

MEMORANDUM

U.S. Department of Homeland Security



FEMA

DATE: 29 November 2004

FOR: Rory Rehbeck, Chair
Search Working Group

FROM: Canine Sub-Committee

SUBJECT: Canine Sub-Committee Meeting Minutes

Please find the attendance and agenda items addressed on the recent Canine Sub-committee conference call:

| MEETING DATE(s) >> | | 11-29-04 | Call # 82 | |
|---------------------------------|------------|---------------|------------|--|
| MEMBERSHIP / ATTENDANCE | | | | |
| Teresa MacPherson | | Chair | | |
| Member | Y/N | Member | Y/N | |
| Teresa MacPherson | Y | | | |
| Ann Wichmann | Y | | | |
| Shirley Hammond | Y | | | |
| John Dean | Y | | | |
| John Gilkey | N | | | |
| Mike Marks | Y | | | |
| Fred Pitts (scribe) | Y | | | |
| Rory Rehbeck (SWG) | Y | | | |
| Bruce Berry (SWG) | Y | | | |
| Dean Scott (Program Office) | Y | | | |

AGENDA ITEMS/DISCUSSION

- Conference Call Minutes
- Dec meeting (?)--Dean
- *Evaluator conf calls*--Bruce, Teresa
- k9 Resource Typing--Teresa
- Eval apps--Lee Prentiss MATF1 handler
- Susan Martinez TXTF1 handler
- Sharing of Resources--Mike and John D
- MA pretest--Teresa
- testing 2 dogs on same site--question from IN
- CSST student/instructor simultaneously?
- reinstatement of Pat Hawn as evaluator COTF1
- Questions from West STM mtg--Fred
- Screening Tools for Dean--Teresa
- CSST--incorporating STM module(s)—Teresa
- *Evaluator conf call topics:
 - AAR—Fred
 - Test Set-up—Fred
 - Chief Evaluator PD and app—Ann
 - Handler pinpointing as time runs out (how much?)—Ann
 - Shopping/refinds—when is it a fail?—John Dean
 - False alerts—Teresa
 - Ladder—Mike
 - “Slow” (what should it be & how to evaluate it)—Mike
 - Lack of Control—Shirley

PROPOSED ACTIONS

- Minutes from 10-28-04 conference call.
 - Approved without amendment.
- Dec meeting
 - Dec 10 and 11 / travel 9 and 12
 - Fairfax, VA
 - Hopefully yes or no answer by the end of this week
 - Funding has to come from the task forces
- K9 Resource Typing
 - All a part of NIMS (database of definitions)
 - Outside of the FEMA USAR system
- Eval apps—
- Lee Prentiss MATF1 handler
 - Application approved
- Susan Martinez TXTF1 handler
 - Application approved
- Sharing of Resources--

- NV and OH may be able to submit business plans which will allow them to borrow canine teams while their plans are being implemented.

SWG Chair
Sub-committee Meeting Minutes
Page Three

Canine Sub-committee
 29 November 2004

- Our planning to be submitted to Mike to see if it can apply to this situation.
- All of this is being carefully and reluctantly considered because there are issues with auditing the task force resources.
- MA pretest--
 - There's going to be one and everyone saw the email.
- Testing 2 dogs on same site--question from IN
 - No, must be on a separate site.
- CSST student/instructor?
 - No, one may not be a student and instructor at the same time.
- reinstatement of Pat Hawn as evaluator COTF1
 - Yes
- Questions from West STM mtg--
 - Carried forward to next Call
- Screening Tools for Dean--
 - Carried forward to next Call
- Should an ex-handler still be a full evaluator?
 - We will examine this further at the face to face.
- CSST--incorporating STM module(s)—
 - Carried forward to next Call
- Eval Conf Calls
 - Moderator - Bruce Berry
 - Dates and times - December 2004
 - Wed 8th at: Noon Eastern Standard Time
 - Thu 14th at: 9pm Eastern Standard Time
- *Evaluator conf call topics:
 - AAR—
 - Overview of new form.
 - Emphasis on complete information including who failed.
 - Type II Test Set-up and process—
 - Is not designed to put further stress on the team. Evaluators arranging the format for this purpose are incorrect.
 - It has evolved into two different styles and you may see either at an evaluation. One is taking teams through the elements in groups of four, or at least smaller groups. The other is to take the entire group through as a numbered unit.
 - It is slated to be a topic of sub-committee discussion.
 - Chief Evaluator PD and app—
 - Overview
 - When it is implemented everyone who is eligible and willing will need to apply. Nobody will be grandfathered in.
 - Handler pinpointing as time runs out (how much?)—
 - Must occur before the time runs out, period.
 - Shopping/refinds—when is it a fail?—
 - Does the canine exhibit a focused bark?
 - False alerts—
 - Type I & II the alert is set at the point you mark the location.
 - Any distractions need to be well hidden.

- Don't put the distractions right next to a victim. Try to have a distinct scent area for each.

SWG Chair
Sub-committee Meeting Minutes
Page Four

Canine Sub-committee
29 November 2004

- Suggestion that the number of distractions be limited to 0 to 3 on any one pile.
- Ladder--up and/or down?—
 - Up only in the evaluation. Up and down in training.
- "Slow" (what should it be & how to evaluate it)—
 - Visible change of pace. We are looking for control over the canine. Use common sense and don't fail a dog only for this issue.
- Lack of Control—
 - Control and safety. Use common sense, it is somewhat subjective. Our goal is not to seek ways to fail teams but to certify that a team has demonstrated a base level of skill.
- Question--The DSCREP says (in the agility portion of the Type II test) that the canine "should" negotiate the obstacles "confidently and carefully". It doesn't say they must, and it isn't on the eval. sheet. Does this mean that even if a dog falls repeatedly, and/or slips and slides, crashes and cries his way up the ladder, or across the plank, or wobbly surface, that it must be a pass? Is there any performance criteria except that the canine eventually gets across the obstacle?
—
 - The handler is responsible for the care and safety of the canine. Use common sense, it is somewhat subjective. Our goal is not to seek ways to fail teams but to certify that a team has demonstrated a base level of skill.
- Evaluator payment means that evaluators are being paid to set-up the Type II and Type I tests, not off doing personal business.
 - This is fraud. It is a task force responsibility to ensure that employees are working.
- Question--Could you go over mapping access on the Type I test? Some evaluators give handlers their original access (perimeter or limited) PLUS the ability to return to any alert sites, while others limit them to only the original access.
 - Access is set to the site criteria.

NEXT Conference Call

- 6 December, Noon. Eastern Standard time