



**State Board of Fire Services
MINUTES
Wednesday, February 20, 2008
Office of the State Fire Marshal, Sacramento, California**



Chair/Ex-Officio

Kate Dargan
State Fire Marshal

Co-Chair

Mike Esparza
California State Firefighters Association

Members:

Richard Blanco
Fire District

Steve Brown
California Fire Chiefs Association

Jerry Davies
Insurance Industry

P. Michael Freeman
California Metropolitan Fire Chiefs Association

David Gillotte
International Association of Fire Fighters

Robert Magee
City Government

Michael Nelson
County Government

Lou Paulson
California Professional Firefighters

John Eric Pearce
California State Firefighters Association

John Winder
CDF Firefighters

Glenn Ziemer
Fire Districts Association of California

Fire Service Labor (vacant)
California Labor Federation

Ex-Officios:

Ken McLean
CAL FIRE

Henry Renteria
Governor's Office of Emergency Services

Dan Terry
California Fire Fighter Joint Apprenticeship Committee

MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Kate Dargan, State Fire Marshal
- Mike Esparza, California State Firefighters Association
- Steve Brown, California Fire Chiefs Association */***
- P. Michael Freeman, California Metropolitan Fire Chiefs Association *****
- David Gillotte, International Association of Fire Fighters ****
- Dallas Jones, California Labor Federation #
- Robert Magee, City Government
- Ken McLean, Deputy Director of Fire Protection, CAL FIRE **
- Michael Nelson, County Government
- Lou Paulson, California Professional Firefighters ****
- John Eric Pearce, California State Firefighters Association *
- Mike S. Williams, California State Firefighters Association #
- Dan Terry, Chair of the California Fire Fighters Joint Apprenticeship Committee */*****
- John Winder, California Department of Forestry Firefighters
- Glenn Ziemer, Fire Districts Association of California

- * attended via telephone conference call
- ** joined the meeting at 1025 hours and left at 1040 hours
- *** joined the meeting at 1104 hours
- **** left meeting at 1040 hours
- ***** joined the meeting at 1030 hours via telephone conference call
- # pending appointment of representative by Governor

MEMBERS ABSENT:

- Richard Blanco, Fire District
- Jerry Davies, Insurance Industry
- Henry Renteria, Governor's Office of Emergency Services

STAFF:

- Tonya Hoover, Assistant State Fire Marshal
- Mike Richwine, Division Chief, State Fire Training
- Dave Hillman, Chief, Law Enforcement
- Tom Hoffman, Staff Chief, Law Enforcement
- Diane Seiple, Staff Services Analyst, Support Services
- Judy Bankert, Office Technician, Support Services

GUESTS:

- Kim Zagaris, Governor's Office of Emergency Services
- Ron Marley, Shasta College
- Terry Miller, California State Firefighters Association
- Frank Oglesby, California State Firefighters Association
- Mike Neu, California State Firefighters Association

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chief Kate Dargan, State Fire Marshal, called the meeting to order at 1010 hours at the Office of the State Fire Marshal (OSFM) Headquarters, 1131 S Street, Sacramento, California.

II. SWEARING IN and ADMINISTERING OATH

Chief Dargan administered the oath of office in person to:
Glenn Ziemer, Fire Districts Association of California
Michael Nelson, County Government
Robert Magee, City Government

III. ROLL CALL

Roll Call of the State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) was conducted. A quorum was established.

IV. INTRODUCTIONS

Chief Dargan thanked the three new members who just came on board. She said an orientation day was being planned for April or May—perhaps to coincide with the next board meeting—for everyone who has been appointed and was not a continuing appointment from the previous administration. Self-introductions of guests were then conducted.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Copies of the minutes from the August 15, 2007, meeting were distributed. Chief Dargan asked for any changes or a motion to approve the minutes.

A motion was made by David Gillotte, International Association of Firefighters, to approve the minutes and was seconded by John Winder, CDF Firefighters. The motion was passed unanimously.

Note: After the meeting was adjourned, a correction to the minutes was suggested. Tonya Hoover had been listed under Staff in the minutes, and she had not yet been sworn in as Assistant State Fire Marshal. She should have been listed under Guests and her title changed to Fire Marshal, Moraga-Orinda Fire District.

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chief Dargan said that February 18, 2008, was the first Code Development Hearing in several years in California with the International Code Council. The meeting will continue in Palm Springs.

Lou Paulson asked Chief Dargan if she knew the status of the Fire Service labor appointment for Dallas Jones. She said she would check into it and report back as an advisory to Dallas.

VII. PROGRAM and ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. State Fire Training (SFT)

1. 2020 Strategic Plan 5.0 Review – Attachment 1

Chief Dargan stated that Blueprint 2020 had been in process for about a year and a half going through revisions, discussions, and additions. The current document (Attachment 1) has remained substantially unchanged for about a year except for some minor adjustments. She said that the intent for the document is that it simply guides the State Fire Marshal's Office policy making in terms of program development over time. The document serves as a method to carry over the strategic planning for State Fire Training from one administration to the next.

Chief Richwine explained that, along with long-term strategy for Fire Service Training in California, the intent of the Plan is to introduce some level of scalability in how those goals are achieved. Many of the items in the Strategic Plan are already being acted upon, and the progress can be followed in the Two-Year Work Plan on the website.

Glenn Ziemer stated that the concept of scalability is very important in that it takes substantial financial input to make the Plan ultimately successful over the long term. Chief Ziemer suggested looking at the Plan to determine what portions of it are scalable and can be achieved at lower resource levels. He also pointed out that Appendix G depicting the OSFM accredited training facilities shows a vivid lack of training facilities in the northwestern part of the state. Since the testing is to take place only in those facilities, he felt anything the State Fire Marshal's Office could do to assist or develop alternative training

sights would be very helpful. Michael Nelson pointed out the lack of training facilities in the central area of the state also.

Chief Dargan remarked the Board will be dealing with Blueprint 2020 on an ongoing basis.

Mike Esparza made the motion to accept the Blueprint 2020 Plan—California State Fire Training and Education Strategic Plan 2008—and Glenn Ziemer seconded the motion. Chief Dargan asked if there was any further discussion.

John Pearce had a question regarding the hybrid course online delivery model. Chief Richwine informed him that was an issue being Beta tested through the State Training and Education Advisory Committee (STEAC). The one-year testing ends in June, so Chief Richwine expressed a desire to bring the Beta testing workgroups to the next Board meeting to give a report on the hybrid online delivery and the Beta test results.

The vote was then taken, and the motion was passed unanimously.

Mike Esparza congratulated all who worked so hard to put Blueprint 2020 together. Chief Dargan added her special thanks to the California Fire Chiefs Association (CFCA) who funded the original consulting bill with a training grant they had received and shared with OSFM. She pointed out that the leadership of John Malmquist, Executive Director of CFCA, was instrumental in putting this all together.

2. Qualifications for Ethics Instructors – Attachment 2

Chief Richwine reviewed Attachment 2. He mentioned there had been some concerns raised regarding the approval process for new ethics instructors. One of the requirements is that you have held the rank of chief officer for a minimum of two years or have two letters of recommendation from current Ethical Leadership in the Classroom instructors. Due to the very limited number of those instructors in the state, Chief Richwine requested the policy be changed to two letters from fire department chiefs who can attest to the ethical requirement. If this recommendation were approved, it would be included in a regulations update in the fall. He said they would make the change internally through STEAC, and it would be reflected in the next rule-making proposal in the fall.

Chief Freeman suggested this two-letter requirement be accomplished on some kind of standardized form or formatted letter available from the OSFM. Chief Richwine said that could be done.

Chief Dargan mentioned some input she had recently received while in the northern part of the state regarding the pinch point of the ethics training availability in terms of keeping instructors in that area qualified.

Glenn Ziemer expressed concern about the situation where individuals are signing off on others who will then become their competition in a private, for-profit enterprise. Kim Zagaris reported efforts are under way to try to get as many people trained as necessary to make it easier for local agencies. John Pearce and Mike Esparza wondered if the two-letter approval process could be accomplished by either ethics instructors and/or fire chiefs. Chief Richwine said it could be an either/or situation.

Chief Dargan offered a concept to think about and perhaps discuss at a later time: anyone serving on a technical advisory or curriculum advisory committee in which they are also an instructor, may in the future be asked for a financial disclosure. Financial disclosure is needed when an individual is making policy decisions regarding something that has a personal benefit for him/her

3. EMT Licensing – Attachment 3

Chief Richwine explained the attachment contained information concerning the background of certification, who the customers are, and the revenue generated.

4. State Fire Training Rulemaking – Attachment 4

Chief Richwine stated the attachment is a proposal to formally adopt SFT's policies and procedures, course information, required materials manual, and course development manuals into Title 19 – California Code of Regulations. SFT has been operating a program for 30 years now with statutory authority to run a program, collect fees, develop standards, and deliver training. SFT is also required to develop regulations to administer the program, but that has not occurred. When Chief Richwine came on board as chief of SFT in November 2005, he made it one of SFT's goals to get it through the rule-making process. Comments are welcome concerning this rule-making process via e-mail or letter. The comment deadline is March 24, 2008. If there is a request for a hearing, it is scheduled for that date at the Resources Building.

5. Review Statewide Training and Education Advisory Committee Update

a. Certification

(1) Chief Fire Officer Certification Training Standard (Action) – Attachment 5

Due to the lack of a quorum at this time, this action item was postponed until later in the meeting. (See Page 5)

b. Curriculum Update

This item was not addressed.

c. Delivery

(1) NIMS Compliance – Attachment 6

Chief Richwine advised that Attachment 6 is from SFT's Policy and Procedures Manual. This is the National Incident Management Courses (NIMS) course requirement and an issue that was raised through STEAC. The City of Roseville Fire Department had some concerns about NIMS compliance versus SFT—State Fire Marshal—certification. SFT requires I-300 and I-400 certification for the fire officer and the chief officer respectively. All the communities and special districts are required to come into compliance with NIMS.

Private vendors who deliver NIMS compliant Incident Command System (ICS) training are often short of required hours for fire officer/chief certification. SFT adopted the National Wildfire Coordinating Group (NWCG) ICS courses. After an analysis of the programs of the National Fire Academy, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and the Emergency Management Institute (EMI), the programs were found to be very similar. STEAC's recommendation is that the ICS certificates from those institutions be accepted--provided they have the recommended hours listed on the certificate.

A discussion ensued concerning the different courses and hours required. Some of the points discussed were:

- There are three existing training tracks—one is NIMS compliance, and then the other ICS minimum training requirements for fire officer, chief officer certification and CICC— and the need to hook them all together so there is consistency between those two tracks
- Some courses have less hours than required
- How to make up the shortage of hours
- Is the California market significant enough that you can just leverage it by requirement?
- There is a mechanism for counties and cities to meet the federal requirements very inexpensively and without a lot of time investment
- Accept what is in place as the standard and not try to accept the NIMS as equivalent
- How does adding hours to a course insure students get out of the course what is needed?

- The attempt here is to open up additional training courses for equivalencies that are already substantially equivalent, but you are going to have to teach the whole course
- NIMS is a watered down ICS operation
- Concern we not dilute our training and requirements as that would be a step backwards.

Chief Richwine summarized that he was looking for a vote to support the equivalencies that have been recommended by STEAC—provided the hours are identified on the certificate as issued for the training.

John Winder made the motion to reject these changes, and Glenn Ziemer seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

Agenda item VII, a.5.a.(1) was then addressed (presented out of order). **Chief Fire Officer Certification Training Standard (Action) – Attachment 5**

Chief Richwine introduced the Board to Fire Service Training Specialist III Alicia Hamilton who was handling the presentation of Attachment 5. She stated the SFT's certification training standards are the base document that determines what it takes to ultimately get the chief officer certificate. Used as the basis for this document were the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) standards that coincide with this level of certification. This document was compiled and organized through the cooperative committee efforts of Rich Cabral (Fresno Fire Department), Ron Martin (Contra Costa County Fire Protection District), Dan Coffman (California Fire Technology Directors), Tom Pambianco (San Bernardino County Fire Department), Mary Jennings (California Fire Fighter Joint Apprenticeship Committee), Mark Romer (Roseville Fire Department), Bruce Martin (Fremont Fire Department), and Bill Vandevort, Team Leader, (North Tree Fire International).

The entire NFPA 1020 will be in the fire officer standards or chief officer standards. Also looked at was what wasn't in the NFPA standards—items identified as being under the authority of the OSFM—that the above committee wanted the chief officers to have training in. One such item was leadership, so Principles of Leadership was added for the chief officer. Other changes were also included that went above and beyond NFPA standards. Each Performance Goal has a Given, a Performance, and a Standard. The Performances will then become the basis for training needed for the chief officer certification. The Performances will most likely become either course outline topics or lesson plans that will develop the training necessary to achieve the certificate.

Chief Richwine called attention to the Certification Tracks on page VI of Attachment 5. Current training standards are now in place for the Chief Officer, Fire Officer, Training Officer, and the Fire Fighter Driver/Operator. The Public Education Officer is being worked on, there is a draft of the Arson Investigator, and soon attention will be turned to the Mechanic series. The goal is once the standards are up to date and linked to the national standards, that then validates the whole certification program, and it provides direction for future curriculum needs. Steve Brown asked how this impacts the reciprocity between the states regarding accepting certificates from other states. Chief Richwine said SFT currently doesn't accept other states' certificates.

Due to the lack of a quorum at this time, this item could not be voted on.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS (presented out of order)

A. California Incident Command Certification System (CICCS) Task Force Status Update (Action) – Attachment 8

Mike Esparza explained Attachment 8 was Frequently Asked Questions that the CICCS task force has updated and continues to update. He pointed out that Chief Freeman from Los Angeles County brought it to the Board's attention—as did others—that people are going all over California to assist with the wildland fire fighting effort, but many of those people may

not meet minimum standards. The bar needs to be raised so that no matter what county someone is working in they will meet the minimum standards. A task force co-chaired by Mike Esparza and Chief Brown reviewed what was available, mainly NWCG document 310-1. Using that as a guide, a committee system was set up for different levels of certification and qualification for the California Fire Service. Some success has been made in implementation, but more work remains to be done. The task force has reconvened with cooperation from the Office of Emergency Services (OES) and the OSFM, and this issue is continuing to be addressed. The Board adopted the 2000 version, but the rest of the fire services have accepted the 2006 version. The California Fire Service is migrating to the 2006 version believing everyone is going on to the next version. In fact, FIRESCOPE and the Board have not voted to accept the 2006 version. Further down the line this CICCIS task force will be proposing their own version.

The bottom line is the current CICCIS--as approved by the State Board--requires the 2000 version. The 2006 version has new positions not in the 2000 version, departments are confused, and both versions are being used in California. The 2006 version is the industry standard, and the Federal Fire Service and other fire service organizations are already using it. Chief Brown said the change needs to be made so all are using the 2006 version. He further stated the task force has been successful, and added that there is a proposal that the task force itself be the peer review panel for the 500 and 600 levels.

Mike Esparza recommended the above be an action item for the next SBFS meeting.

The task force recommendation is that the NWCG 310-1, 2006 version, be adopted in the interim until a California incident qualification guide is established--which is to be developed by the CICCIS task force and presented to the SBFS and FIRESCOPE. Mike Esparza advised that both the CICCIS minutes and the Frequently Asked Questions are on the SBFS and the FIRESCOPE web sites.

Mike Esparza was asked if there was any progress in getting a standard card to issue, and he said yes there was. He stated a basic, standard card has been adopted that has all the requirements the previous, well-known, red card had. The hope is the IQS program—which actually prints a card—will be adopted.

Due to the lack of a quorum at this time, Attachment 8 could not be voted on. Both Attachment 5 and 8 need to be carried over to the next Board meeting due to lack of a quorum.

VII. B. ARSON & BOMB INVESTIGATOR UPDATE (presented out of order)

Tom Hoffman, Staff Chief, Law Enforcement, OSFM, presented this update to the Board. He related that Law Enforcement is down to two certified bomb technicians. He told the Board that Chief Dargan asked for a white paper regarding where the Fire Marshal Arson and Bomb Program should be 5 to 10 years from now. He has asked staff to research all statutory, regulatory, and legal requirements for fulfilling the requirements in the Health and Safety Code. OSFM has the authority to do bomb render-safe procedures we engage in, but does not have a statutory mandate in the Health and Safety Code. OSFM does have a mandate for training arson investigators. Another issue that has come up in the last year is the Fire Marshal adopting a state standard for accelerant detection K-9. Staff will brief Chief Dargan and Chief Hillman on April 1 regarding options to consider for the future of ABI. Due to Law Enforcement vacancies, many local governments have developed work-arounds to obtain bomb technician services from other entities. Law Enforcement needs to provide the services to local government and will deploy people in the most efficient fashion.

Chief Hoffman went on to say that last year quite a bit of effort was spent in securing passage of SB 839 which changed some of the statutory criminal standards for how to measure quantities of dangerous fireworks. SB 839 also provided for a significant increase in criminal fines for people possessing dangerous fireworks. Law Enforcement has the potential to eventually have eight arson and bomb technicians—four general funded and four special funded.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

A. Review of Vetoed SB 828—Accelerant Detecting K-9 Project

Mike Esparza advised the group the vetoed bill was proposed to create a standard for accelerant K-9 detecting teams. Within the veto was direction requiring the State Fire Marshal to take a look at the current standard that is used here at the OSFM and determine what changes are needed to bring it up to date. There was a meeting this morning to discuss the standards which need to be included in this particular program. SFT and Law Enforcement are taking the lead on this. A task force is going to be formed under Chief Dave Hillman with stakeholder input to take a look at the recommendations that were already put together by CSFA. The goal of the task force is to have their work completed by the next Board meeting.

Mike Esparza requested this subject be on the agenda for the next meeting so that the SBFS can get an update and, hopefully, some recommendations from the group.

B. Item VII A.5.c.(2) was then addressed (presented out of order). Online Hybrid—Attachment 7

Chief Richwine informed the group that Attachment 7 was an article written by Dan Coffman, President of Community College Fire Technology Directors Association. He is the chair of the group developing the online hybrid delivery courses. Within the document there are FAQ's as part of an effort to insure everyone the approach to this is deliberate, the course will be Beta tested, and the issues will be flushed out. One of the first things done was an analysis of the learning domains to make a determination of the ones they believe could be taught in a distance-delivery format and which ones need to be taught in a classroom. As mentioned previously, STEAC allowed Beta testing for one year, and OSFM is monitoring that Beta test. Dan Coffman was asked at the last STEAC meeting to start providing evaluations from students so that the Beta test can start being analyzed. Chief Richwine's goal is to have Mr. Coffman attend the next SBFS meeting and give a full presentation on this delivery method to the Board members.

C. Travel Reimbursement

The Health and Safety Code does specify that Board members shall be paid actual, necessary expenses related to activities of the Board, including travel; however, this is an unfunded mandate. OSFM is looking into the possibility of developing a policy regarding Board travel.

D. Frequency of SBFS Meetings

Chief Hoover advised the group that the Board is required by the Health and Safety Code to meet at least annually. Historically the Board has met quarterly, and the consensus was to continue that frequency. Chief Hoover also advised the group a new format will be used for future meetings. Mini staff reports will be provided for all action items, with a suggested action item, background, and analysis.

X. ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION

Chief Zagaris told the group that the LAO has issued a report this morning dealing with the fire siege issues. Chief Brown asked if the link was ever made to send the SBFS minutes to the CAL Chiefs for posting on their web page. Diane Seiple will make some inquiries and reply to Chief Brown.

XI. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

XII. SET MEETING DATES

The next meeting is schedule to be in May, but the exact date will be determined after all the Board members are contacted via email regarding their availability. Chief Hoover suggested we list the dates for the August and November 2008 Board meetings within that email also.

XIII. MEETING ADJOURNMENT

Mike Esparza closed the meeting at 1241 hours.