

MEETING MINUTES

June 7, 2005
Boise, Idaho

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>
<i>Members Present:</i>	
Tim Sexton	USDA Forest Service
John Dickenson	South Carolina Forestry Commission
Dick Bahr	National Park Service
John Segar	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
David Mueller	Bureau of Land Management
Ed Mathews (for Colin Hardy)	USDA Forest Service Research
<i>Members Absent:</i>	
Merlin McDonald	Bureau of Indian Affairs
Jeff Stephens	California Department of Forestry
Kirk Rowdabaugh	NWCG Liaison
<i>Advisors Present:</i>	
<i>Advisors Absent:</i>	
Woody Kessler	BLM Training
Cyndie Hogg	NAFRI Training
<i>Guests:</i>	
Ed Brunson	The Nature Conservancy

Business:

Tim Sexton informed the FUWT that he had been notified two weeks prior that he had been confirmed as Chair of the FUWT. David Mueller was introduced as the new representative for the BLM. Tim also informed the FUWT that Merlin McDonald had been named as the new BIA representative. Merlin had informed Tim that he was unavailable for this specific meeting due to a scheduling conflict.

Agenda Item #1 Complexity Rating of Low and Very Low (submitted by John Segar):

Background: The NWCG Prescribed Fire Complexity Rating System Guide currently does not require that the summary complexity rating determination must equal the highest rating for any complexity element (see below). The Draft Rx Implementation Guide uses the term "Very Low Complexity" to specify a prescribed fire with all complexity elements rated as low.

Discussion: The "Very Low Complexity" terminology has potential to confuse the field and FWS would like the RX implementation guide to use the term "Low Complexity". There appears to be acceptance of this edit, but there is concern that, interpreting the current language of the complexity guide, units could assign a RXB3 to a low complexity fire with one or more complexity elements rated as moderate. Clarifying that low complexity fires have all complexity elements rated low would solve this concern.

Decision Needed: Is there a need to reword NWCG Prescribed Fire Complexity Rating System Guide language (see below) to clarify that low complexity prescribed fires must have all complexity elements rated as low, or can we live with the language as if assuming that "Very Low Complexity" is changed to "Low Complexity" in the Draft Rx Guide?

NWCG Prescribed Fire Complexity Rating System Guide language

Bottom of Page 4

Step #4 - Summary Rating Determination

Generally, since all mitigating measures have been applied, the highest rating from any single element may provide the foundation for the individual rating of Risk, Potential Consequences, and Technical Difficulty. The rationale for this rating should be brought forward from those elements that establish that rating level. The Summary Complexity Rating should take into account the individual single element ratings and agency policies.

If there is anything unique or abnormal about a project, it is recommended the agency administrator be briefed prior to submitting for approval.

Decision: This agenda item proposes to clarify guidance for assignment of RxB3s. The IOSWT has already determined that NWCG does not manage "low complexity" prescribed fire nor RxB3 positions. Consequently, this agenda item is being directed to the Interagency Fuels Committee for consideration.

Agenda Item #2 S580 and Rx 510 Oversight (submitted by Cindy Hogg):

Rx510 and S580 are supposed to be under the oversight of the FUWT. How does the FUWT want to interact with NAFRI and the steering committees for these courses?

Dick Bahr has been the liaison to Rx510. There does not appear to be a liaison for S580.

Discussion: Rx510 is not a required course any Fire Use skill position. It has been proposed as a requirement for RxB1, but will not be approved as such. Because it is not required for any skill position the FUWT is unaware of a reason for the FUWT to provide oversight for this course. FUWT agreed that it is a good course and will continue to liaison with the course steering committee.

Decisions: FUWT agreed to task a group to review Rx310, Rx410, and Rx510 for redundancy and gaps. Tim Sexton agreed to be the liaison with the S580 steering committee.

Agenda Item #3 PMS 310-1 (submitted by Cindy Hogg):

Cyndie Hogg had pointed out that the draft PMS 310-1 listed Rx510 as a requirement for RxB1. She asked if FUWT had proposed this and if so, why.

FUWT had not proposed Rx510 as a requirement for RxB1 and agreed that Rx510 should not be a requirement for RxB1. In light of this issue with RxB1 we agreed to review all Fire Use positions in the draft PMS 310-1.

The two Ignition Specialist positions, RxI1 and RxI2 were reviewed in conjunction with FIRB (Firing Boss).

DECISION: FUWT recommends merging all three positions into a single skill position for use in prescribed fire and wildfire. The new position would adhere to requirements for FIRB with the following additions:

- require S390
- crosswalk tasks between the RXI1/2 and FIRB to assure all tasks are addressed in the new Position Task Book for FIRB
- require trainee assignment to at least one prescribed fire and one wildfire for successful completion of Job Task Book.

RxMA1 and RxMA2 positions were reviewed. The current information from IQCS shows 348 people qualified in the system (BIA-8, BLM-50, FS-263, FWS-14, NPS-13). Specific numbers for qualified, trainee, unqualified and block can be found in the accompanying table.

RXM1	Experience Status			
Agency	Blocked	Qualified	Trainee	Unqualified
BIA		2	2	10
BLM		22	16	23
FS	9	134	54	170
FWS		5	2	5
NPS		4	3	4

RXM2	Experience Status			
Agency	Blocked	Qualified	Trainee	Unqualified
BIA		6	3	13
BLM		28	27	53
FS	10	129	69	131
FWS		9	8	20
NPS		9	16	14

DECISION: FUWT agreed that the tasks performed by RxMAs are usually performed by local unit fire management officers and these skill positions are not needed within the NWCG Qualifications System. Recommend that the two positions be removed from PMS 310-1.

Agenda Item #4 TNC Participation

Ed Brunson provided a review of the history of The Nature Conservancy (TNC) participation in the Fire Use Working Team and other NWCG working teams. FUWT members agreed that TNC participation in FUWT provided valuable insight, improving discussions and subsequent decisions. FUWT members agreed to add TNC as a formal member. Tim Sexton will ask Kirk Rowdabaugh if any additional protocol need to be followed for TNC membership.

Agenda Item #5 Meeting Management

Tim Sexton proposed several business rules for FUWT to improve meeting efficiency and to ensure the work of the committee is shared by all members. The following rules were accepted:

- Meeting locations will be rotated among the FUWT members
- Host FUWT members will manage logistics and note taking for the meeting
- Agenda items for meetings will be submitted to the host member at least two weeks in advance of the meeting
- Agenda items submitted will be accompanied by a briefing paper which explains the topic for discussion and if a decision is needed.

Next Business Meeting - November 8-9, 2005, Charleston, SC. John Dickinson will arrange logistics.