



PREDICTIVE SERVICES OVERSIGHT GROUP

PSOG NOTES

March 31, 2023

1000-1100

Attendees:

<input type="checkbox"/> Facilitator:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chair/NICC: Hartman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NMAC: Fransted
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Co-Chair/GACC: Tomaselli	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CGAC: Nuttall	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fire Management: Achziger
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fire Management: Hinckley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OWF: Fallon	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FMB: Russell
<input type="checkbox"/> PS FA: Gardunio	<input type="checkbox"/> PS Intel: SeLegue	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PS Met: Strader
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> LTP: Nauslar	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Admin: Johnston	<input type="checkbox"/>

Additional Attendees: Charles Maxwell, Robyn Heffernan, Larry Van Bussen, Cheryl Bright

Topic	Presenter(s)	Purpose
Purpose and Intent	Derrek	Information
Review of NCCM, Predictive Services, and CGAC Presentation (NMAC Presentation 4/6)	Derrek/Nick	Information
Feedback Form Distribution	Nick	Information
FMB LTP Summary Presentation for FMB (April 19)	Nick/Derrek	Discussion
LTP Report (next steps)	Nick/Derrek/All	Discussion
PSOG Moving Forward	Derrek/All	Discussion
Roundtable	All	Discussion

Schedule:

NEXT MEETING: April 23, 2023, 1200-1330

Agenda:

1. Review of NCCM, Predictive Services, CGAC Presentation

Presented to CGAC, NCCM and many predictive services groups.

Need additional briefing scheduled for intel.

Presentation to CGAC went well.

Center managers have been involved for 20+ years and are an opinionated group that could influence many decisions regarding predictive services.

FMB won't get steered blindly by the center manager group, but the center managers do have some influence.

There should be some understanding by the center managers of PSOG's intent based on the tasking.

Center managers' concept of how much PS oversight authority they have needs to be addressed at some point but not necessarily by PSOG.

Supervisory chains seem to be the main point of contention holding the LTP concepts to their current progress.

There was some concern about whether the LTP addresses the NFDRS issues or not.

FMB wants to hear the full range of options from the SMEs with the focus on what will make the biggest difference in PS programs regardless of the adverse opinions from various groups.





PREDICTIVE SERVICES OVERSIGHT GROUP

Predictive services personnel find it frustrating to hear that some don't believe they have the capability to run the PS program as they essentially have been for years in addition to their operational duties.

Center managers don't have the additional time or necessary expertise and would assign the duties to the meteorologist, intel or analyst anyways.

These are important discussions to have now to make the program better.

The structure that's been followed in the past is no longer a good, working structure and needs to change in to move forward and create a better program.

It's understood there are varying viewpoints regarding supervision of the PS program and conflict surrounding org chart dictation and center manager oversight. However, FMB needs to be presented with options as they have the decision-making power and the ability to push those out through the agencies.

Next steps: Discuss the concepts a few at a time over the next couple of meetings to flush out more in depth options.

Continue to ensure all groups feel fully briefed and are given the chance to provide feedback before the FMB presentation.

2. Feedback Form Distribution

Live and disseminated to CGAC through chair as well as to PSOG.

Open until at least April 12th

Feedback form specifically asks about 14 concepts as well as additional feedback on the PS program as a whole. Should get feedback on recommendations wanting to put to forth to FMB as well.

3. LTP Summary Presentation for FMB

Plan to give FMB an "executive summary" presentation on the 14 concepts with background information.

Would like to have the official report to FMB before western fire season to include the comments from feedback.

What else specifically should be presented? - An STP 2.0? Options that are being discussed?

FMB should be presented with what PSOG currently has as well as things that have been worked on.

This check in will let FMB know that other groups have been briefed but the proposal concepts haven't been fully vetted which PSOG feels needs to happen before a final proposal is submitted as well as giving FMB the opportunity to provide directional feedback.

Regardless of the agreement of the concepts, FMB could always re-task PSOG regarding certain topics and ideas.

In the end, will there be one agreed-upon plan going to FMB or multiple options?

FMB will want to look at all options but is interested in PSOG's recommendations and SME expertise.

Some concepts may not need to have several implementation options, while others may need phasing plans that will be determined by appropriation and authorization for the initiative.

FMB needs to know there are plans in progress.

STP told FMB there was need for immediate action that needs to be taken in interim of the LTP.

Rather than recreate a STP, let's put forth a "medium-term plan" rolling the previous STP in with the progression to the final LTP. From department perspective, 2024 and 2025 budget cycles are already being briefed on and FMB needs information if PS will be considered for funding allocation.

It doesn't need to be overcomplicated or include writing a new plan but should inform FMB the bare minimum NTEs PS needs to keep the program afloat until the details of the LTP are fully discussed and vetted.



PREDICTIVE SERVICES OVERSIGHT GROUP

The plan from last year won't work and allow the system to function again this year. -The fire danger and fire weather issues that would need to be addressed have changed so the new STP/MTP would be addressing different things than before.

PSOG look at concepts 1-6 to begin with where there are fewer conflicting opinions.

Concept 6 could be used as a mid-term plan frame. Hiring national level NTEs for integration is not entirely vetted but could give FMB a starting point for immediate action.

We could develop the staffing, but the problem is bigger than that. What would it look like to hire 3 people to tackle this as we move forward?

PSOG can provide a request but many of these would have to be policy changes rather than just staffing solutions for short term.

The previous STP addressed how the 7-day going to run, now the concern is having good data through NFDRS. There are 2 requirements we could get established – centralized, SME-managed fire danger. Local people are managing NFDRS data without the knowledge of how it works determining what is seen regionally and nationally. Another issue is repeatable analysis and authoritative output. PS can look at fire danger indices but have no idea what is going into them at the local level since you can get completely different data based on how the nob's are being turned.

Need to create standards, redo training, figure out who SME group is, if a SME group is allowed, to substantially increase the number of people who understand NFDRS version 4 right now.

Perhaps the hires could simply complete QCQA and the focus starting with standards and requirements that are more than whatever we have coming in and out being good enough.

Does the group trust the SMEs to take the 14 concepts as well as major needs and concerns to FMB in a MTP of sorts? If yes, something can be created and presented to FMB on April 19.

SMEs will put something together for immediate action with the understanding it's not going to solve the major issues. These ideas will be discussed in the follow up meetings and disseminated for feedback then presented to FMB.