Status Report

Date: **3/10/12**

Subcommittee: **CSSC**

Accomplishments Since Last Report:

The CSSC completed a more detailed Program of Work with a timeline and key milestones to complete Phase III of the Cohesive Strategy. It contains specific actions to be completed and the primary responsibilities for each subgroup to ensure that all partners are on the same page regarding primary responsibilities, tasks and timelines.

In addition, many members of the CSSC have been hearing concerns about the wildland fire governance structure. There is some concern and confusion about who is responsible for what and how the different groups interact with each other both as it relates to completing the Cohesive Strategy and as it relates to the overall wildland fire governance structure separate from the Cohesive Strategy. Therefore, the CSSC developed a governance "discussion" document that highlights the primary concerns that have been voiced to help inform the WFEC members about this emerging issue.

Planned Activities for Next Reporting Period:

The CSSC is continuing to work on a final draft of the CSSC Charter.   In addition, the subcommittee is developing a Contingency Plan that will include alternative actions that will help us meet our CS commitments (both in terms of timelines and deliverables) and be responsive to any questions we may get from the Hill or others in the event that we experience a bad fire season. Finally, the CSSC is still working on a draft "barriers" document that will focus on National/high-level barriers that inhibit the work of all the partners to address wildland fire risks.

Issues Identified:

None

WFEC Decisions/Approvals Needed:

Review, discuss and approve the Program of Work document. In addition, the CSSC would like WFEC to discuss options to begin to address the governance issues that have arisen.

References:

Contact Information:

Dan Smith - desmith@blm.gov

Status Report

Date: 3/9/12

Subcommittee: Northeast RSC

Accomplishments Since Last Report:

Held a conference call on 3/8. Discussions included loss of an RSC member due to an extended medical absence which will require finding a replacement; additional WFEC and CSSC representation on NERSC conference calls including the addition of Jim Erickson as a second rep with Tom Harbour; updating the RSC on the 3/7 CSSC con-call; discussion of barriers; interaction with NSAT and an update from Danny Lee; scheduling of future webinars and meetings throughout spring/early summer, and further development of our communications plan. In addition, a candidate was chosen as the fulltime coordinator and preparations are taking place to determine how to hire.

Planned Activities for Next Reporting Period:

The next scheduled conference call is 3/22, but this will be replaced by a four hour webinar with the NSAT. We will need to find a replacement for the RSC member who can no longer be active. Hopefully the hiring of the coordinator position.

Issues Identified:

N/A

WFEC Decisions/Approvals Needed:

N/A

References:

N/A

Contact Information:

Brad Simpkins
603-271-2214
brad.simpkins@dred.state.nh.us

WRSC Conference Call March 9. 2012 1:00 PM MST

On the call:
Joe Freeland
Joe Stutler
Corbin Newman
Pam Leschak
Cheryl Renner
Alan Quan
Carol Daly
Pam Ensley
Jesse Duhnkrack
Dave Seesholtz
Kevin Ryan
Mark Beighley
Steve Solem
John Ruhs
Judith Downing
Bill Avey
Tom Quigley
Ann Walker
Jenna Sloan

Agenda

Program of Work

On the WFEC conference call the Western Program of Work was approved. We will get final numbers. We need to come up with priorities. CSSC has elected Dan Smith to leadership position.
There's been no change to the DOI travel arrangements. We've been working on a western communications framework.

Science team will hold a webinar with the Western RSC on March 20.
The process for incorporating new RSC members to be discussed at next WFEC meeting.

Western Program Of Work
We asked for $400,000.
$250,000 for program + $150,000 for leadership
We got $150,000 for program + $150,000 for leadership position
We have gone thru Program Of Work and allocated the budget.

$10,000 is allocated to program area 1 – Identifying specific regional alternatives and display in a Western Region Phase III report.

$55,000 is allocated to program area 2. Continue and expand outreach within the region utilizing the communications framework to gain participation that we may have missed in Phase II.

       Task 1. Communications Strategy Work Group and outreach strategy. $10,000 for a professional member of this group.

       Task 2. Share the Regional Assessment and exchange new information and dealing with comments using a contractor - $30,000.

       Task 3. Monthly updates to stakeholders - $15,000.

       Work with science team – comment content analysis $30,000. Total for Program area 2 -- $55,000.

$75,000 for Program area 3 – Continue to identify immediate opportunities.

Program 4 & Program area 5 should be able to complete using the existing people involved with no additional expense.

Total = $140,000 + $10,000 contingency fund

Vote: All WRSC members concurred unanimously

Comments Received on Phase II Document

Carol explained the process for dealing with comments. This is called the bin 1 exercise – Comments were received from numerous stakeholders. The group pulled out the issues raised/ corrections/ disagreements. These were sorted into categories or bins. There were 226 separate comments.
The first group of comments, or bin 1, was comments usable for Science Team or for developing the performance actions.
Bin 2 comments were consistent with intent of the Western Regional document, but not of immediate use to the process.
Bin 3 comments were suggestions dealing with immediate success opportunities.
Bin 4 comments were suggestions that didn't fit with Assessment.
Bin 5 were issues with national priorities or policies and not something that could be dealt with at the regional level.

Joe Freeland, Alan Quan, David Seesholtz, Kevin Ryan, Carol Daly were on the committee that sorted the comments.

They created a spreadsheet of category 1 issues. The spreadsheet shows what organization the person submitting the comment represents. People are numbered if they are from the same organization.
The spreadsheet is self explanatory and it is keyed to the pages of the Assessment Recommended actions are the key point.
At the end there are three comments where the group was split.
Joe thanked the group for their work.

Questions from others on the call:

Were any comments deal breakers or change the intent of the document?
Secure Rural School was a Bin1 recommendation. Tom wants to share this with the science team now to be ready for the webinar on the 20th.

Joe asked everyone to review the attached spreadsheet and send comments to him by COB on the 14th. Tom can start using this now. If there's change after the 14th, it will be sent on to him.

There was a suggestion that some new language might tone down the word "reform" in number 30 relating to environmental legislation. Some groups have expressed a desire to work on developing acceptable language. Members stated that they support what is in the existing Western Assessment document. Joe suggested that new language could be suggested and if the RSC doesn't support new language, then the language won't change.

Tom stated that the analysis meets the needs of the science group.

Barriers Document

Alan – we will be asking the RSC to identify the 3-5 biggest barriers to reaching their objectives. The barriers will be collected and alternatives will be developed that can be brought to OMB to consider.

Joe Freeland – **Communications team**.

Mailing list is pulled together with about 1,000 names. Will verify the list. Ask people how they want to be contacted. Started discussing deliverables – elevator speech, review of PowerPoint, other products. Too much time is spent on the process. The products will try to capture why we are doing the Cohesive Strategy. How will it affect us? How can others contribute to the process? Will make a visual presentation. This is all still in progress. Recruitment – the group needs the RSC to consider assigning a professional Communicator within the body. He will start looking too. The group is considering using a social media strategy. We need the right skill set, and we don't want to start too much and not be able to maintain it. Communications group is meeting weekly until they have deliverables. Next week they'll have a new PowerPoint and a new elevator speech.
They'll send a note to RSC members regarding the professional help. We need help within 30-45 days.
Phase II report asks for 5 deliverables. We don't want to take on things we can't keep up. They will identify who is on Communications group now.

Technical and Strategic teams

Ann will be on Strategic group and she recommends three people for the technical team – Geoff McNaughton/ Jay O'Laughlin/ Chuck Bushey. Joe will send new list to the NSAT. Need phone numbers and email addresses. Some may join or leave the group. All should get the phone numbers and email addresses and send them to Tom for the recommended people. Here is the list of nominees:

· **Jesse Duhnkrack-NPS, Technical Group**
· **Carol Daly-NGO, Flathead Economic Group, volunteered for both.**
· **Laura McCarthy-TNC, volunteered for both.**
· **Joe Stutler, IAFC, both; joest@deschutes.org (541) 322-7117)**
· **Joe Freeland, BLM, both.**
· **Tony Harwood, ITC, Strategic Group.**
· **Bill Tripp, ITC, Technical Group.**
· **John Ruhs, BLM, Strategic Group.**
· **Karen Prentice, BLM, Technical Group.**
· **Brad Washa, BLM, Technical Group.**
· **Corbin Newman, FS, Strategic Group.**
· **Tim Burke, BLM, Strategic Group**
· **Geoff McNaughton, Utah division of forestry, Technical Group.**
· **Chuck Bushey, IAWF, Technical Group**
· **Jay O'Laughlin, University of Idaho, Technical Group.**
· **Dick Bahr, NPS, Strategic Group.**

Comments from Joe S: My recommendation is that the WRSC approve the nominations as proposed. Considering that some will serve on both group, the mix is exactly 11 people on the technical group and 8 people on the strategic group, this will address the potential concern of interaction between the two groups. In addition, Ann Walker who serves on the WRSC and also WFLC will undoubtedly serve on the strategic group and Doug MacDonald who is our IAFC Liaison will also serve on the strategic group but may also serve on the technical group as time allows.

The first technical team meeting will be the webinar with NSAT on March 20, 2012. The strategic team will meet with NSAT in Salt Lake City on May 10 and 11. Meetings are 8 hours each day.

NSAT Report – Tom Q.

The group is examining data and the Phase II reports, and translating the objectives and actions into outcomes to reduce risk. They are building a few worksheets. On the 20th everyone will interact on that. We may line up another conference call too. Strategic group might also participate in the webinar. All those engaged in process should be on the call. Would like strategic and technical groups to prepare for the webinar by being familiar with what is in report and what the objectives are.

The NSAT has groups looking at data and how to use it in the Risk Analysis. Be ready to share ideas on the 20th. No exercise before the 20th, maybe just a description of what to expect and an example. Plan to work after the 20th on exercises. Timeline is close. The West is planned for 1st interaction. All dates are set for May.

Comprehensive Work Plan

Jenna has put together comprehensive Program Of Work. Joe has looked it over. Shows deliverables/timelines/targets. Take a look at it and make comments to Joe. WFEC will approve this next Friday, so get comments in quickly. No comments yet. The Program of Work is attached.

Anyone have anything to add?

The two Joes discussed post-Phase III. When we have an Implementation Plan we will have the opportunity to really do something, keep people engaged, put together implementation team and meet the goals. Think about that. We want to move into the sphere of actions.

Thanks to Joe Freeland for putting together the agenda. Next call on March 23rd.

Number/Organization Name	Page	Issue	Recommended Action (Changes shown in ALL CAPS or strikeouts
5. Utah BLM	3	Exclusion is all encompassing involving both the suppression and application of fire to the environment.	*Restoring and Maintaining Resilient Landscapes --* A century of fire ~~suppression~~ EXCLUSION has led to dramatic increases in forest stand densities and understory growth.
5. Utah BLM	4	"Severe" relates to fire effects vs. fire behavior descriptors. Replace "severe" with "extreme".	*Responding to Wildfires* -- The West has seen a rapid escalation of ~~severe~~ EXTREME fire behavior over the past two decades
5. Utah BLM	4	Replace "herbaceous" with "exotic annuals"	Same section, 5th line, rewrite as: ,,, millions of rangeland acres have been invaded by ~~herbaceous~~ EXOTIC ANNUALS and woody plants….
5. Utah BLM	5	Replace "suppression" with "exclusion"	On line 4, rewrite as: The majority of federal lands are in the West and current fire ~~suppression~~ EXCLUSION policies have, in part resulted....
5. Utah BLM	5	Delete "emergency" in first sentence of *Basic premise.*	*Basic premise* : A balanced wildfire response requires integrated pre-fire planning with effective,efficient, and coordinated ~~emergency~~ response
1. National Association of Forest Service Retirees	21	.Need to include watersheds in landscape objectives	In the second bulleted statement, last line, rewrite as "landscapes AND HEALTHY WATERSHEDS while meeting social and economic needs."
1. National Association of Forest Service Retirees	22	Important to consider effectiveness of coordination	Under *Basic Premise* , fourth line, rewrite as " include sincere AND EFFECTIVE coordination and integration…."
1. National Association of Forest Service Retirees	33	Local government should be included as key stakeholder	Objective statement 3.5 – rewrite as "communities, LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, and planned activities.
17. Idaho BLM	22	Need to clarify Goal 1, *Guiding Question,* third bullet,	Rewrite to read: Is it likely that near-term investments in ~~fuels treatments and~~ vegetation management might result in greater opportunity to achieve resilient landscapes IN THE LONG TERM?"
2. The Nature Conservancy	22	Objective 1.1 currently reads "Actively manage the land to achieve healthy forest and rangeland onditions" Need to add water, which was not covered in original wording	Rewrite Objective 1.1 to read: "Actively manage land AND WATER to achieve healthy forest, rangeland AND WATERSHED conditions."
	22	Re: 1.1.1, .Need to strengthen the intent of the action, from "contribute to the restoration and maintenance of" to "actively restore and maintain…"	Rewrite to read: ACTIVELY RESTORE AND MAINTAIN BIODIVERSITY, DESIRED SPECIES (INCLUDING THREATENED, ENDANGERED, AND PROPOSED LISTED SPECIES), AND THEIR HABITAT.
	22	To reflect 2009 Implementation Guidance, and to enable the accomplishment of 1.1.3.1.	Add under 1.1. UPDATE FEDERAL LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS AND FIRE MANAGEMENT PLANS, ESPECIALLY THOSE THAT SPECIFY "SUPPRESSION ONLY," TO ALLOW FULL RANGE OF MANAGEMENT OPTIONS.(2009 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE), INCLUDING MANAGEMENT OF FIRE FOR MULTIPLE OBJECTIVES.
2. The Nature Conservancy	22	1.1.3.2 currently reade "Recognize and communicate priority natural landscapes as functioning ecological systems where wildland fire is an essential component and minimal suppression activities will occur." The word "natural" is problematic regarding indigenous practices and climate change.	Rewrite to read "Recognize and communicate priority natural landscapes. INCLUDING THEIR HISTORICAL INDIGENOUS IMPACTS, as functioning AND EVOLVING ecological systems where wildland fire is an essential component and minimal suppression activities will occur."
2. The Nature Conservancy	23	1.1.4.2. needs to be strengthened and also include water.	Rewrite to read: "Emphasize restoration of forests and rangelands AND WATERSHEDS at large landscape scales with a priority focus on the "middle ground". ACTIVELY USE MIDDLE GROUND TREATMENTS TO ACCELERATE RESTORATION AND MAINTENANCE OF LANDSCAPE RESILIENCE."

9. Rocky Mountain Wild, San Luis Valley Ecosystem Council; Rocky Mountain Chapter of Sierra Club; Wilderness Workshop; and Wild Connection	23	[We] recognize the need to have industry that can implement some of the desired treatments. Currently in Colorado, that industry is probably not sufficient to accomplish needed treatments. Reasons for this include: poor economy and thus low demand for products; lack of salable products for most of the wood that would get treated, such as small-diameter trees killed by bark beetles; a lack of capital; and high fuel and transportation costs.	Re: 1.1.5 Some incentives may be appropriate to attempt to develop new industry or to support existing ones. However, it is very important that such an industry be sustainable. In other words, its needs must not outstrip the ability of the land to provide material and still maintain other values, such as wildlife habitat, watershed integrity, [etc.] The emphasis on developing industry to get needed treatments accomplished would not ensure that any such industry is sustainable. **Additional objectives and sub-objectives should be added to address the sustainability issue.**.
17. Idaho BLM	23	Objectives don't cover active rangeland management	Add 1.1.7…USE VEGETATION TREATMENTS TO MAINTAIN AND RESTORE VALUABLE ECOSYSTEM COMPONENTS WITHIN RANGELANDS AND TO PROMOTE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIVE SPECIES.
2. The Nature Conservancy	23	To place the landscape resilience goal in balance and alignment with the goals for fire-adapted human communities and wildfire response in the Western U.S.	Add under 1.2. (perhaps as 1.2.6) "DEVELOP A METHODOLOGY FOR RESOLVING THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE COSTS AND BENEFITS GAINED BY AGGRESSIVE INITIAL ATTACK AND THE COSTS AND BENEFITS GAINED FROM MANAGING FIRES FOR MULTIPLE OBJECTIVES."
2. The Nature Conservancy	23	Need to clarify that "human-caused" does not include prescribed fires and to focus on resilience.	Rewrite 1.2.1 to read "Prevent human-caused ~~wildland fires~~ UNPLANNED IGNITIONS to minimize ~~unwanted, negative effects~~ FIRES THAT REDUCE LANDSCAPE RESILIENCE.
2. The Nature Conservancy	23		Remove "~~1.2.2. Protect social, cultural, heritage, and other values on tribal, state, local, and private land; consider mutual benefits and interests~~" and "~~1.2.4. Manage historic properties considering the historic setting, natural features and critical elements of biodiversity, landscape uses, and other features; prioritize protection locally.~~" Insert instead: ""IMPROVE MANAGEMENT OF CULTURAL RESOURCES THAT ARE EITHER POSITIVELY OR NEGATIVELY AFFECTED BY FIRE ON TRIBAL, STATE, LOCAL AND PRIVATE LAND." And move as currently written into Fire-adapted Human Communities."
2. The Nature Conservancy	23	Broaden 1.2.5. "Identify potential post-fire hazards in advance of fire seasons to clarify roles and responsibilities, position for the best response to impacts on landscapes and communities, and take advantage of the local workforce." Otherwise the statement fails to include the opportunity to do pre-fire planning to benefit landscape resilience. (Words in red added by reviewers.)	Rewrite 1.2.5 to read: IN ADVANCE OF FIRE SEASONS, AND WITH COLLABORATIVE PARTICIPATION OF STAKEHOLDERS IDENTIFY POST-FIRE HAZARDS, AS WELL AS PLACES WHERE MANAGING WILDFIRES FOR MULTIPLE OBJECTIVES WOULD BRING BENEFITS TO LANDSCAPE RESILIENCE. CLARIFY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES. POSITION FOR TAKING ADVANTAGE OF FIRE OPPORTUNITIES AND RESPONDING TO IMPACTS ON LANDSCAPES AND COMMUNITIES. ENGAGE THE LOCAL WORKFORCE.
2. The Nature Conservancy	23	To place the landscape resilience goal in balance and alignment with the goals for fire-adapted human communities and wildfire response in the Western U.S.	Add under 1.3. (perhaps as a new 1.3.2, with the current 1.3.2. becoming 1.3.2.1) "LAUNCH A MULTI-AGENCY WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE (INCLUDING KNOWLEDGE SHARING, RECRUITMENT, TRAINING, INCENTIVES, MENTORING AND PROMOTION) AIMED AT BUILDING WORKFORCE SKILLS IN COLLABORATIVE FIRE PLANNING AND PROBLEM SOLVING, STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT, CONFLICT MANAGEMENT AND GROUP FACILITATION."

2. The Nature Conservancy	23	To place the landscape resilience goal in balance and alignment with the goals for fire-adapted human communities and wildfire response in the Western U.S.	Add under 1.3 REDUCE ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATIONAL BARRIERS TO LANDSCAPE LEVEL, CROSS-BOUNDARY RESOURCE MANAGEMENT.
2. The Nature Conservancy	23	Make connection to CWPPs more flexible – don't necessarily want to get wedded to some CWPPs that are controversial or don't have stakeholder support.	Rewrite the first part of 1.3.1. to read: Collaboratively develop large landscape ecological restoration plans that DOVETAIL WITH AND SUPPORT implementation of CWPPs….
2. The Nature Conservancy	23	Broaden to larger scope, including additional workforce development tools.	Rewrite 1.3.2.ro read: LAUNCH A MULTI-AGENCY WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE (INCLUDING RECRUITMENT, TRAINING, INCENTIVES, MENTORING AND PROMOTION) AIMED AT BUILDING WORKFORCE SKILLS IN COLLABORATIVE FIRE PLANNING AND PROBLEM SOLVING, STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT, CONFLICT MANAGEMENT AND GROUP FACILITATION. Reward line officers/agency administrators for effective collaboration.
2. The Nature Conservancy	23	Want to enable monitoring that has local utility as well as regional value; make monitoring specify the types of effectiveness to be measured (e.g., ecological, economic, fire safety?).	Rewrite 1.3.3. to read: Design and commit to a focused multi-party monitoring component for treatment activities that is consistent across multiple landscapes and jurisdictions and drives investments based on effectiveness." to read "Design and commit to a focused multi-party monitoring component for treatment activities that ALLOWS EFFECTIVE DATA COMPARISON ACROSS MULTIPLE JURISDICTIONS, ENCOURAGES MANAGERS AND STAKEHOLDERS TO ADDRESS KEY UNDERTAINTIES ABOUT TREATMENT EFFECTIVENESS, and drives investments based on specific types of effectiveness.
2. The Nature Conservancy	24	Strengthen connection between treatments and local economies	Rewrite 1.4. Objective to read: Develop and maintain professional and industrial capacity ~~to implement~~ FOR IMPLEMENTING cost-effective and sustainable landscape treatments ~~and~~ THAT SIMULTANEOUSLY support local economies.
9. Rocky Mountain Wild, San Luis Valley Ecosystem Council; Rocky Mountain Chapter of Sierra Club; Wilderness Workshop; and Wild Connection	24	Re: 1.5.5. "Use categorical exclusions (CE) more effectively, consistently, and with clear direction across the country." This is a very bad idea. For small projects, CEs can be appropriate. But for large projects, which would be done under the Western Regional Assessment's focus on developing landscape-scale treatments, they simply cannot be used, as impacts would be sure to occur, but would not be first disclosed, nor would any mitigation be identified or applied.	There is a need to provide clear direction as to when and under what conditions it is appropriate to use categorical exclusions.
3. Natural Resources Defence Council	24	The Equal Access to Justice Act, Endangered Species Act , and National Environmental Policy Act are characterized as "barriers to success" and cited as misused for purposes not intended by their drafters. While all three have been used to stop activities claimed to be for restoration purposes, they only in fact stopped them to the extent that a federal judge was persuaded that the projects were illegal in a way that threatened harm to natural resources	The comments submitted were in response to the *Regulatory Environment* section (pp 16-17) and to sub-objective 1.5.6 No re-write of the objective was proposed bu the commenters. Reviewers, however, suggest (and would be willing to help with) a redraft of objective 1.5.6 that does not include the pursuit of legislative reform as a means for resolving any barriers identified during the proposed examination. .
8. Mendocino County Fire Safe Council	24	Some regulations are restricting and sometimes preventing fire use and prescribed fire	Rewrite 1.5.6 to read: Examine legislative AND REGULATORY barriers that are impeding project implementation….

8. Mendocino County Fire Safe Council		It is crucial to specify and fully involve Air Quality officials in these efforts	Rewrite: 1.5.7.to read: Encourage and enlist local, state, tribal, and federal environmental regulatory agency representatives (SUCH AS AIR QUALITY OFFICIALS) to participate actively in collaborative efforts to restore resilient landscapes
8. Mendocino County Fire Safe Council	24	This is perhaps the most important objective under this goal, and perhaps in the whole Assessment and Strategy!	Rewrite Objective 1.6.to read: Increase public AND LEGISLATORS' awareness, acceptance, and active participation in achieving landscape objectives using all available tools. [Note: Need to add an action item to go with this addition to the objective.]
4. Sandy Shaffer	24, 27	During wildfire incidents, folks need to know what's going on. You have an interested audience; the opportunity should be used to also educate the private landowners, get them to start thinking that they do have a role to play. Use the teachable moment, don't just talk about the # of acres burned and how many people are on the fire.	While communication and public education are both addressed in the plan, the specific actions suggested by the commenter could usefully be included in actions common across goals (page 21) and/or objectives 1.6.1.and 2.1.
8. Mendocino County Fire Safe Council	24	1.6.1. says "Develop and deliver education programs and media campaigns describing the tradeoffs between short duration smoke from prescribed fire and long duration smoke from wildland fire and how prescribed allows for the management of smoke emissions	Re: 1.6.1. These education programs must be specifically targeted toward (1) the public, (2) legislators at federal, state, and local levels, (3) air quality regulators and other regulatory agencies, and even (4) some branches of the fire service itself. (FUSEE is currently working on this, but there needs to be a massive, national campaign if the entrenched fear of fire and intolerance of wildland fire smoke are to be overcome.)
8. Mendocino County Fire Safe Council	25	This highly effective motivational type of programs mentioned in 1.6.5. must continue to be funded under the Cohesive Strategy.	Rewrite 1.6.5. to read: Develop landowner incentives (e.g., tax breaks, free disposal of material, increased use of the Wyden Amendment and other finance or cost-share authorities) for fuels management, INCLUDING PRESCRIBED FIRE, on private lands.
2. The Nature Conservancy	25	Want to be sure that treatments are likely to bring landscape scale results.	Rewrite 1.7.1.2. to read: Target infestation areas that are economically feasible to selectively manage or thin where ~~that activity~~ can improve EXPECTED RESULTING IMPROVEMENTS IN stand condition and ecosystem health WOULD RELIABLY REDUCE INFESTATION AT THE LANDSCAPE SCALE.
4. Sandy Shaffer	26	When the CS talks about loss of "lives and property", how is property defined? Every private property owner I know puts more value on their forest, trees, etc. than on their home, because the house/structures are insured but the trees aren't. This has to be a part of the fuels and suppression equation. I think this feeling could be used in education of the hows and whys of thinning, making stands fire resilient, etc. because landowners are aware of and concerned about diseases that damage or kill stands. They want their forests healthy and their views pretty. Use this!	In WRSC and Work Group meetings, participants definitely included forests and trees in our definition of "property:. We probably should capture that aspect somewhere.in the text of Goals 2 (which includes "property" in its title) and perhaps 3.
7. Sandy Shaffer	26	Goal 2, *Guiding Questions* -- Need some correction here - within the parentheses there are repetitive words. Also the whole thought is grammatically incorrect. Are you looking for CWPPs with all 3 qualities? Maybe just remove the "and" after partnership?	Goal 2, *Guiding Questions* -- suggested re-write of third bullet: Are COMMUNITIES WHERE CWPPs WERE DEVELOPED ~~that are built in~~ WITH a ~~highly~~ HIGH DEGREE OF collaboratION. and ~~demonstrate~~ HAVE ACHIEVED more than the minimum requirements for concurrence, (as ~~defined in the as~~ defined in the Healthy Forest Restoration Act and supporting ~~ommunity~~ STAKEHOLDER-developed handbooks) NOW ABLE TO DEMONSTRATE SUCCESS IN REDUCING WILDFIRE RISK, AND CAN ~~and where~~ THAT success ~~can be realized~~ now ~~and~~ BEexpanded?

Commenter	Page	Comment	Suggested Change
17. Idaho BLM	26	Need to add a *Guiding Question* to relate to the 2.1 objective	Add new *Guiding Question:* Where are unwanted human-caused ignitions causing threats to communities/developed areas?
8. Mendocino County Fire Safe Council	26	In Goal 2, Creating Fire-Adapted Communities, I strongly think that a critical objective needs to be added. From Jack Cohen's work we know that, in order for homes to survive wildfires – i.e., for communities to be fire-adapted – people must BOTH treat nearby vegetation AND harden/maintain their homes to resist ember intrusion. I fear that unless the embers issue is separately and significantly addressed, it will continue to be under-taught and under-appreciated, and communities will continue to burn.	Something like "CONSTRUCT AND MAINTAIN STRUCTURES TO PREVENT IGNITIONS FROM EMBERS" C" needs to be a <u>separate</u> objective, with supporting sub-objectives beneath it, bearing the same weight as fuels reduction.
2. The Nature Conservancy	27	Renumber and Insert where aopropriate (perhaps under 2.2) the sub-objectives currently numbered 1.2.2 and 1.2.4	Re-number and insert 1.2.2 PROTECT SOCIAL, CULTURAL, HERITAGE, AND OTHER VALUES ON TRIBAL, STATE, LOCAL, AND PRIVATE LAND; CONSIDER MUTUAL BENEFITS AND INTERESTS and 1.2.4. MANAGE HISTORIC PROPERTIES CONSIDERING THE HISTORIC SETTING, NATURAL FEATURES AND CRITICAL ELEMENTS OF BIODIVERSITY, LANDSCAPE USES, AND OTHER FEATURES; PRIORITIZE PROTECTION LOCALLY.
17. Idaho BLM	28	Expand objective 2.3 to contain more than just CWPPs as several areas do not have CWPPs and do not have funding/expertise to complete;	Rewrite Objective 2.3 to read:: Continue to ~~develop, support, and maintain CWPPs as one of the primary tools to achieve the goals of the Cohesive Strategy.~~ assess wildfire risk and hazard and identify values at risk in a collaborative manner.
17. Idaho BLM	28	Make former Objective 2.3 the new subobjective 2.3.1	Insert new subobjective 2.3.1 CONTINUE TO DEVELOP SUPPORT AND MAINTAIN CWPPs AS ONE OF THE PRIMARY TOOLS TO ACHIEVE THE GOALS OF THE COHESIVE STRATEGY. Renumber other subobjectives accordingly.
8. Mendocino County Fire Safe Council	28	Re: 2.3.7. " Develop incentives for development, maintenance, and implementation of CWPPs" .As reauthorized in 2008, Title III of The Secure Rural Schools Act specifically included developing or maintaining CWPPs. Our Fire Safe Council will be using Title III funds to update our CWPP in 2012. If Title III is combined with Title II, as rumor has it, this designated source of funding for CWPPs will disappear and objective 2.3 will be severely hampered	An action item should be added under 2.3.7 to support reauthorization of Secure Rural Schools or enactment of legislation that provides a comparable designated source of funding for CWPPs..
4. Sandy Shaffer	28	Item 2.4 Build a culture of self-sufficiency to prepare for and protect life and property – [This] is the toughest but most vital item of the CS. But, we or the feds can't "define" the private landowner's "role" in the CS. The private landowners need to be given enough education so that they discover their role, and accept it. A lot of new stuff will come down on the private landowner if the CS continues to move in the direction it seems to be headed; so they need to be in the equation/conversations now	This is a significant communications and strategic planning issue that needs to be addressed Amend 2.4.1. to read: Define, ~~and~~ communicate WITH, AND EDUCATE ALL STAKEHOLDERS ABOUT THEIR roles and responsibilities ~~of all stakeholders~~ for reducing the threat of wildfire to human life, property, and community infrastructure
8. Mendocino County Fire Safe Council	30	3.1.4.2. The sentence "Coordinate forecasting…" is very important and should be a separate point under 3.1.	Move the sentence "Coordinate forecasting and notification of individuals and institutions (e.g.hospitals, schools) particularly sensitive to smoke and ash" out of 3.1.4.2 and into a new sub item 3.1.4.3.

18. Idaho BLM	33	Re: 3.4.5 -- Do you want to just identify them, or use the data to gain efficiencies? we can identify them right now, but it seems we want a part of this to say that we want to make sure they are adequately staffed, in the right places, and not overlapping.	Rewrite 3.4.5. to read: Maximize the use of technology to evaluate the numbers of coordination and dispatch centers including locations AND DEVELOP SCHEDULE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF ANY NEEDED CHANGES
18. Idaho BLM	33	Ecpand 3.4.7.1. to include federal agencies.	Rewrite 3.4.7.1. to read: Develop a western compact between states, ~~and~~ tribes, AND FEDERAL AGENCIES that allows for ORDERING/DISPATCHING/TRACKING OF ALL RESOURCES USING A SINGLE NATIONAL SYSTEM TO ENABLE incident business payments to take place.
1 National Association of Forest Service Retirees	34	Local government should be included as key stakeholder	Rewrite 3.5.1. to read: Assist private property landowners AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT in mitigating the effects of natural hazards resulting from wildland fire on public lands. (e.g. flash flooding, debris flows, loss of rangeland productivity, loss of timber, etc.)
6. National Wildfire Suppression Organization	45	Re: *Responding to Wildfire,* first sentence. "There is a need to expand the current emergency response system to include suppression resources at all emergency response jurisdictions and agencies.. This will require revisiting the current qualification systems and designing and accepting a universal system that is agreeable to all." Commenter says, "We would concur with this as long as it done not only for agencies but for private resources like ours as well so that we are all on the same page."	The referenced statement needs to be rewritten to clarify whether or not it covers private resources such as those represented by the commenter.

REVIEWERS COULD NOT REACH AGREEMENT ON THE CATEGORY TO WHICH THESE SUGGESTIONS SHOULD BE ASSIGNED. CATEGORY 1 WAS FAVORED BY SOME.			
2. The Nature Conservancy	23	Objective does not contribute to landscape resilience and fits better in Fire-adapted Human Communities	Remove: 1.2.3. I~~dentify, prioritize, and protect economic and commodity values and high priority natural resources (e.g., timber and grazing) across all ownerships~~
2. The Nature Conservancy	27	Objective does not contribute to landscape resilience and fits better in Fire-adapted Human Communities	Insert under subobjective 2.2: IDENTIFY, PRIORITIZE, AND PROTECT ECONOMIC AND COMMODITY VALUES AND HIGH PRIORITY NATURAL RESOURCES (E.G., TIMBER AND GRAZING) ACROSS ALL OWNERSHIPS
15 Idaho BLM	31	Regarding Objective 3.3.1.3: "Where appropriate, place all partner resources into a common, central dispatch system." It's unclear what this means in terms of a "common central dispatch system." Should this say instead a "common dispatch data base"? It's not clear if this calls for a local, regional or national common dispatch system.	Some reviewers believe the intent was to have a common dispatch base not a common dispatch system. Others believe that the intent was to have a common system to be used universally to integrate local municpal capability as well as state and federal. The WRSC needs to clarify what was intended, and then decide which category this comment belongs in.

Western Comments
Suggested Protocol
For
Comments Received

We need to have a clear record of the content analysis and response; the FACA charter for this effort really makes the need for a clear documentation record important. We need to build this record as we go vs. afterward.

Categories resulting from this "content analysis" are:

(1) Good suggestions/improvements <u>within the intent</u> of the original document and useful for defining options or alternatives for the NSAT and Western RSC and to consider, or may be used to develop performance measures or implementation actions for the West.

(2) Suggestions that may be good, but are <u>different than the intent</u> of the WRSC in the original document, RSC <u>will considered these later</u>, following initial trade-off analysis and these may affect options, alternatives, and implementation actions or develop additional performance measures. This analysis would occur near the end of the Phase III effort.

(3) Suggestion that may identify immediate success opportunities that either mirror Phase II content analysis comments or it is clear that an immediate success opportunity exist for follow-up.

(4) Suggestions that simply don't fit with the Western Assessment or merged Phase II Report; these may be incongruent with the Flame Act or guiding principles of the Cohesive Strategy and we thank the responder

(5) Suggestions that are beyond the authority or scope of the Western Region due to timing or previous agreements at a higher level.

In all cases we provide positive communications back to the responders, thanking for their participation and offering continued engagement.

<div align="center">**Western Region Nominations**</div>

<div align="center">**For NSAT Interactions**</div>

The Nominations are as follows:

- · **Jesse Duhnkrack-NPS, Technical Group**
- · **Carol Daly-NGO, Flathead Economic Group, volunteered for both.**
- · **Laura McCarthy-TNC, volunteered for both.**
- · **Joe Stutler, IAFC, both.**
- · **Joe Freeland, BLM, both.**
- · **Tony Harwood, ITC, Strategic Group.**
- · **Bill Tripp, ITC, Technical Group.**
- · **John Ruhs, BLM, Strategic Group.**
- · **Karen Prentice, BLM, Technical Group.**
- · **Brad Washa, BLM, Technical Group.**
- · **Corbin Newman, FS, Strategic Group.**
- · **Tim Burke, BLM, Strategic Group**
- · **Dick Bahr, NPS, Strategic Group**

My recommendation is that the WRSC approve the nominations as proposed. Considering that some will serve on both group, the mix is 11 people on the technical group and 9 people on the strategic group, this will address the potential concern of interaction between the two groups. In addition, Ann Walker who serves on the WRSC and also WFLC will undoubtedly serve on the strategic group and Doug MacDonald who is our IAFC Liaison will also serve on the strategic group but my also serve on the technical group as time allows.

Status Report

Date:　　March 16, 2012

Subcommittee:　　Western RSC

Accomplishments Since Last Report:

The Western Region continues to have conference calls every two weeks. We have completed the nominations for the NSAT interactions with a total of 11 people for the technical group and 8 people for the strategic group. We are set for the March 20th webinar and May 10-11 meeting. We have completed the Category 1 content analysis of 246 comments to the western assessment to share with the NSAT for the work with the tradeoff analysis. The communications strategy group has been formed and has developed a master stakeholder mailing list of over 1,000 participants for the west. We have reviewed and provided substantive comments to the Comprehensive Work Plan for the Phase III efforts as well as the governance staff paper for consideration by WFEC. We have prepared a Phase III PPT for future presentations and sharing.

Planned Activities for Next Reporting Period:

We will begin implementing the program of work with specific focus on the communications strategy; we will be completing the necessary contractual actions of the program of work to complete the entire content analysis of comments received on the Western Assessment; we will have 11 members participate with the NSAT webinar on March 20th; there will be two presentation on Cohesive Strategy updates, one for PNWCG and one for the Great Basin IMT group. We will merge the work plan for the west with the Comprehensive Phase III work plan to ensure dates and completion deliverables are mapped from now until the end of February 2013. /

Issues Identified:

For the West and the entire CS efforts we need to direct our thinking to life after Phase III. What will it look like, what specific items in the Implementation Plan will create both organizational capacity and accountability to create success with implementation other than just another plan completed. What does Cohesive Strategy behavior look like and how can we keep stakeholder involvement in the implementation efforts? .

WFEC Decisions/Approvals Needed:

.

References:

See conference call notes, content analysis criteria and NSAT participation list.

Contact Information:

Joe Stutler, Alan Quan or Joe Freeland

Status Report

Date: March 16, 2012

Subcommittee: Southern RSC

Accomplishments Since Last Report:

The strategy group and technical groups to interact with NSAT have been stood up and dates selected for initial interaction. The RSC will be holding a call Thursday, March 15, to discuss timelines and expectations, communications and outreach, contingency planning and the lead position structure. A small group of the RSC and WG (opportunistically) worked through some of the work plan and discussed more detail.

Planned Activities for Next Reporting Period:

A communications group is partially identified and will be taking the initial communications strategy developed by the RSC chair to the operational phase over the next month. The RSC will continue to move forward on identifying a lead. The Southern technical group to the NSAT will hold a call/webinar March 21 to establish operating parameters with NSAT and timeline/expectations. Continued detail will be added to the work plan as the RSC continues to discuss opportunities and develops the communications and outreach strategy.

Issues Identified:

WFEC Decisions/Approvals Needed:

References:

Contact Information:

Mike Zupko

Status Report

Date: March 12, 2012

Subcommittee: NSAT

Accomplishments Since Last Report:

NSAT continues to assemble data that will be used to characterize risk across the three regions and allow us to estimate the consequences of different alternatives. Specific areas of attention include assembling information on fire occurrence, location, and extent; fire-related injuries and fatalities; smoke emissions and transfer; vegetative conditions and relation to fuel conditions; community preparedness and adaptation to fire; and values of concern.

Preparations are underway for hosting three web meetings, one with each region, during March 20-22. Our intent is to use these web meetings to explain what we're trying to do in Phase 3, how we plan to do it, how we're using the information from Phase 2, and what we expect in terms of interactions with the Regional Strategy Committees and workgroups. All interested parties are welcome to attend the web meetings.

Planned Activities for Next Reporting Period:

We will have completed the web meetings and initiated greater coordination with the RSC representatives that have been tasked with working directly with the NSAT.

Issues Identified:

None

WFEC Decisions/Approvals Needed:

None

References:

None

Contact Information:

Danny Lee (dclee@fs.fed.us, 828-257-4854)
Tom Quigley (tkquigley@gmail.com, 801-301-6715)

Proposal

Date: March 16, 2012

Subcommittee: Cohesive Strategy Sub-Committee (CSSC)

Description of Issue or Assignment:

The WFEC has tasked the CSSC with the day-to-day process oversight and guidance responsibilities to subcommittees and working groups assigned to the cohesive strategy effort. Attached is the Comprehensive Work Plan (February 2012-February 2013). The purpose of the attached document is to respond to the WFEC's request for definition of the following:

1. Intent and broad explanation of the five commitments in the draft Phase II report
2. Tangible end deliverables
3. Interim and end deliverables for each subcommittee and associated deadlines
4. Major tasks associated with each end deliverable

Discussion of Proposed Recommendation(s):

The CSSC recommends acceptance of the attached comprehensive work plan. The CSSC additionally recommends that the WFEC allow the comprehensive work plan to be dynamic, enabling the CSSC to make adjustments, additions, and shifts in priorities as the year progresses. Status updates from the CSSC are provided every two weeks, and any significant change would be discussed with the WFEC if the need arises.

Identify Considerations:

The comprehensive work plan is consistent with the more detailed Regional Strategy Committee (RSC) programs of work. If the WFEC does not support these programs of work as currently drafted, the forward momentum of Phase III is at risk.

Rationale for Recommendation(s):

The WFEC approval of the comprehensive work plan will enable continued work on Phase III.

Recommendation(s):

The WFEC acceptance of the comprehensive work plan.

Decision Method used:

☐ Subcommittee Consensus
☐ Modified Consensus (explain, i.e. majority, super-majority)
☐ Chair Decision

Proposal

Contact Information:
Jenna Sloan, 202-606-5858

WFEC Decision:
- ☐ WFEC Approves
- ☐ WFEC Approves with Modifications (not required to resubmit for WFEC approval)
- ☐ Need More Information (required to come back to WFEC for approval)
- ☐ WFEC Does Not Approve

_____

_____

Roy Johnson, DFO   Date

Notes regarding decision:

Phase III Comprehensive Work Plan (February 2012 – February 2013)

INTENT OF THE PHASE II REPORT COMMITMENTS

The Phase II Report commits the WFLC to providing a "report recommendation to the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, as a result of Phase III, by February 2013. A Regional Action Plan for each of the three regions will be completed in 2013, as well as a National Action Plan." The Phase II Report outlines five items expectations to be completed in Phase III:

    I.   <u>Identify Specific Regional Alternatives.</u>

        The intent of identifying specific regional alternatives is to illustrate strategic investment options developed at the regional level. Regional alternatives are strategic management options that reflect the organizational decision-space available for broad national and regional choices related to wildland fire management and policies; therefore a preferred alternative is not identified. Regional alternatives will identify which objectives will be emphasized and which actions/activities would be the priority under the scenario. Alternatives are broad and strategic; illustrate decision-space; and would require supplemental implementation actions to be identified if any of the alternatives is to be pursued. Alternatives would neither identify specific implementation actions (i.e. who will do what where and when), nor specific process actions (i.e. the Northern Great Basin must identify an aviation strategy); however it is expected that the analysis will inform specific actions the region may wish to pursue. These types of specific actions should therefore be captured as part of the Regional Action Plan. It is each RSC's responsibility to define regional alternatives for their region in a consistent report format (provided by the WFEC). Alternatives are developed through an iterative process with the support of the NSAT.

    II.   <u>Continue and Expand Outreach Within and Among the Regions Utilizing the Communications Framework.</u>

        Stakeholder engagement, involvement, and communication continue to be a priority for the entire cohesive strategy effort. The intent is to institutionalize the concepts, guiding principles, goals, and messages of the cohesive strategy through continued and improved engagement of existing stakeholders. Effort will also be made to reach out to new stakeholders (internal and external), recognizing that time constraints in Phase II limited some participant's involvement. The RSCs will engage in interactions with stakeholders about the alternatives; however the RSCs will determine the extent to which that is possible in the timeline given. Stakeholder involvement is incorporated in the RSC programs of work. National and Regional communication teams will address cohesive strategy communication needs at a variety of levels, allowing for closer cooperation and partnerships on region-specific issues. At the national level, the Communication Steering Group (CSG) will develop informational products for dissemination and will always be available for questions, advice and help. CSGs and RSCs will facilitate two-way communication among stakeholders ensuring messages and relationships are aligned with the CS's objectives.

    III.   <u>Continue to Identify Immediate Opportunities.</u>

        Regions have already identified immediate opportunities for success and effort to continue this work in Phase III is supported. Lessons learned will be widely shared.

    IV.   <u>Complete Regional and National Science-based Risk Analysis Reports.</u>

America's fire problems are complex and difficult to solve independently. To improve our collective understanding, we will gain more knowledge and context through the risk assessment and analysis process. Risk assessment and analysis provides scalable information for reducing risk at the local, regional, and national levels. The intent of the risk assessment and analysis is not to make a final decision as to which alternative management options will be selected. Rather, the intent is to derive information useful for further deliberations among stakeholders, partners, agencies, and policy makers at multiple scales as decision processes move forward within and beyond Phase III.

A Regional Risk Analysis Report as a result of the regional risk analysis will be developed by each RSC. A template for the Regional Analysis Reports will be defined. The RSCs and NSAT will collectively develop content for the report. The RSCs will need to determine the key findings from the analysis to be highlighted in the report (i.e. the story) as well as ensure the interpretations and conclusions remain consistent with the RSC's intent. The NSAT will need to ensure the science content of the report stays consistent with scientific understanding. It also seems reasonable to expect interactions among the NSAT, RSCs, CSSC, and WFEC groups to offer comment on the content of the regional reports.

The National Risk Analysis Report will be developed as a result of the regional analyses and Regional Analysis Reports. The a risk analysis pursued within each region will not be completed at the national level; however a national group will be able to interact with the regional analyses to assess and define national findings.. The National Risk Analysis Report will provide an executive summary of the risk analyses; document the risk analysis process including an explanation on risk characterization; summarize the regional analyses; describe the national-level findings and commitments based on regional risk analyses; and document the next steps for the cohesive strategy effort.

V.   Complete Regional Action Plans and a National Action Plan.
The intent of the Regional Action Plan is to capture actions the RSC has agreed to pursue in the next five years to make progress in achieving the three National Goals of the Cohesive Strategy. Specific actions are likely to be about process improvements related to the immediate successes identified; the barriers and solutions within the region's decision-space; pursing one of the initial or refined alternatives in whole or in part; information as a result of the regional or national risk analysis; feedback received through the communication and outreach effort; and/or the feedback based on stakeholder involvement throughout Phase III. Regional Action Plans also include the identification of performance measures. The action plans will identify who will do what, where, and by when. The intent is to create a mechanism for recording commitments the RSCs have made and to ensure accountability in completing the actions. The actions in each Regional Action Plan document the initial efforts in implementation of the cohesive strategy at the regional and local level in an effort to make a positive difference on-the-ground. A template will be provided to each RSC to illustrate the minimum content components of each Regional Action Plan.

The intent of the National Action Plan is to capture the national issues identified at the regional and local levels and determine a course of action to be taken to evaluate, address, and potentially resolve these issues. The National Action Plan

will be limited to addressing the barriers and proposed solutions identified in the Phase II Report as well as the barrier identified in the Regional Assessments.

The Phase II Report articulates a commitment that Phase III will produce the following eight end outcome deliverables. A Subcommittee has been assigned to complete the development of each deliverables and is responsible for providing a recommendation to WFEC by the date noted. Each deliverable must be vetted and accepted through the appropriate CSSC, WFEC, and/or WFLC channels prior to submitting the recommendation to the Secretaries; therefore the Subcommittee due dates are prior to February 2013 to allow for these review and surname processes. *Note: It may make sense to combine some deliverables into one report; therefore the WFEC will receive a future recommendation from the CSSC on how the deliverables could be packaged.*

1. Northeast Regional Risk Analysis Report [NE RSC by September 30, 2012]
2. Southeast Regional Risk Analysis Report [SE RSC by September 30, 2012]
3. West Regional Risk Analysis Report [West RSC by September 30, 2012]
4. Northeast Regional Action Plan [NE RSC by December 31, 2012]
5. Southeast Regional Action Plan [SE RSC by December 31, 2012]
6. West Regional Action Plan [West RSC by December 31, 2012]
7. National Risk Analysis Report [CSSC 1st draft by November 12, 2012; 2nd draft by December 3rd, final draft by December 17th]
8. National Action Plan [CSSC by December 31, 2012]

RESPONSIBILITES OF WFEC SUBCOMMITTEES
There are both interim and end deliverables to be developed throughout the course of the next year. Each WFEC subcommittee has responsibilities related to the development of the end deliverables. The responsibilities of each group in terms of interim and end deliverables as well as associated timeframes are described below.

Regional Strategy Subcommittees (RSC) are responsible to provide a recommendation to WFEC through the CSSC on the following interim deliverables:

1. Definition of regional performance metrics, measures, and/or factors unique to each region to be incorporated in both the Regional Risk Analysis and Report as well as the Regional Action Plan [Draft by June 18, finalized Regional Analysis Report and Action Plans by September 30]
2. Regional Risk Analysis Report defining Regional Alternative Investment Strategies for their region. [September 30]
3. Regional Action Plan. [December 31]

Cohesive Strategy Subcommittee is responsible to provide a recommendation to WFEC on the following deliverables:

1. Interim deliverables from the RSCs, NSAT, and Communications Steering Group, as tasked by the WFEC.
2. Comprehensive Program of Work for Cohesive Strategy Phase III, including deliverables, timelines, and responsible working groups and subcommittees. [March 12, for WFEC consideration March 16].
3. Process-related guidance for the RSCs' tasking to complete a Regional Risk Analysis Report, including a template for use by each Region. [July 30, for WFEC consideration August 3]
4. Process-related guidance for the RSCs' tasking to complete a Regional Action Plan, including a template for use by each Region. [April 2, for WFEC consideration April 6]
5. Definition of national performance metrics, measures, and/or factors unique to each region to be incorporated in the Regional Action Plan and National Action Plan, as appropriate. [1st draft May 14, 2nd draft by June 18, finalized National Analysis Report and Action Plans by November 1]
6. National Risk Analysis Report providing an executive summary of the risk analyses; documenting the risk analysis process; summarizing the regional analyses; describing the national results based on regional risk analyses; and documenting the path forward. [CSSC 1st draft by November 12; 2nd draft by December 3, final draft by December 17]

RESPONSIBILITES OF NATIONAL-LEVEL WORKING GROUPS
Each national-level working group has responsibilities related to the development of the end deliverables. The responsibilities of each group in terms of interim and end deliverables as well as associated timeframes are described below.

National Communications Steering Group is responsible to provide a recommendation to CSSC, unless otherwise specified by WFEC, on the following interim deliverables:

1. Appropriate communications products to ensure members of RSC/WG, NSAT, CSSC, WFEC, and WFLC are disseminating timely information to and receiving timely feedback, such as: [Ongoing]
    a. Concise talking points clearly explaining Phase III [March 30]
    b. Concise talking points describing how previous efforts connect to the CS (Quadrennial Fire Review, National Fire Plan, Forest Action Plans, etc.) [April 16]
    c. Monthly, or more frequent, updates. [March 15]
    d. Website revisions. [Ongoing, 1st Revisions completed by March 15]
2. Proposal on additional work and deliverables, including needs for resources and funding. The proposal will be evaluated by CSSC and recommended to WFEC. [April 16, for WFEC consideration April 20].
3. Complete any additional tasks and deliverables based on proposal. [TBD]

National Science and Analysis Team (NSAT) is responsible to support the RSCs in developing the interim deliverables described above including:

1. Document the availability, dating, consistency and condition of data necessary for analytical modeling. [Develop collectively with the RSCs. Draft by June 18, finalized in Regional Analysis Reports by September 30]
2. Document data gaps and identify data improvement needs for future revisions of the cohesive strategy and/or iterations of the risk analyses for future process improvements and address for future for consideration in
3. Document the RSC discussion of and rationale for performance measures to be utilized in the risk analyses. [Develop collectively with the RSCs. Draft by June 18, finalized in Regional Analysis Reports by September 30]
4. Document the risk analysis interactions with the RSCs, CSSC and other groups. [Develop collectively with the RSCs and content contained in the Regional Analysis Reports by September 30]
5. Definition of nationally consistent analytical process which can operate at regional scales using regionally specific data, relationships, and assumptions. Retain the individuality of the regions, recognizing regional differences, while employing a consistent analysis across the nation. [June 18]

MAJOR TASKS ASSOCIATED WITH DELIVERABLES

The development of each deliverable requires commitment and work from each of the Subcommittees. Many of the deliverables are interdependent and all Subcommittees will work closely throughout the next year. There are many actions, activities and steps each of the Subcommittees will engage in to meet the expectations defined by the WFEC and produce the deliverables within the given timeframes. The major tasks in terms of interim and end deliverables are described below. Note: the RSCs, NSAT, CSSC, and Communications Steering Group's individual programs of work contain greater detail on each step.

Administrative Tasks	
Major Task	**Lead Resource Name**
Determine tasking and membership for CSSC	WFEC – DFO
Determine tasking and membership for WRSC, NERSC, SERSC	WFEC – DFO
Determine tasking and membership for NSAT	WFEC – DFO
Determine tasking and membership for Communications Steering Group	WFEC – DFO

National Communications Support Activities	
Major Task	**Lead Resource Name**
Address Immediate National Communications Needs	Communications Group
Develop Key Messages	Communications Group
Identify audiences/stakeholders	Communications Group
Identify products/tools to develop including timeline	Communications Group
Develop Communication Products	Communications Group
Develop Briefing Papers	Communications Group
Develop Fact Sheets	Communications Group
Develop Frequently Asked Questions	Communications Group
Develop Templates for RSCs and Organizations to Use	Communications Group
Develop PowerPoint Template	Communications Group
Develop Sample Tweet	Communications Group
Develop Sample Facebook Post	Communications Group
Develop Podcasts	Communications Group
Develop Webcasts	Communications Group
Develop articles	Communications Group
Develop organizational communication processes	Communications Group
Interact with national-level stakeholders	Communications Group
Encourage and facilitate dialog among stakeholders	Communications Group
Monitor changes in stakeholder perceptions and understandings	Communications Group
Assess communications needs (what is working, what to improve)	Communications Group
Span the information gaps between the Regions.	Communications Group
Provide technical assistance when requested by the Regions.	Communications Group

Find and recruit assistance from human communication social scientists	Communications Group
Provide recommendations to RSCs on applications of evidence-based communication principles that solve issues.	Communications Group

Regional Risk Analysis Report	
Major Task	**Lead Resource Name**
Characterize Values to Estimate Risk	NSAT
Identify values	RSC/NSAT
Determine available data to represent values	RSC/NSAT
Validate model results for estimated risk	RSCs
Establish Linkages	RSC/NSAT
Identify factors that contribute to risk	RSC/NSAT
Establish Linkages between actions, contributing factors and risk	RSC/NSAT
Exploratory Analysis	
Develop an initial set of broad alternatives	RSC/NSAT
Review and concurrence by RSC	RSC
Engage with internal stakeholders for review of Initial Alternatives	RSC
Engage external stakeholders for review of Initial Alternatives	RSC
Develop Specific Alternatives	RSC/NSAT
Describe more detailed alternatives for further analysis	RSC/NSAT
Review and concurrence by RSC	RSC
Engage with internal stakeholders in review of alternatives	RSC
Engage stakeholders for review and feedback on alternatives	RSC
Conduct More Complete and Refined Analysis	RSC/NSAT
Explore potential decision space and role of external drivers (climate change, population, etc.)	RSC/NSAT
Identify dollars associated with alternatives	RSC/NSAT
Synthesize Results	RSC/NSAT
Determine key analysis findings – risks, opportunities, barriers, outcomes	RSC
Develop content for the Regional Risk Analysis Report	RSC/NSAT
Draft Report	RSC
Review and Surname	
CSSC Review Report	CSSC
WFEC Review Report	WFEC
WFLC Review/Approval of Report	WFLC

National Risk Analysis Report

Major Task	Lead Resource Name
Develop Content for the National Report	CSSC
Provide an executive summary of the risk analyses	CSSC/NSAT
Document the risk analysis process including an explanation on risk characterization	CSSC/NSAT
Summarize the regional analyses	CSSC/NSAT
Determine national group to interact in an analysis and assess results from national level	WFEC
Interact with the regional analyses (combinations of regional alternatives)	TBD
Describe the national-level findings based on regional risk analyses	TBD
Determine content – regional summaries and national alternatives (combos of regional alternatives)	TBD
Document the next steps for the cohesive strategy effort	CSSC
Review and Surname	
CSSC Review Report	CSSC
WFEC Review Report	WFEC
WFLC Review/Approval of Report	WFLC

Regional Action Plans

Major Task	Lead Resource Name
Develop Guidance and Template for Regional Action Plans	CSSC
Develop the guidance for using the Regional Action Plans	CSSC
CSSC Reviews and Concurs with template	CSSC
WFEC Reviews and Concurs with template	WFEC
Identify National Performance Measures	CSSC
WFEC Review and distribute to RSC if appropriate	WFEC
Develop Content for Regional Action Plan	RSC
Incorporate immediate opportunities from Phase II	RSC
Identify new opportunities	RSC
Identify Actions to mitigate barriers	RSC
Identify Regional Performance Measures	RSC
Stakeholder Review and Feedback	RSC
Invite stakeholders to participate	RSC
Determine review method	RSC
Logistics - location, materials, etc.	RSC
Develop agenda	RSC
Develop meeting material	RSC

Develop documentation of feedback	RSC
Review and Revise Regional Action Plan based on Regional Analysis Results	RSC
Address any new information from the analysis	RSC
Identify actions based on analysis	RSC
Complete final draft Regional Action Plan	RSC
Review and Surname	
CSSC Reviews and Concurs with Action Plan	CSSC
WFEC Reviews and Concurs with Action Plan	WFEC

National Action Plan	
Major Task	**Lead Resource Name**
Prioritize Barriers	CSSC
Identify the barriers from the Phase II	CSSC
Identify criteria for prioritization	CSSC
Request RSC prioritization of barriers	RSC
CSSC prioritize barriers based on feedback	CSSC
WFEC review and concurrence on barriers to be addressed	WFEC
Taskings to Address Barriers	
Determine who/which group will address each barrier	CSSC
Develop tasking and template for response to barriers	CSSC
Evaluate and validate each barrier	TBD
Develop proposal on actions to mitigate barrier	TBD
CSSC Review of Proposals	CSSC
Incorporate into National Action Plan	CSSC
Regional Risk Analyses Consideration	CSSC
Review and consider regional risk analyses	CSSC
Identify any new actions to address analyses findings	CSSC
Develop next steps/implementation strategies/monitoring	CSSC
Incorporate into National Action Plan	CSSC
Review and Surname	**CSSC**
Review and acceptance by CSSC	CSSC
Review and acceptance by WFEC	WFEC
Review and acceptance by WFLC	WFLC
Publish National Action Plan	**CSSC**