



# FIRESCOPE

## CAL EMA FIRE AND RESCUE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### FIRESCOPE BOARD OF DIRECTORS



California Emergency Management Agency  
3650 Schriever Avenue  
Mather, CA 95655

January 11, 2012

### **Members Present**

Bob Roper – Chairperson FIRESCOPE BoD, Ventura County Fire  
Kim Zagaris – Fire and Rescue, Cal EMA  
Mike Dyer – Santa Barbara County Fire Department  
Richard Webb – Linda Fire Protection District  
Sheldon Gilbert – Fire and Rescue Region II, Cal EMA  
Joseph C. Millar – Fire and Aviation Management, USDA Forest Service  
Daryl Osby – Los Angeles County Fire Department  
Keith Richter – Orange County Fire Authority  
Chuck Knapp – California State Firefighters Association  
Tonya Hoover – State Fire Marshal  
Ralph Domanski – Deputy Chief of FIRESCOPE, Cal EMA  
Dale Hutchinson – Fire and Rescue Region VI, Cal EMA  
Sue Husari – National Park Service  
Bill Holmes – Representing Doug Wenham, Fire and Rescue Region III, Cal EMA  
Keith Larkin – Fire and Rescue Region V, Cal EMA  
Mario Rueda – Los Angeles City Fire Department  
Mark D'Ambrogi – Region IV Coordinator / Auburn City Fire Department  
Mike Miller – Representing Nick Dunn, Kern County Fire Department  
Bill Metcalf – North County Fire Protection District  
Jim Wilson – Mariposa County Fire Department, Volunteer Fire Departments  
John Winder – Representing Ken Pimlott) CALFIRE  
Denise Blankenship – Representing Paul Bannister, Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Dept of Interior

### **Guests Present**

Jim Middleton – Mariposa County Fire Department  
Charles Butler – Los Angeles Fire Department  
Mark Lorensen – Ventura County Fire Department  
Mike Richwine – CAL FIRE  
Mike Dayton – Secretary, Cal EMA  
Brendan Murphy – Undersecretary, Cal EMA  
Steve Sellers – Assistant Secretary, Cal EMA  
Chad Stokes – Fire and Rescue, Cal EMA  
Bob Wyman – Deputy Chief of Administration, Fire and Rescue, Cal EMA  
Lori Lopez – Emergency Services Coordinator, Fire and Rescue, Cal EMA  
Lorenzo Gigliotti – Deputy Chief of Special Operations, Fire and Rescue, Cal EMA  
Gary Humphrey – Region IV Assistant Chief, Fire and Rescue, Cal EMA  
Auburn Diede – Fire and Rescue, Cal EMA

## **Welcome, Introductions, Logistics \*\*\* Meeting Starts 1005 \*\*\***

1. Chief Roper introduces himself and welcomes the Board members and guests to the FIRESCOPE BOD Meeting. Explains some members will be late because of flight delays. BOD members introduce themselves.

## **Approval of October 12, 2011 Minutes**

**Action Item – Motioned to approve the October 12, 2011 FIRESCOPE Meeting Minutes.**  
**Motion seconded. None opposed. Motion approved.**

## **CAL FIRE / SFM Update**

Hutchinson mentions that Chief Pimlott and Chief McMurray are in Texas for the National State Forest Meeting.

### **11/12 Budget**

1. Hutchinson explains that CAL FIRE's budget is going to be part of a potential reduction if the revenues projected don't come in. We could suffer an additional 60 million dollar reduction to our budget. We have already taken over the last two fiscal budgets an almost 80 million dollar reduction. If we are part of this additional 60 million dollar reduction it going to have a significant impact to our ability as a department to provide good quality initial attack coverage. This would impact ground resources and air resources. We are working through our internal systems using risk base analysis to figure out what we will have to reduce if need be.

### **Board of Forestry SRA FEE Meeting**

1. Hutchinson: Meeting is being held right now in Sacramento. They will be discussing several items including the SRA fee. They are reviewing the emergency regulation for SRA fee implementation. It already went through the board once; it went to the Office of Administrative Law which is required to make sure it meets all of the legal parameters. It was then moved back to the BOF for revamping; now it is back in today to vote on. The main issue they had to clean up was some of the items surrounding additional structures on one parcel and also some of the impacts of governmental type buildings on SRA and the application fee.

### **CAL FIRE Operation**

1. Hutchinson: We had enough rain to reduce to winter preparedness levels in the North and South part of the State, but since the middle December we haven't had any significant rainfall especially in the Southern region, we are already having fires kick back up, we are having to do additional staffing patterns. We are geared up for winter preparedness but we are having to add additional resources, put aircraft back on, etc. to deal with this dryness. Then there were wind issues in the North. We are concerned about all this but we do have the ability to ramp up or down.
2. Holmes agrees: We are having a budget season and a winter fire season going on.
3. Hutchinson: We have had a lot of interest in which areas have burning restrictions and which don't. You can go to the CAL FIRE website to get this information.
4. Zagaris: We all need to communicate as events happen so that resources are ready to go when somebody has a need, because since we are not in full staffing pattern like we normally are we are all leaning on each other to assist.
5. Holmes agrees: We are using our local and federal partners to help suppress these fires. We are all working together to meet the needs.

### **SFM Update**

1. Hoover: In the budget reduction that CAL FIRE had, there are two areas that OSFM took a small reduction. First, had to eliminate a position within the AVI program, in which we are in the process of

standing up AVI again. The second is, we lost an Assistant Chiefs position in Law Enforcement. We have done some internal reorganization so I don't think it will be a drastic hit on OSFM.

2. Hoover: West Wide Risk will be out in April. With SRA hearing, if we can get an update at the next meeting since it will be released so that we can look from the California stand point.
3. Hoover: Looking to offer up a presentation to Cal MAC. This is going to be a great tool for CAL FIRE but could also be accessible to our local government partners. Once we get up and operating on it, we will be happy to share that information.
4. Hoover: NFPA news, they are giving away free money if you sit on a technical committee representing an enforcer, then they will fund 80% of your travel for your technical committee meeting. You fill out their form, send it in and they will get back to you letting you know that they will fund a large portion of your travel.
5. Hoover: State Board of Fire Services did have a meeting scheduled to meet in February but there were a couple of big ticket items that didn't come through so the meeting is pushed back for some time in March so there will be something for the next FIRESCOPE meeting.

## **Cal EMA Secretary's Report**

1. Dayton: There are two major components that may impact Cal EMA. The first is basically relocation for CSTI. Our thinking behind this is that we would like to co-locate the HazMat training and fire JPA's around the state. We would also like to move the Officer Safety Training law enforcement side to our local law enforcement partners across the state. We think this will move training closer to where training is needed. Unfortunately this will impact 20 of the 29 people though. Nine people will be moved up here and seven of those nine will be instructors focused on training state agencies and local emergency management.
2. Dayton: You may here that there is a new FEMA requirement on EMPG that you take 11 courses on independent study, so we are going to mirror the independent study that is now required by FEMA along with the training that you would take to get the CSTI emergency management certificate, merge those and make it easier to get the certificate in California.
3. Dayton: Because of moves within the agency throughout the State including K Street to Mather, and other efficiencies we are still able to buy fire engines this year using federal funds.
4. Dayton: I have been meeting with staff and letting them know that what we are really going to focus on in the year ahead is the catastrophic plans, (Southern Ca. plan, Bay Area plan, etc.) This is all going to go with the State Emergency Plan.
5. Dayton: Governor's proposal also has a few realignments; it overall reduces the agencies from 12 to 10.
6. Dayton: want to clarify that it has been spoken for me that I am in full support of EMSA going to Public Health, this is not true.
7. Dayton: Regarding the Assistance Firefighter's Grant Program; I had the opportunity to testify before Chairman Denton's committee, I pointed out that our chair of AFG grants is at 4%, this is an unacceptable level, so I would like to get your help on anything we can do to get a greater share.
8. Dayton: RIMS replacement; We have a new contract with ESRI In terms of resource management and tracking this is going to take us to a whole new age. Sellers is going to be looking into upgrading the SOC.
9. Dayton: CDAA; Have not been able to get/provide California Disaster Assistance Act funding after a disaster this year regardless of the magnitude or severity of the event. This may be the case going forward; we were 164 million dollars in the hole and now we are up to 186 million dollars.

Questions:

10. Hoover: Regarding the emergency water supply after an earthquake, OSFM was tapped for a possible piece of Legislation, would like to include all parties, who would you recommend?  
Dayton: I would like to be involved.  
It's agreed that Hoover will be in contact regarding this.
11. Regarding CSTI, as CSTI is redistributed, it's going from the Bay Area to Southern California?  
Dayton: The finance description doesn't capture everything, we are going to have a task force on it and I would like to have strong representation from FIRESCOPE for that task force on how to make it the most optimum. There is no predestination on who will get pieces of CSTI.  
Zagaris: I think one of the things that they were given tasked with the last couple of years is to do as much as they can back out with local government groups as people coming into to CSTI as much as

possible. We have more regional capabilities so that people don't have to travel as far, then your only backfilling 10-12 hours vs. the whole shift. Some changes may take a couple of years but some will happen pretty quickly because CSTI is scheduled to close 12/31/12.

Dayton: Out of CSTI I think it's about 76% of the courses are delivered off of campus right now, and there is a total of 1,300 people trained at CSTI, I'm betting we can increase that number just by some of the people that will be trained here in emergency management.

### **Reestablishment of Cal EMA back to an Office**

1. Dayton: All for going back to an Office. You may not think a Department has as much weight as an Agency, but just look at the Department of Finance. I think it will add more weight in all our efforts to be able to say that we are from the Governor's Office of Emergency Management. Timeline on this change: It's in the budget proposal so the Legislative needs to act on it, it could take up to a year if it goes through the traditional process or it could be on a streamline process if they use the Governor's reorganization plan, which then has 60 days to go through the commission.

### **CFAA Update**

1. Wyman: The biggest change is the clarification of Chief Officer above a BC receiving above straight time, MOU portal to portal language clarification intent created to add to Exhibit A, which we have already done, you will see it on the Salary Survey in the coming year. We also created a letter that will go out any time we deny the above BC received time and a half. The letter was created and has all signatories on it to show unity from the committee.
2. Wyman: Clarification of time frames within the CFAA from business days vs. calendar days. It was agreed upon in Exhibit A that it will now be based on calendar days; this also shrinks the time frames.
3. Wyman: Added a new exhibit; exhibit G is now in the CFAA which replaces the Federal Interstate Agreement for out of state assignments.
4. Wyman: We, Cal EMA and CFAA committee members, are going to provide additional training to throughout the state to local government fire agencies. We will include instructions on calculating the average actual administration rate, and clarification/interpretation on the exhibits.
5. Wyman: Rate Letter/Salary Survey: We are currently waiting for CAL FIRE to receive possible updates to particular rates which may impact the base rate for the upcoming fire season. The Salary Survey's will include the mandatory update to the administration rate regardless of any changes. This needs to be done annually.
6. Zagaris: The major change last year was to get the new admin rate and for people to follow the OMB (Office of Management and Budget) 87 document, most people are probably thinking that they don't have to worry about this anymore but it's a new year and so they are going to have to recalculate. Failure to comply by the date that will be given will drop you down to the base rate and you will stay there until you comply. The feds don't believe that we are going to see an adjustment in the ADA rate. CAL FIRE's bargaining unit was given a step adjustment that will have an impact on that calculation. The CAL FIRE rate and the ADA rate will probably drive up very slightly the minimum base. Another thing that is driving us on this is the Mutual Aid audit by the State Bureau of Audits that was provided to our agency our confidential report. Once the audit is in place we will have 60 days to respond, then 6 months, then 12 months. I have given clear instructions to my staff to not wait and get into this long process. The calculations of the local agencies salaries need further discussion. There are 1,000 agencies out there that make us up and probably 40% of them are using minimum base rates, the rest are using the others, we are all over the board. The positives and negatives are going to come out of this. There is more work to be done and for us to clean up on the Mutual Aid side as providers to the resource if we wish to get reimbursed.
7. Wyman: We do want to make sure that all the agencies need to understand that they have to refigure it, otherwise they will go back to the base rate and the base rate is currently 10%.
8. Wyman: The FIRESCOPE Steering Committee formed a FIRESCOPE Working Group which is going back to the agency administrators to decide what is going to happen with that working group and if they are going to continue to work on any other issues. The CFAA wanted to know regarding the Civilian rate pay calculating issue if that the working group is going to stay in place and deal with this or if it's going to go to the CFAA?

9. Webb: Even though the current CFAA agreement is good through December 2013, we are already talking and thinking about the new one because the main body of the agreement only gets reviewed every 5 years and that is coming up next year.
10. Zagaris: We are working through another exhibit to the document that will basically take away the Interstate Agreement. We have a separate Interstate Agreement with our federal partners that will combine with the CFAA. We think this will make things much easier.
11. Wyman: We hired a contractor to help develop the new reimbursement program. We have been working on making a more effective and efficient way to process the information as well as timely reimbursement to local government. We are still working on getting the Web base, but one of the things we will be able to do is submit and receive invoices via e-mail. We are looking at around 6/2012 for completion of this new reimbursement program.
12. Roper: The Steering Group is going to be meeting this Friday so we will get you an answer on your question regarding the Working Group.

## **CWCG Update**

1. Zagaris: We met yesterday. We talked about CFMA. The CFMA is the agreement between CAL FIRE and their federal partners. It sounds like the CFMA is moving along well. There are some minor items in there but it seems the only issue right now is structure protection and how we identify those resources that are out there. There is more work coming out but overall it is ahead of schedule.
2. Zagaris: The Safety Committee due to the potential shut down last year because of the federal budget at the eleventh hour shut down the annual Wildland Fire Safety Officers Workshop in San Diego, its back on target again for this year.
3. Zagaris: The Interagency Finance Group has been meeting and working to do additional training as well. More particular, the cost shares and those items that are all for anyone who gets involved on the pay side of the house.
4. Zagaris: The operation side of CWCG is also working through a number of items. A couple of years ago they put up a new guideline for the IMTs. They are working to make it easy to understand and to be consistent for those participating in the agreement. But most of all CWCG is trying to redeem their responsibility in the oversight of those teams and the challenges that come with them such as planning, how many teams, who, trying to meet the agency administrators requirements. The teams are still struggling with some of the Deputy IC positions. Two years ago we cut one of the Type I teams.
5. Zagaris: We also had a discussion about Type III IMT's. The federal people are interested in how the Type III interface with the all risk side of the house and their involvement and CAL FIRE wants to know their involvement and how it all works together.
6. Zagaris: The Prevention Group had a meeting scheduled for Monterey in May; the CWCG would like to have a follow up meeting in Sacramento to discuss any issues with the Fire lines on one agenda and the Public agenda to be all done at one time.
7. Zagaris: As far as training we are starting to see a reduction in travel budgets. We are not getting as many people for all the classes that we need. CAL FIRE and Cal EMA have met with the State Foresters regarding IQS. It sounds like CAL FIRE is going to implement IQS at the State level in the coming months. As they do that then we on the Mutual Aid side for the CICCIS will need to move forward with it.
8. Zagaris: Upcoming meetings; the federal IMT's are meeting on 2/29/12-3/1/12, they are meeting at McClellan. Also, there is an upcoming joint Federal State IC meeting at the CAL FIRE Ione Academy. They will be working to change out the Federal IC's rep to CWCG.
9. Zagaris: Another item talked about is the ongoing need to have a representative from North or South Ops from the federal side sit with both the Ops Teams with CWCG. As our federal partners work to fill the vacancies in the North and South we are losing some continuity, some of those things are being picked up by the Ops Team or the Board that I firmly believe were actually the role of the North or South Ops coordinators, they are the ones that do our day to day work with these teams.
10. Zagaris: The 420 Command Journal staff is being merged. Federal and State are doing it together. There is a class starting on 3/19/12.
11. Winder: Just to clarify our IQS process, we are not going to convert to IQS right away, we are going to test it on a unit or two and see how it goes. There are a lot of benefits to IQS, one of the biggest ones is that it automatically populates ROSS.

**\*11:06 - Break**

## **Federal IMT Succession Planning Study Update**

Husari – Have been updating BOD a couple times since the start of project, around 3/2010.

1. Husari: The recommendation is done. We completed it in October and turned it over to NWCG.

Power Point presentation:

\*Overview of the new model: THE INCIDENT MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION MODEL:

- Includes significant changes
- Is designed to make the best use of the workforce in an interagency, multi-jurisdictional environment
- Takes into account the decrease in Federal capacity and increase in state and local IMTs since 2001
- Is designed for implementation within 5 to 10 years
- Will require a strong commitment by all involved, particularly in our individual choices when staffing

\*The analysis phase is complete: THE IMOSP TEAM:

- Identified and developed an alternative organization configuration and management oversight for incident management
- Developed strategies for stakeholder understanding
- Developed strategies for implementing the new model

Husari: The executive summary, the report itself is finish, NWCG has accepted it. They have not yet posted it on the web; however they intend to do so early in the year with a cover memo.

\*Stakeholder input: STAKEHOLDER INPUT HELPED FORM THE FINAL RECOMMENDATION; OPPORTUNITIES FOR PARTICIPATION INCLUDED:

- Workshops (40)
- Webinars (10)
- Online surveys
- Special email box

THE 858 RESPONDENTS REPRESENTED:

- National and regional agency, state, and tribal leadership
- Area and incident commanders
- IMT members
- Retirees, contractors and members of the 'militia'
- Dispatch
- Coordination communities

SAMPLE COMMENTS FROM AROUND THE NATION:

*Need and Approach-*

- "If we fail to adapt, we will be replaced with something that does."

*IMT Size and Configuration-*

- Regardless of what approach is taken, holding the teams to a set number of people is a good idea and will save money. All the teams have gotten too big, which drives up large fire costs."
- "IMTs can currently be scaled up and down, we just don't do it! No one wants to send team members home or not order them in the first place."

*Surge Capacity-*

- "Teams need to be integrated with state/local government personnel, they bring a wealth of knowledge to the fire ground."
- "I think it's important to know that in today's world, IMTs must be integrated with local government. A lot of money and effort has gone into training and qualifying local responders and we must use them for all the right reasons."

*IMT Membership-*

- It is not that the current IMT system is broke regarding the on-the-ground incident management, it's that the current system cannot be sustained."
- "Groom all employees with potential to excel instead of the good-old-boy system where you have to know someone to get ahead, or get on a team."

*Accountability-*

- "Integrating firefighting as part of Federal employee's every day job is more efficient and practical as all you baby boomers retire."

\*Overarching Principles: IMOSP TEAM IDENTIFIED CRITICAL OVERARCHING PRINCIPLES; THESE:

- Are foundational to all future incident management organization (IMO) models
- Have much in common with the NIMO "Nine Key Recommendations to Ensure Success"

Husari: We received a lot of feedback from the survey, and seven models were considered.

\*The Big Changes: THE BIG CHANGES FROM THE WAY WE CURRENTLY MANAGE INCIDENTS INCLUDE:

- Reduce the number of national IMTs
- Increase the minimum number of trainees assigned to IMTs
- Configure IMTs to be responsive to incident needs
- Increase the number of personnel available for assignment as single resources
- Eliminate distinctions between type 1 and type 2 for command and general staff, and transition to one type of national IMT
- Manage IMT trainees at the geographic areas. Trainees are assigned to IMTs based on interagency successional planning needs
- Implement the national rotation of IMTs at national preparedness level 3
- Utilize support centers to provide centralized services that are shared among incidents
- Fold NIMO teams into the geographic area and national rotations with the other IMTs
- Provide target relief to units that provide staffing to IMTs during periods of high fire activity
- Develop language regarding appropriate use of Federal ADs in AD pay plan
- Review the PMS 310-1 Wildland Fire Qualifications System Guide and make training and experience adjustments for the new IMT model
- Develop an integrated succession plan to be used as a guide by NWCG partners. Individuals at the national and geographic areas should be designated to provide guidance, monitor standard implementation, and maintain the plan

\*Moving Towards Implementation: THE 8 GOALS FOR IMPLEMENTATION:

- 1) Create and implement a strategy to ensure that interagency wildfire staffing needs are met.
- 2) Increase efficiency in meeting wildfire staffing needs.
- 3) Establish and maintain a qualified workforce to meet wildfire staffing needs.
- 4) Increase oversight of and accountability for IMT management by agencies and geographic areas.
- 5) Manage IMTs (team selection, trainee selection and IMT rosters) to actively support NWCG agency goals for workforce succession management, employee development, and workforce diversity.
- 6) Take advantage of increased capacity developed by states and local government to staff IMTs.
- 7) Utilize non-fire IMT personnel trained in incident command system under HSPD-5 on IMTs for non-wildfire specific positions.
- 8) Employ a crosswalk of incident command system courses to eliminate redundancy and move toward a single National Incident Management System incident command system qualification system used by all incident types.

\*The Future of Incident Management Organization: GETTING THERE FROM HERE: NEXT STEPS

- 1) NWCG prepares memo updating project status and releasing *Incident Management Organization Succession Planning Stakeholder Feedback Data Summary*
- 2) NWCG communicates recommendations to respective agencies
- 3) NWCG appoints an implementation team
- 4) Continue to communicate to all levels of the Incident Management Organization

Questions on Husari presentation:

Roper: What was the rationale for recommending the typing, Type I/Type II

Husari: We looked at a lot of the incidents and found that when we have a scarcity situation (a shortage of teams available), we assign Type II Teams to extremely complex fires and vice versa, so there is little difference in the task books and the differentiation between incidents in terms of complexity basically when we run out of Type I teams we send out Type II Teams plus the evolution Type II Teams have started taking on much more complex fires. It also relates to the length of time it takes to become qualified, it cuts about 5-10 years off of the length of time it takes for an individual to go through the process to get qualified.

Zagaris: We also lose time in the process in which we have a Type II transition to a Type I.

-Roper: Area command teams, what's the status with the NIMO teams in all of this?

Husari: We got a lot of negative feedback about the Nimo teams. We discussed a lot with the Forest Service Representative on NWCG, and what we ended up recommending is that the Forest Service should stay with its 4 existing NIMO Teams. I think that is the status of the recommendation at this team.

Zagaris: Currently there are two of the NIMO IC's where there selections are up right now. In 2010 when we met in NMAC we met with the NIMO program manager and requested that Gages' NIMO Team be assigned to California, they said that wasn't going to happen.

Lorenson: We currently have a really talented pool of people who are qualified at the Type II level, so when you're processing, do you contemplate how you're going to integrate those Type II folks into the pool, how does that work?

Husari: The transition means the Type II Teams will become part of a national pool that will be used interchangeably with what we are currently calling the Type I teams. Theoretically the Type II teams can be assigned to any incident now that is the case because the difference between a Type I fire and a Type II fire is very subjective.

-Roper: Will it be up to CWCG to determine the fate of the Type I Teams and the implementation of the intergration?

Husari: Yes, but the rosters are recommended to be typed up and smaller as well.

Roper: They're all hazards teams, right?

Husari: Yes. That's also part of the recommendation, that's why it's a 5-10 year implementation process because we also have to complete the work that we were supposed to do under NIMS to do the crosswalks.

Zagaris: The organizations have to redeem responsibilities for the Teams. Over time, the TEAMS are together and don't want to go work with anybody else but they are really there to work for an organization.

Husari: It's not about the fire, it's about the people.

## **EMS Update**

1. Gilbert: All has an old copy of AB1387. This is the bill that would replace the current 1797201 with some new language that will hopefully resolve some problems as far as who can do what under contract with EMSA and who can do things based on the fact they did it previous to 1980. We have been working on it for about a year and a half now. It is a two year bill. There are about 4-5 areas we are close to resolving.
  - If since 1980 you have started providing a service, we are down to disqualifying the agreements. There have been a lot of evolution has happened. Individual cities have signed some agreements with their local EMS agency as it related to system coordination, integration, medical control policies, etc. We trying to get the wording so that it's very clear that this is not a disqualifying agreement. That is a different agreement then if you sign an agreement that specifically says that you're giving over the administration of this portion of the system to the EMS agency.
  - What the MS agencies are getting out of this bill is they are getting agreements for dispatch first response and for transport state wide that are in perpetuity that are not revocable unless you are in breach of this agreement that basically says that we will be a part of the system, we will integrate, we will abide by medical control policies. There is some discussion occurring as to where does the medical control policy begin and end. We are very clear that is doesn't involve the EMS agency telling us how many stations, how many engine, etc. However there is still an ongoing argument as to whether response time criteria can be dictated as a medial control policy such as mobile priority, dispatch system, etc. We are trying to come to an agreement on that now, the Legislation as of now is still silent on it. We are on total opposites. We believe that means they have no influence, they believe that means they do.
  - We have come to the conclusion that trying to dictate future annexations and what is and isn't applicable to this is not where we are willing to go. We are trying to get a clean snap shot of everything that has happened to date. This bill will not protect anything that happens in the future but it will protect anything up to this date.
  - We are trying to clearly quantify that if you have dispatched your own resources up to and including taking the piece out calls, you need to be able to continue to do that. This is a direct result of what happened in Stockton, where they said the call going to go to a private 911 center and that Fire will get a call if needed. We are trying to say that if you have been dispatching your own resources and answering the phone and you've been doing this since 1980 then you need to be left alone.

Questions on EMA Update:

Rueda: With the thought that response times can be dictated to jurisdiction at some point that becomes a mandate which would therefore trigger state funding to meet that mandate, has that been a point of contention?

Gilbert: We are fighting with them over nothing because they're not mandating response times to agencies that we are aware of. If we put in this bill that response times are in play and response times are part of it at the local level it may or may not be a state mandate. It would certainly open the window for them to say that you have to meet a 5 minute response time which equivocates to stations, personnel, and apparatus, which is a local decision because your Fire Chief, and your council, and your district determine what you can afford and what you want to do. This is the kind of stuff we are trying to work



out. We don't want it to be where they can come in at a local and say LA County EMS can't come into the city and say you need to meet this. Should LA County and you have a discussion on what the industry standard is and what's right for your city? Of course, but is there a better way to do that.

Gilbert: We are making progress, there are a lot of good things in here, but there are just a couple of deal breakers we need to work on.

## **IAFC Wildland Committee Report**

1. Roper: In November the cohesive strategy was given back to the WFLC in a meeting in Denver, today is the conference call to finalize it. It is being submitted to OMB to be processed. It has not been posted on the [forestrangelands.gov](http://forestrangelands.gov) website yet, but it soon should be. The outcome of today will begin the process for phase 3 as far as the total implementation of cohesive strategy so there will be more tomorrow, I will send out something after today's conference call.
2. The Wildland fire conference is 3/27/12-3/29/12 in Reno.

## **FIRESCOPE BOD Priorities**

1. Roper: Goes over the BOD Priorities list that were established 7/2011.
2. Roper: Questions that at the last meeting we did the MACS review on the geographic, was there any follow up on that dialog?  
Millar: The dialog that we did have was to get the opinion of the group and looking at the notes we didn't have a whole lot of interaction. We don't have to deal with it today, but it is a subject I am interested in and I am interested in the opinion of the group on their feeling of what I brought forward. I would like it to be maintained as a topic.  
Roper: Asks to have the questions framed for the April meeting for you to lead that part of the agenda.  
Millar: Answers that he can do that.
3. Roper: Regarding the Fire Service Cost efficiencies, it got side tracked over to a special group within the Governor's Office as they were trying to deal with the budget issues, they were made up of Fire Districts, CAL FIRE, contract counties, FIRESCOPE, etc. Not sure if there is anymore need to follow up more on this, or if there is anymore dialog needed on this?  
No response from group at this time.  
Roper: Ok, so we will just have it there right now but we won't do anything.
4. Roper: Regarding the Duplication of efforts within the fire service groups, Keith and Tonya worked on that and provided the report at the last meeting. Some of the items that we talked about at the July meeting didn't materialize, correct?  
Hoover: We talked about the Metro representation, that position is currently open under the State Board of Fire Services and interest needs to be put forward to the Governor. The Governor appoints the State Fire Representatives.  
Roper: Ok, we will follow up.
5. Roper: We also talked about the CICCIS. We asked the CICCIS group to come back with a report for the April meeting about the future and sustainability.
6. Roper: Recommends that as the BOD goes into the April meeting that we put on the agenda for a discussion topic to go over the ICS900 document that is on the web page. It is an older document but is still very relevant in providing the examples and just raises the question. I think it would be a good exercise for this group to, between now and then, talk amongst the people of the agencies and organizations you represent and see if there are language issues out there that we need to bring forward to the BOD to address. We will set some time aside in the April meeting, and use the ICS900 document as a basis to see if we are all on the same page or not.  
Zagaris: I think Ralph may have a draft of the 900 document with the Fire and Rescue Mutual Aid guidelines.  
Domanski: Not speaking for Chuck and the Taskforce but that is one of the things they put on their plan of work, to update those documents and as a request of the BOD, they can push those documents to a higher position. We were going to work on the oldest documents and then work up, correct?  
Butler: We are in the process of revising the 900 document. We have appointed a committee of three Taskforce members to work on that. We should have it done in a month or two.
7. Roper: We will leave Interoperability as outstanding for right now, at the April meeting we will address when we want to start addressing that on time management for future agendas.

## **CICCS/Type III IMT Update**

1. Zagaris: Regarding FIREScope BOD CICCS TF Type 3 Team Initial Workshop Briefing document in packet; these are Scott Vail's notes from the group. We need to get CWCG involved. I provided the language out of the draft minutes to the committee, per your instructions. We are all excited for us all to get together. Both the North and South Ops Chiefs of CAL FIRE along with Mike Richwine were in attendance. Richwine: One of the things we struggled with is, as the report indicates, with the Type III incident, what do we want these Teams to do? How will they be utilized? How will they be requested? All these operational issues, we did not address. We just brainstormed them. Zagaris: The good news is that we have a commitment on funding right now to help with travel. Another thing that is going to impact us is with the Emergency Management side of the house, there are a lot of non-fire people that would like to be involved with what happens with the All-Risk Teams. I think that we need to spread this out. Another thing was its feasibility to keep them trained and utilization. I can't imagine that every metropolitan area in the State has a TEAM. Talking with FEMA regarding the ICS NIMS Typing for Fire and HazMat, right now we have these Type I-V Teams that are really on the table and with the Feds going with this whole thing it's going to make another change.

## **FIREScope OPS Team Report / Task Force Report**

1. Butler: Currently the Taskforce has completed its revision to the FOG, it will go to the Operations Team this month on the 26<sup>th</sup> & 27<sup>th</sup> for a review of the proposed revisions. We are moving forward and have been working with Domanski to try and streamline the process to get the document published once we get the final approval because we are a little behind on our timeline. We will have it out this year as a 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary edition of the FOG  
Zagaris: I want to make sure that everybody knows once both the Ops Team and Taskforce are in agreement, and then it comes to me. I will then send out the draft FOG for your final reviews and Input. Hopefully when we come together in April, you can approve the information. We will have a sheet that will identify all the changes that are in this FOG vs. the old 2007 FOG that we are replacing. We also had our retired Chief from LA City and former Ops Team Taskforce Chairman, Bob Neamy, try to keep it so that it's NIMS compliant. It's a large enough contract that it's under the DGS review, we do have restricted special funds for this, but I still have to go through the process of a large contract. The other nuance that Chief Domanski will work through is to have the FOG as an Application for your phone. I think if we can keep this reasonable like \$5.00 for the FOG on the phone then this will take off on the NIMS side of the house.
2. Butler: We have completed the orientation packet, it's a one page document that is intended to provide to a new member or an interested party basic information on FIREScope. Basically the Taskforce put together a list of links that take you to the various documents on the FIREScope website.
3. Butler: The Clandestine Laboratory Response Guidelines are ready to go the Operations Team in January.
4. Butler: We anticipate that we will have the Marijuana Grow Operations Response Guidelines ready for the Operations Team at their January meeting as well.
5. Butler: The Safety Specialist Group continues to work on the All-Hazard Response to Tactical Law Enforcement Incidents. We expected at the end of the year but we have not received it yet. We anticipate it will be to us within the next month or two.
6. Butler: We appointed a committee of Taskforce members to work on the WUI (Wildland Urban Interface) Placard Concept with Chief Gouette from the Operations Team and CAL FIRE. The composition of this committee of Taskforce members represents Local, State, and Federal agencies. We do not have an anticipated due date on this but we are moving forward.
7. Butler: The EMS Specialist Group has completed a review of the EMSA Ambulance Strike Team Leader curriculum; they have given a report back to the Taskforce on that. We are currently reviewing that report and will be making some type recommendation to the Ops Team at our January meeting.
8. Butler: We have been approached by representatives from the IMWG regarding some concerns they have over compatibility of FIREScope ICS and NIMS relative to the use of units under the Operations Section that is apparently giving some people at the federal level heartburn that we have been using units for operations. They have asked us to address that. It's a belief of some members on the IMWG that if FIREScope doesn't address then the Feds will and it may not be what we would like to see. They have suggested we further define what a unit is on the operations side and explain the difference between a Unit and a Team. Then they would like to see us produce a task book for a Unit Leader on the operations side of the house.

Roper: Can you elaborate on who IMWG is so that everybody has a clear understanding?

Butler: It's the Incident Management Working Group under DHS FEMA. It's my understanding that they are tasked with further developing NIMS concepts.

Zagaris: IMWG it's underneath the NIC (NIMS Integration Center) FEMA.

Husari: Are they concerned with all of the units, Logistics?

Butler: No they are not concerned with Logistics, only in Operations.

9. Rueda: Did he officially refer the RSOC document to you?

Roper: I believe we did, not sure if it was delivered to you?

Rueda: I don't think it was ever given to us, but we have it now.

Roper: Would it be helpful to have a presentation by that committee give to your group so you have the history of where they got to, and then you can take it from there?

Rueda: Yes. The only thing that jumped out at me after I read is that we didn't follow the National Fire Danger Rating System; we came up with a different scale.

10. Butler: There are a number of Taskforce vacancies that we would like to get filled. Currently we have vacancies for Cities North, Counties North, Counties South (formally held by Kern), Fire District South, and Cal EMA. We are looking for people to fill these spots

Zagaris: The Taskforce is primarily made of the representation of you in this room. Case in point is now that we have a new City North Rep., due to the budget; Mark will need to appoint a body. I will work with Ralph to share the template of expectation because when a department commits somebody, they are committing their time and travel to support this. Cities North is Mark (D'Ambrogio), Counties North is Sheldon (Gilbert), Fire District South is Bill (Metcalf), Cal EMA is our FIRESCOPE North position, Counties South is at your wishes whether you want Kern County to maintain that or if you want to go back out advertise for it. If we advertise, it will be County Fire Departments in Region I, Region V, or Region VI that will represent the South.

Roper: What is the pleasure of the BOD for Counties South? Have Kern fulfill it, if willing, or get another representative?

Miller: From Kern's point of view we would be happy to continue to participate.

Zagaris: Kern is going to continue to participate as a permanent member. The question is; do you want to continue to have County Fire Department South representative. My opinion is yes, it goes back to making sure that we are more inclusive than exclusive. There are plenty of County Fire Departments in the South that would have an opportunity, if somebody has the personnel and the funding to get somebody to the meeting, and then we would open it up so that they can't say it's the same old group.

Roper: Anybody opposed to opening it up?

Group agrees to open it back up.

Roper: We will start that process.

Zagaris: I will send out an e-mail to the Southern 3 Regions. I will ask for participation. It will go to Chief Domanski, Chief Domanski will go back to the Taskforce and Ops Team to select that individual, then go from there.

## **Special Presentation**

Roper: Presents BOD member (Mike Dyer) cake for his birthday! Congratulations from all!

## **\*12:30 – Lunch**

## **Old Business**

1. Gilbert: Putting together the position paper for Municipal Fire Services, why it's important to maintain that. There will also be list of resources and some less stringent arguments but perhaps some peripheral arguments that would work on a case by case basis that would be included as a tool box with this newest edition which is that the Attorney General has come out with an opinion that the long and short of it says that for general lost cities, it is not legal to contract out Municipal Fire Protection to a private contract. It does carry the weight of a court decision as it relates to being introduced. That is a big blow to the private Fire Protection Industry as they continue to look for opportunities to grow. That doesn't take away their ability to bid on private fire protection for governmental agencies and different things like that.
2. Gilbert: We were caught up in a pretty significant battle with Wackenhut for about 8 months bidding for a national nuclear laboratory that we provide services for. We did prevail and were awarded the contract last week. We got a 5 year contract out of that. I do need to tell you though that I am reviewing both

bids now and will have more information at the next meeting, but they are no joke, they came in and really underbid it, offered a lot of goodies. The only reason I was able to preserve that contract was to move one of my county resources into the lab to be used as a lab resource and a county resource which worked for us because geographically it was a better location. It's going to take that kind of innovation to go head to head with them because with their two platoon system and their retirement and healthcare, they were in the neighborhood of about 35% less than us and we are a regional provider that is probably 10-15% less than a standalone city.

3. Gilbert: Regarding the BRC update, I don't have anything. I talked to Lou (Paulson) to see if he had a chance to talk to the Governor and get any feed back or direction. I don't think it's even on the Governor's screen at this point. I think if Cal EMA, CPFA, and CAL FIRE, and say that we have all this stuff that has been done where do we want to go? That would be a good goal for this year.

## **New Business**

1. Dyer: Wanted to discuss the realignment and the impact on crews statewide. I know in Santa Barbara County we lost our crew last year and I know CAL FIRE is going through a lot of growing pains with their crews. I was recently asked to do survey about our interest in crews. I ran it by a Sherriff in our county; I think they're at odds as to what the cause should be, so he is refusing to fill out the survey. I just wanted to throw it out there and see what the crew impact is going to be for the next year because I think it's going to be substantial.

Winder: We don't anticipate a big change this year just because this process takes time. We do anticipate a down turn in crew capabilities in the next couple years.

Is Camarillo going to be ok?

Winder: Camarillo is kind of in a different ball park, we are still trying to evaluate that.

Down there is a unique dynamic. We have the Camarillo Fire Center with 3 crews now. We are looking at options for the utilization of the Ventura camp facility. There are a lot of balls in the air on realignment as it pertains to the inmates and inmate firefighter's availability. There is the challenge of the \$46.19 a day that is CDCR's evaluation on what it would cost to you. Then you have the issue of the Sherriff's Association that is getting the money in realignment and then are being asked to send the money back to house my inmate. It's not surprising that this Sherriff did not want to fill out the survey.

Some of these inmates sentence are under a year, so you put all this training and time these folks, and then they are gone.

Osby: We have 500 inmates in our system right now, we fill confident that in 2012 we are going to maintain that population. I have been having ongoing meeting with the CEO of the Sherriff about the process and we have a new Probation Director too. So I'm pretty confident that we going to come up with how we are going to do it and how it's going to be financed.

Zagaris: Not only are we dealing with a fire issue here, we're dealing with an all-risk issue because flooding, mudslides, etc. Unfortunately, I think that people are looking at strictly a dollar issue and not looking at the overall impacts. We need to continue to communicate and coordinate. Mike and I talk and generally anything that looks like a merger or reduction of resources, I send him and Brendan and Steve a note so that as they are talking back and forth to the cabinet of the Governor we can be on the same page of diminishing assets.

Winder: We have 196 crews in CAL FIRE system and our Director, Ken Pimlott, hopes to maintain every one of those 196 crews. Of all the things we run short of during fire season, it's not fire engines, its crews and aircraft that is what runs short. So any reduction in crews is going to hurt all of us.

Roper: For the benefit of the group, if anybody needed a reference to their local Sherriff, who in CAL FIRE would they direct any question.

Winder: Call Clare Frank, she is the Deputy Director of CoOp Fire Programs, she will be a good contact.

## **Cal EMA Fire & Rescue Update**

1. Zagaris: Regarding the reprogramming of radios, as long as I can remember we have always tried to make sure the radio was capable to be used for local loads. With our budget situation and trying to maintain the entire 129 engines and water tenders, we are developing a spreadsheet, there are a number of agencies that have indicated that the only radio that's in the apparatus is ours and they don't have the capability to put another radio in there. Our radios are probably going to go to one standard capability on how we're going to program them and not have that local load. Your people may have to learn how to use manual load. This is a dollar issue, and for us to reprogram everyone's radio is becoming a major issue. It's time consuming. Our friends at the other state agency are not necessarily capable of meeting

my timeline. When they go in and do CAL FIRE's fleet all at the same time, it's a much easier process, we are not in the same boat. Staff is going to be working to identify to our assignees where we are headed and get everybody on notice sooner than later.

2. The replacement engines for this current 11/12 fiscal year were ordered, we anticipate them to be here late May or early June. We are finalizing the specs for the next batch of engines that we are going to bid on, there will be some minor changes but the Type I's will stay the same. We are waiting for CAL FIRE's specs for the updated III's & IV's. CAL FIRE and we have extended our current contract with HME to go to September of 2013. The engines I need to purchase for 12/13, I will probably roll those out the door using the current contract as long as there are no budget issues.
3. Staff has identified in some of the rescue systems I equipment that the road caches need to be replaced. Also working on some of the swift water caches, so somewhere around a couple hundred thousand will be taken out of the federal side of the house.
4. Some time before this week is done; I will be announcing our new Deputy Chief of Special Operations, Lorenzo Gigliotti, and our new Region IV Assistant Chief, Gary Humphrey.
5. We have been able to fill some of our vacancies (as mentioned above), we have exhausted our list so we'll be testing again soon. We have a Deputy Chief of HazMat opening. We have the Region VI Assistant Chief position open because of Brian Woodbeck's promotion to Deputy Chief of Operations. We still need to hire an Assistant Chief for FIRESCOPE North and our Fire Mechanic, he received a better offer with Sac Metro, and our MST support staff for FIRESCOPE OCC is vacant as well.
6. On the horizon, the CFAA audit has been consuming a lot of our time a long with the new reimbursement program, we are in the process of updated all of the fire apparatus and equipment agreements. The last time we have seen an update of it was 1971, back then we paid an attorney general to review all of our documents. Now that we have a staff of lawyers in the same building to work with we are going to put them to use.
7. Lincoln city had a fire last summer; it was a pretty significant mutual aid. All the resources that were ordered were ordered under master mutual aid, we are trying to get the responsible agency to pay. They have gotten attorneys at this point; we are probably going to be heading down some kind of a legal drill. We can't guarantee the people in Region IV or Sheldon's Type III IMT are going to see any money in the near future.
8. We seem to have a lot more requests coming into the system for Fire Investigators and Fire Arson Dogs. The old inventory system that we actually have is not part of ROSS. At some point between Tonya's office and the Mutual Aid Coordinators, we are going to need to go back and readdress typing and who has the resources so that we know where they're at, who's willing to allow them to go and assist one another. It appears that good qualified people who are heading out the door are gone, we are having a harder and harder time getting investigators for some of these arson fires in these economical times of people selling to the insurance companies, or whatever other reasons.

## **MISC.**

1. Roper: We are all fortunate that LA City was able to find there suspect.  
Butler: Actually it was a joint effort between City, County, LAPD, Sherriff's and the National Task Force from APF. It was really a cooperative effort and really went well.  
Osby: He was actually arrested by a Reserve Deputy forth day, first day in a vehicle by himself.
2. Zagaris: Regarding the fires in Chile; we have a relationship with the Governor's office in Chile, and some of the things that are going on there, we'll see.
3. Zagaris: Also, there is an International Air Tanker Conference that is town on the 24<sup>th</sup>-27<sup>th</sup>. I will send a quick notice out. CAL FIRE is in support.

## **Meeting Adjourned**

1. Roper: Next meeting is April 11, 2012 in Burbank.
2. Roper: The Conference will be on March 29, 2012 to set the agenda.