Engine Operators Committee Meeting Notes:

Meeting held on Oct, 27 2009 at the Fire and Aviation Management office in the federal center complex.

Attendance:
Committee Chair/Black Hills NF – Ken Watkins
Mike Ottosen – Upper Colorado River
Chris Rankin – Meadbow Routt/ Thunder Basin NG
Devin Haynie – Rio Grande NF
Scott Sugg – RO
Kelly Kane – RO
Ken Ruer – Regional Fleet

Working Groups:
Revision of Charter
Website
Regional Strike Team/Task Force

Meeting was started by Kelly who advised us of some of the upcoming issues including Budget Woes, and the status of upgrading captains to GS8. Main take home is that no matter how the funding shakes out, continue to work safely and be as effective as possible. Ultimately it is up to each forest to decide whether or not to upgrade into the GS8 pd and with an uncertain budget it is not very likely to happen soon.

Scott followed Kelly's intro by encouraging us to build depth on the committee even on forests where representation is already in place. Engine Academy is proceeding with the planning for FY10's product. The drop dead date was Nov 1 but that has been pushed back to Nov 13.

Ken Ruer who is our contact with regional fleet came in to discuss some pending issues. Ken started out by discussing the difference between a dedicated apparatus and non dedicated apparatus. A dedicated apparatus is one in which the certificate of final completion comes from the manufacturer of the apparatus IE S&S or Brand FX, as opposed to the certificate of final completion coming from Ford or Chevrolet. The implications of dedicated vs. non- dedicated are many; a dedicated apparatus does not retain any value from the auctioning process because we are unable to sell the chassis due to policy. Consequently the F.O.R. for a dedicated chassis is approximately 6 times higher than a non – dedicated. Our F.O.R. is calculated by taking the replacement cost, estimated increase in replacement cost, management cost minus a 30% residual (of original cost) from auction and dividing that number over the life expectancy of the vehicle. The newest type 6 standard to appear is the 643p. The difference between the 643u and 643p is the potential for the 643p to be a non dedicated chassis and a lower cost. There was a lot of discussion about the implications of the 643p and some of the variances it could create. Ken is going to do a more thorough look into the spec and report back to the committee and we can decide our next steps.

Next Ken discussed the e.m.i.s. spreadsheet and how we could possibly use it to help in making our RMEOC replacement spreadsheet. Ken will email this to Ken Watkins and we will go from there.

Working Group Charter Revision:
Ken was the working group lead for the charter revision. We started off by reviewing the old charter and comparing it to changes Ken and Scott had made. One of the main changes was the direction. We are changing the direction from an equipment/safety to a larger scale overall leadership or as Scott put it "how we do business". The thought is not to exclude the equipment/safety aspect but to incorporate it into a larger theme. One other major change was to incorporate the Facilitated learning analysis and the Accident prevention analysis as something we would like to be working on. We are also checking to make sure our goals and mission are similar to the national committee.

Working Group Strike Team:
Eric was the working group lead for Strike Team. We spent a majority of the afternoon discussing this topic at length. The first decision made was to change from approaching this as just a strike team and adding the Task Force which we had mentioned earlier as an option down the road. The next decision was that for the first test run of the Strike Team/Task Force we would limit the scope to Forest Service except on units where they are service first. We will try to write flexibility into this document to include other agencies down the road. The rationale behind this decision was that we needed to keep the complexity down until we have a good handle on how this will work. Next steps will be to present the document to the FAM board possibly in December. In the mean time, Scott will discuss some of the wording in the RMACC mobilization guide with them and see if changes need to be made. Also we will bounce the idea around on our units and try to get a good feel of the hurdles we face.

Working Group Web Site:
Ken was working group lead for the Web Site. The discussions that ken has had with our site admin have been productive. Ken will be the liaison between us and him and hopefully we can get a better handle on the page. We would like to see some way to contact the committee and possibly better navigation. Ken will continue to work on this.

The Committee is in need of a Vice Chair if you are interested contact Ken or Scott.

Next Teleconference is on November 10th at 0830, Scott will send out the number shortly.