

**MINUTES FROM THE  
NWCG WILDLAND URBAN INTERFACE WORKING TEAM MEETING  
Duluth, Minnesota  
May 13-14, 2004**

**Thursday 13 May 2004**

---

**ATTENDANCE ROSTER**

**Working Team Members:**

*Sam Scranton*, (US DOI/Bureau of Indian Affairs) - Chair

*Kelly Hawk* (US DOI/Bureau of Land Management)

*Brian Johnson* (International Association of Fire Chiefs)

*S. Olin Phillips* (National Association of State Foresters – Eastern Area)

*Jim Shell* (USDA Forest Service)

*Jim Smalley* (National Fire Protection Association)

**Guests:**

Barry Mathias, Program Manager, NWCG Information Resource Management

Amy Schneider, WUIWT Communication Program Manager, Fleishman-Hillard, Inc.

Lew Southard, Branch Chief, Fire Education, USDA Forest Service

**Facilitator:**

Don Farrell, DHS/Federal Emergency Management Association, Mitigation Directorate

**Recorder:**

Michele Steinberg, National Fire Protection Association

-----

**Opening:**

Chairman Sam Scranton called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. He asked each participant to introduce themselves, and noted a number of changes on the team as follows:

- Joe Stam has resigned from team, and Wayne Ching (Hawaii State Forestry) is to replace him. Both of them are to attend the September team meeting.
- Rob Neale left his job at USFA, so we have a vacancy. USFA has provided a name for a replacement – Frank Richardson.
- Jack Cohen intends to continue active participation on the Working Team although he may not be able to attend meetings in the next year.
- Lew Southard is replacing Jim Shell, who is retiring
- Mary Corso has left employment with the state of Washington. The Team will need to pursue whether there will be a replacement from the National Association of State Fire Marshals.

Since there were only six team members present out of a total of 13, Sam noted that there was not a quorum. The members present agreed to make tentative decisions and include those in the minutes to be sent to the rest of the team members. Should any decisions be time-sensitive, the Chair could ask for a conference call before the September meeting. Don Farrell suggested the group include rules about quorum and voting in its guidelines. Olin Phillips suggested the group revisit the notion of sending alternates to meetings.

### ***NWCG Meeting Update***

Sam Scranton attended the NWCG meeting being held concurrently with the WUI Working Team meeting at Jim Smalley's invitation (Jim is the WT liaison to the NWCG). Jim had provided an update on the Firewise Communities/USA recognition program to the NWCG participants. NWCG directed the Working Team to trademark the Firewise Communities/USA logo to protect the process, and also asked the group to trademark or register the word "Firewise" referring to the program. Lew Southard noted that if the trademark symbol were placed on the logo and word now, this would show intent and for all practical purposes protect the logo and word. It was agreed that NFPA would do this on behalf of the WUI Working Team.

Sam noted that the NWCG members were pleased with the progress of the Firewise Communities/USA project and that the field trip on the Fond du Lac reservation the previous evening was very positive (Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa is the first tribal organization to be recognized under the Firewise Communities/USA program).

### ***Review of past meeting minutes***

The Working Team reviewed the minutes from the February 2004 meeting. Olin moved to adopt the minutes; Jim Shell seconded. The minutes were accepted unanimously.

### **Update - Old Business**

#### ***Program activity status***

Jim Smalley reviewed the 2004 first quarter report with the group. He noted that there has been lots of activity on the website with many materials being ordered to support local workshops. The program has provided ArcView awards to 27 communities. Jim provided an overview of the updates to the website, particularly details on the new Firewise University. Brian Johnson suggested trademarking "Firewise University" to help maintain the quality and integrity of the program. Jim agreed to bring this back to Dennis Berry, NFPA's counsel for review, along with the other items to be trademarked or protected. Lew noted that the program should consistently apply the existing trademark. Dennis will report to the group in September. Sam asked that when Firewise University is launched, that a major announcement be made so that internal groups will have the information to plug into their websites.

Jim provided an update on the November conference. About 3,300 brochures will be mailed this week (Working Team will get a few each for their use). Jim described the tracks and a few of the highlights, including 70 presenters over three days; an opportunity for recognition of new communities; Congressman Simpson will be there at lunch. There will be a reprise of the hazard assessment course, and participants will get a certificate for this training. Jim Shell noted that we should measure the outcomes of the conference and follow up on the evaluation. Amy Schneider indicated that Fleishman-Hillard can assist by conducting a pre-survey of participants and a follow-up to participants.

Jim showed some photos of the in-progress Firewise Challenge product, and explained its features and the history of the project (adapted from a BLM pilot they used at a national Boy Scout Jamboree). There is a user's guide in the works and the project should be ready this summer.

Jim pointed out the information about the Wildland Fire for Educators piece that was included in the first quarter report. A press release was sent out last month; Lew indicated the Wildland Fire Education Working Team would link it to their web bibliography. Kelly Hawk suggested that Project Learning Tree might want to pick it up. It could also be linked to states' home pages.

#### ***Task Group Reports***

##### **Strategic Planning**

Michele reported on the status of the Strategic Planning activity the WUI Working Team is undergoing. The March strategic planning session resulted in draft goals and strategies that were reviewed by the

Team. A set of draft actions will be submitted shortly to the Team for comment. The Strategic Planning Task Group will then review the drafts this summer before final presentation in September. Olin recommended that Wayne Ching be copied on this information as Joe Stam is currently listed on the Task Group but is leaving the Team. Jim Smalley noted that he shared information about the strategic plan with Jim Hubbard last week. Sam Scranton had spoken to the fuels group (???) to communicate this information to them. Olin distributed a letter to the team that Don Smith (NASF Fire Committee) had sent to state forestry agencies for comments. Some comments have been returned, and Olin will summarize them to present at the June NASF Fire Committee meeting. The group asked Olin if he would also provide summary comments at the next Working Team meeting in September.

### **Stakeholder Task Group**

Amy Schneider described the recent work of this task group, focusing on leveraging communications with various stakeholders. The Working Team reviewed the current list of stakeholders (about 20 total), organized by the Task Group into a tiered list. Tier 1 lists those stakeholders that have made highly significant contributions to the project; Tier 2 are currently or recently active stakeholders; Tier 3 are stakeholders that have made contributions in the past and may be likely to continue participation in the future; while Tier 4 includes stakeholders that have been inactive for any number of reasons. Amy explained that the Working Team representative agencies and organizations are not on this list, as they are members with a higher level of participation.

The Task Group has developed a draft MOU for each stakeholder to formalize these relationships. The MOU includes expectations of stakeholders that can be tailored to individual entities' needs. The next step is for approval from the Task Group on the draft MOU, then each stakeholder will be contacted by phone and mail to ask if they want to formalize using the MOU. Sam noted this formalization clears up confusion – one reason we are doing this is because some groups were soliciting stakeholders for funding using the Firewise name. Amy clarified that the draft MOU statement about funding did not preclude joint projects with stakeholders, but would prevent contractors from having stakeholder status.

Amy asked whether the Working Team wanted to make distinctions among stakeholders given nonprofit or commercial status. She suggested for-profit entities could be “corporate partners. Don Farrell offered that one definition of a stakeholder is any group with an interest, while a partner is someone contributing something and that the program could also give something back to. Brian Johnson preferred the term “corporate partner” and felt it was important to make a distinction between commercial entities and nonprofit groups. The Team should make it clear that Firewise is not able to endorse or certify.

There was concern over the level of commitment and maintenance involved with an MOU. One concern is that agencies represented on the Working Team could not make a legal commitment via such a document. Another is that there is a lot of work to maintain and follow up on multiple MOUs. Regarding the concern about signatures on an MOU, Amy indicated a simple letter could be sent that would not require co-signatures. If an MOU were done, NFPA would likely sign on behalf of the Working Team. Barry Mathias suggested that for-profit entities would have an incentive to contribute to the program if we show that we are a 501(c)(3) not-for-profit organization (NFPA is).

The decision of present members was not to use an MOU format but a Letter of Agreement, Partner Resolution or similar instead. Jim Smalley would be the signatory. The Stakeholder Task group will review the legal implications with NFPA's counsel Dennis Berry and get back to the Team with information.

There was some discussion about face-to-face meetings with stakeholders and the need to determine if stakeholders value such meetings and what their expectations might be. Brian stated that he was opposed to having a separate stakeholder meeting. Sam concurred. Amy indicated that any face-to-face meetings would be for specific activities such as a roundtable to brainstorm on next directions for the program. Jim Smalley said we will invite stakeholders this year to the 2004 conference. Brian said that rather than

pulling stakeholders together as a separate meeting, he would prefer that program staff attend other stakeholder conferences and meetings.

### **Communications Task Group**

Amy described a communications guide that she and the Task Group have compiled for the Working Team, for each member's use. She distributed a CD-Rom to each member and will send them a binder with the printed material (she showed a sample at the meeting). Contents include materials already developed, messaging tools, and a draft copy of Wildland Fire Education Working Team key messages. The guide includes a Firewise Communities/USA media kit that has been sent to the state liaisons and each community. Amy indicated that there will be a separate package developed that is directed to agency field staff. The contents also include a quick reference sheet listing the resources that we have. Some material is still in draft format, including a community PowerPoint presentation to be reviewed by Michele, Jim and others, and a local workshop guide. The media relations material is also internal and will not be posted on the website. Amy encouraged the Team members to distribute the material widely OTHER than the introductory information meant for Team members only. There was general agreement about having Fleishman-Hillard develop a PowerPoint version of the program piece for use by Team members. Brian, Sam and others indicated they were very happy with the product. Jim Shell stated his appreciation for working with Fleishman-Hillard on the Task Group. He noted that Lew Southard should replace him on this group.

### **P-110 Course and WHAM (Wildfire Hazard Assessment Methodology) Task Group**

Jim Smalley stated that revisions for the WHAM book are on hold until we know what is happening with the NWCG P-110 course ("Inspecting Fire Prone Property"). Jim gave an update of what the Task Group is doing with the course outline. They will suggest a name change as well as a new focus on a structure ignition approach to WUI fires. The Task Group has changed a section on "how to report" to "how to document the assessment", which will include the Firewise Communities/USA information. Sam asked whether the course revision includes a field visit segment. Olin and Kelly said that it doesn't right now, but it could be augmented. Jim noted that if the Team decides to redo Jack's post-fire investigation video, it would fit into this course very well. Lew cautioned that the PMS system can't reproduce slides anymore, so the course should not rely on them. Sam asked whether the NWCG Training Working Team had responded to our latest communication (a response to their questionnaire). Jim said they have not responded, but we need to follow up with this. Once we see what the Training Working Team has in mind, the Task Group can pursue the subject matter changes with them. Sam said he will give Dave Koch a call and find out the latest status.

### **Community Organizer Task Group**

Jim Shell noted that the request for proposals reaped proposals from nine states. The Task Group held a conference call to review the proposals, identify likely candidates, and clarify rationale for selection. The finalists were Alabama, Wisconsin and New Mexico. A letter went out to the regions and state foresters to say who got the award. The funds have not yet been transferred, however. The USDA Forest Service regional staff will talk with their respective states. Amy has made contact with all the states, noting that the liaison in Alabama is new and will need some background information. New Mexico is working on getting the funds through the region.

Jim Shell recommended that if we expand this project in 2005, that we administer it differently, as this process was cumbersome. He suggested generating projects by special invitation for the competitive grant process, but using money the states already have through existing channels. Amy emphasized the need for keeping the program as a peer-to-peer effort and the ability to monitor activity. She noted that each of the three current states is at a different level of activity and that it will be interesting to look at whether the program will help advance states to the next level in active states, and/or provide incentives for states just getting started to push their programs.

## **Operation Water Revision Task Group**

The new video will be “Effective Use of Water in Wildland/Urban Interface Fires”. Jim Smalley reported that shooting will start Monday in Bigfork, Montana. Rick Trembath is on the task group and has a site in Genesee, Colorado that a homeowner donated to the fire department to burn down. It may or may not occur but we have plans in place to videotape it if the community will allow the burning.

## **New Business**

### ***Core Program discussion***

Jim Smalley reviewed the outline of a cooperative agreement document he had discussed last week with Jim Shell. The program is at the end of a five-year cooperative agreement and it is time to develop a new one. He would like the new one to enable the Working Team and NFPA staff to develop one-year workplans from it with more ease than in previous years. He showed an outline to the Team that included the following:

- Executive Summary
- Introduction
- Foundations of a Successful National WUI Fire Program
- Project Approach
- Descriptions of Working Team partners’ and NFPA’s contributions
- Goals and Strategies (from strategic plan as guiding document)
- Objectives
- Core Programs
- Budget (Calendar Years 2005-2009)
- Budget Narrative (CY 2005-2009).

Kelly noted the need to have tangible outcomes connected with the agreement and yearly workplans.

The team brainstormed about what to consider as “Core Programs”. The initial list (in no particular order) included the following items at the same level as 2004:

- Website
- Firewise Communities/USA
- Developing/providing information resources
- Communications Plan
- Technical Assistance to communities/states/partners
- Development of future NWCG courses
- Training materials
- Working Team support (includes NWCG feedback)
- Partnership development (Staff time and travel to stakeholder meetings/conferences)
- Firefighter and public safety

Lew asked what will happen if State Farm goes national (insurance industry wide). We think it will expand the demand for our products and programs.

Discussion centered on prioritizing the most critical items and how to develop a budget that would reflect the bottom line. Jim Smalley noted that program administration is built into each activity and would be described in the budget and budget narrative. Lew noted that the budget has to build in an expectation in increase yearly. Brian stated that rather than cutting back resources, look for ways to reduce costs, such as putting materials on the website. He felt technical support is critical to help people find materials and resources. Olin felt the website was the most important program. He felt that the emphasis for publication development in future should be production rather than printing/distribution – that others can figure out

how to get copies that they need. Lew noted that web technology will change dramatically in five years and that we should think about what we will need to build into the site during that time.

There was some discussion of the questions raised in Don Smith's memo to state foresters. Some felt it implied that the Working Team should get rid of Firewise and let someone else manage it. Olin said it was to get input from state foresters about the strategic plan and whether the Working Team ought to focus more on other activities besides Firewise. Olin asked how the Working Team might drop back on involvement in the Program by allowing NFPA to run it administratively, with overall guidance from the Working Team. Some of the comments Olin has received back from states include interest in the Working Team getting more involved in building codes and covenants; improving training for volunteer groups; increasing and improving public awareness; and increasing pass-through grants to assist locals. Thus far, there is nothing that the state foresters responding to the letter have asked for that isn't already in line with the Strategic Plan. Lew asked that the Working Team respond to the state forester comments by letting them know their comments were heard and that much was incorporated into the strategic plan. It was suggested that Olin provide a synopsis of feedback from the comments and the June NASF Fire Committee meeting to the Working Team (and to ECONorthwest for incorporation into the strategic plan), which will provide a basis for response back to the NASF members. Amy offered to provide Olin with any background information or communication tools he might need for the June meeting.

Jim Smalley noted that the cooperative agreement draft includes plans for a national conference every other year, which would include 2006 and 2008 within the 5-year program.

There was additional discussion about core programs, including consideration of what the inputs for each project (such as the website) are, and what the outcomes are. Olin emphasized the need to identify all of the inputs for each of the core programs, in order to fully fund them to ensure the program can run. Kelly and Lew both stated they need gross numbers and basic information on the benefits of the programs.

Lew proposed lumping several of the items on the brainstormed list into large categories. Training materials, Working Team support, community support and partnership development should all be under "Firewise Support and Development" with one large piece of the budget. Kelly agreed as long as tasks were defined and details were provided for each segment. Jim Shell suggested this be called "WUI Fire Program Support and Development. This created five core programs:

- Website
- Communications Plan
- WUI Fire Program Support and Development
- Firewise Communities/USA
- Information Resources

Jim Smalley expressed concern about having to split the budget out to fine details, which will invite questioning and micromanagement. Rather, he is trying to identify the core items for the cooperative agreement. Lew said he would need some background to be able to argue the case for a given program to funders, but agreed there should not be too much detail. Jim Smalley reiterated that more work needs to be done to the cooperative agreement draft to show benefits and details. Jim Shell cautioned that we need to show the bottom line – not everything is a core program.

Jim Smalley presented more detail on one core program – Firewise Communities/USA – to see what the Working Team members thought of the benefit description and other details. Kelly stated that the agencies need to see clear links between the recognition program and activity on the ground. Others brought up the benefits of getting valid research and science put into action with the public, and recognition as a strong motivator of action. Jim Shell noted that besides acres treated, the agency leaders also emphasize safer communities, which is harder to measure but that this program tries to address. Olin felt the benefit statement should include "reducing the numbers of communities at risk from wildfire".

There was a lengthy discussion about the validity/relevance of the “communities at risk” list and definition. Lew said the program recognizes personal responsibility and allows agency staffs to step forward and assist at a greater level. Olin noted that, like the Tree Cities program, Firewise Communities/USA commits communities to maintenance over time, which is a benefit. While some wanted to see some specific language about benefits for state forestry, most felt the benefits did not have to be specified for each partner. Kelly emphasized the importance of addressing the questions of what the agencies/public are getting for the money and tangible results. Jim Shell emphasized the importance of providing information on elements of each core program, including costs.

### ***Firewise status and budget***

Jim Smalley provided an overview of the current budget for calendar year 2004 and where the funds are being spent. His slides included breakouts of four major areas - community support, website, conference, and printing/distribution, with much more detail on the numerous programs that fall under “community support”.

### ***September Meeting Agenda***

The consensus of present members was to include the following items on the meeting agenda for September:

- Task group reports
- Olin Phillips to report on NASF Fire Committee activity and comments
- Review of the five-year cooperative agreement
- Finalize the 2005 workplan
- Discuss the makeup and structure of the team (membership/representation)
- ECONorthwest to present the Strategic Plan
- NFPA counsel Dennis Berry to present on trademark issues
- Fleishman-Hillard to present on communications plan and activities
- State Forester welcome (Olin will invite the Massachusetts state forester)

Michele will circulate these items to the other members for input and modification.

The September meeting will be held at the NFPA offices in Quincy, Massachusetts, September 27-29. The meeting will run as follows:

- ➔ Monday, September 27 - 1 p.m. to 5 p.m.
- ➔ Tuesday, September 28 – 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.
- ➔ Wednesday, September 29 – 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.

### ***Executive Session***

#### ***Review of Proposals***

Six proposals were distributed to the group for review, including two from the Great Lakes Forest Fire Compact’s Prevention Committee (one for a landscaping book showing Eastern U.S. vegetation, one for funding for a Mitigation University course in the Great Lakes Area); one on Firewise Communities/USA recognition program outreach; one on a brochure about surviving WUI fire events; one on the 2005 Communications Plan; and one on a 2005 plan for Grassroots Outreach. Two additional proposals were reviewed and discussed simultaneously, including a proposal from Washington state about sponsorship for a “Wildfire Awareness Week” in the western states, and a proposal to fully fund revision of the NWCG P-110 course “Inspecting Fire Prone Property”.

Jim Smalley asked Jim Shell about a request for use of the Firewise logo for the USDA Forest Service “EcoSmart” program. Jim Shell felt it was premature and wanted to see more detail from the researchers before allowing use of the logo and also felt the Working Team should be able to review the request before approval.

### Eastern Region Landscape Book

The Great Lakes Forest Fire Compact's Prevention Committee had submitted this to the Compact, which did not have adequate funding for it. There was concern expressed about funding a single region project. Jim Smalley verified that the program does not actually have a technical landscaping guide already, though we have collected plant lists, photos, and have the basic information in other formats. Working Team members felt it might be beneficial to rework the proposal to enable a stakeholder or partner such as a landscape architect to assist in development. Olin said his goal in bringing the proposal to the Working Team is to seek the technical assistance for development rather than funding a project that would be given to a student to start from scratch. Sam proposed that Olin look into the possibilities of working with other partners and bring the proposal back for consideration in September. Jim Smalley will work with Olin to contact the project leads for more information.

### Mitigation University

The proposal is asking for \$50,000 to hold a Mitigation University course in the Great Lakes region. Lew said that he has funded these for the last two years and can fund one in the northeast if the appropriate prevention staff person is making the request. He indicated he may not be able to fund it for 2005 but probably for 2006. Sam said there are already two of these courses scheduled for 2005- a basic-level course in the west and an intermediate in Florida. He suggested that one way to keep costs down is to include local trainers, particularly as the intent of the course is to institutionalize the training in different regions. The Working Team members present agreed that the regional person should follow up with Lew for a direct funding request.

### Brochure – “Surviving a WUI Incident for Community Residents”

This proposal from NFPA staff and Pat Durland seeks approximately \$5,000 to produce a brochure to help inform residents of what to do during a wildland/urban interface event, including information on the relative risks and benefits of evacuation and sheltering in place. Jim Shell noted that this really addresses Goal 2 in our strategies and could be a good entry into this area. He cautioned that all member agencies will have to agree with every word – there would have to be a comfort level among agency leadership. Kelly added that local fire agencies will have to agree with the concept and wording. Lew expressed concern about cross-jurisdictional issues and that such advice could end up being in direct conflict with local authorities. Jim Smalley reminded the Working Team members of previous discussions about the shelter in place concept (see minutes from February 2003). He noted that several Australian presenters at recent meetings have felt that this information is what is missing in community – residents don't understand the impact of fire emotionally/mentally and there is a place in our program to help them. Jim Shell felt that the group should not try to decide the content right now but because it meets one of our goals we should launch it and move forward. Sam agreed that this would be something the group would want more information on, and that a task group is probably needed. Don suggested reviewing existing information for other hazards, such as [www.areyouready.gov](http://www.areyouready.gov). Jim Shell suggested describing this project not as a brochure but as a way to address and initiate coordination with agencies on the issue. Olin felt we should convene a think-tank on the issue. Jim Smalley said an interagency meeting could occur as a follow up to the November conference, since the topic will be addressed then. Meeting attendees should include Working Team member agency/organization representatives as well as the American Red Cross and individuals representing NFPA's standards, codes, and RiskWatch program. Sam asked that a fuller proposal be brought to the September meeting for a vote.

### Firewise Communities/USA National Outreach

The proposal seeks \$35,000 for approximately 10 meetings with fire compacts, interagency teams and others to present information about the Firewise Communities/USA program. Olin felt this was a good proposal and added some feedback about the original training on this project. He felt any presentation should focus on how to motivate communities, and within the Forest Fire Compacts to seek out their prevention team or committee. Presentations should also tell the audience what kind of support they can expect from the program, and should answer the question of why the program is important. Brian

suggested being flexible to go beyond the scope of a one or two-hour presentation to make the travel and personnel expense worthwhile. Team members suggested choosing the places to present where we can have the most impact, possibly the states where there is not yet a Firewise Communities/USA liaison. Sam indicated that members present were in favor of the proposal and asked that it be brought back for review by the Team in September.

#### Wildfire Awareness Week Across the West

The proposal was originally sent to NFPA to sponsor this week in states from Texas north and west. Jim Smalley indicated that NFPA doesn't want to sponsor it. The proposal includes development and deliver of campaign materials, a Presidential proclamation, annual theme, etc. It is modeled on NFPA's Fire Prevention Week. Olin noted that the Wildfire Prevention Week that already happens in April doesn't fit the western fire season. Brian was opposed to the proposal because of the expectation for continuity and the cost - upwards of \$250,000 per year to do PSAs, brochures, etc. He felt that the work we are already doing with Fleishman-Hillard and Firewise is meeting the need for information around the diverse fire seasons nationally. Sam felt that if this proposal were critical to our communication strategy, Fleishman-Hillard would already have recommended it. If the WUI Working Team were going to do it, they would have to coordinate with the Wildland Fire Education Working Team to ensure consistency of message and development of multiple messages. Kelly felt it was more important to make wildfire awareness a part of everyday mentality rather than focus on a single week.

#### P-110

The proposal is incomplete until the WUI Working Team gets more information about scope and format from the Training Working Team. Jim Smalley indicated the Task Group will continue exploring options and will review details before the September meeting. They will also talk about what other NWCG courses might need to be revised. Jim Smalley said that Jack Cohen sees P-110 as an introductory level course and feels there ought to be one or two more advanced courses. Jim is also concerned to make sure that the course contains cross-references to appropriate codes. The budget range at this time is anywhere from \$30,000 to \$60,000. Sam asked for an update at the September meeting, if not a full proposal. Olin asked if Jack Cohen will have enough time to assist with the project if we fund it for 2005. Jim Smalley noted that a revision of Jack's post-fire investigation video would fit well into P-110 (could get two uses from one product). Sam suggested the Task Group review P-210 and provide direction and recommendations.

#### Grassroots Outreach

The proposal would be an add-on to core programs. It recommends expanding the program to six states from three. The current program has review built in that would contribute to the design of a 2005 program. The general consensus is that this is a program that should be continued into 2005.

#### ***Strategic Plan draft review***

Michele had folks look briefly at the draft from ECONorthwest on strategic planning – group had a few comments, ready to look at it.

#### ***Cooperative Agreement development***

Jim Smalley is concerned about drafting the cooperative agreement within the next few weeks. Brian felt that the five-year agreement needs to closely mirror the strategic plan and was concerned that we not ignore it while preparing the agreement. Jim Shell noted that the agreement is an instrument to deliver funds, which needs to include adequate detail about what is being delivered. DOI in particular is focusing on deliverables. Jim Smalley noted that USFA has not made the \$75,000 contribution to the agreement that they had promised. Lew will follow up to obtain the funds.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 noon on Friday, May 14.