

[NOTE: This KDL is posted as an example. It is intended to spur discussion and thinking. You'll note that the column headings do not correspond exactly to the columns posted on the KDL website as of 7/11/08. This is an evolving project and we're adapting the forms as teams and units use them and give us feedback. You'll also note that this team decided to enter actions as well as decisions and by other roles than simply the IC and AA. They use short bullets in the table then add detail for each decision below. If you decide you want to add more information than is currently requested, by all means do so, and send it in. We'll enter everything you give us and we'll figure a way to feed it back to you as intuitively as possible.]

## KEY DECISION LOG PHOENIX NIMO Hendricks IMT Decisions

Key Decision Log is a process to document decision making. The process allows for more tracking decision making while exploring alternatives and collaborations for cost management. This process will document the thought process when making decisions.

Who/ Date/ Time	KEY DECISION	ASSOCIATED RISKS	ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED	RATIONALE FOR DECISION	COST IMPLICATION		AA/IC CONCURRENCE
					SHORT TERM	LONG TERM	
LSC  6/4/08 1200	Volunteered and donated facilities	Significant costs related to telecommunications, facility rental, laundry service, etc.	Paying for services	Financial concerns	Significant	Significant	AA/IC concur
FWS/ NCS/ AA  6/7 1200	Request NIMO IMT to augment NC IMT for Type 1 complexity	Low risk / high value; Uncertainty of what NIMO brings to the table; relationship building	Order national Type 1 IMT	Meet federal requirements if complexity reached solid Type 1 w/o high cost of national IMT plus provide onsite mentoring, guiding, developing services	n/a	\$30k/day savings	AA/IC concur
PSC  6/10 1200	Implementation of planning process to meet interagency requirements	Inadequate planning process outputs to meet multi-jurisdiction requirements	Planning process that was agency specific	Meet ICS- IMT interagency needs	Potential claims and investigations compromised	Increased costs of Comp/ Claims lawsuits and	AA/IC concur

Who/ Date/ Time	KEY DECISION	ASSOCIATED RISKS	ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED	RATIONALE FOR DECISION	COST IMPLICATION		AA/IC CONCURRENCE
					SHORT TERM	LONG TERM	
						investiga- tions	
OCS 6/15 0730	Initiate controlled flooding	Major use of water from Lake Phelps	Monitor fire Limited mop-up	The greatest threat for an escaped fire could be eliminated	n/a	Significant	AA/IC concur
OCS 6/18 1200	Simultaneously assist in local IA on USFWS and NC jurisdiction	Coordination of resources. Span of control. Financial issues. Weaken control forces on fire.	No assistance. Limited assistance. Remove IA responsibility.	Financial concerns and IA resource availability could quickly be addressed.	\$7k	\$7k	AA/IC concur
PIO 6/17 1000	Key messages on smoke	Public misunderstanding of the duration of the incident	Status quo	To inform the public that smoke from the fire was to be expected until significant rain.	Unknown	Unknown	AA/IC concur
LCS 6/17 0900	Relocate Food Unit to Northside H.S.	Splitting of base camp operations and driving risks between ICP and Northside H.S.	Leave as is. Feeding of incident personnel in communities.	Space at the Ponzer Community Park is limited.	n/a	n/a	AA/IC concur
FSC 6/18 1200	Interagency Business Mgt Practices	Interagency financial consistency and accurate accountability	All North Carolina business practices	Met the needs of both agencies	Significant	Significant	AA/IC concur
IC 6/19 0900	Conducting During Action Reviews	Resistance to new concept; maintaining necessary periodic review; understanding target objectives; no follow up action	Not adopting the process	Open and honest assessment of incident status; daily or periodic face to face discussion between AAs and IC	Unknown but potentially significant savings	Unknown but potentially significant savings	AA/IC concur
OCS/ IC/AA 6/19	Modify IA responsibility	Inability to address local IA. Fracture relationships between agencies. Financial	Maintain status quo	Financial concerns and IA resource availability could quickly be addressed and better	\$7k	Significant	AA/IC concur

Who/ Date/ Time	KEY DECISION	ASSOCIATED RISKS	ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED	RATIONALE FOR DECISION	COST IMPLICATION		AA/IC CONCURRENCE
					SHORT TERM	LONG TERM	
1100		issues.		understood.			
OCS/ LSC 6/19 1200	Closing down of Mattamusquette Camp	Confusion for ops resources about reporting location	Leaving camp in place	Operations changed from an emphasis on structure protection to water handling	Reduction of support staffing		AA/IC concur
LSC/ OSC  6/20 1200	Interagency Logistical support	Going outside NC State standard procedures	Continue with current procedures	Adhere to NC State procedures DISCUSSION ONLY		Residual value of returned goods	
OSC  6/21 1200	Structure protection return to local VFDs	Reduce exposure of travel time between staging and hotels. Fewer resources exposed.	Maintain status quo	Financial concerns	Unknown	Significant	AA/IC concur

## **Key Decisions:**

**6/04/08**

### **Volunteered and donated facilities.**

The IMT was offered and accepted several offers of volunteer and donated services. Some of these services, such as the Cisco Systems NERV, US Cellular cell phones and tower, and the use of the Ponzer Community Building, are valued at thousands of dollars. Other donated services included the briefing yurt from Blackwater Systems, laundry service by the Baptist Men of NC, Red Cross food service and donations of food and water from local communities. This outpouring of goodwill can be attributed to the credibility and respect the NC Division of Forest Resources holds in the local communities.

**Associated risks:** Not accepting these services would have resulted in significant costs related to telecommunications, facility rental, laundry service, etc

**Alternatives considered:** The alternative would be paying for these services.

**Rationale:** Financial concerns

**Cost implications:** Significant

**Agency Administrator/Incident Commander concurrence:** Concur

**6/07/08**

### **Key decision to order a NIMO IMT.**

**Associated Risks:** Risk was low and value was high. The NIMO team was brought in not to take command from NC but to provide Type 1 augmentation to the NC IMT along with support and guidance when/where requested.

**Alternatives considered:** Wait to see if the incident rose to Type 1 complexity and, if so, order a national Type 1 IMT to manage the incident.

**Rationale:** By ordering NIMO the AAs met the federal requirement for Type 1 IMT should the incident complexity rise to Type 1 level. It also provided opportunity for sharing Type 1 level experience with the NC IMT, further enhancing their organizational strengths.

**Cost Implications:** Estimated weekly cost for a seven member NIMO IMT is \$30K vs.\$150K for a 60 member national IMT.

**Agency Administrator/Incident Commander Concurrence:** Strong support and consensus among all parties involved.

**6/10/08**

**Implementation of interagency planning process requirements for ICS-IMT**

The PSC led the effort to modify the planning process in order to meet high complexity elements on a multi-jurisdiction incident.

The planning process at the onset of the incident was adequate to meet short term single agency requirements however the complexity of a multi-jurisdiction fire required a number of changes in order to meet the needs of the respective agencies.

The decision to make a number of changes in the planning process appeared to be minor at the onset however there was the potential for numerous issues to potentially escalate.

Specific decision included incorporating all resources into I-SUITES, adopting interagency protocol for documentation, establishing separate meeting locations for C&G as well as planning meetings.

Other decisions included modifying products such as the 209 (Incident Status Summary) to include the long duration elements of the Evans Fire. A Long Term Implementation Plan (LTIP) and Rehabilitation Planning process was also implemented. Opportunities were provided that resulted in over 30 trainees on incident. A contract computer system was used to facilitate transitions for long duration fire to facilitate seamless transition.

**Associated Risks:** Inadequate documentation to meet legal requirements.

**Alternatives considered:** Meet the requirements for a single jurisdiction fire.

**Rationale:** Meet the needs of multiple jurisdictions including the State, FWS and FEMA

**Cost Implications:** Increased costs of Comp/Claims lawsuits and investigations if standard requirements for multiple jurisdictions had not been met.

**Agency Administrator/Incident Commander Concurrence:** The IC and AAs provided appropriate leader's intent that focused on assuring the needs were met.

**6/16/08**

**Controlled flooding of the south and west fire perimeter**

The Operations Section Chief, with Incident Commander and Agency Administrator approval, made the decision to initiate a major movement of water – flooding – from Lake Phelps to the fire perimeter via existing and constructed canals and water control structures. Flooding is a common tool used on peat fires during dry conditions. The size of the fire and the amount of material and manpower necessary to meet the desired outcome is on a scale not seen for twenty years. Institutional knowledge and the specialized equipment was present to meet the desired outcome but the concerns for the impacts on Lake Phelps sparked a number of downstream issues and concerns.

The decision appeared simple at the time but further analysis identified a number of major downstream issues. There is no mechanism to address the actual amount of water needed (the number of gallons is in the millions). A number of other regulatory agencies were involved in the analysis of the impacts on Lake Phelps which put an added strain on all sections within the IMT.

**Associated Risks:** Fisheries, habitat, long-term drought, irrigation, smoke, tourism, burn ban, public perception and political pressures. No action = fire escapes perimeter. A short term benefit in fire suppression effort is achieved with a significant long-term effect on fisheries. Public concerns and confusion on the complexity of the fire.

**Alternatives considered:** Monitor fire perimeter until significant (>4") rainfall occurs.

**Rationale:** A consensus approach on how to manage the amount of water that could be met through discussion and monitoring. The upward delegation of risk from the IC through the Agency Administrators to Department level personnel to ensure the values, risks and alternatives were clearly understood by the decision makers.

**Cost Implications:** The flooding strategy may be the least-cost approach when compared to perimeter staffing. A "fire ending event" may not occur for several weeks. Benefits from the flooding strategy would appear within a few days. There is no cost for the water itself.

**Agency Administrator/Incident Commander Concurrence:** The IC and AAs were well briefed by Operations. A unified decision was made by all parties involved. The coordination and communication of the plan was carried forward by the IC and AAs. The decision and external influences associated with the decision quickly became the focus of the IC. The IC asked Operations to prepare a

comprehensive water management plan to present to the cooperating agencies. The plan was approved two days later and is currently in effect on the incident. (See attached).

**6/17/08**

**Key decision to adopt During Action Review process**

NIMO IC shared the concept and reviewed the process of conducting periodic During Action Reviews as a means to ensure key decisions are shared decisions by the AAs and IC. The process was presented in the context of enhancing already demonstrated positive communication and relationship building between parties while addressing critical areas of daily incident management.

**Associated Risks:** The associated risk was possible resistance to a new process coupled with taking no action or wrong action that could negatively affect short and long term incident objectives. The consequence of not maintaining periodic discussion and review between the AA and IC could result in decisions that are costly, unnecessary or inefficient.

**Alternatives considered:** Not adopting the process

**Rationale:** Provides a process for the AA and IC to follow that facilitates open and honest discussion on where they are and where they are going. Helps to clarify mission, objectives, asses change, provide clarity and build consensus.

**Cost Implications:** Potentially significant depending on issues and decisions made.

**Agency Administrator/Incident Commander Concurrence:** Strong support and consensus among all parties involved.

**6/17/08**

**Facilities Management**

Relocate the Food Unit to Northside High School. The Ponzer Community Park is too small to accommodate a base camp for a T2 organization.

**Associated Risks:** There are risks in moving an operation of any kind. There is a driving risk. There could also be the loss or a reduction in meal services for one or two meals.

**Alternatives considered:** Leave feeding operations at Ponzer Community Park. Alternative feeding arrangements in the surrounding communities.

**Rationale:** At Ponzer Community Park available space for parking and additional portable facilities is limited. Parking has proven to be hazardous. Several backing accidents have occurred; the move would eliminate the hazard. Space for carrying out the operations of a T2 Base Camp is inadequate. The portable kitchen in use was over its capacity.

**Cost Implications:** No real difference to food operations. Some investment in time for moving.

**Agency Administrator/Incident Commander Concurrence:** Yes

**6/17/08**

**Key Messages on Smoke**

After attending two public meeting and hearing the public's concern about smoke from the fire and the long-term effects smoke, key messages were incorporated into the daily news releases, fact sheets and Inciweb updates. The purpose was to inform the public that due to the nature of the fuels, the fire would burn for some time. Area residents should know that this fire was a long term incident and that smoke would be present until significant rainfall occurred over the fire. Residents concerned about health impacts were referred to air quality and health officials.

**Associated risks:** Uninformed citizens could cause public relations and political issues for the NC DFR.

**Alternatives considered:** Maintaining the status quo would do nothing to ally the concerns of citizens about smoke in the air.

**Rationale:** To inform the public that smoke from the fire was to be expected until significant rain.

**Cost implications:** Unknown

**Agency Administrator/Incident Commander concurrence:** Concur

**6/18/08**

**Interagency Incident Business Management**

Interagency Business Management Practices were used for coordination with the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) where appropriate.



**Associated Risks:** By using these practices, they were able to meet the financial needs of both agencies. When these practices were not used, there was risk to meeting the policies, procedures and needs of the FWS.

**Alternatives considered:** Interagency Business Practices, or all NC State Business Practices could have been used. A blend of these practices was used.

**Rationale:** Complex interagency incidents that involve multiple agency resources present many challenges to IMTs. Interagency Business Management Practices (IBMP) was used where they were a familiar process, and NC State business practices were used when there was the ability to implement. There are certain NC State policies that limit NC State IMTs in meeting IBMP, as they do not address the emergency situation of a wildfire. Specific instances included:

1. Purchasing was initially done with multiple NC State purchase cards. This impacted the Finance Section in reconciling per NC State standards. The Team brought in a local Buying Team for incident purchasing that better met needs and IBMP.
2. Fire Department resources were not initially tracked in ISUITES for payment or cost purposes, as there was confusion on how they were ordered. Emergency Management IMT was unclear on their role while assigned at the Mattamuskeet Base Camp. NC State Business Management was notified of incomplete payment documents.
3. NC State teams come out for 10 day assignments. IBMP policy calls for 14 day assignments.
4. NC State IMTs can be signed by the Finance Section Chief without any delegation of authority. IBMP would call for a warranted Contracting Officer to fulfill these duties and associated delegation of authority.
5. NC State did accept all advice with appreciation and grace.
6. NC State does use ISUITES which meets IBMP. This met the needs of the FWS for time sheets, equipment invoices, cost tracking and cost share agreement cost compilation.
7. NC State did not utilize the ROSS ordering system for ordering all resources. This hindered an accurate tracking of resources on the incident, both internally and externally.
8. A Federal Comp/Claims Unit Leader was ordered to assist with Federal paperwork and was trained per NCDNR standards.

**Cost Implications:** The Team used the Interagency Business Management Practices that they felt able to implement. This created efficiencies, but the Team took note of practices that they could implement in future assignments that would be cost and time savers.

**Agency Administrator/Incident Commander Concurrence:** The IC and AAs were well briefed by the Finance Section on the issues

**6/19/08**

#### **Initial Attack as identified in the Delegation of Authority**

The IMT was delegated Initial Attack authority from USFWS. Moderate Initial Attack occurred on both agencies jurisdictions on 6/19. The assigning of IA resources and the coordination went very well, however, confusion on exactly what the IA responsibility entailed, coupled with significant IA on North Carolina jurisdiction resulted in a decision to review the IA component of the delegation.

**Associated Risks:** The risks associated with the decision were more financial than tactical in nature. Concerns over the cost breakdown required an evaluation of the IA objective.

**Alternatives considered:** Clarification only.

**Rationale:** Concerns over cost apportionment of IA resources and the designation of IA resources assigned to the Evans Road Fire could be easily resolved with IC/AAs.

**Cost Implications:** Potentially significant however the identification of the issue resolved future concerns.

**Agency Administrator/Incident Commander Concurrence:** Strong support and consensus among all parties for a positive outcome.

**6/19/08**

**Closing down of Mattamusquette Camp**

The Mattamusquette Camp was closed when the operations emphasis changed from structure protection to one of water handling. This location was no longer an efficient use of resources. The camp had been established by the OEM and was no longer the most advantageous use of support resources.

**Associated Risks:** Some confusion could be caused by changing reporting locations for structure protection resources.

**Alternatives considered:**

**Rationale:** Keeping Mattamusquette camp open is not an advantageous reporting location for operations resources. This action allows for consolidation of incident resources.

**Cost Implications:** Reduction in number of support personnel.

**Agency Administrator/Incident Commander Concurrence:** Yes

**6/20/08**

**Interagency Logistical Support**

Use of some interagency support is obviously in place, mostly personnel from other agencies. Additional use of national incident cache resources and other support could be implemented.

**Associated Risks:** Operating outside of NC state operating procedures when supporting state incidents.

**Alternatives considered:**

**Rationale:** This action is a DISCUSSION topic only. NC State operating procedures discourage the use of some outside resources. Use of national incident cache resources for accountable property items, durable goods and some consumables having creditable residual value would reduce the cost of procurement and of having to dispose of items at the end of the incident.

The state does have good reason for adhering to their tried and true procedures. One of them is their food operation, which appears to work well for them.

The current operating procedures will likely remain in place until changed at the state government level.

**Cost Implications:** Long term savings on supplies with residual value.

**Agency Administrator/Incident Commander Concurrence:** Yes

**6/21/08**

**Long-term Implementation planning**

The USFWS Agency Administrator suggested a more flexible approach to managing the fire. The Incident Commander instructed Operations to begin the initial phases of long-term implementation planning on 6/20. A fire spread probability (FSPRO) run was coordinated through the United States Forest Service (USFS). Examples of previous Long Term Implementation Plans (LTIP) were reviewed. The development of the LTIP will carry through transition with assistance from the USFS Phoenix National Incident Management Team (NIMO).

**Associated Risks:** The risks associated with the decision were minimal. Not developing a LTIP brings significant risk to all parties, especially from a financial standpoint.

**Alternatives considered:** Maintain status quo. Continue a short-term (3 day) approach to planning.

**Rationale:** The LTIP will provide IMTs and AAs with a comprehensive approach to long-term (30+days) fire management. The nature of the fire, implications on the communities and the public along with impact to the host agencies will remain a constant until significant (>4") rainfall occurs. Significant rainfall may not occur for several weeks.

**Cost Implications:** Current daily costs exceed \$300,000. An LTIP will address daily costs and allow the AA a decision support tool on further authorization of funding.

**Short-Term:** N/A

**Long-Term:** Estimated savings of 30 percent/day or \$2 million dollars over a 30 day time period (based on sufficient staffing to meet perimeter control objectives).

**Agency Administrator/Incident Commander Concurrence:** Incident Commander initiated the development of the LTIP. AAs will be briefed on a draft plan when it is completed

**6/21/08**

**The release of all non-local structure resources**

The Operations Section Chief, with Incident Commander and made the decision demob all structures strike teams provided through State Emergence Management.

**Associated Risks:** Lost of capacity to provide adequate structure protection give current and forecasted fire weather and behavior.

**Alternatives considered:**

**Rationale:** OPS contacted all four effected county Emergence Management Coordinators to determine their capacity to provide the need meet the structure protection requirements of the incident objectives.

**Cost Implications:** Significant cost savings.

**Agency Administrator/Incident Commander Concurrence:** The IC and AAs were well briefed by Operations.