

California Maritime Academy
Statewide Marine Firefighting Curriculum
Meeting Notes from WORKSHOP #1 - February 22, 2011
Port of Los Angeles, California;
Meeting Notes from WORKSHOP #2 - March 21, 2011
South San Francisco Fire Department EOC;
Meeting Notes from WORKSHOP #3 – May 10, 2011
Sacramento Region (Rancho Cordova, CA);
&
Meeting Notes from Workshop #4 – May 27, 2011
San Diego, California

The first of a series of state-wide workshops focused on the plan development for competent maritime fire fighting training was convened at the Port of Los Angeles Maritime LE Training Center on February 22, 2011. The meeting participants included 31 representatives from 18 federal, state and local agencies.

The second in the meeting series was held at South San Francisco Emergency Operations Center on March 21, 2011. The meeting participants included 20 representatives from 14 state and local agencies as well as a commercial maritime company.

The third in the meeting series was held at the CalDOJ Advanced Training Center in Rancho Cordova, CA on May 10, 2011. The meeting participants included 18 representatives from 9 state and local agencies as well as one port authority.

The fourth in the meeting series was held at the Port of San Diego on May 27, 2011. The meeting participants included 18 representatives from 7 state and local agencies, 2 commercial maritime operators, 1 federal agency (USCG) and 1 out of state agency (Vancouver, WA). Topics of discussion followed the published meeting agenda and the general concepts surfaced and debated at the meeting are captured below, where the additions to the notes following the fourth session are **captured in blue type**.

Additions shown in RED are specific comments offered by LA City Fire Department. Other departments are welcome to provide specific comments for inclusion in the notes summary.

PROBLEM DEFINITION

Capabilities and competencies related to Marine Fire Fighting have declined and been largely ignored nationally since the USCG withdrew active mission support from this area in the 1980's due to resource realignment and prioritization. Although responsibility for MFF response devolved to local response agencies, competent training strategies and resources – with some notable exceptions – have been lacking. The vulnerability and risk associated with this deficiency is unacceptable when evaluated against the potential for loss of life, environmental damage, and large scale commercial disruption.

KEY FINDINGS & ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF INFORMATION:

1. Uniform professional standards for MFF do not exist, although guidelines from various sources are available nationally and internationally.
LA CITY FD: NFPA 1005 Standard for Professional Qualifications for Marine Fire Fighting for Land Based Firefighters.
2. Lack of capability and training for fire personnel to Safely and Effectively fight fire on ship, vessel, pier (Facility), or marina is evident.
LA CITY FD: We believe that the Los Angeles City Fire Department is capable and trained to safely and effectively fight fires within the marine environment. We see the need to formalize that training through a state certification program.
3. Lack of understanding & definition for land based and marine firefighting integration/inter-relationships: Commercial/Private/Public Sector and Multi-Jurisdictional aspects.
LA CITY FD: 1st Responder / Awareness training is recommended
4. Existing MFF Capabilities/Abilities are based on widely disparate agency resources and locally developed specialized training – without overall state-wide or regional coordination.
5. Where local initiatives or national guidance exists – Need to Evaluate for Competence and Leverage for California Regional Applicability - Do not reinvent what already may exist.
6. If there are needed California specific requirements – seek to add to a competent existing document as an operational annex identified as “CA specific”.
7. Use the planning process to identify and address needed marine firefighting competencies and levels of required training.
LA CITY FD: RECOMMEND: NFPA Standard 1005: Standard for Professional Qualifications for Marine Fire Fighting for Land-Based Fire Fighters; NFPA Standard 1405: Guide for Land-Based Fire fighters who respond to Marine Vessel Fire

8. Integrate land based firefighting competencies into marine firefighting abilities and competencies. Consider Specialized Confined Space considerations and working area limitations: EMPHASIS on SAFETY
LA CITY FD - Definition of confined spaces should be limited to those spaces that would be defined as confined space had there not been a fire on board. While acknowledging the hazards of confined spaces and taking appropriate measure to work within them, classifying all interior spaces as such will severely restrict firefighting movements beyond firefighting effectiveness.
9. Determine whether or not the curriculum is a certification track system or a credentialing system.
LA CITY FD - Tiered certification: First Responder, Technician, Specialist FSTEP programs may be more applicable for some departments
10. Investigate development of an MFF model professional typing using wildfire type certification model (red card) to support resource base and mutual aid support.
LA CITY FD: Red card system would not be supported. The Haz-Mat certification profile would be preferred or FSTEP
11. Do not confuse MFF curriculum requirements with existing US Coast Guard STCW license requirements which are international and national training requirements established for merchant mariners – not professional fire fighters/first responders.
LA CITY FD: Training for boat operators should center around tactics and strategies during fire ground operations. USCG certifications meets all operator requirements for pilots and mates.
12. Need for establishment of mutual aid protocols and procedures dependent upon some known level of professional MFF competency (See also Items 7 and 10 of this section).
LA CITY FD: Mutual aid agreements are generally localized. Are we talking about a FEMA type response teams? Long term goals may include this.
13. Sustainability funding issues: Federal and State Grant Programs are intended for limited duration as a funding source – what replaces them to ensure program viability?
LA CITY FD: Funding the development of the curriculum comes first. No need to get ahead of ourselves.
Train the trainers?
14. Operational disparities, environmental conditions and other definitional parameters for training such as Harbors, Platforms, Platforms **LA CITY FD: (Platforms are outside local jurisdictions and would require specific training, release from local obligations, and agreements with private operators, the State OEM and the Coast Guard. Changes in OPA 90 have greatly affect firefighting profiles this area)** Large Terminals, Small Terminals, Petroleum Terminals, Marinas, fresh and salt water firefighting. Differences between Salt and Fresh water firefighting must be examined and addressed in appropriate curriculum. **LA CITY FD: Ships at sea would also have restrictions similar to platforms**

15. MFF response will involve multi-agencies from both fire and LE - some level of required competency for Law Enforcement personnel will likely be required? POST approval or not? If YES, should there be a required LE baseline for a POST course? **LA CITY FD: Marine Firefighter I must be a land-based Firefighter II NFA Standard 1005 3.3.8.2.1 Marine Fire Fighter I... Law Enforcement personnel would need to cross train to meet NFPA Standards as a firefighter.**
16. Different Training Levels for personnel in various agencies, i.e. for Management, Operational firefighters, Law Enforcement, others may be required but span the entire level as needed in training.
LA CITY FD: Separate tracks for Firefighters and Law Enforcement would be a necessity. They are apples and oranges in their requirements and training. Separation of duties is mandatory. Municipalities that hire dual function public safety employees would still have to meet certification for both fire and law.
17. Define “typing levels” for response requirements and training. Need a state wide solution with buy in by departments for the parts that are not specific only to their location. The state wide solution must include location specific training requirements for mutual aid competency levels for response agencies choosing to train to those levels. Questions requiring resolution at the state level: Should the standards be required or voluntary? This is an apparent liability issue that should be examined and discussed, i.e. What defined liability applies for supplying only equipment without necessary training, etc? Is this baseline different for different responders, i.e. Civilian Employees & Volunteers, Law Enforcement, Professional vs. Volunteer Fire Fighter?
LA CITY FD: First responder level would meet every department’s basic needs. Larger jurisdictions would train up to the Technician level or Specialist level based on needs and major ports would train to the specialist level.
18. Look at “historical recognition” initial qualification standard to define/qualify already trained personnel and issue currency card, or whatever is defined in the curriculum.
LA CITY FD: Select and approve a training cadre
19. Create standardized training for all departments and all MFF sub-specialties. Develop/Use typing qualification task books?
LA CITY FD: Define what they are. Task Books currently being used, may be limited to specific departmental operations and apparatus and not generalized marine training.
20. With the advent of new USCG allowances and requirements for Tankships and the provision for commercial MFF, should there be a method of integration for public response agencies with private companies providing firefighting and salvage?
LA CITY FD: Inspection of tankships and barges fall under code enforcement. While it may be reviewed during primary course, curriculum for this should be separated out as an adjunct course. There is enough material there to fill 24 to 40 hour course.

21. Response Authority and Scope to define and guide ICS application in a multi-jurisdictional environment needs clarification for local, state and federal waters to preplan and address the “Who’s in Charge” Question?
LA CITY FD: Code of Federal Regulations place ultimate responsibility with Coast Guard. MOU’s between USCG and local jurisdictions may defer initial operational command with the Fire Department through unified command wheel, while still leaving ultimate command with USCG
22. Maritime Fire Response on all types of Passenger Vessels (Charter, Cruise, Ferry) needs to be addressed.
23. Develop capabilities typing for departments.
24. Include the Vessel Owner and Vessel Master responsibilities for fire fighting in the curriculum.
25. Create a statewide jurisdictional map based on the various LAFCO’s in California to identify gaps.
26. Address policy, jurisdictional and organizational gaps through possible legislation outside of the curriculum development process.
27. Cost sharing & balancing needs to be addressed, perhaps outside of the curriculum development process.
28. Special Districts may have to be developed to address gaps in marine fire fighting areas of responsibility – and financial stability/sustainability challenges.
29. State legal is reviewing current legal conditions regarding marine fire fighting with a report expected out to Chief Zagaris by March 31, 2011.
30. Existing resources will need to be entered into a statewide response database to support mutual aid dispatch.
31. Address small boat fires as most probable incident for land based firefighters as a high priority.
32. Identify financial responsibility for Hazmat incident while dewatering/watering operations are ongoing during a marine fire fight.
33. Identify all stakeholders to request involvement in this process to include:
 - a. Cal Chiefs (CFCA)
 - b. Cal Fire Districts (FDAC)
 - c. Cal Prof FF (CPF)
 - d. Cal State FF assoc (CSFA)
 - e. League of California Cities
 - f. California Association of Port Authorities (CAPA)

34. Recovery of personnel in water during response operations is an issue to consider. Incorporate existing Fast Water Rescue and USAR components into MFF curriculum training.
35. Multiple different response agencies and private responders need to be considered in the ICS operational course and commanders' course as the past has shown a deficit in command and control of these assets in prior incidents.
36. Safety issues for open water transfer of Fire fighters to/from vessels. Practical focus on open water skill sets and equipment needed (such as additional fendering or specialized boarding equipment) so the response vessel and crew is properly prepared and trained to avoid accidents and/or additional casualties during the response action.
37. Formulate and include in training Standard Operating Procedures for underway boarding for Marine Fire Fighters & Law Enforcement & Medical Responders with "float test" requirements included. The float test needs to be conducted in a controlled environment using the typical fire PPE turnouts and equipment or an acceptable equivalent weight and configuration on an individual while using an approved personal flotation device.
38. Environmental considerations need to be incorporated into the curriculum. While life safety is the first and highest priority, protection of the environment is also a mandate of federal and state law/regulation. Input from USCG, state CalEPA, CSLC, Cal DFG, CA OSPR and others may be necessary and needs to be considered both within the curriculum development as well as legislative involvement or analysis pertaining to emergency operations, response and recovery.
39. Awareness and Basic Level Training Courses are needed for non-Fire personnel who may be involved/engaged in a marine fire response (such as lifeguard, harbor patrol, and certain blended forces with responsibilities on the waterfront)
40. The CWCG – The California Wildfire Coordinating Group might be an appropriate model for a similar organization for Marine Fire Fighting? Perhaps follow the "RED card" training designator for Wildfires with a marine fire designator as a "BLUE" card to differentiate between the two classifications. CA State web site is www.cwcg.gov (National Equivalent: www.nwccg.gov)
41. MFF assets and resources are NOT required to be included in the state database, therefore the inventory of response capacities is incomplete and/or inaccurate. Need to consider adding an MFF resource inventory to the state mutual aid fire resources database and offer information to FEMA for national use. USCG databases are also incomplete and inaccurate. Recent addition of "Big Four" private commercial MFF and Salvage contractors potentially adds to capabilities, but is not "transparent" to outside entities.

42. PQS/Task Driven training may be the way to go as the first step in the curriculum development process.
43. As an advisory agency to the state legislature, the California Local Agency Formation Commission (Ca LAFCO) may need to be consulted for analysis as far as on water response jurisdictions and responsibilities. EXAMPLE: Big Bear Lake – multijurisdictional issue; this is one of many areas that may need pre-identified response and payment considerations.
44. Identify and leverage existing training platforms and “brick/mortar” locations such as the MSCC = Maritime Safety & Security Center in northern California and the Maritime LE Training Center in the Port of Los Angeles.
45. Limitations of USCG F/F Training similar to STCW training provided to merchant mariners – but differences of both Navy and USCG programs: Sailors can (and are) ordered to fight fires, save the ship ... different response matrix in civilian world.
46. Priorities in response should be: FIRST - Life safety as Priority #1; SECOND - Ship/Property as Priority #2; THIRD – Environmental Considerations as Priority #3
47. ICS/UC is different in maritime incident i.e. vessel master has responsibilities a land owner does not. Use training, exercises & drills to determine a protocol to follow and test out procedures. Review/Utilize CICCS - CAL Incident Command Certification System <http://www.firescope.org/specialist-groups/ciccs/ciccs.htm>
48. Possible specific topics to consider to think for the MFF curriculum:

- Vessel Hazards - Internal fuel on the vessel, type and location,
- Loss of power
- Host of shipboard Chemicals & issues dealing with them
- Types of marine fuels
- Confined Spaces and Logistics of negotiating ship spaces
- Method of identifying locations onboard various ships
- Basic Ship familiarization by fire dept
- Vessel Pre-Fire Planning; International Shore Connection Flange Adapters; Ship to shore pre-planning
- Vessel Loading/Stowage Plan information – where can it be located?
- Dangerous cargo manifest; 96 hour notice of arrival include manifest logistics
- Tactics & strategy

Hi-rise fire command model- incident command style may be more applicable as a possible template for development of MFF response FIRE SCOPE - HIGH RISE MODEL/ HIGH RISE POLICY <http://www.firescope.org>

49. Training Delivery Options – online for Awareness Level; Blended Learning for Basic and Intermediate Courses; Advanced Tactics & Strategy will require “directed instructor lead” setting.
50. Possible utilization of/collaboration with the California Joint Apprenticeship Committee (CAL JAC) for marine fire fighting course development? Many subject/topic driven “module” based video training developed by them already.
51. Consider development of mobile training team similar to CSTI process.
52. Don’t reinvent but INCLUDE Hazmat training for MFF applications as a part of **BLUE Card** PQS Designation:
 - First responder operations
 - Technician level
 - Specialist level
53. Fire Boat Operations – May Need Operations SOP: Who is in command – operator or firefighter? Boat operations are different depending on the vessel size, type and configuration; some departments/agencies require the operator to hold a USCG license to operate/maneuver the fireboat; others do not.
54. Investigate existing USAF aircraft fire response and mass evacuation/casualty protocols or the commercial airline industry as a possible model for fire response to cruise ship fires.
55. Local policies/protocols will need to be reviewed and considered in curriculum development in those locations where they exist.
56. Consider Statewide/Regional Automatic Aid Agreements to support reciprocal aid for MFF response (SF Bay Region is already working on formulating an automatic aid agreement.)
57. Curriculum needs to address utilization of CalEMA REOC for extended resource and asset logistics support.
58. Curriculum must include discussion and direction regarding international law regarding response to Foreign Flag Vessels and vessel access; Master, Agent or Consulate may grant permission to board vessel; Possible pre-planned authority to board vessels during an incident; Designation by COTP Order.
- 59. Make sure part of the curriculum includes vessel terminology and general layouts for common major ship types and a standardized method of properly communicating pathways and locations on a vessel (deck/frame nomenclature).**
- 60. Include use of physical and simulation training platforms for familiarization on large vessels and small vessels of various types.**

61. Risk assessments may have to be done to identify risks/consequences and competency gaps such as those areas with a small fire department with large near water/maritime infrastructure i.e. such operational areas as at Marina Del Rey.
62. Lack of Defined Method to integrate and/or disengage public resources when/if private contractors arrive.
63. Explore expanded coordinate response with private contractors. Explore collaboration as a potential training funding source leveraging federally mandated Marine Fire and Salvage regulations.
64. MOU's may be problematic as some jurisdictions in California may not allow for indemnification of other entities such as in the Columbia River MFSA .
65. Cost recovery for marine fire fighting is often difficult due to the absence of a mutual aid system that recognizes and includes multi-agency maritime response events; as well as a lack of clear designation of responsible parties under a binding legal framework.
66. Look at FIRESCOPE only as a process outline and support/supplement with development of position-specific qualifications and task book documentation.
67. Consider development of MFF simulator training to mitigate cost and reduce training risk.
68. Concern with having a blue card it may slow down response as the issue may be one of accepted training levels and the associated risk management aspect.
69. Fed and/or CAL OSHA may mandate a MFF level of training as they have with other commercial and professional areas of practice.

IDENTIFICATION OF EXISTING RESOURCES & ASSETS

What MFF training resources and assets currently exist that may be used as tools and references to build a competent program? The objective is to Inventory all possible resources, categorize and evaluate for applicability and competency, winnow the list to leave those of greatest value.

IFSTA Manual with skill sets a good model/starting point

Federal

Federal Fire Service Capacities and Competencies in San Diego, CA

National Fire Protection Association (NFPA)

1974 National Fire Prevention Act

US Navy Fire Fighting Training – San Diego

National Park Service - Marine FF Training - Lake Havasu, Glen Canyon Reservoir has a Beta (Pilot) Course being rolled out in June 2011 (**Reaction from managers of the first course offering indicates additional additions/changes are required**)

National Fire Academy

Blueprint 2020 for USAR

Regional MFF Working Groups – USCG Area Maritime Security Committees

MARAD Marine Fire Prevention, Firefighting and Fire Safety

US Army - FM 4-01.502 (FM 55-502) Army Watercraft Safety Manual

California In-State Resources

CA Department of Boating and Waterways – **40 Hour Course (In revision)**

Swift Water Training capability at state level – Cal Fire

SFFD & Oakland Vessel Specific Marine FF Training Manuals

Oakland Master Task List

HAZMAT

Cal State University: Maritime Academy and CalPoly Courses

OSHA/EPA/Other Fed agency training courses

State Fire Marshall - Online training courses

Regional Fire Academies: Monterey, Harbor Community College Courses; Others

California Specialized Training Institute (CSTI)

Professional Mariner Courses – Commercial Providers (USCG License Compliant)

Chevron and Valero Basic standards for marine firefighting

Humboldt Bay Fire?

Out of State

Private training for FF on offshore platforms

Seattle Fire Department

Texas A&M - TEEEX

Port of Miami

North Carolina Department of Insurance

LSU

FSU

NJ/NY Port Authority

Tri-State Marine

Resolve Marine

TT Bisso

Washington State Patrol - Basic and Advanced Fire Training

Foam and pump schools: Kidde, 3M, Hale

<http://www.haleproducts.com/Main/Content,30,10.aspx>

UNR Reno Fire Academy

Williams Fire

Boots and Coots

State of Virginia Port Authority (POC -Billy Shelton) training program (May be able/willing to Share Information).

Add Large Shipyard environment (NAASCO, BAE) as potential training venue/resource

Add The Merchants Exchange of Portland, OR as potential training information source tied to the Columbia River MFSA (Marine Fire Safety Association) collaborative.

Add State of Alaska as a potential training source, i.e. Alaska State Ferry System & Prince William Sound Valdez, AK.

NEEDS/GAP ANALYSIS

The following topics have been identified as requiring scrutiny and investigation for the purpose of identifying a realistic conditions baseline for a stat-wide MFF training program:

USCG Gap in marine firefighting – what is still possible/likely?

No MFF Standardized Training or Equipment Typing.

Inadequate Program Cost Recovery and Sustainability.

Personnel costs to cover people in training (backfill) and travel and other expenses.

Legislative Analysis with respect to MFF

Lack of qualified/ trained personnel

MF Prevention, Preparedness and Inspection Programs

Admiralty law issues as far as owner / operator obligations, liabilities and responsibilities –Defined?

Response Agency Issues/Challenges related to Action/No Action Consequences – Decision Matrix?

MFF Risk Analysis and Mitigation Strategies: How much Capability is required; Where Located; How maintained and funded?

*Ships Fire Plan Database – **Who Controls & How made Available?***

*State Fire Marshal Inspections Database: **What and Where?***

Ship Facility Specific Hazards: Requirements? Database? USCG & State Lands Commission?

Needs/Gaps Comparison of various EXISTING plans

Resource typing

Incident typing

Emergency Communication Plans: Onboard and External – Available to Response Agencies?

Department typing

Means testing for existing courses

Long term sustainability

Local policy and emergency planning

Lack of statewide equipment inventory

Training needs to address various vessel sizes

EVALUATE POSSIBLE GAP FILLING STRATEGIES

The following suggestions were offered as possible strategies to address gaps in the MFF programs:

Examine training delivery methods (media)

Grant sources/applications with a terrorist nexus, NIMS, fire service, LE cross training

OTHERS?

Do localized studies to identify and rate risk of different types of incidents to drive training requirements

Add a fee to cash tickets on ferry systems to pay for some sustainability costs.

Add a fee to state vessel registration for sustainability in areas that have marinas.

Look at Transportation districts for funding sources.

Focus more on local funding than state level funding due to roadblocks.

Develop private contractor training level requirements similar to wild land fire fighting contractors.

Cost recovery of response operations may come from the OPA 90 pollution fund if all necessary declarations and conditions have been met.

Lobby the Congress members and Senators to get support for fire response being an allowable cost recovery item from the OPA 90 Pollution Trust Fund as opposed to an incident by incident decision. This is a Commandant level discussion.

Perhaps two tiered level of funding: localized and a major harbor/port wide disaster.

Invite the Major Maritime Commercial Stakeholders to the subsequent workshops.

EXISTING OR POTENTIAL TRAINING/EDUCATION PRODUCTS

The following training and education programs were identified as possible resources for existing or potential training/education programs”

CSU Chancellor BA/Graduate Degree programs (CEMHS Project Initiative)

FSTEP vs Certification track

FEMA/DHS/ODP approved courses?

State Fire Marshal/STEAC approvals?

Tiered level of certifications (red card)

Operations Tech Level

Operations Specialist level

Command Management level

Training notification via a network

Statewide Neptune Coalition

Identify current trainers list with qualifications

Remote training courses links for example 90% of awareness course could be online

Provide library on the website with list of off the shelf publications

Add California-specific supplements to existing textbooks

LA City DVD Training Program

Local Response plans in USCG AMSP/ACP

USCG District 11 Response Plans

NPS Beta course

North Carolina Department of Insurance; State Fire
Marshall Marine Firefighting course

FUNDING/ DEVELOPMENT/ DELIVERY

The following elements were identified as KEY issues for development, delivery and sustainability program parameters:

Continued Availability/Expanded Use of UASI, PSGP, SHGP and other targeted grants

US Fire Administration

National Fire Academy

Tariffs/ Taxes/fees/ private sources/ insurance fees/ insurance companies/p&l Clubs

Need a SME committee to develop standards (STEAC?)

CSTI

Measurable performance standards – review, evaluate and possibly tie into NFPA guidelines

State Fire Marshall Health and Safety Code

Need for Common Focus & Establishment of Goals and Objectives: The end product must meet the intent

NAVEDTRA Document

Instructor requirements and required qualifications

CALFIRE has instructor requirements

Do a survey of current instructor pool at other institutions

“train the Trainer” ie send instructors thru other accredited courses

Federal partners may have capabilities

MARAD has pre-positioned ships throughout the state available for onboard training

Participant Task Book

Instructor Task Book

Classroom setting

Physical Training Props Development

IP Based training

Video instruction

Hub and spoke training method – Not One Training Center, But a Coordinated Network

Chevron (NorCal) training facility (New MSSC in development)

Identify hands on vs. conceptual vs. hybrid

AQMD issues need to be addressed

Federal OPA90 model for sustainability

Non profit or special districts for sustainability

JTIP is the Joint Tankship Inspection Program between LA Fire and the US Coast Guard. This may be a good model for the other parts of the State that receive tank vessels. (JTIP) model for possible template/conversion as a JPA for funding support – joint power authority may help the sustainability model.

Training center JPA – Partnerships private/state/local nonprofit organization.

Strength in Numbers: The more agencies involved – the more likely to fund a sustainable program

GAO involvement/study maybe a tool for federal sustainable funding source.

OSPR funding Model (OPA 90) as a possibility for sustainability

Cal JAC funds approved training – reimbursement for training costs – possible sustainment funding option.

EDUCATION & TRAINING CERTIFICATIONS/APPROVALS

Final developed courses must attain some level of professional accreditation and/or certification for operational typing, professional recognition and development purposes. KEY elements for this process were identified as:

Recognized Accreditation of Instructor by one or more agencies/organizations will affect the course accreditation process and ultimately the acceptance and validity of the final course products – this may require “teaming” between entities/agencies/organizations to achieve the final intended results.

Requirements for higher education curriculums are set by the academic senates of the various institutions and their accreditation bodies (i.e. WASC for CSU campuses)

Educational level challenge, cannot create a pipeline to sustain, may need instructors with “eminence in their field” to partner teach – more easily done as Extended Learning/ Professional Development vs. Academic Process.

USCG Certification with regard to tankers or NFPA Standards

CALFIRE Certification for land based firefighters w/ MFF qualifications? They have the state mandated authority to oversee training.

Likely SEEK DUAL CERTIFICATIONS from both POST and CALFIRE/STEAC.

Evaluate/Utilize POST course development and approval process?

National FEMA certification/approval

Tiered level of certifications

Awareness/Orientation Level

Technician Level

Specialist Level

Operational FF

Management/Chief Level

Other level/command NIMS etc

Boat Operators Training

USCG License Endorsements for MFF?

LA CITY FD: Would prefer Cal Fire to be accrediting body

POSSIBLE MFF PLAN STRUCTURE/OUTLINE

The following elements of an MFF Curriculum Development Plan Outline were offered:

Executive Summary

Introduction

Intent (Let go of relationship/ownership “Turf Issues”)

Timeline of plan

Task book development

Historical Recognition (grandfathering)

Established Minimum Standards/Requirements (for all responders)

Prioritized elements in curriculum (TBD)

Vessel Typing – FEMA vs. NFPA

Type 1 5000 gpm

Type 2 1000 gpm

Type 3 250 gpm

LA CITY FD: Five types based on more than just gpm’s. See NFPA Standard 1925 on Marine Fire-Fighting Vessels Chapter 5

Other Vessel Typing Programs (NFPA, FEMA, etc.)

MFF Incident typing

Type 1: Large Passenger Cruise and/or Ferry Vessel

Type 2: Large Tankship (Certain Hazardous Cargoes/Cargoes of Particular Hazard)

Type 3: Large Tankship (POL/Refined Products)

Type 4: Container Vessel

Type 5: Vessel Facility (Bulk POL/Refined Product)

Type 6: Vessel Facility (Container)

Type 7: Other Waterfront Facility (Bulk Non-Hazardous i.e. Cement, Agriculture etc.)

Type 8: Marinas – Fishing Fleets and Private Harbors

LA CITY FD: Would include a much larger number of types to include additional classification based on cargoes and hazards

GENERAL COMMENTS: INFORMATION SHARING DURING AND AFTER DEVELOPMENT OF THE CURRICULUM

Cal Maritime to create a website for interactive collaboration, information sharing and document repository during the MFF Workshop process.

How far off is this? (Process underway ... expect web page to be complete by Aug 2011 Workshop)

Individual comments for inclusion may be shared via e-mail to the POC noted below

NEXT MFF WORKSHOP: STOCKTON REGION

AUGUST 8, 2011 – Port of Stockton

RSVP Required for Entry to below POC.

POC: CAPT Bruce G. Clark, The California Maritime Academy – bclark@csum.edu

Version 5 - Notes Finalized & Distributed: July 11, 2011