2015 ASRC Retreat
Blackburn Trail Center
Creative thinking inspires ideas. Ideas inspire change.

RETREAT NOTES

Friday, January 9, 2015
Informal discussions, dinner

Presentation facilitated by Don Ferguson (MARG): Remote Support overview to demonstrate how Remote Support can be utilized to provide Operations, Planning/Analysis and Logistical support.

Saturday, January 10, 2015

Participants

Don Scelza, AMRG	Michael Hansen, DMVSAR	Victoria Airey, MSAR	Beth Huhn, SAR-Ohio
Steve Weiss, SMRG	Bill Heisterhagen, DMVSAR	Jim Jackson, DMVSAR	Chad Pierce, DMVSAR
Adam Gatti, NWPAK9SAR	LuAnn Gatti, NWPAK9SAR	Audrey Cline, NWPAK9SAR	Caitlin Bemis, NWPAK9SAR
Eric Cass, NWPAK9SAR	Brian Maier, SAR-Ohio	Max Wheeler, SAR-Ohio	Janelle Hideg, (SAR-Ohio)
Padraic Hughes, SMRG	Eric Menendez, SMRG	Carl Solomon, MSAR	Jocelyn King, MSAR
Larry Raskin, MSAR	Don Ferguson, MARG	Keith Conover, AMRG	Alex Patico, MSAR
Missy Tuttle, DMVSAR	Katy Hart, BRMRG	Paula Repka, MARG	Ben McCandless, AMRG
Andrew Hower, SMRG	Alan Holmes, PVRG	Leah McCandless	Toby McCandless

Welcome/Kick-off – Don Scelza, ASRC Chairman
- Thank you and welcome – pleased with turnout and interest in making the organization better
- Participant introductions
- Current State of the ASRC:
    - Great year, several high-profile searches
    - SAR-Ohio highest number of SAR missions
    - New group – Northwest Pennsylvania K-9 Search and Rescue
    - 40/40 Conference – presented retrospective and future work
    - Progress in states: PA SAR Coordinator and AMRG interfacing, positive progress in VA, UAV paper in place, Remote Support continues to move forward – Ferguson working with Inland SAR School
- Recovery:
    - ASRC had well-honed methods for doing things. While SAR changed, ASRC stayed the same. Need to change to meet the needs of the RA's/AHJ's/states.
    - ASRC Direction FAQ – please take time to read. Outlines where ASRC is going and why.
- Q&A:
    - Q: What exactly is ASRC transforming to? Just a standards body? Groups/individuals?
    - A: Details and decisions will be made today during each of the sessions; changes will be made to all governing documents – we will be establishing the direction together and then developing documentation to support.

- o Q: How can ASRC help nudge environment in Ohio?
- o A: Will assist in any way possible. WV came to ASRC for structure – ASRC had prominent role. Council formed, support/interest at state level waning at this time. PA and VA similar situation – waxing/waning dynamics at state level.
- General Discussion:
  - o Big decisions to make this weekend to determine direction of the ASRC.
  - o Change is confusing/frustrating/frightening.
  - o Not prescriptive, but descriptive path intended.
  - o Most changes have already occurred; primarily the documents are just behind.
  - o Keep culture of innovation and integration (referenced excerpts from ASRC Direction-FAQ document).
  - o Strength has been as coordination organization, versus response organization.
  - o Individuals interoperable between groups; culture fosters positive integration.
  - o Strategic Plan will be updated this year. All organization changes planned will align with the Strategic Plan.

Session 1: Operations - Michael Hansen, Conference Operations Officer

- Draft Operational Guidance Manual (OGM)
  - o Received comments from two Groups in written form.
  - o Text in forefront with appendices that can be modified by Conf Ops O without re-approval of the entire document.
  - o Plan is to finish appendices and then send out to all Groups for re-review of a complete document.
  - o Reviewed top headlines in OGM
  - o Accreditation discussion:
    - What is the point of re-accreditation, should initial be adequate with a smaller scope re-assessment?
    - It could help provide guidance to teams for organization/team sustainability.
    - Goal is to ensure teams meet expectation with a high level of professionalism.
    - Sustain culture and reputation.
    - Will afford opportunity to assess how functional the group is – example: coordinate/manage full scale exercise, multi-operational periods.
    - The assessment will be more meaningful if it aids in gauging how well a group meets their market's needs.
    - Chair queried all participants:
      - Do Groups support an initial accreditation? Yes
      - Do Groups support a re-accreditation process? Yes
    - How does ASRC deal with teams that may or may not meet accreditation requirements, but don't meet the needs of the local RA's or the ASRC?
      - Current focus of all governing documents is individuals versus teams/groups.
      - The order that ASRC changes the governing documents is important.
      - Need to develop processes and resources that can support certifying/accrediting teams/groups.
      - All things are inter-related: Bylaws, Training, Operations and certifications.
  - o Request made of BOD to discuss/change the preamble to the Bylaws that changes ASRC from an operational to coordinating entity.
  - o ASRC is not a "response" organization; but the ASRC **is** "operational". Request made for COO to adjust the OGM document accordingly.
  - o Need to look at insurance aspects/impacts throughout the change/evolution.

- o Can ASRC de-couple field certification requirements from the SM requirements?
    - ▪ Need to assess
    - ▪ Hold discussion for Training/Certification session
- Reviewed Notification and Dispatch flowchart (draft)
    - o Looks ridged, but meant to be flexible
    - o Flow is conceptual without numbers and names; can build out flow with supporting documentation to further explain specific segments
    - o Specific request made to insert diagram segment (Three or more ASRC member teams), between "Owning SAR team contacts ASRC through…" and "ASRC Dispatch is opened". Recommended insert: ASRC acknowledges request

Session 2: Certification and Training - Ben McCandless, AMRG
- Would like answers to basic questions about how ASRC implements a new certification process. [PowerPoint presentation]
- **Review of Objectives**
    - o To identify issues and concerns related to the governance of conformance to the ASRC Training Standards
    - o To propose to the ASRC BOD possible courses of action to assure conformance to ASRC Training Standards
    - o To offer rough timelines and levels of effort for courses of action

- **Conformance to the ASRC Standards**
    - o Certification authorities
        - ▪ CQ, FTM, FTL: Group Training Officers
        - ▪ SM-IV through SM-I: ASRC BOD
        - ▪ BRO, CDO, AO: ASRC BOD (though I cannot recall the last of these to be certified)
    - o In 2004 – the last update of the ASRC Bylaws – the Bylaws dropped the requirement that GTOs are formally approved by the ASRC BOD
        - ▪ Partly in consideration of greater group autonomy
        - ▪ In practice, BOD review had become cursory at best
        - ▪ Allows for certification outside the direct authority of the ASRC BOD
    - o In recent years, there have been updates to the performance requirements and administration of the training standards, but fundamental governance of conformance to standards has not changed

- **Concerns with Conformance**
    - o ASRC BOD does not have direct authority over field certifications
        - ▪ Does this represent a risk/liability for the organization?
    - o Some clients have criticized ASRC groups for "self-certification"
        - ▪ Unclear whether the criticism is for ASRC self-certifying or groups self-certifying to the ASRC standards
        - ▪ This is a bit of a dodge – and promulgated "wisdom" of a few ASRC opponents
    - o These same clients are more than happy to have ASRC members in critical SM and field leadership roles

> **Actual problem is lack of direct oversight of conformance to ASRC field training standards**

Participant discussion:

- Question: Does the ASRC implement best practices for the betterment of the conference/groups/members, or just to meet a perceived need of a few external entities?
  - Clients may not be interested in or have the ability to define what best practices meet their needs.
  - Primarily two states have raised concerns with the self-certification issue (VA-VDEM, Maryland-NRP)
  - Create best practice for the ASRC, what makes the most sense internally and protects the culture; acceptance and appear externally is secondary.

- **THE CRITICAL ISSUE**
  - Will our new system certify:
    - That **groups are training members in compliance** with the ASRC standards?
      - Or
    - That the ASRC BOD assures that **members comply** with ASRC training standards?

- **Possible Courses of Action**
  - Groups manage conformance to ASRC Standards
    - Do nothing, make no changes
    - Certify teams not personnel (MRA model)
  - ASRC BOD assures conformance to ASRC Standards
    - Return GTOs to ASRC BOD oversight
    - BOD approves all certifications
    - Create field evaluators under ASRC BOD oversight (NASAR & VDEM model)
      - Any certifier can evaluate and certify a member for CQ, FTM, FTL
      - Certifications for CQ, FTM, FTL conferred by a certifying board
      - Certifiers can evaluate and certify members for CQ, FTM, FTL, but only for members in other ASRC groups
      - Likely implementation: Certification occurs at ASRC AGM (possibly other conference-wide meetings during the year)

Participant discussion:

- CQ should not be included in proposed certification process. Serves only as baseline for active membership/response eligibility (no complex skill-knowledge sets required).
- Poll: Who supports moving away from groups solely certifying own members?
  - BOD Representatives present: [All (7 present)] indicated in favor
  - General Membership: 13 in favor, 6 abstained, 3 wish groups to keep certifying

- **Pros and Cons: Groups Manage Conformance to ASRC Standards**
  - Pro: Certifying a member has fewer steps, and most of those take place within the group - so the ASRC would not be on the hook (as much) for delays.
  - Con: Auditing compliance will be very complex, and require well-trained auditors.
  - Con: Group documentation will need to improve substantially. I expect that AMRG's documentation would not be sufficient to pass an audit, and I suspect that most groups are in the same situation.
  - ???: Group Training Officers duties will not change substantially.

Participant discussion:

- Added Pro: Groups take pride in their training programs that lead directly to achievement of a certification.

- ASRC would need to build a core group of "auditors".

- **Pros and Cons (Big Picture): ASRC BOD Assures Conformance to ASRC Standards**
    - Pro: ASRC retains final say on the certification of all team members
    - Pro: Documentation and compliance burden on groups is reduced
    - Con: ASRC must develop infrastructure to allow rapid assessment and certification of candidates.
    - Long-term Pro: ASRC can start certifying members of other organizations
    - Potential Long-term Pro: Offers potential revenue stream for the ASRC and teams (Similar to American Heart Association CPR training model)
    - ???: Group Training Officer's duties will likely be reduced - since some of the evaluation effort will be farmed out to other Conference-level positions.

Participant discussion:
- Question: Why is it important to even have ASRC standards? One member provided an example of the point of view of a member that is required to maintain/achieve multiple certifications (due to state level requirements) and why there are questions by membership about the need to maintain or even achieve ASRC certification as well.
- Responses:
    - Allows members (resources) to be called upon across state lines, multi-jurisdictionally
    - Ensures all resources meet some standard
- Poll: Do all present support the use of ASRC standards to ensure members train and are certified to acceptable levels? 1 abstained, all others in favor
- Participant presented proposed vision:
    - Training and sign-off managed at Group level
    - Conference proctor/manage written testing
    - Conference proctor/manage field testing
- Added Con: Take longer for members to get certified if rely on BOD to assure conformance
- Added Con: If Group chooses to exceed the ASRC standard, will require Group to complete additional testing internally
- Added Con: Conference must developed mechanism to track/maintain member certification documentation

- **Pros and Cons (Specific COAs): Groups Manage Conformance to ASRC Standards**

Courses of Action	Pro	Con
Do nothing	• No political action required • Maintains group autonomy • Allows some group adaptation to local operational needs/conditions	• Maintains group autonomy • Unlikely to gain any traction with our LE client base
Certify teams not personnel	• Maintains group autonomy • Allows some group adaptation to local operational needs/conditions	• Developing auditing procedure and cultural practices would require a great deal of policy and political effort • Not widely accepted among local clients (e.g., within VA)

- **Pros and Cons (Specific COAs): ASRC BOD Assures Conformance to ASRC Standards**

Courses of Action	Pro	Con
GTOs endorsed by ASRC BOD	• Least policy and political effort for BOD-assured conformance	• May not be accepted by LE clients – seen as no different than current approach
BOD confers all certifications	• Straightforward policy to develop	• Creates lots of new routine work for the BOD to complete • Reliance on GTO and evaluator recommendations may seem much like other (simpler) COAs in this category

Participant discussion:
- One participant relayed that it has been the policy for several years for the Board to endorse GTOs and that FTM/FTL packages are to flow through the Board for endorsement/approval. (Participant relayed that the policy was established by the Board via formal vote several years ago.)

Courses of Action	Pro	Con
Certifier cadre	• Sustained involvement by long-time ASRC leaders	• Is it critical to ensure no intra-group certification by a certifier? • Logistics of certification may be challenging
Certifying board	• Sustained involvement by long-time ASRC leaders • No single-evaluator, single-certifier approvals • Ensures no intra-group certification	• Logistics of certification may be challenging
Certifier cadre – no intragroup certification	• Sustained involvement by long-time ASRC leaders • Ensures no intra-group certification	• Logistics of certification may be challenging

Participant discussion:
- Poll: Should ASRC allow a person within a group to certify members within their own group? Most responded no
- Additional discussion ensued about members solely certifying own members versus group members participating as a larger certifying body - mixed agreement
    - Certifying Board/Certifier cadre should have delegated authority from the Board to perform function.
    - If certifier has delegated authority from Board to perform function – they would be acting in an official capacity for the ASRC and the group with which they are otherwise associated becomes a non-issue.

- o Recommendation that certifying events are conducted in an open/transparent fashion; widely-publicized, widely-attended, all being tested are treated consistently.
- o Possibly use the AGM as the forum for recurring testing opportunity. Some concern about certification delays or lag-time if offering few testing opportunities.
  - ▪ Concern raised about distance and cost for members if AGM is utilized as forum.
- o Could rotate through multiple testing stations, manned by different evaluators that are members of the certifying cadre. Could eliminate the concern of a certifier solely certifying member(s) of own Group – even if they have the delegated authority from the BOD to serve in capacity and even if the process is transparent.

- **Implementation Considerations**

Courses of Action	Changes in ASRC implementation	Changes in group implementation
Do nothing		
Certify teams not personnel	Required	
GTOs endorsed by ASRC BOD		
BOD confers all certifications	Required	Defer certification to ASRC BOD
Certifier cadre	Recommended practices for certifiers	Defer certification to certifier
Certifying board	Required	Defer certification to certifier board
Certifier cadre – no intragroup certification	Recommended practices for certifiers	Defer certification to certifier

> **Policy changes are certainly needed for all but one option (do nothing). ASRC Bylaws changes are likely (tied to a larger Bylaws update).**

- **Timeline: Bylaws Changes**
  - o Bylaws changes are driven by the calendar of voting such changes at an AGM
    - ▪ April 2016: Membership vote on bylaws updates
    - ▪ January 2016: Finalize BOD recommendation to membership
    - ▪ October 2015: Provide critical guidance to committee finalizing proposed Bylaws changes
    - ▪ July 2015: Working discussion of Bylaws changes within ASRC BOD
    - ▪ April 2015: Signal prospective direction to membership at the AGM
    - ▪ January 2015: BOD provide recommended COA to develop

Participant discussion:
- Keith Conover read aloud an excerpt from the existing Bylaws and suggested that implementation of certification changes do not appear to require a change to Bylaw content in order to proceed. General sense that Bylaw updates are needed at this time anyway, to ensure all governance documents are consistent, up-to-date, accurately represent conference vision and are free of conflicting content.

- **Timeline: Policy Changes**
  - o Policy changes should be coupled to Bylaws changes
    - ▪ April 2016: Final ASRC BOD vote on new policies (to accompany new Bylaws)
    - ▪ January 2016: Provisional BOD approval of new policies to govern conformance
    - ▪ October 2015: Provide critical guidance to committee finalizing proposed policy changes
    - ▪ July 2015: Working discussion of policy changes within ASRC BOD
    - ▪ April 2015: Signal prospective policy direction to membership at the AGM

- January 2015: BOD provide recommended COA to develop

- **Timeline: ASRC Implementation**
  - Changes should be coupled to implementation of PTBs
    - April 2016: Final ASRC BOD vote on PTBs; implementation plan adopted under an oversight/governance structure (CTO?)
    - January 2016: Discussion of ASRC-level implementation; identify prospective leaders to implement transition to the new system
    - October 2015: Provide critical guidance to committee developing implementation
    - July 2015: Working discussion of implementation within ASRC BOD
    - April 2015: Signal prospective new implementation to membership at the AGM
    - January 2015: BOD provide recommended COA to develop

Participant discussion:
- The primary goal is to come up with a training and certification system the will work for the teams of ASRC.
- Chair: This is the day you get to decide the direction of the ASRC; the direction discussions need to occur today.

Session 3: 2015 AGM (discussion tabled)

Session 4: ASRC Support of Remote Support – Don Ferguson, MARG
- Background:
  - ASRC has excelled at "remote support" for quite a long time
  - Have adopted technology that will allow enhanced support
    - Analysis, creation of task assignments, segments
    - Geospatial side has been integral
  - The Friday Retreat presentation provided an overview of possible deliverables
  - Would like ideas to increase remote support staff levels; how to get others involved
  - Highlights over past year:
    - Met with VDEM – they are excited about using the technology/great potential resource
    - Within 3 months of VDEM presentation, SMRG was asked to provide support in cold case (with use of VDEM's GIS resources)
    - Several active searches conference-wide used remote support
  - No others have implemented remote support as extensively as ASRC
- Current no formal policy on how to request or use remote support
- Goals brainstorming (with a smaller group developed to propose more detailed concepts)
  - Define what ASRC wants remote support to be:
    - Any help to a search mission from afar
    - Local knowledge that may happen to be remote
    - Crowd sourcing professionals regarding ideas to support a mission
    - Remote reference/research library – to provide answers to questions on site
    - Logistics support
    - Assist with preparation for multi-operational periods; assist with shift transitions to ensure continuity
    - Draft IAP
  - What new resources are needed to support the function?
    - Strategically place resources to support remote support functions (equipment, other assets – some type of standard cache)
    - Develop recommended lists of assets

- - - ▪ Develop instructions on how to setup network and assets
    - o How do we increase the appetite for use of technology in base?
      - ▪ Develop/define mechanism for how ASRC can integrate existing GIS remote support tools across multiple platforms currently in use by each state (RA's).
    - o How can ASRC develop partners to extend cellular capabilities to support technical aspects of connectivity?
      - ▪ Key is to develop and nurture local relationships first
- Training
  - o Three day training class (IGT4SAR) has been offered four times in Morgantown; supported by WVGIS Technology Center.
    - ▪ Materials distributed around the world (with ASRC logo)
    - ▪ Nominal fee ($25) for course, essentially for thumb drive with all tools – comparable class would be $1,500+
  - o Next class will be offered the third weekend in March 2016
  - o Don Ferguson met with Inland SAR School to discuss GIS for SAR, IGT4SAR and integration of coursework into Inland SAR School's curriculum; exposure to analysis tools currently available
- General Discussion
  - o Chair reinforced Strategic Plan (fostering an ecosystem for innovation)
    - ▪ Mechanism to get new teams involved in ASRC and garner recognition for the conference
    - ▪ Extremely beneficial to the conference
  - o Discussion of whether it is time to do something more substantial to help support the ASRC cadre of resources that are currently providing the service.
    - ▪ Conference Operations Officer drafting a Thank You letter to WVGIS Technology Center for their support of the Remote Support Training Program.
    - ▪ Financial support ideas
      - Can provide pizza, donuts, bagels, coffee during training sessions – banner "Refreshments provided by ASRC"
      - Reach out to stakeholders for financial support of the project
    - ▪ Administrative Support
      - ASRC Secretary can provide support in administrative role
    - ▪ Conference Operations Officer goal is to have each team in the conference support Remote Support concepts and actively participate in the program
      - Thank you to University for support
      - Recommend teams that have already participated in the training program to also send Thank yous
      - ASRC encourage other instructors; assist with coordination of training offerings and help with outreach about the program
      - ASRC could provide the thumb drives (1GB) with ASRC logo
      - Provide help with developing documentation – 1 page info sheets, step-by-step instructions with screen-shots (secure feedback from program participants to see what resources would be helpful)
      - ASRC pay for coffee, donuts, bagels, etc.
      - ASRC sponsor one of the evening dinners and utilize/promote as a networking opportunity
      - As an incentive for each team to secure seat licenses, ASRC could offer a rebate on team dues
    - ▪ ASRC could pay for additional GIS training for ASRC Group members to enhance skills
    - ▪ Present at national forums with formal outreach

- o Eric Menendez developed a cell phone locator application that was utilized to solve a lost person incident in CA. Also working on tool to streamline retrieval of tracks off GPS units.
  - o Need to develop training around new tools being developed.
  - o Concentrate on ideas to help "scale up" resource effort; are there other things that could be done remotely to help support a mission?
  - o Need to sell to RA that Remote Support resources could be useful for them
    - ▪ Define scope and market
    - ▪ Sharing (personal) data with remote resources could be a concern for some RAs
- Steve Weiss publically thanked Don Ferguson for all of his efforts in program development and outreach, as well as creation, coordination and deployment of the training program for IGT4SAR. Don's efforts have been instrumental in positively impacting SMRG's success in VA during the course of the last year – through use of Remote Support. Steve Weiss presented a private donation in the amount of $500.00 to ASRC in honor of and to support Don Ferguson's continuing efforts in further developing Remote Support tools.

Session 5: Unmanned Aerial Vehicles – Ben McCandless, AMRG
- What can the ASRC to with UAV's? Many of the base concepts are outlined in the UAV Whitepaper.
    - ▪ Provided an overview of the types of UAV's available
      - • Most common types: fixed-wing and rotor
      - • Other features: auto-pilot, radio, camera – images avail instantaneously (could be of extreme benefit to ground search operations)
  - o Would like to incorporate UAV's in sweep width experiments
  - o Can use to validate/enhance maps – secure imagery and integrate into GIS tool
  - o Could use as a containment tool
  - o Could integrate two-way communications and provide messaging, interface with subject(s) until SAR resources arrive
  - o Use to build relationships with other agencies; offer ability to train together and build relationships/trust – resource network/broader community of users
- Need to develop policies for operators; identify issues, concerns and address
- Detailed discussion of participants' experiences with use of their UAV's (technological options; payload testing, etc.)
- Facilitator recommendations and participant comments:
  - o Appoint a conference representative/lead to manage the UAV project (monitor UAV legislation, develop policy and procedures, liaison with other UAV resources to further explore capabilities and develop best practices)
  - o FAA determining how public can use UAV in non-hobby situations; recommend ASRC get out in front of legislation to promote SAR use of UAV's (manage use versus avoid)
  - o Each Group should query members to see if they have UAV's and/or if interested in working on the project
  - o Integrate UAV's formally into sweep width experiments
  - o Test and document experiments – how effectively can we spot images returned from UAV's at different altitudes?
  - o What does a UAV protocol look like?
    - ▪ Develop protocol
    - ▪ Then test, learn from tests
    - ▪ Adjust and enhance protocol
  - o Conference level policy for UAV use
    - ▪ Interaction with Law Enforcement
    - ▪ Standard marking of devices

- How can the conference consult/interface with existing UAV hobbyists to provide a list of expectations in how their resources can be of benefit in a SAR situation?
  - UAV Community of Practice
    - Invite participants to discuss issues, concerns, concepts
    - Carl Solomon offered to begin communications/outreach to develop network

Session 6: Break-out Sessions (concurrent)

Facilitator	Keith Conover, AMRG	Padraic Hughes, SMRG	Don Ferguson, MARG
Topic/description	Medical ASRC taking a broader view of standard of care and how groups can implement.	Man Tracking Overviews of the three levels of tracking standards developed by SARTI (Search and Rescue Tracking Institute) and discuss possibility of ASRC adopting.	Remote Support Detailed continuation of earlier presentation, discuss guidelines and best practices.

- Breakout Discussions 1730 – 1845
- Reconvene – Breakout Briefings
  - Medical (Conover)
    - Reviewed history of ASRC Medical setup (requirements and Bylaws)
    - Medical Advisory Committee
    - Developed recommendation for ASRC Board consideration on how medical structure should work (vision/principles)
    - Disseminated hand-out with notes (2014-11-13-ASRC-OGM-Medical-Section-revised.pdf); breakout group recommends changes to ASRC governance documents
    - Medical Advisory Committee (Physicians only): medical advice via whitepapers, etc.
    - Medical Committee (any ASRC member interested): statistics, research, how Group operationalize Advisory Committee advice, support other needs of the ASRC/Groups
    - Remove Conference Medical Officer term
    - Recommend Carl Solomon (MSAR) serve as Chair of the Medical Committee, recommend someone else in MSAR serve as the Vice Chair of the Committee
    - Medical direction for Groups will come from Medical Directors. Medical Directors could serve in capacity for more than one Group.
    - Deliverables:
      - Formal recommendation for field medical records by next Board Meeting
  - Tracking (Hughes)
    - Reviewed the 3 levels of tracking certification currently in use in VA: Operational Tracker, Tracking Technician and Tracking Specialist
    - Consensus that a standard is needed by ASRC
    - Promulgate ideas and modify VA standard
    - Operational Tracker can administer testing
    - Eval criteria for evaluator needed
    - Will develop document/documentation for ASRC Board review
    - Recommend named leaders for specialized areas
  - Remote Support (Ferguson)
    - Concentrated more deeply on how to implement activities

- Identified bottlenecks in the current process and how to move forward
  - Bottleneck: When implementing aspects of technology, don't solely rely on the technology but develop backup plan
    - Divide work to ensure there will not be a single point of failure
    - Break work into regions, segments – geographically
- Standard operating guidelines – may have ability to borrow existing documentation and modify for SAR
- Consider a modification to the SM-IV certification requirement to integrate ability to perform some basic functions (i.e. - download a file and print)
- Standardize terminology – develop a menu of things that can be requested for Remote Support (possibly a descriptive graphic and explanation of service)
- Develop guidelines for different types of connectivity situations
  - Drive back to last locale where had connectivity
  - Currently have internet connection
  - No internet connection available in vicinity
  - Lose internet connection mid-mission
- How to incorporate small elements of remote support into standard, general training curriculum
- Recommend standard technology resources for Groups
  - Possibly look for grants for Groups to secure recommended tech list items
- Recommend standard Favorites list
- Each Groups is asked to identify members that are interested in technology – so basic instruction can be shared

Wrap-Up – Don Scelza, Chair

- Came to meeting with ideas on how ASRC can move forward; very impressed and extremely pleased with the amount of work that was completed this weekend
- Are members happy with having a Winter Retreat annually? Consensus – yes
  - Will begin work to plan next Retreat now
- Much work to be completed in a short amount of time; as products are disseminated for review and comment, please make every effort to review and respond in a reasonable amount of time; your input is critical to the process – figure out what works best for your Group and respond with comments.
- Keith Conover announced that compilation of SAR Topics and Standards (MRA and AMRG Cave Rescue) will be completed and released soon – comments are welcome

Chair thanked all who participated.

Adjourn 1925

--
Retreat discussions and content captured to the best of my ability.
Beth A. Huhn, ASRC Secretary

> A special **Thank You** to the following for their extra efforts in ensuring the weekend was special:
>
> - DMVSAR for hosting the event and fully funding the cost of the facility for the weekend.
> - Katy Hart for weekend menu preparation, food purchase and serving as head chef for the entire weekend.
> - Don Ferguson for the wonderful breakfast on Saturday morning.
> - Steve Weiss for coordinating facility logistics between ASRC and PATC.