STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

October 18, 2013 – Sacramento, California

Members Present:
Ron Coleman, STEAC Chair
Roxanne Bercik, Metro Chiefs (via conference call)
Robert Briare, California Professional Firefighters
Taral Brideau, California Fire Fighter Joint Apprenticeship Committee (alternate)
Randy Collins, California Fire Technology Directors Association (North) (alternate)
Bret Davidson, SoCal Training Officers Association (South) (alternate)
Lorenzo Gigliotti, California Emergency Management Agency (alternate)
Mary Jennings, California Fire Fighter Joint Apprenticeship Committee
Ken Kehmna, Fire District Association of California
Ron Myers, League of California Cities
Kay Price, CAL FIRE Academy
Larry Savage, Nor Cal Training Officers (alternate)
Daniel Stefano, California State Firefighters' Association
Nathan Trauernicht, California Fire Chiefs Association
Tom Turner, California Fire Technology Directors Association (North)
Ken Wagner, California Fire Chiefs Association
Kim Zagaris, California Emergency Management Agency

Members Absent:
Dennis Childress, SoCal Training Officers Association
Natalie Hannum, California Fire Technology Directors Association (North)
Sam Hoffman, California State Firefighters Association (alternate)
Stephen Shull, California Fire Technology Directors Association (South) (alternate)
Jim Skinner, League of California Cities (alternate)
Rich Thomas, California Professional Firefighters (alternate)
Nathan Trauernicht, California Fire Chiefs Association
John Wagner, Nor Cal Training Officers Association

State Fire Training Staff:
Mike Garcia, Deputy State Fire Marshal III Specialist
Linda Menchaca, Staff Services Analyst
Mike Richwine, Assistant State Fire Marshal and Division Chief
Ramiro Rodriguez, Deputy State Fire Marshal III Specialist
Mark Romer, Fire Service Training Specialist III
Kris Rose, Staff Services Manager I
Rodney Slaughter, Deputy State Fire Marshal III Specialist

Guests:
Jon Black, Santa Clara County Fire Department
Tony Hargett, Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District
Paul Matheis, SoCal Training Officers Association
Tony Mecham, CAL FIRE – Riverside

I. Introductions and Welcome

Meeting called to order at 9:00 am by Chief Coleman.

A. Roll Call/Quorum Established

Kris Rose conducted the roll call. Roxanne Bercik joined the meeting via conference call. There were enough members present to constitute a quorum. Chief Coleman made reference to a letter in regards to member appointments, and Kris Rose shared those changes: Lorenzo Gigliotti is the alternate to Kim Zagaris for CAL EMA; Natalie Hannum is now the representative for CFTDA-North, replacing Jim Connors, with Randy Collins as the alternate; and Tom Turner is now the representative for CFTDA–South, with Stephen Shull as the alternate.

II. Agenda Review

Chief Coleman asked members for changes to the agenda or if any members needed to leave the meeting early. There were no changes or members having to leave early.

III. Approval of the July 19, 2013 Minutes

Motion: ***Ken Wagner moved to accept the minutes from the July 19, 2013 meeting, and Dan Stefano seconded the motion.***
Action: ***All members voted unanimously.***

IV. State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) Update

Chief Richwine stated that there were no action items from the last meeting.

V. Mission Alignment

Chief Coleman explained to the guests about the mission alignment objectives, and that the majority of items on today's agenda fall underneath this subject matter.

A. Achieving National Recognition

1. Accreditation Site Visits
Presenter: Rodney Slaughter
(Attachment 1)

Rodney Slaughter made reference to the attached documents. R. Slaughter has collected several assessment reports from various campuses, and asked for STEAC members to participate in the next assessment. Merritt Community Colleges assessment will be held the week of November 11-15. Dennis Childress has agreed via e-mail to come up from Southern California to participate. R. Slaughter is also looking for other STEAC members, specifically in Northern California, to participate; he will also speak with the California Fire Technology Directors Association (CFTDA) to get their

involvement with this process. R. Slaughter is also working on a larger scale to support national recognition, as we are going through the IFSAC/Pro Board accreditation process ourselves it is important to bring the current academies accreditation status up-to-date. R. Slaughter mentioned assessments scheduled for February 2014 include Los Angeles City Fire Department and Victor Valley College, and he is looking for participants to assist with these assessments. Tom Turner asked why there is a new assessment for Victor Valley College, when there should be a re-assessment process occurring. R. Slaughter corrected this information by stating that there will be a re-assessment process for Victor Valley College. Randy Collins mentioned a conflict for one of the assessment dates, due to the CFTDA's meeting, as there may be issues with getting members to participate (if the November 11-15 date holds). A suggestion was made by Ron Myers to have R. Slaughter send a copy of this report to the STEAC members so they can check their calendars and notify R. Slaughter of their availability to participate. There is a need for at least one STEAC member, one from the community college, and another staff support to do the assessments concurrently opposed to one campus at a time. Six (6) applications have been turned in, and we areexpecting at least 5 more applications. Chief Coleman asked R. Slaughter to explain the future workload in regards to regional accreditation. R. Slaughter stated that there are 44 accredited academies of which only 4-5 are current, so many will need to be re-evaluated. The process was started 3-4 years ago, and 12 campuses were evaluated at that time. A three (3) year assessment is required for the first application, and five (5) years for re-assessment. Chief Coleman stated it would be an educational experience for all STEAC members to be involved with the site visits. Kenneth Kehmna also provided comments on how helpful involvement is, plans to have the accreditation process done for the local academy, and is willing to get involved with the Los Angeles City Fire Department accreditation. The last accreditation was Imperial Valley College in January 2013, and they will come up for reaccreditation in the 3-year cycle period. R. Slaughter will follow up with an e-mail to STEAC members.

B. Curriculum Development & Delivery

1. Discussion: Curriculum Development Task Force Update
Presenter: Mike Richwine
(Attachment 2)

Ken Wagner provided an update on curriculum development to STEAC members on behalf of Bill Vandevort and Chief Richwine. Bill Vandevort continues to lead the cadres on these efforts. Mark Romer provided information related to obtaining the final approval for the Fire Fighter I curriculum, with preparations for presenting it at the next State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) meeting, and will have the first reading of the new Fire Fighter II curriculum at this meeting. Fire Inspector II has been finalized and is on the website. Cadre teams for Plans Examiner, Company Officer, Chief Officer, Executive Chief Officer, and Fire Service Inspector I/II/II continue to work behind the scenes on updating curriculum.

K. Wagner mentioned to the members it may be necessary to schedule additional meeting in Feb/March and May/June timeframe in order to keep up the pace in getting curriculum completed and he will be having the same discussion with SBFS. In regards to direct timelines, the second reading for Fire Fighter II will take place at the January

2014 STEAC meeting along with the first presentation of the curriculum for Plans Examiner, Company Officer, Chief Officer, Executive Chief Officer, and Fire Service Inspector I/II. The intent is to then schedule a meeting in February/March 2014 for approval of this new curriculum after members have had time to review the documentation along with the first presentation of Fire Instructor III. K. Wagner asked for concurrence from the STEAC members to work on the schedule to add an additional STEAC meeting in February/March and in May/June in order to stay on track with the curriculum approval. Chief Coleman stated that the planning activity is very essential and asked members for comments about adding additional STEAC meetings to the calendar. Kim Zagaris asked about using a tool to get calendar dates out to the team members. K. Wagner stated he will work on this issue immediately with K. Rose by using a program called "Doodle" that will provide dates to the STEAC members for calendaring. Chief Coleman asked about scheduling the STEAC meeting to another location due to parking/space at the Office of the State Fire Marshal. K. Wagner stated that the SFT office will work on that issue. Chief Coleman asked for nominations for other meeting locations. Mary Jennings stated that if the room space is available at the CALJAC office, the conference room can be used. K. Zagaris mentioned the CAL EMA offices are also willing to work with STEAC for use of their conference room space.

2. Approval of Fire Fighter I Curriculum

Presenter: Mark Romer
(Attachment 3)

Mark Romer discussed feedback received from STEAC members and the volunteer associations since the last STEAC meeting. Based on this feedback, the course plan now shows the breakdown of the hours on how the class size would look if there is a smaller class. The caveat is that these numbers are just estimates, times may need to be adjusted based on the student's ability and competency level. Mary Jennings asked if there is a requirement for the minimum number of hours for the course and does the course plan state a specific number of hours required for certification and course completion or is the course plan based on how quickly the student can complete the training. M. Romer responded that it is based on how quick a student can complete the material. There are no minimum hours, except for lecture hours, and the delivery mechanism is keeping track of the hours. Chief Coleman asked for clarification of hours. M. Jennings mentioned that if a department is putting on the training program does the program need to have minimum of hours to completed, even if they have 1 student, but then it would be 60 hours and 126 hours of lecture no matter what. Ron Myers suggested adding an additional column that states the minimum hours required for one person the person would complete these minimum number of hours. Ken Wagner stated we could add another column that will always identify the 126.5 hours, and M. Romer agreed. M. Jennings asked if the course could be delivered in multiple sections. M. Romer confirmed that the course can be broken down by subject in any manner and completed at any time.

Bret Davidson asked about the 8-hour Confined Space Rescue Awareness (CSRA) course becoming a pre-requisite and why it is not in the curriculum. M. Romer responded that CSRA is an existing course, therefore it is built into the system and that the student would have to take as a co-requisite inside the Fire Fighter I course; therefore CSRA

must be taught within the Fire Fighter I course. Tom Turner mentioned the CSRA class is required for Fire Fighter I at the academy but found out that half the students would have already taken the class. Therefore, the class is now a requirement for entry into the fire academy. Chief Coleman talked about an integrated program vs. a coordinated program, and that the delivery system has to be flexible to meet both needs. T. Turner added that in the college setting, they have to submit to the curriculum committee a set number of hours so that they have a set number of units, regardless of the number of students, because of the Title V guidelines to receive the credits/units. M. Jennings wants to ensure that it meets the fire department's needs, not just the community college academy programs. Chief Coleman stated that we need to make sure there is a unified voice between the training officers and the community colleges, because of the two different environments. M. Jennings asked for a definition of "co-requisite" and whether it is listed in the certification training standard (CTS). M. Romer answered that the co-requisite is not in the CTS standard, because it is mandated law, so there was no need to write mandated information and add it to the CTS when focusing on Fire Fighter I it is outside of what is required on a national basis. Chief Coleman asked members if they were ready to continue this discussion, and if so, a motion needs to be presented.

Motion: ***Kay Price moved to accept the motion to continue discussion on the FF I curriculum, and Bret Davidson seconded the motion.***
Action: ***Discussion was continued amongst STEAC members.***

Chief Coleman asked STEAC members to continue asking questions necessary to clear up confusion about the Fire Fighter I curriculum and he then asked M. Jennings to continue with her questions. M. Jennings asked for clarification on whether the CTS should include all the training standards that are required for certification at every level so that all information will be available in one place so everyone involved knows what subject areas have to be competed for certification. M. Romer responded that it is recognized law and we must apply. The validation and development teams looked at this area. M. Jennings continued her comments by saying that the Office of the State Fire Marshal is saying that all training standards for Fire Fighter I should be included (Haz Mat, CSRA, et al). M. Romer stated the CTS focuses on the National Fire Protection Agency (NFPA) requirements. The course plan addresses the additional types of requirements as needed in California, but we can add them to the CTS. K. Wagner added that in understanding M. Jennings' recommendation, those 3 items in the course plan should also be added to the CTS, and the question was asked whether the motion include this recommendation. M. Jennings added that not all students are going to use the course plan as it is written. The CTS needs to list all training, and any other classes added, and ICS-100 is one of those classes. Chief Coleman asked the members whether they were ready to move ahead with a motion to approve or make a recommendation for State Fire Training (SFT) to review. The co-requisites are not in the document but M. Jennings is asking that they be added and clearly defined in the CTS. M. Romer stated that CSRA, I-100 and I-700 can be added to the CTS but not added to the course plan. Chief Coleman has accepted M. Romer's report with an amendment to go back and make the appropriate changes to the CTS, with no changes to the delivery system. K. Wagner added that this philosophy needs to be transmitted back to the other cadres so

when future courses come forward that this desire of STEAC would be addressed in advance. Chief Richwine will communicate this information to Bill Vandevort, who is the lead for all the cadres.

M. Jennings voiced her concern that Vehicle Extrication is not listed in Fire Fighter I because the opinion is that this class identifies basic skills that need to be completed in Fire Fighter I. Chief Coleman asked if Vehicle Extrication is mentioned in the NFPA standards. M. Romer confirmed that Vehicle Extrication is not mentioned nor does NFPA mandate it. He stated though that this should not stop the instructors from delivering the subject. M. Romer spoke to the chiefs at the Nevada and Placer County Associations, due to making the first bid and offering a beta test in those areas. Nevada County leaders gave direction to place Vehicle Extrication in their academy, but Placer County leaders stated that it was not needed. It is the choice of organizations to make the determination on how and when they want to teach the class, it does not stop anyone from utilizing the FSTEP program in any of their academies. It would absolutely change the certification in California and would separate us from the rest of the United States because in those areas division is between Fire Fighter I & Fire Fighter II (as an advanced skill) in other states. Placer County Chiefs decided that if needed, they can teach it at the organizational level. Nevada County Chiefs mentioned that their Firefighters enter into the organization with the skills already. The California Fire Technology Directors Association took the point by saying the academy will offer Fire Fighter I and will add the FSTEP Auto Extrication class because it helps the fire service community which is separate from the certification track because enough hours are built into the academy to have enough fluctuation and ability to do this. Chief Coleman confirmed if a local entity wants to add that is the choice made by those leaders and that the Auto Extrication would not be part of Fire Fighter I, but will be a requirement in Fire Fighter II. M. Romer added that the FSTEP class, as it is today, would have to be re-written to meet the needs of Fire Fighter II where it currently is right now, it will need to be more intensive and defined in Fire Fighter II. Chief Coleman confirmed that Auto Extrication is not state-mandated nor mandated by NFPA.

Chief Coleman asked members for a motion to move ahead with the Fire Fighter I curriculum package with the amendment of the explanation of 3 co-requisites added to the CTS. Randy Collins asked do we have a timeframe. M. Romer answered that the timeframe is located in the implementation plan. M. Jennings asked about experience process. M. Romer responded that there is the task book which will be delivered to students during the academy process and signed off once 6 months of full-time experience, and/or 1 year of volunteer or part time experience has been obtained in a California Fire Department.

M. Romer continued by stating that there are two parts of the testing elements that are standardized: 1) didactic with tests for Fire Fighter I, Wildland Fire Fighter I, and First Responder Operational online through a third party delivery system; and 2) mandatory skills testing which will be on Fire Fighter I, Wildland Fire Fighter I, and First Responder Operational. The skills' testing is standardized and available for all academies and the skills sheets are on the SFT website and available for students to review. Random skills will be mandated by SFT but it will also include standardized testing for all students coming out of the academy. Those tested will have met specific criteria. Chief Coleman stated we are not only speaking about the academy, but the

delivery system, as we are leveling the playing field across the board. K. Wagner added that the team has been continuing to work on the concept of the certification testing, but it has not been resolved at STEAC or the SBFS, he anticipates that we will move in that direction.

M. Jennings asked about the online testing process through a third-party. K. Wagner answered by stating that SFT is purchasing the test banks from Performance Training Systems (PTS), a performance-based system that has an online testing component, where the Fire Fighter I participants go into a proctored environment within a computer lab and take the test online. SFT develops, validates, and provides the test to PTS, who handles the test taking, scoring, and results for SFT. Individual departments will not be able to utilize this test. This testing concept would only be accessed through the accredited regional training programs (ARTP)/accredited local academies (ALA). The Office of the State Fire Marshal (OSFM) authorizes these groups to serve as the proctors/evaluators. If a local Fire Department has individuals that would need training, then the Fire Department would send these individuals to their local ALA or ARTP who then would proctor that testing for them, whether done at the Fire Departments site or on the site of the ARTP/ALA. If the Fire Department has a computer lab, it could be proctored there. Ron Myers asked if we are only adopting the Fire Fighter I curriculum, because there will be more conversation around that process, and K. Wagner confirmed "yes". Chief Richwine added that we have a written agreement in place with the ALA's and have a level of accountability for the testing system. K. Wagner stated we have to comply with IFSAC and Pro Board provisions, which is part of the accreditation process. T. Turner added an individual will have to go to an approved testing site, regardless of where the Fire Fighter I training was completed. Chief Richwine added that in Blueprint 2020, capstone testing for Fire Fighter I is a written exam and skills testing is appropriate and we are moving forward. Chief Coleman mentioned that this technique is used by other states. M. Romer mentioned the beta testing at Sierra College will consist of running the curriculum, and taking everyone through the testing process to identify how the process will work, which will be separate from what is being offered throughCALJAC. R. Myers added that if we are looking at a similar process with all the other certifications there would be more future discussion. K. Zagaris added that once we pass information on to the SBFS, there are other individuals involved, we must provide more communication and really need to get the information out there.

Motion: ***Motion made by Chief Coleman for approval to add the 3 co-requisites in the Certification Training Standard (CTS) for the Fire Fighter I Curriculum***
Action: ***All members voted unanimously.***

3. Discussion: Review of Fire Fighter II Curriculum
Presenter: Mark Romer
(Attachment 4)

Mark Romer discussed the Fire Fighter II certification documentation. The old Fire Fighter II covered the skills of Rescue Systems I which is not included in NFPA and it looks at the point of view that the person is there to support the rescue team, not be

part of it. Vehicle Extraction is mentioned, and there are fire safety surveys and private dwellings as part of prevention. M. Romer continued with the breakdown of the lecture and skills hours, and after his presentation asked the members if they had any questions.

Chief Coleman asked Randy Collins how this will affect the volunteer program at the community college. R. Collins mentioned a future meeting with the advisory committee, but there should not be too much impact at this time. They have been using the community college program for the volunteer departments and focusing on the legal mandates, but will look to see the feasibility, with plans for a step to Fire Fighter I. M. Romer added that we should view this as a positive impact by placing recruits into an internship with hopes to create a Fire Fighter II academy.

4. Active Shooter/Active Assailant (FSTEP) Program
Presenter: Mike Garcia
(Attachment 5)

Mike Garcia presented the Active Shooter program as information only. He attended a Tactical Emergency Medical Support (TEMS) meeting, based on a request sent from the Los Angeles City Fire Department to California Emergency Medical Services Authority (EMSA) about TEMS. Their course has three levels, which is how EMSA got involved. The question is who has statutory authority over certain aspects of the program, and should STEAC and State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) get involved as a group to create an internal program. M. Garcia identified some items from FEMA, but has not found an NFPA standard; however, it could be an FSTEP class if developed. CALJAC is developing a course, in addition to Orange County, and Los Angeles City Fire Department, with the regional training group. Riverside County is also working on a class. Kim Zagaris stated his concern about the paramedics being embedded with SWAT teams, and stated that this is driving the issue that we need to be worried about. CAL OES has been funding some programs on the CALJAC side of the house to work toward some items. Between SFT and CAL OES there is a need to focus on what the next steps are and the process. M. Garcia met with FIRESCOPE and has some coordination with EMSA, but we need to make sure that we are taking care of our front line folks. The plan is to not have EMSA or POST move this for us. The work that has been done involved law enforcement, EMSA, and fire service within a school setting. M. Garcia has completed some work with Rosemont, and Los Angeles City and they have a good approach. K. Kehmna commented that the conversation is getting muddied with what we are trying to do in supporting an active shooter program. There is a big division between tactical medics and supporting an active shooter environment and rescuing those that need to be rescued. Bret Davidson added that the chiefs in San Diego County stated that they do not have any concerns with the tactical medics, although their desire is that the fire service "drives the process" and not POST. At the awareness level, and at the engine company level, there is a difference between supporting a SWAT operation vs. active shooter, and they are very different events for first responders, at the first responder level. That needs to be identified from a fire service standpoint than from a POST standpoint, and that tactical shooter input needs to come from the fire departments in their having a say on the minimum training departments. Chief Coleman re-iterated that there is no NFPA or state mandate, and asked the STEAC members if there is a need for the California fire service to address. In addition, what direction does STEAC need

to get involved for the purpose of mission alignment? What is needed today is what information should be forwarded to staff.

Mary Jennings mentioned that CALJAC received a grant from Homeland Security to develop an operational-level response to active shooter, specifically responding to violent incidents. They are looking at FIRESCOPE's programs, what FEMA has published, and are incorporating the best practices. Law enforcement is now sitting on a curriculum advisory committee for this program, we need to say how we should operate in these conditions, but want law enforcement on our side and make sure that Firefighters are not put in the line of fire.

M. Garcia stated he was not aware of the CALJAC program, but the biggest issue is whether this should be an FSTEP program, or should we use the CALJAC program as a statewide program. We need to stay on the fire service side when dealing with EMSA or POST. M. Jennings stated that no one is going to cross lines or to step out of their appropriate protocols. Conversations are taking place at FIRESCOPE about how arrangements will take place in the ICS setting. K. Zagaris added that he would like to see the OSFM and SFT work with CALJAC and FIRESCOPE. Funding is being made to a number of groups, regardless of being in the CALJAC or volunteer programs. If we follow the guidelines we can make an acceptable program for SFT. K. Kehmna added that the focus needs to come from SFT working with all the stakeholders to make sure we are moving in a common direction, and sharing information at all levels. Chief Coleman also added the need to move ahead with a coordinated program, even though CALJAC has one started. This process does involve many parameters which cannot be resolved with EMSA. R. Slaughter asked if the individuals in Ventura County have been working with CALJAC, because they have created their own program. M. Jennings stated she is working with K. Zagaris on this issue, and when grant funds come that have very short deadlines, we move quickly.

We have a statewide curriculum committee with members from Los Angeles County, CAL FIRE Butte County, Sac Metro, but no one from the OSFM or any state organizations. A pilot implementation of this course will begin in February/March, 2014. An overview of this course will be presented at the CALJAC Workshop in November 2013. K. Zagaris suggested that we include SFT staff on this committee so that we are on the same page. Chief Richwine added that SFT wants to support the efforts to have a single course meet all the fire service needs. M. Jennings will contact Chief Richwine for further discussion. M. Jennings stated that there is no known International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF) involvement in developing a program, but IAFF is part of the national conversation and has some guidelines that have been published. R. Myers asked if there will be some STEAC involvement. We will need to wait and see if it meets the interest of other parties and tailor differently for each group. Chief Coleman asked the members if we have met a consensus on this subject matter, as there were no more questions presented on this subject.

5. **Hybrid-Internet Course Evaluation**
   Presenter: Rodney Slaughter
   (Attachment 6)

Rodney Slaughter provided information on the evaluation of courses being delivered on-line and on campus (hybrid) and is asking STEAC to form a subcommittee to evaluate which learning domains will be allowed for on-line delivery of the new and updated curriculum coming out of the curriculum process.

> ***Motion:*** ***Motion made by Bret Davidson to establish a subcommittee to evaluate the hybrid classes and future integration; seconded by Ken Kehmna.***
> ***Action:*** ***All members voted unanimously.***

Chief Coleman asked for volunteers for the subcommittee. Tom Turner mentioned that Hancock College is delivering several on-line classes, and Natalie Hannum will contact David Senior to come in and chair the subcommittee as David Senior is very familiar with the process. R. Slaughter mentioned he would provide coordination for the STEAC subcommittee and California Fire Technology Directors Association (CFTDA). The adoption matrix should be similar in format to Hancock College's original report. The STEAC subcommittee needs to look at the new courses and provide recommendations to STEAC to help in moving toward quick adoption of these courses. Community colleges are asking when hybrid classes will be offered, so there is a need to get the process started. STEAC members who will participate are: B. Davidson, D. Senior, M. Jennings and R. Myers. R. Slaughter will be the SFT staff contact to the subcommittee. Chief Coleman asked for a vote to accept the subcommittee members: all members agreed, with no member opposition. R. Slaughter will meet with the curriculum development committee and will report the progress to STEAC at the January Meeting.

6. **Open Water Rescuer**
   Presenter: Rodney Slaughter
   (Attachment 7)

Rodney Slaughter spoke about the Open Water Rescuer training program which was introduced to STEAC at the January, 2013 meeting as a rescue swimmer training program. The course name was changed, due to many classes in the SFT database that are RS (Rescue System) courses. The program provides fire departments a mechanism to train their staff to work in an aquatic environment. Tony Hargett from Sac Metro Fire District developed the program and was present at today's meeting to answer questions. T. Hargett has spoken to the Nor CAL/So CAL training officers. So CAL Fire chiefs and the United States Lifesaving Association (USLA) group are asking for feedback. The proposal is to have a 24-hour class which would adopt the USLA manual as the student manual for the program.

The USLA President sent a letter to Tonya Hoover, State Fire Marshal objecting to less than 40 hours of lecture, stating that this is not adequate to train properly. R. Slaughter

further stated that we are not trying to train firefighters to be lifeguards or to take over lifeguard functions. That this is not a training program for every fire department, but enough of a concern for those that have aquatic environments within their jurisdictions to establish a minimum training standard for the fire service.

T. Hargett introduced himself and explained his background. The reason for development is that Sac Metro Fire District does conduct water rescue. Currently, there is no swimming standard to conduct this type of operation. Although many fire departments have had to put a written policy in place. T. Hargett saw this as a potential danger, from his lifeguard experience, and wanted to write curriculum about this issue. Firefighters take over water rescue when the lifeguard goes home, the priority is to support the lifeguards, but firefighters do not have the appropriate level of training. T. Hargett requests feedback from STEAC on how to move forward with the course.

R. Slaughter mentioned that he is getting curriculum from the Fire Departments relative to Marine Fire/Rescue. When we put firefighters in an aquatic environment we need to provide a training standard. Chief Coleman added that this discussion needs to be in the context of mission alignment, but also meet the local needs with a standard of care. Dan Stefano added training officers got involved and enlisted the lifeguards through USLA and has formed a partnership.

Paul Mathias, who has worked with the So CAL group introduced himself and shared his background and experience. P. Mathias stated that 50% of this type of activity occurs off season. P. Mathias gave some experiences when rescuing individuals and the information given from the president of the USLA is correct. This needs to be looked at closely and included in the curriculum. When the fire service gets called for water rescue, firefighters are supposed to be provided with training that the lifeguards receive. There should be requirements for instructor qualifications and requirements for swimming ability. P. Mathias agrees to the USLA process and the requirements, which needs to be in the same context as the curriculum that R. Slaughter is presenting.

Chief Coleman commented that the subject is very complex, and can open oneself up to liability issue if the firefighter has to respond. He is asking the STEAC members what would be the most appropriate action to take based on mission alignment.

Ron Myers commented that in our area we have a section that is not protected by lifeguards and the fire department is dispatched to those kinds of rescues. We were never able to come up with the dollars, training, and the level of effort to make it safe for the firefighters to do an intervention.

R. Slaughter added this class would establish a benchmark to train, not to lifeguard standards, but will adopt the USLA textbook and modify the program to be firefighter specific. Again, not every jurisdiction would need the class, it would be considered based on individual needs, and risk analysis by the department. This class is proposed as an FSTEP training program and not as certification requirement. Interest has been expressed by Alameda Fire Department, Humboldt Bay Fire Department, Sac Metro Fire Department and Hermosa Beach Fire Department. The Course Plan establishes a baseline on what the department needs in tools and equipment and that can be written into the Standard Operating Guidelines (SOG's).

Chief Coleman asked should the community who has a risk be responsible for training its public safety staff. Is it appropriate to add a course of this nature to the FSTEP program so that the system is providing an answer to a local fire chief who chooses to accept this mission? Chief Kim Zagaris responded that CAL OES has dealt with this issue and is accepting the program with the exception of the swim test. Each jurisdiction that has Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) should sit down and identify what process would work for their staff. He would hope that we get to a point where all that are involved would pass it. Ken Kehmna agreed by stating that STEAC should pass this because training that is being offered is not through the USLA but some other internal organization. Chief Coleman added that it is up to the local departments to adopt it instead of it being a statewide mandate. Bret Davidson added that when the lifeguards are off duty, his department is getting a lot of calls, so he sees that the program is needed. Chief Coleman again asked if this program is consistent with mission alignment to adopt something of this nature. Mark Romer added that the course meets the national standards of NFPA 1670 and 1006, which in direct line with mission alignment.

T. Hargett added that the USLA will accredit your agency if you become certified, but will not teach the classes. Chief Coleman asked are we operating under a timeline, and is asking for a re-modification document from the USLA. B. Davidson mentioned an issue with the amount of hours stating when you look at the OSHA guidelines, as the program should not be by hours, but performance and curriculum criteria. P. Mathias added that the program will raise some issues with the swim test, but language can be added that speaks to the local agency or the Authority having Jurisdiction for a need to provide some form of annual in-water training.

Chief Coleman ended the discussion by confirming that there was no motion required, but there is an interest with problems to address, and the discussion of minimum hours vs. performance. R. Slaughter will provide an update at the January STEAC meeting.

7. IAFF Fire Ground Survival Program Equivalency with State Fire Training Fire Fighter Survival FSTEP Course
Presenter: Ken Wagner
(Attachment 8)

Ken Wagner brought back final information on the course equivalency process and discussed the various attachments. He stated that the equivalency process has been established and now is being implemented. Applause was given to K. Wagner and his group for the implementation process. Chief Richwine also added that a department award will be given to this team for their work in the program and a job well done.

8. CICCS 2014 Qualification Guide
Presenter: Scott Vail
(Attachment 9)

Scott Vail spoke about the qualification guide and made reference to the changes in the attachments. The changes are reflected in the summary, and from input from the field and changes caused by FEMA and their adoption of the Type 3 All-Hazard Command,

and general staff positions that were adopted by the State Board of Fire Services in January, 2013.

> ***Motion:*** ***Motion made by Ron Myers to approve the updates to the CICCS 2014 Qualification Guide, and seconded by Ken Kehmna.***
>
> ***Action:*** ***All members voted unanimously.***

Chief Coleman asked the members for any discussion of these documents. Bret Davidson asked if some of the positions from the wildland group were removed. S. Vail explained that this was just a summary of the changes. Ken Kehmna added the positions were removed from subsequent positions just to eliminate redundancy. S. Vail explained the reasons for the removal of some of the wildland class information. K. Kehmna also added that the pre-requisite courses are not being eliminated or diminished but are no longer redundant in the position guide. Chief Coleman added that the report is in alignment with mission alignment. A round of thanks was given to those individuals who participated in the revision and review process.

C. Cross Generational Marketing

1. Twitter and Website Update
Presenter: Kris Rose

Kris Rose shared the recent updates to the SFT website. She explained the process on how the website is being kept updated and pointed out the visual changes. K. Rose also mentioned that the newly established Twitter account now has 56 followers, and SFT has provided 18 tweets. She provided information about a new section that has been added, called "Related Training News" for items that are not necessarily related to SFT, but have been approved by Chief Richwine or Chief Hoover to add to the website. K. Rose talked about the "hot topics" section, and she mentioned that there was new instructor update courses added to the website. She also explained the format and how topics are moved from the "hot topics" section to other areas of the website.

K. Rose showed on the website that the newly approved curriculum can be found under the Instructor Resources tab. In addition, SFT now has a number of downloadable instructor and student manuals that are available and all of the manuals currently housed in the bookstore will be added over time.

Ron Myers asked about the location of the STEAC minutes and mentioned that he would appreciate it if it can be added under the "Hot Topics" section, which would be easier to communicate to the stakeholders, easier to find and to also say that the minutes are approved.

Chief Richwine congratulated Kris and her staff for the hard work and great job that they have done.

VI. Announcements/Correspondence

A. Professionalism Video Presentation – Chief Coleman

Chief Coleman mentioned a 25-minute video from Dr. O'Neal on mission alignment and how it ties into fire service. He was not able to show to the STEAC members due to editing errors. Chief Coleman will present the video at a future meeting.

VII. Roundtable

Dan Stefano mentioned the upcoming Training Officers Symposium in Fresno being held November 18-22, and stated that registration is still open. Additional information can be found on the new and updated CAL Chiefs website.

Tom Turner offered, on behalf of California Fire Technology Directors Association (CFTDA), a thank you to Brandon Erickson, Ken Wagner, and Kris Rose for attending the last CFTDA meeting in Lompoc and appreciates the work that is being done by SFT.

Rodney Slaughter mentioned the receipt of a grant from the National Fire Academy. The funding will be used to deliver the Ethical Leadership Academy through California Fire and Rescue Training Authority. This is a 4-week class that will be offered over a 4-month period (1 week a month), which will be taught by Kevin Brame.

Roxanne Bercik thanked R. Slaughter for his participation in the curriculum development for marine firefighting in the Los Angeles City Fire Department offices and thanked K. Rose for setting up the conference call.

VIII. Future Meeting Dates

A. January 17, 2014; April 18, 2014; July 18, 2014

IX. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.