

Meeting with EOTA

Personnel Present at the meeting included: Paul Jenkins, David McKay, Charlie Brown and Dennis Murphy of EOTA and the Chairman of the EMI-SIG Training Working Group, Bob Burger.

The meeting was held at EOTA in Albuquerque, New Mexico on 1 November 2007. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss: 1) How EOTA may be able to assist or support the EMI-SIG objective of standardizing initial qualifying training requirements for positions identified within the Emergency Response Organization (ERO) at all DOE Sites, and 2) How to incorporate NIMS training within the ERO training process. The intent is to find a way to better clarify training requirements that exist for all the sites and to utilize EOTA capabilities in the implementation of a standardized training process.

The first part of the meeting was to explore the feasibility of utilizing EOTA, with DOE approval and in collaboration with sites through the EMI-SIG Training Working Group, to identify and develop or designate courses or classes that would meet the “minimum” qualification requirements for positions within the ERO. EOTA is supportive and with NA-41 Program Manager guidance would gladly engage in this initiative. This would provide the following benefits:

1. Identification of basic requirements that are standard across all of DOE enabling the development of standardized training. Recognizing that there are site specific subtleties, the training could be built to allow the sites to inject their specific needs into the course without detracting from the DOE standard requirement. The sites would be adding to (and not taking away from) the standardized course; resulting in training that has common objectives, but is flexible enough to allow the sites to address their specific needs. This model is currently being successfully implemented by the EOTA EXR-111 Controller Evaluator Course.
2. Incorporate NIMS requirements into the minimum requirements. Activities that will reinforce NIMS compliance requirements can be woven into the courses. This would not replace FEMA NIMS requirements, but would strengthen the users ability to be conversant with the National Implementation Management System.
3. Establish a DOE recognized, cost effective, standard for the sites, and provide for ease in the evaluation of site programs by inspectors. Inspectors could have a common expectation of the standard level of training at all sites. The sites could have a common understanding of what inspectors are expecting to see when they get to a site.
4. Establish a partnership between site Training Coordinators, programs, and EOTA to develop standardized, measureable objectives, and establish a proficiency/competency testing process to measure the objectives. This proposal will open lines of communication across many organizations, improving efficiencies through the interaction and cross-pollination of personnel across the complex.

Additional stipulations to this process would include:

1. Actual certification of an individual for a specific position or detail would be stipulated through the Guide or Order that it is the responsibility of the “Authority Having Jurisdiction” at each site, normally the Emergency Managers and Training Coordinators, to work those issues. EOTA would only be responsible for verifying that the student met the requirements of the applicable course or training and would provide a certificate of completion for the course or training.
2. Depending on how things come together, EOTA may be able to support data storage for report generation concerning status of training or statistics of site certified personnel. This effort would require in depth discussions to determine feasibility before EOTA could commit to this initiative.
3. Sites would have a standard for each position identified for field responders and Coordinating group (EOC) responders and implement, as a basis, the minimum requirements would be approved by DOE.
4. Sites would be able to add to (but not reduce) these requirements based on needs for their sites approved by the AHJ.
5. NIMS functional requirements for each position would be developed so that sites could implement the training requirements in a more seamless manner. NIMS training must be designed to be in alignment of and in support of guidelines set forth by FEMA NIMS Training. Integration of NIMS into this training would not replace FEMA training (unless accepted as an equivalency by the proper authority) but would serve as an important supplement to show participants how NIMS directly relates to their position. (This topic of NIMS will require more discussion).

More discussion will be needed to get an exact path forward; it is critical that we do not overstep our levels of authority. Some examples of minimum requirements could include:

- a. A basic Incident Command Course that would incorporate the objectives and exact testing of IS-100, IS-200 and IS-700 with a means to make the course site specific. This would be a classroom course administered by the site or through EOTA (website or classroom). The site would administer the academic testing (IS Course tests) and EOTA would establish a Proficiency Model evaluation that the site would complete and provide back to EOTA in order for the certificate of completion to be provided to the student.
 - i. For example, for a field medical response EOTA could perform an analysis (working with the appropriate subject matter experts) to determine the minimum standard of the local protocols and procedures of the jurisdiction state. The AHJ would decide what level their responders would have to achieve, such as First Aid First Responder, EMT-Basic or EMT-Paramedic.

- b. The EOTA analysis could also include a survey of the sites to determine specific requirements for other positions such as Consequence Assessment Team, Incident Commander (Field), Emergency Director (EOC) and other positions as deemed necessary. EOTA is already engaged in an analysis for the public information program element and will gladly share those results with the efforts outlined in this memo.

It would be expected that coordination of the process would be between sites through the EMI-SIG Training Working Group and EOTA. Subject Matter Experts, as determined by EOTA and the EMI-SIG Training Working group, would be involved in fleshing out the positions, requirements to be worked as a final proposal for approval by DOE HQ's and stakeholders identified by DOE HQ's.

Due to the amount of coordination and work required to make this concept a reality it was decided at this meeting that the first steps would be to provide this proposal through the EMI-SIG Training Working Group for comment and ask for approval by Mr. Fairobent of this concept.

Follow-on discussions will be needed to determine the specific path forward, but sending surveys to the sites for their feedback will be one of the critical steps we will have to accomplish. This is key to identifying positions that would require minimum initial qualification requirements.

BOB BURGER, CEM
EMI-SIG Training Working Group, Chairman