

CGAC tasking 20-02 from IWDG

- The following answers are from various data calls and discussions with various GAC representatives and are intended to provide background and information for IWDG moving forward with CIM.
- We recommend developing a communications plan to address CIM. Identifying the groups that need communicated with, i.e., Agency Executive, Line Officers, Agency Administrators, FMOs, IMTs, and Coordinating Groups. It is important to ensure all levels are hearing the same consistent message. What CIM is and what it isn't and why it is a good business model.

1) Determine a sustainable number of teams necessary to meet the needs of the geographic area.

GA	Current # Teams	Needed # Teams CIM	SUMMARY OF TABLE- Everyone wants the number of teams we currently have.
PNW	2 T1 / 7 T2 ODF 3 T1	11	(+1 NEMO)
AIFC	2 T2	3	Teams flexible- one can convert to T1
NOPS SOPS	4 T1 / 6 T2	10	Moving toward a standard type of team currently
SW	2 T1 / 3 T2 / 7 T3	5	
GB	2 T1 / 5 T2 / 9 T3	7	Many T3 team members also on T1 & 2 teams
RM	1 T1 / 2 T2	3	Fully staffed and rostered teams 90+
NR	2 T1 / 4 T2 / 1 WFU	6	If all teams out -keeping rosters full challenging
EA	2 T2	2	Each team has about 120 listed members plus or minus a few. That would be adequate if they were evenly distributed across the 29 required qualifications and more of those 120 were qualified versus trainee.
SA	2 T1 / 1 T2 / 1 T3	3	Don't really think we need additional IMTs.... if we did add teams it would be at the Type 3 level.
Totals	17 T1 / 32 T2	50	WFU/ AC/ NIMO teams not accounted for (no complete report of T3 Teams also)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T3 teams in all areas will need to be formalized if CIM is implemented • CIM teams will only work if dedicated Roster support at GAC level- IC's cannot be asked to fill out a roster after an order. • Overall support for CIM exists- but the pool concept of resources is not supported without greatly increased support, planning and national guidance. 			

2) Provide more direct coordinating group oversight to IMTs and all aspects of IMT succession.

Discussion- Most areas indicate they recognize the need for succession plans and nearly all state they have empowered ICs to continue individual efforts at succession at individual team levels moving forward. To date many efforts have focused on priority training programs and identifying critical shortage positions. Recruitment and subsequent turn over have proven effective in different locations.

Recommendations-

- Develop one IMT application pool for all Geographic Areas that can be cross referenced and is a living document to alleviate seasonality of different parts of the country. It can then serve as the foundation for using pool resources
- Provide IMT community one comprehensive succession plan template with clearly defined expectations for each area and subsequent teams. To be built at the NICC level then distributed to teams through GACCs.
- Agency buy in and support based on statutory obligations.

3) Actively recruit and retain more ICs.

Discussion- The complexity of incident response has increased tremendously. IC's are being asked to maintain command and control of natural disasters, pandemic response, and the ever increasing "new normal" of complex wildland fires. In the last ten years we have witnessed the largest, most expensive, and most destructive wildland fires in history in most of our geographic areas. The time spent on these responses carries them away from their families and their ever-increasing workload. Due to the complexity of the environment they are placed in, our IC's are buying professional liability insurance to protect themselves from a litigation driven society. Yet in the last 10 years we have not changed one thing to incentivize our workforce to become IC's.

Recommendations-

- Work with HR Classification to truly look at the complexity of our IC's. NEMO IC's are GS-14's with less time spent on complex incidents than most of our current geographic IC's.
- Address and potentially eliminate current salary caps for federal employees.
- Manage IMT fatigue and number of assignments with a national rotation for all complex incident management teams. Assure all teams are exercised and direct orders outside the hosting GACC when teams reach an agreed upon number of assigned days.
- Encourage the utilization of deputy IC's on all complex assignments.
- Encourage interchangeability between the Deputy IC and IC to maintain a healthy work/life balance.
- Update the National Mob Guide to allow the Deputy to take IMT out of GACC without prior approval.

- Develop National IC selection criteria process based on best qualified individual. Remove the federal agency bias. (Feds, State, and local Government would be the same priority) ADs would be secondary and allowed to apply.

4) Provide participation incentives for ICs and IMT members –

Discussion- We recognize the increasing challenge of Incident Management and the significant demands required of all IMT members. With the escalating complexity of large fires and the excessive number of days committed on incidents, some personnel and agencies are finding IMT commitments unsustainable. The reduction in fire personnel, as well as a significantly reduced collateral workforce align to create on-going staffing shortages for the majority of Federal IMTs. For a significant period of our IMT history, participation was incentivized by several factors less relevant in the contemporary team environment. Commitment to an IMT roster meant a reasonable expectation of complex incident assignments off your home unit. Team participation created a sense of comradery, filling an important gap for individuals coming off of crews and into management positions. Team participation also created opportunities to advance individual qualifications and incident management skills. The scope and scale of current wildfire occurrence has made the previous motivations less compelling for both individuals and agency administrators.

Although many individuals remain committed to IMT participation, alternative approaches to recruitment and retention of team members seems necessary.

Recommendations-

- Address and potentially eliminate current salary caps for federal employees. This is a particularly important issue for ICs and some C&G. With increasing commitments to assigned days of incidents, this issue is likely to reoccur and has profound effects on moral and willingness to participate on IMTs.
- NIFC could get agreements in place to allow all Federal Agencies to participate in Fire., IE, red cards, training, IMT participation ect... BOR, BOEM, USGS, ect..
- If agreements are expanded the following could an option. Significant engagement with other federal agencies that have traditionally not participated in wildland fire incident management could be significant in filling currently limited IMT positions. Employees, from agencies that do not have wildland fire programs, may have the incentive to engage in a novel experience of incident management and could bring important skills to our IMTs. This increase in participation may have the added incentive to reduce the commitment of current IMT members.
- Develop indices for team participation relative to funded fire organizations and number of personnel. Agency Administrators should have a measured commitment of IMT members that is commensurate with the number of fire funded personnel and incident management workload.
- Manage IMT fatigue and number of assignments with a national rotation for all complex incident management teams. Assure all teams are exercised and direct orders outside the hosting GACC when teams reach an agreed upon number of assigned days.
- Support the use of position sharing to assure seasonal commitments are sustainable.

- Address current disparities in compensation and investigate the potential for position pay for federal employees.

5) Efficiently manage IMT rotations to reduce fatigue and create more equitable distribution of assignments.

Discussion- Teams get used at different levels in different areas. Many go out numerous times others only a few. One goal of CIM is to better distribute workloads to help staffing levels and reduce burnout. Teams that go out often are more likely to be highly functioning. GACs want to control and use their own teams, NICC is tasked with oversight. Many IMT members have day jobs needing attention and limiting assignment availability. When federal employees retire participation on IMTs is also limited by policy, federal regulations and earnings caps. The government spent years developing and training people and many are high functioning after retirement. If CIM is adopted IMT management options become more prevalent.

Recommendations-

- Team use criteria must be national policy, must be nationally coordinated and supported by all GACCs.
- Change teams use criteria by implementing a system in which the number of assignments or number of days out is used to help equalize team rotations.
- At higher Planning Levels NICC should coordinate all IMT deployments with a single type of team (PL4-5)
- One common type of team will reduce workloads, training variances and business complexities opening bandwidth for singular actions and a common IMT operating picture across the nation.
- Change regulations to allow retired IMT members to still be allowed to participate and not be limited by earnings caps or affiliation requirements.
- Agency Administrators need to have an understanding of how and when to order an IMT. Develop better training for AA's. Historically we have seen IMT's ordered for 2-5 day fires that a local unit should manage, or extended IMT's once the incident complexity has been reduced. All contributing to burnout.

6) Ensure an interagency and intergovernmental composition of IMTs.

Discussion- A data call from all GAC's that includes current IMT team composition is being collected and will be attached to this document. This information can help inform decisions and drive change.

Recommendations-

- Develop National IMT selection criteria process based on best qualified or best fit individual. Remove the federal agency bias. (Feds, State, and local Government would be

the same priority) ADs would be secondary. We feel there are well qualified Cooperators that should be allowed to be in the priority.

- Develop Agency Participation targets (Based on Agency IMT use)
This will allow agency's to use this as a recruitment tool and also be a quantifiable metric moving forward.

7) Begin evolving toward a three-tier Incident Management Team structure (Initial Attack, Extended Attack/Emerging Incidents, and Complex Incident Management).

Discussion- Although the complex incident management proposal involves some significant shifts in our current approach to wildfire response, portions of this three-tiered systems are somewhat self-sustaining and much of the framework to accomplish this shift are currently in place. Initial Attack is the responsibility of local units and dispatch centers and is unlikely to experience significant change with implementation of the Complex Incident Management proposal. Also, the implementation of Complex Incident Management teams is well structured in the proposal and although policy and guidance changes will be necessary, outcomes are well defined. The management of incidents ramping up or down may present the greatest challenge to teams and coordination groups.

Recommendations-

We suggest focus on a few initiatives to aid in the evolution to the three-tiered incident management team structure:

- Task GACCs with analysis of lower complexity incidents and the need to continue supporting or establishing Type 3 incident management organizations.
- Develop a working group of GACC personnel to establish procedures and workload assessments of rostering Complex Incident Management Teams utilizing the pool concept.
- Develop a more structured communication strategy for ICs and Agency Administrators.
- Develop an implementation strategy that includes testing in selected Geographic Areas.
- Assign a working group, including current steering committee members, to address training needs and the continued need for S420 and S520.
- Address the continued role of both NIMO and Area Command.
- Develop and maintain a list of areas where policy changes and agreements need to be addressed and or modified to ensure continued operations in a three tier operation.

8) Work toward utilizing a geographic area pool to fill necessary positions on IMTs that are not part of the IMT's roster of core positions (between 20 and 30).

Discussion- Some geographic areas have been utilizing the pool concept for several years. Some were driven to that point due to the lack of Incident Management Team applicants in critical positions, others have been trying to evolve to match the changing reality of IMT participation. Several mistakes have made along the way including trying to pool all positions on a roster, which led to untenable situations with coordination centers and individuals when rostering for

mobilization took place. Some report it has been found through trial and error that set rosters at least down to the unit leader provide for an easier mobilization, team cohesion and better succession planning. Conversely, it has also been reported that “bloated” rosters that are locked in during on call periods often can lead to a lack of availability of critical qualified personal for other teams that have an actual assignment or pending order to be mobilized.

An IMT cultural shift will need to be understood moving into pool use. Teams can make these changes but the workload portion needs to be addressed upfront as other parts of the IMT/IC tasking are focused on changing the IC or C&G level workload on the teams and placing it back on the fire support system.

Recommendations-

- Develop set rosters down to the unit leader level.
- Integrate three teams from different Geographic areas each year to work together to share IMT personal prior to and during mobilization based upon their unique assignments and individual needs.
- All GACCs will need dedicated team coordinators to facilitate CIM. ICs are not interested in ordering the rest of the team from the pool after the initial team activation. That portion must be managed and coordinated to coincide with all deployments through close communications between coordinator and ICs. This will include some preset pool members pre identified and verified availability.
- One pool process nationally is essential, full time pool (module) coordinators that can manage schedules, availability and be in contact with other coordinators to help keep the entire CIM process viable. This will be a big part of taking workload off ICs and IMTs.

Reported Barriers to CIM- (FOR CONTEXT ONLY)

- Fear that pool concept will reduce professionalism and team cohesion.
- Lack of incentive to participate on IMT’s.
- Lack of depth in all sections, including Incident commanders that participate on IMT’s.
- Limited assignments and/or availability of personnel resulting in delayed speed to competency and retention of qualified positions.
- Some GAs have many personnel that support out-of-GACC IMT’s in both qualified and trainee positions which results in a lack of personnel to support in GAC teams. Any additional export of personnel to other teams greatly inhibit continued staffing for some GAs.
- Recruitment and utilization of state personnel. This varies broadly but some state personnel may not have the same flexibility to support out-of-GACC assignments as federal employees.
- Organizational culture - change, which could affect participation.
- Agency barriers, specifically state statutes that might not allow such a change in IMT organization.

- Potential delays in mobilization of functions needed for the most complex incidents.
- Agency leadership engagement will need to occur in support of suggested changes. Specifically, to gain insight on availability of their employees that participate on IMTs. We are working on an average commitment time/days of mobilization so we can better answer the “How Many Teams” question and the succession plan to maintain that number.
- The perceived notion that Type 2 IMT's can't handle complex fires
- Culture - uncomfortable with change and trying something new.
- Some people fear that less assignments would be available.
- The question of where our WFM IMT fits in this framework.
- The need to develop a functioning system (ICAP) that can be implemented across GA boundaries.
- The need to have a highly functioning IMT coordinator.
- I think there is support for CIM (combining Type 1 and 2 IMTs into CIM). Other aspects of the IWDG proposal such as pooling are not being well received.
- We have been experiencing challenges for our geographic area sponsored nominees to attend S-520.
- Agencies throughout Alaska have faced personnel shortages that last few years with increasing day job expectations.
- Less militia (collateral duty fire staff) available.
- Lack of agency leadership directives to support the fire effort during PLs 4 and 5.