



Federal Emergency Management Agency

Washington, D.C. 20472

MEMORANDUM

FOR: Search Working Group
Chair

DATE: 5-18-04

FROM: Canine Subcommittee

SUBJECT: Canine Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

Please find the attendance and agenda items addressed at the recent Canine Work Group conference call:

MEETING DATE(s) >>		5-18-04	Call Number 74	
MEMBERSHIP / ATTENDANCE				
Teresa MacPherson		[Interim chair]		
Member	Y/N	Member	Y/N	
Shirley Hammond	Y			
Fred Pitts	Y			
Ann Wichmann	Y			
John Dean	Y			
John Gilkey	Y			
Mike Marks	Y			
Rory Rehbeck (SWG)	Y			
Bruce Berry (SWG)	Y			
Dean Scott (Program Office)	Y			

Canine Subcommittee Meeting Minutes
Page Two

AGENDA ITEMS/DISCUSSION

- Minutes
- Type I evaluator question 2 yr. STM requirement
- New Evaluators:
Sonja Heritage handler VATF1
Jeaneen McKinney handler NMTF1
Elizabeth Kreitler handler VATF1
Mike Scott (CATF-8) and Ron Weckbacher (CATF-1) have applied to begin Type I shadow process.
- Type I Recert Extension:
Don Lassig and Sky request an extension on their Type I status to recertify this summer after a protracted absents due to medical treatment.
- Review NE & VA tests
- Status Update:
- Do two tests in one weekend constitute one evaluation administered or two? (to count towards Lead requirement) (it appears the precedent has been to count it as one).
- Face to face meeting (review agenda & John's ideas for training)
- Mentor Position Description

PROPOSED ACTIONS

- Minutes
Evaluator conference call minutes approved.
- Type I evaluator question; 2 yr. STM requirement?
We all agree that the STM needs to have the two year experience or become a Type I team.
- New Evaluators:
Sonja Heritage handler VATF1
Jeaneen McKinney handler NMTF1
Elizabeth Kreitler handler VATF1
All three of the above evaluators were approved via email poll prior to this conference.

Mike Scott (CATF-8) and Ron Weckbacher's (CATF-1) applications to begin Type I shadow process have been approved.
- Type I Recert Extension:
Don Lassig and Sky requested and were granted an extension on their Type I status to recertify this summer after a protracted absents due to medical treatment.
- Review NE & VA tests
John Dean reviewed the NE test and had a positive assessment said the evaluation was consistent and fair. Ann Wichmann who took the test attested to the accuracy of John's assessment. Both agree that NE TF did a very good job producing the test. 8 Type II were tested with 4 passing and 8 Type I were tested with 4 passing. John did feel that there was an issue with the debriefing time on the Type I pile. We will discuss it at the Face to Face conference.

Canine Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

Page Three

VA also produced a good test. The rubble, at first thought to be undersized, proved to be very nicely complex piles. 14 Type II were tested with 10 passing. 8 Type I were tested with 5 passing.

■ Status Update:

We are up to an average of 53% pass rate. Last year we had 140 total certified teams (Type I and Type II combined) and this year there are 178 certified teams.

■ Do two tests in one weekend constitute one evaluation administered or two? (to count towards Lead requirement) (it appears the precedent has been to count it as one).

We discussed having the chief evaluator decide if the experience is two separate shadow evaluations or is the weekend going to be counted as one shadow evaluation depending on the circumstances. That decision would then be recorded in the After Action Report. Fred Pitts to write up this and alternatives for email discussion.

■ Face to face meeting (review agenda & John's ideas for training)

John Dean suggested that we have a training opportunity in lieu with each test. This does not add cost to the system. If the number of handler's requiring tests is low then the TF could do a training weekend instead. Instead of 9 evaluators we would have up to 9 trainers.

The CSS course could be broken into modules and they could be presented at these trainings. Modules would be stand alone and handled as check offs. Modules that are less rubble intensive can allow Task Force's without great resources to make a more qualitative contribution.

There may be a problem with funding this concept because the funding is specifically allotted for evaluation. Training can be funded with the funds left over after an evaluation.

We will continue the discussion on how to modularize the CSS course as a separate issue from the training week-ends. John to get a start into this process and it will be incorporated into the CSS course manual reconstruction.

■ Mentor PD

Tim Gallagher would rather see our requirements tightened up for the mentor selection.

Our first attempt:

- Remove evaluator status

- Change "should be able" to document experience to "must be able".

- Remove instructor status

- Remove deployment history

- Discussion on training program templates

The Mentor is a conductor of the training program and as such diagnoses the training needs of the trainees and finds sources to address those issues.

■ Water rescue slated to be an awareness level requirement. Rory Rehbeck asked if the requirement should actually be at the operation level. We all agreed.

NEXT CALL

No next call was set; we will assume that we are meeting next week.