

After Incident Report Lessons Learned Center

The purpose of the After Incident Report is to identify both successes and challenges on an incident that can be used as a learning tool for others. The lessons learned in the report will also be used to improve training curriculums. Issues and trends that are identified may have Information Collection Teams assigned to them in the future for further analysis and resolution.

Type 1-5 incident commanders and agency administrators are requested to complete the following questionnaire for each incident they manage. Crews and single resources are also encouraged to complete the questionnaire for incidents they participated in:

Incident Name: Goldstone

Dates of Assignment: 7/14/02 – 7/20/02

Unit or Jurisdiction(s): Beaverhead/Deerlodge National Forest

Geographic Area: MT-BDF 050

Report Submitted by: Bob Sandman

Phone Number: (406)-881-2371

1. What was the most notable success at the incident that others may learn from?

The IMT's ability to accomplish objectives on "Type I" ground with "Type II" resources. This fire was in steep, rocky terrain on the Continental Divide between Idaho and Montana. Most of the area burned included numerous dead snags. Although ground like this is better suited for Type I resources, Type II resources can get the job done with the right mitigation, direction, support, and line supervision.

2. What were some of the most difficult challenges faced and how were they overcome?

- a. Resources arriving at the incident came through check-in during the day, and were, potentially, being assigned out on the fire the same day without a thorough briefing. The IMT changed the check-in procedure to incorporate a thorough briefing by routing resources through key personnel (similar to the demob checklist procedures used by most IMTs). This IMT continued this practice throughout the remainder of the fire season.
- b. To install phones at the best camp location or move the camp to available phone lines was cost prohibitive. The IMT resolved the issue by moving the ICP to a grade school with adequate power and phone service, but kept camp at the best location (30 to 45 minutes away).

3. What changes, additions or deletions are recommended to wild land fire training curriculums?

Quite a bit of confusion over the 30-mile abatement and mitigation requirements was obvious on this and other fires. A lot of work is needed to get these requirements to a minimum standard for both training and application. This includes applying the work/rest ratio, performance evaluation requirements, implementing the 10 and 18, etc.

4. What issues were not resolved to your satisfaction and need further review? Based on what was learned, what is your recommendation for resolution?

Separating the ICP from camp requires a large adjustment by the IMTs in order to maintain a normal routine on an incident. Generators can be used to solve the power problem, but the phone problem is a more difficult issue to solve without sustaining absorbent costs. More work needs to be done to access mobile cell phone towers or utilize inexpensive satellite telephone services.

Please submit this report to the Lessons Learned Center at the National Advanced Resource Technology Center (NARTC) attention Paula Nasiatka(pnasiatka@fs.fed.us or Fax 520-670-6413)

Thank you for completing the report. Others can learn from your experiences.