

<p>Meeting Date: November 7, 2024</p>	<p>Board of Pilot Commissioners for the Bays of San Francisco, San Pablo, and Suisun 660 Davis Street, San Francisco, CA 94111</p> <p>AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE PILOT TRAINEE TRAINING PROGRAM SELECTION EXAM MEETING MINUTES</p>	<p>Page 1 of 9</p>
--	--	--------------------

ATTENDANCE

Committee Members Present

Captain Robert Carr, Pilot Member
 Captain Dave Gates, Pilot Member (Retired)
 Captain Cevan LeSieur, Pilot Member
 Captain Jesse Pullin, Pilot Member

Committee Members Absent

None.

Board Staff Present

Allen Garfinkle, Executive Director
 Matthew Millspaugh, Assistant Director
 Alethea Wong, Licensing and Training Programs Manager
 Mari McNeill, Administrative Coordinator

Identified Public Present (in person and by phone)

Captain Anne McIntyre, Business Director, San Francisco Bar Pilots (SFBP)
 Roma Cristia-Plant, public

OPEN MEETING

1. Call to order and roll call. (Acting Chair Carr)

Acting Chair Carr called the meeting to order at 9:31 a.m. Board Administrative Coordinator, Marjorie (Mari) McNeill called the roll and confirmed a quorum.

2. Review and approval of Committee meeting minutes. (Chair Carr)

Committee action to approve the minutes from the Committee meetings held on August 1, 2024, and September 24, 2024.

Chair Carr stated he was ready to approve the minutes from the Committee meeting held on August 1, 2024, but suggested the committee delay the approval of the September 24, 2024, meeting minutes until the next meeting (January 9, 2024) to allow committee members more time to review them.

MOTION: Committee member Gates moved to approve the minutes from the Committee meeting held on August 1, 2024. Committee member Pullin seconded the motion.

VOTE: YES: Carr, Gates, LeSieur, Pullin.

<p>Meeting Date: November 7, 2024</p>	<p>Board of Pilot Commissioners for the Bays of San Francisco, San Pablo, and Suisun 660 Davis Street, San Francisco, CA 94111</p> <p>AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE PILOT TRAINEE TRAINING PROGRAM SELECTION EXAM MEETING MINUTES</p>	<p>Page 2 of 9</p>
---	--	---------------------------

NO: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

ACTION: The motion was approved.

3. Directors' Report (Executive Director Garfinkle/Assistant Director Millspaugh)

A) Correspondence and activities since the Committee meeting held on September 24, 2024.

Executive Director Garfinkle stated:

- Board staff continue to prepare the scope of work for proposals and have pursued the ideas proposed in the September 24, 2024, Committee meeting, including potential contractors including but not limited to the California State University Maritime Academy (CMA), Pacific Maritime Institute (PMI) and Dainis & Company, Inc. Services from contractors under consideration include but are not limited to:
 - Providing space to hold the exam, and simulator time, exam development and simulator exam facilitation or psychometricians)
- Board staff have concerns regarding CMA's capacity to fulfill exam related commitments or staffing requirements for the duration of the exam development through to the completion of the exam. Board staff recommend directly contracting with CMA utilizing CMA's facilities for holding/facilitating the exam as well as their simulator and directly contracting with a third party for exam development services. Contracting for exam development directly (as opposed to relegating this to a subcontracting process through CMA) would allow for greater Board control over the process.
- One of the noted alternatives to CMA was PMI, which can provide a simulator operator and design a scenario in conjunction with the Board's existing virtual environment.
- Board staff exam preparations have been geared towards use of the existing three exam modules. If the Board desires to eliminate the simulator portion of the exam, as mentioned in the September 2024 Committee meeting, then Board staff should start a parallel process to evaluate the change, which will require a change to the regulations; but no decisions have been made. Existing regulations, which revised the exam to add an interview module, have only been in place one exam cycle.

B) Updates on topics requested in the previous Committee meeting. Topics may include psychometrists, contractors/contracting options, current industry standards, etc.

Assistant Director Millspaugh stated that the draft agreement for psychometric contractors should be ready to submit to the California Highway Patrol (CHP) by the end of November 2024. Board staff reached out to the Washington State Board of Pilotage

<p>Meeting Date: November 7, 2024</p>	<p>Board of Pilot Commissioners for the Bays of San Francisco, San Pablo, and Suisun 660 Davis Street, San Francisco, CA 94111</p> <p>AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE PILOT TRAINEE TRAINING PROGRAM SELECTION EXAM MEETING MINUTES</p>	<p>Page 3 of 9</p>
---	--	---------------------------

Commissioners for information regarding their Request for Proposals (RFP) for exam development. Accounting for CHP's expedited process, Board staff hope to have an RFP out for bid around April 2025.

Committee member Gates requested Board staff review the court settlement that resulted in the simulator portion being added to the exam, to determine what the specific requirement was, and if the Board has the option to eliminate the simulator portion from the exam process or if it was part of the settlement. Captain McIntyre agreed, stating it would be beneficial to make the 2026 exam less onerous. Executive Director Garfinkle stated that, regardless of what the settlement said, changing the exam process would require a change to the regulations, which would take at least six months.

4. Report and discussion on the 2026 Pilot Trainee Training Program Selection Exam (Exam), including discussion on diversification of the Exam pool and on Exam preparation, staffing, venue, and execution. (Board staff and Committee members)

Possible committee action to make recommendations to the Board on the Exam which may include recommendations on diversification of Exam pool, and Exam preparation, staffing, and venue that may result from the above discussion.

The committee discussed various considerations related to the simulator portion of the exam, including:

- Committee member Pullin supported the idea of conducting a test cycle without a simulator portion.
- Executive Director Garfinkle stated:
 - The Board still has a lot to do in a limited time to prepare for the exam using the current structure, such as obtaining a confirmation that CMA's facilities can be used. If the committee wants to develop a new exam structure, it should be done as a parallel process to preparing the 2026 exam and should involve a psychometrician, who can provide the expertise to craft an exam that would withstand challenges from candidates.
 - The CMA agreement will need to specify what services and facilities are required, such as the dates and number of days (including the exam days and days prior to the exam used in preparation and proofing of the simulator module).
 - The dates selected will need to ensure the exclusive use of the facilities and freedom from having students share the facility that will better enable development and hosting of the exam.
 - The RFP should specify that the psychometrician will assist in preparing the exam and make recommendations on changes and improvements to implement for future exams.

<p>Meeting Date: November 7, 2024</p>	<p>Board of Pilot Commissioners for the Bays of San Francisco, San Pablo, and Suisun 660 Davis Street, San Francisco, CA 94111</p> <p>AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE PILOT TRAINEE TRAINING PROGRAM SELECTION EXAM MEETING MINUTES</p>	<p>Page 4 of 9</p>
---	--	---------------------------

- Captain McIntyre stated the Board will need to confirm how to contract with CMA after CMA is absorbed into California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo (Cal Poly).
- Executive Director Garfinkle stated:
 - Another simulator in California, other than CMA’s simulator, belongs to Orange Coast College, a public community college in Costa Mesa in Orange County; although it may be a much more limited facility than the one at CMA.
 - It is advisable to use CMA’s simulator, if possible, since the Board has a prior relationship with CMA and it is a sister state agency, so it’s easier for the Board to contract with CMA. Contracting directly with CMA also allows the Board to maintain more control by being able to contact the contractor directly and hold accountable.
- Assistant Director Millspaugh stated the Board should follow up with CMA to confirm dates and what to expect. If CMA cannot provide the simulator, then the Board will need to change course.
- Captain McIntyre stated there is a simulator operated by the U.S. Navy in San Diego.
- Committee Member Gates stated the simulator used for the exam will need to be compatible with the simulation software used to develop the simulation (if Transas Navigation Simulator [Transas] software is used then the simulator used during the exam will need to be compatible with Transas software).
- Executive Director Garfinkle stated a 360-degree simulator is not necessary, the simulator could be a narrower view but should not be completely removed for the 2026 exam because there is not enough time to make such a large change. It is still a good idea to consider changes to the modules for the following exams.
- Chair Carr suggested Committee members visit simulators to see the facilities and equipment available and agreed that a 360-degree simulation is unnecessary.
- Executive Director Garfinkle and Committee Member LeSieur stated they could ask Orange Coast College what software their simulator uses.
- Executive Director Garfinkle stated:
 - The contract with the psychometrist could require them to find an appropriate simulator if CMA proves not a feasible option.
 - While considering other options, the Board can continue to work with the assumption than CMA can provide the facilities (but not the operators) because the merger with CMA and Cal Poly will not change the physical equipment availability at CMA.
- Chair Carr requested Board staff develop an RFP with specific details included in the scope of work for the psychometrist to evaluate the feasibility of removing the simulator portion of the exam for future exams.

<p>Meeting Date: November 7, 2024</p>	<p>Board of Pilot Commissioners for the Bays of San Francisco, San Pablo, and Suisun 660 Davis Street, San Francisco, CA 94111</p> <p>AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE PILOT TRAINEE TRAINING PROGRAM SELECTION EXAM MEETING MINUTES</p>	<p>Page 5 of 9</p>
---	--	---------------------------

MOTION: Committee member LeSieur moved to recommend to the Board, in the December 12, 2024 Board meeting, to proceed with the exam as per current regulations for the current exam cycle in an expedited manner with no changes to current regulations. Committee member Pullin seconded the motion.

VOTE: YES: Carr, Gates, LeSieur, Pullin.

NO: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

ACTION: The motion was approved.

5. Review and discussion regarding the vendor or agency selection process to create, host, and execute the written, simulator and oral components of the Exam proposed to be held in 2026.

Possible committee action to make recommendation to Board on selection process to create, host and execute the written, simulator and oral components of the 2026 Exam, including contractual considerations and/or policy changes that may result from the above discussion.

Committee members researched and referenced differences in exam processes and test bibliographies for various pilot commissions in different regions. Some exam differences mentioned included: Local knowledge focus versus non-geographical, interviews instead of exams, targeting younger candidates without maritime experience, and having candidates pay \$350 for their psychological evaluation to determine their compatibility before any other screening and then (if selected) taking a medical based psychological screening.

Committee members and attendees discussed adding mental health screening to determine candidates' trainability/aptitude/compatibility with the pilot program. Comments included:

- Captain McIntyre stated the Board's exam does not currently touch on the candidate's trainability and character.
- Committee member Gates agreed and stated the Board's exam should focus more on a candidate's soft skills such as risk management and anger management.
- Executive Director Garfinkle stated candidates must be in good physical and mental condition and Board staff would continue to pursue mental health screening as part of the application process, as takes place in the Sandy Hook Pilots Association job application process.
- Captain McIntyre agreed with implementing an early mental health screening process; and stated it becomes more difficult to eliminate candidates the further along in the program they are.
- Committee member LeSieur stated some pilot commissions have much longer training programs to allow more time to vet candidates/trainees.

<p>Meeting Date: November 7, 2024</p>	<p align="center">Board of Pilot Commissioners for the Bays of San Francisco, San Pablo, and Suisun 660 Davis Street, San Francisco, CA 94111</p> <p align="center">AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE PILOT TRAINEE TRAINING PROGRAM SELECTION EXAM MEETING MINUTES</p>	<p align="center">Page 6 of 9</p>
---	--	-----------------------------------

- Executive Director Garfinkle stated that to integrate neuropsychology into the exam process, the Board must first:
 - 1) Study the elements of existing neuropsychology in exams that would be applicable to pilots, such as screening candidates for their aptitude in teamwork, risk management, and other areas applicable to the Board.

A request for bids will need to be released to establish a contract to complete the study. The study would be a broad process, separate from exam process, to catch candidates before they become pilots. Adding a mental element to the process is advisable and a mandate to do so already exists in statute.
 - 2) Change medical regulations to integrate psychological screening for candidates prior to contracting with a candidate to be a trainee.
 - 3) Add a periodic psychological testing for existing pilots to catch mental health issues that may impair performance.
- Chair Carr stated the previous efforts to add psychological screening were hindered by the Corona Virus Infectious Disease (COVID-19) pandemic.
- Executive Director Garfinkle encouraged committee members to consider when the Board should conduct the psychological screening. Every step of the exam process reduces the number of candidates, therefore the later in the process it is done, the fewer candidates will need to go through the screening.
- Committee member Gates and Chair Carr stated the exam questions should be written with the assistance of experts with experience with the process, noting the exam could benefit from exam questions developed by an entity familiar with the maritime and piloting industries. Executive Director Garfinkle stated the RFP should include that psychometrist contractor will assist the subject matter experts in crafting questions designed to determine if a candidate has the desired qualities for the position and the RFP should list the desired qualities such as: the ability to work with others and encourage teamwork. The RFP should state that the contractor will help evaluate the candidates' skillset.

Committee members and attendees discussed possible changes to assist with diversifying the candidate pool, including:

- Chair Carr stated that the contractor should be able to remote proctor the examination.
- Captain McIntyre stated the SFBP discusses commitments needed with trainees once they have signed a contract but stated this information should be disseminated earlier and suggested providing a Question and Answer (Q&A) outreach session to help potential candidates understand the program and what it means to be a pilot so they can have a better understanding prior to applying.
- Executive Director Garfinkle stated it would be beneficial to make the exam and pilot program more transparent by making the information more readily available, perhaps

<p>Meeting Date: November 7, 2024</p>	<p>Board of Pilot Commissioners for the Bays of San Francisco, San Pablo, and Suisun 660 Davis Street, San Francisco, CA 94111 AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE PILOT TRAINEE TRAINING PROGRAM SELECTION EXAM MEETING MINUTES</p>	<p>Page 7 of 9</p>
---	--	---------------------------

creating a webinar to disseminate the information. The webinar could have the intended benefit of creating more interest among potential candidates and promote a better understanding of what is expected of candidates as trainees and licensed pilots. Committee member Gates suggested the Board website could add details on expectations for trainees and pilots.

- Committee members discussed recruiting candidates with less experience, earlier in their careers. Committee member Gates stated that the East Coast [pilot agencies and companies] take pilots with less experience and train them, which in turn means they potentially stay pilots longer. Committee member LeSieur stated the Board needs a long-term system to give more opportunities to younger candidates.
- Chair Carr and Committee member Gates discussed a post-exam review to receive professional input and evaluation.
- Committee member Pullin stated the Board got a few extra candidates by expanding the candidate pool to include chief mates, but a post-exam review has not been conducted to determine if any of them made it successfully through the test. Captain Gates suggested perhaps we should examine whether second-officers should be allowed to be candidates as well.
- Committee member LeSieur suggested including candidates with ferry experience (serving on self-propelled vessels of less than 1600 tons).

Assistant Director Millsbaugh stated he planned to reach out to CMA to lock in June 2026 exam dates and asked if committee members envisioned a different timeframe. A virtual exam should be written by May to be ready by June. Committee members noted the exam was previously held in June because midshipmen were not on campus at that time, and considered expanding the exam period to include June and July, possibly limiting use to weekends, but were hesitant to extend the exam to a timeframe when students, unrelated to the pilot exam, would be present; prioritizing a timeframe the Board could maintain free use of equipment with the security of maintaining the confidentiality of the exam.

Executive Director Garfinkle stated Board staff will need to know the exam dates by early to late fall. Also, in response to concerns regarding the long name of the committee, he suggested removing the “Ad Hoc” from the beginning of the committee’s name.

Committee members discussed having a psychometrist perform a new job analysis for the 2026 exam. Comments included:

- Executive Director Garfinkle stated a new job analysis will assist in determining the changes that can be made to the exam.
- Committee member Gates stated for the previous job analysis they interviewed the pilots on what they did, but didn’t focus on importance placed on each point, so the new job analysis should also weigh the importance of each issue.

<p>Meeting Date: November 7, 2024</p>	<p>Board of Pilot Commissioners for the Bays of San Francisco, San Pablo, and Suisun 660 Davis Street, San Francisco, CA 94111</p> <p>AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE PILOT TRAINEE TRAINING PROGRAM SELECTION EXAM MEETING MINUTES</p>	<p>Page 8 of 9</p>
---	--	---------------------------

- Assistant Director Millspaugh stated that the key elements for the RFP should be drafted by December 2024.
- Executive Director Garfinkle stated the RFP could be distributed to committee members prior to the next committee meeting so long as it does not become a serial meeting.

6. Committee member and public comments on matters on the agenda, and not on the agenda. (Chair Carr)

None.

7. Schedule the next Committee meeting, and proposals for items on the next meeting agenda, if applicable. (Chair Carr)

Chair Carr proposed the next Committee meeting be held on January 9, 2025, at 9:30 a.m. and include the review of the RFP.

Executive Director Garfinkle suggested the Board continue to research bibliography materials for the exam.

Chair Carr stated the Board should also start on future exam analysis with different entry ideas.

Committee member LeSieur stated he would reach out to Orange Coast College.

Executive Director Garfinkle stated he has been working to scheduling a school simulator demonstration for the Board members, committee members, and new University of California San Francisco (UCSF) doctors. Once the school has confirmed, he will send a date poll to committee and Board members to gauge interest in participation. This visit to the facility in Vallejo, would be an opportunity for the new UCSF doctors in place to gain a better understanding of what is required on the bridge of a ship. Chair Carr recommended including Pilot Evaluation Committee (PEC) members as well. The committee stated their interest in attending.

8. Adjournment.

Chair Carr adjourned the meeting at 11:30 a.m.

Submitted by:



Executive Director Garfinkle
Executive Director

<p>Meeting Date: November 7, 2024</p>	<p>Board of Pilot Commissioners for the Bays of San Francisco, San Pablo, and Suisun 660 Davis Street, San Francisco, CA 94111</p> <p>AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE PILOT TRAINEE TRAINING PROGRAM SELECTION EXAM MEETING MINUTES</p>	<p>Page 9 of 9</p>
---	--	---------------------------

ACRONYM INDEX

Acronyms / Abbreviations	Definition
BOPC/Board	Board of Pilot Commissioners
CA	California
Cal Poly	California Polytechnic State University
CHP	California Highway Patrol
CMA	California State University Maritime Academy / California Maritime Academy / Cal Maritime
DOJ	Department of Justice
Committee	Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Pilot Trainee Training Program Selection Exam
PEC	Pilot Evaluation Committee
PMI	Pacific Maritime Institute
Q&A	Question and Answer
RFP	Request for Proposals
SFBP	San Francisco Bar Pilots
Transas	Transas Navigation Simulator
UCSF	University of California San Francisco