

questions in both scenarios, and was scored for each. For the evolving scenario, candidates were provided with a 15-minute preparation period, and candidates had 10 minutes to respond. For the arriving scenario, a five-minute preparation period was given, and candidates had 10 minutes to respond.

The candidates' responses were scored on technical knowledge and oral communication ability. Prior to the administration of the exam, a panel of Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) determined the scoring criteria, using generally approved fire command practices, firefighting practices, and reference materials. Scoring decisions were based on SME-approved possible courses of action (PCAs) including those actions that must be taken to resolve the situation as presented. Only those oral responses that depicted relevant behaviors that were observable and could be quantified were assessed in the scoring process.

Candidates were rated on a five-point scale, with 5 as the optimal response, 4 as a more than acceptable passing response, 3 as a minimally acceptable passing response, 2 as a less than acceptable response, and 1 as a much less than acceptable response. For each of the scenes, and for oral communication, the requirements for each score were defined.

For the evolving scenario, the appellant scored a 2 for the technical component, a 5 for the supervision component, and a 4 for the oral communication component. For the arriving scenario, the appellant scored a 5 for the technical component, a 4 for the supervision component, and a 4 for the oral communication component. The appellant challenges his scores for the technical component of the evolving scenario, and the supervision component of the arriving scenario. As a result, the appellant's test material, video, and a listing of PCAs for the scenarios were reviewed.

The evolving scenario involves a fire in a bookstore, and fire has broken through the roof. For the technical component, the assessor indicated that the appellant failed due to the action of ordering members of his company onto the self-venting roof to vertically ventilate above the fire of a steel truss roof. On appeal, the appellant states that he never mentioned the venting over the original fire building. He states that he deployed an aerial ladder and multiple ladders to the roof 60 feet away from the self-venting fire, and vented over adjoining businesses. He states that he cooled the truss and extinguished the fire in interior operations, and placed a company on the exposure roof once the fire had been extinguished and the steel had cooled. He cites page 350 of *Fire Officer's Handbook of Tactics*, by John Norman, 4th addition, which states, "The decision as to whether to commit members to the roof or interior operations must be based on a well-informed size up. Factors to consider include the severity of the fire, how long it has been burning, and whether not fire has reached the truss."

Question 1 asked candidates to describe in detail the orders they would give to their crew to carry out their assignment from the Incident Commander (IC). The description in the scenario indicated that the fire building was in a strip mall of lightweight steel truss construction that was built in 1967. The appellant indicated that he was concerned about a five-minute collapse time once fire entered the trusses. He stated, "I'll have my ladder company position the apparatus in front of the building to maximize the scrub area and we'll be deploying the aerial to the roof. We'll be deploying multiple ah ladders to the roof sixty feet away from the fire building due to the fact that fire was blowing through the roof already. We'll be opening up all natural openings on the roof as well as checking the C side of the structure for any occupants and any victims. I'll be reporting all conditions and observations to command." The appellant provided actions he would take for searching, and he also vented the rear door, on side C. The appellant then takes actions as though he is the IC, and these actions are not a direct response to question 1, which only asks for orders to the crew to carry out his assignment.

Next, the appellant responded to question 2. When he discussed the roof again, he stated, "I would request additional backup lines as well to be cooling the truss space and have ah the, the crews on the roof open up ah to vertically vent directly over the um, fire, to help remove smoke and heat and ah products of combustion, and also to, to vent the rear door to help us with the ah horizontal ventilation." This was a truss roof on fire, such that it was self-venting in the bookstore, and had spread over to the restaurant. The appellant clearly vented the roof directly over the fire, and he did not mention that he would be using the aerial ladder to do so. Also, the wind is blowing north to south, towards side c, and forcing the side c door created a wind tunnel. Further, the roof is self-ventilating so venting the roof is a waste of personnel and puts the members in danger as the truss roof has been compromised. Also, ventilation cannot occur over the seat of the fire without putting the members directly in the flames. As such, the appellant put his crew members in grave danger, and his score of 2 for this component is correct.

The arriving scenario involved a report of fire on the first and second floor of a row home, where there were people squatting inside when the fire broke out. Question 3, the supervision question, indicated that as the candidate is evacuating other rowhomes on the block, one of his firefighters gets into a screaming argument with a resident who does not want to leave, and the firefighter attempts to perform a firefighter's carry with the resident. The question asks for actions to take now and back at the firehouse.

For the supervision component, the assessor noted that the candidate missed the opportunity to call law enforcement to remove the resident. On appeal, the appellant states that he stopped the situation, explained the importance of leaving and ensured the resident was removed, and called the police for traffic and crowd

control, but did not believe that law enforcement assistance was necessary. He maintains that he personally removed the resident.

In reply, at the end of every scenario and prior to the questions, instructions state, "In responding to the questions, make sure your actions directly relate to the scenario. Do not assume or take for granted that general actions will contribute to your score." A review of the appellant's presentation indicates that he called for police for crowd control and safety purposes when he was calling for additional resources in response to question 1.

However, in response to question 3, the actions that the appellant took on scene were to stop the firefighter and he then stated, "And I would explain to the resident the importance of having her being evacuated. That it's for her safety and make sure that she is removed out of the way." While the appellant has confidence in his persuasive skills, his response does not appropriately address the situation. The appellant rewrites the question as though he has changed her mind about leaving, rather than giving an appropriate response to address the problem of a resident's refusal to leave a dangerous environment. There is no indication how he is going to remove the resident from the toxic environment without law enforcement assistance, except by using his own persuasive skills. He does not provide a backup plan in case that does not work, which is the crux of the question. The appellant ignores the fact that the resident was reluctant to leave, and he missed this action as noted by the assessor. His presentation does not warrant a score of 5.

CONCLUSION

A thorough review of the appellant's submissions and the test materials indicates that the decision below is amply supported by the record, and the appellant has failed to meet his burden of proof in this matter.

ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that this appeal be denied.

This is the final administrative determination in this matter. Any further review should be pursued in a judicial forum.

DECISION RENDERED BY THE
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ON
THE 17th DAY OF APRIL, 2019



Deirdré L. Webster Cobb
Chairperson
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries
and
Correspondence

Christopher S. Myers
Director
Division of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs
Civil Service Commission
Written Record Appeals Unit
P. O. Box 312
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312

c: Samuel Griglio
Michael Johnson
Records Center