

PREDICTIVE SERVICES OVERSIGHT GROUP

MEETING MINUTES – July 24, 2019

Participants: Dan O'Brien, Beth Lund, Shane McDonald, Jarrod Simontacchi, Nancy Ellsworth, Nate Benson, Brian Achziger, Heidi Strader, Chuck Maxwell, Matt Jolly.

Not Present: Kelly Castillo, Billy Gardunio, GaBriella Branson.

Managing for the 7-Day Significant Fire Potential Product

National Product Next Steps

- For the last 13yrs, fire danger forecast and system has been under development. Have had operational system running and then developed historical climatology for 40 years to normalize forecast into a percentile forecast. Forecasts run daily unattended. Produce ERC's, Burning Index, and Severe Fire Weather Forecast.
- Opportunity to build upon this system and scale it up to meet different levels of decision making to summarize and/or simplify the information. Original system developed individually by each GACC. Define what actual decisions these products need to be supporting and wrap any new product/system design around this process. Both of the time and space scale. Basic system is in place just need to develop the relationships between this and other systems. It boils down to: What are we trying to solve?
- Real challenge is knowing how to scale it up, staff appropriately, etc.
- Reality = Once the system is streamlined, forecasts developed the computing overhead is really pretty small. Problem arises when something breaks. Any type of cloud based hosting would be adequate. Challenge is who will maintain it and fix the problems that arise. Not set up that way currently.
- What is the ability for different GACC's to interact w/the product in terms of tweaking up/down or providing local inputs to raise the accuracy? What makes the most sense is for people to have the input from the beginning so that it is consistent across the board from the "national" standpoint. Give GACC's the latitude to create their own but at that point it is not a "national" product but a "regional" one and should be labeled as such. Ensure the semantics are clear so that when it is delivered that it is "regional specific" and there are different applications.
- Have current resources available to show how it performs historically against actual data. Can continue to improve going into the future. Provide the national common picture that is sometimes missing. Need to be clear what is considered an "evaluation". Ensure knowledge that products will never be 100% accurate.

Customer Engagement Next Steps

- What is needed? Discuss the types of decisions that we need to make from a national level and how a product can directly contribute to that process. Should truly be part of a decision-support process. Need to quantify how "we" do business. Engage decision-makers from various levels to frame up what a product should inform. After this, the science side of the product is relatively easy.
- For the short-term, having Anne Black reach out to the GACC's, Coordinating Groups, and Predictive Services staff to do an engagement. Survey/Interview/etc...to obtain this type of information. Need to circle back to Anne and get her on the phone with the PSOG group to

PREDICTIVE SERVICES OVERSIGHT GROUP

MEETING MINUTES – July 24, 2019

discuss methodology. Figure out the best method to engage fire leadership so that they are aware of the things they can ask for. Steer more toward what people think about when they're engaging in these decisions. Coordinate closely with Anne.

- Is the timeline in the paper realistic? Tossing it out there as an initial goal gives the group something to aim towards and adjust if needed.
- Potential to have a limited number of customer engagement for a short-term fix. Then there will be a larger, funded overhaul in the future to develop something long-term. In Sept there will be a customer engagement initiative with scientists at CSU. Just don't want to duplicate efforts. Get a proposal/draft statement of work from the RMC Steering Committee (task group)?
 - Engagement Timeline
 - Product Development Timeline
 - Chuck and Brian to work with on these and will get back in front of the group and get in front of the group for consensus.
 - Decision: Group is supportive of the concept and to move forward with getting in touch with Anne Black on the methodology to obtaining the data sets that are needed.

RMC Steering Committee Update:

Not many changes since the last PSOG meeting. Starting work on the new statement of work for the new money coming in. First course of work will social science engagement. Get a list of customer for customer groups and what type of information we'd like out of them.

- Modifying Scope and Purpose
 - Currently there is no signed charter. Need to have a basis for PSOG and other groups to gain expertise before writing projects and funding them. Could provide consultation, technical advice, etc... Touch parts of RD&A and not just the RMC. Looking at renaming, etc. to make more expansive than just the RMC Steering Committee.
 - What capability would PSOG under this model? Currently it is highly focused on meteorology. Wanted to allow for intelligence, fire analysis, etc.. products. To touch the research and other entities out there. Having a technical support group to PSOG adds value and would be useful.
 - Could look at chartering under a different organization. RMC is open to anything PSOG has in mind. Currently charter should be signed by Tim Sexton under their RD&A. Discussion to charter under Rocky Mountain Research Station or PSOG. Would like the PSOG engagement.
- National Program Goals:
 - Any issues or concerns to any of the edits provided and/or to the document on the whole.
 - Questions under bullet #2: Used "incident" vs "wildfire" ... which clarifies all we do more? Just ensure we're focusing on the National Coordination System. Quantifying to decision-makers to encompass everyone and not just those who work in the coordination system. Would it get broader than intended?

PREDICTIVE SERVICES OVERSIGHT GROUP

MEETING MINUTES – July 24, 2019

- Terminology “incident management decision making” invokes thoughts of IMTs managing fires.
- Just use “wildland fire management” ... keep it too broad to reduce confusion. Use throughout the entire document to maintain consistency.
- Find a way to incorporate “cohesive group” and drop the “intelligence unit” portion.
- Management is a broad term and can be interpreted differently. Gearing toward individuals like Dan and/or Nancie as first line supervisors and they would engage leadership upward.
- Will update and send to the group one last time for edits.
- Products and Services requirements
- Unsure how to move on this but is a goal that needs to be reached into. How can we expect a 365 product and there be no support. Look toward potential cost savings by bundling, funnel money into other much needed aspects of the program.
- This could be part of the customer engagement. Target people like Brian, etc. in the program. What is it that is needed for sustainable data sets within the program? Look into picking up data essentially for “free” in other departments, agencies, etc... and create agreements, etc. Start framing up the system that is needed (it is not just the 7-day).
- Dan will contact Brian to move forward with fleshing out this task group.

Redbook Edits: Due soon

- Take memo 18-001 to feed some of the mission into the write-up and some of the expectations that memo generates to add to the Redbook.
- Add intelligence back to the mix.
- Nancie to draft a proposal, send to the group for edits by the next PSOG call in August.

Round Robin:

- Shane – For customer engagement piece, engage NMAC on what types of products are needed.
- Jarrod – When it is time to gain support of NMAC, seek it.
- Nancie – N/A
- Nate – N/A
- Brian – N/A
- Heidi – N/A
- Chuck – N/A

Next Meeting: Wednesday August 28th @ 1200 PST