

**Fire and Rescue Service
Advisory Committee
FIREScope Board of Directors**

October 11, 1995

*(NOTES: each new paragraph indicates that a different person is speaking.
Three dots - ... -indicates a word that I was not able to hear or decipher.
Words or names in parentheses indicates that that is what the word or name
sounded like, but I was not absolutely sure.)*

SIDE 1

(couldn't hear name)

Welcome, Bill.

Jim Sewell, Fire Chief, Ventura County Fire.

Darrell Higuchi, L.A. County representing (Mike Cramer?)

Keith Simmons, Santa Barbara County.

Mike Dougherty, Forest Service from South Ops.

_____, Forest Service, (San Merino Office?)

Mike Colgan, Orange County Fire Authority from FIREScope Task
Force.

John Lee, Montclair Fire.

Andy Anderson, _____

Ralph Alworth, CDF Riverside, representing the Task Force.

Gary Gilbert, CDF, Sierra South Region.

Jim Owen, CDF Sacramento.

Glen Newman, CDF and OES Region 6.

Russ Richards, Stanislaus Consolidated ... Counties North.

Jim Brannon, Linda Fire.

Lena Webb, OES Fire and Rescue.

Mark Ghilarducci, OES Fire.

Pat Kidder, Bureau of Land Management in Sacramento.

Ron Larsen, Sac County Fire, Region 4 Coordinator.

Bruce Ward, OES.

Eldon Nagel, California State Firefighters Association.

Bill Bamattre, L.A. City.

Larry Holms, Orange County Fire Service.

Neil Honeycutt, OES Fire and Rescue.

Dick Andrews, OES.

Gary Costamagna, Sac City Fire.

Jim, you have a new position with the (CD?)

Yes, I have ... from the Chief of Sierra South Region, Region Director.

Congratulations. Also another announcement – we have our leader here, Dr. Andrews has been appointed to a new position as a president of a National Emergency Management Association this coming Wednesday, today?

Last Wednesday.

Last Wednesday. Oh, yeah, got to look at the date on that. So you – that's the top of that agency.

Yeah.

I guess it was ... all that experience you got here in California from HAZ MAT, earthquake, to civil unrest, fire –

Something like that, yeah. Yeah, it's – essentially is an organization – it's all of the state emergency services directors from across the country under Alex Cunningham who some of you may remember who was the

Director of OES during Jerry Brown's administration, was the first ... so it's a special pleasure to have a chance to ...

Congratulations. Okay. Let's see, Neil, you want to give us some logistic information?

I really do enjoy the airplane pictures on the wall – it's a (big?) diversion.

Seems like it's going to be a little warm in here also, the room's small and with the air conditioner handling of equipment. Logistically, the most important item, the men's room is out the hallway to your right – the first door. The ladies' room is at the other end of the building. The office was an Air Force facility and male-dominated – I let them pick room 5 for us, we're very close. ... room opposite end of the building. Lunch will be served at noon. And again, at the bottom of your agenda, \$7.00 per person. And Lena, you want to send the sign-up sheet around as the meeting starts – how would you like to handle that?

I'll just wait till break time and break time everyone needs to come and pay me and I'll sign your name off. Also, the sign-up sheet – will you make sure that everybody signs it – everybody that's here exact please? I'd appreciate it.

And we also – there's some new people who walked in ...

Start on this (corner?) introductions.

Jim (Bristow?) I'm here representing Doug Sporleder.

Mike Douglas, OES Administration FIREScope.

Frank Arnerich, Santa Clara County.

Rich _____ CDF _____

Cary Eckard, Kern County Fire.

Kim Zagaris, OES.

Will Brock, OES.

Paul Beckstrom, OES Fire.

Okay. Do we have a motion to approve the Minutes of July 12th?

I'll move.

Do we have a second?

I'll second.

Okay. Questions? In favor of approval, signify by saying "aye."

Aye.

Opposed?

(no answer)

... passed. Dr. Andrews, OES report.

Let me just – I know some of the items that would mention will be touched on later by Neil Honeycutt and reporting on some of the general budget proposals ... to fire operations and then Mark will be talking more about the – under the US&R report about the last two alerts that we've had – California US&R teams on alert. First, last week for the possible deployment to Florida and then Georgia as a consequence of Hurricane Opal, and also incident support team from California, and then currently for the last 48 hours we've had teams – I believe the San Diego City team and Riverside City team have been on alert for possible deployment to (Manzanilla?) in response to the earthquake in Mexico. At this time it's unlikely that they will actually be sent. One thing I did want to mention and touch on a little bit is that some of you who have been on the Board for a time, you may recall discussions that we had in late 1991 and early 1992 that led to the enactment and the signing by Governor Wilson of Senate Bill 1842 which – 41 – 1841 – that established the Standardized Emergency Management

system. As many of you will recall, that system is based upon the incident command system, the MACS system, operational area, or standard mutual aid agreement. We reached another milestone in the process of putting that SEMS system into place. Again, as background, we have developed the regulations that have been approved by the Office of Administrative Law. We have developed guidelines and a training module. The training modules have been modeled after the generic ICS curriculum that was developed by the National (Wildland?) Fire Group out of Boise, Idaho. And about three weeks ago, we had the first meeting of the Advisory Board that is established and called for in the legislation that has general responsibility of overseeing the implementation and the monitoring of the SEMS system. That Board is to play a role roughly analogous to this Board in that the responsibilities of the SEMS Advisory Board are essentially to oversee the implementation of the Standardized Emergency Management system throughout the state to make sure that there aren't any inappropriate modifications or variations to that system. And also in the event of the need to activate ... punitive side of the SEMS system, which is to deny reimbursement assistance to any local jurisdiction that does not, as ... declared emergency follow the SEMS system and that failure to follow the system result in some kind of difficulty of the response. We do have the authority to essentially deny them reimbursement assistance. That Board would be the group that we would turn to for advice on that, and also frankly to help us take the heat in case that we do that. It's not something that we want to do just on our own. So that Board met for the first time and it includes Chief _____ representing the FIREScope Board, Richard Wilson, the Director of CDF, is also a member of the Board. It includes the Commissioner of the Highway Patrol, representatives of the Sheriffs Association, California Police Chiefs Association, (Utilities?), several

other key state emergency response organizations, and we will be adding to the Board when it meets the next time in early February – representatives from local governments from each of the six mutual aid regions in the state. One of the things that we will need to discuss at probably the next meeting of this FIREScope Board is the exact relationship between this Board and the SEMS' Advisory Board. The meeting went well as I guess testament to the fact that it was the first time that the group got together. There was a much more compliant and docile group than you guys usually are, and so in all it went quite smoothly. But for us again, it's an important milestone in the overall implementation of the SEMS system. It kind of evolved in the early stages of the training to ensure that people across the state are prepared to implement this system on December 1st of next year, 1996, is the time the system needs to be in place and actually operational. We completed some major training of LAPD had training for what, about a two week period? ... trainer program that will then be used for spreading the training ... LAPD. Chief Honeycutt participated in that training, so we're well on the way of making the – what was only a concept in early 1992 into an actual operational reality. So any questions about that process? There is, I should mention, a great deal of interest nationally in what we're doing here and how ... SEMS. Once again, much as we did with the initial development of the Incident Command System and ... system, we'll try to be at the forefront of trying to develop a Standardized Emergency System that's (needs?) to be used across all ... in all major emergencies. A couple of other states – Minnesota being one of them – have a system that's something in place that they call a system – it really does not have the kind of (delivery?) and the background in it that ... the systems here in California have. We are experiencing the same kind of response as some other states as they become aware of this, that the fire

services in California are accustomed to ... as you deal with some of your colleagues and ... founded in California it can't be very good, and we need to put our own fingerprints on this and modify it to our specific needs. But we're very encouraged about what's happened here in California as well as the interest that's been expressed across the country.

How often does that Board meet?

(someone coughed)

How often does that Board meet?

It meets – I think the legislation requires it to meet twice a year.

Minimum.

Minimum – twice a year. So our next meeting, I think, is February 12th. February 12th. And we will – we'll keep it at twice a year schedule, except should we have the need for needing some more people. Chief ... you were there at the meeting.

I don't have anything to add. I think a couple of key dates that the Board mentioned was December of this year – December '95 operational areas throughout the state –

Right.

– are to be in place, and December '96 we are supposed to ... standard (implement?) emergency management system.

Yeah, and one of the interesting things that's occurring with part of the requirements of the legislation is that every county in California must organize themselves into an operational area. Now, an operational area is not synonymous with county government. It basically is all of the jurisdictions contained within the geographical boundaries of the county. And they're required to come together, and by action of the Board of Supervisors, formalize some kind of an arrangement by which local governments and special

districts and utilities will, together with the cities and counties, organize themselves for emergency operations and emergency services. And none of this makes any changes to the in-place Mutual Aid systems. This essentially is all supplemental to the in-place Mutual Aid systems. But those operational areas will serve as an essential layer in the overall SEMS process so that information from cities and counties and special districts will come into the operational area, then being forwarded on to region and on to the state. One of the things that's happening, and probably the most dramatic example, is what's going on in Los Angeles County where the historic suspicion between the County and the City over emergency issues is starting to go away. And we're beginning to see a lot of cooperation and actual agreement between the City and the County over how emergency systems are to operate. There was a workshop that was held two weeks ago at Lake Arrowhead that represents the City and the County came together to really discuss how this operational area is going to be a reality. We still have some other parts of the state where the fences have not entirely been breached yet. In Santa Clara County, the City of San Jose and Santa Clara County are still eyeing each other with a lot of suspicion. And they really haven't started to get together yet. But we're beginning to see -- like in San Bernardino County's another area where there was bad blood between some of the cities in San Bernardino County and the County. And that's beginning to break down. I wouldn't say we're there yet, but there's some very definite movement. And all of this is really being driven by this requirement that they ... be there to have every county in the state formally in an operational area by December of this year. But I think we will then ... starting to build, and as the people become more and more aware of the potential ... for them to lose some dollars should they have a need for

emergency ... I think we'll start to see even more action in some places of the state. Bruce, do you have anything you want to add ...

No, I think you about summed it up. It's moving along very well, and the most important thing for the Fire and Mutual Aid system is it doesn't impact that in the least, and everything goes on, business as usual for you guys. In fact, we are emulating what the Fire Services have all done by developing SEMS for ...

I mean, hopefully when this thing gets in place, you guys having been through not only the development of ICS and the fire system, but also in recognizing that when we have events like the fire storms in 1993, there's, you know, because of changes in personnel and other things, there's always a need to kind of have refresher training to keep people up to date. This system is not going to spring out fully operational and totally effective on December 1st just 'cause the law says that it's supposed to be in place. But hopefully, once it is in place and operational, it should mean that as you guys go about your business, as you interact with other ... and law enforcement or utilities or the emergency services organizations within the cities and the counties, their structure, their terminology, their procedures mirror procedures that you're accustomed to so you're not really running into totally different environment when you begin to interact with some of these other functions.

Neil, you have a report for us?

Yes I do.

I'd like to add one comment ... the Los Angeles ... Mike (Coleman?) has been involved in this process from the beginning. One of the things we talked about during the development of the ICS and ... trade-off to local government. A lot of concern, a lot of concern from the fire community ... concern about this process. And we saw I think the fruit of our labor in Los

Angeles – a couple of things. One is, they invited Mike to come to teach the class of one of the modules – or a number of the modules. It was very positive. They had an L.A. County sheriff also involved in the trainings. And those of us that were there saw the beginning, I think, of very important change. L.A. City Fire was very heavily involved in that process in assisting LAPD. And this is one of the roles that we've discussed here a number of times in terms of the ... Fire Service is ... people that understand the system, and can present it and take it to the masses. So that's been very enlightening. I felt sorry for the ...and the City police officers who has three binders full of information to try to get through in a two week period. They'll take some more time to do that. I think it's working. And Mike, did you have any, in terms of a trainer –

That was a first, I guess. I didn't realize it ... it was a first for LAPD to have outsiders, especially the sheriff – the fire department's one thing, but having the sheriff there was another part of that (building?) that ... talk about.

Just that I think it's beginning to happen, other ... are starting to be felt and that the PD has understood it obviously, and looking at a management system that will work for them.

Well maybe we'll find the (model?)

And we think it would.

Mike, I ... that was law enforcement guys in the last year or so making sure that these things were all in place, and well done.

Neil Honeycutt presentation:

From the OES Fire and Rescue, Mike, the first order of business here is with a lot of pride to introduce somebody you already know, Michael Douglas, our Deputy Chief, appointed Deputy Chief for Administration of FIRESCOPE. Mike's a real asset to this organization, to the state of California, and my

management team – one of his tasks was to bring our manual and older systems into the 20th century. He's ... over there – as we look at all our needs internally, to automate our office, all of our staff, inter-relationship in terms of the way we do work, all those kinds of things – part of his charge.

In addition to taking on the additional responsibility of the FIREScope as you talked at the last meeting, the discussion about – as we lost one of our Deputy Chief's positions, we combined those – Admin and FIREScope. So I welcome Mike as Deputy Chief of Admin and FIREScope and encourage you all to get a chance to know him as we work through these processes over the next years. I think you'll come to find out, that we have at OES that he's very much of an asset.

In line with that move, with Mike into the Admin FIREScope Deputy Chief position – James Jeffrey was moved from Region 1 into Support Services Manager at Riverside. And John Lender was reassigned back as Assistant Chief, his regular position, at Region 6. And we will continue doing double duty with all of our Assistant Chiefs in the field until we are able to fill the positions. At this time, the examination process, the final filing date was extended until this Friday – October the 13th – part of that reason was that a number of Fire Chiefs received the information, the announcement, and failed to pass it down through the chain of command to their subordinate chief officers, announcing our position. So we were able to get that extended and have, I think, about 20 additional people have applied for Assistant Chief, Field Coordinator position, which brings our total to about 50, I think, we're in the process of going through the applications.

Our personnel in Sacramento will review the applications that are received after October 13th, go through a review process, and with the time that takes it to November 30th, takes about five to six weeks to get all the

announcements back, check all the applications and make sure there's any protest, and get that all taken care of, which puts us past the week of Thanksgiving, puts them into almost Christmas, so they've had to, because of their workload, put the examination into the first week of January '96. We'll make appointments on or about February 1st. So those field positions for Region 1, Region 2, Urban Search and Rescue and possibly Region 5 will be made after that time.

As this continues, our internal reorganization continues. This is a process, I guess, that all of us go through and maybe it's a continuous process. We have now finalized our first phase – operations, field operations, all Field Assistant Chiefs report to Deputy Chief Paul Beckstrom in Operations. The Admin FIREScope, as I mentioned, under the responsibility of Mike Douglas. And Special Operations which includes Urban Search and Rescue, HAZ MAT and most likely in the future, EMS and the Medical Mutual Aid system is developed under the control of Deputy Chief Mark Ghilarducci. And with this now we are – have our management team in place and we're looking forward to hiring our people in January or February, and moving forward with preparing for – we keep saying next fire season, but we've been in almost continuous operations since January. I think we call this the Andrews legacy that we are ...

But we are – it's been a very good time for us in terms of even though being very short-staffed, responding to these requests for emergencies – Oklahoma City we responded and fulfilled our responsibilities there adequately, very adequately. But with the earthquakes, this is an unusual hurricane year, and our Urban Search and Rescue people have been (off and on?) alert almost continuously for the last – I want to say about six or eight weeks. We're learning the Mexican geography as we – the west coast for the

earthquakes to the east coast and into the Gulf for the hurricanes. And we'll continue to monitor that and as we speak, that process is going on.

As I said, our personnel – one of our – my charges, my staff have been working on even before I arrived here, was to bring Fire and Rescue, the qualifications of (people?), bring them together. We'll continue with that. We are now one position Fire and Rescue Coordinator, and Kim has been doing double duty cross training work under Urban Search and Rescue, getting his skills up to speed so that we can do the ... to be able to go to Urban Search and Rescue team and coordinate that with them.

Continue to evaluate all of our programs, working internally with OES. As I said a couple of times tongue in cheek, the state bureaucracy has been exciting for me – all those in state government always have a little smile when we talk about working with EPA and working with the Department of Finance. But working with those folks to continue evaluating our programs, getting our budget in place so we can make recommendations to our executive, of what our needs are, and adequately voice those and identify them. And then, with the staff in place, for me to focus more on the long-range planning because obviously an area of need and been short-changed in the last few months.

And we are – and that's being submitted, some budget change proposals, again, this is part of the state budget process. We are asking them for to look at our engine replacement program. We know that's a key to our operation and our biggest need with our engine fleet aging, looking to – well, I can't say we'll get everything we want, but we're asking for a lot in terms of the replacement program. Upgrading our Urban Search and Rescue capability teams and support, and then also our second phase of our reorganization which includes the Fire (Master?) training center, adding

adequate support staff for our personnel and if the budget allows, eventually to mirror an OCC in the North at Redding similar to the operation we have at Riverside.

I mean I know this has been a very busy year. We've been operational almost continuously since January – a couple of breaks. And we are ready and willing and able to answer the call. And I made a note here that we have a new focus on our capability to assist other states and other countries with that responsibility that really does broaden our role and our preparation for those major operations. With that – questions?

(end of Neil Honeycutt's presentation)

Any questions of –

... really for Bruce – Bruce, at the last meeting you committed to having the Board participate in the selection of FIREScope position. And I was just wondering how you fulfilled that commitment.

No, I didn't. Well, my recollection, Larry, was that I was talking about the Assistant Chiefs ... and which is coming up that Neil talked about. I wasn't talking about the specific position.

What do you mean? Do you mean the one that Jim Jeffrey is currently in?

No, we were talking about – I was under the impression – I don't know how the rest ... whoever was going to be the FIREScope Administration was someone that we would have an interest in not necessarily ... as I said before, any veto process, but to participate, if nothing more, ... that process. And I thought we had a commitment that that would occur.

Well, I'm sorry. Either I mis-spoke or you misunderstood me. My statement was that you would be part of the selection process for the Assistant

Chiefs. The only thing that has taken place since then that has changed is that Jim Jeffrey is now taking the place of FIREScope ...

And he may or may not stay there after the selection's made of Assistant Chief, we're going to play that one by ear as it develops.

We discussed that at length this last meeting and that was Larry's impression, it was mine also. Because it was a quite heated discussion and we tried to explain ... we're not in any way trying to dictate or even have veto power of the selection process, but ... certainly play a role in that. And I also thought the agreement was that we would – I mean it was not ... as I recall, Assistant Chief, Deputy Chief – we were talking about all the positions.

I think my response to that was from Chief Manning, who was talking about having a non-fire person at the OCC ... or at least that was my understanding.

Well, it was in the whole context of the discussions, so I went away with the same impression that Larry had. So there must have been some misunderstanding. Because I thought Neil had stated that we would, after the heated discussions that went on, that we would very much ... involved in that process.

It was my understanding.

My focus on the process is fully ... Assistant Chief exam, and maybe that's where I was – that's where I was – my comments were directed to getting this examination process ... as over 50 people, it looks like this point, coming into our agency and being reviewed through a testing process ... exam and the oral board and ... the appointment.

Yeah, there was some misunderstanding, as I recall, and Neil didn't believe or forgot that FIREScope is represented in the very process where he was selected. And I corrected that. And I also, that's when I pointed out that

(welcome?) involvement again by the FIREScope in the selection process. Since then, obviously the testing process for Assistant Chief is going forward as Neil spoke about. And in the discussion, I was responding to Chief Manning's statement that a non-fire person would be running the OCC, or something to that ... or that context. And that was what I was responding to.

Well I think part of the difficulty, or concern, from FIREScope side, was the ... and losing that ...

Which we have no control -

No, Neil explained that about what the state process was ... positions and so forth. But I went away from here with the same impression that Larry had, and that was not a specific statement about the Assistant Chief - we were talking about positions, and Larry even mentioned that he sat on the Board when Neil was hired. And that we would like to have the Fire Service point of view input at least being involved in the process. And I thought -

I'll state it again. You could report it, but you will have the input for the incoming process, the selection made about for Mike Douglas was based on the fact that he was the best person for the job, and that he has demonstrated that potential throughout his career at OES in the US&R system. And we are combining US&R into the Fire and Rescue Branch, as you know, so this is very much a logical next step to put him in that position. He also has the best aptitude for the administrative job, which we are trying to accomplish with our organization. To me that's an internal process, and Dick Andrews agrees with that, and that was the step that we took. Now, I fully expect that you guys will have complete say in everything that occurs in FIREScope based on your decision process you guys use in your own system. Mike Douglas, just because he's in that position, can do nothing unilaterally. You can (not?) review or have input too. Am I right?

(inaudible comment)

I mean, that's my understanding of your decision process – that it's very much a collective participative agreement.

I don't think we were talking necessarily about Mr. Douglas. It was just that we wanted it reiterated that we are involved in the process. Maybe make it a little more ...

What you're doing ...

Well, –

I'd like us all to walk away from this meeting with the same ...

Then throw out for your process whoever you want to be involved in the Assistant Chief selection which is coming up. The last time we had the Forest Service, we had Larry Holms, as I recall. Was that it, Larry?

For the Chief's position?

Yeah.

Yeah.

Just for clarification, I was really concerned when I brought the issue up, that we participate at management level process and I think it's nice that you're wanting us to participate at the Assistant Chief level too, but the reason I brought the subject up was our role as the Board of Directors of FIREScope, we should be also (authority in an election?) So I was under the impression where they're talking about the administrative position – how you go about involving in the Assistant Chief's position – I would be comfortable with however our chairman wants to ... representation.

And not to put too fine a point on this, but by previous action of this Board about a half an hour ago, you approved the minutes of the last meeting. The minutes of the last meeting do not reflect the discussion that's currently

going on. And so if there was a point ... need to be appended to those minutes which are draft until approved by the Board.

Well, Dick, if you don't mind, this point of order on that – if you want to be that detailed in our discussions on the minutes, then it would really be nice if we got our minutes before we opened up the meeting so we have a chance to review them ... the approval of minutes is just a perfunctory function rather than – because people don't really have time to sit down and read through them. We get here, we socialize, we begin our business, and it's the first thing ...

Yeah, we should have them in advance. I agree.

Notwithstanding all of that, Bruce, what's going to be the process for selecting the – now you said that Jim was not – may or may not continue as the FIREScope person in Riverside, is that correct?

Yeah, Jim was put in there, based on my understanding with Neil, that he has the most experience in running the OCC during operations.

Okay.

Previously. So we have put him in there so we can – bring people on board – and it's our intention that the person in Region 6 and the person in Region 1 would be cross-trained in that position. Conceivably, if there's a better person that we bring on board into Region 1, that's the person who will take over that job.

Is the process for the Assistant Chiefs – is that analogous, or the same as the process for replacing the OCC Manager? The OCC Manager is probably not going to be Assistant Chief or Deputy Chief.

No, that's an Assistant Chief. Support Service Managers are –

All right, (disregard?) the Support Services now. They're just throw that out – this is an Assistant Chief position. And this was the point I was

trying to make last time – this will be a person who has really been a fire fighter, who's really fought fires in the real world and knows what's going on out there from the vantage point of working within the OCC, which was really the point I was trying to make.

Okay, and that position has not been filled?

No, temporarily, Jim Jeffrey is in there, and so we get – and he has been moved over from Region 1, and that's since Region 1 is vacant, we're going to –

(inaudible comment)

... temporarily part that I missed. I didn't realize that Jim was temporarily – that that was a temporary assignment there. Larry, I don't know if that was – that's news to you or not –

No. He's been transferred – Jim has officially been transferred to Riverside, and this is back – one of these little nuances here in state government – he's been transferred. He's no longer in Region 1, he's a Support Services Manager role in Riverside. Based on this process and the candidates out of the candidate pool, not knowing who that candidate pool is going to be and the process is ... taking longer than we ever anticipated. We're faced with the urgency of getting someone into the OCC immediately, and Jim's the only person on my staff that has recent experience. And is a person that identify ... and he's there.

I mean that's –

There's a possibility –

Right, he may be one of the candidates ... and all that, but I guess what the clarification that that's a temporary one, and then the appointment has not been made – are you resting easier with that, Larry?

Uh

That there's still an opportunity for us to participate in a higher level?

I think that's helpful.

Okay.

... with Larry Holms as saying, because I remember the same conversation. My conclusion was the same as yours.

What was that conclusion? I mean I'm still a little vague about what we did here that's caused such concern.

I remembered that there was somebody from the Board of Directors was going to be a part of the process -- not necessarily a voting member, but be there during the process.

That's right, and I was referring specifically to the --

Yeah, the point is, there was no process that was involved here. We simply did an internal reassignment of personnel pending subsequent action. There was absolutely nothing -- there was no decision that was made. ... a decision between Jim Jeffrey and John Linder as to who we could put into that position in the short term. And until such time as we're able to augment our staff with additional people -- and I don't know -- I mean, with all due respect to this Board, it doesn't seem to me that we've done anything clandestine here or without consulting and seeking your counsel in all of this.

Well, I'm ... concerned that you (weren't?) at the last meeting, that it was voiced ... at times was the beginning that the Deputy Chief's job ... and that Deputy Chief to be assigned to Sacramento. That didn't, and I don't think does, set very well with most of the Fire Service in southern California. It's a downgrading that most of us see in the FIREScope program -- I'll be honest with you. And that began the conversation and so forth. And I think we walked away from that conversation last meeting with the understanding that where FIREScope was involved, that this Board would have participation in

the selection process. Now, internal movements of personnel in OES, I don't necessarily think that we need to get involved in that. But where it involves FIREScope I think this Board does have the right or the -- we should be consulted. It should be discussed here. I think that's kind of the feeling that everybody walked away from ... everybody agreed with that. Neil? Everybody?

But again, I'm not sure what it is that we've done that goes against that understanding because essentially all we've done is an internal reassignment of personnel.

... No, like I said, that was kind of a misunderstanding, too. You know, Jim's going to be in OCC Riverside, but that may only be temporary. Nobody's suggesting that it's clandestine movements here, but I think it needs to be more in the open, and maybe --

Well I can be very frank with you. I've got six people on my staff. It didn't require a lot of thought about in terms of who had the most recent experience, who could best serve our needs at the OCC, and I caution to use the word "temporary" because it creates a problem from a labor relations standpoint for Jim and his bargaining unit and me using the word "temporary." He's -- it's a permanent assignment -- it may be one year, it may be two years, it may be ten years. But in that sense, based on my concerns for the needs expressed by this Board of what we had -- our obligations for Mike (et al?) at OCC, was to get someone there that wasn't a new employee -- someone who was an experienced employee, that had been through the process and knew the FIREScope system, and get him in there as quickly as possible and make that work. You may already know, Jim's not real happy with that, but that's a different story. But that met our obligation -- we fill our responsibility to that position and to our partnership and FIREScope. And I -- if I -- again, you said it, "heated's" not the right word

– a little bit of emotion at the last meeting. And I recall that talking about the examination process, and I think – I was focused on the Assistant Chief process, with a large number of candidates coming into this. I see this pool of people being the replacement for most of my staff – not all of them certainly because some of them will be here for a long time. But that's what we're focused on that group – our concern on the selection of those folks coming in as new people that will have a full range of skills to be able to serve our needs and yours. And they'll be around to do that for a long time. And so that's been – that's where I was focused on, and that's what I was talking about. And if I mis-spoke, I apologize also. This – we thought we were closer with the final – I believe the last thing I reported that we thought we'd have this examination process completed on or about 1 December. So we're about, because of holidays through Christmas, etc., we're about 60 days off that schedule.

You know, one thing I think needs to be made clear – there's very few people working in the Fire and Rescue Branch of OES. You have very few choices, very few options that we can make. One of them allowed for Jim Jeffrey to go to the OCC because we felt he was our best candidate currently. Despite what Neil says, we're going to take another look at that as soon as we get Assistant Chief in place in Region 1. And secondly, we need a person with strong administrative background – Mike Douglas is that person. We have no choice but to downsize four Deputy Chiefs to three. Our personnel administration in state government won't allow for anything else – we have no choice. There are very few options. And whether the input comes in from FIREScope or not, we're between a rock and a hard spot. That's all there is to it. So we made the best options – we made the best choices considering

what our options were. Now, again ... Douglas is the very best person for the job that he's in right now.

Bruce, I'd have been comfortable with that if you'd have taken time to talk to Gary as the chairman and say here is what – and again, no veto power, just communication. And if there were something of concern that the Board had and we communicated it to Gary, or whoever that person is that Gary has appointed to be in that process, that's all I was really looking for, is just some communication. Those are the key positions and it has nothing to do with the individuals, honestly. Absolutely nothing to do with who you have chosen. But those are the key positions that make for the success or failure of the program that we're charged with making successful. And ... talk ... on it, but that – you have effectively taken that decision process or input away, and I realize you have the ultimate responsibility and ultimate authority to do that. But it would seem to me to be a sounder process if you took just the extra step to communicate, at least with our chairman, on those positions that impact our program.

That's the easy part.

The hard part is trying to mix and match what few assets we have.

I understand that.

Very few assets.

I really do. And we're not trying to interfere. And please don't get the wrong message. But again, we are very concerned about the health and well-being of the FIREScope program.

Well, briefly, just one thought. One (support?) ... to Neil was that that – Neil did come and talk to me about Jim. If we can work together, that ...
(end of this side of tape)

SIDE 2

So I apologize for that. But I will make every effort to call Gary before we make any further moves, including when we have our list in place and we're about to make selections, I'll be happy to consult with Gary before making any selections. I hope that's on the record.

Well, I think the next issue is Gary's going to be expected to touch bases with certain individuals in this group or what Gary can do.

I think when that occurs, what we'll do is, I'll – I'll ask for a specific areas – Region 1, Region 2, Region 5 and OCC, individuals to come and participate in those areas that are affected. I think the whole issue is about what we're all going through, no matter what agency we represent, is the fact that the Fire Service is being put upon – pressure's being put upon us across the whole state to continue to maintain our current levels of service with less people. And it's a concern, I think of everybody in this room. We have had a program that has worked excellent throughout the state, throughout the nation, and because of budget pressures, it's harder to share those resources at a time where the bean counters are watching every dime we spend. And I think that's a big challenge to this Board today, is the ability to keep our system in place, our ability to keep the cooperation moving and the ability to share resources when every time you share it, somebody wants to know what it costs you. And who can we go to to recoup that cost? Who's the ultimate agency that's responsible whether it starts in a local area and goes into a state area or a federal area – the local agencies should be responsible because that's where it started. We all know that that isn't the way it works. But yet, the budget people want accountability all the way around, so – it's a real issue for us. From the sharing the resources to the cooperative agreement – all

those things are going to be real issues that we have to hammer out, and we're getting pressure from the budget people to be accountable, so –

And that's how we got in the position we're in. If we didn't eliminate the position, this would be – this discussion would be ...

I think – I think what we can't lose sight of is how the system functions and how well it functions. And it functions because a lot of us are willing to cooperate. A lot of us are willing to go back to our agency budget people and say that's the way it works and it's more efficient than spending a little bit of money on initial response than spending a lot of money trying to deal with it after it's got out of control. So – I will definitely touch base with those areas that you identify and we'll get some people involved. May not be one for the whole process, it may be a couple for the different –

I'll just say that, you know, if it was a misunderstanding, if we failed to communicate with you, then we apologize. But I also think that you have a responsibility – this is surely not the first time some of you heard this occur. And I'm not aware that anybody picked up the phone and called us and said, well we understand this is going on and we thought this agreement had been reached – you know, what's the story here? I think that some of the opening (salvos?) in this discussion today were reflective of a kind of attitude that I find disturbing because it seems to me that we have through the selection of the Chief and through almost all the other processes that we've been involved in, had a very participatory process. And that's been a commitment that I've made, not only to the Fire Services, but across the board in OES. We try to do things in a very open way. And so to walk into a room and essentially be questioned in that way, you know, what did you do to fulfill this commitment that you made to us – I don't particularly appreciate it. And I would again just urge you, if we've done something that angers you, don't wait till you get

here to do it – pick up the damn phone and call us and tell us that there's a problem. And we'll try to explain it to you or (reverse?) the whole thing.

I was under the impression that it had been fulfilled – coming to the meeting today. So that's – I wasn't trying to sandbag you – if I offended you, I apologize for that. I was honestly under the impression that the commitment had been fulfilled, and I asked Gary five minutes before we started if he'd been contacted and (he?) said no. And so I was really honestly asking for how it was fulfilled. I thought it had been fulfilled, and I was just, for the benefit of all of us, to know how you did make that ... And I'm really – and I apologize if I offended you. But that was not meant – I wasn't sandbagging you. I had taken everything ... was your word, and I assumed that you had fulfilled that with somebody up here close and didn't give it any more thought.

I think we have a clear understanding ...

(laughter)

Somebody shoot this (sucker?) so we can move on?

Yeah, let's move on.

Let's call the ...

One good thing about this group – we are very candid.

So am I.

All right, let's see. After that – any other questions of Chief Honeycutt? If not, we'll move to Paul Beckstrom, you have a Operations report, Paul?

Paul Beckstrom:

Well, fortunately, you heard about all the other activity. Fortunately, we had a fairly slow summer fire mutual aid wise, so the largest fire we had, to my recollection, just occurred last week – the (Vision?) fire in Marin County

we had 13 strike teams on that from the 3rd to October 9th. Everybody ... and home now.

Part and parcel to the previous conversation is that we will be filling four Assistant Chiefs position off of this new list. The position that Jim Jeffrey had occupied in Region 1, Region 2, Region 5 for the first time that anybody can remember, and then the backfill US&R position that Mike Douglas vacated recently. So field coordinator wise, we'll be up to the full staff, which is something which has not occurred since I've been around the last five years.

Our engines are still on-line, we're getting two in March and two in April. Again, the hold-up has been the same hold-up that CDF has had with their engines, and that is getting cab chassis out of (HME?)

We are proceeding with a slow upgrade of our engines by adding 800 feet of single jack, inch and a half – we'll start the newer engines and work back so that there will be another capability there for the ability to make progressive hose (link?) And as I can squeeze dollars out of my Maintenance budget, we've been doing two, three, four a year upgrades on the International wide-body diesels which, regardless of what we do in terms of engine replacement cycles, we'll have these around for some time. So we're repainting a selected few, adding a lot of the aluminum diamond plate, putting dry.(deck?) in, adding a light bar for intersection safety, we're moving the horns down to comply with the other safety regulations. So that's going on kind of behind the scenes. And that's about all I have, unless somebody has any questions.

Any questions of Paul?

Oh, one last thing. We are in the process, and we're very close to converting over to the high band, all high band system. We're not putting any

low band radios in anything any more. Just was handed a list today of what our T-Com division thinks the mountain tops look like – we get them all checked out, we will either at the next meeting, or probably before them, I'll send out a list of what the new inputs are. In other words, we've gone from coming out low band, ... the repeater, and coming back high band. Cross-mated system we've had since the 50's. We'll end up with four frequency (fairs?), possibly a fifth. And the CTCSS tones to be able to totally access OES radio system with a high band radio and as soon as we're dead certain that it's in concrete that these are the frequencies and that there's no holes in the system, we'll share that with you folks.

(end of presentation)

Okay, Mike, do you have an Administrative report?

Mike _____'s presentation:

Well, one of the first tasks in taking this over is to take a look at what the system looks like – take a look at the operation, take a look at the infrastructure, and I must point out that the infrastructure has some problems in terms of technology. ... has, I think, Neil mentioned earlier, to bring the operation into the 20th century. We need to bring the (prime?) out of the 1200 Dark Ages into, you know, the high speed ... that we have now – we want to make it user-friendly, so you folks can call it up. We want to be able to have you do your stress surveys electronically instead of giving the post office a lot of money and sending the surveys down the line in a way that causes weeks of delays. We want to move this forward.

Now, this – you can only eat an elephant one ... at a time. And ... pointed out here that this elephant did not start growing in the past nine.

months. This elephant that is somewhat decaying in terms of infrastructure has been decaying for some years. And why that has happened is immaterial really. The point is, we need to move ahead, and we're going to. We're going to start automating the office down there. We have problems with mapping machines that give off fumes and give our people headaches down there. We need to take care of that. Our people don't have voicemail – they have no way of getting messages when they're not there – we can take care of that. There are a lot of little tiny issues that need to be taken care of to get this operation up to speed. And it's not going to happen overnight. Again, it's been decaying for some time, and it's going to take some time to get it back up to speed.

Our job here is not to come in and do a wholesale renovation of the OCC or FIREScope or anything else. Our task is to do a systems analysis and make it work better for you out there. I'm concerned that I'm getting probably two or three calls a day – who's my operational area coordinator? I don't know. I get calls – I got a call last week – who's in my region? What region am I in? Folks, this is a problem. And again, there are some very, very serious problems out there. And we need to address them. And we're going to. And we're going to improve systems, but again, and I think Chief Costamagna mentioned this – we're all being forced to do more with less. And so my task is to take that less and do as much with it as I can to support you folks. And I can either do that with your cooperation, or you can fight me and it's going to take longer. So I would throw the glove out there to you and say, let's not quibble, let's move ahead, let's make ... work better. And I'll look forward to your cooperation in that regard. Thank you.

(end of Mike's presentation):

Any questions of Mike?

(no answer)

Thank you, Mike. Well, Mark, you care to give us an update on ...

Mark's presentation:

Yeah. I think Dr. Andrews and Chief Honeycutt have already mentioned that we've had a fairly busy year with regards to our Urban Search and Rescue side of the house. And while the system nationwide has seen four complete activations, nine alerts, include about 20 different task forces and five overhead teams that have been deployed over the last – this last year alone – 1995 since the earthquake in Kobe and rolling into where we're at now in Mexico, only emphasizes our international role and the hurricanes, our national role, in supporting that nationwide disaster response for the federal government.

Nonetheless we've been doing this, Mike has mentioned and others have, so eloquently more with less. We're looking forward to the new person coming on to be able to support the mountainous amount of activity that we generated after each activation or alert. We are actively pursuing and in the process of issuing certification for rescue systems training and rescue – and US&R specialists specialty training throughout the state. We've got a couple of satellite centers that we have set up in North_____, Anaheim, and also in Menlo Park, and are currently in the process of negotiating with the City of Sacramento and the American River Fire Protection District, an association for moving the state fire and rescue training center from San Luis Obispo to McClellan Air Force Base in Sacramento. That should help us tremendously with logistical support and financing, etc.

I don't necessarily anticipate slowing of the process. I think the US&R program is here to stay. It got a lot bigger than I ever envisioned it would,

particularly in five years. If you consider the EMS program or the HAZ MAT program taking ten to 15 years to get fully operational, this one has been very active in five years, and I think will impact all of us here.

In addition, we've got the ICS guidelines, the ICS 120-1 guidelines for Urban Search and Rescue that have gone out to the majority of the Fire Service and fire agencies throughout the state are developing their basic light, medium, and heavy rescue capabilities. And it's being incorporated in the (stress?) program this year so that all departments will be able to supply that information and we can get on with that process.

We currently are looking at, probably this year, this next fiscal year – I'm sorry, this next calendar year – instituting the – for the FIREScope program some typing for swift water rescue and possibly we can find space to further specialize in the rescue or special operations arena. That's not my idea – that's coming from the Fire Service. There's a tremendous requirement and need by people in the Fire Service to get more standardized at every step of the way. And I believe that concern or request, because I think it makes all of our jobs easier when the – when activity occurs.

That's all I have on the US&R side. I'd like to just comment on the Hazardous Materials side which has also been thrown my way this last few months. The Hazardous Materials Mutual Aid Plan is moving ahead. We have had several meetings with regards to the establishment of the plan. It has been agreed upon and incorporated that the fire – State Fire and Rescue Mutual Aid Plan will be the State Fire & Rescue and Hazardous Materials Mutual Aid Plan. We will develop another system on the side and we're looking at the resources, the typing as well FIREScope is a partner in that process. Mike Boyle from Orange County is the representative from the Task Force on there. And there is – we've identified some issues that probably need

to go back into the process to be re-evaluated, particularly in what a HAZ MAT strike team is. That has yet to be determined, and I know that FIREScope group argued, or had difficulty with that particular point. But if we don't do it, somebody else is going to do it. We need to get that back into the system and get it taken care of.

I anticipate that by either the next meeting of this body or the meeting after that, we will have the new Fire and Rescue Mutual Aid Plan with the incorporations of particular items and (hazard?) ... in your hands to review and adopt and ratify so we can get on with this chapter and get on to the next. That's all I have.

(end of Mark's presentation)

Questions of Mark?

Just a ... separate from HAZ MAT, the swift water equipment that we purchased during the storms – a lot of it seems to be still at OES and I'm wondering if there's a logistical problem in getting it out to the various task forces.

None of it's in OES. It's all out at the task forces. It's been out for some months.

Mike, you said that there was approval to the Fire and Rescue and Hazardous Materials agreement? Who approved that?

No, it's not an approval. It'll come back to this body for approval of the new updated Fire and Rescue Mutual Aid Plan.

That isn't what I ... you to say. You said that it had been approved and was going to be brought forth –

Well let me clarify so that it is actually on the record so there's no question –

Well, I guess –

The issue –

Why I asked the question –

The issue is that there is a group looking at it, it's chaired by C _____ Powell of the _____ Grande Fire, it's part of (C-PERKS) the equipment and training subcommittee, part of the legislation to establish a Hazardous Materials Mutual Aid Plan. We finally got the non-fire side, the environmental health side to agree that we just need to incorporate Hazardous Materials into the Fire and Rescue Mutual Aid Plan. So – and not have a second plan. So what we've done is we've taken the existing plan and gone through and added where it says "Fire and Rescue Mutual Aid Plan" – "Fire and Rescue and Hazardous Materials Mutual Aid Plan" and outlined a few references with regards to that. Because 90 percent of the Mutual Aid responders within the state are Fire. And so, as a result, it's at the point where we've generated the first draft of that, actually was done by Chief (Dunbar?) at Sac City, generated the first draft of that. I would say this next meeting and the meeting after we will bring the final draft to you all for ratification and approval.

Just a side point on that – I don't remember the date, what year it was, but it was about the same time that (Department?) of Health Services ... giving out on grants throughout the state for HAZ MAT response. This Board in fact did take an action that took HAZ MAT Mutual Aid and made it part of our Fire Service Mutual Aid. We have been on record that that's the appropriate place for that ...

Well, Mark can vouch for this – it's been like pulling teeth to keep it there. Believe me, it hasn't been easy because there's been powers that be out there and the other various disciplines, particularly the other Hazardous

Materials technical side who are trying to deviate from it and develop their own system, and it hasn't been easy keeping it there, but Mark has done a good job ... keeping it right within the Fire Mutual Aid system.

I think a point for Glen that it says in the current Fire and Rescue Mutual Aid plan – it mentions hazardous materials, but only at the time it was written, I guess it was in the 50s, hazardous materials were relatively new and not blown up to the proportion of the size it is today.

Mike, my question was on Mike's statement about the approval. I understand what you do. We have some major concerns about the first draft of CDF as a department, and we'll address that. What he said, you know, when Dick said just a few minutes ago, if you got a question and a clarification, ask it immediately. ... we can't do this both ways.

Mark, my point is that this plan was brought yesterday to the Ops Team South meeting and the Ops Team South requested I bring it forward to the Board meeting to hand out ... information to the Board. So – I don't know if that's premature.

I think it is. And I –

... not.

And I do.

As it relates to this draft, being a draft.

Again, I was not aware that that was going to happen today, and – it's up to you – you can pass it on, I think it's premature, but there is going to be changes in that between –

Would it be valuable for folks that wanted to review it to provide feedback rather than further down the road, sooner?

That's fine.

That's the only point – it was not an issue of anything else other than –

Well, quite frankly, there's nothing substantive that's changed in that document. There's just some additions of verbiage – about 27 or 30 times the word "hazardous materials" put in. There was discussion that the Fire and – OES Fire and Rescue Operational area and Regional Coordinator be changed to OES Fire and Rescue Hazardous Materials Mutual Aid Coordinator. We said that that's basically a moot point – really is not a negotiating point. And we don't think that is going to change. We did add some references in there with regards to mostly just referencing the other agencies that could in fact be brought on as technical specialists. And we referenced the actual legislation that directs us to get the Mutual Aid – Hazardous Materials Mutual Aid Plan in place.

This kind of gets us into some of the Ops team stuff. We can discuss it now –

(inaudible comment)

... where maybe the title ought to be genericized, do we just keep adding more disciplines to the title and (leave it?) as some sort of generic team that can be utilized to genericize the title to be all-encompassing rather than continue to have comma this, comma that, and comma that down the road. I don't know. I have copies. I guess I'm looking for a little bit of guidance whether to go ahead and put them out or –

Yeah, pass them out. I mean, you have them, there's nothing there that's secret or clandestine as ...

... what's going on with the group, whether it's –

Interesting meeting, this meeting, huh?

Mike, Mark can tell you, ...

The Board only – I mean the Ops team – they get a (motion?) to ... bring it (forth?) and hand it out, and it was for informational purposes at that point

in time. And comments that to ... nothing to do with – should it happen or should it not happen. It's an issue of –

I just, again, I –

... to the group and –

It needs to be reiterated – it's a document in process. By no means it is official.

Certainly says that on the ...

And I think we also need to reaffirm that the non-Fire side of the house is very vocal with regards to this particular plan. And you know, compromise is the art of negotiation and we've had to negotiate a few things to ensure that it's a collegial development, okay? But again, Chief Zagaris sits on the committee with me, or actually he had it for the first year or two and did a yeoman's job trying to keep them on line. I think that you'll find there's nothing in there of any significance that will impact you in any negative way. The final issue with it is that they – I say "they" meaning the non-Fire side – is pushing that once it's completed, it be directed to go to public comment. Now my analogy to them of why it shouldn't go is, I pulled the State Emergency Plan off the shelf and asked the authors of that – does this go to public comment every time you upgrade this plan? And the answer was "no" because it's a plan that's just going through a revision within the Fire side, there's no reason it needs to go to public comment. And I think if it does, we'll be opening up a Pandora's Box of thousands of private contractors and all these people that have – are affected by this – or could potentially be affected by this.

Mark? I guess my question is – within this (C-PERT?) group, the intent is then to provide (network?) into the FIREScope decision process after the appropriate role of ... is that –

(Kim?) you want to answer that?

Yes, that's -

The whole intent was that the C-PERT committee has the training subcommittee that trains subcommittee as Mutual Aid ... one of those responsibilities. A number of Fire Service folks sit on that subcommittee. They recommended that instead of developing a whole new system, that the operational areas and the regional coordinators will have to identify some more down the line, that most of the resources are only ... operate by (Health?) and Fire Service, is that they put the system into - existing Mutual Aid system. A number of years ago, even before legislation was gone after by some folks, I said there was no need to get legislation, that in fact they could come back to the OES Fire Advisory, FIREScope Board of Directors and recommend changes to be made at that level on the plan itself, so people thought that they wanted to get a whole new plan. Well, after we went and got legislation, it's right back in your laps for this body actually to review and to make recommendations. The subcommittee that Chief Ghilarducci is working with right now is very well aware that the final say rests with this body here and the ... as far as (further?) action is in that plan. And that's pretty much where we're at. A little more background, as Mark said that this plan was put together by one of ... Chief is very ... with HAZ MAT. Besides just looking at adding some hazard material information, he also has made some recommendations for some additional clean-up that he thought was in here. And went that extra step, which is fine, because ultimately like we said, it's in your lap to review when we get to the final process to come back and discuss it with the Chief Honeycutt, the Fire Mutual Aid Plan supposed to review it on a five-year basis. Last time you reviewed it here was in 1988, so it is up for revision as a whole anyway.

So it's going to come back into the – the FIREScope process when it is at that point for the group.

As soon as the committee finish ironing out some of the draft issues, Mark is going to – Mark's supposed to send it back to Chief Honeycutt and the Director to give back to this Board for your comments.

So there is some value, though, in commenting on the first draft. Essentially this is a first draft, there will probably be another draft or two. But the first draft we get comments in it earlier, get cleaned up.

We just went through ...

These things go into the process at different levels, whichever level is appropriate. It would seem to me the appropriate level for this would not be at the Board level because there's staff work that needs to be done by the other levels to get here. So my question again is, is it going to be submitted through the process?

Kim, may I? Again, you have a representative that sits on the C-PORT

We have a –

Training and Subcommittee representative.

It's an individual from our department that sits on there but is not representing the FIREScope process. He is a specialist group member that reports to the Task Force and sits in that process. So within the process, when they're done with it, that should go either to the Ops Team North or South or the Task Forces.

Mike, excuse me – the point's taken. I'm not necessarily sure in my mind – maybe somebody with some history can explain further than what I've got, but this is not necessarily FIREScope document – this is State ...

Yeah.

This is an annex to the State Emergency Plan, Fire and Rescue, and the Advisory Board when it gets merged with the FIREScope Board of Directors now the signature body on this document, the (red?) document, is actually the body that reviews it – not necessarily North South Ops, it's this body in here that actually reviews that document and makes recommended changes as needed, and the last time in 1988 the only major change that was made was to allow Operational Regionals to go one time to adjacent area with resources – the only changes we've ever made. And that's really the content of the State Fire and Rescue Mutual Aid Plan. It's not a FIREScope document. It's part of the State Emergency Plan and this body here really as a governing body to make recommendations to the Director for that.

Now, I would submit to you that what will go back into the FIREScope process is those items about on the Hazard Materials typing, the Strike Team, the training, and all of those items that will be needed to ensure that you've got standardization in hazardous materials response within the state. Which is another big bone of contention on the non-Fire side. Their deal was that it was too stringent and our comeback to that was that FIREScope looked at OSHA regulations, they've come up with this, it's bought off by the Fire Services, bought off by the FIREScope Board of Directors, and that's a non-negotiable point.

Well, Gary, the Task Force is doing the revisions to the ... work with C-PERK we're very supportive of giving us information to help us type out the HAZ MAT type 1 and type 2 companies. The Task Force did wrestle with the fact about HAZ MAT strike teams. And "strike team" by definition is the same type and kind. We felt that there was not enough resource pool to warrant strike team configurations. But we felt that there would be

application that at the task force level, which does not require a typing consideration.

We just need to get that clarified, Ralph, so that we can, when we go back and meet with them that it's clear where we're at with that.

... we're all clear.

Any questions?

I'm still – you're sure where this is going to (enter?) the process, I guess –

Well, I think I heard Mark say ... in the process, when he gets finished with it, he's going to bring it back here.

That's exactly right. And I –

And ... back here –

So you're not going to let your task force do your staff work for you?

There is no staff work to do. The committee –

... either way so it doesn't really matter what (level?) it ends. I wouldn't expect the Board to take action on it without the opportunity to send it to staff for review.

Well, again, I think that I'll refer with Chief Honeycutt at this point because my impression is that OES – this is a plan, State Fire and Rescue Mutual Aid Plan. This Board and the Director is the approving body. The staff work's already been done. That's what you have in front of you as a reference document – the items that you're going to be working on for the FIREScope process is training, typing, and resources. Just like on the US&R side, it was training, typing and resources, organizational structure. And that's going to be the basis by which HAZ MAT teams are moved to the state. The update of the plan, as far as I've been informed, and as I think

Chief Zagaris just mentioned, is this body's responsibility to approve and ultimately Director Andrews. And correct me if I'm wrong.

We are and have and will continue to utilize – and I thought John ... back to the FIREScope – that's the way he's identified in all the documentation –

That's right.

– his role and represented the ... and take back anything as necessary in the FIREScope process.

Neil, I think that's exactly how we got the document. It came back from him to the Task Force – Task Force to the Ops Team, and the Ops team said bring it forward. So I ...

The intent is that once we're ready to bring it back to the Board here, it comes back to them because we already envisioned that one is that we'd go from here to this Board to the Region and Operational Area Coordinators for review is it's – you know, it's not just going to happen in one meeting, and we figure it's going to take several months for input and any other recommended changes that some of the folks in this room, as well as the Regional and Operational Coordinators may see need to be done to the plan as a whole – not just a one single item.

Well, the Task Force had quite a bit of input on the typing issues of ...

And we felt the issue was resolved based on the fact that there are not that many of those resources out there that would be making ... so we felt that our task force would probably better serve the ICS user.

Is there a problem with this step being done outside and then coming in, Mark?

My question is that we received this just a few days ago as did the Ops team and to ask this Board to take action on this without the staff work being

done would, in my mind, be – would be inappropriate and not all the opportunity –

I don't think we're asking the Board to take action.

No. I mean, hell, this came forward. This was handed out to you today from the Ops team.

My question was: it still remains – and I understand it – it's going to go into the decision process, we'll have an opportunity to do the (staff work?)

Well, I guess since I'm managing it at the state level, what staff work are you speaking of? Could you kind of clarify that for me because I'm not going to go to a C-PERK meeting and have a bunch of people spend a lot of time – I don't think Chief Costamagna wants to give his person hours of time to develop the staff work, only to be given back to you at a lower level to redo staff work again. So clarify that issue with me if you would.

I'll be glad to do that later.

Well, I mean, I think for the group's benefit, it's important that we clarify it now.

The process, I guess, Mark, is all, and I've got an (answer?), thanks.

Okay, so can I – for my own clarification, what is the process we're going to follow? Is this document historically been approved here and not gone through the process, now going to go through the process? I just need direction.

I think what Mike's concern was – go ahead, I'll let you talk about it.

The document is not the issue to me. The issue is, number one, is it appropriate to (write?) disciplines within this – are we going to have Fire and Rescue, US&R cave in – all the additional disciplines to this – the input to that, I think should be done at a level with the task force and/or whatever's appropriate level and your group so that when it finally reaches this body for

approval, it is truly the Fire and Rescue Mutual Aid Plan, and not additions to it.

Well, I don't –

I think our difficulty is moving from Fire to multiple risk.

Yeah, I think Rescue is all-encompassing with those other items you mentioned. It's already clearly there. And no one, to my knowledge, mentioned adding all those other caveats. I think the only thing that we're specifically is the hazardous materials aspect which is what's done in the Fire side already. Is that not correct?

And Mike, I'd ... make a comment. The reason this came to discussion is that it is in the existing plan – not this draft – the existing plan – hazardous material is mentioned, and we're in a little bit of a dichotomy with the non-Fire people to make sure they understand that the HAZ MAT plan is part of the Fire and Rescue Mutual Aid Plan – not outside of that. That would underscore what we're doing ... this body. And that's – that may have driven some of that as the word hazardous materials question. I think through John's involvement, Captain Boyle and others in this process in the C-PERK committee, FIREScope decision process has been and will continue to be kept informed and tied in on those areas where necessary.

I think probably the issue, probably when it came up as it relates to the Ops Team South, is there were several people on there that had some history and ... the last time the document was revised and there was a group, I think, John England was kind of charged with that, and this body put together ad hoc group, for lack of a better term, who did the revision of this document. And I think that that particular group's issue yesterday was – as this revision came forward, it was news, they didn't know it, and it wasn't like this body was – went off and charged somebody, a group, C-PERK or whoever, to do this

thing because it's more of a bottom-up issue than a top-down issue, and maybe that's what kind of got them off on a ...

Well, to get back to the lowest common denominator –

It's not necessarily that the FIREScope decision process is the process – this is a Statewide Mutual Aid Plan, we understand that. ... the Fire and Rescue Advisory Committee is (it?) recommending ... Dr. Andrews approval of this document – it was kind of like this thing came up and they didn't know about it and they thought, well we should know about this thing being revised by somebody.

Well, there isn't – let's get back to the issue. There's legislation that says that a hazardous materials mutual aid plan will be developed.

I understand.

From that legislation, where they started to go off on their own, we've got them merged back into the existing plan. It's already stated in that plan prior to the legislation that hazardous materials was outlined in that plan. It wasn't outlined ubiquitously through the plan as it should be, but it was outlined in one spot. All this group has done is got them to agree – "them" meaning the non-Fire side – that there will be one plan, it will be this plan, we need to incorporate Hazardous Materials Mutual Aid and I guess I'm a little concerned or confused – I don't think Mike was – should have put it into that process back up – it goes, once the committee looks at it – I thought it came back to this Board for (avocation?) Now, if that's different, then I'd be happy to change my tack, and please let me know.

We're on track. We're doing it the right way. We're following the guidelines and we'll keep ... process informed. And my understanding at this point – correct me if I'm wrong, Mark – this is just information that came through the –

(inaudible comment)

– this system, to go back for review so there's plenty of time for review before –

I think to be perfectly candid, the Op team was a little surprised to see it. And the Ops team said, you ought to give that to the Board. I gave it to the Board.

I'm going to throw mine away.

Hey, burn your bra.

I'm afraid to read it.

You have some problems with ...

Yeah, and we'll address that through the process.

I think the process that Mark is using, which is, do all the (drudge?) revision on it and get it done, and then he's going to bring it back and I think that's very appropriate – I think Mark's doing exactly what he's supposed to do.

Yeah, I kind of viewed this as a progress report. And nothing more. Read through it, get familiar with it and better things are to come.

And get it back.

And the process would be then if you do have comment, to provide it back to me and I will get it back into the C-PERK Training and Equipment Subcommittee and Mutual Aid Subcommittee.

Can we send that by E-Mail?

Any way you want to.

Voicemail.

Okay, Mike, I think the Voicemail ...

Do we have any other questions?

Back to the US&R issue.

Oh, that's right.

... an issue that I wanted to raise. In the US&R program, California is, as in many other aspects of the Fire Service, is unique. We are the only state to my knowledge that both has state funding as part of the US&R program, but also we've taken the US&R program and informally incorporated it as part of our much discussed Fire and Rescue Mutual Aid plan. This causes some confusion at the federal level and elsewhere. And it extends from both the trivial to the significant. The trivial being, for example, the widespread discussion in the press during Oklahoma City that this was a FEMA operation. And it spun over into FEMA's being very concerned, particularly their Public Affairs Office, that Sacramento City was being seen on the back of uniforms on television, or the Orange County was seen or Los Angeles County. And so they proposed that all the US&R task forces ... FEMA billboards, and that they have a standard uniform that had FEMA down each arm and FEMA on the back and FEMA on the (legs?) so that no matter which camera ... you would see FEMA. I would just -- ... I think scuttled that idea. But I would hope that each of you, the sponsoring agencies for getting these US&R task forces, would on every occasion, remind people this is essentially a local government capability. This is local government capability that has come together in a national system. This is not a FEMA task force. Again, basing my ... *(end of this side of tape)*

SIDE 3

... the integrity of the Mutual Aid system here in California. This again is one of the unique features of it, and you guys, and as the sponsoring agencies are the ones that really deserve the credit -- not the federal

government that has simply put some dollars into this as they struggle to understand what it is we're doing.

Well, I like those comments.

We all need and like FEMA, but credit is deserved and due to those people that have put forth the effort.

Exactly, and the ... departments giving up this resource and everything else –

And I think it's just a mistake on FEMA's part to try to do it that way. I think they would get a lot more credibility if they said, we've drawn together, you know, this local capability, and we fused it into a national system. But you will see them with big OES (things?) on the back –

(laughter)

Why don't we take ... (nothing further recorded on this tape, either side)

(break)

SIDE 4

... that we had – that we knew ... fix that real quick, so do a little damage control with you folks that we have agreement, we can honor those agreements. I think the wish is that we become more effective and cost apportionment to California Forest Service, CDF, all the partners, we are a model nationally in the Forest Service system in how we deal with cost apportionment. And so we're going to honor that. It's kind of interesting as this summer we sent several of our hotshot crews to Canada. We also put one of our Type 1 teams up in Long Island, New York, and have sent people to a couple of hurricanes. And as much as we're told we're not an all-risk agency, I'm always wondering, do actions speak louder than words. And in this case I think they do. We have a situation in '96 where our budget will

change. The organization that we will have will change somewhat. We're probably going to reduce some of our smaller helicopters, going to change staffing in some of our engines. We have found for us that five people in a Type 3 engine is more effective than three. And works for us quite a lot in the last couple of weeks where we downsized to three people per engine, we had to send five or six engines versus just a couple. And this is the time of year when, for us, we do downsize. We lose about 500 or 600 people. There's a lot of question, a lot of stuff in the newspaper, what the heck's going on? Fires in Marin County, blah blah blah, etc., but we did support that. We did have a lot of equipment available. The configuration of what we'll have next year will probably change. And I don't know what that is yet. We've got several ideas of maintaining a couple of Type 2 helicopters, reducing a lot of our small ones, and changing (tours?). That's -- there's somewhat of a reduction in our budget from '96, it's just part of what happens in the federal government, and I think everyone's going through a little bit of that. So -- but we still, I think -- well I don't have any -- there's no question that we'll need to honor all our obligations to all of our partners and the Mutual Aid agreement, etc. So you're going to hear a lot of rumors, and I think Dick Andrews made a very good point -- if you have a question, ask the person, don't ask somebody else. So give a call. My phone number is Mike Dougherty's phone number. And he doesn't ... (laughter) So give a call and we'll try and give you as honest an answer as information that we have. Oh one thing, you know, OCC in southern California in the last year has made a significant change. And I just have to say that I'm really impressed with the work that's going on down there in cooperation with everyone. It's exceptional, it's great, it's really a role model for us. We want other people in our agency to see what's

happening. And that ... you guys have been involved in – good work.

Questions? Comments? Boy that was easy.

Why don't we keep moving right along for a task force report.

First of all, has everybody gotten a copy of this in the packet? We tried to put it in at the last minute ... discussing what we're doing ... part of the meeting. ... the hazardous materials, ... the task force started as the test class for the lesson plans for HAZ MAT positions that were developed, the specialist group. We have validated the curriculum. The thing that's interesting about this particular approach is that the first draft that we received took 16 hours to present and with the difficulties in committing folks for 16 hours of training, we asked the specialist group to go back and cut out the fat if they could, and they were able to do that, and the curriculum has now been reduced to four hours.

Oh boy.

Liposuction.

(laughter)

(inaudible comment)

The curriculum is safety driven, the – all the major points of the HAZ MAT group have been addressed. These lesson plans will include an instructor's guide, any reference text, exam with the answer key, and view graphs where appropriate. We have also taken it upon ourselves to develop and it's actually referred as Attachment 1, identifies (student?) instructor prerequisites. And that's part of the reason why they ... them up from 16 to four hours. Is that this particular discipline is not for everybody. Based on the positions that we developed for HAZ MAT, there's a lot of skills associated responsibility. And so what we're recommending is that for the student and the instructor, that the participants at these two levels be at least HAZ MAT

technician or of equivalent skill competency. We kind of canvassed most of the players in the HAZ MAT discipline, and most of the departments already meet this criteria. So it was something that would be causing a great deal of inconvenience or impact. We also developed the instructor prerequisites kind of following the State Fire Marshal guides for instructorship. And as far as the student goes, we identified – or we tried to incorporate the new ICS curriculum, those (I?) courses as part of the basic ICS curriculum. For the division groups ... we do not expect the instructor to teach someone to be a division group ... That comes under the existing ICS curriculum. This is just to expand that to the HAZ MAT discipline. And now on page 2 it continues on with the – the only difference being that for Assistant Safety Officer, that they also be Safety Officer qualified because they have a direct relationship between the Safety Officer and Assistant Safety Officers to the HAZ MAT ... So with that, we presented this to the Ops team yesterday and they concur with the fact that the curriculum is very good, very appropriate. We would like to put forth to the Board a recommendation that they accept it. And allow it to be part of the FIREScope documents that we currently provide to ...

Okay, we have a recommendation to accept the HAZ MAT lesson plan to ... instructor ...

And also the curriculum.

And the curriculum. Do we have any comments, questions?

(no answer)

Do we have a motion?

I make a motion we adopt it.

Okay. A motion –

I'll second it based upon that four hour timeframe. A lot of fat taken out of it.

Well that, again, is based on the fact that the skills portion of the position ... addressed in technician ... with competency prerequisite. That gave us a lot of ability to get it down to the (nuts and bolts?)

Any other questions? Okay. All in favor of the recommendation signify by saying "aye."

Aye.

Opposed?

(no answer)

We have ...

We ... high rise. There's still several issues that still need to be resolved. I think for all intents and purposes the specialist group has come to an impasse, so to speak, as far as some of the areas that can't come to consensus. It's interesting that the specialist group does not have any issues with regards to the operational side of high-rise approach – it's the logistical side – the stairwell support systems control, the access, lobby control. Those other position needs that seem to be identified, but we can't seem to get consensus on how they fit in an ICS organization. What we asked the specialist group to do, and John Hooker from L.A. County is our task force liaison, is to gather all the information currently available and then in the next two meetings, the task force is going to try to develop some sort of recommendations to present hopefully to the joint Ops team meeting that's going to occur the latter part of January. We don't want to give up on this particular discipline. I think through the task force and the support from the Ops team, I think we can make some progress. We cannot do an (OSD?) until these positions and reporting relationships associated are agreed upon. So

that will be one of the undertakings that the task force will be doing in the next several meetings up to the joint Ops team meeting in San Luis. The MACS ... exercise – I'd like first to give special recognition to one of our task force members from the Forest Service, Gary (Godfelty?) Gary spent a lot of time helping prepare for this exercise, doing the backup documents and all the forms that it requires of the exercise. If it wasn't for Gary's participation, I don't think we could have had the successful MACS exercise that we enjoyed on that August afternoon. As far as the exercise evaluations, the task force is currently reviewing applications, taking all the information, trying to capture it into major groupings. Some of the major criteria – issues that were identified was to ... consider modifying the Mode 4 activation criteria to allow for a conference call option. We also identified a need to add MACS position checklist to the procedures guide similar to what you find in the ... so people know what the positions are and what they do to each other as far as interaction goes. One issue that came up was the title agency rep – ag rep has some meaning as far as on the incident versus MACS and there may be a need to change the title to be more responsive to the MACS discipline. We're also looking at expanding the ... criteria to expand agency participation to kind of build ... facilitators in the event that currently OES is the champion of the facilitators for the MACS. If for some reason the OES person was not available at the OCC, there will be somebody available to take over that role if the need should arise. We're also looking at changing some of the formatting for the Mode 4 agenda to make it a little bit more free-flowing. We have the National ... Fire Center ... out of Boise come down and film the exercise. What we plan on doing is using the film footage to develop a video to support the (I-401?) module that we'll develop for MACS. Moving up to the ICS hand-off sessions, the second attachment in your packet addresses the trainer's

schedule that have been finalized. We had to move back the sessions dated November because we had some logistical issues that still need to be resolved, but we didn't want to go in there ... prepared. We also found that these modules – again, on Attachment 2 – had to reduce, initially reported as \$75.00 cost for all 17 modules – it's been reduced to \$40.00. I guess there was some relationship with ... based on the fact we bought 900 sets, but they gave us some sort of cost break. And again, I would like to thank Mike (Gordy?) and Alice Forbes at the joint Ops team meeting at Costa ... They came up with the \$35,000 that we needed to go ahead and buy the documents currently and then hopefully through the registration process we'll be able to repay that loan, so to speak, to the Forest Service. We updated November 1st as the deadline for the applications to be returned to the Fire Marshal. And the task group for this hand-off session will be meeting the second week in November to approve the applications by geographic and level of instruction and hopefully shortly thereafter we'll get the letters out to the students advising them of their acceptance to this hand-off session. And again, it's been the task force's position all along that every recognized fire department or agency in California will be guaranteed at least one slot for all these hand-off sessions. So CDF with the Forest Service, the bigger departments don't monopolize the hand-off sessions. Because we're only doing nine, and we're probably going to reach no more than 900 trainers at this first go-around, and hopefully they'll go out and teach this to their constituents that will spread out accordingly. The one issue that I don't ... want to defer this Board the Ops team report, but there's still an issue regards to position training and the curriculum that goes with that. Do we want to talk about it later?

We can do it now. We can ... to do this.

Okay.

We still need some –

What Ralph was talking about is – we talked about it several times here in this group is we need to remove the redundancy in the current IC courses... whatever – there's about 52 courses. And with our adoption of the generic curriculum, how to operate within the system is now in these other courses, and the current courses have – also have that same material in them. So the ability to remove that – those courses and have a 40 hour division group supervisor course become a 24 hour division supervisor course that's very real. We talked about several ways to do it. And I need to – I think I'll just defer that to get with Neil and I until we get together because we talked about pooling some funds and possibly hiring a consultant such as (T_____ H_____) If there's anybody else out there that would be good, to do that for us. Because all of us to try to commit the resources to – it would just probably never get done. So we have some preliminary information from Terry of about \$30,000 to take all 52 courses and remove just the redundancy and make them compatible with – not necessarily to bring them up to today's standards, but to make them compatible and remove the redundancy with the current generic (courses?) So Neil and I will pursue that. We need to get off the dime with that ...

My agency's very nervous when you mention costs anything – we've had this discussion.

We'll continue to figure out how we can ... do that. You know, we've tried several ... that's one of the reasons it's taken so long, the State Fire Marshal went through a grant process and tried to obtain a grant to do this and they were unsuccessful. So that churned around for quite a while trying to obtain that grant, so when that finally fell through, now we're back trying to figure out another ...

Moving on to page 2 of the work with NWCG, we've been working closely with Mike ... representing the ICS ... team and Don ... also that particular working team for NWCG. On changes to the fire line handbook and related ICS forms, the working team did meet yesterday and some of the issues that have been discussed are listed in here in the narrative. The only additions that I have not been able to bring the decision process on because they came as last minute, are to the last time the Board met. But that we feel that the ICS 209 that is very appropriate that we have lat and long information available to the user. Many of the GIS systems now drive their documents based on latitude, longitude. When air tankers come from outside of California, the information they are given are latitude and longitude type of information. So we felt that it would be better served to the ICS user if this had a section in the ICS 209 that included that particular information. I believe the incident program does already allow for this to occur. We want to adopt it as a FIREScope standard which I believe NWCG is also going to agree to as well, nationally if ICS ... The other issue regards the fact that when we did the Field Operations Guide, ... did major changes. We added sections of HAZMAT, Multi-Casualty, US&R. We did some major revisions to the typing standards from engine to single refrigerator units - those type of things. We asked NWCG to consider those changes for adoption in the Fire Line Handbook so we can keep ourselves in concert with each other's document. I don't have a feel for how they're going to accept that recommendation. It was done at the last minute because we were talking, realized that we made some changes to the FOG that I believe were very much to the benefit of the user. We'd like the Fire Line Handbook to also include those changes.

Do you anticipate any reason why they wouldn't?

Well, the Fire Line Handbook is ... wildland-related document and US&R, Multi-Casualty, HAZ MAT are somewhat non-wildland specific, but as Ray mentioned, Forest Service – at least in my experience in Region 5, we're becoming more of a player in the All-Risk discipline.

So they could do it optionally, like we did.

They could, and we asked that they consider our FOG for inclusion in the Fire Line Handbook, and I can't report on the outcome because the meeting occurred yesterday. Moving on to Information Technology – the group – this group is resurrected by the task force to address some of the issues that Chief ... mentioned as far as the technology antiquations that are currently ... The group did vote to change the title to Information Technology to be more responsive to their real mission, which we agree was appropriate. They're also (pleased?) that all agencies that are represented in the task force have also provided representation on the specialist group and it's also pleasing to the task force that these people have not only FIREScope background, but they also have a very good technology ... background, which has been a help in this particular issue of updating the information and could ... more FIREScope. (Lynn Rambo?) has been selected – Lynn Rambo's from ... selected the chair of this group. And one thing ... given direction to this specialist group to address, give the document control to the FIREScope documents. The advent of SEMS and the increased demand for these documents is becoming very labor-intensive to make hard copies of these particular documents. So what we asked them to do is look at the feasibility of developing a "bulletin board" type system where the user can draw up this information like they're doing with SEMS and download it so there won't be a need to have hard copy information when it could be available through electronic types of media. On the communications side – this was given to us

by the Ops Team South based on the problems that have been developing over the in-system incompatibilities from the 800, 400 and various other communications systems that are currently being used by the Fire Services. The specialist group did provide a recommendation that in the Field Ops Guide and the statewide (Frequency?) plan annex – it is the FIREScope's position that for Mutual Aid type of responses, that an engine company have at least 16 channel capability to talk among the users in their particular zone of influence and that for Chief Officers, (Tampa?) strike team, it is an (overhead?) type of position that they have at least 32 channel capabilities to talk to Mutual Aid frequencies that are identified in the FOG. We handed this off to the Ops team and they've got ... over to Mike now for –

What the Ops team did yesterday was vote to request the communications specialist group and their bulletin that they are now publishing on a periodic basis to reintegrate this position that's actually been in the Field Operations – Field Ops ... for many years. We just kind of – it's been there, and no one's ever put any emphasis behind it. And to bring it forward to this group to talk about how we might be able to put emphasis behind that for the Fire Service to put some teeth in that and having folks have that radio capability so we can better communicate on a statewide basis in Mutual Aid assignments. So that's kind of up for grabs, is how we might go about doing that. And currently listed in the Field Ops Guide recommending, and as Ralph said, 16 channels for engine companies and 32 channels for strike team leaders, division ... etc. Been there for a long time, there has never been any emphasis behind that. ... be one way to help alleviate some of our communications problems that we have on a ... basis. Any comments?

As a side issue – and I don't know if we address it here or just let the ... going on with the (FCC?) right now. I think (Gina Freeman?) is involved at the national level representing ...

(inaudible comment)

Well, that's the issue of narrow banding.

Right.

And we're all going to be faced with the narrow banding issue and the problem with that, as I understand it, is that – Chief Ghilarducci could – the issue of they're not mandating that local government change, that they're selling the frequencies off so that instead of having a 25 megahertz your (neighbors?) could only have a 12-1/2 megahertz spread, so the opportunity to bleed over to the air frequencies that you're operating on a 25 megahertz spread is very real. So, in essence, they're going to force everybody into narrow banding because you won't be able to operate, in all likelihood, if you stay in a wide band. As a federal agency, we're being mandated by a certain date to operate under narrow banding. I think it's 2005, something like that. So we will be there – we don't have a choice. We've already made an agency wide choice when we purchase new radios they will be narrow banding capability. So maybe that's a sign we should have our current recommendations in the Field Op Guide to reiterate the issue of not only should you have this 16-channel and 32-channel capability, it needs to be – the radio needs to be also capable to operate a narrow band.

Mike, your ... analogs and digital – going to be required ... gonna have to go to digital radio?

Well, that's all part of the same issue.

Oh okay.

Mike, is that 2005 date from the first step of the reformat?

That was 2005 as I understand it, for the federal agencies to be on-line.
Is that correct, (Pat?)

That's right.

To go to 12-1/2.

To go to narrow banding. So that as we're – as our ... our joint ... as they're buying new radios, they're all buying them that are capable of being converted to narrow banding. And as we buy new radios for all of our vehicles, we're only buying radios that have that capability.

Well isn't there a second step in the future to go to 6-1/4 theoretically as part of that ...

We haven't heard that. It's all an issue of – I think it's a dollar (and cents?) issue of what FCC is doing by selling off those frequencies. As I understand it, they'll sell off a block of frequencies and then whoever buys them will turn around and sell them off again for more money. And –

(inaudible comment)

I believe they had ... going to require all manufacturing of radios to be narrow banded starting next year.

I don't know.

One of the two.

... have the ability to be narrow banded yet.

Yeah, so ... agencies won't be able to get the wide band ... anyone.

Well, radios will still have the wide band, but they have to be capable of being ... converted ...

Just more money.

Exactly. That's right.

Most of the new radios have ...

Well, maybe it's not ...

(inaudible comments)

That was brought forward from the communications specialist group. Our issue is, the problem that we are continuing to have ... configurations as we move up and down the state, need ability to communicate, particularly as we get into a large fire operation and bring in a (Boise?) ... the radios are something to provide that need. So the issue here is how ... a way that we can help Fire Service in California to operate, communications specialist groups still feel that engines having a 16-channel capability and Chief Officers having a 32-channel capability would go a long way in helping to fix that problem. And we could further augment that to say that in the future we also need to have those radios capable of narrow banding. That's probably going to take care of itself anyway.

Then you'll have to add an 800 megahertz radio.

Well, the issue as it comes about -- some folks are on 800, some are on 400, but Statewide Mutual Aid frequency, for the most part, ... and I suspect will continue to operate that way unless everybody knows anything different. There is 800 megahertz Mutual Aid frequencies as well, and I don't know how they work -- whether they're on a ... system --

They work from both.

So we already have that capability, so it's a matter of trying to get Fire Service in California to have the hardware ...

Is there anybody on the communications specialist group that's following what the FCC is doing?

Jim Jeffrey is one that's ...

And I believe Jim's keeping real close tabs on that. Mike Windgate from our agency was also in the communications specialist ... as well. ... to make sure that we don't get converted ... so keeping up on that I don't think is

the problem – what the issue is, we just never have ... better prepared to communicate. And this is – and we've had this recommendation ... how we might go about putting some teeth into it.

Is the communications specialist group making a recommendation through the Ops team? Because obviously we're the vehicle to get the information out, and that's –

I think they're kind of – I mean I think they kind of feel ... the fix is, if everybody would have these radios, they wouldn't have this problem. Not only – but they're not in a position to do anything about that.

They're in a position to make a strong suggestion –

The issue is how they do that. And is there any ideas and all this brain power to try to figure something out.

It's close to lunch –

(It's hard for anybody)

Well basically this body has made those recommendations in the past to all the fire agencies in California to adopt the – you know, to have in their radios the ... all the radios that are suggested in the FOG manual ... The biggest problem is that everyone already realizes that they're ... You have agencies out there that would love to have those new radios, ... I don't know how we're going to get by that. Unless U.S. Forest Service ...

Maybe we could ...

There you go – FEMA.

We ought to work on that.

Until we have elections.

Just as a footnote to the report on the Information Technology group, Lynn Rambo and I have been talking. As you know, as document control ... OES already has a database available with the SEMS document on it. And I've

talked to people who are running that and we're going to move a few of the ICS documents that we're often asked for into that same database on a pilot basis to see how that works so it'll be compressed in the same way that that SEMS documents are compressed, so you can download it in a reasonable amount of time. And it will be at 14.4 K or higher. So as soon as that pilot project is finished, maybe we'll have about 30 days under our belt ... usage codes ... report to the Information Technology Group and that will probably be before you – at your next meeting. So progress is being made and I think it would be good to have the SEMS documents and some of the ICS documents co-located there for one-stop shopping.

Okay.

Anything else, guys?

Well, one of the discussions based on the document control plans, we realize that with the advent of SEMS there's a lot of demand for the position curriculum and all the documents that support ICS organization. You'll be approached by either Jim or John Linder, but we're talking about considering having them as document control point. Or something like (CSGI?) or someplace like that that can have all the ICS forms available, FIREScope available for distribution to the SEMS ... we looked at a couple things for ... to the ICS user – both Fire Service and non-Fire Service so that ... you will be getting a phone call or E-Mail or Voicemail or something.

Is that in process or already ... Okay, that's good.

That was my next item.

That's okay.

Moving on to page 3 – the Decision Process. At Bucks Lake Ops ... the Ops team, task force assignment to take forth the direction that the Board gave the Ops team on the 410-4 document dealing with the FIREScope decision

process to recommend changes and revisions to be more reflective of the selection criteria for the Board chair and membership criteria for the FIREScope Board of Directors. We also are going to be taking the issue that was approved at the last Board meeting to include Region 5 as part of South Ops. And we're also going to be looking at the document to make overall improvements to the document to bring it up to 1995 application. Right now the task force is working on doing some historical research to gain a better perspective on how things have evolved over the years from the time when they had two separate groups – a unified group – all the way to 1995 ... situation status. And as we start with ... as we work on this, we'll be working with the Ops team to get their ... task force to make sure we're on track as far as appropriateness goes. The urban intermix after action reports, again, the Op team gave the task force some direction. We developed two (set up?) groups and the task force, with Mike (Fulton?) chairing the after action report working group, and Gary ... from Forest Service chairing the urban intermix working group, a very good report that is going to probably be taking at least 18 months to accomplish everything that was identified in the Urban Intermix White Paper and again, one of our biggest priorities was ... apply a funding or funding mechanisms that FIREScope can have to help alleviate some of the fiscal liability that agencies participating in FIREScope have to accept. And the final – just as informational, in the task force membership, Jim Jeffrey has returned to task force after a five year vacation. Replacing (someone coughed) and Mike and Gary (Godfelty?) has officially taken over as replacement to Mike ... to the Ops team. Mike stepped out of the room for a few minutes, we elected Mike as the vice-chair for the task force, and Gary (Godfelty) was ... serving as the task force secretary. And with that, that ends the task force report.

Any questions of Ralph? Okay, then why don't we get our lunch and take about a half an hour and start meeting back up.

(lunch break)

... and the idea of how ...

... be able to ... a fortune or a part of the task force and specialist group, two things get in the way of us being totally (involved?) That's going to be one of our major topics of discussion. So we can all be on the same page when we have a joint Ops team meeting in January. Our task force chair, Ralph, ... to our meeting on the 26th to give us a hand ... So it promises to be, if nothing else, very informative meeting for the North Ops team.

That's the 26th of this month? That's the State Fire Marshal –

Yes, and that's ...

Mike, did we cover all the rest of ...

I think so. The only things that ... Op team meeting will be in the San Luis Obispo area, Santa ... County fire department will be hosting. And that'll be the 25th and 26th of January. If anybody wants to attend.

Do we have any questions of Mike?

What's the meeting (like?)

I guess that's all for tonight.

Jim, do you have a report on ... and CDF consolidation?

Jim _____'s presentation:

Yeah, I guess I can start. We finished the formal process of the merging the State Fire Marshal's Office into CDF. And by the formal process, I mean the legislative process. As you'll recall, the Governor earlier this calendar year introduced a reorganization plan #3 as it was called. It had to

move its way through a very structured process in the Legislature. That involved committee hearings and testimony from some of you represented on the Board here, and we appreciate your support. The merger became effective officially September 6th. So I address you here this afternoon as a CDF employee, and very happy about that.

The nuts and bolts of the implementation, just real briefly is, we've decided on a process that has a Phase 1 and a Phase 2. Phase 1 is nearly completed, and that involved moving our administrative staff and structure, about 20 persons, over to CDF. About three-quarters, four-fifths of them have now physically moved. Plus Chief Coleman and his executive secretary Jeannie Smith – they've moved to the executive offices of CDF. And also our legislative coordination staff which is two more positions. Those folks will all be physically relocated by the end of this month, by the end of October. And that will complete Phase 1. Phase 2 is currently under development.

We've established three working groups – our task forces – the top level of which we're actually calling the Working Group. And it consists of the two respective executive staffs of the two departments. Subordinate to that group are two program subcommittees. One is dealing exclusively with the training components – that is the Fire Service training work that CDF does and the Fire Service training does that the State Fire Marshal does, and they're trying to draw a picture and paint a plan of how the training functions could be properly merged together.

The other subcommittee is – we're calling our Program Subcommittee, and it's the other line programs that may or may not be fully integrated or may end up being separate. By that I mean Fire Prevention, Fire Investigation, Public Education and the like. So those three committees are in place and working very hard – they've literally been working two or three days

a week for the past month or so. Their charge is to present to the CDF executive office, Director Richard Wilson, recommendations – one each from the two subcommittees, with a deadline of the end of December 1995.

As a part of that process of coming up with recommendations, there's going to be two public hearings in November – next month. One is going to be a public hearing of the Board of Forestry, and you may be aware that the Board of Forestry is a policy committee that directs CDF – it's not advisory. The Board of Forestry is having a meeting the 6th, 7th and 8th of November. And it's in San Diego. And the public hearing on the subject of the merger is going to be the afternoon of Monday, the 6th of November. Again, in San Diego.

We're looking at that as kind of a scoping meeting. We aren't going to be presenting to the public what the reorganization looks like in terms of an organization chart and boxes and reporting relationships. We're not prepared to present that. We're asking for input. We'll be throwing out some general questions and informing the public, and anybody that shows up as to what's transpired so far what the process is we're going through, and we'll be asking some general questions in that public hearing format.

Also during November, as a matter of fact, November 15th, here in Sacramento, the State Board of Fire Services will be having a meeting, and those are also public meetings. And we're going to structure that meeting the same way as the Board of Forestry. We're going to ask for general guidance, advice, concerns, etc. Again, without presenting a plan. As I said, the committees are charged with presenting the plan to the Director of Forestry by the end of December.

Subsequent to that in the Spring, and this date has not been set, but in probably in February or March, the Board of Forestry will have another public

hearing wherein we'll actually present the plan for Phase 2. And that will be the output as accepted by Director Wilson and presumably the Resources Agency to whom he reports. And so there will be another public hearing ... for all of the stakeholders to input to an actual picture of the way it will be.

Subsequent to those, at that public hearing in the Spring, we will implement – and we've told everybody – the Legislature and everyone else – that we'd be done with Phase 2 by July 1st, '96. I suspect we'll meet that deadline without any real difficulty. We planned on making this kind of a joint presentation of Jim (Dykes?) and myself, and I see Mr. Owen is here representing Mr. Dykes, so – do you have anything to say or –

(end of Jim's presentation)

I was just – I'm sure Jim can make Jim's point ...

Okay. He still might be here.

Yeah. But you know, there is actually – you and Jim are probably as close to the whole process ...

Yeah. Well, Jim Dykes and myself have been asked can we lead these working groups, if you will, from our two perspectives. So yeah, we're pretty much involved in it. Maybe more than we'd like to be at times. Any questions on any of that? Yes Jim?

I was at a meeting not too long ago and there was a board member, a Cal Chiefs board member in attendance, and he indicated that the Cal Chiefs had had no input, had not been invited to have any input into the transition. And that was surprising, disappointing ... And it was our understanding that there would be quite a bit of input from the Fire Service as to the ... the effects of ... about the merge. Now, it was recognized that early on during the – I think the Hoover Commission testimonies ... there was some input, I think

the Cal Chiefs and the Fire Chiefs Association supported it ... that was recognized. But that was recognized. But since things have kicked off and started in, apparently there have been some lack of either involvement or a lack of invitation to participate. And I guess my question is: is it the intent of the Board, or the intent of CDF or State Fire Marshal that these public hearings would be the format that the Fire Service is supposed to participate in any ...

No. Not at all. I'm sorry to hear you say that. That would – I will say that that's reports in error. We've had two stakeholder meetings in our offices and both the Fire Chiefs Board, the president of the Fire Chiefs, and the Fire District Association representatives were at both of those. We have another one scheduled coming up, I believe it's the 23rd of this month, and those – all of those parties will be there. And we've had – again, we've ... *(end of this side of tape)*

SIDE 5

... other than that, just call them.

And give them the Richard Andrews speech.

Okay, any other questions of Jim? All right. Well, we're really moving right along – it's already 2 o'clock. Old business – is there any old business that we need to discuss? Any questions?

At the last Board meeting when Don Manning made his farewell presentation ... there was a talk about having that provided to the members – a script of the discussion. Was there ever any action taken on that to make it available to us?

A copy of –

... to the Board. There was a discussion about making that available to the –

Do you want to make a note of that for our – our minutes of the last meeting – the Don Manning speech? Take it off and transcribe that – get that to –

(inaudible)

Thank you.

Any other old business? Any new business?

I just ... that Ralph brought that up. It just reminded me of what Larry mentioned earlier about the minutes. And if at all possible, if we could get those even a day ahead of time, it would give everybody –

I think it's an issue where ... we'll do that. It creates a lot of problems –

Yeah, I can understand from an operational standpoint. Thank you. I appreciate it.

Okay. Neil, next meeting.

Before we do that, I added Old Business and New Business on the agenda here to give you the opportunity. And I'm back in the history lessons again – around the table, anything like the good of the order, any other information that anyone needs to share, to bring the Board up to date? Or a status report on –

I had one thing – I'm not sure if it's Old Business or New. I had anticipated that we were going to hear on the Kern County criteria for coming to the FIREScope ... that's something you were going ... not ready to do that yet, Mike or –

Probably not – it's being – it's being addressed by the task force as soon as ... to rewrite or review of the decision process. And that criteria has been ... I don't have a copy with me – has been added to the – as one item to be

added to the decision process. It was voted at the joint Ops team meeting that that criteria as presented at the last Board meeting would stand. It was acceptable criteria and it would still be okay. The State Fire Marshal's Office – I talked to (Ron?) during the break, was to provide us with an analysis of the potential for how big this thing could grow based on that criteria. And he had just been busy – he had an individual who was sick and they haven't got it done. He reaffirmed that he would do that. So as soon as – he said he could have it – he said I'll have it ... so we'll get that and we'll be able to have that and have a – that was a key ... just to have a good feel about how big the group could grow based on the criteria. So as soon as we got that, we'd know ... A side note, as Kern has been an active participant at all levels, I personally encourage him to do that. So right now there's really (nothing new?)

Anyone else?

One other – ... the fact that we're doing the research on the decision process, (rewriting it?) We did find something that was maybe of interest to the group with regards to the Ops team membership. The Board and the Task Force are driven by the membership criteria that's currently in the decision process document. The Ops team, at least it's the (impression?) in the Task Force that the Ops team serve a number of people and diversity of the group is based on what the Board would like to see both the (Northern?) Ops team look like – whether they're going to ... department (wildland?), rural, military, volunteer, whatever. When Kern County made its first request to participate at the Ops team level, there was some discussion that the only way they may be able to participate is if somebody were to relinquish that, then transition them. The task force's opinion that that does not have to occur – it's the Board of Directors' responsibility to determine how they want their Ops teams made

up. And if you wanted to add another member in Kern, Kern could participate without having to have a ...

What (Ralph?) is referring to, the task force found some verbiage within the existing decision process, that basically states that Ops teams are made up of people appointed by the Board, and they can vary and they should be representation of the Fire Service North and South based on the ... The Board and Task Force have different criteria.

The Task Force is basically a (mirrored?) representation of the Board. But the Ops team is not. Based on the current – the way it's currently (written?)

That was on the question of –

Theoretically the Ops team (of the past?) correct me if I'm wrong, (Ralph?) I believe based on – it could actually grow to a number of around 18 representative of the Board. And that's the way it's written. But the Ops team is more nebulous, and is basically ... a representation of ... to have to state based on what the Board feels ... representation.

Mike if I may, it states in here that the Operations team members won't ... shall be reviewed annually by the Office of Emergency Services Fire and Rescue Service Advisory Committee – that's a mouthful – and the FIREScope Board of Directors. So it states it – it goes on and talks about all kinds of other stuff, but basically says that this Board will or shall review that make-up annually and do whatever we want with that.

Any other –

Just for those of you that are not aware, the CL 2 ... teams are coming back to Los Angeles County effective Monday –

Is that plural?

Plural.

Three? You said three?

Two of them will be coming back effective Monday, October 16th. And one is contracted for 60 days, the other one as of today is only for 30 days with Chief (Freeman?) hopefully getting additional funding through our old budget and/or through some private donations – through insurance company – additional ... from the insurance company. And I also like to publicly acknowledge that Chief ... from L.A. City and thank him and his staff for doing a lot of admin and logistical work for us over at Van Nuys ... If anybody has any specific questions, please give me a call, I'm the project manager. ... fortunately – anything, please give us a call.

You should know that Chief (Freeman?) did invoke a fine, I guess people making jokes about ...

(laughter)

(a few inaudible comments)

We're kind of setting him up for the next meeting.

It's a task, I will say that.

Anything else? Okay, Neil, next meeting –

Next meeting, as stated, the FOG meeting – agreed by the Board to meet in Riverside the January meeting – the meeting is set for January 10th, 1996, at the OCC.

So – ... adjourn the meeting.

(END OF MEETING)