



Notes

April 19, 2013

1000 - 1200 (Eastern Time)

<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 type="checkbox"/> Glenn Gaines – DHS/USFA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jim Erickson – ITC <input type="checkbox"/> Jim Karels – NASF <input type="checkbox"/> Roy Johnson – DOI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mary Jacobs – NLC <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ryan Yates – NACo <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tom Harbour – USFS <p>Alternates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Dan Olsen – USFS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dan Smith – NASF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Erik Litzenburg– I-Chiefs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jim Douglas – DOI <input type="checkbox"/> John Segar - NWCG <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Patti Blankenship – DHS/USFA 	<p>Support Staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shari Eckhoff – DFO <p>Others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alan Quan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ann Walker <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Danny Lee <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Erin Darboven <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jenna Sloan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Judith Downing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Katie Lighthall <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Matt Hutchins <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joe Freeland <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stephanie Worley-Firley <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mike Zupko <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tom Quigley

<p>Welcome/Introductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tom called the meeting to order at 1000
<p>CS Steps and Timeline – Alan Quan</p> <p><u>Key Points:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alan reviewed the Timeline – see handout • The introductory paragraphs came from the end of the Phase II report • We have significantly changed what we are working on which is not reflected in those paragraphs • National Risk Analysis – see handout <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Next few months – science teams expects a dialogue with WFEC ○ Dialogue today with a follow-up dialogue on May 3 ○ Proposing a two day face-to-face meeting on June 6-7 – want decisions on what to pursue ○ Questions remain regarding a stakeholder review in addition to the internal review ○ Alan - CSSC volunteers to rewrite the introductory paragraphs. ○ Based on original timeline, there was no time included for stakeholder involvement ○ Worked backwards from the completion due date ○ Tom H – understand and support the desire for stakeholder involvement – we tend to get overwhelmed in this time of social media – concerned about what we are asking and then ignoring comments - would generate issues due to lack of ability to accumulate and analyze those comments ○ Need to determine what WFEC wants to do and ask if we can appropriately accomplish it? ○ Jim – agree that we would benefit from as broad a review as possible ○ Jim – Question back to the CSSC – option of using outreach through the various WFEC members, CSSC, Committee Chairs – we reach into all the stakeholder communities. As the DOI representative, I need to reach back into all the agencies. ○ Can we expect all of us to solicit input on the draft from all the constituencies that we deal with and then bring back a consolidated result ○ Alan – what Jim shared is in fact one of the review options ○ Dan Smith – Regional Chairs are concerned about having the time or ability to accomplish



- this
- If we are asking them to do this outreach for the National Report – the regions would be OK with using the folks that are involved in the development of the regional action plans. Don't have the time or capacity to analyze the information
- Dan S – The CSSC is on the same page – There needs to be public outreach and comment related to the National Action Plan
- Mary – the outreach also enables us to receive concurrence
- Mary – Start out with a set of givens – one thing that could help collate comments is the use of a tool like Survey Monkey – if that is the decision, Mary will participate in the development of the tool. Feds should be prepared to have preliminary conversations with OMB in the fall – this helps inform the development of the president's budget
- Desire to engage in public comment – not sure we can accomplish this
- Timeline for risk analysis – **tabling the discussion on public comment until next meeting**
- National Action Plan
 - Alan reviewed the timeline
 - Develop a public stakeholder process to be completed in January

Decisions:

1. Accepted the proposal on the timeline for the National Risk Analysis – Secretaries accepting the CS in January 2014
2. Accepted the proposal on the timeline for the National Action Plan
3. Stakeholder involvement issue to be discussed and resolved at the next. The primary issue is the resources necessary to receive and analyze comments received.
4. WFEC agreed on the need to meet. June 6 for the face-to-face meeting will not work.

Actions:

1. Update the two paragraphs at the beginning of the document – 2 paragraphs – Allan/CSSC
2. Include discussion related to stakeholder involvement at May 2 WFEC meeting.
3. Determine June date based on availability of WFEC members – Shari send out a doodle poll to the WFEC members

Approach for Trade-Off Analysis

Key Points:

- See handouts
- Preparation for what is coming up at the May meeting
- Danny will focus on the discussion about the analytical approach
- Tom Q gave a presentation on the ongoing work of the science team
- Have Information ready for presentation in June – this will not be the actual report
- Report will be submitted for peer review in September and publish in December
- Reminded WFEC of the original assignment
- Pulled together a very large data set for use in the analysis
- Policy options were looked at as strategic direction – possible management actions
- Danny reviewed the analytical approach
- Dealing with a very complex situation – How do we make sense of all this? How do we explain what we are talking about?
- Important is the “so what?” Use for policy and decision making at various levels. Information will be helpful in framing wildland fire discussions at all levels.
- For the May 3 meeting, we will bring a lot of information related to the issues and how we may use the approach to go forward.
- Tom: When we met several months ago in Denver, Danny talked about the limitations of the available data. You seem to be running into the same kind of issues. Some of the issues seem to be around the availability of federal centric data versus non-federal. Are you concerned about where the data comes from? If the data is federal centric – how do you respond to that?
- Danny – tried to grab the data from every source that we are pointed to. A lot of data in the federal systems come from other non-federal sources. An example is NFIRS which is populated by local



fire departments. Consolidated those to put together a broader data set. We have spent a lot of time trying to make that data set useful. Certainly some of the federal information is more complete. Also pulled in information from the States – more problematic due to issues in differences in the way the information was entered between states. Lots of miscoding due to local use of the data.

- Describe the peer review process – submission in September with publication in January. What if there is something that is challenged by other scientists? How do you work that back into what WFEC is working from? The peer review cycle is fairly lengthy. The type of feedback from these large reviews usually doesn't turn things 90 degrees and does not affect the major conclusions. Nothing has come forward that would challenge the basic assumptions.
- Intrigued about the ability to take the conclusions and generate discussion – simple enough methodology for everyone to explain it – that's the nugget of this whole thing at the national scale
- Jim: absolutely need my hand held – really complicated – when we do the discussion in a couple of weeks, it would be helpful to walk us through a practical example of how this analysis will be used at the national and local level. Difficult to answer the “so what” questions. Need a couple of concrete examples.
- Jim: Questions – policy options and themes – are you using this synonymously? The policy questions come into play when we ask “What can we do about it?” Are there a set of policy options in play? Can we add policy options in the future? The tool does not have a box titled “policy options”.
- Ryan: the issues of the county clusters may not be regionally specific. So, when looking at national policy options, the potential is that one size does not fit all. Leading to a strategic discussion related to priorities.
- Jim: Not clear about the policy options idea. This is a one-time trade off analysis – gives us a set of information that can be mined. Is there a set of feasible policy options based on the analysis? Danny – this is one of the reasons to continue to have these discussions. You have to think about how any choices play out differently. Lots of time focusing on that. Less time thinking about constructing a national set of policies which we already know won't fit. It especially doesn't work to have the scientists identify the policy options.
- This is a beginning – if you pull this switch, this is likely to happen. Will inform the potential effect of a policy decision – and where.
- Ryan – National level policy options become more strategic and less prescriptive.
- Danny – right that there are some things that you can only do at a national level. We are saying that a national policy is an agreed upon, consensus choice, that says collectively we are going to attack this particular problem using the resources available at the multi-jurisdictional level. Looking at categories of the things that can be done.
- Bill – for the general WFEC – what is our role in getting something forward to WFLC. Difficult during the conference call to engage the way that I feel is required. Anything we can do to help with the engagement like the use of GoToMeeting or some other technology.
- May 3 meeting – use GoToMeeting – it would be good to hear how things are going with the input of the advisory group – is it working? – does it need to change? – are we achieving success?
- Dan indicated that he was very pleased to see that the direction we are going will make this usable at the regional and state level. Would be very happy to see if there was interest at all levels to clean up and make data available.

Decisions:

1. Bring some practical, concrete examples to the May WFEC meeting.
2. Use GoToMeeting or LiveMeeting for the May WFEC meeting.

Actions:

1. Danny, Shari, Jenna will set up the technology for the next WFEC meeting.

ADJOURN at 12:00