

GATR MEETING NOTES
June 2-4, 2009
Seattle, WA

Tuesday, June 2

D = Decision Item, I = Information Item

Welcome/Introductions

I Renee Beams

In attendance: Kim Bang - RM, Madonna Lengerich - GB, Renee Beams - NW, Cindy Forrest-Elkins - AK, Dennis Baldrige - So. CA, John Grosman - EA, Bob Bell - No. CA, Charley Luevano - SW, Paul Fieldhouse - NR, Diana VanCurler - Logistics, Nicky Webb-Smith - Facilitator.

Visitors: Dick Gormley - Chair NW TWT, Kitty Ortman - Chair NR Coordinating Group.

**Review and Update Action Log/
Update GATR Mailing List**

I/D Nicky Webb-Smith

Item #117 - The language in the FMCG has changed, and the language allows the use of the logo, but it is still a little confusing. They tried to resolve it through the FMCG and now the Incident Business Practices group needs to change the language in the MOUs. The national template for the MOUs currently prohibits the use of the logo, but they are adhering to NWCG standards.

Renee will follow up on this with Kathy Shelton on this. Discussion of how different areas are handling these training providers and using MOUs - some have MOUs and some don't have them and the certificates issued are not NWCG certificates. Additional Note: Renee followed up with the Incident Business Mgmt. folks and this has been posted on their page.

Plans Issue Paper

D Renee Beams

The official approval of the Issue Paper that NR wrote was approved through a letter, but the letter was not really clear as to whether the folks that took the class would be able to get qualified as PSC, but there is still an issue because that option would not get that many folks qualified in Planning Section Chief. The approval letter from the Ops working team is not clear if those folks that take the class will be able to be qualified as Planning Section Chief. The course will be presented in 2010, but would like to make sure that it is clarified that the approval is approval for the whole plan of a way to get the folks fully qualified as PSC. Resources Unit Leader is the position that sets up for Planning Section Chief. Some discussion with a NIMO team was that they really liked the NW issue paper.

BIN ITEM for TWT - Discussion of the letters from IOSWT that were sent to Renee and what they really mean and is this approval to get the folks that go to the course fully qualified as PSC Do we have the approval to have these folks issued a task book and go out and start getting qualified as PSC? Right now there is nothing in writing to back this up. Talk to Merrie to discuss that the GATRs cannot move forward with this bridge from OPS to PSC without further approvals and clarification.

Discussion of the other issue paper of changing the prerequisites for PSC. Discussion that there is a disconnect somehow that these responses did not come back through the TWT and the TWT Liaison Merrie Johnson. Will discuss this with Merrie.

Agreement to continue to work on other ways to get more folks qualified as PSC in the future and get clarification on the current approved proposal.

Merrie Johnson joined the group to help clarify this discussion. Merrie has received some questions about how this is going to work in IQCS as well. Basically this will not be put into IQCS until it is a done deal. Merrie feels that we need to write out specific questions for the team that nail down exactly how this is going to be accomplished. The GATRs are going to have to work with Mike Dudley to work this up.

ACTION ITEM: Paul will develop questions for Mike Dudley to clarify this bridge concept. Group will complete this before COB Thursday. Merrie will follow up with Mike.

Merrie briefed the group on how the new Operations & Workforce Development Team will work and be built. They will stand up that team in 2011. Question was asked whether the meeting in May with the TWT would still happen? They just don't know the answer right now, but Merrie feels that some kind of meeting will still happen.

Nothing has been seen on the S-420 issue paper. Read IOSWT notes and they assigned follow-up to Mike Dudley.

ACTION ITEM: Merrie will follow up on this.

Update on PNW "L" Courses

I Renee Beams

L-380 agency owned version is off and rolling and the leads are going to many areas to present this course. There are now four lead instructors for this course (Frank Norbury, Rowdy Muir, Bill Miller, and Doug Booster).

Had the first meeting on the development of the agency owned L-381, will present an alpha in 2010 and Frank Norbury will be the lead, cadre is Doug Booster, Reggie Molina-Huston, Alex Robertson, and Renee Beams. Once this course is approved, the process will continue to develop more agency folks as leads and cadre the same as was done with L-380. The NE is going to present more of a train the trainer L-380 in 2010 so that they can start working on developing another lead and cadre for the course. The NW is going to do a survey of past L-380 students and their supervisors to see if the course is making a difference and where we are at with this program.

L-480 is well on its way and Doug Booster is going out and presenting the course for other areas now. GB did an alpha of this with Merrill Seleen as the lead. They brought in Kurt Braun to assist with this course. It worked out well and the evaluators felt there was some needed changes and improvements. The leadership committee is starting to realize how hard it is to take the original material and re-work it for use by other possible vendors. There are some issues that need decisions before the GB can move forward with Merrill as a lead for the course. Another issue is that the classes are not being filled when they are presented. The areas feel that the name

of the course should be changed from what it is because anyone could benefit from the course not just team members. Discussion on whether we are required to go out for bids if there is more than one vendor for a course. Different areas are interpreting the requirements differently.

NOLS was used by two areas with good success. California has developed two sites for this presentation. Death Valley is one of them.

FMCG Prerequisites

D Kim Bang

HO #1 - The issue was summarized that there are students coming to courses now that don't meet the prerequisites. This was decided last year after much discussion with the TWT. The GATRs opposed this then and it is affecting the presentations of courses and is an increased workload for those presenting training. The intent was for rare specific cases where folks needed the training, but did not meet the prerequisites. Now cadre are having to spend extra time with students that did not meet prerequisites to get them up to speed or those students that can't keep up are being sent home after starting the class. The feeling is that the failure rate of S-520 was due to some folks attending that did not meet the prerequisites. It has created situations where there are courses being presented that very few are meeting the prerequisites. All the areas have already been flexible, and will continue to be flexible, with letting those special cases take courses when the need was there.

The group agrees with this issue paper and would like to move forward with it. They would like to see some flexibility, but not have the flood of folks that don't meet the prerequisites just because they want to. This should be managed on a case by case basis and not with such a broad policy. The attempt to resolve one or two issues has resulted in a huge negative effect on the field.

Discussion that giving them an NWCG certificate does not qualify them for anything so it wouldn't matter if they get one.

Decision: The issue paper will be given Merrie and Deb to take to the TWT, agenda item for Wednesday's meeting. Kim Bang 6/3/09.

Discussion of the failure rates for S-520, S-420. Question of what the failure rate for CIMC is? Do not know this as the group has not really been involved with the CIMC presentations. Does there need to be some kind of evaluation of this? The real question is whether the evaluation portion of CIMC is on par with S-520. The course material appears to be equivalent.

Discussed with Merrie whether CIMC is being evaluated. The Course Objectives for CIMC and S-520 are the same. S-520 has gone more strategic and she feels CIMC will be going that way in the future. The real issue is whether the students are being evaluated at the same level in CIMC as in S-520? CIMC was developed for the States, but there are Federal folks attending the course and there is concern. It is a false assumption that it is easier to pass CIMC than it is to pass S-520. The evaluation process is the same for both. CIMC has different simulations than S-520, but S-520 is now using one of the CIMC simulations. There are folks that successfully complete CIMC that don't meet the prerequisites and they don't get credit for it until they do meet the prerequisites.

L-580 Feedback (Gettysburg)

The leadership committee would actually like to take the name and course number away. The leadership committee feels that we should be continually learning. They would like to develop a suite of learning for the continuous learning goal. The Gettysburg Staff Ride has been tailored for fire with the Marine Corps Staff Ride. This suite of opportunities could be a detail into a leadership position, a staff ride, or something else. They haven't worked out exactly how they are going to do that yet. They see it as a value that is being brought forward in our culture.

FELB Chainsaw Requirements Briefing Paper

D Bob/Dennis

HO #2 - This came to the attention of CA GATRs through their chainsaw SMEs and they felt that FELBs should have some saw training for safety reasons. The 5109.17 currently requires the training. Discussion of whether it is appropriate to keep the FALA currency requirement in this paper or just require FALA as prerequisite experience. To get this incorporated into the 310-1 it would have to be a course requirement as FALA is a technical specialist position and is not contained in that document. Concern that if the FALA is included that it could exclude some state folks and discussion on this point of the paper. FALA is a valid NWCG position and the qualifications are set by each agency for those positions.

DECISION: The recommendations will be revised slightly and the group agrees this should move forward. Will brief with Merrie and give to IOSWT.

ACTION ITEM: Bob will sent this to Merrie and Kevin Conn.

Discussion of whether the task book should require more knowledge and skills that would address this issue in another way.

Google Earth GETA Product/ DOD Certification Website

I Paul Fieldhouse

NR has been using Google Earth in some of their training and they have some folks that have developed applications using Google Earth. They have a web site (GETA) that is about the group, what they do, and some applications. Some of the applications were demonstrated for the group. The GETA group is willing to help folks out if they have a class or something they would like to try to use the application for. The development shop at NIFC is aware of this work, and the group felt that it is very important that there is communication going on to make sure folks aren't duplicating efforts. This was part of the simulation design and delivery class that was presented last winter in Missoula.

Here is a link to the Google Earth Technology Application Group: <http://geta.firenet.gov/>

Demonstrated the DOD Fire & Emergency Services Certification Program - www.dodffcert.com. Must have a username and password to access this site. This is a site that can be accessed to look up certifications. There is a certification database with a seal number associated with every certificate and the DOD uses this to track/validate certifications.

NR & IQCS Nomination Process/LMS Future

I Paul Fieldhouse

The NR training center staff considered going totally to IQCS to maintain their training system, but decided that at this time the IQCS system does not have everything they need to do this so will continue to utilize Pathlore in conjunction with IQCS. Discussion of the system and the needs of the training community to query their own reports. The states IQS system is going web based.

When IQCS was developed it was focused on the qualifications side and the training side was added on as an after thought. So it was never designed for the training side use. The software for IQCS is outdated and will be changed, but the program and the way it functions will not.

The field folks really like that they can do nominations in IQCS. Discussion of the how the nomination process is working and how folks are making it work. Also, the Forest Service is having problems getting the credit card use process in place and they use the nomination form as the tool to bill for tuition. There is a difference in the business process between the Forest Service and DOI. Also, the addresses that show up on the nomination form coming out of IQCS are not always the correct address to send pre-work to. Most of the training folks are doing dual jobs and do not have the time to make sure the IQCS data is current and up to date. The process of communicating what is happening in IQCS is an issue. If the electronic notification process is used for pre-work, etc. a lot of the students are in non-pay status and would not receive the notification. Agreement that once an area receives the nominations for their courses that they are responsible for all notifications regarding those nominations. There are some issues with nominations not going through the GATR when they are out of area.

Discussion and agreement that there is no need to send out messages of course completion since that information is posted on the training web site and in IQCS.

Discussion of how to enter non-federal employees into the IQCS system and that those folks will not affect the number limitations for the system.

Discussion of the process the Southwest is planning on using this year since there has really been no one there the last two years as a clearing house for their out of area nominations. Charley is still working with the Forest Service on that process and he thinks that he will be the one to forward on those out of area nominations to other areas. Also discussion of who in the SW is going to be the TICS representative. Charley has access right now and will be the TICS Representative. There is going to be a TICS meeting the end of June in Redmond to work on the project.

To turn off the nomination workflow the coordinator needs to go into the system and uncheck the nomination workflow.

DECISION: Discussion of Action Item #123 and adding that to the Ops Guide. Group agrees that this is not necessary and is a non-issue.

PMS 310-1 and PTB Status Report, etc.

Deb Epps

HO #3 - The Fire Use term was used a lot in those documents and needed to be changed due to the changes in our fire program policy. Due to the database that was created when the PTBs changed, development was able to query the database and find all the occurrences of this term to

make the changes easier. Deb briefed the group on where they were at with this. Question of where they are at with the FFT2 Job Aid. Job aid for the FFT2 is not going to happen and is gone. Discussion of the need for this or not. The check lists are included in the S-130/S-190 course already.

The issues with the S-490 course are being worked on right now and hopefully by fall it will be fixed and re-published.

The CD version of the S-130/S-190 course you can still print certificates of completion even if you fail the course. Deb will check on this.

Miscellaneous

Merrie has been interested in the different funding mechanism for the different training centers. Is this something that the group needs to discuss in the future to see if nationally there can be a similar interagency funding mechanism??? This is something that probably will not change in the near future because of how budgets are done. There is a dramatic difference between how things are done within one agency. Discussion on how each area is funded right now.

T3 Skill Development

I Paul Fieldhouse

The role of T3 organization in the NR is increasing and those teams are taking on more complex organizations. So they are including T3 students in their courses to give them the knowledge they need to function in those T3 organizations (i.e. logistics SC course they had eight T3 logistic folks and only one that actually met the prerequisites). Do we want to raise this up to a higher level that there is a need at this level with very little training to go with it? Or just continue the way we have in the past? In NWCG standards we don't have the T3 organizations. The all-risk organizations are working at the T3 level. Maybe look at what they are doing and use some of that for our T3 organizations? There are other areas that the T3 organizations are taking on more complex incidents as well that is why the NW developed the T3 Safety Officer course because there wasn't any type of training for folks at that level. Cost is an issue also. It is cheaper to stay at the T3 level than to call in a T2 team. This is becoming a big thing nationally, and more and more areas are using T3 teams. There are also areas that are just pulling folks from the office to go and take care of this level of incident. Question: Are we better off trying to deal with this on a geographic area level or should we elevate this to try to have something done nationally? Feeling is that both should be done. The concern is standardization across the nation so that everyone is talking the same language.

At the upper levels of NWCG the opinion is that they are T3 organizations and you can fill them with whatever you think you need, ICS does not have Type 3 Teams. The spirit of ICS is that is should be flexible organizations, but that is not happening. You can't get a short team any more. The reason the IOSWT took the T3 designation off of Information and Safety was that they wanted those folks to be able to work on any incident because interpretations were that they could only be used on T3 incidents.

DECISION: Agreement that this is not going to go away. Agreement that this will continue to be handled at an area level and that if an area develops some kind of training they will share with the other GATRs.

Clarification with Merrie

GATRs wanted to clarify how Merrie sees her role with the GATRs as the Liaison to the TWT. Reviewed what the Operations Guide defines that role and discussed this definition with Merrie.

DECISION: the role as defined is still valid, but this could change when the re-organization is implemented.

Develop items for Joint TWT meeting

D All

Briefed Merrie on the Prerequisite Issue Paper that will be brought forward tomorrow with the TWT.

Prerequisites Issue Paper, share that the GATRs will be sending the FELB issue paper to the IOSWT, brief the TWT on the HLCO issue paper that CA is developing, May meeting location.

Discussion on what the IBA will do in S-420 now that it is listed as other training in the 310-1?

More Miscellaneous with Merrie

Discussion on how the changes to FUM1 and FUM2 is going to be handled (HO#3). IQCS was supposed to be making some changes on June 1 and a notice posted regarding this. Has not shown up on home page there yet that this has been done.

Wednesday, June 3 (waiting for TWT notes)

ACE Update

Kris Damsgaard

NWCG Training Development Update
(Curriculum Mgmt. Plan/Workload/Staffing)

Deb Epps

Corporate University Concept

Merrie Johnson

Afternoon with the GATRs

Prerequisite Issue Paper

Felt that the meeting went really well with the TWT overall. Discussion on topics covered with the TWT. Discussion of the prerequisite issue paper and how to proceed with the task of the wording for that issue. Documentation has pretty much been part of the nomination process or working with the training officer when folks that don't meet prerequisites need to take a course. If the group has suggestions on how to word the exception send it to Kim. Discussion on how the different areas are documenting the reason for allowing folks that don't meet the prerequisites in

the class. Key point is that people need to have someone with oversight of their development, not just “I want to take this course.”

S-315 Issue Paper

HO #4 - Discussion of this paper and how to proceed, what the background is, and why we need this course to be developed.

ACTION ITEM: Bob & Paul will talk with structure protection specialists in his area to get a feel for how the development of the structure folks is going to get feedback and report back to the group. Who the target group is and what the objectives for the course need to be. Due Date: July 15th, 2009 report to GATRs

Miscellaneous

Discussion of the SW GATR plans for the two year rotation of the GATR position. Question of whether a letter from the GATRs on the rotation issue would help with this issue? Charley feels that right now they need to wait until the F.S. position is filled because they will play a big part in that decision. A letter to the SW Coordinating Group would help for them to make the decision on this plan. Discussion that the EA will be selecting a new GATR this year with the retirement of John Grosman how a letter to their coordinating group may help with that decision as well. Suggestion to add to the operating guide that it become a standard to send a letter to the coordinating group if a GATR retires or transfers. Start the letter with a brief description

ACTION ITEM: Renee will draft the letter to Coordinating Groups to be sent when a GATR transfers or retires. Due Date: Draft letter to GATRs by July 10th for review and feedback.

Decision: The above will be added to the Ops Guide as a standard procedure for exiting GATRs.

NAFRI Update

Merrie briefed the group on some new, possible, changes in staffing at NAFRI. She is losing two training specialists and may only be filling one of those positions. She will be working on the outreach for the one training (F.S.) position next week. NAFRI is just starting re-development of the M-581 course and are trying to put a steering committee together. They are having issues keeping a steering committee for that course. They are taking a look at all their courses to see where they are at and what needs to be done with them.

Miscellaneous

Discussion of tomorrow's plans for alternate course delivery and how the TWT makes decision on development and revision of courses. Merrie feels that the TWT needs to be told of the GATRs concerns and what courses they think are the easiest to revise and fix in the future.

Thursday, June 4

Work on Alternate Course Delivery

I/D All

Course suggestions for possible alternate delivery: M-581, RX-310, ISUITE, I-400, M-480, S-339, RAWS, D-310, M-410

Is there an opportunity for either an equivalency or interchangeable course???? Maybe look at several alternate delivery methods so that areas could have a choice of how they present the course. Some of these we could deliver differently right now as long as we meet or exceed the objectives for the course.

RX-310 could be shrunk down to two classroom days for the project work and the core lecture material of the course could be developed to an on-line course similar to DOI Learn and AgLearn. There would also be on-line lecture work that could be area specific also. There would be quizzes to ensure that the material is learned. They could also possibly prepare a paper as a final to be sent to the area lead instructor and possibly eliminate the need for any classroom time. Another method would be to do webinars to present the lecture material. It might be possible to record the webinar so that those students that couldn't attend the webinar could view it later to get the material.

I-400 is another one of those classes that is mostly lecture. Same concept as RX-310 with a proctor to administer a final. Just send them the book to read ahead of time with a quiz to make sure they read the material and then bring them in for a day for exercises.

M-480 - this is a one day course that eats up travel and per diem. This is primarily information only and it could be delivered via on-line, webinar, etc. that way the classroom time could be eliminated or you could have small groups at a local location with a proctor to do exercises and eliminate travel.

S-339 - move conceptual stuff into pre-work and then come to class to do a simulation and AAR on a topic. Move classroom portion to application of the concepts and processes with sand tables/simulations. Have a test at the class or a local proctor administer the test. Have 16 hours of classroom time.

RAWS - the student base has been downsized so that it is very difficult to meet the need. Group feels that this could be done as a mentor program and done on the home unit with one-on-one training. Possibly combine to an on-line or webinar for lecture and then come to the field and do a one-on-one at the local unit. Need to change the thinking of the RAWS folks to at least incorporate some alternate deliver method to make this more cost effective.

D-310 is a high expense class and it is limited to 20 because the ROSS training database only has 20 datasets. Increase the datasets so that more students could be sent to the course at one time. If the numbers could be increased, the geo areas could plan concurrent courses and then have the wizards at one central location to do this where each area would not have to come up with wizards for each class.

M-410 - bring two classes together for the lecture and then split the students for the student presentations. Goal of getting 30 to 35 students through the class at one time. It is coming up for

revision and the suggestion has already been made to development to take a look at this course to change the teaching methods possibly. Needs to also have some kind of simulation component added to the course.

ISUITE - On line with everyone on their own computers at home unit with the lead on a computer controlling the computers until they need the hands on work then turn control back over to the students with the lead monitoring the work via computer. Webinar or on-line.

M-581 - move to a net based, webinar format, HO #6 GB recommendations and HO #7 NW recommendations. Pre-work needs to be re-worked. Are there similar units with LFML that the cadre could be shared if run concurrently?? Need to get steering committee that is going to be committed to the course.

DECISION: Remove **S-339** from the list and NR will work on it within their area to deliver differently and then they will share with other areas. **I-400** we can send as pre-work and then do exercises right now. **M-480** is required for dispatch coordinators and the requests come from the area coordinating groups. Keep this on the radar for development to take a look at. **D-310** need to find out if the training database can be increased. **M-410** - keep this on the radar for getting new technology into this. Modularize this so that students could take the modules they need. Or modules could be added that students could take on their own. Take a step back and look at what our upcoming instructors need. Development needs to get the GATRs involved when M-410 goes to revision so that they can have input into the design or send SMEs to help with this. **ISUITE** - Madonna will dialog with the ISUITE folks to see if they would consider the ideas the group has come up with. **RAWS** - Madonna will contact John Gebhard to see if that group would consider the recommendations of this group. **RX-310** - NW will meet with their group and cadre to start brainstorming on this. Renee will send out a request for other area leads and send out info on the software that was suggested for this by her group. **M-581** - Renee will talk to Deb Corner and try to get a feel for how NAFRI would react to the discussions of this group on this course. The GATRs will put together a steering committee comprised of a SME from each area and brainstorm how to make this course better.

Develop PSC Questions for Mike Dudley

The first step is to find out what are the steps to get the folks who take the course qualified as PSC.

Where would the language lie that allows the OPS/PSC bridge to go forward.

Are the folks that take the class going to be allowed to obtain a task book and go forward towards getting qualified as PSC.

Eventually IQCS changes will have to be made to accommodate this change.

ACTION ITEM: Paul will write the needed verbiage for the PSC/OPS bridge that is needed from the IOSWT to allow these folks to continue to go forward with PTB initiation. Send to GATRs for review by June 30.

Gov Trip and Instructor Travel

Since both DOI and Forest Service are using Gov Trip at this time it would be really great if the area that is paying for the travel could do an invitational travel in that system to charge the travel to their code. GB and NW have done invitational travel this way after they get an agreement with the other agency to generate a charge code. Kim is going to check into if this is possible for her area.

Meeting Management

For Forest Service it just came out that a cost analysis has to be done for all facilities including government owned and our own training rooms. Kerry Kerr is trying to track this down right now and will provide more information on this. Kerry's e-mails will be shared with the group as they come out.

Operations Guide/Charter Update

D All

(Includes action items 119, 122 & 123, Add S-481 to Rotation Schedule)

Minor corrections to the body of the document. Will make the TICS appendix into a history of that group for information for new incoming GATRs. Discussed the nomination sharing appendix and needed changes to that appendix.

Discussion of the IQCS generated report that lists all the names that are going to classes for your area and all the nominations that will be coming to your area from out of region.

ACTION ITEM: Bob will have Pam revise Appendix E and send to Kim for insertion into the Guide by June 30.

S-378/HLCO Course

I/D Bob/Dennis

HIO #5 - Need a better topic name for the Issue Paper: Re-establishment of S-374 or Helicopter Coordinator Course. Made editing changes to the Issue Paper to be sent on. Discussion on exactly what recommendations need to go forward.

ACTION ITEM: Bob will rework the issue paper based on this discussion and send out to the GATRs for distribution to the field for more input on this issue to make further determination of need. Responses from the field to Bob by June 30.

Course schedule sharing and identification

I All

Northern Rockies or Rocky Mountain will present S-378 and California only has nine slots open to out of region folks.

S-495 Noms are due October 1.

Discussion of L-480 materials and where the new material that is being developed is going to be housed. The material from the course that GB lead is developing is available for others and they

just need to request it through Madonna. The northwest is using the original material from NAFRI and supplementing it with handouts.

RAWS

Renee sent out the message to the GATRs prior to the meeting and the RAWS folks have funding to present up to four courses per year. California would have at least one or more per year with the needs they have.

Dates for RAWS classes will be available at the spring GATR meeting so that they can decide who will be hosting the course each year.

A note will be added in the Ops Guide to remind the chair of the GATRs to contact the RAWS folks prior to spring meeting to get the dates for the four classes so it can be determined each year where these classes will be.

Prevention

Discussion of who is planning to do these classes. The numbers are not that big so not every area needs to put these on.

FI-210, FI-310 are currently not posted on the training web page and suggestion that FI-310 should be posted.

Loren Walker is looking for money to present the P-310 course and the P-301 group wants to do a Beta Beta of that class and Madonna will host that at GB. There are no plans at this time to present the P-410 course at this time.

Decision: Renee will contact Rosie L. and have her link to the web page for these so that it is available off the national training page.

S-258/S-358

Kim finally got a hold of Susan Bleg. and the result was that we could give her the numbers of courses and what geo areas they need to be in. Previously she has contacted the GATRs and the telecomm managers to find out what the needs were. GATRs feel that basically she has just gotten requests and worked with the Comm. Managers. They can support 4-6 comm tech courses and 2 comm ldr courses.

ACTION ITEM: Kim will write up the process and send to the GATRs for review before it gets added to the Ops Guide. Susan would like to have the GATRs course needs by September. Draft to GATRs by June 30 for review (Renee and Kim)

Decision: the GATRs will decide what their needs are at the spring meeting and the hosting GATR will contact Susan by June 1 to coordinate the presentation with them.

CA will be presenting one of each of these classes and will contact Susan regarding them.

The process is different for S-258 because of the level of the course.

EA GATR Handoff

John is retiring and will be gone by the November meeting and it has not been determined for sure who will be replacing him. His area is working on determining who is going to take on the GATR role. If it isn't determined prior to November John feels that an interim would be Maggie Shuter and he expects to do some sort of hand off.

S-404 Students not wanting to be on Teams

There are students wanting this course, but not wanting to be on teams, then they can't get into S-420 to be fully qualified. It is up to the home unit to determine who is nominated and prioritized for the class and the GATRs do not really have control of that. Discussion of who is "growing" folks for the need that is out there?

Rural Fire Assistance Funding

Does anyone get that type of funding? RM is starting to get requests and is wondering if we are all eligible for that funding? Alaska is getting some funding that way. SW area is getting some money, but the feds don't get involved with how it is spent. A couple academies in EA are getting funding that way.

Round Robin

NR - IMST is going to do a beta course in the fall the week of November 16th in Missoula. Will take out of region noms for that class.

EA - working on putting together a Mac Lake Staff Ride.

RM - Did the Intelligence Dispatcher course this year. The course does not really fit in anywhere. Does not have a number and development doesn't claim it or have anything to do with it. It was developed by the Intelligence folks and they want people to take it. Did the WIMS class and had to produce all the material for the class so it was expensive. Discussion between GATRs regarding this class.

Question if there is a listing out there by the course that shows what the course is required for or ties into? Checked the BLM training job aid and nothing jumped out right off.

November GATR meeting will be held in Portland on November 12th & 13th. Times to be determined based on agenda needs.