

IRMWT Meeting Minutes
November 5-7, 2002
Boise, ID

Attendees:

IRMWT Members:

Andrea Olson (USFWS)
Phil Murphy (State of Colorado)
Cam Johnson (USFS)
Mike Funston (USFS)
Gladys Crabtree (NPS-NIFC)
David Potter (BIA)
Shari Shetler (BLM)

PMO:

Barry Mathias (PMO)

Technical Advisors and Guests:

Mike Barrowcliff (USFS-NIFC)
Ernylee Chamlee (CDF)
Dan Rivers (BLM, System Coordination Office)
Douglas Stephen (NPS)
Greg Jensen (BLM)
Tim Murphy (BLM)
Merrie Johnson (NPS, TWT Liaison)
Tory Majors (USFS, IBPWT Liaison)

Facilitator:

Wilma Strohmeier (Interwest Management Associates)

Notetaker:

Lane Schulz

Welcome and Introductions

Shari Shetler

- Shari Shetler welcomed everyone and introduced the facilitator, Wilma Strohmeier of Interwest Management Associates. Introductions were made around the table.

Meeting Objectives

Wilma Strohmeier

- Finalize last meeting's minutes
- Review the status of projects/other committee work
- Celebrate our successes
- Review and refine results of Strategic Planning in spring of 2001
- Complete and prioritize a plan of action for 2003

IRMWT Meeting Minutes

November 5-7, 2002

Boise, ID

- Identify team member roles and responsibilities for the plan
 - Continue to build a high performance team
 - Review outstanding action items
-

Ground Rules/Participant Agreements

Wilma Strohmeier

- Openness and honesty
- Trust
- Accepting
- No withholding/Assertive
- Confidentiality
- Equal member
- Consensus
- Commitment to outcome

Additional Ground Rules Adopted

- Enjoy!
 - Be fully present and engaged – emotionally, physically, intellectually
 - Communicate respectfully
 - Listen to understand before responding
 - Be back ready to work after breaks
 - We want to ensure that the IRMWT members have enough opportunity to speak. Guests who are here to present should do so in as effective a way as possible, without lobbying. We value the input of everyone in the room and want to hear it, yet also want to ensure that all voting members of the team are heard.
-

Last Minute Adjustments to the Agenda

Shari Shetler

- Add GTG (Geospatial Task Group) to Information Items – Andrea Olson.
-

Finalize/ Accept Minutes

Shari Shetler (Handout)

June Meeting

- It was discussed that Mike's changes to the June 2002 meeting minutes had not been accepted.
- More time was requested by the team in order to gain agreement. It was decided to leave the finalization of the June minutes to be resolved by the team via email by November 15.
- To Mike there seems to be a distortion about what was discussed regarding the Unit Identifier Database. Suggested edits by USFS were handed out and read at the meeting.

IRMWT Meeting Minutes

November 5-7, 2002

Boise, ID

August Meeting

- 6f: No consensus resulted on the issue of requirements for interfaces, except for using the current interface memo until the guideline is finalized. Change the wording to: “The USFS suggests that the PMO role is to report...”
- 7d: Looking for consensus on the last point, that on interagency projects the project manager needs to comply with the lead agency requirements (systems, budgets, process).
 - o Mike F. suggested the following wording: “The USFS requires that the project manager of an NWCG-sponsored project for which they are lead agency needs to be under the supervision of the USFS.”
 - o Mike objects to the PMO being in the role of directing the project manager on interagency projects.
- 8. Barry Mathias will ask Al Borup to call Russ Berry. (Added to Action Items)
- 12. Strike “Proposed to run as a sub-project to ROSS.”
 - o Was not all brought together by September 20.
- 14. ?
- 16. Mike: USFS does not agree that this is to be done within the NWCG context.
 - o Add: “This short term repair is not an NWCG project.”
- Phil Murphy moved to approve the minutes as changed.
- The motion was seconded by Andrea Olson and approved, with no objections.

Old Business

ROSS Status Report

Barry Mathias(Handout)

- Ernylee distributed copies of the CDF memo sent to Neil Hitchcock regarding ROSS deployment coordination in California.
- Shari suggested that the team look at Ernylee’s letter and make comments after lunch.
- Barry Mathias walked the team through the ROSS Status Report. He noted that delays affecting project schedule also affect the cost of the project. Delays at this point in the project will be more expensive than those at an earlier phase of the project.
- Mike F: USFS top management has not been asked to address Issue #?; it has not yet been pointed out to him.
- Some setbacks began to creep in starting in August.
- The oversight of this project is by the IRMWT, and specifically by the USFS.
- Ernylee added that California is engaged in the project, although the report says “except California” (page 2, Training/Implementation Status).
- Mike F: Though things have to be pushed back, the ROSS application is still robust; only the schedule has changed.
- The dispatch module is still on schedule for January 2003.

IRMWT Meeting Minutes

November 5-7, 2002

Boise, ID

- Dan Rivers' question: What is your baseline--is the NWCG actually engaged with this project?
- Answer from Mike: No, all projects are actually owned by the lead agencies. The IRMWT, with the advice and assistance of the PMO, reviews and oversees. The NWCG parent team gets a thumbnail sketch from the IRMWT after every meeting, but not details. The USFS, the lead agency, has made a commitment to meet the requirements of its NWCG charter. If the USFS is not going to meet a deliverable we have to report back to the parent team.
- Wilma: It is important to make a distinction between funds that were not allocated and additional costs.
- Two different delays exist:
 1. delay in training and implementation
 2. delay in approach to upgrading of the infrastructure.
- Doug asked if partial implementation will adversely impact next fire season.
- Neil, as the business lead, does a good job of letting the directors know the consequences of lack of funding.
- Barry asked what the risks (that are not in this report) are of not having the funding.
- Gladys expressed concern that the status report to the IRMWT outlines issues and impacts, but contains no proposed solutions. How does the IRMWT then oversee the project?
- Let's not compare our responses here to responses on ICQS.
- Mike: One outcome of Gettysburg meeting is that the ROSS team will provide a letter detailing the impacts.
- There needs to be more priority given to ROSS implementation by management.
- Dan Rivers: The PMO has a form for reporting on scope, schedule and budget.
- The ROSS project is USFS-funded, but of course impacts every other agency.
- Shari: The IRMWT responsibility is to analyze any problems and provide feedback to NWCG (see Charter). The team needs to respond to the Status Reports, to close the loops and address the problems.
- The objectives of the IRMWT should be to reduce duplication and reduce costs.
- Shari: The IRMWT needs to ask for specific answers to their specific concerns. We need a vehicle for addressing the issues.
- Mike F: But we need to keep this at a high level.

Incident Automation Status Report

Tory Majors

- NWCG agreed to do the project, and \$300,000 of a requested \$500,000 was allocated to USFS.
- Mary Ann Szymoniak was selected as the project business lead.
- Project manager candidates for the interim system have been narrowed from six to two applicants by a sub-group of IRMWT members
- Tory requested that the team make a recommendation for project manager
- This Phase One interim requirement should be part-time for both the business lead and the project manager.

IRMWT Meeting Minutes

November 5-7, 2002

Boise, ID

- The oversight committee would be interagency.
- This is a chartered project, not a service-level agreement. A new module has just been added, so this project is not ready to be simply maintained. There is still a lot of infrastructure to be cleaned up and put in place.
- Review Tory's papers from January and May, 2002.
- Phase One of this project is a 3-5 year projection.

Vote

- An initial motion was put forward that Jeff Park be offered the project manager position, to be supervised by John Skeels.
- Then an amended motion was put forward by Andrea: That the IRMWT recommends the selection of Jeff Park as the project manager for Phase One of the project, based on the following conditions:
 1. That Jeff's project manager duties will be supervised and mentored by John.
 2. There will be an adequate time commitment from his in-line supervisor.
 3. That Jeff will commit to move from the developer role to project manager role.
- The motion was seconded
- The motion was put to a vote.
 - o 4 Yes's
 - o 3 No's: Phil, Cam, Mike F.
- Cam said he felt he was missing information about the choices made. Now that it has been narrowed down to two candidates, he feels uncomfortable voting without more information.
- Phil questioned why we are we now trying to reach consensus, after we voted?
- Wilma explained that we can proceed if there are no "veto" No's, and members can live with the results of the vote. She asked the team if anyone wished to veto.
- There were no vetoes; therefore all can live with the result.
- The motion carried.

IQCS Status Report

Barry Mathias(Handout)

- IQCS is on track and going well.
- The two-month extension actually could be viewed as positive because it puts it at the end of fire season. (Issues & Impacts).
- ? Asked User Tech Associates. UTA is an interim stopgap.
- This needs to be part of a long term O&M plan; we may not be able to wait for the construction.
- The IRMWT needs to have a better idea of how we will staff and support this, whether it will be in-house or out-of-house. Funding was cut, but the commitment still is there. USFS is still willing to meet it, whether in-house or contract.
- Mike B. suggested that the IRMWT recommend to the IQCS team that they move the development of the O&M plan forward in order to better make staffing decisions.
- Barry would like to see the ROSS O&M plan first so we can add to it.

IRMWT Meeting Minutes

November 5-7, 2002

Boise, ID

- We should look at the question of support issues and strategies from a program perspective rather than from a project perspective.
 - Additional concerns:
 - David would like more details to be made available.
 - Mike F. feels comfortable with PMO distillation of the information.
 - The project is meeting the DOI requirements because the lead is BLM.
 - Team members can inquire independently if they want more detail.
 - The process for obtaining more information on the project is to go to the business lead rather than to the project manager.
-

FPA Status Review

Barry Mathias

- The project is going well.
 - There were some organization chart issues: leadership roles were not well defined. The project core team was not connected initially to the project manager (Dan Keller) on the organization chart.
 - The project is establishing clarity about who will be the business lead external to the project (it is not Howard Roose, who is the business analyst). Initially they named Winnie Sorenson, but will probably change that and attempt to contract with Gardner Ferry to be the business lead person.
 - The result is a greater understanding of the roles of Dan Keller and Howard Roose.
 - The final charter and org chart have been changed to reflect input from the PMO. These have not come from Dan yet.
 - The FPA project charter needs to reflect the involvement and oversight of the IRMWT.
 - Federal projects such as this will be handled under FFALC, subject to NWCG protocol.
 - Barry endorses John Noneman as a good choice for full-time deputy project manager, running the project's day-to-day operations. There also has been discussion of moving Dan to Boise, and if that were to happen there may not be a need for a deputy.
 - Ernylee wants to know what avenue they will be using to get state information. It was suggested that until there is a business lead she ask Howard Roose.
 - Mike F. commended Barry and the PMO for their role in helping the directors to understand and adhere to this.
-

ICBS Re-Engineering Project Charter Review and Update

Barry Mathias(Handout)

- Discussion of Cost Estimate Analysis:
 - All alternatives are written from the perspective of a ROSS interface. The Charter needs to be looked at from the business perspective of the cache community.

IRMWT Meeting Minutes

November 5-7, 2002

Boise, ID

- o Mike F: The cache business community is not at the forefront of the fire director's issues and priorities. They may want a more thorough analysis, but they need to jump in and take this opportunity to do it now.
 - ICBS will be a big improvement over the current system.
 - Other agencies' contributions in terms of costs and FTEs need to be accounted for.
 - The desired alternative uses the ROSS infrastructure because of the efficiencies involved in doing so.
 - Mike B: Cache managers and dispatch coordinators, led by Andy Grey, did a study and they support this project.
 - Shari: At the NWCG meeting Neil Hitchcock gave an overview of ICBS, and Dave Milbrat, the business lead, was comfortable with that. It was agreed that the charter that was delivered would be sent by Shari to the PMO for review.
 - Shari proposed that the IRMWT have a chance to look at this and determine whether they agree with the PMO recommendations.
 - Barry pointed out that the business need should be better articulated than it is here. (Mike B indicated that the USFS Fire Director had approved it.) Barry feels the figures needed to get the project done were not delivered at the NWCG meeting. The PMO thinks a major overhaul to the charter is needed to include the business case.
 - David asked if the decision has already been made. He does not want to go through a paper chase on something that has already been determined.
 - Mike F:
 - o The decision was made that the most cost-effective approach is to have Lockheed Martin re-engineer ICBS.
 - o If we do not get ICBS launched this year we will have to stay with what we have now.
 - o IRMWT needs to look at the political realities of what can be done.
 - Andrea: If this is a NWCG project we may need to follow Barry's recommendations.
 - Mike B: this is talking about sharing managing and order processing with ROSS.
 - Dan: The BLM needs to see the business case in order to make a business-driven decision before they sign on. Each agency involved with a project needs to buy in.
 - A business requirements analysis has already been done by USFS, as the lead agency, and it can just be shared and adopted. USFS needs to share it. It was paid for out of ROSS, \$50K.
 - Barry: The charter states that there is a cost savings to using LM, but this is not substantiated. If there has been a BNA, then there is no problem, but this group has not seen the analysis of the business case: ROI, CBA, etc.
 - Mike F: There is a lot of pushback, resentment from the ICBS Project Team at all these requests. The ICBS team is frustrated. The project needs to be coalesced as a project first before it seeks NWCG approval.
 - The urgency comes from the concern that the two systems will not be coordinated, and any further delay is simply adding to that business problem, adding to the work load, etc.
-

IRMWT Meeting Minutes

November 5-7, 2002

Boise, ID

NFPORS Update

Mike Funston(Handout)

- NFPORS is congressionally mandated.
- There are multiple needs, including reporting to Congress on accomplishments of the National Fire Plan.
- The fire directors are stakeholders.
- The USFS shares the same needs and concerns as the IRMWT on NFPORS.
- Jim Stires asked that this team address NFPORS.
- In September, five members of the IRMWT worked to come up with this assessment, dated October 28, 2002.
- We will go over this assessment now and then decide if we want to incorporate it into our NWCG report. They can then decide if they want NFPORS to be an NWCG-supported system.
- Issues exist with FFALC and NWCG jurisdiction.
- This assessment does not include recommendations for improvements, which would be Phase Four, as yet unidentified.
- Santa Rosa meeting comments on NFPORS are more strategic but may not be desirable or even able to be done in the timeframe available (by January).
- IRMWT is not providing oversight to NFPORS.

Discussion

- Doug suggested adding to the list of potential interviewees some who actually will be users of the NFPORS information. In fact, should we just recommend that this is not where this information should reside, rather than getting into this and trying to improve it or even asking questions.
- Barry: the NFPORS project is looking for a home for NFPORS, and they have suggested fire management as the best choice.
- Gladys: Because NFPORS is so much bigger than fire management wouldn't we rather see the system prioritized somewhere else in USFS?
- David: The fire community seems to be the best area to help get this working right.
- Mike F: NWCG may be in the best position to catalyze this project. They may need an assessment like this as a test case.
- Barry: The fire directors would probably appreciate an investigative incursion into the project. Mike has done good work in terms of providing some key questions that should be asked.
- Shari: We could look at NFPORS in terms of NWCG requirements for a project.
- Ernylee: If we could make these questions a bit more generic they could be asked of any project. This might make it easier for the NFPORS group to digest them.
- Barry: The bottom line is that the project must be business-driven. We do not want to duplicate any effort here. The PMO has been working with BLM and USFS and will lay out the agency and interagency ways of approaching it at the interagency fire meeting.
- Shari: A comparison of the NFPORS 300B to Mike's assessment could be used as a way of sending back evaluation on the scope, schedule, and budget of the project.

IRMWT Meeting Minutes

November 5-7, 2002

Boise, ID

- Barry: the project does not have an approved 300 at this time. Dan has the 300. If we had the 300 combined with Mike's assessment, perhaps we could answer some questions.
 - The IRMWT will eventually inherit responsibility for this, so it is in our best interest to try to fix it now.
 - What actions/decisions need to be made by the IRMWT in order to make a big picture evaluation?
 - Mike F: We should just give NFPORS the results of a survey of what the business people at all levels tell us about how this system works.
 - This report is a strategy to force requirements analysis and discipline.
 - Tim Murphy reported on his NFPORS meeting observations. Wini is putting together a user group, which is parallel to what Stires is doing.
 - Are they looking at the technical users' needs? Are the right questions being asked? Wini's group is great for the portion of NFPORS that has a user interface.
 - Shari: Where we need to go with this might be different than what it was in August.
-

SafeNet/Aviation Systems Update

- Rick Mills was not here; therefore this update did not take place.
-

New Business

Delegations of Authority

Mike Funston

- Mike Funston read Tory's suggested changes.
 - The objective was to document this because the players change.
 - The changes are an agency prerogative.
 - David made a motion that the notes be accepted with the changes.
 - The motion was seconded by Gladys Crabtree.
 - The motion was accepted (no one opposed).
-

300B – Increased Oversight

Mike Funston

- The role of the CIO offices in oversight has increased.
 - We need to rethink and streamline the oversight role of the IRMWT.
 - Barry: In an interagency world, we need to look at oversight as the wedges of a pie rather than from the top down, as overlapping authorities.
 - Shari: This topic will fit with tomorrow's discussion of our roles.
-

BLM's SCO Perspective

Dan Rivers

- The BLM System Coordination Office has responsibility for oversight.

IRMWT Meeting Minutes

November 5-7, 2002

Boise, ID

- BLM decided to go with what OMB and GAO established.
- The BLM uses the same criteria for BLM projects as for interagency projects, which simplifies things.
- The USFS and BLM would like to see a 300 “Lite,” distilled down but still able to give the essential information to determine if a project is on track.
- When BLM went to capital planning and investment control, it was necessary to establish a baseline: the 300. If the investment goes into a partnership (such as FPA with USFS) the project must be tracked step by step.
- We are trying to work with the agencies to determine a baseline for projects. This is not solidified yet. A project such as NFPORS, where there is no baseline, is very broad and hard to nail down.
- We are working on how to determine what to do when a project gets way out of scope and there is no longer agreement, and an agency wants to withdraw from the project.
- The tactic of doing an interagency post-project analysis is very difficult on older projects that began on a handshake. We can’t force the 300, for example, on other agencies, but must figure out how to work with them. There is a question of how to partner with agencies whose process is less fully developed than BLM’s.
- Mike F pointed out that the NWCG has experience with interagency issues, so we are actually ahead on this.
- Dan: What happened with homeland security could happen with the fire community. We must achieve a level where everyone sitting in this room is non-agency specific.
- If there are five agencies partnering on a project, the expectations and requirements of each agency must be met even though there is a lead agency. These need to be spelled out in the charter or service-level agreement or whatever you wish to call it. The service-level agreement is basically the same as the charter that we draw up for a new project.
- Agencies need to understand that the charter will function as an agreement and a roadmap, and that this is where they can document their needs.
- There is a detailed agreement on the USDA website.
- There is a new office looking at Federal Enterprise Architecture. Down the road that is the vision. In order to do that, projects must be built that meet the requirements of more than just one agency. By meeting the strictest requirements you meet the requirements for all the agencies. (Or communicate and lower the strict requirements to a level that matches and makes all agencies happy.)
- Shari: We have come a long way in creating this kind of alignment. This is what we attempt to do all the time. It should not be left to the project manager to create this on each project.
- Barry: How can we ensure that individual agency needs are met?

WFLC (Wildland Fire Leadership Council) Comments

Tim Murphy

- The WFLC wants fire directors to bring forward issues that have been difficult or that are projected to be difficult to bring together within the fire community.

IRMWT Meeting Minutes

November 5-7, 2002

Boise, ID

- Tim Murphy suggested that this team consider offering a one-page paper to the WFLC to ask for their support on challenging issues. Get this proposed agenda item to Jim Stires by Nov 21. He only wants a snapshot.

Meeting Adjourned

Shari Shetler

IRMWT Meeting Minutes
November 5-7, 2002
Boise, ID

November 6, 2002

Information Items

GTG Update

Andrea Olson

- Andrea attended the October 8-10 GTG meeting in Tallahassee, Florida.
 - They are dedicated and are doing a good job.
 - They are frustrated with no feedback from us on white papers.
 - GTG would like copies of our meetings notes.
 - A potential agenda item for the next IRMWT meeting is establishing geospatial standards.
 - There is a need to identify a standard.
 - This white paper could be transformed into a standard.
 - The GTG white paper is a response to a request we made to them.
 - In it they suggest a tool to help us meet the standard
 - This is not meant to be the only way to do that.
 - They have been working on this for a long time; it is coming from the ground up.
 - The PMO should look into this.
 - Judy published something on this.
- Action:** Andrea--Have Judy get in touch with GTG on the data standards. 11-15-02
- Action:** Andrea--Distribute GTG white papers # 2 and 3 electronically for team feedback. 11-15-02
- Action:** Andrea--Write a letter back to GTG advising them we will review and respond. 11-15-02
- Action:** Team—Review document (pull out pieces that are process standards, data standards) and send feedback comments to Andrea. 11-22-02
- Action:** Andrea--Compile team feedback and get it back to team. 11-29-02
-

NWCG Meeting Report

Shari, Mike and Barry

- Focused on BLM working with USFS to develop a standard process to satisfy the OMB investment management process.
- Issue: We need to start focusing on configuration and interface standards for all automated projects.
- Neil gave an overview of ROSS status. He handed out a proposed interagency project team.
- Looked at data standards the DAWG group has been working on.
- Mike F: Heads up that IRMWT may start to work on fire occurrence and a single reporting system for agencies. Do we want to guide NWCG thinking on fire occurrence? Discussion followed.

IRMWT Meeting Minutes

November 5-7, 2002

Boise, ID

- Doug: One of the GTG reports includes some recommendations on dealing with fire occurrence. Are we going to address that as well as #2 and #3?
- #1 just needs to be read.
- #2 and #3 need responses. Maybe part of what we need to say is that this is bigger than us. We could write a paper to NWCG giving some options, with recommendations.
- Ernylee: There should be a response every time someone sends a white paper.
- Mike B: We need to address these things in a timely manner.

Action: Mike Barrowcliff will compile existing information and options for fire occurrence and give to NWCG in time for their January meeting. 11-15-02.

- NWCG struck the approval role of the PMO regarding project management
- NWCG indicated that the IRMWT has the same role with FFALC projects as with NWCG projects.

Issue: There may be a need to review and update our project charter as the most effective way to accomplish interagency project requirements.

- This is the first time Barry has seen a WT or combination of teams step up and identify what applications they are using. (Many of which are old ones that need to be refreshed.)
- The view is still out there that applications can be updated by agency.
- Mike B: These proposals are usually just for short-term solutions. Looking at this from the larger perspective has many potential benefits: for example, Fire Family Plus has replaced 18 old applications.
- NWCG tabled the ICs.
- Dave Cleeves and Judy Crosby are working on the possibility of combining some of the working teams.

Organizational Charts

Barry Mathias

- Barry identified in charts the makeup of WFLC and the NWCG.
- He also put up a flow chart demonstrating how NWCG, BLM and USFS each get to the A11.

SafeNet/Aviation Systems

- Mike B. will send electronic copies of Rick Mills' SafeNet/Aviation Systems report from (a previous meeting).

Action: Shari—Check with Rick Mills regarding any action items he may want to add to our meeting notes.

IRMWT Meeting Minutes

November 5-7, 2002

Boise, ID

November 7, 2002

FPA Charter Revision

Barry Mathias

- The FPA Charter is being revised to clarify the role of the business lead on the project. It had Howard wearing two hats--leading the business analysts and also representing the project to the steering committee.
- The business lead needs to be someone who is familiar (with upper management) and can supervise and give direction to the project manager and the rest of the team.
- See the FPA charter, which shows the business lead outside of the box, the business analyst inside the box

Deputy Project Manager for FPA

Mike Funston

- Dan Keller is going through the process of establishing an FTE for this position.
- Applicants from any agency can apply

Interagency Aviation Information Technologies issues and opportunities M Barrowcliff

- The report was presented to Aviation council a few weeks ago.
- They have a need for coordinating infrastructure, and Mike recommended they take advantage of what is already there.
- There is a lack of high-level aviation representation in NWCG.
- Mike recommended that IRMWT welcome any contributions this group wants to make to us.
- This is a first step to creating some coordination between the aviation program and the NWCG.

Round Robin:

- Doug:
 - o Proposes that the group consider when they discuss System and Process an effective way to deal with meeting minutes.
 - o Challenged the group to see if there is a way to read the minutes at the end of the discussion of each subject, and agree right then.
 - o If the minutes were essentially done by the time the group walked away they would be timely and accurate, and would serve as a concise summary of what we just did.
 - o Asked Shari, Wilma and Lane to consider some ideas or ways to help the meeting minutes process.

IRMWT Meeting Minutes

November 5-7, 2002

Boise, ID

- Phil:
 - Shari send me the name of the man from Tallahassee, and I will get him on the team, and possibly on board for the meeting in January.

- Gladys:
 - Will send copy of the 10-Year performance measures (for fire business) to the states.
 - What are people hearing about it, how are you collecting the data?
 - Thinks there should be some follow-up on Fire Reporting, to determine what is going on there, and if that is going to be the next crisis as far as automated application?
 - Question to Andrea: Was there an action item re GTG? Because we asked them to do these reports. (Andrea doesn't think so but will inform the team if there is.)

- Barry:
 - There is a need for the IRMWT to provide a flow chart that is a visual road map to show how our processes work.
 - These projects might be done better in Microsoft project, to convey the matrices we are working on to present.
 - Barry has been working with Mike F. to develop criteria for the process of getting a project to NWCG.

- Mike B:
 - The WildCAD board of directors will be meeting in Boise next week.
 - WildCAD continues to go through the process of becoming a BLM national application, are making moves to become a USFS application, and are going in the direction of becoming a NWCG application.
 - Mike will be meeting with them and can give them some of the preliminary decisions made by this team in Santa Rosa.
 - Mike will send out information on the meeting to IRMWT members in case they can attend.
 - National IRM Workshop talking points need to get out to speakers.
 - Mike would like comments from this team by the end of this week on the talking points so he can firm them up with speakers.
 - Door prizes such as agency paraphernalia are needed for the IRM workshop.

- Ernylee:
 - We will need a laptop projector, flipcharts, markers and masking tape for our next meeting in California.
 - This was a productive meeting.
 - I get frustrated sometimes, but some good things are happening and it will get better.

- Andrea:
 - Within our agency there is beginning to be some interest in fire.
 - Some non-fire people are going to the meeting in Las Vegas.

IRMWT Meeting Minutes

November 5-7, 2002

Boise, ID

- o (Barry—there will be some discussion of CIPC process in Las Vegas, so it will be valuable.)
- Dave:
 - o BIA still has no Internet access and no talk of ever getting it again.
 - o BIA fire has no connectivity to BIA.
 - o We can't use ROSS.
 - o They bought 100 new laptops and are using those with dial in modems for Internet access among the laptops.
 - o No email now. Burn CDs and send them FedEx.
 - o No rumor of COBEL going away.
- Mike F:
 - o last month GAO launched an investigation into Wildland Fire GIS applications.
 - o Objectives were to find out what GIS capabilities the agencies have and determine what barriers there were to that use. (Also will be looking into remote sensing) Typically it is because a vendor in a congressional district has something to sell.
 - o Concern expressed by Mike's management on how FS is handling this. Agency policy is to give good information, make sure they get to the right people who have the bigger picture.
 - o GAO reps will be at the workshop next week.
- Wilma:
 - o Words have power, and create a reality of their own.
 - o You obviously care and bring a lot to the table. And you are beginning to get a lot done.
 - o So your "not fun" comments.... I encourage you to start speaking more positively about this.
 - o Your team will look back and see that you really made a difference, which makes it worth all the pain and anguish.

Action: Barry will email the org charts as soon as he gets them from Dan to Shari.

Action: Shari will distribute them to the team.

IRMWT Meeting Minutes
November 5-7, 2002
Boise, ID

Plus Delta Chart

Plus:

- got resolution to some things
- participation
- having a facilitator and a scribe
- having the whole team here
- meeting rooms were better (but preferred the Owyhee room)
- Barry offered the BLM state office facility
- did see video as a plus
- Barry's handling the FPA charter snag
- breakout exercise good, might help us to resolve other issues in the future
- had paper copies of everything
- Dan River's participation

Improvements

- Liaison could be here
- too much air-conditioning
- didn't see value of diversity video to team
- improve the glacial pace
- don't bounce around on items
- vote more, helps us move on
- electronic copies of handouts before the meeting
- have more CIO's and other IRM agency folks come to meetings
- not leaving meetings early

Thank you, Shari and Glad, for arranging meeting, facilitator and scribe.

Action: Resolve June meeting issues via email by the end of next week (November 15, 2002).

Action: Barry will email the notes from a facilitated meeting in Montana about the IRMWT process to Wilma.

Action: Wilma will create the building trust graphic.