



PREDICTIVE SERVICES OVERSIGHT GROUP

PSOG NOTES

January 26, 2022

1300-1610

Attendees:			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chair: Hartman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FMB: Fisher	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NMAC: McDonald	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CGAC: Castillo
<input type="checkbox"/> Co-Chair:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NICC: Hartman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GACC CM: Ellsworth, Tomaselli	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fire Mgmt: Achziger
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PD FA: Gardunio	<input type="checkbox"/> PD Intel: Selegue	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PD Met: Nauslar	<input type="checkbox"/> NWS:
<input type="checkbox"/> OWF: Fallon	<input type="checkbox"/> Science Advisor:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Facilitator: Watts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Note-taker: Sandoval

Agenda

Draft Charter

7-Day Briefing Paper

7-Day Slides

AGENDA ITEM 4: CHARTER REVISION

Vote 1: Opening paragraph

Choice B - approved

(Nancy, Billy, Nick, Phil, Jim, Derrek, Jason, Derrek, Kelly, Brian)

Recommendation 1: Change “sound” to “informed” - approved

Discussion:

-Choice C “fire environment” encompasses the three pillars listed in B. More concise

-PSOG has been focused on highlighting the 3 pillars—choice B clearly defines them

Vote 2: Purpose Statement

Choice B - approved

(Billy, Derrek, Kelly, Jason, Brian, Phil, Shane, Nick, Jim, Nancy)

Recommendation 1: Agree we need to list the products - approved

Recommendation 2: Remove SIT-209 - approved

Recommendation 3: List products in an appendix to the charter vice in the charter — no discussion

Recommendation 4: Remove IMSR – approved

Recommendation 5: Remove NFDRS – approved

Discussion:

-SIT-209 is a program, not a product, recommend dropping it.

-recommend listing them in an appendix so you can adjust as necessary without having to send the charter for signature.

-IMSR currently should not be listed under PSOG—warrants more discussion, but should come off for now until NMAC is comfortable with it being under PSOG

-NFDRS – we rely on it, but have no control over it—recommend removing it for now

-start small, well-defined and increase over time. Others should own the products, but we offer perspective.





PREDICTIVE SERVICES OVERSIGHT GROUP

Vote 3: Authorities and Responsibilities

Vote 3.1

Choice B - approved

(Jim, Nick, Billy, Kelly, Phil, Nancy, Derrek, Jason)

~~Recommendation 1: drop the word “supervision” and leave as “oversight”~~

Recommendation 2: Put a period after “(NCCM)” - approved

Discussion:

- first original bullet had it encompassed already, no need to change it
- choice B better defines relationship with parent groups
- choice B distinguished between how fire managers interact with their constituents and outlines that NCCM does not just represent dispatch but provides oversight of predictive services units. Choice A does not delineate that.
- is the statement in choice B regarding oversight accurate for all GAs?
 - In short, yes--provides oversight--all GACCs operate this way—for supervision, yes on various levels, may not be direct but have some variation of that.
 - recommend being cautious of laying out supervision positions in a charter. Don't want wrong interpretation to impact where/how predictive services is situated at national level and at GACCs

Vote 3.2

Choice B - approved

(Jim, Brian, Nick, Nancy, Jason, Brian, Derrek, Shane)

~~Recommendation 1: Drop 2nd bullet~~

~~Recommendation 2: Change verbiage to “Provide proper oversight of national and geographic predictive services”~~

~~Recommendation 3: Combine bullet 1 and 2 with emphasis on standardization of products and positions~~

Recommendation 4: Change verbiage to “Provide guidance to national and geographic predictive services” - approved

Discussion:

- issues with “oversight”. It's more about services that need to be provided vice who supervises who.
 - impacts when discussing staffing or predictive services at GACC, what role does PSOG play in ensuring there is oversight to put emphasis on staffing issues. If PSOG has no role in staffing and it's just products, it removes the avenue to bring predictive services issues forward.
 - cannot divorce the products and services from the people. No cohesive oversight for predictive services staffing—leads to dissimilar programs/services/quality.
 - need to think about what we're doing—if we're just doing product standardization, maybe it belongs with NWCG committee. Cannot separate desired outcomes and required staff. Standardization is important, and needed to some degree, but need to have products *and* personnel considered in there.
 - whether we can enforce it or not, PSOG provides an avenue. PSOG should have some oversight (maybe not supervision) of the personnel/staffing. Can't be just products.



PREDICTIVE SERVICES OVERSIGHT GROUP

- how do we ensure proper oversight?
- purpose needs to include guidance/oversight. The way it is written in bullet 2 is too broad. Could be re-worded and still meet intent without causing issues. Provide oversight at national and geographic levels as it pertains to national requirements. Expect NCCM to have issues with current verbiage in bullet 2, if we re-word it, we could get buy-in
- there must be standardization, but unless national office is going to fund the positions, it's going to be nearly impossible to enforce, and likely to cause issues/consternation in the field.
- we go in circles about who has authority. PSOG is the avenue to determine needs and provide to FMB and it's up to FMB to push or not.

Vote 4: Membership

Choice B, but no consensus on details

Choice B as-is

(Derrek, Nick, Phil, Kelly, Billy, Nancy)

Choice B with change to details

(Shane, Jim, Jason)

Recommendation 1: Draw a line under “Agency Fire Management Representatives”, below line would be non-voting. (no consensus – push to FMB)

Recommendation 2: Consider a FENC rep as part of PSOG membership - approved

Recommendation 3: Have only 1 GACC center manager (or assistant) – approved

Recommendation 4: GACC Center manager have one vote – approved

Recommendation 5: CGAC have one vote – approved

Recommendation 6: FMB does not vote – approved

~~Recommendation 7: change from consensus to majority for votes~~

Discussion:

- OWF is not asking to steer anything, just to open communication and provide additional assistance/perspective—products and services from predictive services as external stakeholder.
- discussed broadening the group in November. If we are going back to roots as oversight group with authority/strong recommendations, we might be getting a bit unwieldy with the size proposed. Need strong/proven SMEs involved in feedback. Need to separate end users and the voting membership. Focus who will be moving recommendations forward to FMB. Everything else is SMEs who provide input and feedback.
- Weather Service – heavily engaged with funding—to have them along with us, voting or not, is key. For staffing, Weather Service provides staffing in sense that they are the applicant pool. With staffing shortages, important to work with Weather Service as we move forward
- Science advisor – helpful on issues that we discuss
- Center Managers– shouldn't rely on pool of only 10 center managers, bring in assistants.
- FMB will be non-voting





PREDICTIVE SERVICES OVERSIGHT GROUP

- Weather Service money is mostly research and not operations.
- NCCM has very good communication, don't feel that they need 2 votes.

Vote 5: Chair and Vice-Chair rotations

Choice C - approved

(Billy, Derrek, Phil, Nancy, Jason, Kelly, Shane, Nick, Brian)

Recommendation 1: Vice Chair moves into the Chair as it rotates through – approved

Recommendation 2: Pause on choosing a vice chair until we figure out membership – approved

Vote 6: Decision-making/Quorum

Neither Choice A nor Choice B

Recommendation 1: Eliminate requirement for specific positions to be present for quorum, change to 2/3 membership - approved

AGENDA ITEM 5: 7-Day Product

-Derrek will push out most updated briefing paper and PDF versions of presentations that were delivered to FMB and other groups.

-Need everyone to take these back to your organizations, socialize, and get immediate feedback. Need answer to FMB by the next meeting. Fixers are the SMEs, predictive services staff.

What is the tasking for what needs to happen now?

1. NFDRS transition to V4 has issues and we do not have the time to rewrite the equations to analyze the data
2. Fire Danger Rating System – unstable. Feed that allows 7-day to be populated is unstable and may not exist in summer.

Are there currently proposed solutions or do we need to come up with solutions?

-have some proposed solutions, but need a management body to push it and follow through

1. Immediate/short-term mitigation need for 2022 – need to decide on this soon

Next Meeting: Thursday, 3 Feb 0700-0900 MT – Derrek will send the invite

