

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
GOVERNOR'S BLUE RIBBON FIRE COMMISSION

BEFORE THE GOVERNOR'S BLUE)	
RIBBON FIRE COMMISSION,)	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
)	March 18, 2004
Senator William Campbell, Chair)	Los Angeles, California
)	

CHAIR CAMPBELL: Ladies and Gentlemen, good morning. We'd like to welcome you to our final meeting o the Governor's Blue Ribbon Fire Commission. We'd like to begin today's session by standing and, uh, we have a flag on the screen today [laughter] so, salute the flag and, let's see, where's Jay LaSuer? Jay, would you lead us in the Pledge, after I get up? [Laughter.]

[Pledge of Allegiance is recited.]

CHAIR CAMPBELL: Ladies and Gentlemen, w4e have a special guest with us this evening – this evening – we're not going to be here this evening, by the way. [Laughter.] Our intent is to conclude this meeting by 1600, at the latest. But I would like to introduce a friend of mine that I've known for a long time and she's one of the most talented and delightful people I know. She is now the assistance to Governor Schwarzenegger for the Los Angles area, and her name is Julie Justice McGinity. She got married since the last time we saw each other, but she'd like to bring us a couple of words from the Governor and this might still – it's working, working, no? Yes.

MS. MCGINITY: Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to join you here briefly, and to – it's just a delight to be here on behalf of Governor Schwarzenegger, and to thank you for your extraordinary work. I told Senator that I wish I had some gold stars to hand out, like you know, we used to do gold stars at Sunday school, you know, for attendance. I understand that in the six meetings that this group has held in the last four months that the attendance and the participation and the caliber of the dialogue has been extraordinary, and I want to thank you all on behalf of the Governor for making that effort and for participating in the quality way, as well as with the quantity of your time. I also want to invite you to be highly engaged in this process going forward. You're going to be concluding your recommendations today and I think that those have been completed in a very timely way, and I think that

1 having these recommendations developed and ready to be moved forward for implementation at a time that
2 is so close to this major disaster that we all faced in San Diego is going to help in terms of their
3 implementation. So, I really encourage you all to continue to be involved in the process and keep the
4 pressure on, if you will, so that the political will exists to execute on many of the recommendations that this
5 body has developed. This Governor is all about action, action, action, and I'm please to be able to report
6 back that this group has conducted itself with that M.O. in mind. And, I'm sure he'll just be very pleased to
7 receive your recommendations and look forward to the leadership of Senator Campbell, who was actually
8 my senator when I was a kid! I've known him a long time, but I'm still pretty young. [Laughter.]

9 CHAIR CAMPBELL: You were a young lady. A young lady.

10 MS. MCGINITY: Well? I think it was a school program that took us to Sacramento when I was in
11 the fifth grade. So you decide if I was a child or a young lady in the fifth grade.

12 CHAIR CAMPBELL: You were a young lady.

13 MS. MCGINITY: Anyway, thank you again for your work, and I will let you get on to business.

14 [Applause.]

15 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Julie, thank you very much. I know you have other business you've got to
16 attend to, but we appreciate you being here and bringing the good wishes of the governor, and hopefully by
17 April 5 we will have this all completed and be able to present it to him at that time.

18 MS. MCGINITY: With your great leadership.

19 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Thank you, thank you. Well, good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. I want
20 to thank all of you on the Governor's Blue Ribbon Fire Commission for your commitment and dedication in
21 carrying out our mandate, which is to review the overall response to last fall's southern California fire siege,
22 and to develop recommendations on how California can be better prepared to reduce the loss of life and
23 property in wild land fires. It has been my privilege to serve as the commission chair. As I worked with
24 consultants to prepare a draft report for the commission's review, discussion and further comments and
25 direction, I was struck by the depth of the questioning, the involvement and the hard work demonstrated by
26 all of the members. I have never been more honored than service with this distinguished group of
27 colleagues. Welcome to our seventh, and likely, final meeting of our Blue Ribbon Commission. As you
28 know, today will be dedicated to review and discussion of the draft report for further comments and

1 direction to the consultants in preparing the final report to the governor and legislature. I've asked the
2 consultants who wrote the draft report make a presentation on the proposed summary and findings in report
3 format. I spent several days with the consultants in identifying and appropriately consolidating all of the
4 findings contained in the presentations made before the commission, and categorizing those findings for
5 our review and presenting them in a logical order. We also compiled all of the recommendations provided
6 in testimony and by commission members, and consolidated similar recommendations and categorized
7 them as well. We now have 69 recommendations. It is my hope that we will end this meeting today with
8 less than 69 recommendations, and I think we will have some consolidation in that regard.

9 After the consultant's presentation, and it's going to be very brief, I have asked Chief McCammon
10 and Chief Bowman and Chief Bamattre that if they will make a presentation, and I think Chief
11 McCammon's going to do that, uh, Bill, and they, the fire chiefs have gotten together in the last day or so
12 and have come up with some recommendations that will consolidate that, some of the reports, and will
13 eliminate some of them also, the recommendations, and so I think we'll go to them after that. And then,
14 Jerry Williams, when we get to the findings – where's Jerry – oh, there he is. Jerry, uh, when we get to the
15 findings, you also have a finding that you'd like us to consider. And that being the case, we must conclude
16 today **(UNINTELLIGIBLE)** of our state elective officials, I want to conclude no later than 4:00 p.m. See,
17 we get to blame it on the elected officials. They have to provide some useful purpose for us here today.
18 [Laughter.] So, uh, please we cannot focus on minutiae, but instead we must address the heart of the matter
19 of what this commission wants to state and recommend and give that final direction to the consultants.
20 Before I ask the consultants to begin their presentation, do any of the members have a comment that they'd
21 like to make at this time? Oh, Supervisor.

22 MR. VENABLE: Just one quick comment. Hopefully staff has it there, uh, San Bernardino
23 County Sheriff's Department on behalf of the county prepared a video of the fires of San Bernardino
24 County and it's available for each member of the commission **(UNINTELLIGIBLE)**.

25 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Oh, thank you. It's going to be distributed later on.

26 MR. VENABLE: It's a 9 or 10-minute video.

27 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. With uh, where are they? Oh, there they are. Ken and Joan, it's all
28 yours. Uh, Joan and Ken.

1 MS. CHAN: Good morning, thank you very much. Ken and I are very honored to be part of this
2 commission.

3 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Joan, could I ask you to get closer to the mike, please?

4 MS. CHAN: Can you hear me?

5 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes.

6 MS. CHAN: I've got bronchitis, my voice is pretty raspy right now, but we'll just go over the
7 report really quickly. First of all is the cover page. The cover page has been developed by OES. Next is
8 the forward. The forward has all the names of the commission members, then after that we have the table
9 of contents, and then we have the Chair's letter, which will be developed. Next is the Introduction.
10 Basically the introduction is the governor's press release. And on the Introduction you'll see on the side
11 from here on, you'll see on the left hand side, there's going to be quotes. We're hoping to have a quote from
12 every single testifier, as well as the commission members. And then we have the Executive Summary, and
13 the Executive Summary will be a good example of what the report is going to look like. The Executive
14 Summary has the quotes on the side, as well as a picture. And we're hoping to have pictures on many of
15 the pages. And then we have the summary of the Findings and Recommendations. The Findings and
16 Recommendations are categorized according to the governor's press release. We have a jurisdictional and
17 operational barriers. We have training, we have interstate, regional/mutual aid systems, and we have local
18 building planning and land use regulations, brush clearance, and fuel modification. We did add an extra
19 one. We did add communications because we thought it was so important. Next is the background of the
20 wild fires. And the background on the wild fires, we got this from CDF and we also got the maps from
21 CDF. And at the very end is the representation of the fire destruction, the chart.

22 MR. KOBRIN: The report as currently conceived then goes into the Findings. The process for
23 putting this together was basically, we culled through what came out in the public testimony in the written
24 submission to the commission, including both letters, testimony, a variety of magazine articles and papers,
25 and even some manuals. We went through those and culled out Findings and Recommendations based on
26 everything that was received. We came up with over 370 recommendations, and over 95 findings. After
27 putting that together, we met with the chairman, Senator Campbell, the executive secretary, Bob Gerber,
28 representatives of Sergeant Major, counsel to the committee, Blair Springer, and others, and went through

1 the entire list and consolidated and culled that down to what was in the draft that was submitted to the
2 members. It is still a very rough document, it obviously needs polishing, and we're looking forward to your
3 input today on the changes you want, in addition to the polishing that we'll do.

4 MS. CHAN: And finally we have Appendixes. It starts with the governor's press release to
5 establish the commission, next is the bio. What I did is I condensed a lot of the bio so that they're hopefully
6 about the same size. If there are any mistakes, omissions, please let me know.

7 CHAIR CAMPBELL: What about the other three pages of my bio? [Laughter.]

8 MS. CHAN: Next we have the presenters at the hearing, and then we have CDF's chrono of the
9 fires, then we have OES's after-action report, the preliminary executive summary. After that will be the
10 league CSAC's letter, and then we're going to add, uh, Appendix G will the commissioners'
11 recommendations. We're going to have all the original copies in there. H will be the glossary, and I will be
12 a list of all the documentations that we went over. And then with that, Senator?

13 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. Thank you very much, Joan. I want to thank, uh, Sergeant Major
14 Associates is hosting our lunch and it will be a buffet, so we could make sure that we get through – right up
15 here – as, uh, -- we're going to work through lunch, basically is what we're saying. Bill Bamattre has
16 shaved his mustache and looks 10 years younger, Bill. At least 10. Maybe 12. Okay. We're gonna start
17 with the findings and, uh, we're – Jerry, go ahead. Jerry Williams. Cause we're starting with the findings.

18 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Chairman. There are two additional findings we believe are
19 important to reflect in this report, and I would add two observations. These findings, it's important to note,
20 are not operational in nature, they are in fact public land management or public land use findings. The first
21 is the most destructive, most costly, most dangerous wild fires occurred in older, dense vegetation, burning
22 under extreme conditions. This vegetation has been managed for a variety of purposes that has not been
23 managed to mitigate wild fire risks. The second finding, most structural losses occurred where homes were
24 vulnerable to wild fire threats. In affect, combustible building materials and little or no vegetation
25 clearance. In contrast, in Ventura County, where building codes and brush clearance requirements have
26 been in place for well over a decade, no homes were lost or have been lost since codes have been in place.

27 Two observations, approximately once per decade weather and fuel conditions –
28

1 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Jerry, excuse me. I think we put out copies – does everybody have a copy
2 of these findings?

3 MR. WILLIAMS: I'm afraid not.

4 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Oh, okay.

5 MR. WILLIAMS: But we will make those available.

6 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. Thank you.

7 MR. WILLIAMS: The two observations – approximately once per decade weather and fuel
8 conditions develop in southern California that result in catastrophic wildfires. When these conditions
9 become manifest, wildfire growth and intensity overwhelm suppression efforts, including aerial assets. I
10 apologize that we submitted a report that was just completed, titled Suppression Strategies for the Cedar
11 Fire. We will make copies available to all commission members before the end of the day. I would direct
12 your attention to page 20, where there is a comparison of perimeter growth in relation to production
13 capability, including that of aerial assets. The final observation – prior significant wildfire events, Bel Air,
14 Laguna, Panorama, Malibu, are similar to this one. Among all of the recommendations made in these
15 previous wildfires, the two recommendations that have consistently been difficult to implement focus on
16 vegetative management and building code requirements. At these scales and these intensities, the wildfire
17 problem, is as much a public land management or a public land use issue, as it is a fire operations issue.
18 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Let me do this. Is there anybody who would disagree with those findings
20 and would anybody object to our including them in the report? Without objection, they'll be part of the
21 report. Thank you. Oh, uh, Senator Alpert and then Assemblywoman Kehoe.

22 SENATOR ALPERT: On the findings, I have two things. Under wildfires findings, finding #2,
23 and under local building planning and land use regulations, finding #1. In both of those the finding is that
24 the California state legislature needs to address the conflicting mandates. That appears to me to actually be
25 a recommending. And I just wonder – and this is small – but if we couldn't instead say there are numerous
26 conflicting mandates as the finding, move the pieces that appear to be recommendations of things we need
27 to do to solve it into the recommendations.

28 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Absolutely, good point.

1 SENATOR ALPERT: Thanks.

2 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Did the consultant note that?

3 SENATOR ALPERT: And I can – I've written it down too, I'll go ahead and take it to the
4 consultants as well.

5 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay, thank you.

6 SENATOR ALPERT: Thank you.

7 ASSEMBLYWOMAN KEHOE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to add, too, where we at
8 numerous points throughout the documents, we discussed fuel management which I think is critical,
9 probably second only to the financing of better fire prevention programs. And I would say in each case we
10 need to use language that is balanced, moderate, and that we wind up recommending a process within the
11 legislature for resolving these regulatory conflicts.

12 CHAIR CAMPBELL: And I think it's possible we would be willing to do that. I – I'm sorry, yes?

13 MR. COLEMAN: Senator, I would like to make a comment regarding Mr. Williams'
14 documentation that he just offered for the committee to review?

15 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Right.

16 MR. COLEMAN: I've been recently involved in doing some reconstruction of wild land fire
17 scenarios and have had a chance to read that report prior to our coming here. And I'd just like to encourage
18 all the commission members to read it because it marries up to the recommendations that are contained
19 within the document. One of them is the use of GIS, and the other is the use of science. And my only
20 comment in support of that is that particular report, while it didn't get to us in a timely fashion, it contains
21 some very valuable information.

22 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Thank you, Ron. I think one of the things I want to say about the report, we
23 have made some recommendations that are costly. And we recognize that there are limited funds available.
24 What I want to do is stress those issues to the governor and the legislature, those issues first of all that are
25 policy issues that will make a major difference but don't necessarily cost money. And so as we start to
26 prioritize, I would like for all of us to keep that in mind that the, uh, and maybe we'll block out just an area
27 that, uh, those recommendations that contain a fiscal impact. There are some of the things that we can do
28 without spending money, and I think we've got good representatives from the legislatures here who are

1 going to have their work cut out for them. There are plenty bills to go around, so you can each take 20, and
2 create bills out of them. [Laughter.]

3 Senator?

4 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Come in, Susan.

5 MS. SMITH: Donna Smith, legislative counsel for Congresswoman Susan Davis. She regrets very
6 much that she was in an armed services mark-up until very late last night and there was no way for her to
7 get here by this hour. I want on her behalf to associate her with Assemblywoman Kehoe's remarks about
8 the need for balance in the way the language is used in the recommendations. I understand that the
9 following paragraphs regarding both Findings and Recommendations are not considered as legislative
10 intent. Coming from the Congress where anything that comes out in writing is used legally to establish
11 legislative intent, and I don't think that's the purpose of those paragraphs. It would be much easier just to
12 deal with the highlighted and bolded statements of Findings and Recommendations. Is that the plan?

13 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes, I agreed that they should come out of the – that one was a
14 recommendation, not a finding, and move it over into the recommendation area, as opposed to leaving it in
15 the Finding area.

16 MS. SMITH: It was the paragraphs that follow each of them. Those are not established as part of
17 the –

18 CHAIR CAMPBELL: They are explanations for why the finding was made. There is a degree of
19 legislative – the courts look at a degree of legislative intent, and I think what we've done there is we've
20 taken the summary in some cases, the exact quotes of people as a result from which we derive the findings.
21 So I think that's why it's important that they be there. But of course we'll do what they want as it relates to
22 legislative intent, which they always intend to do. Alright?

23 MS. SMITH: So you're saying, it is worth our time to be concerned about the language in those?

24 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Uh, yes and no. I mean, I don't want to spend all day going through, you
25 know, defining what "is" is. [Laughter.] But I do, uh, that seems the popular way of phrasing it these days.
26 But I do believe those carry some weight, but the report is basically for the governor and for the legislature,
27 and you, the legislative representatives at both the state and federal level, will have an opportunity to
28 become involved and then you will have to, as you present the bill, then you establish the basis for the

1 findings. What we have in there may or may not help you, we hope it would help you. I think what we're
2 trying to do was, because, why did you do this finding? And that's what we want to say. This is one of the
3 reasons, one of the major reasons, we arrived at this finding was because of this. And some of them,
4 they're one line. Some of them are a page. But we thought it was important that they be in there. Alright.

5 MR. HANSBERGER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if I may. Dennis Hansberger, Chief, San Bernardino
6 County. Just to the comment that was just made about the importance of the language, I would concur –

7 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Dennis, can you get closer to the mike? I have a hearing problem.

8 MR. HANSBERGER: I would concur that there is some concern about putting too much weight
9 on the detail of the language. I for one, and I suspect it's true for most of us here, did not receive this report
10 until Monday evening. I have kept schedules probably similar to the rest of you. I have not yet read it
11 cover to cover and I certainly couldn't vote to say yes, the language in here I absolutely agree to. But,
12 certainly the policy and intent of it I agree to and if we could simply make a statement at the beginning of
13 this that qualifies in that fashion, that simply says that given the press of time, this language is intended to
14 be representative but not specifically the individual position of the commission. I don't want to hang the
15 legislature on you, you have to do it as we did. We had less than 48 hours and I have not yet read it cover
16 to cover.

17 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yeah, well, let me try and explain this. The intent was to justify what the
18 finding was. The finding itself is, if it becomes policy, it will become policy through the recommendations.
19 And I think it's important that we keep the findings in there. I don't know what weight they will carry, and
20 probably not very much given the activist nature of our courts. But, I don't think it's going to get to any
21 court. This document is to go to the executive branch of government, and uh, not the judicial branch, and
22 it's to help explain why we did what we did. As Chris reminds me, the real definitions will be in the
23 statutes. Alright. Yes. We want to – where'd the findings go? Oh. We want to start by going through the
24 findings. What? Yes, Chief McCammon. Bill? You're working on recommendations aren't you?

25 MR. MCCAMMON: Yes.

26 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. Then let's hold off until we get to the recommendations. We're
27 going to go through the findings, and I want to say, the recommendations, or the findings are somewhat, the
28 language beneath the findings is somewhat long in certain pages. I don't want to go too far, but on the

1 Finding No. 1, and that's on about page 5 or 6 of the – does everybody have the beginning of the findings?
2 The Jurisdictional and Operational Barriers.

3 Finding No. 1. An orderly utilized federal assets, including military assets, the U.S. Economy Act
4 requires that all local resources be exhausted, including all available civilian contract aircraft. This
5 requirement also must be met to obtain resources from the California National Guard.

6 Finding No. 2. Senator Hollingsworth. But before you begin, I – rather than – I don't necessarily
7 want to read all these findings. If you'd look at it very quickly, we'll ask if there's any objection. If not,
8 we'll leave it in. So, Senator Hollingsworth.

9 SENATOR HOLLINGSWORTH: On Finding No. 1, Senator, I believe that a full discussion of
10 that must also include the Stafford Act Exemption that allows for a governor to directly request those assets
11 and bypass the Economy Acts. We would be complete in our discussion, uh, we would be leaving a
12 complete picture for the public if we didn't also include that in the discussion of the Economy Act.

13 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay, without objection, I will include it in Finding No. 1. Consultants,
14 you get that?

15 MR. KOBRIN: Yes. You want that in the recommendation, or in the discussion after?

16 CHAIR CAMPBELL: No, part of No. 1.

17 MR. KOBRIN: I mean Finding, yeah. Okay.

18 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** I know we want to move through quickly, but I only
19 have two objections. Unfortunately the first one is one of my objections and it's not – I would like an
20 expansion of the explaining paragraphs beneath in that when we read, 'In addition conversations with
21 military authorities indicate they are ready, willing and able to participate in assisting civil authorities when
22 a disaster occurs,' I think that is going in the right direction, but if we are going to make a recommendation
23 to bypass the Economy Act, I think we need to really thoroughly look at what the situation is on a going
24 forward basis and how we can generally coordinate with military and get a full understanding of whether
25 military wants to be involved in civilian fires on a regular basis, or if there's going to be some kind of a
26 priority.

27

28

1 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. One of the recommendations that we make is that with the
2 declaration of emergency by the governor of the state, that we can bypass the Economy Act. We'll be
3 asking our congressional representatives to deal with that. Colonel, go ahead.

4 COLONEL LACROSSE: Mr. Chairman, thank you. Mr. Verga is actually on his way back from
5 Australia, and I expect he'll be here between 11:00 and 12:00. In his absence, I'd like to reiterate some
6 testimony that I made before this commission, because I don't think this is an accurate finding. The U.S.
7 Economy Act, Title 31, United State Code 1535, provide federal agencies the authority to obtain supplies
8 and services from other federal agencies on a reimbursable basis. Each economy act order is supported by
9 determination and finding statement that says 'The use of this interagency acquisition is in the best interest
10 of the government and that the supplies or services cannot be obtained as conveniently or economically by
11 contracting directly with private sources. There's no requirement to exhaust other resources.' I think a
12 more appropriate yet unstated issue is the access and employment of federal resources by state and local
13 authorities. The Economy Act does not apply to the California National Guard, or any other state resources
14 that I'm aware of. If there is some California law or policy that says in order to use the California National
15 Guard on the militia or state-active duty status, the commission should address that as a separate finding.

16 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. Jerry.

17 MR. WILLIAMS: (UNINTELLIGIBLE)

18 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. Bob.

19 MR. WOLF: Yes, I want to make a recommendation to change language of the last paragraph
20 where it says 'Excuse after excuse was heard.' I believe the more appropriate –

21 CHAIR CAMPBELL: You're not on One are you?

22 MR. WOLF: Yes, Finding One, bottom paragraph, first sentence. 'Excuse after excuse' to me is
23 inappropriate. I believe it should be reasons were given as to why military firefighting, instead of
24 "excuses." There is a reason why everything was done, and I believe that's what the commission would
25 want to put forward whether you agreed with the reasons or not, you know, is up to individuals. But I think
26 "excuses" is inappropriate.

27

28

1 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** In fact, Senator Campbell, if I might, if I could build
2 on what Mr. Wolf was saying, it actually seems in appropriate to me to be using the comments of one of the
3 members of the commission as a finding. I don't actually think that sentence belongs in there at all.

4 MR. WOLF: I happen to agree also.

5 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Who else? Who was the next?

6 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** Mr. Chair? It's in the larger Findings section, where it
7 is expanded upon.

8 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes, I've got it now.

9 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** And, if I may, with the indulgence of the chair, I agree.
10 I think that one of the opening statements that you made was that we were here to find out what went right,
11 what went wrong, and address those issues. And I think to see inflammatory language and I consider it
12 inflammatory language. In the final report it's not as professional as it should be. We can all have our own
13 opinions and our own ideas, but to put statements, direct statements, into the text of the report I feel is
14 inappropriate.

15 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Anybody else? Jay?

16 ASSEMBLYMAN LASUER: As much as that's my statement, I'll go ahead and answer that. The
17 reason is a certain amount of fact behind it. Therefore, I did not use the word "reason," I used the word
18 "excuse." Inasmuch as I was told, number one, they could not communicate via radio with the military in
19 the area, and I went to some military and asked. They said they communicate on a regular basis with the
20 CDF aircraft cause they fly in the air space. Inasmuch as they said that we're not trained, and military
21 reports back to me that yes, they are, and they in fact put out a fire a short time before that in Camp
22 Pendleton, then in fact I look at that as an excuse. Inasmuch as they say that the aircraft are not certified
23 and utilize them in a war, and they're certified for that, and they use them for everything the military has,
24 then it's not necessarily the reason. Now, if it's inflammatory to tell the truth, so be it. If you don't like it,
25 go out there with me and talk to them when these things are occurring. Go out there and talk to the people
26 when they're asking for all the help that they're trying to get. That's what I'm talking about. These are the
27 things that happened during the fire. If it's offensive – you know, a lot of things were offensive to the
28 people during the fire. It was offensive to them that they use the military. When they were there, the

1 largest concentration of Naval forces in the United States was aircraft. That was offensive to them. It was
2 also offensive to them they would not allow their aircraft in California, or request **(UNINTELLIGIBLE)**.
3 That was offensive to them. So, get it to look good and paint it the way you want to.

4 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Senator Hollingsworth.

5 SENATOR HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, Senator, commissioners, I hope that the overwhelming
6 desire of this commission and its members is that we get to the bottom of what occurred and have a truthful
7 response, have an accurate response, and so even today at this point in time with testimony that was
8 presented down the table, we haven't settled the issue of interaction of military resources and the Economy
9 Act and our response during the fire. So it seems to me that there needs to be more work done here to go
10 through that interaction so that we have a recommendation, we have a finding, we have a report that
11 reflects whatever happened. Whether it ends up being a comment by one of the members that outlines the
12 finding, or whether it ends up being language that everybody can agree upon, the point is it needs to be
13 something that is accurate so that we move forward and we are able to then take, and through our agencies
14 and through us in the legislature and others, make the differences, make the changes, so that type of
15 situation doesn't occur. So whether we are looking at language that some may consider to be inflammatory
16 or not, fix that, but don't fix that at the expense of compromising the truth of what happened and
17 compromising on actual data as to how those activities interplayed with our existing law and regulation.

18 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** Mr. Chairman, one quick comment.

19 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes.

20 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** You can use the language conflicting information, or
21 conflicting issues, and I think that more professionally states that we're trying to deal with here because the
22 truth is that there are conflicting ideas of what could or could not be done at the time, none of which have
23 been truly proven one way or the other. My only issue is I don't disagree that there were problems. I just
24 believe it can be stated in a manner that works more toward a positive solution, and that's my
25 recommendation.

26 ASSEMBLYMAN LASUER: Mr. Chair?

27 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes, Mr. LaSuer.

28

1 ASSEMBLYMAN LASUER: You can change whether you want to change it
2 **(UNINTELLIGIBLE)**, but that's what I did say. The thing that you have to understand, I understand this
3 report goes to the governor and to the legislature. But I can think of at least 2,000 people in my district are
4 waiting to hear what this commission is doing. And the people in my district that lost over 2,000 homes
5 want to know whether or not this is going to be a little namby pamby white wash – what's going to tell the
6 truth? Cause this will be read by the people in my district, and other districts, it will be read by the people
7 in San Diego that lost their homes, Senator Hollingsworth's district, Assemblyman Dutton's district, all the
8 districts where they lost homes, where people were killed. It's going to be read by the young man that was
9 released from the hospital the other night who's maimed for life because of this fire. These people want to
10 know, if in fact, we're bold enough to tell it like it is, or we're gonna butter it up. So you can go ahead and
11 butter it up if you want, but this is telling it like it is. If that seems unprofessional to you, then the truth is
12 unprofessional.

13 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Well let me say this. All of the testimony will be included in the report.
14 All the statements made by members of the commission will be included in the report and is part of the
15 overall, uh, we have a – Judy or Ken, do you want to jump in here? Or Joan, excuse me, I called you Judy
16 the other day.

17 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** No, I promised you I wouldn't, sir. [Laughter.]

18 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Joan or Ken, we are including all of the testimony, is that correct?

19 MS. CHAN: Exactly.

20 CHAIR CAMPBELL: And we are including the give and take of the responses by members of the
21 commission, is that correct?

22 MS. CHAN: Exactly.

23 CHAIR CAMPBELL: So all that is already in the report, and we just pulled out some of these
24 recommendations, or some of these comments to justify the findings. Is that correct?

25 MS. CHAN: Correct.

26 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay.

27 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** Senator? I just want to make a comment. I also believe
28 with Mr. LaSuer that there should be all information provided, and certainly my comments were not to

1 (UNINTELLIGIBLE) in any way about including that. What I want to make sure is that the language be
2 more appropriate, and I believe reason is one person's excuse and the other person it's an explanation. And
3 you may not like the explanations. So, I would strongly urge that we adopt the changes in the language.

4 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes?

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Before we get off on the wrong foot and spend the rest of
6 the day going over words, I think we're missing the fundamental point that Colonel Rogger brought up, er,
7 I'm --

8 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:: It's LaCrosse, I'm sorry.

9 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I'm sorry, Colonel Tom LaCrosse.

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Pete Verga's assistant secretary defense, Homeland
11 Defense, and he's on his way here. I apologize for not (UNINTELLIGIBLE) --

12 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: The finding is wrong, and that is what we need focus on is
13 correcting the finding, because the finding (UNINTELLIGIBLE) --

14 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Alright, let me make this recommendation. On all findings, we will delete
15 the other paragraphs, supporting paragraphs, and just go with the findings --

16 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I think what we've said -- at least two of us have said, or
17 three of us have said, is that the finding is incorrect based on the testimony of the colonel that we need to
18 get to the bottom of that. So what's the language?

19 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yeah, we're going to hold it -- Pete will be here later on. When Secretary
20 Verga gets back, we will discuss that. We will skip Findings 1 and 2 at this point. In the meantime, when
21 we come to supportive, we going to delete all the supportive recommendations on all the findings. The
22 supportive paragraph, and just go with the findings, and uh, beg pardon? Yeah, as the final document.
23 However, all the testimony, all the supportive evidence, will be included as part of the report. Alright, so
24 that's Finding 1. Okay, Finding 2 --

25 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: And that's the one that I had asked to have changed.
26 Just turn it into a statement, "There are numerous conflicting mandates of various public policies," and
27 again take out the -- yeah, I just want it to be declarative, rather than tell them, because --

28 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay, I see. You want Findings 2 to be a recommendation.

1 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** But in the findings I'd like to just make a statement.
2 "There are numerous conflicting mandates of various public policies." And then in the recommendation
3 part –

4 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** The problem is, that's my line. [Laughter.] Alright, we'll move that to the
5 recommendation area. Okay. Joan and Ken, did you get that?

6 **MR. KOBRIN:** Yes, sir.

7 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** Okay. Finding 3, any objection to Finding 3? Yes? Andrea.

8 **MS. TUTTLE:** Mr. Chairman, I've just been advised that we would like to re-work some of the
9 words on the – the concept is the same, the purpose, the intent of it is the same, there are a few details that
10 if I could have Jim Wright work with your staff. Jim, would you like to speak specifically to the change?
11 It just came to my attention.

12 **DIRECTOR WRIGHT:** If I can. Just quickly, I worked with the consultants on that. Just to
13 quickly clarify that the reduction in the resources that's occurred over a two-decade period in that
14 supporting paragraph there, doesn't reflect current times. So I just wanted to clean that up a little bit for a
15 better description of that finding.

16 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** Alright. Without objection, Finding 3 is adopted with a clarification by
17 Chief Wright. Finding 4. Excuse me. I want to explain to the public that this is a working session of the
18 committee. This is a confidential draft, as confidential as any public meeting can be. And what we're
19 trying to do is get through this as quickly as possible so that the first person who sees the report, the final
20 report, will be the governor. Finding 4. Any objection? Finding 5. Without objection. Finding 6.

21 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** Finding 6?

22 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** Yes, sir.

23 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** Where it says, "maybe more," --

24 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** I was being gentle.

25 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** Where it says, "may be more," it is better. So it should
26 say a little bit more forceful. There's no "may" about it, it will be more efficient.

27 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** We are discussing Finding #6 on the staffing of engines –
28

1 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** "Is more effective and efficient" would be better language.
2 Just take "may be" out and insert "is."

3 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** "Four person staffing on fire engines may be more effective and efficient."
4 You want to make it "is more effective and efficient."

5 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** Yes.

6 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** I put "may" in there. [Laughter.] Would you please reconsider?
7 [Laughter.] I, uh, I know this is a, uh, and I believe they are more effective. However, I didn't want to get
8 into the battle of the staffing that goes on at the local and city and county and state, and feds. That's a
9 debate no matter what you put in the language, it's gonna happen. Yeah, but "may" is acceptable, right,
10 Bob?

11 **MR. GERBER:** To be honest with you, I prefer is.

12 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** Chief Freeman.

13 **CHIEF FREEMAN:** Mr. Chairman, members, if we're going to leave that in there, which I don't
14 have a problem with, more effective and efficient, but more effective than what? I'm sure if we were to
15 say five that we wouldn't agree, so I think we need to say is more effective and efficient than three-oh
16 staffing. Without the supporting paragraphs, I think it gets lost. More effective and efficient than what? So
17 I suggest that we ought to put more than three-oh staffing.

18 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** Than lower levels of staffing – would that be acceptable?

19 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** Lower levels of staffing would be better.

20 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** Okay. Ken, Joan? Alright. Without objection – Wait, wait, wait. Is there
21 objection to leaving "may" in there? Without objection, "may" will be left in.

22 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** The question is, is it a factual statement? Is there
23 anyone who disagrees that it is not a factual statement that –

24 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** I would disagree. Let me tell you what I didn't want to get into. What I
25 didn't want to get into was the issue of when some strike teams are formed, we require four people on the
26 staffing on strike teams. And some departments, if they put together a strike team, or participate in it, then
27 have to take them, they normally have three persons staffing in there and some even two, then they have to
28 take two, they have to close one down, and I didn't want to get into that whole issue, and that's why we

1 used "may." I believe, there's no doubt, it is more effective and efficient than lower levels. But I really
2 didn't want to get into the battle that I'm not getting into.

3 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** Assuming all engines are staffed, yes.

4 CHAIR CAMPBELL: What?

5 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** Assuming all available engines are staffed.

6 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes, and sometimes they're not. Sometimes a strike team appears and
7 you've only got two or three people. Supervisor.

8 MR. HANSBERGER: Yes, just quickly. I think that's the exact point that, that's assuming you
9 had, that you did not have to reduce the number of apparatus you put in the field. But indeed if you have to
10 reduce the number of apparatus you put in the field to achieve that, it may be less effective. But, more to
11 my point would be, I believe, and I think it's been shown, that in the field of public safety, efficient and
12 effective are competing interests. Public safety is not an efficient business, it's an effective business. Using
13 the work efficient and effective in the same sentence is almost counter productive. In order to be effective,
14 you frequently cannot be efficient. And we have to recognize that it's an expensive thing to do and
15 sometimes we have to give up efficiency for effectiveness. So, my point would be that it may be more
16 effective, it may or may not be more efficient. But it probably is more effective.

17 CHAIR CAMPBELL: So what are you asking, Dennis? You want take out efficient?

18 MR. HANSBERGER: Just take the word efficient out. I don't think we're talking at this point
19 about efficiency, we're talking about effectiveness. We get down to budgets, we'll talk efficiency.

20 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** Just one comment. I think CDF has presented information
21 and I believe they have information that says the cost associated with putting a fourth person on an engine
22 has direct correlation to savings and expenditures for combating wild land fires, and I think that's where
23 that was coming from.

24 CHAIR CAMPBELL: If we will eliminate the word efficient, and keep may. That's my
25 compromise. [Laughter.] Without objection? Thank you, Bob.

26 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** Senator Campbell, I have –

27 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes, Chief, go ahead.

28

1 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** I believe once we give our chief presentation of what we
2 have for the fire chiefs, we're going to cover the recommendations that address this issue.

3 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** I know, when we get the recommendations, Bill's going to lead off with
4 that.

5 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** So that will cover the issue that Bob Wolf was talking
6 about.

7 **MR. WOLF:** That's where maybe we can go back and look at it again.

8 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** I missed that, Bob. Probably a good thing. Number 7. Without objection –
9 oh! I'm sorry.

10 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** Just a clarification and a qualification. I going to amend
11 this to read "CDF aircraft, special aircraft and military **(UNINTELLIGIBLE)** aircraft operate with cut-off
12 time policy **(UNINTELLIGIBLE – not speaking into the mike.)**

13 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** Is there any objection to the change offered by Jerry? Without objection?
14 Did the consultants get it?

15 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** I'll get it to you in writing.

16 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** And procedurally, if you have a change, make sure you get it to the
17 consultants. Finding 8. Without objection. How many of you have been to Boise, Idaho? I've been to
18 Cortelaine (sp?), but that's as far as I got. [Laughter.] Okay. Finding #9. Any objection to that? Without
19 objection. Finding #10. Any objection? Without objection. Finding 11.

20 **MR. HANSBERGER:** Senator, would it be more instructive to say also that in the finding that
21 we've got to be able to take the information and get it to the commanders, to the battalion chiefs, to the guys
22 on the ground?

23 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** On 10 or 11?

24 **MR. HANSBERGER:** On 11. This is talking about the finding of **(UNINTELLIGIBLE)**.

25 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** Dennis, that would be a recommendations.

26 **MR. HANSBERGER:** Well, it's a **(UNINTELLIGIBLE)** of a lack of intelligence information
27 gathering ability, but in that finding, we also need to show that there was a problem, there should be a
28

1 finding that there was a problem in getting the information to the right places strategically and
2 **(UNINTELLIGIBLE)**.

3 CHAIR CAMPBELL: We talk about that in the communications area. Findings in that regard. So
4 we're going to expect the legislature to produce about \$3 billion for the change in the communications
5 technology.

6 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** Mr. Chairman? You have the word there is believed to be
7 –

8 CHAIR CAMPBELL: David, by the way, thank you very much for your recommendation on the
9 **(UNINTELLIGIBLE)**, that was excellent and we appreciate it.

10 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** Thank you. You have the words, "there is believed"
11 which makes that somewhat of a questionable statement as opposed to a finding. You might want to strike
12 the work believe and simply state what you have found.

13 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Good point. "Believed to be" is crossed out. Ken and Joan?

14 MR. KOBRIN: Done.

15 MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Chairman?

16 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes, sir?

17 MR. MARTINEZ: **(Chuck?)** Martinez. What it sounds like, with that statement, is that the
18 suppression of management do not consistently monitor. It isn't a lack of your intent or desire, it's a lack of
19 ability based on conditions. It would seem to me, if I understand the finding, the unmet need isn't caused
20 by the individual, but by the circumstance. So to me it's unclear. I don't know how to fix it, to make any
21 sense.

22 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** My quick response to that would be, that No. 11, I
23 think the intention here is to talk about the system, that there's an unmet need and suppression in
24 management. How about to be able to consistently monitor and understand?

25 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Read it to me as you see it now.

26 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** Okay. "There is a fundamental yet unmet need in
27 **(UNINTELLIGIBLE)** suppression of management to be able to consistently monitor and understand the
28 behavior of wild land fires."

1 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Ken, did you get that?

2 MR. KOBRIN: Done.

3 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Got it, okay. Without objection? It is approved. Finding 12. Without
4 objection. Finding 13. Without objection. I'm sorry, where was the question?

5 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** It was a facetious comment that it probably ought to be
6 put in all caps because it's probably one of the most fundamental problems we have.

7 CHAIR CAMPBELL: What, on number 13? Yes, yes, you're correct. Okay, training findings.
8 Next page. Number one.

9 CHIEF ZAGARIS: Senator?

10 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes?

11 CHIEF ZAGARIS: Kim Zagaris. We start out that sentence we talked about California has over
12 30,000 firefighters. We actually have a conflict later in here. The actual number is, we have about

13 **[TAPE ONE, SIDE A ENDS; TAPE ONE, SIDE B BEGINS]**

14 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Finding 13. There are conflicting land management and environmental
15 laws and regulations at all levels of government.

16 CHIEF ZAGARIS: Correct. And on page 7 where the findings are listed, it only goes to Finding
17 12, and then starts on training, so there's one missing

18 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** There's an omission in the summary.

19 MS. CHAN: That was done on purpose, cause we didn't have enough space.

20 CHAIR CAMPBELL: To confuse us?

21 MS. CHAN: That was supposed to only be a sample.

22 CHAIR CAMPBELL: You did that very well. This was one of those 2:00 in the morning
23 mistakes.

24 MS. CHAN: No, it was about 4:00. But, I commend the person who found that mistake.

25 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. Continuing on training. Here we go. Finding 1. And by the way, I
26 consider these some of the most important recommendations, findings, rather, in the, uh, I think the training
27 issue is one that we really have to deal with. Any objection to #1? Finding #2. Without objection. #3.
28 Without objection. #4. Without objection. #5. Without objection. #6. Without objection. #7.

1 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** Question.

2 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** Six, we're back on six.

3 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** We're talking about – are we talking about the national
4 wildlife, or are we talking about the national wild fire? [Laughter.]

5 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** You get to proof the whole document. Thank you!

6 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** We're all going to train some animals to fight the fire. [Laughter.] We did
7 in the early days. Alright, Finding 7. Without objection. #8. Okay. Next section. Interstate Regional
8 Mutual Aid Systems. Any objection to the paragraph? The information is accurate? 175 fire engines,
9 about from federal agencies, 50 fire engines arrived from Nevada, 3 Nevada National Guard helicopters, 50
10 engines from Arizona, 20 from Oregon, 2 from National Guard helicopters from Oregon, from California
11 1,160 government engines, uh, local engines, 275 CDF, 102 OES. All those correct? Then without
12 objection, we'll approve that. Finding 1. Without objection. Finding 2. Finding 3. Without objection.
13 Finding 4. Without objection. Finding 5. Without objection. Next page, Local Building Planning and
14 Land Use Regulations, Brush Clearance and Fuel Modification, Any objection to the initial paragraph?
15 Without objection. Finding 1.

16 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** Now we're back to my issue.

17 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** Yes, you are. You're absolutely right. Remember that one? That's moving
18 into the Recommendation area, Ken. Okay. Finding 2. Any objection? Without objection. Finding 3.
19 Without objection. Finding 4.

20 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** Excuse me, Senator. You went by that one real fast.
21 Could we go back to the last finding for just a second?

22 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** Which one, Finding 3?

23 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** Right there on **(UNINTELLIGIBLE)** we talked about
24 **(UNINTELLIGIBLE)** involvement and helping –

25 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** That's Finding 3.

26 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** Yeah, Finding 3. Could there be some reference in there
27 to fire safe councils, or –

28

1 CHAIR CAMPBELL: We have a lot on fire safe councils. Those are in the recommendation area,
2 though.

3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Okay, I just wanted to make sure that there is a finding.

4 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yeah. We have an awful lot on that. We'll spend a lot of time in this report
5 talking about fire safe councils.

6 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Okay.

7 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Finding 4?

8 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Uh, Mr. Chairman.

9 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes. Senator.

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I hope that the discussion on fire safe councils will
11 include, the tendency that we have now is that they spring up, they're effective for a while after a disaster,
12 and then they have a tendency to kind of go dormant, and then our recommendations would follow after
13 that finding on how to deal with that.

14 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Finding the glass half full rather than half empty. It's a good point, Dennis,
15 but we don't, uh, when we get to the recommendations we'll talk about that a little bit.

16 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: But I think the findings should include the tendency to go
17 dormant.

18 CHAIR CAMPBELL: But we want to say something like, there's a need to encourage ongoing
19 effort in this regard. We'll do that in recommendations. Finding 4.

20 MR. HANSBERGER: Mr. Chairman, uh –

21 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes, sir?

22 MR. HANSBERGER: Just a question. I don't object to the finding –

23 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Go ahead, Dennis.

24 MR. HANSBERGER: -- but is there a point in the report, not having a chance to get through all of
25 it, is there a point in which we discuss the disparity between new construction and existing older homes? If
26 we – but I think we need to focus somewhere on that. We could do it later, but I think we need to –

27 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I think somewhere along in the recommendations, Dennis, we did not make
28 a distinction between, and I think we ought to. When we get to this area –

1 MR. HANSBERGER: Probably recommendations is the place to address this. Thank you.

2 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Right. Thank you. Consultants, you going to remind me when we got to
3 recommendations on that? Thank you. Uh, Finding 4. Without objection. Finding 5. Without objection.
4 Finding 6. Without objection. Finding 7. Let's delete that one. Unless you –

5 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** Senator, perhaps a better finding would be that certain
6 communities have responded more completely since disasters in their area than others, as a finding. I
7 mean, Laguna, I think everyone would agree responded very well. I think there might be some debate, but
8 there's others that Oakland has not.

9 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Jerry?

10 MR. WILLIAMS: I was just going to suggest – **(UNINTELLIGIBLE – not speaking to the**
11 **mike).**

12 CHAIR CAMPBELL: We can delete 7 cause it's already done in your recommendations. Do you
13 represent Laguna? Dennis? Okay. We'll delete. Communications Interoperability and Public Outreach.
14 Any problem with the paragraph? Finding 1. Communications interoperability is essential to the effective
15 command and control of personnel and resources going multi-agency, multi-discipline responses to major
16 incidents. Any objection? Without objection. Finding 2. Any objection? Without objection.

17 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** Alright, question. Are Findings 2 and 3 really about
18 communications or about information gathering, and maybe this need to be a larger topic.

19 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Well they are about information gathering, but that, uh, I think that was, we
20 had, maybe this belongs in – it's Public Outreach.

21 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** The title on the page of this section.

22 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** What about public, or information technology? One of
23 the issues we discussed was, if we have the real time surveillance in the air, how do they get it to the
24 ground and the firefighters on the trucks? So there's a communications element, but there's also an
25 **(UNINTELLIGIBLE).**

26 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I'm going to change it to Communications Interoperability, Public
27 Outreach, and Information Technology.

28 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** Okay.

1 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Thank you. Without objection? Finding 3. See I didn't even – I've gone
2 the whole meeting and haven't talked about the Predator yet. [Laughter.] Without objection on 3. Finding
3 4. Without objection.

4 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Question.

5 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes, sir.

6 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Are we deleting – we are deleting the explanatory
7 paragraphs that follow that (UNINTELLIGIBLE), is that correct?

8 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes, we are, if we're being consistent.

9 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes.

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Cause I otherwise would want to change some of that
11 discussion.

12 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Thank you. Consultants, you got that? Okay. Jurisdictional and
13 Operational Barriers, Multi-Jurisdictional Recommendations. Oh, okay. We're through with the findings.
14 Chief Freeman, you have a comment before we get into that?

15 CHIEF FREEMAN: I do, sir, if I might. I would just suggest that maybe the chair reconsider the
16 elimination of the explanatory paragraphs in toto. I think there does need to be some explanation. It could
17 be much more succinct, but what we need to remember is if the public and other members of the legislature
18 attempt to reach this, they're not going to have all the background that we have as commission members.
19 So I would suggest that perhaps the, if the commission agrees, is that there be some brief explanatory
20 paragraph under each one of those findings which will just amplify that is being presented as a finding.

21 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I would like to second that. I think otherwise people are
22 going to look at this report and wonder who these findings landed in the report without any explanation. I
23 think that is really a good idea. I think it would be a mistake not to have a description of why we came up
24 with that finding.

25 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chair?

26 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes, Judy.

27 MS. MIKELS: Maybe a compromise in that to keep the report readable for action, but yet still
28 have everything in it would be to footnote the location of the discussion under each recommendation or

1 finding, then those who are interested can go to Exhibit B, C, D, whatever it is, and find the lengthy
2 discussion and expand, you know, because they're not going to be interested – yeah, I mean, we know how
3 people are when they read it. They read it for their own focus. And there's going to be areas that people
4 will pick up and focus on and not necessarily be involved in the information on other areas, so if the
5 consultants would just note where the information on that recommendation is to be found, we get over the
6 road snipping thing, but people still know where to find it.

7 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Uh, Chief Freeman, if we use footnotes, does that cover the issue in your
8 mind?

9 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: (UNINTELLIGIBLE) [Laughter.]

10 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Now you've got a good point, Senator!

11 MR. KOBRIN: Senator? Senator? I'd just like to point out, while I appreciate where the
12 commission is going on that, I need to point out that, the way everything was combined from the original
13 400-some recommendations into this, there are now, these recommendations are now a combination of
14 maybe 20 or 30 different things in different locations. It's going to be virtually impossible to footnote in
15 that fashion and meet the deadline to have this to the governor by April 5. So we would need significantly
16 more time to accomplish that under the current circumstances.

17 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I'm sorry. Senator Alpert.

18 SENATOR ALPERT: I'm wondering if, again, if the footnotes are really not a possibility if we
19 could have a really, like a three or four sentence descriptor under each of the findings rather than sort of
20 these lengthy, and some of them which I feel actually are potentially inflammatory or, they're not actually
21 directly related to the finding, and I don't know if staff would be able to do – I know some of them are
22 relatively complex, but something much shorter that really is a descriptor of the finding itself. You know,
23 that could be sent out perhaps to the members of the commission.

24 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Well, let's see if we can get a consensus on what to do here. I think it's a
25 good point, Chief, that you need something down there to tell people exactly what's happening. But I'd like
26 to avoid as much as possible redoing all of them, redoing the whole thing. However, what if we give the
27 consultants the responsibility of performing a Reader's Digest edit of the paragraphs? Any objection to
28 that? Alright – yes, sir?

1 MR. HAMILTON: Another possibility, and I don't know how difficult this would be to do, but
2 would be to tie the findings and recommendations together, and then you would just have one
3 description of where the finding and how the recommendation is going to be implemented, if that would be
4 a possibility.

5 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Larry, could you get closer to the mike? I'm missing part of that.

6 MR. HAMILTON: My suggestion, Mr. Chairman, was can you link the findings to the
7 recommendation, and then you have one description of that finding and recommendation, rather than
8 splitting that out?

9 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Alright. Is it agreeable to allow the consultants to shorten the paragraphs
10 beneath that? Without objection. Now I want to direct your attention to, you each should have a copy of
11 the recommendation worksheet that David Caine was so kind to put together for us. Now, David, we
12 appreciate what you've done, but this doesn't mean you get extra time speak on the issues if we're going to
13 get out of here at 4:00! [Laughter.] Thank you. Okay, now. On the recommendations, Chief McCammon.
14 And I want to say this, I appreciate the work that you and the other chiefs have done on this because you're
15 the experts in this area, and we appreciate your time and the effort that you put into this.

16 CHIEF MCCAMMON: Thank you, Senator Campbell, and what I'd like to do is provide you just a
17 brief overview of the process that we went through and hopefully we can provide some direction to the
18 process that we're going to go through today in terms of the recommendations.

19 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Bill, could you get closer to that mike?

20 CHIEF MCCAMMON: Yes. But I would like to start by thanking everyone that's a member of this
21 commission that is not directly involved in the fire service. I think that while the fires that occurred this
22 last year were horrendous and horrific in some of the things that happened. Fire is not something that only
23 happens once in California every 10 years. We do this every year in California up and down the state in
24 various degrees, and our frustration as fire service professionals is that we really haven't been able to get
25 some of the major policy issues addressed that need to be addressed so they can help us in the prevention of
26 these fires. And so we look forward to the outcomes that come from this commission. I want to personally
27 thank, and on behalf of all the fire chiefs, everyone involved in this process, because we think that it has the
28 possibility to make some of those changes.

1 There's three things that we provided you. There's a letter with the signatures of all the people that
2 were there yesterday. We had broad representation from the fire chiefs that were on the commission, as
3 well as organized labor. We started by going through the matrix that was provided and established
4 priorities, and then we looked at each one of the recommendations and where we could consolidate
5 recommendations that were redundant, we did, and where we felt that there needed to be clarification on
6 what the recommendation was actually stating, we provided that. So, as you go through this document, and
7 I'll turn your attention to page 5, as an example, recommendation number 40 is actually a consolidation of
8 recommendations 40, 42, 43, 49, and 56. So we hopefully have provided a simplified version of this
9 process that we can begin to address some of the things that we want to. The other thing that we did,
10 there's another document that you have in your packet that has nine specific recommendations. One of the
11 things that we're very concerned about, with the number of recommendations that will be put forward, is
12 that they may all get lost, and we really may not get the specific attention we need in the areas that we feel
13 are the highest priorities. So we took the liberty then of doing another prioritization of the number 1's, and
14 we came up with what we believe are the top 9 recommendations that we need to move forward. That's not
15 to say that all of the others we agreed to shouldn't be in there. But again, there needs to be a second
16 prioritization so that we can move forward specifically with some of those.

17 The other thing that we addressed in the letter, um, we understand that there are some significant
18 funding issues related to some of these recommendations and how we're going to pay for those, and we
19 offer three specific recommendations or suggestions that could be considered at a later date, or as part of
20 this process. The first is some type of budgetary guarantee and a protection for revenues that fund fire
21 protection systems. We believe that that is necessary. Additionally, to that, if we're going to look at new
22 revenue sources, one of the sources that was suggested is the establishment of a statewide ¼-cent sales tax,
23 specifically dedicated to accomplishing the goals of the Blue Ribbon Commission. So there would be
24 specific outcomes identified for that tax. And then lastly, a possible re-distribution of future growth –

25 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I think Senator Soto has that bill.

26 CHIEF MCCAMMON: Okay. That's good. And the third was re-distribution of future growth by
27 equal shares of Prop 172 funds to fairly represent the fire service role in public safety. And just so the
28

1 members of the commission understand, most fire departments do not receive 172 funds, and when the
2 original bill was established, fire departments were supposed to be part of that allocation.

3 And lastly, as we looked at this process, there were two big concerns that came up for us. We had
4 an opportunity to meet with President Bush during the fires in San Diego. He was very interested in the
5 work the Blue Ribbon Commission was going to do. We have representation from the congressional
6 districts and Senator Feinstein's staff here, and we believe that a small representative group of the Blue
7 Ribbon Commission needs to take our results to Washington. Because we also believe the federal
8 government has a responsibility and a role in some of the things that we're moving forward. And then
9 lastly we would like some sort of discussion about how we can present our findings to the rest of the state
10 legislature. We believe there's an opportunity to educate the larger body in Sacramento. We need a
11 process to go forward to do that. So with that, we'd like to offer this matrix sheet as a way to begin to
12 prioritize the recommendations.

13 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** Mr. Chairman, if I could address your last point about
14 Mr. Bush. I was just in Rubin Borrallis's office yesterday, and we had a lengthy discussion. He is the one
15 that asked me, how was the commission coming and I told him about today's meeting, and I promised him
16 a copy of the report, to Rubin Borrallis who is the local government liaison for the President, works in the
17 EOB. And so, I think that your recommendation is a good one and one that the commission ought to take to
18 heart because that office is extremely interested in what is going on with this.

19 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** Chief McCammon? Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First
20 of all, thank you for responding to the grid. I thought your recommendations are very thorough and very
21 professional. So I appreciate that. One thing I would like to get from the chiefs at some point is your
22 professional response on how we can better work with the military. Because this has been an ongoing
23 discussion for the commission and it has yet to really be resolved. In particular, do they participate in
24 mutual aid? Have they been asked will they? How can we make this a process that works better in the
25 future?

26 **CHIEF MCCAMMON:** To answer that question specifically, if you look at the 9
27 recommendations that we put forward, I believe it's on page 1, recommendation number 3, we believe
28

1 outlines a process. I think there is a process in play today to correct some of those things for the future, but
2 I think this recommendation goes more specifically to what your concerns are.

3 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** Thank you.

4 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. Uh, Jerry Williams –

5 MR. SEDIVIC: Senator Campbell?

6 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes?

7 MR. SEDIVIC: Jeff Sedivic. Um, if no one has an objection, I'd like these recommendations to
8 move forward as a consensus of the firefighter members of this commission.

9 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** Does that mean that –

10 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I don't think we there yet, Jeff, but we will get there.

11 MR. SEDIVIC: Okay. Just because it's being presented as chiefs and not everybody that was
12 involved was a chief.

13 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I have trouble seeing that far down there when I have reading glasses on.
14 So would you identify yourself, I'd appreciate it, when you speak into the mike?

15 MR. SEDIVIC: Did you get me?

16 CHAIR CAMPBELL: [Laughs.]

17 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** Senator Campbell, just to clarify, I'm sorry if I misstated,
18 but I thought I did mention that organized labor was involved in these discussions.

19 CHAIR CAMPBELL: yes, you did say that. How about disorganized labor? [Laughter.] Jerry,
20 we'll get back to Deedee, and then –

21 SENATOR ALPERT: I would just, on the recommendation, or the discussion of how we could
22 actually make sure that all of our members of the California state legislature would be aware of this. I hope
23 that maybe with the help of my colleagues that we could arrange for a hearing to be held so that this could
24 be presented. I know that some – sir, you're on the public safety committee, that we could perhaps do it in
25 front of the public safety committee, maybe we could have a joint of the two houses, the two public safety
26 committees, and then these recommendations could be presented to everyone, so I think we could try and
27 work together on that as a possibility.

28 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Good idea. You agree? Uh, Jerry, go ahead.

1 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This morning in front of you there was a handout.
2 It's a one-page flow chart. It's titled *Order of Risk Management Effectiveness*, relative rating, wild land
3 firefighting under most adverse weather conditions. I'll give everybody a minute to try to dig that out. It's
4 a one-page flow chart.

5 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Got it. Everybody got it?

6 MR. WILLIAMS: We're offering this as a means to help weight the recommendations that might
7 be made and let me walk through it with you. Once again, this focuses on wildfire threats under most
8 extreme burning conditions. It contends that there are several actions that can be taken, starting at the top
9 and working down. And I'll walk through that just very briefly. The risk mitigation activity that's most
10 effective would hold that wild land fuel hazard abatement or vegetative management is the most effective
11 means of providing protection under adverse weather. It rates as high to very high. If we are not able to do
12 that for a variety of reasons listed under barriers, whether it's air quality concerns or engendered species, or
13 cost, or organizational capacity, or risk, the next best treatment would focus on defensible space, clearing
14 distances and so forth. Under that protection strategy, we would realize a moderate to high level of
15 protection capability under adverse weather conditions. If we're not able to do that because it costs too
16 much, or the amenity values are more important to people, the next line of defense is to focus on safe
17 building construction and zoning requirements. If we are able to do that, again, without treating the fuels or
18 without defensible space, we would see a moderate level of protection probability under adverse
19 conditions. If we not able to do that, then we fall into relying on a reactive fire protection capability or
20 capacity, increase military support, and so forth. This flow chart may help us put into context some kind of
21 weighting mechanism to evaluate the recommendations. It focuses on most extreme burning conditions
22 going back to these wild fires that occur but once a decade. Importantly, it makes a distinction between
23 public policy related issues that occur above the line, or operational related issues that occur below the line.
24 It makes clear that preventative measures, while often more difficult to implement, generally have a much
25 higher rate of return. Most importantly, I believe it tells us that without dealing with the causal factors or
26 the public policy issues above this line, we could easily stand to invest enormous amounts of money below
27 the line again under adverse burning conditions with no discernable return. It was interesting to me in
28 going through briefly, right now close to one half of all the recommendations we making bell below the

1 line. Another 20% of the recommendations aren't even categorized on this line, they have to do with
2 medical standards, or something else. Once more, offer this as a means to help us better understand the
3 relative effectiveness of the recommendations that we might forward to better deal with the kinds of fires
4 that define this event from last fall, and at a decade basis seem to define the fire problem we're wanting to
5 confront here. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

6 CHAIR CAMPBELL: It seems like a good system, Jerry. Thank you. Uh, Dennis?

7 MR. HANSBERGER: I would just like to comment them for putting this together. I think this is a
8 very effective way to put it in a graphic manner, to put it across that, you know, kind of the structure that
9 we've been looking at for this and, would suggest to the commission that we incorporate this with only a
10 couple of minor things I might ask about, is if we include it on the barriers working out the degree to which
11 the Economy Act given the discussion earlier this morning is a barrier. And then adding also that
12 obviously when you're talking about land management defensible space litigation is one of those very large
13 barriers that's been run into quite a bit.

14 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Without a – yes, sir?

15 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** I have one comment, uh, and ask Director Tuttle to
16 comment on it, but since the document refers to forest service lands, the missing element is between the
17 first state of land management and the next stated part of defensible space, and that would be an injection
18 of a consideration for SRA land, state responsibility area land, as well as large private parcels. In the San
19 Bernardino National Forest communities, wild land urban interface, the density within private lands, tree
20 growth has grown to 10 times what the sustainable amount should be. If we adopt the document, and I
21 agree with Senator Hollingsworth, this is a tremendous flow chart, if we add in the state responsibility land
22 and private land areas for consideration, I think we will have made a major step in the right direction.

23 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Andrea?

24 MS. TUTTLE: Mr. Chair, I had not read this as just applying to federal lands. I think it's applying
25 to all wild lands.

26 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Right, it's just a format.

27 MS. TUTTLE: It blocks out where the areas are, and if we need to be more specific about it, then
28 we certainly can. But I read this as wild land and **(UNINTELLIGIBLE)** areas.

1 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Right.

2 MR. HAMILTON: Mr. Chairman?

3 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes?

4 MR. HAMILTON: Larry Hamilton, Department of Interior. Uh, one thing that is missing in the
5 report and it relates to this issue, is when we identify CDF and U.S. Forest Service lands, we need to also
6 put in there Department of the Interior lands, because that includes parks service, fish and wildlife service,
7 Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Bureau of Land Management, and that's not in there throughout the report
8 and that's an important thing to have in there.

9 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Uh, consultants? Without objection, we'll add that where necessary.

10 CHIEF ZAGARIS: Senator Campbell? Kim Zagaris. Maybe what we should do is just mention
11 just local, state and federal, because we're not just talking U.S. Forest Service, Interior, we're talking
12 military installations and other federal properties that are out there. We're talking the entire process.

13 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Private areas also.

14 MR. HAMILTON: I think that's a good suggestions. That's a good generic way to cover
15 everybody.

16 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. Jerry.

17 MR. WILLIAMS: I appreciate that, and that was the intent. Congruent with this, we would be
18 prepared to offer a recommendation that would call for a comprehensive interagency intergovernmental
19 wild land vegetative management plan for southern California that would have several elements, including
20 a balance of harms assessment that would try to reconcile these competing public land policy issues that
21 influence flammability potential throughout southern California.

22 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Thank you. We now know that chaparral may be a weapon of mass
23 destruction. Ronnie.

24 MR. COLEMAN: Uh, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make one other possible consideration
25 on the flow chart. When you look at the one that talks about zoning requirements and fire safe building
26 constructions, over there it talks about it being a cost factor, social political resistance, I would like to see
27 the word regulatory conflict added there, because that is where most of the regulatory conflict emerges.

28

1 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Any problem? Without objection? That will be added. Jerry, did you hear
2 that? Did you get that? Adding regulatory conflict? Okay, any other questions on the flow chart? I'm
3 going to make a recommendation now that we go to the chiefs and laborers matrix for our discussion on the
4 recommendations. Do you want to uh, Bill, do you want to lead off with these? Recommendation #1?

5 CHIEF MCCAMMON: How do you want to proceed? Do you want to just identify them and then
6 see if there's an objection to the rating that we've given them?

7 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Why don't we do this? We'll rely on you for the explanation if there is a
8 need for one.

9 CHIEF MCCAMMON: Okay.

10 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Alright, let me do this. On the recommendations, Recommendation #1,
11 Jurisdictional and Operational Barriers, Multi-Jurisdictional Recommendations. And this is the
12 recommendation where we come back to the U.S. Economy Act, and, Dennis, were you the one who raised
13 a question on the Economy Act?

14 MR. HANSBERGER: Yes.

15 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Is this alright?

16 MR. HANSBERGER: Well, again, I think it doesn't reflect the discussion that we had at the
17 beginning of this meeting as to whether or not it's, and to the degree, it's a barrier. The testimony was
18 presented by the Colonel that it's not, yet the document says that it is, so we need to – that is an unsettled
19 area of this commissions recommendations and findings that I don't think we can determine today that we
20 may need to revisit in the final documents.

21 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Let me do this. Let me make a recommendation till Peter gets here, that we
22 come back to this and see what the Assistant Secretary has to say.

23 **UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER:** And Senator Campbell, can, uh, with the same
24 **(UNINTELLIGIBLE)** amending state statute to activate the California National Guard and someone
25 advised us that actually does need to be changed in statute.

26 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Does that need to be changed? On the CNG? We have a representative
27 from the Guard here today?

28 MR. ZAGARIS: No, but uh, Kim Zagaris –

1 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Kim, that's right. Can you answer that?

2 MR. ZAGARIS: I think actually instinct, we do a pretty effective job of utilizing the National
3 Guard (UNINTELLIGIBLE). We do on a daily basis, when resources are tied, start taking a look at
4 what's available. CDF takes a look at it, we take a look at our federal counterparts, what they have
5 available, how they're utilizing contract, uh, call when needed resources, and if necessary, we receive a
6 request from CDF and we go ahead and do a (UNINTELLIGIBLE) –

7 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Kim, I think the question was –

8 MR. ZAGARIS: I don't think California needs to worry about the use of the guard.

9 CHAIR CAMPBELL: No, the question was, does the state do (UNINTELLIGIBLE) simply
10 amend state statute to activate the California National Guard?

11 MR. ZAGARIS: No.

12 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Do we need to do that? Dallas?

13 DIRECTOR JONES: Well, my question is, I think the question is relating to the MAFF units.
14 Clearly the Guard resources that we have throughout the state --

15 MR. ZAGARIS: Are state asset.

16 DIRECTOR JONES: -- you know, there's no problem, we can activate those.

17 MR. ZAGARIS: Correct.

18 DIRECTOR JONES: But the two MAFF units that reside in the International Guard in California,
19 it was our understanding that we had to have a deployment of other resources before we could activate
20 them, and is that true or not? That's the question, I think.

21 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Colonel.

22 COLONEL LACROSSE: If I could address that.

23 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Could you speak into the microphone, Colonel?

24 COLONEL LACROSSE: Certainly, sir. I apologize for not being able to look both ways. What
25 the California National Guard is the C-130's. The MAFFS actually belong to the Department of
26 Agriculture. There is an existing memorandum of agreement between the California National Guard and
27 the Department of Agriculture.

28 CHAIR CAMPBELL: the MAFFS is the unit that slides into the C-130 --

1 COLONEL LACROSSE: That is correct, sir.

2 CHAIR CAMPBELL: -- to deploy the whatever.

3 COLONEL LACROSSE: The retardant.

4 CHAIR CAMPBELL: The water or the retardant.

5 COLONEL LACROSSE: So the National Guard can do anything the governor and the
6 (UNINTELLIGIBLE) want them to do in order to use the modular airborne firefighting system inside of
7 one of their C-130's. The procedure is already in place through a memorandum of agreement.

8 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Let me understand then, so the MAFF unit here in California, there's one
9 down here in southern California, and one up in northern California.

10 COLONEL LACROSSE: No, sir, there's only one unit, and there are a total of two MAFFS, two
11 of the Modular Airborne --

12 CHAIR CAMPBELL: But the two MAFFS are in different locations.

13 COLONEL LACROSSE: Sir, I think they're both at Channel Island.

14 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Oh, they're both at Channel Island? Okay. I'm wrong. I thought one was
15 up in (UNINTELLIGIBLE).

16 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: And I think in testimony before the commission also that
17 CDF activated OES very early on in the fire siege, so that goes to show that that wasn't an issue.

18 CHAIR CAMPBELL: So, is it an issue?

19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: In our considerations yesterday when we talked about this,
20 this was, we had considerable discussion because of the difficulty to amend or change the Economy Act. If
21 I understand what the Colonel is saying, which we, is the real key, is if we have been misinterpreting that,
22 when I say we'll talk about us collectively, then this isn't the problem that everyone is understanding it to
23 be and in fact, then we can reduce or eliminate this recommendation if we accept the interpretation that the
24 Colonel is proffering for us. I think that's very critical for us to understand that because this eliminates an
25 obstacle that would be very difficult for us to deal with us and a very political issue in trying to amend this
26 act.

27 SENATOR ALPERT: Then I'm going to ask that someone be tasked with action looking and state
28 statute to see if there's anything in state law, because we seem to be talking about a lot of either informal

1 agreements or written agreements, and nobody has yet told me rather state law in any way is hurting or
2 helping in this regard and I would like to ask somebody to actually look at the code.

3 CHAIR CAMPBELL: How about the senate?

4 SENATOR ALPERT: The senate will do it. [Laughter.] I'll task myself with that, and you're
5 right, Senator Campbell.

6 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I was going to recommend OES, but I thought, why not let the people who
7 make the laws explain it to us.

8 MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Chair, Rick Martinez. As I remember, having been in San Diego early on
9 during the fire siege, the MAFF units, the California MAFF units were not the issue. They were activated
10 very quickly. The six other MAFFS that exist in the United States which are not in the state of California,
11 took some time to go through the Department of Defense, which **(UNINTELLIGIBLE)** made that request.

12 CHAIR CAMPBELL: That was the issue, is that right?

13 MR. MARTINEZ: Well, that was part – as I remember all the testimony really surrounds the
14 military assets, in particular the helicopters at the Naval Base in San Diego, as well as other assets, and that
15 I think is where the Economy Act may come in, and I've had that explained to me, I did during the fires.
16 That's a question as how you would access those military assets at the time. And there is the availability, as
17 I understand it, for a base commander to construct a mutual agreement or local agreement with the local
18 agencies to where, pre-established so you don't have to go through the Department of Defense. But that
19 may be a breakdown, so my point is just, on the Economy Act with respect to the MAFFS as the exposure
20 that I had down there then, it wasn't the two California MAFF units, they weren't an issue.

21 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Colonel?

22 COLONEL LACROSSE: The last speaker is absolutely correct. There doesn't even have to be a
23 memorandum of agreement. There is, in DOD policy, what we call immediate response. Individual
24 installation commanders, or head of defense agencies, can render immediate response to save lives,
25 mitigate great property damage, or prevent human suffering. There is no bureaucracy in the Pentagon that
26 will question that.

27 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Can they bring in the other four MAFF units?
28

1 COLONEL LACROSSE: They don't own the other, the other six actually. I think, if you don't
2 mind –

3 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Dallas.

4 DIRECTOR JONES: Yeah, uh, let me walk back a little bit cause I think we're kind of getting the
5 water a little bit muddy. In every fire siege we have in California, almost to the yearly basis, we utilize
6 military aircraft. We utilize the National Guard helicopters, and sometimes that's all we need to access.
7 Often times we can access our MAFF units, the two that are here in California, because they then are
8 readily available, if they're not out of state. And most of the time, quite frankly, the MAFF units are being
9 deployed in Colorado and Wyoming, or other states. But the real issue as far as the use of military is
10 around their base, they can respond off and immediately respond and act. But when it comes into being
11 able to respond either statewide, or as part of a mutual aid program, then is when we get into these inter-
12 agency agreements, both the U.S. Forest Service and the Department of the Interior. As far as regarding
13 the outside California MAFFs, and there are six located throughout the United States, it has been the
14 interpretation that the Economy Act requires the deployment of the private sector retardant-dropping
15 aircraft before they can be accessed. And that has been not just in this fire siege, but well understood by
16 the fire agencies in California. Now maybe we're misinterpreting that provision, but that has been the case
17 in prior years and in this deployment. They were requested by personnel on the fire scene, but they were
18 not able to be deployed because contract aircraft had not been put into play. When the contract aircraft
19 were put into play, they were immediately then responded.

20 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Let me ask you a question, Dallas. The contract aircraft have to be all used
21 up. Does that mean the contract aircraft in California, or nationwide?

22 COLONEL LACROSSE: Again, sir, if I could interject.

23 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes, sir.

24 COLONEL LACROSSE: The Economy Act says not exhausted, not used up, it says that other
25 supplied and services cannot be obtained as conveniently or economically by contracting directly with
26 private sources. DOD doesn't want to be in competition with private sources, number one.

27 DIRECTOR JONES: And I understand that. But not to be argumentative, your saying what the
28 law is. What I'm telling you, though, is the interpretation by all the fire agencies, including the U.S. Forest

1 Service, who is the ordering point for MAFF units, have interpreted that to say that until the contract
2 aircraft are used, we cannot access them. Now if that's in error, we certainly can qualify that and clarify the
3 procedures, but in prior years, and including this year, that has been not by interpretation.

4 MR. HANSBERGER: It appears that the finding, then should be that there exists substantial
5 disagreement and confusion as to the implementation of the Economy Act, and various other interagency,
6 intergovernmental agreements, as well as internal to California ability to utilize different levels of National
7 Guard --

8 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I think the question we're coming to, Dennis, is where do we go for
9 clarification?

10 MR. HANSBERGER: Well, I'm trying to fit into the format that we have this morning, so the
11 finding would be of the confusion, the recommendation ought to be that we clear up the confusion , either
12 through changes, interpretation from solicitors' offices at the federal level, and then those are followed up
13 with regulatory changes at the federal level, and/or if necessary, legislation. The recommendation for the
14 state interplay is that we take advantage of and implement those agreements with base commanders with
15 CDF for training and aircraft certification and so on, and that we clarify from the state legislative aspect
16 that what's available to the extent that we can within the National Guard resources.

17 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Jerry?

18 MR. WILLIAMS: I was just going to offer, I think that's the right track to get on. On an inter-
19 agency basis, that (UNINTELLIGIBLE) that mobilization center in Boise, annually there's developed a
20 military use handbook and the recommendation might be tailored to clarify ordering and process MAFFS
21 or other military asset requests in that handbook.

22 CHAIR CAMPBELL: We need clarification. The question – go ahead, Bill.

23 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Maybe in an effort to move this along, the reason we left
24 as a number one is for this very reason, because there's so much confusion, we didn't feel it would be
25 appropriate just to remove it. But if you look at Recommendation #3, I think it sets out to do exactly what
26 we're asking. And I would like to read it. "The commission recommends that the federal, state, CDF and
27 local fire agencies agree to develop and adopt regulations and operating policies with the military on how
28 to employ aerial assets during wild land firefighting efforts to include . . ." And then it speaks to those

1 things that became issues or potentially were called excuses, or whatever you want to call them, that put in
2 place some policies and procedures on how those aircraft can be used. And I think #3 addresses all of the
3 issues we're trying to talk about.

4 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Andrea.

5 MS. TUTTLE: Thank you. I would like to concur with what's been said here, both by Chief
6 McCammon and by the Senator. I would like to speak to this issue of pre-season planning with respect to
7 other firefighting resources for military in addition to the MAFFs. One of the issues is that we do not know
8 what is available. I very much support this bullet here that says an annual declaration of participation from
9 each base commander at the beginning of the season. Because that was one of the issues that we had no
10 way to know if the resources were trained, equipped, that we simply did not know that ahead of time. And
11 that's why we had to go through that process when the event occurred. So I very much concur that we
12 would like to have, every pre-season, have a local definition of what resources will be available so that we
13 can take care of the qualifications up front. That is indeed the way CDF is proceeding now, already, with
14 meetings with the San Diego resources.

15 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Alright. (UNINTELLIGIBLE)

16 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: And I certainly agree with those statements, although I'm
17 a little confused why that portion of what she was just relating to has been crossed off of item #3 here,
18 "Where the communication with the adjacent military base before each fire advise those authorities of
19 anticipated need. . " and so forth. This one I have has been crossed out.

20 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: It's included as a bullet point up above. It's a little clearer,
21 it says Annual declaration of participation from each base commander to U.S. Forest Service CDL by May
22 1.

23 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Thank you.

24 MS. TUTTLE: We need an affirmative action by the base commander to contact the fire
25 community.

26 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Well, I still, I want to be in the position where we direct somebody to make
27 that, to do what we're talking about. And I, uh, recommend that the uh, where necessary – how about that?
28 -- the U.S. Economy Act.

1 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: (UNINTELLIGIBLE)** said around #1, the commission
2 recommends that the interpretation of the U.S. Economy Act be clarified and if necessary amended to
3 facilitate and permit the immediate ordering of out of state modular air, or in firefighting systems, units and
4 the mobilization of military assets. Period.

5 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** Without objection. Great. Any objection to that?

6 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** (away from mike) Except it's leaving out the state portion
7 of the National Guard portion.

8 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** Right. Do we get, on your recommendations as it relates to the National
9 Board, Bill, do we get down to answering the last sentence there?

10 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** It's my understanding that there is no problem with
11 California National Guard.

12 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** There's no problem with the current system, it works
13 really well.

14 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** Okay. So, should we eliminate that sentence?

15 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** That's what I was doing, putting a period at the end of
16 assets and leaving that out, because I'm under the assumption that there is no problem, or that that's
17 **(UNINTELLIGIBLE)**.

18 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** Well, if there's no problem, we don't want to create one.

19 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** You should have the rest of the military do as good a job
20 as the National Guard **(UNINTELLIGIBLE)**.

21 **[TAPE 1, SIDE B ENDS. THERE WAS SOME TAPE LEFT, BUT NOTHING WAS ON**
22 **IT.]**

23 **CHAIR CAMPBELL:** First of all ladies and gentleman, our host for the luncheon today was Sgt.
24 Major & Associates headed up by Jerry Haleva and we'd like to extend a grateful thanks to Jerry for doing
25 that. Where'd Jerry Williams go. I want him – I wanted Jerry to clarify – maybe he had to go. While we're
26 waiting for Jerry to get back, Senator Feinstein held a meeting in Tahoe last week to take a look at the
27 problems in the Tahoe Forest area, which are almost as bad as the ones in Southern California and it is –
28 James, do you want to handle it?

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I just wanted to point out that during the lunch you probably
2 received a copy of the Healthy Forest pamphlet the Senator put out shortly after the fires and the page that
3 you want to take an extra look at, is the second to the last, actually the last two, about the administrative
4 and judicial review process. I know that's a major concern getting projects approved and the Healthy Forest
5 Initiative did a lot to expedite that. Also, the funds for the Healthy Forest Initiative are moving along fairly
6 well this year. The budget authority resolution just approved last week, has substantial additional funds, so
7 we're hopeful that we might get as much as 760 million dollars actually appropriated this year. We need to
8 work with the house numbers and make sure that the funding and the budget authority happens on the
9 house side as well. The Senator approved it last week. But also I wanted to follow up on the comments
10 earlier about having a meeting back in Washington D.C. with congressional representatives and it's
11 something I need to take up with the Senator, but I think she'd be very interested in hosting a meeting like
12 that.

13 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Alright James. Thank you very much.

14 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Jerry Williams wanted to make a comment.

15 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay.

16 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mel Gerber, our Executive Director.

17 MR. GERBER: Members of the Commission, you have as one of your handouts the 2003 Wildfire
18 Success Story Model Program and the other handout is 2003 Wildfires, The Tragedy Continues. This was
19 in your draft report. This is an updated version and what we are trying to do here is we wanted to insert a
20 couple of pages here that highlight the success story and model program that they have up in the Lake
21 Arrowhead region with the MAST program, the Mountain Area Safety Task Force and the several Fire Safe
22 Councils that they have up in that area. Also, while our main focus is on the fire response and the
23 vegetation management, we also wanted to highlight the fact that even after the fires, there still are
24 problems with erosion, the water shed, the water quality problems, but we wanted to highlight the mud
25 flow, the flash flooding that occurred in Waterman Canyon, so these are revised documents that we plan on
26 inserting into the report.

27 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Bob, thank you very much. Jerry, you wanted to clarify an issue.
28

1 MR. HALEVA: Thank you Senator. This goes back to the flow chart that we've talked about. I
2 want to make clear that these are connectors. It's just as flawed to say that we would concentrate all efforts
3 on land management activities and ignore the Fire Department capabilities and capacities, but the point I
4 think that's important to make in this, is that public policy governing land management and governing
5 building codes and so forth, goes hand-in-glove with Fire Department capabilities and capacities. Those
6 have got to be linked in order to be effective in dealing with these rare events that occur under adverse
7 conditions.

8 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Thank you. Recommendation number two. Okay, Assemblywoman Kehoe.

9 ASSEMBLYWOMAN KEHOE: On item two, if there's no objection, along with social, political
10 and economic, can we add scientific issues relating to the conflicts.

11 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Without objection.

12 ASSEMBLYWOMAN KEHOE: -- we look at data. Thank you.

13 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Ken, did you get it?

14 MR. KOBRIN: Yes sir.

15 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay, without objection, Recommendation two is approved.
16 Recommendation three.

17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Senator Campbell, if I just might add.

18 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes, Bill.

19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: We left out, OES up in the first sentence, so it should say the
20 Federal U.S. Forest Service, State CDF and State OES local fire agencies.

21 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Ken, did you get it?

22 MR. KOBRIN: No, where was that?

23 CHAIR CAMPBELL: You got it?

24 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yes.

25 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. Recommendation number three, without objection, is approved.
26 Recommendation number four, without objection, is approved.

27 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Just one real quick --

28 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes, go ahead.

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I certainly understand the safety factor that we're talking
2 about here, but is there – isn't there – it just seems to me that it doesn't cost anything to have CDF and
3 some other folks look into the possibility under certain circumstances where aircraft could be used past
4 their normal cut off time, which I think right now is 30 minutes before sundown, or something along those
5 lines. There's certain areas and certain fire lines that can be done with aircraft up on top of ridge tops where
6 it wouldn't be effective, if it's a matter of saving lives or, you know, so and so forth. It's just something
7 that they could certainly look at and wouldn't affect anything.

8 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I think supervisor, I think that's what we're trying to do here. Do you not
9 read it that way?

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I didn't. It recommends that all federal, state and local forest
11 fire fighting agencies review the aircraft operator cut off time, determine if there can be a window of flex –
12 ohh -- What I'm talking about, could we make that a number one. Make that as number one as opposed to
13 number two.

14 CHAIR CAMPBELL: We're going to come back on –

15 MR. SAGARIS: I believe Chief Wright could share with you. I believe their aviation folks are
16 meeting and they've already been given that direction, at least at the CDF level to take a look at that
17 particular item.

18 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Well, are we looking at these rankings on this one and
19 adopting those, or –

20 CHAIR CAMPBELL: We're adopting the recommendations and then we'll rank them after we get
21 through.

22 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: So the fire service representatives (unintelligible) they did is
23 not what we're really trying to do.

24 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Right. They may prevail. Go ahead Bill.

25 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Not so much for the numerical ranking, but adoption of the
26 edited recommendations because these recommendations are different than the ones that appeared in the
27 draft report.

28 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Senator.

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Two points on recommendation number four. Can we just –
2 can we just take out during red flag conditions, because they seems awfully specific and just talk about
3 windows of flexibility. And then secondly, maybe add to that language that would state that, study the
4 ability to utilize emergent technologies for night aerial firefighting. We had a lot of discussion and
5 testimony presented on that and I have yet to see in the recommendations that we pursued that anywhere, or
6 that we recommended there be any further study of that.

7 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Bill.

8 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yes.

9 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Did you want to comment on that.

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER. I'm sorry. I was talking during –

11 CHAIR CAMPBELL: On the nighttime use of helicopters. David Caine.

12 MR. CAINE: The document submitted to you from Senator Brulte has a recommendation
13 to expand that provision of item four for a discretionary decision making to allow a one-hour
14 period of immunity to incident commanders in the field and wave areas qualifiers, which are listed
15 on the document, were the backstop after the qualifiers of having more than one decision-maker
16 in the field to be able to make such decisions as to launch aircraft in a period that's now
17 considered a closed window.

18 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Jerry, go ahead.

19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Earlier, we amended finding number seven that would get at
20 this – the perception that aerial assets can be with any kind of fire intensity or severity. I think it's
21 important to keep reflecting that under extreme burning conditions aerial asserts delivering water or
22 retardant do have limits and those may be particularly manifest under red flag conditions. I'd just suggest
23 that we add that statement.

24 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Can some of the helicopters drop at night? Do they have the technology to
25 do that?

26 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Certainly helicopters, if you have specific training and the
27 equipment necessary, can drop at night, and there are some that do. But that's specific to certain agencies,
28 it's not a general rule. Also, I believe that – I just want to caution one thing. You give more than one person

1 in the field the decision-making capability of whether or not aircraft fly, you're setting yourself up for a
2 conflict, where some may fly, some may not fly. If there's a criteria of which that one person is making
3 their decision based on conditions and every condition's different, it should be one person making that
4 decision. That's called unified command. And as a firefighter in the field, the last thing I want is three or
5 four people telling me how to do my job. I need one leader that I can follow and one strategy to follow.

6 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: May I clarify that one. Just so you know, the qualifiers are
7 direct observation of fire conditions and location by reliable ground supervision, the size of the fire and
8 location of structures at risk, distance of fire from aerial support, readiness of aerial support to respond,
9 type of aerial support available and ready, winged visibility and other weather factors that may affect the
10 decision, whether other resources within proximity to the fire are a safer alternative, communication of the
11 aircraft, ground crews and other fire agency personnel, monitoring means such as satellites and technology
12 that may be available, and then last is a backstop if it's necessary to have more than one decision-maker,
13 that would be, for example, you won't have to see one at the airbase and perhaps one that's the incident
14 commander, all three agree then the decision is to go outside existing protocol.

15 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Senator.

16 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes.

17 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Just as a matter of putting all of our thinking about what
18 we're doing here. We're doing rather general recommendations and have a specific action, identifying who
19 makes those decisions are we not? To go into that level of specificity of just how the – what should be
20 included, I don't think many of us have the expertise to do and if we stick with recommendations which
21 say, here's who ought to do it, here's what the kind of thing they ought decisions in generally ought to be
22 making, I think we need to leave it to the experts to fill in those details. Maybe that's kind of a way to look
23 at all of the recommendations.

24 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Thank you. Jay.

25 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Just to build on what the gentleman over here said. I think
26 what we're trying to do, or what our goal is here is to add some flexibility, rather than the way things have
27 been with regard to you absolutely positively have to stop now, we're saying, well make it so you can say,
28 no I think the weather is such and we're in daylight savings time, you can do it, go ahead and do it that

1 way, but if we really start tying in these tight parameters, we may end up doing a worst effect than what we
2 have right now. If we just give them that flexibility to act, and (unintelligible).

3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: And regardless of what we say, it comes down to the pilot
4 that's in the cockpit, makes the final decision of whether or not they're flying. That's what it all boils down
5 to, their comfort level.

6 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Let me ask (unintelligible) to respond here.

7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: The Senator would like to propose changing four then to
8 read as, the commission recommends that all federal, state and local forest fighting agencies review their
9 aircraft operations cut off time and determine if there can be a window of flexibility to expand incident
10 response times, while at the same time taking into consideration flight crew safety. Additionally, the
11 agency should review all technological capabilities to expand aerial emergency response times.

12 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Very nice. Any objections? Without objections. Well-done Bill. Supervisor,
13 I'm sorry. I've developed a hearing problem. I can't tell where the voices are coming from.

14 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I just want to say poor old (unintelligible) from Riverside
15 County's standpoint and this really – we really have no real position here, with the exception that by adding
16 an additional man on our agents in Riverside County, which is one of the largest contract counties, would
17 cost us in the neighborhood of about 21 million dollars a year, and so that's a gigantic impact on the county
18 if that's, if that's in fact – you know, if the recommendation goes forward. And I'm not sure how that could
19 be handled. We could not handle that right now. So that's got to be taken into consideration.

20 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I think when they go on OES assignments, there's a
21 reimbursement involved. So, that would be where you receive a call out for the engines to respond and that
22 would be OES that would specify the staffing hubbles for that particular call-out for the particular incident
23 or mission assignment, and if they ask for it, they reimburse for it. So it wouldn't be a direct cost to you. It
24 would be refunded to you as all other OES appointments. So you would be – the impact would be at the
25 state level, not at the local level.

26 CHAIR CAMPBELL: The key there, is when responding to OES mutual aid and response calls
27 and then the money comes – flows through the –

28

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Okay, we're strictly talking about OES? We're not talking
2 about CDF?

3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: If you're wondering if it's – to answer your question, if it's
4 going to affect the schedule A contract that you have to have four people on it, the answer's no.

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Okay. And that's on (unintelligible).

6 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Bill, did you have something to add?

7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: No, I was just – I think Bob did a good job of clarifying.

8 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay, without objection, item five is – recommendation five is approved.
9 Item six, recommendation six.

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: wait, wait, wait –

11 CHAIRS CAMPBELL: Oops, I'm sorry. Oh Dennis.

12 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: The sentiment of the comments (unintelligible) I accept, but
13 the implementation of that may be very difficult and disruptive because if you are typically not deployed in
14 that fashion and you're asked to deploy in the (unintelligible) staffing, you may then have to vacate other
15 stations and leave other equipment unattended and leave communities uncovered from their normal staffing
16 patterns, even though you might get reimbursed for it – you need an implementation plan to follow this that
17 says, you can't be required to do this and leave other things unattended to.

18 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: If you look at the clarifiers of planned need, there is ample
19 time to do it in our jurisdiction. We staff a combination of three and four person companies, depending
20 upon where they're located and we routinely send our four-person companies on mutual aid, if it's plan
21 need because we have time to collect those resources and get them ready to respond.

22 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Dennis, cleared up?

23 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I just want to make it – I want to make it clear that there has
24 to be the qualifier. I mean it's fine to have that, but you can't sacrifice something else for it.

25 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay, Chief –

26 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Just a – in our discussion yesterday and I think it may help a
27 little bit. If you take out the immediate need, that was a concern that many jurisdictions expressed were
28 currently, and the example I use is Los Angeles County and Ventura County. We have a relationship where

1 if structures are threatened, we will send the closest resources immediately whether they are staffed by
2 three people or what their staffing is. This is referring to a mutual aid request on a planned response, which
3 allows the – provides the time and the ability to provide the four staffing, but doesn't in any way mean to
4 compromise immediate needs that any jurisdiction may have when structures are threatened.

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: And essentially what it means is a planned, you receive a
6 mission order with a timeframe to deploy and that allows the chief of that agency to rearrange his
7 resources, look at the staffing ability, whether or not he could fulfill the OES order or not, he can also say
8 they can't fill it. So that gives the flexibility that I think you are worried about with this and I think that's
9 why the immediate response is taken off and (unintelligible) put in.

10 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay, without objection.

11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mine says immediate, but I'll take it off and trust that that's
12 how it –

13 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I'm sorry, who's (unintelligible)

14 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: There's some confusion over on this side of the table that
15 may be elsewhere around the room.

16 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: The document that we are going through right now, are we
17 going through what was put out from the Fire Commissioning Staff?

18 CHAIR CAMPBELL: No, we're using the Fire Chief's Matrix at this time Dennis.

19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Senator. I want it cleared. Immediate coming out or not?

20 UNIDENTIFIED MALE & FEMALE SPEAKERS: Yes. Yes.

21 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Everybody clear now? Without objection.

22 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Would you repeat the phrase. You took out immediate,
23 but it doesn't make sense now.

24 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Ah, let me offer a little bit of clarification. I think we need to
25 have immediate need, because we're really talking not on the fire department level of immediate need,
26 we're talking the OES mutual aid immediate need, and so you have that planning element built in because
27 the call goes out to a region and we say we need four strike teams, that's immediate need for us, but would
28 not be considered immediate need necessarily by the jurisdictional fire department, and so I think we need

1 immediate need left in there because we're really talking about the OES mutual aid system and not
2 immediate need by a local government agency. The agencies are very able to accomplish the four-0 staffing
3 given those parameters.

4 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Do we all understand that? Immediate is back in.

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: My father Chief Freeman made a comment here. He said
6 why don't you leave in the immediate "comma" plan need rather than immediate and plan, so that it's not
7 confusing and stays consistent.

8 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I didn't catch that. Immediate "comma"

9 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: You take responding to OES mutual aid calls for immediate
10 "comma" planned response, instead of goal of four-0 staffing (unintelligible).

11 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: (unintelligible) delete need, right?

12 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Immediate "comma" and planned response "period".

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Take out the "and", so it's.

14 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Immediate "comma" planned response "period". Okay, without objection.
15 Ken, do you have that?

16 MR. KOBRIN: Yes.

17 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Do you have it correctly now?

18 MR KOBRIN: I think so.

19 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Alright. Without objection. Number six; without objection. Number seven;
20 without objection. Number eight on the federal recommendations. Yes sir.

21 MR. **HAMMEL**: Larry Hammel, Department of Interior. On behalf of the federal partners that are
22 here at the table, one of the requirements that we have which would apply to these federal
23 recommendations is that we would need to go before the office of management and budget and have any
24 recommendations vetted by them that would require extra federal dollars, so that is something that we
25 would have to do once these recommendations are approved.

26 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I've got a little more fundamental issue, because I'm not
27 sure what that recommendation means.

28 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I'm sorry Peter.

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I'm just not sure what that recommendation means. You
2 know, because there are issues of scope and scale and how much and, do you mean, you know, we're going
3 to have five firefighting divisions and the active army and 15 firefighting divisions in the national guard, or
4 – it's just not clear as it's stated what we're trying to get to. If there's a recommendation that the military
5 forces be better prepared to assist several authorities in this particular mission area, I think we could
6 construct a recommendation that would be constructive and move us towards that line, but I think as a
7 mission, I'm not sure that goes to the fundamental mission of the military of the United States
8 (unintelligible) against the United States.

9 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Alright. Chris, do you want to read what you've got.

10 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Tell me if this works for the federal agencies if you want
11 to avoid the office of management and budget getting involved, you could do an internal – we could ask—
12 recommend an internal review by the National Guard and the Department of Defense to make the
13 determination whether firefighting should be part of their mission.

14 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Well, it is part of the mission for military purposes. I mean,
15 we've got military firefighters on bases. In some cases they're uniform, some cases they are civilian
16 employees of the government, in some cases they are contract employees –

17 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: But what we're trying to get at here is, of course, the
18 coordination with the civilian authorities, not just your military mission.

19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Well they do coordinate with civilians. In other words,
20 they're members of mutual aid compacts in local areas, typically the base has a mutual aid agreement with
21 the surrounding community for firefighting as it happens. What I guess I'm not clear on, and it's probably
22 my fault, is what part of the existing system needs to be changed in order to get the result that you're trying
23 to get, and I guess If I understand the result, it's a more rapid access to those mutual aid or assets that might
24 be available, and that doesn't really require a mission change, because in most cases the problem was either
25 lack of qualification or nobody asked, to be quite frank.

26 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chair, I believe the issue here is not – has to do with the
27 California National Guard's mission to have firefighting added. I think you have to go through the National
28

1 Guard Bureau to do that that would allow the (unintelligible) to use training hours and things like that for
2 fire suppression training, I believe, I could be wrong, and if I'm wrong –

3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: It has to do with Title 32 issues in which ever year not only
4 in California but across the Western United States we want to spend more time training (unintelligible)
5 guard assets for firefighting mission. It's an issue of whose going to pay for it, available time,
6 (unintelligible) most places because the Department of Forestry has already purchased the radios and the
7 buckets that we use in California, that's not the case. We're looking to have as part of the guard's national
8 mission, firefighting that way under Title 32, the federal government, DOD would actually pick up some of
9 those costs.

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Now the – the MAST have that as a firefighting mission.

11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: We're definitely talking about the helicopter capability.
12 We've been meeting with the western – the guard western aviation unit this last summer and there's
13 considerable differences in the way the program's being run across the western United States, but even in
14 California, we have a problem. Every year we sit down at the table. Who's going to pay for training?
15 Who's going to pay for the equipment? And it's become a problem. Washington State when they were
16 requested to come down to California, part of the issue was being in Title 32 status and if something
17 happens, there's also some pay issues for the pilots involved and a number of other items, but we believe
18 that El Caida as was stated earlier this summer, was going to burn the forest and we think this falls well
19 within part of that national mission from our standpoint.

20 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Ken, did you have a question on it?

21 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: No (unintelligible).

22 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. Where are we on it now?

23 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Let me do a little thinking and I'll come back with a way to
24 I think get to what you're trying to do, which is essentially to expand the already existing mission of some
25 national guard units for firefighting. (Unintelligible) National Guard.

26 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay, let's move on and we'll come back to item eight, Peter, and we'll let
27 you handle that. Item nine; without objection. Item ten.

28

1 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Regarding item ten, I'm unclear how the JAO even if it
2 chose to accept the request and had the funds to fund it, would identify the value of a negative. We don't
3 know what property was saved because we don't know if we hadn't saved it, what would have burned. We
4 don't know what was saved because the wind changed directions, as opposed to aggressive firefighting.
5 Stevenson Ranch is a good example of really aggressive firefighting, when it's pretty clear what got saved
6 there, but I don't think it's nearly as clear in all the rest of the fires. And it seems to me that this would be
7 an impossible task.

8 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Do we need to put a cost figure on it?

9 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Pardon?

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Put a cost figure on the value of –

11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: What are we trying to accomplish by doing this?

12 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Beg your pardon?

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: What are we trying to accomplish by doing this?

14 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: To see what the economic impact was of the state.

15 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: After every fire, there's always a damage assessment that's
16 conducted and it's – there's some formulas that they use to figure out if a building were to burn or not burn,
17 a loss versus save, and it's very subjective. You can definitely tell what was lost, but how can you tell what
18 was saved? I understand your point. But, somebody – we have to quantify it somehow and I believe asking
19 them to look into doing a study or looking at it would be one way to help quantify to decision-makers or
20 policy-makers, you know, if they take action, you know, of the cost analysis that has to be placed in their
21 minds. If, you know, if we do nothing, then we risk billions, and if we spend 100 million, we save billions.
22 It's that kind of an analysis.

23 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I appreciate what you're saying, that that was the purpose
24 given, but sitting in the policy area, a subjective guess of what might have been saved isn't going to make
25 much headway in directing policy. I think we can make arguments for funding at all levels for worthwhile
26 programs that we justify on the basis of their positive and clear contributions. But – I think a subjective
27 number like that doesn't do a lot for anybody.

28

1 CHAIR CAMPBELL: One of our recommendations is create a joint committee to look on the fire
2 issue and homeland security. Why don't we defer this to that committee.

3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chair.

4 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Oh, yes sir.

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: One thing that I think might be actually more helpful,
6 especially when we're trying to lobby for more dollars to come from Washington, is to know what's
7 currently still in jeopardy, and that might be an easier cost to figure out. We can look at the wild land urban
8 interface, how far are you from endangered areas.

9 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: In terms of The Chaparrals for instance, we burned up
10 200,000 acres, but how many acres are left that just had the same of level of fuel. That makes much more
11 sense.

12 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Right. And in San Bernardino for example, the national
13 forest is – figured out what the property values are for all the homes and forest, and if they're in jeopardy
14 and then come up with a number for that. That would be helpful to have for San Diego as well.

15 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Not only that, but you need to consider the fact that what the
16 fires didn't destroy, that the mud slides did. And that's a loss directly attributed to the fire also.

17 (Unintelligible)

18 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Alright. Number eleven.

19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: On number eleven Mr. Chairman.

20 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes sir.

21 MR. HAMILTON: Larry Hamilton.

22 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes Larry.

23 Mr. HAMILTON: I'm wondering if we shouldn't insert there at the end, requirements for federal
24 grant funds, rather than just federal funds.

25 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. That's fine. Any objection?

26 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Just a comment also building on that. I notice that we have
27 slated for further study and I think that's appropriate. One thing I'd be concerned about, is we need the
28

1 inadvertently introducing a disincentive for local governments to take a more active role in protection
2 responsibilities that they might have.

3 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes.

4 MR. FUKITOMI: Mr. Chairman, David Fukitomi with FEMA.

5 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes.

6 MR. FUKITOMI: I share the same concern also. Is this recommendation meant across the board
7 for all federal programs, for all disasters, or all protection, or just for wild land fire incidents?

8 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Let's be inclusive.

9 MR. FUKITOMI: Just a comment in our deliberations yesterday, if you'll see to the far right, we
10 gave it a three, because we felt that it probably wouldn't happen, because there are so many federal grants
11 where matching requirements exist that this is probably more than we could ask for. We gave it a very low
12 priority.

13 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Supervisor.

14 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I'd just like to say Mr. Chairman that from a county
15 standpoint, I'm going to talk about Riverside County now. This is a very important item for us simply
16 because of – we have one of the last forests here in Southern California that did not burn. But it's been
17 eaten up by bark beetles and all the help that we're getting on that requires funding, matching funds. So we
18 were looking at this as helping to eliminate that because everybody knows that the state has no money, the
19 counties have no money, especially since we send it all up to the state – so we're clear out of money and we
20 have no way of matching anything in order to fight our problem that we have up in the (unintelligible) area
21 with the bark beetles. So, we're – we like what's written down here, that we'd like that eliminated.

22 CHAIR CAMPBELL: We can delete that if you would like. That's why we're here. Any objection
23 to the (unintelligible), beg your pardon.

24 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Item eleven, yes.

25 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: The commission recommends that the federal government
26 reduce or eliminate a matching (unintelligible) we want that left in. We want that. The MAST requirements
27 (unintelligible)

28 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. Right. But you want to limit it to wild land fire.

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: (Unintelligible) we can't even

2 CHAIR CAMPBELL: -- more restoration

3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: We can't deal with anything because we have no dollars at
4 all left. And this, no matter what --

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Can I suggest that we add language for --

6 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: (unintelligible) talking about over there, that they want some
7 incentive from the county or local government and we have no dollars to even (unintelligible)

8 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Could you add language that said for fuels management
9 programs, so then it's specific to your issue.

10 CHAIR CAMPBELL: How about a (unintelligible) kind match.

11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: In kind?

12 CHAIR CAMPBELL: In kind. (Unintelligible), Well basically that's what it means.

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: We tried -- we're trying that. And we've tried a lot of those
14 things, any kind of a match would be fine, anything.

15 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Other than --

16 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: You know, 50/50 match with hard dollars. We just don't
17 have the dollars.

18 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Well what's the desire of the committee -- commission?

19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Well we have advice and comments. If we could match with
20 that, we'd be happy.

21 CHAIR CAMPBELL: We've got five supervisors here as members of this commission. If it's
22 important to them, we ought to keep it in. James, go ahead.

23 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Sure. I'd just like to add that I do think it's going to be
24 incredibly difficult to get the federal government to get congress to agree to this because there are so many
25 programs that do require match, but the way you might make it a little bit more feasible if you add
26 qualifiers like for fuels, fuels management, and the additional qualifier that if it's in an area where's there's
27 been a local and state declared emergency because there's such an incredible threat of fire, that might make
28 it a little bit more feasible.

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Gentlemen, I think it's an excellent suggestion. I think that
2 would help us get there.

3 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I agree.

4 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Ken, did you get this into that?

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I have for federal grant funds for fuels management
6 programs it sounds like (unintelligible) emergencies.

7 (UNINTELLIGIBLE – SEVERAL PEOPLE TALKING AT ONCE)

8 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: If I would say – if I may add Mr. Chair

9 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes, go ahead.

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hazard mitigation fuels management program, one or the
11 other, or both.

12 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Hazard mitigation, and then the verbiage with respect to
13 giving nemesis for those areas which there's been a state or local declaration of emergency for both.

14 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Fire hazards.

15 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah, for fire hazards.

16 CHAIR CAMPBELL: You got it in there Ken?

17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I'm getting there.

18 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Want to read it back?

19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: The commission recommends that the federal government
20 reduce or eliminate match (unintelligible) for federal grant funds for hazard mitigation programs in the
21 areas of –

22 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Where there's a local or state emergency declared.

23 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I'm sorry. Could you –

24 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Where there's a declaration of emergency.

25 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Without objection. Number twelve; without objection. Number thirteen.

26 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Senator,

27 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes.

28

1 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: On that one I think that in the recommendation after it
2 says the commission recommends a committee, then it says the commission will receive rules, regulations
3 and the commission will have technical advisory committees. I assume that they – that they actually mean
4 the committee because the Blue – commission. And then I would just go back to the original
5 recommendation that was made in our original document and just at least pose to the committee that if it's
6 going to be a permanent committee, maybe the broader title is actually better because we will continue over
7 the years to have a variety of disasters probably to respond to so that they – we had – I mean it originally
8 had been suggested on disaster response and homeland security, but that otherwise – I mean we could do a
9 committee for the next year or two to just try and implement the recommendations of this Blue Ribbon
10 Commission, but maybe we do need something more permanent and to have a broader name. It's a question
11 I think people should look at.

12 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Jay.

13 MR. LASUER: Just a comment on that, and I'll just add on what the Senator said. The only thing
14 that bothers me, the comment has been made during the hearings here that we've had the reports on
15 different wild fires year after year after year, and they ended up just gathering dust someplace. I think if we
16 – it just seems like if we broaden this, the scope of – we would do, then we basically deluding this and
17 we're taking another chance that these recommendations will sit on a law and gather dust, so if we narrow
18 it down to where this committee, whoever it is, is supposed to try to make sure that the recommendations of
19 this commission are implemented, then they have one thing to focus on and if you give a committee too
20 many things to focus on, they're going to be out wandering around – it's going to be like herding chickens.
21 It just seems like if we would just narrow it down, it would work a lot better.

22 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: May I make a quick response to that.

23 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes.

24 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I agree that if we broaden the areas of concern that, you
25 know, you take on a larger workload, but if we follow through on the commission recommendations on
26 issues like interoperability, real time monitoring of fires and other disasters, we're going to get into a larger
27 field, because the budget and the personnel that are solely dedicated to firefighting and fire suppression, it
28 will not be big enough to deal with the expense that goes into things like full interoperability, real time data

1 transmission and things like that. We're prone to have to broaden the base of issues that we're dealing with
2 in order to justify the costs.

3 MR. LASUER: Okay last comment is that this will broaden itself, we don't have to broaden it to
4 begin with. We've got to do all these things here, plus the main – the one of the main things we have to do
5 is in training you get a funding source for firefighter training and all, and this is such a broad amount of
6 material that this committee will be doing, even when it's narrowed to this, it's extremely broad.

7 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: That's true.

8 CHAIR CAMPBELL: One of the recommendations that we have is that this commission meet
9 again in six months to determine how the progress that has been made in this area, and then a year from
10 then, on what issues, how the report has done. And I'd like to propose we add that in this recommendation.
11 Without objection. Ken, you got that?

12 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yes.

13 CHIEF FREEMAN: Mr. Chairman

14 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I'm sorry, Chief Freeman.

15 CHIEF FREEMAN: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, this morning I provided a
16 handout, everyone should have this. It's a memo to you sir and I would just suggest for consideration of the
17 commission one additional federal recommendation I guess it would be FR6, if accepted. It's number one
18 on my memoranda and it suggests the commission recommends that congress take necessary steps to
19 provide U.S. Forest Service updated state of the art firefighting aircraft, especially in regions where
20 national forests are adjacent to open areas. And I had made that recommendation in the presentation in
21 Ventura, and I do understand that things have been evaluated perhaps there's been a decision otherwise
22 maybe. I didn't think it was covered, so I would like to suggest that.

23 CHAIR CAMPBELL: You want to add that to the federal recommendations?

24 CHIEF FREEMAN: Yes sir.

25 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. Without objection.

26 (UNINTELLIGIBLE)

27 CHAIR CAMPBELL: -- would he be happy with his name in parenthesis?

28 [Laughter]

1 MR. VERGA: Mr. Chairman

2 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes.

3 MR. VERGA: Pete Verga. I want to go back to number eight. I think I've come up with what I
4 think might be –

5 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay, let me resolve this first. Senator, you have a question on this?

6 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Under the state recommendation one, the language from the
7 fire service officials says that this joint legislative committee would have the authority to implement the
8 recommendation of the Blue Ribbon Fire Commission.

9 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I think it should be (unintelligible) unconstitutional to have it that way, so it
10 should be (unintelligible)

11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: (Unintelligible) it doesn't work. It's going to have to go to
12 each house and –

13 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Are you aware that area to which we are referring Ken?

14 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: No.

15 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. Thirteen at the beginning of the, the commission recommends
16 development of a permanent joint legislative committee on wild land interface that will have the authority
17 to implement – we have to wordsmith that, we do --- will have the responsibility to insofar as possible carry
18 out the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Commission and steal the money from other areas and pass
19 them to –

20 [Laughter]

21 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Now, I'm going to tell the legislators how you handle this, and you go to
22 counsel and you say for all the legislation we want to deal with this. The way the legislation begins is
23 notwithstanding any other provision of law, this shall happen. You get a little opposition with those bills.
24 Pete, you wanted to go back.

25 MR. VERGA: Yes sir, I want to try to go back on that Federal one. Try this for a recommendation,
26 I think it gets to what we're trying to do.

27 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Number eight on the National Guard and DOD.

28

1 MR. VERGA: Right. The commission recommends that the federal government (Department of
2 Defense, Department of U.S. Forest Service, etc.) investigate whether the successful MAST modular
3 airborne firefighting system program and concept of operation can be applied to other aerial delivery
4 means, *e.g., helicopters*. I think that's what we're trying to get.

5 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Alright. You'll give that to our consultant Peter?

6 MR. VERGA: Yes I will.

7 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Ken, you're shaking your head yes, do you like that? It does what you want
8 to do?

9 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yes.

10 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. Did you all hear that? Rick, go ahead.

11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I just wonder –

12 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Oh, I'm sorry Senator.

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I wonder if that's just a little bit too specific because, you
14 know, what if we want a thousand national guardsman in the future, or a thousand active duty military
15 personnel to cut fire lines. I mean, how do you – I don't want us to get that – I think this started off very
16 broad and to get that technical and tight on it may not necessarily reflect what we're trying to accomplish.

17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: To be perfectly candid, I'm trying to get a recommendation
18 that has a chance of being accepted. The Department of Defense is not going to expand into non-core
19 mission areas and we – every year we usually provide a couple of thousand soldiers that we train for the
20 forest service and they go up – usually up into Boise or up in that part of the country. They're put out on
21 the fire lines on an as-needed basis and we'll continue to do that and there's a well-established program to
22 do that. But, in today's environment to convert, you know, the core training – the core mission training
23 areas away from that will be virtually impossible.

24 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chair, could I ask a question.

25 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes, go ahead.

26 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Is that – and I'm not a military expert or an expert at
27 anything for that matter, however.

28 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I'm a military expert, so that's alright.

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Are we talking about with respect to the mission,
2 firefighting mission because we use DOD, it's my understanding we're talking about the national guard
3 forces only and not the Army, Navy –

4 CHAIR CAMPBELL: What we're trying to say here, is I understand Rick, we're trying to say that
5 we want to enable ourselves to better utilize the Department of Defense activities and better coordination
6 and we want to add to one of their responsibilities, when necessary, firefighting.

7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Well I think – I thought what I heard earlier when this – as
8 part of the testimony some meetings back is that – in my limited experience, the national guard, Cal Guard
9 in this case, has to use state funds or that's one of the reasons that the Department of Agriculture bought the
10 MAST is that the guard does not have firefighting in its mission profile. And I thought what this
11 recommendation was leading to is having the guard's mission profile include firefighting so that they could
12 train and be more engaged with the approval of the National Guard Bureau and I thought the umbrella
13 organization of the department –

14 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Well I think the thing was that they didn't – they wanted to be able to use
15 as in San Diego, the helicopters from Miramar and the Coast Guard and –

16 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: But I think that's a different issue because I think you can
17 access those by dealing directly with the base and I think and I believe that was the testimony earlier that
18 there are ways to access that equipment at the base level. This was really so that funds could be expended
19 for training the guard personnel and as it –

20 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: If I could offer –

21 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay, secretary.

22 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Let's take the MAST system, as an example. The
23 Department of Agriculture does own the equipment that is put into the back of the C130's that actually
24 drops the water. All of the training on how to do that is funded under the National Guard Training Program,
25 because the mission profile that a C130 flies on those types of missions is very similar to one that is used
26 for a low altitude parachuting (unintelligible) resupply mission. That is, you go down low and slow, you fly
27 level and things come out of the back of your airplane. And so therefore, that, you know, is sort of double
28

1 bang for the buck. They are getting training on doing that kind of mission profiling, Department of
2 Agriculture and the Forest Service is getting the ability to fight fires using those aircraft.

3 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Alright, without objection. Thirteen. All you alright on thirteen Ken, or do
4 you need it read back.

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: The commission recommends the (unintelligible) legislative
6 committee for wild land interface (unintelligible) to implement the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon
7 Fire Commission. The committee will oversee rules, regulations and resolve conflicting issues.
8 Additionally, this committee will have technical advisory committees as needed. The commission further
9 recommends that it reconvene in six months and again in twelve months to assess progress in implementing
10 the commission's recommendations.

11 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. Without objection. Item fourteen. I'm starting to push a little folks
12 because it's 1400 and a little after and we've got 1600 we adjourned.

13 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, on number 14, understanding your
14 concern about time. Let me just make sure that as we read fourteen to reaffirm the status of the fire service
15 as a public safety entity that that incorporates the integrated responsibilities for fuels management and
16 treatment, because that's exactly what we're talking about here is that these combined skills of exactly what
17 Jerry has here, the combined skills that firefighters and foresters bring to this public safety mission is a
18 combination of both the fuels treatment and the suppression. So as long as that's the understanding here,
19 then –

20 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Is that the understanding? Without objection. You got that Ken?

21 MR. KOBRIN: No.

22 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Andrea will talk to you.

23 MS. TUTTLE: -- if you'll look at the entire national theme of the national fire plan, the open forest
24 restoration act, it is that link that is so strong and that's how we –

25 CHAIR CAMPBELL: And Jerry, let me ask you – give it to Ken. If anybody (unintelligible)
26 recommendations, Ken's going to need to have those. Fifteen.

27 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I have something I'd like added on fifteen.

28 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes Senator.

1 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: On the issue of the 150 additional fire engines and our
2 requisite logistical support, when the reality is, it's not going to happen instantaneously, it seems to me that
3 there needs to be another sentence about a plan that details how we incrementally are going to be able to
4 actually get to the 150 and the logistical support, so that we start to take steps to do that.

5 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Dallas, what's the price of an engine. One engine.

6 DIRECTOR JONES: About \$250,000.00. I think if you approve this, I think once again we'll have
7 to go back to Fire Scope and make a recommendation as to exactly what needs to be purchased for the
8 California Fire Service. Close to about 37.5 million. My recommendation right up front would be to do it
9 over a three-year period with a multi-year contract. Once the contract was let, it would take about a year to
10 receive it under the new guidelines for using with DGS for time acquisition and penalty and –

11 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Ken, let me suggest this. Up to 150 additional fire engines and the requisite
12 logistical (unintelligible) necessary to achieve this goal. So which means you have to keep working at it.
13 Ken, did you get it? Thank you. Dennis.

14 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Just one quick comment. I'm not sure how this fills the fire
15 prevention objective that's contained in there. Fire Suppression yes, but it sort of seems contradictory. We
16 want additional funding for fire prevention, but we're going to do that by buying 150 additional engines. It
17 doesn't talk about staffing those engines either.

18 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Ken, did you get that?

19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: As much as I hate to do it, if I could go back to the number
20 one federal and add something to that and I did get permission, so he won't try and shoot it down. His boss
21 won't kill him, and that was to just add in addition to the helicopters, or other emergency military
22 technologies, so that would include –

23 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Where are you now?

24 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: The first federal one. Number A.

25 CHAIR CAMPBELL: By the way, for those in the audience who have good eyesight, what we're
26 talking about is conveyed up there on the screen, if you can see it. The young people should have no
27 problem. Ken did you get that recommendation? Jeff will you repeat it for Ken. Are you repeating it, I can't
28 hear. Any further discussion on that.

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yes, supervisor. This is I guess along with Mr.
2 Hansberger's concern and I would think possibly some of CDF's concerns. CDF about – I'm assuming now
3 somewhere in the neighborhood of 48% of CDF's 330 so fire trucks are over 14 years old, or in the
4 neighborhood of 14, with over 200,000 miles on them and they've been just patching them and keeping
5 them going and here we're looking at putting – recommending 150 new fire engines to oh yeah, Sue, really
6 their job is not this type of a response. So, I personally don't know about the other county, but personally
7 would have somewhat of a problem with that, it seems like we're sidestepping where (unintelligible) with
8 CDF and that's very essential to us in Riverside County as a lot of counties and we're very concerned that –

9 CHAIR CAMPBELL: But OES – the local fire departments.

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: They're not going to operate them like they operate the
11 hundred they have right now. – Like the hundred you have now.

12 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: OES currently has 110 engine companies that are
13 (unintelligible) by the State of California, but put out for deployment in local government. Local
14 government's allowed to use them if theirs breaks down or they have –

15 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- we contract with CDF –

16 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- CDF, this is OES.

17 CHAIR CAMPBELL: He's talking about OES.

18 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: --And so many of our engines are also in CDF jurisdictions
19 manned by CDF person, but what it is they're manned up by off duty personnel when the state calls and so
20 we are able to access a surge capacity of 110 engines throughout the state, the proposal is to increase that to
21 200 and (unintelligible)

22 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: So what you're telling me Jeff is that Riverside County's
23 contract with CDF, if they – if CDF and Riverside County needs engines, they can get them from OES?

24 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: No. No. CDF, just like L.A. City or L.A. County has their
25 primary protection areas, and so they are buying fire trucks and they are supplying the infrastructure needs
26 for that. In addition to that, this goes back actually to the '50's, --

27 CHAIR CAMPBELL: That was before my time.

28

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: The State of California actually got a grant from FEMA.
2 They purchased 100 fire engines. They put them out in local government with the agreement that the local
3 government agencies would staff them in the event the State of California needed them, which we have
4 currently 110.

5 **[End Side A, Tape 2]**

6 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: --by any local jurisdiction on a regular basis. What it does is
7 it provides search capacity. Many departments had sent out all of the reserve engines and personnel. We
8 still had personnel, we could have responded to the various fires. We had no equipment, no vehicles upon
9 which to send them, so these additional 150 engines would not put an additional financial burden on a day-
10 to-day basis on any of the local fire departments.

11 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Supervisor, does that clarify for you?

12 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Well, no. I understand exactly what you're doing here. Our
13 big concern is on our contract that they're -- they're not able to -- they haven't had the (unintelligible) to
14 replace these engines, so they've been keeping them, and those are the engines that are being used
15 throughout the whole state. I'm concerned about Riverside County here and they're having a considerable
16 amount of problem. A time is going to come when they're not going to be responsive. So we're buying new
17 engines here, why wouldn't these engines then just be turned over to CDF and CDF give them 150 of their
18 engines, older ones, and they could use those as replacements. You might think about that.

19 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. That's a CDF (unintelligible) issue though supervisor. Alright.
20 Sixteen.

21 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Question on that. I have one clarification.

22 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Bob, go ahead.

23 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Talking to Mr. Venable, it probably should be clarified that
24 CDF state funded engine companies because it may be interpreted by some to mean the contract -- counties
25 where we have contracts like Riverside and other places that this commission is mandating that those
26 engines have four people in them. So it would probably be better just to put CDF state funded engine
27 companies, which would also take into areas probably like other counties that contract for state, that they
28 would be seeking additional funding.

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah, that would be – our concern in making decisions here
2 that will have a gigantic impact on our county we can't afford it. And I certainly appreciate what the gist of
3 that recommendation would really help as far as Riverside, and I'm sure San Bernardino County, some of
4 these other counties would be very appreciative of that.

5 CHAIR CAMPBELL: There was another question over here.

6 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Just a real quick question. This is on the year-round funding.

7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yes. Let me explain that issue. The CDF budget basically
8 envisions an eight-month fire season and the budget is – the budget is based on that eight-month fire
9 season. The problem is it is now almost year-round and so I think the legislature – and this is the
10 responsibility of the legislature to look at this and say, can we fund it now on a year-round basis and is it
11 safer to do it that way.

12 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: What I was wondering on that very thing, and CDF can
13 clarify this, in my county, we're year-round fire danger. We have Santa Ana's in January and March, we
14 have one right now in Southern California. Do they have the same problems in Northern California?
15 Because I'm looking at all the money that's in there and I'm thinking, would we have more success in
16 funding year-round for Southern California and not year-round for Northern, or is it necessary in Northern,
17 as well as Southern?

18 CHAIR CAMPBELL: (Unintelligible) do you want to answer that.

19 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: This, of course, will be a matter for the legislature and the
20 finance folks to cover. If we have to prioritize, we would put first priority on San Diego then move up
21 through San Bernardino, that's south of the **Tehatcipies**. What we've done in the past is have emergency
22 augmentations based on the criteria as fire season comes, we have a series of criteria for triggering. So –

23 CHAIR CAMPBELL: That's happened in the last two to three years.

24 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes. So certainly we could prioritize. It would be nice to
25 have it year-round, we probably don't need year-round -- (unintelligible).

26 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I'm just trying to figure out dollar wise, this has got to be a
27 huge chunk of change.

28

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: You know what, what you could also do too, I'd like to
2 invite you Frank to come up and address this real quick. I would say that what we're after is
3 Tehatcpie to Santa Barbara south, is the area where we have the year-round fire season. Not
4 necessarily in Crescent City, but we want the flexibility to justify that, but we have to have it south.

5 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Gentleman and ladies, let me suggest this. This is a budgetary hearing issue
6 and Chief Wright will get to testify before the budget committees on this issue. I love you Jim, but we're
7 running out of time. Senator.

8 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Well, Mr. Chairman, what we want to avoid I think is we
9 kicked this around in the legislature and we decide there's not the funding for it and nothing happens, when
10 what we could do is write this such to say that establishing secure year-round operational capability where
11 appropriate for CDF and if that requires funding when it's available, it's available. If not, if there is certain
12 techniques like changing the operational and maintenance schedules on aerial firefighting aircraft to rotate
13 them in rather than moving them all to Sacramento at once, things like that that don't cost anything, but
14 establish operational year-round capability. Those are things that we want to have come out of this rather
15 than it fall flat on its face in the legislature and we haven't done anything getting us to our goal.

16 CHAIR CAMPBELL: We can write it that way. Go down and talk to Ken and -- no, we'll write it
17 and we'll change it and write it --

18 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- establishing year-round operational capability where
19 appropriate for CDF.

20 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. That's it. That's the phrase Ken. You got it? Establishing year-round
21 capability where appropriate.

22 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: That's much better language I believe than what we have
23 here.

24 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Alright, without objection, that's now approved. Alright next item.
25 Seventeen; without objection. Number eighteen.

26 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Eighteen, Mr. Chairman, I'd suggest that diversification
27 of CDF's aging helicopter and fire truck fleet. So then we look at (unintelligible).

28 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Without objection.

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Senator.

2 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes.

3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: If you go back to seventeen and say, new technology, that
4 doesn't just keep you where we're at today when something else comes up, that's also included.

5 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: (Unintelligible) new technology.

6 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Or other technologies.

7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Other technologies such as phones and (unintelligible).

8 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Alright, Ken, we're moving around fast. Do you have that?

9 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: No.

10 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. It's on item seventeen. New technologies such as, take out existing
11 agents and add in technologies. Great. Without objection. You got that Ken? New. N-E-W.

12 [Laughter]

13 CHAIR CAMPBELL: You notice I didn't try to spell technologies. We did eighteen. Nineteen.

14 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Senator Campbell, we believe that local jurisdictions are
15 already required to have multi-hazard functional plans and in fact this is already in place today.

16 CHAIR CAMPBELL: So you recommend that we don't – we delete that.

17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: That we delete that.

18 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Without objection, it is deleted. Nineteen's out. Twenty. Okay, before we
19 get off that, all the way back to number one, Peter.

20 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yes sir. On jurisdictional operational barriers.

21 CHAIR CAMPBELL: We're waiting for you to get here from Australia, and I know it's a 14-hour
22 flight.

23 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: First of all, the defining as it is written is actually – is
24 factually inaccurate in that the economy act deals with transactions between agencies of the federal
25 government, and so therefore I think as written here it is not really applicable. And candidly, I don't know
26 that there's anything in the economy act that actually needs to get clarified.

27 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Do you have an alternative to the verbiage that we have included in here
28 Peter?

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: As a finding, I would say the request for and employment of
2 federal resources to include the active duty military to fight fires appears complicated and bureaucratic to
3 those unfamiliar with the process.

4 CHAIR CAMPBELL: How about to those familiar with the process?

5 [Laughter]

6 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I think that's an accurate finding and then I think what we
7 ought to do is go into recommendations as to how we go to that, because I don't really think that there are
8 economy act implications in trying to get federal resources. The economy act implications for the two
9 agencies that might be involved in getting the federal resources. For example, under that doctrine of
10 immediate response that we talked about, where a local commander can deploy assets to save lives and
11 property, mitigate great damage and alleviate suffering, there are no economy act implications to that.

12 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Peter, I think our problem was when the Governor declares an emergency,
13 generally speaking it is a significant emergency and ask the President to declare emergency. Time is lost
14 between when the Governor declares and the President declares, and what we wanted to be able to do was
15 utilize the economy act, or bypass, or whatever we had to do to get the federal help right away. Is that –

16 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: The economy act actually does not come into play under
17 that particular –

18 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay, that's fine. Can we put other language in there that would say when
19 the –

20 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: So the period that you're trying to address is the period
21 between a state declaration and a federal declaration, or any other activity by federal elements. Is that true,
22 or is the U.S. Forest Service in there already kind of a thing.

23 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yeah, Forest Service is generally in there.

24 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Okay.

25 CHAIR CAMPBELL: At least in California.

26 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: In that case then what you are talking about is a request –
27 remember the department – the federal government Department of Defense does not take requests from
28 anything other than other federal agencies.

1 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Right.

2 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Except when that immediate response criteria where it's a
3 local-to-local issue. So, what we want to do is streamline the ability of the first on-scene federal agency to
4 be able to get to DOD and I think –

5 CHAIR CAMPBELL: You got it. That's it.

6 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah. Let me think a little bit about the right kind of – I
7 think this is actually the finding. I think the other one is a recommendation to fix it –

8 (Unintelligible)

9 CHAIR CAMPBELL: But if you are going to work out language on we'd really appreciate it.

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Let me think –

11 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Oh, there's FEMA. Go ahead David.

12 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I think what some of the folks are missing is that the
13 majority of federal firefighting assets get employed for a fire without a presidential disaster declaration.
14 That happens only in the top small percentage and it does not require presidential disaster declaration to
15 access those. Those are accessed through the fire service through the various means that I'm no expert in
16 that and I'm not going to get into it, so I'd just say that it would not – any recommendation (unintelligible)
17 predicated on a presidential disaster declaration. Basically, that's just a reimbursement mechanism for the
18 most part in the fires.

19 CHAIR CAMPBELL: The interior comes in and AG is in, the others are in, but we like the three
20 letter DOD.

21 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: It is again in the circumstances where it's not been
22 planned about. For example, during heavy fire season and depending on what the national fire
23 emergency level is, you will have various DOD assets already allocated to the forest service for
24 firefighting. Last summer we had a couple of infantry battalions that were already done. We had
25 the modular firefighting systems that were already activated.

26 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Can we access those with a gubernatorial declaration or maybe we get them
27 without gubernatorial declaration.

28

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: You get them as soon as – as long as you ask the forest
2 service. The forest service is the one that gets it.

3 CHAIR CAMPBELL: When you send those to the – when you give those to the forest service,
4 they're under then the command of the forest service?

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: They're never under the command of anybody but, you
6 know, the military, but they are –can be applied to forest service designated missions through the Boise.
7 The other one's – you know, assign them to where they're going to.

8 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Everything goes through Boise. One-stop shop.

9 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: That's the national coordination center.

10 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I'm going to give you the responsibility of working on that.

11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Let me work on it.

12 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Alright. Back to twenty-one. We're on page three. We got to get moving
13 folks. Twenty, I'm sorry. Twenty, training; without objection. Twenty-one; without objection. Twenty-two.

14 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Just a question on twenty. This is training limited to
15 management, or – this training is limited to emergency management and elsewhere we cover the issue of
16 cross training so that fire fighters in local communities have both training and wild land kinds of situations
17 and structural that's elsewhere in here.

18 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yes.

19 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Alright. Twenty-two. We're on twenty-two.

20 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: We recommended that we reject that. In working with the
21 Department of Homeland Security, we're having sufficient challenges meeting our new mission in terms
22 of training and responding to terrorist activities that –

23 CHAIR CAMPBELL: You want to reject – okay. Without objection we will delete that from
24 the recommendations. Twenty-three; without objection. Twenty-four; without objection. Twenty-
25 five.

26 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Twenty-five is stricken because twenty-four includes
27 twenty-five and twenty-seven.

28 CHAIR CAMPBELL: So we're going to consolidate twenty-four, twenty-five and twenty-seven.

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Correct. Delete twenty-five and twenty-seven.

2 CHAIR CAMPBELL: And you want to delete – where are we putting those, all on number
3 twenty-five.

4 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: No. They're all – twenty-four is the consolidated
5 recommendation.

6 CHAIR CAMPBELL: But then we delete twenty-six also, is that correct?

7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: No, no. We delete twenty-five and twenty-seven.

8 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Oh, okay. Twenty-six is already being done.

9 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: That's correct.

10 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Do you want to leave it in?

11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: We feel that it could be removed because it's being done.

12 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Twenty-eight; without objection, twenty-eight is approved. Twenty-nine;
13 without objection. Thirty.

14 MAYOR MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, Dick Murphy, San Diego.

15 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes sir.

16 MAYOR MURPHY: This has to do with this whole series of mutual aid recommendations that's
17 made part of thirty or thirty-two. You'll recall at the earlier meeting we discussed the issue that when the
18 fires broke out in Riverside and San Bernardino that San Diego sent strike teams up north when the Cedar
19 Fire hit, we were unable to bring those strike teams back for 36 hours and that was a particular hardship on
20 all of San Diego County and we had discussed the ability to demobilize quickly and return strike teams to
21 their origin jurisdiction without long delays. I know that mutual aid is sort of this sacred cow, California is
22 the best one in the world and all that, but at least some of us who dealt with our constituents felt that a 36
23 hour delay was a major factor in our inability to fight the fires and I see nothing in these recommendations
24 that addresses that issue that was raised and so my question is, was it left out – why was it left out? Is it an
25 impossible idea? Why can't we deal with that.

26 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Chief.

27 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Chief Freeman stepped out, but we did include that in our
28 Fire Scope recommendations to develop a policy and procedure to have a shorter lease, for lack of better

1 words, on returning those resources when the home jurisdiction was being threatened. There's something
2 within the purview of Fire Scope to work on that.

3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Where is that in these recommendations?

4 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: It is not in the recommendations. If you feel comfortable
5 putting it, we can put it in there –

6 CHAIR CAMPBELL: You know, I think the Mayor has a good suggestion and we ought to
7 include that in one of the recommendations. It was a unique circumstance, I don't think in my knowledge, I
8 can't recall when a strike team left a certain area and while they're up fighting the fire, another area of the
9 fire starts, so maybe if we prohibit fires from starting in areas where we came from.

10 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Could we also prohibit being the last one to have the fire
11 start that day. We'd rather have been first.

12 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Rather than allow misperception to continue, during that 36
13 hours you probably received over a hundred engine companies from other jurisdictions coming into your
14 area, so it isn't a point of, you know, we send them out and we can pull them back because once they get
15 committed, sometimes it's even more difficult to pull them in. Quite frankly, we were sending resources
16 from Orange County who didn't have any fires going on also into your jurisdiction, so I didn't know the
17 exact numbers, but there is a lot to play when we talk about mutual aid coming and going, so just so that,
18 once they're gone, pulling them back is very difficult.

19 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Chief Bowman.

20 CHIEF BOWMAN: Thank you Mr. Chairman, to get to the Mayor's point, perhaps we
21 could just add that to number thirty-three that Fire Scope is already revealing some other issues,
22 add that as an action item to thirty-three.

23 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Absolutely! Wonderful suggestion. Without objection. Chief Bowen
24 would you give the verbiage to Ken. That's on thirty-three. Okay. We're on thirty-one; without
25 objection. Thirty-two; without objection; thirty-three as amended is approved. Thirty-four; without
26 objection. Thirty-five has been consolidated with fifteen. So that's out. Thirty-six; without
27 objection, oh, remove. Okay, thirty-six and thirty-seven, without objection to remove. Thirty-eight,
28 local building planning.

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Thirty-eight.

2 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes sir. Senator.

3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: The problem of fuels isn't just bark beetle infestation. The
4 Cedar Fire, that was very minor, if at all a problem. It should be fuels created by bark beetle infestation and
5 other natural and/or regulatory processes that create the hazard, or some type of language like that. Other
6 natural and regulatory impediments.

7 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Jerry, do you want to address that?

8 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I recommend when we get to forty, I'll give
9 you some language that folds in thirty-eight with forty and the other consolidated fuels related
10 recommendations.

11 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay.

12 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, again I just want to emphasize where
13 we're dealing with fuel management and fuel reduction, that we want to base the decision – scientific data
14 should be included as a basis for the decision-making, as well as professional fire suppression.

15 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman.

16 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Without objection.

17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: At the risk of being obnoxiously redundant, could we add
18 DOI to Forest Service CDF and FEMA.

19 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: We're going to try to work it into the title of the report.

20 [Laughter]

21 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I could also suggest a global replacement every place you
22 see U.S. Forest Service, put in DOI.

23 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Thirty-eight; without objection.

24 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: With the scientific data added.

25 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Scientific data added. Thirty-nine.

26 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, the Watership Partnership Act to establish
27 and fund this program should include appropriate state and federal environmental agencies.

28 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay, do you want to –

1 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: So we just would add at the end of that, to establish and
2 fund this program that should include appropriate state and federal environmental agencies as part of the
3 Watership Partnership Act.

4 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I'm out of my league. I don't know what the Waterjet Act is. I think the
5 water came out of the interior, so –

6 [Laughter]

7 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Ken, do you know where that –

8 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: It came out of something – a discussion we had
9 (unintelligible) mudslide, but I don't recall the specific (unintelligible).

10 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Folks, how about we just delete thirty-nine?

11 [Laughter]

12 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Jerry, you're going to do the language on that?

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. This would consolidate
14 thirty-eight, as well as those listed over in the column, forty, forty-two, forty-three, forty-nine, fifty and
15 fifty-six. I'd like to suggest that because we've had earlier discussions on how much is remaining in
16 jeopardy and pointed more towards the findings that I read earlier, I'd like to suggest that this
17 recommendation be changed to read: Built on existing unit level efforts to develop a comprehensive
18 interagency, intergovernmental wild land vegetation management/fuel management plan for Southern
19 California. Integrate this comprehensive plan's direction into revised or amended the local, state and
20 federal land management and land use plans. Essential elements of the comprehensive plan will include: 1)
21 a scientifically credible balance of harms assessment that evaluates long-term costs and risks to people,
22 capital improvements and natural resources, including air and water quality, enlisted or endangered species;
23 2) a wild land fuel hazard rating indicating flammability potential and locations of highest wild fire risks
24 relative to social, community and ecological values; 3) a prioritized treatment schedule aimed towards
25 achieving wild land fuel treatment objectives in a specified timeframe; and finally, introduce economic
26 incentives to establish new, unconventional markets as a means to accelerate fuel hazard abatement
27 treatments, including tax incentives for alternative fuels.

28 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. Let's make that for all of California.

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Thank you.

2 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Where you talk about fire hazard –

3 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Wait, wait, wait.

4 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Can we repeat number two please before we go on for
5 discussion. Item – Jerry.

6 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: A wild land fuel hazard rating indicating flammability
7 potential and locations of highest wild fire risks relative to social, community and ecological values.

8 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: And make a tag on the end of that –

9 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Who’s talking—

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Bob. As – I don’t want to wordsmith it, but as CDF already
11 does with the (unintelligible) program does all that very same thing. And if you refer to that, there is a
12 mechanism already in place.

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Right. The introduction here talks about building on some
14 efforts, but consolidating them into a comprehensive intergovernmental, interagency effort that would
15 cover all angles.

16 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Dennis, did you have a question?

17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah. I think there was just a little more departmental jargon
18 in there that I could quite keep up with and my concern is that those of us that (unintelligible) have to
19 implement these things at the local level need to understand it. I may love it if I understand it. I’m a little
20 concerned about the wordsmithing.

21 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Could somebody make copies of this. It’s so long and
22 complexed. Could we go on to the next one and somebody run out to the Xerox machine and come back
23 with forty?

24 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Denise.

25 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah, we’ll get something.

26 CHAIR CAMPBELL: We’ll come back to it. Bob’s right behind you. Okay, but it’s going to
27 consolidate forty, forty-two, forty-three, forty-nine, fifty and fifty-six. Okay, forty-one without objection.

28

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, one suggestion. I suggest removing
2 financially so it just weighs to assist because that would leave open for also providing technical assistance.

3 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I'm sorry, I didn't hear that David.

4 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Just recommend removing financially, so it would just read,
5 identify ways to assist governments, because that way it would leave it open for us to look at a way with
6 providing technical assistance as well.

7 CHAIR CAMPBELL: (Unintelligible) assist. (unintelligible) you want to take financially out? The
8 desire is to leave financially in and add all the others.

9 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: You need to add DOI on that.

10 CHAIR CAMPBELL: And DOI, okay.

11 [Laughter]

12 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I was going to say, if you leave financial and add DOI.

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Just one clarification if that's alright. I think if we leave
14 thirty-eight and consolidate all the other ones, I think what gets lost in this is the idea and the point of a
15 single fuel management program that's statewide. And when I say fuel management, not the long plan that
16 Jerry was talking about, but simply a brush clearance management program for the state and I think he's
17 talking more – his recommendation goes towards an integrated plan, but I don't want to lose the simplicity
18 of a simple statement about brush clearance and the importance of defensible space and –

19 CHAIR CAMPBELL: We're leaving thirty-eight aren't we?

20 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: So thirty-eight stays in, okay.

21 CHAIR CAMPBELL: We adopted that. Thirty-nine's out. Forty we're working on. Forty-one is
22 adopted and we may as well leave financially in David, alright.

23 MS. MIKELS: Mr. Chair, but could you add – I'm sorry, it's Judy Mikels down here.

24 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes, go ahead Judy.

25 MS. MIKELS: Could we leave financial and add, and/or technical, because we don't want to – you
26 know, if that would be the partnership, then that would be the partnership.

27 CHAIR CAMPBELL: To identify ways to financially and technically assist

28 MS. MIKELS: And/or. Because maybe we could get both.

1 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Without objection, that's what'll read. Ken, you have it?

2 MR. KOBRIN: Yes sir.

3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I would actually recommend that you just say, including
4 financial aid and then leave it open for assistance in all manner of assistance, as opposed to try to
5 enumerate. You want to make sure it's clear that it also includes money, but just say including financial aid.

6 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay, that's better. Ways to assist including financial. Ken, you got the gist
7 of that? Forty-two is out. Forty-three may be out. We'll put little check marks by them. Forty-four; okay,
8 without objection that's deleted. Those are the Giramendi. Forty-five.

9 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, is the commission going to contact the
10 Insurance Commissioner and let him know that, you know, this is something we'd like him to work on, so
11 we just don't drop the insurance issue.

12 CHAIR CAMPBELL: No. Yeah, we'll send it over to (unintelligible).

13 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay. Thanks.

14 CHAIR CAMPBELL: And he'll hold a press conference.

15 [Laughter]

16 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I would wonder if he couldn't – instead of just send it over if
17 we couldn't officially act to have the Chair direct a letter to the Commissioner asking the Commissioner to
18 take action encapsulating the action within forty-four. Take an action as the commission that we are – that
19 we're authorizing the Chair to send a letter requesting the –

20 CHAIR CAMPBELL: You got it. We'll do it.

21 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Okay.

22 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Without objection, the commission adopts that recommendation and we
23 will send a letter issuing the intent of the commission to the Commissioner. Forty-five; without objection.
24 Forty-six.

25 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: We need one of those in San Francisco County though?

26 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Absolutely. There's a lot of wild life up there.

27 [Laughter]

28 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Wild nightlife.

1 CHAIR CAMPBELL: That's different. The commission recommends that all federal, state, local –
2 without objection. Federal recommendations.

3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Can I ask one more thing about forty-six. I'm a little
4 confused on forty-six. The spirit of it sounds good, but I wonder if somebody can help enlighten me. The
5 establishment and operation of a citizen led disaster recovery and rebuilding prevention groups. Now, while
6 that sounds wonderful, we in local government and state and other agencies have a specific responsibility in
7 those areas and if we are specifically out doing that job and there's a group that says, we're the citizens
8 recovery group, how do we –

9 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Dennis, let me have Bob, our Executive Director respond on that.

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: There was a gentleman, Mr. Paul **Ventaventer** that provided
11 some public comment and he was suggesting that – and he's actually here today, I guess, suggesting that
12 the citizens that were impacted be involved in a lot of the recovery programs and meetings and committees
13 that were involved in the disaster.

14 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: My staff also has been involved with this quite a bit. My
15 office in the recovery efforts and with the individual that you spoke of. I think the – well the direction – let
16 me lay on the table to recommend is that this commission recommend to the Governor that he establish a
17 task force that is actually a different focus than what we've been operating on – that it involve the local,
18 state and federal agencies that are involved in recovery efforts, the non-profits, the faith-based
19 organizations and the community based organizations, so that they can develop recommendations for
20 recovery efforts for taking the cookie cutter of how to do the aftermath from previous fires and develop that
21 for future events. It's not something that we want to get into in detail, but I think we've recognized a need
22 through the commission acts and that we have taken –

23 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Can we get agreement on the sense of that and then maybe Dennis, you can
24 get language to Ken. Is there agreement on the sense of that?

25 MR. FUKITOMI: Mr. Chair, David Fukitomi. I just might add that we include in there language to
26 look at existing models like (unintelligible) Citizen Corp, some of the other voluntary agency
27 (unintelligible)

28 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Dennis, did you –

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah, my concern is, the spirit of it is great, but I do know
2 that we've had some confusion where people come to our county and say, well I thought so-and-so was in
3 charge, where's so-and-so in charge, and you say citizen led recovery. And citizens don't have any
4 resources to do recovery for the most part. They can on their own part, but they either go to their insurance
5 company or they go to the local government, but a citizens committee doesn't have money and resources or
6 authority to direct recovery, and we need to better define how they can be effective participants, rather than
7 sort of dump on them the responsibility for which they have no resources.

8 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I think that's in argument four, making that task force and
9 having it develop the model so that it can come in with a model in the future.

10 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yeah, we envision kind of a partnership that gives advice Dennis, as
11 opposed to, you know, we don't want to give them authority, but we do wish to give them the ability to
12 include I think as much as anything. Jay, you had a question.

13 MR. LASUER: Just a couple of comments. This is going on currently down in San Diego County
14 and they have no authority, they don't do anything as far as authority. What they're doing, is they have
15 brought successful models down from the Oakland area and how they recovered during the Oakland fire.
16 They've assisted in the clean up. They've assisted with bringing together contractors and all to talk to the
17 folks on how to rebuild and how to re-plan, and all these things. They're not doing the work of government.
18 They're doing the work that government never does. They're trying to help people get information with
19 regards to building and cleaning up and all this kind of stuff that they really truly need.

20 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay, Chief Bowman.

21 CHIEF BOWMAN: Just real quickly Mr. Chair. I would just suggest you just change the
22 wording. Instead of citizen led, have the word citizen involvement in the – actually to David's comment, I
23 threw that word in there on prevention and it's not in the right place. It should read something like, give
24 consideration to fostering and advancing the establishment and operation of prevention, disaster, and – or
25 disaster recovery and rebuilding efforts and have the citizen involvement, not citizen led. We need to put
26 some wording in there so that it meets your need and still accomplishes the intent.

27 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Can you get that wording to Ken?

28 CHIEF BOWMAN: I will.

1 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. Does that – how does that –

2 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Does the commission want to leave it that broad, or
3 specifically recommend the Governor appoint a task force to develop – I sense that this is overly broad to
4 where we might not never accomplish the goal of developing a model for use in future events.

5 CHAIR CAMPBELL: So you're talking about a state commission develop a model. We have a lot
6 of models now though don't we. David, do you want to –

7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yes sir, if you don't mind.

8 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Briefly David.

9 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I think you have an existing body of people that can work on
10 this and at your Fire Safe Council statewide. If your recommendation from the commission is to provide
11 funds and –

12 CHAIR CAMPBELL: That's not the recommendation from the commission.

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- provide funds for disaster recovery programs including re-
14 entry tools like pamphlets, maps, communication type devices, so people do know how to re-enter. That's
15 really the major need and the commission (unintelligible) into service the Fire Safe Council people.

16 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: What about the Governor's (unintelligible) program and the
17 funding that they provide to local volunteer organizations such as CERT and some of the other
18 organizations that exist in the community. Would that be an appropriate place –

19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Some Fire Safe Councils right now are taking CERT
20 training, so they are able to be able to –

21 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Alright everybody – Dave, excuse me. Here we go. I want to go back
22 Dennis to what you stated earlier and see if we can get a consensus on that. Will you restate what you – or
23 the gist, and then we'll work it out.

24 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: The gist of it would be the commission has found that there
25 is a need to develop models for recovery and rebuilding efforts and we recommend to the – that the
26 Governor appoint a task force consisting of state, federal, local and citizen groups and non-profits, faith-
27 based to develop models for disaster recovery and rebuilding, long-term rebuilding efforts for
28 implementation in the future.

1 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. Let's see. Did you all hear that?

2 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: If I could respond. I'm not certain, but I think that a
3 Governor's task force to deal solely with assisting citizen groups with recovery, it seems like it's
4 duplicating the efforts of that statewide citizens group that's already doing it. I'm forgetting the name. Fire
5 Safe?

6 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Excuse me. May I make a recommendation --

7 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: The Fire Safe Council.

8 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Why don't we include the language rather than a Governor's direct the state
9 fire thing to do just what you said.

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I didn't follow what you just said.

11 CHAIR CAMPBELL: The Fire Safe Council.

12 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: But aren't Fire Safe Councils more on the prevention side of
13 things? Isn't there --

14 CHAIR CAMPBELL: No, they're everything.

15 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: We heard that testimony it was people who had
16 experienced fires that were helping each other go through the recovery process and the rebuilding process.
17 It seemed to me it was information sharing, grass roots network, some emotional support, things like that.

18 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Here we go, how about this. We direct OES and FEMA to develop what
19 you talked about.

20 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Sure.

21 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Without objection; such is the order. Okay, that was item number --

22 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: You want the Department of Interior included in that list?

23 CHAIR CAMPBELL: What item is --

24 [Laughter]

25 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: No, I'm waiting for the next item.

26 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Forty-six. That was forty-six. Okay, forty-seven.

27 Mr. HAMILTON: Forty-seven Mr. Chairman.

28 CHAIR CAMPELL: Yes.

1 MR. HAMILTON: Larry Hamilton, DOI.

2 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay, with the addition of DOI, no.

3 MR. HAMILTON: There's actually a group that exists at this point, which is chartered under the
4 Secretary of Agriculture and Interior and it came out of the National Fire Plan. It's a Wild Land Farm
5 Leadership Council. Their charter does the very things that are in this recommendation. The people that are
6 on that group are at the Assistant Secretary level of Bureau, Director level, Chief of the –

7 CHAIR CAMPBELL: So we can delete this, is that what you're saying?

8 MR. HAMILTON: Well I'm saying I would suggest that we give this to the Wild Land Farm
9 Leadership Council because there's a group that already exists that would take this particular –

10 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Alright, and what is the name of that council?

11 MR. HAMILTON: It's the Wild Land Farm Leadership Council. WFLC.

12 CHAIR CAMPBELL: So what we want then is to look into the inconsistencies in the
13 interpretation and implementation of the National Fire Plan in that way. Is that what we're saying?

14 MR. HAMILTON: Yes sir.

15 CHAIR CAMPBELL: We'll refer it to them than a Presidential Commission. Is that correct?

16 MR. HAMILTON: That's correct.

17 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Without objection. Ken, do you get the gist of that one?

18 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yes.

19 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. Joan's shaking her head. Thank you Joan. Forty-eight; without
20 objection.

21 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: No. One of the issues that comes before us regarding
22 flood insurance is that the affect of it is the unintended consequence of encouraging people to rebuild their
23 houses in exactly the same place so they'll flood again two and three more times.

24 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Well they do that along the Mississippi.

25 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Absolutely.

26 CHAIR CAMPBELL: And more than two or three times.

27

28

1 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: And the question is whether this would work any
2 differently. If it were predicated on insurance made available to people who in fact had met certain building
3 code standards, or something of that sort, that would be a different project.

4 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay, good point.

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chair.

6 CHAIR CAMPBELL: David.

7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I would agree and just add that I think it's impractical to
8 establish a program, particularly for very, very specific hazards such as this because you see a
9 (unintelligible) of these requests coming in. I would defer, of course, to Congress to create such a program,
10 but as it's stated, I don't think it's a practical recommendation.

11 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I didn't – I'm sorry. I didn't hear the last part of that. Go ahead Bill and
12 then –

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I have a little different opinion of that in that if there is an
14 insurance –

15 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Bill would you get closer.

16 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: If there is an insurance program for flood, flood areas and
17 they're specific requirements for that, it seems to me that it would work in the fire setting as well.

18 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. Ronnie.

19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I was going to make the same comment, is that one of the
20 things we're trying to look for is an incentive for people to comply voluntarily and if this kind of a program
21 was used as the criteria, it is actually an option of the opposite of the fair plan. This is how people would
22 get out of the fair plan.

23 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. Do we all understand it now? Without objection. Ken, do you
24 understand it?

25 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: We're leaving it alone?

26 CHAIR CAMPBELL: No, we, Donna, what's the group that –

27 (Unintelligible)

28 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Can we add in what the –

1 CHAIR CAMPBELL: --FEMA said.

2 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: And that actually that it should be set up, for example,
3 that you have to (unintelligible), I mean things that people have to do to be able to qualify so that
4 (unintelligible) better behavior in these areas. Maybe the Fire Chiefs can help with –

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Are we talking about forty-seven or forty-eight now?

6 CHAIR CAMPBELL: David, can you get closer to the mic?

7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I'm sorry Mr. Chair. I was commenting on forty-eight, the
8 insurance provision. Are we talking about forty-seven now?

9 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Forty-eight. We are on forty-eight.

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Whatever it is, I would just recommend forty-eight be
11 changed to a three because there's a lot more dialogue that has to happen.

12 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Changed to what?

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Changed to a three, that needs study.

14 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: We're not even on – oh, he wants it to be studied.

15 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Oh, you don't want it under FEMA, you want it under –

16 (Unintelligible)

17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman. Would it be okay to just – I don't care if it's
18 a two or a three, but if you said something like, National Wild Fire and Fire Insurance Program and then
19 say something like, meeting eligibility requirements or eligibility criterion under the direction of FEMA.

20 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay, will you give that word to Ken, without objection we'll adopt it in
21 that manner.

22 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Senator.

23 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes.

24 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Just a quick comment on that. One of the areas that is
25 in my district is a very old area, a lot of houses are homestead, they've been there forever, and
26 they're very, very close together, and it's in a canyon area. If you start putting restrictions like you
27 have to clear 200 or 300 feet (unintelligible) you can't do that. So, there's got to be a little
28 flexibility in there on some of these areas if we're going to get people insurance, or get insurance

1 for them because they just – not everybody can comply with all the good things. We have some
2 homes that are too close together.

3 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. I'm carrying on about four different conversations and I got lost. I
4 need a map to get back on board. Forty-eight. We have agreed and Ken you're shaking your head. Without
5 objection forty-eight is adopted. Forty-nine was part of and fifty and fifty-six, so we go to fifty-one. Oh,
6 this is, okay, without objection. Fifty-two; without objection.

7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Senator, that's a remove because there's already a bill that's
8 been established that's going to do this.

9 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay, without –yes, who wanted to ask a question. Dennis, go ahead.

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Is there a point here when we get to discuss the point of
11 dealing with older neighborhoods though. I think while there may be a building standards commission
12 review, we're looking – we still have to look at the older existing approved neighborhoods that meet all of
13 the codes that they met when they were built, but that has been our bigger problem in our county is not the
14 new neighborhoods, and so if there's an item in here to deal with that, fine. If not, I think we need at some
15 point address the issue of what standards and what mechanisms are necessary to go back into older
16 neighborhoods and try to make them more fire resistant.

17 MAYOR MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, Dick Murphy, San Diego. First of all, I do agree with Dennis
18 completely, but I don't understand why we would remove this even though there's a bill pending, because
19 the bill may fail.

20 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Dick, could you get close to the mic please?

21 MAYOR MURPHY: Yeah, I'm just suggesting that this recommendation is an important
22 recommendation. We ought not to remove it just because there is a bill that has been introduced because the
23 bill may –

24 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Just to clarify, this bill was passed and signed by –

25 MAYOR MURPHY: Oh it's passed.

26 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes.

27 MAYOR MURPHY: Oh, okay. I thought you said it was introduced.

28 CHAIR CAMPBELL: So it's already done.

1 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: It's before the Building Standards Commission now.

2 CHAIR CAMPBELL: It's on the Governor's desk?

3 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: It's been signed.

4 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: It's been signed. It is now before the State Fire Marshall
5 and the Building Standards Commission.

6 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Without objection, delete fifty-two. Fifty-three. Alright, we'll include this
7 with our letter to the Insurance Commissioner, alright. So we'll delete that. You got that Bob. Bob?

8 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yes.

9 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Make sure you're absolutely certain which DOI that is.

10 [Laughter]

11 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Good point. Good point Dennis. Fifty-four; without objection. Fifty-five;
12 without objection. Fifty-six; consolidated. Fifty-seven. This is to make the public more aware of the
13 Incident Command Center; without objection. Fifty-eight; without objection. Fifty-nine; that's a good
14 recommendation, it's going to be tough getting it passed, but I recommend; without objection. Sixty is.

15 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chair, could we go back to that one for a minute,
16 because –

17 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Which one? Sixty?

18 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Fifty-nine. That CDF conduct research. There's already
19 existing groups out there doing that and, you know, at Pt. Magoos we have the Asymmetric Warfare
20 Initiative, which has some application and so I think the direction should be to explore – or to cooperate
21 with ongoing and existing programs, as opposed to direct one more study and one more sense of
22 duplication because I can sit here and tell you of two or three programs I know of that are already doing the
23 types of things, it's just CDF needs to be engaged.

24 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, if I could add onto that. There is in fact
25 a statutory requirement within the Department of Defense, for example, to have a program to
26 transfer applicable technology, applicable military technologies, the state and medical first
27 responders; if I could make a recommendation on the recommendation, it would be that there –
28 the state establish a point of contact to work with federal agencies involved in transfers of

1 technology or words to that effect, I think might be good because it's – and the Department of
2 Homeland Security in particular, with their office as a state and local outreach is sort of a
3 connection between the feds and the states and then we can –

4 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I think that's a good idea. Who wants to do the verbiage on that?

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I would support that and a point of contact
6 also whose with private industry on developing and emerging technology.

7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Senator, just to add what the Secretary was saying, yeah,
8 that is a role for the department, not only through the state and local governments, but our Science and
9 Technology Director, also to partner with the local levels, so I think the matter consolidating single points
10 of contact within the state and put them together with the right –

11 CHAIR CAMPBELL: And who would that be at the state level?

12 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: We often have liaison positions with our various
13 operations.

14 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay, so CDF would be the contact point?

15 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Or, we could or with in cooperation with OES.

16 CHAIR CAMPBELL: With OES?

17 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Could we look at recommendation sixty-two? Do these
18 really belong as one larger measure to explore?

19 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Where are you?

20 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Item sixty-two.

21 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Sixty-two is actually a separate item, but just a little
22 background. CDF used to have a research and development side, due to budget cuts fell by the wayside and
23 the last big one was done down in Camp Pendleton with Fire Stop Two, CDF has been the leading provider
24 in the past years of bringing on technologies into the wild land community working in conjunction with our
25 Federal Wild Land Agencies and that was the reason this was in here, was to look at those types of things
26 that have direct implication for us in the wild land side of the house.

27 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Well then it should have been stated that way. Well my
28 point was going to be that we'd want to expand that to other emergent technologies that other research

1 institutions, our universities and so on have implemented things that deal with the satellite technology – the
2 satellite should be separated out from the others, I don't know.

3 CHAIR CAMPBELL: How about we combine fifty-nine, sixty-one, sixty-two, and OES is the
4 point of contact.

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I think the same OES Fire Scope we were thinking the same
6 and then actually we could put together our –

7 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Alright, good. OES Fire Scope (unintelligible) contact.

8 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I think we might just add into that, we received a lot of
9 information from the aerial technology private sector and that could be folded into that also.

10 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay, who's going to write that one?

11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: And I would again recommend that you write it broadly, like
12 to explore and leverage existing research development and technological advances to their applicability to
13 the fire problems.

14 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. Bill, do you want to write that, (unintelligible). Combine those.
15 Fifty-nine, sixty-one and sixty-two. Okay. Sixty-three; oh sixty. Any objection? Without objection.
16 Welcome to page eight! Sixty-three.

17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Senator Campbell, that's in process now and I think that
18 Chief Zagaris might be able to enlighten you.

19 CHIEF ZAGARIS: Yes, it is in progress, we are working with CDF to implement (unintelligible)
20 at the regional level and it is in progress.

21 CHAIR CAMPBELL: So, we eliminate it?

22 CHIEF ZAGARIS: I'm not – you may want to leave it in just as a one because we haven't
23 finished. I've got funding –

24 CHAIR CAMPBELL: It stays without objection, it stays.

25 **[End of Tape 2, Side B]**

26 CHAIR CAMPBELL: That's a good one. Without objection. Sixty-six; without objection. Sixty-
27 seven; without objection. Sixty-eight; without objection. Sixty-nine; without objection. Okay. We've two to
28 recover from.

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Senator, I'd like to add seventy and recommend it
2 retroacting the Governor reimburse us or compensate us for our services on this commission.

3 [Laughter]

4 CHAIR CAMPBELL: That's going to go real well!

5 [Laughter]

6 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay, let's go back to number one, the Economy Act on findings. Secretary
7 Verga.

8 MR. VERGA: I passed my notes to the scribes I think is what I did.

9 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Oh, then Blair will read it. Blair.

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Okay, this is the finding that Secretary Verga provided. The
11 request for an employment of federal resources to include the active duty military to fight fires appears
12 complicated and bureaucratic to those unfamiliar with the process. That's the finding. The recommendation
13 is, the commission recommends that the Federal Firefighting Partners review the procedures and processes
14 for requesting and employing federal assets to include active-duty military assets with focus of maximum
15 effectiveness (?)

16 MR. VERGA: With a goal of maximum effectiveness.

17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Goal. I'm sorry. With a goal of maximum effectiveness and
18 communicate processes to state emergency management and fire officials.

19 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Everybody got it? Without objection.

20 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: The concern I have, is that we're really just restating what's
21 existing and I don't have a real good comfort level of what's existing is where we want to be in reality and
22 so I think we need some language in it to say, you know, when the incident command deems it necessary,
23 or something along the line, if we can then put it up to the cue and have it acted upon; that's the only
24 concern I have because I think what we're saying here is we're going to clarify the existing, and that's the
25 problem. You know, the existing isn't clear and I'm not sure it will be even after it's clarified, to suit the
26 needs of the state. But when we request units through our federal counterparts, that they be responded,
27 before any other hurdles or qualifications kind of go through and that's I think what we're really trying to
28 get.

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I agree Mr. Chairman. I think that we need to –

2 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Go ahead, Senator.

3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I think that we need to have language in there that says to
4 the effect that once we've all settled, or clarified how it works, that we identify what is deficient and how
5 we would like to make it work.

6 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: And I would even say in the findings, I think you need to
7 take out, "not familiar with the process", because people who are familiar with the process were not
8 successful in making it work this time.

9 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Peter, did you hear the first recommendation from Senator Hollingsworth?

10 MR. VERGA: I did, and I guess the – what I'm struggling with quite candidly is, it is impossible
11 for the Department of Defense to guarantee that there will be federal military assets available at any time
12 and any place, because those assets might not be there at any given time, and so therefore to say that you
13 want to establish a process by which you're going to be able to order-up federal military firefighting assets
14 whenever you need to, is something we can't do as a matter of practicality. I personally, with everything
15 I've looked at, remain convinced that the system that's in place when exercised properly, will get you the
16 response that you need, as quickly as you need it. Now, there were issues, as I understand during this
17 particular thing, having more to do with the fact that the particular crews that were available weren't
18 certified to be able to fly with the CDF control and things like that; and those are other issues that have –
19 not having to do with the process by which the resources are requested and then provided. And what I think
20 we're trying to do is, at least what the point of the recommendation was, was to get a review. We can
21 always try to do better. I mean the one case I'm familiar with the most was the (unintelligible) that came
22 from Colorado and was actually on onsite in less than 24-hours. That's actually pretty good.

23 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Is Colonel **Lasser** here? Colonel Lasser, is he still here? He left.

24 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Senator.

25 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Let me – Colonel Lasser indicated to me that, and Ken you probably
26 know this, that we do our training, we do our helicopter training for OES and CDF I guess, in the
27 Spring in May, each May. Here's the question: Why don't we – why don't we invite the U.S.
28 Military Active to participate in those training exercises so then you go through the issue of radio,

1 you go through the issue of firefighting is different from –

2 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I think currently we're in that process in San Diego,
3 but as already indicated, one of the recommendations is to annually get together and make that
4 commitment with the military bases and we believe that the Interagency Helicopter Training
5 Program will work. The military has already had a review of it and I think it's once again
6 identifying those relationships, what they have, making sure those folks are up to speed and
7 we're all on the same page and Chief Wright, as he's shaking his head, is – the staffs are in
8 process in Southern California, but as we talked yesterday, we're going to need to expand that
9 through all the military bases in California that have those assets.

10 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Let me ask you a question. Why don't we say that.

11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chair, I think the issue was, is if – and I don't labor
12 under the misguided notion that we're demanding that they be available at all times. The military's primary
13 role is the defense of the country. I understand that. Where I think the breakdown is, we keep going back to
14 – when you have a local base in your community, the local Fire Department or whoever can work with that
15 base. This issue is when we go to the U.S. Forest Service and we need DOD assets to come outside from a
16 local base and engage in firefight, I think it gets stopped. I don't understand – I mean I haven't had my
17 times here at the commission that explained to me that you pick up the phone, you call this place, and then
18 they do the search to find the wizard you're looking for, and if it's available, and it's got all the necessary
19 deals, it will come. It seems to me we're not talking about what's located in the community. We're talking
20 about using federal assets to fight fire when the Governor declares a disaster and there's some system
21 federally to engage those assets, which may not be in that community. They could be right across the state
22 line in the next state.

23 CHAIR CAMPBELL: However, if we know that they're trained, then do we not stand a better
24 chance of getting them to come if we know that we have available for them, or they're wired so that we can
25 communicate with them, they know that they can slap on a strike because they can't go in there because
26 they might get lost with their camouflage in the smoke. All of these criteria have to be taken care of before
27 we ask for them.

28

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Well I would agree with that. My only point is I think what
2 we're looking at are assets, which may not be next door, and I don't know how you get them in the federal
3 system.

4 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman.

5 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Hold it just a second.

6 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah, I have a recommendation because I think we're
7 getting a little far of field from the Economy Act and really what we are talking about the (unintelligible).

8 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes.

9 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: How about if we recommend that OES and the State
10 Firefighting Partners meet with DOD, determine their criteria, and if necessary, come back and seek
11 changes. That way you'll have a fairing, because the problem was that we were ordering through our
12 federal partner the U.S. Forest Service, and they were –

13 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Through Boise, Idaho.

14 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: NAFF units –

15 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Don't forget Boise.

16 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: And were denied based on the fact that they have not
17 deployed commercial based on the Economy Act. And that's what we're being told as state fire agencies.
18 Now that may be in error and if so, then we acknowledge that and change our procedures, but if not, then
19 we will come back and we'll seek additional changes as necessary.

20 MR. VERGA: And that's similar to what I was saying. I'm not disagreeing with anything that the
21 Secretary said. We need to have language that allows for a little bit more than clarification and allows for
22 or encourages reinterpretation by solicitors at DOD and/or Interior and nag if we have to. Yet, so it leaves
23 the door open that if that reinterpretation doesn't accomplish what we're trying to, that we have some other
24 action available to us.

25 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I think what we're coming down to Peter is at some, we need to have our
26 people sit down with the DOD people and figure out, is there some way we can speed up the process that
27 we can help train the fires before the fire (unintelligible). This report basically is going to say a couple of
28 very important things. One of them is that the best thing we can do for fighting fires is before the fire starts.

1 That we pre-plan, we do these things because once the Santa Ana wind hits, and the fire is raging, there is
2 nothing – we can't stop the fire. Let's be very candid. It's going to go where it wants to go. But if we're – if
3 we do all of these things, if we do all the clearing around the homes. If we do all the things – and if we have
4 available the military as quickly as we want it, how do we achieve that? And my guess that we're all trying
5 to say is, how do we get together with the –

6 MR. VERGA: There's two cautions I would give. I think it's an incorrect view to look at the DOD
7 as a separate partner rather than part of a federal partner to the state in this activity, because we come to the
8 fight, so to speak, as part of the Federal Government, not separate and distinct from it. And therefore, I –
9 you know, what I'm struggling with is all of my experiences and albeit I look at it from the sort of top end
10 of it, is the process that works fairly quickly. When the process is allowed to work as it's designed, what we
11 end up gumming the works up for lack of a better term, is when somebody does something like S4, I need
12 the three helicopters from Miramar, as opposed to, I need additional airborne firefighting capability and
13 you put it into the system and it responds with what's the best, what's the quickest and how we can get
14 there the fastest. That's not to say that on that local response capability level, that there should not be a
15 better ability for the local commander who can do it on his own authority to be better prepared to respond
16 to likely emergencies he might find in his local area. I think the idea of the San Diego based helicopter
17 units –

18 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Peter, you're right, and what we want to know is, what's the best way to
19 say, and how do we – you know, to the local commander, or to anybody, that we – can you help us. We
20 need help and can we utilize your aircraft in helping fight this fire.

21 MR. VERGA: But Mr. Chairman, I think we've got two different issues.

22 CHAIR CAMPBELL: No, I'm just saying – one is the aircraft and one is how we get through the
23 bureaucratic maze.

24 MR. VERGA: Well, one is the local commander and –

25 CHAIR CAMPBELL: And he can do that anyway, right?

26 MR. VERGA: -- and I think we've wordsmithed that very well already; we've taken that out
27 too. The other is this more strategic statewide asking for federal resources from statewide to the
28 federal for a mutual aid type statewide assistance and the interplay of the Economy Act there,

1 and I think what Dallas has said is pretty close what we need. Yes, we need to clarify. We need
2 more explanation so that all of those – the personnel that are involved, the positions that are
3 involved know how it interplays, but we need to leave the door open in the language of the
4 recommendation to if that's not sufficient for what we're trying to accomplish that we are able to
5 make some changes there.

6 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Well again, I would go back to what is it that's trying to be
7 accomplished. I guess that's what I'm missing in terms of – the MAFFS in California are available on-call
8 to the Governor, so that shouldn't be an issue. The California National Guard Helicopters that are equipped
9 for firefighting are on-call to the Governor. The MAFFS outside of California are either available through
10 state-to-state compact, or through the Forest Service and then if you're getting – you're into the issue of
11 who pays the bill, and that's a sort of a whole different matter. The Air Force Reserve Unit out of Colorado
12 was available for firefighting in California in less than 24-hours from when the request was made.

13 MR. VERGA: The answer to the question of what we are looking for –

14 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Let me try this. Excuse me –

15 MR. VERGA: If I could just answer that question though, it's been asked a couple of times of
16 what we're looking for. The answer to the question of what we're looking for is to be able to utilize
17 Department of Defense resources from a mutual aid or statewide –

18 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Here's – how about this language –

19 MR. VERGA: -- exhausting the civilian.

20 CHAIR CAMPBELL: How does the local and state meet with the Federal Partners to further
21 clarify process of utilizing federal resources and if necessary, improve access to military assets as needed.

22 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: That's fine.

23 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Senator. Peter.

24 MR. VERGA: Yeah, that's fine.

25 CHAIR CAMPBELL: And OES will develop that meeting.

26 MR. VERGA: Okay.

27

28

1 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Alright. Come on Ken, don't break into tears. Without objection. That's the
2 recommendation. Do we still have one to go? Two to go. I'm ready to go. Ken, are you alright? Are any
3 issues unresolved with you?

4 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: We have two written recommendations clarifying what was
5 done before if you want to go through any of these today.

6 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Do you have what.

7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: (Unintelligible) suggestions for prior recommendations that

8 -

9 CHAIR CAMPBELL: We discussed those and approved them. Okay Jerry, you had a question.

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah, there's just one left open. I think it was
11 recommendation number forty. It had to do with that rather long recommendation involving a
12 comprehensive (unintelligible).

13 CHAIR CAMPBELL: We're making copies of that.

14 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Denise has made those available to everybody.

15 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Thank you Denise.

16 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: This is in response to the finding that finds that the most
17 destructive, most costly, most dangerous wild fires occurred in older, dense vegetation burning under
18 extreme conditions over extensive areas this vegetation has not been managed to mitigate wild fire risks.
19 The recommendation that would be attached to this finding then, would read, "Build on existing unit level
20 efforts to develop a comprehensive interagency, intergovernmental wild land vegetation management/fuel
21 management plan for California. Integrate this comprehensive plan's direction into revised or amended
22 local, state and federal land management/land use plans. Essential elements of the comprehensive plan will
23 include a scientifically credible balance of harms assessment, a wild land fuel hazard rating", I won't read
24 all of it, but you can read along - "an objective that aims towards achieving a safer mix of eight class
25 distribution and chaparral and condition class distribution and (unintelligible) fuel types, a prioritized
26 treatment schedule aimed towards achieving wild land fuel treatment objectives in a specified timeframe
27 and finally, introduce economic incentives to establish new unconventional markets as a means to

28

1 accelerate fuel hazard abatement treatments, including stewardship contracting and tax incentives for
2 alternative fuels”.

3 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Everybody seeing that? Any objection?

4 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Just on a formatting basis, maybe the recommendation ends
5 after that first paragraph of land management/land use plans and then in the discussion under the
6 recommendation is the rest of that that follows as to what it would contain the details of what it would
7 contain.

8 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Ken, did you get that?

9 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Just a comment. If we can somehow again build in the
10 scientific basis for the – for the development of the vegetation and fuel management plan.

11 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Jerry.

12 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Just a comment. Looking back at those past large fires, Bel
13 Air, Laguna and Panorama and so forth, all of them had a recommendation to do fuels treatment, but we
14 got stuck because we said we can't do fuels treatment because of VSA concerns or clean air or clean water
15 and this balance of harms assessment gets us to evaluating long-term trade offs and risks while not doing
16 this fuels work. One of the ironies I believe, especially coming off of the Cedar Fire, we were managing
17 vegetation for endangered species habitat and in the bargain, imperiled the very species we were trying to
18 save as a management strategy. Somehow this balance of harms I think will allow us to understand those
19 long-term risks.

20 MR. LASUER: Senator, there has to be something, there has to be something in a recommendation
21 like this that sets a priority of preservation of life and homes. It has to say that that takes priority over
22 everything else. When my people saw the fire coming and all these areas had been set aside, there was just
23 nothing but dead dry brush. They didn't have a chance. There were no firebreaks. There was nothing to
24 stop the fire. We have to somehow say that the top priority is human life and homes and we haven't done
25 that anywhere in our report.

26 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: A balance of harms makes those priorities clear and as we
27 listed here, people and capital improvements and natural resources.

28 MR. LASUER: We need to say it so Joe Six-Packs understands it. Seriously, you know.

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I'm just introducing a proposed recommendation.

2 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman. I very much concur with the spirit of this. I
3 think it's well stated. I just had the question of what's the definition in this use of the word unit; unit level
4 effort.

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: As used here, it's ranger district or forest, or state unit.
6 There are –

7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I want to say governmental.

8 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah. I guess the question I have is back to the Joe Six Pack
9 issue of – put it in my general plan and how does somebody know what that means.

10 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Bob, did you have a –

11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: A different subject.

12 MR. LASUER: I don't have a problem with what he's saying Senator. I just think it should be so
13 the common person on the street can understand that, hey you know, we think you're the most important
14 thing, you and your home, so they can read it, and see it. And it's well and it does everything, but nobody's
15 going to understand it.

16 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay, go ahead.

17 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I think that the work of the commission absolutely has
18 been focused on preservation of life and property and that should be – you know, the introduction to the
19 recommendations. I mean, like a mission statement. This is going into the body of the text at some place,
20 right? And I think that because the fuel management issue versus, you know, density environmental
21 regulations, how to implement this stuff has been so critical to our discussion, it would be more helpful if
22 we left it whole, rather than try to use the shorter version of it. And I'm fine with life and property being
23 the focus of –

24 MR. LASUER: All I'm saying is I didn't have a problem with this, but I like it so when the people
25 down the street read it, they can understand it. They are the most important thing. They and their homes.

26 CHAIR CAMPBELL: In that regard, let me say, I believe the Chairman will include in his letter to
27 the Governor the following statement: The legislature must determine whether or not the protection of life
28 and property from wild fire should take precedence over potentially conflicting public policy mandates.

1 The legislature must make that decision. That will be in the letter to the Governor from this report. Jerry,
2 we'll start with you.

3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Thank you Mr. Chairman. One of the –

4 CHAIR CAMPBELL: The hour is 1535.

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: One of the things I think could be important to convey in
6 that letter is the fact again that we were managing these lands for a series of objectives. It had everything to
7 do from endangered species to clean water, to (unintelligible) to whatever. The irony here is that the
8 management strategy in managing the fuels that way only defeated the very objective we were managing
9 for.

10 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Okay. Good point. Thank you. Supervisor.

11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yes, two quick things. First, if somebody can put a price
12 tag on sixty-five, sixty-six and sixty-seven, I'd be interested to know that. They're all great objectives, but
13 I'm a little concerned that that's one of those things that defeats itself by price. But my real point at the
14 moment is I still want to go back to an earlier point I had and that is, at least in our county, I don't believe
15 we lost a home that was under 30 years of age and the problem continues that we need to address how to
16 return to old neighborhoods and we need to develop programs to upgrade the fire safety of non-conforming
17 structures in wild land urban interface –

18 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Dennis. Do you want something on retrofitting of older homes?

19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Sure. I want that, but it's a little bit more than that, but that
20 would do it.

21 CHAIR CAMPBELL: And what do you want to say in that regard.

22 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Well, maybe just what I said, and that is develop programs
23 to upgrade the fire safety of non-conforming structures in wild land interface zones. But the question then
24 becomes who. Who's responsible –

25 CHAIR CAMPBELL: We can add this in the Building Code section.

26 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Okay. I think that –

27 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Now tell me what you want to say.

28 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: That's it. That gets it. What I just said –

1 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Ken, did you get it? Okay, you'll give it to him, fine. Bob.

2 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yeah, real quick Mr. Chairman. I think we've talked about
3 it several times during commission meetings. I brought it to the attention of the commission, is that CDF
4 right now is under reduction orders to reduce it's resource management personnel by almost two-thirds and
5 these are the very professional – the (unintelligible) professional foresters and all the individuals that would
6 be the ones who would go out and implement the very things that the commissions going to be calling for
7 and CDF at this point has not received orders to cease and desist on those layoffs. So I think maybe to help
8 us out there in Sacramento if the commission may want to add a recommendation that impending layoffs be
9 forestalled so that we have people to be able to implement all the control burning and other treatments that
10 we're talking about, because the local governments, counties, cities, are going to be relying on CDF to
11 provide that assistance, and it's not going to be there.

12 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I don't want to infringe on the legislature's budgetary responsibility to
13 make those fiscal assessments. However.

14 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I mean they'll be reading –

15 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I mean it's a budgetary issue. The legislature in its infinite wisdom must
16 make those decisions. And the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee Appropriations Committee –

17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: But also it ties into the budget.

18 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Senator Albert.

19 SENATOR ALBERT: I didn't actually want to talk about this. However, I think Mr. Wolf, it's a
20 good point, but I have been saying to everybody I have not had a day in the past two weeks where someone
21 has not come and told me why their program, whether it be rural hospitals, community clinics, the
22 University of California Community Colleges and I can go right on down the list, school lunch, cannot be
23 cut this year and what it is actually going to do to the State of California and I've told all of them that
24 unless we are able to raise some additional revenues, that is absolutely impossible, and even if you raise
25 revenues, there are still going to have to be serious cuts made. So, it would be hard for me to say – to say
26 that in the report so that it somehow appears that this is the one we are supporting as opposed to all of the
27 other awful choices we're going to have to make, I think it's difficult in this year even to do that.

28

1 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chair. In response to that – or, not in response, I
2 didn't mean that. But you know, there are lots of conservation organizations, there are private organizations
3 that have this expertise on board. It doesn't necessarily mean the state has to fund it, and I think we need to
4 stop always going to the state and the feds for the funding when there are private resources out there and
5 available. Maybe the direction should just be to make sure that CDF has the ability to seek those resource
6 people through any means. I don't know if there's legislation that says it can't or departmental rules, or
7 whatever, but to me, that's the important part. If those are available through a grant process or a non-profit,
8 then CDF ought to be able to somehow make that happen and that does not impinge upon rightfully so the
9 state's budgetary authority.

10 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I don't want to – I don't believe the sense of the commission is to get
11 involved in a budgetary issue. Do I detect a difference of opinion? Chief.

12 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: In recognizing that Mr. Chair, we did raise the issue of a
13 quarter cent sales tax. It would be beneficial to us before we extend a lot of time and effort to get a – while
14 we have the opportunity of all the legislators here to give us some direction on that, if that's something to
15 pursue, if it's possible, if it's something that they feel that we could build enough support, so we have the
16 best opportunity here, while we have people that are very knowledgeable of the issue.

17 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Chief, one member of this committee has that bill. Senator Soto, and she's
18 not here today. It's her bill to add the quarter cent sales tax for fire. I don't know what's going to happen to
19 it. I don't know if our recommendation in that particular area would have an impact. There's disagreement
20 on this commission as to how we should act in that regard, what we should do in that regard and I'd rather
21 not, in all candor get involved in –

22 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Maybe if we just ask for an open door and we come up to
23 Sacramento looking for our efforts, we'd appreciate that.

24 CHAIR CAMPBELL: That's right, and make good placards.

25 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Senator, one quick thing. With regard to those funding
26 issues and so forth, the Federal Government recently through Congressman Lewis presented a check for
27 150 million dollars. Is it possible to access parts of those funds in order to make sure that we do not lose
28 some of the critical people because that money was supposed to be earmarked towards forest management.

1 CHAIR CAMPBELL: It was earmarked for forest management, but also directly on vegetation
2 management. It didn't deal with personnel to my knowledge.

3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: No, I understand personnel, but there are other costs
4 associated with management of the forced areas, which maybe that money could be accessed which would
5 in effect help us –

6 CHAIR CAMPBELL: A half billion dollars total.

7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: It was 150 million dollars.

8 CHAIR CAMPBELL: No, it's a half billion for different things, other things.

9 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Well I'm talking about just (unintelligible)

10 CHAIR CAMPBELL: And justifiably so, that's your area.

11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I know.

12 CHAIR CAMPBELL: But I know that 150 million was going toward the removal of bark beetle,
13 dead trees and things of that nature, so, I don't what other else, but I know there was half a billion in there
14 for other issues through FEMA. It expanded the role that FEMA may have who – to play. Go ahead, Chief.

15 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Senator Campbell if I might. I know that time is growing
16 short, and we aren't going to have time I don't think today to look further at the recommendations that
17 we've approved in terms of priority levels.

18 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Let me tell you what my intent is in this regard. My intent is that Ken and
19 Joan will stay up until six tomorrow morning, or eight tomorrow morning. I want to get out to as quickly as
20 possible these recommendations. The edited recommendations to everybody just so there's – and if you
21 have any significant disagreements, which I don't think you will. I think we've pretty well gone through
22 them, then you can get back to us and we can edit if we have to, to clarify what the commission wanted.
23 But I want you to see them before we print them up. That will be just on the recommendations, not on
24 anything else that we've done, because that's the key is to what we're going to present.

25 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: One of the things that we did yesterday was to reprioritize.
26 In other words, to look at these and say, you know, there's 30 of these that rise to the top, but there were 9
27 of them that we thought were of utmost importance that needed to carry a little more weight in terms of
28 their positioning in the report and I'm just wondering if it would be possible for the members of the

1 commission – of the recommendations we get back, their top 10, so that when the report is assembled,
2 those 10 items rise to the top in terms of what the commission believes are the areas that need to be
3 addressed first.

4 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Let me tell you the other thing we're going to do. We're going to divide the
5 recommendations between fiscal and non-fiscal and that way, and the reason I want to do it that way, I
6 don't want to put out a report that says all the commission did was ask for more money. What I want to do
7 is first stress our policy and give priority to the policy changes that we're advocating and those
8 recommendations before putting out the recommendations that relate to costs. And in so, I have a feeling
9 that, I mean, I think one of the key issues is training. I think that ought to be one of the things that we've
10 talked about. And there are other policy issues that don't directly involve money, but eventually will and
11 then I think we can talk about methods of revenue enhancement to be able to afford some of the things that
12 we're talking about. David.

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Senator, in item 44 you refer that one to the Insurance
14 Commissioner. This is regarding building industry issues and Supervisor Hansberger raised an important
15 point about retrofitting older buildings and my thought is that we overlooked some substantial testimony
16 we took on retrofitting with recommendations for non-flammable roofing and other materials and there was
17 a suggestion during one of the hearings about tax credits to incentivize retro-fitting and I believe they came
18 from –

19 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I think we – don't we have something in here about standards. Didn't we do
20 standards for – number forty, David, takes care of the standards issue.

21 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: But did it include a potential for tax credits to incentivize?

22 CHAIR CAMPBELL: But the tax credit would be great for retro-fitting of older houses and if we
23 want to make a statement in there that something to the effect that to incentivize the retro-fitting of older
24 homes, tax credits ought to be utilized.

25 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Would you want to then have item forty-four split into two
26 recommendations; one for the commission and one for the –

27 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I'm on item forty, David.

28 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Forty.

1 CHAIR CAMPBELL: It consolidated all of those and that's where it would go.

2 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Oh that'd be fine. Thank you.

3 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Alright, we can't keep going back. Okay, Peter.

4 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: On priorities.

5 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Under what?

6 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Under priorities, is what you were discussing before we
7 went back to another issue.

8 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes, go ahead.

9 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I would like to ask the Chair, it sounds like we're not
10 going to be able to set priorities before the day concludes, that as close as possible if you're going to
11 separate fiscal and non-fiscal, I understand what you're doing there. Under the fiscal ones that we try to
12 prioritize, if you can, as close as to what all the fire – members of the commission got together, as close as
13 possible. Number one priority, number two, number three.

14 CHAIR CAMPBELL: They listed nine. I have no problem with that.

15 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Thank you.

16 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Peter, go ahead.

17 MR. VERGA: Just if the Chair will indulge me just a moment. I want to make sure that my fellow
18 commissioners understand that any of my remarks is not in any way, that we don't understand we're an
19 important role to federal government and the Department of Defense has in dealing with this problem.

20 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I took them all personally Peter.

21 MR. VERGA: Well I certainly hope not. But, you know, everything we're doing is aimed at trying
22 to make sure that the system that we have in place – or the system that ends up in place at the end of the
23 day, allows for that proper balance that we have to maintain between the attention of our military mission
24 and being able to help the local community and issues like access to the local military installation, that
25 might not be the right place to go, you know, if they're getting ready to deploy to Iraq, they're going to be
26 packed up, but a request that says we need helicopters goes into the system and they may come from
27 upstate as opposed to Camp Pendleton or something like that. That's what we're trying to get out of –

28

1 CHAIR CAMPBELL: But I think just a meeting of sitting down and talking about it. I want to saw
2 that the Predator, the Predator did an awesome job – now wait – awesome job on television last night I saw
3 Osamah Bin Ladin in flowering white clothes and we didn't take him up. That was before they were armed.

4 MR. VERGA: I'm glad you noted that.

5 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Jerry.

6 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, Again, just a suggestion to help with the
7 prioritization that we're going to be trying to do here, it might be useful to take a look at this decision flow
8 chart that we talked about earlier and see if we could array the recommendations in the context of each of
9 those headings as a means to help the commission understand the relative importance, or the relative
10 priority.

11 CHAIR CAMPBELL: I'm going to use your flowchart as we do the prioritizing.

12 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman. I agree with that comment, but I don't
13 understand the implementation in one regard. As I read the flowchart, I think, great, it deals with prevention
14 first, it deals with avoidance of the problem, but I look at the top nine recommendations and they appear to
15 be buy more equipment and spend more money before you do the prevention. So, I don't know how you
16 applied that and got to the expensive items versus the avoidance items and so I'll spend more time studying
17 that, but that flowchart didn't give you the same product that I think you're talking about.

18 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Why don't you clarify that.

19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Just as a point of clarification, when the fire
20 representatives got together, we did not have this flowchart. We used Chief Bowman was kind enough to
21 bring a (unintelligible) choice analysis concept to us that we use on all 31 of the top recommendations to
22 come up with a the top nine.

23 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman.

24 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Yes sir.

25 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: When we discussed segregating the recommendations by
26 fiscal and non-fiscal –

27

28

1 CHAIR CAMPBELL: -- all of them involves a little bit of each, but yes, the key ones like the – I
2 don't want to include the 150 new trucks for OES with the policy recommendations. That was the kind of
3 division I was making.

4 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I understand that. I guess my question goes to – we
5 talked about 50 years of history, repeating history over and over again, and my impression of the
6 reason that occurs is that people run away from the heavy lifting. And, we will be back in this
7 situation again if we shy away from the heavy lifting. In this case, it means money, and I think the
8 commission should know that. I think we all do. And as we advance it forward, if we simply take
9 the low hanging fruit that can be accomplished without costing any money, or doesn't upset
10 different stakeholders, there will be another commission.

11 CHAIR CAMPBELL: That's why we come back in six months Chief. No, seriously, I think if we
12 make a recommendation that we come back in six months and then a year, then I think we can take a look
13 at has the quarter cent sales tax passed. Have there been any other proposals for financing that may have
14 passed at that time, and give the legislature a chance to do it's job. I agree and I think we've all said all
15 along, we do not want this to sit on the shelf and if we keep coming back and poking at it, we can keep the
16 dust off it.

17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Just one last comment. I'm concerned from a professional
18 firefighter level that the needs for staffing and training and all those things that we've identified, because
19 they do have a cost associated to them, don't get lost when we do the split that they have an equal
20 importance for being addressed and I'm kind of concerned that if we split those off, that it would be easy
21 for not just us, but people that read it down the road to go, oh well, that's a money thing, we'll forget about
22 it. But it's just as important to the lives of men and women on the fire lines and we don't want to see that
23 get taken aside and put way for the easier stuff.

24 CHAIR CAMPBELL: James.

25 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Really quick, there's a minor
26 edit that I think is necessary to number forty-one. The Forest Service was left out of that provision and I
27 think they need to be added because they are essentially the agency that's to administer the healthy forest
28 dollars and I think that if you just add Forest Service –

1 CHAIR CAMPBELL: James, you got it; without objection.

2 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: And additionally to ask the Forest Service to notify local
3 governments about the programs available through healthy forest. We've already received calls from
4 supervisors about that.

5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I think we have to add DOI too.

6 [Laughter]

7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: No, they're already in there.

8 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Ronnie.

9 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, we're getting really close to the end of
10 this thing and I would just like to make one last comment. I've been involved in governmental
11 entity activities for 40 years. I've never seen so much stuff talked about so fast by so many
12 people to come to a conclusion and you should be commended as our chairman.

13 [Applause]

14 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Thank you very much. On this division, I want to come back to that Bob. I
15 think the public policy will go in concert with the fiscal recommendations, but what I want to stress is the
16 importance of public policy change, what has to happen in that regard as opposed to letting it all be about
17 money. I don't want the headline to read that we're going to be in a position where this commission
18 requested seven billion dollars. And so that's why I want the public policy aspect to lead it. I want to say
19 this, I will have a meeting in the Governor's office next week and talk about a little bit about the
20 presentation of the report to the Governor. I don't know how he wants to do that. My recommendation
21 would be that we do it in Los Angeles and each of you would be invited to attend in that regard. But this all
22 depends on his schedule and his time as it relates to April 5th. It may be done in Sacramento, but if you'd
23 keep your schedule open, we will get word to you just when and how it will happen. The legislatures on
24 break. Everybody's life, liberty, property will be safe for one week.

25 [Laughter]

26 CHAIR CAMPBELL: When the legislature is in recess. Alright. Let me say this, I haven't been
27 around as long as Ron Coleman has, but I was elected to the legislature in 1966, when Ronald Regan went
28 in as Governor and I carried him in on my coattails. Maybe it was vice versa, it was a long time ago. But

1 I've attended a lot of meetings and I want to say that it has been amazing, your attendance has been
2 absolutely amazing. I don't think we've had a meeting where we've had more than three or four people
3 who may have had a conflict and were unable to meet. I remember one of the big discussions at the
4 constitutional convention of 1787 was it took them 14 days to get a quorum. We never had that problem.
5 We had our quorums every time here at this meeting, and I want to commend each of you and because
6 we've held all of these meetings in Southern California, and we cover from Ventura to Riverside and San
7 Bernardino, the largest county in the universe, and San Diego to get all of you to drive through Southern
8 California traffic is in and of itself worthy of a commendation and so I do appreciate that. But more
9 importantly than that, I appreciate all of your expertise, your involvement in the process, your willing to
10 engage in discussions and this is the other one, not falling asleep; the chair is the only one who every now
11 and then dozed, but that I can attribute to H. H was a good thing to attribute that to. But I truly appreciate
12 each and every one of you and the time and effort that you have devoted to this, so and I stand amazed at
13 your fortitude and your perseverance. And also, your intellectual ability and flexibility in participating in
14 the discussions that we've had these seven meetings. I want to pay tribute most of all to Dallas Jones and
15 OES. They have provided the resources with which these meetings have been conducted and you don't get
16 large meeting rooms free these days, and so I appreciate. When we first heard that we were going to have a
17 dais with 34 people on it, we kind of looked at each other and said, now how can you get 34 people on a
18 dais and then it dawned on me, Congress has committees that large don't they James. They have 34 people
19 on a committee. The hotels with I think one exception have been remarkably in their assistance and help to
20 us. But not only Dallas, but his people and Bob Gerber and Denise Banker. Where are you Denise? There
21 you are over there, have done this –

22 [Applause]

23 CHAIR CAMPBELL: They're the ones who set up these rooms and make sure everything runs
24 smoothly that we have – that the microphones work and by the way, did you ever try and go anywhere and
25 get 20, 30, or 40 mics to work in a system? The hotel doesn't have the system. I think we have to bring that
26 in every time we have one of these meetings. We have taped all of this and they have – so everything is on
27 tape. It's on video also. We've videotaped everything. Ken, is that – yes, so we have two resources here.
28 And we have – this has been a wonderful experience and I want to thank Jerry Haleva and Blair Springer,

1 or Robin Springer, Blair Springer who have donated their time and effort to assisting us in this and as you
2 know –

3 [Applause]

4 CHAIR CAMPBELL: And they have done – Jerry used to be my Chief of Staff and Blair was the
5 head of the committee on the joint legislative committee on fire police emergency and disaster services and
6 we changed to joint committee on emergency services years ago. So, they are thorough familiar with the
7 process of what we've done, but as I say, I'll meet next week with the Governor's staff and work this out as
8 to what happened, from the standpoint of how we're going to work it out.

9 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Is the legislature in D.C. again?

10 (Unintelligible)

11 CHAIR CAMPBELL: Well they generally go during the break. No. Oh that's right, they – I
12 forgot, I forgot, they create another break, that's what happens. Anyway, any final comments from
13 anybody? I appreciate each and every one of you. Thank you very much and this meeting stands adjourned.
14 Only five minutes late!

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28