomplish the final editing for the report with input from the communications group • Have received comments back on the tasking from the workgroup members as well as from the CSSC • Next week will meet face to face with Sarah in DC • Want to touch base with the other groups • Looking at a lot of interim communication products – make them available to everyone in this process • How to enhance the knowledge and understanding of WFEC's role in the Cohesive Strategy to better meet the intent of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) – will have a product at the next WFEC meeting • Joe has some concerns with the process and feels that the communication is focused on meeting the FACA requirements versus getting the information out to the field and public <p><u>Decisions:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None <p><u>Actions:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deliverable for next meeting will be a proposal on how to enhance the knowledge and understanding of WFEC's role in the Cohesive Strategy 2. We will look into the use of the phone bridge to accommodate two lines – one for the members and one for the public
5	<p>CS Communication Strategy Framework</p> <p><u>Description:</u> The tasking for the development of the communication strategy framework will be presented for concurrence.</p> <p><u>Outcome:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Approved tasking which includes deliverables and timeline. <p><u>Reference Material:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Communication Strategy Communication Strategy Framework proposal <p><u>Key Points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walked through the tasking memorandum • Need better communications within our agencies • Need to ensure that we have clear leaders intent • Emphasize that there is a due date for the entire plan – after our meeting in November when we get WFLC's input • Noted that implementation addresses the need to identify how this plan should be monitored in the future • Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Questions/concerns/issues/thoughts identified ○ Beth: none ○ Bill: thumbs up ○ Ryan: sounds great ○ Jim E: comfortable with it – appreciate Ann's comments that Joe wanted to share with



Meeting Notes

August 19, 2011

#	Topic
	<p>us</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MAC: lots of good work. Question related to membership. Should we consider NGOs as a member since a lot of the communication is going to be done along those lines. ○ Mary – the NGOs are part of the regional groups and are included in that way ○ Roberta – no objections. Have reached out to some folks that she has worked with in the past. Definitely works with the folks as part of the regional groups. ○ Bill – Asked if they would be considered a point-of-contact ○ Roberta – we definitely need them ○ Mary – would prefer that we think about it and don't want to bog down the plan with the implementation of the plan. ○ Roberta – need to educate everyone on what this group is doing now. ○ Kirk: the first two pages and fourth page is great <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Page 3 – there are 4 bullets – omit 2 and 3 from the tasking ▪ Reports will be submitted to the WFEC and are made public. ▪ Don't want to redefine in a tasking the roles and responsibilities of WFEC – they are identified within the WFEC charter ▪ Recommend that the WFEC members, WFEC Liaison to the CS-CW and WFEC DFO be removed from the tasking memorandum itself ○ Tom: on the first page – put a clause, sentence, or something to reiterate that we come together as peers ○ Second – with the final document due on December 9 – heard an understanding that we need some kind of draft at WFLC – include a more overt bullet in the timeline that acknowledges some type of document being ready for the WFLC meeting. ○ Mary and Roberta concur with changes ○ Validated the following changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Page 1 – reflect words related to peers ▪ Page 3 – second and third bullets be removed ▪ Page 3 – WFEC responsibilities be removed – all three paragraphs ▪ Page 4 – Additional item for deliverables and timelines – substantive draft be ready for WFLC ▪ Page 3 – team members – stay as is with the understanding that NGO are a critical part of this outreach ○ WFEC members – approval with amendments ○ Mary – Good ○ Beth – Agree ○ Bill – OK ○ Ryan – Agree ○ Jim E – OK ○ MAC – OK with changes – may indicate that there will be other Points of Contact – this will be incorporated with the page 1 modifications ○ Kirk – made a good draft better ○ Tom – Don't delay the work that you are doing. Prepare a final document with the above modifications to return to WFEC in two weeks. ○ Tentative approval until next meeting. <p><u>Decisions:</u> 1. Update document as indicated above</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> 1. Modify proposal and readdress at the September 2 WFEC meeting</p>
6	Large Air Tanker – Update



Meeting Notes

August 19, 2011

#	Topic
	<p><u>Description:</u> Tom will provide an update on the national large air tanker strategy development</p> <p><u>Outcome:</u> 1. Understanding of current activities.</p> <p><u>Reference Material:</u> 1. None</p> <p><u>Key Points:</u> 2. Picking up the task of development of a aviation strategy 3. A visible component is related to the large air tanker 4. Kirk and Tom are working on that</p> <p><u>Decisions:</u> 1. None</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> 1. None</p>
7	<p>Incident Management Organization Succession Planning - Update</p> <p><u>Description:</u> Bill will provide an update on the Incident Management Organization Succession Planning.</p> <p><u>Outcome:</u> 1. Understanding of current Activities</p> <p><u>Reference Material:</u> 1. None</p> <p><u>Key Points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NWCG held their business meeting next week. • One topic was a report and initial round of decisions related to this topic • Had a couple hour presentation • Draft stakeholder engagement summary • Tentative NWCG thumbs up • Have until COB next Friday to provide editorial comments • Will pick up at the NWCG September meeting for final approval of the document • Also having an update memorandum regarding status of this NWCG tasking • Then a couple of months to go back through the agencies to get a sense of any additional needs and/or clarifications • Special meeting in December for final thumbs up after visiting with agency leadership • Discuss how to interact with the Fire Governance Structure regarding acceptance of the report • Project team related to collection of stakeholder feedback is reaching conclusion and shifting to putting together an implementation team • Impressed with the amount of engagement across the country and those affected by wildland fire management <p><u>Decisions:</u> 1. None</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> 1. None</p>
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></p>



Meeting Notes

August 19, 2011

#	Topic
	<p>1. Understanding of activities within the members' organizations.</p> <p><u>Reference Material:</u></p> <p>1. Each member prepare a paragraph or two to address their organization's relevant activities, issues, etc</p> <p><u>Key Points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What's phase 3 going to look like • Where is the national science team on their analytical model • Need to be on the September 2 agenda to develop the request <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ WFEC needs to better define the outcome of Phase 3 ○ Request a proposal from CSSC and the RSCs to develop their view of phase 3 ○ Include timeline ○ Include the objectives • Need to show up to WFLC with a good product • Kirk will give the CSSC a heads up • Ann – huge desire for the workgroup members to put a lot of language in their phase 2 reports related to funding and budgets – recommendation to remove that language – so that this is in fact the cohesive strategy regardless of what the budget looks like. • Tom and Kirk – anticipate the OMB review and any financial specificity will most likely be problematic • We can deal with the money aspects of it later on • Once the report is delivered to congress, they can request what it would take to implement the strategies • Bill – suggest that WFEC members have an executive session – status check on how we are operating – rules of behavior, etc. <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> 1. Awareness of public opinions related to WFEC activities</p> <p><u>Reference Material:</u></p> <p>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>



Meeting Notes

August 19, 2011

#	Topic
	<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
11	The meeting was adjourned at 11:58 by Tom Harbour, WFEC Chair.

Note:

Subsequent to the July 1 meeting, the WFEC and WFLC dates have changed as follows:

Date	What
September 30	Phase 2 CS deliverables are due from the RSCs
October 3-5	CSSC and RSC coordinators pull documents together and develop package to go to WFEC
October 5	COB – Phase 2 Documents delivered to WFEC
October 11-13	WFEC meets to review and deliberate the Phase 2 deliverables. Questions are answered and modifications to the documents identified.
October 14-20	CSSC and RSCs make any necessary modifications and begin to prepare for presentations to WFLC
October 21	Final Phase 2 Deliverables completed and sent to WFEC
October 25	Phase 2 Deliverables submitted to WFLC
October 28	WFEC meets to work through WFLC presentation and make additional assignments
November 4	Final preparation for WFLC meeting
November 9-10	WFLC meets to review and approve Phase 2 Deliverables and the Way Forward for Phase 3