



## STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

October 17, 2008 Sacramento, California

	<b>Member</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Representing</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Term Exp</b>
1.	Boomgaarden, Marc	Yuba City FD	League of California Cities	X		12/31/08
2.	Childress, Dennis	Orange County FA	SoCal Training Officers	X		12/31/08
3.	Coffman, Dan	CSU Los Angeles	CA Fire Tech Directors	X		12/31/09
4.	Coleman, Ronny	Retired Fire Marshal	Chair		X	---
5.	Gallinatti, Tom	Oakland FD	Metro Chiefs		X	12/31/08
6.	Jennings, Mary	CFFJAC	CFFJAC	X		12/31/08
7.	Martin, Bruce	Fremont FD			X	12/31/08
8.	Olson, Kevin	CAL FIRE	CDF	X		12/31/09
9.	Rayon, Howard	Santee FD	CSFA		X	12/31/09
10.	Romer, Mark	Roseville FD	NorCal Training Officers	X		12/31/09
11.	Rooney, Hal	Santa Clara County FD	FDAC	X		12/31/09
12.	Senior, David	Allan Hancock College	CA Fire Tech Directors	X		12/31/08
13.	Thomas, Rich	Newport Beach FD	CPF	X		12/31/08
14.	Wagner, Ken	Roseville FD	CFCA and Vice-chair		X	12/31/09
15.	Zagaris, Kim	OES	OES	X		12/31/09
	<b>Alternate</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Representing</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Term</b>
1.	Amaral, Brad		NorCal Training Officers		X	12/31/09
2.	Jennings, Mike	Murrieta FD	SoCal Training Officers		X	12/31/08
3.	Knapp, Chuck		CSFA		X	12/31/09
4.	McCormick, Ron	Fremont FD	NorCal Training Officers		X	12/31/08
5.	Myers, Ron	North Co. Fire Authority	League of California Cities	X		12/31/08
	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Position</b>			
1.	Hamilton, Alicia	OSFM - State Fire Training	Training Specialist	X		
2.	Hoover, Tonya	OSFM	Assitant State Fire Marshal	X		
3.	Miller, Monica	OSFM - State Fire Training	Office Technician	X		
4.	Owen, Christy	OSFM - State Fire Training	Staff Services Manager	X		
5.	Richwine, Mike	OSFM - State Fire Training	Chief	X		
6.	Rodriguez, Ramiro	OSFM - State Fire Training	Deputy State Fire Marshal	X		
7.	Slaughter, Rodney	OSFM - State Fire Training	Deputy State Fire Marshal	X		
8.	Vollenweider, Ken	OSFM - State Fire Training	Deputy State Fire Marshal	X		
	<b>Guests</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Representing</b>			
1.	Beresford, Brian	San Pasqual Reservation FD				
2.	Maxcy, Howard	San Pasqual Reservation FD				
3.	McCoy, Marcus	Humboldt FD				
4.	Ridley, Michael		AST, Inc.			

5.	Smith, Jess	Glenn County FD	AST, Inc.			
6.	Yazloff, James	San Pasqual Reservation FD	Cogswell Polytech College			

## **I. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 9:00am by Acting Chair, Tonya Hoover.

## **II. Introductions and Welcome**

Acting Chair welcomed members and guests, and a quorum was established.

## **III. Approval of Agenda**

**Issue:** Approval of the Agenda

Discussion: None

**MOTION:** *D. Coffman moved to approve the agenda. D. Senior seconded the motion.*

*Action: The motion carried unanimously*

## **IV. Approval of Minutes**

**Issue:** Approval of the August 26, 2008 minutes.

Discussion: None

**MOTION:** *D. Coffman moved to accept. D. Senior seconded the motion.*

*Action: The motion carried unanimously.*

## **V. Consent Calendar**

**Issues:** None

Discussion: None

**MOTION:** *None*

*Action: None*

## **VI. Old Business**

### **1. Community Risk Officer (CRO) Course Outline & Certification Training Standards (CTS); Presentation of Memo Re: EMS Component**

**Issue:** Update and Action

Discussion: R. Rodriguez started by reporting to the group that the CRO CTS workgroup had addressed the issues and concerns of the STEAC members regarding the EMS awareness component incorporated within the CTS. He explained that he shared the members' sentiment with the team and in response, Ken Shockley, the team leader and Public Information Officer for the Fresno Fire Department, sent the STEAC members a letter, which was included in the handouts. The letter was to assure them that the EMS awareness component is part of the standard as a Community Risk Educator, Specialist, and ultimately, Community Risk Officer, which are the three proposed levels of certification. Any type of community risk associated with a respective organization, would be addressed in the standards to teach how to develop a public service message or

announcement regarding EMS awareness, which was a concern at the last meeting.

D. Childress also forwarded the CRO CTS Draft & course outlines to the Southern Training Officers and there was one response that came back from Newport Beach, which R. Rodriguez shared with the workgroup. They identified terrorism, pandemic, earthquakes, floods, tsunamis, etc., as issues which are not necessarily incorporated within the standard as an identified risk. R. Rodriguez responded that the standard is merely a tool to develop a public service message/announcement on any given risk. He went on to add that the group was hoping STEAC would take action on the CTS, the Procedures Manual and the draft course outline, which were all included in the handouts. R. Rodriguez added that the purpose of the three proposed levels of Community Risk Educator is to teach, supervise, and manage. The CTS provides a framework to take concerns, such as pandemic or terrorism, to the community by means of a public safety message. The workgroup wanted to make sure that at a minimum, the NFPA 1035 Fire and Life Safety Educator Standard was incorporated to be able to develop a thorough, yet concise, public message. D. Childress thought that this should satisfy the concerns of the Newport Beach group. H. Rooney questioned whether there were discussions of Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) training and how it would incorporate into the CTS. R. Rodriguez explained that through the CTS they are shown the proper procedures to develop or identify their resources, and that was where CERT becomes significant, by consideration of how to best utilize their capabilities to serve the community. He clarified that various elements of CERT had been discussed without specifically addressing it as a response team.

**MOTION:** *D. Coffman made the motion to adopt the final version of the Community Risk Officer CTS. The motion was seconded by D. Senior.*

**Action:** *The motion carried unanimously.*

**M. Romer joined the meeting at 9:10a.m. K. Zagaris joined the meeting at 9:15a.m.**

## **2. Fire Control 3 Work Group Update**

**Issue:** Update

**Discussion:** K. Vollenweider informed the committee that the Fire Control 3 course guides and position taskbooks are virtually complete. They were expecting to have the final product ready to present at this meeting and though the workgroup has been working diligently to complete this project, they were unable to get a finished version together in the time for the meeting. M. Richwine expressed his appreciation for the group's hard work and stressed the importance of the topic of Live Fire Training, and wanted to

make sure the group took their time in the development of the course materials.

**MOTION:** *None*

**Action:** *The work group was asked to present their completed document for STEAC's review at the next meeting, along with a package that will provide the updated classes, where they will be held, and who will be hosting them.*

### **3. Master Instructor Update Class Schedule**

**Issue:** **Update**

**Discussion:** A. Hamilton informed the committee that several Master Instructor Update classes have already been scheduled throughout the state, the first of which is November 13 in Fresno. The classes to follow would be held in various locations throughout California, including San Jose, Monterey, Roseville, Modesto, Whittier, Santa Fe Springs, and San Diego. They are scheduled to take place between November 13 and the end of February. It is anticipated that there will be a maximum of 30 students, and minimum of 18 students per class. The new Master Instructor courses could, potentially, start being taught after January 1, 2009; however, if scheduled now, instructors can still teach the old Instructor 1A and 1B until June 30, 2009, to allow people to finish. M. Richwine added that the announcement, containing all the pertinent dates and information, would be sent out to all the STEAC members within the next week, so they could begin disseminating it among their respective schools/organizations. Another area of concern regarding this issue was Capstone Testing, and M. Richwine asked the members who had previously volunteered to be part of the Capstone Testing workgroup to stay after the meeting to arrange future meeting dates. A. Hamilton described a letter she received from a community college requesting clarification of the lecture and lab hours listed in the CIRM manual, as their students' interpretation was that the only attendance requirement for the course was the 25 hours of lecture while being able to forgo the additional 2 lab hours. It was agreed that the language should be changed to reflect 24/16, so as to prevent confusion. D. Senior pointed out that for some colleges, it can take up to a year to make curriculum changes, so if the curriculum for 1A, 1B, and 1C comes out now, they may not be able to respond by the starting date of next June. D. Coffman described an email he received from City College of San Francisco complaining about the student/teacher ratio. The old requirements state that the class size is 25 students, whereas the current version reads 16 students with one Master Instructor; 25 students with an additional Master Instructor. The complaint was that it would eliminate the ability of the college to teach the class because it would not pay for itself. D. Senior said that most community colleges have a minimum requirement of 15 students to conduct a class, there are a few community colleges that have their maximum set at 20 students but most of those can

get by with less, especially if it is a state mandated class. D. Senior felt that this comment was not representative of community colleges statewide. D. Coffman said that he would communicate to the person who sent him the letter, what had been discussed at this STEAC meeting.

**MOTION:** *None*

**Action:** *State Fire Training (SFT) will get notice out to the instructors, allowing them the opportunity to register. They will also get the announcement out to all STEAC members and information posted to the website. It was suggested that a FAQs sheet be put together to help facilitate the students and provide some direction during the transition, but internal processes would first need to be worked out.*

#### **4. Quality Improvement Program: Presentation of Latest Draft**

**Issue:** **Update**

**Discussion:** M. Richwine began by reminding the STEAC members that the draft QI Program, which was being developed with the assistance of Jeff Meston, had been posted to the SFT website. Its purpose is to create internal processes for both student and instructor evaluations as well as establish basic investigative questioning techniques. The workgroup will have the final draft ready to present to STEAC shortly. M. Richwine recently spoke with Jeff Meston about the evaluation forms, regarding the feedback they had received and which suggestions would be feasible for implementation. The development of guidance documents or checklists was deemed necessary to the implementation of the program to ensure that the investigation and audit processes are conducted in a methodical manner. M. Jennings felt that it would be valuable for the committee to meet again to add more substance to the draft, addressing issues that would help promote the validity of all SFT programs. M. Richwine said he would like to have a vetting process and more input. It was agreed that now that there was a framework and regulatory process, they can be married to come up with something that makes the entire program clearer. M. Jennings thought that with changes being made to numerous programs, the objective had not yet been captured adequately. M. Richwine informed the group that all questions can be emailed directly to him and he would forward them to Jeff Meston. He felt that this program was essential to SFT as a goal of Blueprint and explained that a document of this type has never been available before and would be valuable to pass on and use to train new and existing staff.

**MOTION:** *None*

**Action:** *The subcommittee will research who volunteered to be part of the group and schedule a meeting to discuss the process.*

## 5. On-line Hybrid Beta Test/Presentation of Final Report

**Issue: Update (Information Only)**

Discussion: D. Senior indicated that the work group conducted the Beta Test, as was discussed at the last meeting when a draft report was handed out. Included in the meeting's handouts was the final report. On page 19 of the report, STEAC members were provided the conclusions and recommendations based on the testing. The only items reflecting any change were on pages 17-18, where statistics were added to detail students' habits of accessing the class. D. Senior explained that anytime students take a class, regardless of which platform is being used, the instructor can go in and find out when people are accessing the classes, which part of the classes they are accessing the most, and other general related information. He used this example to drive home the idea that online classes are very flexible and students tend to enjoy that aspect. The recommendations remained virtually the same, although, a couple of points that had already been addressed were removed. There were two items to be considered, for which the workgroup didn't feel it necessary to make recommendations. First, he acknowledged that the drop-out rate in online classes is between 30%-50%, usually due to an inability to manage the workload or failure to appear to the classroom portion. This creates the situation where out of a given class of 25, the instructor may end up only having 10 active students. The question posed was whether they can allow more people into the hybrid classes, so they can do their didactic online and then have the maximum amount actually show up to the classroom portion and guarantee that there would be no more than that amount in the sit-in class. The work group didn't have a clear way to resolve this issue but thought it was worth considering. M. Jennings didn't think it was prudent to make any blanket statements about how this could be accomplished for the simple reason that programs offered by community colleges and universities, and the formats in which they are presented, differ so greatly. She felt that the project should move forward with registration and attendance issues still being explored in detail, but using a broader perspective. It was suggested that what might have to happen is each college would present a proposal, to be approved or disapproved by SFT, as to how their online course would be conducted. The second issue concerned feedback from instructors and students who took the Management 1 class and felt that it is all didactic and did not see a reason for having an 8 hour in-class session. The work group did not feel that they wanted to make this recommendation but thought the issue should be brought before STEAC to allow the committee to discuss it further.

The issue of instructor qualifications was also discussed as the work group recognizes that instructors need to have attended several online instruction methodology classes before they can teach effectively online. D. Coffman questioned what they envisioned would be entailed in order to teach this class again in the online format. M Richwine responded that based on what had been discussed, a process would most likely need to be created

where an application is sent to SFT to teach online classes. This would establish a system of checks and balances that would allow SFT to ascertain whether there is proper IT support for that online component while ensuring that the instructors have the training essential to this function. It would also allow an opportunity to discuss the over-enrollment issue. M. Richwine shared a suggestion, made by the CA Fire Technology Directors, that SFT could hold instructor workshops throughout the state in order to introduce this technology, in cooperation with community colleges and instructors who are interested in having it available. M. Richwine speculated that the timeframe for implementing this project would be about a year, considering there are still some issues that need to be worked through, including changes that would have to be captured in regulations. He felt the best way to approach it would be to have the online work group continue to meet, take their report to the State Board of Fire Services (SBFS), and start working to flush out any additional issues. D. Senior advised that while the work group continues its participation, it would be worthwhile to have SFT lead this portion of the process in case questions/issues arise. He then clarified that the motion would be to accept the recommendations based on the work group's finding that online instruction does, in fact, work for SFT.

**MOTION:** *R. Myers moved to accept the final report. M. Romer seconded the motion.*

*Action: The motion carried unanimously.*

## **6. Proposal to Deliver Management 1 in Full On-line Format**

**Issue: Presentation of Draft**

**Discussion:** D. Coffman sent all the members a memo with a report that explored the feasibility of online instruction for Management 1, within the Fire Officer series. He explained that this class was originally approved to be taught 32 hours online and 8 hours in the classroom, with very specific learning domains in the classroom. Of those learning domains, 6½ of the 8 mandated hours were lecture. Throughout the entire class, there are 5½ hours of scenarios which run, in most cases, about ½ hour each. His belief is that the Management 1 subject matter is conducive to the online format and that the entire class can be taught online with the scenarios being exercised through threaded discussions, blogs, and other web-enhanced media. All students would be required to participate online in the scenario exercises, which means that they have to check in, answer the questions, and collaborate with other members online. In comparison to the classroom version of the course, D. Coffman found that it is virtually impossible to present a scenario to 40 students within a ½ hour because so few people have the opportunity to participate, which makes it much more limited. The MGMT 1 scenarios are better conducted in the online format, in his opinion, because the program requires them to sign in, capturing information such as the time at which they participated and how long they

took to complete the exercise. It also requires that students give cogent answers rather than passively tagging onto other responses, which creates accountability. In addition to his own assessment, D. Coffman indicated that most of his students agreed that this course could be taught completely online. T. Hoover questioned whether there would be a proposal to possibly shift to a web-based scenario situational, where a student can track a scenario and get to an end result, with the option to then go back and redo it for another result, if the first attempt yields unsatisfactory results, or possibly work in some sort of interactive web-based scenarios. D. Coffman explained that in every scenario, whether it was mandated in the classroom or elsewhere, he required his students to participate by providing case studies or articles that create a scenario, then asking them how they would respond to the situation, based upon what they had read as well as their department's policies and procedures. He acknowledged that he did run into some technical issues with the threaded discussions, and therefore, didn't feel that the first set of classes was exercised adequately. But he was able to resolve the issue by the second set of classes, resulting in a smoother discussion. D. Childress explained that he sent this proposal to the Southern CA Training Officers and they distributed it to several training organizations in their area. He mentioned that one of the letters he got back from a battalion chief located in Redding questioned how a fire officer could effectively exhibit verbal/nonverbal communication skills and interpersonal relationships in the field without proper training and that cannot be taught on a computer. He felt that the most powerful impact on student learning outcomes is derived from student discussions, role-playing and other exercises required by the management lessons plan. He added that the Southern CA Training Officers shared this sentiment and had voted unanimously to retain the hybrid delivery of this course. M. Romer shared that the issues that he had heard echoed this concern, as face time was critical to the function of this position. D. Senior pointed out that this is an entire academic class, which would not require, in his estimation, any face time but he recalled M. Richwine's position that the transition needs to be made slowly to allow more ease in bringing the fire service on board. M. Jennings expressed her agreement with the sentiment of both Childress and Romer. T. Hoover urged the committee to consider that the main audience is the fire service, and if the audience changes 10 years down the road, we would need to engage them and provide what they need to do the best possible job. M. Boomgaarden declared his enthusiastic support for online training but he thinks that one of the things that many departments rely on in the Fire Officer series is the preparation of their fire officers with the minimum qualifications. He felt that this personal interaction, at the first line supervisor level, is an extremely important piece of any department and the opportunity to present live with feedback is important. He was in complete agreement with Jennings, Childress, etc. M. Jennings proposed that rather than considering moving the class completely online, she would

prefer to see the next curriculum committee reinforce the interpersonal skills section of MGMT 1. D. Coffman suggested that if the class was going to be conducted as a hybrid, that SFT include all the topical areas that have scenarios in them and as it changes, it would reflect those learning domains that have exercises. His reasoning behind this is that there are currently only 2 learning domains that have exercises that were taught in the classroom and he'd like to use the classroom time for all the exercises while teaching the material online. D. Senior asserted that no matter what the committee votes, the course needs to be palatable to the fire service. M. Jennings didn't feel that it would be practical to move forward with MGMT 1 online, because she didn't feel the materials had been tested adequately. R. Slaughter said that he understood D. Coffman's point and he thought that as long as the people who participated in the online program had the opportunity to work with the new curriculum work groups so they can identify some online components of the curriculum already online, that might be the best way to resolve the issue. T. Hoover proposed that comments regarding the course could be gathered and brought back for re-review after it had been discussed with concerned individuals. M. Richwine agreed that the best approach would be to rework it and bring it back with the new curriculum, after SBFS has accepted the report and as SFT moves forward with the curriculum rewrites and the course outlines. D. Coffman wanted to be assured that in the previous motion to accept the report, the motion accepted that all the classes can be taught as they were originally proposed. With that, he withdrew the proposal to eliminate the 8-hour classroom session, which he didn't feel was necessary to bring back before STEAC, but rather, addressed in the next rewrite.

**MOTION:** *This action item has been withdrawn for motion.*

**Action:** *None*

**The committee took a 10-minute break at 10:37 a.m.**

## **7. Fire Officer/Chief Officer Course Outline Update**

**Issue:** **Update**

**Discussion:** M. Richwine reminded STEAC members that SFT is pursuing grant funding through the Public Safety Education Advisory Committee (PSEAC) of the Community College Chancellor's Office. The proposal approved by PSEAC will fund the cadre to develop course outlines for the Fire Officer and Chief Officer courses which will make up our renewed certification based upon the CTS. He stated that as of this date, SFT has not received grant approval, and is still unsure as to when grant approval will be secured. It's impacting our ability to move this project forward. He felt that it was worth funding an initial meeting with SFT funds to kick-off this project and see how much work can be done independent of the grant.

M. Richwine said that he was going to try to seek answers from the Chancellor's office about whether they could be reimbursed later.

M. Richwine called attention to the notice that had been sent out and posted to the website, that SFT was seeking applicants interested in serving on the course outline workgroup and received about 35 applications. A few selections have been made based on criteria such as registered instructor status, rank, experience, etc. It has been determined a group of 10 or 11 will represent the committee. After the course outlines are completed, another work group will be formed for curriculum development.

**MOTION:** *None*

**Action:** *Information only*

## **VII. New Business**

### **1. AB 2917 Passage – Impact on State Fire Training**

**Issue:** **Update**

**Discussion:** C. Owen handed out an informational sheet regarding Assembly Bill 2917 which had recently been signed by the Governor. She apprised the committee that among other things, it requires EMTs of all levels to submit to a Criminal Offender Records Information Search (CORIS) regardless of where they certify. There is a potential impact to SFT, in that the CORIS results may be dual released, to the State Emergency Medical Services Authority (EMSA), where they will be stored, and to the certifying entity. This would create an additional workload for the State Fire Marshal's Office (SFM), since CORIS are not currently required. Implementation date of this bill will be no later than July 1, 2010. C. Owen stated that she had been working with CAL FIRE staff, because as an employer of EMTs they are heavily impacted as well. The bill authorizes EMSA to increase fees in order to maintain the program. In order to cover the EMSA fees, SFM will have to increase the cost for certification. M. Boomgaarden asked if there will be a fiscal impact on EMTs that are currently certified. C. Owen explained that these issues would be flushed out in EMSA regulations. D. Coffman asked for clarification as to whether both agencies would be charging a fee. C. Owen explained that presently, SFM has a \$25 certification fee for initial or recertification, EMSA would levy a fee in order to support their costs for a statewide registry and staffing cost on their end. SFT would collect the new fee for EMSA then transmit the funds collected to them on a monthly basis. She added that the EMSA fee does not include the CORIS, so if someone doesn't already have a CORIS process implemented by some authority, that person will have to go to a Live Scan location, pay the Live Scan vendor their fee and the CORIS fee would be in addition to that. K. Vollenwieder questioned if they had discussed the impact on the number of EMT-Is throughout the state, because he assumed most of the

volunteer agencies would just drop their program since this would be a costly venture, especially at the volunteer level. C. Owen said that the work group had taken it into consideration, but it was determined that the public's safety outweighed fiscal impacts. The last item she wanted to bring to the group's attention was that there had been some misinformation circulated regarding requirements in the legislation as it pertains to the SFM's certification program. Early versions of the bill included language that would have limited our ability to certify, because it required individuals to be certified in the county in which they worked. SFT requested that this language be removed through participation on the work group because a statewide registry would eliminate the concern of "certification shopping." The language was changed and the SFM's certification authority will remain the same; it will still allow for certification of anyone with fire service affiliation throughout the state. SFT will be working on a marketing plan to dispel this rumor, so that people understand that they can continue to come through the SFM for EMT-I certification and at the same time, educate the public on how AB 2917 will affect them.

**MOTION:** *None*

**Action:** *Information only.*

**T. Hoover was called away to a phone conference at 11:40 a.m. In her absence, M. Richwine moved the meeting forward.**

## **2. NAFTD Questionnaire**

**Issue:** **Update**

**Discussion:** None (Item tabled until next STEAC meeting)

**MOTION:** *None*

**Action:** *Will come back to STEAC for discussion in January*

## **3. EMS Management (Chief Officer)**

**Issue:** **Update**

**Discussion:** M. Richwine explained that the Chief Officer CTS had been approved by SBFS with the stipulation that more attention be given to EMS management. He announced that he has some EMS Division Chiefs coming to meet people who manage EMS programs, on November 18 & 19, just to take a look at the responsibilities and tasks that are needed and add it to the CTS. At that point, the draft will be circulated at a future meeting and then it will go back to SBFS to conclude that project.

**MOTION:** *None*

**Action:** *Information Only*

#### **4. New Accreditations**

**Issue: Consideration of Accreditation for San Pasqual Reservation FD, Mt. San Antonio College and Los Angeles County FD**

**Discussion:** R. Slaughter began by introducing three guests, Brian Beresford, Howard Maxcy, and James Yazloff, from San Pasqual Reservation FD, one of the sites seeking accreditation. The site team was impressed with the facilities, training, and the tools/equipment at San Pasqual. R. Slaughter explained that San Pasqual has a plan to develop a new training facility that will include, among other things, dormitories and a rescue tower. Currently, they do most of their tower training at Heartland Training Facility, which had previously been visited for Confined Space Rescue and Rescue Systems 2 approval. One aspect that the Accreditation Team found interesting is a 4-hour class that San Pasqual offers called “Customs and Traditions” which gives insight to firefighters from outside of the reservation on how to be respectful of Native American customs when responding to an emergency. The Academy students include those from both the reservation and the general population, so the class is offered as a means of cultural immersion to familiarize firefighters with the customs and traditions of the people who live there, since they are often on reservation grounds, and in some cases, living in their dormitories. Having spoken with Chairman Lawson, the team found he is very committed to the program in terms of the resources to build the new training facilities. Local fire departments, other Native American fire departments, and Palomar College have all sent letters of support. Their Fire Fighter I Academy includes a 67-hour Basic Wildland Firefighting course, for which CAL FIRE sent a letter of support and will provide instructional staff to help them with that portion of the program. The overall idea of accrediting a Native American Academy is that they can bring in other Native American people from other areas and train them as well. Their ultimate goal is to become the first accredited training facility for the fire service within the Native American population. R. Slaughter clarified that the motion was whether or not to approve San Pasqual Reservation on a conditional basis, for one year, to help them integrate their program with SFT, upon which time they will be revisited for further accreditation. R. Slaughter indicated that, in fact, all the conditions for recommendation approval had already been met. T. Hoover admonished the committee that the approval of San Pasqual Reservation had not been added to the agenda as an action item, but allowed that if the committee felt comfortable in moving forward with a decision, based on the information they had been provided, and the present guests to answer any questions, action could be taken. At this time, the motion was carried to add San Pasqual Reservation’s Accreditation to the agenda as an action item. R. Slaughter then requested that the motion be amended to include action on all 3 proposed sites.

***MOTION 1: D. Childress moved to add the decision for San Pasqual Reservation's accreditation to the agenda as an action item. R. Thomas seconded the motion. (The motion was then amended to include Mt. San Antonio College and the Los Angeles County Fire Department's accreditation as action items).***

***Action 1: The motion carried unanimously.***

Discussion: The group was invited to ask any questions they may have to the guests from San Pasqual. D. Childress was curious as to whether the reservation fell within Palomar College's district. Howard Maxcy indicated that San Pasqual Reservation does fall within Palomar College's district and they have requested that their program be run through the college as soon as funding has been secured. It is their expectation that once funding has been established, students can start receiving units through the college for their training on the reservation. M. Richwine questioned how enforcement of the statute regulations on tribal lands works. Howard Maxcy explained that their regulations are determined strictly by the state and they adopt the state's regulations as tribal code. K. Zagaris pointed out that as a sovereign entity, they are not required to follow regulations created by the state. Brian Beresford added that he is a state certified instructor who deals with the SFM's office regularly and they make a point of following all the policies, procedures and regulations set forth by SFT. M. Richwine clarified that because they are electing to participate, they are therefore subject to the regulations. R. Slaughter noted that their department is in a growth area so the firefighters trained through this academy have the opportunity to stay on as reserve firefighters and can become part of the pool from which the reservation department hires as they begin to grow. With all the new developments on the land, there is room for expansion within the department. The reservation is currently applying for IFSTA accreditation.

***MOTION 2: K. Zagaris motioned to accept conditional accreditation for San Pasqual Reservation for the duration of one year. D. Senior seconded the motion.***

***Action 2: The motion carried unanimously***

Discussion: R. Slaughter continued his presentation of the two other sites that were up for consideration. The first of these was Los Angeles County Fire Department, which was applying to be an accredited local academy. R. Slaughter thought that this was a major step for the SFT system, not only in terms of the resources they have to offer, but also because of the number of students they can potentially introduce to the program. The site team recommended approving L.A. County Fire conditionally, based on the finding that the department did not yet seem to have a clear business plan in place. How they would implement SFT processes within their system was still being worked out due to the fact that it is so large and spread out. He touched on some of L.A. County's best practices, which

included the offering of several different training sites, driver/operator training, and that Del Valle Training Facility is in the process of building a hazardous materials site and is proposing a possible rescue academy. Provided they can come up with a business plan to integrate SFT procedures into their system, the team recommended conditional approval to further develop their processes.

**MOTION 3:** *K. Zagaris motioned to accept conditional accreditation for L.A. County Fire Department. D. Coffman seconded the motion.*

*Action 3: The motion carried unanimously*

Discussion: The final site R. Slaughter presented was Mt. San Antonio College. The site team had an opportunity to tour the campus facility, to view their driver/operator simulator and library resources, which were very impressive. They met with the college president who was very supportive of the program. They were also given a tour of the Ontario Training facility behind the Ontario airport, which is used for their Firefighter I Academy. Their tower, tools, and equipment, are all kept at this location, while the college itself owns several pieces of apparatus that they keep at this facility for driver training and other operations. The site team noted that many of the cadets were now coming in with their Bachelor's and Associate's degrees and most have already been EMT certified. R. Slaughter acknowledged that there have been some recent issues with test security at San Antonio College, but within the last year and a half they have instituted a policy that aids in the monitoring of exams through use of a check sheet system they have developed. Regarding best practices, the dean recognized that firefighters who are deficient in reading, writing, and arithmetic were not apt to cross campus to access the learning center, so the dean has replicated a learning resource center right at the Fire Technology Program for students to receive the aid of tutors, computer access, workshops, etc. They also have a Fire Technology club, which goes into the local community to find projects with which they can help. At the Ontario facility, the students define the core values for their class and the instructional staff and director reinforces them as the students move forward through the program. He concluded that the site team's recommendation for Mt. San Antonio College is for reaccreditation for 5 years.

**MOTION 4:** *D. Coffman motioned to accept reaccreditation for Mt. San Antonio College for a duration of 5 years. K. Zagaris seconded the motion.*

*Action 4: The motion carried unanimously*

## **5. Hired Equipment Operator Safety Training FSTEP Proposal**

**Issue:** **Consideration of Course Revision**

Discussion: A. Hamilton provided the group copies of excerpts from the CIRM manual and the SFT Procedures Manual in their handouts. She explained that

about two months ago the United States Forest Service (USFS) and CAL FIRE came to SFT asking if they could create a course for Hired Equipment Operator Fireline Safety Awareness and work it into the FSTEP delivery system. They provided SFT the curriculum, outline and intent, which is that it is designed for operators of privately owned equipment under contract with the State of California and USFS, on any active Wildland fire. The class is a result of AB 1127, established in 1999, which required that these operators be trained. K. Olson added that this class has been offered regularly throughout the state for years. Through discussions with USFS, they have identified that one of the greatest issues they have faced with vendors is getting them through the safety class during a time when they would be of greatest use, such as fire season in July. They came to the conclusion that there are plenty of people who would be able to teach this class, so it makes sense to offer this as a SFM class with registered instructors. SFM could potentially hold the class on their own, through a company or at a community college. M. Richwine said that it was his understanding that USFS and CAL FIRE were turning this course over to State Fire Training and they are going to take a step back and allow the delivery system to offer it. A. Hamilton explained how the students would receive a FSTEP certificate and a wallet card, but would be required to recertify yearly, with the card only being valid from May 1<sup>st</sup> through April 30<sup>th</sup>. By stipulating these dates, everyone will be clear as to when they need to recertify. M. Richwine admitted there were still many questions to address. SFT wants to ensure that there is a statewide instructor cadre that would be able to deliver this course, but also envisioned this course as one that can be taught primarily at the accredited academies and community colleges every spring and, potentially, summer. It is SFT's intention to have the course in place by March or April 2009. The course outlines have been sent to the Fire Tech Directors and community colleges to present to their curriculum groups. A. Hamilton continued that the course will be 8-hours and that the materials, which are based on older IFSTA manuals and Wildland Firefighting texts, need to be updated while some of the videos presented in the course aren't available anymore. SFT was asked to require an additional instructor qualification for anyone teaching the class, which specified that they attend and pass CDF Firefighter I – BASIC or S-230 Crew Boss (Single Resource). A. Hamilton expressed that SFT's requirements were much more stringent and they didn't think it would be too great of a hurdle to have instructors comply. If the class goes through the SFM, the instructors will now have to meet certain standards to be registered and it allows the class to be taught at a higher standard that will be monitored. M. Richwine requested K. Olson's help in getting answers to move the program forward and asked the committee that if they had any further questions or concerns about the course to send him an e-mail.

**MOTION:** *None*

**Action:** *Information Only*

## **6. Driver Operator Curriculum**

**Issue:** Update

Discussion: A. Hamilton informed the members that Driver Operator 1A and 1B had been updated to the second addition IFSTA manual, but the course outlines and content remain the same. SFT sent letters out to instructors stating that any course starting December 1, 2008, will need to utilize the new materials. She reiterated that a Class B driver's license is required to participate in the course. There is a 2009 NFCA 1002 standard, and even though SFT does not yet have an official CTS guide, the curriculum does meet that part which applies to engines. M. Richwine thanked M. Romer for his help on the course material.

**MOTION:** None

**Action:** None

**T. Hoover rejoined the group again at 12:00p.m.**

## **VIII. State Board of Fire Services Report**

**Issue:** Report on Last Meeting

Discussion: M. Richwine shared that SBFS had approved the Training Instructor updates unanimously. He explained that the Community Risk Officer updates were presented with a discussion on its status as well as the status of Prevention 1A and 1B course update. They were also informed of the fact that the SFT regulations are now published in Title 19.

**MOTION:** None

**Action:** None

## **IX. Announcements**

M. Richwine announced that SFT is trying to move in a green direction, so in an effort to reduce printing costs and waste, they are going to start making student course materials available on CD and for download on the website. SFT is also hoping to establish an instructor resource center so they can post instructor guides and have an opportunity for a chat room where instructors can post comments, feedback, etc. The internal processes are being worked out and are likely to be available starting next fall.

T. Hoover explained that one of the items they have been dealing with in the SFM's office concerning STEAC is the conflict of the Fire Safe Inspector curriculum and the creation of certification. This came from a discussion with Cal Chiefs that dates back about 5 years. The timing is much better now to look at developing a Fire Safe Inspector certification. There is a cadre currently working on this in conjunction with SFT, and as their work progresses, STEAC will most likely receive a presentation and update

explaining the need, what it's about, and where we'd like it to go. It also helps match up some MOU items with the Department of Insurance, one of which provided education and public outreach as well as certification.

## **X. Roundtable**

H. Rooney wanted to discuss the NWCG Position Paper. He said that it was brought up in the last meeting regarding NWCG certification. M. Richwine informed everyone that the position paper was available on the website; it concerns certificate issuance and who can and cannot issue them, and how to go about setting up an MOU for certificate issuance. He conceded that he did not have any answers at this point, but would speak with K. Olson to develop a strategy on how SFT can continue to offer NWCG course certificates, if needed. It was determined that this was a topic requiring further discussion and was then denoted as an item to be added to the agenda for the next meeting.

M. Romer reminded everyone that the California Training Officers 13<sup>th</sup> Annual Training Symposium was coming up on November 10-14, 2008.

## **XI. Future Meeting Date**

Tentative meeting dates were established for the rest of 2009:

January 15

April 17

July 17

& October 16

Office of the State Fire Marshal  
Sacramento  
1131 S Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

## **XII. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30pm by T. Hoover.