EVALUATIONS, REVIEWS, AND INVESTIGATIONS

1 Introduction

All fire programs should be periodically reviewed. Evaluation of wildland fire management program performance should be done on a continuing basis and should provide an overall adaptive management framework for all individuals involved with the program. Reviews may be scheduled on a regular cycle; or triggers may determine the need for a review; or park, regional or national leadership may request a review. The National Park Service has developed a *NPS Wildland Fire Program Review Guide* that describes the review framework.

All wildland fires and fire-related incidents must also be reviewed at some scale, whether it is a tailgate after-action-review or at the other end of the spectrum, a formal review conducted by a team. This includes all prescribed fires, which will also be reviewed as appropriate. Reviews are conducted for one or more of the following purposes:

- To examine the progress of an on-going fire incident and to confirm effective decisions or to correct deficiencies.
- To identify new or improved procedures, techniques, or tactics.
- To compile consistent and complete information to improve or refine park, regional, or national fire management programs.
- To examine anomalous fire-related incidents in order to determine cause(s), contributing factors, and where applicable, to recommend corrective actions; if negligence is indicated, the circumstances will be reported and investigated in accordance with applicable regulations, policies, or guidelines.
- To determine the cost effectiveness of a fire operation.

The following direction is supplemental to that provided in the current edition of the *Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation Operations*.

2 Responsibilities

For all types of reviews, the responsibilities at the national, regional, and park levels are intertwined and not reasonably differentiated by level. To indicate the connectivity of these responsibilities, they are not broken out by national, regional and park levels in this section. This chapter is intended to be read in its entirety.

Distribution of Reviews

Regional fire management officers will be responsible for determining specific

information from fire reviews that might be of interest or concern to other park areas. Such information might be specific problems that occurred or recommendations that might be applicable elsewhere. Regional fire management officers will forward such information within 30 days to the Branch of Wildland Fire, Fire Management Program Center for appropriate distribution. Reviews of general interest, significance, or present lessons learned will be posted on the Lessons Learned Center Fire Incident Reviews website in order to promote a learning culture and support organizational and individual, performance, leadership, accountability and responsibility.

2.1 Wildland Fire Reviews

The authority to convene a wildland fire review rests with the park superintendent, regional director, or the Associate Director, Visitor and Resource Protection. It is the clear responsibility of the park superintendent to be accountable for a park wildland fire review. They can call for a wildland fire review, must insure timely completion, and are ultimately responsible to implement recommended actions. The regional director is responsible for following up with the park superintendent and ensuring that park and wildland fire reviews are established and completed in a timely manner and that recommended actions are completed. The park superintendent may request technical support from the Branch of Wildland Fire, Fire Management Program Center (FMPC), and regional, park, or interagency personnel with the appropriate expertise.

2.2 Significant, Controversial, or Unusual Wildland Fire Event Reviews

The Associate Director, Visitor and Resource Protection, will convene an ad-hoc team to review Servicewide fire management programs subsequent to the occurrence of any significant, controversial, or unusual wildland fire management activities.

All reviews will be conducted as constructive critiques aimed at determining the facts related to the specific fire or fire management program. They will identify commendable actions, techniques, and decisions, as well as areas that need improvement. Reviews are intended to resolve operational issues, not impose punitive actions.

All wildland fire incidents which result in human entrapment, fatalities, or serious injuries, or result in incidents with potential, will be investigated and reviewed. See the chapter on Standards for Operations and Safety in *Reference Manual 18 (RM 18)*.

2.3 Program Reviews

As previously mentioned, program review responsibilities at the national, regional, and park levels are intertwined and not reasonably differentiated by level. In many cases, the responsibilities are dependent on the genesis for the review. For more information, refer to the *NPS Wildland Fire Program Review Guide*.

3 Individual Wildfire Reviews

3.1 Incident Management Team (IMT) Closeout and Review

See the *Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation Operations*.

3.2 Large Fire Cost Reviews

Large fire cost reviews will follow protocols as outlined in the Reviews and Investigations Chapter of the *Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation Operations* and as described in the Department of the Interior's Office of Wildland Fire *Memorandum 2016-013, Criteria for Reviewing Wildfire Incidents*. Whenever possible, Large Fire Cost Reviews should be combined with other reviews of an incident to reduce duplication, costs, and burden on park and review team resources.

3.3 Local (Park) Level Review

See the *Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation Operations*. The superintendent or their designated representative should conduct the park level review. The superintendent will appoint other qualified persons, including the park fire management officer (or an official who has designated fire program management responsibilities) to be a part of the review. The purpose of this review is to provide the superintendent with information to recognize commendable actions and to take needed corrective action(s).

Costs associated with the review will be charged to the account assigned to the fire with the approval of the regional fire management officer. A copy of the complete report will be sent to the regional fire management officer, who will review it and, if appropriate, forward a copy to the Branch of Wildland Fire, FMPC.

3.4 Regional Level Review

See the *Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation Operations*. A regional

level review may be conducted for any fire that

- Crosses a park's boundary into another jurisdiction without the approval of an interagency agreement.
- Results in adverse media attention.
- Involves serious injury to fewer than three personnel, significant Departmental property damage, or an incident with potential. This review is separate from and in addition to any specific accident investigation.
- Results in controversy involving another agency.

The regional level review will normally be conducted at the park where the fire occurred. The regional fire management officer or his or her designated representative will convene the review. Review team members should include the superintendent of the park, the park's fire management officer (or the official who has designated fire program management responsibilities), the incident commander(s) for the fire, and other individuals agreed upon by the regional director and superintendent.

If possible, the review team should visit the actual fire site as part of the review. A copy of the review report will be sent to the Branch of Wildland Fire, FMPC. Costs associated with the review will be charged to the account assigned to the fire.

3.5 National Level Review

See the *Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation Operations*. A national level review may be conducted for any fire that involves Servicewide or national issues, including

- Significant adverse media or political interest.
- Multi-regional resource response.
- A substantial loss of equipment or property.
- A fatality, or multiple, serious fire-related injuries (three or more personnel). This is in addition to the required serious accident investigation (see *Reference Manual 18,* Standards for Operations and Safety chapter).
- Any other fires that the Associate Director, Visitor and Resource Protection wants reviewed.

The national level review will normally be conducted at the park where the fire occurred. The Chief, NPS Division of Fire and Aviation or their designated representative will convene the review. It should be attended by the superintendent of the park, the park's fire management officer (or an official who has designated fire program management responsibilities), the regional fire management officer, the incident commander(s) for the fire, and other individuals

agreed upon by the national fire director, the regional director, and the superintendent.

If possible, the review team should visit the actual site of the fire as part of the review. All costs associated with the review will be charged to the account assigned to the fire.

Exhibit 1 provides an outline for final reports of fire reviews. Exhibit 2 provides a checklist of sample questions that might be asked during a fire review.

These two documents should be used for park, regional, and national level reviews.

4 Program Reviews

4.1 Operations Evaluations

Operations evaluations of parks and regions may include review of fire management programs to assure compliance with established National Park Service standards.

4.2 Servicewide Fire Program Review

The Associate Director, Visitor and Resource Protection, will convene an ad-hoc team to review Servicewide fire activity during any year in which significant, unusual, or controversial fire activity occurs. This review team will analyze the reports from national level reviews and appropriate regional level reviews to determine what, if any, policy or operational changes should be initiated. The review team will develop findings and recommendations and establish priorities for action.

4.3 Fire Preparedness Reviews

For information on fire preparedness reviews see the *Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation Operations*. Fire preparedness reviews, utilizing the Preparedness Review Checklists, will be conducted annually by park fire management staff. Regional readiness review teams may be used to conduct more in-depth, objective reviews on a scheduled basis (for example, once every three to five years). These teams benefit from being interagency in composition.

4.4 Park Fire Program Reviews

The National Park Service has a *NPS Wildland Fire Program Review Guide* that

describes the processes and tools for conducting Wildland Fire Management Program Reviews within the National Park Service (NPS). Its primary purpose is to provide effective program evaluation techniques and discuss the specifics of each phase of the program evaluation process. Many of the tools found in the guide are optional at the discretion of the team and the desired outcome. As explained in the guide, reviews can be scalable. They may simply be a phone interview to determine the status of an issue or a full large scale review that measures the health of a program.

Evaluation of wildland fire management program performance should be done on a continuing basis and should provide an overall framework for all individuals involved with the program in order that they may find the evaluations and recommendations useful. To be effective, program evaluation efforts must be placed within the broader context of program and organization management and control. A flexible capacity for internal self-evaluation is fundamental to the management and ongoing improvement of programs, processes, and activities. Evaluations should address whether quantity, quality, effectiveness, and efficiency are satisfactory based on national and interagency standards. As a result, suggestions are made for improvement including alternative processes, new approaches or strategies, workforce adjustments, funding strategies, and/or changes in information technology. During all interviews, the Review Team should attempt to identify solutions to potential problems mentioned during the interviews.

These program reviews will be conducted in accordance with *DO/RM 18; DO/RM 60, Aviation Management Departmental Manual 485, Chapter 7**; and the *Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation Operations*. The authority to conduct program reviews stems from 16 USC, *DO/RM 18; DO/RM 60*. The regional director will convene review teams to review park wildland fire and aviation management programs on a regularly scheduled basis, or subsequent to the occurrence of any significant, controversial, or unusual wildland fire management activities.

Fire and fire aviation program reviews provide comprehensive program management and operational evaluations. Involvement of line management and cooperators, where applicable, is critical. The objectives of these park fire program reviews are as follows:

- Ensure consistency with current planning and program analysis, budget allocations, and acceptable administrative procedures.
- Ensure operations are conducted in compliance with Departmental, NPS, and interagency regulations and policies.
- Compile consistent and complete information to improve or refine the park's fire and fire aviation management program.

**Updated: August 2025 to reflect new Departmental Manual link.*

- Produce a written report that contains an executive summary, along with findings, recommendations, and action plans, in the areas of program management, operations, fuels management, fiscal management, health and safety, facilities, and fire aviation management.

All reviews will be conducted as constructive critiques aimed at determining the facts related to the specific program. They will identify commendable actions, techniques, and decisions, as well as areas needing improvement. A written report will be developed by the review team and forwarded to the park superintendent by the regional director.

4.5 Regional Fire Program Reviews

As described in section 4.4, the National Park Service has a *NPS Wildland Fire Program Review Guide* that describes the processes and tools for conducting Wildland Fire Management Program Reviews within the National Park Service (NPS). The purpose of regional wildland fire and fire aviation program reviews is to provide support to regional management in improving program effectiveness, customer service, employee safety and morale, and fiscal accountability.

The review is designed to obtain, analyze, and evaluate information concerning the management, planning, and operational procedures of the program. The review will look at what guides the program now, what is in place, and how that is working; and it will focus on policy, procedures and practices. If a policy or procedure is not being followed, the reason must be determined and suggestions for change identified.

In general, the focus of the review is accountability, clarity and adequacy of policy and guidance, the region's interpretation and implementation of policy, and areas where policy change or addition is required. The evaluation is a systematic method to determine effectiveness of projects through implementation of current Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy.

Fire program reviews provide comprehensive program management and operational evaluations. Involvement of line management and cooperators, where applicable, is crucial.

The general objectives of the regional fire program review are to accomplish the following:

- Validate adequacy of management policy, structure, and guidance to support field organizations in performing their duties.
- Confirm compliance with laws, regulations, and Departmental and Service guidance.

- Identify opportunities to share ideas, methods, and techniques developed by other offices or individuals.

All reviews will be conducted as constructive critiques aimed at determining the facts related to the specific program. They will identify commendable actions, techniques and decisions, and areas needing improvement. A written report will be developed by the review team and forwarded to the regional director by the Associate Director, Visitor and Resource Protection.

4.6 OMB Circular A-123, Management's Responsibility for Internal Controls

The Federal Managers Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) requires that Federal entities perform annual internal reviews and provide annual assurances regarding the management, accounting and administrative controls in all programs. This is implemented by the Office of Management and Budget's *Circular A-123, Management's Responsibility for Internal Control* which defines the requirement for implementing internal controls in federal agencies. NPS fire management programs will comply with this requirement.

Internal controls, in the broadest sense, are necessary to achieve the objectives of effective and efficient operations, reliable financial reporting, and compliance with applicable laws and regulations. To comply with this process, fire managers must take systematic and proactive measures to:

- Develop and implement appropriate, cost-effective internal control for results-oriented management
- Assess the adequacy of internal control in Federal programs and operations including financial and internal controls
- Separately assess and document internal control over financial reporting
- Identify needed improvements
- Take corresponding corrective action
- Report annually on internal control through management assurance statements.

While the testing and assurance effort will provide input regarding whether the agency internal controls within these cycles are properly designed and operating effectively, it is also important for the Service to develop a risk assessment process so that we may be able to self-identify what changes are needed to our internal controls and the subsequent improvement of our programs.

The national and regional offices will designate senior subject matter experts to develop fire management internal controls and a testing and assurance process for their programs in order to comply with this requirement. These controls can

be developed jointly or separately although it is preferred that we share the workload of testing because both the national and regional offices will conduct testing and assurance. This overlap is necessary because of differing line authority, responsibilities, and management perspectives of the offices. Regional offices will work with their regional Internal Control Coordinators, Audit Liaison Officers, and the Fire Management Program Center when testing and reporting the controls. The Fire Management Program Center will develop guidance for the regional offices following direction provided by the National Park Service Accounting Operations Center.

Exhibit 1

OUTLINE FORMAT FOR WILDFIRE REVIEW WRITTEN REPORT

This format is provided to develop consistency in the Servicewide fire review reporting system. This format will assure more efficient review of reports at the park, regional, and national levels.

Fire reviews will follow the general outline listed below. The list of subjects is included for consideration, but only those subjects that the review team identifies as commendable actions, policy issues, or correctable deficiencies need be included in the written report. Identified action items will be monitored by the region for compliance in the future.

I. Introduction

This section will include the names, titles, agency/home units, fire qualifications, and business phone numbers of the review team members. Information regarding the date and place of the review will also be included.

II. Summary Narrative

This section should contain the basic who, what, when, where, how and why, and should serve the purpose of an executive summary. Unusual major events should be mentioned but not detailed.

III. Readiness Evaluation

A. Pre-fire weather conditions
B. Fuel conditions
C. Topography
D. Special constraints
E. Planning status

1. Fire management plan including resource management objectives
2. Pre-response plan
3. Agreements
4. Prevention
5. Step-up plan

Exhibit 1

IV. Management Evaluation

A. Initial response evaluation

1. Dispatch
2. Description of management effort
3. Personnel qualifications
4. If unsuccessful, why?

B. Extended attack—Type II or Type I incident

1. WFDSS: completed by whom, review clause?
2. Fire complexity analysis
3. Delegation of authority/agency administrator briefing
4. Personnel qualifications
5. Park preparations for extended attack and overhead transition
6. Safety
7. Operations
8. Planning
9. Logistics
10. Finance and procurement
11. Human resources management
12. Public information
13. Interagency coordination

C. Resource objectives were clear and supported incident decision-making.

V. Fire Effects

VI. Emergency Stabilization and Burned Area Rehabilitation

VII. Mobilization/Demobilization

VIII. Appendices

Exhibit 2

SAMPLE QUESTIONS FOR FIRE REVIEWS

I. Readiness Evaluation (Pre-fire Conditions)

A. What were the weather conditions?

1. What were the weather indices at the time of ignition?
2. Describe the recent precipitation pattern and how many days since last measurable precipitation.
3. Describe any significant weather factors such as frontal systems, downbursts, thunderstorms, etc.
4. How did existing weather conditions compare to the predicted "normal fire year" conditions?

B. What were the fuel conditions?

1. What were the fuel conditions at the point of origin (include fuel model(s), major species present, age class, live and dead fuel moisture, live/dead ratio, etc.)?
2. Were fuel conditions significantly different at other points within the final perimeter? If yes, what was different?
3. How did fuel conditions compare to conditions expected during a "normal fire year"?

C. What were the topographic conditions?

1. What were the topographic conditions at the point of origin, including slope, aspect, elevation, and position of fire on slope?
2. Were these conditions generally constant throughout the fire? If not, how were they different?

D. Were there any special constraints?

1. What was the land ownership pattern for the lands burned, and those lands immediately adjacent to the burn?
2. Were there structures or other improvements that hampered fire management? If so, describe them.
3. Describe any problems with access during management efforts.

E. Planning status

1. Was the fire management plan current and appropriate?
2. Was preparedness planning current and adequate?
3. Were agreements and contracts in place?
4. Was step-up plan in place and current?
5. Were preparedness staffing and specific actions appropriate on the day of ignition, and consistent with the step-up plan?

F. Prevention

1. Was the fire preventable? If so, what could have been done to prevent it?
2. Is prevention adequately covered in the fire management plan (to include a prevention plan)? If not, describe deficiencies.
3. Was the investigation action prompt, appropriate and thorough?
4. If the fire was caused by human activity, describe law enforcement action taken and cost recovery initiated.

II. Wildfire Management

A. Initial Response

1. Dispatch

a. Was the duty dispatcher qualified?
b. Did a failure in the initial response dispatch contribute to an escape? If so, how?
c. Were the initial response dispatch procedures followed as outlined in the fire management plan? If not, describe differences.

2. Description of wildfire management effort

a. Were the initial fire conditions accurately portrayed?
b. Was the initial response appropriate for known conditions, in terms of both numbers and strategy?
c. Were the proper types of equipment sent?
d. What was the initial response strategy?
e. Was resource status accurate? If not, what needs to be corrected?
f. Did initial response equipment work properly?

g. Were communications adequate?
h. Was equipment usable and properly maintained?
i. Were initial response forces dispatched from the nearest available source?

3. Were all initial response forces qualified?

4. If initial response was unsuccessful, describe specifically why.

a. Were conditions beyond control?
b. Were insufficient resources dispatched?
c. Did forces take too long to arrive?
d. Were management actions inappropriate?
e. Was fire potential underestimated during the size up?
f. What could have been done to give initial response a better chance of success?

B. Extended Attack/Type II or Type I Incident

1. Wildland Fire Decision Support System (WFDSS)

a. Was a decision published/approved using WFDSS? If not, why?
b. Who prepared the decision document?
c. Did the agency administrator (superintendent) publish a decision in WFDSS?
d. Did the published decision and chosen strategy for managing the wildfire reflect the goals and objectives from the fire management plan?

2. Was a fire complexity analysis done?

3. Personnel qualifications

a. Was a qualified Incident Commander (IC) assigned? If not, why?

4. Park preparation for an extended attack

a. Did the park anticipate the needs of the IC and line up the necessary overhead, firefighters, equipment, and support personnel?

b. Was an incident action plan prepared?
c. Were there adequate records of the park actions to date?
d. Was an appropriate incident management team requested? If not, how can we improve in the future?
e. Was it ordered soon enough?
f. Did it arrive at the requested location and on time?
g. Was the team properly equipped and supplied when it arrived?
h. Was a limited delegation of authority prepared prior to the IC/team arrival? If not, what was the reason?
i. Did the superintendent conduct a briefing for the IC, including discussion of the limited delegation of authority?
j. Was the takeover transition by the team smooth?
k. Was WFDSS used in the briefing?
l. Were the necessary staff specialists and command staff present at the briefing?
m. Were human rights and training needs covered in the briefing? If not, what will be done to ensure the subject is covered in the future?

5. Safety

a. What were the safety problems on the fire?
b. What was done to resolve them?
c. Were all safety concerns resolved?
d. Was the safety officer position filled and properly used? If not, how is this to be addressed in the future?
e. How did the team incorporate safety in planning strategy, briefings, tactics, and supporting logistics? Was the ICS-215a, Incident Safety Analysis process utilized?
f. What was the incident commander's attitude toward safety?
g. How did the IC communicate safety considerations to incident personnel?
h. Was safety an obvious priority?
i. What preventive actions were instituted?
j. Was a medical unit established? If not, why?
k. Was it adequate to the incident's needs?
l. Were emergency medical plans appropriate to the incident and did they work?
m. Did the IC assure that each accident was thoroughly investigated by qualified personnel?

n. Were the necessary forms and documentation completed?
o. Describe monitoring of crew condition to identify tired crews and provide adequate rest.
p. Were the 24-hour rest/work cycles considered and implemented for this incident?
q. Did employees routinely work in excess of the standard 12 hours after the first operational period?
r. Did the safety officer monitor work schedules?
s. What can be done to improve safety on future incidents?

6. Wildfire management operations

a. Were incident action plan objectives and targets realistic and achievable?
b. Were there unapproved deviations from the incident action plan?
c. Was aircraft use prudent and safe?
d. Were line production targets achieved?
e. Were operational period changes completed at estimated times?
f. Were strategies and tactics employed sound and consistent with accepted fire management policies and procedures?
g. Were probabilities of success calculated and subsequently updated as the incident progressed?
h. Were the control objectives achieved? If not, what would have helped achieve objectives?
i. Were safety objectives attained? If not, why?
j. Was the incident management team kept intact throughout the incident? If not, why?
k. Did line supervisors stay with their assigned resources during the operational period? If not, why?
l. Describe how the agency administrator was involved.
m. Was the agency administrator readily available for consultation?
n. Did the agency administrator attend IMT strategy meetings and any interagency meetings?
o. Did the agency administrator keep the regional director informed of the incident's progress?
p. Did the agency administrator participate in all major decisions?
q. Did the agency administrator visit camps, airports, and other incident facilities?
r. Did the agency administrator tie up communication lines with non-fire

business?

s. Was the agency administrator interested and involved in all personnel issues?

7. Aviation operations

a. Was aviation safety paramount?
b. Was air attack effective? If not, how could it have been improved?
c. Were aircraft used according to their best capability?
d. Did air attack meet incident objectives?
e. Was it cost effective?
f. Were drops accurate?
g. Was an airspace closure put in place? If used, were there any problems?
h. Was fugitive retardant utilized? If not, is it possible to use in the future?
i. Was aviation support available commensurate with incident need? If not, what would have improved support?
j. Were aircraft maintained in an airworthy state throughout the incident?

8. Planning

a. Was the planning organization adequately staffed? If not, what was needed?
b. Was the WFDSS properly used?
c. Did the agency administrator recertify the WFDSS at least daily?
d. Was the WFDSS updated as conditions changed?
e. Did intelligence gathering function smoothly and provide incident management with the information needed in a timely fashion?
f. What methods were used to collect intelligence?
g. Was available intelligence sufficient?
h. Were calculations and assumptions of probable fire behavior and location calculated for successive intervals?
i. How accurate were the projections?
j. Were resource needs calculated based upon these projections?
k. Were incident action plans prepared for every operational period? If not, why?
l. Were the management objectives clearly stated?
m. Was there a clear description of the work to be accomplished?

n. Were expected production rates defined?
o. Was there a discussion of weather and fuels?
p. Was there a current map of the fire?
q. Was there a communications plan?
r. Was there information concerning pick up and drop off points and transportation times?
s. Were all resources identified and correctly listed?
t. Was there a safety message?
u. Did line overhead understand all elements of the plan?
v. Were plan briefings held and were they adequate?
w. How were local overhead forces incorporated in the team structure?
x. Was span of control within acceptable limits?
y. Were divisions and branches appropriate to the incident's complexity?
z. Were single increments and strike teams combined into groups or task forces when possible to reduce the span of control?
aa. Were contingency plans considered in the planning process? If not, how would they have helped in the final analysis?

9. Logistics

a. Was the communications plan adequate?
b. Were there adequate frequencies available?
c. Was there frequency interference from other incidents or non-incident users?
d. Was there adequate communications hardware and was it available in a timely fashion?
e. Was the food service adequate?
f. Was the availability, quality, and quantity of food acceptable to fire fighters?
g. Were sanitation standards met?
h. Was a national caterer used?
i. Was the transportation plan responsive to incident needs?
j. Was there sufficient transportation to get crews to/from line assignments in a timely fashion?
k. Were access roads adequately maintained?
l. Was dust abatement adequate?
m. Were access routes marked and was traffic flow adequately controlled?
n. Were duty hours for drivers within the standards established by

Department of Transportation?

o. Were all drivers qualified to operate assigned vehicles?
p. Was the logistics organization able to meet operational period change deadlines? If not, why?
q. Was incident base security adequate?
r. Were there adequate controls on the issuance of supplies and equipment?
s. Were incoming/outgoing supplies manifested and checked off?
t. Were personal effects of fire fighters protected?
u. Were there any criminal incidents?
v. To what extent were commissioned law enforcement personnel involved in the overall security program?
w. Was the incident base layout and operation acceptable?
x. Was the incident base size manageable?
y. Were camps efficiently run?
z. Were inmate crews separated from the rest of incident base population?

10. Finance and procurement

a. Were established procurement channels and procedures followed?
b. Did all orders go through a single point (supply unit)?
c. Was a buying unit used? If not, would it have helped?
d. Were any supplies or services ordered outside the system? If so, why was the system not the better method?
e. Were nearest available sources used?
f. Was the most reasonable mode of transportation used?
g. Were equipment rental agreements properly completed prior to equipment use?
h. Were equipment rental records kept current?
i. Were food, lodging, and other purchases reasonable in terms of quantities and cost?
j. Were reasonable orders placed?
k. Were lead times adequate?
l. Were item amounts reasonable?
m. Were requested items consistent with incident complexity and needs?
n. Were receiving procedures in place and always used?
o. Were specific individuals responsible for receiving and receipting all incoming supplies?

p. Was property identified and marked upon receipt?
q. Were proper property issue, transfer, and return procedures in place and used?
r. Was all property accounted for during the demobilization phase?
s. Was timekeeping and associated record-keeping accurate?
t. Were crew time reports used and signed by the appropriate overhead?
u. Was posted time current for both personnel and equipment?
v. Were all compensation claims investigated in a timely fashion?
w. Were complete records established for all claims?
x. Were all claims investigated by trained and qualified persons?
y. Were payments completed in compliance with the prompt payment act?
z. Was an Administrative Payment Team (APT) used? If not, would one have helped?
aa. Did the APT arrive on time?
bb. Were there any coordination problems with the APT?
cc. Did the finance section chief participate in the preparation of the incident status report? If not, how would that participation improve the report?
dd. Was monitoring of cost effectiveness ongoing and adequate for the command staff's needs? If not, what could have been improved?
ee. Were standard commissary procedures followed? If not, how was commissary handled?
ff. Were procedures adequate to track oil and gasoline issues? If not, what would have been better?
gg. Were procedures in place to monitor exempt Fair Labor Standards Act personnel who might approach maximum pay limitations? If not, why?

11. Human Resources Management

a. Were all personnel qualified and carded for their assignments? If not, what assurance was provided regarding their qualifications?
b. Were there difficulties in obtaining qualified personnel?
c. Were opportunities for training assignments identified and taken advantage of?
d. Were identified shortage category positions given priority for training?
e. Was a training specialist assigned to the incident?
f. Were trainees evaluated in writing?
g. Was the performance of all individuals evaluated continuously? If not,

why?

h. Were written evaluations completed and discussed with all overhead prior to their release?
i. Were evaluations objective, factual, and honest?
j. Was immediate action taken to correct any noted deficiencies?
k. Were all crews provided a written evaluation of their performance prior to release? If not, why?
l. Were all human rights complaints promptly documented and investigated? If not, why?
m. What section were human rights placed in?
n. Were there any complaints?
o. Who conducted the investigations?
p. How were situations resolved?

12. Fire Information

a. Did the incident management team use the information officer position effectively? If not, how could it have been improved?
b. Was accurate information provided to the media in a timely fashion?
c. Was the Information Officer (IO) function conducted with minimum impact upon the fire management and the park as a whole?
d. Was the IO available to the media?
e. Was the park interpretive program effective in relaying fire information to visitors? If not, what could improve it?
f. Did the interpretive program address fire management issues prior to the fire?
g. What interpretive techniques were in use during the fire?
h. Was the interpretive effort proactive or reactive?

13. Interagency Coordination

a. What was the extent of interagency involvement in the incident?
b. Was pre-planning adequate? If not, how could it have been improved?
c. Was there any cost sharing involved? If not, how could sharing have been advantageous?
d. Were there any problems in assessing shares?
e. Was a Multi-Agency Coordinating (MAC) group activated? If not, was it needed?

f. Was the MAC group effective in setting priorities and allocating resources?
g. Did the MAC group become involved in the management of the incident?
h. Did all agencies feel they were effectively represented on the MAC group?
i. Were the MAC representatives qualified?
j. Was Area Command (AC) established? If not, was it needed?
k. Was AC effective in coordinating the management of the various incidents?
l. Were affected agencies allowed input to the AC decision process?
m. Were all members of area command qualified?
n. Were there any conflicts between AC and MAC?

III. Fire Effects/ Damage Repairs

A. Was a resource advisor designated and available for consultation regarding all aspects of environmental impacts resulting from wildfire management actions? If not, would resource damage have been reduced?
B. Were there irreversible effects upon park cultural or natural resources?
C. Were environmental considerations discussed at all strategy meetings?
D. Were fire lines, access routes, camps, helispots, and other facilities located and constructed with minimal environmental impact in mind?
E. Was the use of heavy equipment restricted?
F. Was post-fire emergency stabilization and burned area rehabilitation carried out and was it effective?

IV. Mobilization/Demobilization

A. Were mobilization and demobilization orderly and adequate to meet the IC's objectives?
B. Was the closest forces concept applied to the mobilization?
C. Were interagency resources realistically used?
D. Were requested time frames for arriving resources realistic?
E. Was the most reasonable mode of transportation used?
F. Did all resource orders go through the established dispatch channels?
G. Were priorities established and followed?
H. At what point was demobilization addressed by the IC?
I. Was the demobilization plan in writing?

J. Was timing of transportation reasonable and was it cost effective?
K. Were park resources the last to be demobilized?

V. APPENDICES

Include all documents relevant or required for the particular fire to provide a clear and detailed picture of the incident, including:

A. WFDSS with all updates.
B. Incident Action Plans showing incident strategy and any changes in tactics.
C. Map of the fire, by burning periods.
D. Incident Status Summaries (ICS-209).
E. Precipitation record and National Fire Danger Rating System (NFDRS) ten-day fire danger records with graph of fire danger indices.
F. Weather information including previous day's forecast, subsequent daily forecasts throughout the incident, and all fire behavior predictions generated as a result of these forecasts.
G. Completed NPS Wildland Fire Report Form.
H. Display maps showing fuel models, transportation system, communication points, and any other information deemed necessary to understanding of the incident.
I. Press releases and public information.
J. Personnel and equipment charts showing buildups by burning periods.
K. Detailed financial summary of the incident.

Distribution of Reviews

Regional fire management officers will be responsible for determining specific information from fire reviews that might be of interest or concern to other park areas. Such information might be specific problems that occurred or recommendations that might be applicable elsewhere. Regional FMOs will forward such information within 30 days to the Branch of Wildland Fire, Fire Management Program Center for appropriate distribution. Reviews of general interest, significance, or present lessons learned will be posted on the Wildland Fire Lessons Learned Center Fire Incident Reviews website in order to promote a learning culture and support organizational and individual, performance, leadership, accountability and responsibility.

Table of Reviews

Required Activity	Frequency	Required by	Delegating or Authorizing Official
Fire Preparedness Review	Annual	*RM 18*	Park
Program Review (Park)	As needed	*RM 18*	Park (conducted by Region)
Program Review (Region)	Every seven years or as needed	*RM 18*	Region (conducted by WASO)
After Action Review (AAR)	Management discretion	*Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation*	Park
Fire and Aviation Safety Team Review (FAST)	As fire activity dictates	*Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation*	Geographic Area Coordinating Group
Aviation Safety and Technical Assistance Team Review	As aviation activity dictates	*Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation*	State/Regional Aviation Manager or MACG
Large Fire Cost Review	Per DOI OWF Memorandum 2016-013	*DOI and Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation*	Director
Individual Fire Review	Management discretion	*Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation*	Local/State/Region/National
Lessons Learned Review (LLR)	Management discretion	*Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation*	Local/State/Region/National
Escaped Prescribed Fire Review	Per escaped fire incident	*Prescribed Fire Planning and Implementation Procedures Guide*	Local/State/Region/National

*Higher level management may exercise their authority to determine the type of review or investigation.

Table of Investigations

Wildland Fire Event	Investigation Type	Notification Requirement	Management level that determines review types and authorizes review*
Serious Wildland Fire Accident	Serious Accident Investigation (SAI)	National	National
Wildland Fire Accident	Accident Investigation (AI) FS only- FLA may be used	BLM/NPS- National, FS/FWS- Management Discretion	Region/State/Local
Entrapment	SAI, AI, LLR, depending on severity	National	National
Fire Shelter Deployment	SAI, AI, LLR, depending on severity	National	National
Near-miss	LLR, AAR	Management Discretion	Region/State/Local
Fire Trespass	Fire Cause Determination & Trespass Investigation	Local	Local

* Higher level management may exercise their authority to determine the type of review or investigation.

Action Review (AARs), Lessons Learned Review (LLR), Facilitated Learning Analysis (FLA), Administrative Investigations (AI) and Serious Accident Investigations (SAI)

NPS Reference Manual 18	https://www.nps.gov/subjects/fire/wildland-fire-plans-and-policy.htm
Large Fire Cost Reviews	https://www.doi.gov/sites/doi.gov/files/elips/documents/owf_policy_memo_2016-13_criteria_for_review_wildfire_incidents.pdf
Interagency Standards for Fire and Fire Aviation	https://www.nifc.gov/standards/guides/red-book
Prescribed Fire Planning and Implementation Procedures Guide	https://www.nwcg.gov/publications/pms484
Facilitated Learning Analysis	https://lessons.wildfire.gov/library/facilitated-learning-analysis-fla-implementation-guide-2024