

**[START OF TRANSCRIPT] ALASKA FIRE STANDARDS COUNCIL NOVEMBER 2020 INTRIM MEETING**

**[00:02:52] Dan Speaker:** Sorry about that, folks. Uh, it's 1:04 PM. We'll call the meeting to order at 1:04. First thing to do is to do a quick- you guys hear me?

**[00:03:08] Hartley Speaker:** I can hear you chair.

**[00:03:11] Jake Speaker:** Yes, we can hear you.

**[00:03:13] Dan Speaker:** Okay, I thought I just saw that I said that I left. Let's do a quick roll call from our seats. Brian Long, on. I know he said he was here. I think he is a guy that doesn't have a name.

**[00:03:43] Sara Speaker:** No, he's got a name. Um, it shows that he's on the phone through the thing he is using phone audio.

**[00:03:51] Dan Speaker:** Well, he's texting me saying he's here. Christian Hartley is here. I see you. Sarah Garcia?

**[00:04:04] Sarah:** I'm here.

**[00:04:06] Dan Speaker:** Sarah Jake bender.

**[00:04:07] Jake Speaker:** I'm here, Dan.

**[00:04:09] Male Speaker:** Excellent. Thank you, Chris Edsel, talked to you earlier. You're here. Got it. Chris Steve there you are.

**[00:04:16] Chris:** I'm here.

**[00:04:18] Dan Speaker:** Excellent, Joe Dingman.

**[00:04:23] Joe:** I'm here.

**[00:04:25] Dan Speaker:** Hi Joe. Thank you. Everyone's eating, eating lunch. Walt Weller?

**[00:04:34] Walt:** I'm here.

**[00:04:34] Dan Speaker:** Thank you all. Appreciate it, Dave Gibbs. I don't see Dave on. Rusby, Firemarshal Rusby, are you on?

**[00:04:52] Rusby:** I'm here.

**[00:04:53] Dan Speaker:** Excellent. Thank you, sir. Dan Grayan is on. We've got Dawn, Dawn thank you for setting up **[00:05:02 inaudible]** with that Mark is on. Our Administrator is on, hi Mark, thank you.

[00:05:11] Mark: Thank you.

[00:05:13] Dan Speaker: Okay. Here it looks like we have Brandon Lewis, Catherine McCoy, Lloyd Nakano, Virginia Mike Michael, Mike Hanson from Alaska, [00:05:27 inaudible], Justin body, Chris Wilkins, and a player to be named later. Did I miss anyone or guest?

[00:05:42] Sara Speaker: There is a JH.

[00:05:46] Jesse: Hey, sorry. This is Jesse Halterman calling from Fairbanks. Uh, just got my, uh, audio working here. I don't know if you can hear me?

[00:05:53] DanSpeaker: Perfect, yes got you Jesse thank you.

[00:05:57] Jesse: Thanks for allowing me to participate.

[00:05:59] Dan Speaker: You bet. All right. Well, thanks visitors for being here. Uh, next step is to approve the agenda. Can I have a motion to approve, this interim meeting agenda, please.

[00:06:16] Chris Speaker: I make a motion.

[00:06:19] Dan Speaker: State your name please.

[00:06:25] Chris: This is Chris I make a motion. Second motion.

[00:06:28] Male Speaker: Is that Christian?

[00:06:42] Dawn Speaker: Was that Chris Edsell or Chris Steeves I missed that.

[00:06:44] Dan Speaker: It was Chris Steeve that made the motion. I believe it was Hartley that, uh, said that they would second.

[00:06:53] Dawn Speaker: Thank you.

[00:07:00] Dan Speaker: Any changes for the agenda now that we have a motion? Hearing none we'll approve the agenda as is, and we'll move to item five, interim business, rural fire protection program, and adoption. To get everyone up to speed a year ago well, a year, a year in a couple months ago at our fall meeting in 2019, we voted to suspend certification of this program until we had a standard that was specific to the actions that we teach in the field that was unique to the rural fire protection program, so that we weren't trying to use a square peg in a round hole. Then we voted to suspend that suspension. We to table that suspension, uh, with a one-year moratorium, that's been extended at the fall meeting of 2020 until the, uh, until January or the end of December. January one, 2021, and this meeting is to discuss further action and direction and updates on

the program itself, where we're at, whether we want to make a motion to change any of the actions that we're moving forward with now, or to continue on the path that we're on. I'm going to guess that the rural fire protection committee chair, Lisa shield would like to probably speak on this, is that correct Lisa?

**[00:09:04] Lisa:** Uh, I'm not really sure what you're asking for, um, submitted the standard and just speeding to hear what you guys have to say, whether you vote on the standard or not, so that I can move forward. Mark might have something to add.

**[00:09:30] Rich:** Hey Dan, its Rich.

**[00:09:32] Dan:** Yes, sir.

**[00:09:33] Rich:** Um, I think, um, the group did a pretty decent job putting this together. Um, it gives us a direction to go. Um, there are probably a few small things we could fret out once Lisa gets the go ahead from the council, but I would support it.

**[00:10:01] Dan:** Thank you.

**[00:10:01] Joe:** This is Joe Dan, but I concur.

**[00:10:07] Dan:** To confirm what we're speaking about is the standard that was delivered for the fall meeting. Is that correct? The standard as written,

**[00:10:19] Dan Speaker:** Uh, standard as written but, uh, I believe that there are some things that we can look at with this program and we're going to allow the work to be done until January, 2021. I would say um, that's the committee work on it.

**[00:10:45] Male Speaker:** **[00:10:45 inaudible]**

**[00:10:46] Male Speaker:** Yes.

**[00:10:50] Male Speaker:** My understanding was there was a subcommittee of some sort or another committee created that was trying to do some work on this in the last week, week and a half, two weeks, maybe. Um, I'm not sure the origin of all that, but I guess I heard some rumors of that going on. Was there recommended changes or, um, probably we need to know about, uh, that happened there?

**[00:11:18] Male Speaker:** Sure. There's what we did was we put together a subcommittee, a steering committee so that we had a liaison between the council and the committee, because there weren't any, uh, sitting council members on the committee that was so we didn't have that connection. We

didn't want that to be the thing that slowed this down. If that's the way to put it. We want it to be able to have representation from the administrator's office, from the council and from the committee. That if there were questions about direction, uh, that was not so much work, but help to keep the work moving. Because when we left the fall meeting, we left with the discussion points were that this is on first blush, doesn't meet the needs that we had requested. Didn't have the information in it that made it Alaska specific. It was trying to take in a, still trying to take language from an FPA and make it fit the work that's being done in rural Alaska. The understanding was that that wasn't adequate and wasn't the wishes of the council, but to make it a true Alaska specific standard that spelled out exactly what they do in the field, uh, and document that and reference it.

**[00:12:52] Lisa:** I just like to point out **[00:12:54 crosstalk]** sitting council member and he's on the committee for this program.

**[00:12:58] Male Speaker:** Can you say that again Lisa?

**[00:13:01] Lisa:** Joe Dang Man is one of the committee members for the rural fire protection standard and he's also a council member.

**[00:13:10] Male Speaker:** Sure, thank you for that. A, we didn't have, we weren't a hundred percent sure, but we were pretty sure and Joe's seat, uh, was expired, not expired, but he's essentially in a terminal position until his seat because he's filling a seat that's not matches his demographic. We were still thinking that we were going to lose Joe essentially.

**[00:13:36] Male Speaker:** Dan, that the subcommittee, the steering committee, um, was there any take away from that last week that would suggest that the standard that was presented to us at the fall meeting does not actually meet the needs of the program?

**[00:14:04] Dan:** I would say so and my answer is, I represent the council as a whole, uh, from what I gleaned from our discussions starting two years ago, was we're looking for a true Alaska specific standard. That is that clearly delineates, what is being taught matches- what is being taught in the field and is specific to what is being done in the field. My understanding from our fall meeting was that this didn't- from our first blush, the comments that were made from the people that had seen it. Uh, and granted, we all had not taken a deep dive into it. That was the point of giving more time and having this meeting was that it didn't do that. That was where we that was my understanding of the direction we left the meeting, the fall meeting.

**[00:15:01] Male Speaker:** Can we get, um, I guess I'm thinking of more like city council meetings where you asked for a staff report, um, in this case, I think you'd sort of

asked that of Lisa if he had anything to say, but I'd like to hear from that council as to how they feel that this meets the needs of uh, rural Alaska.

**[00:15:29] Male Speaker:** **[00:15:29 inaudible]**

**[00:15:48] Male Speaker:** Did you have something Mark?

**[00:15:49] Mark:** Yeah. I didn't know if you guys could hear me or not. I've been trying to get my voice to work here. I do have some input, uh, you know, with **[00:15:59 inaudible]** phone.

**[00:16:02] Male Speaker:** Yes, please.

**[00:16:04] Mark:** Yes. I've had an opportunity, of course I'm the new guy, but still it took the takeaway from our fall meeting. Um, I've taken and reviewed all of the materials and I'm looking at this from maybe two different perspectives. One is, our office has to implement this product. Having it, uh, validated by the council is critical for us. Then on the other side of that is also reviewing it with a critical eye as to, so the meet the intent of what you've asked, I would say yes and no. Yes, in that it does, I've looked at all of the material with the Lisa and her team have developed and actually I'm hoping they actually get a chance to review it in person and sit down here in the next few days. We'll see. The other piece, um, does it necessarily meet a national standard level I'm hearing that you did not want that I'm seeing in the standard that it does by reference? Um, I think that was a good effort. I think it validates, um, being able to go back to, uh, unapproved consensus standards. I'm not a voting member. Um, I'm the guy that's going to work with this program once it's approved or not approved? Um, my, my takeaway at this point is, uh, we've got an 85 to 90%, um, products here that you can in fact work with and meet the needs of rural Alaska and we can give you, uh, give the standards of a reasonable part in the high 90 percentile with an additional review with the steering committee. That would be my recommendation, take that for what is worth.

**[00:18:07] Male Speaker:** Thanks Mark.

**[00:18:17] Rich:** Dan this is Rich, who was placed on the steering committee, if you would?

**[00:18:25] Dan:** Sure so Gordon Descatner, Lisa shield, Brad Paulson and myself and Mark Bramith.

**[00:18:37] Christian:** Chair, this is Christian if I may.

**[00:18:38] Male Speaker:** Yes.

**[00:18:40] Christian:** How many of those members of the steering committee are from a rural community that would be impacted by the standard?

**[00:18:55] Male Speaker:** I would say probably none of them are from a true rural, rural community. They, one of them teaches in the rural communities with the program. One of them was the sort of original oversight of the old program. One of them was the council administrator. One of them is myself as the council chair.

**[00:19:19] Christian:** It's just something to think about. I mean, look at the way that our own body is structured. It might be good to have at least a couple of people on your steering committee that are going to be the most directly impacted because if we're going to steer away from national standards, which personally I do not like to do, um, we're going to want to make sure that we're not setting a standard, that those rural communities necessarily can't move or that they can exceed really easily. We don't want to set the bar too low or too high kind of a thing.

**[00:19:51] Male Speaker:** Sure I hear you except that's not, wasn't the intent of the committee. The subcommittee was there to just provide that liaison and guidance when needed. That's why the council administrator was there because he does have to administer the program. Uh, but the intent wasn't to take the place of the rural fire protection committee itself, which should have all of those people that presented on it.

**[00:20:18]** It was so that if they have- a direction, because it seems like truthfully, if you go back and look in the minutes and I would, I hope that everyone has, or would this direction has been given repeatedly over a long period of time now. I do feel like we're a lot closer. I don't feel like we're there. That's a personal, that's my personal opinion. I'm just one seat. Uh, and, and I'll own that. However, I think that we get wrapped around the axle when we don't meet for six months and we forget the specificities of what we've asked for. The steering committee was to help prevent that from slipping off the plate from Lisa and her committee, having to work in a vacuum without direction or guidance from the council, and then bringing a product forward that the council, uh, isn't familiar with. That was to help just bridge that gap.

**[00:21:17] Male Speaker:** How many other standards have steering committees?

**[00:21:20] Male Speaker:** Zero, but this particular standard is unique in that it is in operation being certified under a 1992 version currently of NSPA 1001, uh, this was flagged because of that, because we're so far out of compliance. And so far out of the normal revision process.

**[00:21:55] Male Speaker:** I understood that. I don't want you, I don't know if you have to repeat all that stuff again, don't worry about that. Um, it just, I don't know. It

seems like having a steering committee on top of a subcommittee that reports to a board doesn't necessarily increase the efficiencies to get that done. Even with that six-month lag, is that not the administrator's job? Would that not be Mark's job would be to keep that committee on task. Now it's being spread to that steering committee is what's happening?

**[00:22:29] Male Speaker:** Uh, the idea was with Mark being new in the office, we were trying to offer that support and assistance for him.

**[00:22:37] Male Speaker:** Okay. What kind of action do you want to take now Chair?

**[00:22:56] Male Speaker:** I'm looking for direction from you. I'm looking for additional input on where, you know, we left with the, as I mentioned, we left with the sort of feeling that this wasn't exactly meeting our needs, but was a lot closer and that we needed more time to review it. We postponed it until January. We wanted to have an interim meeting to discuss it further. Once everybody had a chance to look at the materials. That's where we're at today. We're here to have that discussion. That's our main goal.

**[00:23:30] Dean:** Chair this is Linden and I'm not in my regular office. I'm having a heck of a time trying to find that standard and where I didn't have it printed out and doing a didn't bring it with me. It doesn't appear on the website anywhere. It wasn't included in our packet for this meeting. As far as I know, am I missing something?

**[00:23:55] Male Speaker:** No it was not. I think we, uh, I know I was expecting there to be, uh, perhaps revealing or further newer documents to be attached.

**[00:24:06] Chris:** This is Chris **[00:24:07 inaudible]**. I don't have your email when I can. I have it pulled up right here and I can forward it to you. If you give me your email.

**[00:24:18] Male Speaker:** I can screen share if Dawn wants me to.

**[00:24:24] Male Speaker:** Would that be appropriate chair?

**[00:24:27] Male Speaker:** Of course.

**[00:24:27] Male Speaker:** Thanks.

**[00:24:34] Male Speaker:** All we're talking about is approving the standard, which as I recall is a couple of pages, um, that says, uh, this rural protection program and references certain pieces of NSPA and has a, um an appendix if I'm not probably using the right word, but it's, um, a few edits to those NFPA sections that makes them applicable to what we're doing, but it does

not include all the other PA sections because we don't have the rights to do that.

**[00:25:20] Male Speaker:** How do we overcome that standard when it comes to NFPA, want to IFC then? Because we've referenced directly from that?

**[00:25:30] Male Speaker:** Repeat your question.

**[00:25:32] Male Speaker:** I've heard that comment, made a couple of times that we cannot post because it's not in, we don't have the copyright to, we don't have the rights or permissions from NFPA to use it, but we don't with international fire code ISER. And we post that to the state website on our, um, the Alaska fire life safety code by referencing the standard and then modifying it as locally required. Is that what we're doing here then?

**[00:26:05] Male Speaker:** I would tell you that my understanding of the council's direction was that we were going to write a specific standard to Alaska, not referenced in a PA unless it fit. Uh, and that was the direction that I thought was given was if it fits great, let's reference it. I think in most of the cases, it just doesn't fit. We didn't- so the way I understood the direction from the council was that this would be our first and it's in the minutes, numerous times where it's talking about the first true Alaska specific standards that this is that this references what we do, and it references the materials that we use to teach this. Uh, so that was my understanding. I will say that one of the reasons that Gordon Descatner was on the steering committee was because he has worked extensively with NFPA and, uh, had information on using their materials and getting permission to use— they are generally very willing to share without a copyright issue, if you ask, like, as a lot of people are. Uh, so, that was the intent was something that he could be a, a true assist with is that he's worked extensively in that field

**[00:27:37] Rich:** Chair this is Rich.

**[00:27:37] Male Speaker:** Yes.

**[00:27:39] Rich:** I could be wrong, but I thought that's what this is. Um, what Lisa and the group has put together here is actually, um, what they are teaching. This is where they're drawing each and one of those, those, those portions that they do, this is where they're drawing it from. Is that correct Lisa?

**[00:28:04] Lisa:** Yes, so my understanding from not just the meeting in **[00:28:07 inaudible]** but also all the other meetings that I have been, you know, listening to as the clerk for all those years, um, was that we didn't want to be using a standard that was old reference to NFPA is that we wanted



to update it to NFPA. So what we teach in the communities at this moment, because that was the very first thing I did when I took this position and could actually do my job, was to update all of our curriculum to meet exactly what was in the old standard, um, as it applies to our rural communities. It does, it fits the needs exactly to what we were doing in our communities. This update to this standard, all we did was we took the old NFPA, the old standard, um, cross-referenced it to the most applicable NFPA standards. 1500, 1001, 1035, 1021, 1072, and found the current updates for everything, and then just swapped them over so that, um, yeah, so that we can have everything current to the current NFPA standards for what we're doing.

**[00:29:35] Chris:**

This is Chris apologize for not being at the last meeting, but, uh, I see the harm in referencing the NFPA standard, that, where we came up with the items that we're teaching, um, that way it shows that we didn't just come up with this on our own, that we're using some sort of reference, uh, out there and that, you know, we're not certifying to an NFPA standard. We're not giving an AppSec seal for this. There's no pro board seal it's called the Alaska standard for rural fire protection. So I don't, I don't see the problem with referencing the NFPA standard, where the information came from. It just shows that we did good research in my opinion.

**[00:30:27] Male Speaker:**

This is **[00:30:29 inaudible]** Dean. Um, I think our, you know, our previous intents and maybe the discussions that we've had about an Alaska specific standard, um, I think those are coming from the council. Then we charged a committee to come up with the standard and the committee made up of people who use this and who live in the rural areas, um, decided that the best way to do it was to take the bits and pieces of the NFPA's various standards that they use and put it together in something, um, and say that that's functioning for them. I guess I'm going to defer to that committee as being the experts. If they feel that this is, that works best as a standard, um, I don't know who I am to get in front of that standard away. I would support approving this the standards so we can move forward.

**[00:31:37] Lisa:**

I would like to clarify part of this process where I think there might have been, there might be some miscommunication or misunderstanding happening. Um, I'm all for having this whole process, based off of, you know, the standard that we have previously, it worked for 20 years. You know, I agree with Steve Shrek when he went to the council, this council multiple times and said, we really don't need to do an update because this is what's meeting the needs in rural Alaska, it's written in a format that is understandable. It gives enough information to really articulate out everything that we're supposed to be doing. Uh, but I also can see the other side of it, where we want to be updating it to the current standards for NFPA; if this truly is just an Alaska standard and we don't have to reference anything to NFPA, then keeping the standard that's

been working and proven to work for 20 years would have made sense, just take away any reference to NFPA.

[00:32:41]

That becomes the document that we use. Um, you know, did it need to have some updates? Yes, because in our opinion, we need to have use fire setting awareness level. We need to have a level for recruitment and retention, parts for recruitment and retention, within a program we need to have, you know, a number of different things that we just didn't have in the program previously written into the program. That process had already been started for the curriculum. I don't have the, this standard referencing a curriculum because the curriculum that we're using is the curriculum that's on the old standard, because that's, what's been approved by the council. And that's what I have to continue using. When I go into these rural communities with my instructors to teach until the standard is updated. I can't cross reference this into the curriculum because the curriculum is not updated.

[00:33:34]

If the council is not going to accept this standard, then I'll continue to work off of the old standard because that's been working. It works really well. It meets all the needs that we have with some updates that I would like to put into it. I've been an advocate for updating this program also, but not necessarily; trying to, um, wedge it into current NSPA standards. My understanding was that the council, this body, all of you requested specifically that this standard reference, current NFPA, um, chapters where applicable, and when you have to change, one word from, you know, forcible entry to forcible access, you know, otherwise it fits, all the things that we're teaching fits, if it's called access and not entry as an example. That's not what the council wanted. I don't have a problem continuing to work on this program, but I've got to have something that I'm working with in the communities, as we continue to use the program, because the program is in use currently, I'm leaving in less than a week to go do the VCSO Academy. I can't, you know, now I'm going back to shore up the curriculum because I've got components of the curriculum that are not, that we were going to remove.

[00:35:17] Female Speaker:

Hello, can you hear me?

[00:35:20] Male Speaker:

Yes, you are a little gobbled up.

[00:35:30] Sarah:

I think part of this issue is that we have something that we are referencing like we are not making that's standard that [00:35:31 inaudible]

[00:36:08] Male Speaker:

Correct. That, was one of the concerns that was, did you guys all hear Sarah?

**[00:36:13] Male Speaker:** Chair could you repeat I had a real hard time. If you could summarize or repeat for us, that'd be great.

**[00:36:22] Male Speaker:** What she is saying is one of the things that we've stated, uh, in previous meetings is that the issue here is that when we're talking about reference materials where it's A, let's, let's be very clear. We are not trying to take away anybody's existing programs or the reference materials that they are teaching from. We're saying we need to update this to a current standard that can happen on a separate and parallel track. We're not voting to tell you to quit training with the materials that you're using now. We're saying we shouldn't be certifying programs, uh, with a state certification until we meet our own standards. The training can continue. The training materials that you're using can continue. The question was, should we be certifying these programs if the standard isn't following our own internal policies for update certification and review.

**[00:37:25]** To that point, what Sarah was saying was that that's why the reference materials matter in this case, because if the standard is 20 years old, are the materials 20 years old? What are the materials? Uh, these are questions that typically don't come up at the standards council level, they get handled in committee. The reason that happens is because the standard revision process for pretty much every other standard, we use have something that every person is familiar with and can go and look at because it's published. When those materials are published, most a lot of our council members come from obviously fire backgrounds. They're familiar with the materials. There's a general consensus that we understand what we're talking about when we talk about additions of books, coming out, test banks and such when we do a standards revision and how that matches up with additions of curriculum texts and things like that, this program is unique that doesn't have any of those. We and the council hasn't seen those materials. This is why it rose to the level that it's rows of review, just because this one's different. It doesn't have, we don't have that same, uh, communal amount of base knowledge in this program that we do with any of our other programs. I would say there are some that come a little closer, but nothing quite like this, because it's because it's unique because it's not a national standard.

**[00:39:09]** This is not our normal run of the mill let's update, fire instructor, uh, NFPA 1041. It's just not the different animals. I think that we, we owe it to ourselves to take it seriously. This was a big task. We know that it's a big job. I think it's a noble one. I think it's really important for us all to make sure that we understand what it is that we're committing to when we say yes or no, uh, this program is affecting a lot of communities in a very positive way, but we want it to be the best it can be. I think that's what Lisa wants for us, what our committee wants. That's what we want. We all want the same thing. We just need to make sure that we're

going about it in the correct way that we are, uh, putting a standard on the streets that we're all very comfortable with and that we believe in.

**[00:40:09] Male Speaker:** If we were to take action, this is, would be to approve the standard, which then would direct the committee to complete the curriculum, the skills teach that test questions, all that created that task questions, all that sort of stuff that would happen after approval of the standard. Correct?

**[00:40:36] Male Speaker:** Correct, that's exactly what would happen. However, as I mentioned before, what is different about this one is that, uh, that can only happen as long as it's understood that those are two separate parallel tracks, meaning, uh, that work can continue on an update and uh, new standards, new updated materials. I don't think that that product should be a certified product. If that work is still being done. Again I'm saying me, I have my own opinion on this. Of course, I'm just one compliment, but that was the direction that the council has given previously. I'm just reiterating it. If the council has changed their direction, uh, then that's as a council, that's what we do. We hash this out, we discuss it. If direction changes, then we do a few changes. From an administrative point of view, this came because we had the previous administrator who said we are in no way close to compliance with the program and it needs to be fixed. He brought that to the council. The council agrees. That administrator isn't here anymore. We have a new administrator, but they have the same responsibility. Ultimately it's going to fall on that administrator to be able to sign off on that program and say, yes, I believe in it. If this works, I'm comfortable with how this works in our revision profits and how it looks.

**[00:42:05] Sarah:** This is Sarah.

**[00:42:07] Male Speaker:** Yes, go ahead Sarah.

**[00:42:11] Sarah:** My understanding is that we've had **[00:42:13 inaudible]** to certify this program unless it's not **[00:42:19 inaudible]**

**[00:42:39] Male Speaker:** Sarah is there a way for you to turn down your volume or something on your phone? You're coming across garbled.

**[00:42:47] Male Speaker:** It's like your gain is too high. If you're using a microphone, like the microphone is too close.

**[00:42:54] Male Speaker:** Any chance you can try that again and hold the mic a little further away or something.

**[00:43:06] Christian:** Chair this is Christian, while she's working on that. Um, I think if I am, please feel free to re-educate because I can be just as forgetful as

anybody else. I remember the discussions when they very first started. I remember the discussion about how out of date it was that it was not meeting current firefighting standards based on all the other certifications that we issue everything that we issue is based on an NFPA standard. So that was, I think part of the problem is the fact that that specific standard wasn't Alaska specific standard and the previous direction was to try to get it more in line with the national standards so that there was less, not necessarily liability, but less burden on the council to update an internal standard. I think it would behoove us to consider separating the Alaska specific standards entirely from the ones where, NFPA 1001, we're going to adopt that.

**[00:44:08]**

We are going to do pro board if sex certification requirements NFPA 1002, will we have an Alaska specific standard like this? I can't think of any others just to throw it out there. We might have a specific standard on wildfire firefighting in Alaska that is different from NFPA. Like don't know the standard number for that 77, 1077, but maybe rather than trying to modify everything to meet the NFPA standards like you were talking about. We had a previously established standard. It's still being taught. It's being certified at this point because it was still being taught to the VPS and into the other rural communities. Just update that standard to what us as a council feel are the professional standards we would expect out of that program. I mean, that's all our mission is to establish professional standards. It's not; our mission is not to just adopt professional standards that are available on the shelf, but to establish professional standards. There's no reason that we can't create our own without having to reference directly the NFPA.

**[00:45:29] Male Speaker:**

Uh, that's correct and that was my understanding was that was our direction coming out of the fall meeting, uh, coming out of the meetings before that.

**[00:45:40] Male Speaker:**

Not in an officer's role, not in a leadership role, I've been hearing both messages. I've been hearing it for both sides of that yes it's said Alaska specific standard. Then in the following sentence will be mentioned where we should meet the national standard, but its Alaska specific and it goes back and forth. Apparently I need to answer my phone.

**[00:45:59] Male Speaker:**

I will say this is why we're here. This is why we're meeting. We need clarity of direction that I thought we had. We need to know what that clarity is. My understanding is that the clarity and the clarity I delivered through the steering committee was just that. This needs to be a truly a Alaskan standard. The NFPA 1001 that was written specifically with levels, starting with firefighter one and moving upwards does not meet the needs of what we're teaching in rural Alaska. It is specific to requisite knowledge. That is not true requisite knowledge of what we're doing in rural Alaska. It's the standards; the intent of the standard doesn't meet our intent when we're teaching the rural fire protection

program. That was super clear, was what we should be working on then is an Alaska specific standard that says, here's what we do.

**[00:47:03]**

Christian is, right we don't have many of these, but coming out of the fall meeting, we were pretty clear that this will be the first one actually coming out of fall 2019. We said, this will be the first true Alaska standards, which was pretty exciting. Uh, and yes, exactly in our bailiwick right where we're supposed to be, which is not just adopting, but creating. To that end, that's where I thought we were going. That is what I've been supporting is developing a true specific to rural Alaska standards. I think that would give it the most benefit and clarity to the people that have to teach it.

**[00:47:43] Male Speaker:**

So did the steering committee and the other committee meet and have these discussions? I heard the question. I apologize. I don't remember hearing an answer.

**[00:47:54] Male Speaker:**

We have emailed back and forth on, A here is what we're looking for. Uh, so I, to me, I consider that process ongoing Lisa and I spoke about whether we should postpone this meeting because it was coming up quickly, but we determined not to postpone that we would push forward. Uh, but the fact is we still have, we still have until January, and I have to go back and look at the notes on whether it says January one or January 30th or if we were that specific. Again, this is where I get frustrated folks, bear with me. None of this has anything to do with what's being taught right now. It has to do with the certification of the program, which I don't in my, again, just one council member's opinion is not the thing that matters the most here. What matters is getting the standards together and making it a quality standard. I think that from the administration standpoint, the certification part is what they have to put their name on. When they put their name on it, they represent all of you as the standards council. And that was an issue that brought us here today.

**[00:49:05] Rich:**

Hey, Dan, this is rich.

**[00:49:07] Dan:**

Yes.

**[00:49:08] Rich:**

Do we have a list of where this doesn't meet the requirements? Have you guys got that far? Um, I guess what I keep hearing from, from, from Lisa and Mark is this part here that we see does meet what they need out there. Now, Lisa has shared with us, there's some additional things, um, that potentially need to be added. Um, I think, and I don't mean to speak for Lisa so she can jump in here. Um, we need to be very specific, um, maybe in a written format when we go back to them. They understand exactly what it is they're asking we, the committee are having them do. I think we've lost something, in there. I see Lisa raising her hand jump in Lisa.

**[00:50:09] Lisa:** After **[00:50:12 inaudible]**, that is exactly the question that was asked of the administrator. Gordon is a part my team for this. He has been reviewing this stuff as we've been moving forward. This was the understanding, that I had, um, not a miscommunication and understanding that all of the conversation for all of this time has been, we need to be referencing current NFPA standards. If that NFPA standard does not line up correctly, then we need to show the alteration for it, which is why the annex is there. If, the direction had been, create a completely separate standard that has nothing to do with NFPA that belongs only to Alaska. And why would I undo something that's worked for 20 years? Why would our committee do that? We would add some new information to it, but we would have kept the standard as is and put more information in it without referencing anything NFPA.

**[00:51:16]** I think that, you know, Sarah never repeated what she said, but I did pick up what she had said. She said the entire point was, um, to reference NFPA so that we have some things that we are just not creating something out of, nothing of whatever we feel like creating. Um, and that's why we needed to reference in NFPA. I'm getting mixed messages from the council when I go back and look at the minutes because I have, I have scrutinized the minutes to try to get some kind of clarity. It says that we need to, my understanding is that we need to update this to current NSDA standards and make it Alaska specific. There is no standard out there that is NFPA, that mixes, or that we adopt as a council.

**[00:52:09]** As Alaska, when I say we, I mean, Alaska, we don't adopt parts of all of us different standards and put them into one specific standard. My guidance that I had from the previous administrator plus everything from those meetings is that this is unique to Alaska because it does pull in all these different components two of the different NFPA standards. In one document, if this isn't what we should be doing, then I have no problem using the old one because it meets everything that we need to be doing. I would just put some updates in it. And if it doesn't have to reference NFPA, then don't take that reference out. Um, on a side note, um, just because I'm on the record right now, I think it's inappropriate for my peer to be directing what I should or shouldn't be doing, um, as a council member.

**[00:53:01]** Um, because there's this mix information that's coming from the council and then, you know, my peer in my own office. Um, that's a side note, but this comment that if I'm teaching something, that's not a part of the standard that it needs to see things certified immediately, I'm not teaching something. I never said that I was teaching something outside of the standard. What I said was we are teaching to that old standard because that's the standard that's been approved. And I have to continue teaching to that standard until this one is done. Adding

supplemental stuff doesn't take away. I can add supplemental stuff. It doesn't take away from what we're doing.

[00:53:45] Joe:

This is Joe.

[00:53:47] Male Speaker:

Hey, Joe, we're still waiting to hear from Sarah. I think she called back in. She was next in line.

[00:54:02] Sarah:

I'm on the phone. Can you hear me?

[00:54:05] Male Speaker:

Yes. Uh, so a couple of things, my original point was that if we were using a document that was referencing old material, that old material had been updated, it would stand to reason that we would update ours accordingly. Um, I asked the clarifying for us to have something clarified in terms of what we were actually teaching now. Mark had referenced to teaching BCSO Academy, new material. Are we, certifying? Are we putting an old stamp on new material, or, what are we doing here? I think their original thing with whether or not we were going to continue to certify to what we were considering an old standard. Um, and I feel like we've gotten lost in the mix here.

[00:55:01] Male Speaker:

Uh, correct. That is what we're here to talk about is the program, how the program is being developed. The original intent was to not certify the program anymore until it was updated to a standard that the council was happy with and willing to put their stamp and name on.

[00:55:26] Male Speaker:

That's what we voted. We voted to keep certifying until January.

[00:55:33] Male Speaker:

Correct.

[00:55:44] Male Speaker:

I would like to get in line to speak here if Joe needs to go-.

[00:55:49] Male Speaker:

Joe, you are up.

[00:55:52] Joe:

I just wanted to say that we're looking at two different things are NFPA standards, professional standards, and that we need to run through this line by line, make sure that all our NFPA standards were up to date. Instead of re-wording NFPA standards just through that done in Alaska professional standard that we can all agree on. Um, so separate those two, we've got two different things we're looking at right up your, your NFPA standard and then as an addendum, so the Alaska professional standard.

[00:56:37] Male Speaker:

Thanks, Joe. Uh, that was I still believe that was the direction that the council gave. Uh, I know that that was the message that I had received from the fall meeting and the message that I forwarded with the



steering committee. I still think that's the right way to go, but that's for all of us that decided. Go ahead Dave.

**[00:57:03] Dave:**

I guess I'm just seeing, I'm hearing thing that we want to do a Alaska specific standard that meets NFPA or that, um, I guess we're saying it doesn't have to meet NFPA is what I'm hearing some people say, but I like what the council, what the committee has done by utilizing those reference standards rather than having, you know, a bunch of new language. I guess it's what I do in my business. Uh, you know, my day job um, you utilize those, uh, reference, uh, you know, the reference standards, the codes you use those and modify as appropriate. I feel we've done that in this and that this is an Alaska specific standard. Uh, I'm not real familiar with the Alaska professional standards. Maybe that's kind of saying the same thing, for that second page of the annex, I don't know.

**[00:58:09] Male Speaker:**

I don't know if anybody else is next in line, but this is Chris Hemsworth. I agree with Long Dean, you know, that we want to create an Alaska specific standard and referencing the multiple NFPA standards from different curriculums. Um, I think that is a smart way to do it. I think we have a draft, um, of an Alaska specific standard because this isn't, it's not just one NFPA standard, it's multiple one pulling the Alaska specific things that we can use referencing the standard from NFPA. It shows that, like somebody said, we we've done the research and we've looked and pulled it from a national standard, but compiling multiple different standards. I agree and I think that you know, this is a good start to, an Alaska specific. Ron, I'm not super familiar with the Alaska rural fire protection standards. Um, you know, but that's just my thought on it.

**[00:59:11] Chris:**

Hey Dan, this is Chris, Steve. Um, I just want to verify that I heard, I want to make sure I understood it right when Mark, at the beginning of the meeting, when we were talking about it, he said as written 85, 90%, this is a standard that he can work with some minor tweaks. Is that correct, Mark?

**[00:59:43] Mark:**

Yes, that's right.

**[00:59:46] Chris:**

Okay. Thank you for clarifying. I think- I've heard Dan make the same point multiple times. I've heard other people make the same point multiple times. Are we at a point where we there's an action that we can take or are we still discussing?

**[01:00:18] Male Speaker:**

Dan I think you're muted.

**[01:00:23] Dan:**

Sorry about that. Uh, this meeting is specifically for this discussion folks and it doesn't need to be adversarial. That's what we're here for. I hope that that's how you're all taking it. The intent was that each of you

would have a much bigger chance to do a deep dive into the program. Uh, the documents that came out because the concern was that we didn't have a lot of time to look at those document prior to stepping into, uh, that meeting. Here we are and what I'm hearing is that there's still people saying, I didn't see that. Or haven't seen, I worry a little bit about that because I want you to understand, I think all we talk about when we talk about having an Alaska specific standard is writing a standard that is specific to what we teach in the field for rural fire protection.

**[01:01:14]:** This document that we have in front of us, the rural fire protection document references directly in NFPA in numerous cases, there are a few that are asterisks. Those asterisks are where they've modified slightly some of the language, which I think on the ones that they modified helped some, I still don't think it answers every question, but it answers some of them. There is many that aren't, that I don't think are, uh, specific to how we do business in the field in rural Alaska. At least not my understanding from talking to people that teach in rural Alaska it doesn't seem like the way that this was written or the intent behind the language here and how it was written matches up well. That's the concern. If you look at them, I'm sure that that, that helps some, right. If you haven't looked at it, you should, because that's, this is what we're putting our name to, and this is what we're signing off on.

**[01:02:29] Female Speaker:** I have a question.

**[01:02:31] Male Speaker:** Perhaps we just want to get closer— yes who has a question/

**[01:02:34] Lisa:** Me Lisa.

**[01:02:35] Male Speaker:** Sure.

**[01:02:36] Lisa:** Um, you know, the instructors that I have are all on this committee. Um, and so I guess my question is when you say that, the people that you're talking to are saying that they're teaching in rural Alaska and the program isn't lining up with what we're teaching. I guess I'm concerned about that because, since I took this position, we have, um, created a curriculum that is, has continuity to it. The instructors that I use are a part of my committee; they've been a part of revising that curriculum as we use it and perfecting it to meet the standard that we had previously. I guess as the program coordinator, it concerns me that there are people that say that they're teaching this program in rural Alaska, and it doesn't meet their needs. I'm curious as to where that's coming from. Typically, you're meaning...

**[01:03:41] Male Speaker:** Not, what I said at all, not what I said at all. Sorry for the misunderstanding. What I said was that the NFPA standards that are

referenced, don't meet what you're doing in the field. I guess it's just what you're teaching and what you're teaching from. I believe addresses the needs of rural Alaska. I don't think that it matches the intent of many of the NFPA standards that are being referenced.

**[01:04:12] Lisa:** Well, I hear that. I think that's why we have an asterisk it was my understanding that annex and, making modifications to those specific components are, um, was the whole point. There are things on there that we can do. Um, you know, if you read through organization, the fire department, and maybe it would help if I pull up the reference document I'm, um, we use, because that reference document has all of the verbiage that, if somebody above me, to include, the fire Marshall or someone says, you can take the information and put it directly, into the standard, um, and get a document from NFPA that allows me to cut my face into our Alaska standards. I would love to do that because as it is now, I don't like this document doesn't have any details in it because I've got to go back to my reference document where I kind of know  
**[01:05:18 inaudible]**

**[01:05:39] Male Speaker:** You're kind of breaking up Lisa.

**[01:05:49] Joe:** This Joe, just so you know, you completely lost all connection. We lost about the last minute.

**[01:05:58] Lisa:** I'm just saying, I'm going to pull up the reference documents that we've been using.

**[01:06:12] Male Speaker:** Lisa, you're probably running short of bandwidth, try shutting the camera off and maybe you it'll clear up

**[01:07:12] Male Speaker:** Joe did you have something while we wait for Lisa to come back?

**[01:07:20] Joe:** Yes, I think what you're trying to say, Dan, is that we're referencing 1001. There's not a firefighter one program. Don't reference the standard. We need to reference the whole thing. Um, and for 1002, because a lot of rural villages don't have driver operators um, is that what you're trying to say?

**[01:07:44] Dan:** Uh, I'm not saying, I'm saying we shouldn't reference a document that doesn't fit. Uh, the standard, I don't know how you, how well you guys can see that screen was there are, just places where, uh, let's just grab any of them. Uh, and tell me that you believe that the intent of rural firefighting in Alaska includes the scope of NFPA 1001 for firefighter two, for fo-foam firefighting and flammable liquids fires. Uh, I understand that a lot of the villages have the TriMet unit, but I also don't believe that that standard was written with the same mindset that we have in rural Alaska. I don't think that that standard is a direct bolt

up, but it's there and it's written and it says, this is what we're doing. I don't understand how that can; can directly, build up if that makes sense. I mean, that's, that's one example. Uh there's numerous- like that.

**[01:09:01] Male Speaker:** If we're going to reference the standard and we don't want to part and parcel it.

**[01:09:05] Male Speaker:** If we're going to, well, I don't mind part and parcel at all. Actually I absolutely don't. That was the original, the original direction was referenced what fit. I felt like that clarity got lost because we said, hey, if it meets 1001 great, but what happened was that they said, okay, then we're going to reference 1001. No, we said, if it sits, I don't believe that it does in most cases, that's the concern. Uh, we said yes if it fits use it.

**[01:09:36] Male Speaker:** We take a standard and we just highlight what's the protocol applicable, and what's not?

**[01:09:42] Male Speaker:** More important than that. You know, there were examples that I've given before where the intent is not the same as, as the original thing. You talked about NFPA 1002, we have references to two drafting, uh, so to speak to your water supply stuff, that is not commensurate with a way that perhaps that's being taught to rural firefighters, because there's nothing in NFPA 1001, there's nothing in the curriculum for NFPA 1001 specifically that talks about setting up a mark, three pumps in a pond grafting with a fire apparatus in NFPA 1002 but it does make sense, like, but we're teaching people that, and that's great. We should be teaching people that but we should be referencing what documents we are using to write those standards. Is it, are we using a forestry document that probably has that very well fleshed out? Are we referencing that as our basis and saying, here is what we have and how we do that job. That's how we should be writing our standards specific to what we're teaching in the field.

**[01:10:57] Male Speaker:** Now I completely understand what you are talking about, that's why we built a document we can take things out and put other things in.

**[01:11:08] Dan:** Yes.

**[01:11:09] Male Speaker:** Okay.

**[01:11:11] Dan:** I hope that makes sense. Uh, anybody else please weigh in? This is, where this conversation started a very long time ago.

**[01:11:19] Sara:** This is Sarah.

[01:11:20] Dan: Yes.

[01:11:21] Sarah: Can you hear me? I think this is what Chris said earlier, and this is what I tried to say at one point. I think it got messy, but we don't want to pull things out of thin air. We should have some sort of reference document, whatever that may be, but creating something from like, to say we are creating something from scratch. I don't think, I think, we need to have something to back this up, like we can create the standard, but you have to have references to things that have been tried, true but all tested.

[01:11:52] Male Speaker: I think that's accurate as far as where the information comes from that we're going to use it to teach from. That to me is the reference document that we referenced, that we pull our instructional material from, but it can be referenced as out with the standards as well.

[01:12:36] Male Speaker: We make a motion on this or?

[01:12:39] Male Speaker: That is what is going to happen if- do we have a prepared document to take an action on or do we need to make a motion to postpone again?

[01:12:51] Male Speaker: The document you have is a document in front of you now on the screen.

[01:13:05] Male Speaker: If there's more work to do then we need to allow them time to do the work. From what- gathering from Joe, and then from Mark's comments early on, you know, if it's an 85, 90% document, I think we should have a hundred percent document before we're approving it. If there is work to do then I concur that we need to do the work. I think the, to me the question was, is this the beginning of it? Or was this just a trip down the wrong path? We need to start over with something else that looks more like, uh, all the words that are in NFPA, but don't use the number, but all the words of an Alaska standard in one document is going to be a 30-page document. Nowhere does it reference anything else, but if you looked at it real closely, you would notice that this is the same language that came from somewhere else. You would see, um, you know, bits and pieces of other standards that you recognize. Either you can personally add words in there and don't reference where it came from, or you can, you know, and make the little modifications you want, or you can start from what we have in front of us. Here is all the bits and pieces that we're adopting, except with these changes. I think the basic question was, which path did we want to go down?

[01:14:44] I feel that, since they've gone down this path already at, I think it's the right way to go. Then we, uh, for more changes to be done, then we'd give them time to make more changes.

**[01:14:56] Male Speaker:** Chair if I may, how was this only an 80% document? I missed that portion. I must've been while I was on my phone call.

**[01:14:56] Male Speaker:** Sure. I can answer that.

**[01:15:11] Male Speaker:** Go ahead, Mark.

**[01:15:12] Mark:** Yeah, 80, 85%. Um, comment was recognizing the fact that not everything bolts up as smoothly as perhaps you would like to see it with more eyes on it than I can obviously with more eyes on it, but that will happen in, uh, in the second revision. My point is the fact that if there is enough bolting up and again, you have to remember too, is that when you go out in the field and see if you're teaching to a standard and they're going to make the variances and allowances based on what's available in the community, we cannot write a standard to every single situation we're going to find in every single Alaska community, we have to create a foundation document. That was my perspective going in granted. I'll readily admit I don't have the background of this, action but you know, looking at this from the perspective of, can we work with this? If I can get something along the lines of attentive of approval to move forward. I think we can with the steering committee, being able to take that technical expertise and look at, um, you know, with whether it bolts up smoothly or, if we have some variance over and it needs more attention that that's where that, can you go back to the, the original committee? Um, I hope that answered the question. Um, trying to keep away from anything too declarative.

**[01:16:46]** What I have and again, everyone has a chance to read through all of this either- I have, I've read through every single line. Um, if I had any significant concerns with moving forward, I bring them up.

**[01:17:02] Chris:** Hey Mark, this is Chris Steve, just a question. Would you say the 10 or 15% left would be minor administrative changes that could be worked out after a standard was accepted, or is it stuff that you think we would as a council really need to look at and approve those changes?

**[01:17:28] Male Speaker:** No the concerns. I guess that keeps me from saying a hundred percent. Um, so some of it I'll say half of it is administrative. The other half would be, um, the applicability to, drawing off of the standard towards what they were teaching it in the field, in my personal unfamiliarity with those specifics. It's very few items in that regard, if it were approved, we move forward, in the process of developing or creating a final product for delivery in the field. I think that would be the appropriate time to rev up those loose ends because we can sit here and spend over a year, trying to get long. And I'm going to look at things different from you or from anyone else. I think 85%, my opinion, again, I'm not a voting member, but in my opinion, it's something I can work- that answer your question.

- [01:18:41] Male Speaker: Uh, that clarified what I was asking it to me yes.
- [01:18:47] Rich: Hey Dan its Rich.
- [01:18:50] Dan: Yes, sir.
- [01:18:53] Rich: Hopefully clarify, um, what Lisa and her group has put together here, as we look under the general knowledge and skill requirements, this is what they're teaching and we're all in agreement with what they're teaching your point as I understand it is back to the NFPA line of that. Does it really match up? What I'm hearing Mark saying is the general knowledge and skills is correct, and this is what we should be teaching. We just need to clarify where we're pulling our standard from and making it an Alaskan standard where it needs to be and where it does line up with NFPA so be it and leave it there. Is that correct from you what you understand?
- [01:19:57] Male Speaker: I believe so. I think that the big concern is that the standard currently referenced are not in line with what's actually being [01:20:11 **inaudible**] nor are the standards of reference now in line with the intent of the standard as we referenced it.
- [01:20:33] Christian: Sarah this is Christian-.
- [01:20:38] Male Speaker: Hold on one second Sarah was talking, but she had some feedback Sarah first, then Christian.
- [01:20:45] Sarah: Can we just clarify, Mark, you made a comment, um, what for what is being taught is every class for lack of a better word being taught the exact same way? It's if there's, so I guess my point is a standard is a standard. Everyone gets that for the training record. For example, everyone should have everything marked off on that training record. Is there any reason that wouldn't be the case?
- [01:21:17] Joe: This is Joe, what we'll try. I haven't taught his courses yet out in the villages, but from what I understand from Lisa is that they'll go out into the village like a day early, find out what their capabilities are. If there are things on that, uh, standard that don't meet, that they don't have in that village. Then they don't teach that, they have to find out what their capabilities are, adjust that program to that village.
- [01:21:56] Lisa: Can I speak, this is Lisa.
- [01:21:59] Male Speaker: Yes.
- [01:22:03] Lisa: Yes, for the most part, everything in the program on the training record is being taught in every community. The variance is in this happens all

the time. This is the most applicable scenario. They have no capability to do foam because they don't have compressed air systems. We teach them, we have a component in the knowledge component where we talk about foam. We do it fairly briefly because they may get access to a cask unit. They may try to purchase one. They need to have a basic understanding of how foam works. Can we mark off on the training records that we went outside and sprayed foam or simulated spraying foam? No, because they have no system to do that with that is the most common scenario. Sometimes it's, we're teaching because they've got a water tank or they've got one that they're using on their roads, for keeping the dust down.

**[01:23:13]**

They're going to use that at a fire, um, so we have to, teach them all of the components of the knowledge level for water supplies, but they don't have a nine horsepower pumps. We are not going to do hands-on skills with the nine horsepower pump because they don't have it. We have to use their water truck and figure out how to help them get water out of that truck to spray towards the fire or to spray around that fire to keep it contained. Those are the only variances that we're really running into. Um, is it possible that in the future we could have a fire department, um, or a community that pays for us to come into their community and teach them this program? They have no equipment at all the best possible, but then we're going to have to look at that and go, how much can we teach and how much skills can we teach and would they be able to get certified after that or not? Likely in that scenario, we may not be able to certify them. It doesn't mean that we don't use the program that we have and use the standards that we have.

**[01:24:29] Male Speaker:**

I would agree with that a hundred percent in that doesn't mean that you have to certify training, and we don't want to ever deny somebody training, but they may not be able to achieve a level of certification that happens all the time.

**[01:24:46] Male Speaker:**

Thanks for clarifying Lisa.

**[01:24:52] Lisa:**

Joe is right. Part of the problem with this is that we have to get there early because we can't even do these assessments over the phone. We have to do them in person. We have to be able to shoot from the hip, right? When we get there to figure out how we're going to train based on the training records. When Mark, makes the comment that this is 85, 90%, um, you know, that's an administrative conversation that him and I need to have. I feel that the committee, which is why we submitted it, the way that we submitted it, we put in all the components to include the components that we want to have into that standard. Into that training record, I pulled up what I think you're still looking at that training record for the rural fire protection specialist, which is the longest program we have.



[01:25:36] It has all of the components in it. I'm not sure what we would add to this, um, or take away because the people that have been working with me on this are my current instructors. They're the past program director. They are people that we put together with the most subject matter expertise to come up with this. Um, can we've tied in to the curriculum? No, because the curriculum is currently tied to the old standard. I haven't re-written the whole thing to match up to a standard that hasn't been approved yet. Does the committee want that? Absolutely we want that. That's how this entire thing got started a year and a half ago when I took this position was to take the standard and line it up exactly with what the [01:26:32 inaudible] needs in the communities. That intent will not change because that is how we expect to be doing this; I'm not new to what a standard is. Can we reference some polls or language directly out of the NFPA and put it into this standard? If we get permission, I would prefer to do it that way.

[01:27:03] Male Speaker: Where applicable I'm assuming is what you mean.

[01:27:07] Lisa: For the components of the standard that are in front of you. Anytime that something has to be removed from that subsection, then there would be an asterisk articulating what's being removed from that subsection.

[01:27:26] Christian: Chair this is Christian. If I may...

[01:27:30] Male Speaker: Yes.

[01:27:31] Christian: It's only been, two and a half decades. I know we haven't had enough time to discuss the changes needed to the standard or anything. One of the things I wanted to point out is we keep talking about asterisks, which portions of NFPA, 1001, do we want to reference what is from what 1002, 1004, etcetera. If I go look at the NFPA standard, like let's just say, for example, NFPA 1001, when they give you their list of referenced documents for their standard, they identify them by name. That's it? It does not say we're going to take this component out of this.

[01:28:12] It's just simply, I'm trying to bring up the table. Contents backup, um, you know, reference documentation is NFPA 1581. It doesn't say which part of 1581, it just gives the name. Why are we having to spend two pages identifying which position of that standard we're pulling out for this class? My understanding is this is not a handoff class that we're doing. This is something that is coordinated through as a rural office. They're coordinating the class for that department. Like Lisa said, they're going out, modifying it as needed for that local department. Why are we not able to simply reference that these standards is what our curriculum is based off of and leave it at that? Why do we have to go to so much detail about which standards and what you know, which decimals out of that standard?

- [01:29:18] Male Speaker:** I know I can speak to what I think the intent there is. Is specifically to reference you make I think a great point that we should be the documents uh, as used. Your question is, okay, why do I need to reference these-.
- [01:29:43] Male Speaker:** This is the portions that we're taking out of it that's the curriculum, but the actual standard doesn't-curriculum and standards are two different things.
- [01:29:55] Male Speaker:** 100% right but our standards still have to have reference documents for that very exact reason of, we want it to be able to be updatable, and we want that information to be relevant and valid and re-creatable by whoever picks up this program next. If you don't have that work, then you can't, you have to go back to the drawing board and go, why is this way? For us to say, we referenced NFPA 1001. That's great. We can say that, but somewhere in that document, when NFPA 1001 says that they referenced NFPA 1583, for instance, somewhere in there, you mentioned that, uh, I've got NFPA 1001 right here. I know for a fact that if you scroll down and start going through the standards, you're going to find that reference to NFPA 1583 in one of the standards, you're going to see it in the requisite skills, knowledge, in other words, the base level information, or how it references, or it's going to be in the annex, it will be there and it will tell you why they referenced that document.
- [01:31:09]** That's what we're building is why are we, we should be building, why are we referencing this document because of it has to be audited and reviewed they don't have to know that we can't just say this document references, the newest version of NFPA 1001. Then as I pointed out, go to, NFPA 5.3.1, which is firefighter to flammable liquids and say, yeah, that's exactly what we're teaching in the field. That doesn't both up 5.3.1. Doesn't both up. Neither does the one that talks about controlling flammable gas fires. I don't think the intent of those two standards, which are both non asterisk standards that are points of the standard that are referenced. I don't think either one of those, uh, that the intent was to utilize those, to teach what we're teaching in rural Alaska. I think we need to teach those skills in rural Alaska, but I think we teach them differently with different PPE and different, uh, sort of a different approach because of the fact that we're working in rural Alaska with limited water and limited hose size, for instance, limited PPE. That's not the intent when they wrote NFPA firefighter two standards guaranteed It was.
- [01:32:26]** We have to reference which parts of that do bolt up so that they don't think that we're referencing Nope, all of this stuff matches up and how it's going to have to be specific at some point. That's, again, just my opinion. I think that if we're writing the standard, we should write it in the way that is going to be best updated and most specific in what we do. This is not, this is to protect the folks that are out teaching in the

field so that if something were to ever happen, they have a reference document to say, this is how we thought this is what we thought is how we thought it. And the standards council was signed off on the same. Yes, we concur how it should have been taught.

**[01:33:23] Male Speaker:** We're back to the question being to make a motion, to adopt this standard, or make a motion to tell Lisa, to put it in the shredder and go back to the old standard and change the header on it. Is that what I'm understanding? I'm wondering what action we need to take right now.

**[01:33:45] Male Speaker:** We're not talking about the old standard. The old standard is the standards of in current use right now, still references 1992 NFPA 1001.

**[01:33:53] Male Speaker:** I understand that. I think what are our actions that we need to take right now? Because there are a lot of people stretching next right now?

**[01:34:01] Male Speaker:** Sure. Uh, understood. I think the action right now was this was a chance for you guys to review the material, uh, that you didn't have time to review before. If you felt comfortable to either adopt or to postpone adoption of the document that you have in front of you, until there's further work done, knowing that we have a deadline of January to do not stop training, but to stop certification of the program until we have a completed product,

**[01:34:44] Male Speaker:** Um, uh, fire Marshall, when's the next VPSO academy that has to have a program?

**[01:34:52] Male Speaker:** Next week.

**[01:34:55] Male Speaker:** After January 1st. Is it always an end of the year thing?

**[01:34:59] Male Speaker:** No.

**[01:35:00] Male Speaker:** Um, potentially spring, , and fall or spring and winter.

**[01:35:07] Male Speaker:** Well, I would like to see some progress on this chair if you'll entertain it, I will make a motion that we adopt the standard as presented to us. Then we will update it at the spring meeting. Didn't hear you chair.

**[01:35:27] Male Speaker:** Sorry about that. Christian, can you repeat your motion

**[01:35:30] Christian:** If you'll entertain it? My motion would be to adopt the standard as presented to us at this meeting with, to adopt at this meeting and then adjust it as needed at our spring meeting. I just want to get some motion going forward. I don't want to keep spinning our wheels.

**[01:35:56] Male Speaker:** I second it.

- [01:35:58] Male Speaker: I second it.
- [01:36:02] Male Speaker: Now that I made the motion that was the one for discussion.
- [01:36:07] Male Speaker: Okay. Uh, I'll start with this discussion and saying, I don't love the name of that motion with the direction. I think it's given. I think that
- [01:36:19] Male Speaker: Just motion to adopt and leave it at that.
- [01:36:20] Male Speaker: Well, here's the thing, uh, if the question that remains on the table is right now, Lisa and her crew are working from a out of the reference document and out of base standards so to speak that was flagged two years ago or two plus years ago as we progress. However, I think we've been, again, very conciliatory in that we want, we all want the same thing. Not just the program to move forward we want it updated. We have not currently taken action except to table action on teaching from the current program. What I don't want to do is I don't want to blur the line. If we adopt this to say, we're going to adopt it so that more work can be done. I don't say, I don't know why, because I think the work can be done without a document. If that's the wishes of the council, that's fine too, but what we shouldn't adopt it and then it just goes into practice because your motion wouldn't have prevented that from happening. It says adopt it and then, update it as needed by spring. I don't know that that's, I don't know that the wishes, maybe it has the wishes of the council, but the way it was spoken to bring-
- [01:37:39] Male Speaker: Yes, I agree with you.
- [01:37:46] Male Speaker: Chair this is Jake.
- [01:37:48] Male Speaker: Yes.
- [01:37:52] Male Speaker: I mean, just to speak to that, I mean, I guess what I hear you say, like is there is some elements here, let's acknowledge that this document has references to NFPA standards. Um, I would be hard for us to, at least for me to adopt this standard right now. I don't have the program to verify. I mean, you've given some examples here, Dan, of where some elements from this NFPA don't where you don't believe they match up. Without those looking at that rule up fire protection document to say, hey, is for example, you know, 533 are we doing that? Um, it's very difficult to adopt this standard. If it sounds like there's some debate about whether or not all of these elements that are listed, um, are in fact being taught per that standard. Does that make sense?
- [01:38:47] Male Speaker: Well, the standard hasn't been adopted, so no, we're not teaching to that yet. We're teaching to the old one with the old curriculum, but Lisa,

is not going to spend the time to the curriculum if we don't adopt the standard that says that that is what needs to be done.

**[01:39:07] Male Speaker:** - changes happen. Do they happen by a curriculum by the curriculum or do they happen by asterisk in the standard?

**[01:39:28] Male Speaker:** Well, we adopt standards regularly that we do not have all the information for, we don't have test base until the standard is adopted. We don't have the curriculum necessarily unless it's an over-the-counter shelf on the shelf thing for our standard that we adopt, when we look in the future at NFPA 10, we're going to have to create all that stuff. My understanding was when we are adopting as a council, a standard; we are setting what we want that certification to meet. Then we look at the testing and all that aspect afterwards that's done administratively. Most guidance has been provided by the council on the standards that the council expects everything to meet. Am I inaccurate on that chair?

**[01:40:20] Male Speaker:** No, you're accurate. The difference here is that we're not working from a known, typically when we do this, we're working from a known, we're working from a standard that we're updating or one that has, uh, typically in fact, we've spent quite a bit of time arguing about standards in the past because we weren't sure that it fit Alaska fire. Also one comes to mind, even though there was a clear standard, if there was curriculums out there, it still took years for the council to crack and say yes, this off the shelf sort of standard is actually applicable in Alaska. That was one that was a national standard from top to bottom, has published curriculum, and it was debated for years before we finally **[01:41:06 inaudible]** fire off for one program being taught Alaska regularly again after a **[01:41:11 inaudible]** I hate it. That's unfortunate, but that's coming from a published, uh, standard when they publish curriculum. We are working off of, I feel like the standards council has always been on this one, working from an unknown to a known and that we have a standard, it doesn't appear to be accurately referenced and have not have not had the familiarity with the, because there's no national curriculum or curriculum thesis uh, that people have had a chance to see in their entirety to understand how they, how they built up. I think that that's probably, that was that's from a, just a council member standpoint, administratively, there was a bigger issue, administratively. The big issue was the, uh, how far out of these that was so that's, that's why it's a little different.

**[01:42:11]** Yes, we can still adopt this. The thing is that the new standard can, could be adopted with the understanding and clarity from the council on what the direction and action needs to be. I think that's what we were trying for in the fall. That's where I felt like we were trying for it. That's what I went for with the steering committee was to drive, try to provide clarity. Because I felt like that was missing. Uh, and that's, that's unfortunate. I think that's our fault. All of our faults on the council that

we do there's sometimes where we get wrapped around the axle and then we go, okay, see you guys in six months and you go back and we don't have clarity of action. We come back six months later and we go, hey, where were we on this? We have to start over. We've really, my, my only desire here today, whatever action you guys as a council say is that please? We have to provide clarity on what the direction is with the action is, what the direction is if we have a direction to give, because that's the piece that seems like it has been months.

**[01:43:19] Male Speaker:** What we need to do is we need to reference the standard and reference only those parts of that standard that we're changing the rest of it out.

**[01:43:33] Male Speaker:** Well, we still need a reference what we do teach that doesn't match the standards, things that we do in Alaska with rural fire protection. They don't come from an FDA standard because I know they exist.

**[01:43:48] Male Speaker:** Yes, that rules out in Alaska standard. What I'm hearing for direction for where we want this document to go is to yes reference the NFPA standards that we can. Then add onto that the, basically the skills that we're teaching or the knowledge we're teaching under another underlying thing as Alaska fire professional standard is that the- we want NFPA reference where applicable and to basically make up a Alaska, this is a skill under this new Alaska standards. Is that what we're getting at?

**[01:44:33] Male Speaker:** I think the direction, well, uh, if you're asking, I will say that the direction is to write in Alaska specific standards. One of the documents that we should reference is NFPA where applicable, uh, but the standard is like, why would we wanna start a standard that says, uh, you know, NFPA 1500, 10.1.2, and then under that Alaska, uh, Alaska standard, 1.1.1 NFPA 1001, 5.3.1. Why not say Alaska, rural fire protection standard 1.1.1, 1.1.2, one point and go on down and then put the language in the language volts up within NFPA when we write that great, we're going to reference in NFPA, and we're going to make sure that it's documented, these ones are pretty much verbatim, right out of NFPA. That's okay. If we want the same thing, it's okay to write it.

**[01:45:34]** We are not stealing their language. We're saying words. We have the same mindset and direction that they have. That's what we want for our firefighters, but it's our standard. We can still reference NFPA 1001 as a guidance document for that. We can show that, but we just, or we should be showing where it doesn't come from NFPA 1001. Where does it come from? I feel like I have said this over and over again, and I don't want muddle the message. I want people to hear it loud and clear. If we do something different, that's not bad. We just need to reference the where's the reference to how we pull water in rural Alaska. When we pull water, where is that reference? What are we using? Let's if it's not

there, let's write it. If we can write it, uh, that would be great because we can reference this as what we're teaching. I think those documents; I think that that material can be found. If we're going to use it, great. Let's document.

**[01:46:44] Male Speaker:** There's motion on the floor and I have to leave at three. I have a prior commitment.

**[01:46:58] Male Speaker:** Any other discussion on the motion that's on the floor.

**[01:47:02] Male Speaker:** If anybody has a better motion, I'm happy to entertain it too. I just want to get progress.

**[01:47:07] Female Speaker:** Chair could I please get some clarification? The motion was either to adopt or it had a little more information in that first motion do you want to re-state it or how would you like that to be said?

**[01:47:24] Sarah:** This is Sarah, maybe Christian to Dan's point. If we adopt it, then in theory it can just be in play versus we want to acknowledge that more work needs to be continued and for them to go forth and conquer.

**[01:47:44] Male Speaker:** I understand that. It's just that we keep doing that. Like I said, I could personally vouch that I have heard three different directions to go forth and vouch over the last two years. I'm just trying to get, I want to give them a direction that they need to go forth and conquer. It is as simple as it's not a completed document. We're aware of that, but it needs to be, we were told we have a deadline. Do we extend that deadline? Is that the only other option?

**[01:48:21] Male Speaker:** The deadline is not until January.

**[01:48:26] Male Speaker:** Well, that would be in about three days.

**[01:48:27] Male Speaker:** I'm not saying it's not enough time. I just to make sure people understand that.

**[01:48:37] Male Speaker:** I think to Christian's question, I feel like we have to extend it. Um, well, let, let me back up. We have to do more work, whether we can do that in the time before it expires, because what I'm hearing, what I feel like is there again to what I said earlier, uh, I can't make that decision is especially if I hear an input that, this document isn't complete, um, like there is certainly elements of reference standards there, but picking on you Dan is not really picking on you, but just because I remember you pointing out, hey, I don't think this standard, uh, under NFPA or a section under NFPA1001 is what we're doing. Um, I think we have to resolve those issues when we can adopt the standards.

- [01:49:35] Male Speaker: Uh, if I may say, I still have to go forward with a motion, maybe what we can do then is make them, you know, if the body agrees with that, um-.
- [01:49:44] Male Speaker: Modify your motions?
- [01:49:46] Male Speaker: Actually we need to vote that motion down and then someone can come up with an alternative solution. I can resend the motion. It's just, I want there to be progress and I got to go.
- [01:50:00] Male Speaker: When we adopt that standard, we don't ever adopt a standard saying we're never going to look at it again until the next review section, we always as a council, have the ability to add it to our agenda at any meeting to adopt or look at it, update it, whatever it is. Um, but I think if we don't- we got to do something, and I don't know a vote on this one way or the other. I do have a prior commitment that I have to leave for.
- [01:50:40] Male Speaker: I believe we just heard keep teaching as they are teaching it and give us some time to re-twist the standard, uh, for the program.
- [01:50:57] Male Speaker: Chair I don't know who the second was for my motion, but I would like to resend my emotion and replace it.
- [01:51:03] Male Speaker: I believe Joe was your second.
- [01:51:10] Male Speaker: As long as he's okay with it, I'd like to resend the motion. Um, how much time does the committee and the subcommittee and the closet committee, how much time is needed to get this a finished product?
- [01:51:27] Male Speaker: Chair if I may?
- [01:51:29] Male Speaker: Yes, Mark.
- [01:51:32] Male Speaker: My recommendation take it for what it's worth is if we have the opportunity to approve the standard as it sits right now, that gives us the opportunity to move forward with developing an updated curriculum, during that period or that phase is when we would identify the things that don't fold up as smoothly, as we'd like, and we can adjust them otherwise we're creating duplication. Quite frankly, the bandwidth within the office is to give you a hard and fast time of getting this done by January is unlike. Um, so take them for what it's worth, uh, vote it up, vote it down extend it um, we'll keep pressing having the ability to work off of an approved standard really is the foundation that we need, right from Mark 10 cents worth of opinion.
- [01:52:35] Male Speaker: This is Long Dean, and I believe that that's what Christian's motion intent was the adopted standard, make adjustments to it, as things are



identified during curriculum development. Um, and then modify that standard later to match up to what- those due changes.

**[01:52:58] Male Speaker:** Yes, but I'm getting the impression now that that's not going to work for whatever the goal is.

**[01:53:10] Male Speaker:** The goal is what the council as a whole wants. It's not an individual. It's what the council as a whole wants. If you're willing to keep your, uh, motion on the floor to be voted on, as it fits, we'll know if that is what the council wants to do or not. We had to do something though, like-

**[01:53:33] Male Speaker:** I mean, and Joe never gave me permission anyway. It was still on the floor on the table.

**[01:53:39] Male Speaker:** Chair, I would like to, if you're it's your call, but I'd like to call the question so we can find out if the council wants to move forward with the document as has been presented with us and make the amendments as we need to later on.

**[01:53:55] Male Speaker:** Is that your motion? Can you read that, though, as you read it the first time?

**[01:53:59] Male Speaker:** I didn't write it down. I'll just make it as a new motion. I make a motion that we adopt the standard as presented at this meeting. I think I should just end it at that, adopt the standard and move forward.

**[01:54:17] Male Speaker:** Is there a second for that motion?

**[01:54:20] Male Speaker:** I second that.

**[01:54:25] Male Speaker:** We have a motion on the floor to adopt the rural fire protection standard has presented and written currently.

**[01:54:38] Male Speaker:** Then obviously in springtime, when all the administrative work has been done, we can look at adjusting. Chris, you're going to miss all the CFI talk.

**[01:54:58] Male Speaker:** Did you just add that-?

**[01:55:01] Male Speaker:** I did not add it to the motion because like Chris had mentioned I think it was Chris. We look at standards all the time. We don't have to specify that we're going to be looking at it in the spring.

**[01:55:14] Male Speaker:** I feel like it's my duty to mention that we still have pending other actions. Uh, so just know that we are our other pending action is that without- I would have to go back and look at the, uh, is this removing the January deadline for certification of the program that is now not to

new standards, uh, removing certification of the program until it is updated too, that would be a separate action. That's still on the table because this does not; I don't think it answers that.

**[01:56:01] Male Speaker:** Uh, but it does not. I agree with you on that. The goal is just to adopt the standard and then we could look at extending that deadline as a separate action.

**[01:56:08] Male Speaker:** I just want to make sure that people don't think one is tied to the other because I want to make sure what, again, we have clarity moving forward, so far we have adopted on the table motion adopt the Alaska specific standards that has been presented, uh, in September for our meeting that is as presented in **[01:56:30 inaudible]**. Let's call a vote.

**[01:56:39] Female Speaker:** Would you like me to do a roll call?

**[01:56:42] Male Speaker:** Uh, can you do a roll call vote if you have it in front of you?

**[01:56:46] Female Speaker:** Absolutely do. Brian Long?

**[01:56:52] Male Speaker:** Long is no.

**[01:56:57] Female Speaker:** No, Christian Hearty?

**[01:57:04] Christian:** I should unmute myself, I'm a yes.

**[01:57:07] Female Speaker:** Sarah Garcia?

**[01:57:10] Sarah:** No.

**[01:57:12] Female Speaker:** Jake Bender?

**[01:57:20] Jake:** I'm sorry about that, this is Jake no.

**[01:57:23] Female Speaker:** Chris **[01:57:23 inaudible]**.

**[01:57:26] Chris:** Yes.

**[01:57:28] Female Speaker:** Chris Steve?

**[01:57:31] Chris:** Yes.

**[01:57:33] Female Speaker:** Joe Dang Man?

**[01:57:35] Joe:** Yes.

**[01:57:39] Female Speaker:** Dave Linden?

- [01:57:41] Dave: Yes.
- [01:57:44] Female Speaker: Walt Weller?
- [01:57:46] Walt: Yes.
- [01:57:46] Female Speaker: Dave Gibbs is in here. Rick Gootsee?
- [01:57:53] Rich: Yes.
- [01:57:56] Female Speaker: And Dan Grind?
- [01:57:57] Male Speaker: No. I think the yes have it. We'll adopt the agenda as written, with the intent to give further clarification from the council, I think, as it develops, is there further action that you would like to take today on the January deadline for certification of this current program?
- [01:58:30] Male Speaker: I'll make that motion to extend the- postpone the deadline, our extension chair.
- [01:58:37] Male Speaker: I make a motion to amend the deadline.
- [01:58:45] Male Speaker: The way we worded it last time was that we tabled the vote to suspend certification.
- [01:58:52] Male Speaker: This is a whole new program correct? It got a different name and everything?
- [01:59:02] Male Speaker: I think we need to allow continuing certification under the old program. If we need to adopt a new standard we're not implementing. We're going to continue certification in the new program. Until sometime that the new standard actually can start certifications. Christian if it's okay with you I would make a motion that we continue certifications under the old standard until our spring meeting.
- [01:59:35] Male Speaker: Just to give us a little bit of time, Jake if you're okay with it. My suggestion was going to be to make us for July 1st. Just that way if there's any classes coming up throughout the spring. It's not a big rush thing at the end of our meeting to get new tests done and all that.
- [01:59:53] Male Speaker: July one is fine.
- [02:00:00] Male Speaker: I'll second his motion discussion.
- [02:00:30] Female Speaker: Uh, excuse me. Could you, uh, I heard that Hartley was the second on that, not the motion on that. Who is it that made the motion I was typing?

[02:00:42] Male Speaker: Uh, was that Long Dean?

[02:00:43] Male Speaker: Yeah.

[02:00:45] Female Speaker: Was it Dave? Thank you very much.

[02:00:53] Male Speaker: Good luck with the minutes on this one. The motion is to, uh, continue certification of the current programs for rural fire protection until July one of 2021. Dawn can you call a roll call vote please?

[02:01:25] Don: Yes, I can. Brian Long?

[02:01:33] Brian: In light of the first vote an extension seems prudent given time so yes.

[02:01:41] Female Speaker: Thank you, Christian Hearty?

[02:01:45] Christian: Yes.

[02:01:47] Female Speaker: Thank you Sarah Garcia?

[02:01:52] Sarah: No.

[02:01:53] Female Speaker: Thank you, Jake Bender?

[02:01:59] Jake: Yes.

[02:01:59] Female Speaker: Thank you, Chris [02:02:01 inaudible]

[02:02:02] Chris: Yes.

[02:02:04] Female Speaker: Thank you. Chris Steve?

[02:02:07] Chris: Yes.

[02:02:08] Female Speaker: Thank you. Joe Dang Man?

[02:02:12] Joe: Yes.

[02:02:15] Female Speaker: Dave Linden?

[02:02:18] Dave: Yes.

[02:02:20] Female Speaker: Walt Weller?

[02:02:24] Walt: Yes.

[02:02:27] Female Speaker: Thank you. Uh, David Gibbs is out. Rich Bootsee?

[02:02:32] Rich: Yes.

[02:02:32] Female Speaker: And Dan Grind?

[02:02:34] Dan: That's a no vote for me.

[02:02:37] Female Speaker: Okay.

[02:02:40] Dan: Yes, Carrie. All right. Any other action before we talk about certified fire investigators, folks, this one should be quick. Uh, none. Thank you. First of all, uh, before we jump into, you know, we don't always agree on everything and that's okay. That's why we're a council and that's why we're a group. That's what, we're the report. I appreciate each one of you and what you're doing and I promise you this. I vote my conscience and I vote what I believe is what [02:03:22 inaudible], but I absolutely respect and appreciate what we're working towards.

[02:03:30] Uh, so certified fire investigator, if I'm not mistaken, the only issue that we have is removing the finger background fingerprints, uh, from recertification after the initial, uh, not removing the background check portion, but removing the recurrent fingerprinting, uh, requirements every three years. Is that correct?

[02:04:08] Male Speaker: Yes. I believe so.

[02:04:13] Male Speaker: The only piece that we're waiting on there, even though we put this on the agenda was, do you have a fire Marshall Bootsie was going to check on his end of things to make sure that wasn't a requirement that came from somewhere we didn't know about and didn't have the language, uh, so that we weren't in violation of some other requirements that we didn't know about if we removed it. I mean, it seemed like when we talked about it at the fall meeting; we were pretty much as a group. It seemed like most of the council members were in agreement that could go away, but we didn't want to remove it without doing our homework. Fire Marshall Bootsie, do you have information on this?

[02:04:55] Male Speaker: The research I did there was, excuse me, not recurrent, um, thing or a background, not the background, but the, uh, fingerprints. Um, likewise, uh, in DPS for our investigators, we don't go to that recertification process as investigators to redo our fingerprints, um, from the day we start. I couldn't find anything that would require it. We are, um, with the special commission that we are offering to the fire marshals, um, of the deferred jurisdictions right now, uh, in that process, when they first submit their, uh, application for this special commission, uh, we do require the, uh, fingerprints, but we do not require them on recertification in two years. There are special commissions are done in two year cycles.

[02:05:56] Male Speaker: You don't require fingerprints again?

[02:06:00] Male Speaker: Not on the recertification.

[02:06:04] Male Speaker: Well, I appreciate that. Uh, anybody else? I think that was the information we were looking for. Any other comments or questions about that information?

[02:06:28] Rich: Okay. Dan Rich.

[02:06:28] Dan: Yes.

[02:06:28] Rich: Um, one point of clarification, if a person lapses that like on the special commission, if they lapse in there's a year or two period that goes by when they resubmit, it's not considered a resubmitted, it's a new application again, and it would be required at that point.

[02:06:51] Male Speaker: Uh, I can understand that makes perfect sense. Uh, okay, well, I'll go ahead and make the motion on this one for discussion. Uh, my motion would be to remove the recurring fingerprinting requirements from the recertification process for certified fire investigator certification directive.

[02:07:14] Chris: Chris Hemsworth, second.

[02:07:15] Male Speaker: Chris will second. Discussion? Hearing none. Dawn, can you call a vote, please?

[02:07:34] Female Speaker: I certainly can. This is for the CFI, uh, motion that's on the floor. Uh, Brian Long?

[02:07:52] Long: Confirming it's a yay is to remove it, correct?

[02:07:56] Male Speaker: Correct?

[02:07:58] Long: Yes.

[02:08:01] Female Speaker: Christine Hartley.

[02:08:03] Christian: Yes.

[02:08:03] Female Speaker: Sarah Garcia.

[02:08:07] Sarah: Yes.

[02:08:09] Female Speaker: Jake bender.

- [02:08:11] Jake: Yes. Christopher
- [02:08:14] Female Speaker: Chris Steves has left uh, has left the meeting. Joe Dang man?
- [02:08:25] Joe: Yes.
- [02:08:27] Female Speaker: Dave Linden?
- [02:08:30] Dave: Yes.
- [02:08:33] Female Speaker: Walt Weller?
- [02:08:36] Walt: Yes.
- [02:08:39] Female Speaker: Dave Gibbs is not here. Rich Bootsie?
- [02:08:41] Rich: Yes.
- [02:08:43] Female Speaker: Dan Grant?
- [02:08:45] Dan: Yes.
- [02:08:47] Female Speaker: Yes, carry.
- [02:08:48] Dan: Awesome, thank you very much appreciate that. Thanks, folks. The last agenda item, uh, is just so we figured that it would be not prudent for us to not, we talked at our last meeting about the fact that we often don't prepare for the next meeting until right before it, and the information just sort of sits out there during that time. It seems like it would be appropriate to just since we have the administrator here at the meeting to just get some updates. We didn't want to just spring that on him. So we asked them to put it in as an agenda item and just give us an update on some of the things that we talked about in the meeting in the fall that we walked away from. Those things are, uh, uh, clarification on how the certification process is going with the enforcement of the, uh, requiring payment prior to scores in search going out. We asked about our pending test validation issue. We have quite a, if you remember, we have quite a backlog of flagged tests that were, uh, flagged for poor questions that hadn't been gone through and embedded in people's scores, adjusted accordingly. Then we asked to for an update on what the options are for certifying officer trainings, so that we can continue to keep putting new CEO's into the pipeline. So those are the three things we asked Mark, it's all yours, sir.
- [02:10:29] Female Speaker: I will go ahead and share my screen for you, Mark.

[02:10:32] Mark:

Go ahead and share the screen, Dawn or pop up those PowerPoint slides. Advance for the next slide, please. One of the things that I've mentioned in the last, uh, our last meeting is the process I'm using to evaluate the bureau, what we're doing, where we're at and where we're going, um, completed the awareness component. Now that I'm in the appraisal component, what I'm going to show you and what, um, you're going to see here or snippets being pulled out of that appraisal process. Underneath the certification test process review, uh, a lot of endings uh, we've identified some areas, uh, that needs some specific attention. Next slide, please. Primarily, um, where we're at and I'm just going to run through where we're at and it'll get to the specific question.

[02:11:47]

I just want you to see the background and the, the, uh, the deep dive we're taking on this program, uh, completing an internal audit and function that's been completed. Um, I've requested, uh, informally at this point and am drafting a formal requests for a complete fiscal audit, as well as, um, department state of Alaska department level reviews. Some of our processes, um, not germane to this particular topic at the time, but it leads us into, um, a comparative review of our next or our current guidance relative to, um, timelines and the effectiveness, of the fiscal component we've wrapped up, we're down to just a few dollars. Um, there is a task saturation level, um, that we are currently exceeding, um, effectiveness. This is only a piece of it. I don't want to overstate the fact, um, with, uh, personnel vacancies COVID and then having to go through this process validation, um, with me, um, is certainly slowing down some of the processes.

[02:13:06]

I'll take the ownership there, but I need to understand the process so that I can find those efficiencies for us to move on. There aren't necessarily enough data points at this point for this particular question to specifically point to, um, where we collect or how we collect our payments. It does stand reason that in the past and in this is germane in the past is we've had an economy of scale or an economy of action in the fact that Dawn in this particular case could sit down and do all the invoicing at one time, um, collect payments at one time. You have efficiency, of tasks in that relation, as opposed to now every single action requires that additional step. Can I tell you exactly what the data points and the loss manpower this point? No, I will tell you that these are the three areas that we are looking at.

[02:14:19]

Um, the individual invoice payment components. Uh, we have reviewed that the group invoice and payments, uh, giving an example of, you know, a fire department that's hosting multiple departments where we have individual, um, payment requirements. Um, that'll be next. I want at least 10 data points for each one of these, so that I, at least statistically I can give you, um, hard, hard numbers that passed the blush test. And then the third one is institutional invoicing, um, example of UAF. We've already looked at that and addressed it. I think, um, this



format as you asked prior to me, um, works in that particular capacity, next slide please.

[02:15:11]

Additional factors, um, that are affecting the task saturation aren't just associated to, um, where, and when we like these, obviously we're running into some issues with, uh, with COVID, that's actually a big one. Then unfortunately, uh, Dawn is also running into a very large, um, hurdle in that she is trying to do her job while showing me how to do her job in that I recognize is also, uh, an additional challenge so that those are some of the data points we're trying to collect so that I can answer that more specifically unless knowing. Honestly, it's less about me answering to the specific question, more about, uh, finding the efficiencies of scale so that one person can actually put out the requisite amount of work, um, and get us out of that tailspin that, uh, the chair very eloquently in the last meeting in reference to, uh, where we are in our processes. Any questions on that particular, uh, exhibit that is exhibit one, um, in reference to the first question, a lot of work left to do there, you'll see that, uh, it's being addressed, but by no means fully addressed.

[02:16:52]

If there's no additional or any questions or you can wait and hold your questions till the end and ask either, or, or jump in at any point. On exhibit two, yes go ahead and go to the next slide. Um, that's not for me in this topic. Right, so the test review analysis is a component that is actually the one that we're the furthest along in, out of these three, Here is some of the areas where we're identifying some of the challenges in being able to answer to you number of tests, questions, or CO's need to ensure we're validating all of this information and we're at about 50%. We have a CO training issue there to address. Next slide please.

[02:18:02]

Either tasks have put on the certification clerk is once we get those, um, challenge test challenge questionnaires back is that we verify that information there, uh, prior to providing it to me and I want to review them on a monthly basis so that we don't have the backlog that we have. Then again, now pops down into my lane, and these are the three points as far as moving forward. The way that I'm going to resolve this issue is to make determinations and document it on the challenge sheet. Then I'm going to take a look at the way we're, uh, our process works there.

[02:18:51]

I've also noticed too in the review, the next slide action speaks with better. Go ahead and go to the next slide. Here is the meat and potatoes of the actual process as we stand today. Um, I've completely reviewed every single one of the test challenge sheets. Um, I can tell you, it was, uh, 574 sheets for a total of 1105 questions. Uh, the vast majority of the questions came out of the hazmat arena. Um, I managed to, um, all 19 courses were affected to one degree or another. If you

want that those data points, I have those as well of the 574 question challenge forms. We've been able to validate 216. Now, what that means is there's enough information provided on the challenge sheet, actually, um, look up the test version, the individual that challenged the test question, the date, the test session.

**[02:20:08]**

Essentially, uh, just the shade under half, um, or actually validated now 322 of them require additional information, but as enough to where we should be able to dig it up and I invalidated, uh, a handful more, uh, where there just was not enough information to pursue. Next slide. That is all complete. These are the areas I was looking for was likeability. Um, they actual challenger their ID test state test version specifically, um, and then to remove the invalid challenge, that's all complete. Um, I'd prioritize the challenge questions, uh, for, for review, by course that's ongoing now for example, uh, hazmat the whole hazmat, um, challenge component is all 472 with the exception. Well, all of them. That priority is going to be a lot lower than once we moved to 1072, if there's no challenge questions, um, here next month.

**[02:21:33]**

That's where we sit today is the actual matching the challenge sheets with the appropriate test versions on those challenge sheets that we're able to address that with production surge, scheduled for this to be complete by the end of January POM being end of month, as well as to evaluate the sheets against the resource material. We're finding, I'm finding a lot of the questions they're not actually, um, posing a question as to the information as delivered, the technical information, what they're questioning is either the grammar, the readability, or their understanding of the information as it's expressed. Define curious. Next slide.

**[02:22:35]**

Consequently, I want it, we're going to go through this process here of identifying those patterns so that we can avoid this in the future and hopefully work with our committees a little closer, um, to write out those bad tests, question processes, obviously taking appropriate action within our current guidance, some areas that are actually, we jumped slides here, and this was actually there we go. That's the end of exhibit two. Any questions there?

**[02:23:34] Male Speaker:**

I just have one, uh, Mark, first a comment thank you this is great information and this is just a comment for the group. Uh, I appreciate what you're doing and what you're working on. I just had a thought along the way that from a CEO standpoint and an instructor standpoint, I've generally found that the COs are pretty eloquent when they explain this most of the time, but the process of how to flag a bad question. I think, but I've also seen COs when I was an instructor. I've seen COs that maybe don't hit the mark I appreciate your insights that perhaps some of this as a CO training issue, uh, for sure, and that's going to be key, but if it's not, in the instances where that's not, I also think that you have to

have certain information if you were told, so you have to have certain information on the back to allow your question to go forward, which is how the presentations are written when we presented to candidates for nesting is that you have to put X, Y, and Z on this form, or it won't be valid. That test question won't be a true challenge question. If they get that information and they don't do their part, then I don't think we wasted any time on that question. Like if yes, I always tell people, I always give them an example. If you write in question number 27 sucks, and that's all you say, Hey, man, don't expect us to spend any time dealing with that question back to the council of administrators. There is equal parts to responsibilities, but we do have to make sure that the CO's are delivering that message because if they're not, then it's not the student's fault.

[02:25:26]

Like I've heard COs just say, hey, you can just flip the test over on the back. There's place to write down the bank questions. That's all, that's the end of the instructions. That's not accurate, so thank you.

[02:25:36] Male Speaker:

Some of the comments, too, is to speak to that even deeper. Some of the comments from the students are, is, you know, like I'm just, I'm at the end of the test. I want to get it done. I want to get out of here, but this question kind of bugs me. That was, that was one of them I've gotten or received, or we have received test challenges where it was the question number of given tests and then just WTH.

[02:26:10] Male Speaker:

[02:26:10 crosstalk]

[02:26:13] Mark:

Say again?

[02:26:16] Male Speaker:

Some of that stuff can be instructor issue too.

[02:26:21] Mark:

It very well could be, is what I'm trying to do is take these 1105 questions and quantify and prioritize what we're going to work on. My time's obviously fairly limited, so I need to make it as efficient as possible and speak to those, um, overarching areas within the program that need attention. This was a good exercise. That's why you ended up with the level of detail you did is because I need to see where we have issues to address. Once we move on to and actually you can go to, uh, exhibit number three is when we get into a CO's, um, we're actually setting better than maybe we thought we were. The availability of maybe a refresher training throughout the year is a conversation we're having. Um, as you can see, right, there is, uh, the test version trend analysis ties directly into, um, the previous exhibit and then taking, um, actions in accordance with our current guidance.

[02:27:34]

Um, you know, there, there's not a whole lot of guidance on this process here that isn't, uh, fairly outdated. We are going to be looking

at that closely, obviously ongoing at that level for this point in time. What we have completed, um, for this presentation is we currently have 51 certifying officers, 28 of which are very active. Then we have five people that are in the process of becoming COs and in a COVID in trotted world. Um, that is a very creative process and he's not necessarily, um, the way we're going to move forward, but we have some very interested candidates and we're trying to, uh, put them to good use.

**[02:28:33]**

Any questions there? More to come on the training options is one, um, bit of a concern that the current guidance not guidance, that the current process is an eight-hour training, um, which is about half too much. What I believe we can do and what we're going to move forward is a pre-work. Um, whether it's video a YouTube video of some form that they view first before they move into the realm of hands-on with, um, subject matter expert or another CO and in the mentorship process where they watch a CO and then they are watched by CO, that's kind of the direction we're going to be moving in that. I suspect this is something in the six to nine-month timeframe to see full fruition. Any questions for me there? I feel like I'm talking too much.

**[02:29:53] Male Speaker:**

Mark, I'm a little confused. Some of what you just described are things that are already in place. The, uh, observe is our step one or step A, and then take the lead is the step B. Uh, those are already in place. I think, uh, I'll speak for myself. I have a perspective Theo in my department system, in the pipeline now, is there a path forward for that person to finish up? He's done his step, A step B but would like to do whatever other official training is in place. Uh, at some point they have to wrap this whole thing up.

**[02:30:33] Mark:**

Right, so that would be the, what is now currently an eight hour in class presentation that I honestly don't want to put anyone through at this point. Um, more to follow on that is that's the component that's actually, um, under review or revision if you will, or a modification or update. Yes, um, we can certainly-.

**[02:31:03] Male Speaker:**

- anybody else can be able to help. I'm sure that they're happy to do so. Uh, I agree. I, you know, we put together some interim training for, uh, for COVID. We said, boy, if we've got to get somebody trained up real quick to be a CO due to COVID, uh, I think we put something together pretty quick. If that's the segue into a more, you know, uh, a more, slightly more robust, but also more widely disseminated training component, that's probably a good direction to go.

**[02:31:37] Mark:**

Yes, and anything that gives us a place to jump off from, and it sounds like that has worked, um, with a degree of success. Certainly not something I've addressed yet. Um, basically what I was trying to do here is just kind of show you the path forward on what we're looking at doing

and kind of where we're at currently. Um, originally I was, uh, thinking we were in a little worse shape than we actually are, but we do need to ensure sustainability. There is a number of pending items that perhaps we'll bring up for the spring meeting for you on or offline either way. My presentation.

**[02:32:34] Male Speaker:** Thanks very much, Mark. I appreciate it. Uh, Mark, I just have another question and this doesn't, if you don't have an answer, this is not on the agenda. It's just a question. Feel free to tell me you don't have an answer, but one of the other things we did was we flagged a test, right. A what we thought would be probably tests for review. We talked about it at our fall meeting and that was just a beta, series of tests. Have we had a chance to look into those yet?

**[02:33:01] Mark:** Actually, after fire officer two. Um, I have, yes-.

**[02:33:08] Male Speaker:** Where you talked about bringing Gary Davis in to do the review on it, I think.

**[02:33:26] Mark:** Yes, within the **[02:33:26 VEDO]** components there were 25 validated questions, 42 that require additional information and 11 that were invalid. Of all the questions, we're looking at 67 questions and they all are, um, focused around 15, roughly 15 to 18 questions. So yes, it has been identified in resolution I do not have for you, but I can get them.

**[02:34:02] Male Speaker:** I'm not sure if we talked over each other, but we had talked about bringing in Gary Davis. Who is a CO and maybe a driver operator uh, VEDO guy to come into the office? Is that still something that's pending? Can it still be done?

**[02:34:19] Mark:** I don't know um, can we do it, uh, if I can figure out a work around with, uh, I'm not even in the office, um, our offices, we're all working from home right now under current guidance. Pending a resolution or a workaround to that then? Yes, absolutely. Moving forward with that, no I have not, and have made a note of it.

**[02:34:52] Male Speaker:** Thanks Mark, anybody else have any questions for Mark?

**[02:34:55] Male Speaker:** Hey Dan, this is Dave Linden. Um, just to look it over the questions from VEDO that have been brought to the attention as, you know, potential issues?

**[02:35:10] Male Speaker:** No, that was a test. That was a test audit a so what the term that I've used. I don't know if we have it written any other way, but we've flagged the test for review. Like when we do a revision, we, part of the thing we do as a testing review, but this test has a very low pass rate. There is a certainly certain portions of it that have a very high failure

rates. It was noted. Uh, last year it was noted throughout these last 12 months in the fall meeting, several people that had students that have gone through it, flagged it. And I'll say since the fall meeting, I had another group test that were well instructed. Uh, and this was a concern for me going into it. We worked hard knowing that we had a bad test, we worked extra hard to get these guys in the book.

**[02:36:03]** Uh and we still had a very high failure rate. Uh, we just don't have any confidence in the test. Uh, we don't believe that it's a student aptitude issue with the amount of time that was spent instructing and testing locally. They did very well on their curriculum test. When you're using the curriculum package, they did excellent on all of their curriculum tests and then took the state test and had a very high fail rate.

**[02:36:31] Dave:** I just asked because I believe I'm now the chair of that committee, but I'm still not going to be doing any action on that for a month or two. Um, at some point I assume that would be part of my responsibilities is to look at the test questions.

**[02:36:52] Male Speaker:** That would be great. I think that was one of the, part of, uh, not to put words in Mark's mouth, but that surge, that work surge effort was to bring, uh, somebody in because you had said that you wouldn't be able to address in any type of, uh, from a committee standpoint. We were like, hey, what if we just hired this guy to come in and take a look and take a look.

**[02:37:17] Male Speaker:** perfect.

**[02:37:18] Male Speaker:** Thanks, Dave.

**[02:37:23] Male Speaker:** Speaking, you know- go ahead, Mark I'm sorry I was talking over you.

**[02:37:27] Mark:** I'm sorry I'm talking all over you too. Uh, based on what I'm looking at here is, is we have two tests versions under VEDO that actually look or appear to be problematic. It can be; one of the workarounds is we make this may be a little easier to scan it in and chat online. Yes, I want to put it to bed too. We'll put it at the top as priority.

**[02:37:55] Male Speaker:** From a, uh, you know, wearing both hats, from a deputy chief standpoint, very frustrating. It causes a lot of disenchantment disenfranchising of my firefighters from a council member standpoint, it's a loss of trust with our fire department. It's frustrating because we know that they just have less and less, less and less trust is things like this linger.

**[02:38:27] Male Speaker:** I'm available to discuss few times before I actually tackling it. I have some ideas of where the problem is after the last time I did a CO for VEDO and studied the questions a little bit while I was watching test.

**[02:38:42] Male Speaker:** Thanks, Dave. Gentlemen any other questions or comments before we end the meeting? That's, uh, our conclusion. While you guys were thinking of what you want to say, I'll say, thank you. I know that we haven't set a spring meeting date yet. We're still our goals would be to set that in January for a March timeframe, but not to set the dates until at least January to sort of get a better idea of where we are with COVID and everything else before we start talking too seriously about nailing down a specific date. Uh, I did want to give you an update on people that I reached out to personally on council seats is that they told us that it wouldn't be, they told us there was no way they were going to fill council seats in October, that it probably wouldn't be till November, uh, we're now November 6th. I haven't heard anything yet, but I'm still expecting sometime in November to hear. Thank you for those that are pending, uh, still holding your seats in and the expectations of whether you refilled a seat, or you, uh, are replaced.

**[02:39:54]** I appreciate you guys hanging in there with us for as long as you can, because we need to be both. We think you're all very valuable. Hang in there with us. I hope that those that are on the council, I know that, uh, those people that have asked we spoke highly of everyone. That's currently sitting in council seats and they're like, yes, we want so, uh, we'll keep moving forward. If we have new people, it'd be great to have new folks and we'll introduce them to the world of standards. Anybody else have any comments?

**[02:40:39] Brian:** Yes, Dan this is Brian.

**[02:40:40] Dan:** Yes, sir.

**[02:40:41] Brian:** I just want to thank folks for a constructive discussion today. I had come into this a little bit weak specifically to the rural fire protection situation, uh, though it was, um, there's feelings on both sides can be frustrating at times people kept it civil which helped me understand. I was appreciative of the tough discussion on the time spent. Because I think I have a lot better understanding of what's going on and I appreciate their time.

**[02:41:06] Dan:** Awesome. Thanks Brian. Appreciate it. Hey folks, if there's no other comment-

**[02:41:28] Male Speaker:** I just want to say, I appreciate everyone having me on eth council, and if I'm replaced before the next meeting, I've had a good time; I enjoyed myself, thank you.

[02:41:39] Dan: Thanks, Joe. We appreciate you too. Alright, folks, we'll say goodbye. Thank you all for your time. I know it's valuable. Appreciate you.

[02:41:58] Female Speaker: Are you, uh, is there going to be a motion to adjourn?

[02:42:01] Dan: I guess we should.

[02:42:02] Female Speaker: I second.

[02:42:03] Male Speaker: I move.

[02:42:03] Female Speaker: Sorry, I didn't mean to jump in there.

[02:42:07] Male Speaker: Thanks. Appreciate it. Can I have a motion to adjourn?

[02:42:10] Male Speaker: Motion to adjourn?

[02:42:12] Male Speaker: I'm Brian motion, Joe Dang Man seconded, okay, there is your motion. We're adjourned at 3:44 PM.

[02:42:20] Female Speaker: Sorry. I just need to know Brian Long was that Brian Long. Brian Long is who is the second person?

[02:42:28] Male Speaker: Joe Dang Man.

[02:42:30] Female Speaker: You guys were quick. Thank you very much.

[02:42:32] Male Speaker: You bet. Thank you.

[02:42:35] Male Speaker: Thanks, everybody.

[02:42:38] Male Speaker: Bye-bye

[02:42:39] Male Speaker: Thanks. Bye Jay.

[02:42:41] Male Speaker: Thanks all.

[02:42:42] Female Speaker: Official time is 1544. Thank you very much.

[02:42:47] Male Speaker: Thanks, Dawn.

[02:42:49] Female Speaker: You're welcome. Thanks, everyone. Camera off.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]