00:00:13

*Dan:* Good morning, Christian. We're getting started here, shortly. I hope everybody is here. How is everybody today?

00:01:32

Christian Hartley: Everyone is apparently really excited and enthused and talkative.

00:01:40

Kurt: Good morning, everybody.

00:01:40

Dan: Good morning, Kurt. Mark, can you hear me?

00:01:55

Mark Brauneis: I can, Dan.

00:01:58

Dan: Interesting, I can't hear you, that's what I need to figure out. I don't have any audio from you.

00:02:12

Chris Edsell: Can you guys hear me present?

00:02:17

Dan: Hey, Chris. I can hear you, can you hear me?

00:02:18

Chris Edsell: Yeah, I can hear you.

00:02:39

Dan: Mark, did you try Faulken again?

00:02:42

Mark Brauneis: Yeah, test one, two, three. Can you hear me?

00:02:45

Dan: Yeah, now I got you. Thank you. Good morning, Wood.

00:02:56

*Dan:* Ladies and gents, I am having camera issues this morning. It doesn't seem to want to connect, go figure. Worked fine last time I used it, but I'm here and I've got good audio, so, that's good.

00:03:27

Dan: You open yourself up to all kinds of jokes.

00:03:30

Dan: Yes, that I do. [inaudible 00:03:37] each related.

00:04:17

Dan: Excuse me. Yeah. I'm looking for Mike Henson. He said he's got some slow Internet issues he's dealing with, so, I was just scanning through the names here. I don't see him pop up yet. Let's give him a couple more minutes to see if he shows up.

00:05:00

Michael Hanson: Good morning, Mike.

00:05:03

Dan: Hey! Good morning, Mike. Did you end up just having to call it on your phone?

00:05:11

*Michael Hanson:* Yeah, still work to do. GoToMeeting is a new one for me. So, I got to figure it out.

00:05:18

*Dan:* No worries. Excuse me. Okay. Well, good morning, everybody. It's 9:02 a.m. Let's call this meeting to order. Would Dawn be able to do a roll call?

00:05:39

*Dawn:* Good morning. Yes. Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the spring meeting, Brian Long. I see Brian is on. Christian Hartley, I heard from.

00:06:01

Christian Hartley: Yeah.

00:06:03

Dawn: Michael Hanson, I heard on the phone.

00:06:07

Michael Hanson: Good morning.

00:06:09

Dawn: Good morning. Jake Bender?

00:06:10

Jake Bender: Good morning, Dawn, I'm here.

00:06:13

Dawn: Good morning.

00:06:14

Chris Edsell: Chris Edsell. Good morning, I'm here.

00:06:19

Dawn: Good morning, Christi. I say Chris might be a different Chris. Joe Dingman?

00:06:34

Chris Steeves: Hi, this is Chris. I'm here.

00:06:34

Dawn: Hi, Chris, Good morning.

00:06:37

Chris Steeves: Joe Dingman? Okay. David Lundin?

00:06:44

Dawn: Good morning.

00:06:44

David Lundin: Good morning.

00:06:48

Dawn: Dorianne? I don't want to mess up your last name.

00:06:52

Dorianne Sprehe: That's, okay. Good morning, Dawn. I'm here.

00:06:57

*Dawn:* Good morning. David Gibbs. That's right. He's not going to be in person. Richard Boothby? And Dan Grimes.

00:07:11

Dan Grimes: I am here.

00:07:14

Dawn: Good morning. And Mark Braneis? Good morning.

00:07:24

Dan: Hey, we have a quorum. Thank you very much, Dawn. Much appreciated.

00:07:28

Dawn: You're welcome.

00:07:30

*Dan:* We also have some visitors. I see Sarah Garcia is here. Who else did I see? Tyler Bones is here as well. And Virginia and Michael is here. Excuse me. So, three visitors.

00:07:48

Dawn: Excuse me, Chair. I thought I saw Lloyd on the phone as well.

00:07:52

Dan: You're right. I see Lloyd also. Thank you.

00:07:54

Dawn: You're welcome.

00:08:03

*Dan:* Right. Next item of business is to approve the agenda. And I get a motion to approve the agenda.

00:08:23

Chris: I'll make them out, Chair, a motion to approve the agenda.

00:08:29

Dawn: I'm sorry, who said they would approve it?

00:08:33

*Chris Steeves:* There were two of us, discretion, hardly. I can move or second, whichever you need.

00:08:39

*Dan:* Chris, have used the first and just spoke up. Who's the other? The second. Any one second in the approval of the agenda?

00:08:56

David Lundin: I got second.

00:09:05

Dan: I got Lundin, seconding that.

00:09:05

Dawn: I'm sorry, I missed who seconded?

00:09:10 *Dan:* Dave.

00:09:10

Dawn: Thank you.

00:09:14

*Dan:* Okay. Next item is the approval of the minutes. I know that the minutes got posted late. I know that they're in transcript form and they're very long, but by that same token, because they're long they hope that they're pretty darn accurate since their professional transcriptionists service did them.

00:09:40

*Dan:* Our goal is not to continue to produce those as the minutes, but to make minutes from them. But with that said, can I get someone to offer a motion to approve them?

00:09:51

David Lundin: I don't know where they are?

00:10:03

*Dan:* Hi, Dave. They are on the Standards Council website. On the right-hand side, when you go to the Standards Council.

00:10:17

David Lundin: Got it. I've not reviewed them.

00:10:38

*Christian Hartley:* Just to keep the meeting moving forward, Chair, this is Hartley. I'll make the motion to approve the meeting minutes of the previous meeting?

00:10:48

Richard: This is Richard. I'll second.

00:10:51

*Dan:* Okay. We have first from Christian Hartley and second from Richard. Thank you. And like I said, we are working towards making sure we have a more compact and reviewable minutes to talk to the council members in a more timely fashion moving forward.

00:11:17

Dan: All right. Next item of business is item six. Reviewing the statute missions and our own strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats grid. Mark, can you pull that up, since you're sharing the screen and walk us through what you saw from going through this, this week? While he's pulling that up, I welcome the visitors. I didn't specifically welcome the new members and my apologies for jumping through that. I wanted to say welcome to Dorianne, who's from Wrangell, and Mike from Unalaska. Thank you, guys. Welcome officially to be on the council and rocking and rolling. We are happy to have both of you.

00:12:47

Michael Hanson: Thank you, Dan.

00:12:51

Dorianne: Thank you, Dan, good morning.

00:12:53

Dan: Good morning. Okay, Mark.

00:13:06

Mark Brauneis: All right, good morning. We're going to go ahead and we'll start with the statue. What we've done on this PowerPoint that you're viewing is and I fully recognize it's a bit of an eye-chart. But the packages that we sent out clearly delineated all of the information. No changes or anything of any significance there. If you have anything that you'd like to recommend, we wouldn't address that further down the road.

00:13:31

Mark Brauneis: So, the first thing is the legislative statute that organizes last part of Standards Council will move on and this is a matter of underneath the format of this council, this is something we have to review at the beginning of each meeting. So that will be there. Also, additionally, you should see next slide, will be our mission statement, which I pulled up and it's still the last time this was revised was in 2014, however, it is still fairly relevant, we'll look at that on an administrative level as to whether or not we want to bring anything forward there. Speaking to the mission and our values.

00:14:23

Mark Brauneis: Next slide. And then kind of the meat and potatoes as far as our SWOT or Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and threats. Again, this is somewhat dated material, but also we'll need to address on re-administrative side. Next slide. And then finally it's our strategic plan and strategic goals. What I've done is we've pulled down what was pre-existing, made some adjustments as to actions that have been taken. The items that you see in green are ongoing and in yellow there has been an adjustment based on dates or vacancies, what have you. Red indicates when we get down to strategic goal, objective two, you'll notice red, we are not meeting that standard or that objective currently, but with some of the performance measures that are coming into play that we'll speak to you once we get to the technical committees and where we're at on the different standards, the review processes. We'll be able to turn that green fairly quickly.

00:16:08

Mark Brauneis: Moving on to strategic goal three, everything there is under review, not really anything of any significance. These are really 30,000 foot level goals. The objectives and the targets, how we're going to meet them are fairly administrative as we go down the road, not a lot of changes there. I will say that under strategic goal three, that I am looking at target one and target two much closer as they fall within our realm of responsibility here specifically?

00:16:45

Mark Brauneis: Strategic goal (four) is also ongoing. I anticipate doing this developing by individual standard, a publicly viewable matrix that will be on our website they will identify all track changes and the status for each standard. One of the biggest comments I'm receiving is we're not closing the loop in the communications process for completing actions. Work may have been completed, but no one knows about it. We're going to start putting everything up

on the website. More pertinent things as they come down the pipe will be in a crawler format along the bottom, so, that we're getting relevant information out there as quickly as we can. So, that all falls underneath that. Again, yellow because it's under review, it's not complete by fall the conference will have that complete.

00:17:54

Mark Brauneis: Target two understand strategic goal four, is red. We have currently lost accreditation for hazardous materials under the pro board. I had that package at about 80 percent. I have a little bit more review. I need to get with our technical committee for some support there. And we'll be able to turn that green in short order. Again, objective two, target two on review or still requires review, honestly not gone through that yet. Strategic goal, five, is currently read as an incomplete. We have not reviewed the certification policy manual or provided any input or updates on that in some time. It was initiated, but not completed, so, it's on up front on the to do list.

00:19:08

Mark Brauneis: Essentially everything else for strategic goal, six and seven and eight are all under review as completed or were green and will address and adjust these for the next meeting, updating them. So, that's pretty much the going in position that I came into the job where we were. And we'll make the adjustments and adjust this as well and get it out in the next meeting. So, that was the conclusion to that.

00:19:48

Dan: Thanks, Mark. Can you go back to strategic goal five, please and can you explain? I'm trying to read through this, sorry, it is a little small.

00:20:12

Mark Brauneis: Yeah, Dan, it's bit of a eyechart. This PowerPoint process is more of a placeholder to the packages that we sent out, albeit somewhat late. So, strategic goal five specifically speaks to the legislative action that to my knowledge has not moved forward at all and I have zero visibility that any of this has occurred as it's printed here. Consequently, I don't see this as having been accomplished at all, so, it's red, until I can review it further or I get additional information. Is it dead? Do we want to move forward with this, what have you. But, Dan, I'm going off of a document that this is where we're starting from. So, if it needs adjustments, feel free to jump in.

00:21:09

Dan: Thank you, Mark. That one caught my eye. I am not familiar with the specific regulations that we were trying to accomplish with that. I'm sure that we capture them somewhere in time, but it might be a bit of a research project for you to find out where we left off on this. I do believe that the intent was to put something into regulation that would back up the Standards Council and their efforts. Don't remember if it was specific to some of our initiatives with live fire or if it was specific to recertification or if it was more global, I just don't have that institutional memory that speaks directly to that.

00:22:11

Dan: If anyone else that's been on the council for a while has a better memory of this than I do, can you refresh our memory? Otherwise, Mark, we're going to have to ask you to dig deep and maybe meet up with Gordon, find out what specifically this was targeting.

00:22:28

Mark Brauneis: Absolutely. I'll make those notes here.

00:23:03

Dan: I'm not hearing anybody else with input on that. We will move forward to the administrative report, item eight. Thank you, Mark, for going through the strategic plan. And I know some of these things, folks, we will speak to some of those red items that you saw as I was scrolling through or going to speak to more specifically during our updates on the standards and certification summaries and progress reports for the committees.

00:23:41

Mark Brauneis: All right. We'll go to the next slide. A series of slides rather, move on to the finance report. Here we go. Good morning, everyone. Mark Brauneis here, your administrator. If I had no chance to meet with you or chat with you yet, my apologies will get there. We're going to begin. My report to you is in your package, you received the number of documents reflecting the way we track the funding or organization to encapsulate it and make it a little more indigestible, we have the following slides. But essentially, we walked into fiscal year with 375, 100 year-to-date, we've spent 836. The projected expenditures at the end, it shows kind of running balance of 181, which will, if you look at the bottom there, will reflect some carryforward. Next slide, please? We're about 67 percent through the fiscal year at this point, so, I'm trying to nail down hard numbers. It's a little more accurate once we get into the full meeting, than we have a much cleaner look back.

00:25:08

Mark Brauneis: So, again, we're about 67 percent through the fiscal year. Nothing significant to report on personnel services. We have one employee and you'll notice in your documentation the cost in there. Our contractual obligations, we do have an \$8300 contract ending that will impact our bottom line, but again, nothing tremendously significant. Commodities, we're starting to use more as we update some of our internal data management equipment. But again, not even met the \$1000 limit there, so, pretty minimal as you scroll through those spreadsheets.

00:26:00

Mark Brauneis: So, we left FY'20 at about 1,223 carry over. And even with the additional 30, we carried forward. In this cycle, even with the utilization of our contractors, our Delta is we're going to leave 21 projected at 122001, so, out of 200 or less difference in our carry forward. And these are preliminary numbers, but just to give you an idea of what we're tracking, how we track it and where those moving targets are, and then once again we get into the fall, it's a little easier to give you a wrap up for the full fiscal year.

00:26:55

Mark Brauneis: Next slide, please? And before I even move on, are there any questions at this point? All right. Well, we'll go ahead and move to the next slide then please. Here we've seen a significant retraction in overdue invoices. We've essentially cut that in half in the clerk's office. This is our QuickBooks dashboard reflecting a profit and loss statement you can see. Not too distant past those numbers were significant. We're down to very, very small numbers, 625. I don't know that we'll ever see zero, but again, we'll try over the next six

months to see if we can have that number as well. We are obviously at the whim of occasionally people who don't pay or there are just challenges with overlap between reporting and updating. I think that's a pretty significant improvement from even this time last year.

00:28:20

*Mark Brauneis:* Next slide, please. Okay. So, that concludes the dollars in cents from money side of my report know, in the spring meeting, it looks like there's very little significance to pass on there. We'll move in today fiscal year on our testing and certifying activities. There are number of qualifying documents in your package. So, for those there are, I know in the past folks have wanted to see where we're testing, who is testing, what are we testing? So, we provided that. But this slide and the following slides specifically consolidate our overalls.

00:29:08

Mark Brauneis: And despite COVID, we've seen a little bit of a retraction, as you can see, are running averages for tests over three years is 941. And for 21, we're sitting at 77 on the certificates issued. We've seen just a small retraction, but I don't know that it's tremendously significant. And then, again, you drop down, you can see the proctored tests. And this one is, just so everyone knows moving forward, this is a highlight that I'm paying special attention to, because what it is to me is an indicator one, how well the instructions I've heard and then almost more importantly, is the quality of the tests we're providing. If those numbers are staying static, well, then we can create a mean to operate off of. I just Don't have that data right now. It looks static when you look between these two years, but I want to ensure that we're utilizing these tools to provide the best product possible. So, you'll see more of this or more on that a little later on.

00:30:31

Mark Brauneis: Next slide. All right, Net exam's update. This is where we're at on that. We originally had scheduled Haz Mat awareness to come out for a beta test with our Deputy Fire Marshals. We were unable to accomplish that, so, we did it with Anchorage Fire Department. Identified a couple of technical glitches, one specific glitch is, our system doesn't lock the student out, when they're taking the test, so, that's gone back to net exams for to be examined and give us a solution.

00:31:17

Mark Brauneis: Taking that into account, we are going to continue because we are not always going to be able to use either the tablets or a training lab or testing lab, but we're going to continue to have to a lesser degree, a demand for paper testing. So, on the 30th of this month, in what 10 days, we will be offering a beta test paper or Haz Mat operations to see how that all is looking. Once that's accomplished, I'll package that all up and give with our stakeholders and with our technical committee in reference to Haz Mat, so, everything will get on the same page and move forward there.

00:32:08

Mark Brauneis: As an update, as far as our third-party accreditation goes with IFSAC we are currently updated to the current 1072 standard. And I am having to play a little bit of a catch up there as to the steps. So, I'll be touching base with those, again, those stakeholders to make sure we've got with all our Ts crossed and Is dotted. So, that's where we're at on that.

It looks really good. I'm pleased. I wish it was moving faster than it is, but I would rather take the time to build these products to a marketable degree instead of constantly revisiting them. So, that's where we are at on that.

00:32:56

Mark Brauneis: All right, next slide. As we transition out of my report as far as to the information I typically will provide and we're going to transition into the technical advisory committees before I move out of that is this graphic I called up delineates how we do business and to what degree this office provides support to the council and what that interaction and flow of information should look like. So, we are implementing some management controls here to better mirror and be successful at meeting this and these objectives.

00:33:51

Mark Brauneis: Next slide, please. This is the consolidated matrix that I need to qualify a few things on before we move into the technical committee. This will be my last input before we move on to agenda item nine. On our website, not only do we need to provide an individual status for each standard, where we are at in the process, review processes, we can answer a lot of questions with these datasheet as datasheet process and you're going to see come out in the next six weeks. This is the consolidated wrap up of that product. And to qualify it a little bit, there are some additional information I've come across in the last week, that this may or may not match information you currently have. If you get with me offline, we can address that and update, especially specifically speaking to our committee leads, if the data I have is incorrect, then we'll update that and move forward.

00:35:15

*Mark Brauneis:* So, on this particular sheet, this will be the wrap up of all our standards, what's been approved, what we're working towards when it's due and then again, it will lead into the actual data sheet for each individual standard, that this basically is going to be the life cycle for the standard.

00:35:35

Mark Brauneis: You'll notice on the left, under the NFPA standards there some asterisks next to some of our standards. Those are the standards we are currently accredited to. Under IFSAC that were specifically looked at and accredited without equivocation by IFSAC during their visits, regardless of the addition. I have some background work I need to do there to get a little more depth on what that means to us. Then, of course, the certification titles. The different levels we are offering, the current edition when the next edition comes out. I put in the council committee leads: this will be on the website as well, so, that we have a point of contact for the individual stakeholders.

00:36:34

Mark Brauneis: You'll notice underneath a number of the council committee leads that [inaudible] personnel are in parentheses, are part of the management controls that we are going to go through is removing the [inaudible] personnel from lead chair or lead role in moving into a support role or the process management. The theory here or the direction we're moving, the management control, is to operate very similarly to the NFA grant process, where we roundtable our responsibilities and the offices in a calendar driven twice

or three times a year process and get the work done in a matter of days instead of weeks, months, years.

00:37:42

*Mark Brauneis:* So, that policy will come out here in the next couple of weeks on what we're doing. But it also brings us more in line with previous slide on what our responsibilities are and how we're going to successfully use those. If you have any recommendations for those vacancies under the council committee leads column, I will absolutely entertain that and added to the consolidated lists so, that we can ensure we keep vibrant, engaged, and excited committees.

00:38:25

Mark Brauneis: So, now the fun part. We'll get to this specifically in individual committees, but everyone knows where is never good. Currently the two standards identified in red have significant issues that I can speak to with the leads because again, I'm going off of what I feel it as incomplete information, so, I need a little more institutional background. As well as I've engaged with and in talks with IFSAC on expectations, what we provided, what we haven't provided versus what we show we've provided. So, these may be relatively easy fixes, I just don't know and I don't blow smoke, so, if it's wrong, it's bad, and it's on us, I'm going to talk. And those two don't look great at the moment.

00:39:30

Mark Brauneis: The three that are yellow, have very, very minor challenges. Primarily they are letters from me to IFSAC resolve those. And then everything else is current, except you notice the dates or the review dates are this year. So, we will be in a lot of cases. The reviews already begun. I won't belabor that to get into the next section. And then, of course, we've got adoption dates over on the side. So, the question I would have other than providing this information to you is, if there is more information or you don't feel this is relevant or you feel there's other information that could be included that would increase relevancy and transparency, please let me know. This is a draft product that I got finalized at 9:30 last night. We'll continue to improve this process and it will be the wrap up for individual data sheets.

00:40:41

Mark Brauneis: Next slide, please.

00:40:41

*Dan:* Hey, Mark. Before you go to the next slide, you might give people a chance to speak to this one. Just for clarification, let's test the voters here. Hey, Dave Lundin, do you believe that you're the FADO lead?

00:41:02

David Lundin: Correct.

00:41:02

Dan: Okay. So, we do have a name to put in fire apparatus driver/operator, we have Dave Lundin.

00:41:09

Mark Brauneis: Awesome.

00:41:11

Dan: And a point of order in the way this list is written, I'm just scrolling down, of course my eyes go right to the stuff I'm responsible for, and no I don't believe that this is entirely accurate. It's showing green in 2023 when we have not finished the 2019 update nor is that reflected in the last adoption date all the way to the right. But that was what the last work done was on the 2019 version. It shouldn't be green, that should be red.

00:41:51

Mark Brauneis: And which one we're talking to, Dan?

00:41:53

Dan: That's 1041 fire service instructor.

00:42:06

*Mark Brauneis:* Okay. Again, garbage in, garbage out, so, point taken, and I'll add that to the list. I can only provide you guys with the information I am able to show you right now. And that's kind of the point of this is to fine tune this and then get it out there for public view, so, that that kind of thing doesn't happen again. Was there anyone else?

00:42:31

Dan: There's a question on the IFSAC, but 1072, Tyler are you online? Can you voice your question?

00:42:47

*Tyler Bones:* Thank you for recognizing me. Just a quick question. I know that 1072 doesn't list IFSAC under the level, but all the other IFSAC ones are listed there. Is that just a typo or are we not pursuing IFSAC for 1072?

00:43:02

Mark Brauneis: That's a typo.

00:43:05

Tyler Bones: Okay. Thank you. And then also-

00:43:09

*Mark Brauneis:* So, let me go close the loop on that, as that is a typo, however, like I mentioned before, we did experience a setback with Pro Board, and that package is near complete. And I do need to touch base with you on that for some events, so, we can go green with Pro Board, but we're green with the IFSAC.

00:43:35

*Tyler Bones:* Great. Okay. And then just one other observation. I know, Don (Werhonig) won't be on today, but I'll cover for him again. But, 1006 technical rescue is the last version that those are written to is the 2013 edition. So, those are a revision out of day two. So, I don't think the review stats is correct on technical rescue.

00:44:00

Mark Brauneis: Plan 1006?

00:44:02

Tyler Bones: Correct.

00:44:08

Mark Brauneis: All right, fantastic. Thank you.

00:44:20

Chris Steeves: Hey, Dan. This is, Chris.

00:44:22 *Dan:* Yes.

00:44:24

*Chris Steeves:* A just quick question, I'm having some- never mind you answered my question. Thank you.

00:44:36

Dan: In case people don't see the chat window, Chris had a question about Haz-Mat Ops being expired, Haz Mat Ops isn't expired to IFSAC, if we did lose our accreditation with Pro Board because of the time it took us to switch to 1072. But Mark has a packet to regain that in hand now. Mark do you have a rough timeline? What do you think that takes to get back in good graces with ProBoard.

00:45:06

Mark Brauneis: I would be lying if I gave you a date. I know my interactions would have focused primarily on IFSAC to get that cleaned up and that turnaround times been roughly a month. I'm going to give them the same benefit of the doubt. So, even if we had another month, then we should have this resolved, what is this, March, April, May? But we'll say by the end of May. If it gets the outside. And if it comes in earlier, again, it'll come in as an update on our website for everyone to see.

00:45:41

Dan: Mark, there's a continuing question on that, that I think a lot of people have on different levels as we work through getting caught up. What is the process that you foresee moving forward with grandfathering people in so, that when we're back ProBoard accredited, will the people that fall between the old standard and getting a 1072, that's IFSAC but not Pro Board, will they be able to get that Pro Board sticker updated to their sir?

00:46:13

*Mark Brauneis:* Unless ProBoard has an issue with it, I don't see why not. We do have windows of opportunity for grandfathering. We have windows of opportunity for transition between standards like 472 to 1072 is not a transition. So, I don't know any other way to answer the question when absolutely I want to accommodate within the rules everyone we can.

00:46:45

Dan: And Chris, I do know that this is not the first time stuff like this has come up and we've been able to work our way forward, providing opportunities to grant those, I don't see that this will be any different. I suspect that administratively there is language that speaks directly to that. I just I have never seen it, not privy to it, I've been a part of it at times in the past, but the last time when we did the Haz Mat update. And having to go in and apply for that grandfathered certificate to the new standard. So, I know that they usually offer it as a window, is my recollection, where there's a period of time that if you want that, if you want that accreditation, that you send in an application and there's a window of opportunity. And

from now until whenever and if you don't apply within that time, then they have to close it out. So, I suspect this will be the same.

00:47:47

Mark Brauneis: Correct.

00:47:55

Dan: Thanks, Mark. Just to confirm, since we have everybody on the line, I'm still looking through old documents trying to find. I thought we had somebody that stepped up and took the rapid intervention crew. I don't see it on here. I know Mark and I talked about this earlier this week, if there's anybody on-line that has a recollection can point us in the right direction as to who stepped up. I'm going through the minutes right now and this is back to that transcript thing. I'm doing a word search and not having a lot of luck finding who might have stepped up and been responsible for that?

00:48:42

*Christian Hartley:* Hey, this is Hartley. I was the one that stepped up to offer help with the committee, not as committee lead.

00:48:50

Dan: And funny, I think I might have done the same thing. I'm actually looking for my name. I told Mark that a couple of days ago is that if no one else said yes, I might have said if you can't find anybody else, I'll do it, but I done so far not having any luck finding that. So, thank you.

00:49:06

Dan: Okay, Mark. Does anybody else have any questions for Mark on this page?

00:49:21

Christian Hartley: At this point, any input to inquire is to ensure that we're providing you folks with the most accurate information, just touch base with me. I have been out of pocket for a little while, but I'm back and we'll get this thing updated and move forward.

00:49:42

Dan: So, I think the big thing will just make sure that Mark moving forward that the dates match up, right? There should be no reason why that current NFPA addition doesn't match with the review date and statuses, so, that those are accurate. And correct me if I'm wrong, but we're about to go into committee reports and speak more specifically to this, each one of these as we go. Correct? So, that will help.

00:50:14

Christian Hartley: And in my brief was to create a segue into that.

00:50:21

Dan: But I think you have some specific information on each of them that if the committee lead doesn't or if you haven't been able to meet up with the committee leads, you'll have some additional information, specifics on it.

00:50:32

*Christian Hartley:* I do have some, yes.

00:50:49

*Dan:* Okay. Thanks, everybody. We'll move on here. One point of order: Mark, did we say 10 or 11? 11? Is that our goal for public comment?

00:51:14

Mark Brauneis: Public comment was at 10 o'clock.

00:51:16

Dan: Okay. So, in 12 minutes, we're going to go into public comment and that way we have an opportunity for people in case we wrap up early, we don't want people to have to listen all day wondering when their chance for public comment is. So, that agenda item will be at 10 AM, so, that's in about 12 minutes. So, if you're on the line and listening, waiting for an answer, that'll be your chance. And with that said, we'll move into item nine: technical advisory committees and progress reports. So, we'll start with NFPA 10, public extinguishers and that should be Christian Hartley.

00:52:05

Christian Hartley: Oops, I should have been paying attention to that thing. I mean, you saw the previous screen, I was going to ask you - did we not at the last meeting - and I could be totally, woefully incorrect - did we not adopt the 2018 standard NFPA 10. I know we don't have a certification program yet, but I thought we adopted the newest 10?

00:52:29

*Dan:* We did not, not exactly. What we did was, we adopted the newest standard recognized by the state fire codes. We wanted to leave that window open So, that if when the state was behind on adopting the newest regulations, we didn't put ourselves in a bind. We did approve in NFPA 10 to whichever version addition is recognized by the state.

00:53:03

Christian Hartley: Okay. As far as my report, I did send to the chair and to Mark, nobody else has been involved, nobody else has seen it yet, so, it's not ready for consumption yet, but a proposal for restructuring the NFPA 10 entire, I don't know whether it would be well received or not. So, I had a system that I used to teach based on the existing NFPA 10 when we were allowed to teach it and provide the tests with skill sheets and everything - I had a complete packet. I am proposing that we change the structure of it to more in line with how we certify. Because I've gone through NFPA 10, I've gone through the international fire code, I've gone through NICET(?): Nowhere does it require a level one, level two, level three. And the way that the state currently does it, we don't even give any kind of education or certification for level one. Level two is your annual inspections and level three is everything else. I mean, basically it's how it ends up working out. Level two can also do that: they can select where it goes, but the level three was a big catch all for it.

00:54:18

Christian Hartley: I have proposed and I've got the document out if you wanted me to share my screen, but probably not - I just don't know, do you want to give me or maybe assign some other people or does anybody else want to be involved to look this over and try and get more input on it? Because what I would like to do is have this a total packet ready for a presentation and potential adoption at the fall conference. How do you want me to move forward with that chair?

00:55:00

Dan: All right. Simple mute button issue. I would recommend that we take what you've done, and by the way, I think it's a great direction. I appreciate it, personally. I don't think that there's anything that would cause a hurdle from my personal review, but I'm not the only end user. When we're ready to make this proposal to the council, just have a short packet together saying here's how we expect this to be delineated. Make some of the questions from a working standpoint, right now what are the end user expectations and are we creating hurdles that people don't have to jump through now, is that something that we can accept?

00:56:00

Christian Hartley: One of the things and I'm not sure how to address it in the actual direction, because I've actually drafted the full directive entirely so, that I'm trying to get as full as I could, you read that. But, after talking to Mark and stuff, I just think that this program is the perfect place where we can use Netexams. The biggest reason why LSIB made it so, difficult to take the testing as it is right now was because of test integrity. I think Netexams allows us to retain a much higher test integrity while maximizing outreach to those more rural fire departments or rural industries that would want to provide this education and have their people certified, but using Netexams as opposed to a mailed out paper testing were possible. I think we can increase the access to the certification on a really big scale statewide.

00:57:05

Christian Hartley: That was the part that excited me as well. It seems like it's a better direction overall. My concern is that, we talked about the term unfunded mandate, I don't want to just throw that around loosely, but if I understand this correctly, and we were breaking this back out to sort of what it used to be with additional tested levels, is that acceptable to our end user group to go to, okay, now I do have to train and test at level one and is that actually something that the end users are clamoring for, do they want that or are they going to say, wait? Now I have to pay a testing fee or I didn't have to do that.

00:57:55

Christian Hartley: The current level one is strictly your monthly examinations. It's not in your annual. I do not propose connecting that in. I just take the way to start our basic level certifications at the annual level, at the annual inspections and not monthly. I think a good element of that level of training, and that's why I made a task sheet for it, was that somebody certified at the inspection level, which is what would be considered currently the level two is also needs to have some level of knowledge of how to teach their co-workers, how to do a monthly evaluation, a monthly inspection.

00:58:51

Dan: I misunderstood.

00:58:53

Christian Hartley: Without adding a new certification for the monthly, it remains the responsibility of the business or organization. We don't start certifying until the inspection level, which is the current level too.

00:59:10

*Dan:* Perfect. My misunderstanding when I was going through that, because of the way it was going out, I did catch that. Thank you.

00:59:17

Richard Boothby: Hey, Dan. It's, Rich.

00:59:22 *Dan:* Yes.

00:59:22

Richard Boothby: We get quite a few complaints from the end users, i.e., the fire extinguisher people, about they must meet our timelines when we can do the testing, that kind of thing. And also, with COVID, we've had some that have been scheduled and due to COVID, they've been not having been allowed to happen. I did talk with our end users, a couple of them in the last two weeks face-to-face, and mentioned this to them and they were very excited to see this online start up, so, yeah, they are excited about it.

01:00:08

Christian Hartley: I don't have quite the final level, because I need to finish up on the recharge technician level. Right now, one of the things I don't have and for legitimate reasons is access to the test bank with sake what LSIB currently uses for the testing. So, I would need some help coming up with the tests for these programs, or would that just be done strictly by Mark's office, once I could finish that. The director, when the skill sheet then they would take care of putting together the written test, is that how that would work? This is my first time being involved in this kind of role.

01:00:53

Dan: Christian. Go ahead.

01:00:53

Dan: I was going to say, Mark and I talked about this last week, I think that they already had a plan for working through the testing side of it. I don't know where those test banks come from. If I remember right from previous council meetings, there is no one publishing test banks on this. So, this would be written in house by subject matter experts. So, Chris, I would believe that you would still be continuing to be involved in that if that were the case.

01:01:33

Christian Hartley: I mean it's up to you Chairman. I can share a screen and show everybody what it looks like or do you think it would be better just wait until the fall conference and have emailed out to everybody ahead of time?

01:01:46

Dan: I think that would be more appropriate, but I'd like to have a final proposal by then.

01:01:51

*Christian Hartley:* Got you. Will do. That's all I have Chair, unless anybody had any questions or other suggestions?

01:01:56

Chris Edsell: Hey, Christian. This is Chris.

01:02:00

Christian Hartley: Yeah.

01:02:04

Chris Edsell: I'd be interested in seeing what you got if you want to email to me as an end user of this product and a complainer at the current testing situation, I'd like to be involved, if you don't mind.

01:02:19

Christian Hartley: Okay. I'll do that. I'll find your email address.

01:02:30

Dan: Okay. We're going to stop our technical advisory committee reports here. It's 9:59. We're going to go ahead and start opening up for public comment. Minute early, anybody is here that has public comment, I'd like to speak, now is your opportunity, please identify yourself and then state your peace. Anyone at all?

01:03:35

Christian Hartley: Hey, Chair. Just so, that we can make the public comment section last longer, maybe we can ask our two new members to introduce themselves?

01:03:44

*Dan:* It's a great idea. Would Mike and Dorian like to say just a brief thing about what brought them to the council?

01:03:55

Dorianne Sprehe: Go ahead, Mike. Okay. This is Dorianne. I'm the Fire Medic Trainer down here in Wrangell. I appreciate the opportunity to serve on this board with you guys. I was brought to and encouraged by Mr. Garcia. I appreciate all the work she's done for the fire service in the state, in her many capacities. And I'm just looking forward to giving back a little bit. I'm happy to be here. Thanks, guys.

01:04:53

*Mike:* All right. This is, Mike. So, I had this school speech going and then I was muted. So, can you hear me now?

01:04:59

Dan: Yeah. We got you loud and clear.

01:05:02

Dan: Excellent. So, I've been attending council meetings for a while now, and I was real curious and interested in the back end accreditation process for the state. I'd been talking back and forth with SFA President Justin Bode about kind of our role as a bay and kind of how we can move forward with the council and he encouraged me to apply for it. So, I got on here with you guys. And yeah, I'm just kind of real interested and curious and happy to help out.

01:05:36

*Dan:* Well, thanks, Mike, thanks, Dorianne, very nice to have you both, much appreciate. Okay, last chance for public comment. Didn't see anybody else join, So, I'm going to assume we don't have anyone. We'll move on with our committee reports. So, next up NFPA 472,

1072. I know that we have Tyler on here. Tyler, do you want to speak to 472, 1072? You and Mark give us a little more information?

01:06:10

Tyler Bones: Sure. I can go first and then turn it over to Mark. The committee has not been involved in any of the 472, 1072 items since early 2020. So, today it's been pretty quiet. As a status update, there is a new standard that will be coming into effect in 2022. It's NFPA 470, which is intended to bring 472, 473 and 1072 into one standard again, so, expect to see that. There are changes that are being rolled out. I'm on the Committee for Awareness Ops and Tech and I know we're starting to change our curriculum to meet for 470 so, that it's compliant when it rolls out. But beyond that, and that's all the updates I have for the committee.

01:07:13

Dan: Tyler, this is the Chair. I heard you say that there hasn't been a lot of input from the committee, but that was after you turned in, I believe, a pretty healthy packet of work to get that standard updated. Is there anything that was left undone that needs to be addressed or Mark can jump on as well as if there are pieces that, I seem to remember a story and it's just anecdotal, but I'd like to get it out there and make sure that we're accomplishing what we need to accomplish. Is there a piece that involved skill sheet revision that you guys needed to see, wanted to see, just remember that there been some pieces and parts that perhaps both sides didn't come together on?

01:08:02

Tyler Bones: The Haz Mat committee only reviewed, IFSTA's course material and Jones and Bartlett of course material. The IFSTA contracted to have two different individuals write the skill sheets. I only got a chance to review them once, maybe twice. One individual wrote them twice or modified them twice. I think [inaudible 01:08:31] one of the staff also had some work at them at the skill sheets as well.

01:08:39

*Tyler Bones :* The last time we reviewed skill sheets was December of 2019 and I believe it was mentioned at the fall meeting that they had been submitted to the IFSAC, but the committee had not reviewed that version of them. We have had nearly zero involvement in skill sheets. Did that answer your question?

01:09:22

Dan: Yeah. Sorry, I was muted, but I was talking, it was brilliant, high level stuff. So, if we can make sure, Mark and Tyler that we connect you two together and ensure that the committee has an opportunity to do a final review. It sounds to me like those skill sheets are published, if they're published and we're doing classes and the committee hasn't seen them, I have some concerns with that and I think the council should as well, So, can we close that loop?

01:09:53

Mark Brauneis: Yeah, absolutely. I can speak to a little bit of it. So, I'm coming in the middle of this thing here. The skill sheets were completed. The test banks were completed. The transition was approved. The information was sent to IFSAC, it was approved, and we are updated to 1072. However, it didn't complete the review processes here, at least I'm seeing

in my notes and everything I was saying is absolutely correct, so, we do need to close that loop. We're using this paper test on the 30th as well as the HMA to give me a better foundation on what we have and where it needs to go instead of having people waste their time. So, here after the 30th, I'll have a product, that I think we can ship out for a review and go from there.

01:10:53

*Tyler Bones :* And Chair, just add to that, you mention the new version is published, if you're referencing are practical skills sheets that are being used today, published on the website: those are still the 2014 version. The new ones have not been published to a public portal that I know of.

01:11:14

Mark Brauneis: No, not yet.

01:11:16

Dan: Okay. So, that clarifies some things and the point here is that just so, that everyone has clarity: We're saying that we've gained accreditation through producing materials that meets the accreditation process and has there been a class or two using this material?

01:11:42

Mark Brauneis: Not to my knowledge, that's why we're using the material on the 30th.

01:11:49

Dan: Okay. Just the tests or the skill sheets as well?

01:11:55

Mark Brauneis: My intent was to do both, but I was going into this with the understanding based on the information in front of me that this had already been vetted. We can absolutely get this out to the committee for them to take it. We can either do it before the beta paper test or after. If we do it after, it might save us a stuff.

01:12:29

Dan: So, Tyler - I'm sorry I don't want to beleaguer in this, but you said you have seen those skill sheets at one point, is that right?

01:12:37

*Mark Brauneis:* Not the ones that have been submitted. Those were worked by another third-party contractor to be fast and we never saw them.

01:12:52

Dan: Okay. We need to get those to you as soon as possible, clearly. I don't know how long that's going to take to make that happen, but can we get that process going? I think you guys sensed I have some concerns here where we're talking that we gained accreditation, updated accreditations, but we have a product that hasn't been seen by the technical committee that should be step one in ensuring that, that process is closed, that we've done all the work we need to do.

01:13:23

Dan: So, let's make sure that that happens, but that is an action item to get those skill sheets to the Haz Mat committee for review ASAP. But the testing, just to finish up on that, we're talking about beta testing. Is this, when we say a beta test on a paper test, it's just a paper

test. It's an accurate terminology used as a beta test. I mean, aren't we just printing a question based off and the test materials have been reviewed, correct?

01:13:55

Mark Brauneis: That's, okay. Let me back up a little bit. It is a beta test. We're actually printing the test questions and the test banks will be apportioned off of net exams. It's actually the hidden base there and then we'll provide the test to accomplish the test. And then we have to in-house develop the next steps forward on how we're going to manage that data and either uploaded into net exam, score the tests manually. So, there's a number of steps that are tied directly to net exams, might have been able to speak a little clearer than what I did to that. Does that make sense?

01:14:39

Dan: Not exactly. Truthfully. I guess to me, if the Test Bank itself has been vetted and uploaded in the net exam, any test we print off of that is a validated test already. It's not really a beta test. It's just hitting print on some questions instead of doing it on an iPad.

01:14:57

*Mark Brauneis:* Correct. It's a BETA test on the system in the process as opposed to the test. I can certainly change the terminology there.

01:15:06

Dan: Understood. You're just making sure that this works, basically, a print and printed test. The direction from the council previously has been this has to be an option all the time. It needs to be fleshed out for every level, so, that's important that they know that. When these people take the test because the test has been validated, do they know that they're testing to the new level or are they thinking they're still testing to the old?

01:15:41

*Mark Brauneis:* This course was offered as a 1072 course. The instruction was to 1072. The test is being offered as a 1072 test, understanding that based on the information I have available to me is this was a fully vetted and currently accredited program through IFSAC. Obviously, in the conversations we've had, it's got some thesis missing, but here in the next day or Monday. And I can send out the skill sheets. They're already in a PDF form. It's an email. We want fully close with it.

01:16:23

Dan: Truth be told, what I believe is most accurate with IFSAC and Pro Board is they are less concerned with the nuts and bolts. They are more concerned with the processes, how we do things. I'm not necessarily surprised. I don't think that the reason IFSAC might not be aware of the fact that we weren't fully vetted on this in, just because they don't care as much about skills sheets, they care about how we use the skill sheets and that we're following our own policies to test fairly and equitably. This seem like semantics, but, yes, I think we have a question.

01:17:04

David Lundin: Yeah. This is Lundin. I'm looking at the schedule coming up for testing and I think it's seven classes in the next two months that would be testing. And it sounds to me like we have two different standards right now for testing the same information. Am I misunderstanding that?

01:17:30

Dan: I don't think we do. It's a valid question, Dave. I think that if the information has been accurately sent out, telling people we are 1072 and you need to be teaching at 1072 to take this test, then we're good. The biggest issue is just making sure that we're properly vetting the material, like the skill sheets that we just identified. If they aren't doing their own thing and just looking at the website, and are pulling their materials from there, as far as the old 472 materials, then we would have more of a problem.

01:18:14

David Lundin: We are going to be doing a test on the 30th using a new test bank printed off from the online testing. Yet we also have tests on the four days later at two other departments. Are they using that same information or are they using the old test, in which case that two different tests floating around? It just feels we're on top of each other with things.

01:18:45

Dan: Yeah, I totally agree, Dave. Mark and Dawn, can you guys speak to that?

01:18:52

*Mark:* I can speak to that. The 1072 is scheduled on the 30th and that is specifically to close the loop on the 1072 program and the roll out. We're still currently operating under what is published on the website. That is, until that changes, which I'm not comfortable doing until we close the loop, it sounds like on skilled sheets and that's where we're at, does that makes sense. We're still operating under whatever the guidance that is on the website is the published guidance, the 30th test again is a test of the system if you will.

01:19:38

David Lundin: Is it a different test than it will be offered on the third?

01:19:47

*Dan:* It's the same test. Well, I need to look into that, just to be honest, because I want to say it's the same test bank, but I don't believe so. Regardless of 30th, Test is unassociated with the published testing processes we have in place now.

01:20:09

David Lundin: Okay. The testing that will be occurring on the 3rd and following that for classes that are already in process are using what's been going on for the last couple of years?

01:20:21

Dawn: Correct.

01:20:21

David Lundin: And what has been done on the 30th is a one off that they already knew that's being tested to or the class has been held to the future adopted or the future standard that we will be using?

01:20:39

Dan: Correct.

01:20:39

David Lundin: Okay.

01:20:45

Dan: Let's mark it. You said correct at first, but at the second go, you said you needed to find out. Let's make sure that we have that clarity and that the students and training officers have that clarity as we're scheduling these out.

01:21:04

Dan: Absolutely. Just to clear up a little bit of confusion. I just may have completed it is the way he reiterated the question and it is what I was saying correct to this is a one off, we are currently testing to the 472. Once we close the loop on the 1072 skill sheet issue, then we will publish to the website the 1072, and there will be a crossover time. If we put the 1072 out on Monday, we can expect the folks testing on the fourth to be held to that standard. So, there is a crossover period of time to add to this conversation.

01:21:51

Dan: Thank you. Totally agree. That's exactly what we're trying to delineate, is that people have that opportunity and are made aware, I know that both dynamics exist. There are departments that have probably approached and said, we're already moving on. We've updated our own internal materials to 1072 and want to [inaudible 01:22:12]. You're going to have other departments that don't have those resources and they're just going to continue to use yours.

01:22:19 *Dan:* Right.

01:22:28

Dan: Okay. Thank you. I think we have some clarity moving forward on 1072. I would like to propose a break. It's 10:20. Can we take a 11-minute break? Everybody back at 10:30. Everybody a chance to stretch, get a new cup of coffee. Let's recess until 10:30.

01:33:37

*Dan:* All right, welcome back, everybody. I think we're ready to get started again. We will start up with the next committee report, which is NFPA 1001 and that will be Mike Hanson.

01:34:06

Michael Hanson: Can you hear me?

01:34:08

Dan: Yes, sir.

01:34:10

Michael Hanson: All right. I'm just kind of obviously first meeting as a board member. I don't have a ton of background. I've had some back and forth with Sarah on this. And then we haven't talked a ton about kind of the committee lead role as far as the standards concerned 1001. Sarah's on the line, which I saw she was. I'm actually going to pass the buck to her, so she can give a report and then her and I can get the other offline and discuss it further.

01:34:46

Dan: Thanks, Mike.

01:34:53

Sarah: So, I pass the buck to Mike on this time. I'm a bit on my end up-dates.

01:34:55

Dan: Mark, do you have any update on NFPA 1001?

01:35:15

*Mark Brauneis:* I do. Based on the information that I have here, 2019 skill sheet correlations are complete. Our net exam test bank is uploaded. It appears that the 2019 is not been adopted by the council. No. So, my piece of this so far, that's where I'm at. And now that we have a new committee lead, as I can touch base with him and move forward this time.

01:36:05

Dan: Okay. If I understand this right, if we're going by the form that we have in front of us on the screen, then we're assuming we have not voted as a council to adopt the newest version of this. I'd like to move this item now to new business, put it on the new business, otherwise not identified and pick it back up as a motion to vote in the new current standard, as long as Mike is okay with that.

01:36:44

*Michael Hanson:* Yeah, that's fine. Do we need to make a motion or are you just going to move it down?

01:36:49

Dan: I think right now we can move it down. We already have a placeholder items not previously identified. So, I don't think we need emotion. We'll bring it up and ask for emotion to adopt.

01:37:05

Michael Hanson: Sounds great.

01:37:07

*Dan:* It looks like there may be a couple more like that. Okay, thank you, NFPA 1002, driver operator?

01:37:18

David Lundin: This is Lundin. As many of you may recall, when I volunteered last fall, I said, but I wasn't going to be able to do anything for a few months. That few months has extended to several months. So, not anything has been done except to get anxious about it and start to form a committee. I do have one person who's willing to help and I would be open to taking suggestions, if anybody wants to email me with other people, they would suggest that I contact to be on the committee.

01:38:08

Dan: Great, thanks, Dave. So, if you're interested, council members or council members that know people that are interested, subject matter experts on fire apparatus driver operator, talked to Dave Lundin. And Mark, I believe there was one other action item also on this from a fall meeting, and that was the test, the test review specifically identified, flagged as a possible bad test. Could you speak to that?

01:38:40

*David Lundin:* It did. The solution at this point, it does look like based on the numbers, if you look at the data, that we have a significant failure percentage on the older, on the current tests for pumper and four mobile water supply. But I'm sorry, I misspoke, it's for

Aerial. Well, anyways, we have the skills correlation complete for the 2000 standard, as well as the test banks for the 2017 standards are complete to go out to the committee, the J&B, and its the chunks of test banks are prepared to go out to the committee for vetting, and that will resolve potentially or should resolve that issue.

01:39:47

Dan: Excellent.

01:39:50

David Lundin: Touch base here in the next week or two, and we can get this process going. I can give you answer.

01:39:56

Dan: Awesome, thank you. Yeah, I am aware for the last time I did a seal for this that I was looking through the test questions and there were several Aerial questions on the Pumper Mobile Water Supply test. And so that's my take on why there may be some poor scores, but happy to look at the new tests and investors.

01:40:29

David Lundin: Hey, I have another question about this, Mark. I'm looking at dates and I know you talked briefly about this when you were first going through the document that's in front of us. But can you clarify that we adopted the current edition, the 2017, in 2017, it's now 2021, that's four years or three and a half since we adopted it. It's yellow. Where are we in the timeline of when does this need to be done and completed to maintain our accreditation.

01:41:07

*Dan:* So, to speak that specifically, I was originally under the impression that we had a two year for Pro Board, three year for IFSAC, and after a little more research, that's partially true. But it depends, of course, on how quickly NFPA feels the next edition, so there's a caveat in there, which is why that's yellow. If we get these test banks vetted, the skill sheets are already done. We need to do the correlation and we get that in, we're fine. Based on data and based on the conversation I had with IFSAC.

01:41:50

David Lundin: Am I to understand there is no timeline?

01:41:53

Dan: No, that's not. No, there is obviously a timeline. This was due in 2020. So, we are rapidly coming to a fail point, but we're not quite there. They have not turned us red yet. I don't have a heartbeat for you, but I'll get it.

01:42:20

David Lundin: Out of curiosity, is that an official stance from them and that they have granted us an extension of sorts, or is this more of a we've talked to them on the phone and they said, "Hey! just keep working on it."

01:42:36

Dan: Yes. It was more about, "Hey! I'm the new guy. I've got a couple of issues. We're in the process. We're all but done. Do I need to go ahead and file for formal extension if we're so close, or can we beg forgiveness and file now?" And that was the direction I was given. And I

can certainly do this if it looks like it's going to be significant period of time. It's all file or a formal extension and get it in writing.

01:43:07

David Lundin: I think that might be wise. I also think that now would be a good time for you to set a timeline that you think that the committee and the group can get this accomplished by. So, your office essentially and the committee, it might be who you guys to set a timeline for this?

01:43:36

Dan: Yeah, point well taken. I'll go ahead and look at that. And get I don't want to just come up with an arbitrary date. I'll go ahead and get the lead on this, provide them what I have, we'll get a committee around and it has to happen soon. And within the next 90 days would be a good target.

01:43:59

Richard Boothby: Hey, Dan, this is Rich.

01:44:00

Dan: Yes, sir.

01:44:02

*Richard Boothby:* Point of clarification. What Standards Council has adopted right now is the 2017, Mark, are we moving to the 20, because the council has not adopted the 20 yet or told us to move to it. If we get this through Pro Board right now with the 2017, that still means we're four years out of date, correct?

01:44:30

Dan: There's not a '20, I believe there's a 2022.

01:44:34

David Lundin: 2022.

01:44:37

*Richard Boothby:* Okay. I was just panicking a little bit, because if we're already at four and there was a 20 out there, we probably should be going to that. But, okay, I understand.

01:44:54

Dan: Okay. Anything else on 1002? Sorry, I'm not trying to put anybody on the spot, but I think these are important to get that clarity on each one of these. There's been a bone of contention for some time. And, Mark, now that you're fully in with both feet into the position, we want to make sure that we have a plan with each of these as we go. So, thank you for your patience.

01:45:21

Dan: All right, next item of business is NFPA 1003 airport firefighter, Darcy Perry is the lead on that. Any updates, Mark, I'm looking through here. I believe that we adopted. I know that there are some committee work being done. I thought that we adopted the 2019 edition. I don't see that here, but I believe we did. And maybe we didn't. I think there was a delay in getting the 2016 version, and maybe that's what I'm remembering is the 2016 version to until 2019 updated. But that doesn't seem right, because I don't think there was 2019.

01:46:18

Mark Brauneis: The information I have is it was 2015 Standard. It is a 2015 standard that was adopted in March of 2016. The one that we spoke on is there was an administrative action that needed to be accomplished with this act, and then that's 100 percent or 15. And then we need to move into and that would go on your future list, if you will, for adopting and moving into 2019, so choose based on the information I have.

01:47:06

Dan: Okay. Well, I think that they would be ready to adopt, so we can reach out to the committee chair and/or committee lead and try to make that happen ASAP. Ready. That will be one we'll want to flag as an action item for fall is to adopt the 2019 standard. We can make a note of that.

01:47:41

Richard Boothby: Go it.

01:47:47

*Dan:* Okay. NFPA 1005 Marine firefighters. Firefighting for land-based firefighters. I know that Mark has been chasing this one around. So, Mark, you want to speak to this?

01:48:15

Mark Brauneis: That's a good analogy, I need a boat for this one. Yes, that's the extent of my humor. There is a local fire department that has received a grant to work their way forward on providing this training and we're trying to run that to ground as to whether or not they want to continue to do so. I do have and have located a test bank. There is also and in our conversations very quickly, it was identified that there is currently information or a program or training program using the wrong word there available. We need to acquire that, put together a committee and move it forward if they so choose.

01:49:08

Mark Brauneis: But I guess the first question would be, does the council see this as a standard they want to pursue. And if so, great, we'll go ahead and move forward with acquiring the development of committee and Test Bank and what have you in the whole package. But there is a relevant tank training curriculum out there now, which was a hold up in the past, there was not and now there is. That's essentially where I'm at on it.

01:49:55

Dan: Mark, I think that if you're asking that this is already a previously adopted standard, so this is one that the council went into and their eyes wide open and said, yes, we think this is important unless you have information or somebody speaks up now that says, no, I don't think that's important and wants to make a motion to remove it. I think we continue to press forward.

01:50:22

Chris Steeves: Dan, this is Chris.

01:50:31

Dan: Is this Chris Steeves talking? Chris, we cannot hear you.

01:50:39

Chris Steeves: Sorry. Can you hear me now?

01:50:41

Dan: Yes, very well.

01:50:45

Chris Steeves: We've spent a lot of money on this program through the grants of the Chiefs Association gotten everything and all the work that was done by Mr. Butts and everybody. I don't think it's one we want to just not keep moving forward. A suggestion maybe would be that local fire department talking about that just got a grant, maybe somebody from there would like to be a committee lead?

01:51:15

Dan: That is the current direction that we've taken, Chris. We've already asked the administrator to reach out to them to see if someone wants to be a lead from them. We just haven't heard back yet, I believe, is that correct, Mark? That's the newest update?

01:51:32

*Mark Brauneis:* Correct. Yes. I have approached them and asked for a technical expert in any support that they could give us. I've just not [inaudible 01:51:42] time to respond.

01:51:46

*Chris Steeves:* Is the department a secret? Can we say who it is, maybe somebody on the calls got in with them?

01:51:52

Mark Brauneis: It's Anchorage Fire Department. It's not a secret.

01:51:56

Chris Steeves: Okay.

01:51:56

Dan: Okay. I'm hearing no other input. I believe that the direction is we keep moving forward. And so, let's proceed that way with finding a lead and trying to make this update happen. And that brings us to 1006. I believe that, that would be Tyler Bones, who's going to do his best for Don Werhonig?

01:52:37

Tyler Bones: Yeah. Don, apologizes, he's teaching a Wolfer class today and so he's not able to get on again. So, he apologizes. Standard 1006, if you go on-line and look at our existing practical skills that are posted there for the 2013 edition, which is now two editions behind. There is a newer version that just got published this year. And So, for Don to move forward, really, we need the committee to adopt. If nothing else, the 2017 edition, but preferably the 2021 edition so that we're able to get a committee together and begin working on.

01:53:25

*Tyler Bones :* The major difference between 2013 and 2017/2021 is that they eliminated the level one, level two and have now gone to awareness operations of technician to match the ten-

01:53:46

Dan: Just all the ten series.

01:53:48

Tyler Bones: The other rescue standard to match it. It's actually a good change. The other major change is our current edition that's adopted. General technical rescue must be taken before the other series. So, rope, find space vehicle, water, whatever the 2017 edition got rid of that requirement. And so, really if we roll into the newer editions of the standards, the general technical rescuer one will go away, which quite honestly is only ever been taught once in the state for Kodiak fire. We have had a few requests lately to teach it, but only because we are getting requests for departments for confined space rescue and rope rescue.

01:54:42

*Tyler Bones :* When we explain currently they have to do the general technical rescue and then they kind of shift focus to that. But nobody is really wanting to step into that that certification just to then find out that eventually we're going to move in to where they don't even need it. And So, that's the big ask there. There is the council adopts the newer versions or version of 1006 So, that we can move forward.

01:55:11

Tyler Bones: Don and I have both received feedback on the fact that this is not an IFSAC approved or Pro Board approved certification and that people have been a little frustrated at times that they didn't necessarily realize that when they started going down the path of trying to hold the class. There's no notation anywhere on the website that, that clearly defines that. You really must dig for it. And So, we have had feedback that people would like to see if a certification isn't IFSAC or Pro Board that it's duly noted somehow on the website because I think the assumption is right or wrong, the assumption is if the council is involved, it's got some kind of an international seal, which obviously is not the case.

01:56:03

*Tyler Bones :* And then, I don't know the other thing that Don was wondering was, what does it take to pursue that IFSAC or Pro Board seal, because there is a lot of interest in the fair banks area and definitely in the military to have the international recognition, so that's usable other places than just within the state of Alaska. That's all.

01:56:36

Dan: Thanks, Tyler. That's a good update, I appreciate it. Mark, perhaps you can get some information to that committee on what it takes to regain IFSAC or Pro Board or both accreditation to that standard, so that they understand what that might entail? My personal opinion, I believe it's mostly administrative. So, long as we have our ducks in a row, generally those accrediting entities, like I mentioned before, just want to see that we're following a process, our own processes of testing equitably and site security and consistency. And if that's the case, then it shouldn't be a tall hurdle. I'll let Mark tie in with the committee on that. Mark, can you put that down there or Dawn put that down as an action item please, to follow back up with the committee on what it's going to take to gain IFSAC accreditation for technical rescue?

01:57:43

Dawn: Yes. I have it on an action list.

01:57:51

*Dan:* Thank you. NFPA 1021, fire officer: should be Alex Boyd. I don't see him on this morning. Mark, were you prepared to speak briefly about that?

01:58:08

Mark Brauneis: I can briefly. He was hoping to be able to pop in and he might have been very, very efficient use of our time to get to this point by this time of the day. I have spoken with him (Alex): we have currently outstanding completed fire [inaudible] 2020 skill sheet, correlations are complete. Fire officer two, test bank validation - if one and two is uploaded into net exam, there is an administrative action I need to take for fire officer two to gain that accreditation from IFSAC and that will happen by the end of the month.

01:59:01

Dan: Thank you, Mark. A point of order on this: I'm going down the list, I'm just trying to make sure we make notes, but I know that the work has been done on fire officer, and I know personally as someone who uses the materials and has worked with as a committee member with Alex, that I believe we adopted the standard, the 2020 version of it. Actually, I don't think it's an accurate 2020 version. I believe that we already adopted it - if we didn't, we were supposed to. So, without the committee lead, I don't feel comfortable making that vote. But if he shows up before the end of the day, I'd like to move that to new business to consider a vote on updating to the 2020 standard - I believe that's the level that the work has been done to. If we don't get in, we don't get in. I would push to a new business item for the fall meeting, but I want to make sure that we capture these, if we really haven't voted on them, we need to.

02:00:16

*Mark Brauneis:* Yes, we've been on two different lists than for the moment, should he pop in. And then also, if he doesn't, we've got action item moving forward.

02:00:27

Dan: Okay. Thank you. So, that brings us to NFPA 1033, certified fire investigator. Should be Bryan Crisp. I don't see him on. I do see that we have some pending issues here: A, it looks like there's a typo. It looks like we adopted it 2015, but it's reflecting a 2014 edition and that the next one is 2021, which is a little unique in the way they do things, so we need to check that information and see if that's a typo and if that's accurate. And it looks like we're going to be due to adopt a new standard and that can probably wait until fall. It looks like 2021, we'll have that envelope time after the fall meeting to work on it. Any input there, Mark, from the administrative side?

02:01:55

*Mark Brauneis:* Negative. That is not a standard that I had made my way down to. My notes here don't reflect that we've made any other adjustments to that other than what came up in the last meeting in reference to finger print.

02:02:11

*Dan:* Sure. And I want to thank everybody, by the way, everybody that called in on the special meeting in November for closing that loop and making sure that we addressed their concerns for certified fire investigator, removing the fingerprint requirement for recertification only. So, thank you for that. All right, that brings us to 1035, fire and life

safety educator, that's Virginia. Virginia, do you have an update on that? I see that you're on here. And then, Mark, you have something to add to that?

02:03:00

*Mark Brauneis:* Right now what I'm reflecting is that 1035 skill sheet correlations are complete, test bank has been validated. The only thing outstanding are the data uploads of the test banks for one and two, three is uploaded and has been used.

02:03:30

Dan: Mark, are you saying that-

02.03.31

*Mark Brauneis:* Also this spreadsheet is not reflecting? I'm sorry, I misspoke on that, disregard three as in reference to our service instructor 1041. Ahead of myself.

02:04:10

Dan: There's a lot underneath here, I'm looking at this. We have fire and life safety educator, how many levels of that is there?

02:04:24

*Mark Brauneis:* Based on the information that I have, the approved levels right now that we're looking at is there three PIO, YFIS and [inaudible 02:04:35].

02:04:37

*Dan:* Okay. Those are the three levels that are listed. I was confused. I didn't know if there were three levels of fire and life safety educator separate from these. These seemed like specialty pieces. This is not my not my expertise. We have the current NFPA edition is 2015 that we did adopt in 2017 and we're due for a new standard this year.

02:05:15

Mark Brauneis: Based on the information I have. Yes.

02:05:17

Dan: There is a few of these. This is a good example and maybe we need to talk about this, but do I understand that some of this work is pending on 2015 or is it the 2021 standard that we're talking? It's in the green and it looks like that's what we're working on, is that right? I just want to make sure we're not doing any work on 2015, we're updating to 2021 now.

02:05:48

Mark Brauneis: That is my understanding. Yes.

02:05:52

Dan: Okay. Do we have a new committee lead for this?

02:05:56

Mark Brauneis: We do not. That will be on the list of folks that we need to hunt down.

02:06:02

*Dan:* Okay. Council members, if you are interested in this, like to serve, this is a great opportunity to step up. If you know someone, please give the name to Mark and Dawn to try to keep this moving forward.

02:06:26

Mark Brauneis: And you will see a notice going out on a variety of different websites

requesting support and assistance in this regard. So, if you have anybody or know of anybody, please let us know.

02:06:56

Dan: Okay. That brings us to NFPA 2041, fire service instructor. That's myself as the committee lead. My information what I believe to be true is that the 2019 version committee work was completed. We made suggested changes to skill sheets. We did the test bank review and provided that information back to the administration. There was no information back to the committee on the suggested changes or a final review process on the skill sheets. Personally, I would like to make sure that we go through those one more time after we see the changes in writing before they get published.

02:08:03

Dan: I know that they have not been published. The test bank has been updated. The certification directive, the cert directive for that does reference the newest editions of the book, the curriculum and that the test is validated to that, so that would be the 2019 material, but I have not seen anything back on the suggested skill sheet changes, nor have we addressed as a committee how we want to proceed, and this is something that we were seeking administrative guidance on, is how we address the live fire instructor into this, because the newest addition 2019 includes a live fire instructor as a piece of 1041 to line up and all the instructors [inaudible] in one spot that was their goal.

02:09:19

*Dan:* We have not addressed that at all. Whether or not that stays. The questions that committee indeed has is, does that standard when you have an instructorship listed, do they get certified under 1041 as a live fire instructor, but it references 1043 or they get certified under 1043 and it just references 1041? I don't know where that properly belongs.

02:09:59

*Mark Brauneis:* From our end, that is not a question I have looked into yet. I've added it to the action items. I can tell you that I do have in my possession all of the test banks and skill sheets with comments that I can get back out for review.

02:10:30

Christian Hartley: This is Christian. If I can ask a question about the live fire instructor. In the past, ISFSI has come up and taught classes before, hence that could be incorrect, that could be totally misunderstood, but it was my understanding that the state recognized that in the past and would also recognize the recertification of the ISFSI live fire. I don't think they call it an accreditation; they call it something else, but is that something that the council currently recognizes from them?

02:11:12

*Dan:* I believe we have at some point in the past, Grandfather. No, we didn't. We made people take a state test to gain their state certification.

02:11:27

Christian Hartley: Oh, great. That's what I wanted to be sure, because to renew your live fire with ISFSI only required maintaining your membership with the organization every year for three years, and then recertify did not seem like in appropriate skills verification.

02:11:46

Dan: I think that we have Jason Buist on the line and when we get to the standard here next hour here in a second. Well, it is next. So, we'll have that conversation and he might be able to provide a little more light on that.

02:12:00

Christian Hartley: Yeah, I can fill in that that blank.

02:12:03

Dan: Awesome! Thanks.

02:12:05

Christian Hartley: Okay. So, just closing out 1041 here for a second. We have some action items to determine where live fire instructor might sit with this and skill sheets will go back out to the committee for final verification before we publish. Is that correct, Mark?

02:12:31

Mark Brauneis: That would be correct, yes.

02:12:47

Dan: I see a note in the chat. We have Alex Boyd on the line now.

02:12:54

Alex Boyd: I am. Can hear me.

02:12:55

Dan: I Can. Hi, Alex?

02:12:59

Alex Boyd: Sorry I wasn't able to find here, but some folks have let me know that I was up and jumped in, so we got a few minutes.

02:13:06

*Dan:* No problem. We're talking about fire officer and we just wanted some clarification the date to the standard is the work that's been done on the standard at the 2020 addition level, is that correct?

02:13:24

Alex Boyd: Yes, that's my. My brief is very similar to the one I just overheard from yours on instructor. In 2019 just prior to Gordon's departure, did bunch of work on the program and then it was handed off when he left. And again, I think you and I spoke when a lot of the effort was being redone. I believe it's all been done about with the administration here, this week and just let them know if anything is missing, we're more than happy to redo it. But basically, my report is identical to what you had with your instructor.

02:14:00

Alex Boyd: We believe everything was done. We brought it up to the grand standard, did a validation, correlation and consolidation of the written test bank for fire officer one and two and we did all of that, I'm not sure where the work stands after it was submitted. We did just complete another fire officer two and have now had uninvolved. So, everybody that was doing the evaluation as director promised as well as Brockie was the other. He did an outside look at it and have made some suggestions on the adjustments for fire officer two and they were ready to move forward on those, that's where we are at.

02:14:41

*Dan:* Perfect. Thanks, Alex. And just to clarify, because we have some clerical stuff that we need to account for. Right now, we don't show a voting and I believe we voted on this previously. We don't show one in the record. So, we're going to make sure that we formalize this and the recommendation is that we adopt the 2020 standard, is that correct?

02:15:01

Alex Boyd: Absolutely.

02:15:03

*Dan:* Okay. We'll go ahead and move that to new business and vote on it by the end of the meeting. No further action needed from you right now, we just want to make sure that we have that captured.

02:15:12

Alex Boyd: Outstanding. And don't hesitate, I apologize again. I'm not able to stay on the hall meeting and just kind of have to pop back out. So, thank you much. Feel free to reach out to me, if you need me, I'll jump back in.

02:15:22

Dan: Awesome. Thanks, Alex. Appreciate it.

02:15:25

Alex: Thank you, guys. Have a great day.

02:15:29

Dan: Thanks, everybody.

02:15:31

*Dan:* All right. Okay. Next item of business on the agenda is, after firing instructor for committee reports is after fire instructor for committee reports NFBA 1403 live fire instructor technician. Jason.

02:15:49

Jason Buist: Everybody, this is Jason Buist. All right, so obviously NFBA has been in flux here for a few years with the advent of 1001 and all the new information they put in there, it's not just 11 areas anymore. I think it's like '19. And then the fire instructor update that has live fire portions in it. And then, of course, both of those hopscotched with 1403 which came out a year late, because of all the information they put into that.

02:16:17

Jason Buist: So, I think all of those things, all three of those standards now kind of correlate. And it's time for us to update our well I would suggest that we update to the 2018 standard. Obviously with the instructor stuff that they put live fire in the instructor curriculum. It's sort of kind of everybody sort of looked a little bit sideways like, all right, where are we going with this. And then they added all the information to the other stuff, but never had a curriculum update. And that is now the only curriculum 1403 as the Jones and Bartletts live fire instructor. And I'd been in conversations with the two main guys that wrote that that curriculum, which is Forrest Reader and Dave Casey.

02:17:06

Jason Buist: And they were frustrated too and the fact that all that stuff just popped up and

then there was no curriculum to attach to it. So, Jones and Bartletts has updated their online platform with that stuff. And So, I think we're ready to update our state adoption of the 2018 standard.

02:17:29

Jason Buist: Obviously, that will require a new test bank and the vetting of that and everything that goes with it. As to the question about ISFSI, Society of Fire Service Instructors credential, I don't believe that that is IFSAC yet. I was just talking to Chris Steeves and he said that they had a class down there. Chris, is that an IFSAC accredited program?

02:17:59

*Chris Steeves:* I do not believe so. It's their class and what we do with it from there, whether we ask for reciprocity or whatever [inaudible].

02:18:06

Jason Buist: Yeah. So, when we built the standard in 1516 for the state, we wanted it to be where you could get the Society of Fire Service Instructors accredited program and then we would give you the state version. Gordon was not in favor of that. We didn't really beat it to death - he just said, "I don't think that's a good idea.", so we didn't put that in there. I'm still open to doing that. Obviously, some people want that program or they get grants and can afford that program, so, I don't see any reason why we can't have that option. I don't think that's my decision, obviously, but I wouldn't mind it if that's what happens. I think it's a good program. I've taken it a couple of different times. I currently don't have that one because I have our Alaska state one and I felt like I needed to have some brand loyalty there.

02:19:07

Jason Buist: I know that some other people in the state, like Ben Flagel, just went through the process of doing it - it's a pretty substantial process to get redone, get your recertification through them. You have to basically deliver a lot of paperwork of what positions you've held and then you actually have to take a written test through their computer platform. So, it's not super easy, but it's not as simple as just being a member. It's cheaper if you're a member, but when you pay the money to get recertified and you're not currently a member, you also get a membership on top of that: it's something like \$400, so it's pretty spendy. Does that answer your question?

02:19:58

*Dan:* I think it does. Thanks for the update. Again, Jason, you're in that same boat where right now we're showing, well, this one, it's not just showing. I know it's accurate that we have adopted the previous version. And is your recommendation that we adopt the new version? 2018 version?

02:20:19

Jason Buist: Currently we are on the 2012 version. But we should stay up with the times. And now that everything matches, all those three standards are correlated. They have a test bank and the new curriculum is being updated. There's no reason why we can't go to the 2018 standard for the state.

02:20:36

*Dan:* Okay. We're going to move that to new business and propose a motion to vote that 2018 standard, so that you can get to work.

02:20:48

Jason Buist: Yeah. It shouldn't be that difficult as there's only one curriculum book out there. And they're updated, the test bank obviously will cost some money to do that and then the vetting process. I'm hoping to do a class this spring, but I don't know how long it will take to get the new test bank. So, I'm kind of up in the air on that right now as far as which curriculum we're going to be teaching under.

02:21:22

Dan: You'll need to work with the administration on that as far as where they're going to obtain their test bank from. And any recommendations you have, obviously, as the committee legal will assist with that?

02:21:36

Jason Buist: Yeah. I know the last one that was purchased was through a grant when Seward Fire Department, in '15 or '16, they got a grant to build their live fire facility there in Seward and part of that grant money was for the Test Bank. So, I know it's expensive, but I imagine it's probably be the same organization that they got through. I believe it's one that the state is used for several other tests.

02:22:09

Dan: Great. Thanks, Jason. Much appreciated.

02:22:12

Jason Buist: Yep. And if anybody has any more questions about it or needs classes, just get a hold of me. One more thing on that. I'm working with Air Force right now, because the DOD is using our state platform as the basis for their live fire instructor. And they are doing it with the 2018 standard. But when that's available, it'll be on their online platform, the Total Force Virtual Learning System, which is available to anybody, you don't have to be a DOD person for that. So, there will be a lot of information on there. And currently you can log in as a guest and take any of their programs, obviously not for certification because you have to be a DOD member. But there's anywhere from firefighter one, airport, marine all the way to RIT, fire extinguishers, all kinds of stuff. It's available for free as a guest if anybody wants to take those courses.

02:23:08

Dan: Interesting. Thanks, Jason.

02:23:10

Jason Buist: Yup.

02:23:20

*Dan:* Okay. Any questions on that standard or update? All right. Hearing none. We'll move on to NFPA 1407 Rapid Intervention. It looks to me, I'm looking through this, it looks like we're due to get a standard update and we need a committee to lead. Mark, do you have any additional information on rapid intervention crews to bring forward today?

02:24:00

*Mark Brauneis:* I do not. No. Other than the fact that, like you just mentioned, we need to build the community from that one.

02:24:16

Christian Hartley: Chair, this is Chris. I'd be willing to help with the committee. I don't want to leave that one. I need to see how the renewals, how that's done, so that I can know that for future?

02:24:30

Dan: Understood. Thanks, Christian. Anyone else have an interest or a suggestion.

02:24:53

*Christian Hartley:* I know Casey Litten spent a lot of time developing the red program for the air force. He might be interested, I can check with him.

02:25:03

Dan: That would be great. Thanks.

02:25:08

Richard Boothby: This is Rich. I'm going to reach out to a couple I know also.

02:25:11

Mark Brauneis: Perfect. Thank you.

02:25:12

Dan: Okay. If you find people, please, forward their names ASAP to mark at Standards Council, and we'll try to get that moving forward. It would look like we need to adopt a standard, so I have to put that on new business for the fall meeting and hopefully we'll have a committee chair who can make a recommendation and have some work done on that by fall. That brings us to NFPA 1521 Fire Department Safety Officer and Jake Bender.

02:25:57

Jake Bender: Good morning, Chair. How are you?

02:26:00

Dan: I'm great.

02:26:01

Jake: Good. The work on this review by the committee members has been done. I need to complete the final report and some supporting documents to present to the committee. That's for the fall meeting, really the holdup is me completing the final report and sending it back out to the three committee members just for their final signoff and then on Sarah.

02:26:34

*Dan:* So, Jake, I have some questions about this one. Currently, did we adopt the standard yet?

02:26:42

Jake Bender: No, not to my knowledge.

02:26:46

*Dan:* We basically said go out and seek the information that you wanted to bring forward to recommend adoption, is that correct?

02:26:56

Jake: Correct. That's something that council will have to do to vote on that. It looks like

historically it's been discussed before and considered, but I never found anything that indicated that it had ever been officially adopted as a certification level.

02:27:16

Chris Steeves: Chair, this is Chris Steeves.

02:27:20

Dan: Yes, Chris.

02:27:20

Chris Steeves: I feel like we adopted this many years ago, around the time that fire conference was in Anchorage. And an outside organization came up and taught it. We got ProBoard certifications and then I believe that we got a State cert out of it also. There was a lot of controversy around it.

02:27:44

Dan: Well, that's funny because I was about to ask more questions that might dig into that. Okay. It sounds like we have a little bit of homework to do, some research.

02:27:56

Chris Steeves: Yeah. If I remember right, it had to do with the organization that thought it wasn't a accredited organization in the state, but they came up top of the class. But I feel like we've got to state cert out of it.

02:28:09

Jake Bender: Dan, I can dig around on that, because I think I got certified under that agency during that same time, so that will give me a time frame to look and see if we ever discussed this, and that's in meeting notes or anything around that same time period, if Chris thinks that we discussed it.

02:28:30

Dan: That would be really helpful. Chris, are you on the committee with Jake?

02:28:36

Jake Bender: He is not.

02:28:36

Chris Steeves: I'm not.

02:28:40

*Dan:* Jake if you wanted to do some research and be able to make a report and a recommendation to us all meeting?

02:28:48

Chris Steeves: Yeah, absolutely. I have some spoke about questions that might point us in the right direction overall. First off, I want to make sure I know what we're talking about. I'm looking at 1521. Is that the new name of it? I don't believe the name is accurate fire safety officer, I think that's wrong.

02:29:09

Dan: That's correct. It's actually Fire Department Safety Officer.

02:29:15

Chris Steeves: The reason I say that is because I want to make sure we clarify between that

and some of the other programs out there, like incident safety officer. This is this the full fire department safety officer program, much more robust than a one- or two-day class on incident safety officer.

02:29:33

Jake Bender: Yes, correct. I was actually to get in the details, there's two levels under there, a health and safety officer and an incident safety officer, like we see another NFPA standards.

02:29:43

Dan: That was going to be my next question. I thought there might be levels as well.

02:29:47

Jake Bender: Yes, there are.

02:29:48

Dan: OK, perfect.

02:29:50

Chris Steeves: This is Chris Steeves one more time.

02:29:51

Dan: Yes, sir.

02:29:53

*Chris Steeves:* I just signed into state impact. I did not get a state cert, but I do have a Pro Board cert from it. There was no state cert.

02:30:01

Dan: Okay. Thank you.

02:30:06

David Lundin: Chair, this is David Lundin.

02:30:06

Dan: Yes, sir.

02:30:06

*David Lundin:* I'm looking at the packet from last fall's meeting. I want to make sure I'm looking at last fall. No. I'm looking at the from 2018 and it says in this list that it was adopted in 2009.

02:30:28

Dan: Thank you. So, that has a historical date at least.

02:30:33

David Lundin: Yes, thanks Dan.

02:30:37

*Dan:* We can maybe let the record reflect that somewhere, Mark? That at least it's on the books in 2009. Obviously, we still need to adopt the 2020 version. So, I do believe that this is one of those standards that sat. I don't think this has ever been taught as a state certified program so far. Any other questions about NFPA 1521 fire department safety officer? We're

done. We'll move on to rural fire protection specialist and Mike Hanson, previously, Lisa Shield.

02:31:32

Michael Hanson: All right, so I do get report from Lisa. I'm actually going to recommend Joe Dingman for the chairmanship because he's already on the committee and have a little bit of historical knowledge and just kind of take a step back. But I'll give you the report. \$100 the Rural Fire Protection Specialist Test Bank is complete. The Rural Fire Protection Operations apprentice curriculum and question and Test Bank is complete. Both need to be sent to the Committee for Test Vetting Skills and training records, where I'll draft it for review by committee. New test policies also drafted.

02:32:05

Michael Hanson: As far as roll over money for that we talked about and I spoke about earlier would like to make a recommendation to maybe use some of that money to send CO's out to rural villages. It sounds like two people usually go out and test or teach and then test these classes and be nice to have some state support on that as well just for our rural brethren out here. The testing for the rural program will stay paper done on site, the seal instructor, new test pilot does reflect that. And what I have. Any questions I will send over to Lisa.

02:32:55

*Chris Steeves:* Mike, this is Chris Steeves. Either maybe you or Lisa could answer this. You mentioned sending the more COs out, could you give a little detail behind that, like what the idea and the intent and possibly the cost of that would be?

02:33:13

Michael Hanson: Yeah, I can touch on it and then Lisa can cover the rest. But currently they send an instructor and most instructors are also certified as COs. Both of them, as it stands right now, the village is required to pay for it. If we could kind of show some state support for border council support for that and have the council pay for the CO portion of that travel and per diem, I think that would be very helpful.

02:33:47

*Chris Steeves:* Okay. Any estimate on what that would cost? I know we're carrying a lot of money over, but yes, we're always.

02:33:59

Michael Hanson: Obviously, it's going to change just depending on which village it is at the time, depending on flight costs and things like that. But it's generally the 40-hour program. So, about a week's worth of travel and training costs and then depending flight. So, anywhere from a 1000 to \$1500 dollars per class. Thanks.

02:34:36

*Dan:* OK, thank you, Mike. Much appreciated. Glad to hear that that's moving forward. That looks like that concludes our committee reports. It's 11:30, that means we can go in for another hour. I'd like to recommend that we take a quick break, 10 minutes and come back and we'll finish out the last of the meeting. Should be quick. So, let's recess for 10 minutes till 11:42.

02:35:09

Dan: Okay. Welcome back, everyone. See that we've updated our document to include some new business items. Like to add to that. If I could, Mark and Dawn we now have a report in hand from our technical rescue on 1006, so that we don't have to wait till fall and the recommendation is adoption of the newest version of NFPA 1006. So, if we can add that in and vote on it, that would be great. Excuse me.

02:46:58

*Dan:* Okay. We already did our public comment. We have our item 10 association reports. First things first, Mike, we have two agencies, or two associations represented here. We have the Firefighters Association seat and the Fire Chiefs Association seat. So, Mike, do you have a report or any questions or information from the Fire Alaska Firefighters Association?

02:47:33

Michael: I do. Current association out here, just kind of a quick update for us. So, Dagan Rapo, as we do every year you guys saw that we cut the price in half this year, it was a fantastic success overall instead of selling 50 to 60 percent of our ticket. It sounds like we sold nearly all of them. Maybe we had 20 left over, something like that. Obviously offering a bunch of benefits to all of our members, any department and we're making a pretty significant push to get back into a lot of the different departments that we have in the past that had an interest, but don't currently are not currently members.

02:48:19

Michael: Giving out high school scholarships. Every year we give up four high school scholarships to our association members, children, four association members. In 2020 due to no conference gave out six. Obviously, we're still doing the same NFPA meal ticket reimbursement. I got the numbers right here: we sold 1496 out of the 1500-gun raffle tickets this year in 2020. If they will be giving \$5000 to Fairbanks this year for kind of the beginning conference reimbursement fees that could potentially be paid back. Do you have the MPP gov partnership now for added benefits for our members? Private insurance still providing \$10,000 on our off-duty accidental death and dismemberment policy with the additional 10 percent possible [inaudible 02:49:10].

02:49:13

*Michael:* Active chapter so far in 2021: four more pending. So new chapter this year are Cooper Landing, Juneau, Yakutat and Palmer. And then we did pay out three AD&D claims this year, gentlemen Alaska, one from [inaudible 02:49:31]. And that's kind of what we've been up to.

02:49:36

*Michael:* As far as what Justin and I had spoken about: we did want to get some clarification. We can do this off-line, it doesn't have to be on record. But what the rule [inaudible 02:49:46] is with our seat on council and how we can kind of further that rule and how be it more help to you guys and be more involved. And that was one of the big takeaways we had from Justin and I's meeting, what we want to discuss during this member report. That's all I got.

02:50:08

Dan: Thanks, Mike. Understood, and we can definitely follow up. Typically, this is an

opportunity for the associations to bring forth any agenda items that they have specific to the Standards Council and provide input that's specific to the association directions they'd like to see or concerns they have.

02:50:32

*Mike*: And that was my assumption. I just now spoke that as well. We're going to bring that up at our next meeting, get some stuff for you guys to possibly discuss.

02:50:47

Dan: Awesome! Dawn and Mark, my apologies. We left off the Alaska Professional Firefighters Association, that's the third association report. So, we'll have to update our minutes moving forward and agenda. I know it was on there, previously somehow slipped off. It's a very short report from the Alaska Fire Chiefs Association. As far as council specific items, the input I've received from the Chiefs Association is that the Chiefs Association has some concerns. I think they want to make sure that, that is heard loud and clear. They have some concerns delays in processing new standards and are validating and updating new standards. They want to make sure that the council itself recognizes that they're concerned for their constituency, the firefighters of Alaska. And the damage that it possibly can do to their organizations, if we don't continue to push hard on staying up to date on both our state processes, but also our third-party accreditation. Third party accreditation is important to many of these agencies and the constituencies within them. So, that that is understood.

02:52:14

Dan: They also wanted to make sure that we understood that they support the council strongly. They've repeatedly offered their support for our efforts to achieve alternative funding and through the legislature and have stood beside us and argued on our behalf repeatedly. Those are the two inputs from the State Chiefs Association. Jake, take it away with the Alaska Professional Firefighters.

02:52:53

Jake Bender: All right, Dan. I'll be shorter, I don't have anything to report that is relevant to the council.

02:53:08

Dan: Okay, thank you, Jake. Okay. I believe that all of our old business has been taken up. We didn't have any pending business. We have several new business items to get to. We're going to push through obviously. I think we'll be done here in fairly short order. So, we're going to ignore item 13, which is lunch, and try to wrap this up. We have a few items on new business. If the person running the presentation can scroll those up just a little bit, so we have a better picture of all of the new business items.

02:53:54

Dan: Okay. So, we have some adoptions to work on. We also have nominations for Chair and Vice Chair. We typically do the Vice Chair position in the fall and we do the Chair of the council in the spring meeting. We pushed the nominations for Vice Chair, because we were pending seat reappointments. And so we had a sitting vice chair that was in a seat and they had not been appointed or reappointed at that point. So, we wanted to wait until we determined whether that was going to happen. That was Sarah Garcia. And she was not reappointed. So, we now have a vacant Vice Chair Seat.

02:54:46

Dan: I think to keep those separate and I'll take input on this from the council, if our intent is to keep those separate, if it matters to have that that six month gap, we can appoint a Vice Chair for six months and then reappoint on the regular schedule, which would be my recommendation, if anybody has any input either way, please speak up now.

02:55:14

David Lundin: I concur in your recommendations. It's Lundin.

02:55:17

Dan: Great, thank you. Okay. So, we'll work on that in a minute. I just wanted to put all of those items up so that you can see them. We have a couple more good to the order stuff that will be presented here soon. So, let's start working through what we have now. We have motions or we have new business to adopt several standards. So, item 14A, NFPA 1001, that's into the 2019 version. NFPA 1001 is on the table, with some of like emotion to adopt or someone like to make a motion to adopt that, please.

02:56:01

Chris: I still do.

02:56:02

Christian Hartley: Hartley to second.

02:56:07

*Dan:* Hartley to second. Open for discussion. Okay. Hearing no discussion. What we'll do is we'll do a vote, there's a name for this kind of vote, don't ask me what it is.

02:56:29

Chris: Roll call vote.

02:56:33

*Dan:* Roll call vote. Correct. Thank you. So, we'll do a roll call vote on each of these. We can start that, Dawn.

02:56:42

Dawn: Yes, sir. Brian.

02:56:45

David Lundin: Mr. Chair, this is Lundin.

02:56:47

Dan: Yes, Dave.

02:56:50

David Lundin: Before we get into that, we could move and adopt all four of these at vote once if we go confident that would be into that.

02:57:02

Dan: If someone would like to make that motion, I would entertain it, absolutely.

02:57:07

Christian Hartley: This is Hartley. My only concern with that is item number B being the 2017 adoption versus the 2021 adoption. I was going to see if there would be support of changing that? The other three could be combined without any problem, I don't think.

02:57:25 Dan: I think that's a typo. The recommendation from the committee is the 2021 edition. Dawn: Is that for 1006? 02:57:37 Dan: Yes, correct. 02:57:37 Dawn: Thank you. 02:57:52 Michael Hanson: I also concur with Lundin. If you'd be willing, you could just amend your motion to adopt all four of those standards, the most current additions. 02:58:11 Richard Boothby: This is Boothby. I move that we adopt all four additions. Christian Hartley: And I second. 02:58:41 Dawn: Chair, if you're ready for the roll call? Dan: Yes, we're ready. 02:58:48 Dawn: Thank you, Brian Long. 02:58:50 Brian Long: Aye. 02:58:51 Dawn: Christian Hartley. 02:58:55 Christian Hartley: Yes. 02:58:55 Dawn: Michael Hanson. 02:59:00 Michael Hanson: Yes. 02:59:00 Dawn: Jake Bender. 02:59:02 Jake Bender: Yes. 02:59:02 Dawn: Chris Edsell. 02:59:08 Chris Edsell: Yes.

02:59:08 Dawn: Chris Steeves. Chris Steeves: Yes. 02:59:16 Dawn: Joe Dingman. 02:59:19 Joe Dingman: Yes. 02:59:21 Dawn: David Lundin. 02:59:24 David Lundin: Yes. 02:59:26 Dawn: Dorianne. 02:59:28 Dorianne Sprehe: Yes. 02:59:28 Dawn: Richard Boothby. 02:59:34 Dorianne Sprehe: Yes. 02:59:34 Dawn: Dan Grimes. 02:59:37 Dan Grimes: Yes. Dawn: Thank you, that's unanimous. 02:59:39 Dan: Excellent. Okay. That brings us to nominations for Chair. Christian Hartley: Nominator, we continue the chair for a life for Mr. Grimes? 03:00:15 David Lundin: Seconded. Dan Grimes: Excepted. But we put it next year. Dawn: Excuse me, could you tell me who the second was once again, please? 03:00:28 Dan: Dave Lundin.

03:00:47

Brian Long: Hey, Dan. You're still good with that?

03:00:50

Dan: Yes, sir, I'll continue.

03:00:54

*Christian Hartley:* But also, to the other council members: do not be discouraged, if you're interested in the position, consider nominating yourself or someone else as well.

03:01:05

*Chris Edsell:* Also, that Vice Chair's position: it's a perfect place to get engaged with Dane and Lundin.

03:01:31

Dan: Any other nominations for Chair? Okay. I'm hearing none with no other nominations. I don't believe that requires a vote at that point. We'll move forward to Vice Chair. Nominations for vice chair for a six-month period ending at the fall meeting, where we will renominate a chair position for 12 months. Anyone at all?

03:02:49

Michael Hanson: Steeves, you want to do it? I'll nominate Steve's if he wants to go ahead.

03:02:57

Chris Steeves: Negative. Thank you for the offer, but no thank you.

03:03:03

Christian Hartley: I was actually going to also nominate Steeves second for that. Lundin, would you be willing to do it, because you've been on the council for a while?

03:03:16

David Lundin: I don't think I could do a justice with everything else I got going. We got Brian Long.

03:03:21

Dan: Brian Long would you be interested in accepting a Vice Chair?

03:03:30

*Brian Long:* I'm pretty much in the same boat as everybody else with COVID still hitting us, we're all pretty tied up.

03:03:45

Dan: Well, we can't move forward without one.

03:03:50

Dorianne Sprehe: This is Dorianne. I would put my name there.

03:03:55

Dan: Great. Thank you, Dorianne. I would second that.

03:04:04

Dan Grimes: I would third it.

03:04:06

Dan: The typo on the name. It's S-P-R-E-H-E I believe?

03:04:14

Christian Hartley: Common spelling,

03:04:17

*Dawn:* Sorry, chair. That's how she told me to pronounce it, and I was just still spelling it that way. Who was the second please?

03:04:34

Dan Grimes: Dan Grimes.

03:04:45

Dawn: Chair, if you were the second, do you remember who was the first?

03:05:15

Dan: Dorriane.

03:05:15

*Dan:* Perfect. Thank you. OK. Again, no other nominations, thank you, Dorianne, for stepping up for the organization. Much appreciated.

03:05:27

Dawn: Thank you.

03:05:27

Dan Grimes: Thank you, Dorriane.

03:05:29

Dorianne Sprehe: Thank you for the opportunity.

03:05:37

*Dan:* Okay. Got those taken care of. We should be at item nine, which is the operations, item 9A there are other new business, operations plan review. Mark, did you want to speak briefly about that? I know that you are still tracking down those documents. Last time we talked.

03:06:11

*Mark Brauneis:* The conversation we've had is that, one is the most current one, I could find it was 2016 and we were going to do a strategic plan in the spring and operational plan in the fall.

03:06:23

Dan: Correct. And I think that's the right direction. I think it's just some of those things got moved around. So, I just wanted to make sure the council heard that. Our plan is to do the ops plan in the fall and the strategic plan in the spring. Okay. So, that brings us to items otherwise not listed under new business. We have a few things to go through there. I don't know if we had a couple of things that we talked about in the pre-meetings leading up to this. I'm sorry, who's at?

03:07:16

Mark Brauneis: It was me, disregard.

03:07:18

*Dan:* Okay. The first thing is service plaques. I think, Mark, that you had an update on service plaques. Actually, this would have been old business, but under new business, I have

another recommendation for a plaque. Maybe we can wrap this both up and can you give an update on the people that we had listed out that hadn't gotten plaques yet, then I have a nomination for one?

03:07:48

*Mark Brauneis:* Okay. To close a loop on that: as we have plaques for Walt, Sarah and Arlen. And then we still yet have to order one for Brian. Gordon and Jeff are complete, and then there's also an outstanding with Lisa Shield that I need to track down.

03:08:17

Dan: The plaques that you mentioned were for service?

03:08:22

Mark Brauneis: Correct.

03:08:23

Dan: Correct. OK, thank you. I'd like to make a nomination for outstanding contribution to the council, for a plaque, for outstanding contribution to Sarah Garcia, who served as the Vice Chair for a long time and had her hand in many, many, many parts of the council in a very positive way over a long period of time.

03:08:59

Richard Boothby: Is that a motion, Dan?

03:09:01

Dan: It is a motion, Lundin.

03:09:03

Richard Boothby: I second.

03:09:09

Dawn: Who is the second, please?

03:09:10

Richard Boothby.

03:09:10

Dawn: Thank you.

Dan: Any discussion? Okay. Hearing none. We'll say that that motion carries thank you. We'll get that captured and sent out to Sarah and Sarah if you're on here. Thank you very much for your service to the council. You did outstanding work for us. It's really appreciated.

03:10:06

Sarah Garcia: Thank you.

03:10:06

Dan: Okay. The only other thing I had under new business, not otherwise listed, was that there was a request and I think all the council members probably need to at least hear this. And Mark, I mentioned this to you behind the scenes, but I just wanted to make sure that we followed up with everyone. A lot of the people that sit on the council also do work as SEOs. And our representation to the council, both as council members and SEOs, has previously been recognized through something that identifies us as council members.

03:10:44

Dan: We've had several different iterations of shirt. Some clothing that has the patch and identifies us as council members. I don't know if there was a budgetary issue with that or if it just administratively wasn't sort of followed up on. But as we bring in council members, I would like to make sure that we have a pipeline and the ability to get people a item of clothing, a shirt that identifies them as council members, both for new council members and also for our SEO corps, I think that's an important piece.

03:11:23

Dan: When people show up at other people's departments and say, I represent the council, it would be nice if they had that visual representation. I'd like to make a motion that we provide those items of clothing, a shirt of the administrators choosing my personal recommendation would be a polo that indicates council member or certifying officer responsibilities.

03:11:51

Christian Hartley: So, Brian, I second it.

03:12:10

Dan: Any discussion?

03:12:17

*Chris Edsell:* I might have missed your comments about this chair, but where's the money coming from to pay for that?

03:12:26

*Dan:* You didn't miss my comments on that. My motion is that we do it, and I would like a proposal back from the administration to determine whether it's doable within the current funds or not.

03:12:46

Richard Boothby: Dan, this is Rich.

03:12:48 *Dan:* Yes.

03:12:48

*Richard Boothby:* We have sufficient carry-forward that we have not used yet. We should be fine with this, Mark, do you agree?

03:13:02

*Mark Brauneis:* The only thing I'll look into just to confirm is the fact that we have fiscal authority to buy this type of item under the current fiscal guidance. I don't foresee it being an issue, but I'll look into that in closed loop.

03:13:19

*Richard Boothby:* Sure. We do have authority. This is something that we have done in the past. I'm not sure where that dropped, but we can talk about it on Monday.

03:13:41

Dan: Any other discussion? Can we do a roll call vote, please?

03:13:55

Christian Hartley: Hey, Chair. This is Christian. A point of information or question for you. Do we have to do a roll call vote because it's online, or can we just ask if there is objection and go with unanimous consent?

03:14:09

*Dan:* You probably can ask for unanimous consent or assume unanimous consent if no one has any opposition. So, I'll ask now, does anyone have any opposition to moving forward with this, under the current budget constraints? Okay. Hearing none. Assume unanimous approval.

03:14:52

Dan: That closes out item 14. Unless anybody has any other new business not otherwise listed, use your opportunity if you have stuff that needs to be determined or decided. Okay. Hearing none. Item 15 is just a placeholder action items, those will be developed and sent out. I believe we determined three weeks or within three weeks of the meeting, we'll have minutes and action items out to the council, to the council body.

03:15:44

Dan: Future agenda items will be added to the agenda at that time for the next meeting. And future meeting dates, we need to talk about a future meeting dates - that brings us to item 17. And who has the conference dates up in front of them, believe that it's here. I believe it's the last week of September, but can somebody correct me, is it 27th or 20th that it starts? I think it's the 27th, I just got confirmation.

03:16:33

*Dan:* So traditionally what we have done is, proposed our meeting for the Sunday before conference, So, as to not interrupt conference. We used to do it on the first day, but we had a lot of other stuff going on and that caused a lot of people to miss other opportunities. So, my proposal now would be that we hold our meeting on Sunday the 26th in Fairbanks, Alaska in person, at the fall fire conference.

03:17:04

Dan: It will be a blended meeting. If you're not able to make it: obviously, we will have capabilities to zoom in as well or use a digital meeting platform. Unless anybody has any opposition to that, we'll start that day, you can start planning for it. And for those that are new to the council: if you weren't planning on attending the fire conference already, that cost is covered by the council.

03:17:49

Christian Hartley: The cost of the flight, not for the whole conference, correct?

03:18:00

Dan: Correct. And the same for accommodations. Those accommodations have been only for the day, the day that it takes you to get there and have the meeting. After that, you're on your own. Okay. That, folks, brings us to set our fall meeting date. I need a motion to adjourn. Hang on, last but not least, anything for the good of the order. I know we just lost Lundin to a fire, he had to bail.

03:18:53

Christian Hartley: I think the good ordered is best served by adjourning chair.

03:18:56

Dan: I do, too. I did have two things. I just want to say thank you to everyone for your continued service to the council. We do have some items to catch up on that we didn't mention. We did lose a member this year to that resigned just a few days ago. So, Dave Gibbs resigned his position in an email to the council chair and the council administrator a few days ago. So, we will be working to fill that. Seat is a member of the public of a community over 2500. So, we'll be seeking filling of that seat. We'll work through boards and commissions for that and we'll let you know how that goes. So, when they open that up, it's always up to them, the boards and commissions.

03:19:43

Dan: Our recommendation would be that they fill it immediately. They may ask us not to and fill it at the normal fall time when they filled our seats. We can't guarantee that. We are still also from that point of view, Joe Dingman is still holding a seat. Joe knows that seat is an improper seat for him to be in. And Joe, that seat that just came open would be a seat that you could fill. And what that would do is if that recommendation works, we'd be recommending that Joe stay on the council. We've talked about this before. If there was a seat that fit in this case, there is now a seat that fits. And our recommendation would be that Joe fills that seat and that they try to fill the empty seat, which would be a member of the public of the community under 2500.

03:20:41

Joe Dingman: Yeah. I was going to mention that Dan.

03:20:42

Dan: So, that's the idea. That's where we're going to try to go with that. We'll be working with boards and commissions to make that happen. So, I wanted to bring that forward to everybody. It's just a heads up. And the last thing is, legislative. I didn't give a legislative report. I have been working intermittently behind the scenes on the alternative funding measures for the council with the legislature. I have not received a lot of feedback this session so far. I haven't stopped trying. I just wanted you guys to know that, we haven't worked as a council on this because there's still a lot of restrictions on traveling and meeting as a group. You know, where this left off was we were gaining momentum and we were going to travel in mass to Juneau and go visit the legislature as a body, as a council to lobby for alternative funding and we are picking up some steam.

03:21:37

*Dan:* In the interim, COVID got shut that down. We're still recovering and slowly opening from COVID. We have no commissioner in the Department of Public Safety. The commissioner we had was an advocate for us and we're currently have somebody in the interim filling that seat. All of these things are things that have sort of slowed that process, but we have not stopped work, I have not stopped work and I will continue to update it, as we motion or move.

03:22:13

*Dan:* Thank you for your patience, we're not going to stop. That's what I wanted to let you know about.

03:22:20

Richard Buppie: Hey, Dan. This is Rich.

03:22:23

Dan: Yes, Rich?

03:22:25

Richard Boothby: To go along with what Dan just said: the interim commissioner is Kelly How. Kelly How has always been in support of us in the past when she was with DPS. What I do know on the commissioner situation, is that there are interviews being done, I understand. We don't know any names. And sure, we'll be notified when the public is notified that there's a new commissioner. Everything that we're doing legislatively right now is being done on either teams or telephonically, none of us are even allowed down in the building at this time.

03:23:19

Dan: Thank you. I appreciate that, Rich. All right. Last chance for good of the order.

03:23:28

Joe Dingman: Hey, Dan.

03:23:30

Dan: Yes, Joe.

03:23:33

Joe Dingman: You said the minutes from this meeting will be on about three weeks?

03:23:36

Dan: That's the goal. Yes, sir.

03:23:38

Joe Dingman: Okay. That's what I need to know. Thank you.

03:23:47

Dan: Okay. Thanks, everybody. I appreciate your time and I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

03:23:53

Dawn: Motion to adjourn.

03:23:58

*Dan:* All right. Thanks, everybody. We're adjourned at 12:20 p.m. I appreciate all of your time. Have a great day!

03:24:07

Dawn: Thanks, Dan.

03:24:09

Dan: You bet. Take care!