

Defining Standardized Performance Capability Metrics for Incident Management Teams Based on Resource Typing Levels

A System To Standardize the Performance Capabilities
for Typing Incident Management Teams

Jeff Soulé
USFA Type 3 All-Hazard IMT (AHIMT) Technical Assistance Program
All-Hazards Incident Management Team Program Manager
Emergency Response Support Branch
U.S. Fire Administration
16825 S. Seton Avenue
Emmitsburg, MD 21727, USA
301-447-1304

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	i
Executive Summary	1
Desired End State	1
How Incident Management Teams Are Referenced in This Document.....	1
Issue	1
Proposed Solution	2
Project Background	4
How AHIMTs Support the National Preparedness Goal	5
Incident Management Team Definition.....	6
Current Incident Management Team Typing.....	7
Incident Management Team Capabilities	9
Developing the Standardized Metrics.....	11
Outreach and Analysis.....	11
Research of Existing Documentation	12
Addressing Organizational Differences in Complexity Determination	12
Performance Capability Metrics – Design and Concept of Operations	14
Implementation of the Metrics.....	14
Using the Metrics Table	15
Team Performance Capability Details.....	29
References.....	42
Project Members.....	43

Questions regarding this document should be addressed to:

Jeff Soulé
USFA Type 3 All-Hazard IMT (AHIMT) Technical Assistance Program
All-Hazards Incident Management Team Program Manager
Emergency Response Support Branch
U.S. Fire Administration
16825 S. Seton Avenue
Emmitsburg, MD 21727, USA
301-447-1304



Executive Summary

Desired End State

This document describes the background, history, significant research conducted, methodology, and framework developed to establish a process to quantify specific minimum Performance Capabilities that All-Hazards Incident Management Teams (AHIMTs) should possess at each of the National Incident Management System (NIMS) resource typing levels of Types 4, 3, 2, and 1.

By adopting the methodology and metrics proposed in this document, the response community and AHIMT programs are provided a solid foundation of guidance and metrics that assists in ensuring that all AHIMTs that respond to a jurisdiction's or agency's request are properly prepared and of sufficient Performance Capability (Type) to manage the incident or event successfully. It will also provide a system of measurement that can be incorporated into current curricula, exercises, and standards that course and exercise developers can use to measure successful performance capability at each Resource Typing level. Finally, it will establish the typing criteria for an AHIMT as a *single resource*, based on its capability, in compliance with the National Incident Management System Resource Typing methodology.

How Incident Management Teams Are Referenced in This Document

There are slight differences between the qualification processes and requirements that members of discipline-focused¹ Incident Management Teams (IMTs) follow while attaining their Incident Command System (ICS) position qualifications from among those indicated in the All-Hazards-focused Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) National Qualifications System (NQS) guidelines or the All-Hazards Incident Management Teams Association (AHIMTA)² Interstate Incident Management Qualifications System (IIMQS) guidance. For the purposes of discussing the levels of performance capability and competencies based on either the Incident Command System (ICS) position qualifications criteria developed under the FEMA NQS and the AHIMTA, or on those developed by discipline-focused sponsoring organizations, we use the word "team" and the acronym *AHIMT* (referring to the All-Hazards Incident Management Team program) synonymously in this document, except when a specific reference to IMTs operating under a discipline-focused program is needed to provide contextual differentiation [see p. 7 of this document].

Issue

Resource management within the National Incident Management System (NIMS) includes the subject of resource typing:

"Resource typing is defining and categorizing incident resources by capability. Resource

¹ For example, the National Wildfire Coordinating Group (NWCG), U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Department of Agriculture's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), and U.S. Food and Drug Administration's Food Emergency Response Teams (FERTs).

² The All-Hazards Incident Management Teams Association (AHIMTA) is a 501(c)3, not-for-profit professional association founded in 2010, comprised of incident management practitioners from multiple disciplines representing Federal, state, and local agencies; nongovernmental organizations (NGOs); and the private sector.

Defining Standardized Performance Capability Metrics for Incident Management Teams

typing definitions establish a common language for discussing resources by defining minimum capabilities for personnel, teams, facilities, equipment, and supplies”³ (emphasis added by author).

Although IMTs have always been categorized by their type, there are no agreed-on standardized minimum performance capabilities that an AHIMT or a discipline-focused IMT deployed as a *single resource* should possess at each typing level. No organization is currently able to answer the question, “*Exactly what level of performance capabilities should each Type team possess, and what are the specific differences of performance capabilities between the Types?*” The frequent response of using an incident’s complexity level as part of the answer – “*a Type 2 team should be capable of managing a Type 2 complexity-level incident*” – introduces a certain degree of circularity and can therefore no longer be deemed sufficient, particularly when considering the variations seen in the definition of incident complexity levels. The recently released FEMA *National Incident Management System Incident Complexity Guide* ⁴ provides much-needed homogeneity in incident complexity-level definitions, but the introduction of the “Incident Management Indicators” is a new concept that discipline-focused groups will need to accept and incorporate. The national guideline on incident complexity will be extremely helpful to the response community, but the incident complexity guidance will not resolve the lack of performance metrics that define successful performance [see p. 4 of this document].

Because both IMTs and AHIMTs are requested and deployed as a *single resource* with the intent of having them manage an incident determined to be of a certain level of complexity, there needs to be a common understanding of the minimum performance capabilities and competencies in which the AHIMT, as a single resource, is proficient and which it is capable of achieving. As described in NIMS, to type resources properly, minimum capability metrics must be established. Reflective of the All-Hazards focus of NIMS, the metrics should focus on the minimum capabilities applicable to the All-Hazards or “discipline-neutral” environment. Once agreed on, these capabilities should be considered as the minimum capabilities that organizations and agencies should use when developing, maintaining, or deploying AHIMTs. These Performance Capability Metrics would then be used to guide discipline-focused organizations to use as their baseline capability — to which they could, if needed, add any additional discipline-focused capability for their discipline-focused teams to meet in addition to the All-Hazards capabilities.

Proposed Solution

Developing a common understanding of the performance capabilities an AHIMT possesses as a single resource, based on the resource typing levels, will enable both sponsoring and requesting organizations to understand more fully their use, capabilities, expectations, and limitations. Quantifying and standardizing the performance capabilities of AHIMTs by resource typing level will also provide additional guidance to those responsible for developing the training, certification standards, Position Task Books, and exercises for the individual positions of which the AHIMT is composed.

³ U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency: *National Incident Management System*, Third Edition (Washington, DC, 2017), p. 6.

⁴ U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency: *National Incident Management System Incident Complexity Guide*, January 2021 Draft (Washington, DC, 2021), p. 4.

Defining Standardized Performance Capability Metrics for Incident Management Teams

After considerable research and analysis of competencies, capabilities, prior research studies, after-action reports, and interviews with IMT members, the present document sets out minimum performance capabilities by resource typing level, after inviting and encouraging the open dialogue necessary for the discipline-focused organizations to discuss and finalize this critically needed, yet never developed, standardization for typing this resource.

The Performance Capability Metrics described in this document should not be confused with the United States Fire Administration (USFA) *3-Tiered Preparedness System for All-Hazards Incident Management Teams* introduced in 2019 and currently undergoing preparations for implementation. The *3-Tiered Preparedness System for All-Hazards Incident Management Teams* is a USFA-sponsored, peer-developed national best practice that quantifies operational, logistical, and administrative preparedness for response, but does not indicate the performance capability or resource type of the AHIMT.

The proposed Performance Capability Metrics for IMTs presented in this document provide the metrics to determine the resource typing of a team at the Type 1, 2, 3, or 4 level. The two systems are separate but complementary in that once adopted, the systems will ensure that AHIMTs that respond to requests for assistance are properly prepared and of sufficient performance capability (Type) to manage the requesting jurisdiction's incident or event successfully.

It should also be noted that, although there are five recognized levels of incident complexity, the least complex incident, complexity level Type 5, does not require the use of any ICS position other than the Incident Commander. This absence of need for an IMT at the Type 5 incident complexity level resulted in the complexity level not being included in the performance capability discussion.

It is well understood that modifications to current training and qualifications programs will need to be implemented, and some personnel will need to become familiar with new skills and concepts, like the Community Lifelines being implemented by FEMA. To account for this, a multi-year Phase-In approach should be agreed to by the stakeholders.

Project Background

In 2018, the Texas A&M Forest Service performed an after-action review of how All-Hazards Incident Management Teams were mobilized and used during Hurricane Harvey, which made landfall on the Texas coastline on August 25, 2017. The resulting report, *ESF #4 After-Action Report on Availability and Use of Incident Management Teams for Hurricane Harvey Response When the Nation Was at Preparedness Level 5*,⁵ included several recommendations to address identified gaps and eliminate ambiguity in matching deployed AHIMTs to mission assignments. The recommendations included four that were specific to Incident Management Teams:

- The AHIMT community should clarify AHIMT typing, especially as existing teams continue to seek higher training, size, and experience.
- Standards should be defined which fully address the capabilities of a particular AHIMT.
- Additionally, a mission assignment analysis should be developed for ordering IMTs.
- Development of AHIMT typing standards and assignment analysis should be completed with input from all partner agencies and groups involved with the AHIMT program.

Simultaneous, but separate from the after-action review, was the 2018 initiation of the project to develop the USFA O-325 *AHIMT National Tier Qualifying Exercise* curriculum, an exercise being developed to support the USFA 3-Tiered Preparedness System for All-Hazards Incident Management Teams, for determining the operational, logistical, and administrative preparedness of AHIMTs. During the development of the exercise objectives, it was necessary to identify specific performance expectations for the Type 3 AHIMTs to achieve during the exercise. Research into the unit and course objectives was completed within the National Wildfire Coordinating Group (NWCG) courses S-420, *Command and General Staff*; S-520, *Advanced Incident Management*; S-620, *Area Command*; the National Association of State Foresters (NASF), *Complex Incident Management Course (CIMC)*; and the USFA O-305, *All-Hazards Incident Management Team Introduction* course. Discussions with the course developers and committee members representing the NWCG, Firefighting Resources of California Organized for Potential Emergencies (FIRESCOPE), USFA, the NASF CIMC cadre, and others indicated that minimum Performance Capability Metrics have not been established that differentiate capability between the levels of resource typing. Although the differences in performance capability are widely acknowledged, no organization is currently able to answer the question, *“Exactly what level of performance capabilities should each Type team possess, and what are the specific differences of performance capabilities between the Types?”* The answer often provided has included the incident complexity level as part of the answer itself, creating a certain degree of circularity: *“A Type 2 team should be capable of managing a Type 2 incident.”* That answer can no longer be deemed sufficient because of that circularity, particularly when considering the variations seen in the definition of incident complexity among agencies and discipline-focused groups.

In order to develop an exercise to test and validate the capabilities of a Type 3 AHIMT properly, it is necessary to develop performance benchmarks or metrics against which to measure each team’s performance. Recognizing the issue, the USFA All-Hazards Incident Management Team Program Manager tasked the O-325 exercise development cadre to undertake the research and provide a draft proposal. The O-325 subject matter experts (SMEs) who reviewed the material represent the wildland fire, structural fire,

⁵ P. Hannemann, *ESF #4 After-Action Report on Availability and Use of Incident Management Teams for Hurricane Harvey Response When the Nation Was at Preparedness Level 5* (2018). Texas A&M Forest Service.

Defining Standardized Performance Capability Metrics for Incident Management Teams

municipal law enforcement, law enforcement ICS trainers, and emergency management disciplines. To ensure the integrity of the product, SMEs who possessed documented “on-scene” ICS position qualifications at the NWCG Type 2, Type 1, and Area Command incident complexity levels were involved in the development and validation. Position qualifications represented in the cadre included Area Commanders and virtually all Command and General Staff positions at all levels of incident complexity. Several reviewers were also current or former members of training and standards committees for NWCG and/or the FIRESCOPE organization, with team training experience for the NWCG, U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), FIRESCOPE, USFA, FEMA Incident Management Assistance Teams (IMATs), and the Emergency Management Institute (EMI).

This document is the result of hundreds of hours of research and analysis conducted by SMEs in IMT training, deployment, development, and experience. The metrics proposed are open to discussion, but reviewers should understand that a cadre of their peers with significant IMT expertise guided by extensive research efforts was involved in the development of this proposal. This effort should be considered a well-researched, significant work effort to provide a peer-developed proposal for consideration.

How AHIMTs Support the National Preparedness Goal

The U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) National Preparedness Goal (NPG)⁶ describes the 32 core capabilities that assist the whole community to be prepared for all types of disasters and emergencies. The presence of the core capability *Operational Coordination* throughout the five mission areas (prevention, protection, mitigation, response, and recovery) demonstrates its importance in preparing the United States to be a secure and resilient nation and in ensuring the success of the other core capabilities. The core capability of Operational Coordination is described as follows:

“Operational Coordination

“Establish and maintain a unified and coordinated operational structure and process that appropriately integrate all critical stakeholders and support the execution of Core Capabilities.

“1. Mobilize all critical resources and establish command, control, and coordination structures within the affected community, in other coordinating bodies in surrounding communities, and across the Nation, and maintain as needed throughout the duration of an incident.

“2. Enhance and maintain command, control, and coordination structures consistent with the National Incident Management System (NIMS) to meet basic human needs, stabilize the incident, and transition to recovery.”⁷

The National Preparedness System⁸ outlines an organized process for the whole community to move forward with their preparedness activities and achieve the National Preparedness Goal. The National

⁶ U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency: *National Preparedness Goal*, Second Edition, September 2015 (Washington, DC, 2015).

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁸ Refer to the National Preparedness System: <https://www.fema.gov/national-preparedness-system>.

Defining Standardized Performance Capability Metrics for Incident Management Teams

Response Framework (NRF),⁹ a part of the National Preparedness System, is a guide to how the Nation responds to all types of disasters and emergencies. It is built on scalable, flexible, and adaptable concepts identified in the NIMS to align key roles and responsibilities across the Nation. NIMS provides a consistent nationwide template to enable the whole community to work together to prevent, protect against, mitigate, respond to, and recover from the effects of incidents, regardless of their cause, size, location, or complexity. NIMS consists of three major components: Resource Management, Command and Coordination, and Communications and Information Management.

The Capability Target for Operational Coordination is described thus: *“Communities use standardized language to set targets that reflect the level of capability they plan to build and sustain. Communities use the same standardized language to measure how much capability they have. The standardized target for this Core Capability is provided below [:]*

“Within (#) (unit of time) of a potential or actual incident, establish and maintain a unified and coordinated operational structure and process across (#) jurisdictions affected and with (#) partner organizations involved in incident management. Maintain for (#) (unit of time).”

The Core Capability Development Sheets describe the validation of that capability through this process: “Exercises and real-world events validate capabilities and are opportunities to identify areas of success or needs for improvement.” The tools include the Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program¹⁰ and the National Exercise Program.¹¹ In order to validate capabilities properly, those performance capabilities must first be developed.

Incident Management Team Definition

Using the ICS outlined in the NIMS as the organizational framework and planning system, AHIMTs and IMTs are organized, typed, and deployed as a specially trained team of ICS subject matter experts who plan for and manage major and/or more complex incidents within a Federal, tribal, state, or local jurisdiction. Their use aligns with providing the “unified and coordinated operational structure” stated as a critical core capability in the NPG. They are also used to manage or assist in managing large planned events. The FEMA NIMS does not differentiate between discipline-focused IMTs and those that use the guidelines under their National Qualification System (NQS). As a result, the definition of IMTs provided in the NIMS and current typing documents should be considered, regardless of their qualifications process. The term *Incident Management Teams* is defined in the NIMS as follows:

“Incident Management Teams

“IMTs are rostered groups of ICS-qualified personnel, consisting of an Incident Commander and other incident leadership and personnel qualified for other key ICS positions. IMTs exist at local, regional, state, tribal, and national levels and have formal notification, deployment, and operational procedures in place. These teams are typed based on team members’

⁹ U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency: *National Response Framework*, Fourth Edition, October 2019 (Washington, DC, 2019).

¹⁰ U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency: *Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP)*, February 2020 (Washington, DC, 2020).

¹¹ Refer to the *National Exercise Program*: <https://www.fema.gov/national-exercise-program>.

Defining Standardized Performance Capability Metrics for Incident Management Teams

qualifications and may be assigned to manage incidents or to accomplish supporting incident-related tasks or functions.”¹²

There are slight differences between the qualification processes and requirements that members of discipline-focused¹³ IMTs follow while achieving their ICS position qualifications and those indicated in the All-Hazards-focused FEMA NQS guidelines. For the purposes of discussing the levels of performance capability and competencies based on either the ICS position qualifications criteria developed under the FEMA NQS or those developed by discipline-focused sponsoring organizations, the word *team* and the acronym *AHIMT*, referencing the All-Hazards Incident Management Team Program, are used synonymously in this document, except when specific reference to IMTs operating under a discipline-focused program is required.

Current Incident Management Team Typing

Standardization of resources, including AHIMTs, is essential to interoperability among organizations during incident response. As indicated above, resource typing is a methodology used to define and categorize incident resources by capability. Resource typing provides a common language for discussing resources by defining minimum capabilities for personnel, teams, facilities, equipment, and supplies. Several decades of successful use of resource typing demonstrate its value as a way to ensure the delivery of the correct capability and kind/type of resource in response to a request.

Resource management preparedness involves: identifying and typing resources; qualifying, certifying, and credentialing personnel; planning for resources; and acquiring, storing, and inventorying resources.

“Identifying and Typing Resources

Resource typing is defining and categorizing incident resources by capability. Resource typing definitions establish a common language for discussing resources by defining minimum capabilities for personnel, teams, facilities, equipment, and supplies. Resource typing enables communities to plan for, request, and have confidence that the resources they receive have the capabilities they requested.”¹⁴

FEMA is continuously developing guidelines for resource typing personnel and teams, including the current Type 3 AHIMTs, to complement the introduction of the NIMS. The FEMA guidelines for the typing of teams and other resources are described in a series of documents referred to as the FEMA 508 documents. The typing of position qualifications is discussed in a separate series of documents referred to as the FEMA 509 documents. The FEMA 508 document for IMTs does not differentiate between discipline-focused IMTs and those that use the guidelines under their NQS. As a result, the IMT in the current typing documents documented in the FEMA 508, *Resource Typing Definitions*, published on the Resource Typing Library Tool

¹² U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency: *National Incident Management System*, Third Edition (Washington, DC, 2017), p. 32. Retrieved from <https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/148019P32>.

¹³ Examples of discipline-focused Incident Management Teams include the NWCG, USCG, U.S. EPA, and U.S. Food and Drug Administration.

¹⁴ U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency: *National Incident Management System*, Third Edition (Washington, DC, 2017), “Identifying and Typing Resources,” p. 6.

Defining Standardized Performance Capability Metrics for Incident Management Teams

(RTLTL) website,¹⁵ should be considered independent of their qualifications process. The NIMS Job Titles/Position Qualifications within the RTLTL also establish minimum criteria required to be able to perform in a position in incidents at a particular resource typing level.

The NWCG provides national leadership to enable interoperable wildland fire operations among Federal, state, local, tribal, and territorial partners. The Federal land management agencies sponsor NWCG qualified wildland-fire-focused multi-agency teams that are designed to manage wildland fires on Federal lands, as well as state and local lands, per agreement and request. In addition to their expertise in wildland fires, these teams have been used for responses under Emergency Support Function #4, Firefighting, for non-wildland-fire incidents when the activity level from the wildland fire season permitted. Past examples include Hurricane Andrew (1992), the World Trade Center Attack (2001), and the Columbia Shuttle Recovery mission (2003). Superstorm Sandy (2012) and Hurricane Harvey (2017) are recent examples of those types of deployments. Although they are discipline-focused for wildland fire, the NWCG-managed IMTs are recognized as the best practice example on which all other IMTs are patterned. Existing Type 1 and Type 2 IMTs managed by the NWCG were incorporated into the FEMA IMT resource typing guidelines by adapting and appending NWCG's existing typing methodology to the FEMA IMT resource typing guidelines.

The FEMA and NWCG typing methodologies for both IMTs and AHIMTs as a single resource are based solely on 1) the qualifications of the personnel that deploy with the team,¹⁶ and 2) the AHIMTs' *composition*. A team's composition is the term used to specify which ICS positions are filled and the number of personnel in each ICS position that must be filled (e.g., 2-Operations Section Chiefs, 1-Planning Section Chief) when an AHIMT of that resource type is deployed. Although resource typing, by NIMS definition, is based on performance capability, IMTs as a single resource are currently not categorized based on team performance capabilities like the other resources within NIMS.

The current components identified in the FEMA 508 for IMTs lack performance capabilities other than the component of "Personnel Management Capabilities Per Team," which is no longer included in the NIMS Incident Complexity Guide. As currently written, there is no methodology provided for how the IMT will manage the number of personnel indicated, or how *successful management* of those personnel is determined. In contrast, the FEMA 508 for an Urban Search and Rescue Task Force¹⁷ is very prescriptive; it provides detailed performance capabilities that inform program managers which capabilities they need to maintain, and provides requesting jurisdictions a detailed understanding of what capabilities each type of Urban Search and Rescue Task Force is capable of achieving.

There is some confusion and consternation regarding referring to AHIMT/IMTs *resource typing* as a particular "type" team and the definition of *incident complexity level* also being referred to as a particular "type." Incident complexity levels and resource typing are two separate systems and a resource's type does

¹⁵ The Resource Typing Library Tool (RTLTL) is a catalogue of NIMS resource typing definitions, job titles/position qualifications, and Position Task Books. Retrieved from <https://rtl.preptoolkit.fema.gov/Public/Resource/View/2-508-1050>.

¹⁶ Incident Management Team Resource Typing Definition 2-508-1050: "Command and general staff type should match the IMT type, though subordinate positions, such as Unit Leaders, are not tied to incident complexity and may be of a single type."

¹⁷ Incident Management Team Resource Typing Definition 8-508-1262: Urban Search and Rescue Task Force.

not dictate or preclude the use of that resource on an incident of a different complexity level. In the IMT domain, past practice led to misunderstandings between the two systems. Compounding the confusion, several organizations also referenced or included the level of IMT resource typing as an integral part of their definition of incident complexity. As an example, in past Complexity Guides, the incident was defined as being a Type 1 incident because a Type 1 IMT was being used to manage it. However, the logic that the incident's complexity level was, at least in part, determined by the AHIMT/IMT type did not hold in many instances, as the deployment of a Type 1 IMT under ESF#4 to manage a FEMA Logistical Staging Area does not necessarily make that a type 1 assignment. The acceptance and incorporation of the NIMS Incident Complexity Guide provides much-needed homogeneity in incident-complexity-level definitions and will disconnect the references to IMT level within the descriptions of incident complexity level.

The Performance Capabilities developed and presented in this document were completed with a strong understanding and appreciation of the need to support the relationship between the current IMT capabilities based on the resource typing of the personnel and the proposed incident management Performance Capabilities, the draft incident complexity levels, and past best practices.

Incident Management Team Capabilities

The term *capability* is being used to avoid any potential confusion with the term *competency* used in the All-Hazards NIMS ICS training domain. For the purposes of this document, a *capability* refers to a cluster of behaviors and products expected from incident management personnel to succeed in achieving incident management functions or objectives.

An AHIMT is typed and ordered as a single ICS resource, although, depending on its type, it is composed of as few as eight or potentially as many as 58 or more personnel¹⁸ who have received ICS position training, experience, and qualifications as single resources. These personnel completed their position training and acquired experience using the individual position's duties and responsibilities and ICS position competency sets. Working within an AHIMT environment occurs during and after training assignments on incidents, events, and exercises, and results in increased knowledge, skills, and abilities, particularly within the team environment. Additional team-based training requirements have been implemented by most discipline-focused organizations. For example, the NWCG has established position qualification requirements for each of the ICS positions they recognize in their wildland-fire qualifications process. The NWCG qualifications guide specifies that personnel desiring to be members of the command and general staff of any of the approximately 35 wildland-fire-focused Type 2 IMTs recognized by the National Interagency Coordination Center¹⁹ attend the NWCG-sponsored course S-420, *Command and General Staff*, or the NWCG-sponsored L-481, *Advanced Leadership for Command and General Staff*. The EPA and USCG have similar standards, although they use their own agency-developed versions of the courses.

Currently, there are 16 wildland-fire-focused Type 1 National IMTs recognized by the National Interagency Coordination Center.²⁰ The NWCG qualifications guide specifies that personnel desiring to be members of

¹⁸ 2021 National Interagency Mobilization Guide, NIFC-Multi-Agency Coordinating Group, "IMT Configuration." Retrieved from <https://www.nifc.gov/nicc/mobguide/index.html>.

¹⁹ From <https://www.fs.fed.us/wildlandfire/prepared.shtml>.

²⁰ 2021 National Interagency Mobilization Guide, NIFC-Multi-Agency Coordinating Group, Chapter 20, "Overhead and Teams." Retrieved from <https://www.nifc.gov/nicc/mobguide/index.html>.

Defining Standardized Performance Capability Metrics for Incident Management Teams

the command and general staff of any of the 16 recognized IMTs attend the National Advanced Fire & Resource Institute (NAFRI)-managed course S-520, *Advanced Incident Management*, or the NASF-developed CIMC. Some states have also developed Type 1 IMTs for intrastate deployment using a qualifications process that varies by state, although attending the NASF CIMC course is a common requirement.

Despite the similar qualifications' paths, there is no common agreement on the minimum performance capabilities an AHIMT as a "single resource" should possess at each of the resource typing levels. As previously stated, no organization can currently answer the question, "Exactly what level of performance capabilities should each resource type team possess, and what are the specific differences of performance capabilities between the resource types?" Because an AHIMT is requested and deployed as a single resource with the intent of the AHIMT managing an incident determined to be at a certain incident complexity level, there needs to be a common understanding of the capabilities and competencies in which the AHIMT, as a single resource, is proficient and which it is capable of performing.

One of the greatest advantages experienced when using a highly functioning AHIMT is the synergistic effect seen in performance that demonstrates that an AHIMT is more than just the sum of its parts or its ICS positions. The level of capabilities an IMT has together as a resource is greater than the capabilities of the individual positions of which it is composed.

Incident complexity levels and resource typing are two separate systems. A resource's type does not dictate or preclude the use of that resource on an incident of a different complexity level.

The lack of a common set of standardized capabilities an AHIMT should possess presents challenges like those displayed in the level of "team training" conducted by the different team-sponsoring organizations. Research has documented numerous examples of discussions regarding curricula overlap and gaps between NWCG S-420 and S-520 courses because there is no standardization of the capabilities an AHIMT should possess at each resource typing level. This issue complicates implementation of a stair-step methodology of increasing competency levels as the resource typing increases. Although it is widely accepted that an AHIMT's capabilities increase with resource typing, currently there are no quantifiable standards and metrics to measure across the resource typing levels that indicates they actually *do* increase.

This challenge became evident to the course developers for the USFA capstone exercise course for evaluating Type 3 AHIMTs for possible National Tier resource deployment, the USFA O-325 *AHIMT National Tier Qualifying Exercise*. The course developers must ensure the capabilities being evaluated do not overlap those of the resource typing for Type 2 AHIMTs or leave gaps in capabilities between the resource types; these course developers could not find any reference to AHIMT or IMT performance capabilities by resource type. Research and recollection by cadre members indicated that developing standardized AHIMT or IMT performance capabilities based on resource type or complexity has been discussed extensively by committees and working teams of the entities mentioned, but not completed.

Developing a common understanding of the performance capabilities an AHIMT possesses collectively by resource type will enable the sponsoring organizations to better coordinate an AHIMT's use, expectations, and limitations. Quantifying and standardizing the performance capabilities of the AHIMT by resource type will also provide significant additional guidance to those responsible for developing the training, qualifications standards, Position Task Books, and exercises for the individual positions of which the AHIMT is composed.

Developing the Standardized Metrics

Outreach and Analysis

As development of the exercise objectives for the USFA O-325 was initiated, the lack of AHIMT performance capability metrics quickly became apparent to the development cadre. Because many of the cadre are former members of the NWCG committees (such as the then-Training Working Team, the Incident Operations Standards Working Team, Leadership committees, and others), the cadre were well-informed on the historical issues the NWCG experienced in regard to performance capabilities by type. Consultation with the other members of the development cadre brought in the additional expertise of the personnel responsible for NWCG, CIMC, and USFA team-oriented courses. A list of the members, including biographical descriptions of their professional and incident management backgrounds, is included in the Project Member section of this document. The SMEs in the cadre who reviewed the materials during development of the draft represent the wildland fire, structural fire, municipal law enforcement, law enforcement ICS trainers, and emergency management disciplines. All possess significant “on-scene” Incident Command System position qualifications on NWCG-managed IMTs at the Type 2, Type 1, and Area Command incident complexity levels, and all are active in the USFA Type 3 AHIMT development program and the nascent All-Hazards program. Position qualifications represented in the cadre include Area Commanders and virtually all Command and General Staff positions at all levels of incident complexity. Several reviewers are also current or former members of training and standards committees for NWCG and/or the FIREScope organization with ICS team training experience for the NWCG, USCG, EPA, FIREScope, USFA, FEMA IMATs, and EMI.

The level of performance capability an Incident Management Team possesses as a single resource is greater than the sum of the capabilities of the individual positions of which it is composed.

As previously stated, several members of the cadre served as curriculum developers, course coaches, or course managers for the NWCG S-420, *Command and General Staff*; NWCG S-520, *Advanced Incident Management*; NWCG S-620, *Area Command*; the NASF CIMC course; and the USFA O-305, *All-Hazards Incident Management Team Introduction* course; and they are developing the USFA O-325 *AHIMT National Tier Qualifying Exercise*.

Each iteration of the draft document was peer-reviewed by the cadre. The resulting drafts were subsequently redistributed for additional review and refinement. After development of a final draft, copies will be distributed to stakeholder associations including NWCG, FIREScope, AHIMTA, USCG, and CWCG, with a request for comments. Concerns from the stakeholder review that need adjudication will be completed before the final draft is distributed for comments by the AHIMT community.

Feedback requests from the AHIMT community will be initiated using the same process used for vetting the USFA *3-Tiered Preparedness System for All-Hazards Incident Management Teams* document. Conference calls will be conducted with the Type 3 AHIMT Program Managers and/or Incident Commanders, using the AHIMT teams list on file with the AHIMTA and USFA. Comments received during the comment and feedback period will be researched and analyzed by the cadre. Feedback needing adjudication will be completed, and the resulting document will be distributed for stakeholder and endorsement by the response community.

Research of Existing Documentation

The References section of this document contains a list of the documents, reports, internal NWCG memos, and published and unpublished research papers the cadre reviewed and analyzed to ensure that the draft performance capability criteria were aligned with, built on, or complementary to previous or closely related research and documentation. The historical reports and memos from the NWCG committees are of particular importance because of NWCG's well-developed qualifications path and history of resource typing. As expected, several of the documents reviewed highlighted the issues seen because of a lack of performance criteria. The lack of performance criteria prompted discussions regarding the lack of synchronicity with the curricula for NWCG's S-420 and S-520 courses and the need for developing a stair-step approach of increasing the levels of performance capabilities required from Type 2 to the Type 1 level.

The course and unit objectives of the NWCG/USCG S-420/ICS-420, *Command and General Staff*; USFS Region 5 version of S-420, NWCG S-520, *Advanced Incident Management*; NWCG S-620, *Area Command*; NASF CIMC course; and USFA O-305, *All-Hazards Incident Management Team Introduction* courses were analyzed for potential team performance capabilities that would be appropriate metrics.

The comparison studies between the FEMA EMI NIMS All-Hazards Position-Specific courses and unit objectives with equivalent course content from NWCG using the "NWCG Comparative Analysis," completed in July 2011, and the "Crosswalk/Gap Analysis of the NIMS/ICS All-Hazard Position-Specific Courses with the NIC Core Competencies," completed in October 2011, were analyzed, and any appropriate performance criteria were extracted for refinement.

Several IMT-related research papers conducted for the Australian and New Zealand fire services were analyzed and referenced. Two papers, "Evidence To Support Incident Management Team Capability"²¹ and "Managing Emergencies: Key Competencies for Incident Management Teams,"²² provided numerous salient Incident Management taskwork and teamwork competencies that, although not appropriate to the development of capability metrics, did contain principles that will be included in the USFA O-325 exercise curricula.

The 2013 report containing the stakeholder feedback conducted for the NWCG Executive Board concerning how best to organize and manage national wildland fire IMTs, "Incident Management Organization Succession Planning Stakeholder Feedback," was helpful in that it highlighted the fact that, and provided concrete evidence that, a lack of definitive performance standards differentiating between Type 1 and Type 2 IMTs resulted in survey respondents' failure to understand why there were both Type 1 and Type 2 IMTs.

Addressing Organizational Differences in Complexity Determination

A critical element in establishing valid and standardized minimum performance capabilities by resource typing levels is common cognizance of incident complexity indicators and descriptors at each incident complexity level or type. Standardization of performance capabilities relies on a consensus on the definitions at each level to prevent overly broad variations when developing capabilities. Several Incident Complexity Guides and complexity analysis tools from All-Hazards and discipline-focused agencies and

²¹ Owen, C., Hayes, P., Brooks, B., Cameron, S., & Conway, G. (2018). Evidence to support incident management team capability. *The Australian Journal of Emergency Management*, 33, 44.

²² Hayes, Peter AJ and Omodei, Mary M. Managing Emergencies: Key Competencies for Incident Management Teams. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Organisational Psychology*, Vol. 4, No. 1, 2011: 1–10.

Defining Standardized Performance Capability Metrics for Incident Management Teams

stakeholder groups were reviewed to elicit levels of performance capability required to manage effectively the level of incident complexity indicated. The tool most commonly used by discipline-focused agencies and stakeholders is a document called a *complexity analysis*, a document that leads the user through a series of questions and results in selecting a complexity level. These tools have been specifically focused and framed for use within a discipline's operational environment²³ and reflect the conditions typically experienced in that operational environment. It is noted that each discipline-focused complexity analysis tool is highly specific to the sponsoring discipline and its methodology and operational environment. Unless the differences between the wide-ranging All-Hazards environment and more narrowly targeted discipline-focused analysis tools are addressed, the resulting performance capabilities would not reflect the potential conditions or capabilities within which AHIMTs are required to operate.

The intent of using a specific Complexity Guide was not to preemptively determine a national incident complexity model, because doing so is clearly outside the purview of the development cadre. The intent was to provide critically needed context for developing AHIMT capabilities. A baseline of complexity is critical because the operational environment of the AHIMTs can be quite different from those of their discipline-focused IMT counterparts. For example, it is common practice at All-Hazards Type 3 incidents for the Operations Section to include functionally organized branches within its overall operational organization. Functional branches like the Hazardous Materials Branch, Law Enforcement Branch, and Damage Assessment Branch are common examples within the AHIMT operational construct. However, the complexity analysis tools or descriptions for entities such as the NWCG do not condone or acknowledge the use of branches at the Type 3 level, but only at the Type 2 or Type 1 level.²⁴ A Complexity Guide that properly reflects the All-Hazards operational environment is critical to determine correctly the AHIMT operational capabilities at a specific complexity level. Without adjusting for the differences in the operational environment between AHIMTs and IMTs, the resulting capabilities for Type 3 AHIMTs could inadvertently lead to the Type 3 AHIMTs being underprepared for meeting the jurisdiction's expectations and the operational environment commonly experienced by Type 3 AHIMTs.

To provide context for the All-Hazards environment, the USFA used the 2014 Draft Complexity Guide that was vetted by numerous stakeholder groups represented on the National Integration Center's (NIC's) sponsored *Incident Management Support Group/Incident Management Working Group*, active during the 2009–2014 period. The original document, completed in 2014, was delivered to the NIC and was subsequently included in the U.S. Department of the Interior's NIMS Incident Positions Qualification Guide (IPQG)²⁵ with changes only to the title and categories. Other qualification entities also adopted slight variations of the indicators, although the methodology remained largely intact. To facilitate developing the performance capabilities for this project, the USFA engaged SMEs and representatives from several stakeholder groups to provide an update to the original 2014 draft, including an analysis to ensure that it remained complementary to recently developed training, doctrine, and supporting guidelines released by

²³ For example, *Wildland Fire Risk and Complexity Assessment*, Appendix E. Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation Operations, January 2021. Produced by the Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation Operations Group, National Interagency Fire Center, Boise, ID.

²⁴ *Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation Operations*, January 2021 edition. Produced by the Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation Operations Group, National Interagency Fire Center, Boise, ID, Appendix F-2. Chart.

²⁵ U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Emergency Management, *National Incident Management System Incident Positions Qualification Guide*. Washington, DC, June 2017

the NIC, the EMI, and the USFA. The USFA Draft Complexity Guide was finished in 2020 and is used to assist in determining performance indicators of the AHIMTs. The original 2020 USFA draft completed a comment-and-review cycle and was adopted and distributed by the National Integration Center as the FEMA *National Incident Management System Incident Complexity Guide*.

Performance Capability Metrics – Design and Concept of Operations

The intent of the Performance Capability Metrics is to assist in developing guidance for the FEMA NIMS ICS resource typing of AHIMTs. The metrics would apply only to AHIMTs that desire to respond to requests for deployment from the state-to-state Emergency Management Assistance Compact (EMAC) process, through Emergency Support Function #4 requests under the National Response Framework (NRF) during a Presidential declaration of emergency or major disaster, or those AHIMTs participating in the FEMA Supplemental Response Team program.

The Performance Capability Metrics should not be confused with the USFA *3-Tiered Preparedness System for All-Hazards Incident Management Teams* introduced in 2019, which is undergoing implementation. The USFA 3-Tiered Preparedness System for All-Hazards Incident Management Teams is a USFA-sponsored, peer-developed national best practice that quantifies operational, logistical, and administrative preparedness for response, but does not indicate the capability or the resource typing of the AHIMT.

To elucidate the differences between the USFA *3-Tiered Preparedness System for All-Hazards Incident Management Teams* and the Performance Capability Metrics: The *3-Tiered Preparedness System* provides metrics to determine how prepared a team is to manage the administrative, operational, and logistical support conditions at a particular deployment, and the Performance Capability Metrics provide metrics to determine the resource typing and Performance Capability of a team at the Type 1, 2, 3, or 4 level. The two systems are separate but complementary in that once adopted, the systems will ensure that AHIMTs that respond to requests for assistance are properly prepared and of sufficient performance capability (Type) to manage the requesting jurisdiction's incident or event successfully.

Although there are five accepted levels of incident complexity, Type 5 through Type 1, the complexity of a Type 5 incident is considered to be at a level whose difficulty in managing or mitigating is not great enough to require any ICS position other than the Incident Commander. As a result, there is no need to develop or recognize an AHIMT, IMT, or formal incident management organization for a Type 5 complexity level incident.

Implementation of the Metrics

Some of the performance capabilities may introduce topics, concepts, or capabilities not currently addressed in the training and exercise programs of existing ICS Incident Management personnel or team qualifications programs. It is well understood that modifications to current training and qualifications programs will need to be implemented, and some personnel will need to become familiar with new skills and concepts, like the Community Lifelines being implemented by FEMA. To account for this, a multi-year Phase-In approach should be agreed to by the stakeholders. Because of the significant value this project provides to those responsible for developing a training curriculum and qualifications program, the cadre working on the USFA O-325 *AHIMT National Tier Qualifying Exercise* curriculum are integrating the Type 3 metrics into the exercise objectives being developed.

Defining Standardized Performance Capability Metrics for Incident Management Teams

Using the Metrics Table

The metrics table lays out the individual subject areas in which AHIMTs should be able, at a minimum, to demonstrate successful performance so as to be considered capable at the resource typing level indicated.

Performance capabilities that are different, new, or expanded from one resource typing level to a higher resource typing level are shown in **boldface** in the resource type where they first appear (except at the Type 4 capability level), indicating the difference between the resource typing levels.

Although not shown in the example below, there are a few instances where there is no differentiation between a minimum performance capability at one resource typing level and at a higher resource typing level. For example, the Performance Capability #2, “Incident/Event Management, Unified Command,” requires the same capability for a Type 1 team as for a Type 2 team. In those cases, the phrase “Same as Type 2” is used under the Type 1 column. This is done to maintain consistency with the NIMS resources typing document methodology.

The metrics tables are laid out as follows.

TEAM PERFORMANCE SUBJECT	TYPE 4 Capability	TYPE 3 Capability	TYPE 2 Capability	TYPE 1 Capability
#1 Transfer of Command (to either a Command or Support Role) (Refer to details)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of initial incident management priorities • Develop or confirm the local-jurisdiction-developed initial incident objectives • Develop appropriate strategies to meet the objectives • Clarify local jurisdiction’s expectations of the team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of initial incident management priorities • Assist in development of Delegation of Authority or letter of expectations • Identify limitations (restraints) and constraints • Develop incident objectives with no assistance from an AA/AHJ (Authorities Having Jurisdiction) (if rated at the national Tier under the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of incident management priorities • Assist in development of Delegation of Authority or letter of expectations • Identify limitations (restraints) and constraints • Develop incident objectives with no assistance from an AA/AHJ • If under an Area Command (AC) structure, work collaboratively with AC to develop incident objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of incident management priorities • Assist in development of Delegation of Authority or letter of expectations • Identify limitations (restraints) and constraints • Develop incident objectives with no assistance from an AA/AHJ • If under an AC structure, work collaboratively with AC to develop incident objectives • Develop appropriate long-

Following the metrics table is a section titled “Team Performance Capability Details.” This section provides additional details, descriptions, and insights into the subject areas and performance capabilities required. If the subject and performance capabilities are common knowledge in the response community, then we considered that no additional details were necessary.

Note: Refer to the “details” section for the explanation and specific details, examples, and information.

All-Hazards Incident Management Teams should demonstrate successful performance capability in the following subject areas:

TEAM PERFORMANCE SUBJECT	TYPE 4 Capability	TYPE 3 Capability	TYPE 2 Capability	TYPE 1 Capability
<p>#1 Transfer of Command (to either a Command or Support Role) (Refer to details)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of initial incident management priorities • Develop or confirm the local-jurisdiction-developed initial incident objectives • Develop appropriate strategies to meet the objectives • Clarify local jurisdiction’s expectations of the team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of initial incident management priorities • Assist in development of Delegation of Authority or letter of expectations • Identify limitations (restraints) and constraints • Develop incident objectives with no assistance from an AA/AHJ (Authorities Having Jurisdiction) (if rated at the national Tier under the USFA 3-Tiered Preparedness System; see details) • Develop appropriate strategies to meet the objectives • Clarify local jurisdiction’s expectations of the team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of incident management priorities • Assist in development of Delegation of Authority or letter of expectations • Identify limitations (restraints) and constraints • Develop incident objectives with no assistance from an AA/AHJ • If under an Area Command (AC) structure, work collaboratively with AC to develop incident objectives • Develop appropriate strategies to meet the objectives with minimal assistance from an AA/AHJ or AC • Clarify local jurisdiction’s expectations of the team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of incident management priorities • Assist in development of Delegation of Authority or letter of expectations • Identify limitations (restraints) and constraints • Develop incident objectives with no assistance from an AA/AHJ • If under an AC structure, work collaboratively with AC to develop incident objectives • Develop appropriate long-term strategies to meet the objective with minimal assistance from an AA/AHJ or AC • Clarify local jurisdiction’s expectations of the team • Deconflict objectives and strategies with adjacent incidents/within complex

TEAM PERFORMANCE SUBJECT	TYPE 4 Capability	TYPE 3 Capability	TYPE 2 Capability	TYPE 1 Capability
<p>#2 Incident/Event Management Unified Command (Refer to details)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the incident/event by implementing and using the Unified Command structure, if appropriate • Integrate Unified Commanders into the Unified Command structure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the incident/event by implementing and using the Unified Command structure, if appropriate • Integrate Unified Commanders representing local and state agencies into the Unified Command structure • Confirm that Unified Command is properly demonstrated throughout the organization • Reconstitute Unified Command as the situational changes dictate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the incident/event by implementing and using the Unified Command structure, if appropriate, on an Incident Complex • Integrate Unified Commanders representing local, state, and Federal, agencies into the Unified Command structure • Confirm that Unified Command is properly demonstrated throughout the organization • Reconstitute Unified Command as the situational changes dictate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as Type 2
<p>#3 Incident/Event Management Teamwork (Refer to details)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All personnel fulfill their assigned duties and responsibilities of assigned ICS position(s) to the Type 4 complexity level • Apply skills on “All-Hazards” incidents (e.g., tornado, hurricane, flood, searches, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All personnel fulfill their assigned duties and responsibilities of assigned ICS position(s) to the Type 3 complexity level • Apply skills on “All-Hazards” incidents (e.g., tornado, hurricane, flood, searches, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All personnel fulfill their assigned duties and responsibilities of assigned ICS position(s) to the Type 2 complexity level • Apply skills on “All-Hazards” incidents (e.g., tornado, hurricane, flood, searches, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All personnel fulfill their assigned duties and responsibilities of assigned ICS position(s) at the Type 1 complexity level • Apply skills on “All-Hazards” incidents (e.g., tornado, hurricane, flood, searches, etc.)

TEAM PERFORMANCE SUBJECT	TYPE 4 Capability	TYPE 3 Capability	TYPE 2 Capability	TYPE 1 Capability
<p>#4 Incident/Event Operational Management (Refer to details)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capable of managing a limited number of operational resources while maintaining an appropriate span-of-control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capable of managing up to three functional branches in the Operations Section • Capable of managing the implementation of Branch Tactical Planning in one branch 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capable of managing up to five functional and/or geographic branches in the Operations Section • Capable of managing the implementation of Branch Tactical Planning in all branches 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capable of managing functional and/or geographic branches in the Operations Section • Capable of managing the implementation of Branch Tactical Planning in all branches • Capable of using a second Operations Section as indicated by incident scale/scope
<p>#5 Incident/Event Planning Management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide for effective resource accountability • Provide for adequate situational assessment and reporting • Able to provide an effective planning process that results in, if needed, a verbal Incident Action Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide for effective resource accountability • Provide for adequate situational assessment and reporting • Able to provide an effective planning process that results in a complete written Incident Action Plan for timely distribution to supervisors • Capable of coordinating and facilitating implementation of Branch Tactical Planning • Provide for appropriate demobilization planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide for effective resource accountability • Provide for adequate situational assessment and reporting • Able to provide an effective planning process that results in a complete written Incident Action Plan for timely distribution to supervisors • Capable of coordinating and facilitating implementation of Branch Tactical Planning • Provide for appropriate demobilization planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide for effective resource accountability • Provide for adequate situational assessment and reporting • Able to provide an effective planning process that results in a complete written Incident Action Plan for timely distribution to supervisors • Capable of coordinating and facilitating implementation of Branch Tactical Planning • Provide for appropriate demobilization planning

TEAM PERFORMANCE SUBJECT	TYPE 4 Capability	TYPE 3 Capability	TYPE 2 Capability	TYPE 1 Capability
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide for documentation collection and storage management • Complete short-range contingency planning (up to 3 days) • Conduct transition planning as appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide for documentation collection and storage management • Complete mid-range contingency planning (3 to 5 days) • Conduct transition planning as appropriate • Incorporate recovery planning into incident operations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide for documentation collection and storage management • Complete long-range contingency planning (over 5 days) • Conduct transition planning as appropriate • Incorporate recovery planning into incident operations • Capable of coordinating and facilitating implementation of a second Operations Section into the planning process • Capable of coordinating and facilitating implementation of a second Logistics Section into the planning process
<p>#6 Incident/Event Logistical Management (Refer to details)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilize and/or establish a resource ordering system in conjunction with the AHJ for obtaining required equipment, personnel, and supplies • Provide limited logistical support (i.e., food and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilize and/or establish a resource ordering system in conjunction with the AHJ for obtaining required equipment, personnel, and supplies • Establish/Identify support and operational facilities and locations (ICP, Base, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilize and/or establish a resource ordering system in conjunction with the AHJ for obtaining required equipment, personnel, and supplies • Establish/Identify support and operational facilities and locations (ICP, Base, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilize and/or establish a resource ordering system in conjunction with the AHJ for obtaining required equipment, personnel, and supplies • Establish/Identify support and operational facilities and locations (ICP, Base,

TEAM PERFORMANCE SUBJECT	TYPE 4 Capability	TYPE 3 Capability	TYPE 2 Capability	TYPE 1 Capability
	hydration) to incident personnel	<p>JIC, Staging, etc.) and provide requested logistical support to all facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan for and provide logistical support for the duration of the assignment 	<p>JIC, Staging, etc.) and provide requested logistical support to all incident facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan for and provide logistical support for the duration of the assignment • Plan for long-term incident support needs • Provide requested support to multiple remote camps and staging areas 	<p>JIC, Staging, etc.) and provide requested logistical support to all incident facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan for and provide logistical support for the duration of the assignment • Plan for long-term incident support needs • Provide requested support to multiple remote camps and staging areas • Be capable of using a second Logistics Section as indicated by incident scale/scope
<p>#7 Incident/Event Financial Management (Refer to details)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the capability to make emergency purchases and to cover deployment expenses of the AHIMT • Provide the capability to purchase or procure necessary supplies for the AHIMT or operational missions in conjunction with the appropriate AHJ • Provide estimated and actual costs, including daily <i>burn rates</i> and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as Type 3 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as Type 2.

TEAM PERFORMANCE SUBJECT	TYPE 4 Capability	TYPE 3 Capability	TYPE 2 Capability	TYPE 1 Capability
		<p>cumulative costs, for the team’s activation, response, operation, demobilization, and return of any equipment and supplies to service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In conjunction with the local AHJ and affected entity(ies), provide the capability to track and document any equipment time • In conjunction with the local AHJ and other affected entity(ies) and availability of data, provide the capability to assist in collecting costs, performing cost-effectiveness analyses, and providing cost estimates and recommendations for the incident 		
<p>#8 Integration and Use of Volunteers (Refer to details)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate auxiliary and volunteer organizations into the response to the incident/event 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate volunteers (auxiliary, spontaneous, and VOADs) into the management of the incident/event through development and/or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as Type 3 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate volunteers (auxiliary, spontaneous, and VOADs) into the management of the incident/event through development and/or

TEAM PERFORMANCE SUBJECT	TYPE 4 Capability	TYPE 3 Capability	TYPE 2 Capability	TYPE 1 Capability
		implementation of a Volunteer Management Plan		implementation of Volunteer Management Plans covering multiple functional and/or geographic areas
<p>#9 Integration and Use of Private Sector, NGOs, and Assisting and Cooperating Agencies (Refer to details)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interact and update affected private sector and NGOs • Communicate and coordinate with any Assisting and Cooperating Agencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate private sector and NGOs into the operational planning process during the response phase • Develop and manage a plan to involve the private sector and NGOs in the transition from the response phase to the recovery phase • Establish and maintain ongoing relationships with Assisting and Cooperating Agencies' representatives • Provide staff to support coordination at off-incident facilities (EOCs, ECCs, MACS, etc.) as needed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate private sector and NGOs into the operational planning process during the response phase • Develop and manage a plan to involve the private sector and NGOs in the response, transition from response operations to the recovery phase, and during the recovery phase • Establish and maintain ongoing relationships with Assisting and Cooperating Agencies' representatives • Provide staff to support coordination at off-incident facilities (EOCs, ECCs, MACS, etc.) as needed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as Type 2

TEAM PERFORMANCE SUBJECT	TYPE 4 Capability	TYPE 3 Capability	TYPE 2 Capability	TYPE 1 Capability
<p>#10 Integration and Use of Military and/or National Guard (Refer to details)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and manage a plan for limited to moderate involvement of National Guard assets (e.g., road blocks, security, limited aviation for S&R) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and manage a plan for integration and moderate to substantial involvement of National Guard assets (e.g., road blocks, security, limited aviation for S&R) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and manage a plan for integration and substantial involvement of Active Duty Military and/or National Guard assets
<p>#11 Interaction with Elected and Appointed Officials (Refer to details)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue established interactions with locally elected and appointed officials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage interactions with local-, state-, and National-level elected and appointed officials Provide support for public meetings and presentations as needed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage interactions with local-, state-, National-, and international-level elected and appointed officials due to high national media focus and attention Provide support for public meetings and presentations as needed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Type 2
<p>#12 Interaction with FEMA Planning and Response Operations (Refer to details)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinate with appropriate ESF representatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinate with appropriate ESF representatives Coordinate with Federal Coordination Centers and FEMA entities (JOC, FCO staff) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinate with appropriate ESF representatives Coordinate with Federal Coordination Centers and FEMA entities (JOC, FCO staff) Provide support and representation at local FEMA coordination entities as requested

TEAM PERFORMANCE SUBJECT	TYPE 4 Capability	TYPE 3 Capability	TYPE 2 Capability	TYPE 1 Capability
#13 Strategic (Long-Range) Planning (Refer to details)	• N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop Strategic Plans that encompass up to 7 days • Incorporate technical specialists such as NOAA into planning efforts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop Strategic Plans that encompass up to 21 days • Incorporate technical specialists such as NOAA into planning efforts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop Strategic Plans that encompass up to 30 days or longer • Incorporate technical specialists such as NOAA into planning efforts
#14 Donations Management (Refer to details)	• N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and successfully supervise a donation management process • Manage a central donation site that receives supplies and monetary donations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and successfully supervise a donation management process • Manage multiple donation sites and streams • Manage multiple donation streams that may consist of services, durable and expendable supplies, and monetary donations 	• Same as Type 2
#15 Evacuation and Reentry Management (Refer to details)	• Manage and/or assist in coordinating emergent evacuation and reentry of population within the incident perimeter until the incident is mitigated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage and/or coordinate and integrate with authorities responsible for evacuation and reentry plans and procedures. Affected population may include those within and immediately surrounding the incident perimeter • Coordinate with authorities responsible for providing sheltering and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage and/or coordinate and integrate with authorities responsible for evacuation and reentry plans and procedures. Affected population may include those within the perimeter and the general area surrounding the incident perimeter • Coordinate with authorities responsible for providing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage and/or coordinate and integrate with authorities responsible for evacuation and reentry plans and procedures. Affected population may include those within the perimeter and the region or state surrounding the incident • Coordinate with authorities responsible

TEAM PERFORMANCE SUBJECT	TYPE 4 Capability	TYPE 3 Capability	TYPE 2 Capability	TYPE 1 Capability
		<p>housing. Sheltering facilities may be required for up to 24 hours</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide for longer-term evacuated area security as appropriate 	<p>sheltering and housing. Sheltering and housing facilities may be required for several days</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide for longer-term evacuated area security as appropriate • Provide longer-term protective action planning • Provide for support for short-term resident/owner reentry with local jurisdiction authority 	<p>for providing sheltering and housing. Sheltering and housing facilities may be required from several days to months</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide for longer-term evacuated area security as appropriate • Provide longer-term protective action planning • Provide for support for short-term resident/owner reentry with local jurisdiction authority
<p>#16 Debris Management (Refer to details)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement pre-incident/jurisdiction-developed debris management plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement enhanced pre-incident/jurisdiction-developed debris management plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement enhanced pre-incident/jurisdiction-developed debris management plans • Assist in developing long-term, area-wide debris management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as Type 2
<p>#17 Management of an Incident within an Incident (IWI) (Refer to details)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use standard SOGs for local AHJ(s) • Provide basic resource accountability and reserve forces in place • Medical resources accessible as needed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop written standard procedures for anticipated incidents using local emergency procedures and resources • Plan for potential IWIs as part of the IMT planning processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop written standard procedures for complex IWIs, using expanded local, regional, and specialized resources • Plan for potential IWIs as part of the IMT planning processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as Type 2

TEAM PERFORMANCE SUBJECT	TYPE 4 Capability	TYPE 3 Capability	TYPE 2 Capability	TYPE 1 Capability
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide enhanced resources to support IWI Plan implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide enhanced resources to support IWI Plan implementation • Develop IWI plans for unique or nontraditional threats • Train, exercise, and implement as necessary 	
#18 Aviation Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination of limited (one or two) aviation assets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage up to 4 aviation assets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage up to 5 fixed-and/or rotor-wing assets • Manage aviation operations that involve multiple bases and heli-spots 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage more than 5 fixed-and/or rotor-wing assets assigned to tactical and/or logistical missions • Manage aviation operations that involve multiple bases and heli-spots
#19 Information Dissemination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare and deliver, as directed, media release(s) • Prepare and deliver, as necessary, public warning information about the incident 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare and deliver, as directed, media release(s) • Prepare and deliver, as necessary, public warning information about the incident • Provide support for public meetings and presentations as requested by the AHJ • Monitor news and social media and provide incident information as requested • Recommend public information strategies and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare and deliver, as directed, media release(s) • Prepare and deliver as necessary, public warning information about the incident • Plan, arrange, and facilitate public meetings, presentations, and press conferences • Monitor news media and multiple social media platforms to provide incident information and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as Type 2

TEAM PERFORMANCE SUBJECT	TYPE 4 Capability	TYPE 3 Capability	TYPE 2 Capability	TYPE 1 Capability
		plans on behalf of the AHJ/AA	gather incident-related information for possible vetting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and manage a system for vetting raw information collected from social media to process it into possible actionable incident data or intelligence Recommend, develop, and execute public information strategies and plans on behalf of the AHJ/AA Coordinate within the framework of the JIS and JIC to provide unified and cohesive messaging across the jurisdictions involved 	
#20 Transition and/or Incident Closeout (Refer to details)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct debriefings with Agency Administrator(s) as requested Close out incident as appropriate for AHJ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct debriefings with Agency Administrator(s) as requested Close out incident as appropriate for AHJ Recognize transition indicators, evaluate and recommend options, and prepare and implement an effective Transition Plan as needed Provide “lessons learned” documentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct debriefings with Agency Administrator(s) as requested Close out incident as appropriate for AHJ Recognize transition indicators, evaluate and recommend options, and prepare and implement an effective Transition Plan as needed Provide “lessons learned” documentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct debriefings with Agency Administrator(s) as requested Close out incident as appropriate for AHJ Recognize transition indicators, evaluate and recommend options, and prepare and implement an effective Transition Plan as needed Provide “lessons learned” documentation

TEAM PERFORMANCE SUBJECT	TYPE 4 Capability	TYPE 3 Capability	TYPE 2 Capability	TYPE 1 Capability
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide an Incident Summary or Synopsis of AHIMT actions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide an Incident Summary or Synopsis of AHIMT actions • Provide information for After-Action Reviews (AARs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide an Incident Summary or Synopsis of AHIMT actions • Support/participate in AARs and other formal reviews

Team Performance Capability Details

#1. Transfer of Command (to either a Command or a Support Role)

This includes both transfer from Initial Response to an AHIMT assuming a management role, and transfer from Initial Response to an AHIMT assuming a support role. Regardless of the role the AHIMT assumes, the Transfer of Command process on an incident must be as safe, efficient, seamless, and orderly as possible.

It is not common for a Type 1 or Type 2 AHIMT to assume management from initial response resources without there being some level of organized on-scene incident management in place, most commonly at least a Type 3 organization or AHIMT. However, it is common for a Type 3 or Type 4 AHIMT to assume management from initial response resources with only limited incident management positions in place. As a result, Type 3 and 4 AHIMTs are more likely than Type 1 or Type 2 AHIMTs to encounter either limited initial incident objectives or incidents where only the incident priorities are being considered. The *initial* priorities of 1) life safety, 2) incident stabilization, and 3) property and environmental conservation must then be used to develop initial incident objectives with limited assistance from the AHJ.

As an incident progresses or becomes more complex – hence larger in scope and longer in duration – incident priorities often are expanded with bullet points that reflect more encompassing, holistic, or comprehensive factors than just life safety, incident stabilization, and property and environmental conservation. As indicated in the FEMA implementation of the Community Lifeline concept, these additional factors or considerations may include integrating the restoration of the infrastructure, essential services, and addressing deficits in the Community Lifelines to enable successful reentry, repopulation, and return to a viable community. AHIMTs must be capable of managing both initial incident priorities and objectives, as well as transitioning them into a more comprehensive set of objectives that include the factors described.

AHIMTs must be prepared to work with Agency Administrators (AAs) or Authorities Having Jurisdiction (AHJs), who have little experience in the process of authorizing/delegating, in-briefing, providing leaders' intent, and working with an AHIMT.

At the Type 1 and 2 levels, and at the Type 3 level if being deployed under the FEMA Supplemental Response Team (FEMA SRT) program, AHIMTs must be capable of working under an Area Command structure.

#2. Incident/Event Management: Unified Command

The National Response Framework: An Introduction describes Unified Command as an ICS application used when more than one agency has jurisdiction or when incidents cross political jurisdictions. Agencies work together through the designated members of the Unified Command to establish a common set of objectives and strategies and a single Incident Action Plan. Each participating agency maintains its own authority, responsibility, and accountability.

At the Type 3 and Type 4 resource typing levels, Unified Command may consist of local or state law enforcement, fire, and EMS managing a serious multi-vehicle accident or hazardous materials incident, or a large-structure fire or railroad accident requiring evacuation of the neighborhood.

At the Type 1 and Type 2 resource typing levels, Unified Command may include multiple jurisdictions and agencies representing Federal, state, and local agencies involved in managing the response to and recovery from a hurricane or an area-wide flooding event.

#3. Incident/Event Management: Teamwork

Using the criteria within the FEMA NIMS Incident Complexity Guide, personnel filling ICS positions on the AHIMT should demonstrate mastery of the competencies necessary to accomplish the recognized ICS position's duties and responsibilities at the indicated incident complexity level. Personnel should also display the ability to assist other team members with meeting the AHIMT's overall minimum performance capabilities in the Performance Capability Metrics chart by accomplishing their duties and responsibilities and their assigned portion of the work effort.

Exercise(s) at the indicated incident complexity level should be designed, or the Incident Complexity Guide indicators should be used, to validate an ongoing incident that permits demonstration of the capabilities indicated. If an exercise(s) is (or are) used for AHIMT validation, the exercise(s) should be designed around non-discipline-focused incidents such as tornadoes, hurricanes, floods, and earthquakes, etc.

#4. Incident/Event Management: Operational

There are two less frequently practiced ICS organizational modifications discussed in the ICS construct that a team needs to be capable of performing at the appropriate typing level: Branch Tactical Planning and Adding a Second Operations Section. The capability of successfully accomplishing these modifications, when indicated at the appropriate resource typing level, is explained below.

Tactical Planning Within Branches²⁶

Branch Tactical Planning (BTP) is the development of detailed tactical plans within the Operations Section at the Branch level, which is done in place of the Operations Section Chiefs performing that function themselves. It is implemented by delegating the Branch Director-level position(s) within the Operations Section to develop their detailed tactical plans, including resource allocations, for their individual Branches. As an example, BTP is often necessary on Type 3 incidents in the Law Enforcement Branch because the technical expertise, qualifications, and skill necessary to accomplish safe and effective planning resides within the tactical resources that comprise the Branch (e.g., S&R Dive Teams, SWAT Teams, EOD Teams, Evacuation Planning, etc.).

At the Type 3 level, this performance capability is introduced and implemented by indicating that the team needs to be capable of managing one Branch implementing BTP. This is accomplished by limiting BTP to just the Branch(es) that must do their planning at that level, usually because of the specialized technical expertise, qualifications, and skill necessary to accomplish BTP. The other Branches continue under the standard central planning structure. In either case, the Planning Section would provide each Branch doing individual BTP with the required support in terms of personnel and other support resources to incorporate BTP into the Planning process. As the resource typing level increases, teams

²⁶ "Tactical Planning Within Branches," E/L/G 0400 Advanced Incident Command System for Complex Incidents, ICS 400 Instructor Guide, p. IG-119, April 2019, FEMA.

must be capable of managing additional Branches implementing BTP while still managing the overall planning process.

Adding a Second Operations Section²⁷

The I-/ICS-400 curriculum discusses the option for adding a second Operations Section to the organization: “[T]he model shown represents a complex incident in which the sheer volume of resources required means that the Operations Section cannot be further expanded without exceeding ICS span-of-control guidelines and it is not possible to establish separate incidents.”

Recent history has shown that when the Operations Section cannot manage the “sheer volume of resources required,” other functional sections of the AHIMT are similarly stressed. When multiple functional sections are in similar maximum-load situations, the current practice is to convert the incident into an Incident Complex.²⁸ Over the years, as incidents have increased in size and duration, the use of Incident Complexes has increased, while the concept of adding a second Operations Section has been implemented only rarely.

However, because the I/ICS-400 curriculum still indicates the potential for a second Operations Section to be added to the organization, Type 1 AHIMTs must be capable of managing its addition and successfully implementing the changes necessary to manage the implications for the workflow, organizational construct, coordination, and teamwork required between the planning, logistical, finance, and command functions. If the stakeholders feel this adaptation is no longer relevant, then doctrine will need to be developed and the curriculum should be modified to eliminate the option; then the requirement can be removed.

#5. Incident/Event Planning Management

For details regarding Branch Tactical Planning and adding a second Operations Section, refer to the details provided in #4, Incident/Event Management: Operational.

For details regarding adding a second Logistics Section, refer to the details provided in #6, Incident/Event Management: Logistical.

Contingency Plans identify possible or potential events and the contingency actions, tactics, and resources needed to mitigate these events if they were to occur. Contingency Plans address the “what if” factors associated with operational strategies and tactical plans. Examples include possible inclement, adverse, or severe weather; the need to evacuate an area due to degradation of conditions; loss of electrical power to an area, etc. A Contingency Plan should not be confused with Strategic or Long-Term Planning discussed in #13, Strategic or Long-Term Planning.

#6. Incident/Event Management: Logistical

As first explained in #4, Incident/Event Management: Operational, there is a less frequently practiced ICS organizational modification discussed in the ICS curriculum that a team needs to be capable of

²⁷ “Adding an Operations Section,” E/L/G 0400 Advanced Incident Command System for Complex Incidents, ICS 400 Instructor Guide, p. IG-126, April 2019, FEMA.

²⁸ “Incident Complex: Two or more individual incidents located in the same general area and assigned to a single Incident Commander or Unified Command,” FEMA: National Incident Management System, Third Edition (Washington, DC, 2017), p. 65.

performing: Adding a second Logistics Section. The capability of successfully accomplishing this modification, indicated at the appropriate resource typing level, is explained below.

The I-/ICS-400 curriculum states that “if an incident is so geographically dispersed that it is not feasible for the Incident Base to support the incident logistical needs, it may be necessary to establish another Logistics Section.”²⁹

Recent history has shown that when the Logistics Section cannot manage from one base an incident whose nature is geographically dispersed, additional ICS Camps are established to provide the required logistical services. If the issues continue, consideration is given to converting the incident into an Incident Complex.³⁰ Although this is discussed in the curriculum, the concept of adding a second Logistics Section has been implemented only rarely.

However, because the I-/ICS-400 curriculum still indicates the potential for a second Logistics Section to be added to the organization, Type 1 AHIMTs must be capable of managing its addition and successfully implementing the changes necessary to manage the implications to the workflow, organizational construct, coordination, and teamwork required between the planning, logistical, finance, and command functions. If the stakeholders feel this adaptation is no longer relevant, then doctrine should be developed and the curriculum should be modified to eliminate the option; then the requirement can be removed.

#7. Incident/Event Management: Financial

The finance function is the most entity-specific function within the ICS. Federal, state, and local levels of government all have disparate financial accounting systems, procedures, and statutes that are typically very specific, detailed, and often inflexible. Even similar levels of government, i.e., city level or county level, are unique to the specific entity.

The agency-specific nature of the finance function is demonstrated in staffing guidelines for the National Incident Management Teams. Because their original design was for use on Federal lands, the National Mobilization Guide recommends that all Federal Type 1 and Type 2 IMT positions within the Finance/Administration Section (except the Cost Unit Leader) be filled by current agency (Federal) employees.³¹

Any time an AHIMT deploys outside of its own entity, it will have limited capability in acquiring or ascertaining cost, contract information, personnel time records, and other finance-related information unless it is delegated or granted some level of authority or authorization, or is assisted by the AHJ. Finance capabilities will likely be highly situationally dependent. However, as incidents escalate and additional financial support is required, those incidents almost always quickly exceed the local AHJ’s procurement abilities and experience. The AHIMT’s Finance Section personnel need to be capable of adapting to unique local requirements and processes, while providing advice to overwhelmed AHJs on

²⁹ “Adding a Logistics Section,” E/L/G 0400 Advanced Incident Command System for Complex Incidents, ICS 400 Instructor Guide, p. IG-128, April 2019, FEMA.

³⁰ Incident Complex, National Incident Management System, p. 65.

³¹ 2021 National Interagency Mobilization Guide, NIFC-Multi-Agency Coordinating Group, p. 42, “IMT Configurations.” Retrieved from <https://www.nifc.gov/nicc/mobguide/index.html>.

short- and longer-term finance and contractual issues that may surface. In turn, the involved AHJs need to recognize the incident will stress or exceed their standard operating procedures and capabilities.

Contracts and purchasing are governed by whoever's money you are spending, but as regional-, state-, or Federal-level agreements are used, each level has endorsed certain standardization of their language. Even with that standardization, there will always be a level of reliance on the involved entities' finance, human resources, procurement, and comptroller personnel to delegate, assist, or enable the gathering of needed cost data, and to resolve any AHJ contractual issues.

In recognition of the variables, the current Performance Capabilities of the Finance Section function within the All-Hazards environment included in #7, Incident/Event Financial Management, are focused on the Finance Section function's capability to assist the AHIMT during activation, response, operation, and demobilization.

#8. Integration and Use of Volunteers

Most incidents involve some level of volunteer participation – affiliated and unaffiliated, deployed and self-deployed. The challenge for AHIMTs is to capitalize on the availability of volunteer resources while ensuring the safety of both responders and volunteers and maximizing the responders' ability to perform tasks effectively within the established Incident Command System. Research and history demonstrate that

“A large convergence of spontaneous volunteers can present serious issues and risks associated with massive convergence. Spontaneous volunteers can actually hinder disaster response by creating health, safety, and security issues, distracting responders from their duties, and interfering with response operations. Volunteer efforts can be ineffective because organizations and management systems have not prepared for nor considered how to integrate the volunteer resources. As a result, response personnel are diverted from their primary duties to consider how spontaneous volunteers will be used, to create and assign tasks, to manage logistics related to volunteers, and to supervise actions.”³²

Volunteer Management Plans provide AHIMTs a tool for incorporating into a response appropriate unaffiliated volunteers, spontaneous volunteers, and affiliated volunteer groups such as Medical Reserve Corps (MRC), Community Emergency Response Teams (CERTs), American Red Cross (ARC), Voluntary Organizations Active in Disasters (VOADs), AmeriCorps, and faith-based groups. The level of involvement varies by incident complexity.

Type 4 resource type: Examples include auxiliary and volunteer organizations, like associations that offer to provide rehabilitation services including hydration, warming or cooling, shelter, or other physical and mental support to the responders; CERT personnel who provide traffic management and assist in crowd control; and the American Red Cross or ARC, which provides water, safe shelter, and hot meals to displaced and evacuated residents.

³² Fernandez, Lauren, Joseph Barbera, and Johan Van Dorp. “Strategies for Managing Volunteers during Incident Response: A Systems Approach,” *Homeland Security Affairs* 2, Article 9 (October 2006). Retrieved from <https://www.hsaj.org/articles/684>.

Type 3 resource type: Volunteer organizations may be more fully integrated into the appropriate functions of incident management. Examples include coordinating with the ARC and other VOADs to manage a Volunteer Reception Center (VRC) to process volunteers and develop or implement a community's Volunteer Management Plan, which covers one location to provide food, shelter, and comfort for families affected by incidents such as wildfires, hurricanes, tornadoes, and earthquakes.

AHIMTs at this resource type level should have awareness of the CONOPS of Family Reunification Centers and Family Assistance Centers^{33, 34, 35} to avoid miscommunication or misunderstandings of responsibilities. Implementation and coordination with an entity's Family Reunification Center and/or Family Assistance Center plans and procedures may be necessary if the incident involves a Mass Fatality Incident (MFI), Mass Casualty Incident (MCI), or large-scale evacuations.

Type 1 and Type 2 resource types: The examples are similar, but may involve the management of volunteers and volunteer organizations at multiple locations where facilities provide food, shelter, Family Reunification Centers, Family Assistance Centers, and comfort for families affected by incidents such as wildfires, hurricanes, tornadoes, earthquakes, or terrorism. AHIMTs at the Type 1 and 2 resource typing levels should also demonstrate understanding of the CONOPS of Family Reunification Centers and Family Assistance Centers to avoid miscommunication or misunderstandings of responsibilities. Implementation and coordination with an entity's Family Reunification Center and/or Family Assistance Center plans and procedures may be necessary if the incident involves an MFI, MCI, or large-scale evacuations.

#9. Integration and Use of Private Sector, NGOs, and Assisting and Cooperating Agencies

The private sector and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) provide resources that help communities respond to and recover from the impact of an incident.

The private sector, comprised of small, medium, and large businesses, is not considered to be part of the NGOs, but can be critical to repopulation and recovery efforts. Private-sector organizations range from nationally significant infrastructure to small and locally owned and operated businesses that, although small, provide staples and are often critical to the community. The private sector includes commerce; health care; private, cultural, and educational institutions; and industry, as well as public/private partnerships that have been established specifically for emergency management purposes.

In order to restore affected areas to a level at which residents can successfully re-occupy their dwellings, incident management must look beyond the restoration of roads, inspecting buildings for safe occupancy and clearance of debris, to include as well the process of restoring the community to a functioning level that can support the residents' return. Utilities such as water, power, Internet, and local retailers play a significant role in supporting residents' return.

³³ *Tips for Healthcare Facilities: Assisting Families and Loved Ones after a Mass Casualty Incident*, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Assistant Secretary for Prevention and Response, Technical Resources, Assistance Center, and Information Exchange (TRACIE). Washington, DC, 2018.

³⁴ *Mass Fatality Incident Family Assistance Operations*, U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington, DC, n.d. Retrieved from <https://asprtracie.hhs.gov/technical-resources/resource/4825/mass-fatality-incident-family-assistance-operations-recommended-strategies-for-local-and-state-agencies>.

³⁵ *Reunification Standards and Procedures*, Disaster Cycle Services, The American National Red Cross, 2016.

Defining Standardized Performance Capability Metrics for Incident Management Teams

NGOs play vital roles at the local, state, tribal, territorial, insular-area, and Federal levels in delivering important services, including those associated with the response core capabilities:

- Identifying sheltering locations, ensuring access to those facilities, and communicating their locations to the whole community
- Providing emergency commodities and services, such as water, food, shelter, assistance with family reunification, clothing, and supplies for post-emergency cleanup
- Supporting the evacuation, rescue, care, and sheltering of animals displaced by the incident
- Supporting search and rescue, transportation, and logistical services
- Identifying and supporting the health, medical, mental health, and behavioral health resources of the impacted community
- Supporting disaster survivors, identifying unmet needs, and developing individual recovery plans

The NGOs and private-sector organizations must be included in the incident planning process and not viewed as a “when we get to it” priority. The level of involvement varies by resource typing, and AHIMTs must be prepared to interact, and be capable of interacting, with these organizations to develop plans to incorporate their incident response actions. Utility and infrastructure entities must be closely coordinated with operations to ensure the safety of the responders, utility companies, and residents while working to restore critical infrastructure.

At the indicated resource typing level, AHIMTs must have the capability to incorporate the private sector and NGOs into the operational planning process during the response phase, to develop and manage a plan to involve the private sector and NGOs in the transition from response to recovery, and to reach out to and coordinate closely with current and future cooperating agencies, while maintaining ongoing relationships with assisting agency representatives.

#10. Integration and Use of Military and/or National Guard

This subject includes establishing and maintaining strong and effective working relationships with personnel from the Department of Defense (Active Duty and Reserve components), DHS, and other Federal, state, and local agencies to facilitate effective use of military assets during planning, preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation. When indicated by the resource-typing-level metrics, AHIMTs should be familiar with the Defense Support of Civil Authorities (DSCA) incident response process, including the levels of response, types of military response available, and any limitations for the use of military assets. These include:

Active Duty: Active Duty component units are a full-time force with all their personnel available for tasking, making it possible for them to respond quickly in many situations. Active Duty personnel are governed by Title 10 of the U.S. Code. Active Duty resources are always under Federal command authority and military command through their chain of command. This chain of command extends to the President as the Commander-in-Chief. Active Duty involvement in an emergency response may be determined by implementing Mutual Aid Agreements (authorized under DoD Instruction (DoDI) 6055.06) with civil agencies. Typically, all options involving use of the National Guard have been exhausted within a state before considering the use of Active Duty units.

National Guard: The National Guard (Army NG and Air NG) is a military reserve organization within the military reserve components, but is different from the Federal Reserve units (Army Reserve, Navy Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Air Force Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve) because it is subordinated to

the various state governments, with the commander-in-chief being the state governor. National Guard units are usually a part of the local community in the vicinity of their duty station. National Guard commanders may provide an immediate response to a local community, but they do so typically under state laws.³⁶ The Guard plays an extensive and evident domestic role. As part of its unique “dual-mission” responsibilities, the Guard responds routinely to domestic requirements within each state. The National Guard represents a significant asset that governors can mobilize rapidly to provide protection, relief, and recovery.

Reserve: Reserve units are very similar to the National Guard in their drilling status and are organized, trained, and equipped to perform their assigned duties. Since this is a part-time force, personnel must be recalled and mobilized for their taskings. An advantage of interacting with Reserve units is that in their civilian life, they are likely a part of the local community in the vicinity of their duty station. It is common to see Reservists perform the civilian equivalent of their military occupation within their civilian profession. The difference between the National Guard and the Reserve is that the Reservists, like Active Duty personnel, are governed by Title 10 of the U.S. Code, bringing about issues of civil statutes’ applicability to a given emergency situation.

#11. Interaction with Elected and Appointed Officials

As the incident complexity level increases, so does the likelihood of interaction with elected and appointed officials. The resource typing for AHIMTs follows this increasing interaction based on the resource typing level. As an example, a Type 3 incident will usually involve local-level officials, possibly some state-level officials, but as a general rule, will not involve elected or appointed officials from the Federal level. As the complexity increases to a Type 2 level, the AHIMT is more likely to interact with local and state elected or appointed officials and occasionally with officials from the Federal level. Type 1 incidents typically involve interactions with all levels of elected and appointed officials – local, state, territorial, tribal, and Federal officials – and possibly even international representatives.

Interaction with elected and appointed officials can be divided into two approaches:

1. The incident is within the jurisdiction or authority of the elected or appointed official. In these instances, the AHIMT may be working directly for the individual (Agency Administrator/Agency Executive). The interaction and interpersonal relationship that an AHIMT establishes with this individual will be critical to the team’s ability to build trust with the elected or appointed official(s), which will help manage or support the incident to a successful conclusion.
2. The incident is not within the jurisdiction or authority of the elected or appointed official. It is common for an AHIMT to interact with elected or appointed officials from outside the involved jurisdiction. These officials fill various levels of government and may require a situational briefing, a site visit, or a tour of the incident, or may just have questions or request information and/or updates on the incident status. Oftentimes these visitors to the incident, depending upon the office the official holds, are referred to as Very Important Persons (VIPs) and may

³⁶ Typically, this would be under Title 32. However, the NG can be activated under Title 10, which allows the President to “federalize” National Guard forces by ordering them to active duty in their reserve component status or by calling them into Federal service in their militia status. The ability to use them under either Title 10 or Title 32 contributes to their “dual mission.”

require the team to take special actions to accommodate these individuals, such as the President, a state Governor or U.S. Senator, etc. The AHIMT may or may not actually work for these individuals, but still needs to be sharp and focused when interacting with any elected or appointed officials.

#12. Interaction with FEMA Planning and Response Operations

Most Type 4 and Type 3 incidents will not involve any interaction with FEMA personnel. As incident complexity increases to Type 2, there is a higher likelihood that interactions with FEMA will occur. If the President declares the incident to be an Emergency Declaration or Major Disaster Declaration, AHIMTs will almost certainly have some level of interaction with FEMA Planning and Response Operations. The resource typing for AHIMTs follows this increasing interaction based on the resource typing level. It is important for AHIMTs that may be involved in higher-complexity incidents to have a solid understanding of how FEMA responds during these disasters and of FEMA's roles and responsibilities. An AHIMT's interaction with FEMA operations will be critical to the success of both FEMA and the AHIMT.

AHIMTs should possess a working knowledge of the community lifelines concept that FEMA uses to identify and address unmet needs and integrate recovery planning with daily operations in the most severely impacted areas. A Community Lifeline enables the continuous operation of critical government and business functions and is essential to human health and safety or economic security.

The seven Community Lifelines³⁷ represent only the most basic services a community relies on and are those which, when stable, enable all other activity within a community. The seven Community Lifelines are:

1. Safety and Security
2. Food, Water, and Sheltering
3. Health and Medical
4. Energy (Power and Fuel)
5. Communications
6. Transportation
7. Hazardous Material

Community Lifelines help drive response and can be used by all levels of government, the private sector, and other partners to facilitate operational coordination and drive outcome-based response.

Community Lifelines are assessed and reassessed throughout an incident and help to identify required response actions in each operational period until stabilization is achieved.

Stabilizing Community Lifelines is the primary effort of FEMA during the response phase to lessen threats and hazards to public health and safety, the economy, and security.

#13. Strategic (Long-Range) Planning

Strategic-level planning considers the big-picture, longer-term perspective of how to achieve the desired end state over time. These decisions are often framed by statute, policy, planning documents, the AHJ,

³⁷ Refer to FEMA's Community Lifelines page at: <https://www.fema.gov/emergency-managers/practitioners/lifelines>.

Defining Standardized Performance Capability Metrics for Incident Management Teams

the AA, and or the socio/political climate. Strategic planning should be focused on what a successful outcome or desired end state should look like and what it will take to shape that outcome.

There are two main types of Strategic (Long-Range) Planning used by the incident management community. Both types of strategic-level planning documents consider the same big-picture, longer-term perspective of how to achieve the desired end state over time. The primary difference between the two types is what actions or operations are included within the definition of the “desired end state.” The difference is straightforward. The two end states are:

- The desired end state is achieved when the response phase operations are completed, or
- The desired end state is achieved when both the response phase and recovery phase operations are completed.

Strategic Planning that uses the end state defined as when the “response phase operations are completed” is traceable back to the first use of IMTs in the wildland fire discipline. The original mission and use of IMTs was to control a forest fire and perform the necessary functions that re-enabled the local Federal land management agency to assume management of the fire and release the IMT. The end state was achieved when the response phase — “control of the fire” — was attained and the incident was downscaled to permit the assumption of management by the local forest or district. This was also due, in part, to different funding sources used once the fire was controlled. The management of recovery operations and mitigation actions such as Burned Area Emergency Rehabilitation and rebuilding of trails, bridges, and forest infrastructure was completed by the local Federal land management agency using different Federal funding authorities with established criteria and time constraints. In the past, the location and nature of forest fires typically did not affect a significant population or urban infrastructure, and this definition was an appropriate response from a management and cost-effectiveness perspective.

Strategic Planning that uses the end state defined as when “both the response phase and recovery phase operations are completed” reflects the objective of ensuring the delivery of critical services that alleviate immediate threats to life and property when communities are impacted by disasters. This emphasis is a result of a significant increase in the public’s expectations of the Federal Government response actions, which in turn result in FEMA becoming more responsive and involved in assisting affected communities to mitigate the effects of All-Hazards incidents. As part of its response and recovery efforts, FEMA incorporates the use of a long-range planning document called an Incident Strategic Plan (ISP). The ISP provides overall direction for incident management and specifies milestones to be accomplished over time. It includes estimating requirements and anticipates activities over the lifecycle of the entire incident – including recovery phase operations and activities.

For the purposes of the AHIMT Performance Capability Metrics #13, Strategic (Long-Range) Planning, the desired end state is achieved when the response phase operations are completed. Long-Range Planning does not typically include aspects of the longer-term recovery phase operations. Although elements of the recovery phase, including addressing Community Lifeline stabilization targets, may be initiated during the response phase, the focus of the AHIMT’s performance capability remains the response phase operations.

#14. Donations Management

The increased presence of social media *live streaming* and multiple platforms, combined with the media's striving to cover local-, regional-, and national-level incidents with news stories, often results in donations. As information and requests are shared and retweeted, an AHIMT can be faced with the potentially challenging need to manage substantial amounts of donated unsolicited goods, unaffiliated volunteers, and undesignated cash. This subject relates to goods, services, and financial donations. Volunteers who show up to assist in donations management are discussed in Subject Area #7, Integration and Use of Volunteers. Donations and volunteers to assist with donations management are a valuable asset, but if not managed correctly can take on a life of their own and draw away resources that may be better used otherwise in responding to the disaster. Depending upon the incident, many of these Donations Management responsibilities may be coordinated or supervised through the local city, county, or state Emergency Operations Center (EOC).

At the appropriate resource typing level, AHIMTs must be capable of:

- Developing and successfully managing a donation management process
- Managing multiple donation sites and streams. This means that donations may need to be accepted at several locations and several type of donations may be involved – e.g., food, water, financial contributions, and services supplied at different locations
- Managing donations that may consist of services, supplies, and monetary donations. Services may consist of equipment like portable cell towers, satellite phone service, vendor-supplied catering, and space in retail or commercial buildings

Donations management issues will undoubtedly impact AHIMT operations on some levels. An AHIMT must be prepared to anticipate these impacts.

#15. Evacuation and Reentry Management

Jurisdictions that experience storms, weather-related events, and emergencies within their communities may have developed community- or jurisdiction-wide Emergency Evacuation and Reentry Management Plans³⁸ as part of their overall Emergency Management Plan. If present, these plans should be obtained and studied before they need to be implemented. However, many jurisdictions will not have an Emergency Evacuation and Reentry Management Plan in place, or it may not address the specific incident being faced by the AHIMT. This will require an AHIMT to work with the appropriate AA and/or AHJ, who has the legal authority to develop, implement, and conduct evacuations. Evacuations require close coordination with the agencies responsible for planning, implementing, and carrying them out within the jurisdiction. Lessons Learned from past large-scale evacuations have shown that Evacuation Plans which anticipated evacuation behaviors and considerations for how reentry would be handled and managed are more efficient and effective than those who do not adequately consider the behavior of those evacuated individuals.

Ideally, unless the AHIMT has been tasked with the specific objective or mission of managing the evacuated and/or relocated population, the AA and the AHJ should maintain responsibility for this

³⁸ Reference "Planning Considerations: Evacuation and Shelter-in-Place; Guidance for State, Local, Tribal, and Territorial Partners," July 2019, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

function. Managing shelters that are safe, secure, comfortable, and accessible can be a complicated process, and planning for their operation should begin well in advance of the need.

#16. Debris Management

Jurisdictions that experience storms and weather-related events typically develop a Debris Management Plan – a written document that establishes procedures and guidelines for managing disaster debris in a coordinated, environmentally responsible, and cost-effective manner. An effective Debris Management Plan:

- Facilitates response and recovery activities
- Facilitates a community's quick return to normality
- Reduces impacts to humans and the environment
- Ensures effective use of resources
- Helps to control and minimize costs
- Aids in complying with applicable local, state/tribal/territorial, and Federal regulations

An AHIMT deployed to a jurisdiction experiencing an incident resulting in a large amount of debris should recognize that a Debris Management Plan is indicated. The AHIMT should determine from the impacted jurisdiction(s) whether a Debris Management Plan is in place. Absent that, the respective state-level Emergency Management Agency should be questioned about the presence of a state Debris Management Plan or whether the agency can provide guidance or technical assistance. If no Debris Management Plan exists, the AHIMT may need to work with local, state, and/or Federal officials to develop one.

The human, financial, environmental, and political costs associated with insufficient debris management planning can be devastating:

- Disaster debris can complicate and delay disaster response activities such as medical care, transportation of victims or relief teams, firefighting, and delivery of provision of shelter, food, and water to disaster survivors. Implementing a Debris Management Plan facilitates the quick return of a community to normality.
- Disaster debris can complicate and delay the short- and long-term recovery of the community and its return to normality.

#17. Management of an Incident Within an Incident (IWI)

Any accident, injury, or medical emergency during an incident that directly affects Incident Management Team personnel and any assigned resources can significantly disrupt the incident management environment and personnel. Multiple After-Action Reviews, investigations, and civil actions strongly indicate the high priority that Incident Management personnel should place on continuously evaluating and planning for possible IWIs. Department- or agency-developed incident-specific Incident Emergency Plans (IEPs) or IWI Plans may be available to assist IMTs during less complex incidents. A local jurisdiction may also have existing IEP or IWI Plans in place that can be implemented for larger or more complex incidents. If no previously developed plans are available, the IMT should develop and implement incident-specific plans that specify emergency procedures, actions, and roles and responsibilities to ensure injured/ill personnel are provided prompt and effective medical care. Most IMTs have developed IWI Plans or IEP implementation procedures.

Defining Standardized Performance Capability Metrics for Incident Management Teams

Some examples of the specialized resources available to assist during more complex incidents include Rapid Extraction Modules, night-flying aircraft, hoist-capable helicopters, Back-Up Teams (dive, hazardous materials entry), Rapid Intervention Crew(s), etc.

#18. Aviation Management

The term “aviation assets” includes fixed, rotary, unmanned, and lighter-than-air aircraft.

#19. Information Dissemination

No additional details required.

#20. Transition Planning and/or Incident Closeout

Generally, the more complex an incident is, the greater the need to ensure a good Transition Plan is developed between the outgoing AHIMT and the person/team assuming responsibility for the incident. This transition may be back to the Local AHJ, or to another AHIMT at the same resource typing level, or it may go to a higher- or lower-type AHIMT, depending upon the incident situation. In each of these examples, the outgoing AHIMT should develop a thorough Transition Plan. It is recommended that this Transition Plan follow a nationally accepted Transition Plan template.

Based on the current incident situation, the incoming organization or team should also work with and negotiate with the outgoing team to ensure a smooth Transition Schedule can be agreed upon that meets the needs of both the outgoing AHIMT and the incoming organization or team. This helps to transition the incident smoothly.

References

- Black, Anne E. (2013). "Incident Management Organization succession planning stakeholder feedback." *Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-297* Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, p. 322.
- Boyatzis, R., K. Thiel, K. Rochford and A. Black. "Emotional and Social Intelligence Competencies of Incident Team Commanders Fighting Wildfires." *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 53 (2017): 498–516.
- Core Capability Development Sheets, National Preparedness Goal. U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency, December 2011. *Operational Coordination*. Retrieved from [HTTP://www.fema.gov/national-preparedness-goal](http://www.fema.gov/national-preparedness-goal). Updated: 11/05/19.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency, ICS Core Competencies. September 2007. Retrieved from www.training.fema.gov/EMIWeb/IS/ICSResource/assets/ics_core_competencies_sep07.pdf.
- Hayes, Peter A.J. and Omodei, Mary M. "Managing Emergencies: Key Competencies for Incident Management Teams." *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Organisational Psychology*, Vol. 4, No. 1, 2011: 1–10.
- National Fire Protection Association 1581: Standard on Emergency Services Incident Management System, 2020 edition.
- National Incident Management System. Washington, DC: Department of Homeland Security, FEMA 501, October 2017. [HTTP://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/148019](http://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/148019).
- National Response Framework. Washington, DC: Department of Homeland Security, January 2020. Retrieved from www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nrf/nrf-core.pdf.
- National Incident Management System Guideline for the National Qualification System, U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency, November 2017. Retrieved from <https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/151291>.
- National Incident Management System Guideline for Mutual Aid, U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency, November 2017. *Performance Criteria and Metrics*.
- National Wildfire Coordinating Group. Incident Management Team Development Implementation Plan Talking Points, Training Working Team Memo, May 2, 2006.
- National Wildfire Coordinating Group. S-420 Task Group Discussion Report, Training Working Team Committee discussion document, April 26, 2004.
- National Wildfire Coordinating Group. Letter to Field, S-420 Status Report, Training Working Team Committee discussion document, December 11, 2007.
- National Wildfire Coordinating Group. NWCG Training Competency Conversion Implementation Plan, Training Working Team Committee discussion document, February 27, 2006.
- National Wildfire Coordinating Group. NWCG Standards for Wildland Fire Position Qualifications, PMS 310-1. Boise, ID: National Interagency Fire Center. March 10, 2021. Retrieved from <https://www.nwcg.gov/publications/pms310-1>.
- Owen, C., Hayes, P., Brooks, B., Cameron, S., & Conway, G. (2018). Evidence to support incident management team capability. *The Australian Journal of Emergency Management*, 33, 44.
- Resource Typing Library Tool (RTL), U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency, March 2021. Retrieved from <https://rtlt.preptoolkit.fema.gov/Public>.

Project Members

Title	Name and Background
Program Manager	Jeff Soulé USFA All-Hazards Incident Management Team Program Manager
Project Manager	Geoffrey Wilford USFA Program Support Contractor <p>Geoffrey Wilford retired in 2008 as an Operations Battalion for the Kern County (CA) Fire Department. Chief Wilford’s career spanned 33 years in positions that included three years on a hand-crew and the ranks of firefighter, engineer, captain, and battalion chief. During that time, he served on the local extended-attack management team, a Federal interagency Type 2 team, and over 20 years with a Type 1 IMT in the planning section, including Planning Section Chief Type 1 (1995 to 2019), and Operations Section Chief Type 1 (2001 to 2019). He was also qualified as a Type 2 Incident Commander (2001 to 2019).</p> <p>Chief Wilford represented the Firefighting Resources of California Organized for Potential Emergencies (FIRESCOPE) on the National Wildfire Coordinating Group (NWCG) Training Working Team (2001 to 2008), during the origination and rollout of the National Incident Management System (NIMS) and the national ICS program. One of his roles was to develop partnerships between FIRESCOPE, the nascent All-Hazards program, and the NWCG. He also co-chaired the “Incident Management Team Development Plan” (IMTDP) project (2005–2006) that began identifying the issues between the S-420 and S-520 courses.</p> <p>From 2007 through early 2014, Chief Wilford was identified as a <i>Key Staff</i> and under subcontract to provide subject matter expertise and technical writing and editing to the working groups sponsored by the National Integration Center (NIC) that provided national guidelines and standards for the implementation of NIMS. Under that contract, Chief Wilford provided subject matter expertise in incident management to DHS’s National Integration Center staff and was responsible for technical editing of numerous drafts of the All-Hazards guidance documents and standards for the NIMS. During that time, he wrote the drafts of the publication now known as the National Qualifications System, led the workgroup that developed the 2010 All-Hazards ICS forms, and assisted in the initial resource typing efforts of several dozen resources and positions.</p> <p>Chief Wilford is the CEO of Incident Management Training and Consulting, LLC (IMTC), the original developer of 18 of the DHS Emergency Management Institute’s (EMI’s) All-Hazard Position-Specific curricula for the DHS AHIMT program (using NWCG and FIRESCOPE curricula) and provided the subject matter expertise for the DHS-sponsored video <i>The NIMS Planning Process</i>. IMTC was also the training provider for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2003–2009) and the U.S. Coast Guard (2012–2017).</p>

Chief Wilford is currently a member of the All-Hazards Incident Management Teams Association (AHIMTA), where he has served on the Incident Qualifications Committee since 2016. He is the author of the *All-Hazards Incident Management Team Response and Planning Guide*, an AHIMT reference guide and textbook for ICS courses in the U.S. and Canada. Chief Wilford is currently under a multi-year contract to provide documents, guidance, guidelines, and enhancements to the USFA All-Hazards Incident Management Team program.

**Members
(Alphabetical)**

Paul Broyles

Paul Broyles' career spanned 36 years with the U.S. Forest Service and U.S. National Park Service in positions that included Park Ranger/Law Enforcement Officer, Structural Firefighter 2, Search and Rescue team member, wildland firefighter, and Fire Management Officer. During that time, Mr. Broyles served on Federal interagency Type 2 and Type 1 Incident Management Teams from 1980 to 2018, in all aviation positions up to Air Operations Branch Director, in operations, including OSC1, and in command, including ICT1 and LOFR on a National IMT 2005–2018.

Mr. Broyles' final career assignment, lasting over 20 years, was to the National Interagency Fire Center as the National Park Service (NPS) National Training and Safety Officer (1988–1997) and Chief of NPS Fire Operations (1997–2009).

Mr. Broyles served on the NWCG Training Working Team (1988–1997), the NWCG Safety and Health Working Team (1989–2004), including the last four years as the chair, and the Incident Operations Standards Working Team (1997–2009). He was instrumental in development of the first and subsequent versions of the *Federal Interagency Fire and Fire Aviation Operation Standards*, known as the Redbook. He was also involved in the development of the first NWCG *Incident Response Pocket Guide* and other Federal and NWCG wildland fire qualifications standards, including numerous revisions of the NWCG 310-1 *Wildland Fire Qualification Standards*. He also represented the Department of the Interior during the development of the NIMS/ICS in 2005–2006.

Since retiring in 2009, Mr. Broyles has been active as a subject matter expert (SME) and consultant on numerous projects, including a two-month assignment working as an ICS adviser to the USCG during *Deepwater Horizon*. Mr. Broyles is currently a member of the All-Hazards Incident Management Teams Association (AHIMTA), where he has served on the Incident Qualifications Committee since 2013. He is currently on the AHIMTA board of directors as the Region X representative.

Bill Campbell

Bill Campbell retired in 2019 as Chief of the New York State Incident Management Team Program for the Division of Homeland Security & Emergency Services. During that time (2007–2019), he also spent several years working in the Training & Exercise Section of the State Emergency Management Office, and spent the last seven years of his time there as the Director of Training and Exercises. Mr. Campbell has over 37

years' experience in the emergency services and emergency management fields, with most of this time spent in emergency response, emergency management training, and, more recently, incident management. He holds a Bachelor of Science (B.S.) degree from the State University of New York College at Cortland.

As Chief of the New York State Incident Management Team Program, Mr. Campbell was instrumental in the initial development of the New York State All-Hazards Incident Management Team (AHIMT), officially recognized in May 2004. In addition to helping establish the NYS AHIMT, he has been a member of a national IMT, the Rocky Mountain Type 2 IMT (Blue Team), since 2008, and is an NWCG-qualified Type 2 Planning Section Chief and a Liaison Officer.

During his 33-plus years of state service to the State Emergency Management Office and the Division of Homeland Security & Emergency Services, Mr. Campbell has responded to numerous major and/or complex incidents. The more notable incidents included the crash of TWA Flight 800, the North Country Ice Storm in upstate New York, the F-3 tornado in Saratoga County, the 9/11/2001 terrorist attacks, and Hurricanes Irene and Sandy in 2011 and 2012. Mr. Campbell has also responded with his Incident Management Teams to floods, hurricanes, and wildfires around the country, including Hurricanes Frances and Ivan in Florida, Hurricane Katrina in Mississippi, Hurricane Gustav in Louisiana, and Hurricane Harvey in Texas, major flooding in North Dakota and South Dakota, and wildfires in Colorado, Wyoming, Nebraska, South Dakota, Oregon, and Washington State.

In 2000, Mr. Campbell was awarded the New York State Conspicuous Service Medal by the Division of Military/Naval Affairs for exceptionally meritorious service to the state of New York. In 2003, he was selected as a SME by the National Wildfire Coordinating Group (NWCG) in Boise, ID to revise the ICS-National Training Curriculum. The New York State Training Council recognized Mr. Campbell in 2004 for "Excellence in Practice" for his work in leading the training initiative on the ICS, and he was selected by DHS-FEMA's National Integration Center to participate in several NIMS Working Groups, including: NIMS Doctrine; NIMS Training & Exercise; and NIMS Intelligence/Investigations.

Mr. Campbell is a charter member and original Board of Directors representative for the All-Hazards Incident Management Teams Association (AHIMTA), founded in December 2010. He continues to serve as one of 11 directors on the board after previously having served two terms as first vice president.

Nick Duvally

Nick Duvally's incident command experience spans more than three decades and demonstrates his front-line capabilities in All-Hazards Incident Management. For the last 27 years, Chief Duvally has served as a member of Los Angeles County Incident Management Team 1, and for 20 years has served as a member of a Type 1 National Incident Management Team managed by the United States Forest Service. Chief Duvally is qualified as a Planning Section Chief Type 1, Resources Unit Leader,

Defining Standardized Performance Capability Metrics for Incident Management Teams

Situations Unit Leader, Demobilization Unit Leader, Documentation Unit Leader, Training Specialist, Strike Team Leader, Field Observer, and Safety Officer and Incident Commander Type 3. Chief Duvally has provided guidance and expertise in incident management for FEMA, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. Coast Guard, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. His incident command experience also includes deployment to the Pentagon following 9/11, and to Hurricanes Katrina, Wilma, Frances, and Ivan, in addition to hundreds of other incidents in California and specifically in Los Angeles.

Chief Duvally earned a B.S. degree in Fire Protection and Safety Engineering from Oklahoma State University. He is a current or past member of the following: FEMA/NIMS Incident Management Working Group, FEMA/NIMS Animal Emergency Working Group, FEMA/NIMS Core Competencies Working Group, NFPA ICS Professional Qualifications Committee, and IFSTA Indoctrination to the Fire Service Committee, and he has served as Committee Chairperson for the IFSTA Private Fire Prevention Committee.

Chief Duvally's on-the-job experience as a professional firefighter has been extensive, beginning in 1971 as a member of the Willingboro, NJ Volunteer Fire Department, continuing with the Stillwater, OK Fire Department, then moving to the La Habra Heights, CA Volunteer Fire Department, and culminating in his present career with the Los Angeles County Fire Department, a career spanning almost three decades. Entering the LA County Fire Department first as a firefighter and paramedic, Chief Duvally quickly moved up the ranks to Firefighter Specialist, then Captain, Battalion Chief, Assistant Chief, Fire Marshal, and currently Deputy Chief.

From 2009 through early 2014, Chief Duvally provided subject matter expertise in the areas of Incident Management and Animal Emergency Response to the work groups sponsored by the National Integration Center (NIC) that provided national guidelines and standards for the implementation of NIMS. In addition to assisting in resource typing almost 30 positions for on-scene ICS positions and resources, he was a co-editor of the draft model Position Task Books, the 2010 conversion of the NIIMS ICS Forms to All-Hazards Use, the 2014 revisions and corrections to the NIMS ICS forms, and the NIMS ICS Qualifications Guide for all ICS positions.

Chief Duvally served as the ICS Training and Qualifications coordinator for the 4,500-member Los Angeles County Fire Department, from 2002 to 2010. He began his involvement with the California Incident Command Certification System (CICCS) in 2002. He has served on the local, regional, and state review committees for 18 years. In 2008, Chief Duvally became the Chairman of the State CICCS committee and has served in that position ever since. The CICCS establishes the ICS qualifications standards for all 1,000 fire departments in the state. This committee publishes the administrative and qualifications guide every three years and oversees the ICS qualifications process throughout the state.

Bill Easterling

Bill Easterling retired in 2017 as the Fire Marshal and Administrator of the Genesee Fire Protection District (GFPD), culminating his 23-year career in the fire service. The GFPD is located west of Denver, CO at an elevation of 7,800 feet and includes the communities of Genesee, Genesee Village, and Chimney Creek, and the Genesee Business District/Town Center.

Initially working as a volunteer starting in 1994, Chief Easterling used his significant financial management background as an administrator for the District. He also assumed the full-time position of GFPD Fire Marshal and became a chief officer for Genesee Fire Rescue. While at GFPD, he also served on the board of Highland Rescue Ambulance service, a nonprofit corporation. During that time, Chief Easterling revamped the administration and assisted in securing its financial future by converting the corporation to a special tax district.

In 2000, Chief Easterling joined members and representatives from other local-area fire departments and formed the Jefferson County Type 3 Incident Management Team (Jeffco). The Jeffco Team was one of the first All-Hazards Type 3 Incident Management Teams formed. Chief Easterling is qualified as an Incident Commander Type 3, Operations Section Chief Type 3, Division Supervisor, and Structure Protection Specialist. From his membership in the Jeffco IMT and his work with several interagency Type 1 and Type 2 IMTs, his response experience includes a wide variety of incidents across the United States, including the Hayman, High Park, and Waldo Canyon fires, Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, the 2008 Windsor Tornado, and, as a first of its kind, managing the 2018 Federal law enforcement staging area for Hurricane Irma.

Chief Easterling is a founding director of the All-Hazards Incident Management Teams Association (AHIMTA) and has served as an at-large Board member continuously since its inception in 2010. He is the Board representative on the AHIMTA Incident Qualifications System (IQS) Committee and has participated in the development of the AHIMTA Interstate Incident Management Qualification System (IIMQS) Guide, position descriptions, and the Position Task Books. Chief Easterling has served on numerous NIMS work groups at FEMA's National Integration Center (NIC); he is one of the founders of, and serves as a member of, the NIC Coordination Group (NCG).

Chief Easterling has a B.S. degree in Business Administration (1973) and a year of postgraduate work at Mississippi State University, and obtained his CPA license in 1975. After working for several years as a sole practitioner at a CPA firm, he purchased the practice and successfully transitioned it into a larger, more diversified financial management firm. His firm specialized in income and estate taxes and management advisory services. During this time he also served on the boards of several private corporations. Chief Easterling sold his firm in 1983 and moved to Atlanta, GA, where he worked as an individual investment portfolio manager. He moved to Colorado in 1990 and in 1992 added investment brokerage services with an international brokerage firm to his portfolio. He maintained his investment brokerage services until 2002, when his full-time duties and passion for the GFPD won his full attention.

Paul Hannemann

Paul Hannemann retired in 2020 as a special adviser to the Director, Chief of Fire Operations, Texas A&M Forest Service, culminating a career of more than 30 years. His past positions included Chief of Fire Operations and Department Head of the Incident Response Department from 2010 to 2019, and the same positions for the Texas A & M Forest Service.

Mr. Hannemann is a nationally qualified Type 1 Incident Commander, Type 2 Planning Section Chief, and Type 2 Logistics Section Chief, and currently serves as one of the Incident Commanders for the Lone Star State IMT. He has managed wildland fires in several states in addition to hazardous materials, tornadoes, and other All-Hazards incidents.

Mr. Hannemann's ICS Management and Training experience includes development of more than eight Type 3 Incident Management Teams for the state of Texas, performing as the Simulations Team Leader for the National Association of State Foresters' Complex Incident Management Course (CIMC), serving on the DHS-US Fire Administration Type 3 IMT Development Team, being a Lead Instructor for the USFA AHIMT Type 3 introduction course, delivering training to the U.S. Coast Guard theater-wide (2013–2017), and participating as part of the U.S. Forest Service Planning & Logistics Training Cadres.

Throughout his career, Mr. Hannemann has been heavily involved in defining and setting national-level doctrine and guidance for ICS qualifications entities. His membership has included serving on the NWCG Training Working Team (2008–2009), the National Association of State Foresters (NASF) Complex Incident Management Course Cadre (2003–Present), NWCG Operations & Training Committee (2009–2013 and 2016–2020), NWCG Incident Management Organization Succession Planning project (2009–2012), NWCG All-Hazard Oversight Project Team (2009–2011), NWCG Training Committee (2013–2016), and NWCG L-580 Leadership Course Steering Committee, a subcommittee of NWCG Leadership Committee (2010–2019), and the NWCG NIMS-ICS Committee (2017–Present).

Mr. Hannemann started with TFS as a Contract Trainer in 1981 and became the first Regional Fire Coordinator in 1995. He also served as the State Regional Fire Coordinator from 1997 to 1999 and Chief Regional Fire Coordinator from 1999 to 2010. Prior to 1995, he was the Fire Department Administrator, Emergency Management Coordinator and 9-1-1 Coordinator for the City of Fredericksburg, TX and Gillespie County, TX.

Mr. Hannemann retired from the Texas Army National Guard as a Lieutenant Colonel. He is a graduate of the U.S. Army Command & General Staff College. He has a B.S. in Building Construction and a Master of Education degree (M.Ed.) in Industrial Education from Texas A & M University. He is certified by the Texas Commission on Fire Protection as a Master Firefighter, Master Instructor, Intermediate Wildland Firefighter, Level III Firefighter, and Level III Fire Instructor.

Mike LaPlant

After eight years of active duty service as a Fire Protection Specialist with the United States Air Force, Mike LaPlant joined the Ventura County, CA Fire Department and has served as a firefighter, Fire Captain, Battalion Chief, Division Chief, and Assistant Chief, retiring in 2014, after a 32-year career, as the Department's Deputy Chief.

During 11 of those years, Chief LaPlant served as a member of California's FIRESCOPE Task Force, the developers of the Incident Command System, including serving as the Task Force Chair for two years. During this time, he accomplished the rewrite of the MACS 410-1, participated in the development of the California Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS), assisted in the adoption of ICS as directed by HSPD-5, worked on the development of the regional Urban Search & Rescue (US&R) taskforce concept and description, and assisted in several rewrites to the FIRESCOPE Field Operations Guide, which is considered the forerunner of all Field Operations Guide currently in use.

Chief LaPlant was also a member of a federally sponsored Type 2 IMT as both a Planning Section Chief and an Operations Section Chief. Currently, he is a member of a Type 1 IMT as an Operations Branch Director.

Chief LaPlant is certified as a Company Officer and a Chief Officer in the California Fire Service Training and Education System and as a Master Instructor certified by the California State Fire Marshal's Office. He specializes in instructing command and control and the application and use of the Incident Command System, including several of the ICS position-specific training courses. In addition to presenting hundreds of training sessions throughout the United States, he was recently asked to assist the Seattle-King County (WA) public health department in its effort to control the COVID-19 pandemic as part of their Health and Medical Area Command organization.

George Maier

George Maier's career includes over 40 years of extensive experience of fire suppression, incident command, and training through his career with the Fire Department of the City of New York, where he retired as a Battalion Chief serving Midtown Manhattan. Chief Maier's responsibilities have included being the officer in charge of the Hazardous Materials Training Unit, the Executive Officer for Special Operations, as well as creating the FDNY Incident Management Team, serving as the Planning Section Chief on the FDNY Incident Management Team, and working with the nationally recognized consultants of McKinsey & Company after the 9/11 World Trade Center attack to improve FDNY's preparedness for operational response. This critical task targeted the expansion of the ICS, and developed an Incident Management Team within the Fire Department of the City of New York, key elements of ICS in a major at-risk metropolitan area.

As a contract instructor with the National Fire Academy, Chief Maier specializes in the ICS training for structural collapse, high-rise fires, multi-alarm incidents, and unified command and multi-agency catastrophic incidents. Chief Maier is a lead instructor for the ICS Command and General Staff course, as well as the All-Hazards Type 3 Incident Management Team Introduction course. Chief Maier also brought his expertise to bear when he served as a SME for the United States Fire Administration's All-Hazards Type 3 Incident Management Team course development, the All-Hazards Planning Section Chief course, and Resources Unit Leader course. He previously served on the revision team for the USFA ICS 300 Intermediate Incident Command and the ICS 400 Advanced Incident Command courses. Additionally, Chief Maier served as an instructor at the Nassau County, NY Fire Service Academy from 1982 to 2009, specializing in Command and Control and ICS courses.

An NWCG-qualified Type 2 Planning Section Chief, his ICS credentials include being a charter member of the NIMS Consortium, which he currently serves as president. He previously served as the Consortium's representative on the FIRESCOPE Joint Operations Team. As a member of the Consortium, Chief Maier has written model procedure manuals for instituting ICS for high-rise fires, structural collapses, emergency medical, hazardous materials/CBRNE, and unified command/multi-agency incidents.

From 2009 through early 2014, Chief Maier provided subject matter expertise to the Incident Management Working Group sponsored by the National Integration Center (NIC) that provided national guidelines and standards for the implementation of NIMS. In addition to assisting in resource typing almost 30 positions for on-scene ICS positions and resources, he was a co-editor of the draft model Position Task Books, the 2010 conversion of the NIIMS ICS Forms to All-Hazards use, the 2014 revisions and corrections to the NIMS ICS forms, and the draft NIMS ICS Qualifications Guide for all ICS positions.

Chief Maier is currently a member of the All-Hazards Incident Management Teams Association (AHIMTA), where he has served on the Incident Qualifications Committee since 2016 and is currently the Chair of the Committee.

Mike Rubenstein

Mike Rubenstein began his Law Enforcement career in 1987 in Oregon, where he worked on a multijurisdictional Marijuana Eradication Team. In 1993, Sergeant Rubenstein returned to Colorado to begin working for his current employer, the Jefferson County, CO Sheriff's Office, currently with the rank of Sergeant. He has been and remains active in Mobile Field Force leadership since 2007.

Sergeant Rubenstein has been significantly involved in the application of the ICS within the law enforcement community, starting in 2000 and through 2004 working with the Jeffco IMT as a liaison officer and within the evacuation/LE function on multiple fires. In 2004, he joined the Jefferson County Type 3 All-Hazards IMT. Since

then he has been deployed on more than 40 Type 1, 2, and 3 All-Hazards incidents, including wildland fires, hurricanes, tornadoes, public health events, floods, blizzards, and political conventions. In 2015 Sergeant Rubenstein deployed as the ICT3 for the Jeffco IMT, the first All-Hazards Team to be deployed under ESF4 for evacuation and sheltering on BIA lands. Sergeant Rubenstein is currently qualified at the All-Hazard Type 3 level in the following positions: Incident Commander, Planning Section Chief, Operations Section Chief, and Liaison Officer. NWCG qualifications include Liaison Officer and Type 2 Planning Section Chief. In addition to a Duty Officer and ICT3 on the Jeffco AHIMT, Sergeant Rubenstein is rostered as an alternate PSC2 on an Interagency Type 2 Team.

Sergeant Rubenstein has been serving as an Evaluator on HSEEP exercises since 2007, when he assisted in the full-scale air mobilization exercises with the National Disaster Medical System. Since that time he has participated Salt Lake City's "shakeout," a passenger train tunnel derailment, a National Nuclear Weapon Accident Exercise, and FEMA'S Wide-Area Resiliency and Recovery Program.

Sergeant Rubenstein has been providing subject matter expertise in setting national-level doctrine and guidance for the ICS since 2005. He and the Jeffco Team worked with the FEMA Region VIII AHIMT pilot project, creating the first All-Hazards Type 3 Qualification Guide and Position Task Books in 2005. Those documents were adopted by the State of Colorado and eventually used by FEMA during development of guidelines. Sergeant Rubenstein is actively engaged with the NIC as a SME/Practitioner evaluating and editing NIMS ICS doctrine, including the National Response Framework, National Mutual Aid System, NIMS Updates, National Qualification System, the NQS AHIMT Training Focus Group, and the NQS AH Position-Specific courses. He is currently working with the FEMA Field Operations Directorate (FOD) assisting in the integration of AHIMTs as Supplemental Response Teams (SRTs) into the FOD's overhead capacity to support responses to National Disasters.

Sergeant Rubenstein represents the AHIMT community nationally on the National Emergency Management Association (NEMA) Emergency Management Assistance Compact (EMAC) Advisory Group, which administratively governs and oversees the National EMAC program. He is also a founding and current member of the National Integration Center Coordination Group (NCG).

In 2010, Sergeant Rubenstein teamed with two other Jeffco Team members to form the All-Hazards Incident Management Teams Association (AHIMTA) and appointed the first Board of Directors at the 2010 conference. He is currently an envoy to the Board of Directors specializing in Federal partners advocacy and relations.

Dana Simpson

Mr. Simpson's extensive ICS experience is reflected in his having served as a member of local and National Incident Management Teams since 1994. During this time, he has been assigned in the Logistics Section as a Logistics Section Chief, Facilities Unit

Defining Standardized Performance Capability Metrics for Incident Management Teams

Leader, Ground Support Unit Leader, Food Unit Leader, Medical Unit Leader, and Supply Unit Leader on Type 3, 2, and 1 incidents. Through his National Incident Management Team membership, he has been involved in over 50 team responses, including wildland fires, HAZMAT incidents, Exotic Newcastle Disease breakouts, hurricanes, civil unrest, major flood events, electrical power restoration in Puerto Rico, and COVID-19 response. As a Logistics Section Chief Type 1, Mr. Simpson developed his in-depth skills in ICS as a member of California Interagency Incident Management Teams directing ordering, receiving, storing, and distributing all equipment and supplies, providing food, medical, repair service, and facilities for complex all-hazard incidents, and administering National Catering and Showering contracts as a Contracting Officer's Representative. He has also qualified as a Liaison Officer and Human Resource Specialist and has deployed on numerous Type 1 and Type 2 incidents.

Dana Simpson's 31 years of experience in the Kern County (CA) Fire Department bear witness to his expertise in local incident management and hazardous materials responses. Retired as a station captain and hazardous materials team relief captain, he responded to all emergencies, including structure and wildland fires, aircraft incidents, hazardous materials and refinery incidents, train derailments, and medical incidents in the department's busiest stations. Mr. Simpson served as HazMat Group Supervisor in the aftermath of a major train derailment and for numerous highway cargo incidents involving pesticides and other toxic products.

A graduate of Cerro Coso College, Mr. Simpson also holds a Fire Science Certificate from Bakersfield College and is a graduate of S-520, Advanced Incident Command, presented by the National Advanced Resource Training Center. Through the NWCG qualifications system, he is qualified as a Type 1 Logistics Section Chief, Facilities Unit Leader, Ground Support Unit Leader, Supply Unit Leader, Liaison Officer, and Human Resource Specialist. His completion of courses at the California Specialized Training Institute resulted in his being certified as a Hazardous Materials Specialist and an Arson Investigator, as well as being certified in Technical Rescue Systems. He has also taken numerous specialized courses at the Center for Domestic Preparedness, California Specialized Training Institute, Texas A&M Engineering Extension Service, and the Reno Fire School. Mr. Simpson uses his U.S. Navy technical training in the areas of electronics and shipboard firefighting in his many applications of Incident Management.

Charles "Boo" Walker

Boo Walker is Qualified as an Area Commander (AC Team #2, 2015–2018) and has worked as a Deputy Area Commander, Assistant Area Commander – Logistics, and Area Command Aviation Coordinator since 2002. Mr. Walker is also qualified as a Type 1 Incident Commander, Type 1 Operations Section Chief (Southern Area Type 1 Team 1988–2002), Air Operations Branch Director, Safety Officer, and Air Tactical Group Supervisor.

Defining Standardized Performance Capability Metrics for Incident Management Teams

Mr. Walker served on the Steering Committee of the Complex Incident Management Course, sponsored by the National Association of State Foresters, for 20 years. For the last five years he has been serving as the committee chair. He also co-chaired the Steering Committee for the S-520 Advanced Incident Management Course and S-620 Area Command Course. Mr. Walker's instructional experience spans 35 years at both the regional and the national level.

Mr. Walker has been involved in All-Hazards incidents throughout the United States, Mexico, Canada, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. His involvement with FEMA assignments has included floods, oil spills, hurricanes, fires, and tornadoes. NASA awarded the Public Service Medal to Mr. Walker for his work with the aviation operations of the Space Shuttle Columbia Recovery effort.

To Cite This Document

Soulé, J., Wilford, G., Broyles, P., Campbell, B., LaPlant, M., & Maier, G. et al. (2021). *Defining Standardized Performance Capability Metrics for Incident Management Teams Based on Resource Typing Levels*. Emmitsburg, MD: U.S. Fire Administration, Type 3 All-Hazard IMT (AHIMT) Technical Assistance Program.

