

MEETING NOTES

FIRESCOPE Board of Directors

A FIRESCOPE Board of Directors' meeting was held September 8, 1978, in Sacramento. Present were:

John Chaffin - Acting Chairman	USFS (R-5)
Clyde Bragdon	LA County
Bob Callaham	USFS (PSW)
Alex Cunningham	OES
John Gerard	LA City
Stan Masson	Ventura County
William Patterson	Santa Barbara County
Larry Richey	CDF

Also in attendance:

Dick Barrows	OES
Frank Borden	LA City
Bob Irwin	FIRESCOPE
Roger Land	OES
Rusty Schweickart	Governor Brown's Office

I. BUDGET

Key issue of the meeting was the future funding of the Operations Coordination Center for State Fiscal Year 1979-80.

It was agreed that the OES should include a Budget Change Proposal in its 79-80 request for \$60,000 to finance the operation. It was agreed:

- 1) That this was to support the State responsibility for local partners and be considered as a continuing part of the regular State budget.
- 2) That it should not impact existing OES or CDF budgets.
- 3) That \$60,000 represented 75 percent of the needed Operation and Maintenance funding, and that the Forest Service (R-5) would commit up to \$20,000 (25 percent of total needs) to complete the financing.

All Board members agreed to actively support the OES in its effort to acquire the funds.

During the preceding deliberations, it was displayed and demonstrated that the OCC O&M costs will increase annually, as more and more of the design elements become operational. A rough estimate indicates an increase of about 50 percent per year from 79-80 through the 81-82 Fiscal Year. Board members are aware

Meeting Notes (cont.)

of the potential increases and agree on the necessity to continue this increasing support as long as the Program continues to show justifying benefits.

II. ECONOMIC EVALUATION

A brief summary of the preliminary results of the Economic Evaluation contract was presented. This shows a very favorable cost-benefit ratio for the recommended FIRESCOPE System.

Copy of the summary is attached (attachment 1).

III. FIRESCOPE FUNCTIONS AND URBAN ISSUES

The Program Office letter of August 24, 1978, was reviewed. Items 3 (system functions) and 4 (urban issues) received much discussion. The concern is to include urban issues in actions, not just later planning.

Many of the urban concerns (scarce resources status, costing, mapping, etc.) are now in the planned capacity of the System. No serious problems are expected in implementing these ONCE SPECIFIC FUNCTIONS AND REQUIREMENTS ARE AGREED TO BY THE AGENCIES.

Research recommendations have been made for almost all of the required functions. The impasse that exists can only be broken by the partner agencies reaching agreement on what *they* want.

The Board members agreed to "provide for the planning, integration, evaluation, and implementation of various urban applications in the FIRESCOPE Program. Activities will be initiated this year. There shall be no degrading of the existing Program efforts. The Board shall continuously monitor and approve the developing recommendations."

To accomplish this direction the Board agreed to:

1. Personally instruct their Operations Team, Task Force and Specialist Group members to reach agreement on system functions with emphasis on the integration of urban applications.
2. Have the Program Office initiate action by preparing an instruction to the Operations Team, etc., outlining the task. The memo will include space for each Board member to endorse the instruction.

Due date for the first effort will be *November 20, 1978.*

Meeting Notes (cont.)

IV. NEXT MEETING

The Board selected the dates of November 27 and 28, 1978, as time for the next meeting. Location will be Griswold's in Claremont.

The Program Office will prepare the agenda and details for the meeting after conferring with each Board member in October.

*Robert L. Irwin*

ROBERT L. IRWIN  
Program Manager

Attachment (1) Briefing 9/8/78

Attachment 1

Briefing - 9/8/78

Preliminary Results of FIRESCOPE Economic Evaluation

I. Alternative Studied

The contractor examined nine implementation alternatives. These were grouped into three configurations:

	<u>Investment</u> <u>(Millions)</u>	<u>O&amp;M</u> <u>(Millions)</u>
Low:	\$ 8.1	\$0.6/yr
Mid-level:	11.0	1.0/yr
High:	14.6	1.5/yr

The Mid-level is the system configuration recommended by the Program Office for implementation.

II. Efficiency Versus O&M Costs

Earlier studies (SRI, 1973) estimated that an integrated FIRESCOPE System would result in an increase in suppression effectiveness of about 20 percent.

This study shows, for the "recommended" system:

- If cost-plus-loss per acre is \$200, then a five percent reduction in burned acres will pay annual O&M costs.
- If cost-plus-loss per acre is \$300, than a three percent reduction in burned acres will pay annual O&M costs.

Information from partner agencies shows that cost-plus-loss per burned acre in the FIRESCOPE Region range from \$200 to \$500 per acre.