

OPERATIONS TEAM NOTES  
LA City Supply & Maintenance Division  
June 29 & 30, 1981  
Number 15

I. Attendance

J. Monesmith	B. Irwin
L. Biddison	F. Borden
R. Barrows	R. Hebrard
H. McElwee (1st Day)	G. Ross
T. Haney	R. Land
J. Uribarri	B. Halliburton (1st day)
R. Creel	Ventura absent both days
H. Nelson	Santa Barbara absent 2nd day

1st Day

I. Previous Meeting Notes:

Biddison moved to approve the notes as written. Second by Borden.  
Unanimous vote. (VNC absent)

II. Previous Meeting Action Items:

The current status of the Action Items are shown in the attachment.

III. MACS Goal #2 Development:

McElwee and Haney described the progress and future projections made by the Task Force. Haney explained the Task Force will be working on developing a uniform order form to be available in paper form initially and then programmed for automation starting in April 1982. Two important considerations in the development of a common order form are the impacts on the National System presently being used by the Forest Service and the CDF State-wide system.

R. Barrows pointed out the MACS Goal #2 recommendations are centered around a hard-wire system which may be vulnerable during disasterous situations and that many of the procedures are missing. Creel explained the procedures were purposely not defined because, for the present time, they are intended to be as they are today.

After a common form and an automated system have been developed, the procedures will be reviewed for improvements in efficiency. The paper form and present communication systems will be used as a back-up to the hard-wire and automated systems.

R. Barrows moved for approval of the Task Force conclusions and progress report as presented and for the Task Force to proceed

with development utilizing the Operations Team definition of single point ordering as a criteria. Single point ordering is defined as:

- (1) Incidents order directly from the local agency dispatch, R/U or forest.
- (2) R/U or Forest order from CDF RO6 or SZ\*.
- (3) Local agency dispatch centers order from OES Area Coordinators and they from OES Regional Coordinators, if necessary.

CDF RO6, SZ and OES Region 6 Coordinators will be colocated at the OCC and interact to effectively coordinate the allocation of resources. (see attached diagram).

\* CDF Contract counties are considered equal to R/U when dealing with fires on SRA lands.

The Team did not recommend further staff work by the Task Force concerning the attributes of colocating Forest, area, county and OES dispatch.

#### IV. Proposal for OCC Facility

Mr. Howard Littlefield presented San Bernardino County Emergency Services proposal for a Disaster Training Center which could include a final FIREScope OCC facility.

Funding appears to be uncertain at this time. \$6-18 million in development costs was projected depending on the extent of the project. Some purchase of land will be required.

The San Bernardino Board of Supervisors is presently awaiting a presentation. Their views, therefore, are uncertain at this time.

#### V. Effective Coordination Between OES Regions 1 and 6.

The recommendations developed by the Task Force were reviewed. R. Barrows suggested the addition of an item 6 stating "OES provide a paid OES Fire Division Staff member at the OCC during periods (generally modes 3 & 4) requiring coordination between Regions 1 & 6".

Hebrard explained it may not be possible for a CDF individual to be released from all other duties and responsibilities during modes 3 & 4. In addition there may be some question concerning whether the regional coordinators need the assistance of a paid OES Fire Division Staff Member to adequately coordinate between each other. However, the Group agreed the proposals should go forward to the OES as recommendations.

Halliburton moved to accept the recommendations of the Task Force with the addition of the recommended item 6. The Program Office will forward these recommendations to OES for their action.

Second by Borden, Unanimous vote.

VI. Task Force Concerns and Recommendations:

McElwee explained the Task Force's need for more and clearer direction from the Operations Team. Herb suggested occasional combined Task Force/Ops Team meetings might be beneficial.

R. Barrows recommended the Program Office provide leadership to the Task Force. He also suggested the Task Force be removed from the decision process and be provided specific tasks to accomplish.

Biddison pointed out that even though there have been some problems a great deal of positive production is occurring.

The Operations Team agreed to provide clearer and documented direction on products being returned to the Task Force. In addition a more critical review of issues will be made to determine if they should be addressed above the Task Force level.

2nd Day

VI. Continued

A new issue concerning the relationships between the Task Force and Specialists Groups was raised. Do the Specialists Groups work for or are they directed by the Task Force? Irwin explained that work plans for the Specialists Groups, which should be assembled in a M.B.O. frameworks should be reviewed and approved by the Operations Team.

Staff work and recommendations coming from the Specialists Groups should be reviewed by the Task Force, with their support or suggestions added, prior to presentation to the Operations Team. Recommendations coming up through the Decision Process should be documented and signed by the Task Force and the Specialist Group Chairmans.

Consensus could not be reached on these subjects. Because of time constraints, further resolution of the Task Force concerns was tabled until the next meeting.

VII. Evaluation of CH47 Helicopter

Chief Ken Brass provided information on the possible 1981 evaluation of the support helicopter for the SMS. The SMS module will cost approximately \$500,000. The helicopter is projected to cost \$5-11 million plus.

LA City is interested in any other multiple uses of the helicopter. Use of military A/C is also being investigated.

A/C used for this system could carry approximately 1,000 gallons

of water; or 2 brush rigs; or large numbers of personnel, etc.

The city plans evaluation from August 31, 1981 to September 22, 1981. Agencies are encouraged to provide potential uses for the A/C for evaluation between September 1 to December 31, 1981. Funds for the users would be necessary up-front in order to extend the contract.

#### VIII. SCA Proposal for an OCC Facility

Bill Hanna plus representatives from Security Corporation of America (SCA) presented their proposal for an OCC facility.

A three page fact sheet was provided describing SCA support capabilities for FIREScope operations. Hanna stated a contract has been signed for the first facility which is to be located in San Bernardino County. SCA plans to bear the development costs and will expect a use fee for occupancy. They plan to be in the facility and functional by the end of the year.

Drawings and layouts of the San Bernardino Facility were provided plus locations of planned facilities throughout the Nation.

The structures are approximately 35,000 square feet. No problems were seen in providing necessary space for FIREScope needs.

Satellite communication networks are in the SCA designs. These would be available for FIREScope use. The satellite links are anticipated to cost \$20-21,000 annually. Excess capacity would be available but at a premium rate. Each agency would be required to provide transmitting and receiving capabilities.

Harold Nelson explained a facilities programming flow chart. From reviewing the process it was agreed it would serve to adequately investigate the proposals by SCA and San Bernardino Emergency Services as alternatives for providing needed facilities.

Nelson will provide staffing requirements necessary to accomplish the planning steps at the next meeting. This would include time requirements for Operations Team, Task Force, etc.

#### IX. OCC Staffing and Control Plan

A short presentation of the first draft of the OCC staffing and control plan was provided for information by Roger Land. Tentative checklists for the second phase will be provided at the next meeting.

#### X. Redraft of Computer Access Policy

Uribarri presented a redraft of the computer access policy and requested additional input. Some additional criteria recommendations were: (1) Federal wildland agencies would have direct access to the computer. (2) All other Fire Departments

plus the military bases (other than the CDF,) would have access through the OES master mutual aid system. (3) Information users could be logged off when priority use was needed by resource coordinators. (4) Possibly restricting information users to retrieving information only. Agency needs vs. computer capacity is still uncertain. Some additional work on policy refinement, FIREScope boundary identification (FIMS users) and computer capacity will need to be staffed out and reported at the August meeting.

A moratorium will be placed on the issuance of LOGIN ID's until the policy is firmed up.

#### XI. Definition of Mobilizations Centers

The Operations Team approved the Task Force's recommended definition of Demobilization and Mobilization Centers as: "An off-incident location at which emergency service personnel and equipment are temporarily located pending assignment, release or reassignment."

#### XII. FY 82-85 FIREScope Program Planning and Budgeting

Monesmith explained the need to progress with more detailed program and budget planning. Specialist Group and Task Force expertise will be necessary for acquiring the needed detailed information. The Team agreed the project was necessary and approved the involvement of the Specialist Groups and Task Force.

#### XIII. July Board Meeting Agenda

The tentative agenda is attached.

#### XIV. July Operations Team Meeting

Dates: July 20-21, 1981  
Place: Angeles National Forest  
150 S. Los Robles Ave.  
2nd Floor Conference Room  
Phone: 213-577-0050