

Fire Management Planning Workshop - Notes January 26-28, 2016

Contents:

Workshop Agenda	Page 2
Workshop Participant List	Page 5
Notes and Highlights from Daily Discussions	Page 6
Summary of Key Action Items & Recommendations	Page 24

ACTION ITEMS

RECOMMENDATIONS

USFS Fire Management Planning Workshop - Agenda

Tuesday, January 26, 2016		
0800-0830	Greetings/Logistics/Introductions/ Strategy and Tactics for the next 3 days	Tami Parkinson, Laura Barrett, Frankie Romero
0830-0915	WO FAM Expectations and Goals	Elizabeth Reinhardt, Mark Lichtenstein
<u>Updates from Research and WO FAM</u>		
0915-0950	Risk Management Principles to Consider for Land Management Planning	Matt Thompson
0950-1000	BREAK	
1000-1130	Related Projects, Efforts, Initiatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LMP Tech Guide for Fire Mgt. Specialists & Visual Models for FAM Planning • WFMRD&A/WFDSS Objectives Briefing Paper • Spatial Fire Plans/FMRS • R5 RF Letter for Fire Planning • Draft WO Letter Re: Fire Planning 	Clint Cross Tim Sexton Laura Barrett Phil Bowden Elizabeth Reinhardt
1130-1230	LUNCH	
<p><u>Panel – Lessons Learned from Recent LMP Efforts –</u> 10 Min. Each with 30 min. Q&A at the end. <i>Presenters, please bring an electronic and 2 hardcopies of pertinent LMP sections to leave in the room for reference.</i></p> <p>How are you approaching fire management in your LMP revision? Any innovations/ ah-ha moments? How will the result benefit your spatial fire planning, incident decision making and related efforts? Major Issues? What would you do different next time?</p>		

1230-1430	R1 – Flathead R2 – San Juan R3 – Kaibab R5 – Sierra, Inyo, Sequoia R8 – Francis Marion WFMRD&A LMP Support	J. Krueger, R. Connell Cary Newman Ariel Leonard P. Bowden, J. Anderson Brian Schaffler L. Barrett/T. Parkinson
1430-1445	BREAK	

Tuesday, January 26, 2016 (continued)

Small Group Work Time – Identifying the Problems

1445-1600	Assign 3 Workgroups, Rotate ~30 min per station <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stumbling Points: What isn't working in LMP's and Fire Planning and how can we fix it? • Visual Model; how do all these planning parts fit together (Fire Response & Management Options)? • Open BIN item 	Moderators: Laura Barrett Clint Cross
1600-1630	Workgroup Report Outs and Group Discussion	Topic Moderators
1630-1700	Bin Items; Wrap-up; Expectations for Tomorrow	Parkinson, Barrett, Romero

Wednesday, January 27, 2016

0800-0815	Plan of attack for the day	
-----------	----------------------------	--

Background Information on USFS LMP's and FMP's How fire management does (or does not) fit in with the 2012 Planning Rule, NEPA, and other USFS Planning Guidance? Should Fire Management be a distinct section in new LMP's? What triggers NEPA? Are there flaws with our strategy of relying on LMP's for NEPA decisions and tiering other planning efforts in order to avoid NEPA so that they are nimble and can adjust to changing conditions?

0815-0900	USFS Fire Management Plans: Legal Challenges, Court Rulings, and Current Status	Alan Groesbeck
0900-0915	BREAK	
0915-1000	Land Management Plans, Land Management Planning and the NEPA process	Joe Carbone & Joe Krueger
1000-1130	Questions for Alan, Joe C., Joe K. or others	
1130-1230	LUNCH	
Small Group Work Time – Proposing Solutions		
1230-1500	<p>Assign 3 Workgroups- Café approach or stationary. Ponder Key Questions such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should we have a standard for fire response categories for all NFS lands? If not, why not? If so, what should they be? • Do we need to agree upon some basic fire management planning principles? (Exposure/Risk to Responders vs Gain and probability of success; statement of short vs long term risk/reward; etc.) • What are the accepted process(es) to conduct the supporting analyses (e.g. Risk Framework, StarFire, Cooperators meeting, etc.) 	<p>Moderators:</p> <p>Frankie Romero</p> <p>Tim Sexton</p> <p>Jim Menakis</p>
1500-1515	BREAK	
1515-1615	Workgroup Report-Outs and Group Discussion	TBD
1615-1700	Bin Items; Summarize Day's Events; DRAFT Recommendations; Expectations for Tomorrow	Parkinson, Barrett, Romero
Thursday, January 28, 2016		
0800-1000	Q & A with Alan, Joe, and others	Tami, Laura, Frankie
1000-1015	BREAK	

1015-1130	<p>Formulate Recommendations and Action Items: Specify Actions, Assign Responsibility, and Due Dates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific Actions to Improve Fire Management in LMP's • Specify Actions to Improve Fire Management Planning and Incident Response (Pre and post ignition) <p>Workforce Capacity Assessment—Can our current workforce meet the need or do we need to evolve? Identify Actions to achieve within current fiscal/organizational capability.</p>	<p>Moderators:</p> <p>Tami Parkinson</p> <p>Laura Barrett</p> <p>Frankie Romero</p>
1130-1230	LUNCH	
1230-1530	<p>Group Discussion – BIN, Review Remaining Stumbling Points & Fixes; Specify Actions (Assign Responsibility, and Due Dates, or Agree to Post-Pone), and <u>summarize recommendations for Leadership</u></p>	All
1530-1630	<p>Wrap up – Did we Achieve our Objectives? What Comes Next?</p>	All

Fire & Fuels Planning Workshop, January 26-28, 2016

Participant List (updated 1/28/16)

	Name	Area of Expertise	Home Unit	Contact Email
1	Elizabeth Reinhardt	AD – Fuels/Fire Ecology	WO-FAM	ereinhardt@fs.fed.us
2	Laura Barrett	Fire Planning	WO-FAM	lbarrett@fs.fed.us
3	Frankie Romero	Fire Use, Fuels	WO-FAM	fromero@fs.fed.us
4	Phil Bowden	S. Sierra Early Adopter Forests	Region 5 FAM	pbowden@fs.fed.us
5	Tim Sexton	Decision Making, Objectives, WFDSS	WFM RDA	timsexton@fs.fed.us
6	Lisa Elenz	Incident Objectives/ WFDSS	WFM RDA	lelenz@fs.fed.us
7	Matt Thompson	Risk Management, Economics	RM Research	mpthompson02@fs.fed.us
8	Rick Stratton	Fire Planning & Analysis	Region 6 FAM	rdstratton@fs.fed.us
9	Joe Carbone	Forest Plan Revision Process, NEPA	WO-NFS	jcarbone@fs.fed.us
10	Alan Groesbeck	Legal Aspects of Fire Mgt. Planning (Six Rivers Decision)	USDA OGC	Alan.Groesbeck@ogc.usda.gov
11	Bill VanBruggen	Regional Fire Director – Fire Program Mgt.	Region 3 FAM	bvanbruggen@fs.fed.us
12	Brian Schaffler	Fire Planning	R8 Francis Marion	bschaffler@fs.fed.us
13	Jennifer Anderson	S. Sierra Early Adopter Forests	Region 5 FAM	jenniferanderson@fs.fed.us
14	Ralph Rau	Dep. Forest Sup., NLOT	R1, Nez Perce	rerau@fs.fed.us
15	Alexis Martin	Fire Planner/Note Taker	R4, Payette	atmartin@fs.fed.us
16	Jon Regelbrugge	District Ranger, NLOT	R5, Inyo	jregelbrugge@fs.fed.us
17	Clint Cross	Fire & Fuels Planning	R8/WO Detail	clintcross@fs.fed.us
18	Laurie Kurth	Fire & Fuels Planning	WO FAM	lkurth@fs.fed.us

19	Andrew Bailey	WFDSS, GIS, Data Mgt.	WFMRDA	Andrew_Bailey@nps.gov
20	Cary Newman	Fire Planning	R2 FAM	cnewman01@fs.fed.us
21	Rick Connell	Forest Fire Staff, Fire Management	R1 Flathead NF	rconnell@fs.fed.us
22	Jim Menakis	Risk Assessment	WO-FAM	jmenakis@fs.fed.us
23	Ariel Leonard	Forest Planner	R3 Kaibab NF	aleonard@fs.fed.us
24	Joe Krueger	Environmental Coordinator	R1 Flathead NF	jkrueger@fs.fed.us
25	Jesse Duhnkrack	DOI Fire Planning and Policy/Observer	DOI-OWF	jesse_duhnkrack@ios.doi.gov
26	Tami Parkinson	Facilitator	WFMRDA	tparkinson@fs.fed.us
27	Joe Scott	Fire Analyst/ Observer	Contractor	info@pyrologix.com
28	Gary Brown	Drop-In; Regional Fire Planner	R4 FAM	
29	Tim Metzger	Drop-In; Fire Planning Specialist	FS Enterprise Team	
30	David Seesholtz	Drop-In; Liaison with NEPA/Planning LOT	FS PNWRS	
31	Mark Hale	Pre-meeting Consultation: Incident Objectives/ WFDSS	WFMRDA	mahale@fs.fed.us
32	Mark Lichtenstein	Fire Planning & Budget	WO-FAM	melichtenstein@fs.fed.us

Notes: Tuesday, January 26

- **Expectations and Goals:** From the WO (Reinhardt)- at the end of the week, come to common vision to send to fire leadership, LOT group, EMC that enhances link between LRMP and fire planning.
 - 2006- Six Rivers decision, Judge ruled that FS should have gone through NEPA when doing Fire Management Plan. Then in 2009 fire policy switched to two kinds of fires, tremendous opportunity to use wildfire. Confusing, what were the expectations of us. Then in 2012 there was the new forest planning rule, then in 2014 came the letter from Jim Hubbard to use Spatial Fire Planning.
 - Forests need better guidance in LRMP to incorporate into spatial planning. There is a disconnect from LRMP to spatial fire planning, some LRMPs do not even talk about using fire.
 - One other event, Randy Moore, letter directing in R5, will use risk assessments in forest plan revisions.
 - Overall, big picture goal is to be able to use fire responsibly and well.
 - Questions to answer: Understand the line between ecosystem planning and response to wildfire, how can we get to where we want to be so we can do the pre-planning, how much consistency across the agency can there be for those or what is more "grass-roots". What pieces of planning effort belong in LRMP, how much latitude do we have to interpret LRMP in spatial planning, or should LRMP be detailed in giving direction, can we be true to the spirit of NEPA and be true to planners.
 - One of the hard truths talked about by Senior Leaders (RF's, Deputy Chiefs, etc).: We need to do better pre-planning
 - We are in a good position this week to take recommendations forward.

- **Risk Management principles to consider for LRMP planning-Matt Thompson, ERM Presentation**

How to adjust LRMPs as things change on the land, or things that were wrong when the plan was written. Need an adaptive plan, still not there as an agency.

Desired conditions are not taking climate change into consideration. For example, are we planning for enough fire on the landscape (whether it is wanted or not). Or conversion of timber to grasslands, etc.

"We are setting up the landscape to burn under the worst conditions"-Finney, referring to fire management strategies that seeks to suppress most fires at the smallest size possible.

PODs: displayed map of wildfire risk, with red indicating high risk of damage/loss from wildfire and low chance of positive outcomes, green low risk of damage/harm and high chance of positive outcomes. What can we do in the red area to treat the fuels? Establish objects and tasks to improve the red to move towards green.

- **LMP Tech Guide-Clint Cross**

Objective is to provide specialists working on fire management portions of LMP's with tools and best practices for creating good LMP direction for fire management that can translate easily into Spatial Fire Planning elements that support fire management analysis & incident decision making.

Fire components (risk) need to be in LRMP but also useful for downstream of the LMP.

How will it fit in WFDSS

How will it fit in Fire Management Reference System

➤ **Objectives Briefing Paper-Tim Sexton**

Review of objectives in 2014 requested by Tom Harbor. More than 90% were generic and provide very little meaningful direction for incident commanders. Did another review in 2015 and saw improvement but there was still some misalignment in the direction that IMT gets. Intend to incorporate leader's intent, delegation of letter into WFDSS. There remains a lot of vagueness on objective priorities.

To achieve an objective, we have to expose firefighters to risk. Some objectives we will be willing to take more risk for than others. Though difficult to describe, it needs to be clear to a team. This should be part of the pre-planning conversations. **During workshop, have discussions to propose ideas on how to talk about this.**

➤ **R5 RF Letter for Fire Planning-Phil Bowden**

Needed RF letter because we were moving along without clear leader's intent related to LMP revision. The letter directed revision teams to integrate fire management and wildfire risk into LRMPs.

➤ **Draft WO Letter-Elizabeth Reinhardt:** Draft letter re: fire planning.

Over the course of the next few days, think about, if there is a letter coming from the WO, what would we recommend be in the letter, what will it say and who will it be from?

➤ **Spatial Fire Planning-FMRS-Laura Barrett:**

By 2016, spatial fire planning is required to be fully implemented across all forests. The fire management planning guide is replacing the Fire Planning Handbook. A briefing paper was drafted which highlights the need for spatial planning and using the FMRS, current risk process, though it had not been widely distributed. To successfully plan Spatial in WFDSS and in the FMRS, we must have fire at the table in the LMP revision process; with the ultimate goal of Incident Objectives and Requirements that help ICs prioritize.

➤ **Lessons Learned from recent LMP efforts:**

Listen for Common themes across forests (success, pitfalls)

Flathead: Show expected future fire trends, talks about climate change, need all the allotted time frame for completing plans, keeping it strategic to give managers flexibility, how do we take this strategic info into spatial planning-Flathead is using management areas/Zones and management option descriptions similar to those from the Alaska nomenclature (Critical, Full, Modified, Limited). Challenges are the non-fire issues such as wildlife habitat needs and how it changes as fire occur.

Lisa-recommends using Management Shapes, in WFDSS, to adjust each year to these changes, Joe said that would be a hard work load to keep up with, given that it is so hard to keep up right now. Lisa-this is a shift in thinking, how we do things. Is this a specialized position and do we need reorganization? This may likely drive us to spatial LAND planning, not just spatial fire planning; talk to non-fire planners about this.

San Juan: Cary Newman- Developed under 1982 Planning Rule, ROD signed 2013.

Plan components are tied to both Resource Direction and Area Direction. Fire and Fuels Management has a section under Resource Direction that provides clear goals for the management of wildfire in support of ecosystem benefit, however the language in that section did not change significantly from the draft LRMP in 2007 and therefore does not reference the two kinds of wildland fire set forth in the 2009 *Guidance for Implementation of the Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy*. Under Area Direction each Management Area and the 9 distinct areas in Management Area 2 has an "allowable uses" table which stipulates whether "fire managed for resource benefit" is allowable, restricted or prohibited. It is assumed that "fire managed for resource benefit" refers to unplanned natural ignitions.

Spatial Fire Planning – Management Areas became Strategic Objective shapes; Desired Conditions and some Objectives became Strategic Objectives. Standards and Guidelines became Management Requirements.

LRMP components: Desired Conditions, Objectives, Standards and Guidelines - how can/should the components be interpreted into Strategic Objectives vs Management Requirements? Cross walking is often vague.

What latitude do we have in synthesizing LRMP component statements into concise, meaningful Strategic Objectives or Management Requirements that are easily understood and useful to decision makers, fire managers and first responders? What are the liabilities of statement synthesis?

Why can't SO shapes overlap? SO shapes (in WFDSS) cannot overlap. You may have a Strategic Objective that applies to many but not all SO Shapes. You must activate that Strategic Objective for every SO Shape it applies to. When you draw a Planning Area that spans multiple SO Shapes where that Strategic Objective applies to you see those Strategic Objectives repeated multiple times in the Decision.

Kaibab-Highest priority for plan revision was to restore fire adapted communities, allows fire managing fire for resource objectives on most areas. Issues of redundancy in WFDSS were avoided by how LRMP was set up. What helped us: no big issues that prohibit fire, used interdisciplinary team throughout, active fire/fuels person on team.

Desired Conditions for Wildland Fire Management

- Wildland fire maintains and enhances resources and, as nearly as possible, is allowed to function in its natural ecological role.
- Regular fire entry protects social, economic, and ecological values at risk from high-severity disturbance effects.
- Wildland fires burn within the range of intensity and frequency of the historic fire regime of the vegetation community. Uncharacteristic high-severity fires rarely occur, and do not burn at the landscape scale.
- Wildland fire is understood, both internally and by the public, as a necessary natural disturbance process integral to the sustainability of the Kaibab NF's fire adapted vegetation communities.
- Information and education programs result in children and adults who recognize their responsibility for preventing human-caused wildfires.
- Wildfires are detected early.

Standards for Wildland Fire Management

- [Initial action](#) on human-caused wildfires will be to suppress the fire at the lowest cost with the fewest negative consequences with respect to firefighter and public safety.
- Managers will use a decision support process¹ to guide and document wildfire management decisions.

Guidelines for Wildland Fire Management

- Decision documents, which define the objectives and document line officer approval of the strategies chosen for wildfires that progress past [initial attack](#), should include interdisciplinary input to assess site-specific values at risk and develop incident objectives and courses of action to enhance or protect those values. At a minimum, the interdisciplinary team should:
 - Identify smoke sensitive receptors, and identify appropriate objectives and courses of action to minimize and mitigate impacts to those receptors.
 - Evaluate the risk of cheatgrass invasion. When there is a moderate to high risk of cheatgrass invasion, mitigation measures should be developed. If adequate treatments are not available, or if they are cost-prohibitive, objectives to minimize the burned area should be developed.
 - Develop objectives and courses of action to minimize fire-created openings to those within the reference range of variability for the vegetation community.
 - Develop objectives and courses of action to address the desired conditions for wildlife habitat and key habitat features such as snags, logs, large tree-form oaks, and oak thickets.
- If current or anticipated fire behavior and fire effects exceed the desired fire behavior and effects, protection objectives should be developed for wildfires, or a more conservative prescription

¹ The decision support system currently being used is the Wildland Fire Decision Support System (WFDSS).

window should be produced for prescribed burns. Strategies and tactics to mitigate those effects should be implemented on active wildland fires.

- Actively growing wildfires in the Desert Community vegetation type in Kanab Creek Wilderness should be suppressed, as this vegetation type is not known to be fire-adapted.
- Minimum Impact Suppression Tactics² should be used whenever they will successfully meet incident objectives, especially in the foreground of high scenic integrity areas.

Francis Marion LMP Revision-Brian Schaffler: Success for winning public approval for more burning: Use partners to convey the dangers of fire exclusion, show lots of scary pictures and data, being able to tell the story of why more fire on the ground, what will happen if we don't.

Data gathered for LMP revision benefited spatial planning: HVRA inventory, WUI analyzed and defined (3 ways), fire behavior modeling, meteorological data, fire occurrence, disturbance and forest activity data, FRCC delineation. Desired Conditions at the Forestwide Scale includes:

- Mimic historic fire return intervals using RX fire at low intensities.
- Reduce Wildfire Risk to human populations and infrastructure.
- Consider the broader landscape and work with adjacent landowners.

Objectives at the Forestwide Scale includes:

- **Consider the Broader Landscape:** Increase Wyden Agreements for RX by 10 percent within 10 years.
- **Reduce Wildfire Risk:** Assist counties in developing county wide CWPP's within 10 years of plan approval.

Two Management Areas (MA 1 & MA2).

- The primary difference between them is the ability to safely apply landscape-level, low intensity, and frequent RX fire.

Do different? Use SouthWRAP for LMP would save Fire Planner a lot of effort

Sierra NF: for fire in LMP, the focus was the use of wildfire because that is where the work will get done, can't get it done with Rx alone, didn't have a fire person on team but really needed one- is a critical team member to have someone like a fire ecologist, benefits to spatial fire planning- zones will SOS with objectives, other info will be management requirements, a regional level person on the steering committee would be beneficial to provide the decision guidance
Do different: start sooner, integrate earlier, some support on how to synthesize all the info, guidance document perhaps? Used Fire MAs that spoke to the focus of the area: WUI protection, General Forest protection, maintenance, and Resource benefit, but did not direct one action only. Each area has a continuum that considers the focus of the area and the current conditions of the fuels to inform the decision maker (Critical Protection, General Protection, Restoration, and Maintenance). Region 5 used MAs because they thought they needed a "hammer" or strong LMP leverage to encourage more management of wildfires for resources, over suppression actions when appropriate.

Spatial Fire Planning in WFDSS-Lisa Elenz

Don't re-create the wheel, use tools you already have such as FMUs from FPA if they would work and can be tied to decisions in your LMP

Be sure line is involved and other resources as well

This does not need to be a cut-and-paste effort from LMP to WFDSS, there is room for some interpretation!

Notes: Wednesday, January 27, 2016

➤ Forest Service Fire Management Plans-Alan Groesbeck (OGC)

(FS) decisions not made until we respond to a fire

Programmatic direction, is NEPA required? In the case of Retardant the FS did a nationwide analysis.

Irreversible & Irretrievable commitment of resources (req's NEPA before this point, if in planning, but not in an emergency response)

? Site specific NEPA is difficult on fires, because conditions are not known

Decision for Six Rivers Case: the FS failed to do NEPA on their FMP where they made decisions on response that was not made in the LMP

Maintain Line Officer and IC discretion, or else there must be a robust discussion, within NEPA, including alternatives.

In NEPA discussion, LRMP, we must discuss fire, or we'll have to do it someplace else. We didn't do NEPA on the FMP, but said that we should suppress all fires in the Highway 199 corridor; however we couldn't clearly tie that to anything covered by NEPA.

To remedy to court decision- FS pulled FMPs.

Can't do FMP and NEPA in time frames required for annual FMP

Maintain discretions for Line Officers and ICs to respond depending on conditions/situation, what's happening and why you'd respond 999/1000.

Adaptive management allows you to adjust to changes...nepa?

Six Rivers Decision:

That particular Judge sees FMP like an LRMP, they should have NEPA because:

- 1) Fire Response can in some cases result in "irretrievable commitment of resources", or the loss of something that you won't easily get back
- 2) The way the FMP was designed and used removed discretion from the manager and required a particular response under certain conditions, which in turn could result in "irretrievable commitment of resources"

Lessons Learned: Everyone knows that as a practical matter, FMP development and periodic updates cannot comply with NEPA timelines, so:

- Move appropriate FMP parts into the LRMP, rather than stand-alone doc, but know that can't simply dump all the fire discussion into the LRMP and hope LRMP NEPA will cover it.

- Give plenty of discretion to line officers and ICs, judges didn't like absolutes such as only one way of doing something, (ie condition X= response Y) unless there is an in-depth NEPA analysis of alternatives to support the conclusion.
 - FMP - Do not make decisions that are not found in the LMP (e.g. the Six Rivers FMP stated that suppression was the response along the Hwy 199 corridor, but this was not found in the LMP).
 - Leave language open that in general may suggest but does not require a particular response.
 - Allow for actual response decisions to be made by responsible officials when the location and conditions are known rather than in advance.
- Be careful with standards and guidelines-are they realistic? Can they be achieved, given budget and personnel constraints?

NEPA: When bringing fire into LRMP, then LRMP EIS must discuss fire

➤ **LMPs, Land Management Planning and NEPA-Joe Carbone/Joe Krueger**

Joe Carbone (EMC)

- NEPA applies to decisions that are made, if no decision, no NEPA.
- - checklist of when NEPA applies (objectives?)
- programmatic NEPA (Strategic Decisions/Plans) more mileage we can get of this the better
- Emergency Response (no NEPA documentation) 2008, post 6-rivers. Not every response is necessarily an emergency.
- Run Cards: (my thoughts, Laura) if we are clear on the objectives, what they will protect, they don't necessarily have to suppress the entire perimeter...note that we have multiple objective fires...we need to change the culture to be more clear about this within fire.

Anchor to:

- NEPA applies to agency proposals and decisions only
- There are USDA and FS NEPA regulations
- FS regulations line out when NEPA applies; applies when we are making a decision and ensures we are considering the environment when we make a decision.
- Strategic LRMP decisions requires programmatic NEPA: covers strategic broad decisions, expectation is that it is not in great detail.
- Emergency Response: No NEPA documentation required, not subject to NEPA – this is a change since the 2006 ruling on the Six Rivers FMP
 - 36 CFR 220.4 USFS NEPA Procedures: (b) *Emergency responses*. When the responsible official determines that an emergency exists that makes it necessary to take urgently needed actions before preparing a NEPA analysis and any required documentation in accordance with ... [for EISs, CEAs, and EAs] ... then the following provisions apply. (1) The responsible official may take actions necessary to control the immediate impacts of the emergency and are urgently needed to mitigate harm to life, property, or important natural or cultural resources. When taking such actions, the responsible official shall take into account the probable environmental consequences of the emergency action and mitigate foreseeable adverse environmental effects to the extent practical.

- Fire Recovery Decisions: Site-Specific NEPA – Not BAER, but more like reforestation and restoration plans

Joe Krueger (Flathead NF Planner)

- can't really tie it to
- EIS, fire section, where we won't be doing NEPA later on huge effects analysis. CHALLENGE.
- what is the right mix...for natural process (don't do rain).
- maintain as much flexibility as we can in the plan, but challenge is in the EIS.
- Tech Guide (tie to 6 rivers decision)...effects analysis
- adaptive strategies under different conditions and how you would act. Allow discretion to play out on ground...but consider potential conditions.
- we want an example of a plan that meets the six rivers Decision
- if you have suitability of resource benefit/ suppression (but does the EIS actually cover those 'decision'.
- In General: these area will manage fire for benefits and these for suppression, but don't need to be too specific, because it is programmatic. Programmatic statements need general wording.
- forests need to be thinking about spatial components (Clearly define the need to put spatial information in WFDSS) (Tech Guide)
- examples of good direction in WFDSS (protect from fire...how?, from high intensity fire, from any fire, from really smoke during this time, from suppression efforts).
- TECH GUIDE SOULD DRAW THE TIE TO SPATIAL FIRE PLANNING/ANALYSIS IN WFDSS!

Desired Conditions, Objectives, Standards and Guides-

Describe Highly Valued Resources and Assets (HVRAs in LRMP)

Action: (Cary) Need to make a decision-In the tech guide will we provide an avenue to manage for protection objectives only for some forests?, and explain why this avenue remains open.

Alan: Keep direction broad, may state a typical response might be suppression in a particular area to protect values but not state specific response for a particular area.

Lisa: What are the issues on the landscape and how will fire impact? How to pull that out of LRMP and into WFDSS?

Rick: We need spatial LRMPs

Plan the LRMP with respect to fire management, so it can move easily into decision making tool (WFDSS or other).

TechGuide-direction stating how to address changes since LRMP was written, based on site specific EIS, EAs??

Ariel: LRMP Guidelines: must adhere to the intent. Might be permissible to not follow a Guideline specifically, but must demonstrate how you are meeting intent.

Ariel: There are ways in the LRMP, monitoring, to address the effects of wildfires and we should be looking at these. Assess the effect of fire suppression, uncharacteristic wildfires. Need to utilize monitoring plan and use them to inform the LRMP over time.

LRMP/spatial fire planning needs to contain information that informs line/managers when a fire starts.

Changing zones, can be done, just have to follow the process.

Tami: How can we give direction to forests for LRMP direction into spatial planning, regarding using verbiage verbatim, latitude to manipulate wording without changing decision?

Alan: If LRMP is silent on issue, then acting on best available info may be okay. If direction given is not useful, need a plan amendment.

Breakout Groups

➤ **Pros/Cons of Adopting National Standard Fire Mgt. Objective Categories – Examples: Alaska Fire Mgt. Options (Critical, Full, Modified, Limited); S. Sierras LMP categories (Critical, General, Restoration, Maintenance)**

Pro:

- Standardized terminology helps improve communication for responders,
- Forces us to use a range of categories of responses (rather than just suppression)
- Forces a risk/benefits analysis
- Enhances communication with public/stakeholders
- Accountability – did we respond in the manner in which we said we would?

Cons:

- May be overly restrictive
- Could constrain the planning team
- Language matters, **how they are described is critically important**
- If contained within LRMP then have to amend as conditions on landscape change
- Using a specific tool to get there, would be a drawback,
- Increased understanding by public leads to increased scrutiny.
- Those things near boundaries could end up on the “wrong side of fence”. Need to be able to move the “fence” but this could be difficult when contained within the LRMP.

Could live with it if:

- Standardized locally
- Defined by LRMP objectives
- Didn't force a forests hand to use a certain category
- It keeps terminology consistent over the years, to until at least a revision of the LRMP
- Keeping it at the “why” (objectives), not the “how” (strategy)

Take out the name "response" category, another name such as "management continuum" category. Response implies how we would respond, what we will send

Within LRMP it is very difficult to have a flexible "fence".

Could have it as a guideline within LRMP, easy to change the "fence" without amendment,

Question about NEPA when "moving the fence", would it need to be done?

Make categories optional, but encourage that they be used, make it standardized categories to use.

Special group to work on this

Bring in social science experts to help; to address effective communication/language that public would understand.

➤ Risk Process Options feeding into LRMPs

End point wants:

- Info needed for decision making for wildland fire
- Spatial and clearly defined
 - Impacts/benefits priorities where, why, when
- Promoting the benefit of fire
- Ability to address smoke issues
- Info to help balance outside constraints
- Match reporting metrics
- Unified approach to litigations
- Temporal conflict LRMP vs risk assessment

Pieces we want:

- Probability of fire, risk assess
- Benefits/negatives of fire (values/resources)
- FM Intensity Class
- Net value change
- Transmission (where fire comes from)
- Public and private support, collaboration with partners, help understand risk in short and long term
- Issues: who is available to do this work
- Expertise to interpret information/data
- Conflict: temporal conflict between LRMP and risk assessment, risk changes as landscape changes
- Recommendations: FSim run at national level (Phil), spend a few VLAT equivalents and get it done. (Rick Stratton) Recommends a Landfire-type approach, where this is run periodically at scales that can be used by the Regions/Forests, as a minimum.
- Overall, it seemed that risk assessment was the way most people want to go.

➤ **National Fire Management Planning Principles that translate thru to Meaningful Incident Objectives & Requirements:**

- Flexible and Adaptive
- Consistent and Compatible: terminology, desired conditions statements for fire risk
- Collaborative
- Clear and Comprehensive
- Spatial/temporally scalable
- Best Available Science
- Actions based on need for change -don't do it unless there is a need
- Be realistic
- Acknowledge the need for fire on the landscape at the appropriate scale and severity
- Engage stakeholders when determining values at risk and strategies for addressing them
- Don't promise what cannot be delivered
- Use wildland fire to achieve multiple resource benefits, with the emphasis on wildfire, we are at about 3 million (rx and wildfire) need to be at about
- Plan for the best/right mix of resources in the best/right place to protect value at risk and achieve resource objectives (both in planning and response)
- Ensure all planning team members are informed of resilience/sustain of DFC statements
- Include/conduct quantitative risk assessment with spatial display to inform LRMPs and SFP and/or qualitative risk assessment with spatial display
- Plan the fire related LMP language and spatial attributes to be used in the decision support system so it transfers easily, rather than trying to retrofit after the fact.
- The level of standardization needs to be commensurate with scale (national level=general standards, forest=more detailed standards)
- Fire is an ecological process, not just a tool
- Risk assessments include benefits not just losses
- Fire IS interdisciplinary, affects virtually all resource areas (pros/cons)

➤ **Other Topics:**

Demonstrate and highlight the link between better LRMP/spatial planning and firefighter safety to take forward to senior leadership – Better LMP objectives = Better Fuel Conditions = Safer conditions for firefighters and public

Guidance for Spatial Fire Planning compliance for forest using current LRMPs.

Cross check with Federal Fire Policy

Notes: Thursday, January 28, 2016

Lisa: Can the language from LRMP be modified when put into WFDSS? Alan- LRMP language can be different, Reasonable interpretation would be okay, but best to be consistent. Trouble may be if it isn't entirely clear.

Cary: What latitude do we have to take outdate language and synthesize into current? Alan-Be sure it is reasonable interpretation; be sure it does not contradict. (same as above statement)

For both of the above questions, have it documented somewhere, why language is changed, rationale.

If the plan doesn't say anything about managing for resource objectives (plan is silent), describe what you want to do and how it is going to move towards desired condition.

Phil: In CA, we are still regulated for wildfire when we cross the "line" from emergency to non-emergency. Law was set up when it was WFU or prescribed natural fire. Where does it become questionable if it has crossed the emergency line. Alan: not sure exactly where on the continuum, but for CA, the more people on the fire, the further it is away from an emergency=the more managed, the less it is an emergency.

NOTE: There were other interpretations of what constitutes an "Emergency" other than this one provided above. (e.g. any ignition = Emergency in terms of the jurisdictional agency always has a duty to monitor and act to protect values and enhance resources when conditions warrant) However, given the limited time available, this workshop did not endeavor to define what may or may not constitute an Emergency as it pertains to interpretations by individual smoke regulators such as CA, or 36 CFR 220.4 USFS NEPA Procedures discussed earlier in the workshop.

In LMP: maximize discretion to the line officer, as a general rule, if you are within prescription, regulations, etc. won't be liable, we need to follow what we said we were going to follow and then usually are not held liable.

Generally, handbooks, manuals are not binding, if you don't follow the directives, document why not.

Standards, guides do not expire; make sure they are realistic and clear. Avoid the boiler plate, be sure what you say is good for that situation; ensure plan is crafted for specific landscape. Will have problems if what you are doing on the land contradicts the standards/guidelines.

LMPs are difficult to challenge, plans to a specific project are easier

Take a look at the preamble to the 2012 Planning Rule (It's the reason behind the intent of the Rule).

We have replaced FMPs with spatial fire planning and FMRS, direction states that we will use FMPs so are we okay? Alan: we are okay, just need to have an instrument to explain what we are doing. These instruments demonstrate that we have thought about and planned for unplanned ignitions (fires that we can't do NEPA on because there isn't time once it has started). EIS is done on LRMP which talks about wildfire=EIS done on wildfire

Lisa: Alan, what makes you nervous? Alan: In the plan whatever you say, make sure it is backed up by NEPA. It is the best practice. Will run into trouble if you stretch the NEPA or don't follow it. Give line officer as much discretion as possible. Have the NEPA to show that you looked and thought about things. Line officer to look at all alternatives-Which is the most enviro friendly alternative, what are the enviro impacts of all the alternatives, then explain why the particular alternative is selected? Judges are skeptical about "after the fact" decisions.

Advice for us on, line officer can't be everywhere, our planning and operational tools are designed to support managers because line is not always available. Forest Service speaks to the Responsible official=who has the delegated authority, so this is covered through delegation letters to duty officers, incident commanders, acting line officers, agency administrators, etc.

Frankie: Do we want to craft our FMRS docs to say conditions "indicate" a response rather than state there is only "one particular" response? If you do state a single response, then should have NEPA to back that up. It is better to put all the available info (indicators) in front of the decision maker, then let them decide, this keeps a broader decision space for responsible official. The responsible official should have as much decision space as possible to make a good decision in regards to safety, risk, etc. Alan: **FMRS documents** should favor 'indicators' of particular response & avoid specifying a particular response, so the delegated official retains the final decision on how to manage the fire.

➤ **Draft Fire Integration in LMP Flow Chart**

Question: do we want to say "you will do an assessment" and provide guidance on how to do it. Manual direction says you can't develop any new LRMP information without an assessment, risk assessment ahead of LRMP assess allows fire to bring something to the LRMP team table.

Action?: Quantitative nation-wide assessment to provide to all forest.

Once LRMP assessment starts, the clock has started. Keeping the risk assessment before LRMP assessment, buys you more time to complete a quality assessment before the LMP assessment clock starts ticking. (Is this what we want to recommend?) This would reduce the angst about meeting tight timelines among employees.

What are the most useful elements from a quantitative assessment to inform an LRMP: the zone descriptions (conditional net value change, where it occurs and the source of the net value change, ignition points, perimeters in order to get a sense of risk, use data from Fsim), HVRAs, # historical fires, acres, cause. Most important: identify HVRAs

Risk assessment may be ideal, using term useful,

Suggest changing the name to Wildfire Effects Assessment or Wildfire Assessment; Joe Scott – the GTR already gives it a name, to call it something else could cause even more confusion.

Qualitative baseline: HRVA character
Quantitative: FSIM

There isn't really one or the other,

Where is the line between providing guidance about what to bring to the LRMP table without overly confining, putting un-needed burden on what the assessment might be. (What is the 'right' level of analysis...best bang for the buck?)

Think all are in agreement that at a minimum completing a wildfire effects/risk assessment strongly recommended, perhaps required.

What are the governing directives for LRMP planning? Put it in an introductory paragraph that along with it's nice to do it, it is also required.

There is a draft Technical Guide for integrating fire into the LRMP revision process out, we didn't want to broadly share because felt input would drastically change the draft, it really wasn't ready to present, is "extremely" draft, "like a plate of runny eggs", just not ready to serve yet.

Action: Send out draft guide to group for feedback/review.

Suggested avenues: Strategic Fire management Zones (LMP MAs) or fire integrated into LRMP MAs (other resources) but is very limiting and may set up forest for failure. Providing more options now. Offer up a few options with pros/cons of each to help the field determine which one is best for them.

Joe K: don't limit yourself through geographic areas, can also use other tools such as standards, guidelines, ask yourself what you want out of it? You want a spatial way to manage fire.

The guide needs to be written in such a way that would allow fire plan components to fall into any of the four boxes (see PowerPoint), needs to flow downstream to spatial fire planning

Important to have a spectrum of expertise on the group for development of the LRMP/spatial planning from risk assessment experts, LMP planners, on the ground fire managers (the implementers) WFDSS experts, other? Etc.

Action Item: Do we need to invite anyone else to the calls?

➤ Identify Priority Areas for Further Action or Improvement

1. Tech Guide/LRMP Planning

- Plan the LRMP to flow into spatial planning
- Spatial LRMPs should be our goal.
- Roll-out plan to/thru a variety of groups
- Ensure the tech guide helps implement 2 kinds of fire policy (consistent with other guides)
- Ensure smoke is addressed (Might work with NWCG Smoke group or Pete Lahm)
- Ensure Plan components are not too constraining, leave final decision to time of incident
- Monitoring
- Commitment of resources (irretrievable)
- If LRMP describes management zones but not specify where, then map can be update and maintained annually or more frequently.
- Keep line officer/IC discretion, judges don't like absolutes (condition x=response y)
Prioritization: same as decisions, give discretion to LO/IC. Prohibition/requirement must be from LRMP or NEPA decision. Keep specific response decisions out of LRMP
- Get LMP planning team tuned into spatial fire planning up front (specify type of data/ outputs)
- Identify resource concerns and how fire affects it both detrimentally and enhances (even better if this can be by FIL or some other measurable attribute)
- Be careful with standards/guides, are they realistic, achievable?
- LRMP must address fire, per FHS 1909 23.11, drives toward fire management section in LRMP
- If the plan doesn't say anything about managing for resource objectives (plan is silent), describe what you want to do and how it is going to move towards desired condition.
- Identify the triggers to evaluate and update LMPs, Amendments
- Link Why & How
- Move appropriate parts of the FMP to the LMP
- Prioritization: Same as decisions (prohibition/requirement)
- Give discretion to LO/IC
- Must be from LMP or NEPA decision
- LMP Guidelines must adhere to intent. If it's not followed specifically, then it must demonstrate how it meets the intent
- If LMP describes response zones but not specifically where zones are?
 - Then Map can be updated outside of the LMP, and annually or as needed without an amendment
- FMRS: operational plans that tie to LMP (make sure we're getting out of the LMP what we need to for these plans.)

Recommendations

- Name change to Tech Guide-EMC
- Joint letter of support from EMC/FAM

2. Fire Management Planning/FMRS Guidebook AND Spatial Fire Planning WFDSS

- Help the field synthesize/interpret LRMP terminology into WFDSS (LRMP desired condition, goals, objectives, standards, guidelines converted to strategic objectives, management requirements in WFDSS) with examples
- Standardized terminology, possibly a dropdown in WFDSS, 2 kinds of fire-consistent and clear (tied more to objectives than response)
- Use examples from forests that have completed spatial fire planning, share with OGC and decide if it's okay, is it defensible
- Lessons learned from "early adopters" of SFP, Briefing Paper??
- Guidebook updated as necessary, new plans will be basis for SFP (capture this expectation, so that Forests don't just roll over old FMUs in WFDSS, but take full advantage of the Spatial Fire Planning – the expectation of letter)
- Update guide to ensure SFP is completed, how was it done, how well is this translating in decision process? Measure in Fire reviews and WO/Regional/Forest Reviews
- FMRS: Old plans" if silent, then acting on best available info may be okay, if direction given is not useful, need LRMP amendment
- Guidance for synthesizing LMP language to SFP in WFDSS
- Old Plans: If silent, then acting on best info may be OK. If direction given is not useful, then may need amendment to use fire or make useful spatially in WFDSS (Tech guide?)
- Field needs guidance when there is conflicting interpretations on meeting SFP requirements

3. Other:

- 'Fire Response Zones' (Scope this out) and develop a proposal
- Communicate to the field
- Fire/EMC at WO/RO level will plan for and provide roll-out strategy/activities
- Create schematic of various guides and the intent of each.
- Use LMP process as basis for developing a visual diagram for the Tech guide and show "on ramps" for fire management planning involvement
- WO FAM will provide National Wildfire Risk Assessment product regional/local use
- Add spatial fire planning/FMRS criteria to large fire review checklist (future fuels checklist)- Elizabeth/Mark
- Draft communication tools with consistent language re; 2 types of fire, how we describe wildfire effects (describe these based on strategic/incident objectives, did we achieve objectives or not).
- **Demonstrate link with Firefighter Safety in communications** – Good LMP direction for fire management defines what is at risk and what opportunities exist which are fundamental aspects of sound risk management. LMP's that are easily translated into strategic fire management objectives result in clarity of purpose for responders and the public; LMP's that strive towards more resilient fire dependent landscapes can result in lowering overall forest fuel quantities over time which can enhance firefighter & public safety while protecting and enhancing our natural resources. **Important IDEA FOR NLOT! (Ralph Rau)**
- EMC will propose shift to spatial LMP in 2017 innovation meeting (Joe C)
- LMP planners lesson learned meeting (May)- Joe Krueger, will share lessons from this meeting
- Briefing for fire NLOT (include workshop notes)-Jon, Ralph, NEPA NLOT (David Seesholtz, Joe Carbone)

- Early adopter (EMC) calls, report from this group-**Joe Krueger + 'helper'** from meeting, will roll out 'findings', etc from this meeting
- Matrix of wildfire risk assessment, money/time/expertise to produce various risk assessment products-WO FAM, **Jim M.**
- Consider early " review" release of tech guide-**Joe Carbone, Clint Cross**
- Send brief to fire/fuels planners, LRMP planners to alert to this effort-**Elizabeth, Joe Carbone**
- Cross check w/ Fed Fire Policy

➤ **Additional Action Items for consideration**

- **Draft Categories**
 - Definitions & How Many
- **Words of Wisdom/ Do's & Don't to Share**
 - New Plans, Old Plans, When to Amend
 - Level of Interpreting that OK
- **Review/Confirm Recommendations**
- **Clarify/crosswalk LMP objectives/Standards/Guidelines to WFDSS Strategic Objectives**

USFS Fire Management Planning Workshop January 26-28, 2016

SUMMARY

The following discussion/action items and recommendations emerged as a result of the USFS Fire Management Planning Workshop held in Boise, Idaho where well over 20 participants including fire planners, fire management officers, NEPA planners, Environmental Coordinators, Line Officers, Fire Directors, and legal expertise from Department of Agriculture OGC gathered to discuss opportunities to improve strategic fire management planning as it relates to Land Management Plans, Spatial Fire Planning and Fire Management Reference System components. More details and context are captured in the full workshop notes, so please refer to those for additional information.

Discussion/Action Items Specific to LMP Tech Guide		
What (action, key point, etc.)?	Who?	When?
<p>Conduct wildfire effects/risk assessment prior to LMP assessment to “keep the LMP timeline clock from starting”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the most useful elements from a quantitative assessment to inform an LRMP? the zone descriptions (conditional net value change, where it occurs and the source of the net value change, ignition points, perimeters in order to get a sense of risk, use data from Fsim), HVRAs, # historical fires, acres, cause. Most important: identify HVRAs • Identify resource concerns and how fire affects it both detrimentally and enhances (even better if this can be by FIL or some other measurable attribute) • Where is the line between providing guidance about what to bring to the LRMP table without overly confining, putting un-needed burden on what the assessment might be. (What is the ‘right’ level of analysis...best bang for the buck?) • Suggestions to change the name to Wildfire Effects Assessment or Wildfire Assessment 	Tech Guide Group	On Final Draft Release
<p>Use LMP process as basis for developing a visual diagram for the Tech guide and show “on ramps” for fire management planning involvement</p>	Tech Guide Group	On Final Draft Release

Put LMP governing directives in an introductory paragraph	Tech Guide Group	On Final Draft Release
<p>Give discretion to line officers, FMO's and ICs; plans should not specify only one way of doing something, (i.e. condition X= response Y) unless there is an in-depth NEPA analysis of alternatives to support the conclusion. Also with prioritization, give discretion to line officer, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FMP - Do not make decisions that are not found in the LMP (e.g. the Six Rivers FMP stated that suppression was the response along the Hwy 199 corridor, but this was not found in the LMP). • Leave language open that in general may suggest but does not require a particular response. • Allow for actual response decisions to be made by responsible officials when the location and conditions are known rather than in advance. • Generally, directives are not binding, if not followed document why not • 	Tech Guide Group	On Final Draft Release
<p>LMP Standards, guides do not expire; make sure they are realistic and clear. Avoid the boiler plate, be sure what you say is good for that situation; ensure plan is crafted for specific landscape. Will have problems if what you are doing on the land contradicts the standards/guidelines. Can they be achieved, given budget and personnel constraints? Need to follow what we said we were going to follow and then usually are not held liable, stay within regulations and prescriptions.</p> <p>LMP Guidelines must adhere to intent. If it's not followed specifically, then it must demonstrate how it meets the intent</p>	Tech Guide Group	On Final Draft Release
In the LMP whatever you say, make sure it is backed up by NEPA. Will run into trouble if you stretch the NEPA or don't follow it. Have the NEPA to show that you looked and thought about things while giving line officer as much discretion as possible	Tech Guide Group	On Final Draft Release
Create schematic of various guides and the intent of each.	Tech Guide Group	On Final Draft Release

If LFMP is silent on issue, then acting on best available info may be okay. If direction given is not useful, need a plan amendment.	Tech Guide Group	On Final Draft Release
Move appropriate parts of the FMP to the LMP	Tech Guide Group	On Final Draft Release
Forests need to be thinking about spatial components, tech guide should clearly define the need to put spatial information into WFDSS, TECH GUIDE SHOULD DRAW THE TIE TO SPATIAL FIRE PLANNING/ANALYSIS IN WFDSS, plan the LMP with respect to fire management so it can move easily into decision making tool (WFDSS or other), possibly have spatial LMPs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Get LMP planning team tuned into spatial fire planning up front, specify types of data/ outputs needed from LMP 	Tech Guide Group	On Final Draft Release
Decide if there will be an avenue to manage some areas of forests for protection objectives only, and explain why this avenue remains open. Describe this in the tech guide	Tech Guide Group	On Final Draft Release
There are ways in the LRMP, monitoring, to address the effects of wildfires and we should be looking at these. Assess the effect of fire suppression, uncharacteristic wildfires. Need to utilize monitoring plan and use them to inform the LRMP over time.	Tech Guide Group	On Final Draft Release
Cross check with Federal Fire Policy Ensure the tech guide helps implement 2 kinds of wildland fire (wildfire and rx) policy(consistent with other guides)	Tech Guide Group	On Final Draft Release
State in tech guide: Important to have a spectrum of expertise on the group for development of the LRMP/spatial planning from risk assessment experts, LMP planners, on the ground fire managers (the implementers) WFDSS experts, other? Etc	Tech Guide Group	On Final Draft Release
LMP describes response zones but not specifically where zones are? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Then Map can be updated outside of the LMP, and annually or as needed without an amendment 	Tech Guide Group	On Final Draft Release
FMRS: operational plans that tie to LMP (make sure we're getting out of the LMP what we need to for these plans.)	Tech Guide Group	On Final Draft Release
Advise Fire/Fuels Specialists to take a look at the preamble to the 2012 Planning Rule (It's the reason behind the intent of the Rule).	Tech Guide Group	On Final Draft Release

Strategic LRMP decisions require programmatic NEPA: covers strategic broad decisions, expectation is that it is not in great detail.	Tech Guide Group	On Final Draft Release
Emergency Response - No NEPA documentation required, not subject to NEPA – this is a change since the 2006 ruling on the Six Rivers FMP (see 36 CFR 220.4 USFS NEPA Procedures)	Tech Guide Group	On Final Draft Release
LMP Guidelines - allows for alternative means or actions than those described but must adhere to the intent. If the actions described by the guideline are not followed specifically, then must demonstrate how meeting intent.	Tech Guide Group	On Final Draft Release
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify the triggers to evaluate and update LMPs, Amendments 	Tech Guide Group	
Change the name of the Fire Management LMP Tech Guide that FAM has initiated to conform with EMC standards	Tech Guide Group	due by release of final draft
ACTION: Send Draft Technical Guide to Integrating Fire in the LMP Revision Process out to all workshop participants for review/comment.	Tech Guide Group	Feb. 12; reply due Mar. 4, 2016
ACTION: Invite Ecosystem Coordinator/Forest Planning expertise to engage in Technical Guide development	Tech Guide Group	Immediately

Discussion/Action Items Specific to FMRS/SFP Guides		
What (action, key point, etc.)?	Who?	When?

<p>FMRS documents should favor 'indicators' of particular response & avoid specifying a particular response, so the responsible official retains the final decision on how to manage the fire.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Responsible Official" includes any employee with delegated authority such as line officers, FMO's, IC's, duty officers, etc. • If a single response is identified, if you do state a single response, then should have NEPA to back that up. It is better to put all the available info (indicators) in front of the decision maker, then let them decide, this keeps a broader decision space for responsible official. The responsible official should have as much decision space as possible to make a good decision in regards to safety, risk, etc. 	<p>Laura Barrett</p>	<p>Next FMRS Guide Revision</p>
<p>Consider list of Fire Management Planning Principles developed at this workshop for inclusion in future updates of FMRS guidance.</p>	<p>Laura Barrett</p>	<p>Next FMRS Guide Revision</p>
<p>Consider including the following advice in future updates of Spatial Fire Management guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LMP language can be different from WFDSS objectives, reasonable interpretation is okay but be consistent with LMP intent. It is OK to interpret/condense/synthesize LMP direction BUT document what you did & why in advance (SFP documentation in FMRS?) • If LMP is silent on if/how fire can move towards desired conditions; may describe in FMRS/SFP components what you intend to do and how it will move towards the desired conditions • If LMP does provide direction but is not useful, then need to amend the LMP. • Clarify/crosswalk LMP desired condition, goals, objectives, standards, and guidelines to WFDSS strategic objectives and management requirements • New plans will be basis for SFP (capture this expectation, so that Forests don't just roll over old FMUs in WFDSS, but take full advantage of the Spatial Fire Planning . 	<p>Laura Barrett</p>	<p>Next SFP Guide Revision</p>

Include statement in FMRS/SFP guidance describing how we are replacing FMP's with FMRS/SFP; this will cover question of federal fire policy requiring FMP's for every burnable acre.	Laura Barrett	Next SFP Guide Revision
Provide guidance regarding Spatial Fire Planning compliance for forest using their current LRMP	Laura Barrett	Spring 2016

General Recommendations/Action Items

- Explore possibilities for a Joint letter of support for a Fire Management LMP Technical Guide from EMC/FAM Directors, SPF/NFS Deputy Chiefs, etc – **Elizabeth Reinhardt, Joe Carbone**
- Develop a nationally standardized set of “Fire Management Options” or categories for use in communicating what our fire response tendencies may be under various conditions. Solicit help from Social Sciences to ensure language is understandable to the public. Present draft standard to Fire LOT/Fire Directors for vetting/review– **Frankie Romero, Laura Barrett; target draft Summer/Fall 2016**
- Complete FSim runs at national level, something like the Landfire approach, where it's periodically run at certain scales and made available to everyone as a National Product. – **Elizabeth Reinhardt & Fire Modeling Institute; in progress**
- Incorporate an assessment of LMP direction and associated Spatial Fire Planning and FMRS components in WO/Regional/Forest Fire Program Reviews. **Add spatial fire planning/FMRS criteria to large fire review checklist Mark Lichtenstein, Elizabeth Reinhardt – Target spring 2016 review season.**
- Take a few recently completed LMP's to OGC (Alan Groesbeck) for review/comment – **Laura Barrett, Due Summer 2016**
- Develop a Briefing Paper on this workshop along with notes to present to Fire LOT – **Ralph Rau; Target by next Fire LOT meeting**
 - Demonstrate and highlight the link between better LRMP/spatial planning and firefighter safety to take forward to senior leadership. Demonstrate link with Firefighter Safety in communications – Good LMP direction for fire management defines what is at risk and what opportunities exist which are fundamental aspects of sound risk management. LMP's that are easily translated into strategic fire management objectives result in clarity of purpose for responders and the public; LMP's that strive towards more resilient fire dependent landscapes can result in lowering overall forest fuel quantities over time which can enhance firefighter & public safety while protecting and enhancing our natural resources.
- Present Briefing Paper on this workshop along with notes to present to NEPA/Planning LOT – **David Seesholtz, Joe Carbone; Target by next Fire LOT meeting**
- Share insights from this meeting and propose shift to spatial land management planning in 2017 EMC Innovations Meeting – **Joe Krueger + one additional workshop participant TBD; May 2016**

- Develop a Matrix of wildfire risk assessment options showing money/time/expertise necessary to produce various risk assessment products-WO FAM, **Jim Menakis, Spring 2016**
- Consider sending out an early “ review” release of tech guide to solicit feedback but also provide the field with a sense of what's in the works-**Joe Carbone, Clint Cross, Spring 2016**
- Send brief to fire/fuels planners, LRMP planners to alert to this effort - **Elizabeth, Joe Carbone, March 2016**
- FAM/EMC at the WO/RO levels will plan for and provide roll-out strategy/activities to support bringing these new guides out to the field; Draft all communications tools with consistent language (2 kinds of fire, not 3) with examples for how we describe wildfire effects (describe these based on strategic/incident objectives, did we achieve objectives or not). – **All, starting now**