



STEAC Meeting Minutes

July 12, 2019 – Sacramento, California

I. Introductions and Welcome

Members Present

Bradley Arganbright, Nor Cal Training Officers (alternate)
John Bagala, California Professional Fire Fighters
John Binaski, League of California Cities and STEAC Vice Chair
Taral Brideau, California Fire Fighter Joint Apprenticeship Committee
Tom Carlisle, California State Fire Fighters Association
Chris Coates, So Cal Training Officers (alternate)
Ron Coleman, STEAC Chair
Randy Collins, California Fire Technology Directors Association (North)
Gareth Harris, Fire District Association of California
Kyle Heggstrom, FIRESCOPE (alternate)
Sam Hoffman, California State Fire Fighters Association (alternate)
Scott Jaeggi, California Fire Technology Directors Association (South) (alternate)
Javier Lara, Cal OES
Jeremy Lawson, Cal Fire Training Center
Brian Marshall, CAL OES
Gaudenz Panholzer, California Fire Chiefs Association
Richard Rideout, California Metropolitan Fire Chiefs Inc.
Brent Stangeland, CAL FIRE
Rich Thomas, California Professional Fire Fighters (alternate)

Members Absent

Tony Bowden, Fire Districts Association of California (alternate)
Bret Davidson, So Cal Training Officers
Matthew Jewett, California Fire Technology Directors Association (North)
Ann Rosales, CAL FIRE Training Center
John Walsh, Nor Cal Training Officers
Gail Warner, California Fire Technology Directors Association (South)
Bertral Washington, League of CA Cities (alternate)
David Winnacker, California Fire Chiefs Association

State Fire Training Staff

Mark Bisbee, SFT, Training Specialist
Joe Bunn, SFT, Training Specialist III
Wendy Collins, SFT, Asst. Deputy Director

Kevin Conant, SFT, Fire Service Training Specialist III
Jim Eastman, SFT, Fire Service Training Specialist III
Brandon Erickson, SFT, Associate Government Program Analyst
Kirsten Fonseca, SFT Staff Services Analyst
Chris Fowler, SFT, Deputy State Fire Marshal Supervisor
Andrew Henning, SFT, Division Chief
Rick Lum, SFT, Training Specialist
Nick Pavone, SFT, Division Support
Caryn Petty, SFT, Deputy State Fire Marshal I
Marisol Ramos, SFT, SFT Inst. Registration
Kris Rose, Staff Services Manager I
Kristahna Valverde, SFT, Division Support

Guests

David Baldwin, Sac Fire/FIRESCOPE
Greg Belk, CAL FIRE
Michael Bryant, Retired LA County Fire Department
Larry Collins, CAL OES
Rebecca Gibson, State Fire Training Legal Counsel
Low Goetsch, Training Chief Contra Costa Fire
Paul Gonzalez, South Bay Regional Public Safety Training
Greg Kurtz, Livermore Pleasanton Fire Department
Jason Livermore, Hayward Fire Department
Billy Milligan, City of Riverside Fire Chair/CAL OES Training Working Group
Andrew Murtagh, San Francisco Fire Department
Brendan O'Leary, City College of San Francisco
Abe Roman, Berkeley Fire
Allison Shaw, Sacramento State University Editor
German Sierra, Las Positas College
Linda Vaughn, South Bay Regional Public Safety
David Wiseman, STEAC Legal Counsel

Welcome

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 A.M. by Chief Ron Coleman.

Roll Call/Quorum Established

A quorum was established during introductions.

Member Appointment/Reappointment

Brian Marshall-Member Appointment-CAL OES
Javier Lara-Alternate Appointment-CAL OES

Chief Coleman welcomed Brian Marshall and Javier Lara to Statewide Training and Education Advisory Committee (STEAC).

Past Member Recognition

Kim Zagaris-Member-CAL OES

Chief Coleman recognized Kim Zagaris and wished him well.

II. Agenda Review

Presenter: Chief Ron Coleman

Chief Coleman asked if there are requests for an agenda item to be moved forward.

Andrew Henning requested to move the State Fire Training Fee Report, item 9A, above curriculum development and delivery.

Chief Coleman agreed and asked if there are any additional comments.

Note: Some agenda items were read out of order due to the appeal hearing.

III. Instructor Disciplinary Appeal – Michael Bryant

Presenter: Chief Ron Coleman

David Wiseman advised there will be an appeal today before the Statewide Education and Advisory Committee (STEAC). This will be held in open session under the California Code of Regulations 1990.09, which is the regulations that authorize this appeal before STEAC, and they cite provisions of the government code of section 11425.10. Those government code provisions relate to the administrative adjudication bill of rights, chapter 4.5 of the government code informal adjudicative hearings. Under those provisions, subsection A3 states hearings shall be held open to public observation, provided in section 11425.20. He advised in terms of the proceeding itself, they have laid out a presentation.

Prior to beginning, there is an opportunity to challenge the voting members under government section code 11425.40, which allows an individual to exclude a voting member for various reasons stated under that section. He advised if there is someone challenging it, he believes the board can exclude any witnesses that will testify as to the challenge under government code section 1112683. After any voting member challenge, we will deliberate and the board members that were not challenged will come back with their decision regarding the challenge. After those have taken place by State Fire Training (SFT), we will move to actual appeal. Prior to that, the board will exclude any witnesses that will be called in the proceeding itself under code 112683 and closed evidence code 777. At that point in time the parties may wish to make motions on preliminary matters. Once that is completed, one of the parties will begin their opening statements which will include presentation of evidence to the board and followed by the closing or alternate party who can also present witnesses and cross-examine witnesses. After the events, both parties will be given an opportunity to make closing statements. After closing statements, the members who were authorized and not

challenged successfully will deliberate the matter in closed session. A decision may or may not be rendered after that. Prior to beginning, opening statements may be provided by both parties. The voting members can ask questions of witnesses during the period that witnesses are presenting.

Chief Coleman asked if there are any questions.

Rebecca Gibson advised they would like to clarify some of the proceedings when they reach the motion section.

John Bagala asked if this will be recorded.

R. Gibson advised the open session will be recorded, but the closed session will not. She also advised SFT does not have any challenges at the present.

Michael Bryant advised they do not have any challenges either.

R. Gibson clarified this is a second level appeal under Title 19, rather than an initial hearing on the disciplinary action. Pursuant to Title 19 section 19990.09 the second level appeal requires all written evidence be submitted prior to the hearing. SFT asks that no additional written evidence may be produced by either party today per that regulation.

M. Bryant asked for clarification.

R. Gibson advised per regulations all evidence must be submitted in writing, reversing or revoking the action. In subsection B-1 testimony may be provided, but evidence should have been submitted in writing prior to today's hearing.

M. Bryant asked if this includes any new evidence that has arisen since the April meeting was postponed. He advised when they submitted their information they made note there would be additional evidence forthcoming. That was noted on page 2 of the STEAC notice of decision on first level appeal.

D. Wiseman advised he believes counsel is referring to California code of regulations Title 19. It states under B-1 that "after review of all submitted materials and/or testimony provided during the hearing". He advised Chief Coleman it references during an administrative hearing, so he would say evidence can be submitted during the hearing.

R. Gibson advised they don't oppose testimony being provided, they only oppose new written evidence being submitted because the appellant has had the opportunity to submit that prior to this hearing.

John Binaski asked if most evidence had already been submitted in the packet.

M. Bryant answered yes. He referenced page 2 of the second level appeal process, which was submitted within the time frames. He advised there's evidence relevant to a public records request, which was noted in the second paragraph identified on page two

of the documents being submitted forthwith. That was one of the reasons the April meeting was changed to July.

R. Gibson clarified they don't oppose anything submitted pursuant to that letter and prior to this meeting, however the admission of new written materials today does not give SFT the ability to review those prior. The letter was written in March and the public records provided to the other party, so there was ample time to submit additional written documentation to SFT. Anything submitted with the packet or testimony provided today is not opposed, but any additional written materials that they were not given a chance to review before today are being opposed.

D. Wiseman advised if anyone is producing new evidence that a copy should be given to the opposing party. He advised he believes both parties do have the opportunity to submit additional material, but that is up to the chair.

Chief Coleman asked what the recommendation from legal staff is.

D. Wiseman recommended that pursuant to the regulation both parties are permitted to submit any materials at the hearing today whether it had been provided prior or not.

Chief Coleman advised he will be following the counsel of legal staff. He asked if there are objections.

R. Gibson advised the second motion they would like to bring is to limit the scope of evidence and testimony to the appeal at hand, specifically on page one of the appeal submitted by M. Bryant. She referenced the items M. Bryant had listed that he will be appealing. She would like to limit the scope to the disciplines being appealed, not the violations themselves.

M. Bryant advised he supports that.

J. Bagala asked what the discipline being contemplated is.

R. Gibson advised the current discipline that was appealed at the first level was a 180-day suspension, a requirement to retake an Ethical Leadership class, and any additional violations within a 24-month period would result in revocation.

M. Bryant asked if items relevant to revocation can be discussed.

R. Gibson advised for the scope of this appeal they are discussing these violations and the penalties for them.

M. Bryant clarified he wouldn't be here if the revocation was not a part of this investigation

R. Gibson clarified the purpose of the motion is to narrow down the discussion to the discipline of each violation without going into the details of the violations. They would focus today on the discipline to simplify the hearing today to the issues at hand. The second part of that is what the testimony will be and what evidence will be allowed. She

advised they would like to save time by avoiding having to go through all the evidence already provided at the last appeal.

M. Bryant advised he supports this and he plans to be brief and concise. Chief Coleman agreed.

R. Gibson advised their next motion is to ask the committee to recognize the burden of proof is on the appellant to persuade this body that Chief Mike Richwine's decision should be upheld or withdrawn.

M. Bryant agreed.

R. Gibson advised their last motion was to notice the committee has received the copies of the prior proceedings, so that they don't have to resubmit them if there is no opposition.

M. Bryant advised he will reintroduce the documents of what was originally submitted. He advised there are also some documents that were not originally submitted between the first appeal and the second.

R. Gibson advised it is to avoid walking through evidentiary proceedings to prove that M. Richwine's appeal. Essentially they are asking for notice of the hearing transcript that was submitted from the first level hearing, M. Richwine's two decisions, and the notice of discipline. She advised it only consists of those four documents and does not preclude additional documents

M. Bryant agreed. He asked to make a motion to submit a timeline relevant to note-taking of the sequence of events which are relevant to the appeal process.

R. Gibson advised upon a cursory review the dates seems correct, but there are annotations and notes that speak to the appellant's view of the circumstances that they don't necessarily agree with. She advised they oppose the admission, as this should have been discussed before today because there are points they were not able to review. She requested that the document not be seen by STEAC or the chairman until it has been admitted appropriately into evidence.

Chief Coleman advised it can be heard during the proceeding.

J. Binaski asked M. Bryant if there are any more motions, and if he understood the decision regarding the document.

M. Bryant advised it can be introduced as evidence at the end of the meeting or during his presentation. He advised he has one more motion, and would like to request transcript and audio within a reasonable timeframe.

D. Wiseman advised a public records request cannot be made in advance, but it can be made after the meeting.

R. Gibson requested a ten-minute recess to discuss evidence.

Chief Coleman asked if there is an exclusion of any specific witness. R. Gibson answered no.

M. Bryant advised he has no objections.

Chief Coleman called a 10-minute recess. Chief Coleman advised that the 10-minute recess is now over and called STEAC back to order. He advised both parties are in a closed settlement meeting, and the agenda items will be reviewed in the meantime.

Later in the meeting Chief Coleman and STEAC Council David Wiseman advised that both parties have reached a settlement agreement that they feel is beneficial to the SFT program. Michael Bryant had to leave to catch a flight, so they agreed to convey that they were choosing to stay the appeal for the time being to allow them to execute the settlement agreement, and will forward correspondence to hopefully dismiss the appeal prior to your next hearing. She advised this is the intent but nothing is signed yet. Chief Coleman advised the hearing will be held over until the next meeting.

IV. Approval of the April 12, 2019 Minutes

Presenter: Chief Ron Coleman

Chief Coleman informed the members that the two parties are now engaged in a settlement discussion. He advised that the regular agenda would be followed until they return from the settlement discussion.

He also advised that Bertral Washington's appointment letter arrived too late to be posted on the agenda. Chief Coleman welcomed him to the committee as an alternate for League of California Cities.

Randy Collins advised he would like to make one correction to the minutes. Under item 5A, "Dr. Hudson" should be spelt "Dr. Tunson".

Motion:	<i>Randy Collins moved to accept the minutes from April 12, 2019 with one correction. John Bagala seconded the motion.</i>
----------------	--

Action:	<i>All members voted unanimously.</i>
----------------	---------------------------------------

Chief Coleman reminded Statewide Training and Education Advisory Committee members that alternates can only vote if their primaries are not present. He asked Caryn Petty to present item 6E, Community Risk Curriculum Prerequisites.

V. State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) Update

Presenter: Andrew Henning

Andrew Henning advised the SBFS met on May 23rd, which was their first meeting since August 2018. There was a lot of curriculum which had been approved by Statewide Training and Education Advisory Committee (STEAC) and not SBFS. Some

of these courses which had critical need, like the water rescue courses, had been allowed to be offered so they are now catching up with SBFS for approvals. SBFS approved the following:

- Reaccreditations of 8 Accredited Local Academies (ALA) and Accredited Regional Training Programs (ARTP), and the 3 new ALAs and ARTPs
- Updates to the Fire Investigator certification
- Fire Fighter 2 (FF2), Fire Control, and Vehicle Extrication prerequisites to allow those courses to be taught within the Fire Fighter 1 (FF1) academy and to roll directly into FF2 without FF1 certification if all courses have been completed
- Non-certified ALA & ARTP alternate delivery letter that was the proposal from California Fire Technology Directors Association so that the fire chief doesn't have to sign several sheets of paper with numerous signatures
- Executive Chief Fire Officer associate's degree requirement
- Update to the confined space rescue awareness instructor requirements
- Changes to the implementation plan and interim procedures for the Emergency Vehicle Technician certifications
- New aircraft rescue and fire fighter awareness
- Open rescue boat operator for both the small vessel course and large vessel course.

He advised that State Fire Training (SFT) will be seeking approval at the SBFS meeting on August 22, 2019 for CA-219, River and Flood Rescue Technician, Ethical Leadership for Instructors, and the SFT fee report.

Randy Collins asked if it's safe to say everything approved by STEAC was approved by SBFS.

A. Henning answered yes. He explained some of those courses went for a first reading and are now going back for a second reading, such as some of the water rescue courses.

VI. Consent Items

A. ALA's Testing Non-Employees Program

Presenter: Andrew Henning

Attachment: 1

Andrew Henning advised that Accredited Local Academy (ALA) testing of non-employees was discussed at the Steering Committee. He explained there are departments like Sacramento City that run a joint academy with a lot of the neighboring jurisdictions participating, including City of Davis and West Sacramento. The current procedures state that they are not allowed to test the West Sac and Davis employees because they are only allowed to test their own employees. He explained they are having to partner with an Accredited Regional Training Program (ARTP) and run two separate tests at the same time to meet State Fire Training (SFT) procedures. This would allow an ALA to test a neighboring jurisdiction's employees, with up to 49% of the

employees being from a neighboring jurisdiction. For example, if there is a 10-person academy from the ALA and 9 people come from outside for a total of 19 they will be able to test. He advised that the non-employees of the ALA must be hired by a neighboring jurisdiction. The ALA cannot let people buy seats into their academy, and the cadets cannot be pre-employment because those cadets should be focused towards the community college system. John Binaski asked A. Henning to define “neighboring”.

A. Henning advised they didn’t want to place restrictions on the definition, and acknowledges that everyone has a unique situation. He advised he is open to suggestions if Statewide Training and Education Advisory Committee (STEAC) would like to make a recommendation to define “neighboring” or use a different term. It was left vague enough to not place specific parameters on the ALAs. Richard Rideout asked if testing needs to be approved by SFT before taking place. A. Henning advised approval will not be necessary. It will be up to the ALAs as part of their record keeping to be able to justify to SFT that they are meeting the 49% ratio.

Motion:	<i>Richard Rideout moved to accept the motion. Gaudenz Panholzer seconded the motion.</i>
Action:	<i>All members voted unanimously.</i>

Gaudenz Panholzer asked if all the people had to have gone through the same academy. He asked if a neighboring ALA is running an academy, can a few people from a non-ALA be sent over for the testing portion.

A. Henning advised that the steering committee did not specify that they had to go through the same academy. If a non-ALA is holding an in-house academy, that academy can be sent to the ALA for testing if the 49% ratio was met. G. Panholzer asked to define “non-ALA departments needing private testing”. A. Henning advised that Folsom has a 100% in-house academy, and they ask Sac City to come do testing. This is something where they need to partner with a community college for testing.

Randy Collins advised that private might be better described as ARTP in that context. He advised that he is wondering if they are creating a problem with the looseness of the term “neighboring”. He is a little uncomfortable with it not being more defined.

Linda Vaughn advised that she agrees with R. Collins. Her concern is that one of the charges for the ARTPs is to support and facilitate that testing with those non-ALAs. She advised that with this change the question is whether the responsibility will now move away from ARTPs as the agencies go to the ALAs. She advised that she wants to make sure we’re not shooting ourselves in the foot.

Andrew Murtagh advised that he doesn’t think there are a lot of joint academies in California where people are being sent over 100 miles to participate. He advised that if this did require that you be in the same academy, then it would be more likely to keep this between agencies one or two counties away.

R. Collins advised that he has learned that people are willing to travel across the state to take certification testing. He asked what would prevent them from doing the same thing with the ALA.

A question was asked if there was a request for this process to be available for somebody who wasn't in a joint academy.

A. Henning advised that there was some discussion regarding that topic. He advised that ultimately the Steering Committee is proposing a recommendation to STEAC, and if STEAC feels it should be a joint academy he has no problem making this modification.

John Bagala asked why they couldn't go one county away, instead of across the state, if the testing is consistent. He advised that flexibility is more inclusive to get everybody into the system. If one academy is 8 weeks and another is 14 weeks but they both met all the learning objectives, he doesn't see a reason to prohibit testing together. In his county, they do not have an ALA or ARTP, so any time he must have someone go test they must travel. They use Santa Rosa Junior College, but if there was a need within his organization and San Francisco had an opening that worked with the timing, he would just as soon have the flexibility to ask San Francisco to help with the testing. He advised that with a small department, it is important to be able to ask who can accommodate a couple people and still be under the 49%. When it comes to small departments and academies, the 49% rule can also lead to a numbers game. He advised the more flexible we can be, the better.

J. Binaski advised that he is a firm believer that the ARTPs should serve as an entry gate to the fire service. This should not open a door to departments running for profit, so they should be employed by the agency. He advised he is trying to address the people who are under the old certification but didn't meet the work requirements. This enables you to be able to go to an ALA that's running a joint academy doing testing for five people. Two people from another agency can go there and be signed off that they completed the Fire Fighter 1 (FF1). He clarified they're not in the academy, they're just doing the testing process to get those people through the door. He advised lots of places have the hiring open for FF1. This gives you the ability as an ALA to do the testing for the Fire Fighter 2 together if you're over the 51% threshold. He advised those were two of the things they were trying to address with this policy change. He advised he agrees with J. Bagala and would prefer to be flexible, but sometimes you must compromise to get results.

R. Rideout asked if this precludes a joint academy. A. Henning advised it will not.

B. Mid-Career CFSTES Course Prerequisites

Presenter: Mark Bisbee/Andrew Henning

Attachment: 2

Mark Bisbee advised there are Metro agencies that never participated in the State Fire Training (SFT) system and therefore did not go through the California Fire Service Training and Education System (CFSTES) certification track. He stated that to take a Chief Fire Officer course you must complete the educational requirements for SFT

Company Officer. The equivalent experience that would meet the requirements is five (5) years as an officer (Lieutenant or higher), or five (5) years CAL FIRE Fire Apparatus. This gives a chance for those fire departments that haven't previously participated in the SFT system before to participate without having to start at the bottom and work their way up. Now people that never took the curriculum because they are already in that rank can replace curriculum with experience and time.

Randy Collins asked if the time requirement identified in the report distinguishes between years of volunteer and paid experience. K. Rose advised that she is unsure, but in certification it is usually 6 months of full time experience or 1 year of part time volunteer experience.

R. Collins advised that the process needs to be made very clear so as not to cause ambiguity and problems. K. Rose advised she will take note.

A question was asked if you can complete a Company Officer task book if you are not a Company Officer under the new requirements. K. Rose confirmed this is correct. It states in the task book that it up to the authorized signer or fire chief to determine if you meet the requirements to be certified.

R. Collins read a line from the second to last paragraph that states "These changes do not waive the certification prerequisites". He asked if this means that the A.S. degree is still a requirement for a Chief Officer certification. He mentioned that John Bagala brought this up at the last meeting and there was a discussion on the subject.

K. Rose explained that for certification, not coursework, Company Officer and Chief Officer and Executive Chief Officer state that you must have the prior certification or be in that rank. If you are applying for Chief Officer, you need to be a certified Company Officer or Fire Officer or be in the rank of Chief Officer as a certification prerequisite. She explained she had asked for that to be included because they don't have the same thing for Fire Inspector. The staff report talks about this also impacting Fire Inspector courses. For Fire Inspector 2, SFT doesn't say that you need to be a Fire Inspector 1 because that type of terminology may not be used in the fire service. To be Fire Inspector 2 certified you must be Fire Inspector 1 certified. The A.S. is still required and J. Bagala's question regarding the A.S. will be discussed at a future Statewide Training and Education Advisory Committee (STEAC) meeting.

R. Collins asked if there is a sunset to this. He advised if there is no sunset this will create a loophole, so one should be attached. The sunset will accommodate the people who this is impacting, but encourage people that come in the door now to use the SFT system.

J. Bagala advised this is not the conversation for the associate's degree, but that his proposal was to provide an alternate pathway for a certain period for mid-career personnel to achieve whichever level of certification it is, especially the Chief Officer with the A.S. requirement, with the idea being that it quickly sunsets. It's identified that there is a window and after that you're right back to the associate's degree. K. Rose advised that topic will come to a future STEAC meeting and was discussed at a staff meeting yesterday. She mentioned it will still prevent someone from becoming certified.

For example, if they were to try to become a Chief Fire Officer and only take the Chief Fire Officer classes, without being in the rank and without a Company Officer certification they would be stuck. They would have to wait until they become a Chief Officer.

John Binaski recommended that SFT rework this and bring it back. Andrew Murtagh advised that when something important is given a sunset, the people that don't participate can never get back in. If a fire department has never been in the program and decides to try, the sunset prevents them from doing so and will become an access issue to the SFT system. There will be no pathway in unless departments certify every member of their department all the way up to their current level, which is unlikely to be approved. Chief Coleman advised this needs more work.

J. Binaski made a motion to pull it from the consent calendar and look at adding the difference between volunteer time of service, and an option to receive more direction on a sunset clause and how that would affect people.

Motion:	<i>J. Binaski moved to accept the motion to pull the item from the consent calendar. Randy Collins seconded the motion.</i>
Action:	<i>All members voted unanimously.</i>

Richard Rideout advised this is something the Metro Chiefs brought up. He thanked Caryn Petty, Chris Fowler, and Andrew Henning for meeting with them. He advised this has been a very big concern. He would like to see something reworked so that if new organizations decide to come into the system it won't limit them.

Motion:	<i>Gaudenz Panholzer moved to accept the motion for consent items C, E, F and G. Tom Carlisle seconded the motion.</i>
Action:	<i>All members voted unanimously.</i>

C. Petty advised she would like to take a moment to acknowledge Operations Deputy Chief Abe Roman from Berkeley Fire. She would like to give him the opportunity to speak to his experience.

Abe Roman thanked SFT for all their support. He advised they look forward to participating. They were like San Francisco in the past, but they want to partner up with everybody and it's great building relationships. The face to face aspect means a lot, and if it weren't for the Accredited Local Academy (ALA) accreditation part of it they probably wouldn't be here. The citizens of Berkeley strongly believe in diversity and part of the process is making sure they have a say in diversity through the ALA process, and himself and the citizens of Berkeley appreciate that. He thanked the room.

C. Certification Task Book Issuance – Open Task Books

Presenter: Mark Bisbee/Andrew Henning

Attachment: 3

Mark Bisbee advised the current task book system is cumbersome. Current applicants that meet all the qualifications for certification must contact State Fire Training (SFT) to

issue a task book, complete it, and then send it back to SFT. This update streamlines the task book process and places it more in line with the California Incident Command Certification System. The fire chief or fire chief designee at the agency having jurisdiction will now issue the task book, and SFT will only have to touch it once upon submission for completion.

John Binaski asked if this must be approved by State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) before SFT can update and publish the new process.

Kris Rose confirms that it does need to be approved by SBFS. This process will be implemented on January 1, 2020.

D. ICS 300/400 Course and Instructor Update

Presenter: Andrew Henning

Attachment: 4

Andrew Henning advised that Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) released an update to the curriculum for ICS 300 and ICS 400 in April 2019. FEMA is requiring that instructors complete a webinar, and that students review some of the new course materials. He advised that Office of Emergency Services has already transitioned to the new requirements. State Fire Training's (SFT) transition is a bit delayed with an implementation plan in place, based on the approval process of going through Statewide Education and Advisory Committee (STEAC) and State Board of Fire Service (SBFS). He advised they didn't want to jump and shut out their instructors. The instructors of ICS 300 and ICS 400 will be required to view the webinar and the documents. They will then log in to the SFT user portal and fill out a webform, self-certify that they have reviewed the webinar and course documents, and from there they will be registered to teach the new curriculum. There will be a phase out window in which instructors will lose their eligibility to teach ICS 300 and 400 courses with SFT if they haven't completed the requirements by a certain deadline.

Motion:	<i>Randy Collins moved to accept the motion. Gaudenz Panholzer seconded the motion.</i>
Action:	<i>All members voted unanimously.</i>

John Binaski asked where to find the webinar. A. Henning advised it will either be a link through the webform or they will have an informational bulletin that SFT will put out that walks people through the webform. He advised this is the first time they are using a webform to do an instructor update, so it is a learning process for everyone. SFT is also looking at using this process for instructors to self-certify that they have reviewed the new Title 19 regulations, the new procedure manual, and their ethics agreement every one-two years.

E. Community Risk Curriculum Prerequisites

Presenter: Caryn Petty

Attachment: 5

Caryn Petty advised they reviewed the Community Risk curriculum at the three levels and found that the course hadn't been acquiring much enrollment statewide since implementation. Some of the prerequisites are hard to find or nonexistent, so they have been revamped. The Fire Prevention curriculum has been retired, so they updated to mirror Fire Inspector 1A as the prerequisite for the Community Risk educator level. For the specialist level, they added two of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) courses that will replace what is currently listed. The officer level, FEMA IS29, has changed to PIO Awareness G289 for the Office of Emergency Services delivery. While this class is hard to find, it is still being offered. A curriculum cadre will convene soon to review the curriculum and revisit and new additions or ideas. They are updating the prerequisites to make the class more available.

F. Fire Inspector 1 Qualifications and Curriculum Update

Presenter: Caryn Petty

Attachment: 6

Caryn Petty advised they reviewed the current curriculum with the original cadre via conference call and there were no substantial changes. They will be adhering to the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) curriculum by making sure the current curriculum matches NFPA's updates, which also produced no substantial changes. They updated from California fire code I1, assistance, to R2.1, occupancy, to mirror what is occurring in the state. The Fire Inspector 1A prerequisite was originally lined out to be the prerequisite for 1B, and 1B the prerequisite for 1C and so on. There was a move by the cadre to make 1A the prerequisite for any of the remaining, so that students can take them out of order in the 1 series. They also updated reference documents to match new procedures manual.

G. Berkeley Fire Department Reaccreditation

Presenter: Caryn Petty

Attachment: 7

Caryn Petty advised that State Fire Training (SFT) visited Berkeley Fire Department on May 23, 2019 for their reaccreditation on their 5-year reaccreditation cycle. A site evaluation took place with members of SFT. There were no deficiencies and everything was in order. The self-assessment report review detailed their new 5-year plan goal for the agency, as they are progressive and moving in the right direction. They serve a very diverse community with exceptional customer service. They are focused on serving the needs of the growing area, which is small now but growing upwards. They have exemplary member participation not only at Statewide Education and Advisory Committee but also at the cadres, curriculum development committees, and other steering groups. We appreciate their involvement and look forward to more contributions in the future. C. Petty recommend reaccreditation for Berkeley Fire Department as an Accredited Local Academy.

VII. Accredited Academies

A. Southwestern Community College Accreditation

Presenter: Caryn Petty

Attachment: 8

Caryn Petty advised that State Fire Training (SFT) traveled to Southwestern Community College on April 30th, 2019 for an initial Accredited Regional Training Program (ARTP) accreditation visit. They were unique in their presentation, as they are currently working on developing their fire fighter academy and their actual training facility, so a complete evaluation was not able to be conducted. She advised there is a big push to get this done now because they are creating a partnership with Chula Vista Fire Department to serve as their oversight ARTP for their fire fighter academy, as Chula Vista is not an Accredited Local Academy (ALA) in the SFT system. They have proposed a two-phase process. The first phase is to occur with Chula Vista about an upcoming academy in the fall. Constructions for the new training facility on the college campus will begin next year. Phase two will be when their own program is up and running. She advised that Southwestern College began their fire tech program in 1991. It has been very robust with great training. This next step is to create the Fire Fighter 1 academy to serve the underserved folks in the southern region of San Diego, and the smaller agencies within this region that are not ALAs. They have been approved for a 21.5-million-dollar joint venture program for a joint training facility with the police training and Emergency Medical Services training onsite. With that, we are not able to give them the normal three-year accreditation. Referring to the procedures manual Title 19, they decided upon a conditional approval of one year. SFT provided them a laundry list of things they must do within that year to show they are making progress. The intent is to revisit them in April or May of next year, evaluate their progress, and create an all new initial accreditation visit. With that, C. Petty recommends the one year conditional approval for Southwestern College as an ARTP with all the rights and responsibilities associated with ensuring they are adhering to the supplemental list they have been provided.

Motion: *Jeremy Lawson moved to accept the provisional accreditation of Southwestern Community College.*

Randy Collins seconded the motion.

Action: *All members voted unanimously.*

R. Collins reminded the board of the packet that he handed out at the last meeting that was put together by California Fire Technology Directors Association with the grant on partnerships and different ways to deliver the certification testing. He advised the college is a model and they do it in a way that may be more unique than any jurisdiction across the whole state, and they should be applauded for the way they think outside of the box when it comes to finding ways to deliver to local needs.

VIII. Curriculum Development & Delivery

A. Ethical Leadership for Instructors (2018) Curriculum and Instructor Requirements

Presenter: Jim Eastman

Attachment: 9

Jim Eastman advised this was heard at the April 2019 STEAC Meeting, and that SFT staff had reached out to those with concerns. J. Eastman advised they had found a way to utilize a Peer Assessment for Course Equivalency (PACE) 2 type of review. There was no further content changed. He advised the change was under item 6.

Andrew Henning advised that under the old procedure manual they had a PACE 2 committee, but due to how long it took to form the committees they transitioned to a subject matter expert staff submitting a recommendation to the Division Chief. In the new procedure manual, they merged the original intent of PACE committees. Staff will continue to evaluate and make recommendations on PACE 2 requests, but if someone is denied they can challenge it through a PACE 2 committee so their peers can determine if they meet State Fire Training's intent for an ethics instructor or other CFSTES or FSTEP instructor. He advised if someone doesn't meet the prescriptive requirements to be an ethics instructor, they can go through the PACE process to bring their relevant experience and qualifications into consideration.

Motion: *Jeremy Lawson moved to accept the motion. Randy Collins seconded the motion.*

Action: *All members voted unanimously.*

B. Fire Fighter 1 & 2 (2019) Curriculum & Certification

Presenter: Chris Fowler/Jim Eastman

Attachment: 10

Chris Fowler presented a slideshow that explains the Fire Fighter 1 (FF1) and Fire Fighter 2 (FF2) curriculum. She advised there are several people they would like to thank for participating in this process. The fire fighter cadre met for 4 weeks over the course of 5 months, and ended up adding a week to the program because there was so many details to include so that they could present a full course curriculum that truly represented what was instructed. She acknowledged Mike Busoni, German Sierra, Chief Greg Belk, Andrew Murtagh, and Paul Gonzalez. She acknowledged the volunteer fire service as being represented by Donovan Lacy of Shasta College.

Jim Eastman acknowledged Allison Shaw as being very instrumental in the curriculum development and formatting. He also acknowledged the staff that supports State Fire Training (SFT).

C. Fowler advised they have aligned FF1 and FF2 with the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) standards. NFPA 1001, 1051, 1072 and other standards are

referenced for instructional content and professional qualifications, and they have incorporated all these into the fire fighter curriculum for the student and the instructor.

J. Eastman advised the professional qualifications document is what you should read for the Job Performance Requirements (JPR). The NFPA added a new standard this year known as unit 6, which gets into Authority Having Jurisdictions (AHJ) having to decide the level of medical service that will be delivered. They did not dive into that with the cadre, but they did reflect and see that and you should have one of those levels of service you are providing now. They still are reinforcing the standard first aid prerequisite for all candidates that get into the Accredited Local Academy (ALA) or Accredited Regional Training Programs (ARTP).

C. Fowler advised they can have their Emergency Medical Technician or paramedic they meet the minimum requirement. She advised units 2 and 3 are blank because these are still being developed by the behavioral health cadre that is meeting alongside FF1 and FF2. They anticipate taking the curriculum and putting it in place in those two units. Confined Space Rescue Awareness (CSRA) remains a separate 8-hour course as it is mandated by law. Time is allowed for it in the total course schedule, but they did not include it as a course plan as it is not for them to deliver. Fire Fighter Survival has historically been taught based on the AHJ preference. If a fire fighter instructor teaches the Fire Fighter Survival course during an academy then there is no SFT diploma issued to the student. If the course is registered and approved through SFT using an SFT registered instructor then the student will be given a diploma. This has complimented the colleges that are giving out as many diplomas as possible and the academies that may or may not choose to have that diploma available for their employees or their cadets, and this still stands.

J. Eastman advised there were additional IS classes added to the methodology of delivery including 100, 200, 700 and 800. Some agencies have labor contracts they must negotiate around, so how AHJs deliver this is up to them. He advised the main point is that all this must be covered before doing unit 2-1 because that's where the incident command system starts to be utilized during the academy. He advised they also want to make sure they are still referring to Blueprint 2020 by addressing certification testing. In the future, all FF1 and FF2 2019 curriculum will require the testing process effective January 1, 2020. In addition, FF1 2013 testing process will continue up to June 30, 2020, and FF2 testing will continue until the end of December 31, 2021 because they understand there are many people in the system seeking FF2. Another major change is narrowing down to two reference sources. The first one will be Fire Fighting Essentials with the other being Jones and Bartlett 4th edition. The third source used in the past is being dropped because it would be unyielding to go through the process of validating a third resource, with only one or two users of this source.

C. Fowler advised you can deliver FF1 curriculum married with FF2 modularly or combined. They are moving towards the shift anticipated by the NFPA update in which all curriculum is one, so they have taken the task book and incorporated it into FF2. All JPRs included at the end of the educational experience, so it is brought together into one task book at the end of their academy. The FF1 certification is achieved upon

graduation of the academy, which allows for more employment opportunities. They have heard that the 6-months to 1-year experience requirement is a stop gap to getting a job so they would like to eliminate that by incorporating the employment requirement into FF2 which allows them to complete their entire educational process and get their experience and complete their FF2. This is in alignment with what they see the national standard moving to, and a lot of states have already moved to this model. She advised they would like our candidates and cadets to follow the same process and not have to go to another state to do so. There will be no changes to the instructor requirements for the delivery of either curriculum.

J. Eastman advised there is a proposed transition period in the course plans. If this gets adopted in a narrow window the plan is to make it available very soon. FF1 (2013) will continue as of January 1, 2020 and goes through June 30th. Then FF2 will be introduced and go into the process until December 31, 2021. This can be implemented as soon as January 1, 2020 if desired.

C. Fowler listed the curriculum hours as below:

- FF1A structure component: 260 hours
- 1B Hazmat: 24 hours
- Wildland: 56 hours
- CSRA: 8 hours, standalone course
- FF2A Structure: 48 hours

She advised the curriculum previously had standalone courses that could be delivered or not delivered in an academy, but now it is all inclusive and truly a representation of the minimum amount of material that should be delivered. This does not however include testing, as it is the discretion of the AHJ to create the testing model and hours can vary. She also explained that sets and reps are the practice students must do to be considered proficient. The minimum requirements include the lecture, one demonstration from the instructor, and one observed demonstration of that skill by the student. The sets and reps are the responsibility of the academy, and how much to have students demonstrate proficiency is up to the AHJ.

J. Eastman explained they plan to back out the time for HazMat, Wildland, and testing. Once these have been backed out the hours will be 279. FF1 in a 2013 model will be about 482 after all hours have been added up. With the 2019 curriculum being proposed, the conglomeration of FF1 and FF2 will be 308 hours plus the 8 from CSRA plus HazMat plus Wildland. What is being proposed is a substantial savings in hours. They are also proposing to take the original 150 questions and add in an additional 50 for the FF2 portion, for a grand total of 200 questions.

C. Fowler advised the cadre was supportive of this model because of the economic and logistical benefits to the agencies and colleges. Combining all the material and giving it to the cadet in one delivery is better than sending them to the floor after they have passed their academy, having them come back and take their exam, go back out to the floor for a probationary period, and then come back for FF2. The goal is to eliminate that economic liability for everyone.

J. Eastman advised this will also help facilitate the new SFT testing process within Acadis.

C. Fowler advised students will receive their certificate upon graduation through the Acadis system. SFT will no longer be collecting the pre-coursework data, as that will now be the responsibility of the academy. SFT will know they have been successful based on the completion of their exam, and they will be able to print their diploma at home if they choose and go work as a FF1. She advised this will accommodate reciprocity as well, better meeting the needs of the Department of Defense and veteran candidates in the state that have training on the federal side. This will allow more agencies to consider veteran candidates meeting that minimum standard of training.

J. Eastman advised the potential impacts include new curriculum, updated job announcements, and new hours. The numbers suggest it is worth taking the cadre's recommendation. He also advised C. Fowler will be the administrative contact.

Andrew Henning thanked the cadre, departments, and colleges that participated. He advised the cadre spent 5-7 weeks participating. The behavioral health component is expected to be completed and built into the course plan for the October Statewide Education and Advisory Committee (STEAC) meeting so that members can see the combined package. He advised SFT will be seeking FF2 International Fire Service Accreditation Congress (IFSAC) and National Board on Fire Service Professional Qualifications (ProBoard) accreditation for the 2019 edition, which will affect everyone in the room. This means capstone testing will be rolling out for the 2019 FF1, required when the 2013 FF2 curriculum retires on December 31, 2021. He emphasized that January 1, 2022 is when capstone testing will be required for FF2 and if you don't apply for FF2 by December 31, 2021 you must take the test. He advised another big change is being able to combine the FF1 and FF2 written testing. This is alignment with the changes they have done to FF1.

Chief Coleman asked if there are questions.

Tara Brideau asked if they still must take HazMat and Wildland. C. Fowler answered yes. T. Brideau asked if the behavioral health component is coming back for a vote, and if it will be reviewed before being immediately voted upon.

A. Henning advised that as soon as the module is done SFT can send it to STEAC for a review, and then bring the package to a vote in October. The other option is to leave the module out of the fire fighter course plan, and bring that module to a vote independently knowing that when the 2019 FF1 is initially rolled out it won't have the behavioral health component included. He advised there is a time crunch to be compliant with IFSAC/Pro Board, and so that students can start using the newer edition of textbooks.

T. Brideau agreed, and advised she wanted to make sure they would hear the material ahead of time.

A. Henning asked if there is a preference from STEAC regarding the matter.

Gaudenz Panholzer advised they should send it out ahead of time. STEAC members agreed with G. Panholzer.

Sam Hoffman asked if this can be delivered in a hybrid fashion. C. Fowler advised not currently.

Kevin Conant advised if a student takes an online class, they have not been given proper opportunity to ask and clarify questions with an instructor present.

John Binaski advised he thinks most community colleges will start using the new model in 2021. He asked how we can address the people that are there between 2015 and 2021 and did their FF1 but didn't take the certifications as a combined course.

Andrew Murtagh advised that they ran the scenarios with every possible type of person. He advised anyone that took the 2013 FF1 no longer must accomplish the task book. The day they get that FF1 certification they can work on their FF2.

J. Binaski asked who will provide the training if the community colleges have now rotated their course delivery to a combination model in which FF2 doesn't stand alone.

A. Henning advised there are two options. The 2012 FF2 is sticking around until the end of 2021 and the departments can administer that on their own in-house, or the colleges can administer it. Also, anyone can jump into the new 2019 FF2 at any time, which is modular. The colleges can always cycle a student in for the 2A course which is the FF2 portion of it.

C. Fowler advised there is the option to deliver it in the modules to meet the needs of various students, but you can also deliver it in total. FF2 is embedded in the course plan, so you can extract it or leave it in.

A. Shaw advised there is also a stand-alone 2019 FF2 track being released at the same time to deal with the people who only have FF1.

A. Henning advised FF2 is still considered a non-registered course with SFT. You can conduct a standalone FF2 course under the old 2013 format or the new 2019 format and the only thing you would have to register with the state would be if you're using the 2019 format is the capstone testing. A question was asked if there are changes to the JPRs in FF2. J. Eastman advised there are some minor tweaks.

A question was asked if we have reduced some of the responsibilities from captain level to more of a fire fighter level.

A. Murtagh explained the NFPA did not remove these tasks, so these can't be removed if we are to remain NFPA compliant.

It was explained that the challenging part is that they are doing things that are typically captain-level jobs, and it becomes difficult to demonstrate that someone with 18 months finishing at an ALA or ARTP is getting a sign off on that.

J. Eastman advised that they address it as more of a senior fire fighter now going up to the next level.

A. Murtagh advised that it doesn't have to be on an incident. You can do them as a demonstration. The perception is that you have done this. You wouldn't expect a fire fighter to do this, it is more of a captain's responsibilities.

A. Henning advised staff will reach out to IFSAC/ProBoard and see if we can justify a modification of that, or see what our potential options are.

When it comes to Fire Control 4 with flammable liquids, the language does not say "simulate", it says "do".

J. Eastman explained this was defined in the FF2 and they married it more to the extension of what was covered in FF1. He advised we will probably see an evolution of this becoming one fire fighter, getting away from FF1 or FF2. They have already done this with one of the chapters in 1001, where they combined both 2 and 1 into one chapter.

Paul Gonzalez advised they cleaned up a lot of the confusing language and clarified they can be simulated. The only two exceptions are the vehicle fire is which requires live fire, whether it's a prop or a real car, and the Fire Control 3 component, structural fire attack, can either be a prop or a class A type burn.

J. Eastman advised there were a lot of hours in FF2 in the 2013 version with 112 identified and 40 wrapped up in structure burns. They thought 40 hours seemed excessive, so therefore you now see the numbers decrease.

Randy Collins asked for clarification about the task book for FF1 no longer being required. J. Eastman advised the task book is still required, it is just being moved and must be completed and submitted with the FF2.

A. Henning advised they plan to bring forward some of the 2019 changes to existing people who have completed an ALA or ARTP FF1 under the 2013 curriculum. They are looking at not requiring the FF1 task book to be completed at the time of application for FF1 certification, and not requiring the experience for the 2013 FF1 at the time of application. They will transition that to the FF2 certification under the 2013 system. They will be writing an information bulletin that will be brought to the October STEAC that explains how the process is going to work. He explains they are not cutting out the FF1 task book for 2013, but essentially it will not be required to be submitted to SFT until they apply for their FF2 certification.

R. Collins asked if the hours were predicated on a class of 50 students. J. Eastman advised it is based on the increments of 30 in the course plan.

John Bagala asked how someone could take Fire Fighter Safety and the HazMat/Wildland if they have an IFSAC/Pro Board FF1 and only need those courses. He asked if they must go to an ARTP or ALA that's already running an academy and sit in for those two days.

A. Henning advised most of them come with their HazMat already because the HazMat is required for FF1 in every state. The only thing California does different than any other state is require wildland in their FF1 certification. Therefore, everyone from the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) that is coming to California for the most part does not have the wildland requirement. Under this new system they would have to go get their wildland training, and that could be the Cal Fire basic course, or a few National Wildfire Coordinating Group (NWCG) courses, or the new Wildland 1C course. At that point they would just have to do our IFSAC/Pro Board testing for the wildland skills and written portion only, then they could apply for California FF1 certification through the user portal. Under the current system there is a task book and experience requirement, so the new system streamlines the process for them as well by requiring only the testing before they can apply for certification.

J. Bagala asked if students will be good to go if they show up at the NWGC courses and find a place doing the testing, like an ALA or ARTP, and piggyback off that. A. Henning advised that is correct if they are an employee of the ALA, or a neighboring ALA.

R. Collins advised he found 79 JPRs and 66 skill sheets. He asked how many skill sheets the students will be responsible for when it comes down to the testing. J. Eastman advised there is some discrepancy currently, but it will be defined clearly in the future.

A. Henning advised they want to present this presentation to California Fire Technology Directors Association, and they are also scheduling more ALA meetings. They plan to do it at the symposium, and possibly several classes within the symposium. If the training officers or any regional group would like to have this presented to them, staff will be more than happy to do so, and the cadre members as well if they are nearby and willing to participate.

J. Eastman explained this was why it was important to have representatives from the North, South and middle regions.

A. Henning advised that this as well as Fire Control 3 are big changes to the California fire service, and advised STEAC that SFT has open ears for any suggestions. SFT is willing to attend meetings and hold webinars.

R. Collins asked if the CSRA course will be available at the end of the year. J. Eastman answered yes, and that it can be downloaded now.

A. Henning advised they are seeking SBFS approval on November 1. They have typically never done a pilot course, but he would like to get STEAC's opinion on rolling this out on January 1 knowing that it might need some changes or might not 100% have approval pending a cancellation of a STEAC or SBFS meeting.

R. Collins advised he doesn't have a problem with the roll out time, but he is concerned about the curriculum approvals process for the community colleges. He explains that if everything retires June 30 of next year that will be very tight, so he asks that date be extended to 12/31.

A. Henning advised that SFT's clock expires on their 2013 curriculum with IFSAC/Pro Board on June 30, 2020. He has asked for an extension once, and he will be more than happy to ask for an extension a second time but he will not ask for a third extension, so he needs a definitive date to ask for. He advised they will also not be supporting question mark come January 1st for the after-hour calls. If someone is testing on a weekend or holiday and things go sideways with Questionmark, SFT will not be there to bail out the academy. We will only be supporting Acadis through the SFT user portal starting January 1 and that is essentially an economic decision that the SFT user portal will be a more stable platform.

It was asked if the 2019 curriculum accounts for the proposed changes that Fire Control 3 is up for in hours and content. A. Murtagh answered that Fire Control 3 is not required for FF1. He advised that it can be an option though, and that class is likely going from 16 to 24 hours. That was built into the piece, but it is not required and is just an option. If you do not do FC3 you will need a live burn on your skills test day, but if you did FC3 you will not need a live burn on your skills test day.

It was asked if there is a place-keeper in Fresno for Q & A on this. C. Fowler advised they can create that. A. Henning advised if there is a time and place they want them at to let them know.

It was asked that more clarification be provided regarding the time frames for the work experience for FF2. C. Fowler advised it is still the 6 months or 1 year, and it goes into the FF2 completion requirements.

C. Fire Inspector 2 Qualifications and Curriculum Update

Presenter: Caryn Petty

Attachment: 11

Caryn Petty advised they reviewed the Inspector 2 curriculum to make sure it aligned with National Fire Protection Association (NFPA). They had a cadre meeting via conference call and there was a recommendation to add 8 initial hours to the 2C curriculum given the required activities and material that needs to be covered. There will be a reconvening of that cadre to redevelop this curriculum. The requirements have the International Code Council (ICC) Fire Code Inspector 1, and has been moved from initiating the task book to completing the certification so it is no longer a requirement to initiate your task book. There were no addendums to the existing task book beyond that.

D. River/Flood Boat Technician FSTEP Curriculum

Presenter: Joe Bunn/Kevin Conant

Attachment: 12

Joe Bunn advised this is the last of the aquatic courses developed through a grant through California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (CAL OES). This 5-day course will replace the 1998 Rescue Boat Operations course. This has been used as a

pilot program since 2017, and it has now been transferred to the State Fire Training format with the hope to pass Statewide Training and Education Advisory Committee (STEAC) and State Board of Fire Service (SBFS) to replace the older course by the end of 2019.

Richard Rideout asked if there are open water elements in the curriculum. J. Bunn advised there are not, and the open water elements courses have already been updated.

E. Rope Rescue Awareness/Operations and Technician FSTEP Curriculum

Presenter: Joe Bunn/Jim Eastman/Rick Lum

Attachment: 13

Joe Bunn advised on December 18, 2018 a cadre of shareholders met including Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (CAL OES), State Fire Training (SFT), Fire Scope, and a few from the community college system. Their vision was to put together a series of courses to encompass all the present training occurring now, with standardized training that could be utilized by many groups. He advised they came up with four classes. He also stated that hopefully in the future they can put together the Structure Collapse 1 and 2, which will encompass all the disciplines that are required to keep these individuals qualified for regional teams, single resources, and the fire service in general. He acknowledged the great cadre, which worked on both the operation and technician levels. They will hold pilot courses in the Fall, and hope to have a validation committee at the beginning of next year. As they stand these courses are Fire Service Training and Education Program (FSTEP), however it is simply a matter of going through the validation process and putting them on track with the other forthcoming courses so that they can come up with a certification with the state of California for a specialist technician. He acknowledged Paul Gonzalez, Jim Eastman, and Rick Lum for their hard work with this difficult project.

F. FSTEP Fire Control 3 Curriculum (2018)

Presenter: Kevin Conant

Attachment: 14, 15, 16

Kevin Conant advised the cadre set out with an editor to create Fire Control 3 (FC3) curriculum, while National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) was creating updates and new standards. He advised they have reduced some hours, and stayed in alignment with the brand new NFPA 1041 that identifies live fire instructor. He acknowledged the incredibly passionate cadre members, 100% of which stayed with the project the entire three and a half years. He advised there were some challenges as far as our current system, and they had several charges. This included issues which seemed to be in conflict, like making it easier and NFPA compliant without lowering standards. NFPA 1403 says a fire chief can determine who is qualified to teach live fire, but the cadre didn't agree with this standard. When creating instructors, they were concerned with how they could validate through demonstrated competency that person is capable without taking away the responsibility and authority from the fire chiefs. The task book was created so that the fire chief certifies that person is his or her selection. He advised

it's a 24-hour course now that meets or exceeds the latest NFPA standards 1001 and 1403, and addresses the significant research and development done by National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) and Underwriters Laboratories (UL).

The new course includes 16 hours of Fire Control 1: Basic Fire Chemistry (FC1), 16 hours of Fire Control 2 (FC2), and 16 hours of Fire Control 3B or 3A. To address the stipulation in 1041, the negotiated settlement was that they needed to create specific instructor courses. FC3 will be inclusive of all the chemistry, dynamics and fire behavior elements with all the strategy and tactics of the old FC2. He advised that instructor had to be exposed to all this information at once, to be in alignment with the latest research. He advised anyone teaching FC3 will be going through a new course called Instructor Live Fire Training Fixed Facility, which includes props and towers. If an Authority Having Jurisdiction (AHJ) chooses to use acquired structures, then the instructor must go to a second 32-hour course known as Instructor Live Fire Training Acquired Structures, in addition to Live Fire Fixed Facility, because of the additional hazards and risks.

The NFPA standards require that all fire fighters shall demonstrate live fire training job performance requirements (JPR). You can decide if you want to include FC3 in your curriculum, or simply follow 1403 and do live fire testing at the end. This course prepares the student to successfully demonstrate those JPRs of live fire tactics for structural fire, meeting and exceeding the NFPA requirements, including the brand new NFPA 1700 Structural Firefighting that is coming out in 2020. It also includes a 5:1 instructor to student ratio, so there is a lot of opportunity for the student to get inquiry, coaching, skill mastery and eventually evaluation by the instructor. Significant changes were made to instructor qualifications which are outlined in the implementation plan. He recommended everyone read the information for any future questions that may arise. He advised that at Andrew Henning's direction, FC1 will be phased out December 31, 2020. He advised staff will be creating a FC1 module using the information for FC3 for those organizations that want a separate module. That will be presented to this body at another time. He advised it is the same with FC2. They are hoping by that time the first draft of the NFPA 1700 will be out so that they can ensure that it is in complete alignment with any JPRs that may come from that.

Fire Control 3A and 3B will phased out December 2020. The designation of senior instructor is going away. He advised it took 9 burns to become a senior instructor, and there was nothing in NFPA that restrictive. Historically, this was the best attempt at trying to ensure competency at a level that gave assurance to the master instructors that this person could be on their own leading and running a live burn. They decided to raise the minimum qualifications for the prerequisites for a live fire instructor, because of what is required in the new NFPA 1403, and the 1041 Live Fire Instructor and Live Fire Instructor Lead. This person needs to know how to do an incident action plan, so ICS 300 is where they'll learn how to build incident action plans. They also need to do course completion of a safety officer course, such as S-404, L-954, or the fire department Safety Officers Association incident safety officer course. This ensures instructors will know how to look at events through the eyes of a safety officer, to raise the level of competency and comfort. You must hold a permanent position as a fire fighter for 3 years, or work as a volunteer for 6 years. You must complete the instructor task book documenting specific expertise in live fire training, and this must be in the fire chief's memo or California Fire Technology Directors Association director's memo. In

addition, the AHJ must have a letter verifying your qualifications to deliver live fire training.

The student instructor task book will be signed by the fire chief, in absolute alignment with NFPA. He advised current senior or primary instructors of FC3A or 3B must attend the new Instructor Live Fire Training Fixed Facility course and will be authorized to teach the new class upon completion. The current instructors won't need to complete the task book; they just need to be exposed to the new course material. To remain an instructor in good standing you must have completed ICS 300 and a safety officer course by December 31, 2020. Those who have not taken Instructor Live Fire Training Fixed Facility, ICS 300 and a safety officer course by December 31, 2020 will lose their instructor status and must start the track over as though they are a brand-new instructor.

For those that are trying to get their senior and primary, there is a simple way for them to fall into this because they only must do 2 burns to 2 different instructors to get their task book signed off. If an agency has already been following NIST, UL and NFPA developments they simply need to submit for a Peer Assessment for Course Equivalency (PACE). State Fire Training (SFT) doesn't want to encumber anyone from getting their certification. If a community college still wants to offer FC1, FC2, and FC3 certificates it will be modularized.

John Binaski asked where the course plan is for Instructor Live Facility and task book. K. Conant advised it is in the attachments.

J. Binaski asked who will be authorized to teach the new Instructor Live Fire course. K. Conant advised the cadre for FC3 will be the instructor pool for the three new courses, and additional instructor cadre members will be added as they complete the course.

A. Henning advised they have been working with training officers to have the first roll out of the class in November.

Randy Collins asked if the instructor class has a name and number of hours yet. K. Conant advised it is a 24-hour course. The three new courses are Fire Control 3: Structural Fire Fighting for the Student Fire Fighter, Instructor Live Fire Training Fixed Facility and Instructor Live Fire Training Acquired Structures.

R. Collins asked if existing FC3 instructors must repeat all their training. K. Conant clarified that they will only have to take this new course, or have a PACE. He advised that before this is brought back they will address what the track is to become an instructor of instructors.

Andrew Murtagh advised there are many current instructors of FC3, and the requirement for the current certification is 24 hours per the task book. He asked how it takes 24 hours to catch them up on what has changed, which is 100% of what a new student gets. K. Conant advised this cadre said there is no short cut to those 24 hours. It takes that much time based on about 6 years of development.

It was stated that the intent of the Live Fire Training Instructor is to give people skills and fill the gap. There is more to it than just FC3, as you are also learning live fire training.

A. Murtagh advised he thinks this is a great way to start a program for people that are learning from scratch. He thinks the issue will be the community colleges that have been training and task booking these people to be live fire instructors and now must tell them it takes 24 hours to give a student this information and it also takes 24 hours to teach an instructor how to teach this, even though they just spent 3 years teaching and jumping through hoops.

K. Conant explains there is no curriculum out there today that absorbs everything that NIST, UL and the NFPA standard requires. There isn't a class that you can just add to. These fulfill NFPA's JPRs for Instructor of Live Fire Trainer, and Instructor of Live Fire Lead. A. Murtagh advised 24 hours is a lot for someone that is already certified to teach FC3, and that someone is responsible for paying these people to go to classes for these hours.

K. Conant advised FC3A and FC3B do not address 1403 and are no longer compliant at all. A. Murtagh asked if the class for instructors that have already been certified must be 24 hours. K. Conant advised all the experts say yes.

It was stated that the cadre were originally looking at a 40-hour class and carved it down to 24 hours, which is tight just to get the content in. J. Binaski advised he somewhat agrees with what A. Murtagh said. K. Conant advised current seniors only need to take a 24-hour class and they can teach everything.

J. Binaski advised that through his agency's payment they become certified then they go to a community college on their off days. If there aren't jurisdictions willing to follow that then there are a lack of instructors.

Randy Collins asked if there will be a gas prop requirement in the task book.

It was stated that you are not required to have a gas prop and they prefer that gas props are not used but there is an option for it if that's what you have.

R. Collins advised the old FC3A and FC3B classes had a 10:1 instructor student ratio, and the new 5:1 ratio will be problematic. K. Conant advised it is defined by standard.

A. Murtagh advised there are hundreds of FC3 instructors, and they only have one year to complete this class which means the class will need to be held numerous times. He explained the timing seems tight. He asked if the 5:1 ratio is for the task or lecture.

It was stated that it is 5:1 based on the roster. He advised the big change is seniors not being required. R. Collins asked if the minimum qualifications will be defined. It was stated that for minimum qualifications you need to be a live fire instructor.

K. Conant advised he has been advocating for a new instructor status called skills coach. It was specifically written in the staff report that an instructor is someone that

could answer questions, coach, handle skill mastery, and evaluate. He thinks the 5:1 ratio is necessary for hazards, but when you're not dealing with hazards a registered primary instructor could be facilitated by skills coaches.

J. Binaski advised the current course plan says you must put on the registration. He asked if he would need 5 instructors when registering a course with 25 people. K. Conant answered yes.

A. Murtagh advised that means whatever we have okay now that was okay at 10:1 must double. If there are 150 fire control instructors in the state, that means we now need 300. That is what the 5:1 versus 10:1 will mean.

It was stated that skills make up two of the three days. He doesn't know of the number of instructors will necessarily double because of the way you're going to play the ratios. He advised there will be PACE.

K. Conant advised a fire chief could use all the NFPA curriculum and task books without registering the class through SFT and technically still be compliant.

A. Henning advised they have received many good comments from this group, and they will look at this and bring it back as a final package to Statewide Training Education Advisory Committee (STEAC) in October. If they don't have a final package by October, they will reevaluate and try to find the holes in the plan. He advised he has heard that retiring the current FC3 at the end of 2020 is an aggressive date with the roll out, and he has discussed with K. Conant if there needs to be an overlapping of the two curriculums for a little longer to ensure roll out and get instructors through the course. He advised STEAC is here to advise SFT and make recommendations, as well as State Board of Fire Services, so they are all ears.

It was recommended that pilots are scheduled so that questions can be answered in October and hard data can be provided. A. Henning advised he is on board for this.

R. Collins advised he recommends pushing out the implementation plan to allow for more crossover, as this will push colleges that have spent money certifying instructors as seniors back to square one.

K. Conant advised he has heard four action items including coming up with the minimum qualifications to be an instructor for the instructor course, better language for ratios, pilot course feedback, and pushing out timelines.

IX. State Fire Training Updates

A. SFT Fee Report

Presenter: Andrew Henning

Attachment: 17

Andrew Henning advised that State Fire Training (SFT) had their preliminary discussions with Statewide Training Education Advisory Committee (STEAC) and State Board of Fire Service (SBFS) about the fee increase. At the last STEAC meeting in April

an agreement was reached on what the fees should be. SFT staff then created a fee report that gives a background on the creation of SFT and the funding history, as well as the impacts of previous fee and the goals of the new fee. With that, they also justified how they reached the new fees. The fee increases were necessary to continue to operate as they are, as well as fund unfunded positions that are currently vacant and add new positions as well. This fee was sent out to the Ad Hoc Committee that was created by STEAC and the SFT fee subcommittee. This report is part of their justification to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) package. Currently the fee for the testing component of Fire Fighter 1 (FF1) is \$75, which covers the testing through the SFT user portal. That fee will be applicable to the 2019 FF1 as well as Fire Fighter 2. The certification fees are also \$75 each, and includes International Fire Service Accreditation Congress (IFSAC) and National Board on Fire Service Professional Qualifications (Pro Board). He advised that staff is proposing we combine the testing fee and the certification fee into one set fee of \$150, paid for at the time of testing. The benefit of this is that once students graduate their academy they will be able to apply directly on the user portal and be issued their certification digitally. This would save the students time by eliminating paperwork and the need to mail checks. The students will log into their SFT user portal, go to the webforms, select "apply for FF1 certification", and the system will validate that they have met the requirements. The SFT staff would then enter their IFSAC seal number and digitally issue their certification, practically automating the entire process. He advised this is the only change they have made to the proposed fees. SFT is still moving forward with the implementation date of July 1, 2020, with the backup of January 1, 2021.

Randy Collins asked A. Henning if the backup date is predicated on hold ups by STEAC or SBFS. A. Henning advised there are a lot of unknown variables when it comes to the OAL process. They plan on submitting to the OAL by early September. Typically, regulations go into effect the following quarter. The 6-month air gap is there because most of the academies and colleges run on the semester system and if they figured it would be a cleaner break to implement this in July rather than in the middle of a community college semester.

R. Collins expressed his concern for community colleges that only take packages to their board once a year. A July 2020 deadline may make it difficult for them to capture the fee increase by then.

Linda Vaughn advised her college must submit for approval before any fee increase can happen, and that usually is done twice a year but for some colleges it is an annual thing. If they don't get it submitted they may not be able to meet that July deadline and the college would have to eat the cost. A. Henning asked if the college submitted in the next few weeks if they could make the July deadline. R. Collins advised it depends on the cycle for the college.

A. Henning advised we are still at the end of our fiscal year, and the last number he heard they were \$60,000 in the hole. He advised he is cutting his curriculum development budget for next year. The Sacramento State budget is the easiest thing for him to cut. He can't cut positions, so the longer we delay the fee, the more we must start reducing SFT services.

L. Vaughn advised that if SFT had the numbers before end of the calendar year the colleges should be able to submit all the paperwork they need for approval to have it start by fall 2020.

A. Henning advised they anticipate to have this report with the finalized numbers to be taken to OAL. This will be an official approved report shortly after the SBFS meeting happens if there are no major modifications made by the SBFS. After it goes to SBFS it goes to OAL. There is then a 45-day public comment period. If a college makes a comment about missing the deadline SFT can take this into consideration.

L. Vaughn asked if most community colleges submit a single check for all students, or with the new system students will pay directly. A. Henning advised colleges will be invoiced for the California Fire Service Training and Education System (CFSTES) and Fire Service Training and Education Program (FSTEP) fees, along with the certification fee. The user portal has no mechanism for SFT to charge the students directly.

Andrew Murtagh asked if there is a movement to get SFT a bigger budget. He advised he will receive major pushback when the check being cut to SFT quadruples. With a class of 54, this is a lot of public funds. He asked if there is a mechanism for someone to go to their assembly member. A. Henning advised that as a state employee he cannot advocate for this change, but there are other people on the committee that can.

Chief Coleman advised there have been numerous attempts to receive general fund. It has been difficult to receive general fund due to inconsistencies in argument. He advised if we are going to move ahead in general funding it needs to be moved forward by the people in this room, not the Fire Marshal office.

R. Collins advised that having been a member of the subcommittees that worked on these and running an Accredited Regional Training Programs (ARTP) and having several FSTEP classes embedded in his academy, he did the math for the increase of \$20 to \$75 for these courses and found an increase of \$500 in their fire academies. He advised that he queried other academies throughout the state and some of those fees are based on them having many more FSTEP classes and some will be going up closer to \$800. This will cause an issue in terms of equity for the students. He advised he started a conversation with some other groups and started a statement of problem, and he thinks now is the time to work on a legislative fix. He advised the support of this group is critical, and there is a window of opportunity now based on what's happening with climate and fire severity. Not a lot of money is being put towards training, and we need trained fire fighters.

Chief Coleman advised this is the first time we have had a strong financial case to move ahead because there are numbers, proof and testimony. It will take a concentrated effort of the organizations represented here now. He advised that just because you have a great idea it does not necessarily mean the governor agrees with it.

John Bagala advised that California Professional Fire Fighters (CPF) is legislatively robust and very active up in the state capitol. There have been low level conversations when they first started talking about this at the oversight committee that echo what the chief is saying. He advised the entire state of California is represented in this room right

now. When you add the SFT oversight committee below it and the SBFS over the top the footprint is enormous. He advised that when it comes to a campaign, the more work that gets done the easier it is to get everything in the works. The awareness is the highest, we have the governor, a majority in both houses, and a budget surplus. When you line these up, there will never be a better time to do this. He advised if we were ever going to try to get some funding for the office now is the time.

Chief Coleman advised that the issue is STEAC can talk about it but not do it. He asked everyone to think about how much they know about this problem, versus how much their superiors know about the problem. We need to reach a saturation in the leaders of the California fire service. The fire service always ends up at the end of the line when it comes to funding issues. This is not a process that can be taken lightly. He advised just because we are all in agreement, doesn't mean the governor will agree.

John Binaski advised that as a member of the D-risk coalition this has come up, but as they met and dealt with budget issues it was clear that money is going to go to wildland issues. The issue right now is that the system is in place and there's a revenue system for it, so why put general fund towards it when there are other causes out there. This is the message they are trying to work to overcome with the legislature and governor's office. He advised this is the reality of our capacity to get things done.

Chief Coleman advised that he can identify at least 4 periods of time that they thought it was the time to do it, and each time there was a reason it didn't succeed. There needs to be a collaborative consistent vote, so there cannot be any one organization out of sync.

A. Murtagh agreed with what the members were saying. He advised the training benefits citizens, so fire fighters should not be paying for their own certifications. He asked if the new fee increase prevents the state from funding training with general fund, since it may appear SFT is doing financially well. He asked if there is a method to walk the fees back if funding is successful.

A. Henning advised if we received general funding we can introduce a complete or partial fee reduction.

R. Collins asked legal counsel if STEAC members can participate in a lobby. Chief Coleman advised that STEAC is restrained in its ability to advocate legislation.

David Wiseman advised he didn't research if STEAC can participate in lobbying or advocating. It could present significant issues, but pursuant to the 1st amendment it can be done outside of STEAC. He asked to be granted more time if an official opinion is needed.

L. Vaughn advised she was chair for the advisory for the chancellor's office. She advised that as an advisory they can provide analytical or anecdotal information to either support and/or refute something but they cannot be politically active in the pursuit for the legislation. As an advisory committee, you can provide all the facts and data for them to make an educated decision.

Wendy Collins advised the fire service is a group of fixers. If they see a problem, they fix it. This tendency means people on the outside may not realize there is a problem. She advised this means they, as a group, may have failed by not being able to fix something. They need to find a way to articulate this out. She asked them to please know it is not that the fire service is failing in training, they just need to approach it in the appropriate way. She advised sometimes things need to break before a problem gets the attention it needs. She advised she isn't saying to break it all, but consider a change of mindset from what the fire service usually presents to the public.

A. Henning asked what the group's thoughts are on building the FF1 certification fee into the testing fee to make it \$150 for testing so that we can streamline SFT's issuance for FF1 certifications. He advised this would mean the day you graduate your FF1 academy at an ALA or ARTP you would be able to apply for certification at home and have that hopefully within two weeks. If approved by STEAC and SBFS, SFT is in the process of moving forward this combined \$150 fee to be implemented on January of this year if departments choose to use the new 2019 curriculum. The goal is to have everyone that is tested in FF1 2019 automatically receive IFSAC/Pro Board, which is a \$5 reduction in cost compared to what it is today. We needed to have that \$75 testing fee in place if you are using the 2019 curriculum. The certification fee will be slightly cheaper than it is today. He advised if you are using the old 2013 curriculum the fees are staying the same, which is \$40 for FF1 and \$40 for FF2 and an unknown amount for testing, but electing to use the new FF1 will bring you into the new fee structure 6 months ahead of time to cover the full cost recovery of testing.

Chief Coleman advised he is hearing a recommendation from staff to adopt this motion with the amendment of combining the FF1 and FF2 fees.

Motion:	<i>Gaudenz Panholzer moved to accept the motion. Tom Carlisle seconded the motion.</i>
Action:	<i>All members voted unanimously.</i>

It was asked if SFT will dictate how the testing is done. A. Henning answered that it can be done modularly or consecutively, and it also includes all retakes that do not include retraining whereas before it was \$18 a retake. If you have exhausted all retakes or fail out of the written, which requires more training, the \$150 resets to cover SFT's cost.

R. Collins advised he fully supports this because he recognizes the need, but it will cause a financial burden for a lot of students in the community college system. He advised he also thinks you need to create a problem to come to a better solution, and while there may be pushback it is a necessary step.

Chief Coleman advised there are powerful and influential forces opposing what we do, and articles often appear in the newspaper that make statements that are counterproductive to claiming financial weakness. The political reality is that they must demonstrate and prove that this is a necessity for the benefit of the fire profession.

B. National Reciprocity

Presenter: Andrew Henning

Attachment: 18

Andrew Henning advised this would allow State Fire Training (SFT) to automatically have a set defined reciprocity process for people coming into California with International Fire Service Accreditation Congress (IFSAC) and National Board on Fire Service Professional Qualifications (Pro Board) certification. Currently SFT only has an automatic reciprocity program for Fire Fighter 1 and HazMat. He advised they have been accepting other out of state IFSAC and Pro Board, but they make them go through the Peer Assessment for Course Equivalency PACE 3 process. SFT is clearly defining every single level of IFSAC/Pro Board certification that they are willing to do a reciprocity for. He clarified they are not doing a certification reciprocity; they are doing a course reciprocity. For example, if someone came in with their Fire Officer 1 and 2 that is IFSAC/Pro Board we will give them a reciprocity for our Company Officer 2A, 2B, 2C and 2D if they take our fire service labor management course. He explained they don't want someone coming in from Department of Defense or another state that doesn't understand how the California fire service's management position functions, so they came up with other courses that they would need to reach reciprocity. This is the same for some of our fire prevention courses, as California is unique on how we have modified our fire codes and regulation process.

For reciprocity for a Fire Inspector 1 and Fire Inspector 2 they are looking at SFT Statutes and Regulations courses. This will essentially be an automatic equivalency that SFT will be willing to accept. He would like Statewide Training Education Advisory Committee (STEAC) to review the courses they are willing to take a reciprocity for, as well as the courses SFT will require them to have, and provide feedback.

C. FY 19/20 Curriculum and Related Projects

Presenter: Andrew Henning

Attachment: 19

Andrew Henning advised there have been a few minor changes to what was brought to Statewide Training Education Advisory Committee (STEAC) in April. In four days, the behavioral health awareness and cancer cadre accomplished the Fire Fighter 1 module but they were not able to complete the Company Officer, Chief Fire Officer, and Executive Chief Fire Officer modules. They have asked for 2 additional cadres including one cadre for Company Officer and the second cadre for the Chief Fire Officer and Executive Chief Fire Officer. The same cadre will be meeting in October and January to finalize that project. He advised they have tentatively delayed the Structural Collapse 1 and 2 that was geared for fiscal year 20. They have discussed potentially partnering with the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services on looking at potentially moving the structural collapse forward sooner rather than waiting 18 months. He advised Fire Fighter Survival was last updated in 2010 and they are consistently doing 2300 students per year. Of the curriculum projects that haven't been updated recently, they felt updating this course would be the best use of State Fire Training money. The other projects being planned are being done through a "conference call cadre", and include minor updates based off National Fire Protection Association standards with

only minor job performance requirement changes. This includes the Driver Operator series, which includes 6 courses and 5 certification tracks. They are looking at updating Instructor 1, 2 and 3, as well as looking at the Community Risk Reduction course prerequisites and hours.

D. Title 19 – Regulations Update

Presenter: Caryn Petty

Attachment: 20

Caryn Petty advised in April 2018 State Fire Training (SFT) began a revamp with Title 19, the procedures manual, and the Course Information Required Materials documents within their agency and found a lot of discrepancies, editorial errors, and things that needed updating to bring current courses up to par. That package has been blessed and is now live as of July 1, 2019. Another Office of Administrative Law (OAL) package was submitted this week regarding the Title 19 listing of the SFT fee schedule. There are courses that have been retired and courses that have been approved that were not on that list, so the list has been updated to include the new fee list with some changes to terminology regarding SFT business processes but nothing beyond that. She advised that will be up for public commentary in September, and Statewide Training Education Advisory Committee will receive notice via email.

X. Announcements/Correspondence

A. Plumas LAFCo Correspondence

Presenter: Andrew Henning

Attachment: 21

Andrew Henning advised the State Fire Marshal received a letter written to Chief Dennis Mathisen, and Chief Mike Richwine gave it back to A. Henning to bring to Statewide Training Education Advisory Committee (STEAC) for input. The letter is requesting State Fire Training (SFT) bring back the volunteer fire fighter certification, which was retired at the end of 2016. He explained this was retired because there is no national standard for a volunteer fire fighter, and the main concern for trying to bring back the certification and curriculum is this lack of national standards. It would be difficult to come up with a single certification track and curriculum that meets the needs of all volunteer departments. He advised there is no requirement to have a Fire Fighter 1 (FF1) certification through SFT, and nothing precludes volunteer fire departments from using SFT course plans as an outline and selecting specific modules or components to meet the needs of their departments.

Chief Coleman advised this has been a topic of discussion for almost five years. He advised California State Firefighters' Association (CSFA) is represented, and they probably have more representation with volunteers than any of the other groups. He asked if CSFA has any comment. Tom Carlisle advised he does not. Chief Coleman advised that in the long term it is a safety issue. It was stated that volunteer fire fighters are just over 30% of the capacity in California, so it may be appropriate to readdress this and legitimize it.

Randy Collins advised he has delivered a volunteer fire fighter academy and has been very successful for seven years. There have been 30 students or more in every section offered so there is a need for this, although he recognizes the dilemma of making everything National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) consistent.

T. Carlisle advised that as a safety officer he considers it a safety issue. He advised he was a volunteer for 19 years before becoming a professional, and he was also taking classes the entire time. He explained that working in the fire service can be fatal, and you need to take the time to get the certifications and qualifications. He advised we can't be expected to deliver a 20-hour class to a volunteer fireman and feel confident.

John Bagala asked if we know how many departments were utilizing the volunteer fire officer certification, and if we are trying to create a need for something that will not be utilized. A. Henning advised staff would have to compile that data.

T. Carlisle advised if we are going to look at any volunteer training track we would need to reinvent the wheel because we can't use the old curriculum. Jim Eastman advised other states are using NFPA 1001, but they modularized it.

J. Bagala asked about changing the certification name to "emergency services volunteer" so that the word "firefighter" is not used. He suggested if there was a certification to allow people to work in a support role maybe that could address the need.

A. Henning advised Blueprint 2020 directed SFT to align with NFPA professional qualifications and in this case, there is nothing for him to align to. An avenue may be a course, but he would not recommend a certification track. With the course, it is picking and choosing what you like out of FF1.

John Binaski advised the fiscal year 19/20 has already been laid out, so even if SFT wanted to work on this something else would have to be bumped out of the queue since budget and resources have already been allocated. A. Henning advised they will look at the statistics of the old class and reach out to NFPA to see where they are at.

XI. Future Meeting Dates

A. October 11, 2019, January 10, 2020 and April 10, 2020

Presenter: Chief Ron Coleman

XII. Roundtable

Presenter: Chief Ron Coleman

Randy Collins mentioned their fire tech directors group had an interesting conversation with the National Fire Academy regarding online instruction. They have historically used Black Board as their platform, but they are switching to Canvas which is the same platform everyone in the California community college system uses. He advised their reps offered their assistance with instructors to help develop classes if needed, but they are waiting to hear back.

Tom Carlisle advised California State Firefighters' Association's (CSFA) annual meeting is down in Visalia on the 14th, 15th, and 16th. He invited people in the room to come check it out whether they are a member of CSFA or not.

XIII. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 1:30 P.M.