

Firescape Meeting notes 9-4-08

Don Falk, Brooke Gebow, Steve Plevel, Tom Swetnam, Sherry Tune

Notes by Brooke

Pardon the reordering—just trying to make us sound logical

1. A good place to start: What are we trying to do?

- Build on knowledge and experience already associated with the landscape

- Continue with projects currently planned

- More effectively address ecological and safety challenges

- Implement on a bigger scale

- Bring in new science

- Manage adaptively

We need to be able to articulate how FireScape helps reach these goals.

2. Don—July 29 regrouping meeting (Brooke, Don, Sherry) came up with the 3-pronged project management proposal:

- Fire science (lead Don/Tom)

- Compliance (lead Brooke)

- Outreach (lead Steve)

Sherry would maintain an overall coordination/district representative role.

3. Tom—crucial 4th part is operations/implementation and the need to built major capacity to realize the vision.

Don—think of the 3-headed monster as a tetrahedron, with that 4th component sitting above and tied to the other 3.

Brooke—ops/implementation capacity will be a forest-wide problem, not just something the Catalinas-Rincons have to deal with.

4. We agree that public outreach needs to be a core component, not an afterthought.

Sherry—Jeanine sees more traditional public participation using the nepa framework (vs cast of thousands).

Steve—we need more public participation, buy-in, than traditional nepa involvement. People will choose to be involved or not. They'll provide information and want to know what's happened to that information. [Steve is interested in helping with an openly public process from start to finish, but not a process that ignores the public except for nepa formalities.] "Public" includes many internal and external entities. Forest planning process seems to be gathering a lot of information from the public, but it's not clear how that input will feed into the plan. We want a cleaner process.

Tom—we will keep working on questions about engagement—What is sufficient, efficient? Who is involved in what? We need to have something real to be talking about then address this solid

thing on a regular basis. [Brooke comment—this would be the reason for stopping to take stock this summer—to figure out what the “real” thing is.]

5. Don—how do we relate back to the bigger group, after the palace coup? (We need a good name for the smaller group—steering committee?)

Communicate with group that work is continuing

Leads meet with others as logical/practical

Practice diplomacy at all levels, especially with agency fire folks

Steve/Don—use big meetings to accomplish specific purpose: examples

Keep consulting group about who needs to be involved and best process

Roll out progress from smaller groups

Look for overlap in purpose with other groups (like Fire Departments, Buffel Grass people) and coordinate common resource needs (like GIS services and products)

Coordinate integration of FireScape vision with continuation of plans on the books

6. **HOMEWORK:** An assignment for Steve is to meditate on usefulness of physical presence on the mountain (public engagement, science sides). There are several possibilities in play: property donation to UA SNR, old FMO cabin, crew quarters between Rose Cyn and Palisade.

8. Don—what kind of role do we want to see for NPS? Planning? Implementation?

Sherry—Kristy looking for seamless ecological mapping for park and forest (tangible product of C-R firescape).

Steve/Brooke—Data collection for science/monitoring can cross boundaries and be coordinated across boundaries.

7. **HOMEWORK:** 3 leads draft basic list of tasks (science, outreach, compliance) and coordination requirements with other functions (internal and external). Example: Developing proposed action (compliance) needs input from science on desired conditions of units, treatments to get there, monitoring plans, when and where research takes place.

Steve—Monitoring needs to be integrated fundamentally into the proposed action

Don—Does monitoring as part of the proposed action expose the CNF to lawsuits if it doesn't happen?

Brooke—There are a lot of unfunded/unexecuted monitoring mandates. We need to monitor and should put it in the proposed action.

7. Money and Teams

Sherry—got \$80K extra—allocated to Bill H, Heidi, Josh, Tyson etc.. Got back \$60K for Huachucas. Have \$325K for TEAMS.

Don/Sherry—we need to have a structure to best use TEAMS; money will go fast.

Tom—don't forget social science (Sherry—teams has social science expertise).

Brooke—overall timeframe for TEAMS & compliance 2 years in Huachucas.

Chris French conversation

Sherry—update on 3-headed monster + implementation

Don—trying to have a structure that allows moving forward organized, efficient, allows good communication; smaller group taking the lead to enable getting things done in a timely way. Each lead has homework to formulate path/summarize history. Still need to fly structure by larger group.

Chris's availability? In next 3-6 mo he can accommodate conference calls. Needs to understand goals. Would like to see our plan of attack—3 area plans. Needs to understand his role, best contributions. TEAMS ready this fall. (Brooke—likely 6 months to get a proposed action)

Chris—agrees that having proposed action up front will help. Would like to be engaged as we develop science side? Questions like %watershed treatment for exceeding thresholds of erosion, etc. are of interest.

Don—research questions will be fairly bounded and not address huge, complex areas. Model runs will likely be aimed at satisfying implementation, nepa needs. Will be other opportunities for just cool science. Don thinking more about fire-related analyses and has been directing ecological mapping to be more relevant to fire. (Chris would like to see tighter science in the matching of treatments to ecological types, but Brooke says beware of tying hands with tight prescriptions.)

Chris—early collaboration with community is key. Involve people up front. Anticipate issues for analysis through early discussions, lets team be better prepared for analysis.

Don—could use help engaging insider folks. Chris—not involving them dooms process.

Chris's schedule wide open for discussions. Sherry remains main contact.

PROCEDURAL TIP: Be copying communiqués to this group: Brooke, Chris, Don, Sherry, Steve, Tom

HOMEWORK (Sherry?): Set a meeting with bigger group. Agenda includes update from Chris on strategy, timeline, organization.

[Brooke is out hiking and biking for a month. Back first full week of October.]