



**Appalachian Search and Rescue Conference
Board of Directors Meeting
Saturday March 3rd 2001
Thorton Hall, University of Virginia Campus,
Charlottesville, VA**

Present: Suzen Collins (Chair), Peter McCabe (Vice Chair), Emily Minor (Treas), Peter Pennington (Sec), Tom Lovejoy, Mark Eggeman, Kevin Croper, D.J. Douglas, Randy Frank, Stephanie Dorrow, Jared Ulmer, Robert Koester, Rob Miller, Todd L’Herrou, Heidi Forrest, Billy Morgan, Lauren Schiff, Amanda Harrison, Lia Clattenburg, Darren Chen, April Cropper.

1. Chair’s introduction

Suzen Collins called meeting to order at 1:25pm.

Special announcements: Kevin Cropper is acting as today’s secretary. Todd is serving as Parliamentarian to keep the meeting on track.

2. Vice Chair’s Report

External Affairs - Request that action be taken regarding the Delaware Valley Regional SAR group interested in becoming part of ASRC. This was discussed at the June 2000 meeting.

Operations – There is concern from Pepper Broad acting for MARG and AMRG about their continued interest in staying a member of the ASRC on the basis of their indication that they have been unsuccessful in establishing communications with the ASRC Chair during the last months. They had hoped to be at the Jan meeting but were held up because of a snowstorm.

3. Treasurer’s Report

Cash flow by month (see report). Restitution from ex-treasurer has occurred as dictated in the January meeting.

Outflows

MetroCall (\$26.50)
Keith Conover for getting the web address (\$70.00).
Included bank statement and line by line balance.

Requests for dues sent to all groups (some delays due to waiting on a roster from PVRG who doesn’t have a roster yet this year). Numbers are calculated except for them. (PVRG has a roster now, will get it to the Treasurer.) There are 17 people who are unclaimed by any specific group. With the exception of PVRG, every other group has confirmed that the numbers she has are correct, so the correct totals are there.

DRAFT

Projected income

Amazon.com	\$40/yr
Scheduled repayments	\$1900.00
<u>Dues</u>	<u>\$1825.00</u>
Total income :	\$3765.00

Projected costs

Metrocall	(\$500.00)
Website	(\$70.00)
Postage	(\$400.00)
<u>Reimbursements for dispatch for 2000</u>	<u>(~\$700)</u>
Total Expenses :	(\$2548.34)

There was a discussion concerning the phone costs for BRMRG being billed to ASRC, specifically the Alltel cell phone costing \$114/yr. It is the cell phone used at missions for base operations. But we also have free AT&T phones. A question was posed as to why the AT&T phones were not used instead. It was explained that sometimes they don't work, so the Alltel is for redundancy for use when coverage is weak for cell.

There was a discussion concerning the December 2000 expense of \$200+ for the 800 number. This is out of line with the previous months. Suggestions were made that it was due the three searches that month. The suggestion was made to use a direct call 800 number (only calls back to one base dispatch number). \$232 is disproportionate. Could also be end-of-year administrative charges. The recommendation was made that someone contact AT&T for details. Tasking was given to the Treasurer for an itemized list of billing for that phone that month.

4. Secretary's Report (made by the chair in the absence of a secretary)

Last meeting, old secretary resigned. The minutes from the last meeting were approved.

5. Chair's report

The chair noted that it has been unusually slow, with unusual missions – evidence searches. Thanks for the continued interest. Indicated that later on in this meeting, we will be bringing up some ideas on increasing training ideas and also at training that might be available to us in regards to our being a non-profit organization and increasing efficiency.

5. Committee Reports

a) Medical - Stef Darow

Medical certification forms for the year are due by the end of March. Everyone has had them for 8 months. By our ASRC policies a member must be qualified w/ first aid and CPR (Note: no med qualifications for CQ). CPR/First Aid is only an 8 hour class every two years. Members have 90 days to get recertified after their lapse date. It shouldn't be a big issue to get certifications. Members are not covered under workman's comp if they do not have their medical certifications. Group medical officers should be budgeting funds for getting several of their members certified as instructors for CPR/FA and acquiring mannequins, etc. Funds should also be raised to purchase medical bags and litters to replace old ones.

DRAFT

Dr. Lindbeck, the current medical director, will be leaving us. There are two possible replacements for a new med director, one from MCV, one the NoVa area. Both are very interested and have extensive backgrounds.

The state of Virginia is dissolving their Shock Trauma level. We will either need to become an EMT-B agency or upgrade to EMT-I.

There is a SAR-SIM coming up – multiple subjects in the woods; so review mass-casualty incident triage and wilderness first aid.

The Medical officer plans to visit every group to review how to fill out a patient care report. This report is needed for liability reasons. Medical backups for fundraising need better patient care reports. There is a need for a paper trail showing that ASRC does patient care well. Patient care reports go to the state, so that is a good indication for requesting grants, etc.

The video went well. Todd and Suzen came down and we got two questions from someone in WV. Filmed 1.5 hrs, saved 50 minutes. State sending a check for \$300 for expenses incurred.

Question - What are the legal and liability ramifications when a member does not have their medical certifications. Does the member get demoted to CQ? We have quite a few members (IS even) who don't have certification. Action Item - Bob will follow up with Winnie Pennington, VADEM, about the workman's comp question.

Question – Peter McCabe – I believe that a number of years ago, the ASRC passed a very specific rule that when groups are doing fund raising events, they cannot use ASRC credentials or the EMT license. That seems in conflict with always needing to fill out the incident injury form. That doesn't seem to comport with the not getting good forms back. No one seems to know. Todd and Bob did not recall. Lauren quoted from the ASRC Ops manual – 6.3.2 – “No group shall operate as an EMS authority under ASRC license.” Bob replied that just because you are a member of an organization, it doesn't mean the organization is total responsible (or controlling!) of what you do.

b) Training - Acting as training chair, Jared Ulmer

The committee is working on the Incident Staff recertifications and IC training. We need a training chair. Go back to your groups and talk to your training officer and recruit.

ASRC GSAR – we'd like to do it again. Also desire to develop a program for continuing education for FTM and FTL – clue awareness, family handling. Materials and ideas are available at the URL : <http://www.vcu.edu/ocp/ocpdocs/nonprof.html>

(Billy Morgan) asked if anything was “decided” in the training committee meeting. Jared replied that they have several motions.

c) Operations – Lauren Schiff

The following groups were represented at the Ops Committee meeting: MSAR, BRMRG, SWVMRG, SMRG, and PSAR.

DRAFT

The Ops Committee will be reviewing the objectives of the previous Ops committee and will bring our objectives at the next meeting.

The Ops Committee had a discussion about the difficulties that the ASRC has in integrating with local resources. The cultures in different areas vary and we have had difficulty integrating local command structure. Two recommendations were made in the meeting:

- Frank Bennett suggested making use of the ICS local liaison position .
- Bob Koester suggested using local resources in visible positions (staging, briefing, etc). He made a McDonald's analogy—the people you think of when you go to McDonalds are the staff behind the registers, not the managers in the back office. It is important to keep local exposure very strong.

Dispatch will be asked to send out the gazetteer map page and zip code if available so that members can look up MapTech directions on the web.

Peter mentioned earlier that Delaware Valley SAR has requested to be considered as an applicant for affiliate/associate membership. The Operations committee supports the motion to do so. Requirements need to be ironed out in the Operations and Admin manuals. To get the process going, the committee would like to accept their letter of application.

TSAR has proposed a change to the Admin manual for nametags that was reviewed by the committee.

Thirty-six month reviews has arrived. The committee needs to catch up with this. Suzen offered names of several volunteers to assist.

The ops committee suggested including formal incident reviews as apart of the ASRC meeting agenda. The purpose of these reviews would be to present a summary of the incident, obtain lessons learned, perform Q&A, etc. Reviews may also encourage attendance at meetings by those who were at the searches. Information gained from the review may also assist members in mental recovery after a difficult search.

d) Public Information - Randy Frank

The Public Information committee is building a list of upcoming speaking events (fairs, etc) - public awareness, fund-raising. They will be trading dates, etc through email.

The committee is also working on redoing the webpage. Will have information to take back to groups with the suggested changes. The web information may include an ASRC “store” that would not involve financial transactions, but would provide connections to groups to obtain ASRC stickers and the like.

Had a search in MD – by appointment. Another one next week – work w/ Park Police. Also met w/ Special Ops in the Waterloo barracks – willing to use ASRC when they need manpower. ACAs can call them to get ASRC into any searches in MD that we aren't immediately involved in.

Questions – Billy Morgan– does ASRC have a URL? Yes – arsc.net . Are we looking at getting our own website instead of sharing w/ BRMRG? How much do we need? It would take about \$15 a year to directly connect and not see a BRMRG address. About \$20 a month to totally host on our own. The current size of the site is about 2 – 3 Mb. Billy Morgan – see me after the meeting; might have a

solution - and a commendation on how the site looks good right now. Billy Morgan – might be able to get a website donated (600Mb).

e) Safety did not meet (Folded into training).

6. Group Reports

Suzen – in interest of time, forego group reports unless anyone has something specific.

Tidewater – (Billy Morgan) In December, we were notified that a member had died – Stu – is there some way to put up a memorial (page on website?) Some way to memorialize? Certificate of appreciation? TSAR is looking at a coaster w/ ASRC logo. Plaque? Price about \$10 (for a poster). Other ideas?

M/SAR – (Peter McCabe) – There have been people at searches from teams not associated in any way w/ state of VA nor have an MOU. This is a liability issue. Should have a discussion and a policy considered on an incident when ASRC is part of the management team, we should screen those who are there, and ask unaffiliated folks to leave. Or at least not put them in charge.

7. Old Business

Suzen didn't see anything in old minutes that stuck out.

There were several staff recertifications from the last meeting that were unresolved. Bob reported the following:

Amy Rue-out of country.

Gary Mechtle – no missions.

Trudy Poole – only one mission – not enough to meet requirements.

Jim Poole – wouldn't release his email address.

Josh Babcock - Still have not heard from Josh.

Mark Pennington – dropping IS certification.

IC/IS list will be updated

No other old business.

8. New Business

a) Operations

Proposal to amend the General Administrative Manual:

Annex D 1.4.1. Add: "The use of Navy Blue with appropriate size white lettering, fabric name tape in place of the blue plastic nametag on the uniform shirt is allowed as a personal preference."

Passed, with zero against, two abstentions.

Motion to begin the process to bring the DVRSR (Delaware Valley Regional Search & Rescue, Inc.) into associate status.

Have a copy of a letter May 2000 from them regarding getting in.

DRAFT

Seconded.

Discussion

(Billy Morgan) – Did they do a presentation to ASRC? No, just a letter and discussion with Peter while he was chair. Do we expect presentations? No, but not a bad idea for the future. However, these guys have been around for a year.

There was a debate on the bylaws and the terminology of “affiliate” versus “associate” status. Emily found it - Affiliate status. However, the bylaw changes were never incorporated to the current affiliate vs/ associate thing.

We don’t have “applicant” – have made groups “probationary” – completely operational under MOU. Since “Applicant” does not appear in our documentation, that gives no operational status. The probationary membership - Probationary Certified, Probationary Affiliated, - has an equipment requirement which does not exist for Full Certified or Full Affiliated. So there are differences in equipment.

A lot of discussion has occurred about the Programs becoming Associate members.

We have three levels – Certified, Associate, Affiliated. Certified – us (see bylaws for numbers of certain training levels and etc). Affiliate - you have a vote, Rules and regs – must have equipment and people, but below level of certified. Associate – A whole new spectrum of freedom within the ASRC hierarchy – do some stuff, but don’t need all the equipment. Associate level bylaws will be established by the BOD for each applicant. Nobody at Virginia SAR Council can say you brought someone in who doesn’t meet standards, for Certified and Affiliate. We would need to send someone from ASRC to check their (DVRSR) equipment and training and numbers.

Dave O – What level are they being sponsored at?

Peter – Read original bylaws stuff. MSAR has agreed to be the sponsoring group.

Dave O – I have three questions. What level? What requirements at that level? What is being done to make sure they meet those requirements?

Answers : Level – Associate level (their letter incorrectly states “Affiliate” under the old meanings for “associate” and “affiliate”).)

Requirements – requirements to meet ASRC membership. 10 active members, 2 w/ ASRC FTL or higher and X w/ ASRC FTM or higher training.

What’s being done –

Lauren would like to contact the group to let them know we still want them, and figure out the set of standards we are operating under.

Motion w/ Amendment:

Moved to begin the process to bring DVRSR into associate member status (AMENDMENT – which will confer no operational status at this time until they are completely approved as an associate group and voted on by the BOD.)

Passed with zero against, three abstentions.

Motion to have a committee review the difference between Associate and Affiliated and Applicant and update bylaws and operations manual.

(By Dave O)

Friendly amend – Have the chair direct which group to do that. (Todd)

Passed unanimously.

Delegated to Ops.

DRAFT

Randy Frank – could we expedite the process of bringing them (DVRSR) in by moving quickly on this?
Lauren will get on it.

b) Training

Incident Staff re-certification – Replaces what is in the training standards w/ ones that are comparable with the changes made in IS last meeting.

Motion (Jared)

Changes to Section 6.b (?) – “Motion to replace the current IS re-certification requirements in the ASRC training manual with those on the attached page.”

Changes summarized by Bob – These changes do not relate to IC.

FTL -> IS -> IC3 -> IC2 -> IC1 is still the route

Partial shift? One minute on scene counts as a shift.

Jared will update the Training standards with all the changes in the past few months

Passed with one against, two abstentions.

Motion 2 –

“To add to the current IC re-certification requirements in the ASRC training manual the following paragraph:” paragraph vii (on the IS re-certification) will be added to the IC re-certification (with IC instead of IS).

Discussion

Bob mentioned that persons get a chance to respond to why they are voted down. Not as stringent as a true due process procedure.

Peter comment – Is it appropriate to consider that someone specific should be named to handle the letter?

There is a suggestion for a friendly amendment that the letter be sent within ten days.

Todd – question – then what happens if not sent within ten days?

During a suspension a person cannot respond as IC or IS.

Peter – add “suspension from former status” be inserted in there.

Also, what is the recourse if accused of something? Thirty days is not much so need the 10 day limit.

Both Friendly amendments accepted (10 days, former status).

April – We should have a discussion of what status you go to and where that leaves that person.

Dave O – What is the cause behind this paragraph?

Todd – What happens to the person if the board fails to do what they are required to do?

Tom (from BRMRG) – Upon written notification, you are (suspended) for thirty days.

Jared will withdraw the motion and it will be returned to committee for further discussion. Route all concerns through there.

Peter – There are many procedures in professional agencies that provide for how to handle this. Bring the person into the hearing before the process starts.

Dave O – Do we need to raise these concerns about the IS standards? They can be meshed with the new IC ones.

Motion withdrawn and returned to committee.

Motion (Jared) –

“Add the attached page to the ASRC Admin manual concerning the IC Mentor Program”– keep tabs on new ICs. There is an addition to the third bullet “failure to consistently contact the mentor will be

brought to the attention of the BOD by the mentor.” This will be added to the Admin Manual under 2.12.

Discussion

Todd – questions that we only start this at IC3 level. Not at IS level?

Bob – Not clear who the IS mentor would be. Could come up with more details on this one.

Dave – Is this a requirement? Yes.

Peter – What will the effective date be? The date of approval.

Bob – This has been going on at an informal level, but this puts into writing the practice and who is responsible. If you are staff, you have recourse if you see something (good or bad) to respond to in a new IC – go to their mentor.

Emily – friendly amendment – change “mentee” to the “new IC” – NOT ACCEPTED.

Todd – I’d really like to emphasize the importance of this process.

April – Do you make an effort to ask staff working with the IC to get feedback?

Bob – Yes, somewhat. But I don’t want to formalize a need to make contact.

Peter – It is a good idea to talk to staff for feedback.

Passed Unanimously.

Nominations for new IC and IS

Kinsey Row of SWVaMRG submitted the following nominations for IS. They have completed PSO and MSO:

Kinsey Row

Bobby Poage

D.J. Douglass

Tom – Motion to accept all three (DJ, Bobby, and Kinsey) at the same time for IS.

Seconded.

Bob was instructor and they will be fine.

Vote : Unanimous acceptance.

BRMRG presented the following nominations for IS.

Emory Shelton

Alex Dahlgren

Amanda Harrison

Dan Christy

Lia Clattenburg

Sarah Johns

Motion to accept IS nominations.

Second.

A lot have worked as staff already.

Vote : Unanimous.

No IC recommendations today.

c) Other Items

Bob : The ICG class date is : June 1-3, 2001. Since there is a high likelihood that not everyone will get in who wants to, there will probably be a second course, date TBD. Location: Charlottesville.

DRAFT

Todd :

Motion that upon receipt of donation from State of VA for video, ASRC reimburse SMRG for what they reimbursed Stephanie Durow.

Seconded.

Passed with zero against, one abstention.

Motion to revise the ASRC General Administration Manual – small step revisions.

Change Three Paragraphs :

6.1.2 - Modify final part of final sentence to read “45 days” and add “(s)” to offense(s) if there were more than one. And add “or recognition” to discovery of offense. So should now read “within 45 days of the discovery or recognition of the alleged offense(s).”

6.2 – Appointment of investigator – upon receipt of written charges.... changes : “will provide written notice” to “will provide written notice via certified letter” and second change – modify language regarding appointment to match sequence 2 and 3 of paragraph 6.3.3, so that the chair does not appoint the investigator if the chair is the accused.

6.3.1 – Regarding a pre-hearing, change wording from “notify in writing” to “notify in writing (via certified letter)”.

Discussion

Peter – suggest tabling due to importance until groups have a chance to review them. Suggests tabling until May.

Motion: table the motion to change the admin manual.

Second (Billy Morgan)

Discussion

Bob - I'll vote against tabling so I can vote as I see these as small changes.

Todd – I would suggest we implement these changes too.

Dave O – It would be courtesy to have written copy of the changes.

Todd – I made them after lunch, and there will further changes in the future.

Peter – If there will be other changes, it would seem logical to consider them as a whole later. I am also sympathetic to those w/o the manual.

Randy – If there are going to be changes, should we consider doing them all at once.

They won't be ready/will need to go through Ops committee.

Vote On Tabling motion: Two for, eight against, one abstention.

Motion to table has failed.

Continuing discussion from motion under discussion.

Billy Morgan– In the addition of 6.2 to the wording of 6.3.3, what does that change?

Todd – explained.

Billy Morgan– Oh, so moving the wording.

Peter – Please recap 6.3.1 changes.

Todd – The addition of “(in certified letter)”.

Comment from guy behind Randy Frank – What is the “recognition” part?

Todd – It is about discovering the significance of the action.

Passed with zero against, one abstention.

Suzen:

Suzen – That serves as a good precursor to the next item.

DRAFT

On 12 February, I received documentation from Pamela Paulding about the charges brought by Peter McCabe against me (Suzen).

Suzen has not sought anyone to investigate. Does Peter have anyone in mind?

Peter – Someone higher than IC2 status, and in keeping with the manuals, someone who was not involved with the incident.

Suzen – I agree on non-involvement, but disagree with the rank level. That would have only left us one person.

Randy – Considering that Dave Carter brought you up, he might be the better person.

Dave O – Considering the motion that just passed, wouldn't the BOD have to appoint the investigator?
YES

There was a request to read the charges.

Stef – No reason to read or highlight the charges.

Dave O – Suzen cannot chair during the process.

Todd will volunteer to chair during this phase of deciding on an investigator.

Bob – As an ACA, there is nothing special about us in investigative skills. Investigator would just collect information. Having seen the charges, there is nothing in there that would require using someone of ACA level, or any particular level. As involved as everyone in here would be, perhaps both would be /should be removed.

Todd – Is there a reason to pick a particular level? To do so, perhaps hearing the charges would help. In which case we'd need to clear the room.

Stef – How far back do these charges date? Where you (Suzen) chair when they happened?

Suzen – Yes, they stem from the January meeting. Peter, is that correct?

Peter – Essentially, yes.

April – Is this the last general item?

Suzen – I believe so.

Emily – BRMRG has clarification of the phone bill thing.

Dave O – At this point in time, is all that is required that we appoint an investigator?

April – I move to table the investigation until we finish all other business so those who are not involved can leave.

Motion: Table investigation discussion and appointment of investigator until other business finished.

Second.

Passed with one against, zero abstention.

Chair returned to Suzen during other business.

Emily – New letter from the finance officer of BRMRG – the irregularities are related to paying bills in overlap under/over payment. Billing is from requesting reimbursement.

Motion (Todd) – Recommend we reimburse BRMRG for \$114.18 and \$119.97 and one-half of the 800 number – (\$530.93) b/c BRMRG most often uses the phone more than anyone else.

Bob – That 800 number is an ASRC number, not a BRMRG number

Todd – I modify my motion to reimburse the *full* \$530.93 of the bill.

Todd – So my motion now stands to reimburse \$703.94 (original amount they requested).

Randy – Can you clarify the numbers and changes?

Emily – The December charge covered multiple months, the new copy of the bill is spread over the appropriate months. (Using bills, not check stubs.)

Jared – Also several really long searches.

DRAFT

Todd – The amount I suggested for reimbursement is based on their checks, so what they paid out not what they were billed (which was \$765.08).

Passed, zero against, one abstention.

(Recap – reimburse \$703.94)

Suzen - A reminder – tentatively rescheduled rain date for evidence search in MontCo MD. Two previous evidence searches – shoe prints, body. This new one will be for remains missing for 10 months. Therefore, we would not request those under 18. But the current response would not be big enough. Officer Hannan would like to see us back again based on work by Peter and Randy. What does turnout look like for that date? (11 March 2001.)

Todd – How does that correspond with the college-based group’s spring break?

Gary – Starts our (BRMRG) break. Means better chances of being able to respond.

Suzen – Do we want to do a no-chance-of-live-body search? Gets us in the door.

Randy – Half search, half PR with a person who can call us in for more searches.

Suzen – This will probably not be a simple thing, due to fallen leaves and time passed.

April – I don’t want to do a lot of these types of searches, but I want to support MD searches.

Stef – B/c we do not have a VA mission number, we do NOT have workman’s comp. You won’t be covered if you get hurt.

Randy – Liability is covered by MOU w/ state police.

Suzen – Mo Co police have agreed to go through MD State Police to get that.

Randy – If there is a problem with the MOU, call me and I’ll talk to Special Ops.

April – What are our minimum needed numbers?

Suzen – Thirty would be tough, but doable.

Peter – SMRG, remember this is a weekend mission you can respond to in order to get mission numbers.

Todd – Let’s open dispatch this week to see.

Brenden – Yes, I’ll do that.

Bob – I have a handout on statistics.

Break to just the BOD to discuss appointment of Investigator.

Rejoin to consider a forgotten motion from Bob.

Motion to accept Mark Eggeman as ACA.

Passed with zero against, two abstentions.

Motion to adjourn.

Seconded.

Passed.