

2014 ICAP DATA:  
I.M.T. APPLICANT POOL BY AGENCY AND GEOGRAPHIC AREA

**ICAP Data Analysis**

Assumptions

- Data are distilled from raw ICAP data.
- These data reflect all applicants, and thus analyze recruitment and interest. The data do not distinguish between Selected and Denied, nor between Trainee and Qualified.
- The data reflect one single individual applicant, and eliminate duplicate applications by a single individual. Thus, the data reflect true numbers of individuals who applied to IMTs.
- Some duplication may exist among regions, as several applicants applied to multiple Geographic Areas (GA). However, this is generally less than 5 individuals per GA. Duplicates were eliminated on the National count, thus the National totals will not be equal to the sum of the individual GAs.
- Individuals who applied to multiple sections of the IMT organization were designated to a section as such, in order of priority:
  1. If an applicant identified a Command and General Staff (CGS) position, they were counted under CGS, regardless of selection or trainee status. This reflects interest and willingness to promote into higher levels of responsibility.
  2. If selection was indicated for one position, that section was selected.
  3. If no selection was indicated, the section with most qualifications listed was selected.
  4. If an equal number of qualifications were listed across sections, the section with the applicant's highest qualification was selected.
- On the original spreadsheets, the qualification used to designate the section is shown first. The exception is where an employee expressed interest or trainee status for a CGS position but was selected for a different position. In this case, the selected position is listed first, but the applicant is still counted under CGS.
- "Rural Fire District" was changed to "County and Local" (C&L) and combined with any local or county fire district identified.
- It is probable that "Other" is most often a county or local fire district, because the agency is self-selected by employees who likely did not think their agency fit into any of the options. However, information has not been sufficiently examined to make a confident determination. Therefore, Other and C&L are analyzed both separately and combined.

### National totals

Agency	Total individual applicants	CGS	Finance	Logistics	Ops	Plans	CGS AD	Finance AD	Logistics AD	Ops AD	Plans AD	% by Agency of all applicants	% of ADs by Agency	
BIA	45	12	15	1	6	15	8	2	0	3	0	7	1.1	26.7
BLM	508	64	148	43	94	122	101	20	7	20	7	10	12.8	12.6
FWS	101	7	34	4	17	27	19	2	0	3	0	2	2.5	6.9
NPS	156	30	52	13	29	24	38	12	2	12	1	3	3.9	19.2
FS	1979	429	638	264	325	453	299	182	49	89	56	53	49.8	21.7
Other	328	44	84	17	106	53	68	11	1	19	6	7	8.3	13.4
C&L	300	42	94	16	81	59	50	12	2	11	9	8	7.6	14.0
State	554	106	200	43	143	74	94	43	5	29	15	14	14.0	19.1
<b>TOTAL NATIONAL</b>	<b>3971</b>	<b>734</b>	<b>1265</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>801</b>	<b>827</b>	<b>677</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>104</b>		
% of Total		18.5	31.9	10.1	20.2	20.8	17.0	22.5	16.5	23.2	11.4	15.4		
If we assume Other is C&L:														
C&L	628	86	178	33	187	112	118	23	3	30	15	15	15.8	13.7
%:	DOI	20.4	USFS	49.8	S,C,L,O	29.8								

### Rocky Mountain Geographic Area

Agency	Total individual applicants	CGS	Finance	Logistics	Ops	Plans	CGS AD	Finance AD	Logistics AD	Ops AD	Plans AD	% by Agency of all applicants	% of ADs by Agency
BIA	4	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0.9	0.0
BLM	76	5	22	10	14	16	14	0	0	2	1	2	17.0
FWS	22	3	8	0	7	3	4	1	0	1	0	1	4.9
NPS	20	5	2	5	4	1	8	0	2	2	0	1	4.5
FS	168	22	48	19	35	35	31	7	3	10	1	1	37.7
Other	39	5	6	5	15	6	7	1	0	3	0	1	8.7
C&L	45	13	14	5	12	7	7	4	2	4	2	1	10.1
State	72	10	30	6	15	14	7	5	1	3	1	0	16.1
<b>TOTAL Rocky Mtn</b>	<b>446</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	
% of Total		14.1	29.4	11.2	22.9	18.8	17.7	13.7	16.0	24.5	6.0	8.9	
If we assume Other is C&L:													
C&L	84	18	20	10	27	13	14	5	2	7	2	2	18.8

### Northern Rockies Geographic Area

Agency	Total individual applicants	CGS	Finance	Logistics	Ops	Plans	CGS AD	Finance AD	Logistics AD	Ops AD	Plans AD	% by Agency of all applicants	% of ADs by Agency
BIA	10	2	2	0	2	4	2	0	0	2	0	0	1.7
BLM	74	16	26	5	12	17	14	8	1	4	2	1	12.6
FWS	10	1	3	0	3	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.7
NPS	13	5	6	0	0	3	4	2	0	0	1	2	2.2
FS	351	84	131	16	53	86	65	44	5	16	9	10	59.8
Other	13	4	2	2	4	4	1	0	1	2	1	0	2.2
C&L	7	3	2	0	3	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	1.2
State	109	51	48	3	13	21	24	20	1	11	11	8	18.6
<b>TOTAL Nrn Rockies</b>	<b>587</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>21</b>	
% of Total		28.3	37.5	4.4	15.3	23.9	18.9	12.8	1.4	6.3	4.3	3.6	
If we assume Other is C&L:													
C&L	20	7	4	2	7	5	2	0	1	4	2	0	3.4

### Southwest Geographic Area

Agency	Total individual applicants	ADs	CGS	Finance	Logistics	Ops	Plans	CGS AD	Finance AD	Logistics AD	Ops AD	Plans AD	% by Agency of all applicants	% of ADs by Agency
BIA	11	0	4	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.3	0.0
BLM	40	3	11	2	11	8	8	1	0	2	0	0	8.5	7.5
FWS	10	3	5	0	1	3	1	2	0	1	0	0	2.1	30.0
NPS	32	8	9	2	8	3	10	4	0	3	0	1	6.8	25.0
FS	244	66	82	28	42	60	32	26	8	14	10	8	51.8	27.0
Other	48	7	14	2	15	5	12	1	0	5	0	1	10.2	14.6
C&L	15	3	2	1	6	0	6	1	0	1	0	1	3.2	20.0
State	71	5	22	7	27	7	8	0	1	1	0	3	15.1	7.0
<b>TOTAL Southwest</b>	<b>471</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>14</b>		
% of Total		20.2	31.6	8.9	23.8	19.3	16.3	23.5	21.4	24.1	11.0	18.2		
If we assume Other is C&L:														
C&L	63	10	16	3	21	5	18	2	0	6	0	2	13.4	15.9

### Alaska

Agency	Total individual applicants	ADs	CGS	Finance	Logistics	Ops	Plans	CGS AD	Finance AD	Logistics AD	Ops AD	Plans AD	% by Agency of all applicants	% of ADs by Agency
BIA	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	0.0
BLM	50	4	11	3	17	8	11	1	1	2	0	0	25.3	8.0
FWS	9	1	3	0	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	4.5	11.1
NPS	24	5	7	4	4	1	8	1	0	2	0	2	12.1	20.8
FS	41	15	22	6	3	6	4	9	4	2	0	0	20.7	36.6
Other	8	4	4	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	2	4.0	50.0
C&L	5	0	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2.5	0.0
State	59	22	27	3	18	7	4	11	2	6	2	1	29.8	37.3
<b>TOTAL Alaska</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>		
% of Total		25.8	38.9	9.6	21.7	12.6	17.2	32.5	36.8	27.9	8.0	14.7		
If we assume Other is C&L:														
C&L	13	4	7	2	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	2	6.6	30.8

### California

Agency	Total individual applicants	ADs	CGS	Finance	Logistics	Ops	Plans	CGS AD	Finance AD	Logistics AD	Ops AD	Plans AD	% by Agency of all applicants	% of ADs by Agency
BIA	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.2	50.0
BLM	27	3	9	5	4	6	3	1	0	1	1	0	3.8	11.1
FWS	12	1	4	1	2	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	1.7	8.3
NPS	24	5	11	4	1	5	3	2	1	1	0	1	3.8	20.8
FS	304	49	121	37	35	70	41	21	10	6	9	3	43.1	16.1
Other	166	22	44	6	49	26	41	7	0	8	4	3	23.5	13.3
C&L	152	16	46	6	49	22	29	5	1	3	2	5	21.6	10.5
State	18	5	4	0	8	0	6	0	0	5	0	0	2.6	27.8
<b>TOTAL California</b>	<b>705</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>12</b>		
% of Total		14.5	34.2	8.4	21.0	18.7	17.7	15.4	20.3	16.9	12.1	9.6		
If we assume Other is C&L:														
C&L	318	38	90	12	98	48	70	12	1	11	6	8	45.1	11.9



Northwest Geographic Area

Agency	Total in individual applicants	ADs	CGS	Finance	Logistics	Ops	Plans	CGS AD	Finance AD	Logistics AD	Ops AD	Plans AD	% by Agency of all applicants	% of ADs by Agency
BIA	7	1	2	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	0.7	14.3
BLM	93	13	28	8	14	22	21	2	2	6	1	2	9.4	14.0
FWS	13	0	5	0	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	1.3	0.0
NPS	14	5	4	4	1	3	2	2	1	1	0	1	1.4	35.7
FS	573	181	173	107	99	111	83	79	27	36	17	22	57.8	31.6
Other	30	2	11	2	7	4	6	1	0	1	0	0	3.0	6.7
C&L	88	8	31	5	11	28	13	1	1	1	4	1	8.9	9.1
State	174	8	51	21	47	18	37	4	0	4	0	0	17.5	4.6
<b>TOTAL Northwest</b>	<b>992</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>27</b>		
% of Total		22.0	30.7	14.8	18.1	19.8	16.5	29.2	21.1	27.2	11.2	16.5		
If we assume Other is C&L:														
C&L	118	10	42	7	18	32	19	2	1	2	4	1	11.9	8.5

DRAFT V3 08/08/14