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Executive Summary

In 2010, the Rural Domestic Preparedness Consortium (RDPC) implemented a post-training evaluation program to evaluate the effectiveness of its courses. This report details the results of the course evaluation for AWR 144 Port and Vessel Security for Public Safety and Maritime Personnel, which is one of several awareness-level courses that RDPC currently offers to rural communities. AWR 144 is designed to educate rural public safety officials and personnel in maritime jurisdictions who may respond to maritime incidents.

The sample drawn for the evaluation consisted of participants who had completed AWR 144 between January 2009 and July 2011. The adjusted sample size for the evaluation was 820 and a total of 194 completed surveys were returned, which resulted in a 22% response rate.

Overall, the evaluation uncovered positive and negative aspects related to the training objectives of the course. For example, participants indicated that the course had helped them to better understand the following concepts:

- Importance of the Maritime Transportation System (MTS) to the Nation;
- U.S. Codes, laws, and regulations related to maritime security;
- Maritime Security Levels (MARSEC levels) and actions and measures associated with each level;
- Transportation Worker Identification Card (TWIC) and its importance to maritime security; and
- Potential hazards and safety issues surrounding a maritime environment.

Conversely, participants also indicated that they have not had a chance to implement or use the following knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) obtained from the course or the recommended tools and procedures:

- Identifying threats to the MTS in the student’s jurisdiction;
- Utilizing existing initiatives (e.g., America’s Waterway Watch, the National Response Center, state initiatives, etc.) that are in place to counter maritime threats;
- Reviewing the security plan(s) of facilities and/or vessels in the student’s jurisdiction;
- Participating in drills or exercises with facility/vessel personnel in the student’s jurisdiction;
- Opportunities to handle Sensitive Security Information (SSI) from a facility and/or vessel; and
- Opportunities to contact the Area Maritime Security Committee (AMSC).

The RDPC will use the information obtained from this study to refine the AWR 144 course curriculum during its upcoming three-year review process in order to ensure the RDPC continues to offer high-quality training courses.
1.0 Introduction and Program Purpose

The Rural Domestic Preparedness Consortium (RDPC) was established in 2005 by Congress to develop and deliver all-hazards preparedness training to rural communities across America. The mission of RDPC is to coordinate the development and delivery of preparedness training in support of rural homeland security requirements and facilitate relevant information sharing. It is essential that emergency responders in small, rural, and remote communities are properly trained to deal with all-hazards events. It is also important that the training delivered to rural emergency responders be effective in meeting its goals and objectives. For more information on the RDPC, please visit http://www.ruraltraining.org/.

In 2010, the RDPC established a Level Three Course Evaluation Program to evaluate the training effectiveness of its courses. This program is based on Level Three of Donald Kirkpatrick’s Four Levels of evaluating training programs — behavior.1 The purpose of the program is to measure the transfer in behavior that has occurred in the participant due to his/her completion of the training course. Therefore, the program assesses whether the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) that each participant acquires via the training course are being applied in the daily work setting of the participant.

Kirkpatrick claims that four conditions are necessary for change to occur in a participant’s behavior once he/she has attended a training course. The first two conditions — the person must have a desire to change and the person must know what to do and how to do it — can be accomplished through a training course by “…creating a positive attitude toward the desired change and by teaching the necessary knowledge and skills.” Furthermore, these two conditions are bestowed upon the participants and their willingness to learn the training curriculum, as well as the training instructor and his/her ability to educate the participants to meet the learning objectives. The third condition — the person must work in the right climate— is outside of the training program’s (e.g., RDPC) control, as this condition pertains to the participant’s immediate supervisor or work environment as a whole. Kirkpatrick lists five different kinds of climate, which range from a supervisor intentionally preventing a participant from implementing the KSA that he/she acquired from the training course to a kind of climate in which a supervisor requires the participant’s learning transfer courses. It is likely that participants in RDPC training courses will work in climates more like the latter, since the participants of such courses are middle-to-senior management level and the training courses are essential to participants’ job duties. The final condition — the person must be rewarded for changing — can be either intrinsic or extrinsic, according to Kirkpatrick. Kirkpatrick explains that intrinsic rewards may include the feelings of satisfaction, pride, and achievement that can occur when change in behavior has positive results, while extrinsic rewards include praise from the boss, recognition by others, and monetary rewards, such as merit pay increases and bonuses. The RDPC may contribute to either type of rewards by simply encouraging participants throughout the training process and by providing an incentive to participants, such as continuing education units.

The RDPC used these conditions as a framework in developing the four criteria that courses must meet in the Level Three Course Evaluation Program.

1. The Terminal Learning Objective (TLO) for each training module must be observable and measurable for research and training purposes.
2. A process and the needed tools must be in place to be able to evaluate the transfer in behavior from the classroom to the workplace (e.g., RDPC’s Level Three Course Evaluation Program).
3. Participants can and must use the tools that are in place to fulfill their responsibilities in the evaluation of the transfer in behavior.
4. Participants must be provided with on-the-job opportunities to demonstrate the TLO for each module learned in the training course.

Based on the criteria above, AWR 144 Port and Vessel Security for Public Safety and Maritime Personnel was selected as a suitable candidate for evaluation. Further, the evaluation was conducted in parallel with the required three-year course review and update of AWR 144. The remainder of this report details the results of the course evaluation.

---

2.0 Course Overview

The Maritime Transportation System (MTS) has been a major factor in the American economy for nearly 400 years and is critical to the economic life of the United States. To illustrate its sheer size, the MTS is comprised of the following:

• 12,000 miles of commercially active waterway systems;
• 1,000 harbor channels;
• 361 ports, handling over 95% of the U.S. overseas trade and 100% of foreign oil imports;
• 2,000 cargo terminals;
• 18,000 bridges;
• 238 lock chambers;
• 97,000 navigational aids;
• Ferries transporting 113,000,000 passengers and 32,000,000 vehicles per year across 35 states; and
• Half of the world wide cruise fleet carrying 5,000,000 passengers annually. (Transportation Research Board, 2004)

Further, the MTS employs 13 million people and contributes $750 billion to the Gross National Product (Transportation Research Board, 2004). The U.S. Department of Transportation (2010) estimates that a one week shut down of the Los Angeles and Long Beach container ports would result in losses of $9.3 million to $21 million per day. Therefore, the MTS is a major factor in the economic life and stability of America. The inland waterways of the MTS further encompass many high risk terminals that are located outside large municipalities, but which share the same risk factors as larger ports.

To help protect the Nation’s rural ports and vessels, the RDPC developed AWR 144 Port and Vessel Security for Public Safety and Maritime Personnel. AWR 144 is an eight-hour instructor-led course designed to educate rural public safety officials and personnel in maritime jurisdictions who may respond to maritime incidents. It is critical that the maritime and emergency response community work together during an incident involving the many port and vessel facilities throughout the country. This course will assist the public safety community in understanding the unique and complex security needs of maritime facilities and vessels. Through this course, first responders will gain a better understanding of the criticalities of the maritime system, thereby increasing their ability to defend it. The training will also enable first responders to better assist the facilities and vessels with the orderly, secure, and safe flow of commerce that is vital to all maritime communities and to the nation. Some of the key elements as well as the topics addressed through the course include the following:

• Characteristics of the MTS;
• Threats to the MTS;
• Maritime security-related issues arising from natural disasters;
• Maritime security levels and regulations;
• Threats to critical maritime infrastructure and threats posed by small vessel-borne improvised explosive devices (VBIEDs);
• Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC);
• Maritime environment safety issues;
2.0 Course Overview (Cont.)

- Homeport and the Area Maritime Security Committee resources;
- Common vessel types and basic terminology; and
- Resources for interfacing with facilities and vessels.


- Access Control and Identity Verification
- Community Resilience
- Cybersecurity
- Environmental Response/Health and Safety
- Forensics and Attribution (Prevention)
- Infrastructure Systems (Response)
- Intelligence and Information Sharing (Prevention and Protection)
- Interdiction and Disruption (Prevention)
- Long-Term Vulnerability Reduction
- Mass Search and Rescue Operations
- On-Scene Security and Protection
- Operational Communications
- Operational Coordination
- Physical Protective Measures
- Planning
- Public and Private Services and Resources
- Public Information and Warning
- Risk and Disaster Resilience Assessment
- Risk Management for Protection, Programs, and Activities
- Screening, Search, and Detection (Prevention and Protection)
- Situational Assessment
- Threat and Hazard Identification

To cover the items above, AWR 144 is comprised of ten modules each with individual TLOs. Table 2-1 presents the modules and their corresponding TLOs, which were utilized in the research design.
Table 2-1: Modules and Corresponding TLOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>TLOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Module 1: Introduction, Administration, and Pre-test</td>
<td>To explain the course purpose, goals and objectives, and summarize how course materials will give the participants an understanding of maritime security basics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 2: Introduction to the U.S. Maritime transportation System</td>
<td>To be familiar with the extent of the U.S. MTS, describe the economic impact of that maritime transportation on the state of the participants, list common vessel types, and define some basic maritime terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 3: Threats to the U.S. Maritime transportation System</td>
<td>To identify threats to the maritime sector that they might encounter in their jurisdiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 4: Maritime Security Regulations</td>
<td>To be able to list relevant U.S. Codes, laws, and regulations important to the security posture of the facilities and vessels in the participants’ jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 5: Maritime Security Level</td>
<td>To describe the security measures required at each MARSEC level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 6: Sensitive Security Information</td>
<td>To define sensitive security information (SSI), describe major handling, transmission and storage regulations, and describe procedures to follow if disclosed SSI is turned into the participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 7: The Transportation Worker Identification Credential</td>
<td>To explain the significance of the TWIC card, including vetting procedures, security features, and suggestions for interface with facilities when TWIC violations occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 8: Maritime Environment Safety Issues</td>
<td>To describe dock and vessel safety concepts as they relate to law enforcement, fire service, emergency medical services, emergency management, public works, and natural resources personnel when responding to an incident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 9: Homeport and the Area Maritime Security Committee Resources</td>
<td>To utilize the Homeport site to obtain information about maritime security. Students will also understand how their participation in the Area Maritime Security Committee will assist in integrating their response role with the wider port security stakeholder group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 10: Post-test and Course Evaluation</td>
<td>To complete a comprehensive post-test and course evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 Methodology

As previously mentioned, an evaluation survey was used for the AWR 144 level three course evaluation to assess whether the KSAs that each participant acquired via the training course have been applied in the daily work setting. The sample drawn for this study was comprised of all participants who had completed the course from January 2009 to July 2011. Participants from this time frame were specifically selected to participate in this study because it had been at least two and a half months since the training was completed. This timeframe was determined to be an adequate amount of time for participants to have possibly utilized the KSAs acquired from the training. A total of 857 participants were invited to participate in the survey. The mailing address that a course participant provided during course registration was used to send the evaluation invitation letter.

Multiple methods were implemented to collect data for the study. Respondents were initially contacted via postal mail with a letter inviting them to participate in the study by completing it online or sending back a hard copy (see Appendix A for a copy of the invitation letter). The mailing date for this first mailing was December 6, 2010. On February 4, 2011, as a courtesy reminder of the RDPC’s invitation to participate in the survey, postcards were mailed to all subjects who did not respond to the initial mailing. Lastly, in a final attempt to solicit a response from those subjects who had not yet participated in the study, the RDPC mailed another reminder postcard on June 20, 2011. The RDPC officially ended data collection on September 12, 2011.

The course evaluation was completed via a survey instrument, which included nineteen single-choice and two open-ended questions. The first six questions were designed to collect demographic information such as gender, age, level of education, job duties, employment status, and level of responsibility. The next thirteen questions directly aligned with the TLOs listed in Section 2.0. The final two questions were focused on obtaining details of actions, which took place as a result of attending AWR 144. Please see Appendix B for a copy of the survey instrument.

The RDPC utilized two survey formats to collect data for this study. The first format was a pen or pencil self-administered survey in which respondents returned via postal mail. The other format was an online self-administered survey which enabled the RDPC to download the data from a central server via the Internet. The software used to create the instrument and collect the data was the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences® (SPSS) Dimensions’ mrInterview™ program. Respondents were provided the online link to the survey in the cover letter that accompanied each mailing. Additionally, each subject was assigned a unique three-digit survey code as an identifier to track his/her completion of the survey, which was also provided within the invitation letters. Subjects had to enter their survey codes in order to access the online survey. When participants preferred to mail the hard copy of the survey back the research personnel at the RDPC, the data was manually entered into a database. After data collection was complete, both databases (on-line and hard copies) were combined and analyzed with SPSS® 19.0.

4.0 Results

The adjusted sample size was 820 due to some subjects having an insufficient mailing address. Overall, a total of 194 completed surveys were received, resulting in an adjusted response rate of 22.3%. Survey completion method was distributed with 53 (or 27.4%) completed online and 141 (or 72.6%) returned via postal mail.

The data from each of the 194 surveys were analyzed using the SPSS® 19.0. Statistical analyses to include frequencies and percentages were conducted to analyze the data. It was determined that these methods of univariate analysis were the most appropriate given the research objective. In regard to the single-response questions, subjects were asked whether they have utilized the skills learned via AWR 144.

In terms of demographics, the respondents were overwhelmingly males (91%, n=176), individuals within the law enforcement community (69%, n=132), full-time paid employees (88%, n=170), and individuals within the 36 to 55 age range (65%, n=126). Approximately two-thirds (67%, n=130) of the respondents also indicated the obtainment of a college degree (associate, bachelor, master). Lastly, over one-third (38%, n=72) indicated they served in line staff positions followed by senior, middle, and lower management.
### Figure 4-1: Gender Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 4-2: Age Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56+</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 4-3: Discipline Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School/GED</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates Degree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 4-4: Discipline Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management Agency Personnel</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental Administrative</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare/Public Health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works/Public Utilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Authority/Security</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 4-5: Employment Status Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Paid Employee</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Paid Employee</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Volunteer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Volunteer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 4-6: Employment Level Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line Staff</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Management</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Management</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Management</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 Results (cont.)

See Figures 4-1 through 4-6 for detailed demographic information.

The objective of this study was to determine if participants who successfully completed AWR 144 have a better understanding of concepts related to port and vessel security as well as if they have utilized the KSAs acquired from the course in their work setting. Overall, the data indicates that the course helped the majority of the participants to better understand the maritime security concepts. For example, more than 90% of the responders indicated “Yes” on five specific questions (7, 10, 13, 15, and 17) designed to capture whether the participants felt that the course was helpful in learning the maritime security concepts. These questions captured concepts such as:

- Importance of the MTS to the nation (97%);
- U.S. Codes, laws, and regulations related to maritime security (94%);
- Maritime Security Levels (MARSEC levels) and actions and measures associated with each level (95%);
- TWIC and its importance to maritime security (93%); and
- Potential hazards and safety issues surrounding a maritime environment (96%).

Conversely, less than a third of the participants answered “Yes” on questions 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, and 19 indicating that they have not had a chance to implement or use obtained KSAs and/or recommended tools and procedures. The questions related to concepts such as:

- Identifying threats to the MTS in the student’s jurisdiction (22%);
- Utilizing existing initiatives (e.g., America’s Waterway Watch, the National Response Center, state initiatives, etc.) that are in place to counter maritime threats (28%);
- Reviewing the security plan(s) of facilities and/or vessels in the student’s jurisdiction (28%);
- Participating in drills or exercises with facility/vessel personnel in the student’s jurisdiction (20.5%);
- Opportunities to handle Sensitive Security Information (SSI) from a facility and/or vessel (22%); and
- Opportunities to contact the Area Maritime Security Committee (AMSC) (26.5%).
**Figure 4-11: Question 10 Results**

**Question 10:** Did the course provide you with a better understanding of the U.S. Codes, laws, and regulations important to the security posture of the facilities and vessels in your jurisdiction? (n=188)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4-12: Question 11 Results**

**Question 11:** Since taking this course, have you had an opportunity to review the security plan(s) of facilities and/or vessels in your jurisdiction? (n=190)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4-13: Question 12 Results**

**Question 12:** Since taking this course, have you had the opportunity to participate in any drills or exercises with facility/vessel personnel in your jurisdiction? (n=190)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4-14: Question 13 Results**

**Question 13:** Since taking this course, do you now have a better understanding of the Maritime Security Levels (MARSEC levels) and the security actions and measures associated with each? (n=194)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4-15: Question 14 Results**

**Question 14:** Since taking this course, have you had the opportunity to handle Sensitive Security Information (SSI) from a facility and/or vessel? (n=193)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4-16: Question 14a Results**

**Question 14a:** If “yes,” did you use what you learned in this course about the handling, transmission, and storage regulations and procedures when you received the SSI? (n=44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4-17: Question 15 Results**

**Question 15:** Since taking this course, do you have a better understanding of the Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) and its importance to maritime security? (n=194)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4-18: Question 16 Results**

**Question 16:** Since taking this course, has your agency received any reports of forged or altered TWICs? (n=192)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the question related to TLOs, the research team collected demographic information in order to analyze possible behavior differences among various groups of participants, such as level of responsibility and discipline. T-Tests were performed to identify whether significant change in behavior existed between the groups. The results of the tests did not reveal any statistically significant differences.

In addition to the questions above, respondents were asked to answer to open-ended questions on the survey (See Appendix C). The first open ended question focused on actions taken as a direct result of attending the class (Please list any actions your organization has taken as a direct result of attending AWR 144: Port and Vessel Security for Public Safety and Maritime Personnel [updated security plan, modified procedures, etc.]). Common actions among responses were developing new or updating existing security plans and/or procedures, partnering and/or networking with other area agencies, and obtaining a better understanding of the maritime security concepts taught in class.

The second open-ended question asked if the participants have been responsible for outlining key components of port and vessel security because of what they learned in the course (Because of what you learned in AWR 144: Port and Vessel Security for Public Safety and Maritime Personnel, have you been responsible for outlining the key components of port and vessel security in your jurisdiction? If so, please explain). Eighteen responders (or 9.2%) indicated that they have indeed been involved in these actions ranging from rewriting or revising security plans to assisting the U.S. Coast Guard, directing security vessel placement, and installing security enhancements (e.g., fencing, surveillance system) among other actions. Appendix C provides the detailed responses of these open-ended questions.
5.0 Discussion

In *The Kirkpatrick Four Levels: A Fresh Look After Fifty Years (1959-2009)*, Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2009) state that the actual execution of learning programs and overall corporate strategy occurs primarily at Level Three. Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2009) also quote 2008 research by Bersin and Associates that indicates that as much as 70% of learning may take place when a trainee takes the learning material back onto the job. The course designers of AWR 144 had a specific type of student in mind when the course was developed, given the rural focus of the RDPC. They pictured the lone deputy sheriff patrolling a road along the Ohio River in rural West Virginia at midnight, or firefighters in a small rural parish in Louisiana along the Mississippi River. With these responders in mind, what information could be given to the rural response community that would make their response job easier and more efficient when responding to the marine terminal in their jurisdiction? Questions that need to be answered with data from this Level Three Evaluation are:

- Do the students think the RDPC succeeded in conveying that information; and
- Can the RDPC find examples in job performance where crucial learning continues to occur?

A closer examination of some of the data indicates interesting information about the respondents’ opinions of the course’s effectiveness.

First, the evaluation results indicate interesting information about the respondents. Demographic data indicates that survey respondents were generally older males (36 years of age and older) whose job position is largely line staff or lower/middle management. This job position may be the factor behind some of the overall responses. For example, a line officer may not be in a position to:

- Review security plans (question 11);
- Influence department/agency policy to permit participation to participate in any drills or exercises with facility/vessel personnel in their jurisdiction (question 12);
- Handle SSI (question 14);
- Attend the AMSC (question 19); or
- Outline the key components of port and vessel security in their jurisdiction (question 21).

This is reinforced by the response to question 19. Unfortunately, AMSC membership tends to be confined to senior management level. A typical complaint heard by instructors during this course is that line officers know that the committee exists because it accounts for the chief’s absence for part of the day. The officers, however, are not provided information or feedback from the committee meeting and have no knowledge of the committee’s purpose.

On the other hand, there are simply no nationwide statistics concerning some of this data, such as emergency responder participation in maritime drills and exercises. U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) personnel in most sectors would almost certainly state that local emergency responder participation in drills and exercises should be encouraged, so a reported “Yes” figure of 20% might be viewed as a substantial amount.

Further, the responses to the open-ended questions are also interesting in that they reveal the diversity of the MTS, the student population of AWR 144, and the range of interests represented in the classroom. For example, the responses to question 8b range from individuals who are not active around the maritime industry to maritime industry security professionals.

Overall, it is clear from the positive responses that the students agree that the major goals of each module are being met at what may be called a Kirkpatrick Level 2. Translating the concepts into the workplace, finding examples in job performance, may depend on circumstances beyond RDPC’s control, such as job function, and the results in these questions are more mixed. For example, while respondents indicated that although they better understand threats to the MTS after taking the course, the large majority of them (78%) have not identified threats in their jurisdiction.
5.0 Discussion (cont.)

This may simply reflect the security reality along the respondents’ waterways. There was also substantial variation in the language used by the respondents identifying threats, ranging from basic “suspicious persons” to sophisticated responses containing regulatory language. It should also be noted that 25% of the responses identified the small vessel threat, which is the focus of another course currently under development by the RDPC. Further, respondents stated that they are not using initiatives to counter maritime threats such as AWW, state initiatives, or the National Response Center. This may be a function of job position or a function of the fact that these programs are simply under-utilized by all their stakeholders.

Lastly, questions 15 and 16b provided interesting insight into agencies and TWIC. Eight respondents reported receiving reports of forged/Altered TWIC’s, but only 2 of the 8 reported using procedures learned in the class. Six of the 8 have worked out their own solutions. Information regards to what these solutions are would be beneficial that can be added to the course as best practices.

6.0 Conclusion (cont.)

Is the intent of the course design successfully indicated within the evaluation results? The responses indicate that after the respondents attended the class, they used concepts that affected general awareness, promoted liaison, and encouraged information sharing. The MTS is a network of critical infrastructure largely in the hands of private industry, but located on private, municipal, county, parish, state, tribal, and federal lands. The various responder stakeholders in these jurisdictions affected by rural maritime commerce that have attended \textit{AWR 144} and completed the Level Three evaluation have indicated that they believe the major goals of the course have been accomplished and that they can take concepts from the course and positively impact the security postures of their jurisdictions. Perhaps a next step in strengthening the maritime security of America’s rural waterways would be addressing the gap identified in this evaluation and reaching out to senior management with a course specifically for this job responsibility, such as a management-level version of the current course.

In summary, the findings from this study suggest that the course development and evaluation processes developed and administered adopted by the RDPC is effective at producing training courses that achieve the goal of increasing the KSAs of participants. In any event, the RDPC will use the information obtained from this level three course evaluation to refine the \textit{AWR 144} course curriculum during its scheduled three-year review and update and integrate the lessons learned from this evaluation into future evaluations.
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Appendix A: Modified Version of First Invitation Letter

Dear <insert name>:

You have been selected to participate in an evaluation research study regarding your completion of the course *AWR 144 Port and Vessel Security for Public Safety and Maritime Personnel*, a training sponsored by the Rural Domestic Preparedness Consortium (RDPC). This study is being conducted by the Justice and Safety Center (JSC) at Eastern Kentucky University (EKU) and is funded by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency, National Training and Education Division. In this study, researchers are assessing the transfer of knowledge from the classroom to the job in order to determine the success of the training, as well as to help guide the development and delivery of future training.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There will not be any consequences for refusal to participate, nor will we identify those who refuse to participate. Your willingness to participate, however, will result in highly beneficial information for RDPC. It is important that your unique perspective is represented, so we ask that you not transfer the survey to another individual to complete without first consulting us. The information that you provide us will be kept confidential and you will not be identified in any way. Your information will only be combined with information from other respondents taking part in the study.

This project was reviewed and approved by EKU’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Research Subjects. If you have questions about your rights as a participant in this study, please contact the EKU IRB Administration at 859-622-3636.

You may access the survey online at the following link: http://surveys.jsc.eku.edu/AWR144survey.html. Once you access the survey, you will be required to enter a three or four-digit survey code number. Please locate your survey code number in the top-right corner of the first page of the paper version of the survey. The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Please complete your survey by March 15, 2011.

If you have any questions, please contact Erin Henry at (859) 622-6763 or erin.henry@eku.edu. Thank you for your willingness to share your experiences with us. We appreciate your participation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. Pam Collins
Principal Investigator, RDPC / Executive Director, JSC – EKU
Appendix B: Survey Instrument

Rural Domestic Preparedness Consortium
AWR 144 Port and Vessel Security for Public Safety and Maritime Personnel
Level 3 Course Evaluation Program

Instructions: Please answer the questions based on your experiences since taking AWR 144 Port and Vessel Security for Public Safety and Maritime Personnel. If you encounter any problems while taking the survey, or have any questions or comments in general, please contact Erin Henry at (859) 622-6763 or erin.henry@eku.edu. Thank you in advance for your participation.

Click “Next” to proceed in taking the survey.

Survey Code:

Please enter the three digit survey code number that can be found at the top right corner of the first page of the paper version of the survey instrument. You must enter your assigned number before you may proceed in taking the survey. (Set numbers range from 201 – 1060)

1. What is your gender?
   Male
   Female

2. What is your age?
   Under 18  36-45
   18 -25   46-55
   26-35   56+

3. What is the highest level of education you have completed? (Please mark only one answer)
   Some high school  Master’s degree
   High school/GED  Doctorate’s degree (e.g., PhD or EdD)
   Some college    Professional degree (e.g., MD or JD)
   Associate’s degree  Other (please specify): ____________
   Bachelor’s degree
4. Which discipline below best reflects your current position and job duties? (Please mark only one answer)

- Emergency Management Agency Personnel
- Emergency Medical Services
- Fire Services
- Governmental Administrative
- Healthcare/Public Health
- Law Enforcement
- Public Safety Communications
- Public Works/Public Utilities
- Port Authority/Security

5. Which of the following best describes your current employment status? (Please mark only one answer)

- Full-time paid employee
- Part-time volunteer
- Part-time paid employee
- Other (please specify): ______________
- Full-time volunteer

6. Which of the following best reflects your primary level of responsibility? (Please mark only one answer)

- Line staff (no supervisory responsibilities)
- Lower management
- Middle management
- Senior management

7. Did the course help you to better understand the importance of the U.S. Maritime Transportation System (MTS) to the economy and the need to protect the nation’s ports, vessels and terminals?

- Yes
- No
8. Since taking the course, have you identified any of the threats to the U.S. Maritime Transportation System in your jurisdiction (e.g., unauthorized intrusion into facilities, small vessels entering closed areas, natural hazards, suspicious persons on ferries/passenger vessels, questionable cargo on vessels, etc.)?

   Yes
   No

   (a) If “yes,” did you use what you learned in this course to identify possible threats?

      Yes
      No

   (b) If “yes,” what threats did you identify in your jurisdiction?

      (Open-ended Response)

9. Since taking this course, have you utilized any of the existing initiatives (e.g., America’s Waterway Watch, the National Response Center, state initiatives, etc.) that are currently in place to counter maritime threats?

   Yes
   No

10. Did the course provide you with a better understanding of the U.S. Codes, laws, and regulations important to the security posture of the facilities and vessels in your jurisdiction?

    Yes
    No

11. Since taking this course, have you had an opportunity to review the security plan(s) of facilities and/or vessels in your jurisdiction?

    Yes
    No

   (a) If “yes,” what types of security plans have you reviewed (e.g., the security plan for a passenger vessel in your jurisdiction, the security plan for a port, etc.)?

      (Open-ended Response)
12. Since taking this course, have you had the opportunity to participate in any drills or exercises with facility/vessel personnel in your jurisdiction?

   Yes
   No
   
   (a) If "yes," in what drills or exercises have you participated?

   (Open-ended Response)

13. Since taking this course, do you now have a better understanding of the Maritime Security Levels (MARSEC levels) and the security actions and measures associated with each?

   Yes
   No

14. Since taking this course, have you had the opportunity to handle Sensitive Security Information (SSI) from a facility and/or vessel?

   Yes
   No
   
   (a) If "yes," did you use what you learned in this course about the handling, transmission, and storage regulations and procedures when you received the SSI?

   Yes
   No

15. Since taking this course, do you have a better understanding of the Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) and its importance to maritime security?

   Yes
   No

16. Since taking this course, has your agency received any reports of forged or altered TWICs?

   Yes
   No
(a) If "yes," did you use the procedures you learned in this course when responding to the forged or altered TWICs?

Yes
No

(b) Do you have any comments regarding forged or altered TWICs?

(Open Response)

17. Since taking this course, do you have a better understanding of the potential hazards and safety issues surrounding a maritime environment?

Yes
No

18. Since taking this course, have you had the opportunity to access the U.S. Coast Guard Homeport website?

Yes
No

19. Since taking this course, have you had the opportunity to contact the Area Maritime Security Committee (AMSC)?

Yes
No

20. Please list any actions your organization has taken as a direct result of attending AWR 144: Port and Vessel Security for Public Safety and Maritime Personnel (updated security plan, modified procedures, etc.)?

(Open-ended Response)

21. Because of what you learned in AWR 144: Port and Vessel Security for Public Safety and Maritime Personnel, have you been responsible for outlining the key components of port and vessel security in your jurisdiction? If so, please explain.

(Open-ended Response)

You have now completed the survey. Please look back over the survey and make sure you have answered all of the questions. If you have questions or comments about the survey, please contact Erin Henry at (859) 622-6763 or Erin.Henry@eku.edu.

In addition to AWR 144, the RDPC offers a wide variety of training courses for rural first responders. Please visit the RDPC website (http://www.ruraltraining.org) for more information on additional course offerings.

THANKS AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME AND PARTICIPATION!
Appendix C: Responses to Open-Ended Questions

Question 8. Since taking the course, have you identified any of the threats to the U.S. Maritime Transportation System in your jurisdiction (e.g., unauthorized intrusion into facilities, small vessels entering closed areas, natural hazards, suspicious persons on ferries/passenger vessels, questionable cargo on vessels, etc.)?

Question 8b. If “yes,” what threats did you identify in your jurisdictions?

- Small vessel entering a security zone in place for “Tall Ships”. Recreational boater was advised.
- The possible hijacking of larger commercial or passenger vessels and the approach of smaller vessels to restricted areas.
- Nuclear-small vessels entering closed areas.
- Suspicious persons.
- Ease of access into restricted area via the river, not enough assets to cover the restricted area, improper area/asset coverage during shift change, no way to cover the East side of the river without a shallow draft vessel.
- Along with previous experience and other information, yes I used the information to identify threats in my jurisdiction. With high water we have threats of natural hazards and man-made with the towing industry and threat to transportation infrastructure of bridges.
- Note: not active around maritime industry!
- The threat from the foreign flagged ship’s passenger ships that visit our port.
- Small vessels entering closed areas, natural hazards.
- Suspicious persons and vessels with illegal border crossings and those vessels encountered in restricted area.
- Unauthorized intrusion into dock area.
- We had a small boat stealing from the marine industries.
- Suspicious Persons.
- Questionable cargo.
- Threats to CI/KR and suspicious persons and/or passenger vessels.
- Heavy fog forced a vessel into port. As vessel, no ID gave it special attention.
- Threats identified were vessels near the water filtration/ power plant. The boats were stopped and subjects identified. Muskegon County also has a ferry service. The employees was advised what to look for reference suspicious passengers.
- Vehicles entering restricted areas of the port with no real reason for the entry and after talking with the driver/drivers they were asked to leave or in some case had the passenger removed from the area and told to wait for the driver outside the area.
- Small vessel entering restricted area.
- Threats from personnel working at adjacent facility.
- Identified numerous weaknesses in our security system.
- Suspicious persons.
- Unfamiliar vessels in areas of port/critical infrastructure facilities in area of jurisdiction.
- Observed unauthorized persons entering FAA Tarmac via watercraft. Observed vessels in water inlet cove (restricted area).
Question 11. Since taking the course, have you had an opportunity to review the security plan(s) of facilities and/or vessels in your jurisdiction?

Question 11a. If “yes,” what types of security plans have you reviewed (e.g., the security plan for a passenger vessel in your jurisdiction, the security plan for a port, etc.)?

- Port authority security plan.
- The standard operating procedures for all waterfront operations.
- The process that vessels use by pilots.
- Fleet security plans.
- Port Physical security plan and authorized personnel identification programs.
- Security plan for a passenger “dinner cruise” vessel.
- SOP’s for USCG
- The port security instruction.
- The security plan for the ferry service to the island and the security plan for the marina provided by the resort.
- Facility and passenger vessel plans.
- Our port security plan.
- Vessel Security Plans; Facility Security Plans.
- General emergency planning for Port of Manistee.
- Our emergency action guidelines plans.
- Facility Security Plan for a shipbuilding facility with Government contracts.
- Vessel, port and critical facilities.
- Our department Harbor Patrol security plans.
- Plan for facilities and plan for port.
- Moth marine facility and port plans.
- Port security.
- Coop Plan.
- Security plan for passenger vessels.
- Port plan.
- Passenger/gambling casino boat, chemical/oil facilities.
- Multiple Port Security Plans.
• Multiple Ferry Terminal Security Plans.
• Both ports and vessels.
• Homeport.
• Maritime security plan.
• Port current training and exercises
• Vessels coming into Muskegon Lake, cargo ships and larger passenger vessels. Muskegon county and Ottawa also joined in on a mock training reference possible attack.
• Security for the port facility that I work at.
• Port Plan.
• Worked security for G-20 Summit, joint operation with VSCG, RCMP, & other local agencies.
• Port security plans.
• Grain Barge Security.
• Security plan from a neighboring facility.
• Security of power plant & restriction plans.
• No plan in place.

**Question 12. Since taking the course, have you had an opportunity to participate in any drills or exercises with facility/vessel personnel in your jurisdiction?**

**Question 11a. If “yes,” what drills and exercises have you participated?**

• EMS and Fire related - illness and INJ extrication form a vessel.
• Operation Lockdown (June-July 2010) Canadian border exercise with U.S. Border Patrol, U.S. Coast Guard and NY Law enforcement agencies.
• Quarterly required drills for the port.
• Bridge and port authority drill.
• Worked border patrol and coast guard at Oswego harbor.
• Point defender exercises.
• Annual Security “MTSA” Exercises for various facilities in my AOR.
• We have conducted exercises without commercial port facilities.
• Several on Lake Erie open waters as was as regional airport.
• CBP
• Port of Albany Training Exercise.
• Rescue drills, patrol drills, emergency response drills.
• Our dept. participated in a drill at a fuel storage facility on th eriver front.
• Trans-mountain exercise in Paducah 10 NOV 10.
• Nuclear spill table top exercise.
• Table-Top Exercises at Ports.
• City of Rochester.
• NY naval militia small boat training on the Hudson river exercise.
• “Trojan horse.” We operated with NYDEC to detect small amounts of radiation levels emitted from IED’s that might be on other small boats either in a harbor or on the river.
• Muskegon County participated with Ottawa and Kent County reference The Water Consortium. The exercise was based on a mock terrorist attack. Bombs were placed at the water pumping stations along with the water filtration plants. The exercise was to respond and control the situation.
• Incidents involving assaults on workers within the port as well as explosions within.
• At the facility that we secure.
• Quarterly and annual drills and exercises.
• G8-620 Summit Securit - Toronto, ONT.
• Monthly security drills conducted within our facility.
• Tabletops with other first responders.
• Control, subdue and boarding.
• Vessel searching with U.S. Customs and Border Protection
• Fueling stations/Exxon Mobile, Gas companies.
• Grand rapids water treatment exercise.
• WMO exercise on Lake Michigan.

Question 16. Since taking the course, have you had an opportunity to participate in any drills or exercises with facility/vessel personnel in your jurisdiction?

Question 16b. Do you have any comment regarding forged or altered TWICs?

• Yes, the entire TWIC program needs to be looked at. TWICs and MMDs are too easy to get. For example, the ability to speak English is not a requirement to get an MMD.
• The passing of information from “top-level” down to the people who are on the from lines does not happen as often as it should with my department!
• None
• It would be nice to have a brochure or “quick access” laminate card handy for lost/alter TWICs.
• I’m a trusted agent from the TWICS program.
Question 20. Please list any actions your organization has taken as a direct result of attending AWR 144 Port and Vessel Security for Public Safety and Maritime Personnel (e.g., updated security plan, modified procedures, etc.)?

- None (x23).
- N/A (x6).
- Just having a better awareness when traveling by facilities located on water’s edge.
- Involvement into the TLO program.
- Working with the FBI.
- Training and coast guard and area fire departments.
- Fleet security plan.
- We have updated the port’s FSP.
- Have conducted joint maritime ops with USCG.
- We have opened lines of communication with ports in our respective areas.
- Operation Lockdown with border patrol an US customs.
- We are members of the U.S. Coast Guard Area Committee Located in Massena, NY.
- Operation Sea Hunt.
- Updated security plan/instruction.
- Modifying procedures, bundling procedures.
- No actions that I am aware of! Not saying that they have or have not done so. I work more behind the scenes with cameras.
- Continued participation in area maritime committee.
- None that I know of.
- Should we be called to state active duty, plans are being made to put the MS state guard in a position we can ensure the call regarding incidents on our waterways.
- Sorry to say none because the base I am stationed at really have no affiliation with ports.
- Better understanding of TWIC and general requirements as required for charter boat services and employees of charter boats resulting in a more thorough evaluation of persons involved in criminal activity with respect to Federal regulations.
- We have updated on emergency actions plans and conducted port exercises.
- As a retired police officer and worked with many communities in water and seaport development in a second job. Wanted to be aware of dangers from other people that want to harm our nation.
- As a USCG Auxiliary representative to AMSC meetings we are now a more viable asset.
- Updated procedures for LE personnel assigned to those duties and security plans for operations for multi-jurisdictional events.
• Our Agency in relation to this is part of the (NBITF) Northern Border Initiative Task Force for Ohio Homeland Security. Have been involved in the NBI for the past 4 years. Our major task is currently patrolling the United States and Canadian Border from vessels crossing to and from Canada and our areas. Our objectives and purpose of the NBI is to prevent any vessel encounters and cross bordering into the United States, and any transportation of any illegal activities, such as transportation of illegal aliens, weapons, etc.

• Update and awareness to our security plans.

• Our marine patrol officers and CIRT Officers have training in this area.

• None that I am aware of. But then again our “from lone” people are not kept abreast of information that we should have.

• We partnered with Ohio Homeland to be part of NBI Project.

• Updated port security plan.

• Port security plan update.

• I do this kind of work every day in my job.

• Just being more cogniznt of our surroundings and keeping them in the loop with our plans.

• Monitor waterways.

• Modified and established policies, opened communications and participate in activites iwh the Coast Guard.

• More awareness of western rivers.

• We are updating our operations and checking our ports.

• Awareness level ID of vulnerable areas, application of FEMA port grant to address same.

• No actions as a result of this course. The information provided in the course is extremely introductory, and I do not feel I gained any new knowledge as a result of attending.

• Awareness survey.

• Applied (and received) Port Security Grant Award. Planning of drills and exercises in a maritime setting.

• Integrated into port training sessions.

• The facility has updated all security within the fenced in areas of the port itself.

• Updated security plan.

• Issued RAD equipment and pace equip to each vessel operator.

• Instituted regular briefings/discussions with port personnel.

• A floating boom was put in place to keep small vessel traffic out of a restricted area.

• None, the course was really not relevant to us.

• Contracted local united states power squadron and gave lecture and coast guard literature.

• Better understanding of the economical impact of the national waterway systems.
• Work close to the coast guard.
• Inclusion of USCG to local LEPC meetings.
• Strengthened our general security.
• FTX with Holland BPW.
• Added an SSI statement to the pages at the FSP.
• FEMA provides grant money for training and related course development.
• None. Citizen Corps does not have a direct connection to this at this time.
• Checks on facilities, fuel depots, marinas more frequently.
• Training on vessels.
• Unknown.

Question 21. Because of what you learned in AWR 144 Port and Vessel Security for Public Safety and Maritime Personnel, have you been responsible for outlining the key components of port and vessel security in your jurisdiction? If so, please explain.

• No (x54).
• N/A (x6).
• No. We have the benefit of a US Coast Guard facility in our town. I would merely be of assistance to them in any way possible. The instruction in AWR 144 gave me the opportunity to meet and learn alongside some very qualified USCG personnel.
• Not at this point, but will in the future.
• Yes, we have installed improved perimeter fencing and a security camera system.
• Currently manage all aspects of my agency’s maritime assets (law enforcement vessels).
• Direction is given on a daily basis on security vessel placement.
• No but I am in collaboration with those who do.
• No, I have had no further involvement.
• Primarily I have directed other toward available information and the training SAA-TPOC.
• We have reviewed our all hazards approach to include port facilities and vessels.
• During a tabletop exercise for local LEO in response to an incident with my facility.
• Yes - With the course I am now better equipped to direct both air and surface assets on our waterways and ports in my ADR.
• No, I am not the watercraft administrator.
• I do not believe this course has that kind of depth (RE: US codes, laws, etc).
• Chairperson of AMSC Subcommittee for CI/KR.
• No, I am not the watercraft administrator.
• I do not believe this course has that kind of depth (RE: US codes, laws, etc).

• Chairperson of AMSC Subcommittee for CI/KR.

• No - Ling Officer, we have made contact with other local agencies about security.

• If we had gotten the grant, yes. We with USCG could have been at the training. It would have been helpful. We need more of this here. The city took the lead on this. It was great.

• I routinely run law enforcement operations at maritime venues in my agencies OA, but this course did not provide any useful information to help me improve security plans or allegations of assets.

• In a manner of speaking, yes. The class was great. Thank you Rochester Police Dept. The only way we think it would have been better is if the USCG had been there.

• Yes. Wrote the above referenced PSPG application and am a member of exercise development team.

• Yes, I am the individual responsible for a thirty mile county long stretch. I often work with the USCG, Canadian authorities and other local agencies. Most of ports are small yet I am very aware.

• In charge of contract security officers for the port of Buffalo, also trusted agent for TWIC program.

• I currently serve as the facility security officer for our facility.

• No ports in my land locked county.

• Yes conducted direction for security patrols in our power plant facility and surrounding water ways which include inlets and marina’s.

• I have been involved with rewriting our Emergency plan.

• Yes - Recommendations on security plans for key critical infrastructure.

• Designated as part of Agency Port Response Team.

• It has helped me as I revise/review our FSP.

• No - I work in the JFO at federal disaster sites for FEMA in Hazard Mitigation.
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