

MINUTES OF MEETING

Client: Fire Standards Council	Location: State Public Health Lab Conference Room
Job No:	Corres. No.:
Date: 14 & 15 May, 2007	Date Issued: May , 2007
Page: 1 of 19	Recorded By: Sheavon Clayton

Purpose of Meeting: Fire Standards Council Meeting

ATTENDEES

Greg Coon
Gcoon@ci.kenai.ak.us

Jeffrey Dobson
jsdobson@yahoo.com

Doug Frey
grrmay@gci.net
freydd2@bp.com

Richard Leipfert
richl@city.ketchikan.ak.us

Greg Moore
Greg.moore@nana-colt.com
mailto:moore@mtaonline.net

Brian Davis

Jodie Hettrick
Jodie_hettrick@dps.state.ak.us
(Bryan) Buddy Lane
blane@gci.net

Rocky Jones jonesgr2@bp.com
Rocky.jones@matsugov.us

Yvonne Kopy
planning@theborough.com

ABSENT

Carol Reed

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date:	30 March 2006	Job No.:	Action By
Page:	2 of 19	Corres. No.:	Date Required By

1. Chair – Doug Frey –Interim Chair	
<p>1.1 Roll Call</p> <p>1.2 Jodie Hettrick – State Fire Marshal or designee</p> <p>1.3 Yvonne Kopy – Public/Restricted/2500 or less</p> <p>1.4 Bryan (Buddy) Lane – Chief Admin Off/Fire Chief/paid staff</p> <p>1.5 Brian Davis - Fire Fighter Representative</p> <p>1.6 Rocky Jones – Volunteer Fire Fighter/restricted/2500 or less</p> <p>1.7 Richard Leipfert – Chief Admin Off/Fire Chief/volunteer staff</p> <p>1.8 Jeffrey Dobson – Fire Fighter Representative</p> <p>1.9 Greg Coon – Fire Fighter Representative</p> <p>1.10 Greg Moore – Public/Community 2500 or more</p> <p>1.11 Doug Frey – Volunteer Fire Fighter/restricted/2500 or more</p> <p>Absent - Carol Reed – ASFA Admin. Officer Rep.</p>	
2. Call to order	
3. Communications –	
3.1 Letter to Eddie Athey	DF
3.2 Letter to Dan Grimes	RL
3.3 Letter to Chief’s Association	YK
4. Persons to be heard	
<p>4.1 Report on Accreditation from IFSAC personnel</p> <p>JH: Charles Lott, KY, quite a bit of work to do.</p> <p>Handout.</p> <p>CL: One issue consistency, issues with testing, issue with meeting the standards.</p> <p>Let’s develop a timeline to fix all this stuff. As you can see, I will go over the report real quick.8/10 have to validate – 19 things we test on and 26 test sheets, only test on 18 but it is random. Have to be validated and correlated by 08/10</p> <p>Have to be done and completed before 12/07</p> <p>Stand alone HAZMAT ops and HAZMAT testing.</p> <p>The big thing was training programs.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Cert officers – everyone is a little different</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">No training programs for training officers</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">No way to train the evaluators</p> <p>Little things</p> <p>Went to Cordova to do the training and had no idea what fire protection did. Students have to watch program so they know what their rights and responsibilities are.</p> <p>JH: Theresa Staples, Charles Lott, and Derek Simmons are our IFSAC representatives and they will be the ones that come back in the fall to do the re-test.</p> <p>GM: Are corrections that need to be done based on funding?</p> <p>JH: no</p>	

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date:	30 March 2006	Job No.:	Action By
Page:	3 of 19	Corres. No.:	Date Required By

<p>How IFSAC works by Charles Lott</p> <p>Org set up by peers, international, to decide best way to be NFPA Set-up procedure manual, you do have to meet the procedure manual.</p> <p>3 days of intense scrutiny, look at test bank, policies and procedures. Have to have consistency and meet the standard. It has to meet the NFPA standard. We are not telling you how to do it we are just giving some suggestions. We are here to make sure you are meeting a policy that has been established by peers</p> <p>Testing process is just like – a true random test</p> <p>The key thing is to make sure it is consistent and the integrity is there. Once changes are made and fixes are put in place is there a re-check. If you can prove that all the fixes can be put in place there will be a revisit and you will be approved if there are no “re” re fixes. Conditional goes away and you keep your accreditation. We will work to help you.</p> <p>BD: Consistency – is it from one student to the next or region to region?</p> <p>CL: It was both. Which is what worries us the most.</p> <p>BD: Randomization- can you still have a sub-set to test all the time?</p> <p>CL: In other places, you can have core questions but they have to be random? 5 stations we want to do plus hazmat. Always separate hazmat. Have to be competent in everything.</p> <p>I (Charles Lott) am the Area 1 coordinator. Cover 8 counties, 40 part time “employees” who cover 68. Looking for volunteers to evaluate the test bank</p>	
<p>4.2 In absentia – letter from Scott Davis regarding FFI age limit for testing – resolved itself</p> <p>JH: When letter was submitted, followed up with risk management – they had no problem with us testing under the age of 18. Commissioner was uncomfortable with testing anyone under 18 (liability) so we won’t test under 18.</p> <p>North Star, South Thomas and Kodiak have requested under 18, our policy was to never test under 18.</p> <p>Department of Safety says no so it is a moot point.</p>	
<p>5. Consent Agenda – Approval of Minutes from October 1 & 2, 2006 meeting in North Pole</p>	
<p>5.1 Doug moves to approve Any changes to minutes? Motion to Approve minutes from October 1&2, 2006 meeting Second</p>	

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date:	30 March 2006	Job No.:	Action By
Page:	4 of 19	Corres. No.:	Date Required By

All in favor – 10; Opposed – 0		
6. Unfinished Business		
6.1 Standards Council Funding Report		GM, CR, BL, YK, JH
<p>When we left in October we thought we had a plan, but it has been changed several times Where do we go from here? JH: HB 211 for insurance funding JH: Charging for certification – most stable way to go because we have more control there To initially get this going, we should be charging for certifications, even charging the smaller departments. A lot of turnover within the MatSu Bureau, the thought may be that it would be nice to get certification, but I don't want to have to pay for it. JH: I feel like we are being left with no other choice, it is a good quality certification It is just to offset costs, it is not a base budget Travel expenses last year were about \$6500 – Firefighter II would have paid for that DF: We need a fee schedule, what are we going to charge, and what are we charging for DF: Do we want to tackle this today? JH: I think it will show a good faith effort if we do something in this council. GM: Has a fee schedule been bounced off the Chief's Association and the Firefighters? JH: Chief's okay, I don't think the firefighters will say no. GM: Would it be prudent to ask those associations? JH: I don't think we have that kind of time YK: Rural training, our department pays for it but no-one goes. DF: Do we all want to wade through this? We will talk about this first thing when we come back</p>		
2:22 PM Break		
Resume 2:38 PM		
<p>DF: Thoughts? RL: Accreditation is significantly more expensive, do we want to go with and actual reimbursement? JH: Should make it a flat rate for everyone BD: I suggest a sub committee, I will work with Jodie and Buddy (Greg C., Brian, Buddy and Jodie) DF: Let's have a brain storming session. I will go around the table</p>		

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date:	30 March 2006	Job No.:	Action By
Page:	5 of 19	Corres. No.:	Date Required By

7. Brainstorming Session Regarding Proposed Fee Schedule	
<p>Department Accreditation fee – flat rate GM: Are the fees all going to be the same, one simple fee?</p>	
<p>YK: Fee for test as opposed to class fee; should we charge every time they take the test? RL: Breaking out fee schedule, application fee JD: Multiple tests or applications, do you get a reduced rate? E.g. group rate? RJ: IFSAC stamp fee? Comparison with other departments</p>	
<p>JH: Reciprocity fee, renewal for instructor – same or less every time they renew? Same, we will set up a fee schedule, we code everything and it ends up in the right account. GM (?): Fee from State, IFSAC, and testing fee – will it cost smaller communities the same as larger? Are we going to charge for all certifications or just a select few All, if you get a state certification you are paying BD: Subsequent tests should be split out DF: Statutory authority, do what ever needs to be done to accept credit cards. Motion to table Second All in favor – 10, none opposed</p>	
8. Unfinished Business Continued	
<p>8.1 Fire Officer I Draft to be sent to council members via email for review – JH Bud and Bill have developed training record and skill sheets – tabled for tomorrow</p>	
<p>8.2 Long Range Planning 8.3 Funding: BL: Interior Fire Chief’s met with interior delegates, and we thought we did a pretty good job, we thought our delegates would do better. RJ: In Juneau – it sounded very positive BL: Where did it get axed out? Because that is where we need to focus our attention. Professional firefighters would be a good resource.</p>	
<p>8.4 Action Items from Previous Meeting – Report on Status/Action needed 8.5 Verify CO manual reflects EMS and HAZMAT issues JH: Verifier I & II were good, still a question on what NFPA is requiring. Steve (Schreck) would like to be here tomorrow to argue the point. Why don’t we get NFPA on the phone and decide what we are</p>	

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date:	30 March 2006	Job No.:	Action By
Page:	6 of 19	Corres. No.:	Date Required By

<p>going to do? Firefighter II is not taught to be a team leader. I thought we already decided – entry level and journeyman.</p> <p>8.6 Firefighter I & Firefighter II skill sheets to be modified to reflect the same. JH: tabled until next meeting (? I am not sure if it was tabled)</p> <p>8.7 Get criminal background information to law for review/implementation JH: we have to adopt regulations DF: how do we move on to the next level? JH: wait until we have someone to do this DF: Table until the next meeting</p> <p>8.8 Fire Standards Council web page JH: up and running we can add more if we want. What do you want to see on the site?</p> <p>8.9 Draft language for funding realignment GM: (this was not discussed)</p> <p>8.10 Fire officer review of standard DF: are we at a point where we can set a target date? JH: I will give you the training records, skill sheets and program tomorrow. Standard review comments, re-draft before next standards council meeting. All comments back by 07/10/07</p> <p>8.11 Research LIO costs for teleconference JH: there wasn't really a cost, the issue is availability. Spring is out. The other issue is that a public meeting is too long, we could potentially block out the time in the fall. We have to let them know 6 months in advance. Cost was minimal.</p> <p>8.12 Research dispatch standards RL & BD: existing standards? There are none. No standards, we can take to the NFPA standards that we can piggy back. If we initiate something, jurisdictions will be happy to join in. Public safety dispatch. Lead dispatch, they have their own internal certification, on-the-job training, no specific training program Very open to seeing a State standard DF: Would you find it helpful? If there is one would you be able to support it? BD: Yes and yes, they (Anchorage and Fairbanks) would do their best to follow it if we adopt it. DF: We sent one of our guys to certify it as an instructor, based on NFPA 1061. Question I have to you is how do we bring this together?</p>	
--	--

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date:	30 March 2006	Job No.:	Action By
Page:	7 of 19	Corres. No.:	Date Required By

<p>Draft something that meets our needs, everyone needs to look at that and get comments together.</p> <p>YK: If you are looking at a combined program and since the police department is so well funded could they draft?</p> <p>RL: They wouldn't meet our needs.</p> <p>JH: What I am hearing is that 'they' have to lower their standards and they are hiring people off the streets because they don't have trained people?</p> <p>They feel it is a need that they can meet</p> <p>YK: We can't meet our need.</p> <p>DF: We are going to review dispatcher NFPA standard and discuss whether or not we agree to adopt with or without changes, then move forward.</p> <p>JH: I will make everyone a copy for review.</p> <p>DF: Table discussion for next meeting? – no-one opposed (next meeting agenda)</p> <p>8.13 Research business plan in minutes</p> <p>RL: I will try to have them tomorrow</p> <p>8.14 Mr. Grimes' HAZMAT resolution</p> <p>RL: I will try to have them tomorrow</p> <p>8.15 Post minutes of last meeting</p> <p>They were posted pretty quickly, they were unapproved and will be approved and reposted.</p> <p>8.16 Thank you letter to Chiefs.</p> <p>YK: done</p> <p>8.17 Forward incident safety officers to Fire Standards Council</p> <p>JH: obviously didn't get forwarded. We are not ready at this time, we have a very rough draft</p> <p>8.18 Draft language for revoking certificates</p> <p>DF: We did it, have it for your reading pleasure</p> <p>After we met and discussed, it takes us back to the regulation 'thing' what we agreed on in the denial piece, rather than have 2 different criteria. You can't get it if you are bad, if you are 'bad' you can't renew. Revocation should mirror denial</p> <p>That's our proposal <i>*see attached proposal</i></p> <p>RL: This is specific to revocation?</p> <p>DF: Right, we had our own criteria, what we suggest is that we adopt the same criteria for revocation.</p> <p>As we looked through the police standards, it sounded like what we wanted.</p> <p>Didn't we have stuff that was related to time periods? 10 years, etc.? Does someone who is 18 and gets in trouble get to try again when they are say 30?</p>	
---	--

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date:	30 March 2006	Job No.:	Action By
Page:	8 of 19	Corres. No.:	Date Required By

<p>There are varying degrees of misdemeanors. (see minutes from 10/1 & 10/2/06)</p> <p>Revocation of certification paragraph B ...shall revoke basic, intermediate, or advanced after hire has used marijuana...</p> <p>Do we want to use this broad of a language? There has to be an appeal process.</p> <p>Do fire departments have a random test?</p> <p>JD: for cause</p> <p>You were caught and now we are taking your certification away.</p> <p>Everyone that has a drug testing policy has an Employee Assistance Program (EAP) and now we are eliminating EAP to allow for rehabilitation</p> <p>If you raise your hand for EAP before you are 'selected' for testing then you are okay. We have to have an appeals process, so we can look at it on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Denial and revocation take a law – we should table it until we can actually deal with it.</p> <p>JH: motion to join with other project</p> <p>BL: second</p> <p>None opposed</p> <p>8.19 Develop business plan</p> <p>BL: we need to have goals and objectives to show that we are organized. We need to show we have goals and we are going in a direction.</p> <p>Are we doing this to show we are a viable organization?</p> <p>JH: I have not seen an actual business plan.</p> <p>RL: I will have my administrative assistant give me one</p> <p>BL: long range fiscal plan and all that kind of stuff. We should be visiting this every year.</p> <p>DF: We tried that. A lot of it we are rehashing at every meeting.</p> <p>8.20 Obtain clarification on supervision of administrator</p> <p>DF: I did that</p> <p>Dan McCrummin –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supervision vs. direction of council – each State employee must have a State supervisor. Board will set the policy, State employee must enforce. JH: It should be independent or supervised out of the Commissioner's office, not the State Fire Marshal's office – would still take direction from us. Actual supervision is a State employee, we set the parameters. 2. PERS vs. Non-PERS – Long-term regular full-time position goes into PERS. Contract employees are only available for non-PERS 3. GG Union vs. Supervisor's Union – 2 or more employees will 	
---	--

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date:	30 March 2006	Job No.:	Action By
Page:	9 of 19	Corres. No.:	Date Required By

<p align="center">be placed in the GGU.</p> <p align="center">Recess until tomorrow at 9 – everyone in favor</p>	
<p>9. Resume at 9:10 day 2</p>	
<p>9.1 Present – Greg Moore, Buddy Lane, Doug Frey, Brian Davis, Greg Coon, Jodie Hettrick, Rocky Jones, Jeff Dobson, Rich Leipfert, Yvonne Kopy</p> <p>9.2 Absent: Carol Reed</p>	
<p>10. Continue Unfinished Business</p> <p>10.1 Fee Schedule discussion (JH, BL, BD, GC)</p> <p>JH: Accreditation of a Fire Department (31 depts that are accredited) not mandatory, fbks ester was not accredited, if an accredited allows testing they can sit for the test. Rarely happens (challenge)</p> <p>JH Need to recoup costs because I am using part of the training budget, we've got to do this</p> <p>JH Accreditation fees won't cover costs, will cover some of the costs</p> <p>BD: What is the incentive – they are paying for a true independent 3d party audit, allows us to certify our firefighters</p> <p align="center">Proposed Fee Schedule</p> <p>Accreditation -</p> <p>Initial =\$500</p> <p>Renewal = \$250 every 5 years – true audit every 5 years, required</p> <p>Certification</p> <p>\$15 written tests (extinguisher? Can we charge a fee? Credentialing?)</p> <p>\$15 practical tests</p> <p>\$10-15 IFSAC seal dependant on actual cost (actual seal cost is going to be \$15)</p> <p>\$15 reciprocity per certificate</p> <p>\$0 Basic Fire Fighter (or apprentice) –</p> <p>GM: should there be some sort of cost even if it's minimal?</p> <p>JH: just makes another issue we have to deal with (we never see their paperwork)</p> <p>DF: you can't charge one person and not charge everyone (eg reciprocity v. basic firefighter) Change to \$5.</p> <p>BL: If we are going to get the same people either way I say charge them;</p> <p>JH: I don't think it will matter</p> <p>GM: Make it an administrative fee not a certification fee</p> <p>BD: approximate total from all the "fees" was 18k total cost was around 15k</p> <p>JH: Average for 06 was 580, written, practical and IFSAC seal is</p>	

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date:	30 March 2006	Job No.:	Action By
Page:	10 of 19	Corres. No.:	Date Required By

<p>around 20k. 8756, 6000 (income) IFSAC seals cost about 800, average cost for travel, etc is about 12k. Administration of this would not be a problem, credit cards would be handled by Prism, current staff wouldn't mind taking payments on line.</p> <p>JH: This money will go into the fire standards council budget, other than personal services it will not go through my budget. FSC will cover costs for travel, honorarium, and IFSAC. Secretary/Treasurer will be in charge of the budget</p> <p>We will need to have some way to pay stuff.</p> <p>Fee schedule doesn't have to be by regulation, easier to be by procedure. Regulations take too long to fix e.g. if we are way too high or way too short.</p> <p>DF: 3/27 email from JH 'AFSC does not need to adopt regulation to set fees '</p> <p>JH: Already procedures set in place that we can follow because we are not shuffling a lot of money. Some basic guidelines will do.</p> <p>BL: We need to keep part of it separate, so not to appear inappropriate.</p> <p>JH: exactly, don't want to rob Peter to pay Paul.</p> <p>BL: is it statute that fire department has to be registered?</p> <p>JH: yes</p> <p>BL: What happens if not?</p> <p>JH: basically a funding and grants issue</p> <p>BL: If we can get the power that all of this has to happen – reg fire dept, have to have Fire department registered, firefighter I refresher, and mandatory firefighter I certification...</p> <p>Doug – Statute will have to be changed to do the above.</p> <p>“contrary to early misconception, statute does not mandate minimum training requirements...</p> <p>Local governments will elect to adopt or follow...” (DF reading statute)</p> <p>YK: In rural Alaska it is not a matter of can we afford it, it is do we have the people. Volunteer forces shrinking.</p> <p>BL: Reality is if they don't have this training is the safety of the firefighter.</p> <p>GM: I embrace the training as a benefit to be in the fire department, some people don't get involved for the lack of structure.</p> <p>BD: you think they are organized, they hope that these people will show up. They happen to show up when the necessity arises. Sometimes it is better to not have a 'fire department' than to have a haphazard fire department. I think we should have training standards.</p> <p>BL: is it a handful of communities that don't have/want the training or...</p> <p>DF: come on back we have gotten off the topic we need to get back to certification fees.</p> <p>Implementation,</p> <p>Take a 5 minute break at 9:55</p> <p>Back at 10:14</p> <p>JH is going to kick off on how this is going to happen</p>	
---	--

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date:	30 March 2006	Job No.:	Action By
Page:	11 of 19	Corres. No.:	Date Required By

<p>Registration – fire dept registration</p> <p>To become a registered fire department you have to – apply to State of Alaska. Application includes authority to respond, personnel roster, have to submit fire reports</p> <p>You have to meet all requirements, to be registered</p> <p>If you are not registered you can be charged with breaking & entering, cannot get worker’s comp,</p> <p>Not a legal department if you are not registered</p> <p>We want to know what your jurisdiction is, that you have a training plan. It is up to the community to enforce the “registered department. How are we going to enforce the current requirements? Current requirements say you have to be registered, if not registered you don’t get funding, grants and we are not going to train your personnel. We have not enforced it as much. We are at about 120 registered fire departments and we have about 300 communities that could have a fire department. The only way to really hit someone is to ‘take’ grants back.</p> <p>BL: Come up with a plan/decision for this at the next meeting. Not just spend a few minutes here an there, spend a substantial amount of time.</p> <p>Everyone is comfortable with \$5 for basic firefighter and apprentice – yes</p> <p>Extinguisher, we need to do some research. Extinguisher erased.</p> <p>Fire services means...</p> <p>Implementation date – 07/01 –</p> <p>BL: is that practical?</p> <p>JH I could start doing this tomorrow.</p> <p>JH: If you have already sent your app in, are you exempt? Anything that is on the record now should be grandfathered in. As of today (5/15), you will be charged. Everything prior to today is grandfathered.</p> <p>BL: (suggestion) In order for the state to continue doing certification we have to start charging.</p> <p>GM: Motion that we adopt the written fee schedule</p> <p>RJ: second make IFSAC a flat 15\$.</p> <p>Amended (1) to include due to office the 15th</p> <p>Amended (2) to reflect that if it is submitted (including postmark by) 5/15/07. Discussion (grandfather clause)</p> <p>All in favor (none opposed)</p> <p>Unanimous decision of the council to adopt the fee schedule</p> <p>Doug will send a letter with all of your help if we draft this letter and put Doug’s signature. Put a generic fire standards council email address.</p> <p>Guidance from the fire marshal re: notification</p> <p>DF: We have adopted a fee schedule – mechanical things, we were under the impression that the line item was removed yesterday.</p> <p>DT: The way it works is that there is no funding that is why it is zero</p> <p>DF: We want to send an email out stating that the funding had been eliminated, and that an effort to maintain training the Alaska Fire</p>	
---	--

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date:	30 March 2006	Job No.:	Action By
Page:	12 of 19	Corres. No.:	Date Required By

<p>Standards Council has adopted a fee schedule and list it, and want to know if that is okay DT: need to be real careful about tying these together, we need to be cautious we don't burn bridges. Don't want to irritate the people that have been working real hard for us. Contemplating sending a letter spinning a positive light on the fact that there is no funding and we are in a real good favor and we don't want to 'mess' that up. GM: did our adoption of a fee schedule put you in a good spot to support our council DT: it will help JD: would it be counter productive DT: why don't you talk about the fee schedule and I will talk about the funding JH: it looks like we are making the effort to fund RJ: relate EMS and Police, 'to better align ourselves with...' BL: I am going to introduce this tomorrow at our chief's meeting YK: find it an outrage that you have had to battle for so long to become equal to the police. Public doesn't know, they are not aware. We assume fire and police are funded. FM: a lot of the fire departments are getting better every year.</p> <p>Action items: DF: I will put together the email with the fee schedule JH will handle the admin part (I've got to change the application)</p>	
11. Unfinished Business Continued	
11.1 Verbiage clean-up of mission statement and budget JH: I don't believe I got to that. We had a question on which mission statement and I was supposed to go back and review. Hold for next meeting for closure (3 year and 4 year term sent to board)	
11.2 <u>Fire Marshal, David Tyler, joins meeting briefly</u> "Commissioner has told me that this is a project that will be funded next year" DF: Do you see this jeopardizing the relationship? DT: No	
11.3 Send information about removing leadership requirements to accredited departments (unfinished business continued) JH: Did it. Now we have to reconsider it, Schreck still has an issue with that. GC: Did we not clarify that a year ago? Can't we say 'that is over and you have to deal with it?' DF: Yes, we need training and education to come to us and say this is what needs to happen.	
11.4 Send response to Kenai Chiefs on dispatcher training request.	
12. Action Items from Previous Meeting	

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date:	30 March 2006	Job No.:	Action By
Page:	13 of 19	Corres. No.:	Date Required By

<p>12.1 Get criminal background information to law for review/implement Regulations need to be written, moved to fall meeting – hopefully we will have administrative support by then, marry with revocation pieces.</p> <p>12.2 Fire Officer review of standard and FF I and FF II skill sheets to be modified to reflect EMS and HAZMAT issues Hand-out back to JH by 07/15/07</p> <p>12.3 Research dispatch standards Tabled for next meeting – add to agenda</p> <p>12.4 Research business plan in minutes Mr. Grimes HAZMAT resolution Forward Incident Safety Officer to Fire Standards Council All on hold</p> <p>12.5 Verbiage clean up on mission statement and budget Need to revisit</p> <p>12.6 Clean-up conflict on website re: 3 year term and 4 year term Need to verify that it gets clarified</p> <p>12.7 Add Standards Council information in ASFA recruitment information Will have to be checked at next meeting – CR absent</p> <p>12.8 Review NFPA 1061, do a ‘soft’ edit – should it be adopted in it’s entirety?</p> <p>12.9 Review and modify at the next meeting – business plan</p> <p>Recess at 11:32 back at 1:00</p> <p>Back at 1:07 (without BL – here at 1:11)</p>	
13. New business	
<p>13.1 Incident safety officer JH: non-event, on hold status until we implement and finish Fire Officer I (pending approval of FO I)</p> <p>13.2 Driver Operator JH: non-event, no action</p> <p>13.3 CO requirements JH: non-event, due to changes in IFSAC audit and improvements, should bring back to meeting this fall. Will have something out prior to meeting for everyone to review. Changes will be out prior to fall meeting</p> <p>13.4 Industrial Firefighter – Steve Schreck Handout – training standard for Industrial Fire Brigade/Incipient Firefighter SS: it doesn’t vary too much from NFPA 1081, what we are trying</p>	

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date:	30 March 2006	Job No.:	Action By
Page:	14 of 19	Corres. No.:	Date Required By

<p>to accomplish is an even playing field from the beginning for basic Our goal is for each of these (apprentice, basic, and incipient fire brigade) to be even.</p> <p>The hope is that these 3 levels will come together and then we will have the air pack endorsement and then it will go to FF I and FF II This standard exceeds NFPA (draft of 08/02/06) Ventilation is important, very few industrial fire brigades in AK, hoping the only thing that will have to happen is site specific training.</p> <p>GM: Are there any industrial fire brigades in AK? SS: Yes there are a few BD: Industrial fire brigades supposed to meet same standard as fire departments? SS: They should DF: OSHA says that incipient can...structural firefighter can...(incipient trains once a year, structural trains quarterly) OSHA requirements NFPA 1081 in between incipient and structural you have advanced interior – OSHA does not require SS: from the State point of view (TEB) we are looking for entry level GM: Goal her is incipient industrial fire Same thing we did for FF I SS: we are trying to give it a beginning BL: Steve, do you have some examples? SS: Greens Crate Mine, some of the canneries – we don't know, that is why we want to take care of this now, so we can be ahead of the game YK: DOT doesn't fall under this, it is federal government GM: I think this is a bit beyond an incipient SS: The only thing that is different in this one is ventilation. The only thing that I have done that is different from NFPA 1081, besides putting it in a list, is ventilation. BD: (to YH) is there a consistency issue? JPRs – no BL: My only concern is that someone may think they are going to be putting on an air pack and... SS: Agree that donning and doffing should be assigned by the authority having jurisdiction DF: As an industry individual, I would be very paranoid about passing this out as an 'incipient' document. I say not to show people stuff that they are not going to use. It just feels way over and beyond incipient. SS: this is my interpretation of 1081 JH: we are here to look at who we are training GM, DF: Who does this actually apply to? Not us.</p>	
--	--

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date:	30 March 2006	Job No.:	Action By
Page:	15 of 19	Corres. No.:	Date Required By

<p>SS: we are working towards protecting people by giving them knowledge not hurting them. I attempted to simplify the incipient stage in 1081.</p> <p>BD: do we want to be more restrictive? Or do we want to mirror NFPA?</p> <p>DF: OSHA's standards are 'way less' than NFPA</p> <p>JH: Chapter 5 NFPA (incipient) focuses on the absolute basics</p> <p>BL: could we take the standard and make it more restrictive and change ventilation?</p> <p>SS: I think it is important to have something in place to give a direction</p> <p>BD: if we adopt 1081 as written would it accomplish what you want to accomplish for basic firefighter?</p> <p>SS: I am not sure</p> <p>DF: how do we proceed with this?</p> <p>JD: change of venue, pilots are taught visual flights – small window where they go under the hood IF they get into a scenario where they can't see they can get out. I can see a parallel, this is not to teach you to do it this is to teach you what to do to stay alive,</p> <p>BD: table this until August (next meeting) and set-up a task group to evaluate Steve's proposal.</p> <p>Motion and second</p> <p>All in favor</p> <p>DF: Rocky Jones, Greg Coon, and Greg Moore to work on this, review, come up with a recommendation and come back. – please keep Steve in the loop.</p> <p>GM: One other thing – task group to clearly define incipient, basic and advanced.</p> <p>13.5 Exterior SCBA endorsement</p> <p>Steve handed out</p> <p>Background</p> <p>We have a huge problem with fire departments buying equipment. Only solution is to train people, we are not going to stop them from buying equipment.</p> <p>Designed as an endorsement only because I want them to have one of these (apprentice, basic, industrial)</p> <p>RL: why are they having to have more (duplicative) skills</p> <p>SS: more practice</p> <p>BL: 1-1.4 fit tested, you have to have a questionnaire, isn't that part of the program? Isn't that something you bring with you?</p> <p>SS: I would like to see this done at our training centers with our trainers for about the first year to work out all the bugs.</p> <p>BD: Realistically, how many departments can fit test their</p>	
---	--

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date:	30 March 2006	Job No.:	Action By
Page:	16 of 19	Corres. No.:	Date Required By

<p>members?</p> <p>SS: none, eventually we want them to be able to. (discussion re: handout from Steve)</p> <p>GC: I am really confused on what our objective is</p> <p>SS: This is a training program that says if you get in a bad situation this is how you get out. Here's what you do if your situation changes.</p> <p>I'm afraid if we don't adopt a standard someone's going to die, that is my objective</p> <p>JH: Motion to do similar format to this as for incipient – form a task group</p> <p>YK: Second</p> <p>All in favor</p> <p>DF: Brian would you be willing to work on this task group</p> <p>BD: yes</p> <p>Task group for SCBA, Brian Davis, Buddy Lane, Jeff Dobson</p> <p>Take a 10 minute break back at 2:30</p> <p>13.6 SS: what I am asking for is clarification as a team leader (FF II skill sheets)</p> <p>Looking at NFPA, nothing says as a team leader – as a member of the team)</p> <p>Question comes in for the fire attack skill sheets</p> <p>We've had some discussion and some debate because NFPA does use the terminology of coordinate</p> <p>SS: to me this is saying this person is trained to become a leader, I believe the intent from NFPA is that this person is leading the team and is not just a member of the team</p> <p>GC: who is on the team?</p> <p>SS: the people on the hose</p> <p>BL: you are not in direct control, the officer is</p> <p>GC: one of us is the team leader and of the two of us on that line alone someone has to be responsible for coordinating</p> <p>BL: I don't agree that you have to be firefighter I for 6 months before you can be firefighter II, I don't agree with that at all. I don't think that is the intent, you can't be a leader as firefighter I.</p> <p>BD: coordinate an interior attack and coordinating an interior attack line are 2 different things</p> <p>BF: Skill sheet says fire attack</p> <p>JH: conflict is in the actual NFPA standard</p> <p>RL: you don't feel 'coordinate' is an appropriate term</p> <p>SS: no, where we are running into difficulties is 'do I run scenario</p>	
---	--

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date:	30 March 2006	Job No.:	Action By
Page:	17 of 19	Corres. No.:	Date Required By

<p>3 times to evaluate each of them or can I run it once and evaluate all of them?</p> <p>SS: FFI as a team, FFII as an individual, I believe 'team leader' is the wrong terminology regarding an attack</p> <p>GM: attack line not attack scene</p> <p>JH: we have to show this is what we do</p> <p>GM: IFSAC says that's okay? JH: yes</p> <p>RL: Each individual needs to be evaluated:</p> <p>SS: yes, in my opinion everyone needs to be evaluated</p> <p>BD: skill sheets need to be revised too</p> <p>JH: basically we are just clarifying so everything says what it needs to say</p> <p>BL: indirect supervision vs. direct</p> <p>JH: FFI direct, FFII general supervision</p> <p>JD: all of the definitions are not lining up, there is something missing. It is not at our level it is at NFPA level</p> <p>GC: one paragraph summarize what we are saying right here</p> <p>JH: As long as we are meeting requisite skills – still conflict</p> <p>SS: definition order and organization, harmonious relation or action, bring into common action or condition</p> <p>RL: I think if we change the skill sheets to say 'line', it will be clearer</p> <p>BL: some of the fix could be Fire Officer I and Fire Officer II, how to lead</p> <p>BD: I think there is a gap, they may have been trying to fill a void</p> <p>GM: that makes sense</p> <p>JD: Firefighter III?</p> <p>BL: Steve, what do you want to do?</p> <p>SS: clarification on coordinate, clarification on what is supposed to happen.</p> <p>JH: restate and modification of skill sheet</p> <p>GC: size up as it applies to your specific assignment</p> <p>JH: see changes (discussion re: incorporate/describe/address)</p> <p>DF: we need to get all of the instructors on the same sheet</p> <p>BL: you don't have to tell them to address it they are going to know</p> <p>JH: leave task steps</p> <p>DF: instructors?</p> <p>JH: we publish exactly what each scenario is and that is where we can test each skill</p> <p>DF: are we ready to act Yvonne?</p> <p>Motion to make indicated changes to skill sheet and identify, and to modify testing guidelines to accurately reflect the</p>	
--	--

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date:	30 March 2006	Job No.:	Action By
Page:	18 of 19	Corres. No.:	Date Required By

<p>intent of the skill sheet JD: second Questions? All in favor, none opposed</p>	
<p>13.7 Discussion on upcoming member term expirations – remaining until 2009 – assuming Rocky doesn't get ousted because of population growth DF: If you want to continue, please get a letter to the appropriate boards and commissions. All they request is an email. Those of you who are not going to re-up could you let Jodie know so she can send out an email so anyone that wants to can apply?</p> <p>13.8 Discussion on election of new council Chair, effective date, etc. DF: I think we should elect a new council Chair now so there is no confusion in the fall – what are your thoughts? RL: we decided when we would elect in December of '01? JD: we decided to do elections in the spring JH: but re-election is in August DF: what do we do here? GM: Chair has to be elected annually BD: Doug can resign now and we can elect DF: I fully plan to participate until August 15, tender my resignation at 3:30 on the 15th of May JH: we can elect on of those people who intend to stay. I think we should toss the interim thing RL: move that we hold our annual election now, second, discussion all in favor</p> <p>Open the floor for nominations BD: I will nominate Buddy as Chair GC: Second Questions? All in favor Buddy opposed Motion carries Nominations for vice chair JH: Greg Coon BL: Second Questions? All in favor GC: Opposed</p>	

MINUTES OF MEETING

Date:	30 March 2006	Job No.:	Action By
Page:	19 of 19	Corres. No.:	Date Required By

<p>Motion carries Secretary/Treasurer? JH: Yvonne Kopy Second Questions All in favor, none opposed Congratulations – there are your new officers Please send an email saying who the new officers are</p>	
<p>14. Ethics Update</p>	
<p>14.1 BD: I thought ethics ‘training’ was once a year DF: what we did was made it available at every meeting, just in case you missed it. You can do it every 12 months. Buddy is now the ethics supervisor, if there are any self imposed conflicts it should be reported. ‘Go by’ has to be sent every quarter, I will also send you the official letterhead. Sign in sheet, you watch the video, sign the sheet, and you are good to go for the next 12 months.</p>	
<p>15. Future agenda items</p>	
<p>15.1 No new business</p>	
<p>16. Next meeting – Fall conference in Valdez</p>	
<p>16.1 For the TEB staff we cannot have it during the conference, have it post or pre-conference JH: Have it pre-conference BL: we would like to do it before pre-conference (around 9/21) JH: will find an area with internet access BL: we will set the meeting in stone once we coordinate with the conference committee BL: Due to lack of technical support we are going to have to view the video (ethics) next meeting</p> <p>Motion to adjourn Second Meeting adjourned at 4:10 May 15, 2007</p>	