

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES
FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FIRESCOPE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Minutes of the Meeting
April 8, 1998
Sacramento, California

DRAFT

MEMBERS PRESENT

William R. Bamattre, Chief - Los Angeles City Fire Department
James Z. Brannon, Chief - Linda Fire Protection District
Ronny J. Coleman, Chief Deputy Director - CDF&FP - State Fire Marshal Office
Gary Costamagna, Chief - Sacramento City Fire Department
Stewart W. Gary, Chief - Livermore-Pleasanton Fire Department
Neil Honeycutt, Chief - Office of Emergency Services - Fire and Rescue
John Jansen, Northern Director - California State Firefighters' Association
Pat Kidder, Fire Management Officer - USDI - Bureau of Land Management
Charles Prather, Chief - Orange County Fire Authority
Roger K. Purdie, Chief - Vista Fire Department
Russell Richards, Chief - Stanislaus Consolidated Fire Protection District
Keith Simmons, Chief - Santa Barbara County Fire Department
Douglas Sporleder, Chief - Santa Clara County Fire Department
Bruce Ward, Deputy Director - Office of Emergency Services

MEMBERS ABSENT

Daniel J. Clark, Chief - Kern County Fire Department
Brian Hatch, Director - California Professional Fire Fighters
Tom Nichols, Protection Specialist - National Park Service
Ray Quintanar, Director - USDA - Forest Service - Fire and Aviation Management

OTHERS PRESENT

Andy Anderson, Chief - Quincy Fire Department
Marla Chase, Office Technician - OES - Fire and Rescue
Patrick Cooney, FIRESCOPE Assistant Chief, North - OES - Fire and Rescue
Michael Dougherty, Assistant Director - U.S. Forest Service - South Op's
George Ewan, Emergency Op's Coordinator - U.S. Forest Service - South Op's
Dave Festerling, Deputy Chief - Ventura County Fire Protection District
Mark Ghilarducci, Deputy Chief - OES - Fire and Rescue - Special Op's
Mike Harris, Area Chief, South - CDF&FP - OES Region VI Coordinator
Darrell Higuchi, Deputy Chief - Los Angeles County Fire Department
Richard Helton, Office Technician - OES - Fire and Rescue
Jeff Jones, Chief of Operations - CDF&FP - Cascade Region
James Little, Assistant Chief, Long Valley Fire Protection District
Bill Lokey, Assistant Chief - OES - Fire and Rescue - Special Op's
Jim Marquis, Assistant Chief - OES - Fire and Rescue - Region II
Robert Martines, Chief of Operations - CDF&FP - South Op's
Glen Newman, Region Chief - CDF&FP Coast-Cascade Region

Jim Owen, Deputy Director - California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
Gary Pavusko, Deputy Chief - OES - Fire and Rescue - FIREScope Administration
Joe Perry, Chief - California Fire Chiefs Association
Darrell Ralston, Assistant Chief - Ventura County Fire Protection District
Teresa T. Romero, Office Technician - OES - Fire and Rescue - FIREScope
Tim Turner, Area Chief - CDF&FP - Sierra Region
Steve Vittum, Division Chief - Santa Barbara County Fire Department
Hank Weston, Chief - Grass Valley Fire Department - Region IV OES Coordinator
Chris Wurzell, Assistant Chief - CDF&FP - South Op's
Jack Wiest, Area Chief, CDF&FP - Cascade Region
Kim Zagaris, Assistant Chief - OES - Fire and Rescue - Region IV

OPENING REMARKS/INTRODUCTIONS (Neil Honeycutt)

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by Chairman Gary Costamagna. Chief Honeycutt thanked Pat Kidder for the use of his facilities at the Bureau of Land Management Building here in Sacramento.

Pat Kidder announced that his BLM Office in Phoenix, Arizona will provide him with a master copy videotape of the interactive teleconference regarding the Federal Fire Program that was held this morning. Please let Pat Kidder know if you would like to receive a copy of the videotape, and he will be happy to provide you with one.

Chief Honeycutt went on to make the logistics announcements for the day and then self-introductions were made by the Board Members. Deputy Chief Darrell Higuchi of the Los Angeles County Fire Department attended the meeting on behalf of Chief P. Michael Freeman. Deputy Chief Dave Festerling of the Ventura County Fire Department attended the meeting on behalf of Chief Bob Roper. And Deputy Director Jim Owen of the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection attended the meeting on behalf of Director Richard Wilson.

APPROVAL OF JANUARY 14, 1998 MINUTES (Gary Costamagna)

Assistant Director Dougherty of the U.S. Forest Service requested that the minutes show that the U.S. Forest Service abstained from the motion made by Chief Freeman for approval of the *FIREScope Advisory Board Response to the 1997-98 Budget Request for Studies* document being submitted to the Legislative Analyst's Office. And the same in regards to the OES Engine Funding Working Group Report. Assistant Director Dougherty requested that the minutes reflect that the U.S. Forest Service abstained from the motion made by Chief Richards to accept the recommendations in this report. The U.S. Forest Service does not have an opinion one way or another and feel it is not in their jurisdiction to vote in these two matters and requests that the minutes reflect the U.S. Forest Service abstaining from these two motions.

With those changes in the minutes, Chief Costamagna asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the January 14th Board Meeting. So moved by Chief Bamattre and second by Chief Simmons. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT (Bruce Ward)

In regards to the El Nino response, things went very well. We benefited by the fact that we had nine months of relentless pounding by the media and politicians which helped us to get focused at every level in California. Drainage ditches and culverts were cleared. Law

enforcement, fire and public works were all speaking with each other. All levels of government were all working very well together. We had the Governor's Flood Emergency Action Team initiatives that came out of the January, 1997, floods which we were able to implement one year later. Overall, it was a classic example of how emergency management should work when everything goes well, when you identify the hazard. El Nino unfolded exactly as the experts said that it would. El Nino was every similar to the 1982/83 El Nino. The coastal counties received the bulk of the damage.

One of the things that worked very well in OES at the state operations center level was that we had a joint fire and law enforcement branch put together to send out scarce resources like the swift water teams and the air resources. By this coordination in communication, we made sure we weren't wasting any of the scarce resources. We had put out a letter to both fire and law enforcement communities requesting that at every level, particularly in the operational level, that there be planning conducted prior to this event. And in most cases there was planning, and contacts were made and new discussions opened up, and everyone benefited from that.

Another thing that worked out very well was that we put together what we called mobilization centers in Tehama, Santa Rosa, Monterey, Stockton and Madera where we requested CDF Incident Management Teams to put together incident command posts. Large scale staging areas, where they put CCC Crews, Department of Corrections Crews, and other strike teams that could do a rapid response to problems in the area where there were flood fights going on. While they were very expensive, they really worked very well, particularly politically. The politicians loved them. The same ones who were most affected in the central valley last year in January, 1997, came out and saw the state reaching out and working closely with county government. This was a big success.

In addition to that, one of the other things that was successful was the evacuation guidelines that we put out as a result of the Governor's Task Force. They used those evacuation guidelines at the Rio Nido evacuations where people are still out of their homes. They followed them to the letter of the law, and it was very helpful to county administrators, law enforcement and fire at that level. It gave them the guidance they needed.

FIRE APPARATUS FUNDING TASK FORCE(Gary Costamagna/Richard Solis)

At this time we have members requests in the Senate and in the Assembly. The Senate members requests consists of a minimum of twenty Senators and the Assembly Budget Request is above forty Assembly members on a Members Request Letter. At this time we passed the first hurdle from Senator Kopp's budget. We are scheduled to go back to Senator Kopp's Budget OES Funding Committee in May and next week we will be at the Assembly Budget Hearing. Chief Roper and I want to thank Chief Freeman for the freedom of having Rich Solis of Los Angeles County up here working. He has been working very hard. It now appears that the request is on solid ground. The request is for a \$5 million augmentation to the OES Engine Program for this fiscal year. I want to thank Chief Sporleder for his support in the Bay Area with Senator Scherr and Assemblyman Canine. This was key support. Thank you very much. We've met with budget analysts in both the Senate side and Assembly side and all bases seem to be covered right now.

Chief Sporleder announced as an update, that Assemblywoman Duchini has agreed to place it on the Assembly Budget. This was the last thing we were working on which was trying to get it into the Assembly Budget, and it appears that we have been successful. Next week on the fourteenth will be the President Budget Hearing, and we'll see how that goes.

Richard Solis of the Los Angeles County Fire Department reported that they were able to get twenty of the forty Senators bipartisan to sign the letter requesting Sub-committee II in the Senate to augment \$5 million for the fire engines. Chief Costamagna, Chief Roper and Richard Solis went to a hearing. At that hearing, Senator Kopp put it over providing that there is money in the May Revise. Since that time, Chief Roper and Richard Solis have met with the Department of Finance. They have indicated that if there was some money in the May Revise, they would be favorable towards the fire engines.

On the Assembly side, they have forty-eight of the eighty bipartisan Assembly Members that signed the letter requesting \$5 million for the fire engines. A hearing is set for Tuesday, April 14th at 2:00 p.m. in Assembly Sub-Committee IV. They have a meeting with the speaker at 11:30 a.m. and a meeting with Rod Wright who chairs that committee. Also, the Budget Consultant called Richard Solis and said that this item is now part of the Assembly Budget. This is very positive because once it's upon the budget, it's going to be pretty difficult to remove it, but it all looks very positive at this point.

COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT FIRE SUPPRESSION (Neil Honeycutt)

Last Thursday the Five Party Agreement Meeting took place here in Sacramento. It is our next to the last meeting for this year. We went through the Five Party Agreement line by line to look at two things. One was to structure the agreement to avoid duplication. In that process we identified a number of secondary issues that were addressed which Assistant Director Dougherty will comment on as well. But the important part was going through it line by line. It gave us the opportunity to look at the full document and it also gave everyone the opportunity to speak. We restructured it where it fits more of the construction of a legal document. Lines are numbered so that we all have a base line. So when we have the discussions during the Five Party Agreement Meeting and have important changes, we will vote and record that vote and have the information added to the contract permanently. And those elements that are on a year-by-year basis, will be at the back of the contract so that we don't have to change the whole document. Such things as salary, administrative surcharges, and other parts of the contract that change on a regular basis.

We did have a lot of discussion in regards to the ordering process. Looking at the consistency for ordering and that it is in concert with established processes with the federal wildland agencies and CDF. As OES's responsibility to inform local government fire chiefs, we have to be sure that we have done everything we can do through the training we provide to both the 950 plus fire chiefs and approximately five thousand strike team leaders throughout the state, that we get that information out to these people and keep them informed.

We spent a lot of time discussing the position of strike team leader trainee formally known as Assistant Strike Team Leader. This position does not exist in ICS language. Many of the local government fire chiefs have expressed to me and other members of the advisory group that the position of strike team leader trainee is important and is needed for a number of reasons. The real issue is that the person needs to be certified and is going to become qualified. We have a large pool of strike team leader people that have been through training. And as we get into certs and quals in the future, we have people that take the class and are certified, but they are not qualified. They have not been out on an incident. In order to accommodate the position and meet the needs, this position will allow for that person to get out and get those qualifications.

We will have our final meeting on April 28th. We will finalize the information, get it published and get it out to the California Fire Service. I will now turn it over to Assistant Director Dougherty for further comment.

Assistant Director Dougherty stated that from the U.S. Forest Service's perspective, they've had some things change internally as a result of reviewing this document and what was thought to be understood. One of them was their review of their financial status and how they did business. With this, a fire billing unit has been created out of the Mather Office, which they never had before. Instead of having to go through five people to get paid, you now only have one person to deal with. This new procedure has been set up to meet the sixty days requirement to get a bill paid. So service all around will be much improved as a result all of this. It is important in the process, and it was important enough to put it into the document, to have OES assist us all even at the incident, so that everyone knows how they were ordered, whether it be by mutual aid or through the Five Party Agreement.

Chief Honeycutt stated that there was a lot of discussion on business practices as to how OES does their business and in working with CDF and the federal element and their business practices. This was how we came up with the sixty-day process. Another key element in that business practice was that in the past, the F42 agreement stated that it had to be signed by the billing agency. It never said that the receiving entity had to sign it. Now it does. The Incident Commander at the incident that you go to or his designee must sign that document for it to be valid. This is an important issue from a business practice point of view. These new forms are not yet out, but the old form still allows for this to occur. This new procedure will clear up any question about who signed the form as an acceptable contract submitted for reimbursement.

Comment was made that one of the things that may have been confusing about the financial side of what was charged was when they took an average of battalion chiefs, captains, and firefighters. These were fairly easy. But how do you figure the average rate if you send somebody in the overhead position that does fit into these categories; such as a division chief, or a Clerk Typist III? Was there any resolve in this issue? Is there going to be an average of those salaries or actual salaries that are placed into that? Neil's response was that it's an average actual rate of the person who is performing the service. If their rate of pay is higher than the minimum established rate, then we pay an average for that rate. If it's a clerk typist, that average pay rate, we pay that rate submitted by your department. We give you that responsibility to provide that information to us. We take that and then process it with the average rate for that person to be reimbursed. Now on those positions where there is one of a kind for only that one department, we go back to that agency and ask who is this person and what is their rate of pay. This should be explained under Overhead. It should be in there, but we'll look at this again to be sure the legal definition and the language is clear. This starts July 1st.

The Stress Survey was sent out about two weeks ago. The salary portion has been separated from the Stress Program. And the salary part should be out in about two weeks. We were waiting for after this meeting to be sure the salaries were all in place before it went out in the mail. Question was asked if the F42's would be in place for this year. Neil commented that probably not. Their goal is to have them ready by July 1st depending on how fast the changes are made. The committee has four samples of F42's to go through. There is a budget to go to print on these once the committee finalizes them.

OES FIRE AND RESCUE BRANCH REPORT (Neil Honeycutt)

We spent quite a bit of time preparing for and dealing with El Nino, primarily in February. There were a lot of isolated problems around the state. The Coastal Region II was impacted the heaviest. It seemed that for about a fourteen day period, it rained heavily every third day. We had the rise and fall of the Northern and Coastal rivers. In OES Operations, we were prepared with law and fire to coordinate both our air and swift water resources and any other specialized resources that were a law or fire resource. We encouraged the operational area coordinators and regional coordinators to get to know their local counterpart.

There is secondary issue here, and that is that many of the fire operational areas don't have a good working relationship with the Sheriff who is the operational area coordinator for most counties. So we are encouraging them to open those lines of communication. And then during the disaster operations when the third element, the emergency management side of the county and state get into place, opening the EOC's and working through that process with them. That requires a higher level of coordination and there were fewer problems this year than there were in the past. And our goal is to work through them so that resources that are available locally are used. If not available at the operational area, they go to region to supply them, and if region can't supply them, obviously it comes to the state and then we supply them. An element of this is as the folks in ICS law enforcement get more familiar with typing, especially swift water resources that are typed, they will have a better idea of what we are talking about in terms of how we order resources and utilize them in the field. At this point, the law enforcement side of the house has a wide variety of resources that are available. Some have the same name and some don't. That is why we encourage the support of the local Sheriff to get the right resources.

We have two vacancies in the branch. As you will recall Jim Jeffery received a certificate at our last board meeting. And since then, Will Brock of Region III has now retired as well. Will has now gone to work with NorthTree.

Paul Beckstrom of Operations is on vacation this week. On his behalf, I just want to report that we do now have our five new engines. Our Type II's are starting to arrive. Assistant Chief Zagaris is working in getting them outfitted. One of these engines will be at the Training Officers Workshop in San Jose at the end of this month. We are looking to getting these five new engines into the field as quickly as possible.

Deputy Chief Ghilarducci commented on what they have been working on regarding terrorism and special op's. Chief Costamagna, Chief Bamattre, Chief Freeman and Deputy Chief Ghilarducci attended a conference in the Washington area on terrorism, NBC response. They sort of go hand in hand.

The last time he reported on the haz mat issues, they were dealing with the issue of reimbursement and how that was all going to come together to finalize the haz mat mutual aid plan. He stated that they were going to speak with the Attorney General's Office and get a ruling on the actual intent of the section of the Emergency Services Act that talks about the hazardous plan with regards to mutual aid. The Attorney General's Office stated that the intent as written indicates that mutual aid guise should be consistent with the Master Mutual Aid Agreement and, in essence, the way it was written, would cause it to bring mutual aid through the system. But they also said that they had to still go through the long version of the Legislation to find out if whether or not we can make an amendment or if there is something in there where we can address contracts and reimbursements and these types of things. We made a little bit of headway in understanding the haz mat reimbursement issue in the mutual aid plan, but we're not quite there yet. It is important statewide because it ties into supporting haz mat requests in regards to this new issue of

chemical biological terrorism where we could get a lot of resources coming in to support a particular jurisdiction.

The second part is the actual completion of the plan. The holdup was the rewrite of the Hazardous Materials Incident Contingency Plan (HMICP) and the references in the fire plan with regards to that. Some of the haz mat, non-fire folks wanted more definitive information in the fire plan. We agreed that there would be some references and the definitive issues with regards to all the other state agencies or other clean-up agencies; such as, Fish and Game and the Oil Spill Response, etc., would be clearly outlined in the update of the HMICP. Once we get the mutual aid issue completed, the plan is done. We are hoping to have it completed by mid-summer or at least brought back to this group by mid-summer for review.

In these last couple of days we attended a conference put on by the Bureau of Justice Assistance and the International Association of Fire Chiefs. The three days were spent in hearing all the federal agencies. There is a lot of money involved with terrorism and weapons of mass destruction. We heard a lot from the FBI and the EPA, Health and Human Services and the National Guard about what their role is going to be and how they are going to respond in support of local government. Most of the support we are going to get from these technical specialists is going to be in six, nine, or twelve hours after an incident. So when we have a biological or chemical type situation, the local first responders are going to be dealing with it, backed up by the state responders through the mutual aid system, at least for California. A lot of that is going to happen in the first few hours. Of course, we saw that in Oklahoma as well where all live victims were extricated in the first nine hours of the incident. So the role of the fire service in dealing with these things, need to be really looked at and addressed in order to be prepared.

Some of the scenarios that we were given were pretty staggering with regards to the biological and chemical threat and the poll-of-ratio of one of these types of incidents. Being able to work with the SEMS System here in California is going to be pretty important. We are going to have to depend on each other for support and response. Decon, identification, containment, isolation and decon issues with regards to NBC, and then mutual aid response, and then the federal response, and how we're going to manage all those resources.

I know that the Task Force just recently reviewed the haz mat safety plan, and I would say to the group here that you may want to go back to that, because I don't see much in there about NBC. We must be able to take into account the most current threats that we are facing and be able to incorporate a NBC response in regards to haz mat. In many cases it's really a major haz mat response incident. We are still sorting out these kinds of things with regards to the fire service response and other agencies response. Chief Honeycutt asked Mark if he was referring to the FIREScope ICS 208 HM Site Safety Plan document. Mark said yes.

Mark went on to state that in regards to the issue of weapons of mass destruction, we really need to come together on that because one event can impact a lot of people, a lot of jurisdictions, and we are going to have to depend on each other for that type of response. Particularly mass decon. In talking with the specialist around the state, we are beyond limited in California than all the other states for mass decon operations.

The other thing is the effects that it will have if we do have a large amount of people and are not able to contain the event rapidly. First of all, identifying that it is a biological chemical event. Containing it, because you are going to get some people walking out, and then what happens when those people get to a hospital. Making sure the hospitals in the state have

the capability for mass decon. Currently the hospitals in the state are barely at where they can operate on a day-to-day basis. You get diversions in corridors of ER's everyday. So it's a larger issue where we need to incorporate all levels both in the private sector and the fire service and be able to identify and get up to speed on some of these new issues.

Chief Honeycutt commented that they have been trying to keep tabs on all the things the federal government is doing. He last reported that the State Board of Fire Services at their last meeting were trying to identify who has the funding and the training and how it is applied to local governments around the country. They have a program to provide levels of training to cities that they have identified and did not take into account how those cities interact with their operational areas or their counties or the rest of the state. And this is one of the things that we have been trying to keep tabs on is how this training money is used. California received some money for training. It came to OES, it was passed through the State Fire Marshal's Office for training and that money is available. The National Fire Academy has a piece of this and they're trying to keep \$2 million in their budget to do awareness training and basic incident command for terrorism events. And so there is a number of federal agencies out there that are involved in this and it's kind of hard to keep all the players in line.

Chief Gary asked in regards to NBC if there is a task team or a collective group in the state who could come up with some awareness training material on a haz mat fro type or a quick lesson plan. Maybe some video-based training to get out to the cities and districts and first responders that don't have US&R teams or don't have dedicated, full-time, well-trained haz mat teams. Lawrence Livermore of National Laboratories went through an audit last year and they had a cooperative swat agreement with the Alameda County Sheriffs Department. DOE came in and said not good enough, you're a major target, you'll beef up your security force staffing and have an on-site swat team twenty-four hours a day. So the feds are looking internally at their own internal facilities securities. In response to Chief Gary's questions, Chief Coleman stated that at the last board meeting, he indicated that in cooperation with the National Fire Academy they had received ten thousand copies of the Self Study Guide (*Emergency Response to Terrorism Self-Study*) which they are now distributing to fire departments free of charge, but there have been very few requests so far. Notices have been put out via mass mailing to all fire chiefs, it's on their website and in their training bulletin. Distribution of this document has been linked with the National Fire Academy, CSTI and other training components. They would like to distribute this document to those fire service agencies who are not well informed on this subject or anyone else who can use this information. They are just waiting to be contacted for requests.

Chief Bamattre added that he and Chief Freeman sit on a task force under the International Association of Fire Chiefs for terrorism and they soon hope to have some products for distribution. They've been working for over one and one-half years towards getting some sort of distribution of information out. They don't believe there is a level of general awareness globally among the fire service at the local level. Chief Bamattre stated that he can take the task force recommendations back to the IAFC's Board since they are already working on an implementation plan. This should include an awareness video. Not necessarily a first responder type video, but more of a clearing house of what's going on at the national level concerning terrorism, along with a field operations guide insert. The National Fire Academy has also promised to have one available in the fall. So, they are looking to coordinate all efforts to come up with something that would be an interim as this training comes out.

What was discussed at this conference was based on what took place two years as to the lack of awareness. The awareness is now rising that money is starting to flow. There is tremendous competition for the dollar. It's really incumbent upon the fire service and law enforcement at the local level to really join hands in competing with the federal agencies for this money. What is happening, is that it is easier for the federal government to pass that money to federal agencies because they're close by. They have a better lobbying effort. They just gave \$10 million to the National Guard, an organization that isn't really tasked with this type of responsibility. But take that \$10 million and distribute that nationally and by the time it gets down to the over 30,000 fire agencies, it becomes very diluted. The struggle right now is focusing an appeal and lobbying effort so that law enforcement and fire service as first responders locally get a major portion of these available funds.

Deputy Director Ward asked Chief Bamattre that as a recipient of the Metropolitan Medical Strike Team, if that was of any value. Deputy Director Ward stated he kept hearing conflicting information. Chief Bamattre stated it was. They got this through the Public Health Services and some other funding only because there was a willingness on the part of the Los Angeles County area to do an inter-agency. They made a presentation similar to what the National Guard did, as a collective organization that was starting to respond to the issue in a larger area than at just a small level. This is one area they've been successful in getting. But the question raised by that as discussed this weekend is that you had the Marine Corps there doing a first responder haz mat team, Public Health Services, the National Guard, the FBI, and the Army. You now have all these agencies acting as first responders. We feel what the first step needs to be is an understanding. One of the proposals we have is to get a national policy on the response. Identifying levels of response, the timeframes, defining what levels of response are in realistic timeframes and working to get it. But the best efforts we've been able to have is when we marry law enforcement and fire in a large enough area that you can command at least some response at a federal level.

Deputy Director Ward stated that in Los Angeles County there is a terrorism task force that is one of the best he has ever seen that involves FBI, law enforcement, fire, and medical. They really have a good organization built up just for these very concerns. Our concern is that around the state we don't see many other inter-disciplinary type efforts like this. Because it is really going to require team work.

Chief Bamattre stated the key is going to be working with the FBI. The only clear thing that came out of this conference was that the FBI Special Agent in charge is going to be the focal point of accessing the federal agency for the response. Whether they're requested and when are they coming. We need to overcome some of the traditional resistance in working closely with the FBI. The FBI stood up there talking ICS. We're working real close with the FBI down in the Los Angeles area. But again, what we're looking to do is to include the whole county of Los Angeles, not individual jurisdictions. Then we can draw on an artery like both Los Angeles City and Los Angeles County have for haz mat teams, but also with Santa Fe Springs, Santa Monica, and Vernon. So we're looking to make sure that there is a seamless interface between those different agencies in the haz mat area.

Chief Coleman asked, based on the question raised by Chief Gary, if it would be desirable to do a mailing to all the members of the FIREScope Committee of the packet of all this information on the self-study guide so that people will know what we are talking about rather. Would this help raise the level of awareness? Chief Gary responded yes, this would surely help all of us.

Chief Gary went on to state that it would be a shame if we look back three years from now and see that we fragmented our way through this. We are able with the FIREScope

structure to task force and process a work plan through something. Do we want to set up a structure inter-agency group and have OES take the lead. We should do something to bring some chaos and some organization into it so that the larger agencies who are already into it can share with the regions. OES can extend the olive branch to law enforcement and say, hey we have to work together on this. Deputy Director Ward added that this was his larger goal. He didn't know if it should be this group and OES to do it, the State Board of Fire Services, or Cal Chiefs, or probably all of the above.

Chief Coleman stated that from the standpoint of the State Board of Fire Services, FIREScope has a stronger menu for that than the state board has. The state board is strictly internal to the fire service, whereas this board has the relationship with the other aspects of emergency response. Chief Coleman will put it on the agenda for the next board meeting for purposes of discussion. Chief Honeycutt stated that they did have this discussion at the state board primarily just for information purposes.

Deputy Director Ward stated that this is really a difficult issue to deal with. They've been wrestling with it as well. One of the things that they have done is establish a state standing committee on terrorism. It includes a lot of the major players. Chief Honeycutt is in it, and CDF was asked if they would be interested in becoming involved as well. We were also successful in getting the four Special Agents in charge of the FBI to come meet with us. The FBI is very forthcoming and very willing to work with locals nowadays. Some of the things we wanted to do was put out local government terrorism planning guidance, and we are in the process of doing that. That's not as specific as to what you are looking for, which is pretty much fire specific and first responder oriented. Deputy Director Ward was not quite sure what shape this should take, but he felt OES should absolutely be involved. And he would be very willing to become more involved so that we could all form some shape to Chief Gray's concept.

Deputy Chief Higuchi stated that he would sit on the committee on behalf of the Los Angeles County working group. Their training plan also consists of all the interest in health services and law. They now have a great working relationship with the FBI. Should a secondary device go off, who is going to take care of you? It's going to be local fire. For this reason, the FBI now feels that we should be part of the command post. As a matter of fact, Director Tim McMalley from the Los Angeles Office is now modeling what they've done and taken it back to Washington to disseminate to all their field offices emphasizing this is how it should occur. Deputy Director Ward stated that in dealing with Los Angeles City and Los Angeles County, they are miles ahead of everyone else in the state. It's really come together beautifully. He's never seen such cross disciplinary cooperation. So now they're trying to put together some model guidance that they can get out to other counties and cities to do something similar to what Los Angeles County and Los Angeles City have done. Although they are so much richer in resources there compared to some other parts of the state, they're almost self-contained by comparison. Chief Gary commented that maybe that model plan could be disseminated throughout the regions. Maybe the OES Regions would agree to host some meetings to do some education. He could see the nine bay area counties taking that model and say here is how we are going to make it work. Deputy Director Ward stated that Agent John Lightfoot of San Francisco is reaching out actively, so he will talk to them more again and try to coordinate more activities like that.

Deputy Chief Ghilarducci stated that at an operational level, you have to consider the potential impact of a biological weapon. The way we respond to haz mats from this point on needs to be a little bit different. How you place your equipment, how you address the situation has to be different today than it ever has been in the past based on the potential with regards to chemical and biological terrorism. We've been talking about policy and the

overall plan. But at the ground level, both the law enforcement and fire and even swat teams approaching these types of incidents can become contaminated or killed. And that's the one thing we need to be very concerned with and how our protocols address responding in the future.

Assistant Chief Zagaris stated that besides the self-study course, the National Fire Academy already has a sixteen-hour program about terrorism available to the fire service. They are also working on an operations class and a command class as well. Chief Honeycutt stated that the Fire Academy has three programs: the awareness which is a self-study guide, an incident command for terrorism that is patterned after a haz mat incident command, and basic tactics books so for those who respond to make them more aware that they are in an unusual situation and rearrange their tactics. Chief Coleman stated that the self-study course and the awareness short study course is now available but the other two are not yet finished. They will be put out through the informational network as soon as they become available. Chief Coleman went on to state that information like this is sent out to the fire chiefs every thirty to ninety days and, yet, there is still someone who does not get the information. He doesn't know how to reconcile this. If anyone has any ideas on how to fix this, please let Chief Coleman know. Chief Gary commented that it's good to hear that there is more talk going on about this now.

Deputy Director Ward stated that on the issue of funding, federal government agencies are competing for the money and very little of it is getting below federal government. BLT wants to push a single formula to everyone else throughout the country. There is the Department of Energy and the Department of Health Services. And now the National Guard and the FBI. I know Director Andrews has been working through the National Emergency Management Agency trying to break loose some of these funds. We may not see a lot of this money. It may take a lot of in-kind services and cooperation like they are doing in Los Angeles City and Los Angeles County, which is really the model.

Chief Bamattre stated that there is an organization down in Alabama that tracks extremist groups throughout the country. The biggest threat is the domestic extremist groups because most of them are racial isolationists. They tend to stay away from large metropolitan areas and locate in the smaller jurisdictions, which really puts a lot of the smaller agencies at tremendous risks. The list of these groups is truly amazing.

Chief Honeycutt stated that with the Board's permission, he would include this subject of terrorism as an agenda item for the next board meeting in order to keep the discussion going and to continue working on what's been done at the state level. Comment was made that maybe we should coordinate a group to bring some things together. Deputy Director Ward stated that maybe Chief Honeycutt could pull together a task group and begin to look at issues. Chief Honeycutt stated that is what he had in mind in order to bring it to the next board meeting. In this way, they can better put together all the loose pieces for more discussion at the next meeting. And also have Chief Coleman put together the information that is available and get that out to increase interest on this matter. Then through the OES Regions, have those meetings and have those discussions and keep the level of interest up.

Assistant Director Dougherty mentioned that at the last Op's Meeting they put together a terrorist working group with Deputy Chief Higuchi as the chair. We just need to refocus on it to get it off the ground. San Jose and San Francisco were charged to be involved, but they chose not to get involved. Perhaps Chief Gray's department would like to be involved. We should just refocus on this group to get it going instead of creating a new one. Deputy Chief Higuchi stated that they sent out a letter from Chief Freeman to San Diego City and San Jose and those Chiefs said that they were already too busy and that it was a low priority for them, and San Francisco never responded. They are waiting for

thirty days and then they will start proceeding. They are also developing a FOG Manual that is ICS pure relative to terrorist incidents.

Deputy Chief Higuchi went on to state that the Los Angeles area received a \$450,000 grant from Public Health to develop a MMST. They have determined that this amount of money will treat a minimum of 1,000 casualties. Chief Coleman suggested that we list all the resources that are out there now and pull them together instead of creating a new committee. Chief Coleman went on to state that from the standpoint of the National Fire Academy and the training system's point of view, he will put something together and come prepared to the next meeting with a complete overview of everything that is out there that they know and have access to that everyone else can access and put this out on the table.

Deputy Director Ward asked if Deputy Chief Higuchi could do an overview of what Los Angeles County and LOS ANGELES City are doing on the multi-disciplinary task force. This would give a perfect example to everyone here as to what they could take back to their own communities. Deputy Chief Higuchi stated that as an example, they are purchasing auto injectors, reachable position. There is only one sole source in the United States. So he could save a lot of fire departments a lot of time doing a lot of research because he has the letter of the sole source military, and there are only two things you have to do in order to get them. Deputy Director Ward stated that it would be helpful to get an FBI Agent here and perhaps Denny Bean or somebody down there who understands the law enforcement. Most of all, how they all relate to each other and integrate with each other, because this is really the key to all of this.

Chief Coleman stated that Mike Freeman is a member of the State Board of Fire Services. He proposed that maybe we should go to the different organizations that serve as the distribution network and have that same presentation made. As it was mentioned, there are a lot of people who don't know what the state of the art is or what the status is on a lot of the stuff. We don't need more committees to make more work, but we sure need to make people aware of what is available and pull together everything that we have. Chief Richards asked Chief Honeycutt to be sure to place this subject on the agenda for the next board meeting. Deputy Chief Higuchi stated he would like to be invited to the meeting to participate in this.

Chief Honeycutt asked Deputy Chief Pavusko to give his FIREScope/Administration Report. On March 21st the Stress Inventory was sent out. They have set up an Action Plan and those stress items that come in with new chief's names, addresses or phone numbers, will be entered into the database then sent out with a cover letter to the operational area or region for their information. They are working under the new Lotus Notes Program which is working out very well. They should have a directory completed by July 1st. On the FIREScope end, they are archiving historical documents starting from the inception of FIREScope so that there will be a library of all those documents, meetings, minutes, etc. This will continue throughout the rest of this year.

Chief Ghilarducci showed a videotape entitled *Surviving the Secondary Device* that he brought back with him from the conference he attended. It is by the Bureau of Justice Assistance and Georgia Emergency Management Agency. It is tied in with the Atlanta bombing and the secondary device which took place. The video is available free of charge to all departments by contacting the Bureau of Justice Assistance. There is a booklet that comes with the tape. Copies of the booklet will be given to everyone here today which has all the points of contact in it. Everyone will also receive a copy of The Hate Directory that lists all the hate groups in the country. This list is from the Internet, which concerns law enforcement because it should be treated as a confidential document.

The video was about the Sandy Springs, Georgia, birth control clinic incident. Emphasis was placed on changing ones way of thinking on how to handle bomb threats. We must protect first responders due to secondary device incidents. The video also talked about a secondary device found at an Atlanta nightclub. We've got to change the way we think and respond to an incident due to a secondary device in order to prevent first responders from becoming victims themselves. A cell phone or a radio can be used to set off a secondary device, so we need to think about changing how we communicate. If the media and their equipment are too close to the scene, they might also set off a secondary device. Extension of the boundaries can save lives due to the fact that debris from the bomb now can spread to a wider area than in the past. Recommend videotaping the scene and greater emphasis on accountability of staff and limited entry and exiting the scene as well. The key lessons learned in the Georgia bombing were: do a recon and look around; can you identify the injured; can you get in; can you get them out and not become victims yourselves.

Chief Ghilarducci asked that a lot of what we are hearing today be treated as confidential information and be handled as such. Chief Coleman stated that the State Fire Marshal Office operates an Arson Bomb Investigation Unit for the state and according to the recent statistics on bombs, California is the bomb capital of the world. You should also be contemplating protection of your communications facilities and administrative staff due to increased threats toward these areas. These areas should be a priority for protection from bomb threats. We have some training information for clerical personnel and making staff more aware of what to look out for regarding bombing incidents. Chief Coleman will distribute this information to the members of FIREScope.

Chief Costamagna stated that because of what he heard in the last four days at the conference, his major concern is that because of the Presidential Directive 39, FEMA, FBI, DOE, US Coast Guard, and the US Marine Corps, are all establishing haz mat teams, special response teams and they are all saying that they operate under the Incident Command System. Yet, when you speak to them about ICS, it is not even generic SEMS. Everybody has their own ICS and as much work as we've done in this state in making ICS standardized throughout the state and throughout the country, everybody is still not following the standard ICS. This should be a major concern of the FIREScope Committee because we will get resources that are self-dispatched and they will show up and set up their own command post, and will be there to help. But it will take a Type I Overhead Team to just manage the resources that will be coming to help you. This is definitely an issue we need to address when we talk about it at the next board meeting.

VIDEO PRESENTATION BY PAUL WARNER (Gary Costamagna/Paul Warner)

Paul Warner is an owner of a forest management company located in Vernon, California. During the drought season and during a lot of the complex fires, he rented out a lot of equipment which was used in fire control, mainly dozers and water tenders. During the course of these catastrophic fires, they became aware, especially in dozer operation, that a lot of times dozer groups were unsupported either by engines or hand crews or any kind of backup and saw a lot of good lines lost because of one little slopover or spot. So they started looking at ways to improve this situation.

One of the basic problems was getting any kind of water into really rugged terrain behind these dozer groups working out there. It became clear to them that they needed some type of vehicle with dozer capabilities as a transporter to carry large amounts of water. So they started looking around for what they could use as a carrier, and became aware that probably some kind of military application would be appropriate.

At that time, they had been talking to some surplus dealers and became aware of army personnel carriers that were used during the Korean War called M75's. They are probably the first track laying prototype APC that ended up in Vietnam. They are three-quarter inch armor plate steel powered by gasoline and cooled like a Volkswagon motor. These are no longer being used by the military and were brought back into the United States from NATO. The surplus dealer gave them one just because he had one hundred of them and had no idea what he was going to do with them.

They began retrofitting this vehicle and finished it. They encountered some problems based on weight and power plan, but went ahead and about the time they were concluding, he met a fellow from the BLM who said, I think the Army is building something just like what you are building. He stated that he had seen a tape of it. It was down in Fort Polk, Louisiana. He said he would get Mr. Warner a copy of the tape.

Mr. Warner found out that the Army was building a vehicle very similar to what they were doing, except that the Army had access to a little later armor model that they did. They used what is called an M548A1, which is an unarmored A113, a Vietnam vintage machine. But it's aluminum alloid. This machine was designed strictly to carry cargo. Basically, where the crew compartment was, there was a flatbed designed to carry 12,000 pounds of cargo. And an engineer who worked in the Public Works Department at Fort Polk had basically the same idea they did. He designed it to carry less water but equipped it with a cap system and some other bells and whistles. And when they saw that, they knew that using a 1950 vehicle as compared to an updated 1970 vehicle, that they should change directions.

But in order for civilians to access armor from the military, it's a very complicated process just because of the militias out there. The ATF doesn't want tanks coming out when they're coming in. We found out right away that the Army was not going to send us some of these. So with the help of Assemblyman Tom Woods and Steve Fitt from his office, they contacted the National Guard and formed a consortium. Additionally, some of the major forest land owners in California are getting very concerned about this urban, or the rural interface. Sierra Pacific, in particular, on 1.3 million acres in California now. During the Fountain Fire they lost about 40,000 acres in five hours, which was about a \$30 million loss for them. So they came on board stating that they would fund this program to retrofit a test vehicle to be evaluated in California. This is where they are right now and are in the process of moving these vehicles from Louisiana to California.

The first bit of the tape is about the vehicle that they developed and the second part is on the one that the military built at Fort Polk. Videotape is entitled M75 ATFV (all terrain fire vehicle) by Warner Enterprises.

Highlights of the video were: the vehicle has the ability to operate in all terrain, carry large amounts of water, and can function as an active fire fighting tool on its own. It is the first vehicle of its kind to combine the mobility of a dozer with the water capacity of an engine or water tender. It can reach speeds in excess of forty miles per hour forward and eleven miles per hour in reverse. Due to its rubber track pads, the M75 can cross or operate on paved roads as needed without damaging the road surface, unlike the dozer. It has the capacity to hold 2,000 gallons of water or foam which can be applied to a fire at approximately 300 gallons per minute.

The vehicle that the military built is called Fire Track. It moves at a speed of 30 miles per hours fully loaded. It is equipped with a V6 diesel engine, automatic transmission, track steering, and a radio intercom system. It has the capability to climb up to a sixty percent

incline. The 1,000 gallon water can be filled in four minutes. It produces 22,000 gallons of foam. It has the capability of spraying 130 feet in any direction. It has flame throwers on both sides of the vehicle.

Mr. Warner mentioned that the current status of the program is that there is a Memorandum of Understanding about ready to be signed by the California National Guard, Sierra Pacific Industries, his company, and the forest service. The agencies will agree to evaluate and test the vehicle in wildfire situations in California. Then based on that information, they'll see where the program goes.

There is almost an unlimited supply of these vehicles. There are approximately 2,500 in the United States. Currently, they are being hauled onto artillery ranges for hard targets and are destroyed that way or they are being pushed off the decks of an aircraft carrier as a fish habitat. The tax payers in 1970 dollars already have \$400,000 each invested in these vehicles. It costs about \$100,000 to retrofit one. Half that cost is the cap system. Fort Polk has built about six of these vehicles. Some for the Navy, some for other bases. Fort Polk is tooled up and pretty skilled in doing the initial retrofitting at a pretty reasonable rate. We have the money available to give to them to do the initial retrofitting and have not been able to do that. It's easier for the government to take money, but it's not easy to give it to them. We are hoping to get some Forest Service or CDF help in accomplishing that. No public money is involved at this point. Mr. Warner had a handout showing what the vehicle looked like before being retrofitted and then what they look like in a military configuration.

FEDERAL FIRE POLICY (Neil Honeycutt)

Chief Costamagna mentioned that there is a perception in the fire community that there are some major changes occurring in the Federal Fire Policy. Assistant Director Dougherty stated that the real emphasis behind the Federal Fire Policy was that there are five wildland agencies and they all had different internal regulations and rules about how they do business in a fire environment both fighting fire and fuel. The primary purpose of the document you received in your packet entitled *Federal Wildland Fire Management - Policy and Program Review* was to bring all those regulations or rules together so that we are all doing the same thing. You can look at the Interior Agency's rules versus the Forest Service Rules versus what was the proposed rules. The proposed rules are what we were going to do jointly as Interior and Agriculture to do things alike. This is the big emphasis behind this is getting the federal, the Interior agencies and the USDA wildland agencies to do things the same.

There is also a lot of information on prescribed fire, preparedness and safety and planning. There is only one element that is near and dear to everyone here and that is the urban interface issue. Everything else has to do with all the other activities we do in fire management together. It states that when we fight a structure fire, we're going to fight it within our training and experience level and we are basically only going to deal with structure fire from an exterior attack if we are in that position. It also states that in a major wildland fire operation, that the federal agencies do not bear the sole cost of operating an urban interface alone.

What is supposed to happen with this document is that it has to be taken back and put into manual direction for the different agencies. Each agency is to create a manual direction as to how to implement what it is stated in this document. The issue really needs to happen on the fire ground as it relates to determining who is responsible for what if it is in a multi-jurisdictional situation. One thing that the US Forest Service is emphasizing internally is

that our forests need to get together with their cooperators ahead of time so that they all know, plan, and predetermine how they are going to interact and operate together once they hit the fire ground so that they are not trying to create this once they arrive.

Chief Honeycutt stated that the reason it is on the agenda today is because a question came up three meeting ago that the actual Federal Fire Policy may, in fact, be blamed for more than it's due. This had a lot to do with policy issues. It originally came up as a discussion because they were told that during incidents like the Narrows and Mill Fires, that a procedural change in policy or philosophy had been noted. And it was to have a discussion at this Board to clarify how the Federal Fire Policy and the other federal agencies' individual policies and procedures impacted the relationship with local government through the cooperative agreement and to prepare the fire service for a change that is inevitable. We worked this through in the Five Party Agreement and there will be some other things that may come out of the policy that Assistant Director Dougherty alluded to as the US Forest Service goes further down the line. This Board really has not had the opportunity to have a full and complete discussion. Today, we are hoping to have a final discussion and answer any questions that anyone has relating to all the implications of the Federal Fire Policy on California local government.

Assistant Director Dougherty stated that some of the emphasis behind this was in the 1994 fire season. In that particular year, the federal agencies combined spent one billion dollars in fire suppression. Assistant Director Dougherty's agency spent \$700 million. That obviously woke up the Congress. And one of the things that came out of that was that they put together an inter-agency group of federal agencies to review the 1994 fire season.

One of the cost centers that came out of that review was the cost of structure protection and how much money the federal agencies spent in structure protection. As it turned out, the issue was far worse than other parts of the forest service outside California. For a long time the U.S. Forest Service has been in the business of doing cost share agreements and trying to figure out who was responsible for sharing that cost to some degree. As an example, they were just speaking with their partners from Forest Service Region IV which is Nevada, Utah and part of Idaho. They had one forest that spent \$50 million in 1994 on structure protection alone. They've never done anything like that here and spent that kind of money. So this really made an issue out of it from a national perspective. The emphasis really is that the rules haven't really changed for the U.S. Forest Service. The emphasis is paying when they should and not paying when they shouldn't. If there is a change, the change is to assure themselves that they are not paying when they shouldn't pay based on their responsibilities and their authority.

One other comment Assistant Director Dougherty made was that he has been aware that there have been a lot of chief organizations holding meetings discussing this issue without any federal participation. His agency's point of view is that if you are going to have these meetings and discuss this issue, Assistant Director Dougherty or his boss would be more than happy to attend and participate to help with that discussion.

Chief Costamagna commented that he felt the real issue was what Assistant Director Dougherty had stated earlier, that the forests are sitting down and talking to their neighbors and flushing the issue out at that level. It is Chief Costamagna's hope that this occurs very rapidly because of the upcoming fire season. You will have IC's in a unified command making some major decisions at the unified command level in the ordering of resources and whether those resources are being ordered through the mutual aid system or through the Five Party Agreement. What is the resource going to be used for?

Assistant Director Dougherty went on to state that this is a very complicated issue, and they are doing their best to educate their own folks. But it's not a simple task. They have an agreement that they call a Four Party Agreement as everyone knows which is the federal agency's relationship with CDF. They have a change in protection responsibility they call DPA Rules for Protection Areas where the state protects some federal lands and they protect some state lands. They have just gone through a whole review of that process. It will now be better for them because of the fact that certain areas heavy with structures, CDF took back and areas that were more of a wilderness characteristic they took.

There are still some areas from an efficiency perspective that they still protect on behalf of CDF that have structures. So they have that relationship that they have to deal with. And within their current regulations, it is written that they will not take on a wildland fire protection responsibility that has structures on it for another jurisdiction that does not have a structure protection department. This can be a volunteer group, but they must have something available. As they've gone through this review, they found places in the state and places within the national forest that there is no fire protection in that area, and they are working through that. There is no easy answer. They have an issue where the state is acting on behalf of the U.S. Forest Service and the U.S. Forest Service is acting on the state's behalf that changes events a little bit to meet what they would do on those grounds. But nevertheless, as a wildland agency they never have the responsibility for the structures, not to say they don't have the responsibility from preventing the wild fire from getting into the structures.

Question was asked was not the discussion of the last two meetings having to do with how reimbursement was going to come. There was a fear that somehow sending northern resources south may not be reimbursed. For some cities this is a major issue. They cannot go beyond the minimum protocols. Was this issue taken off the table? Clarification was requested.

Assistant Director Dougherty responded that this is part of the confusion part. If Assistant Director Dougherty's agency is ordering resources for structure protection purposes or to assist with perimeter control because they feel perimeter control is a major component of structure protection, they will pay for that. Now conversely, if the U.S. Forest Service as the unified command orders resources that they feel is adequate to meet the needs of the incident, and there is a fire protection district who wants more for whatever political reasons they have, then they have every right to order them. But the U.S. Forest Service is not going to pay for them. So the question comes in then, you can have resources that have been ordered out of two different systems. They can be ordered by the Forest Service under the Five Party Agreement, and they will pay for them. They can be ordered through the same dispatch center because they're utilizing the unified ordering form, but they are really being ordered for the needs of that fire protection district or that city fire department and the U.S. Forest Service is not going to pay for them.

It is very important to know how you have been ordered so that when you send a resource, you know if you are or are not going to be reimbursed. This is why when Assistant Director Dougherty talked about the Five Party Agreement earlier, he requested that OES be another checkpoint. Chief Honeycutt's issue was, as a coordinator of mutual aid for the State of California, that when those requests come in, it is imperative that the local fire chief know that it is either a Five Party request or a Mutual Aid request. And the concern is when we are deep in the fire season and it's the third, fourth or sixth fire, when we get a request from far away for "mutual aid for structure protection" in a community that is being threatened by a wildland fire or a forest fire, this is where the U.S. Forest Service gets into problems. One, identifying and getting the order clearly placed. Who is requesting the order, what type of order it is, getting that to local government and letting them make a

decision as to whether or not they will respond and then getting that information back to the incident as to who are the responders and where are they coming from.

Up to two years ago, if the order had an F or a U on it, it was a five party request and we processed it without hesitation. Obviously this has changed. The system works from the bottom up. OES is not normally involved in it immediately. Going from the unified ordering point to the operational area, then to region and then to the state. So we need to make sure that everybody in the whole system understands that and asks those questions.

Assistant Director Dougherty added that on the other side, if the order is either a CDF Ordering Number or a US Forest Service Ordering Number, the way the unified ordering point process is laid out is that the order number has a three-letter identifier for the fire department where the fire started, and it stays that way through the entire incident. So the fire could have actually started on your jurisdiction, immediately left and went to the CDF or the forest service where the bulk of the money is going to be spent, and if you use the assumption that your fire department is paying for all of this stuff, when, in fact, the state or the feds are really paying for it. It would eliminate unified order if we did that, which is the concern. We definitely do not want to do that. A concern was made that there may be a time where no one will want to go. We need to be sure that this issue is very clear to everyone. The concern should not be who is going to pay for what when one is called upon to assist.

Another thing is that when an incident is declared a disaster, then FEMA becomes involved and this changes everything. Under the Mutual Aid System, you cannot be released from one incident into another. When you are released from an incident, you are released to home. The Five Party Agreement is a way to reimburse for mutual aid response for these large disasters. This is what it was developed for. It was not developed for paying for engines, it's not assistance by hire. It's a way to get the money back quicker than going through the disaster declaration which was what we had until 1987. We have minimum requirements for hire under the Five Party Agreement which is different under mutual aid. Those at the unified command level need to understand how reimbursement will occur depending on how resources were ordered, either by mutual aid or Five Party Agreement or assistance by hire.

OPERATIONS TEAM REPORT (Mike Dougherty)

The Op's Team and the Task Force was asked to develop a guide to assist everyone regarding these same issues on the Federal Fire Policy. They came up with a document called the *Users Guide to Mutual Aid Agreements, Disaster Declarations and Assistance for Hire*, which contains examples and scenarios. The document is not yet ready to be distributed. It needs further review by CDF and OES. The document should be ready by the next Board Meeting. Question was asked since this document is not yet ready for distribution for this upcoming fire season, what do we do to get the word out throughout the state that if you are asked for resources during this fire season, it may not be all reimbursable. How do we get that word out to all the local fire chiefs and ranger units. Response was made that maybe we should go with what Deputy Chief Higuchi has and give that to OES to distribute to all regional coordinators with a statement stating, "you may or may not be paid because of these conditions," "here are the things that the regional coordinators were asked to pass on to you".

Chief Simmons stated that there is a tape by Jonathan Winters that explains what it takes for declared disasters and reimbursements through that master mutual aid. This may be a good item to distribute as well.

Chief Honeycutt stated that he will take the information that Deputy Chief Higuchi has and distribute it at all the region meetings that are coming up in May. They will do a mass mailing of about 1,000 letters or more, but there will still be that ten percent who will continue to have problems with this issue. All they can do is keep getting the information out through the regional coordinators.

Chief Gary stated that the problem may not be within the fire service, but within the city managers who have not been informed or educated on the master mutual aid system. Every county has a monthly City Managers Association Meeting where an area coordinator could attend and brief them about the Master Mutual Aid System. We could have the City Managers Department League put it out via the newsletter to all the city managers in the state. The next league meeting is coming up in Anaheim in the Fall.

Chief Costamagna called for a motion. Motion was made by Chief Gary that when the user friendly mutual aid guide that the Op's Team and Task Force is working on becomes available for public distribution, that the region coordinators make an effort to get it to the area coordinators to the local city and county by the city, county managers meetings. Chief Gary will also ask the league to put it in a mailing through the city managers department newsletter and as a separate component, if the Board feels it is important enough, ask the league to dock this for their seminar in Anaheim this Fall. Second was made by Chief Sporleder. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

As mentioned earlier the Op's Team has a terrorism working group that is headed by Deputy Chief Higuchi. Since the last Board Meeting, the Op's Team has been working through a conference call process and the high rise OSD is almost completed. The concerns between Orange County and Los Angeles County have been worked out. It will soon be presented to the Board. The site safety plan is done and approved by the Op's Team, but is still under review since there is an issue relating to terrorism. The site safety plan was developed to meet federal and state law guidelines, which goes along with the system safety officer for haz mat who needs to sign off. As previously mentioned, the users guide for mutual aid which is in the development stages, should be completed very soon.

Chief Honeycutt asked Assistant Director Dougherty to talk about the 1993 FIRESCOPE After Action which were ten items that were developed. This document has now been retired. They reported on what has been accomplished with it in items they thought they could still get some work done or molded into the Strategic and the Work Plan for the Task Force. The S430 test courses have been completed and gone through it's test. It will be put into Document Control and made available for utilization. This was done through the State Fire Marshal Office and members of this group.

Also, Chris Wurzell is working on a Damage Assessment Format Report. This group was put together to come up with a standardized process for damage assessment statewide. Chief Anderson stated that North Op's will be having a meeting in Davis on May 28th. Also, the Cal Rural Conference will be held in Chico on the 14th through the 16th of next month and hope some of you can attend that. Assistant Chief Cooney has been working on Public Information and he stated that they had their first meeting a few weeks ago in Redding. The group consists of CDF, US Forest Service, BLM, NPS, City of Redding, City of Sacramento, City of Chico, City of Oakland, and North Lake Tahoe FPD.

Chief Costamagna asked about the Calabasas recommendations. Chief Freeman had requested of Chief Honeycutt that the Op's Team give a status update on the Calabasas

recommendations. There were about ten or thirteen of them. Deputy Chief Higuchi stated that there were 56 original recommendations of which ten or thirteen were submitted by Chief Freeman to the Board for possible consideration for statewide adoption and looked at the common denominator such as certs and quals that qualified you. It was a statewide issue, not just a local issue. Chief Costamagna stated that they were different from the original ten that the Board brainstormed in Riverside. The original ten were priorities for the Board. The Calabasas Report that Chief Freeman gave asked the Board to adopt ten of the recommendations of the After Action Report. Chief Honeycutt and Assistant Director Dougherty will research the minutes of the Board Meetings and report on it at the next Board Meeting.

DEMONSTRATION OF RIMS (Troy Armstrong)

Chief Honeycutt introduced Troy Armstrong, the RIMS Program Manager for OES. The Response Information Management System was created to assist local government throughout the state to provide them with resources and a way to manage large scale disasters. We currently have the Lotus Notes, Dates System connected to all 58 county emergency operation centers, twenty state agencies and ten federal agencies. During the last floods the system was used to connect an average of forty different agencies at any given time.

This system was designed from the OES state operation center, regional operational center, relating down to the operational areas. As the system has been developed, they've gotten a lot of requests from city and county governments to see if they could develop something that would help them manage individual resources because this is what they worry about. The state operation center worries about a state agency is providing the assistance that an operational area needs. The operational area worries about individual resources. So they started working on applications that would assist agencies to track individual resources.

The other task they were assigned on behalf of the fire community was the PRIME System that is run out of Riverside which is used to distribute information, basically ICS 209 Form Reports from large wildland fires and wildland arson reports. This system is about ten years old. So the OES Information Technology Branch was asked to design an application that would do the same things the PRIME System could with the only difference being that we put it on the Internet. So that the only thing receiving agencies would need is access to the Internet and Netscape or Internet Explorer, which costs about \$8 per month to use. The product is just about finished, and is in the final testing stage.

In this system, it will show all the 209's that have been filled out. You can go in and read them, create them, modify them, and constantly update them. It keeps a record of all ICS 209's in the system. Same thing with all the other reports. The RIMS System automatically transfers to the Internet. They are completely interactive with each other. There is no manual conversion that needs to take place.

Question was asked about the ability to archive. Applications were developed to provide this capability. All you need is a modem to access this system. This system does work with satellite cellular phones which costs about \$500 to \$600. All a fire department needs to access this system is a computer, modem phone line, and an Internet service provider. The Internet service provider costs about \$8 per month to use. This is all they would need. Everything else is handled by the OES Information Technology Branch. There are fourteen servers throughout the state. If you want to connect directly into their server, you would need to have an \$89 copy of Lotus Notes, otherwise you can connect through the Internet via satellite.

Question was asked if there is a connection with the Arson Information System. Answer was not at this time, but it can be done. It only takes about three weeks to add a new program. They can add new information as requested if necessary. You can do resource tracking if you desire. They are currently working on a GIS mapping integration application as well.

STATE FIRE MARSHAL'S REPORT (Ronny J. Coleman)

Certs and Quals Update: At the last State Board of Fire Services Meeting they were advised that this topic was under discussion and that the Board would be developing some information with respect to the statewide training advisory committee. This topic was not discussed at this State Board of Fire Services Meeting and has been put on the agenda for the May 5th Meeting for further discussion.

Second item is the Master Calendar of Events. They are trying to keep everyone aware of all the meetings being held on a statewide basis in order to avoid scheduling conflicts if it can be helped. State Fire Marshal Coleman requested that if you have something you would like to put on the calendar, all you have to do is send his office a fax or a note and it will be put on the master calendar in the office.

Another item is something that they do every four years, which is called the California Fire Census. This was originally done through the State Board of Fire Services. State Fire Marshal Coleman has frequently been contacted by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research to answer questions about the fire community in California; such as how many fire departments are there, how many districts are there, how big are they, how many fire fighters are there in Southern California, etc. State Fire Marshal Coleman recently held a meeting with the Chancellor's Office of the California Community College and talked about growth in the community college system having to do with what money is going to be set aside for fire protection. And they asked a lot of similar questions like where are the firefighters, what ranks are they and where are they distributed.

This is the first version of the census that you are receiving today. You notice it says FIRESCOPE Committee Meeting and is listed as yellow, because they will be communicating with a variety of special interest groups in the state. Everyone who is listed will be approached. As you look at the questionnaire there are only two kinds of answers they are looking for. Yes or no and numbers.

When the census is completed there is a program that develops a pure report. This means it goes through and analyzes fire departments by size, like metro fire department or volunteer fire department. They develop output reports like how many are in the haz mat business, how many are in the EMS business, how many do this and how many do that, etc. State Fire Marshal Coleman went on to state that anyone who participates in this program has the right to ask them to do special studies. They have completed about fifteen to twenty studies so far. The questions cannot be changed because the program has been written to support this.

State Fire Marshal Coleman's purpose of bringing this census here today is to specifically request of those that represent departments here as a member of FIRESCOPE, get their input into this process. This is the third time this has been done. The first time it was done, they received ninety-one percent of the California fire community. The second time they did it, they got ninety-three percent of the California fire community. State Fire Marshal Coleman's objective is to retain at least ninety percent. The data being generated out of this is very useful for other agencies and types. The plan is to send this out to very

specific people that represent leadership roles in the California fire community. The census will be mailed out in May in order to allow them to produce the completed report by the end of June or first week in July.

State Fire Marshal Coleman wanted to emphasize the role of the Internet. They are now posting a lot of their information on the Internet so that people can access it. When State Fire Marshal Coleman attends various meetings, he keeps hearing how someone was not informed about something. The other thing is that they will continue with the mailings that go out to individual fire chiefs. Any suggestions on improving getting the word out to everyone is most welcome.

For information purposes, twelve fire departments in this state protect fifty percent of the total percent of the population and nine of them are members of this Board. Twelve counties in the whole state spend eighty percent of the total amount of money on fire protection in this state and nine of those counties are members of this Board. This is the reason State Fire Marshal Coleman brought this to FIREScope, because they are a significant part of the database. This census goes to FIREScope first, then it goes to State Board second, and then to the respective organizations that are on the list and then it goes out to the general membership mailing.

TASK FORCE REPORT (George Ewan)

In regards to haz mat, the specialist group that developed the site safety plan tried to develop something that was all-risk and they found out that other than creating a very large document or a numerous page document that you would need to fill out, they felt it was unwise to do that. That is why they dropped back and developed the 208 HM for haz mat, dealing with everyday hazardous material problems. Not anything in catastrophic proportions; such as terrorism, biological or nuclear or anything like that. This particular form addresses haz mat everyday, meets the intent of OSHA so we are legal when we do things. It does not address confined space. They made this form for a one-engine fire department through major cities for hazardous materials. If the Board wants us to look at catastrophic, they can reconvene the specialist group and start building site safety plans for different types of responses. The recommendation of the Task Force is to approve the document as is. Chief Honeycutt stated that this ICS 208 HM Form is included in all the National Fire Academy's programs and meets the minimum requirement for all the haz mat curriculum.

With the high rise, there were some comments from the conference call in March that systems and lobby which have been ironed out. The Task Force is working to get changes made that were agreed upon. They went back to the specialist group and those agencies that had major concerns and spoke to them and are incorporating those changes that were agreed upon. They are adding some emphasis to elevator and stairwell safety support into rapid intervention crews. It was not in there before, but it is in there now. They hope to have it to the Joint Op's Teams by July for approval.

On the ICS curriculum, it was also reported that the Task Force at their last meeting in March received a copy of the S430 All Risk Type Training for the Operations Section Chief. There were quite a few agencies who participated in it along with a group of subject matter experts that did a test course and provided input. There was a lot of good feedback about the course. The changes have been made. It fills a three by three binder and it has a video to intro. the scenarios. The Task Force is looking at it and will recommend approval to the Op's Team. Copies can be provided for those who like one to preview.

The Task Force is also starting to look at the Division/Group Supervisor and the Task Force/Strike Team Leader. These are the next two they are going to look into. They are in the process of collecting subject matter experts to help do the rewrite, update and include all risk aspects for these two subjects.

The last thing to report on is the Public Information Education, North which has already been discussed.

Question was asked by Chief Sporleder in regards to rapid intervention "crews" or rapid intervention "teams", is there going to be an attempt to have a uniform designator for that? They are building that into their county mutual aid plan. Chief Honeycutt responded that rapid intervention crew under ICS is not a "team" unless you are a strike team, so your proper designation for rapid intervention would be a crew, either an assembled crew or as an engine company or truck company. That terminology was consistent with NFPA and 1500 Federal OSHA. The correct ICS terminology is rapid intervention "crew" which is being used nationally and is also being used by the National Incident Management System Consortium. The Specialist Group discussed this and the correct terminology is "RIC" rapid intervention crew that is used nationally. Chief Honeycutt saw it written on some training material as rapid intervention team "RIT". We need to start correcting the terminology by using a common language in all the material for the Fire Marshall and all the training information that is published. Also the training information that is published by IFC. Chief Honeycutt recently received information on the two-in, two-out rule and the reference there was rapid intervention "teams". Chief Costamagna suggested that maybe a letter needs to be written to a few organizations clarifying that the correct terminology is "crew".

Motion was made by Deputy Chief Higuchi to have the Task Force Specialist Group confirm the correct terminology of rapid intervention "crew" as opposed to rapid intervention "team". Second by Chief Sporleder. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Chief Honeycutt suggested that the Task Force Specialist Group be sure that this be included in the glossary and then look at what defines it; such as Type One or Type Two. Chief Costamagna went on to state that there is a lot of documentation coming out Federal OSHA and International Association of Fire Chiefs (IAFC) where they are calling them rapid intervention teams. This could continue to infiltrate the system while we would be the only ones attempting to maintain standards in FIREScope terminology. Chief Honeycutt will draft a letter for Chief Costamagna's signature on behalf of the FIREScope Board of Directors that will be sent out to the fire service organizations; such as the IAFC and IFF and the National Fire Academy informing them of the correction terminology that should be used.

CORRESPONDENCE (Neil Honeycutt)

In the packet everyone received today, for your information only, there is a letter from the City of Hesperia Fire Protection District from Chief Latipow wherein this is the issue that when a order is placed (this was during the Narrows Fire) that somewhere along the ordering process, the request with the three-letter identifier which indicated local responsibility was lost and some of the resources that wound up on the incident were used in a way that was different than what was first perceived. Chief Latipow sent a packet of 214's and other documents from the incident to demonstrate that people were used on the fire in a way that was different than was perceived. This points out why it is important to get this information out to every fire chief and through all the ordering system process as quickly as possible. This is just for informational purposes only.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

Question by Deputy Director Owen, do we have anything that summarizes the difference between law enforcement ICS and ICS? Who's going to operate and under what incidents with law enforcement ICS if there is significant differences and what incidents will operate under ICS? Response by Deputy Director Ward was that this is basically a SEMS maintenance issue. If you look at SEMS there is a fire ICS which is generally utilized everywhere the same way. In the evolution of SEMS, we figure the next big kid on the block is law enforcement. So a committee was pulled together to look at ICS for law enforcement.

State Fire Marshal Coleman has some of the books that have come out of the committee. They noted that there were two or three models of ICS in law enforcement throughout the state of California. In reality, most of law enforcement does not use ICS at all. Their first effort was to come together with one system for law enforcement and this is what it represents. And it is noted in there very clearly that there are small differences between the generic fire ICS and law enforcement ICS. They took it through the SEMS maintenance system and went to the technical committee, it went to the SEMS Advisory Board and they approved it.

At the next law enforcement ICS committee meeting they will be discussing how can they train law enforcement to use this? They don't come together frequently like fire does in large groups, so they have to look for opportunities to get the word out for training that this is the generic model for law enforcement ICS at this time. The differences are stated in the document. Assistant Director Dougherty will ask the Task Force to look at what the differences are just for informational purposes only more for educational purposes.

State Fire Marshal Coleman has the draft copy. The final copy will be coming out of print in about three weeks and will be sent out the fire service in order that everyone will be made aware what it looks like. There is no reason that fire cannot coordinate with law enforcement utilizing these systems. Deputy Director Ward encouraged fire services to work with their local police department and county sheriffs to be sure they understand the ICS law enforcement.

Chief Bamattre expressed his personal appreciation to everyone and as well as on behalf of the department for the tremendous support they received and the outpouring of sympathy and resources due to the deaths of the four fire fighters that the Los Angeles City Fire Department suffered in March. It was extremely supportive for his department and a real testimony as to the unity in the fire service. At the second funeral they had, there were 214 RSVP's for apparatus at the service itself. More than that just came. His department is making it a point to get all the thank you's out to everyone as quickly as possible.

OES REGIONAL COORDINATORS REPORTS

Region I: Nothing to report by Deputy Chief Higuchi. Chief Honeycutt asked that he be contacted so that he can coordinate the dates in order to structure an agenda for all six regions so they can talk about the same things in addition to items Chief Newman would like on his agenda.

Region II: Assistant Chief Marquis reported for Chief Newman that no major problems to report regarding El Nino. Most of the activity never got out of county most of it due to quite a bit of preparation on the part of operational areas. As a result, there was a lot of in-county mutual aid through the region. There were a few swift water movements. The Oakland swift water component of their task force was sent to San Mateo, Santa Cruz and to Marin County in support of a power incident up there. Some of text specs were utilized from the new Type I US&R Team in Marin County to help with some of the US&R evaluation needs in the Rio Nido landslide incident. Moved some state resources, primarily some pumps and HT facets. Other than that, not a lot of activity. One additional comment regarding the Rio Nido incident and the integration of ICS law enforcement, the CDF shore team was working in conjunction with local government and the sheriff's office and exchanging positions in the command structure there and it was a very smooth operation. The law is a great cooperater in that county.

Their region meeting is coming up. Their plan is to make it a two-day workshop to refresh the operational area coordinators and perhaps the dispatch supervisors if possible on the nuts and bolts of the system. Chief Newman would like to do an EOC REOC SOC orientation class in order to clarify some questions that are currently being asked regarding how the fire system stands alone from the disaster response system and how to better coordinate between the REOC and SOC level in order to do a better job at the county EOC's. Deputy Director Ward commented that the out of the SEMS maintenance system, they are putting a mission tasking specialist committee basically to clarify these issues. One area of clarification needed is on the way the fire service orders resources versus the way OES assigns missions which are much more generic and broad. Deputy Director Ward will get together with Assistant Chief Marquis to share the information he has so that everyone can benefit from the same information.

Also at the regional level, the ECC was moved last month from Sonoma to Saint Helena. Steve Grafino did a very nice job there. They set up a mobile communications center as a backup for the move. The 911 lines were moved over, but there were no problems there. Chief Honeycutt commented that over 600,000 PGE customers were at risk, the sub-station in St. Ignacio, OES tasked CDF to send about ten or twenty crews to build a wall around a PGE sub-station. It was a major operation under bad weather conditions, but the mission was accomplished. It was an interesting job. Over 600,000 Northern California customers were at risk of losing every bit of power they had. The sub-station was under water and CDF was tasked with building a dike basically under water around that facility.

Region III: Chief Wiest made an additional comment to what Deputy Director Ward stated regarding training that this issue had come up from the floods of last year which had to do with the working process that needs some clarification. In regards to El Nino, they had one CDF incident management team that was at Tehema at a mobilization center that had been set up there. They had a two mobile kitchen units, two mobile communications centers, they had 52 fire crews, and 102 overhead and a total of 1,038 personnel assigned for Region III. With everything combined with Region II and Region III there was an excess of 1,500 people assigned. As far as expenditures, CDF extended through the mutual aid requests received through OES, \$3.2 million. Some of that will be reimbursable due to the Declarations from FEMA.

The next Region III Meeting is scheduled for May 1st at the joint CDF and USFS facility with the agenda already completed and Chief Honeycutt informed.

Region IV: Chief Weston reported that the next Region IV Meeting is set for May 8th at the El Dorado Hills Fire Department. All joining regions have been invited to attend the

barbecue being put on by the El Dorado fire fighters at \$10 per person. Please let Chief Weston know if you are interested in attending.

There were a couple of operational changes in Amador County and Sacramento County. In regards to the Williams Fire, the fire payment had left OES December 12th but has not been paid yet, so the Director of OES and the Director of CDF along with some legislatures will be receiving a letter requesting payment from that operational area.

Region V: Chief Turner reported on behalf of Chief Gilbert that in regards to El Nino, there was some flooding on Highway 99. Their annual May meeting has been scheduled for May 18th in Visalia.

Region VI: Chief Harris reported that they were mostly supplying resources to the other regions due to El Nino incidents. As notification, the San Bernardino Area Coordinator has changed jobs, but is still the Area Coordinator. Chief Martines will be contacting Chief Honeycutt to schedule their region meeting. Also, they have completed their dispatch level training in all their area coordination points. As previously mentioned, it is a very good lesson plan and encourages everyone to take a look at it. It's primary focus is on the new concepts on mutual aid and how that applies to the dispatch level along with issues on the federal fire policy and what dispatch centers need to track. Chief Honeycutt requested a clean copy of the lesson plan so that he can share it with the other regions.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting has been scheduled for July 8th in Sacramento. Location to be announced.

ADJOURNMENT

Chief Costamagna requested a moment of silence before the meeting was adjourned in honor of those fire fighters that were lost to the Los Angeles City Fire Department.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m. by Chief Costamagna.