



History of the Legacy Systems: approx. 4:39 minutes

Lyle Carlile (Fire Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs)

-So what is driving the need for a new system? Can wildland fire agencies realize a more effective and efficient system? The next few minutes we will spend some time delving into the history of fire planning and why fire program analysis is being developed.

Narrator

– In the past fire planning and budget systems have been unique to the five federal wildland fire management agencies and to the state fire management organizations. The systems were developed to meet differing agency program emphasis items and missions, such as resource values, social values, and natural resource utilization. Most of the systems were created over twenty years ago.

In 1978 the Forest Service received congressional direction to develop a process to support future fire program budget requests with analytical data demonstrating the cost benefit relationship between the amount of the fire preparedness budget and the performance of the proposed program. In other words, it was to measure suppression costs against resource losses.

This program became known as the National Fire Management Analysis System or NFMAS. The preparedness analysis portion of NFMAS was called Initial Attack Analysis or IAA. In 1985 the BLM, followed by the BIA in 1991 adopted IAA. These agencies coordinated with the Forest Service throughout the 1990s to make continuous improvements to the system renaming it Interagency Initial Attack Analysis or IIAA.

While those three agencies worked with IIAA, in 1983 the National Park Service developed their own fire program analysis system called FIREPRO. The Fish and Wildlife Service soon adopted a modified version of FIREPRO designed to more readily meet their agencies objectives. The Fish and Wildlife system became FIREBASE. Many tribal and state wildland fire entities also use versions of these analysis systems to develop their fire program budget. FPA will replace the existing systems of NFMAS, IIAA, FIREPRO, and FIREBASE. These systems were tailored to fit each agency's specific needs and are becoming outdated. Existing systems were never fully developed to consider all the aspects of the fire program and lack the ability to consistently analyze preparedness budgets between agencies.

Steve Botti (Fire Program Planning Leader, National Park Service)

– It wasn't that the existing systems were fundamentally flawed it just that they didn't go far enough today to really provide the kind of analysis that was needed. One of the problems was that they weren't all linked together. They really analyzed separate aspects of the fire management program rather than all the aspects together and how they interacted together. Now, the situation has changed and fire management is focused on more complex issues and objectives, like ecosystem restoration wildland urban interface, cultural resources, so a different analytical approach now is needed to establish how we protect those kind of resources and that will integrate all the elements of the fire management program now that we have like hazard fuels reduction, rehabilitation, prevention, as well as suppression, so the whole focus has shifted and we need a different approach to really incorporate all of that.

Narrator

- Current models focus only on a particular land management unit and the personnel and equipment available at that unit. These models do not consider the fire fighting resources that are available from other federal, tribal, state, or local entities. By considering all resources on a landscape-scale analysis FPA will create opportunities to increase overall cost effectiveness of the fire management program.