FEMS Board – Executive Committee
Agenda – 1/4/2016

1. Call to Order
   a. From the Board: Agenda Additions
   b. From the Public: Matters Not Listed on the Agenda

2. Consent Agenda
   a. October Meeting minutes

3. Fire Rescue System Strategic Plan - update
   a. Plan progress –
      i. Pantops Update

4. Unfinished Business
   a. FEMSB Work Plan Items/Policy - for Decision/Action
      i. Meeting at VAFC regarding Bylaws
   b. Volunteer Recruitment and Retention - update
      i. Hollymead, Ivy and Monticello Station Recruitment and Retention Plan –

5. New Business
   a. Virginia Fire Chiefs Show (are we going again as a board
   b. Pantops Update
   c. Temp OA’s Update

6. Next Meeting
   a. Monday, January 4th, 2015 1600hrs. ACFR Conference Room

7. Adjournment
A meeting of the Executive Committee of the Albemarle County Fire/EMS Board was held on Monday, October 5, 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
Dayton Haugh, Charlottesville-Albemarle Rescue Squad
Kostas Alibertis, Western Albemarle Rescue Squad

Others in Attendance:
Tom LaBelle, Albemarle County Fire & Rescue
John Oprandy, Albemarle County Fire & Rescue
David Puckett, 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. September 2015 Minutes
MOTION: Chief Haugh moved, seconded by Chief Eggleston, to approve the Consent Agenda and the September 2015 minutes as presented. The motion passed unanimously (3-0).

3. Fire Rescue System Strategic Plan - update
a. Plan progress
There was no update provided, but Chief Eggleston stated that this week they had a re-appropriation request into the Board of Supervisors that included funding for a second strategic planning process, and they would need to talk later about a good time to conduct a future session.

4. Unfinished Business
a. FEMSB Work Plan Items/Policy - for Decision/Action
i. Committee Report/Recommendation Process
Chief LaBelle stated that Christina Davis had been going through and looking at every association/organization to see when they held their executive and station meetings, but that list was not yet finalized. He said that the hope was that by the FEMS Board meeting, they would have a good feel for what open dates there were. Chief LaBelle stated that while Chief Lambert had done most of them, they would look at them in a little more depth.

b. Volunteer Recruitment/Retention Update

i. Hollymead, Ivy and Monticello Station Recruitment and Retention Plan – update

Chief LaBelle reported that ACFR had hired three of the Ivy station volunteers, as well as a volunteer from Scottsville Rescue and one from Seminole Trail. He stated that two Ivy volunteers had resigned – one who had moved to Northern Virginia for a job, and one who recognized he was not able to keep up with the 48 hours monthly participation.

Chief Alibertis commented that 48 hours was a lot.

Chief LaBelle responded that for some it was, for some it wasn’t, and as long as members were putting in at least 36, they were not pressured. He added that they also had two new members apply, so they would hopefully be going into either the next Firefighter I or the EMT-B class.

Chief Eggleston stated that they had the banners up for the academy, which would be taken down since the academy started, and he had not checked in on the participation of the Firefigher I academy.

Chief Oprandy stated that there were 15 signed up for the hybrid, with another 5 or 6 anticipated because of college student recruitment, with the deadline on October 7th or 8th.

5. New Business

a. ACPD Active Shooter Policy

Chief Puckett stated that they had been working with Albemarle County Police for almost a year to work out an on-scene process for an active shooter, and how they can access and treat patients earlier in the incident. He said that the initial component was looking at the Albemarle County Police Department policy and modifying that so that it allowed Fire/Rescue to integrate with it, specifically rescue task forces. Chief Puckett said that the theory was to go into a “warm zone,” which had been cleared but was not completely secure, to go in under police protection or while officers were posted – with rescue going into a triage location to treat patients. He stated that the policy was more of an ACPD policy than a Fire/Rescue policy, and on the back side of that was training and equipment, ultimately with an ACFR or FEMS policy to dictate how they operated within the rescue task forces themselves – what the qualifications were, how would do it, and so forth. Chief Puckett said that one of the first questions they would have was whether individual agencies would want to participate as part of that and have personnel and training, and provide that service, because that would dictate where they went with the policy. He added that they did not want to force this on anyone but this
would determine whether it was just ACFR personnel or a wider net, so they should plan it out.

Chief Eggleston asked for confirmation that the training and qualifications would just be for the warm zone operations.

Chief Puckett responded that this was the case, but with these incidents there was always a lot to do, including within the cold zone as people are exiting an incident and are wounded. He stated that this particular training focused on getting people out of the warm zone and out into the rest of the MCI to treat them appropriately, and said that research historically has shown that injured patients remained in a building for at least an hour as it was secured, with people dying as that was happening. Chief Puckett said that they had done some initial training with some ACFR staff on tactical emergency casualty care, which was the same program that departments like Arlington, Fairfax and Hanover were using. He stated that this was basically combat protocols that were modified for this population versus the 18-25 year old population, and noted that they had also done some research on equipment and gear. He said that the hope was that this fall they would start doing some integrated training with the PD, because they would need to use shared terminology and protocol. He added that there would probably also need to be some ongoing annual training to retain qualifications, and identification on-scene to let people know someone had been through the training.

Chief Puckett stated that PD had been adamant that Fire/Rescue personnel be trained and understand what they needed to do and what their limitations and expectations were, and ACFR was adamant from its point of view that they did not want their protection to be any random officer that showed up. He said that there were other duties that those officers could do, but they would not serve as the protection team going into an event, so there was some give and take as they were trying to figure out the system.

Chief Eggleston asked if ACPD had a timeframe in mind.

Chief Puckett responded that last fall they had a “Spartan Academy” training coming up, and PD was still getting all their people through active shooter training, which was a single officer hunt and kill type operation as opposed to waiting for a full team of officers to arrive. He stated that at the end of that academy, it was hoped that ACFR could integrate some personnel so they could go through those movements together. Chief Puckett said that they had talked about using a few SWAT medics, because they train regularly with PD, as they could come out and play the PD role with smaller scale exercise where they could carry their weapons and do the protection, and ACFR could handle the rescue aspects.

Chief Haugh said that at some point they needed to get into a mindset where they were not sending 12 career engines and one ambulance to these types of calls, because they could not afford to have these calls handled like airport calls.
Chief Puckett stated that with the new CAD, different call types were set up so that they escalated more quickly.

Chief Haugh commented that they needed everything that could move a patient to respond to these types of calls.

Chief Alibertis said that they were going to have to look deep to find them.

Chief Haugh stated that they would also have to consider utilizing the commercial services and emphasize the importance of having them show up when they were called.

Chief Eggleston said that there were the technical aspects involved in the warm zone training, but there was also the mass casualty event – which had not been updated in a long time, such as where they could get 10 ambulances.

Chief Puckett stated that he had gone over this with ECC not that long ago as they were trying to put together an MCI response, and in his mind those details had not really been ironed out. He said that while ACFR could probably collapse all of its resources to handle that type of incident, but if any were to come in during the response, it would be very difficult.

Chief Alibertis said that it would also be difficult if they were already out on calls, and they would probably only get their first unit in but that’s about it. He stated that this went along with how to strategically plan responses, because a lot of times resources were tied up for something non-essential and then they were stuck and hoping that nothing else happened.

Chief Puckett stated that a new CAD system was a good opportunity to take a look at some of those things, to figure out if there were some new things that could be done. He mentioned that there was a way to set up alerts so that if system resources got below a certain level, it would either notify the dispatcher to go into a modified response plan or at least notify someone. He said that it was probably worthwhile exploring, if for no other reason than to determine system-wise how often there were no ambulances left, two engines in the County left, and so forth – just to keep track of.

Chief Alibertis noted that this would be helpful as there were often responses to Scottsville and Nelson County that drew down resources, and Rockfish Volunteer Fire Department had been struggling recently.

Chief Eggleston commented that at one point, one-third of Scottsville’s rescue calls were coming from outside of the County.

Chief Alibertis said that UVA covered Buckingham with one truck, and he had heard of a recent incident where someone waited an hour for a response – and the UVA truck called for help from Station 11. He stated that they needed to consider the amount of support they were sending outside of the County as part of their response strategies.
b. Consolidating Purchasing Considerations for 2017 Budget

Chief Puckett stated that there were three items that had emerged that were at least worth a discussion to possibly take to FEMS to see if it was worth consolidating expenses. He said that one was pump and ladder testing, which was done annually and currently paid for by ACFR and broken out into pieces. He said that in the past, stations had opted out from year to year, but now everyone seemed to be participating, so his question was whether it was worth it to keep doing it like that or having it centralized and just paying the invoice.

Chief Eggleston asked for confirmation that there was a potential cost savings for that if they told the vendor.

Chief Puckett responded that there really wasn’t, because ACFR paid the bill and then took it out of line items for each station’s part – so this wouldn’t be a savings, it would just save a little bit of work administratively.

He stated that the other two items had potential cost savings, with dumpster service moved to contract, reducing costs by about 60% from FY 2014-15, from $6,000 to $2,300 annually. Chief Puckett said that they would pay one invoice no matter how many dumpsters were emptied, or perhaps each station could get on the same contract. He stated that the other item for cost savings was for oxygen, as they had shifted from Roberts to a state contract with Air Gas, lowering costs from $21,000 in FY 2014-15 to $9,800 in FY 2015-16.

Chief Alibertis said that his unit had talked to Air Gas, and they offered that cost savings even without consolidation.

Chief Eggleston expressed surprise that there was that much mark-up on oxygen.

Chief Puckett stated that there was also the service and tank leak monitoring, as Roberts came by every week, whereas you had to call Air Gas. He said that the more tanks you have in the same size, the lower your costs were, and if they wanted to plan for reserves, they could keep some at ACFR in the event of an emergency. Chief Puckett stated that he felt it was imperative to at least try to take advantage of these savings.

Chief Alibertis said that the two companies also bill differently, and it was a lot cheaper, so they did not even bill the same.

Chief Puckett said that for biohazard waste, that company was charging ACFR every month whether they picked up or not, so through a bit of research they found a company that did not charge unless there was service performed.

Chief Alibertis stated that biohazard was challenging because they did not have much of it and it just sat around until they figured out what they would do with it.
Chief Haugh said that his station usually had three or four boxes before the company came to pick it up.

Chief Eggleston stated that it sounded as if they should have a conversation at the FEMS Board level, especially the pump and ladder testing.

c. Part Time Office Associates
Chief LaBelle stated that when the FEMS Board reviewed the budget priorities several months earlier, they had discussed the possibility of having temporary part-time office associates, with the idea of providing administrative support for volunteer organizations. He said that some stations had good support whereas others did not, and they had come up with a list of items that could be covered under this: Fire/RMS database maintenance; Fire/RMS call entry; general administrative assistance to the secretary and/or president of the organization; and assistance to quartermasters. Chief LaBelle said that the idea was that at the end of that timeframe, they would have an idea of what the actual needs were for each organization and whether an office assistant position was needed versus hardware/software management.

Chief Eggleston said that this was another re-appropriation request, so they wanted to at least start this to see how well it would be received. He stated that the County Executive’s office had expressed concern about starting something and not having the funding to keep it going, so they have asked for Fire/Rescue to include outcomes to be expected. Chief Eggleston stated that he saw a big benefit, because at the end of the day they only had so much time – and any help at all would relieve department leadership to focus on other priorities.

Chief LaBelle said that it was envisioned that these temps would work about 20 hours per week, with about 9 hours spent in the station with leadership, some interaction with FEMS totaling about 3 hours per week, and about 8 hours open time. He noted that it may not be exactly 20 hours, and his hope would be that the role would help them identify some issues and create manuals and other support systems that stations could use for the long-term with their administrative volunteers. Chief LaBelle said that they could possibly hire temp OAs every few years to help figure out the station’s needs, as it was hard currently to have the human resources to go out and figure that out, other than anecdotally.

Chief Haugh stated that it would be helpful for his station just to keep the personnel database up, and Christina had been great about it, but it would be helpful to have some additional support.

Chief Eggleston said that the biggest concern from the Board would be managing expectations as to what Fire/Rescue hoped to get out of the process, and the concern about sustaining the positions.
Chief Haugh stated that he understood that concern as there might be an assumption that the work would be provided for every department.

Chief LaBelle said that a primary objective would be to figure out what those needs actually were, but until they could get down to that level, the assumption was always that more human resources were needed.

6. **Next Meeting**
a. Monday, November 2, 2015 – 1600hrs, ACFR Conference Room

7. **Adjournment**
The meeting adjourned at 1633 hours.
AGENDA TITLE/ISSUE: Fire EMS Board Executive Committee Minutes  
AGENDA DATE: October 5, 2015

MOTION: To approve as is  
MOTION MADE BY: Chief Kostas Alibertis  
SECONDED BY: Chief Dan Eggleston

SUBSEQUENT MOTIONS/AMENDMENTS:

1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALL OF THE QUESTION:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Dan Eggleston (ACFR)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief L. Dayton Haugh (CARS)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Preston Gentry (Crozet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Danny Tawney (Seminole Fire)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Kostas Alibertis (Western Albemarle)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I hereby attest that the foregoing is true and complete to the best of my knowledge.

Tom LaBelle  
Clerk  
10/05/2015  
Date
A meeting of the Executive Committee of the Albemarle County Fire/EMS Board was held on Monday, November 2, 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
Dayton Haugh, Charlottesville-Albemarle Rescue Squad
Preston Gentry, Crozet Volunteer Fire Department
Danny Tawney, Seminole Trail Volunteer Fire Department
Kostas Alibertis, Western Albemarle Rescue Squad

Others in Attendance:
Howard Lagomarsino, Albemarle County Fire & Rescue
John Oprandy, Albemarle County Fire & Rescue
David Puckett, Albemarle County Fire & Rescue

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

a. From the Board: Agenda Additions
Chief Alibertis stated that he would like to add an item regarding the Recruitment and Retention Committee charter.

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

2. Consent Agenda
a. October 2015 Minutes
MOTION: Chief Haugh moved, seconded by Chief Gentry, to approve the Consent Agenda and the October 2015 minutes as presented. The motion passed unanimously (5-0).

3. Fire Rescue System Strategic Plan - update
a. Plan progress
There was no update provided.

4. Unfinished Business
a. FEMSB Work Plan Items/Policy - for Decision/Action
Chief Eggleston stated that there were no policies before them for action, but they would discuss the Fire Corps CSU policy later in the meeting.

b. Volunteer Recruitment/Retention Update
   i. Hollymead, Ivy and Monticello Station Recruitment and Retention Plan – update
   Chief Eggleston stated that Chief LaBelle had provided an update at the FEMS Board meeting the previous week, and said that they were trying to expedite the release process although it had become a bit more complicated with Station 2 and Station 4 in the mix now. He noted that Chief LaBelle had also reported that three of the volunteers from Ivy had been hired by ACFR.

5. New Business
   a. Fire Corps CSU Policy (discussed after item b.)
   Chief Lagomarsino reported that this was a policy that established the CSU officially, which encompassed what Kathyne Presson had been doing. He stated that the policy itself was the establishment of the unit, and one the reasons for having an operations manual instead of spelling out everything in the policy was to make it easier if there were minor tweaks, such as a change in the distance permissible for a CSU person on duty to take a vehicle home – which would require coming before the FEMS Board in order to make the change. Chief Lagomarsino noted that there was a lot more in the policy about definitions, which was at the request of the Fire Corps members because they did not understand all of the terms included. He stated that there was also a checklist as part of the manual, and in the event there was no CSU member on the scene anyone on the scene could use the list. Chief Lagomarsino mentioned that Fire Corps was already doing a lot of these things, and this step just formalized that.

Chief Oprandy asked EC members to provide comments and suggestions to him or Chief Lagomarsino, with a revised version distributed and voted on at the next meeting.

Chief Eggleston asked if they would also accept input on the manual.

Chief Lagomarsino responded that they would, and said that part of the reason for the manual was to inform new members as to what was involved with CSU and provide more written explanations of procedures.

Chief Alibertis asked if they were issuing more than helmet, boots and gloves.

Chief Lagomarsino stated that they were issuing those items and there were flashlights and a radio in the vehicle.

Chief Alibertis asked if it might be reasonable for them to have some form of identification.

Chief Lagomarsino responded that they had sweatshirts that said “CSU” and reflective jackets that did not have identifying markings.
Chief Alibertis asked if it should be included in the manual in terms of what was expected of CSU members.

Chief Lagomarsino responded that it could be included, and added that they also had traffic vests.

Chief Eggleston noted that Chief Lagomarsino had talked about the role of CSU at the graduation of the citizens’ fire academy at Station 2, and the policy and manual were a way to help formalize this.

Chief Lagomarsino added that formalizing the manual would also help establish a schedule and ensure that vehicles were in rotation for those on duty.

b. Helmet and Shield Color
Chief Eggleston stated that at the last FEMS Board meeting, there had been concerns raised that the Quartermaster Committee was getting too detailed about requirements for helmet and shield color, with a combination proposed to define a particular member’s status and skills. He said that there was general consensus among the FEMS Board to keep it simple: red for non-injury, yellow for officers, white for chief officers, and black for firefighters. Chief Eggleston stated that Chief Puckett was going to have a discussion with Nikki Haley as the head of that group to convey to them that FEMS did not want to get into that level of detail.

Chief Puckett responded that from a central supply standpoint, they had just purchased black shields, so if an individual department wanted something different they would need to swap it out directly.

Chief Alibertis asked him to explain why a department would switch out.

Chief Puckett stated that ACFR used it for non-released members as an internal mechanism, using a black helmet with a red shield that said “recruit” or “rookie” or something like that, so that they could be identified in the station more so than on scene. He noted that if someone came in on a different shift, for example, they could be identified as to what level they are capable of functioning.

Chief Tawney explained that at Seminole, his members would go from “dot” or “rookie” to “r-dot,” which was a step in between being released – so they could function as a firefighter with an officer, but that could not be designated with a different color helmet. He clarified that Seminole designated differently those who were not fully released.

Chief Gentry stated that Crozet designated lieutenants with a black helmet and a different color front shield, and he had no problem with going to yellow helmets as long as the red or black lieutenant shield remained on the front.

Chief Tawney said that his station did the same thing.
Chief Eggleston noted that the most critical point was to designate non-IDLH people.

Chief Tawney agreed and said that the rest of it was just officer, firefighter, etc., and his non-released members knew that they had to stay with an officer when they got off of a rig – so it would be easiest to designate officers with yellow and chief officers with white.

Chief Eggleston noted that the “r-dot” aligned with the red shields.

Chief Puckett stated that central supply could not handle individual shields for each department.

Chief Gentry said that he did not have any problem with central supply wanting departments to provide their own shields, as long as they knew what helmets were going to be used.

Chief Alibertis stated that Chief Grandstaff had expressed concern about consistency with the helmet colors, and he did not want shields to be designated.

Chief Eggleston clarified that Chief Grandstaff’s concern had been that this was becoming excessively complicated and difficult to track, so if they just let stations utilize the front shield, they would still have red for IDLH, yellow for officers, white for chief officers, and black for firefighters. He said that Chief Puckett and Nikki Haley were going to discuss this, then she would share the FEMS Board’s desire for a simpler designation with the Quartermaster Committee.

c. Recruitment and Retention Committee Charter
Chief Eggleston reported that FEMS had discussed the possibility of having dinner provided by Atlantic at the FEMS Board meeting in December at Station 2, but Purchasing had vetoed the suggestion due to potential conflict of interest. He stated that it would still be nice to have some kind of potluck dinner since it was close to the holiday season.

Chief Alibertis reported that the Recruitment and Retention Committee had been the first to come up with a charter and presented a copy of the committee’s draft, which he noted had been streamlined from four or five pages down to one. He stated that he envisioned having the charter be a template for the other committees, with a place to designate whether a committee was standing or ad-hoc, and said that he would also like to discuss what constituted a quorum. Chief Alibertis said that he would like for there to be at least a representative majority, so that when an item got to the FEMS Board it at least had majority representation behind it. He cited the Training Committee items related to transport agency priority seating in the PVCC classes, which at the FEMS Board level had been completely turned around so that the majority of spots were reserved for I to P with very few for B to P. Chief Alibertis noted that it was possible that a majority could show up and not represent a majority of the stations or the majority number of members, or the agencies that ran the most calls.
Chief Tawney commented that the problem was that there were very few departments participating in the Recruitment and Retention Committee, which was why the number cited in this was “3.”

Chief Alibertis said that the turnout had actually been good, and this was intended to be a template for all committees, not just R&R. He explained that there were two different numbers, and “3” meant that they could conduct a meeting, with “weighted majority” meaning that they could vote on an item to forward to the FEMS Board for a decision. Chief Alibertis stated that a weighted majority would take into account the number of calls that a station ran, because without that provision small agencies could make decisions that affected much larger ones, without adequate input from those units.

Chief Haugh asked how this could be fixed so that the small stations would support it.

Chief Eggleston commented that small stations would be hesitant to be minimized in this process.

Chief Alibertis stated that it was a difficult position, but it would save the trouble at the FEMS Board because it reduced the risk of it being pushed back and delayed.

Chief Haugh said that requiring it to be a majority would mean that six stations were needed for a vote, so this would reduce the possibility of not having adequate representation.

Chief Alibertis noted that in their bylaws and by ordinance, there was supposedly representation from rescue in all of the votes.

Chief Eggleston responded that they could address the rescue aspects in another way.

Chief Alibertis said that it had come somewhat diluted.

Chief Haugh stated that he could not picture those who would be weighted the least agreeing to be weighted as such, and the intent was to get the majority of stations approve something before it got to the FEMS Board.

Chief Alibertis pointed out that a simple majority would be six out of eleven stations.

Chief Eggleston asked if the committees actually voted to send something forward.

Chief Puckett responded that his committee tried to build consensus on issues and determine the will of the group by the end of the meeting.

Chief Alibertis asked how the Training Committee had arrived at its decision on the training policy for the paramedic program.
Chief Oprandy stated that they could have voted on it, but there were some things that committees did as part of their business that did not get sent up to FEMS.

Chief Alibertis said that it would be nice if there were a representative from the majority stations.

Chief Oprandy said that this was why Chief LaBelle had suggested having a FEMS Board representative as a liaison for each committee, but you did not want committees to feel that they needed to ask permission on everything. He added that before committees put a lot of work into a specific policy or decision, it would be helpful for them to have feedback from the FEMS Board as to whether an item had support. Chief Oprandy noted that at the Training Committee, the demographics of the group had changed from one meeting to the next – so the proposal ended up changing.

Chief Alibertis stated that what they were addressing was how to minimize those situations.

Chief Oprandy asked if the same thing would happen at the FEMS Board with the voting that took place there.

Chief Alibertis responded that it was a one person/one vote system, and he used the analogy of Congress and Senate with everyone able to have input while representing their constituents – but without a minority representation.

Chief Oprandy said that if six stations voted at the committee and those six were also at the FEMS Board, it would be possible for an item to go through with only the smallest stations represented.

Chief Haugh stated that the people were different at those levels.

Chief Alibertis said that not everyone represented at the committee level had a close connection to their chief or the authority to represent their stations.

Chief Tawney stated that the charter states, “Each representative is empowered by their chief to make decisions on behalf of their agency.”

Chief Gentry asked what Robert’s Rules stipulated in terms of majority.

Chief Eggleston responded that it could be a simple majority or super majority.

Chief Haugh said that it could be a majority of those present and voting, or the majority of the whole group.

Chief Tawney stated that it could be defined however they wanted.
Chief Alibertis noted that there was a difference between the majority vote of the stations that showed up versus the majority of the whole group.

Chief Oprandy asked if they could implement an at-large membership.

Chief Alibertis responded that this was for committees, so that structure would be problematic.

Chief Eggleston said that the goal was to prevent the committees from spending a lot of time and moving something forward to the FEMS Board that wouldn’t be supported, and that was why Chief LaBelle had suggested using liaisons.

Chief Alibertis mentioned that there would be a lot of money spent on banners, and that never came to the FEMS Board.

Chief Eggleston stated that it was a careful balance because the committees needed to have some autonomy, but at the same time the FEMS Board position should be considered so that committees don’t get too far off track.

Chief Puckett said that he thought that the charters served to provide direction and guidance to committees as to what power and authority they had at that level – and what needed to go to the FEMS level – but what he was reading did not make that clear.

Chief Alibertis stated that if there was a section that should be added, the committees would have the opportunity on this the following night.

Chief Oprandy emphasized that it was important to establish with the committee chairs what they understood to be the decisions that they owned at the committee level, and which were to be brought forth to FEMS.

Chief Puckett stated that it was essentially a “scope of authority,” similar to how a project scope would be defined.

Chief Alibertis said that it could be a financial scope if there were dollars attached to an item, and asked what other parameters should be addressed.

Chief Eggleston responded that it would be helpful to have the committees deliberate this a bit first and come up with recommendations.

Chief Puckett asked if the Training Committee would have the scope of authority to schedule training classes.

Chief Oprandy said that given what they had been doing for the past year, they would have a better handle on what they needed to clarify in terms of scope.
Chief Alibertis asked if the [Recruitment and Retention] Committee had the authority to speak with vendors about retirement plans, since they had been charged with investigating the retirement plan, and then bring that information to FEMS.

Chief Eggleston responded that they should do their due diligence to talk with people and vet ideas and bring back proposals and options to the FEMS Board.

Chief Alibertis said that perhaps the purpose of the committee is to explore those options and make recommendations.

Chief Haugh stated that he agreed with Chief Oprandy that the committees were the most familiar with what tasks they had done, and they could evaluate those lists and decide what should move forward to FEMS and what shouldn’t.

Chief Eggleston said that they should err on the side of giving the committees more responsibility, so they would remain engaged.

Chief Oprandy stated that there would be decisions made every year such as setting the training schedule, and special project decisions such as the retirement plans.

Chief Alibertis said that they still needed to decide what constituted a majority.

Chief Haugh said that if they were already challenged to get six people to a committee meeting, then it really could kill that committee’s effectiveness.

Chief Alibertis stated that the other side of that was that it pushed the chiefs to send representatives to those meetings.

Chief Puckett said that if chiefs wanted to block something, they could just not send a representative.

Chief Alibertis responded that it would not really be blocked because it would have to come up to the FEMS Board, so a chief would only be blocking it from being resolved before getting to the FEMS level.

Chief Eggleston stated that some committees were better attended than others, and he commented that the EC should focus on roles and responsibilities and expectations, and that would cover about 90% of the concerns – with the understanding that the FEMS Board had the ability not to accept a proposal.

Chief Alibertis agreed, adding that there should be reasonable and consistent quorum standards for the committees – with not all of them having representation from every station.

Chief Eggleston reiterated that the problem they were trying to solve was not having committees send something forward to FEMS that would be kicked back.
Chief Gentry asked what a quorum was for the Executive Committee.

Chief Eggleston responded that it was a simple majority, so three out of five members minimum were required.

Chief Alibertis said that it was reasonable to have six stations as adequate representation at the committee level.

Chief Eggleston asked if it was typical to get that kind of turnout, and noted that they would not have had a quorum for the Operations Committee.

Chief Alibertis said that if a chief did not have anyone to send, the number would become 10 instead of 11.

Chief Eggleston asked how that could be tracked.

Chief Tawney suggested that each year the chiefs at the FEMS Board would be asked to designate representatives for each committee, or forfeit representation at the committee – which would put everyone on the record and force the issue, so that there could not be complaints after the fact that stations were not adequately represented. He said that if they could start generating some consistency with the committees, they should be able to get six different representatives from agencies, with some committees having been more active than others.

Chief Eggleston clarified that the committees could hold a meeting but could not forward a recommended policy unless they had a simple majority.

Chief Puckett asked if there could be a failsafe in the event that a simple majority was not present for two or three meetings consecutively.

Chief Tawney suggested no more than two meetings, and said that having the chiefs identify representatives was a solid idea that forced everyone to be better about their committee involvement. He commented that the committee structure was relatively new and Chief LaBelle was trying to formalize it, so perhaps they could discuss this further at FEMS.

Chief Eggleston said that they could talk about this at a future meeting or worksession.

Chief Alibertis stated that if a committee failed to reach a quorum for two consecutive meetings, the item should automatically go forward to FEMS for review.

Chief Eggleston said that he would share this information with Chief LaBelle and would schedule some time for this discussion at the FEMS Board.

Chief Alibertis noted that the committees were meeting the following night.
Chief Eggleston responded that they could work on scope.

Chief Haugh said that it was important to note that a single committee experience was not reflective of the committees as a whole, and they did not want to spend a lot of time trying to fix a problem that happened infrequently.

Chief Eggleston commented that the more they can communicate to the committees what was expected of them and what their focus was, the better they would become.

Chief Tawney suggested that once per year they should have a committee goal session in which the FEMS Board discussed the goals for each committee.

Chief Alibertis pointed out that they had been dealing with the retirement item for about 10 years.

Chief Eggleston stated that the dynamic regarding retirement systems was the same throughout all fire and rescue systems, with younger members not caring and older ones wanting to address it.

Chief Alibertis said that they should be looking at the supplemental insurance, as several members had maxed out their insurance.

Chief Eggleston responded that Chief LaBelle had talked with the insurance vendor about that, and it would likely be possible to convert over to workmen’s compensation – although that brought up other issues.

Chief Puckett said that the supplemental would pay all the small claims, which was mostly what was brought forward.

Chief Alibertis said that the requirements for workmen’s comp were very different, and those claims could be denied.

Chief Eggleston stated that it really came into effect when there were catastrophic events.

Chief Tawney noted that it was probably standard procedure for the first claim to be denied.

Chief Alibertis commented that the burden was placed on the volunteer, which was not fair.

Chief Puckett asked if that burden was better than bankruptcy.

Chief Haugh stated that the County could probably self-insure for a catastrophic event.
Chief Tawney asked why that wasn’t an option.

Chief Haugh said that the County would probably save money over the long run by self-insuring rather than paying increased workmen’s comp premiums.

Chief Alibertis stated that workmen’s comp brought a lot of issues with it.

Chief Eggleston said that it was burdensome, but when it worked it worked well.

6. Next Meeting
a. Monday, December 7, 2015 – 1600hrs, ACFR Conference Room

7. Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 1651 hours.
A meeting of the Executive Committee of the Albemarle County Fire/EMS Board was held on Thursday, December 3, 2015 at 1935 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
Danny Tawney, Seminole Trail Volunteer Fire Department
Kostas Alibertis, Western Albemarle Rescue Squad

Others in Attendance:
Tom LaBelle, Albemarle County Fire & Rescue
Howard Lagomarsino, Albemarle County Fire & Rescue

1. Fire Corps Policy and Manual

Chief Lagomarsino stated that the chiefs should have a copy of the policy in their packet that lined the changes, and one of the suggestions was to pull out the part regarding what to do about discipline with a reference to change of command – and it was all in the manual, not the policy itself, so the manual can change at any time.

Chief Gentry asked Chief Lagomarsino if he had received any feedback from any of the people that might participate in the program.

Chief Lagomarsino responded that there were only two people involved, and one person said that she had not seen it, so she was given a copy and he had not heard anything from her since.

Chief Gentry stated that they needed to listen to the feedback on things that they liked and didn’t like.

Chief Lagomarsino said that the policy itself adopted the manual, but the manual could be changed even after the policy was adopted without having to go through further review, and it was intentionally done that way.

Chief Tawney commented that he recalled that discussion, and the fact that they would have to go back and change every little item in the policy – so it was easier just to go back and change the manual.

Chief Lagomarsino confirmed that this was the intent.
Chief LaBelle said that working with Chief Lagomarsino, they have taken the Fire Corps from two people to ten – and they recognized the importance of having their involvement and having them feel comfortable with everything, so creating the policy was part of that. He stated that while it could have been off-putting to suddenly have a policy enacted, participants have said that they would like to see some organization to the structure.

Chief Eggleston asked the chiefs if they were okay with moving this forward to the FEMS Board.

The chiefs agreed that they were.

Chief Tawney commented that it was necessary and a good thing for everybody involved.

Chief Lagomarsino said that hopefully with the manual, they would know when someone was available.

Chief Eggleston added that perhaps some of the Fire Corps participants would have an interest in CSU.

Chief Tawney stated that it was a great resource for command, because the Fire Corps personnel would show up and do things that the chiefs and responders did not have the resources, time and expertise to do.

Chief Alibertis said that it was deserving of some structure.

Chief Eggleston stated that he would put something together for the FEMS Board.

The chiefs adjourned their meeting at 1945 p.m.