



**State Board of Fire Services  
MINUTES  
Thursday, August 18, 2011  
Office of the State Fire Marshal, Sacramento, California**



Chair/Ex-Officio  
**Tonya L. Hoover**  
Acting State Fire Marshal

Vice Chair  
**Mike Esparza**  
California State Firefighters Association

Members:

**Steve Brown**  
California Fire Chiefs Association

**Jerry Davies**  
Insurance Industry

**David Gillotte**  
International Association of Fire Fighters

**Robert Magee**  
City Government

**Patrick McOsker**  
California Labor Federation

**Lou Paulson**  
California Professional Firefighters

**Michael S. Williams**  
California State Firefighters Association

**John Winder**  
CDF Firefighters

**Glenn Ziemer**  
Fire Districts Association of California

**Fire District** (vacant)

**County Government** (vacant)

**California Metropolitan Fire Chiefs Association** (vacant)

Ex-Officios:

**Mike Dayton**  
California Emergency Management Agency

**Andy McMurry**  
CAL FIRE

**Dan Terry**  
California Fire Fighter Joint Apprenticeship Committee

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Tonya L. Hoover, Acting State Fire Marshal  
Steve Brown, California Fire Chiefs Association  
Jerry Davies, Insurance Industry  
David Gillotte, International Association of Fire Fighters\*  
Robert Magee, City Government\*  
Andy McMurry, CAL FIRE\*\*  
Dan Terry, California Fire Fighters Joint Apprenticeship Committee%  
Michael S. Williams, California State Firefighters Association  
John J. Winder, CDF Firefighters  
Glenn Ziemer, Fire Districts Association of California\*

\*Attended via conference call

\*\*Arrived at 10:26 a.m.

% Arrived via conference call at 10:03 a.m.

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Michael D. Esparza, California State Firefighters' Association  
Mike Dayton, California Emergency Management Agency  
Patrick McOsker, California Labor Federation  
Lou Paulson, California Professional Firefighters' Association

**STAFF:**

Mike Richwine, Division Chief, State Fire Training  
Sherry Habon, Administrative Assistant  
Diane Seiple, Staff Services Analyst, Support Services  
Alicia Hamilton, Retired Annuitant, Fire Service Training  
Mark Romer, Retired Annuitant, Fire Service Training

**GUESTS:**

No guests in attendance.

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Tonya Hoover, Acting State Fire Marshal called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. at the Office of the State Fire Marshal (OSFM) 1131 S Street, Sacramento, California.

- **Roll Call/Determine Quorum**

Roll call of the State Board of Fire Services was conducted. A Quorum was established with the call in of Dan Terry at 10:03 a.m.

- **Approval of Minutes from the February 17, 2011 Meeting**

David Gillotte made a motion to approve the minutes, Jerry Davies seconded the motion. The Board unanimously approved the February 17, 2011 minutes as submitted.

- **Announcements**

Dan Terry announced that California Fire Fighters Joint Apprenticeship Committee Program Director Yvonne de la Peña has been reappointed as a Commissioner to the California Apprenticeship Council by Governor Jerry Brown. A press release announcing the appointment is to be issued by the Governor's Office today, August 18, 2011.

II. **PROGRAM and ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Chief Hoover introduced State Fire Training Division Chief Mike Richwine to give the STEAC Report.

**A. State Fire Training (SFT)**

**Chief Richwine**

**(1) The Emergency Vehicle Technician Certification Training Standards (CTS) formerly Fire Mechanics Certification Training Standards.**

Chief Mark Romer was introduced to give the briefing.

With NFPA 1971 Coming out State Fire Training (SFT) was approached by the Fire Mechanics Academy to assist in developing the CTSs for the Fire Mechanics Academy. SFT brought together five experts from the Fire Mechanics Association/Mechanics Academy. They took NFPA 1971 and developed the CTS. The CTS identifies the knowledge required, as well as the Job Performance Requirements (JPRs) for the positions. We identified three positions within the CTS: Mechanic, Technician and Lead Technician. The group sent it to their constituents and vetted it through both north and south training associations as well as the Mechanics Academy; the overall response was good. The CTS was presented to STEAC and approved; the group is now asking for the final approval of the CTS that will allow them to move forward in developing the identified courses.

Chief Richwine requested a motion to approve the new certification training standards. He reported that this is a commitment SFT made to the Fire Mechanics dating back to the 1980s, so they were pleased about the progress made thus far.

Steve Brown made a motion to approve the Emergency Vehicle Technician CTS, John Winder seconded the motion. There was no response to Chief Hoover's request for discussion. Chief Hoover then called for a vote; the Board responded with unanimous approval.

**(2) Eliminating written Capstone Test and adding Job Performance Requirements (JPR) to the Certification Capstone Task Book (*approval recommended*)**

Chief Richwine presented a proposal to use task books to verify performance in lieu of Capstone testing. One of the goals in Blueprint 2020 was to move to Capstone testing. This was tried with one of our smallest certification tracks (Instructor) and found that there were several unintended consequences in implementing statewide written exams. The cadre then reviewed the standards and courses determined that a better approach was through taskbooks.

Alicia Hamilton was introduced to brief the Board: Ms. Hamilton began by providing some background. The Capstone task book that came out two years ago for Fire Instructor I ended after the applicant's teaching experience. Then they had to take a state administered written exam. We are proposing that instead of the written certification exam that the candidates complete job performance requirements that come directly out of the CTS. In both the Inspector I and the Training Instructor I there is a list of items that need to be signed off by their supervisor or Chief, whoever is authorized to sign. This will work for all certification tracks from the Emergency Vehicle Technician to the new Company Officer and Driver Operator.

Alicia Hamilton then called for questions.

### **Questions, Answers and Comments**

*Question - You made mention of unintended consequences, could you expand on that?*

We were going to be requiring Instructors to write the exams for the individual courses that the candidate would be going through. We have concerns about the ability of some of our instructors to write those exams and consistently link them to the standards.

Another concern was the logistics and cost of scheduling and holding statewide exams at consistent intervals through out the year. Because some of the courses can take several years to complete (example: Company Officer and Fire Officer) we felt a written exam wasn't the best way to test their knowledge and experience; the JPR will determine that much better. There are formative tests (quizzes) throughout each of the certification courses and there is still a 50 item summative exam written by the instructors at the end of every Certification course. We are not doing away with written tests; the testing will be done during the course, with the taskbook being completed after the course work.

One of the issues raised at STEAC was our goal of national accreditation. If we move into Pro Board or IFSAC accreditation we still have the flexibility to add a written exam as part of the task book, if required by the accreditation entities.

One of the outstanding items we still need to work through STEAC is the language in regulation and how we would process taskbooks internally. The recommendation out of STEAC is that we approve the taskbooks in lieu of the Capstone Exam; SFT would then come back and report on the business process/details.

*Question - Are there written guidelines as to who gets to sign off on the skills listed in the taskbooks? It says Fire Chief or their authorized person. This has been an issue with CICCS.*

We have a process now; the Fire Chief has to send SFT a list, in writing, as to who is authorized to sign for what levels (who can sign for Fire Fighter and who can sign for Fire Officer being two examples).

*Question/comment - The Chief would have the guidelines as to the minimum standards for the person to have authority to sign at each level, and then they would send you those names; is that what you mean? You want to be sure because this involves a lot of different aspects, sometimes salary incentives, sometimes departments don't support certification, and the individuals have to do it on their own.*

*Question – Would the taskbooks be downloaded off the Internet? Can only fire departments initiate this or could it be initiated by a community college?*

The only way to get tasks signed off is through having employment. The tasks are very specific; they have to have a certain amount of time on the job in that specific position.

Mike Richwine – SFT will come back to STEAC and the SBFS with the formal business processes. In fact, STEAC will be forming a group to work on these processes. We are seeking approval of the Certification Capstone Task Book process that replaces the written certification exam with job performance requirements.

David Gillotte made a motion to approve. Michael Williams seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously to approve.

**(3) Curricula Update** (see *Round Table Discussion, State Fire Training on page 9*)

**(4) Reaccreditation of Rio Hondo College**

**Mike Richwine**

STEAC recommended approval of Rio Hondo College as an Accredited Regional Training Program. Rio Hondo is one of the original academies accredited in the '90s. Rio Hondo has a very robust EMT program, Wildland Fire Academy, Fire Fighter Academy, and all the resources to meet SFT's requirement for accreditation, including local processing. Based on our assessment, we are seeking a reaccreditation of Rio Hondo.

Steve Brown made a motion that the reaccreditation of Rio Hondo be approved, Michael Williams seconded the motion. The Board unanimously approved the reaccreditation of Rio Hondo College.

**B. Code Development and Analysis**

Chief Hoover introduced Kevin Reinertson, Supervising Deputy State Fire Marshal.

**(1) Supplement to Title 24, 2010 California Building Standards**

The OSFM just completed its rulemaking that created the supplement to the California Building Standards Codes. The supplement is going to be for the Building Code, Fire Code, Residential Code and some editorial items for the California Electrical Code. This rulemaking consisted of several big ticket items that were supported by groups such as the fire service, building officials, builders and industry. We made critical amendments that would help the business community here in California regarding warehouses and factories while providing fire operations the ability to evacuate smoke via smoke and heat vents or smoke control systems. The building industry reported being hampered by the model codes so we rectified that by modification through our office. These changes served the fire service and the industry as a whole. Several other modifications were made to that package including making permanent our emergency rulemakings on antifreeze solutions, and the adoption of the three TIAs that were adopted by NFPA 13, 13R and 13D. The other emergency rulemaking has to do with smoke alarms power connection and interconnection. We felt that this was an emergency because the codes conflicted with the law. We needed the ability for existing residential buildings to still use battery operated and non-interconnected smoke alarms. This corrected the regulation to be consistent with existing law allowing for battery operated alarms in existing buildings. The rulemaking was adopted July 20, 2011 by the Building Standards Commission and will be published January 1, 2012 with an effective date of July 1, 2012.

Many jurisdictions have large buildings with modifications taking place to them, or new buildings that are coming into the area. Since the regulations have been adopted, but are not in effect yet, they are there for you to use at the local level if you choose.

We are beginning our rulemaking cycle, our pre-rulemaking activities to adopt the 2012 editions of the International Building, International Fire, Uniform Plumbing, Mechanical Code, and International Electrical Code. Over the next 6-9 months you may receive notices for our office regarding stakeholders meetings and task force meetings to move our existing amendments forward and look at what is coming to us in the new codes. There are some advancements in fire safety. Our office was able to forward PV regulation in the fire code rather than guidelines. There will be good things as well as clean up in these new codes.

Chief Hoover – There is a lot of joint effort being done by plan reviewers and building officials, etc. and by the fire service holistically; operations has been actively involved in our code adoption process. We cast a wide net for the fire service and it has been a model for places outside of California as to how we engage all of our stakeholders. To Kevin, great job, to those in code development and those that participate in our task groups thank you very much.

### III. OLD BUSINESS

#### A. Update: Fire Department Lists (Discussion)

Tonya Hoover

A twenty-seven page fire department list was sent out with the hope the Board could help with the clean up. We would really like to clean up our reporting to NFIRS, but first I would like to make sure we have an accurate list. Changes can be sent to Kirsti Fong in the CAIRS program.

The following points were taken from group discussion:

- In the CAIRS presentation at the last meeting we are at 45% on (of departments) reporting.
- Going through the list from beginning to end and estimating how many emergency incidents are probably not being reported into the system, it would certainly exceed a million. The first county I examined, it was clear that there were 30-40 thousand incidents missing for that county in terms of reporting into the system.
- There have been some consolidations, reorganizations etc. and the list we currently have names the district as well as all the cities within that district. It makes a difference if they are a county fire department that included a lot of cities or if they are a Fire District; are the cities under contract or actually in the district. Some cities want to maintain their own statistics even when they are part of another department. All these things change the reporting relationship.
- The current lists shows federal agencies and tribal fire departments that are not required to report. It appears that there are a lot less independent fire departments/districts in California than on this list. There is a substantial amount of consolidation and contracting.
- It is a mandate that the information come through the State Fire Marshal's Office by statute. It is also mandated that it be reported nationally as it relates to grants.
- There is no penalty in the statute that requires reporting, but a list of who is not reporting given to those that are handing out the money could help change that. That may be the only leverage we have to get the numbers that are essential. If those that give grants see that you are not reporting, your grant will not be approved.
- Grants are tied to reporting; if there is no reporting for a one year cycle the department's FEMA grant is supposed to be dropped, but this is not happening. Maybe there is a way to press that issue with FEMA on the importance of collecting that good data.
- In these budget times, noone is going to do what they are not forced to if there isn't another motivating factor and it isn't already automated in to something they are already doing.
- IFF and IChiefs are looking at piggy-backing to do data collection in an effort to keep the fire based EMS systems in place. Stats are critical. If the data is inaccurate due to reporting or technical issues, it needs to be corrected; we are relying on it for more than just grants.

- With anything, work load is an issue, CAIRS has been reaching out to departments that were reporting and are not reporting now, to see if they understand the reporting/program, and sometimes it's just a staffing issue.
- It may be technical as to why the data is not being transferred over appropriately or accurately, but we are beginning to rely on the numbers for a lot of other thing than grants.
- In some instances, departments are entering the data in but their software is having a problem connecting with NFIRS/CAIRS. There are many different manufactures of reporting software; they are standardized as to the information gathered and are required to be NFIRS compliant.
- It is easier if the departments send their information directly to the OSFM then we can validate it quickly and forward to NFIRS. When they enter directly into NFIRS there is a delay in validating that information, NFIRS won't release that information until the SFM does their quarterly review.
- In order for a fire department to gather information out of NFIRS we have to validate the data. And if the data didn't come through the OSFM there is a delay in validating, which delays the department from being able to pull the numbers from NFIRS. NFIRS does a quarterly download to CAIRS for validation.
- Some departments think they have to populate two different systems. And some think that when entering data into NFIRS, it automatically downloads to us (CAIRS); it doesn't. But, if the data is entered into CAIRS it automatically populates NFIRS, NFIRS knows that you are reporting and that the information has already been validated, so there is no delay in being able to pull the information from NFIRS.

Chief Hoover asked members to do whatever they can to get folks to understand the importance of reporting; we are being asked every day for data to prove our worth in what we do.

### **Recommendations/Suggestions**

- Some departments may not understand how easy reporting is, or maybe because of staff turnover the instruction as to how to report was not passed on. A suggestion was made to send out an informational sheet with step-by-step instructions as to how to enter/submit the data.
- CalEMA also has interest in these stats; their Region Chiefs can possibly follow-up with departments.
- Another suggestion was made to reissue the Information Bulletin out of CAIRS with a letter saying that reporting is a mandate and how important it is; and that not reporting could affect their ability to obtain FEMA grants.
- Action item: Follow up with Cal EMA to see if they have the Fire Department Designator List available.
- Action item: Connect with FDAC (Catherine Smith) to get a list of fire districts in CA. FDAC hired a consultant to develop an accurate current list.
- The IFFA, IFCA, CPF, would be helpful in getting the message out on the importance of reporting.

IV. **NEW BUSINESS**

**Tonya Hoover**

- **SBFS appointments/reappointments** - If a member's appointment expires, that member can continue to serve and vote until they are reappointed or a replacement is appointed. If you are interested in reappointment let those you represent know and they will have to inform the Governor's office. As a neutral party, the OSFM can not give any information regarding appointments or have anything to do with the appointment process. The SBFS member roster with term conclusion dates is available on line.
- **Update of SBFS Webpage** – by providing a short bio on each Board member and highlighting the State Board's work.

V. **ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION**

**SBFS Members**

**Glenn Ziemer**

**CAL FIRE statewide SRA fee implementation** - FDAC and its members are working with a legislator from Siskiyou County to initiate clean up language that would exempt those areas in the SRA that also fall in the boundaries of existing legal fire protection districts. Imposing a statewide fee into a jurisdictional area that may technically be SRA, but is primarily served by a local fire district raises a lot of political and financial problems since prop 218 measures are the only funding available to fire districts. A state fee would kill any chances a fire district might have of going forward with a 218 measure of their own.

The original thought was that the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection (BOF) were going to point out that there were very serious operational problems in the original language. The way it is currently written, the money is technically only allowed to go to prevention, not to suppression; they are working to clear up that portion, but there is still a dispute whether CAL FIRE should be allowed to collect a fee in a fire protection district. George Gentry of the BOF is working with the legislative representative to see how to make this work. The BOF is also interested in cleaning up the bill so that the money generated can be used on suppression as well as prevention.

It was suggested by another member that the CPF should be contacted early on in the bill development process.

**Andy McMurry**

**CAL FIRE statewide SRA fee implementation** - CAL FIRE was not made aware that the bill was coming and had no input. As part of the Budget, the Governor recognized that the proposed language in AB1X29 had issues; he then directed CAL FIRE, the Department of Finance, and the Legislature to work on clean-up language to make it implementable on the fire protection side as well. The clean-up language has been submitted to the department of Finance. Until the clean-up language is adopted and new legislation is passed we have a law on the books giving CAL FIRE and the BOF tasks and deadlines. At the BOF August meeting the Board directed Executive Officer Gentry to come up with emergency regulations that will be implemented September 1. But if this is what we have to implement, we are moving ahead as directed and don't anticipate sending out any bills until January. We are anticipating lawsuits once the first bill goes out.

On August 22, the BOF will hold a meeting to hear the emergency regulations; under the emergency regulation process there is no public comment. Emergency regulations are temporary until we can go through the regular regulation process with public comment.

**State Budget** – Since the beginning of last fiscal year CAL FIRE has taken about a 70 million dollar reduction, mostly in down staffing, elimination of exclusive V-LAT (very large air tanker) contract among other things. We have been told that we have to take another cut of 15.8 million; we have not yet determined where it will come from. We have been told that it is unallocated but permanent; all the reductions are permanent. This year fire season started late, the weather cooperated, we were able to staff up and take advantage of salary savings, but we are not going to plan on that in perpetuity. Nothing is off the table; we are not going to realize these saving without cutting into every program. We will do what we can to have the least impact on our initial attack capability as possible.

#### **Tonya Hoover**

**State Budget** – The cuts will affect our fire prevention mission within CAL FIRE, looking at where our programs are General Funded, and how we deal with the cuts in those General Fund areas like pre-fire engineering, inspections services, public education outreach; it is painful all over. Within the special fee areas of the OSFM, they are not part of the discussion at this time because they are special funded; programs like Fire Engineering, State fire Training, Codes and Regulations, Pipeline Safety, Fire and Life Safety, that are fee generated.

**Smoke Alarm Task Force** - Good news, California has made national news again. The group that was brought together five months ago to take a look at photoelectric, ionization and other technologies for smoke alarms has completed their work, and the final recommendation report will be posted to the OSFM web site tomorrow. I am very proud of the work the task force has done. This is another example of stakeholders coming together to work through a very complicated issue and make recommendations that are possible. I will be working through the recommendations from the framework of the OSFM. It won't be next month, but we are committed to completing as many as possible over the next four years. To those of you that participated or had people participate on the task force, thank you.

We have gotten a lot of interest; the state of Ohio has brought together a committee and they are interested in our report and I will be presenting a briefing to the Fire and Life Safety section of IChiefs next week. We have also had interest from NFA and the US Fire Administration.

**Renewable Energy** – We were asked by the Governor's Office to bring together a panel for discussion on renewable energies. The panel had members from fire operations, research, and industry. The panel was able to give a perspective on renewable energies, its effect on the fire services' ability to do their job and how the fire service sees renewable energies forward. We had kudos from the Governor's Office and positive feedback on the information the panel provided. To those who participated or had staff participate, thank you.

The OSFM will be bringing together a committee called "Renewable Energies Revisited" covering not only photo voltaic, sun collectors, wind turbines, alternate fuels whether they are bio fuel, hydrogen gas, etc. They will be looking at how it affects our code arena, what we need to do in the code, and what we need to do in State Fire Training to prepare our workforce for new technology.

**Fireworks and the Disposal of Fireworks** – This is a very complicated, convoluted issue that has a tremendous fiscal impact as well as a personnel (staffing) impact to the Office of the State Fire Marshal as well as the local jurisdictions. The fireworks are considered a hazardous waste, which adds to the complexity and cost. We are about to start a disposal operation which is very costly. I will be looking to the SBFS for your knowledge, experience, your connection to your communities, and the departments/agencies you represent to help with this topic.

The State Fire Marshal is statutorily responsible for the disposal of fireworks in California. Whether they are safe and sane, but are not permitted in a jurisdiction and have been confiscated by law



enforcement, or illegal fireworks that cross our borders from Nevada, Mexico or other areas; the OSFM is responsible for disposal of those collected by local fire and law enforcement. On the average 100 thousand pounds per year needs to be transported out of state because there is no place to dispose of them in California.

The lawful way to dispose of fireworks is a little different in each state, most states burn it. We have been working with our Cal EPA partners on the possible re-designation of some of these products that are all packaged, haven't been opened, haven't been used; that would make it contraband vs. hazardous waste; as contraband the product is not as costly to transport and dispose of.

Dave Gillotte - Unfunded liabilities are not good for the state, and they get passed down to the local levels that have the same problem. We are looking to anti-terrorism money, law enforcement money, WMD money, something we can get whether it is federal that is passed through the state or from the state law enforcement budget; or anything else that is relative to this. The Chiefs need to go after it, with legislative support as to how to get it; otherwise the mandate will be there and continue to use up money intended for operations, prevention, etc.

Mike Richwine - We have looked into a number of options including anti-terrorism and WMD money in the past and can revisit it. We aren't going to sell the fireworks back and generate revenue that way, it's not good public policy; but there are opportunities for recycling and proper disposal. The laws are archaic and in conflict with current hazardous waste laws. Originally we had an Arson/Bomb staff that would burn the fireworks and that was the practice until the late '80s-early '90s. We are working with Cal/EPA and DTSC to try and work through this in a manner that is lawful. The cost is anywhere from 3-5 dollars per pound; at 100 thousand pounds you can see that it is a drain and an unfunded obligation. We are going to need ideas, creative thinking and help from all the members. We will be making this a regular report at future meetings.

Tonya Hoover – I am open to all sorts of suggestions except one, I am not selling fireworks back. Any other suggestions are open.

### **State Fire Training** – curriculum projects

Alicia Hamilton reporting

- Command 1A - finished and possibly being rolled out after the first of the year.
- Command 1B - in its first draft, we are finding it difficult; there is very little out there on initial attack of all risk we have included.
- Command 1C – WUI Company Officer – Is coming a long well, the student manual is in its first draft. We are using CAL FIRE material in conjunction with Firescope and NWCG
- Fire Management and the New Leadership Class – Not started as of yet, but according to the timeline will be completed by March of next year.

Mike Richwine reporting

- Prevention 1 – Fire Code application for Company Officer – retooled to a single course that is now applicable
- Chief Officer Program – no progress
- Rescue Courses – made progress
- RIC Operations – will be rolling out
- Instructor update – rolling out next month
- Firefighter Safety and Survival – being delivered now
- Proposal given to STEAC for a new classes
  - Rescue Systems and Structural Collapse
  - Technical Rope Rescue Course that bridges the gap between LARRO and Rescue Systems 1

- We will have those proposals at the next SBFS meeting. This is part of a bigger picture regarding the development of a Rescue Technician Certification Track that is being proposed.
- Emergency Vehicle Technician – Developing the courses

We have been looking at our development and delivery capabilities in State Fire Training and recognizing we are on a five year mark with our Blueprint 20/20 strategic plan. We have 100 classes that make up our State Fire Training System and Certification; we are struggling to keep up with course work and maintaining the standards and curriculum to support the system. STEAC has been made aware and we have a couple of focus group meetings to take a look at the system and the way we develop curriculum, the products we will be providing, the use of off-the-shelf publications, engaging more with national publishers and looking at partnering more with other entities that provide training or similar services. We have a relationship, through a contract, with Sacramento State University; we are able to increase our capabilities for developing curriculum through them. When you look at other states' successful State Fire Training programs, they are typically linked to a university. We see an advantage with having a relationship with the UC and CSU systems and are looking for opportunities to partner within our own agency and non-governmental organizations. We need to change the current system and communicate it in a way that doesn't cause panic for those currently in the system, and sets a path forward for the future firefighters that will be entering into a new training education system. The focus groups are made up of representatives of the organizations reflected in STEAC and SBFS. We will be coming back with a formal report at a future meeting. State training agencies are partnered with Universities and also have strong ties to industry and through training props and training center development they are able to utilize resources. We have 41 academies throughout the state. The problem is not in the delivery but in the administration, the development of curriculum, maintenance of standards and testing. I believe State Fire Training needs to be focused on those three things. It is a complex program that is difficult to maintain. We need to get focused and partner out what we can.

Jerry Davies offered Farmers University as a possibility. The University is a 158, 000 sq. ft. building with extensive class rooms, as well as a two-story home is various states of building and fire for claims training, located in Ventura County and part of Los Angeles.

- |       |                                                                                                                                                                  |                     |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| VI.   | <b>PUBLIC COMMENT</b><br>Chief Hoover opened the floor to public comments<br>No members of the public were in attendance to comment.                             | <b>Tonya Hoover</b> |
| VII.  | <b>SET MEETING DATES</b><br>A. Next meeting November 17, 2011 at OSFM<br>Future meetings will be kept on the current quarterly scheduling cycle.                 | <b>Tonya Hoover</b> |
| VIII. | <b>MEETING ADJOURNMENT</b><br>John Winder made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Michael Williams seconded the motion.<br>The Board voted unanimously to adjourn. | <b>Tonya Hoover</b> |