

FIRESCOPE

Operations Team Meeting

August 9 and 10, 1979 - Riverside Fire Lab

I. Attendance

Borden	King
Barrows	Lund
Clark	Philpot
Harris	Schori
Halliburton	
Irwin	Scherr
Land	Springer

II. Mapping

Mike Renslow provided an excellent briefing on mapping techniques, progress, and plans.

Highlights were:

- A list of mapping products already delivered to partner agencies (attached).

- A list of those products to be delivered (also attached).
- The development of orthophoto-based "Response Books" for Ventura County (and perhaps Santa Barbara County).
- The development of a new grid system that will probably have national application.
- An explanation of how the "Family of Maps" can work to provide common information to a variety of organizational levels and functions.
- The potential savings of almost 1 man-year per month and the reduction in revision time from 18 months down to 4 months for the "Family of Maps" process.

III. Decision Process

- A. Irwin presented a briefing with several charts to set the stage for this portion of the meeting. The objective of the briefing was to explain the Board's direction for more complete staff work, and develop a better understanding among the Operations Team of all the factors involved in the decision process.

Copies of the charts are attached and show:

1. "Formal Time Dedication to the Program" - The relative amount of time each group in the decision process devotes to meetings and collective work on Program needs.
2. "Program Knowledge" - Suggests that expertise and understanding of the Program and its integration is roughly proportional to the formal time dedicated to it.

It also points out three major areas (Agency abilities, Federal and Forest Service requirements, and Program design) that need to be better understood by all.

3. "Program Power" - Shows that the actual power to make decisions and influence Program direction is vested in groups with the least time and awareness.

It graphically points out the need to condense vast amounts of information into concise "packages."

It also displays (in conjunction with Chart #2) the problems inherent in governing a technical, information-knowledge-based process by traditional methods and practices.

4. "Program Staffing" - Compares the staffing available to the FIREScope Program Office with that which would exist if the Program were a military unit or private industry performing the same task.

This emphasizes the value and necessity of the Decision Teams and contractors in performing work, since the FIREScope Program Office is working with only about 10 percent of the staffing private or military entities would assign.

- B. Land presented a proposed revision of the Decision Process organization chart. This chart presents what was felt to be the INTENT of the Board, although there were several Board proposals that were dissimilar. Land's chart captures the basics of the various charts drawn by Board members.

Land's proposal was generally approved, and is attached for reference.

- C. Revisions in the narrative portion of the Decision Process were not completed. However, the following progress and decisions were made:

1. Word changes: The Operations Team will recommend the following to the Board:

- Page 1, last line: Change "direction" to "administration"
- Page 7, last line of section C-1: Add "development and" between "overall" and "implementation"
- Page 8, second line: Add "development and" between "its" and "implementation"
- Page 8, item D-2: Change "once every three or four months" to read "quarterly"

2. Decision procedure: The Operations Team felt that consensus was no longer a proper procedure for reaching important and long-lasting decisions. In reaching this position, the following process was followed:

- a. Definitions: The Operations Team agreed that "consensus" meant "voiced support--silence is acceptance--no voiced objection(s)."

It was agreed that "development" was that planning, budgeting, contracting, procurement, testing, and evaluation work that takes place while technologies or procedures are being moved from a conceptual or design stage to a point where they can become operational.

"Implementation" was defined as that stage where a technology and/or procedure is ready for agency integration into its formal operating procedures.

b. Alternatives: The following alternatives were examined, as shown:

(1) Consensus:

Pros

- Protects agency autonomy
- Is "face-saving"
- Produces less open controversy
- Does not "tie the hands" of work groups

Cons

- One voiced objection could kill Program
- Does not provide clear direction to work groups and agency personnel

- Old issues resurface

(2) Voting--majority, recorded vote (six for Operations Team):

Pros

- Provides clear statement and record of each agency's position
- Program development can proceed without consensus—with limited uncertainty
- Provides clear direction to work groups and others
- Requires clear(er) statement(s) and understanding of the issues
- Provides better documentation of decisions
- Less tendency for old issues to resurface

Cons

- Can create barriers, animosities
 - "Unaffected agency" can put "affected agency" in sensitive position
 - May "tie the hands" of work groups
- (3) Voting--majority, recorded by numbers only (six unidentified "ayes"):

Pros

- All except first item under "recorded vote" above
- May not "tie the hands" of work groups

Cons

- Can't record an individual agency's position (may also be a "Pro")

- Can create barriers, animosities
- "Unaffected agency" can put "affected agency" in sensitive position

c. Application: It was agreed that for development issues, and for recommendations to the Board, a majority, recorded vote procedure should be used.

For implementation actions, a signed agreement should be obtained. This agreement should state any exceptions, or alternate procedures.

It was also accepted that sufficient time, effort, and study would be committed to break any apparent "deadlocks" and develop the best possible compromise before final votes or signatures were sought.

3. Motion by Barrows, "second" by Schori, "The Operations Team shall establish a majority voting procedure, recording votes by agency. The procedure shall be carried out according to Roberts Rules of Order."

The vote: Unanimous in favor.

4. Motion by Schori, "second" by Barrows and others, "The Operations Team shall recommend this same procedure to the Board of Directors, to substitute for the word 'consensus' in item D-3, on page 8 of the 'FIRESCOPE Decision Teams and Specialist Group Charters,' revision 5 November, 1978. The recommendation should stress the acceptability of specific agency exceptions to the majority decision(s).

The recommendation should also state that the Operations Team has adopted this same voting procedure."

The vote:

<u>Ayes</u>	<u>Nays</u>	<u>Absent</u>
OES	LA County	LA City
CDF		
USFS R-5		
Program Office		
OCC S/S Mgr.		
F.S. Research		
Ventura County		
Santa Barbara County		

Further Decision Process work was postponed after these votes. The topic will be continued at the next meeting (September 17). In the meantime, Roger Land will develop proposed narrative revisions for review at that meeting.

IV. MACS Configuration

Direction from the Board, as written in the rough draft notes of their July 31-August 1 meeting, were reviewed on this topic.

Irwin introduced, and the group reviewed, the paper "MACS Design History" written by Irwin (copy attached, along with copy of "FIRE-SCOPE Multi-Agency Coordination System Development Agreement").

The Operations Team then proceeded through the Board's list, using the coordination chart that was exhibited at the Board meeting (attached) as an expression of the Board's intent.

A matrix (reproduced below) was developed to cover each of the Board's points. Each item was voted on. Voting focused on the basic question, "Can this item be achieved--to some degree--under the Board's intent for MACS?"

As the deliberations progressed, the Operations Team found it necessary to add clarification to several items on the Board's list. These clarifications occurred throughout the voting, but are collectively presented here for brevity:

- A. Under item 1-a, the word "committment" was stricken, and the substitute phrase "request and voluntary assignment" was added. The word "available" was inserted between "adequate" and "resources."

Under item 1-b and throughout, the word "regional" is understood to mean "FIRESCOPE region."

- B. It is understood that the achievement of item 2-b will require some--as yet undefined--changes in the Statewide Master Mutual Aid Agreement.
- C. The word "allocated" in item 2-d is defined as "implementation of the priority-setting process, with the approval of involved agencies."
- D. In item 3-c, the word "establish" is taken to mean "the determination, by a multiagency group, of those incidents which portend the most serious potential costs and losses." There is no intent here to dictate any legal or fiscal action to any agency, or to hamper the delivery of all possible resources, under the circumstances.

In the same item, the word "available" was inserted between the words "for" and "resource."

E. The wording of item 5-a was changed to read "Integration of local, state, and Forest Service resource coordination systems for the FIRESCOPE region within MACS."

F. In item 5-d, the words "regular Dispatching procedures" were stricken, and the phrase "existing Statewide Fire and Mutual Aid procedures" was substituted.

The results of the voting on each item were ("yes" represents a unanimous vote):

<u>Item</u>	<u>Can do</u>	<u>Can't do</u>	<u>Degree</u>
2-a	yes		
2-b	yes		
2-c	yes		
2-d	LA City	F.S. Research	CDF 60%
	LA County	USFS R-5	OES 60%
	OCC S/S Mgr.	Santa Barbara Co.	Prog. Off. 40%
	Ventura Co.		
2-e	yes		
2-f	yes		
2-g	yes		

3-a	yes	
3-b	yes	
3-c	all except CDF	CDF 50%
3-d	LA City	CDF 45%
	LA County	FS Res 70%
	OES	USFS R5 50%
	Ventura Co.	Santa Barbara Co. 50%
	OCC S/S Mgr.	Prog. Off. 50%
3-e	yes	
4-a	yes	
4-b	yes	
4-c	yes	
4-d	yes	
5-a	yes	
5-b	yes	
5-c	yes	
5-d	yes	

G. At the close of these deliberations, Irwin reiterated several points:

1. The degree of achievement on the collective list of coordination requirements may govern the extent of further Forest Service implementation efforts.

A legitimate and visible improvement over past coordination is the key to obtaining further Federal funding.

2. Partner agencies must develop an understanding of the hardware configuration limits before any final decisions are reached.

The potential conflicts at this time appear to be:

- a. Implementation of equal capacities at R-1 and R-6 (OES Regions) borders on the creation of two "FIRE-SCOPES."
 - b. Anything less than equal capacities reduces the performance of R-1 and increases dependence on R-6. That begins to "recentralize" MACS.
3. "Splitting" the capabilities, i.e., maintaining R-1 and R-6 as separate entities, raises significant questions of who should finance--and who can justify--requirements of the second system.

V. Closing Agreements

At the close of the meeting, several agreements on action to be taken were reached. These are enumerated on the cover letter transmitting these notes.

ROBERT L. IRWIN

Program Manager