A meeting of the Albemarle County Fire/EMS Board was held on Wednesday, February 25, 2015 at 1800 hours in the Fire Rescue Conference Room of the County Office Building, Stagecoach Road, Charlottesville.

The following members were in attendance:
John Oprandy, Albemarle County Fire & Rescue
Preston Gentry, Crozet Volunteer Fire Department
Todd Richardson, Earlysville Volunteer Fire Company
Calvin Butler, East Rivanna Volunteer Fire Company
George Stephens, North Garden Volunteer Fire Company
Mike Grandstaff, Scottsville Volunteer Fire Department
Danny Tawney, Seminole Trail Volunteer Fire Department
Mike Reid, Stony Point Volunteer Fire Company
Kostas Alibertis, Western Albemarle Rescue Squad

Others in Attendance:
Tom LaBelle, Albemarle County Fire & Rescue
Chuck Pugh, North Garden Volunteer Fire Company
Kathyrne Presson, Albemarle Fire Corps
Scott Lambert, Albemarle County Fire & Rescue
David Puckett, Albemarle County Fire & Rescue
Christina Courtney, Albemarle County Fire & Rescue
Doug Walker, Assistant County Executive

I. Call to Order
Chief Alibertis called the meeting to order at 1801 hrs.

A. Moment of Silence
Attendees observed a moment of silence.

B. From the Board: Matters not Listed on the Agenda
i. Update from Chiefs – matters of importance from stations
None were presented.

ii. Addition of Agenda Items
Chief Alibertis noted that Chief Gentry wanted to add something to the agenda, and said that Deputy County Executive Doug Walker would talk with them about the budget.
Mr. Walker addressed the FEMS Board, stating that County Executive Tom Foley had recently presented his recommended FY16 budget to the Board of Supervisors and in a public hearing, and it was now subject to a series of work sessions and discussions. He said that there were some aspects of the presentation and the budget proposal that were very important to the fire rescue system, and it was different than how the budget had been presented in the past – so he wanted to ensure that they had a chance to understand it. Mr. Walker said that he would present one piece of it, but the entire presentation – both the PowerPoint and the podcast recording – were on the County website in the budget portal.

He stated that the presentation highlighted the gap in forecasted revenues and intended expenditures over the next five years, and the challenge Board and staff had in closing that gap without doing things differently. Mr. Walker said that there were three things Mr. Foley was planning to do, one of which was to reallocate a penny currently going to support capital projects back into operations, so that the items that would be unfunded in the capital plan – the ACE program, sidewalk construction, and school modernization – were not core services. Mr. Walker explained that there was a challenge in funding core services at the expense of funding aspirational projects, and one approach was moving a penny of tax revenue – equating to about $1.6 million – from capital to support operations, and that would be split 60/40 with schools as consistent with the County’s formula.

Mr. Walker stated that the other major change was creating a separate fund for fire rescue, moving all expenditures and revenues for both operations and capital for all functions of the system into a separate fund, and moving the equivalent of 6.6 cents of the tax rate plus an additional penny that the Board would have to raise by increasing taxes in this upcoming budget. He said that this became a significant conversation for the Board in their consideration of whether they want to raise taxes or not, and it was the only revenue increase proposed in the FY16 budget. He said that the action would establish a fire rescue services with intention to provide transparency and combine all revenues and expenditures so they can be tracked over time. Mr. Walker stated that one big point was the need for the general fund to now pay or what was the most recent FEMA SAFR grant, as nine firefighters who were funded through that grant would now have to be picked up by the County. He said that most of the turnout gear purchased 10 years ago had reached the end of its useful life and needed to be replaced, and there was about $138,000 needed to replace the equipment. Mr. Walker stated that those two issues alone comprised almost $750,000 of new local costs that had to be picked up to support what was already being expended in the system. He said that the total proposed fund was $14.5 million, of which $13.8 million was in operations and the remainder was to support capital needs.

Mr. Walker said that in 1999, the County Executive and Board had a discussion with the community regarding the development area and the fire rescue services being provided from the rural area into the development area, and from the City into the development area to serve critical core needs. He noted that the new Pantops station was the missing link intended to fill the remaining gap, and the increase in investment in the
combination system was intended to support volunteers, staff, and equipment and facilities over time. Mr. Walker said that the aspects of the system that the fund intended to support were training opportunities, operational funding, daytime staffing support on the volunteer side, system enhancements including aging apparatus of the fleet, the three new fire stations, a new fire station at Pantops along with staffing to support that station in future budgets, establishment of EMS services over time. He emphasized that even with these investments, Albemarle in relation to its peers rated among the lowest per capita in funding for fire rescue services. Mr. Walker said that the following week, the Board of Supervisors would get into more detail about the operational budgets and public safety, including fire rescue, and this takes that concept and breaks it down into more detail.

He stated that the increase in fire rescue funding from FY15 to FY16 was approximately $1.7 million, or almost a 17% increase, with the vast majority being the increased local cost to support the nine firefighter positions for the full year as well as picking up the turnout gear at $134,000. Mr. Walker said that there was a $706,000 reallocation of costs from the volunteer line to the career line for fuel, insurance, LODA, turnout gear, and health services. He noted that part of this, particularly on the fuel side, reflected changes in procurement that saved them money and was more efficient. He stated that the budget also reflected increases of $38,000 for volunteer accident insurance because the premiums had gone up, $30,000 for system-wide fuel based on rates and consumption, $20,000 for volunteer recruitment and retention advertising and materials, and $17,000 for a scaled-down continuation of a project risk grant. He said that there was also an approximate $218,000 increase in support for volunteer fire and rescue stations, which was consistent with the practice they have had in the past to review their operational request and intending to support 100% of operations.

Chief Alibertis asked if there was a way to get that information posted or sent out to everyone.

Mr. Walker said that it was on the County website.

Chief Alibertis responded that he was hoping just to have a breakdown of what he had just explained versus the entire presentation.

Mr. Walker said that he could certainly try to send that out, and if it generated conversation or questions they could talk to Chief Eggleston or Chief Oprandy as well. He stated that this was a combination of the presentation at a higher level, and more detail as to what was actually in the budget, and this was a significant increase in support for fire rescue from FY15 to FY16, and a change in the way it was budgeted and accounted for.

Chief Tawney said that the majority of the change in funding was the nine salaries that now had to be picked up by the County following the end of the SAFR grant.

Mr. Walker confirmed that it was.
Chief Tawney asked what the income was from revenue recovery.

Mr. Walker responded that they did not have that with him.

Chief Oprandy said that $1.6 million was this year’s projection for EMS cost recovery.

Mr. Walker said that the revenue is accounted for within the fire rescue budget. He stated that this community talked frequently about tax rate as a surrogate for expenses or revenues, and he was more accustomed to talking about money, because the tax rate was just a representation of one place of where the money came from to pay for it. Mr. Walker said that the general fund revenue was more than the real estate tax rate, and the community was comfortable making the connection between taxes paid and services received – which was a significant motivator for the Board of Supervisors and the County Executive to make this change in an effort to convey to the community what they were getting for their taxes.

Chief Tawney said that one of the slides had mentioned enhanced staffing at Earlysville, Stony Point and East Rivanna.

Chief Alibertis said that the information was historical, used to show the evolution of the system.

Chief Oprandy stated that specifically in the recommended budget from the County Executive, under the volunteer fire rescue category of funding, it indicated a decrease of $487,000 or 22%, if someone were to just read the line item. He explained that what was not reflected in that was the fact that all of those expenses had been moved to a separate fund – and the reality was that the fire rescue operating budgets combined to increase $218,000. Chief Oprandy clarified that they had moved out fuel, insurance, line of duty, health services and some other operating costs such as foam.

Mr. Walker noted that there was an expected increase of $20,000 or 28.6% in the fire rescue tax credit program, and recent changes had made that program easier to use and more efficient, and it was getting more utilization, which increased costs to the County. He said that the system had gone to an automated process, which has made it easier to use, and more volunteers were taking advantage of it.

Chief Oprandy said that he thought there were probably a lot of people who were not turning in the vouchers.

Mr. Walker commented that being able to segregate the cost center and have dedicated revenue support it enabled them to recommend some expenditure increases in the fund that might not have been possible when competing with everything else.

Chief Tawney asked if that was the biggest reason for separating it.
Chief Aliberti said that it was a lot easier politically to increase taxes because it’s needed for fire rescue versus just the general fund.

Mr. Walker indicated that it was something that the public certainly understood.

Chief Reid asked if their budgets would still be submitted to the County, or if they would go to ACFR.

Mr. Walker said that they would follow the same process, and would just show up differently in the budget and in the audit.

Chief Aliberti said that it was really an accounting change, not a dollars and cents change.

Chief Gentry asked for more information about the 60/40 split with education.

Mr. Walker explained that the formula that the schools and County used was a 60/40 split between new revenue, with 60% going to schools and 40% going to general government – and this shift of 6.6 cents plus the 1 cent was all dedicated, so there would be no split in that amount of money. He stated that any growth in that would all go to the fire rescue fund and would not go to schools, and when they took the penny out of the capital fund and put it into operations, they did split that.

Chief Stephens asked if fire rescue would see a decrease for things like equipment replacement, given the shift of the money out of capital.

Mr. Walker said that he did not anticipate any change, and it was really just moved from one location in the budget to another. He said that the County was aware that there were upcoming fleet replacement needs, and that they were a significant investment – and he did not anticipate any reduction in the commitment to fleet replacement.

Chief Oprandy stated that the ACE program and sidewalks and school modernization projects have gone unfunded, and that was where the capital essentially came from.

C. From the Public - Matters not Listed on the Agenda
None were presented.

II. Approval of Consent Agenda
MOTION: Chief Grandstaff moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Chief Gentry seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (9-0).

III. Worksession
There was no worksession held.

IV. Committee Updates
A. Executive Committee
Chief Gentry reported that the Executive Committee meeting had been very brief.

Chief Tawney said that all that they had talked about was preliminary discussion on the field operations guide.

Chief LaBelle noted that the minutes were on the website.

B. Recruitment and Retention Committee
i. Sample Charter – Chief LaBelle reported that the committee had met the previous evening, and this was the third month that the charter had been circulated. He said that the idea of the charter was to help define a committee and communicate that to the membership, and it would be modified and expanded over time. Chief LaBelle added that this was also intended to keep committees that do not have FEMS Board members sitting on them from wandering off in a direction that doesn’t align with board priorities. He said that the other item that came up at the Recruitment and Retention Committee meeting was the fact that tax vouchers were due, and those were handed out at the last meeting or mailed – and they had been due on February 20, but really all that was needed was a list of members who had made more than 100 calls for the previous year. Chief LaBelle said that Christina Davis at the ACFR office could assist, and the forms could be dropped off at the Finance Department of the County.

Chief Grandstaff pointed out that the envelopes would not fit in the dropbox.

Chief LaBelle stated that they would be putting in the grant application for SAFER early the following week, for a total of $360,000 over four years for a number of things including recruitment and retention efforts, turnout gear for new members, and Firefighter I classes for new members.

Chief Alibertis asked if they were supposed to do anything with the sample charter provided.

Chief LaBelle responded that they did not really have a constitution and bylaws for the board, so there was no real process for them to vote on it, and the Executive Committee was going to start working on constitution and bylaws. He said that his recommendation would be that as they get developed and they come up with a finalized process, they do it once and do it the same way, rather than creating two different paths.

Chief Tawney said that there was nothing binding by this.

Chief Alibertis agreed, and said that it seemed as though they could do this in less than six pages.

Chief LaBelle said that there were other formats available if desired.
Chief Alibertis said that it seemed to be more effort to go through what was not populated nor may never be populated to find what was populated.

Chief LaBelle responded that once they get the SAFER grant, a whole bunch of things get populated, and the committee had been talking about a publicity program, so as projects start to emerge, the items get filled in.

Chief Alibertis said that a charter should be a very simple, basic explanation of the committee, and as it deals with things that are variable, such as the SAFER grant, it tells him that it wasn't charter material but was a separate component of that committee.

Chief LaBelle said that one way of doing a charter was to have separate scope of work projects, and a one-page or half-page charter, and sometimes it was a packet. He said that what he had presented was everything the committee was working on, and the reason he approached it from this standpoint was because it included everything in one place.

Chief Alibertis said that the point he was making was that information like that could be attached to the back without changing the formal charter, and once they establish bylaws, they would not have to go through a cumbersome process in order to change a charter – such as three-quarters of the membership voting.

Chief LaBelle offered to do a shorter version and bring it back to the next meeting.

Chief Tawney said that he would like to see both options and pick one.

Chief Grandstaff said that he would prefer to have a standing charter and then an updatable scope of work, as it seemed like less work once everything was in place.

C. Training Committee (heard after the Ivy Recruitment and Retention Plan update)
Chief Lambert reported that they had kicked off the spring semester of the academies, and the hybrid course was full and continues to be full. He said that the EMT class had started with 16 people but was now down to 15 due to one person being overcommitted with other obligations. Chief Lambert stated that they were on a streak of nine consecutive Firefighter I classes to have a 100% pass rate, and registration was up for most classes. He said that for regional school, they currently had 206 students registered, which was the highest number of students registered since he had been involved since 1999.

Chief Reid asked what the pass rate was for the EMT classes.

Chief Lambert said that ACFR had only been involved with one EMT class from a teaching perspective, and took over a teaching perspective in the most recent class in Earlysville, with 16 people start that class and 14 people finish it, and all 14 passed their practicals the night of the exam. He stated that he had received notification back on 11
of the 14 as far as the written test, and he had not been made aware of anyone who had failed the written test as of yet.

Chief Alibertis asked if he wanted to take some time to address the training bulletin that was in their packets.

Chief Lambert responded that there were some changes to the talk groups in the zones as part of the rebanding project, and Chief Walker had communicated a rebanding schedule that started the previous Monday. He said that the rebanding had created a few new talk groups to address some coverage issues in Scottsville and fixed a tactical non-revert issue that was in a previous template of the radios. Chief Lambert stated that they wanted to make sure they had a simple overview that they could post at stations, and the other big change was that they used to have analog channels in one zone and digital tack channels in a different zone, and a decision was made by the committee to split that, so now each zone has half analog and half digital talk groups. He said that there would probably be more communications policy considerations as they move forward, but this should at least provide people with an understanding of what the talk group changes are going on currently, and the interim plan until everyone got rebanded.

Chief Grandstaff asked if they had any idea of when the Scottsville channels would be working, because they were programmed the day before but they don’t work.

Chief Lambert said that his last communication with Gabe Elias was that he was hoping it would be resolved by the end of the week, but there was not yet an exact time frame.

Chief Grandstaff said that he also had a bit of a stressful situation when they came down to program the radios but ended up taking them back with them because they weren’t prepared to do them.

Chief Lambert said that he would communicate that to Chief Walker, and said that he had indicated there was a complication with the rebanding a few days earlier.

Chief Alibertis asked if the zone two, position two City fire response was a dedicated frequency separate from the rest.

Chief Lambert responded that his understanding was that it was an overflow channel and was supposedly not going into production even after the rebanding, and the thought was that the radio traffic might get to the point where the City needed a separate response channel. He added that it was only designated for overflow conditions, and there was no plan to put that as a live talk group.

Chief Alibertis said that it hopped zones, which didn’t make sense because then you had to toggle between two zones.
Chief Lambert said that the thought process was if there was a split back to the City having one zone and the County having one zone, there was a talk group dedicated to the City response and an equal distribution of analog and digital talk groups for the County and the City.

Chief Puckett noted that this was driven by the City, not ACFR, and the City wanted the channel laid out as it was. He said that this created some questions as to whether they wanted to implement it, because they would have to dedicate another dispatcher to be able to manage the two different channels and two different zones.

Chief Grandstaff said that the original meeting they had about the code plugs a year or so earlier, they were pushing to go back to all digital tack channels in the City.

Chief Oprandy said that under this, alpha tack 8, 9, 10 and 11 were digital.

Chief Lambert said that was correct, whereas the current code plug set has all of the alpha channels as analog. He said that this was the biggest functional change, and he didn’t know whether there were policy considerations with this. He added that Chief Brown had been involved with the decision to automatically assign the analog channels first, but this at least provided the flexibility to not change zones if an analog versus a digital talk group was desired.

Chief Alibertis said that if you got assigned a tack channel 6 and above, you could not hear it on your pager, as it only scanned 3, 4 and 5 – so if there was a plan to implement widespread use of the digital groups, they would need to reconsider what they had put in the system to monitor that the pagers can access.

Chief Puckett said that his understanding was that the committee had done some analog and digital testing, and the intent was to start using some digital channels operationally as a first pull, until there was some better interference in the radios, so the intent for now was to stay analog.

Chief Alibertis said that he just wanted to make sure so that people were in the know.

Chief Lambert asked that chiefs direct any questions to him from a training bulletin perspective, and as more information came out he would forward it.

B. Turnout Gear
Chief Puckett reported that they were almost ready to kick off the new laundry process and had all of their supplies in, and Nickie Huff had been working out some instructions so that everyone understood what to expect and how to deliver things and pick things up. Chief Puckett said that she had been working on setting times to come down to each station and give the bags along with laminated instructions, and also to pick up redline gear as available.

Chief Reid said that he would have had a lot more to give, but was told to discard it.
Chief Puckett said that some of the older sets of gear had become very brittle, 15 or 20 years old in some cases, and not even usable for training – although it was worth evaluating all of it for potential use. He stated that Ms. Huff had the first quartermaster meeting scheduled for March 17, and encouraged stations to provide someone to attend. Chief Puckett said that it looked as though there would be substantial additional funding in the budget, and as of July 1 they would start receiving those funds, so it would be nice to have a plan before having the money in hand.

VI. New Business
A. Radio Update
Chief Puckett reported that the rebanding was taking place this week, and there would likely be some radios missed, so they just needed to schedule a time to take them to Clear Communications so the units were done by the deadline at the end of March.

Chief Stephens said that they had missed the station radio at North Garden.

Chief Puckett said that was a more complicated issue, and he would have to find out how to deal with it.

Chief Puckett reported that the purchase order had been cut for the mobile radio replacement, and only the Apex radios were being replaced, with a timetable expected for April or May. He stated that there was an item planned to be on the Board of Supervisors agendas for additional funds for pagers, including a discussion as to whether there should have been legal action taken against Apollo for the original pagers – and depending on what happened with that, they were debating on whether to put the reappropriation of funds on the agenda before that question was answered. He said that Chief Eggleston had mentioned that since they were using reserve funds, they didn’t know whether they had enough funds to do it in one shot, or whether they needed to do it over a few months so they didn’t completely use up the reserve fund. Chief Puckett said that if it went through successfully, they should be able to order some pagers in April.

Chief Puckett reminded the group that the SCBA demos would take place on March 25 at 5:00 p.m., and both Scott and MSA had been confirmed to present, and were given 45 minutes each for whatever presentation they wanted to do.

B. Fire Corps
Chief LaBelle said that there had been a lot of concerns about how Fire Corps was progressing, and they would be holding a meeting the following night.

C. Stony Point Loan Forgiveness Request
Chief LaBelle stated that Stony Point had sent a loan forgiveness request to the Board of Supervisors, who asked Chief Eggleston for his opinion on how to move forward with the request. He said that Chief Eggleston had an opinion on it, but wanted to get feedback from the FEMS Board as a whole as to how they wanted to move forward.
Chief LaBelle said that some of ACFR’s concerns were that if they go back to forgiving corporate loans that the organization signed on to, whether it opened the door for the County to say that they would need to participate at a higher level in the loan process if they were ultimately going to have to pay them off at a later date – which was probably not what anyone wanted to do. He said that the second concern was that the process by which Stony Point went was not unlike the process other organizations had done in the past, whereby instead of going through the CIP process, they chose a more expeditious route. Chief LaBelle said that the question for the County is what the point was of having a zero-interest loan and a process that allows organizations to expedite and go around the CIP process, if it is going to end up paying those loans. He stated that the chief did not want to open up to questions the two ways of funding projects in their communities, and did not want the County to ask why all projects were not running all construction projects through the CIP process.

Chief Alibertis said that if they do pay off these loans, the money would have to come from somewhere else in the ACFR budget – so they would essentially be robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Chief Reid asked if everyone had read the letter, and said that he had still not had a chance to speak with former Chief Ted Armentrout – so he would like to postpone this agenda item until the following month.

Chief Alibertis said that if they were going to act on this item, it would be nice if they had a packet with the letter and any kind of history. He said that his understanding was that Chief Reid did not even get the letter, so it was hard for the FEMS Board to have a purposeful discussion with the Chief if he was not privy to the letter.

Chief LaBelle stated that it was emailed out to the FEMS Board.

Chief Reid said that it was sent a few days ago, but said that Chief Alibertis was referring to the original sending of the letter.

Chief Oprandy asked if Chief Armentrout, who was now the Stony Point Board Chair, did not send the letter to Chief Reid but instead sent it to the Board.

Chief Reid said that they had talked about the letter and making the request based on the policy that ACFRB had written, which was something he had been working on for quite some time, but he did not get a copy of it.

Chief LaBelle stated that the problem is, they were in the middle of the County budget cycle, and if they postpone it, they would be postponing it until next year.

Chief Oprandy explained that Chief Eggleston needed to provide the County with an answer, and wanted to get some thoughts from the FEMS Board.
Chief Reid said that he would like to hold off on discussing the item, as he had a strategy that he would like to propose.

Chief Alibertis said that he wanted it to be clear that it was at the request of the Stony Point Chief that the matter be tabled until the following month.

Chief LaBelle said that he wanted to make sure that Chief Reid understood that doing so may mean that they will be too late for this budget cycle.

Chief Reid said that he did not want to rob Peter to pay Paul, and did not want it to affect the relationships among the Chiefs and the stations.

Chief Tawney said that he would speak about this, because it seemed that Seminole’s project rubbed Chief Armentrout the wrong way. Chief Tawney said that his station’s project did go through the CIP process, and sat for almost nine years – with the project continuing to change during that time. He said that when the Board of Supervisors finally decided they were going to fund it, it was out of the blue, and Chief Armentrout has put Chief Reid in an awkward position. Chief Tawney said that there was no way he would support the County having any hand in whether or not they can borrow money from private equity sources, and this sets them up for that. He asked if the first $50,000 of the $100,000 was a private loan.

Chief LaBelle confirmed that it was $52,000.

Chief Oprandy stated that it was a $500,000 project in total, for all the renovations, parking lots, etc.

Chief Tawney asked what portion of the balance Stony Point was asking for forgiveness of, taking out the corporate loan, which would not get support from the FEMS Board.

Chief Reid said that the outstanding County loan was $60,000, and the request was made in 2003 and has been ongoing since – although the construction did not take place until 2007 or 2008. He said that their bunk room had been the size of a bathroom stall.

Chief LaBelle said that was why they got a 0% loan, because the County recognized that the station needed to address that issue, with the understanding that it would be paid back over time.

Chief Oprandy said that there was also a grant of $250,000 from the County to address the HVAC system, the parking lot and the roof, and then did the low-interest loan for the project; Stony Point then wanted to add the metal building outside, so they went out for the commercial loan at just over $100,000, which now has a balance of $52,000.

Chief LaBelle stated that Chief Eggleston wants to be in a position to go back to the Board and say that paying off a corporate loan is a negative, but there were negatives
to paying back the 0% loan as well. He said that the Chief wanted to emphasize to the Board that paying back either of those loans created problems for previous projects, existing projects as well as future projects.

Chief Oprandy said that Chief Eggleston was prepared to make that recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, but he did not want to do that without at least having that conversation with the FEMS Board.

Chief Alibertis said that as an agency, he would not support the County having a say in him going out to borrow money – and a zero-interest loan was something they wanted to take advantage of.

Chief LaBelle said that the concern was the County coming back and asking why they were even bothering to offer 0%, and would direct them to the CIP program.

Chief Alibertis said that he did not feel that his agency could support any more intervention from the County as to what they might do as a private corporation.

Chief Tawney said that it set them up for more hurdles.

Chief Butler stated that each of their station’s individual boards looks at the need and the available processes of either the CIP or direct borrowing, and when he sat on the board at East Rivanna, it was a business decision with the expectation that it would be paid over the course of time like any other loan. Chief Butler said that if that was the route that Stony Point took, the expectation would be that they would pay off their debt and not go back later on.

Chief Reid said that this goes back to 2003, and he was trying to fully understand the policy and what the definitions meant.

Chief Tawney asked if the grant of which Chief Oprandy spoke was something that was specifically procured for that project, or whether it was a larger grant with a certain amount of money allocated to the Stony Point project.

Chief Oprandy responded that $250,000 was allocated from the County to Stony Point in the form of a grant.

Chief Tawney said that he agreed with Chief Butler that if the Stony Point Board made a decision about moving forward with the loan, they needed to stand by it. He said that Chief Armentrout seemed to imply that 100% of Seminole’s project was funded by the County, but the reality is that the station spent several hundred thousands of dollars of their own money and gave up lots of things along the way to get under budget.

Chief Alibertis clarified their position as everyone supporting the position that Chief Eggleston and the County were taking at this time, with the information provided.
FEMS Board members agreed.

D. Other

Chief Gentry stated that over the last several years, Crozet had asked to be added into the line item budget for snow removal and ground maintenance, and it was brought to their attention at their station meeting that Station 11, Station 12, and Station 15 were provided with snow removal.

Chief Tawney said that it was all of those plus Berkmar Rescue.

Chief Puckett confirmed that it was all the County-owned buildings.

Chief Tawney said that he did his own, and one of the first things he did when he became Chief was buy a snow plow.

Chief Puckett said that only County buildings were done by the County.

Chief Tawney asked what it would take to have the stations added onto their route.

Chief Oprandy said that it had been a strategic initiative request for the past several years, and he agreed that it was part of basic operating needs – but “lawn care, janitorial service including snow removal” had been excluded long ago when fire and rescue first started. He stated that last year, ACFR had tried to fold it into the operating budget over time and had some conversations with OMB about it, and possibly with the new fire rescue fund, they might get it accomplished more easily.

Chief Puckett said that they have had inconsistent service from the County, although they have worked this year to put more specific contract language in place regarding service level expectations.

Chief Gentry asked which stations had changed their notification systems.

Chief Puckett said that Station 11, 12, 15 and 10 all had WestNet, which was “First N” alerting; Station 8 used a different system.

Chief Tawney said that this was one of the things they had to do with their Seminole Trail project, and had to look at other options because WestNet was pricey.

Chief Puckett said that WestNet was expensive, but it would ultimately have integration with CAD, so as soon as a dispatcher hit an address and a call type, something in the station would go off.

Chief Tawney said that their station’s was 5 or 10 seconds, which was probably what Crozet would face, as there needed to be a direct fiber optic feed. He said that they would have a more generous notification had they been able to afford Rio Road down to Berkmar, but they were waiting until they ran the fiber to Station 8 so they could tap into
Chief Tawney said that basically Crozet would have communication between the station and CAD that would be direct, and that was the difference, and he offered to provide his station’s contact person to Chief Gentry.

Chief Alibertis said that Chief Eggleston had planned to talk to Tom Hansen about an issue with ECC, which had made a unilateral decision to make an operational change by abandoning their Ebola policy, which greatly concerned him. He said that the 911 center made a lot of unilateral decisions on operations without including the shareholders in those discussions, and at some point they needed to rope it back in since fire rescue was running the calls. Chief Alibertis said that Chief Eggleston agreed with him on that, and would represent that position to ECC.

Chief Alibertis reported that Wendy Roberman would be retiring the following day, and wanted to recognize all of her great contributions to ACFR.

Ms. Courtney indicated that there would be a party for her that Friday in the office.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2020 hours.
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