A meeting of the Executive Committee of the Albemarle County Fire/EMS Board was held on Monday, July 6, 2015 at 1600 hours in the Fire Rescue Conference Room of the County Office Building, Stagecoach Road, Charlottesville.

The following members were in attendance:
Dan Eggleston, Albemarle County Fire & Rescue
Preston Gentry, Crozet Volunteer Fire Department
Dayton Haugh, Charlottesville-Albemarle Rescue Squad
Danny Tawney, Seminole Trail Volunteer Fire Department

Others in Attendance:
Holly Bittle, Albemarle County Fire & Rescue
Tom LaBelle, Albemarle County Fire & Rescue
David Puckett, Albemarle County Fire & Rescue
John Oprandy, Albemarle County Fire & Rescue

1. Call to Order
Chief Eggleston called the meeting to order at 1600 hrs.

a. From the Board: Agenda Additions
There were none

b. From the Public: Matters not Listed on the Agenda
None were presented, and the meeting proceeded.

2. Consent Agenda
a. June 2015 Minutes

Chief Eggleston stated that there was no June Executive Committee meeting, and therefore no minutes to approve.

3. Fire Rescue System Strategic Plan - update
a. Plan progress –
Chief Eggleston stated that there was no strategic plan update.

4. Unfinished Business
a. FEMSB Work Plan Items/Policy - for Decision/Action
None were presented.
b. Review Budget Status

i. Results of the prioritization of the Budget Work Session.

Chief Eggleston stated that at the last FEMS Board meeting, members had an opportunity to provide input on budget items for prioritization. He said that Chief Oprandy would report on the items.

Chief Oprandy reported that in terms of strategic initiatives, the volunteer administrative assistance got the most votes – nine; followed by Pantops ambulance staffing – five, marketing and advertising funding – five, and volunteer worker’s compensation – five; fleet supervisor – three; and volunteer retention – one. He stated that there were no votes left for other items. He stated that for CIP budget items, the ranking was the training facility – nine votes; mobile data computers – four votes; and station IT infrastructure – one vote.

Chief Eggleston stated that they would have time to further discuss it, and at some point he would come back to the FEMS Board and let them know what he was recommending. He said that they had talked about the volunteer assistance for quite some time, and would explore all options including adding a part-time person to ease into it and get some quick results. Chief Eggleston said that after they reengage with the FEMS Board in later meetings, they could dive into the details, and he was not certain of the deadline for submission.

Chief Oprandy reported that they would come to the FEMS Board at the end of July with the final budget package in terms of five-year planning items, to present to the Executive Committee prior to submission. He noted that the CIP was later this year, so it would be submitted in September and discussed by the FEMS Board and EC in August. Chief Oprandy stated that the only difference in the CIP items was changing the Earlysville project from a bay expansion to a building expansion, but he had some follow-up work to do to make sure that was the case.

Chief Eggleston stated that Rick Randolph was running for the Board of Supervisors and came into ACFR several weeks earlier to ask some questions. Chief Eggleston said that Mr. Randolph has wanted to put the Keene Landfill site training facility back on the table for discussion, as he felt it was stopped prematurely because of the controversy around police firing range component, and might reasonably accommodate a driving track for the police department and a training facility for fire and rescue. Chief Eggleston said that the current facility was not suitable long-term, and if they really wanted something to accommodate the size of the system, it would need to be somewhere else. He noted that this was still pretty far out and there may be more convenient locations, and in discussing these types of sites, people don’t want them in their backyards. Chief Eggleston said that maybe the Keene site would work out, but it would be discussed further at the FEMS meeting.

c. Ivy Station Recruitment and Retention Plan – update
Chief LaBelle reported that they had two new prospective members for Ivy, but had also lost two members – one who joined the Air Force and another who moved to Northern Virginia. He stated that this left 19 members, but they would be back up to 21, and they would likely see a bump before Firefighter I. Chief LaBelle said that 10 out of the 19 were released at the Firefighter level, and they were working on getting people released at the EMT or EVOC level.

Chief Eggleston stated that this should be a report for volunteers in general – with an increase in volunteers for Station 11 and Station 12 – and Fire Corps people should also be included.

5. New Business
a. List of Excluded Individuals and Entities (LEIE) Policy
Chief Oprandy reported that this policy was being introduced to the Executive Committee to begin to move through the policy process, so next month they would vote to move it to the FEMS Board or not. He stated that sometime last fall, soon after hiring Holly Bittle and having someone look at the cost-recovery program, Ms. Bittle determined that the Office of the Inspector General had a list of excluded individuals and entities. He said that as a billing agency, ACFR has to compare its rolls – the people they have operationally and beyond – to this list. Chief Oprandy stated that if someone is placed on the list for “fraud,” after a finding on that individual, they could no longer be associated with ACFR as an agency.

He said that ACFR met a few weeks ago with the transport agencies and discussed this to try to determine whether they were ready to move the policy forward, and said that it fairly straightforward that they were required to do this. Chief Oprandy said that not all peer localities had a policy related to this, but most of them – if not all – were checking the list, and ACFR felt it was important to have a policy both for transparency reasons, and so there was a standing policy in place in the event someone was put on the list. He stated that Ms. Bittle had put together a draft policy that would move through the process, and she was present to discuss this.

Ms. Bittle stated that she had put together a summary sheet of details on what this was, and said that in Virginia she went through and checked the list – which was easy to find on the OIG website. She said that in Virginia, there were 1,194 exclusions, which was less than 1/10 of 1% of the population, so the likelihood of someone popping up was relatively small. Ms. Bittle stated that the list was maintained so that if someone was on the exclusion list, they could not be involved in any healthcare services, or ACFR would have to refund any of the money collected from their calls.

Chief Haugh asked if any changes had been made since the last time this was reviewed by the FEMS Board.

Ms. Bittle responded that there had been minor changes made in C and D, and she could go through the comments if desired.
Chief Oprandy stated that this was the introduction of the first draft copy of the policy, and over the next four weeks, if they had feedback, questions, or concerns, they would be addressed. He said that when they see it the second time, they would have some final conversation about it and determine whether it could move to the FEMS Board. Chief Oprandy noted that this was a pretty straightforward policy spelled out by the OIG.

Chief Haugh asked if there was anything to be gained by holding onto it and not just going ahead and sending it the FEMS Board, adding that Ms. Bittle had done a good job of explaining it and establishing the draft policy.

Chief Eggleston agreed that there was no value in holding it at the EC level, and it was the prerogative of this committee to move it forward – with the main benefit of more conversation being to have the FEMS Board have more discussion among members who had not yet heard about it.

**ACTION:** Chief Haugh moved to send the draft policy to the FEMS Board for their review and decision. Chief Eggleston seconded the motion.

Chief Tawney asked if this involved all agencies, including those who did not perform EMS, and said that he did not recall any discussion about this.

Chief Oprandy clarified that Chief Haugh was referring to the meeting held with the transport agencies, and this was the first time the matter had been brought to EC. He stated that there was not a lot of leeway with this policy, but the question had been raised as to how this would apply to an agency that did not have an EMS license.

Ms. Bittle stated that she would be following up on that point with the County Attorney.

Chief Eggleston said that it was difficult to make the list, as you would have to be convicted of fraud.

Ms. Bittle said that it was difficult to make the list – but it was widespread to the point that it involved anyone on the scene. She reiterated that she would follow up with the County Attorney on the policy and its provisions.

Chief Gentry asked for an explanation of exactly what the policy was saying.

Chief Oprandy explained that if you are a billing entity, there are certain federal regulations that must be followed – one of them being that people on the fraud list cannot be involved in billing for any federal program, such as Medicaid and Medicare. He said that if someone on the list was involved, an agency would be subject to fines.

Chief Tawney said if Medic 8 billed for services, Seminole Trail was not billing and was not involved at all, and it seemed odd to him that the policy would cover the station.
Chief Oprandy stated that they have asked where the line was drawn, but if Seminole Trail people were on the scene and involved, it would be considered involvement.

Chief Eggleston said that it could be a stretch, but emphasized that the feds did not want anyone who had ever been convicted of fraud to even be associated with it – and while it mainly covered billing entities, it was broad enough to cover the stations if they were involved in a call. He stated that he looked at the list, and there was only a handful of people in the entire area.

Chief Gentry asked how a station would play into this if they were responding to a call.

Chief Eggleston said that it would really apply to anyone involved in billing.

Ms. Bittle said that she was checking for clarification, but it really applied to anyone who was “touching” a program. She noted that there was a list of mandatory exclusions and permissive exclusions, which she had also listed in the policy, and the only time there might be an issue was for a person defaulting on a health education loan or scholarship operations – and to be excluded it took about 40-60 days to go through the process before a person could be put on the list.

Chief Haugh pointed out that the policy pertained to more than fraud: distribution of prescriptions or dispensing of controlled substances, a revocation of license, defaulting on a health education loan. He asked if a health education loan would pertain to someone borrowing to go to school to become a doctor.

Chief LaBelle and Ms. Bittle confirmed that this was their understanding.

Chief Eggleston asked if it was not mandatory that localities had this policy.

Ms. Bittle stated that Chesterfield checked regularly but did not have a policy in place yet, and they had obtained Albemarle’s draft policy so that they could review it. She said that Forsyth County, North Carolina, had a draft policy.

Chief Eggleston said that the only reason he had brought this forward was to ensure they were communicating about it, in the event they had someone who made the list. He stated that there were a lot of people in the area because of UVA who might have health education loans, and said that Chief Alibertis’s primary concern was those students who might be in default on their student loans. Chief Eggleston said that this was worth discussing at another level when it got to the FEMS Board.

The motion passed unanimously (4-0).

b. Committees
   i. Supporting Work of Committees
   ii. Interaction Between FEMS and Committees
Chief Eggleston stated that they had more committees now than ever working on various items, and at the same time Chief LaBelle was working with them to further develop their charters and purposes. He said that EC and FEMS were scheduled to receive some recommendations and/or policies from those committees, so it was a good time to discuss this.

Chief LaBelle said that two meetings ago, the FEMS Board approved the scope of work for the Recruitment and Retention Committee, and his plan was to sit down next with the Training Committee, then the Operations Committee, and finally the Fire Prevention and Life Safety Committee, to look at the scope of work documents and get them back to the FEMS Board. He stated that this is in tandem with the by-laws work FEMS had done a few months earlier, and the definition of the scope of work intended to reduce the frustration at the committee level of putting in a lot of work on an item – only to find out from the FEMS Board that the work was considered tangential. Chief LaBelle said that they had discussed the possibility of having a FEMS Board member sitting on each committee, which he considered to be very helpful, and said that he would continue to bring this up – even though he realized it could mean an extra meeting. He stated that the committees have felt they were more productive than the FEMS Board and the Executive Committee because they were working on specific projects, and that was actually a good thing because it gave participants a sense of productivity.

Chief LaBelle said that the feeling now was that a lot of things were getting to the FEMS Board very quickly, and it was important for the EC to provide feedback on that pace and their level of comfort with it. He stated that the question was how they could continue to increase the level of communication and comfort, as most chief officers – career and volunteer – had a tough time delegating things out. Chief LaBelle stated that some of the decisions were pre-dictated through regulations and policies, such as with EMS operations. He said that over the next few months they would be nailing down the initial committee structures, with EC and FEMS discussing it and helping to refine their scope. Chief LaBelle stated that it was clear to everyone that in order to keep moving forward, the most input and participation would happen through the committee process.

Chief Eggleston noted that it was also a matter of practicality, as it was more efficient to have the committees do the research on particular items and come up with strategies. He stated that the Operations Committee in particular had done really good work, especially with the Working Incident Policy, and he would like to see that continue to be built upon.

Chief Eggleston said that there had been a lot of discussion at the Board of Supervisors level about the Pantops Fire Station, which was a new item to some of the Board members so they wanted time to follow up with questions. He stated that they were supportive of the station in general, but wanted to make sure they feel comfortable before they move forward – so they can express it accurately to their constituents. Chief Eggleston said that he anticipated going back before the Board in August.
Chief Gentry asked if Chief Eggleston could explain the new substations filling in for other stations.

Chief Eggleston explained that Station 6 had an idea of relocating or building another station, and they had a proposal regarding addition of another station at Proffit Road and Route 20 with the intent to cover that area as well as Pantops. He stated that it was five miles to the development area edge at Route 250/Route 20, which did not even come close to meeting response time standards. Chief Eggleston stated that he and Chief LaBelle had met with Chief Mike Reid and shared that information, and he felt differently about it – and was upset about the discrepancy. Chief Eggleston said that Chief Reid had tried to get individual meetings with Board of Supervisors members, who in turn came back to Chief Eggleston with questions as to how this proposal arose. He stated that several Board members had indicated that they talked to Chief Reid about this and expressed to him that it was not justified, and said that he told the Board that ACFR was not going to do anything on it other than following up with Chief Reid.

Chief Gentry asked if there would be any new requirements under the new insurance company, as Provident had been fairly flexible with certain aspects of the claims process, such as notification to stations.

Chief Eggleston responded that the new company was supposedly even more customer-focused, and said that the agent they would be getting was a volunteer in Manassas and a former fire chief – so it was hoped the service would be even better. He noted that the Provident premium had increased significantly, and he was glad they had re-shopped it, as it resulted in better coverage at a lower price. Chief Eggleston said that there were only two companies out there – Provident and VFIS – and the agent was planning to come and meet with individual stations.

Chief LaBelle stated that they were planning to have a worksession with the FEMS Board after July 1, and the idea was to have stations bring in community board members, with Jim Stokely and Gretchen Kreigel present to explain the County’s insurance coverage.

Chief Eggleston stated that VFIS had an educational component and would be putting more training education online, so if there were issues with people backing into light posts and such, the company could come out and help educate departments on how to prevent those kinds of risks.

6. Next Meeting
a. Monday, August 2, 2015 1600hrs. ACFR Conference Room

7. Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 1636 hours.
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