

**Joint NWCG/GACG Meeting  
Whitefish, Montana  
May 23, 2002**

**NWCG Attendance:**

Don Artley, Chair, Montana Division of Forestry  
Jim Stires, Vice Chair, Bureau of Indian Affairs  
Roger Erb for Roger Spaulding, Fish and Wildlife Service  
Paul Broyles for Sue Vap, National Park Service  
Robert Krepps, NASF, Missouri Department of Conservation  
Neil Hitchcock for Jerry Williams, Forest Service  
Hugh Wood, Fire Administration  
Gary Orr for Don Motanic, Intertribal Timber Council  
Lynn Findley for Larry Hamilton, Bureau of Land Management  
Jim Smalley, NFPA  
Jim Stumpf, Executive Secretary

**GACG Attendance:**

Charlie Keller, EACG  
Pat O'Bannon, CACG  
Miles Knight, SACG  
Len Dems, RMCG  
Nate Short, ACG  
Mark Forbes, PNCG  
Bill Lafferty, PNCG  
Bob Jacob, RMCG  
Bill Clark, GBCG  
Tom Boatner, NRCG

**Guests in attendance:**

Bruce Suenam, IAWF  
Tory Majors, IBPWT  
Dave Mihalic, NPS (Aviation Use Committee)  
Jim Payne, Forest Service

## 1. **SUBJECT:** GACG Advisory Group

**DISCUSSION:** The GACG feels their best role is to help shore up communications between NWCG and the field GACG is as an Advisory Group. They feel their main mission is communication and will provide input to various changes, provide input into NWCG on new issues, and get information to local areas to help information flow to lower levels of the organization quicker. Bill Clark will draft the charter for the Advisory Group for field review by July 1. Each coordinating group will provide a dedicated person to the group. All information coming from NWCG should be sent the chair of the GACG AG who is responsible for information dissemination to GACG's. General correspondence to GACGs will occur through the current and existing information flow, that is to each GACG. The NWCG liaison to the GACG is the NWCG Chair. GACG-AG would like to meet on an annual basis at the Spring NWCG meeting. Bill Clark, GBCG will chair the newly formed advisory group.

## 2. **SUBJECT:** Aviation Task force

**DISCUSSION:** The TF was chartered by NWCG in February 2001 to examine restrictions on use of aviation resources that become barriers to both safer and more cost effective air operations.

## 3. **SUBJECT:** FIREWISE

**DISCUSSION:** Jim Smalley provided an update on the status and work being accomplished with the FIREWISE initiative.

## 4. **SUBJECT:** Thirtymile Fire review/Action Plan

**DISCUSSION:** Thirty one action items are identified in the fire review. The remaining piece of the action for completion is the administrative review. The Administrative review team has completed their work resulting in 9 people having administrative action levied on them. Jim Payne, Forest Service, discussed actions that agencies are doing differently in 2002.

To date NWCG nor any of the working teams has been tasked to accomplish any of the actions indicated. This tasking and highlighting of specific actions has not taken place. Jim Payne agreed to pass this information on to Jerry Williams for action.

## 5. **SUBJECT:** Certification/qualification for non-NWCG entities

**DISCUSSION:** Develop performance measures for EERA's. Currently there are very limited, if any specific requirements for qualification/certification of employees carrying out duties under an EERA. There was a general discussion on what exactly a non-NWCG entity is defined. There were differences throughout the country in just how municipal and contract entities are carded. Formal contracts can add additions that outline specific requirements for training and certification and qualification.

It was suggested that a task group from the IBPWT, IOSWT, TWT, and SHWT be developed and meet to determine the requirements for various positions in the fire organization. This would also include a determination of what the 310-1 requirements are for all the identified positions, including technical specialist types. NWCG will task the listed WT's to develop standards, qual/cert requirements for fire contractors for use on contractors and EERA's.

**6. SUBJECT:** Incident Management Team configuration

**DISCUSSION:** WHY? Team size is increasing, increasing incident complexity, different staffing standards between IC's and GACG's, NASF cost study, lack of IMT size flexibility to assign short teams, using ICS to use teams. PROCEDURES - IOSWT tasked in Fall 1999 to review and recommend changes., surveyed IC's on size and configuration of IMT's, met with T2 & T1 IC's, informal review with agencies and GACG's. FINDINGS - T1 teams respond to a wide variety of fire and all risk incidents, Is there a difference or a need to have T1 & T2 teams, T3 IMT's a local issue not NWCG responsibility, T2 IMT are increasing being used outside of local GACG's, Large fire costs RECOMMENDATIONS - Difference between T1 and T2 teams IC's need to have flexibility on team configuration, teams should be consistent between GACG's, T1 team std = 28 members, +6 trainees, and 10 wild cards.=44 total, does not represent all risk actions. T2 both short and long teams - short = 10, long = 27. Not assigning trainees at the time of mobilization, configured to manage less complex incidents.

**7. SUBJECT:** Crew Typing Standards

**DISCUSSION:** IOSWT has been developing standards for configuration, size, and performance requirements, etc. Original proposal for T1, T2 IA, and T2 crews. Short term solution for T3 until the contracts can reflect a long term fix for T3 crews.

**8. SUBJECT:** Weather Service MOU

**DISCUSSION:** Agreement is out to agencies, solicitors and the weather service for review/comment. The methods for reimbursement of the weather is also being worked on. Once the National MOU is established the GA agreement and operating plans can be developed.

**9. SUBJECT:** Use of AD's on IMT's in the Command and General Staff

**DISCUSSION:** IC, DIC and FSC can not be AD's on T1/T2 teams according to the National Mobilization Guide. California will not accept a team with any AD's contained on it in a Command and General Staff position. The National MAC Group needs to work on this problem with the only area that is not in concert with current national direction.

**10. SUBJECT:** NWCG role in Homeland Security

**DISCUSSION:** This is considered as a National MAC issue. The situation and decision will be made when needed. If Type 2 mobilization is going to be more of an issue it may be more difficult to keep or develop Type 2 Teams.