

NATIONAL WILDFIRE COORDINATING GROUP

Montana DNRC, Forestry Division
2705 Spurgin Road
Missoula, MT 59804
(406) 542-4300

March 20, 2002

386.1

TO: NWCG MEMBERS

FROM: DON ARTLEY, Chair, NWCG

SUBJECT: PROPOSED IMT CONFIGURATIONS

Attached is a copy of the proposed Incident Management Team configurations that the IOSWT presented at our January meeting. Please ensure that the proposal receives field review within your organizations. In addition, we will discuss the proposal with GACC representatives at our upcoming joint meeting in May. The IOSWT will make a final recommendation at our fall meeting in Emmitsburg. We should be prepared to make a decision on the recommendation at that time.

DA:kmk

cc: Bob Leaverton, Chair, IOSWT
Neal Hitchcock, NICC
Chairs, Geographic Area Coordinating Groups

Incident Management Team Configurations

Introduction

The National Wildfire Coordinating Group (NWCG), following their Fall 1999 meeting in Quincy, MA, charged the Incident Operation Standards Working Team (IOSWT) to determine if changes to IMT configuration would improve efficiency, reduce costs and make more firefighters available for national mobilization.

Process

The IOSWT collected input on this issue from Type I Incident Commanders, Type II Incident Commanders, and Agency Administrators. Information gathering extended through the 2000 fire season and culminated in a joint meeting with Incident Commanders, Agency Administrators and the IOSWT.

A number of facts were brought forth in this discovery process. In no particular order these are:

1. Type I Incident Management Teams need to be able to respond to a wide variety of National incidents. These incidents are usually fire, however, complex fire incidents generally include characteristics of “all risk”. Type I teams are also asked to respond to other incidents requiring emergency response skills, i.e., hurricanes, etc. This tasking would often be at the National or Type I level.
2. Currently there is very little difference in the configuration of Type I and Type II teams, as both are being asked to respond to similar incidents with the same expectations upon arrival. There is a need to differentiate between the two types of teams in terms of improved administration of team response vs. incident complexity.
3. Local teams are still needed for quick response to less complex incidents. There is also a need for Type II teams to be nationally mobilized to less complex incidents.
4. There is a need to nationally address the issues contained in the document: “Cost Containment on Large Fires: Efficient Utilization of Wildland Fire Suppression Resources.”

Recommendations

The IOSWT working team makes the following recommendations relative to the incident team configuration issue. The recommendation accomplishes several objectives, in that, it recognizes the increased complexity of Type I incidents, and the need for increased skills, it allows the flexibility for I.C.’s and Agency Administrators to adjust skill needs above and beyond required positions, and it differentiates between the size of Type I and Type II Teams.

1. Type I and Type II incident management teams should not have the same configuration.
 - A. For National mobilization, Type I Teams would include 28 team members, plus allowance for 6 trainees, and allowance for 10 additional positions to be negotiated with the Agency Administrator during mobilization. This configuration adds one Operations Sections Chief to Command and General Staff, increasing the team structure from 27 to 28 positions. There would be no Type I “short” team. The 10 negotiated positions allow flexibility in the inclusion of technical specialists, various unit leaders, and apprenticeship positions.

A Type II Team would be 20 members plus 7 negotiated at mobilization. Trainees would not be mobilized with Type II teams. A Type II ‘short’ team would be 10 positions. This configuration would be valid for mobilizations outside the GACC. The 7 negotiated positions would allow flexibility in the inclusion of technical specialists, various unit leaders, and apprenticeship positions.
2. Incident Commanders need to have flexibility based on the incident and Agency Administrators need to adjust the team configuration at the time of mobilization.
3. Team configuration should be consistent on national or intra GACC mobilizations. In order to maintain consistency, it is important that consensus be achieved on the issue and administration of the standard is consistent during national mobilization.

Rationale

The configuration of Type I teams should allow the teams to perform at a high level immediately upon arrival at an incident. Agency Administrators expect to “hand-off” these major incidents to the teams when they arrive. Additional positions have been added to teams outside the normal configuration in order to meet these escalating expectations. The recommended configuration would allow the Type I teams to be all risk capable, to handle Type I incidents and to maintain a highly skilled team.

The configuration of the Type II teams would allow for more rapid mobilizations at a local level and should reduce costs. These teams would be configured to manage less complex incidents. Not assigning trainees would allow for more use of local unit trainees.

TEAM CONFIGURATIONS

TYPE I	TYPE II LONG	TYPE II SHORT
ICT1	ICT2	ICT2
DPIC	DPIC	DPIC
SOF1	SOF2	SOF2
IOF1	IOF2	IOF2
OSC1	OSC2	OSC2
OSC1	OSC2	OSC2
OSC1	PSC2	PSC2
PSC1	LSC2	LSC2
LSC1	FSC2	FSC2
FSC1	DIVS	AOBD
DIVS	DIVS	
DIVS	AOBD	
DIVS	RESL	
DIVS	SITL	
AOBD	FBAN	
ASGS	FACL	
ATGS	SUPL	
RESL	GSUL	
RESL	COML	
SITL	TIME	
FBAN		
FACL		
SUPL		
GSUL		
COML		
PROC		
TIME		
COMP		
<i>Plus 10 additional positions negotiated between the IC and the Agency Administrator</i>	<i>Plus 7 additional positions negotiated between the IC and the Agency Administrator</i>	