

# NWCG Fuels Management Committee

---

---

## Attendees

---

### FMC Members

**Present:** Mike Van Hemelryck (NPS) Chair; Angie Simpson (BLM); Annie Benoit (NWCG); Frankie Romero (USFS)

**Absent:** Tate Fischer (FWS); Vice Chair: Mark Jackson (BIA); Andy James (NASF)

**Guests:** Kristy Swartz

---

## Decision Log

---

### Topic: RT-300 Review

**Presenter:** Mike Van Hemelryck

**Discussion/Considerations:** Landscape Scale RX Fire video – feedback (Romero) below: example of Low Complexity Programmatic” talking about district wide pile burning isn’t clearly distinct from “Moderate/high complexity Multi-Unit Programmatic”; this is often a point of confusion as the rules for each are different so need to make sure we differentiate; probably better if we want to address low complexity programmatic plans to talk about it separately with its own title to differentiate from the rest of the video and highlight with an image like the one below that the reason we allow for unit specific information to be updated after the plan is approved is because there should be very little chance of spread outside the unit because of conditions like pile burning with snow on the ground...that’s why its “low complexity”.

PMS 484 Reference:

- **Programmatic Low Complexity Plan** can be used for prescribed fire projects having similar fuel types, terrain, and prescription, and employs the same types of firing and holding tactics. Site-specific unit information may not be known until implementation. When known, information is incorporated into the prescribed fire plan without technical review or amendment. Programmatic Low Complexity Plans can be prepared to address broad areas, such as administrative units (ranger district, refuge, field office, or park).
- **Programmatic Moderate/High Complexity Plan** (may be known as a Multiple Unit Plan) is used for prescribed fire projects with multiple ignition units that can be ignited separately or concurrently. Each unit has site-specific information developed for applicable plan elements such as ignition, holding, and contingency prior to technical review and approval.

Example of varied complexity for various stages provided of a black line operation being conducted by a Type 3 burn boss followed by ignition of the overall unit by a RXB2 is not a realistic and therefore advisable example as a RXB3 is not suitable for a black lining operation that requires both ignition and holding actions. Recommend changing example to RXB2 for blacklining and RXB1 for full unit ignition.

Agency Administrator – not necessarily true that all AAs for all jurisdictions need to approve the burn plan; it is possible via agreement for one AA to defer to another for the approval/oversight of the burning. Is there any problem with just eliminating the entire AA section as the approval of programmatic burn plans is not any different from any other burn plan so not really any need to discuss in this video if it's the same for all burn plans?

**Decision:** Mike will give Mark a heads up that FMC is still reviewing. DD April 16, 2021 for FMC review.

### **Topic: IDP Change Requests**

**Presenter:** Mike Van Hemelryck

**Discussion/Considerations:** Comments from the SME IPD Burn Boss Feedback. Need to reference both the PMS 424 and PMS 484. Keep NEPA out because in the RX IA Guide, it includes language for the states. Its to Federal Agency specific. Taking the burn plan to the field, “Have critical information from the burn plan ready to reference in the field for completing the briefing and safe project implementation”.

**Decision:** Everyone agreed with that change.

### **Topic: NWCG Glossary Terms**

**Presenter:** Mike Van Hemelryck

**Discussion/Considerations:** MIST term – request to change from Minimum Impact Suppression Techniques to Minimum Impact Strategy and Tactics, with FS Wilderness function is shared with suppression, so we need to coordinate with FS Wilderness partners and not just making the term from a suppression standpoint.

**Decision:** FMC recommends not changing this term, and Frankie will provide the feedback and say FMC discussed and agree.

---

## **Action Items or Assignments**

---

**Name(s):** Mike Van Hemelryck

**Action/Assignment:** Mike will give Mark a heads up that FMC is still reviewing. DD April 16, 2021 for FMC review.

**Name(s):** Frankie Romero

**Action/Assignment:** Will do request not to change for the NWCG glossary term MIST.

---

## **Date, Time and Location of Next Meeting**

---

**Date:** May 12, 2021

**Time:** 1300-1700

**Location:** Microsoft Teams