

User Group Session 9 - NextGen WFDSS Focus Group

Spatial Fire Planning Dashboard

Response – Resolution

1. What is your first impression of the Spatial Fire Planning Dashboard?

- 95% of Users had a positive or indifferent impression.

2. Comments or suggestions for the Spatial Fire Planning Dashboard?

- Many users felt the changes eliminate the middleman to upload data and dashboard appear easy to use. It was mentioned that the dashboard/AGOL was slow.
 - The common ESRI AGOL platform was chosen to streamline the process.
 - ESRI AGOL is also an off the shelf solution that is interagency/enterprise accepted and approved. IT development prefers the use of off the shelf solutions over nonstandard solutions that incur long-term development and maintenance costs.
- Some users felt the spatial fire planning dashboard was clearly developed for people familiar with geospatial platforms. These users requested that there needs to be continued work to make the UI more user friendly for all users including those that are less technically savvy.
 - AGOL has been chosen as the geospatial platform due to the interagency and enterprise level approval. There are limited options for modifying the user interface.
 - WFDSS Classic was developed prior to the availability of an interagency/enterprise level application. The geospatial capability was programmed using open-source software which was allowed tailoring the interface. Developing and maintaining a nonstandard geospatial solution is now considered duplicative since there is an off the shelf option.
 - ESRI AGOL is also an off the shelf solution that is interagency/enterprise accepted and approved. IT development prefers the use of off the shelf solutions over nonstandard solutions that incur long-term development and maintenance costs.
- Some users felt, visually it looks like it will only work with large computer screens and would not work very well with small screens found on tablets or smart phones.
 - Due to the large data sets that will be used in spatial fire planning, it is unlikely users would be able to use a tablet or phone.
- Some users like POD data and feel it should be included whether or whether not they are included in the fire management plans.
 - WFDSS NextGen is currently working on ingesting the RMA PODS Service.
- Users suggested that orphaned data be included in the same Dashboard. Since the orphaned language records will have a Unit ID, the user could click on a Unit and in a separate small tab, all orphaned language could load. It would allow users to click back and forth from language with shapes (one tab) to language orphaned (second tab). It would be nice for a 'one stop shop'.
 - There are some data from WFDSS Classic that do not have the correct Unit IDs or a unit ID.

- Some data has mismatched or outdated Unit IDs.
- There are also concerns regarding viewing the orphaned data mixed with the production data.

3. How do you feel about the available shape types?

- 77% of users were positive or indifferent to the available shape types.

4. Comments regarding the available shape types?

- Some users felt the definitions were confusing. They request that the definitions continue to improve with clear text.
 - The definitions will be an evolving process with the IFPC Interagency Fire Planner Committee.
- Some users like POD data and feel it should be included whether or whether not it is included in the fire management plans.
 - WFDSS NextGen is currently working on ingesting the RMA PODS.
- Users were questions if layers like Greater Sage-Grouse habitat management were going to be nationally managed as multi-unit non overlapping shapes?
 - These large layers will be at the discretion of the end users.
 - There will be national reference layers in the application, however, these layers will not have fire planning language attached.
 - There is an effort to allow national fire planners ability to load these large data sets and required fire planning language.

5. How do you feel about the proposed shape names?

- 77% of users were positive or indifferent to the proposed shape names.

6. Comments pertaining to the proposed shape names?

- Some users felt the names were clear, concise, and descriptive.
- Some users felt there was a need to work on clear text descriptions.
 - The definitions will be an evolving process with the IFPC Interagency Fire Planner Committee.
- Some users were concerned that with the variety of shape types and names, the end user could miss categorize the uploaded shapes.
 - The benefit of the ESRI AGOL service, is that it provides the ability to address the miss categorized data on the fly, as needed.

7. Does the proposed spatial fire planning dashboard in AGOL meet the fire planning needs?

- 77% of users were positive or indifferent to the proposed spatial fire planning dashboard meeting the fire planning needs.

8. Comments regarding spatial fire planning needs?

- Some users felt AGOL is a common, easy to use platform that should meet all the needs, and links for easy editing.

- **Some users suggested that there needs to be an easy edit interface for non-GIS Types.**
 - AGOL has been chosen as the geospatial platform due to the interagency and enterprise level approval. There are limited options for modifying the user interface.
 - WFDSS Classic was developed prior to the availability of an interagency/enterprise level application. The geospatial capability was programmed using open-source software which was allowed tailoring the interface. Developing and maintaining a nonstandard geospatial solution is now considered duplicative since there is an off the shelf option.
 - ESRI AGOL is also an off the shelf solution that is interagency/enterprise accepted and approved. IT development prefers the use of off the shelf solutions over nonstandard solutions that incur long-term development and maintenance costs.
- **Some users suggest that once the Next Gen WFDSS is released for official use there should be in-person workshops for different target user groups (AAs, Fire Managers, Fire Planners, SOPL, IMTs, etc...). Positions should be created to help with this if the current org doesn't have the capacity for this especially with the funding currently available earmarked for strategic planning related to Wildfire Risk Reduction. During this unprecedented time of organizational re-alignment the position descriptions related to required spatial fire planning (WFDSS and IFTDSS) should be updated to clearly define who is responsible for updating Spatial Fire Plans and actually utilizing them because units are not being held accountable to a consistent standard and sadly many Fire and Fuels Planners, Fire Managers, and Agency Administrators openly state that they do not value fire analytics or spatial fire plans in fire response or land management planning.**
 - There will be a combination of in person and online sessions.
 - There are many complexities of each agency and their organization charts. Each agency will need to determine their own direction.
 - There is ongoing coordination with the IFPC Interagency Fire Planner Committee at NWCG.
- **Some users pointed out that there are still units that never made it to spatial planning and may need extra support to transition. Clear interagency direction on PCL/PODs would be helpful - national vs. unit level responsibilities.**
 - These users will be able to use planning areas, user created shapes and PODS to delineate a strategy for their decision. However, in large fire units it is beneficial and time saving to utilize the spatial fire planning dashboard for the pre-work.

9. Feedback on Focus Group Session 9

- **Users felt the presentation was a great concise presentation of how SFP will be incorporated into NextGen.**
- **Users are looking forward to spatial fire planning and WFDSS NextGen going live.**
 - Users can currently access the spatial fire planning dashboard.
- **Users suggested that WFDSS NextGen needs to be incorporated into S-482 curriculum.**
 - WFDSS NextGen is currently being incorporated into courses.
- **Users felt like we stepped backward from previous sessions. Clear purpose and intent statement at the get go will help. Sounds like we need to look more at unit level transition as we move towards going live with this. If you aren't already planning this - do alpha and**

beta testing - side by side decisions with actual fires - trial by fire literally. Will help troubleshoot any potential problems foreseen and unforeseen. Bring in an AA or two, have them test it out when you are ready.

- The system will be available as soon as possible in testing/training capacity. At that time users can do their own side by side testing.