

National Predictive Service Group (NPSG) Meeting

Meeting Notes

Location: Moose, Wyoming

Meeting Dates: April 26-28, 2005

Members Present:

- Tom Wordell – JFSP – PS/Fire Analysts Representative
- Rick Ochoa – NICC – Fire Weather Program Representative
- Chip Collins – NPS – Field Level Fire Managers Representative
- Kim Christensen – NICC Manager – NICC Representative
- Gerry Day – NWCC – GACC Managers Representative
- Roger Lamoni – NWS, Western Region – National Weather Service Representative
- Brad Smith – NASF Representative
- Neal Hitchcock – NMAC (Backup) Representative
- Mike Lococo – ONCC – Intelligence Coordinators Representative
- Charlie Leonard – NICC – Intelligence Program Representative
- Chuck Maxwell – SWCC – GACC Meteorologists Representative

Members Absent:

- Alice Forbes – NIFC – NMAC Representative

Guests:

- Jay Ellington – Conference Call at 11:00 a.m. on 4/26/05 (Web Page Implementation Status Report)
- Tom Rolinski – Conference Call at 3:30 p.m. on 4/26/05 (7-Day Significant Fire Potential Product – Status Report)
- Heidi Bigler Cole – Conference Call at 4:00 p.m. on 4/26/05 (User Needs Assessment Proposal)
- Deb Frauson, Teton Center Manager on 4/27/05 for part of the day

Notetaker: Bonnie Bradshaw

Meeting Agenda Topics:

1. Fire Environment Working Team – Update
2. National Preparedness Level (NPL) Final Report
3. Pinch Point Phone Survey – Update
4. Web Page Implementation – Status Report
5. Fire Operations Drawdown Project
6. Action Item Tracking Table Review
7. Fire Potential Definition
8. 7-Day Significant Fire Potential Product – Status Report
9. User Needs Assessment Proposal
10. Funding Status and Decisions for 2005
11. Management of National PS Program
12. Intel Position Duties – Coordination vs. Predictive Services
13. Fire Occurrence Reporting System (FORS) – Update

14. Monthly Verification Standards – Update
15. WGA Fire Weather Resolutions – Update
16. 209/SIT Reporting by Ownership/Protection/Jurisdiction – Update
17. Seasonal Assessment Update/FX-Net Gridded Data Project
18. User Needs Assessment Proposal Update
19. Inventory and Examples of PS Products
20. Recognition and Performance Awards
21. Future Meetings Schedule
22. Strategic Plan – Development of 5-Year Action Plan
23. Riverside Meeting Notes Review
24. Status Report on Predictive Services

Exhibits Handed Out:

- A. Agenda (3 pages)
- B. Action Item Tracking Table (7 pages)
- C. Techniques for Creating a National Interagency Process for Predicting Preparedness Levels (3 pages)
- D. Predictive Services Questionnaire Responses by Mets to Pinch Point Phone Survey (17 Group Responses – 2 to 3 pages each)
- E. Fire Potential Definition (3 pages)
- F. Proposal for User Needs Assessment: Mailed Survey Component (3 pages)
- G. Proposal for User Needs Assessment: Focus Group Component (2 pages)
- H. Proposal for User Needs Assessment: Web Based Survey Component (2 pages)
- I. Proposal for User Needs Assessment: Web Traffic Component (2 pages)
- J. Funding Spreadsheet (1 page)
- K. Optimizing Short-Term Pre-Positioning of National Firefighting Resources: A Research Feasibility Study Proposal (2 pages)
- L. Proposal: Decision & Risk Science for the GACC (3 pages)
- M. Proposal: A Framework for Verification of the USFS RMC Fire-Weather Forecast Product and Statistical Comparison with NOAA NWS Weather Forecasts (15 pages)
- N. FCAMMS: Towards Operational Utilization (1 page)
- O. Proposal: Nevada Lightning Activity Level (LAL) 10-Day Forecasts (11 pages)
- P. Proposal: Gridded FX-Net (4 pages)
- Q. Proposal: Geospatial Integration for Southwest Predictive Services (9 pages)
- R. Geospatial Integration for Predictive Services (1 page)
- S. Predictive Services Management Issues (2 pages)
- T. Predictive Services Questionnaire Responses by Center Managers to Pinch Point Phone Survey (6 Responses – 2 to 3 pages each)
- U. Deb Brown Memo to NPSG on Response to Comments from the NMAC on Ownership vs. Protection in SIT/209 Program, dated April 25, 2005 (2 pages)
- V. Predictive Services Questionnaire Responses by Intel to Pinch Point Phone Survey (9 Responses – 2 to 3 pages each)
- W. Predictive Services Products and Services Inventory-Workload Questionnaire (2 pages)
- X. Thursday Brainstorming Session (3 pages)
- Y. Summary of Intel Responses to Predictive Services Questionnaire (4 pages)
- Z. Summary of Action Items (3 pages)

Tuesday – April 26, 2005

Meeting started at 8:10 a.m. Meeting folders distributed. Agenda (Exhibit A) included.

Welcome, Introductions & Meeting Logistics: Tom Wordell welcomed everyone. Chip Collins gave the logistics of building and the area. Everyone introduced themselves. Heath Hockenberry will update the webpage with the new charter and contact lists. Request for cell phones listed on the team internal list was made.

➔ **Action Item No. 65:** Correct Charter and contact lists posted to the website.

Lead: Rick Ochoa and Heath Hockenberry

Target Completion Date: May 2005

➔ **Action Item No. 66:** Cell phone numbers will be added to the team internal list for NPSG.

Lead: Tom Wordell

Target Completion Date: May 2005

1. Fire Environment Working Team – Update (Tom Wordell)

First meeting was in Boise a few weeks ago. This team is chartered under NWCG, combining the Fire Weather Team, Fire Danger Team, and Fire Behavior Committee into one new team. They are discussing charters and organizational issues presently. Tom Wordell is the representative for NPSG on this team, with Rick Ochoa being alternate.

2. National Preparedness Level (NPL) Final Report – Update (Gerry Day)

Gerry showed a PowerPoint presentation entitled, “Techniques for Creating a National Interagency Process for Predicting Preparedness Levels” and distributed a handout of the presentation (Exhibit C). This was a Joint Fire Science Project started two years ago. The intent was to modernize the preparedness planning process, develop a proactive process that assesses workload and response capability of the wildland fire program, assess and account for other factors that influence “workload” and “capability to respond, and develop a national process. Everyone will be getting a copy of the report (Preparedness Levels Study Final Report 2005). Tom talked about the Quadrennial Fire and Fuel Review Report and how Predictive Services and the need for better decision science is pointed out in various parts of the report. The NPL project fits well into this new strategy report. Report is currently being circulated in the fire community. Neal believes that this report is timely. The report will be presented to the Joint Fire Science Governing Board by Erik Berg.

Question posed was, “Since we have this Final Report, where do we go from here?” Kim Christensen stated that this is important, but we have to keep in mind that we have two other programs (Fire Occurrence and Roman) that are struggling to keep funding. We may experience the same struggles with this project. Tom stated the PMO should be briefed on this report. The PMO is a key coordination office for many projects. Neal is willing to do some exploration on this project with FS and BLM. Gerry stated that this will have to be presented to the Center Managers. Center Managers were the project sponsors. A new champion is needed for Phase 2 on this project.

- ➔ **Action Item No. 67:** Brief FENWT on NPL Final Report at June Meeting and discuss with Program Management Office Staff.
Lead: Tom Wordell
Target Completion Date: June 2005

- ➔ **Action Item No. 68:** Brief Center Managers on NPL Final Report.
Lead: Kim Christensen and Gerry Day
Target Completion Date: June 2005

- ➔ **Action Item No. 69:** Explore NPL Final Report with FS and BLM.
Lead: Neal Hitchcock
Target Completion Date: June 2005

3. Pinch Point Phone Survey – Update (Chuck Maxwell, Chip Collins, & Mike Lococo)

Mike distributed the Met responses from the survey (Exhibit D). We are missing part of Rocky Mountain and Southern Area. People assigned to do the survey were: Chuck Maxwell – Intel, Chip Collins – Coordinators, Mike Lococo – Meteorologists. This survey was e-mailed out, follow-up telephone calls were made to ask the survey questions, and responses were documented. Major areas of concern were staffing, funding, standardized products, program leadership (National and local), and Information Technology support.

Mike Lococo discussed Mets results: His overall feeling is that there are some cracks in the PS foundation, and we need to fill them. Staffing – Issue is that if the bulk of the workload is falling to the Mets, they need more horsepower. Money – They know the positions are funded, but they want to know about travel, training, and support money. Gerry stated the real need is to determine if there is agency commitment to PS. There are various different vacancy positions and limited dollars, and it becomes an allocation decision. Funding needs to be made clear with the agencies (if funding for Mets is included in the funding) so they fill those positions. Tom stated that there are questionable lines of authority. Rick stated that people think that Mets are only working for the GACCs, but in reality they serve the geographic area, as well as the National level.

Chuck Maxwell discussed Intel results. Some issues or concerns were: accurate and timely fire reporting, general data quality, collateral duties, data and organizational infrastructure, and actual roles and responsibilities. Kim stated that she and Susie are working on coming up with one position description for GACC Manager and Assistant Managers.

Chip Collins discussed Coordinators results. He talked with about 60% of Coordinators. Skills lacking were Fuels fire analysts. Data and technology were thought as being sufficient. Seasonal jobs were considered lacking during fire season. Accomplishments cited were National direction and guidance brought by NPSG and meteorological expertise now available at GACCs to assist in coordination with NWS.

The following table summarizes what the key pinch points were with each group surveyed.

SUMMARY:

	Mets	Intel	Coordinators
Commitment	X	X	

Staffing	X	X	
Money	X		
Leadership/Program/Lines of Authority	X	X	X
IT Support, GIS	X	X	X
Product Development	X		
Data Infrastructure: Quality, Access, Integrity, Occurrence	X	X	
401/IFPM Standard PD		X	
Collateral Duties		X	
Roles and Responsibilities		X	
Seasonal Positions			X

Gerry stated that the key areas appear to be staffing, leadership, IT support, and data infrastructure. Neal stated that some of these issues can be solved now, and work can be started on the others.

Discussion was stopped and will be resumed later because of the Conference Call with Jay Ellington.

Refer Topic: *Discussion will be continued on Thursday on Pinch Point Survey.*

4. Web Page Implementation – Status Report (Conference Call with Jay Ellington)

Jay sent a letter to all Center Managers a few weeks ago about the implementation. July 1st was the date set. He has received a contact name from each GACC, except Alaska. Dave Curry is the contact for Alaska. He will ask the GACCs about implementation, FTP access, and status. He will send an e-mail before July 1st to find out the status of each GACC. BLM had a question about DreamWeaver. There is no requirement stating that DreamWeaver has to be used. Issue with DreamWeaver is at West Great Basin. IT will not let them purchase it. Gerry stated that when Excel documents are imported to the site, it adds specific Microsoft characters in the document. This may need to be resolved. Jay stated that we are moving ahead and that we should start seeing things on the production site. He has heard nothing official from any GACC that they will not participate. Short List is SW, East Basin, NW, and Northern Rockies. Southern Area – He is meeting with Pete next week. Rocky Mt. was asking for an extension passed the July 1st date. He has not heard too much from Alaska. Rumor is that AK does not want to participate because of not having any input on this. He has not heard from anyone if they are doing the website internally or contracting it out. (Call ended) Bottom line was that implementation seems to be going fairly well so far except for some delays on getting the national server site up and running.

Gerry stated that there will probably be more application problems other than web page problems because of the different programs used. Tom stated that putting it on a national server was due to space limitations. Gerry stated that Northwest is evaluating moving to the national server in Kansas City.

➔ **Action Item No. 70:** Investigate Alaska's participation on the National GACC Web Page. What are the issues with AK adopting National Webpage template and how can they be resolved?

Lead: Kim Christensen

Target Completion Date: May 15, 2005

➔ **Action Item No. 71:** Check with John Gebhard (IT Manager) about the issue of BLM GACC website not being accessible on the web and when is it going to be resolved.

Lead: Rich Ochoa

Target Completion Date: May 6, 2005

Update Given on 4/26/05: Rick talked with John Gebhard today. Two options: Pull websites to Denver or have States host the websites outside the BLM firewall. John is sending an e-mail to FMOs and IRM to provide options and solicit input. Task completed on 4/26/05.

5. Fire Operations Drawdown Project (Neal Hitchcock)

Neal stated that the FS met last week, and they are interesting in the analysis on Fire Operations Drawdown. Not everyone is consistent. They recognized that PS is a key. The FS Operations people want to start working on consistency from area to area. They might do some prototypes for the upcoming fire season. It will take some staff time. Mike showed a resource spreadsheet on California. Neal stated that this spreadsheet is a first step in the process, and he will get back with the Operations Group on what is currently available.

6. Action Item Tracking Table Review – Pending Items (Tom Wordell)

Handout (Exhibit B) distributed. Tom led a discussion about Pending Action Items. See the following Task list and comments:

Task No. 7 (2003-07) – Issue Paper on RAWs Data Quality Oversight.

Gerry stated that this should be included into Management issues. Add Chuck Maxwell to responsible party list.

Refer Topic: *Bin Item.*

Task No. 20 (2004-11) – Ownership

a. 209/SIT Reporting

b. MOB Guide Change

Refer Topic: *Bin Item.*

Task No. 23 (2004-14) – Develop and Communicate Criteria for Submitting Proposals to NPSG.

Tom stated that introduction should be changed. Add: What is the consequence if this proposal is not approved? In the overview, add some budget language.

➔ **Action Item No. 23 Revision:** Add Budget Information to Project Overview and require explanation on proposal of what the consequences are if proposal is not funded.

Lead: Tom Wordell

Target Completion Date: May 2005

Task No. 32 (2004-23) – PS Webpages posted to FAMWEB GACC.nifc.gov page and Links to GACC Webpages.

➔ **Action Item No. 32 Revision:** Deadline extended to July 1, 2005.

Most GACCs will meet the deadline. Rocky Mountain asked for an extension. Not sure about AK.

Task No. 33 (2004-24) – E-Mail to GACC Predictive Service Groups re Naming Conventions.

Rick discussed this task. Implementation letter went out 3/28/05. Task completed.

Task No. 35 (2004-26) – List and Examples of Current Products and Services into Working Document.

Rick stated that this was never completed, but relates to new Tasks No. 78 and 79.

Task No. 37 (2004-28) – Input from GACC Meteorologists and Intell Groups re Interaction with FCAMMS.

Rick stated that nothing has been done as of this date. Further discussion is necessary.

Task No. 38 (2004-29) – Contact Sue Ferguson/Sim Larkin re FCAMMS to Generate NFDRS Outputs to Web.

➔ **Action Item No. 38 Revision:** Rick will talk with Paul Schlobohm (FENWT Chair) about FCAMMS and relay information to Tom.

Lead: Rick Ochoa

Target Completion Date: May 1, 2005

Task No. 39 (2004-30) – Engage Research to Solve Issues.

We have made some progress; however, this is an ongoing item.

➔ **Action Item No. 39 Revision:** Invite Eric Berg and Mike Hilbruner to the next NPSG meeting to discuss research and how we can get plugged in.

Lead: Tom Wordell

Target Completion Date: June 2005 to contact.

➔ **Action Item No. 39 Revision:** Develop an abstract to articulate issues with NPSG related to research.

Lead: Gerry Day, Chuck Maxwell, and Tom Wordell

Target Completion Date: June 2005.

Task No. 43 (2004-34) – Invite Kim Kelly to April 2005 Meeting re Needs Assessment and Product Development.

Gerry invited her and she was on annual leave this week. He will invite her to Fall Meeting.

Task No. 44 (2004-35) – Develop Questionnaire to Identify “Pinch Points”, Key Successes and/or Accomplishments for Improving PS Functionality.

Completed on 4/26/05.

➔ **Action Item No. 72:** Consolidate the responses to the Pinch Point Questionnaire into a report. Tom will contact Heidi Bigler Cole to determine how to do this.

Lead: Tom Wordell

Target Completion Date: May 2005

Task No. 46 (2004-37) – Develop Process to Check Performance of GACCs for Issuing Products on time and In Compliance With Standards.

Tom stated that once tracking is instituted, it helps improve performance. Gerry suggested that a report card should be done on a yearly basis, not a monthly basis. Tom suggested that the predictive services should be done on a monthly and the rest on a yearly basis. Kim stated that a spreadsheet will have to be kept on each product.

- ➔ **Action Item No. 46 Revision:** Send letter to the GACCs to inform them of monitoring program. Make calls during fire season as needed. Issue report at end of Fire Season 2005.
Lead: Kim Christensen
Target Completion Date: May 15, 2005

Task No. 48 (2004-39) –

a. Work With Fire Directors to Correct Obstacles and Deficiencies in PS.

Kim addressed it with Fire Directors in a broad prospective. They committed to support this. This is ongoing.

b. Develop Process for Annual NFAEB Updates on PS Issues and Needs.

Ongoing.

Task No. 49 (2004-40) – Contact Larry Bradshaw to Express Concern re NFDRS Products Need To Be Transported and Archived.

Tom stated that Larry is actively archiving. Task completed on 4/26/05.

Task No. 50 (2004-41) – Proposal Written on Data Collection Approach.

Completed on 04/26/05.

Task No. 51 (2004-42) – Issue Statement Written on Agency Policy on Spot Forecasts.

Rick has completed a draft. He has to talk with Heath about this and get his consensus. Issue to be discussed with Paul and then put on meeting agenda. Gerry stated that a letter should be sent to the Fire Directors and asked specifically what their policy on spot forecasts is (Nationally and at the Regional/State levels) and what their expectations for updates are. Tom proposed a different approach. Why not have FENWT address this issue? Rick stated that the issue was getting updates to the Spot Forecasts.

- ➔ **Action Item No. 51 Revision:** Need to get agency requirements on Spot Forecasts on both wildfire and prescribed fire. Also determine if agencies allow field offices to put further additional requirements in place. Contact Dennis Dupuis (BIA) and Agency Fire Directors.

Lead: Rick Ochoa

Target Completion Date: Agency Requirements by 5/31/05 and issue paper by Fall 2005.

Task No. 53 (2005-02) – 7-Day PSA Fire Potential Product.

Ongoing. This will be discussed on Wednesday.

Task No. 54 (2005-03) – Update Strategic Plan Appendix A With Historical Information.

Fall 2005.

Task No. 55 (2005-04) – Development of Non-Monetary Award for Website Development Task Group.

Ongoing. This will be discussed Thursday.

Task No. 56 (2005-05) – NPSG Strategic Plan Development.

This will be discussed on Wednesday.

Task No. 57 (2005-06) – Review of Ongoing Commitments.

Ongoing.

Task No. 58 (2005-07) – Contact Dave Curry re Alternate Meeting Place for PS Meeting.
Kim talked with Dave Curry, but no place has been selected.

➔ **Action Item No. 58 Revision:** Need new location for meeting by mid-May.

Lead: Kim Christensen

Target Completion Date: May 2005

Task No. 59 (2005-08) – Design and Develop Survey That Meets OMB Standards.
Completed on 4/26/05.

Task No. 60 (2005-09) – Discussion with Don Artley about NSAF Representative on NPSG.
Completed on 4/26/05. Brad Smith is representative.

Task No. 61 (2005-10) – Present the Proposed Definitions for “Fuel Dryness” and “Fuel Conditions” to the FDWT and FWWT Prior to Final Decision on Definitions.
Completed in March 2005.

Task No. 62 (2005-11) – MOB Guide Reminder to GACCs of Their Commitment to Verify Monthly Products.
Kim stated that Mob Guide was completed in January 2005. Task completed January 2005.

Task No. 63 (2005-12) – Letter Written to Center Managers Defining the Product Verification Process.
Completed on 3/17/05.

Task No. 64 (2005-13) – Bullet Statements on Management of the National Predictive Services Program.
Completed on 4/26/05. Will be presented tomorrow.

Task No. 10 (2004-01) – We could not find this anywhere in the notes. Gerry wrote a letter, dated 01/25/04, to Jim Stires, BIA. Task completed.

7. Fire Potential Definition – Update (Tom Wordell)

Handout distributed (Exhibit E – Fire Potential Definition). Tom stated that it was a follow-up to an Action Item. These definitions were taken to PS Units and the Fire and Environment Working Team (FENWT). These terms would be added to the NWCG Glossary of Terms.

➔ **Action Item No. 73:** Send out Fire Potential Definitions to GACCs' Predictive Services.

Lead: Tom Wordell

Target Completion Date: May 2005

➔ **Action Item No. 74:** Submit Fire Potential Definitions to Judy Crosby to add to the NWCG Glossary.

Lead: Tom Wordell

Target Completion Date: May 2005

8. 7-Day Significant Fire Potential Product – Status Report (Conference Call with Tom Rolinski)

Tom Rolinski (Conference Call): He stated that he presented the plan to do the Fire Potential Product, with completion being May 2006. He developed the Implementation Plan that goes through the basics and what is behind the product. He discussed how to implement this across the nation, but the focus is getting the West completed. There is going to be a workshop in Portland next week, with SW, EGB, NR, WGB participating. This fall, all components will be in place for the West. For the other GACCs (EA, SA, and Alaska), the equations will be written by next spring. Goal is to have everyone on board by next May. He has a Task Order for \$35,800 for three GACCs in this fiscal year.

\$38,000 will cover Tom Rolinski for this year for work and travel. Travel money can come out of individual travel accounts. Majority of the amount was for the work on the equations. Tom Wordell explained that compatibility with data bases was discussed with Jay Ellingston today. Tom Rolinski stated that the product should not affect any web operations. Product is done in Excel and does not have to interact with any other product. Gerry Day asked the question, “What would happen to the schedule if only 2 of the 3 were funded? Tom Rolinski replied that there would be a hole in the system if the third one is not done by next May. EGB, NW, CA, and RM have had their equations done by someone else.

Chuck Maxell asked the question, “Does fire/weather correlations have to be done by next week? Tom Rolinski replied that is was not necessary. Until equations are done, the correlations do not come into place. Chuck will have until this fall to complete the correlations.

Tom Rolinski estimated that \$36,000 (\$12,000 for each of the three GACCs) will be needed for next year. Alaska is dealing with Canadian Fire Danger System. Tim is not sure about the cost using the Canadian Fire Danger System. It might be more. (Call ended)

9. User Needs Assessment Proposal (Conference Call with Heidi Bigler Cole)

Tom Wordell distributed four handouts (Exhibit F – Mail Survey Component, Exhibit G – Focus Group Component, Exhibit H – Web Based Survey Component, and Exhibit I – Web Traffic Component). Overview is that Heidi will not be using this for her thesis because it would not give Pat Winter ownership in the proposal. Web Traffic would tell you who the users are and how many hits on the site. Tom suggested holding off on this. Focus Group Component would involve the NPSG to hold workshops.

Heidi explained the handouts:

Component	Pros	Cons
Mail Survey Component	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives robust data statistically • Tells how well you are doing • Gives good coverage • Array of data can be drawn from conclusions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited by responses that are returned
Focus Group Component	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helps answers questions like why are things the way they are and how can we improve • Gives people chance to engage their opinions • Gives diversity of thoughts and ideas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrictive by the number of people the survey goes to

Web Based Survey Component	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific information on GACC websites • Helps fine-tune information on the web • Helps explore specific products that are out there • You see where people are getting their information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannot draw statistical data from this • Not representative of users • No monitoring, just a guidepost
Web Traffic Component	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Came from interview with the group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited because of tie to only 3 or 4 GACC sites

a) Mail Survey Component: Percentage of returned survey – 40% response rate is good if you have a good survey pool (500 – 600 people). If a letter accompanies the survey from an important person, the response is better.

b) Focus Group Component: This one paired by the Mail Survey Component would be a good mix. Survey sent out first and then on to the Focus Group.

c) Web Based Survey Component: Link on website, people click on, website specific, questions posed. This is probably not practical now because site is not standardized. She has no OMB issues with this.

d) Web Traffic Component: This is really contingent upon consistency between the sites.

Budgeted \$\$: Budget is \$31,000 for this fiscal year. Report would be done on their own time. Report would be published in 2006, and done immediately after the analysis is completed. Incentive was discussed (possibly a pin) when survey is completed. Heidi would train NPSG on techniques, provide one day training, and be a part of the first Focus Group.

Questions	Heidi's Answer
How many workshops would be needed?	Ballpark figure of six or seven (1/2 day sessions).
Can this be tacked on to other meetings?	Good way to go logistically.
Size of the workshops?	Usually 5 or 6 people with a facilitator. Facilitator has 7 questions. Capturing the data is done by another person who listens and captures reactions and comments. Sometimes a tape recorder is used. Sticky notes can be used also.
If we choose the Mail Survey and identify target groups, do you envision the same set of questions going out to each group?	Yes. She thinks we can have a well informed survey that will identify gaps.
What if we used the Web Based Survey directed to specific people by sending it via e-mail?	It would be hard to verify, however, you would have a ready-made data base.

Heidi asked the question: Who is added to mail survey list? She wants to know.

Tom explained that the Pinch Point Surveys were completed with Mets, Center Managers, and Intels, and responses are electronic. Heidi stated that this is a separate source of information and would work with any of the products. Tom stated that areas of concern were boiled down to 4 or 5 key areas. This is internal feedback. Heidi stated that the information would be helpful to

develop survey questions and also helpful as background information for the focus groups. She will talk with Pat and call Tom back today or tonight. (Call ended)

Group discussion about this matter. Answer to Heidi's question about who to be added to the mail survey list. The group brainstormed and came up with the following answer:

FMOs,

IMT's (T 1-3)

Fire Use Team Members,

Quadrennial Fire and Fuels Review participants

Geographic Area MAC members & CEO Boards

IHC Superintendents

GACC Managers and Coordinators

Pub/External Affairs

Fire Behavior Group (to include FBANS, LTANS and Fire Danger Specialists)

State Fire Chiefs

Meeting ended at 5:00 p.m.

Wednesday – April 27, 2005

Meeting started at 8:00 a.m.

10. Funding Status and Decisions for 2005 (Tom Wordell)

Handout distributed (Exhibit J – Funding Spreadsheet). Group reviewed the spreadsheet and discussed the following items:

- National 7-Day Product Development.
- User Needs Assessment Survey.
- Optimizing Short-Term Pre-Positioning of National Firefighting Resources. Handout distributed (Exhibit K).
- Cheetah – State and Federal Data Import.
- Cheetah – Update.
- Decision & Risk Science for the GACC. Handout distributed (Exhibit L). Gerry Day presented and explained the proposal.
- Verification/Validation of MM5 Fire Weather Forecast. Handouts distributed (Exhibit M – A Framework for Verification of the USFS RMC Fire-Weather Forecast Product and Statistical Comparison with NOAA NWS Weather Forecasts and Exhibit N – FCAMMS: Towards Operational Utilization). Chuck Maxwell presented and explained the proposal.
- Lightning Activity Level 10-Day Forecasts. Handout distributed (Exhibit O – Nevada Lightning Activity Level (LAL) 10-Day Forecasts).
- Gridded FX-Net. Handout distributed (Exhibit P).
- Geospatial Integration for SWA. Handouts distributed (Exhibit Q – Geospatial Integration for Southwest Predictive Services and Exhibit R – Geospatial Integration for Predictive Services). Chuck Maxwell presented and explained the proposal.
- Red Flag Fuels.

Decision: *The following items will be funded for FY 2005:*

\$ 6,300	<i>2005 National Seasonal Assessment Workshop – East & South</i>
1,100	<i>2005 National Seasonal Assessment Workshop – West</i>
831	<i>User Assessment Plan – Framework, Goal #1</i>
31,000	<i>User Needs Assessment Survey</i>
48,000	<i>National 7-Day Product Development</i>
4,000	<i>Cheetah – State and Federal Data Import</i>
2,500	<i>Cheetah – Update</i>
9,431	<i>Decision Science Short Course</i>
12,767	<i>Verification/Validation of MM5 Fire Weather Forecast with NWS Weather Forecasts</i>
20,000	<i>Gridded FX-Net</i>
<u>2,000</u>	<i>Performance Awards</i>
\$137,929	<i>TOTAL</i>

11. Management of National PS Program: (Tom Wordell)

Tom touched on the following issues briefly:

- a. NPSG Charter
- b. Process to Update NWCG/NFAEB on NPSG Issues
- c. Lines of Authority to Ensure Compliance with Guidelines
- d. Program Funding
- e. Engaging Research
- f. Performance Measurements.

Rick Ochoa:

- Lines of authority are the crux.
- There should be a national direction.
- A person is needed on the Met side that will provide direction.

Neal Hitchcock:

- A Management entity needs to be our chartering group.
- What is our relationship with FENWT?
- We have not articulated the national standards.
- Management needs to be engaged and provide direction.

Tom Wordell:

- Alice Forbes stated that NPSG would be an umbrella for Mets, Intel, and Fire Analysts.
- Management is not engaged.
- More agency commitment is required.

Gerry Day:

- Distributed a handout (Exhibit S – Predictive Services Management Issues). He explained the handout.
- Give Fire Directors a status report (successes and deficiencies) on what has been accomplished with NPSG and the direction for the future. Describe three different scenarios and ask management how they want the future program to look.

- Suggested that a small group be organized to look at the Pinch Point Survey, and draft a document showing successes, deficiencies, history of PS, and where we are headed. This document will be circulated to the group and discuss it on a conference call.

➔ **Action Item No. 75:** Draft a Status Report on Predictive Services (successes, deficiencies, history, and future direction).

Lead: Rich Ochoa, Mike Lococo, Chuck Maxwell, and Chip Collins

Target Completion Date: First week of May, 2005.

Refer Topic: Discussion will be resumed tomorrow (Thursday) with the group to flesh out some of the basics for this Status Report.

Note: Deb Frauson, Teton Center Manager, joined the meeting and was introduced by Chip Collins.

12. Intel Position Duties – Coordination vs. Predictive Services (Mike Lococo & Chuck Maxwell)

Roles are not understood or well defined. Staffing is a huge issue. Cracks are in the Intel community. Some GACCs have Fire Analysts/Fire Behavior personnel in their Intel positions, where other GACCs have Intel people who have come up through the ranks from dispatching. Kim stated that one issue that should be considered is to draw the line and not have Intel personnel do coordinator duties. Gerry stated that the Intel position, from a GACC Manager's position, is the biggest weakness we have. We lack depth in terms of number so adequate staffing quickly becomes a problem when a GACC gets busy. Our "deep pockets" of skills, while an asset, is not evenly distributed. Neal stated that if you want the skills in the position, it needs to be defined. Chuck stated that people need to have roles and positions defined.

13. Fire Occurrence Reporting System (FORS) – Update (Tom Wordell)

Tom stated that the NPS budget that was expected to fund this project has been cut. George Conley is trying to get this on the agenda on the NFAEB Committee to determine what to do now. The project is currently on hold. Tom has told George that he is available as the business lead once the project gets back on track. Gerry proposed that we draft a letter supporting the project and clearly defining our view of its proper scope, which should include situation reporting from beginning to end. Meeting is in May.

➔ **Action Item No. 76:** Check with Allen Deitz to find out if FORS is on the NFAEB Agenda for May. If so, contact George Conley and relay NPSG's support of FORS and draft letter.

Lead: Tom Wordell

Target Completion Date: May 6, 2005

14. Monthly Verification Standards – Update (Tom Wordell)

GACCs agreed to go along with this and try it. Implementation is scheduled for May.

15. WGA Fire Weather Resolutions – Update (Tom Wordell & Neal Hitchcock)

Neal stated that an effort has been milling around to build a Fire Weather Center. Various approaches were looked at. The NWS will be the lead. All 3 Secretaries (NOAA, DOI, and FS) will have to be involved. This is a two year process, and it will have to go to the White House.

Note: Handouts were distributed (Exhibit T – Predictive Services Questionnaire Responses from Center Managers).

16. 209/SIT Reporting by Ownership/Protection/Jurisdiction – Update (Kim Christensen & Charlie Leonard)

Handout distributed (Exhibit U – Deb Bowen’s Response on Ownership vs. Protection in SIT/209 Program). Charlie gave an overview. Don Artley was concerned that if Sit/209 data was shown by ownership, the States would appear to be doing very little in terms of protection. He would like to see the States getting credit for the role they are playing. The current reporting method is a mix of reports for both ownership and protection so users do not know how to interpret the numbers. Charlie stated that the program needs to be modified. Suggestion was made that another tab on the Sit Report be created so one tab is used to report ownership and one tab is used to report by protection. Kim stated that we need to find out what the Fire Directors want and what realistically we can do. Neal suggested that the feedback be given back to NMAC for their consideration. Tom stated that the 209 Program has slowly metamorphosed over time in an attempt to fit new data calls and other applications. This is another opportunity to show why a system like FORS is needed. Implementation of a new Sit/209 System will not occur this year. Training and programming need to be done before implementation can occur and it is too late in the season to attempt to do it now. Program can potentially be ready by January 1, 2006.

➔ **Action Item No. 77:** Status Report to NMAC Group on 209/SIT Reporting by Ownership/Protection/Jurisdiction.

Lead: Kim Christensen and Neal Hitchcock

Target Completion Date: May 2005 NMAC Meeting

17. Seasonal Assessment Update/FX-Net Gridded Data Project (Rick Ochoa)

Meeting on Seasonal Assessment was in Boulder, and it went very well. Rick gave a brief synopsis of the meeting. One GACC was not represented at the meeting. Rick suggested that all GACCs must have representation at this meeting. A video conference was suggested, but everyone agreed that getting together was better. Rick gave an update on the report. Gerry is concerned that Intel people are feeling left out, and maybe they question the value in adding to the product, which could be the reason that their attendance is low.

Note: Put the Seasonal Assessment Meeting on the Fall Agenda regarding the attendance issue, as well as include Intel in agenda/speaker/presentation and scope in development.

18. User Needs Assessment Proposal Update (Tom Wordell)

Tom talked with Pat. She stated that the amount requested would not change if we used a web-based “Zommerang” survey. Pat liked the idea of different alternatives with the response. Tom told her that the Group agreed to fund the first year of the mailed survey component. She will check to see if we funded the 2006 portion, if the dollars can be carried over.

Note: Handout distributed (Exhibit V – Predictive Services Questionnaire Responses from Intel
Note: these responses were later consolidated by Bonnie as Exhibit Y).

19. Inventory and Examples of PS Products (Mike Lococo, Charlie Leonard, & Rick Ochoa)

Handout distributed (Exhibit W – Predictive Services Products and Services Inventory-Workload Questionnaire). Rick and Charlie explained the questionnaire and wanted the group to review it before it was sent out. This was originally assigned to them as Task No. 35. Add a column showing intended user, and change the last sentence to say “outlook products” instead of weather products. Also add the date of issuance. Gerry proposed that instead of sending the survey out,

each member of the NPSG be assigned a GACC and look at the website sometime during fire season, fill out the survey from what they find on the website, and call the GACC to make sure list is complete. The purpose of this questionnaire is to get an inventory of products. Tom suggested that Rick and Charlie front load the standard products all GACCs are issuing so that NPSG members are looking for the same things.

➔ **Action Item No. 35 Revision:** Discontinued – See Action Item No. 78.

➔ **Action Item No. 78:** Develop a spreadsheet to list inventory of PS Products and Services.

Lead: Rich Ochoa and Charlie Leonard

Target Completion Date: June 1, 2005

➔ **Action Item No. 79:** NPSG members will conduct a web survey and interview GACC PS to complete the inventory spreadsheet.

Lead: All members participating.

Target Completion Date: October 1, 2005

Assignments:

- SA – Mike Lococo
- EA – Chuck Maxwell
- RM – Gerry Day
- SW – Chip Collins
- EB – Brad Smith
- WB – Roger Lamoni
- NR – Kim Christensen
- SO – Neal Hitchcock
- NO – Rick Ochoa
- NW – Tom Wordell
- AK – Charlie Leonard
- NICC – Mike Lococo

20. Recognition and Performance Awards (Tom Wordell, Neal Hitchcock, & Rick Ochoa)

Gerry stated that Bill Plough was the first member to leave the group. He showed an example of an award. When a member leaves the group, he suggested an award be given and put in a glass or acrylic plaque. He further suggested that a yearly contribution award certificate be given to an outstanding Met and/or Intel person to show appreciation for their support. The award should differentiate between Task Group leaders and members. Groups are:

- Web Task Group
- SIT/209 Program Group
- Framework Task Group
- Definitions Task Group
- 7-Day Product Task Group.

➔ **Action Item No. 80:** Develop a template for award plaques and certificates for NPSG members who have left the group and group project leaders.

Lead: Gerry Day

Target Completion Date: June 15, 2005

➔ **Action Item No. 81:** Identify an individual or group annual performance award to be presented at the annual Joint Predictive Services Meeting (Nov. 1-3, 2005).

Lead: Entire Group

Target Completion Date: October 2005

21. Future Meetings Schedule

October 4-6, 2005 – Fall NPSG Meeting in Portland.

February 1-2, 2006 – Winter NPSG Meeting in Southwest.

April 25-27, 2006 – Spring NPSG Meeting in Boise.

22. Strategic Plan – Development of 5-Year Action Plan (Gerry Day)

This agenda item was tabled and will be put on the October 4-6, 2005 Meeting Agenda.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Thursday – April 28, 2005

Meeting started at 8:15 a.m.

23. Riverside Meeting Notes – Review and Approval (Tom Wordell)

Group approved the Riverside Notes.

24. Status Report on Predictive Services (Entire Group)

Group discussed what the letter to management should contain a status report on Predictive Services. Letter should follow the Framework Goals. Points to be discussed in the letter will be:

Introduction

I. History

II. Current Situation (Successes and Current Issues)

III. Possible Future Scenarios

IV. Intended Outcome

V. Recommendations

See Exhibit X - NPSG's Brainstorming Session on Status Report,

Note: Handout distributed (Exhibit Y – Summary of Intel Responses to Predictive Services Questionnaire).

25. Bin Items

a. Pinch Point Survey – covered in No. 24.

b. RAWs Data Quality Oversight (Task 7).

We need to have discussion on this issue. Postpone until the authority issue discussed with Fire Directors.

c. Ownership (Task 20) – covered in No. 16.

26. Future Agenda Topics

- NSAW – How to re-engage Intel into the Seasonal Assessment process.
- Strategic Plan – 5 Year Action Plan (postponed from April Meeting).
- Decision Support Training?

27. Action Items Reviewed

➔ **Action Item No. 82:** Invite Susan Goodman to next NPSG Meeting to engage geospatial group.

Lead: Tom Wordell

Target Completion Date: June 15, 2005

28. Notes

Decision: On Meeting Notes, the following decisions were made:

- a. One Excel spreadsheet will be used to capture Action Items, Decisions, and Topics.*
- b. A CD will be made of the Meeting Notes that will also contain the exhibits (meeting handouts) and will be distributed to every member on the NPSG.*
- c. All handouts distributed at a NPSG Meeting should be submitted to the Chair electronically for inclusion in the Meeting Notes.*

In order for consistency in the Meeting Notes, Gerry Day asked Bonnie Bradshaw to be the permanent Notetaker. Bonnie replied that she would be happy to take on that position, provided that two requirements can be met: (1) that her current FS Task Order (done by Kim Christensen) is extended to include these meetings, and (2) that her current supervisor (John Noneman at FPA) is in agreement with this arrangement. Tom will follow up on this.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

Note: Summary of Action Items listed in these notes is attached as Exhibit Z.