



ROCKY MOUNTAIN COORDINATING GROUP

Bureau of Indian Affairs (Southwest, Rocky Mountain and Great Plains Regions)
Bureau of Land Management (Colorado and Wyoming)
Fish and Wildlife Service (Mountain/Prairie Region)
Forest Service (Rocky Mountain Region)
National Park Service (Intermountain and Midwest Regions)
State Agencies in Colorado, Wyoming, South Dakota, Nebraska and Kansas

Minutes of Fall Meeting November 13-14, 2013 Rocky Mountain Area Coordination Center Lakewood, Colorado

In Attendance:

Members

- Chair** Ken Kerr
- Vice Chair** Ron Graham
- Jay Esperance
- Rocco Snart
- Kyle Cowan
- Bill Ott
- Willie Thompson
- Mike Davin
- Bob Jones
- Dave Carter
- Cal Pino
- Dave Hall

- Earl Imler
- Ross Hauck
- Dan Smith
- Business Manager** Brooke Malcolm

Ex-Officio

- Chad Ray

Add'l Member Reps & Guests

Tim Mathewson – RMA Predictive Services
Kevin Weaver – BIA Rocky Mountain
Cliff Hutton – Operations Committee

I. RMCG Succession

All

- A. Ron Graham ready to serve as 2014 RMCG Chair.
- B. 2014 Vice Chair/2015 Chair will be Mike Davin – NPS.
- C. 2015 Vice Chair/2016 Chair will be Rocco Snart – CO DFPC.
- D. Graham planning to attend January GACGAC & NMAC/GMAC meetings in Boise. Topics will include:
 - 1. EIM Projects for IMT strategy
 - 2. ICAP system for IMT applications

II. Review of RMCG Charter/Mission Statement

All

- A. Reinforcement by Chair that the mission of the RMCG needs to be carried forward with new members.
- B. Field personnel hold the group accountable for these statements.
- C. Perception from RMCG members that RMA-FEC does not seem to engage with RMCG very actively on a regular basis.
 - 1. FEC Chair Crapser did deliver a verbal commitment and Leaders' Intent at the 2013 Spring Meeting for all ICs, deputy ICs, and RMCG members.

2. FEC does not have a charter or any formal organization, which contributes to confusion and lack of support for RMCG efforts at times.
3. Recommend requesting a more formal arrangement for the group to encourage internal consistency, information sharing, and accountability.
 - a. Group may need to develop internal processes for handling difficult or controversial issues.
 - b. Execs feel that they are either already working on these issues effectively, or that there are no problems to be addressed.
 - i. Kerr has taken specific examples to his exec.
 - ii. Esperance confirms that there is very little consistency among the members and meeting attendance. There also doesn't seem to be a good working relationship between some of the members.
4. Some execs are not willing to step up and get involved. Crapser has assumed the Chair role by default, in the absence of any support from the other agencies.
5. Some execs may not be engaged due to other commitments and higher priorities outside of fire.
6. Tactic should be to ask for the FEC's involvement with RMCG on a regular basis in order to improve the effectiveness and leadership of RMCG.
 - a. IMT Meeting in April is a good opportunity; Risk Management meeting is another.
 - b. Annual RMCG Executive Summary should be presented in person at Winter Meeting in January.
7. Kerr recommends that each RMCG member propose a recommended draft charter and agenda items (developed by RMCG) for each meeting to request that the group improve its consistency and engagement.
 - a. RMCG Chair and/or Vice Chair should be present at every executive meeting to ensure that RMCG issues are addressed.

III. RMCG Consensus Decision Model

- A. Review of Revised Consensus Model (11/2011 Version).
 1. Adopted by RMCG at request of executive group.
 2. Revised in October 2011 to clarify guidelines for dissent and blocking.
 3. Members agree that any revision or recall of the consensus model would need to be approved by executive committee.
 4. **TASKING:** RMCG Committees (primarily Operations and Training) will be consulted by liaisons for their input on Consensus Model.
- B. Definition of Quorum: two-thirds of members must be participating in order to conduct business during meetings and conference calls. Currently, quorum requires nine of the fourteen members be present for decision-making.
 1. Clarification that, once quorum is reached, 75% of those present must agree in order to suspend consensus and move to Robert's Rules of Order.
 2. Clarification that 75% of members present (after quorum is reached) are required to agree for consensus to be reached.
 3. **TASKING:** Davin will match definition of quorum between all RMCG documents (Charter, Consensus Model, Operating Plan).

- C. Agreed that RMCG will continue to use Revised Consensus Decision Model moving forward.
 - 1. Cowan registered reservation due to general dislike for consensus model.

IV. RMCG Membership & Advisors

- A. All members agree that RMCG membership guidelines are clear, including added Charter verbiage from 2012.
- B. Membership corrections needed to Charter and other RMCG documents:
 - 1. Great Plains BIA and Midwest NPS will be added to list of member agencies.
- C. Ott raised concerns that some of the other agencies (BIA, NPS, BLM) have multiple chartered representatives, while USFS has only one.
 - 1. Suggests that executives may need to weigh in on representation for all agencies.
 - 2. USFS executive position is that RMCG should only charter one representative from each agency.
- D. Clarification from McMahill that two NPS representatives are necessary to provide a voice for both NPS regions in the RMA.
- E. Confirmation that Charter already includes verbiage indicating a preference for a unified voice among multiple representatives from the same agency (RMCG Charter, p.4).
- F. Chartered RMCG members must deliver their delegations of authority to RMACC Manager and/or RMCG Chair (via Business Manager) each year (refer to Recurring Action Log).
- G. Consensus that only chartered members (or their delegated representatives) who are present during discussions may be considered for consensus or vote.
- H. Agreement that RMCG members may delegate a representative only from his/her own agency to RMCG when the primary, chartered member is not available to participate.
 - 1. Individual agencies may handle internal/"acting" delegations in different ways.
 - 2. Recommendation from Kerr that potential alternates or "acting" RMCG/MAC members be pre-identified in the spring prior to the fire season to allow for adequate preparations and briefings. (Added to Recurring Action Log.)
- I. **TASKING:** Business Manager will distribute example delegations of authority to RMCG members via e-mail.

V. MAC Membership & MAC Plan

- A. Add verbiage to MAC Plan to match RMCG Charter re: additional non-decision making participants.
 - 1. MAC Membership should be comprised of the delegated representatives that have authority to obligate money on behalf of their agencies.
 - 2. Partners such as the FMAG advisor and ESF4 should not (and will probably not be willing to) be included for purposes of voting or consensus.
- B. Edit MAC plan to reflect membership description in RMCG charter: "Members will be those who have responsibilities for wildland fire and/or the authority to obligate funds on behalf of their agencies. All others will be considered advisors

- or SMEs included to enhance the incident prioritization and resource allocation process."
- C. MAC Plan Appendix A (directory) will be revised into multiple appendices to identify (1) delegated primary MAC members for each agency, (2) delegated alternate MAC members, (3) advisors, and (4) other pre-identified partners.
 - D. Update MAC Plan p.4: "Prioritize fire management incidents..."
 - 1. Reference Revised Consensus Model for decision-making process (attach as an appendix to MAC Plan).
 - 2. Insert "Decision-making Process" at B. (everything moves down a letter)
 - a. First use Priority Decision Matrix and priorities developed by MAC Coordinator. Reference Consensus model or one sentence from Charter Mission Statement re: consensus decisions by group in cases of deviation from MAC Coordinator priorities.
 - E. **TASKING:** Graham, Davin & Malcolm will complete edits to all RMCG documents (Charter, Operating Plan, MAC Plan) prior to Winter Meeting in January.

VI. MAC Operations & Rules of Engagement

- A. **TASKING:** Snart will Follow-up with Donovan Puffer re: FEMA tasking from MAC AAR in July 2013. (See Action Log)
 - 1. Follow-up needed with Dave Hard also re: same information from Colorado OEM.
- B. Ott concerned that MAC Plan and MAC activities may not fully account for risk management at a geographic area level.
 - 1. Incident risk management should be accounted for in 209s.
 - 2. Each agency's big-picture risk management plans need to be brought to bear on incident prioritization and other MAC activities.
- C. Agreement that all MAC members must be well-informed prior to MAC meeting for best decisions to be made. MAC members should be engaged 24-hours/day.
- D. Ott raised question: is MAC meeting held at appropriate time to match operational cycle?
 - 1. Kerr suggests considering when information (209) is received, when does the prioritization process take place (by MAC Coordinator), and how does MAC meet deadlines to best serve operational periods?
 - 2. Some feel that timing of MAC meeting is fine, with the understanding that decisions may change in light of continuously evolving incident conditions.
- E. Esperance has concerns that LMACs sometimes obstruct implementation of RMA MAC decisions (i.e. locally holding air tankers for IA while ongoing incident needs air support urgently).
- F. Reiteration by Kerr that RMA Tactical Group is designed and geared toward managing IA and emerging type 3 incidents.
 - 1. Helps RMACC Manager and RMCG DO set priorities at PLs 1-3.
 - 2. Communicates and makes recommendations to MAC and RMACC Center Manager about movement of severity and IA resources.
- G. Priorities are developed by MAC Coordinator based on decision matrix, reviewed and approved by MAC Group, then handed over to RMACC Center Manager for allocation of resources to incidents according to agreed priorities.

- H. Still a need to dovetail MAC Plan with MAC Exercise, including escalation/de-escalation in PL.
 - 1. 2013 MAC Exercise focused more on communication and roles of MAC partners than on practicing MAC functions and referencing MAC Plan.
 - a. This format did not necessarily prepare MAC members for MAC activation as much as it fostered better communication among the members.
 - 2. Kerr recommends RMCG pursue a more “real-world” exercise for 2014.
 - 3. Reference Operations Committee product for 2014 Mob Guide for PL escalation/de-escalation.

VII. Roles & Responsibilities of MAC Support Functions

- A. When should support positions be activated? There were redundancies in 2013 with some of the support positions.
 - 1. Davin's draft indicates positions that would be ordered if needed, depending on complexity.
 - 2. Some are RMACC positions that provide some support to MAC; others are MAC-specific positions that are independent of RMACC.
 - 3. Kerr requests addition of sentence on MAC Plan p. 3, 1st paragraph to describe who will order and when (RMACC Manager orders in coordination with MAC, depending on need).
- B. Evaluation of selected support functions:
 - 1. Finance: would serve both RMACC and MAC by conducting daily conference calls with IMT finance sections, as well as be a resource for incident business questions.
 - 2. Logistics: drivers, etc. that can support logistics for RMACC and MAC, depending on logistics needs.
 - 3. FBAN: need for support identified in 2012-2013 to assist MAC when RMA Predictive Services workload is highest; provides fire behavior-specific expertise to supplement work of GACC meteorologists.
- C. Table from RMA Mob Guide p.108 rewritten to improve consistency. Incorporated Ops Committee inputs via Snart. New version will be submitted for 2014 Mob Guide.
 - 1. Table divided into three sections: RMCG functions, MAC functions, RMACC functions.
 - 2. Ott suggests that draft organizational table oversteps MAC's responsibilities. Support functions for RMACC should be coordinated by RMACC Manager, including clear step-up plan tied to PL levels to meet floor staffing needs and the MAC support needs.
 - 3. RMCG should develop formal tasking for RMACC Manager to develop operating plan for RMACC, with accountability enforced by direct USFS supervisor.
- D. MAC Plan updated to clarify roles & responsibilities of MAC and MAC support functions; referred to table in RMA Mob Guide p.108. Final draft will be presented at Winter Meeting for RMCG approval.
- E. RMACC Manager Delegation of Authority revision was previously requested by Fletcher.

1. Thompson believes that this should wait until new Center Manager is hired so that person can have input and delegation can be matched with experience & capabilities.
2. Former Center Manager had difficulties with being “stuck in the middle” and blurred lines between coordination roles & responsibilities and tactical decisions.

F. ACTION ITEM FOR 2014 WINTER MEETING: Assign RMACC Operating Plan & roles/responsibilities of MAC support functions to new RMACC Manager for completion before 2014 Spring Meeting.

VIII. Team C Status Discussion

- A. Team was originally Type 3; Type 2 status earned under Joe Lowe.
- B. Focus was for first response to State of South Dakota & Black Hills, leveraging local knowledge and fast response with local members.
- C. Desire to be GACC team stemmed from lack of assignments in zone for a couple of years.
 1. Hybrid team was developed as a compromise.
 2. Lowe pushed for zone concept.
- D. Team was made purely zone team again for 2013, until other teams are committed.
 1. Notice of zone team status was not received by GPZ board until mid-January.
 2. Team members were upset, due to having committed to Team C as a GACC hybrid team.
 3. Leadership said this should not have been a top-down decision.
- E. Current request from GPZ board (received Spring 2013) is to reinstate GACC team status.
 1. BKF Forest Supervisor (Bobzien) requested reconsideration of decision; RMCG denied request due to proximity to start of 2013 fire season.
 2. Requests for information revealed that team is not primarily local anymore; Type 3 teams with high capacity are available locally.
- F. Esperance concerned that local fire staff is on the team, so little to no capacity remains for local IA if team is committed.
- G. Team C has added capacity for GACC when number of teams was reduced.
 1. Ott requests that State of South Dakota provide RMCG with written acknowledgement that Team C will be a GACC team. Concerns that GPZ Board may be trumped by Governor.
 2. Letter from GPZ board may not be enough if Governor decides team should be held locally.
 3. Ott requests letters from Sec. of Ag. & BKF leadership to support GPZ board letter from Travis Lipp.
- H. Deadline for decision needs to be made by end of Feb. to ensure all language gets into the Mob Guide. Consensus to approve notification to team applicants and Great Plains Zone Board (et al) immediately of new team status.
 1. Kerr suggests writing a letter to GPZ leadership that Team C is being accepted as GACC team, including all expectations, availability of

- additional support (IMTs) if needed, and a statement that this decision is final.
- 2. Hutton & Ops Committee concur that response in letter form is appropriate, and Ops Committee concurs with RMCG decision.
- 3. Ott and Esperance will groom way for letter with Bobzien and State of SD officials.
- 4. Ott drafted letter from RMCG to Travis Lipp (Chair, Great Plains Board); letter approved and signed by Chair. Sent via FedEx to Lipp (for receipt on 11/18/13), with courtesy copies delivered via e-mail.
- 5. Decision will be included in RMCG annual Executive Summary in January.
- I. Team will likely remain available year-round, with a strict commitment to the RMA rotation schedule during fire season.
 - 1. Mob Guide language has been submitted by Esperance to Operations Committee for approval and inclusion for 2014.

IX. Improvement of Critical Information Sharing

- A. Item from MAC AAR in July.
- B. Specific issue was regarding aircraft safety messages related to "high, heavy & hot" flying conditions.
 - 1. Problem in 2013 with coordinating critical safety messages in a timely fashion.
 - 2. Communications recommended by safety officers were delayed by up to three days due to internal agency reviews; Kerr believes value added did not justify the delay.
 - 3. Agreed that a "less-than-perfect" message that conveys pertinent information quickly is better than a perfect message that is delayed.
- C. Ott believes that SAT/ASTAT should be empowered to develop and disseminate messages directly, especially where critical safety information is involved.
- D. Agreement that internal policies and activities should not conflict with or obstruct critical safety communications being delivered to the field.
- E. **TASKING:** MAC Group will thoroughly review delegations of authority (usually from templates) for safety teams to ensure timelines and expectations are clearly identified and that proper authority is granted for autonomy for development and issuance of this type of message (deadline 2014 MAC Exercise).
- F. **TASKING:** All RMCG members will communicate this approach to each agency/unit aviation staff to ensure better communications in the future.
- G. **TASKING:** Cowan and Esperance will begin development of inbriefing packet/checklist for safety and other support teams (deadline 2014 MAC Exercise).

X. SAT Report Action Items

- A. Continuity of Command
 - 1. West Fork AAR becoming very difficult to coordinate due to retirements and scheduling conflicts. May not be possible to achieve in the near future.

2. Per Ott and Thompson: USFS has made efforts internally regarding the continuity of command issue.
 3. **TASKING:** Ott & Thompson will provide RMCG with a Lessons Learned document so that information can be shared with other agencies.
- B. Mobilization of State & Local Government Resources (Snart)
1. LEAN project in Colorado still a priority, but has been delayed due to floods and staffing vacancies.
 2. WebEOC in Colorado was tested during flooding. Awaiting AAR for that incident.
 3. 30-30-90 initiative in Colorado underway.
 - a. Desire to get 30 engines to incident within 30 minutes 90 percent of the time.
 - b. Strategy to bridge staffing gap between initial attack and extended attack.
- C. Medical Emergency Plans
1. RMA medical SOPs are adequate, as determined previously by RMCG.
- D. Preparedness
1. This is a national issue, beyond purview of RMCG.
- E. Policy (Carter)
1. Assigned to Carter and Rys-Sikora. Neither available for comment; will be revisited at next meeting/conference call.
- F. Initial Attack (Cowan/Jones)
1. Heli-rappel capabilities are not available currently in Colorado.
 2. Cowan's inquiries indicated that this capability is not necessary, not cost-effective, and there are limited incidents/terrain where rappellers would be appropriate.
 3. Helicopter extraction for medical emergencies and cargo delivery are the more important capabilities in the RMA.
- G. Communications (Davin/Snart)
1. Issues regarding radios and frequency use have not yet been thoroughly researched.
 2. Davin suggests coordinating with radio experts to develop Lessons Learned document and/or address specific issues.
 3. Will update again at RMCG Winter Meeting.
- H. Incident Issues
1. Issue was resolved previously by USFS Safety Officers.
- I. Dispatch (Fletcher)
1. RMA aviation officers working with national group to develop new typing system for Air Attack platforms.
- J. Environmental (Hall/Pino)
1. Oil & gas field safety presentation from Southern Ute Agency distributed by Pino.
 2. Mitigation measures have been taken in other areas.
 3. Safety monitoring is ongoing; risk analysis available for local areas to customize.
 4. Pino & Hall will update whenever new information is available.
 5. This issue should be included in safety team inbriefing packet.

- K. Next updates will be at 2014 Winter Meeting.

XI. Predictive Services Workload Issue Paper

- A. Issue Paper first presented on September conference call.
 - 1. RMA Predictive Services provides several services that other GACCs do not.
 - 2. Requests for products and specific assistance are accommodated a large portion of the time.
 - 3. Current staffing plan for program is based upon pre-2001 fire statistics.
 - 4. With only permanent Predictive Services staff during fire season, several of the services the field units have requested will not be offered.
 - a. Capabilities are limited to fulfilment of national requirements and a few of the additional services currently offered.
- B. RMCG members were asked to prioritize Predictive Services products and/or present alternatives (including funding) for supplemental staffing.
 - 1. Esperance consulted FMOs for priorities; almost all of the services listed were rated as high or moderate priority.
 - 2. Multi-media briefing is consistently important for field personnel; many units use it every day.
- C. Supplemental staffing pool is very small, due to the specialized training and experience needed.
- D. Use of AD support was discontinued by USFS in 2013.
 - 1. BLM Colorado stepped in to provide money for continuation of Predictive Services ADs.
 - 2. Looking for a more permanent solution moving forward.
- E. Ott's concerns relate more to AD use on the RMACC floor than to Predictive Services.
 - 1. ADs used for staffing during periods when there was not enough activity to justify them.
 - a. Confusion why additional staff was necessary in 2013 when RMA is at PL1 or 2.
 - 2. Should be used only for surge capacity when no other resources are available.
 - 3. Agreement that ADs should not be used to supplement staffing due to performance problems in permanent staff which have been identified. Performance issues should be addressed as necessary.
 - 4. Times during 2013 season when 60-70% of dispatch staff on floor were retired agency employees hired as ADs.
 - a. Not clear why so many ADs are needed, because there doesn't appear to be a shortage of agency dispatchers.
 - b. ADs are used at RMACC because there are business practices specific to this center, which are contained in the various desk SOPs.
 - i. Requires that anyone who comes in must be trained in the RMACC-specific procedures, which can take a full two weeks to accomplish.

- ii. This strategy does not match with ICS, which stipulates that any qualified individual should be able to “plug & play” anywhere in the system.
- 5. Ott has requested a more equitable cost sharing arrangement so that the RMC support cost is not borne entirely by USFS.
- F. All agencies are asked to commit to a timeframe during the fire season to fund the AD support for Predictive Services.
 - 1. Kerr suggests RMCG members work together to determine a schedule depending on funding availability and cost sharing.
- G. Ott suggests having new RMACC Manager develop Operating Plan for RMACC, including staffing levels tied to PL.
 - 1. Plan should include cost-share agreement (Ex: USFS pays for RMC Support for dispatch staffing; DOI pays for Predictive Services staffing).
- H. Kerr suggests approaching universities with a plan to recruit interns using year-end money.
- I. Per Mathewson, need for decision to be made as soon as possible; interested meteorologists may not wait much beyond January before they look elsewhere for work.
 - 1. Kerr commits to BLM Colorado funding from beginning of May through August for AD Predictive Services support.
 - 2. Request for all agencies to share the cost so that one agency is not paying the whole bill.
 - 3. Funding for AD training will be approved; Mathewson will work with new FMO and Gill Fay for specifics.
- J. Per Snart, some funding for RMACC position(s) may be available from the State of Colorado, depending on 2014 budget decisions.
- K. More discussion on cost sharing and support staffing will take place at Winter Meeting in January.

XII. Tactical Group Discussion

- A. Operations Committee developed 2014 RMA Mob Guide language and Tactical Group Conference Call template.
 - 1. Both documents approved after review and minor edits to clarify roles & responsibilities of group and match MAC Plan language.

XIII. Preparation for 2014 MAC Activation

- A. Request from Davin to have 2-hour timeframe at RMCG Winter Meeting for review and approval of 2014 MAC Plan.
- B. MAC Exercise will be coordinated for May 2014.
 - 1. Should include all contributors to MAC (OEM, FEMA, DOT, etc.).
 - 2. Business Manager will ensure all 2013 MAC participants are added to mailing list for MAC Exercise so that they have the opportunity to participate.
- C. VTC and WebEx will be used to allow virtual attendance when absolutely necessary.

1. Kerr emphasizes that face-to-face participation is always preferred and should be the first priority whenever possible.
 2. This may require a change of venue for MAC when activity is focused in areas other than Colorado front range.
- D. Snart will coordinate 2014 MAC Exercise for first week of May (tentative).
1. Suggestion to look for someone other than Kleinman's NIMO team to formulate and run the exercise.
 2. Should focus on active use of MAC Plan, SAT/ASAT inputs, and issues from 2013 season.
- E. Further planning and specific details will be discussed at 2014 Winter Meeting agenda.
- F. Davin will include 2014 MAC Plan in MAC Coordinator Checklist document.
1. All MAC participants will also be expected to understand the current MAC Plan and be able to effectively refer to it prior to MAC activation.
- G. Suggestion from Graham to activate MAC for practice during seasons when activity is lower.

XIV. 2014 Winter and Spring Meeting Planning

- A. Davin coordinating 2014 Spring Meeting as RMCG Vice Chair.
1. Will be second week of April at Little America Hotel in Cheyenne, WY.
 2. **TASKING:** Graham will write a save-the-date letter for Kerr's signature before end of December.
 3. Agenda will be very similar to last year.
 - a. Executives and RMCG will meet with ICs again on afternoon before main meeting begins.
 - b. May be opportunity for i-Suite, ROSS, and other training sessions on last day.
 4. Vendor that provided social event last year will be at meeting again.
 - a. Concerns about ethics and conduct have been alleviated, as the arrangement is between the hotel and the vendor, and participation in the social event is voluntary.
 5. Suggestion about inviting a representative from the Wildland Firefighter Foundation to collect donations.
 6. Trying to coordinate golf tournament as a possible fundraiser.
- B. Winter Meeting will be in Cheyenne, WY or Fort Collins, CO during the third week in January.
1. Graham, Davin & Malcolm will meet as soon as possible to develop the agenda.

XV. Mobilization Center Plan Review

- A. Draft plan was developed by IMT from Northwest Area that managed 2013 Mob Center in Grand Junction.
1. Needs to be reviewed, edited and approved by January 2014 for use during fire season.

- B. Important to have mob center cost-share agreement developed for future seasons.
- C. RMCG should promote development of local plans for specific mob center locations in each zone.
- D. **TASKING:** Davin & Malcolm will complete edits to plan (according to working session recommendations) and present at Winter Meeting for RMCG approval.

XVI. MOU with Pueblo Community College

- A. Cowan presented proposed MOU for training at Pueblo Community College.
- B. Questions raised by group regarding RMCG's authority to sign this MOU.
 - 1. Practice of signing MOUs was started in 2003, per Cowan.
 - 2. Premise is that this will help ensure guidance, monitoring and quality control for courses offered by signatory institutions.
 - 3. Kerr does not believe that he has authority to sign MOUs for BLM Colorado. May be same for other RMCG members.
- C. Kim Bang joined via telephone to clarify and answer questions on behalf of the Training Committee.
 - 1. First MOU requested in past four years.
 - 2. Based on a national template for MOU with educational institutions.
 - 3. Training Committee is responsible for monitoring and enforcement of guidelines.
 - 4. Institutions (cooperators, etc.) may not need MOUs if they are covered under a statewide agreement.
 - 5. Per Field Manager's Course Guide, NWCG certification can be issued for any course offered which is taught by NWCG qualified instructor.
- D. Consensus to return the document to the Training Committee for clarification and determination of signatories from each agency (per Kim Bang's recommendation).

XVII. 2014 Buying Teams

- A. Desire of Business Committee to have a RMA Type 2 Buying Team for 2014 season.
- B. Graham and Ott will instruct Business Committee and Operations Committee chairs to coordinate for BUYT recruitment using ICAP.
- C. Add to agenda for December conference call.

XVIII. Committee Liaison Assignments

- A. Will be discussed at Winter Meeting.
- B. Graham will be RMCG chair in 2014, so new liaison will need to be assigned for Business Committee.
- C. Pino will be Southwest Area Coordinating Group chair for 2014; will identify alternates in his 2014 Delegation of Authority.

XIX. Preparedness Level Escalation/De-escalation

- A. Snart and Perea worked with Operations Committee to develop plan for PL step-up and down.
- B. Will be added to December conference call agenda for review and approval.