

*Office of Emergency Services
FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FIRESCOPE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
MEETING OF JUNE 16, 1993*

DRAFT

MEMBERS PRESENT

Bill Maxfield, Chairman - Chief/Retired, Contra Costa County Fire Department
Donald Manning, Vice Chairman - Chief, Los Angeles City Fire Department
Rich Aronson, Chief - OES Fire and Rescue Division
Jack Brocchini, Deputy Chief for Gary Costamagna, Chief - Sacramento City Fire Department
John Bryant, Assistant Director for Dick Henry, Director - U.S. Forest Service
Bob Burnham, Fire Staff for Pat Kidder, Fire & Aviation Officer - Bureau of Land Management
Ronny Coleman, California State Fire Marshal
Bill Harrington, Assistant Deputy Director for Richard Wilson, Director - California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
George Lund, Chief - Ventura County Fire Department
Jim Radley, Deputy Chief for Larry Holms, Chief - Orange County Fire Department
Keith Simmons, Deputy Chief for Dan Fraijo, Chief - Santa Barbara County Fire Department
Bill Zeason, Deputy Chief for P. Michael Freeman, Chief - Los Angeles County Fire Department

MEMBERS ABSENT

Chris Cameron, Regional Fire Management Officer - National Park Service
Frank Buscher, Chief - Tiburon Fire Protection District
Gary Costamagna, Chief - Sacramento City Fire Department
Dan Fraijo, Chief - Santa Barbara County Fire Department
Loren Pettis, Chief - Montclair Fire Department
Richard Wilson, Director - California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection

SPECIAL ADVISORS PRESENT

Bob Hamilton, Assistant General Manager for Eldon Nagel, General Manager - California State Firefighters Association

SPECIAL ADVISORS ABSENT

Brian Hatch, California Professional Firefighters

OTHERS PRESENT

Andy Anderson, Chief - Quincy Fire Department
Richard Andrews, Director - Office of Emergency Services
Will Brock, Assistant Chief - OES Fire and Rescue
Sherri Belchamber, Office Technician - OES Fire and Rescue

OTHERS PRESENT

Art Cota, Division Chief - California State Fire Marshal, Training
Mike Dacy, Chief - Sacramento County Fire Department, OES Region IV Coordinator
Mike Dougherty, Assistant Fire Coordinator - U.S. Forest Service, South Zone
Mark Ghilarducci, Deputy Chief - OES Fire and Rescue, US&R
Candace Gregory, Division Chief - California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
Lee Mitchell, Deputy Chief - OES Fire and Rescue
Bev Passerello, Legislative Liaison - Office of Emergency Services
Bill Saufield, Retired Chief - Dixon Fire Department
Kim Zagaris, Assistant Chief - OES Fire and Rescue



The meeting was called to order at 0940 by Chairman Maxfield. Round table introductions were made and Rich Aronson discussed logistics.

APPROVAL OF JANUARY 13, 1993 MINUTES

IT WAS MOVED BY CHIEF MANNING, SECONDED BY CHIEF COLEMAN AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 13, 1993 MINUTES AS SUBMITTED.

NOMINATION FOR CHAIR - FIRESCOPE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

IT WAS MOVED BY CHIEF RADLEY, SECONDED BY CHIEF COLEMAN AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO NOMINATE AND ELECT CHIEF DONALD MANNING FOR CHAIRMAN OF THE FIRESCOPE BOARD OF DIRECTORS/FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

At this time, Chief Manning took over the meeting as Chairman. Rich Aronson advised the group that since Chief Manning was previously Vice-Chair, a recommendation for filling that position should be made from the group, and since the Chair is now filled with someone from Southern California, the Vice-Chair should be someone from Northern California. After discussion, Chief Manning indicated that he would talk to possible candidates; a Vice-Chair will be nominated at the next meeting, along with consideration of the position previously held by Chief Maxfield representing County Fire Departments North.

IMS/ICS ISSUES

Chief Radley reported for Chief Holms on ICS/IMS issues, stating that the focus has been on the structural fire module, which is now finished. They will be continuing to work on high rise, EMS, Haz Mat, US&R and wildland. Appointments of Chairs have been made

for each of those modules. The next two meetings will be in Orlando on July 16 and 17 and in Phoenix in September. Mike Colgan will be attending the Orlando meeting for Chief Holms.

One of the concerns that came up from the Operations Teams was whether California's responses should go through the Board of Director's representative, which is Chief Holms, or should everyone respond on their own based on their feelings, and how it will affect their department. Chief Radley stated that he felt this issue could use some further discussion today during the Ops Teams reports. One of the questions in the structural module is the reference to "sectors" and what is going to be done with that. Chief Radley also mentioned that he would like some input from this group as to the issue of incorporation of the IMS Group. The Phoenix people seem to be pushing for incorporation. John Bryant advised that Phoenix is saying that they have to incorporate in order to receive FEMA grants, however, when asked by the Operations Teams to get a legal opinion on the incorporation, Phoenix declined, stating they were unable to do that. It is the feeling of the Operations Teams that incorporation is not necessary in order to receive federal dollars, and they are opposed to the incorporation. Chief Zeason and Mr. Bryant asked for the Board's support, in the form of a letter to Gary Morris of the Phoenix Fire Department, asking him to site the requirements FEMA has for incorporation in order to receive grants, and without it, the Board sees no reason for incorporation.

The Board also reviewed the DRAFT letter submitted by Chief Zeason, for the OES Director's signature to the Director of FEMA, requesting that FEMA consider sponsoring the consortium curriculum workshops at the Fire Academy and assist in defraying the cost for participants. The workshops would have representatives from across the nation and would move forward with the plan to develop incident specific models, and a management model for Urban Search and Rescue, Multi-Casualty, Haz Mat, High Rise, and Wildland Urban Interface incidents. The consortium is agreeable to have staff from the Academy participate, as they have in the past, and is willing to make all of the products of these workshops available to the Academy for instructional purposes. Mr. Bryant stated that this letter should be sent after the Orlando meeting in July.

IT WAS MOVED BY CHIEF SIMMONS, SECONDED BY CHIEF MAXFIELD, AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE BOTH OF THE ABOVE LETTERS IN CONTEXT AND CONCEPT.

Mr. Bryant advised the Board that, at the last IMS meeting in Texas, Alice Forbes was elected Vice Chair. Mike Dougherty, Mike Colgan and Bob Neamy will be Curriculum Committee Members; Andy Anderson will be Administrative Committee Member; and John Bryant will be Conference Committee Member.

TASK FORCE REPORT

Mike Dougherty reported that the Haz Mat OSD and Position Manuals were complete and approved through the Decision Process. The Task Force is actively working on training materials to include recommended prerequisites. Training material will be self-paced or suitable to be delivered in a classroom environment. The Task Force is also reviewing all Resource Typing Standards, and will have several recommended changes, deletions, and additions.

The entire Multi-Casualty package has been reviewed for errors or conflicts. This was a big task due to the volume of the document. Mr. Dougherty expressed his thanks to OCC staff, Rachel Parks and Jim Jeffery for completing this monumental task. The Task Force has also completed a review of State Fire Marshal Lesson Plans on High Rise, Unified Command, and ICS organization. The High Rise Lesson Plan was the only one needing major modification. Claude Creasey (LFD), and Bob Wineman (LAC) did the majority of the revision work. All three Lesson Plans were returned to the State Fire Marshal's Office with the TF's recommendations.

The draft OSD for USAR is completed. The Task Force will review and finalize it for Operations Team approval. It should be ready for the next joint meeting in July. The Task Force is putting together a specialist group for High Rise ICS. The IMS Procedures Guide for Structural Fires is complete and provided to the IMS Consortium. A cover page has been developed to state that FIREScope does not endorse the use of the term "Sector". The Task Force is requesting the Board's approval of the cover letter, and recommending that the document, including cover letter, be made available through Document Control.

IT WAS MOVED BY CHIEF ZEASON, SECONDED BY JOHN BRYANT, AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE THE COVER LETTER TO BE SENT OUT WITH THE INCIDENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM PACKAGE, STATING THAT THE USE OF THE TERM "SECTOR" IS NOT ENDORSED BY FIREScope.

The Consortium plans to start working on High Rise, Wildland Urban Interface, Multi-Casualty, Haz Mat, and US&R. Mike Colgan (ORC), is appointed to work with 1841 Sub-Committee for implementation. The Generic ICS Course should be completed soon. Contractor Terry Haney has completed his contractual responsibilities. NWCG Training Working Team to finalize. 310-1 should be out soon, it has gone through final reviews.

OPERATIONS TEAMS REPORTS - NORTH/SOUTH

John Bryant advised the Board of an issue that came up at the June 10th Operations Team meeting regarding the Census that was sent out by the State Fire Marshal's Office, and the need for it to be returned as soon as possible. To date only 30% have been returned. Bob Hamilton said that the issue also came up at the Coordinating Council meeting, and he sent a message on the ICHIEF'S bulletin board requesting the Census

be completed and returned. Mr. Bryant also reported that there will be an IMS Conference in Phoenix, September 13-15, and in order to keep the standardization going, California is participating heavily. There have been numerous invitations to California members to speak at the conference. The Operations Teams have asked Chief Holms to send a letter to Gary Morris requesting a copy of invitations to California people, so they will know who is going.

Andy Anderson reported that the North Operations Team is hosting the joint North/South Operations Team meeting July 8-9, 1993, at Bucks Lake. Items to be discussed include: IMS, SB-1841, State and Federal mutual aid situations, impact of state budget on local government, and the State Fire Marshal survey.

REIMBURSEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE REPORT

Lee Mitchell reported that the reimbursement sub-committee has met twice, to go over the five party agreement. Copies of agreement are in members packets. There were three changes to the agreement this year 1) The 12-hour free period was reduced to 2 hours, and reimbursement will be paid on an hourly basis; 2) Locally owned apparatus can not be transferred from one operational area to another without the permission of the Fire Chief who loaned that piece of apparatus; and 3) Assistant Strike Team Leader's will be reimbursed at the engine crew rate instead of at the Strike Team Leader rate. The annual salary survey was used to determine the new rates. Apparatus Crews and Assistant Strike Team Leader increased from \$585 to \$602 per 24 hours, an increase of 2.9%. Strike Team Leader and Overhead personnel increased from \$748 to \$769 per 24 hours, an increase of 2.8%. The Agreement is going through the signature process at this time and as soon as the five original copies with signatures are returned, OES will send a statewide mail-out of the final signed document to all fire departments.

HAZ MAT MUTUAL AID LEGISLATION

Dave Zocchetti updated the Board on current Haz Mat legislation. He gave some background information on the legislation (SB-1093 by Killea), asked for direction from the Board for future legislation, and asked for the Boards support of the legislation. He mentioned two issues of concern; liability, and standards for training. Mr. Zocchetti stated that the Government Code clearly covers firefighting, but it is unclear for Haz Mat, especially outside the responder's jurisdiction. He stated that originally the bill was intended to add to existing conditions in the Government Code, extending it to cover Haz Mat even if it involves a non-fire agency responding, however, the bill was assigned to the Senate Judiciary Committee because it dealt with the issue of liability. The California Trial Lawyers Association did not want liability extended beyond what is currently in law. The Trial Lawyers stated that Section 25400 in the Health and Safety Code, should provide protection to Haz Mat responders. Mr. Zocchetti stated that he felt the H&S Code Section

was specific to clean up activities, and not initial and emergency response. Board members expressed their concern and offered guidance and suggestions regarding Haz Mat Mutual Aid responses, liability, and training standards. Mr. Zocchetti explained that the training was not a state mandate, but rather a standard in order to cover the liability protection, and if the liability protection were dropped from the bill, so would the training standards. He encouraged departments to contact him for input, or other issues on this bill. He can be reached at (916) 262-1763.

Dr. Andrews stated that he had some concerns about another Bill, SB-1082 by Calderone. He explained that it was a complicated bill which, on the surface, appeared to be part of an overall effort to streamline regulations by addressing issues of how Haz Mat programs are administered and carried out. However, after amendments, the bill would consolidate much of the existing programs currently under OES and SFM Haz Mat unit, and place them under CAL EPA. This bill appears to address streamlining, but at the same time takes a great deal of control away from local governments and turns it over to CAL EPA. Dr. Andrews recommended that any department involved in Haz Mat response contact Dave Zocchetti regarding this bill.

CDF 90 DAY REPORT

Bill Harrington updated the Board on the CDF 90-Day Report. Last summer the Director of CDF asked for a review of the organization in terms of what they were doing. He asked a management group to look at how CDF does business, examine the department functions, and make recommendations back to the director within 90 days. The report came back in mid-December identifying issues, and solidifying 19 items that were being looked at. These 19 items were grouped in to three broad categories: 1) Strategic decisions, 2) collaborative decisions, and 3) administrative decisions. The project goal was to address and resolve major issues facing CDF at that time. The theme of the project was for CDF to adopt a strategy to streamline and improve its delivery of services; seek out cooperative relationships with private sector and other government agencies; establish a comprehensive mission for operations; and continue to develop strategies to address changing conditions. Some of the elements of the 90-day plan are being incorporated into the current re-organization. The remainder of the issues in the 90-day plan have been put on hold until after the re-organization is completed. The four primary working groups completed recommendations for re-organization and their recommendations will go to the executive group next week, and then on to the Director.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BUDGET ISSUES

Ronny Coleman, reported on the White Paper Working Group's "draft" of the proposed impact of reduction of firefighting personnel and apparatus due to current funding proposal, which is a property tax shift of 2.6 billion dollars being removed from local government and distributed to the K-12 education system.

The working group met and developed a "white paper" on possible consequences to the fire service, if the property tax shift occurs. The list is not specific. It talks about slowing down the developmental process, increased inability to deal with law suits, staffing reductions, larger property losses, and an increased loss of life. All of these are generic generalities that we are predicting will happen if these proposals occur. The California Fire Service Census, was developed to collect information to back-up some of these predictions. As a result of the Census 393 departments, out of 1,015 have responded. These 393 departments constitute 90% of the cost of fire protection in California. The document "Fire Facts" was developed from the responses to the Census, however, it is changing daily. As a result of "Fire Facts", we have discovered 90 different ways to fund a fire department in California, and any proposed tax shift that solves one organizations tax problem, creates another one for someone else. In discussions with the policy people, it was obvious that they did not recognize the difference between an independent district, a dependent district, and a municipality. There is a big difference when it comes to how the property tax shifts will impact individual agencies. The "White Paper" document, which was a lot of generalities, is now supported by the "Fire Facts" document, which tells exactly what the consequences are. Using this information to drive discussions within the Governor's office, there was a meeting to discuss three alternative plans. Plan 1 is to exempt all special districts from the property tax shift in the Governor's new budget proposal (which means that dependent and independent districts will be exempt from the property tax shift). This is specific to districts that provide fire protection, which is not the same as fire protection districts. The amount of \$280 million dollars is significant, and \$190 million of that is within Los Angeles County alone. Plan 2 would extend the half cent sales tax for 6 months in order to raise \$750 million dollars, \$250 million of which will be diverted to municipalities and counties to attempt to fill back the remainder of the money that is shifted. Data and statistics were collected through the Fire Census, in conjunction with Grey Davis' financial transaction reports for cities, counties, and district. The problem is, none of this is reality until the Conference Committee comes together to finally adopt the budget. As it stands right now, local government is making forecasts based on the assumption of the \$2.6 billion dollar property tax shift, and are making reductions that are resulting in closures. The Governor's budget ameliorates that, but will not become reality until it is accepted by the Legislature. The next step is in the hands of the Legislature and the Governor's Office in terms of how they bring it all together. To date, the SFM has keystroked information on 280 of 393 fire departments that responded to the Fire Census. That information will be fed back to the individual agencies, then a report will go to all members of this Advisory Committee, indicating trends and patterns, and what has been predicted. Chief Coleman advised that he just talked to some Senate members about the budget situation, and theoretically, if Governor's budget passes, the impact on the fire service will only be about 10% of what has been predicted.

Chief Coleman submitted the White Paper Committee document to the Board of Directors for approval.

IT WAS MOVED BY CHIEF COLEMAN, SECONDED BY CHIEF SIMMONS AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE THE WHITE PAPER COMMITTEE DOCUMENT, TO BE INCLUDED IN THE FIRE FACTS DOCUMENT AS AN INFORMATIONAL PACKET, AND MADE AVAILABLE TO ALL FIRE SERVICE AGENCIES

SB-1841

Paul Flores distributed a handout and updated the Board on the implementation of SB-1841. The Bill was introduced by Senator Petris from Oakland, because he had some personal and direct impact from the East Bay Hills Fire that led to the development of this bill. The Bill has three elements; 1) OES, in coordination with response agencies at a local level, develop a standardized emergency management system; 2) the State Fire Marshal establish a statewide uniform requirements for fire hydrants; and 3) all water systems with 10,000 or more service connections, review and revise their emergency response plans. The Bill also requires OES to work with water agencies in addressing that element of the bill. Development of the Emergency Management System is being called SEMS. The Bill establishes a framework, and asks that it apply the principles of ICS, MACS, the State Master Mutual Aid Agreement, and related existing systems such as the Fire Mutual Aid System, in addition to the operational area concept. In first attempting to deal with applying all of the various concepts into a standardized emergency management system, within OES and within the committee that is working on it, there was a need for a model. Attachment A in the hand-out, is a depiction of that model, which is still going through a lot of refinement. In addition to applying the system to multi-agency, multi-jurisdictional emergencies, there was a need to look at how the system might apply to all types of emergencies from the incident level all the way up to catastrophic disasters.

The model provides a general view of how the system may operate, and is being used to determine what will be put into the regulations. During development of system, there are three critical milestones the committee is trying to abide by. The most crucial is establishing SEMS by regulation by December 1, 1993. The items in Italics are not included in actual bill, but will be included in regulation. The second milestone is December 1 1994, at which time an approved course of instruction must be adopted by SEMS Board of Directors. By December 1, 1995, local agencies be organized into operational areas; this will be one year prior to the to the system being implemented in December 1996. All state and local emergency response agencies will use SEMS in responding to multi-agency, multi-jurisdictional emergencies. If they do not use the system, they will not be eligible for reimbursement of response costs at the state level. It's uncertain how FEMA will react as far as reimbursement for agencies responding outside the SEMS. Under the Natural Disaster Assistance Act, the State puts in a 25% match, FEMA pays 75%. It is not clear how FEMA would react if State did not pay their 25% to agencies that do not use the system. Mr. Flores explained that the State cannot

pass a law that would regulate how FEMA would allocate their disaster funds; however, the State can withhold 25% match under a presidential declaration. An Advisory Committee was appointed by Dick Andrews in February, and held their first meeting March 16. They have had six meetings since that time, and although there have been a lot of different opinions on how to develop the Emergency Management System, the committee has reached consensus on what will go into regulation. The only outstanding aspect that a consensus has not been reached on, is how to establish the criteria by which to certify or evaluate whether a local or state agency used the system. In order to deal with training aspects, the Advisory Committee set up a Training Working Group in April. This working group held their first meeting on May 5th and have had two meetings since then. They have reached consensus on the approved curriculum package to submit to SEMS Board of Directors. Regulation will require that the SEMS Board of Directors establish a SEMS Decision Process to protect the system once it is in place. The Committee has addressed what the decision process will look like, which will probably be similar to the FIREScope decision process; however, members felt this should be the first action of the Board of Directors. They will give the Board alternatives and let them make the decision.

LUNCH BREAK

Additional discussion on SB-1841 was requested after the lunch break. Bill Harrington brought up the issue of new curriculum for positions within SEMS, and expressed some concerns that the development of new materials may conflict with existing curriculum that is already being used in the Mutual Aid System. Chief Harrington suggested that the Fire and Rescue Advisory Committee make recommendations, or at least encourage the use of the existing curriculum and system. Chief Coleman said he understood the concerns because there is already an existing ICS system, and although there is a need to adapt it to multi-disciplined responses, he would like clarification as to where the SEMS Committee is going, and what baseline they are using. Because Paul Flores had already left the meeting, Art Cota explained the process the SEMS Committee was using to establish the Emergency Management System. He said they were reviewing all of the existing programs, and plan to take the best of each program, whether it be the National Fire Academy, FIREScope ICS, or the Phoenix Program. Mike Dougherty advised that the Phoenix Fire Department has stated that they have already converted to ICS, with the exception of using Section instead of Division/Group, and the Fire Academy teaches ICS as it is known in California. Mr. Cota said that the general direction is ICS and MACS as the framework, but it has not been adopted. Members questioned why it would not be adopted. Mr. Cota explained that there are a lot of other disciplines being represented, and they may not endorse FIREScope ICS because it is fire service generated, and fire service maintained. Dr. Andrews stated that there has to be some modification because so much of ICS is specific to fire functions, but on the issue of training, there is very little attention being given to training as it affects field operations, the System takes effect at the Emergency Operations Center level, within a single jurisdiction, or multiple jurisdictions or operational area, and then on up, and that's where the emphasis on the

training is going to have to be. He said he was not sure there was a focus on training for first responder or field units, except as it relates to the issue of the coordination between field units and the incident commander at an emergency operations center. The trigger for what constitutes this standardize emergency management system is not the incident, but the activation of an emergency operations center, and once that happens the standardized system has to kick in.

Chief Coleman questioned the regulation draft showing that the entity could adopt its own incident command system. Mr. Cota responded that the SEMS training packet will be known as the model training program, and one of the proposed regulations is that a local agency shall use either the SEMS model training program or an approved equivalent. "Approved" meaning the local agency approves whatever equivalent they choose to use, as long as it meets the behavioral objectives of the SEMS model training program. Members questioned who would determine that. Mr. Cota stated that it would not become a point of question unless the after action evaluation determined the performance was sub-standard. Members also inquired as to why local governments were being given an option. Mr. Cota said if the eventual training package is something other than what they are using now, the option will allow them to continue using it if they feel it meets the objectives of the model training program. He also advised Director Andrews that the Training Committee may need some further direction, if they are supposed to be working from the local area vs. the operational area and up, because, he believes they are looking at all facets of response.

Ron Coleman, said that he understood the point was to develop a statewide emergency management system, that fits together, and to get other disciplines to adopt an ICS-like approach so it comes together at the EOC level. Chief Zeason suggested that the Training Committee take a good look at ICS, MACs, and Unified Command, the system is already there. Mr. Cota said that there are members of the group that do not agree with that. Chief Zeason said his understanding is that the Governor has indicated that all state agencies will use ICS; and now you're contradicting that by establishing SEMS, and using some other system, which seems to be contradicting what's already been established. Dr. Andrews stated that there was a big difference between the Governor signing an executive order saying that all state agencies are going to use ICS, without any definition or standard as to what ICS is. OES and CDF use ICS, Water Resources has developed an ICS model, CHP has something they call ICS, but beyond that, he said, it is extremely vague as to what ICS is.

Chief Coleman stated that ICS is integrated throughout their curriculum, at all levels, and the fear is that the direction the Training Committee is going will be a new system. He asked Mr. Cota if the Committee is saying that someone can continue doing what they are currently doing, but then be subject to a third party evaluation? Mr. Cota stated that a third party evaluation will be part of the legislation, mandating that the 90 day after-action report be done by OES; and that after-action report is a part of the ability to reimburse through the state disaster fund.

Mr. Dougherty advised that if the Committee is taking the ICS, MACS, Unified Command System and modifying it for law enforcement, water districts or other disciplines, there should not be a problem, even with responders from out of state; however, if they are re-organizing the system and how it does business, then there will be a big problem. Mr. Cota stated that he did not see them moving in that direction.

Dr. Andrews said he was sorry that Mr. Flores left the meeting, and was not able to benefit from and have input in this discussion. He advised the Board that they intend to try and use what has already been develop to the extent possible, adopt it without substantial modification, however; it is important to recognize that the inherant charge to that Committee and to the charge of the legislation forces a dialogue among disciplines that has never occurred before. He stated that Chief Holms is on the Training Committee, CDF has a representative on that Committee, and members should talk to them and make sure these issues are raised. He also recommended bringing Mr. Flores back to the next meeting to talk, in more detail, about where the whole process stands.

John Bryant suggested that the Board ask the Task Force to put together a package, modifying ICS to other disciplines, while adhearing to the basic functions, and assist with the development of MACS for the Training Committee to consider. Mr. Dougherty stated that the Task Force could get to work on it right away and should not have a problem meetubg the timelines the Training Committee is facing.

IT WAS MOVED BY JOHN BRYANT, SECONDED BY CHIEF SIMMONS AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED TO APPROVE THE MOTION FOR FIRESCOPE TO OFFER THE ASSISTANCE OF THE TASK FORCE IN COMPLETING THE DEVELOPMENT OF MACS AND MODIFYING ICS FOR MULTI-DISCIPLINES, FOR THE SEMS TRAINING COMMITTEE TO REVIEW

Mr. Dougherty also suggested that the SEMS Training Committee might consider requesting the MACS curriculum from the Federal National Training Center.

FIRE FOCUS 2000

Chief Coleman briefed the Board and distributed the document "FireFocus 2000". He explained that he started the proposal as a Fire Chief with a local government department, and it deals largely with the State Fire Marhsal's Office. Information was collected on what is being done in other countries, and other states. Files and proposals that have been before the State Legislature, going back to 1947, were researched. There have been five or six proposals to integrate the State Fire Marshal's Office into another agency, so this is not a new concept. There have been some discussions at the local level, about the Fire and Rescue Division of OES, which is also mention in the report. Chief Coleman said when he put the report together it was not directed at any "one" agency, it was a theoretical concept, and was developed originally as part of a fire administration project.

He said he did not use his own model, but looked at models from New Zealand, England, Germany and from several other states; considering some conceptual ideas about what could possibly occur if there was less money to do business with. The document defines terms, and gives a historical background. He advised that he wanted members to understand that this proposal was only intended to put some topics on the table for discussion, because there are problems with continuing to do business as usual. There are studies from 1949, 1972, 1976, 1979, 1983, 1991, 1992, so the concept has been around for a long time. It is speaking to functional consolidation, mergers, and problem statements; and is an expression of Chief Coleman's own personal professional opinion. Chief Coleman said that he would like to publically apologize to Dr. Andrews, because he incorporated a lot of OES discussion into the document, then after realizing that OES Mutual Aid System is really a relationship between local government and local government; not between the state, he did not take the time to edit it out.

Chief Coleman outlined the three models which are: 1) status quo, 2) one statewide fire organization, leaving local government to their own devices, and 3) a merger or consolidation of state fire service organizations that provide support to local government fire service organizations, which could be more cost effective with regard to communications centers, etc. On the chart, the model shows the State Fire Marshal working under the direction of the California Department of Fire Services, which is a methodological department in this context. OES is not shown on this chart, but due to lack of editing as previously mentioned, was not deleted from the dialogue portion of this model. The model shows four basic operations, 1) Engineering and enforcement, 2) training and education, 3) field operations, and 4) administration and data collection. The model proposes considering use of the Government Code to re-organize, and identified what some of the benefits and purposes. Basically the structure would be identical to CDF, but the State Fire Marshal would no longer be an independent office, but rather become a function under CDF as an arm of fire prevention. Chief Coleman said he has received a lot of comments regarding this issue, and he feels compelled to put this issue on the table at this time because of money issues and re-structuring. He also stated that absent a statewide plan, it will be difficult for the local governments. The document was written from a Fire Chief at a municipality's point of view, trying to apply the same principles at a higher level. Chief Coleman said he will continue to propose this concept, however, to date the Agency Secretary has reviewed it and submitted it to the Governor's Office. At this time, it has stopped at the Agency Director, and has absolutely no effect on anything.

Chief Manning indicated that this could impact everyone dramatically if implemented, and it would have been helpful to have had some discussion and input, before the document was released. He recognized Chief Coleman for the years of thought and hard work that has gone into this project, but stated because members had not had the opportunity to review the document, it was difficult for them to take a position on it.

Dick Andrews advised members that the Governor's office has formed a Task Force, comprised of representatives from CDF/SMF/OES. They are trying to look at some of the

same issues that Chief Coleman has raised in Fire Focus 2000, including organizational logic and fiscal necessities. Dr. Andrews said that he felt there are questions that need to be raised, and that is why he asked that Fire Focus 2000, and the CDF 90-Day Report be put on the agenda. It is an opportunity to put these issues on the table, and instead of working from the rumor mill, and have a formal process for discussing them.

Chief Manning asked for other comments or questions, none were brought forward at this time.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Bev Passerello distributed the Legislative Summary, and updated the Board on bills that may have an impact the fire service. Mrs. Passerello advised that any bills that are not out of their house of origin by the 11th of July will automatically become two year bills. Currently the Legislature is working on the budget issues, and the Worker's Compensation Reform. See enclosed Legislative Summary for detailed information.

OTHER BUSINESS

Chief Manning and Director Andrews thanked Chief Maxfield, and extended their personal appreciation for his commitment to the Board of Directors, his leadership on this committee, and his support of the California Fire and Rescue Mutual Aid System. Chief Manning also thanked Board Members for their confidence in electing him to chair this committee, as Chief Maxfield retires.

NEXT MEETING DATE

After some discussion, Members agreed that they would like to hold a meeting between this meeting and the next scheduled meeting in October. The next meeting date was set for **Wednesday, August 18, 1993.**

With no other business to discuss, Chief Manning adjourned the meeting at 1400 hours.