

- Introduction: Welcome to CRR Radio from the Vision 20/20 Project.
- Ed Comeau: Hi, my name is Ed Comeau from the Vision 20/20 Project. Today, on CRR Radio, we're talking about NFPA 3000, standard for an Active Shooter/Hostile Event Response Program. This is a new standard that was put out by NFPA in late April. Today, we're joined by John Montes, the Emergency Services Specialist from the NFPA, who is a staff liaison for the standard, and committee members, Lori Moore-Merrell, who's the Assistant to the General President from the IAFF, and Massachusetts State Fire Marshal Peter Ostroskey.
- John, can you tell us what NFPA 3000 is all about?
- John Montes: Sure, so NFPA 3000 is a new and provisional standard, only the second provisional standard in the history of NFPA, that is for an Active Shooter/Hostile Event Response Program. It's a first of its kind, and even though it says provisional in the title, it is a ANSI-accredited, out-there-in-the-world registered standard.
- Ed Comeau: Thanks, John. I'll be getting back to you in a minute looking for more details, but Lori, why was a standard created in the first place? What was the driving force behind it?
- Lori Moore-Merrell: Well, I think that there was quite a demand from the fire service itself to have a standard. You see, prior to this, we had no real guidance from any authoritative source that would've provided general guidelines, even, on how to put together joint responses with law enforcement. Though many departments have done it, there were lots of variations. The increasing number of incidents with this active shooter, any sort of hostile event type responses, a lot of our departments were being thrown into the mix and just having to do the best they could. Other departments had done some training, joint training, and we are seeing now the after-effects in a lot of the lessons learned, if you will, post-incident on who had done training prior joint training, working together preparing and those who had not, and it was very, very relevant to the situation and the outcomes of the situation, honestly.
- Lori Moore-Merrell: There was quite a demand from the fire service, particularly, for some sort of standard that would help us pull together some details, some guidelines, some points to get some direction to the local agencies on how to do this and how to prepare. Specifically, the request came out of Orange County, Florida with Chief Otto Drozd who made the request to NFPA with lots of backing, both from the IAFF, the IAFC, and the Metro Chiefs, all saying, "Yes, we need something." The original request came from Chief Drozd, and here we are.
- Ed Comeau: To me, it looks like there is a need for it, and tragically, these incidents seem to keep happening on a regular basis. Marshall Ostroskey, was that the driving urgency for developing 3000?

- Peter Ostroskey: I joined the NFPA 3000 committee while it was already in progress, but it was impressive that NFPA, for only the second time in the organization's history, adopted this standard using a provision in the standards adoption process that enabled them to quickly get a product out. That's really reflective of the times and the urgent need for this, but I think, certainly, the user community and NFPA really raised the issue that a timely document was necessary, so they took steps to make sure that this happened fast.
- Ed Comeau: Back to you, John, and in looking at the committee that was developing this standard, it's not only quite large but also very diverse. What was behind the selection of the committee members?
- John Montes: It is, yeah. We have, now, it's up to 50 members, representation from across all the law enforcement disciplines, local, federal, and state, representation across all the fire service, EMS service to fire service, emergency management, universities. There's nine physicians on the committee. The other thing that there's nine of that I think is really interesting, there's nine people that were actually survivors and/or responders to recent active shooter events. There's someone that was at Sandy Hook, someone that was at Las Vegas, two or three people that were at Pulse, someone that was at the Oak Creek shooting in Wisconsin at the Sikh temple. These people have been in it. We have someone that was shot 15 times on the committee and he survived. His experience and his understanding of what occurred provides an invaluable resource, especially when you look at things like recovery.
- Ed Comeau: As I mentioned earlier, John, I was going to ask you for more details about just what is in the standard.
- John Montes: I'll just go in order, very high level. There's a risk assessment both for a community and a facility. There's the program requirements, so if you're developing an Active Shooter/Hostile Event Response Program either as a community or facility, who needs to be at the table is in there, and then what plans and guidelines that are a part of that. Those minimum things you need are in there. It just sets the minimum. It doesn't say what's in those plans and guidelines because those are local capabilities and local tactics. It just says you need to have one for these things.
- John Montes: It talks about resource distribution. It talks about unified command, communication center coordination, which is your dispatch centers for 911, responder competencies. This is a really interesting section. Basically, the committee puts together a list of competencies, and competency means knowledge of. It doesn't mean that you have to demonstrate it. That would be a qualification, but knowledge of certain items. The best example is threat-based medical care. It says that all of the first responders, police, fire, and EMS have to have knowledge of threat-based medical care, which is really bleeding control.

John Montes: It set up competencies, and it actually set them up as separate chapters, one for police, and one for fire and EMS. They included the EMS one with fire because they found that there was only a few things that were different, and they laid those out in the chapter instead of making a separate chapter that pretty much read the same. They made competencies for law enforcement, competencies for fire and EMS, public notification, public education that you have to teach communities how to prepare, respond, and recover for these events, and really, that goes back to some of the things that are out there already like bleeding control, Stop the Bleed, run, hide, fight, avoid, deny, defend, whatever your program is. It doesn't specifically pick one. It just says you need to teach something.

John Montes: Then another interesting chapter, which is a facilities chapter, facility readiness, and in that chapter, it says that the facility has to have a plan as part of its annex to its emergency operations plan. That plan has to be exercised on an annual basis. If the facility does an annual fire drill, then it has to do a drill of some kind, an exercise of some kind for its active shooter/hostile event plan. In that, the committee actually wrote it in a way to give facilities some flexibility because they didn't say that it has to be the whole plan. It could be part of the plan.

John Montes: They also said that the facility doesn't have to do a full-scale, boots on the ground exercise. It actually listed functional exercises and tabletop exercises, these options to give facilities even more flexibility. It also said if you have a campus, I'll use Harvard University, they have 200 facilities, 200 buildings, they said it's okay to do one for the campus, not just for every single facility. Instead of doing every single facility, you can do the campus. It has a continuity of operations chapter, has a recovery chapter, and that one is really interesting because it focuses on recovery from these types of events and how it's different from the disaster.

John Montes: The best example I can give you there is in the disaster under the National Disaster Response Framework from FEMA, there's a phase of recovery called short-term recovery. The committee said there's no such thing as short-term recovery in an active shooter/hostile event. You don't get back into your house. You don't get your power turned back on and your services restored and you're fine. This recovery goes on for years and years in perpetuity. You have to plan for it differently. They have a lot of information there on that.

John Montes: Then the last chapter I'll talk about is they have one for hospitals as receivers. Specifically, if you're a hospital with the expectation to receive patients, like in an emergency department, there are some requirements in the standard that talk about having two means of communication with your first response community, exercising with your first response community on an annual basis, and specifically planning for how you will manage spontaneous arrivals. When you look at some of the incidents that have happened recently like Vegas, Orlando, or even back to the Aurora shooting in Colorado at the movie theater.

- John Montes: There are specific examples of hospitals being completely overwhelmed and unaware of how many more patients are coming, and that being unable to get additional resources because they had no situational awareness. The standard provides some help in preventing that from happening in the future. It covers quite a few things. Like I said, it really does affect the whole community from the public citizen through community education, all the way to the first receiver, all the way to the recovery in perpetuity, so a big bite of the apple.
- Ed Comeau: Well, there certainly is a lot of content for people to use, which leads me to my next question for Lori. I'm an AHJ. How can I use 3000 in my community?
- Lori Moore-Merrell: The local levels, whether it's fire, police, or local government agency, local official who wants to get the standard, they need to get the standard in their hands, they need to read. First and foremost, read the standard. Don't just listen to what other people tell you it says. You need to go in and learn it for yourself. That's the unfortunate part of a lot of our standards. We will have somebody else tell us what it says. Often, those reports, if you will, get a bit skewed. I would just encourage you as leaders at the local level, read the standard. It is not that long. We tried to make it concise but relevant, so it is important that you know what's in there's so that you can go back and reference. You can compare it to what you've already done. You can see if there are lessons to be learned. You can see if there's anything even that we might have missed that, "Oh, wow, this needs to be taken up," so that you can contribute back to the process as well.
- John Montes: The best thing you can do is find what's relevant to you. If you're a school principal, if you're a campus executive or a safety manager on the campus, find what's relevant to you, implement those components for yourself and your organization, but then reach out to your partners in response, and in healthcare, and in all those other facets that are in there, and get them involved. Be that catalyst that gets everybody getting together. A great example is a hospital. If you're a hospital, you're working to try and meet the requirements of the receiving chapter, you should be bringing in your response community and saying, "Hey, in order for us to do this, we need your help," and vice versa.
- John Montes: If you're a fire or police agency or an ambulance service, taking charge and saying you want to implement the things that are relevant to you, then you need those other partner organizations to work with you. It's almost like we want it to grow organically within communities. Separately, we are working really hard for leadership across the country in leadership organizations to get it and push it and get people using it. Our hope is that we build safer, more prepared communities by doing it from the top-down, from the bottom-up.
- Ed Comeau: John was mentioning earlier about how there is content for everyone, whether you are a fire, law enforcement, EMF, hospitals, campuses. Marshal, was that the idea, to bring everyone together under one umbrella?

Peter Ostroskey: I think it incorporates a lot of other entities into this because it does have to be a whole community reaction. When we look at risk mitigation, we have to take a look at where those risks exist in a community. In addition, we need to make sure that the actions we take in reaction to any of those risks is reflective of the other needs of other constituencies that we might not recognize. For example, when we look at hardening of an education facility, we want to make sure that the practices and policies and procedures that they adopt in doing so to make the facility safe and make their constituency safe is not violating another code for lack of information and understanding. I think this strengthens the ability to really look across the continuum and get a dialogue going that's whole community and that takes into account everybody's needs, but also make sure that we aren't violating codes in lieu of an understanding of them.

Ed Comeau: Lori, what's been the reaction of the standard now that it's out?

Lori Moore-Merrell: So far, all good things, and I think it is just starting to be read. A lot of people have referenced it. They've heard a lot of presentations on it. From the presentations that we're giving, that others from the committee are giving, I think the feedback from the audiences is very, very good. This is needed. I'm excited to have it. I'm looking forward to reading it, but I think we're still on the front-end of really comprehensive digestion of what's in there by a lot of our local leadership. I think a little more time under our belts and we'll start to see more and more feedback and get a bit more use under our belt, if you will, for the standard.

Ed Comeau: Marshal, while this is predominantly a response standard, I noticed there's quite a bit of emphasis on public education as well.

Peter Ostroskey: I think that, again, that we have the ability to utilize our terrible experience but also to take those lessons and make sure that when people see something, they say something, that when they're faced with one of these events, that there are certain things that they can accomplish to make themselves safer and also lead to the success of an operation related to one of these. For instance, the run, hide, fight process is very important, and that's a public education component so that, again, when tragedy strikes, people have the ability to impact these incidents. I think that we raise the quotient through public education.

Ed Comeau: It's really obvious that there's a lot of information in 3000. If people want more about it, John, where should they go?

John Montes: The best place to go is www.nfpa.org/3000.

Ed Comeau: Well, we've been talking about the new document, NFPA 3000 which is a standard for an Active Shooter/Hostile Event Response Program with John Montes from the NFPA, Lori Moore-Merrell from the IFF, and Peter Ostroskey, the Massachusetts State Fire Marshal who were on the committee that developed the standard, and I really appreciate all of you taking the time in



joining us today. Again, if you're looking for more information on the NFPA 3000, you can go to www.nfpa.org/3000. I'll be sure to include the links on the show notes below as well.

Ed Comeau: If you're looking for information on community risk reduction, be sure to visit the Vision 20/20 Project at www.strategicfire.org/CRR where you'll find guides, videos, toolkits, and a whole lot more. Be sure to subscribe to CRR Radio, now in our second season, where you can listen to other episodes. You can subscribe on Apple Podcast or wherever you get your podcasts. My name is Ed Comeau and thanks for listening to CRR radio.

Conclusion: Thanks for joining us on CRR Radio from the Vision 20/20 Project. For more information on community risk reduction, please visit us at www.strategicfire.org.