

STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY

COMMITTEE MINUTES

Office of the State Fire Marshal
July 22, 2011—Sacramento, California



	Member	Department	Representing	Present	Absent	Term Expires
1.	Bartley, Ed	Modesto Fire Department	CA Trng Officers (North)	X		12/31/12
2.	Childress, Dennis	Orange Co. Fire Authority	So Cal Fire Tech Directors		X	12/31/12
3.	Coffman, Dan	CSU Los Angeles	CA Fire Technology Directors Assn.-South		X	12/31/11
4.	Coleman, Ron	OSFM	Chair	X		N/A
5.	Connors, Jim	City College of San Francisco	CA Fire Technology Directors Assn.-North		X	12/31/12
6.	Jennings, Mary	CFFJAC	CFFJAC	X		12/31/12
7.	Kehmna, Ken	Santa Clara Fire Dept.	FDAC		X	12/31/11
8.	Knapp, Chuck	Fire Captain (Ret.)	CSFA		X	12/31/11
9.	Lawshe, Steve	CAL FIRE Academy	CAL FIRE Academy		X	12/31/12
10.	Martin, Bruce	Freemont Fire Department	CFCA	X		12/31/12
11.	Myers, Ron	North County Fire Authority	League of California Cities	X		12/31/12
12.	Olson, Kevin	CAL FIRE	CAL FIRE		X	12/31/11
13.	Thomas, Rich	Newport Beach Fire Department	CPF	X		12/31/12
14.	Wagner, Ken	Roseville Fire Department	CFCA and Vice-Chair	X		12/31/11
15.	Zagaris, Kim	Cal EMA	Cal EMA	X		12/31/12
	Alternate	Department	Representing	Present	Absent	Term Expires
1.	Capehart, Tim	Bakersfield Community College	CA Fire Technology Directors Assn.-South		X	12/31/11
2.	Davidson, Bret	Rancho Santa Fe Fire District	So Cal Training Officers	X		12/31/11
3.	Hurley, Charles	Oroville Fire Department	League of California Cities		X	12/31/12
4.	McCormick, Ron	Fremont Fire Department	CPF		X	12/31/11
5.	Tollefson, Tennis	Sierra College	CA Fire Technology Directors Assn.-North	X		12/31/12
6.	Wagner, John	Sacramento Metro Fire Department	CA Trng Officers (North)	X		12/31/12
	Staff	Department	Position			
1.	Purkeypille, Mark	OSFM—State Fire Training	Office Technician-Recorder	X		
2.	Richwine, Michael	OSFM—State Fire Training	Division Chief	X		

**STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY
COMMITTEE MINUTES
Office of the State Fire Marshal
July 22, 2011—Sacramento, California**

3.	Rodriguez, Ramiro	OSFM—State Fire Training	DSFM III	X		
4.	Romer, Mark	OSFM—State Fire Training	Retired Annuitant	X		
5.	Slaughter, Rodney	OSFM—State Fire Training	DSFM III	X		
6.	Vandevort, William	OSFM—State Fire Training	Retired Annuitant	X		
7.	Wilshire, Mary	OSFM—State Fire Training	Manager, Certification & Instructor Registration	X		
	Guests	Department				
1.	Chapman, Wayne	Orange County-Rope Rescue		X		
2.	Clark, Bruce	CSU Maritime Academy		X		
3.	Clegg, Boyd	CFMA		X		
4.	Gear, Joe	CalEMA (OES) Fire & Rescue Brach		X		
5.	Godiner, Frank	Chula Vista Fire Department-Rope Rescue		X		
6.	Hamilton, Alicia	SFT Retired Annuitant		X		
7.	Kelly, Don	Stockton Fire Department-Rope Rescue		X		
8.	Mathias, Jim	CAL FIRE				
9.	Ojeda, Ernie	Los Angeles City Fire Department		X		
10.	O’Leary, Brendan	City College of San Francisco, Administration of Justice and Fire Science		X		
11.	Ostrander, John	CSU Maritime Academy		X		
12.	Reyes, Don	Los Angeles Fire Department-Rope Rescue		X		
13.	Rickman, Tracy	Rio Hondo Community College		X		
14.	Schmeltz, George	Valley Fire Services		X		
15.	Soltis, Ken	CA Fire Technology Directors Assn.-President		X		

STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Office of the State Fire Marshal
July 22, 2011—Sacramento, California

I. Call to Order/Introductions and Welcome

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 A.M. by STEAC Committee Chair, Ronny J. Coleman. Role call was completed and a quorum was established. The Chair welcomed members, alternatives, and guests.

II. Agenda Review

Discussion: None

III. Approval of Minutes

Issue: Approval of the January 21, 2011 Minutes

Presenter: Chair Ron Coleman

Motion: Bruce Martin motioned to approve the January 21, 2011 STEAC minutes. Kim Zagaris seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion: None

IV. Old Business

A. Task Book in Lieu of Capstone Written Exam

Presenter: Mark Romer

Motion: Bret Davidson motioned to approve the new task book process for certification in all cases. Tennis Tollefson seconded the motion. The motion passed with one abstention by Ken Wagner.

Discussion:

Mark Romer stated that the recommendation letter from Mike Richwine suggests moving forward with the concept of instituting task books in lieu of the capstone written exams. Additionally, there are three related documents for the STEAC representatives to review. Ron Coleman has communicated with George Apple the Fire Prevention Officers President, to ensure that they have input into these processes.

Mark Romer stated that it was his assumption that this issue was not just for Prevention, but rather to move to a task book concept for certification for all State Fire Training (SFT) programs from now on and in lieu of capstone written exams. Alicia Hamilton noted that SFT already has a task book so it would be eliminating the capstone testing portion and adding job performance requirements to the task book.

STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES Office of the State Fire Marshal July 22, 2011—Sacramento, California

Regardless of whether SFT goes with the International Fire Service Accreditation Congress (IFSAC) or ProBoard accreditation, it will not be a mandatory certification in California. Rather, this would be an option for those who are moving outside the state where other states accept those types of certification. SFT can offer a written test for that type of certification if there is a need for that. Other states have gone with the task book process with job performance requirements (JPR) and they do not have any written test. Bret Davidson has spoken with military units near San Diego and stated that they use ProBoard accreditation. These units have reported that there are task books that ProBoard accepts but that still do not exclude an organization from ProBoard's process of accreditation.

One of the advantages of going to a task book format is that it is very difficult for an individual to study ten different courses and extract the important information in order to successfully complete an all-encompassing written test. In addition, there are changes that occur in the requirements during the course of an individual's required coursework. Another advantage is that SFT has no way of checking on an individual's ability to successfully accomplish specific tasks. This will prove that individual is capable of performing the requisite task at hand instead of just answering a certain number of questions on a test. The Training Officers Association has spoken about this and concur that the task book is a more valid process than a written test. The task book process would also put more of the burden on the individual fire departments because they would be required to sign off on the task book.

Ken Wagner (CFCA) stated that, when it comes time to vote on this issue, he will abstain because he has not had an opportunity to review all of the documents relating to this issue. His concern is that previously, all of the major stakeholders stated that capstone testing was the direction they wanted to adopt for course testing. The task book process is a major deviation from this. Rodney Slaughter (SFT) noted that the difficulty in instituting the capstone testing in the Instructor courses, for example, is the administration of the testing process itself. Also, the intent of the testing process is still aligned with the Blueprint 2020 goal, but the format of testing is different.

Bruce Martin (CFCA) stated that he briefed CFCA on this issue but there was no response. Currently, the task book is being used with CICCIS (California Incident Command Certification System).

Alicia Hamilton noted that when the capstone testing concept was first brought to STEAC, there were three options that were presented. The option that STEAC voted for was the one which incorporated JPRs that SFT would administer the capstone test. Adding the JPR requirement fulfills STEAC desire to have JPRs as part of the testing process.

It is not mandatory that a capstone written test be administered as part of the certification process for the successful completion of a certification track (e.g., Fire Officer, Chief Officer). However, a task in the task book could be to complete a written exam. Therefore, in approving the task book process, there is a proviso that STEAC can allow testing as part of the task book

STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Office of the State Fire Marshal
July 22, 2011—Sacramento, California

process. Mike Richwine stated that he believes there is some degree of flexibility with both accrediting entities, IFSAC and ProBoard on the issue of task book versus a capstone written exam.

In summary, STEAC has approved, with one abstention, the concept of a new task book process for certification in all cases (i.e., certifications). However, STEAC has not resolved all of the specific internal procedures on how this process will be accomplished. The next step is to report the details of this motion to the State Board of Fire Services (SBFS). If it is necessary that a written test be included as a component in the task book, a group will be formed from STEAC to examine the task book and testing process. This group would then submit its recommendations for the implementation of the task book for certification.

On an important note, Alicia Hamilton stated that STEAC can only deal with what the current processes are at the immediate time. To date, STEAC has adopted neither IFSAC nor ProBoard. If, in the future, it is necessary to institute a reciprocity or challenge test, it should be a wholly separate issue.

Additionally, John Wagner (Northern California Training Officers Association [North]) noted that the Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District, has adopted the task book process within the last three years and stated that they work well. Within this department, the task books are used for all aspects of training.

<p>Action: (1) Mike Richwine will report the motion to approve the task book process to the SBFS. Dependent upon SBFS' approval, a spin-off group will be formed to study the processes of this issue, including the incorporation of a certification exam in the task book. The group will then come back to STEAC with recommendations at the October 22, 2011 meeting. The volunteer group will consist of Bret Davidson, Alicia Hamilton, Mark Romer, Tennis Tollefson (CFTDA [North]), Bill Vandevort, and John Wagner, and (2) Alicia Hamilton to update the Training Instructor task book with JPRs and implement.</p>
--

B. Chief Fire Officer Application Guidelines-Center for Public Safety Excellence MOU

Presenter: Chair Ron Coleman

<p>Motion: Ken Wagner motioned to accept a proposal for the Center for Public Safety Excellence and to prepare any relevant documentation. Ron Myers seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.</p>

Discussion:

Ron Coleman recommended that STEAC accept the communication from the Center for Public Safety Excellence, authored by Paul Brooks, the Center for Public Safety Excellence's Executive Director.

STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Office of the State Fire Marshal
July 22, 2011—Sacramento, California

Randy Bruegman (Anaheim) and Mike Smith are candidates for the Chief Fire Officer application process. Randy Bruegman has already gone through the Center for Public Safety Excellence's Chief Fire Officer certification process. Bruce Martin's analysis of both the Center for Public Safety Excellence and California processes showed that the national-level one is the easier and more cost-effective process.

<p>Action: (1) Chair Ron Coleman appointed a subcommittee consisting of Ken Wagner and Ron Myers, and (2) Chair Coleman will present an associated report at the October 21, 2011 STEAC meeting.</p>

Chair Ron Coleman reconvened the meeting after a 10-minute break at 10:06 AM.

C. Marine Fire Fighting Training Curriculum—Update

Presenter: Bruce Clark and John Ostrander

Discussion:

One of the key areas of the CSU Maritime Academy's focus is mariners engaged in maritime firefighting. Approximately one year ago, Cal EMA requested the CSU Maritime Academy to facilitate standardizing a maritime firefighting program for California. There is currently a lot of independent activity at the national and state level. Specifically, in the areas in how a fire fighter deals with a maritime-related fire, in a port environment, engaging different types of ships, types of cargos, port facility activity, and jurisdictional issues.

Under a state DHS grant, CSU Maritime Academy has facilitated the process since the beginning of 2011. Four workshops have been conducted to date: the Port of Los Angeles, the San Francisco Bay Area region, Sacramento, and San Diego. There will be another workshop held on August 8, 2011, in the Port of Stockton. The final workshop will be held in the Eureka/Humboldt Bay area in October 2011. These workshops are public forums but are targeted at the fire community. However, everyone is welcome to attend.

CSU Maritime Academy will disseminate a notice regarding the exact date, time, and location of the final workshop. Following the October 2011 workshop, CSU Maritime Academy will hold a plenary session for all of the stakeholders in November of 2011. The location will likely be in the Bay Area. After this session, CSU Maritime Academy will collect the data and produce a final report to Cal EMA before the end of the year. This report will include a basic outline with a training curriculum hierarchy.

So far, representatives from 41 agencies have attended the workshops and approximately 63 of those representatives have attended one or more of the workshops. CSU Maritime Academy's primary responsibility is to collect data and figure out a baseline and to figure out what type engagement is already occurring. Some jurisdictions, particularly in southern California and in the Los Angeles region, already have robust internal departmental training

STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Office of the State Fire Marshal
July 22, 2011—Sacramento, California

programs. CSU Maritime Academy's main focus is to leverage the best practices and the benefits of other departments' experience to provide for a common standardization process. Currently, there is no standardized best practice for maritime firefighting at the local, state, or national level.

The National Park Service is engaged in this process. They have developed a one-week/40-hour course which began in June 2011. They have been an active participant in this entire process.

Kim Zagaris brought up the question on how units such as the CSU Maritime Academy, the San Diego facility, and the Treasure Island facility will fit into the maritime firefighting training program. He stated that, on July 6 and 7, 2011, he attended a meeting in Washington D.C. where he had a conversation with Wayne Yoder from the National Fire Academy. During this meeting, it was agreed that the typing for fireboats that are currently used in California will likely change. There will be at least five types used because the goal will be to meet some of the NFPA standards.

Chair Ron Coleman asked Bruce Clark if there were anyone in the CSU Maritime Academy maritime firefighting workgroup who represents volunteer fire fighters. Chair Coleman suggested contacting Chief Timothy Wall, the Chair of Volunteer and Combination Officers Section (VCOS). Bruce Clark agreed to contact Chief Wall.

There is still a wide presumption that the United States Coast Guard (USCG) has responsibility on all navigable waterways. In this respect, they do have the regulatory obligation. However, for approximately the last 30 years, their ability to operate in a maritime fire situation has degraded significantly. As the USCG has pushed away from this responsibility, local responders have attempted to fill the vacuum. In the current workshops that CSU Maritime Academy has held, some of the attendees who are relatively senior fire personnel believe that the USCG has responsibility. However, in an urban port setting, the USCG will rely on local responders.

Action: None.

Charles Hurley canceled via e-mail at 10:23 AM

Bruce Clark and John Ostrander departed at 10:23 AM

D. Rio Hondo Site Accreditation

Presenter: Mike Richwine and Tracy Rickman

Motion: Bruce Martin motioned to approve the reaccreditation of Rio Hondo Community College. Kim Zagaris seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Office of the State Fire Marshal
July 22, 2011—Sacramento, California

Discussion:

A reaccreditation site visit of Rio Hondo Community College was conducted by Dennis Childress representing STEAC, Mike Richwine representing SFT, and Steve Shull representing the California Fire Technology Directors Association.

Rio Hondo Community College is number two in the state and number nine in the nation in awarding Associate of Arts degrees. So far, in 2011, Rio Hondo has administered 19 OSFM classes. Additionally, they run 70 EMT classes and two fire fighter academies. They currently have an MOU with the USFS.

Recently, POST has not allowed Rio Hondo to run a police academy. Rio Hondo used the funds that would have been used for the police academy to fund the fire program. The fire program is one of the premiere programs on campus and Rio Hondo is very focused on vocational education, such as the fire, police, EMS, wildland, corrections, auto technology, and nursing programs.

Mike Richwine reported that there were no deficiencies in the site reaccreditation and recommended to approve Rio Hondo Community College's third reaccreditation. The only item which needs improvement is for Rio Hondo to create an accurate organization chart for their fire program.

Action: None.

~~E. Fire Control—3A Working Group Update~~ **CANCELLED—Deferred until October 21, 2011 meeting**

Presenter: Tony Roberts

Tony Roberts canceled his attendance at the STEAC meeting and asked to please defer Old Business Item IV.E: Fire Control—3A Working Group Update until the October 21, 2011 meeting. Mark Romer stated that the Fire Control 3A Working Group has not yet received an official letter regarding Item IV.E. from Cal OSHA regarding this issue.

F. FIRESCOPE Safety Specialist Group—Emergency Traffic Guidelines

Presenter: Kim Zagaris and Mike Richwine

Discussion:

FIRESCOPE and NFPA have adopted guidelines for the use of the term 'emergency traffic'. However, it is still permissible to use mayday. Working back through the documents by inserting emergency traffic instead of 'Mayday' will aid in instituting the use of emergency traffic. The challenge is that by adopting NIOSH (National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health) case studies which use the term Mayday. Therefore, the safety specialist workgroup did not feel comfortable changing documents that were not under its control.

STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Office of the State Fire Marshal
July 22, 2011—Sacramento, California

Alicia Hamilton reviewed the documents and found that in the June 2010 edition, there were only 26 instances of Mayday, and only three of them are from NIOSH quotes or case studies. The other one is a FIREScope document that states that “Mayday may be used as a cry for help.” Two terms are used to start one of the skills when the downed fire fighter issues a cry for help. The workgroup changed the verbiage to ‘fire fighter emergency’, and then emergency traffic begins. In all, the workgroup eliminated 70 to 80 percent of the term Mayday and changed the term to either emergency traffic or fire fighter emergency. All of the Command and Control are case studies, so those remain unchanged. Also, the current RIC document does not have any uses of the term Mayday.

As of July 28, 2011, SFT has not communicated back to the FIREScope Safety Specialist workgroup regarding this issue. SFT received the issue paper from Tom Drayer on emergency guidelines the week of the current STEAC.

Action: Both SFT and Cal EMA workgroups to meet and report back to STEAC on their findings at the October 21, 2011 meeting.
--

Jim Mathias leaves at 7/22/2011 10:55:09 AM

V. New Business

A. Issue: Emergency Vehicle Technician (EVT) CTS

Presenter: Mark Romer

Motion: Kim Zagaris motioned to approve the proposed Emergency Vehicle Technician CTS in its entirety for implementation. Ken Wagner seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion:

The EVT CTS is divided into three sections: 1) Emergency Vehicle Mechanic 2) Emergency Vehicle Technician, and 3) Emergency Vehicle Lead Technician. Master Technician was omitted. In instituting this EVT CTS, it will be an important step in a new direction for the Fire Mechanics Academy.

NFPA 1071 (Standard for Emergency Vehicle Technician Professional Qualifications) came from California and SFT’s certification process. Along with information from all of the other states, there was input from the EVTCC (Emergency Vehicle Technician Certification Commission). Valley Fire Services was asked the OSFM to bring our training to align with 1071. Currently, the EVT Academy offers six certification classes. However, this will dramatically increase in the future. This increase in classes will also increase the workload of the Academy Board who are all volunteers. The most difficult part of emergency vehicle industry is that it

STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Office of the State Fire Marshal
July 22, 2011—Sacramento, California

changes constantly. For example, the fire pump has changed in just the past three years. This will facilitate change in the Academy once the goal is reached in instituting the change.

Kim Zagaris stated that he is in favor of the new EVT CTS. Marty Schmeltz noted that, although there is minimal assistance from Cal Chiefs (CFCA), in the end this will make it easier and more economically viable for the individual fire departments. It will give the departments more options in the delivery of the EVT CTS to their own personnel because they will be able to take advantage of more regional training.

Currently, there are approximately 19 certified mechanics, 121 Level II mechanics, and 520 Level III mechanics. However, there are many mechanics who choose not to attend the Academy due to the fact that they must sometimes pay out-of-pocket. Also, some departments do not require their mechanics to achieve Level I, II, or III. This CTS will allow for more regionalized instruction once the subject matter experts are identified as instructors.

The original intent was to standardize certification to maintain compliance with California law and standards, as well as the national standards. SFT wants to ensure that they are providing service to mechanics. The standards and certification requirements have now been assessed. The next step is to develop the courses to support certification. The certification standards have been vetted by subject matter experts. Everything is written in the new format for CTS and the JPRs have been identified throughout. There will be JPRs in a task book developed for each one of the levels of certification that are tied directly to JPRs out of NFPA.

Action: None.

B. Issue: Rope Rescue Technician

Presenter: Kim Zagaris and Ernie Ojeda

Motion: Ken Wagner moved to approve the 40-hour Rope Rescue Technician course an FSTEP course with the proviso that the curriculum group and staff get together to finalize the course title and roll out class. Bruce Martin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
--

Discussion:

California rescuers do not have a standardized rescue curriculum for rope rescue training that meets industry standards and delivers technical interoperability. The need for this course was first identified in 1993. This course is built around operational and technician levels. The first meeting of the Rope Rescue Technician Committee was held June 2010.

Currently, if an agency verifies that an individual has been teaching skills that are in the skills verification packet, such as high lines, ascending and passing knots, then that individual may come to the roll-out class and be verified by the class cadre. Once that individual is verified, the cadre will teach the individual the most current method so as to maintain consistency. Before

STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Office of the State Fire Marshal
July 22, 2011—Sacramento, California

attending this class, an individual must be (1) an instructor in the California state system (2) a LARRO RSI (3) an instructor with a number. The instructor prerequisites skills verification is to form a core group of instructors who have a consistent knowledge base of Rope Rescue Technician techniques.

The Rope Rescue Technician workgroup met with Patrick Bell, one of the authors of the Rope standard that is used in California. The workgroup reported that it has acceptance from Cal/OSHA on this program. At this time, there are 454 LARRO instructors in the system but it is unknown how many would apply for this Rope Rescue Technician course.

The Student/Instructor Manual is complete except to add pictures and a final review. The course documents will be available on CD-ROM, and it will be up to each agency whether to print the documents out or not.

This particular program was brought to SFT a couple of years ago. Currently, SFT has an approval, in concept, from STEAC to develop a rescue certification track. SFT's primary goal is to finish the curricula that it has already begun working on. Rodney Slaughter noted that SFT started out with LARRO, RS I, and RS II without developing a CTS for rescue systems. He would like to bring all of the rescue groups (e.g., Confined Space, Trench Rescue, RS I, and RS II) back together.

The workgroup's plan was to get the approval from STEAC to make the Rope Rescue Technician course an FSTEP class which would then be presented to the SBFS. If, in the future, there is ever a USAR track created, then the course could be switched over to a CFSTES class. At this point, in no way is this a certification packet. However, there still needs to be a CTS developed for rescue systems.

Action: (1) Inform SBFS that the 40-hour Rope Rescue Technician course be made an FSTEP class (2) SFT staff shall monitor the progression of this item and work on its format, and (3) Will be added as a discussion item in the October 21, 2011 STEAC meeting.

Chair Ron Coleman reconvened the meeting at 11:48 AM after a 10-minute break

C. Issue: Rescue Systems 2/Structural Collapse Technician (SCT)

Presenter: Kim Zagaris, Ernie Ojeda, and Don Kelly

Motion: Ken Wagner moved for STEAC to approve the Rescue Systems 2 / Structural Collapse Technician (SCT) bridge course as an FSTEP course and that SFT and the developers finalize an appropriate title. Mary Jennings seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
--

Discussion:

STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Office of the State Fire Marshal
July 22, 2011—Sacramento, California

The prerequisites courses to take the FEMA SCT class are as follows: Confined Space Technician, Trench Technician, Vehicle Machinery Technician, Rope Rescue Technician, Water Awareness, and HAZMAT Operations. The classes that the workgroup would like to institute as prerequisites for the developing Rescue Systems 2/SCT course are as follows: RS II, Rope Rescue Technician, Confined Space Technician, Trench Rescue Technician, Vehicle Machinery Technician, Water Rescue Awareness, and HAZMAT Operations. In all, there are approximately 250 hours of prerequisite training to qualify to take this proposed class. FEMA currently has an 80-hour course entitled SCT. The KSA (knowledge, skills, and abilities) developed in this class meet the KSA found in NFPA 1006 and 1670. Currently, LARRO is a prerequisite to RS I and II. The equipment list for RS II is in the FIREScope ICS-120-1.

After a student completes the class they are recognized as an SCT. After successful completion of RS II, with the prerequisites also in place, the student is recognized by SFT and Cal EMA to work on type I and type II apparatus. This course is designed to bridge the gap between RS II and the FEMA SCT class. However, it can also be used for any Emergency response personnel in California. Dave Hammond will put his lecture online so the student can preview before attending the class. There will be no charge for this.

This course would impact approximately 1700 fire personnel, who are composed of three-person teams. Bruce Martin expressed that this proposed class would make it more efficient to bring a department's Fire Fighters up to training standards and not be redundant. This would be the first time SFT has adopted an online course as one of its courses. It is unknown at this time if there would be any issues such as, ADA compliance issues, IT support, server issues, etc. In terms of reviewing the course for updates, FEMA is on a review schedule of the SCT curriculum every three years, so there may need to be an update review every three years for this proposed course.

Action: Assign a curriculum person to this issue. This will also be a California State University issue.

The Rescue Systems 2 / SCT group departed at 12:38 PM

D. Issue: Legislative Update (AB 398, AB 770)

Presenter: Mike Richwine

Discussion:

AB398 authorizes the OSFM to accept DOD Fire Fighter certification as equivalent to California Fire Fighter certification. The original intent of the bill was that DOD Fire Fighters could submit their DOD Fire Fighter certification to the OSFM and SFT would issue a Fire Fighter I certification. However, it is the local Fire Chiefs of each department who certify the Fire Fighters, so the original intent would have overridden local authority. The current language of the bill states that, if and when the OSFM becomes IFSAC or ProBoard certified, SFT would

STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Office of the State Fire Marshal
July 22, 2011—Sacramento, California

then accept DOD Fire Fighter certification. Until that time, the process will remain the same. Ultimately, moving forward with Fire Fighter I accreditation at the national level will open up the door for DOD reciprocity.

There is still a concern about the experience requirements. Most DOD assignments may not do the ventilation, forceful entry, etc. However, according to Mike Richwine, most DOD assignments encompass all of the tasks that are equivalent to a California Fire Fighter I certification. This bill has been analyzed as having no impact on the OSFM, and therefore, the OSFM has no position on the bill. Although AB 398 states that the OSFM would be authorized to accept DOD Fire Fighter certification parity. As a result, once the bill is passed, it would be up to the OSFM to ask the local Fire Chiefs to accept DOD Fire Fighter training.

AB 770 places the OSFM and the Commission on POST (Peace Officer Standards and Training) on the California state 911 emergency advisory committee for the purposes of training and education. If the bill were to pass, the likely outcome would be that it would put pressure on the OSFM to institute a public safety dispatcher certification and training program. Using the NFPA standards as a model, this would require a large expenditure of time, money, and resources.

Action: None.

E. Report on SFT Focus Group Meetings

Presenter: Mike Richwine

Discussion:

Five years ago, work on Blueprint 2020 began, and upon review, the OSFM has been able to meet most of the immediate and mid-term goals. However, Mike Richwine stated that he did not believe that SFT can sustain the current system much longer with the available personnel and resources. SFT has over 100 courses that require maintenance. Based on his analysis, SFT would need seven additional personnel to work on standards and curriculum alone, providing that they can negotiate all the other barriers.

SFT has worked with CSU Sacramento's technical writers on alleviating the workload. The primary dissatisfaction that is heard most often is that curricula is obsolete. Chief Richwine has asked CSU Sacramento to put together focus groups of users and stakeholders. The desire, initially, was to increase the capacity to facilitate the workload so that SFT can have more curriculum projects running. However, this was not tenable. Instead, SFT hired a facilitator to construct focus group to discuss the future of training and education. The first focus group was the Mission Alignment Focus Group which examined the five goals of Blueprint 2020 and to try and evolve into the next generation of training and education in California in accordance with the five goals.

The Tactical Planning Focus Group was focused on curriculum development alternatives and standards development. There are wholesale changes being recommended in that area. It

STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Office of the State Fire Marshal
July 22, 2011—Sacramento, California

became apparent during the Tactical Planning Focus Group discussions that there is a need for more strategic discussions to occur which needs to include all areas, including linkages to the UC, CSU, and community college systems.

SFT and the focus groups will meet sometime in the end of August or the first part of September. The discussion will be focused on the six strategic directions: (1) achieving national recognition (2) engaging all generations in the planning process (3) evolving, evaluating, and reconfiguring curriculum development and delivery (4) pursuing a strategic partnership (5) evaluating and reconfiguring State Fire Training, and (6) changing stakeholders' perceptions. Additionally, the discussion will include beginning the development of an implementation plan to achieve the six strategic directions in a 90-day, one-year, and five-year plan action item format. SFT will then report back its findings to STEAC during the October 21, 2011 meeting.

Other states are much more advanced and have incorporated more technology in their delivery and have simplified their systems. Illinois, for example, has four command classes, two leadership classes, use IFSTA publications, and are now pursuing national accreditation. In Texas, any Fire Fighter can access their entire training records online. The successful states are now partnering with industry and are being supported by universities.

Mike Richwine recommended that SFT hire a marketing expert to market to the younger generation by utilizing the platform of social media.

Action: None.

VI. Correspondence

A. Training Instructor Class Maximums and Instructor Requirements

Presenter: Chair Ron Coleman and Ken Soltis

Motion: Ron Myers moved to approve that STEAC reconsider that one Master Instructor would be sufficient to handle 32 students for the lecture portion of the Training Instructor 1A, 1B, and 1C courses. Rich Thomas seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion:

This question has been put before STEAC at the October 15, 2010 meeting (Item V.B.). STEAC has requested that the Director's Association supply some cost figures for the Training Instructor 1A, 1B, and 1C classes. Ken Soltis provided STEAC with information that the Committee did not previously have. However, the report that STEAC had requested was to display both the revenue and the income. This information was not fully represented in the available documentation presented to STEAC. Ken Soltis assured that the sample data from the three community college FTEs (full-time equivalent) are representative of the larger community college population. The costs represented at the STEAC meeting showed a forty percent increase (Santa Rosa, Rio Hondo, and San Diego) over a straight lecture class.

STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Office of the State Fire Marshal
July 22, 2011—Sacramento, California

Ken Soltis expressed that the costs of running the Training Instructor classes are prohibitive. The maximum class size that has been set for these classes is 25. The old class size was 40 and did not have a requirement for a second instructor. STEAC had authorized that the class size may be as high as 32 students. In some of the community colleges, there are no lab rates for the second instructor since the second performs the same duties as the primary instructor. In the end, it depends on the contract that the individual college has.

One of the reasons that the class size was limited to 25 was that, during the October 15, 2010 STEAC meeting, it was discussed that a Master Instructor is not necessary for every nine students during the skills evaluation. Rather, it only needs to be a qualified skills evaluator. The homework load in these courses is tremendous. For a single Master Instructor to grade over 25 students, the workload for the instructor was deemed too burdensome for the Instructor. If the fire service were to relinquish control of this training program, approximately 150 fire departments would be required to send their employees to colleges to take training courses that are approved by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing in order to maintain a funding source.

As it currently exists, the Training Instructor program is in the process of being approved by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing as equivalent to their teacher training for all of their career technical education. The Commission on Teacher Credentialing is impressed with the quality of instruction that is available.

<p>Action: (1) Implement a workgroup which includes representatives from the Fire Technology Directors Association and representatives from the Master Instructor curriculum, for the purpose of studying the issue under consideration (2) Provide Ken Soltis with the exact details needed for a report to STEAC at the October 21, 2011 meeting. This item was assigned to Mary Wilshire, and (3) Add this item as an Old Business Item for the October 21, 2011 STEAC meeting agenda.</p>
--

VI. Announcements

A. Issue: Fire Prevention I Course

Presenter: Mark Romer

Discussion:

The Fire Prevention I course cadre is waiting on only one document. After this is received, a pilot course will be planned for somewhere in the Bay Area.

VII. Roundtable

A. Issue: Florida Fire Marshal Chapter 69A-39 Fire Safety Inspector Certification

Presenter: Ron Coleman

Discussion:

STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Office of the State Fire Marshal
July 22, 2011—Sacramento, California

Ron Coleman participated in an audit in the Florida State Fire Marshal during July and provided STEAC with handout copies of the Florida State Fire Marshal's current Fire and Life Safety requirements. Chair Coleman believes that the California OSFM will face a similar audit in the future.

B. Issue: TCM (Terrorism Consequence Management) Course: Improvised Explosive and Incendiary Devices-IED CFFJAC in Conjunction with Kaplan University

Presenter: Mary Jennings

Discussion:

Each department will need to register through the CFFJAC. This will be offered online through Kaplan University. Any member of the California Fire Service may register to attend. However, each department will be required to register their employees/members due to the nature of the course information, which is not appropriate for non-public safety personnel. CFFJAC will disseminate a notice via e-mail in the next week. This course is being offered through a TCM contract with Cal EMA. There is also a 12-hour classroom course being offered. The list of instructors and the order form is available online on the CFFJAC website:

<http://www.cffjac.org/go/jac/news-and-events1/news-and-events/cffjac-announces-terrorism-consequence-management-course-dates/?keywords=tcm%20ied&tag=&searchSectionID=>

VIII. Future Meeting Dates

Proposed Date: October 21, 2011

9:00 A.M. – 4:00 P.M.

Office of the Fire Marshal
1131 S Street
Sacramento, CA 95811

Chair Ron Coleman adjourned the July 22, 2011 STEAC meeting at 1:24 PM

**STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY
COMMITTEE MINUTES
Office of the State Fire Marshal
July 22, 2011—Sacramento, California**

July 22, 2011 Statewide Training and Education Advisory Committee minutes posted at:
http://osfm.fire.ca.gov/advisorycommittees/advisorycommittees_steac.php

Contact: Mark Purkeypile (916) 445-8444, mark.purkeypile@fire.ca.gov
OSFM-State Fire Training Division
1131 S Street, Sacramento, California 95811