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The Alaska Type 2 team was ordered on July 14, 2013 and received an in-briefing from the outgoing California Type 1 Team on July 16, 2013 at the ICP at North Pole Elementary School. The transition between teams occurred over the following 24 hours and the command was transferred to the Alaska team on July 17 at 1800.

On July 16, the Alaska Incident Commander received the delegation of authority and the Wildland Fire Decision Document. These documents outlined the following objectives for the team:

1. Provide for the safety of fire fighters and the public.
2. Develop and implement structure protection plans to protect residences, military infrastructure, and identified high value military areas and resources.
3. Disseminate information to the media, public, and other agencies in coordination with the Alaska Fire Service Information Officer, Military, State, and Borough.
4. Utilize appropriate suppression methods to keep the fire to the smallest possible size.
   a. Use of indirect line construction and burnout operations is allowed.
   b. Only aviation resources will be used within Impact Areas, except on hardened roads with coordination of military EOD/Range Control personnel.

The team implemented the following Control and Management Objectives to achieve the above delegation of authority objectives and adhere to the WFDSS decision (7/16/2013).

**Control Objectives:**

Keep fire:
--East of a line along the Transmitter Road, north to the Chena River and south along the Trans-Alaska Pipeline to the Salcha River.
--South of the Chena River
--North of the Salcha River
--West of the South Fork Chena River, south along eastern boundary of the Training Area, south to the Salcha River.

**Management Objectives:**

Provide for firefighter and public safety utilizing risk management practices.
The Alaska Team continued the UXO briefing to all incoming resources. Daily safety briefings were provided to resources on the fire and a safety message was included in all IAPs.

Protect military infrastructure, private residences, cabins, improvements and jurisdictional lands within and adjacent to the fire area.
Suppression priorities shifted from military lands to state lands as fire behavior and perimeter containment dictated. No values were lost during the Alaska team’s tenure.

Support local unit initial attack as requested.
No requests were made for initial attack from the Fairbanks Area.
Minimize or mitigate threats to known cultural resources by utilizing Resource Advisors and/or Archeologists.
Resource advisors were used to mitigate damage from suppression activities.

Coordinate and communicate fire information with the public and all stakeholders.
One public meeting was held in Pleasant Valley on July 25. Traplines and media releases were completed throughout the incident.

Coordinate, develop, and implement fire suppression repair.
Fire suppression repair plans were received for both the Army lands and State lands. Repair work was initiated and completed in Divisions F, K, L, M, and N. Repair work was initiated in Division P and should be completed by August 1st.

Minimize threats and impacts to riparian areas, critical watershed and other high value natural resources.
Resource advisors were used to minimize impacts when dozers or other heavy equipment were utilized.

Incident Commander

Summary:
The Alaska fire season had established an intensive pace from the beginning of June and conditions for the Stuart Creek Fire, igniting on June 19th, promoted large fire growth from that date onward to mid-July. The fire is located in the USAF/US Army impact zone and surrounded by the urban interface values of Eielson Air Force Base and related infrastructure, community of North Pole, and values located on Chena Hot Springs Road, and the Chena River Recreational Area. An Alaskan Type 3 Team managed this fire, followed by a Washington Type 2 Team, a California Type 1 Team, and eventually the Alaska Type 2 Team on July 17th. Transfer back to a Type 3 team occurred on July 30th. Command attended two public meetings to ensure concerns were addressed on both sides of transition.

Overall, Stuart Creek 2 was a high profile fire in the midst of numerous jurisdictional agents (USAF, US Army, DOF, Parks). It had difficult terrain and access along with high visibility within the Fairbanks area. There was excellent interaction between the Military Zone and State of Alaska’s Division of Forestry to protect values at risk on the northern end.

Challenge:
Implement the right sized organization to continue meeting the objectives. The previous team had established containment figures of over 50% and fire behavior had moderated. However, the fire still had high potential to move outside of containment lines.

Resolution:
The team maintained an incident meteorologist and fire behavior analyst. The crew complement was increased from 11 crews to 22 crews. Containment expectations were (re)established with Operations and the Agency Administrator. The turn back standard was established at 100 feet throughout the targeted perimeter. The emphasis of the fire had been primarily on the south end protecting the Air Force assets. The Alaska Team established a stronger presence on the north end to complete containment. This included the consolidation and movement of the helibase. The Fire Behavior Analyst and Meteorologist updated FSPro projections and long range forecasts. The probability of fire activity and additional growth was high. The team continued with the large fire organization (crews) in an attempt to take advantage of the available support, weather, and strengthen high visibility perimeter.

Challenge:
The California Team adjusted the transition time from 0800 HRS on July 18th to 1800 HRS on July 17th to accommodate transportation times.

Resolution:
This was initially viewed as “within the critical time of the burn period.” However, conditions had moderated and the California and Alaska Teams took additional measures to mitigate any
potential issues. This included additional meetings with C & G, the option to reconsider, and shadow
time after transfer.

**Challenge:** Utilization of Type 2 crews (Alaskan) and Type 2 IA crews (Lower 48).

**Success:** Alaskan Type 2 crews performed well in assigned tasks. These crews were organized,
enthusiastic, and well behaved. This would be a good year to evaluate and strengthen the Type 2 crew
program. These crews in some ways out performed the L48 Type 2 IA crews – reference Operations.

**Challenge:** Variety of land management issues including Impact Areas, military infrastructure, roads,
rivers, and recreational areas.

**Resolution:** The resource advisors were assigned early in the fire and engaged throughout the incident.
Cooperators such as USAF, US Army, FNSB, Troopers, Division of Parks, Range Control, etc. were
available and regularly attended meetings or were available by phone. Agencies provided valuable
expertise and assistance.

**Challenge:** Extensive spike camp network and transportation requirements

**Resolution:** The smokejumper boat operations and air boat supplementation allowed for alternatives for
travel along the line and to spike camps. This limited the amount of helicopter time required to move
crews, overhead, and supplies. The demonstrated utility of these boats was in the speed that Division S
completed their objectives as compared to Division A which was not accessible by boat.

**Safety**

When the Alaska IMT arrived and took control of the incident the Safety function was well staffed with
six line safety officers. An additional SOF2 was ordered to supplement the one team SOF2 due to the
complexity of the assignment, the size of the fire and traveling distances, and the multiple spike camps.
There was a good handoff of the function which allowed no break in the overall attention to the incident.
The Alaska IMT not only used the 215-A to identify major risks and hazards but also the 215-R
(probability and severity matrix) to aide in the mitigation process. There were 415 visits to the Medical
Unit with 3 Reportable/Lost time injuries and no severe injuries. The incident experienced three vehicle
accidents resulting in no injuries. The first was caused by distraction of the operator resulting in major
vehicle damage, the second was a two vehicle MVA caused by failure to yield to oncoming traffic
resulting in moderate to high damage to both vehicles, and the third was a single MVA caused by
inattention of the operator causing minor damage (cosmetic) to the vehicle and the gate post that was
struck.

The major hazards and risks on this fire included:
- Unexploded ordnance
- Shallow rooted trees
- Air operations with multiple aircraft
- Driving
- Uneven and unstable ground

**Challenge:** Working in and or around unexploded ordinance close to military training areas and impact
zones.

**Resolution:** Military EOD Unit provided continual UXO (unexploded ordnance) training for all incoming
incident personnel.
Challenge: Multiple modes of transportation needed to support any potential Medevac situation.

Resolution: The potential of smoke and inclement weather creating poor to no flying conditions demanded the identification of multiple modes of transportation (helicopters, UTV’s, boats, ambulance, trucks, hoist capable aircraft) to fit the situation.

Information
The objective of the Stuart Creek 2 Fire Information section was to “Disseminate information to the media, public, and other agencies in coordination with the Alaska Fire Service Information Officer, Military, State and Borough”.

The Information staff consisted of five persons and the workload was divided into 4 Branches:

- Media Coordination
- Social Media
- ICP Info Center / Internal Info
- Community Relations

Success: The public meeting conducted at Pleasant Valley on July 25th provided an opportunity to closeout with the community and was well received.

Success: The Information section staffed an Information / Firewise booth at the Farmers Market in Fairbanks.

Challenge: The traditional channels of information (emails, phone, and media) and the external/internal information sharing were not being utilized upon arrival of the Team. The outgoing team was utilizing traplines and Inciweb.

Resolution: Have a daily conference call with the JIC/Agency PAO or PIO for coordination and to receive direction from the hosting agency.

Challenge: Info was posted on Facebook and that was monitored by the team but the team did not have control of what was being posted. If a response was needed there was no way to respond on behalf of the IMT.

Resolution: Establish a Team Facebook page so that we can control the message coming from the Incident and respond as a Team to comments posted on Facebook.

Challenge: Clarification of roles, responsibilities and relationships between the Joint Information Center (JIC) and Team were not well communicated.

Resolution: Clear expectations from Agency PAO/PIO should be communicated to each IMT. This would be best if communicated in writing.

Challenge: A Newspaper purchasing process was not set up by the preceding team.

Resolution: A newspaper purchasing process was established by buying team at a local vender and the process worked smoothly.
**Challenge:** The Stuart Creek 2 Information group did not establish a Twitter account for the Fire because Tweets about the fire were coming out of the Alaska Fire Service. This was awkward for the Information Staff on the Fire because they had no control of the fire message and no way to respond to Tweets on behalf of the Fire.

**Human Resources**

The Human Resources assigned were managed in a positive manner that promoted mutual respect, respected diversity and harassment free environment. The Incident Commander and Human Resource Staff promoted and ensured an appropriate environment for all resources through education in the form of IAP messages, participation in daily briefings and personal interaction with Engine Crews, Overhead Staff, Contractors and other cooperators. Incident ICP and field camp accessibility evaluation was conducted in compliance with ADA, however mitigation measures were unnecessary to implement at any of the sites.

**Success:** Crew Bosses, Division Supervisors, Safety Officers and Overhead Section chiefs were proactive and provided invaluable assistance in resolving issues brought to their attention. Their proactive approach set the tone for a harassment free work environment throughout this assignment.

**Challenges:** The geographic location of the ICP from Spike Camp and other field personnel.

**Resolution:** The Alaska Interagency Incident Management Team Ground Support Supervisor arrived on the incident and immediately resolved the transportation issue by issuing the HR a dedicated vehicle which allowed the HR the freedom to move about as necessary between the Spike camps, supply units and heliports.

**Success:** There were approximately 8 significant HR issues on the fire assignment. One issue was referred back to the home unit FMO. All HR issues brought to the attention of HRSP were of a personnel nature and none were within the prevue of the Civil Rights arena.

All 8 significant issues were resolved and there are no outstanding issues remaining.

In the event Human Resource Issues arise the key contact personnel in Alaska are: Elise Burtrum, BLM EEO Manager, 907-271-3685; Robert Palos, EEO Specialist Alaska Fire Service, 907-356-5508.

**Operations**

**Summary**

The Alaska Team was successful in containing the Stuart Creek Fire because of our understanding of suppression operations in Alaska and our experience working with regionally essential resources. We were quick to adjust staffing and operational configuration to proceed into Divisions A and S, while continuing to strengthen containment lines in other divisions. We maintained minimal staffing to get the job done quickly and adjusted our workforce as inclement weather aided suppression efforts. We had good communication with line supervisors, and continuously nudged them to complete work assignments and demobilize unnecessary resources.

Once the staffing began into Divisions S and A, we utilized aerial support to move personnel and equipment along. Crews were instructed to pack up every morning and be ready to bump down the line as progress continued towards the south along the South Fork Chena River.
**Success:** The availability to use local overhead helped with logistics; spike camps, boat operations, and multiple use aircraft. Ability to choose from a large pool of overhead and place trusted firefighters in unstaffed divisions expedited containment.

**Success:** AFS provided Randy Lennon who did a great job as a liaison. He helped with the understanding of federal and military policies.

**Success:** Operations was able to move swiftly, aided by stellar logistical support from the fire staff as well as AFS support. The ground firefighters commented daily on prompt logistical support.

**Challenges:** The previous team recommended and staffed 11 crews to complete the job. After taking over, we realized that the containment depth and continuity was not adequate enough. Divisions L, K, M, N, P and R were “screaming” for crews and had major holding concerns. We also needed to staff divisions S and A to begin completing containment.

**Resolutions:** We communicated with the weather and fire behavior staff and confirmed that moisture was eminent in the next few days. We ordered enough crews to staff Divisions S and A along with two additional crews to disperse among the requesting divisions. We waited to see the moisture and its effects on the fire before filling additional orders.

**Challenges:** Suppression repair implementation prior to the plan being reviewed and signed

**Resolutions:** The dozer line was quickly deteriorating with possible long term effects. We ordered equipment and proceeded, utilizing local cooperator Resource Advisors.

**Air Operations**

Upon arrival at the incident the air operations consisted of up to eight helicopters and two fixed wing. As the incident downsized aircraft numbers and personnel were adjusted to meet operational needs.

**Success:** During the first operational period the helibase was reestablished and collocated with supply to the north end of the fire, saving as much as 50% in flight times.

**Success:** Working jointly with AFS, specifically Tom Schimdt at the helibase, who constantly loaned and scheduled the use of Zone aircraft to support the incident.

**Success:** Use of carded HECM crewmembers to support air operations in the field, alleviated the normal requirement to place HECM’s in the field, greatly reducing the number of personnel normally assigned to the air operations.

**Success:** Were able to use advanced academy personnel in multiple rotating positions at the helibase. The assignment was long enough to allow personnel to get quality training in positions such as ABRO, TOLC and cargo.

**Challenge:** Upon arrival quickly assessing what was working within the air operations and what was not.

**Resolution:** At the end of the first AK team operational period, helibase was broken down relocated to the north end of the incident; collocated with a new supply and completely functional for the next operational period.
**Challenge:** Scheduling the use of “loaner aircraft from AFS”.

**Resolution:** Established and maintained good communication with Tom Schimdt at the AFS helibase.

**Logistics**

The logistics section functioned very well in meeting the challenges of supporting incident personnel that were spiked out on the fire line, at base camps and helibase. One key to the successful transition from the California Type 1 Team to the Alaska Green Team was the early interaction and sharing of information prior to the team’s arrival.

**Success:** The use of the State of Alaska RapidCom trailer provided telephone and internet service at the Firebird Spike camp and Grange Hall helibase. Improved communications assisted the functional areas in coordinating the movement of personnel and supplies throughout the fire area.

**Success:** Contacting MEDL of outgoing team prior to transition allowed for extending needed resources rather than having to order replacements.

**Success:** Logistical support provided by Alaska Fire Medic program allowed rapid turnaround of medical supply orders.

The medical unit had 413 patient contacts. Twelve of those contacts were referred to a physician for evaluation. There was one significant injury, a thermal burn to a lower leg.

**Challenge:** Providing food service at staging areas, spike camps and helibase.

**Resolution:** Use of a caterer at the Firebird spike resolved the issue of feeding a large group of personnel (+200) co-located in one road accessible camp. The caterer, Big Daddy’s, did an outstanding job of providing meals for firefighters and overhead. The caterer reduced the time crews spend preparing meals and provided a very clean, sanitary camp. Fresh food boxes were provided to line and personnel in small spike camps. Blanket purchase agreements were established at three restaurants for overhead assigned to ICP. A recommendation for future incidents would be to have the school kitchen available to provide meals for team overhead at ICP.

**Challenge:** Providing efficient delivery of supplies throughout the fire area.

**Resolution:** Establishment of a joint helibase and supply area closer to the fire activity reduced ground transportation and aircraft flight times.

**Challenge:** Conflicting requirements for tracking the S’#s for facilities that were issued to expanded dispatch and the buying team.

**Resolution:** FACL created spreadsheet to track all service S’#s and quantities issued to the incident regardless of procurement method.

**Recommendation:** One S# issued per vendor per unit type (e.g. portable toilets, portable sinks, etc.) with the ability to add and subtract units under the same S#. The vendor should submit invoices to FACL for verification of services provided, then signed and faxed to person responsible for payment.
Challenge: Management of the First Student Inc. busses assigned to the incident in support of crew movement to/from/around the incident.
- Swapping of bus drivers without notification
- Reluctance of drivers to perform daily vehicle preventative maintenance (PM) checks; numerous drivers stated that they weren’t authorized by the company to perform PM checks.
- Loss of continuity and operational knowledge due to multiple swaps of drivers during the fire assignment.

Resolution:
- Contracting officer could consider stipulations on length of commitment for drivers in the contract.
- Vendor needs to train personnel on how to perform field preventative maintenance checks before arriving at the incident.
- Demob busses where this takes place and look for an alternant vendor.

Challenge:
ATV’s were procured and sent directly to the fireline without pre-use inspections.

Resolution:
Procurement of ATV’s needs to be coordinated with GSUL at the incident or mob center to arrange pre-use inspections.

Challenge:
Coordination of fuel tenders with limited hours due to high cost.

Resolution:
- Using a 500 to 2500 gallon fuel bladder and pump instead of a fuel tender when available.
- Using 2 fuel tenders to cover operational period to not exceed base hours.
- Fuel tender should be hired under a daily rate.

Finance
The Alaska Team, in a cost containment effort, chose to release the caterer (Big Daddy’s Barbeque) and the shower unit (Water Wagon) from the Firebird Spike Camp when it had reduced in size. The caterer cost was over $125,000. The shower unit was approximately $4,000/day.

A cost analysis was completed by the IBA Mike Taylor to determine the more efficient and economical solution for feeding the staff located at the ICP. This was completed prior to the Alaska Team arrival. This analysis is available in the COST section of the Financial Final Package. It was determined that the Alaska Team would continue to follow the standard of eating at 3 local restaurants (Little Richards Diner, Pagoda, Elf’s Den). Unless otherwise documented, the Alaska Team is sticking with the “no per diem” as the meals are provided.

There has been undocumented word that the previous team was encouraging people to claim per diem for those meals that they did not eat in the restaurants. This apparently came from the Food Unit Leader and other management positions. It is unsure if the personnel will be claiming per diem for those meals. This might be an item to research in the future.

The ICP facilities did not have showers available. The previous team had set up 5 rooms at the North Pole Hotel to allow for ICP personnel to shower as needed. When the Alaska Team arrived, the rooms
were cut down to 3 “shower” rooms initially and subsequently down to 2 rooms. Compared to the cost of the shower unit (approx. $4000/day), this was a significant cost savings (max $400 compared to $4,000).

Claims/Potential Claims

There are currently a total of 9 claims (applicable documentation) filed with the COMP Tracy Nicholson, or with the California Type 1 team. The Alaska Team has only issued S#s for two claims (Claims #7 and 9). All other claims will need to be reviewed and mitigated by the local agency.

Challenge

First Student busses – For a multitude of reasons, the First Student busses were switched multiple times within the incident however kept their original E#s. The changes were normally identified when the shift tickets were audited. No post inspection was ever completed on the original bus and in some cases there was no pre-use inspection completed on the replacement bus.

Resolution

The Alaska Team Ground Support and Finance sections decided that if no pre-use inspection was completed on the replacement bus, the Ground Support attempted to perform a pre- inspection while the bus was in the field and then the post inspection when the bus was demobed. However if the pre-inspection could not be performed on the replacement bus, the post inspection was completed using the original busses pre-inspection.

Challenge

Commissary was requested and issued to the Type 2 hand crews and the camp crews. There were delays in getting some of the emergency commissary boots due to the lack of available “requested” boots. There were also orders being called into the AFS Military Administrative group without going through the IMT, which caused confusion when the orders and/or commissary paperwork arrived at the ICP.

Resolution

The IMT received the requests (except a few orders that went directly to the AFS Military Zone Admin) and forwarded them via ordering to the commissary team.

Consideration for the Future – When there is a Buying Team in place and an IMT, there is no reason for the local unit to handle this process. The BUYT could have purchased the commissary and sent it to the IMT to disburse to the crews.

Challenge

Crew members on several Type 2 crews were switching between positions on the crews and also requesting to have their rates changed to include FALA. Based on the Crew Management guide, the Type 2 crews do not need/require a FALA or FALB on the roster. The configuration, per the guide, is Crew Boss, Squad Bosses, and crew members.

Promotions and demotions on Type 2 crews due to disciplinary actions within the crews were not communicated. These were not documented with any explanation to OPS or Finance, only name shuffles.
on the CTRs. Also, there were several crew members who were switched into other positions on the incident without documentation on the switch. These normally included rate changes, if they were AD or EFF, a new Resource/Request number is required.

Resolution

FALA/FALB - No FALA or FALB were paid by the Alaska Team while responsible for the incident. The team recommended for the crews, in the future, that they need to make sure that there is an addition to the Resource Order that states that the crew was requested to travel with FALA and/or FALB personnel on the roster. The roster should be specific to who is FALA and FALB approved, and if they do get to claim the work, they will need to keep the names consistent (no rotating on a daily basis).

Position rotations – Whenever there is a change in the position on a team roster (Squad Boss to Crew Member, Crew Member to Squad Boss, Squad Boss to Crew Boss, etc.) there needs to be a subsequent document signed by the DIVS stating that they have seen the red card and that the person is qualified to perform the job. Finance has no way to verify this information and needs to be given some type of documentation that the Operations managers are aware of the changes.

Assignments Outside of Crew – When a crew member is taken from the crew roster and placed in a non-crew assignment, there must be a request submitted for their new position/order. Without this, there will not be any record of them having been switched over to this position. It also makes it difficult for Operations to follow their personnel.

Challenge

Upon arrival to the incident, the Alaska Team was provided a document outlining the medical transportation procedures to be used by the team. When the team COMP had to take a mandatory day off, and the FSC Mari Witt attempted to use the process, the local protested the use of the process due to it being a weekend and “having plans”.

Resolution

The “on call” person, Megan, was able to meet all of the fire personnel who were transported due to medical issues throughout this time period and also through the remainder of the incident. The process was followed by the team with no issues following the weekend of 7/20-21.

Plans

Summary
The planning section received an excellent package from the outgoing Type 1 team. The ISuite database is complete and updated, the demobilization of remaining resources is complete as far out as the Type 3 team is comfortable, the GIS data and products have been provided to the agency administrator. The suppression repair plan is a consolidated document for all the affected land managers and has been implemented.

Challenge: Some equipment and rental cars did not check in when they arrived on the fire. There were a few instances when the procurement person told the vendor to go directly to the fire. Equipment showed up with pending resource orders with the resource information hand-written by the vendor.
Resolution: The individual speaking to the vendor needs to clearly state that the resource needs to check-in at ICP. An alternative may be that a check-in be establish at the hosting agency’s transportation department. The resource orders should be filled before the equipment is sent to the fire to ensure the proper piece of equipment is filling the order.

Challenge: FAMWEB became unavailable for saving data entered for the 209 for at least one evening (July 22nd).

Resolution: The 209 was submitted as a Word document directly to AICC. A recommendation is to issue a notice to users if there is known down time on the system. This would reduce unnecessary stress and hours to troubleshoot the system.

Challenge: The short team that was ordered includes 13 positions. For the Planning Section that includes only a chief, situation unit leader, and a computer specialist. This is an unrealistic organization to follow a Type 1 team.

Resolution: The short teams should not be ordered.

Challenge: Days off/extensions – The assignment extension document required in the Mobilization Guide is challenging to complete in a timely manner. The document specifically requires signatures be gathered in the order listed with the resource’s supervisor being after the host GACC.

Resolution: AICC offered to facilitate the gathering of signatures and delivery of the document to expanded dispatch. This reduced that challenge of contacting the sending GACC. If the resource is from Alaska it would seem reasonable that AICC need not be a signature.

Challenge: The NIROPs infrared product was helpful but on one occasion was re-evaluated mid-day and on another occasion was not supplied to the fire until several hours after the product was available. The palm IR camera was a useful tool for detecting specific hotspots along the line.

Resolution: The NIROPs IR product was useful to the Type 1 team when they were unable to determine the perimeter. The three “flights” that the Alaska team requested were of questionable value. This tool is probably best used early in the fire when perimeter detection is the primary concern. The palm IR, while more operator dependent, is very useful as the operator submits specific notes on each hotspot detected (i.e. a crew is already working this) which helps to prioritize the workload.

Success: The California Team reported 68 trainees during their 14 day assignment. The Alaska team had an additional 46 trainees for a total of 128 trainees on the Stuart Creek 2 Fire.
### Table 1: Trainees during Alaska Team Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Air Ops</th>
<th>Command</th>
<th>Logistics</th>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Plans</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FWS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1:** Trainees during Alaska Team Assignment by Agency and Function

**Table 2: Total Trainees on Stuart Creek 2 Fire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Command</th>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Plans</th>
<th>Logistics</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Air Ops</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL GOVT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1:** Trainees during Alaska Team Assignment by Agency and Function

**Table 2: Total Trainees on Stuart Creek 2 Fire**
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