

**MEDINA COUNTY EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY
EXECUTIVE BOARD
FEBRUARY 25, 2015**

Members Present:	Brian Guccion	Conrad Sarnowski	Matt Hiscock
	Christina Fozio	Carl DeForest	Ralph Copley
	Ben Nau	Ralph Copley	Asst. Pros. Bill Thorne
	Martha Catherwood	Bob Painter	

Guest: Assistant Pros. Bill Thorne

Conrad began the meeting at 8:30am. He turned the floor over to the fire chiefs to start off the meeting. Conrad asked if everyone understood why we were meeting today and asked who was going to be the lead spokesperson. Jim Baird, the President of the Medina County Fire Chiefs began by apologizing for the lack of attendance at the last meeting. He wanted to assure the group that it was not intended to ignore the board. He said they had a meeting following the boards December meeting and had conversation on how to solve the problem with the TROT team. The catch was the association did not come to any resolution before the next board meeting so they did not have anything to report. That was an oversight on its part and it was not intended to portray a lack of interest in the process but the association simply did not have anything concrete to give the board. Since then the association has come with some resolutions from the Medina County Fire Chiefs and he turned the meeting over to Chief Potts. Chief Potts thanked the board for allowing the association to represent their position on this. He explained that the Medina County Fire Chiefs and the County EMA have a great working relationship and have tried to address a lot of the problems within the county as it relates to those issues of public safety. Under the leadership of Buck Adams and the previous fire chiefs, given what the rule setting was, a lot of things between people were just agreements with handshakes and there was never any formalization to any of the structures. Potts went on to explain the fact is even when the fire chiefs organization when they looked at things, most of the stuff that was performed was by verbal agreement without documentation. He said that is something the Chiefs need to address, it was not something they were prepared to address; he thanked the board for the comments that they made because it provided the chiefs with an opportunity to sit down and have a good discussion among all the chiefs and talk about the direction they need to go. He said that in order to do this they looked to all the other counties; how they run their tactical rescue team and what they found in Summit County and Cuyahoga County; the areas of Northeast Ohio; almost all of these the governance comes from a Council of Governments. We have had this discussion over a number of years is that a COG would be one of the best ways for us to have it. He said they also recognized that if they needed to go to a COG whether that COG is within the County EMA Executive Board or it is with a separate COG that was created for other functions within the county. He said the Chiefs themselves need to create more organization by-laws that provided more organized structure to the team. Potts said they have developed those and can present those right now (copies were handed out). He explained that what the members are getting is the organizational by-laws for the team that provides the structure for the team, the level of participation for the individual communities, how it is governed, what are the duties of the officers,

team responsibilities and the supervision. He said it is not a final document, it is a document they are continually working on and refining; as of yesterday, he is pleased with the fire chiefs because they have spent a great deal of time working with these documents and talking with other counties and discussing the problems they face and they have spoken with Christina and she raised some concerns that we all have to address; so it is not a final document but it is a document they feel can be completed in the next month or two. Potts said this document ties into one of 2 structures; it can tie into the governance and oversight of the EMA Executive Board or it can be done, if the communities of Medina County show an interest in developing a Medina County Council of Governments. He said they have had this conversation before; he made the statement to Mr. Thorne about the information regarding his recommendations of the first draft of the COG where Potts said the changes were made using the ORC and he provided Thorne with a Medina County Council of Government By-Laws; Potts said that certainly they should not be the ones writing those; they prepared them for review and it would be up to each of the communities when and if that organization would come together to review those by-laws and to go ahead and provide the final draft of those to be adopted. Potts also handed Thorne a copy of a draft of an Intergovernmental Agreement that would be used to form the COG. He said this is the Chief suggestion; he said that at the February 11th meeting the chiefs voted in support of a COG and the by-laws so that they can move forward to address the boards concerns. Potts said this is as far as they have progressed so far and they welcome any questions they have related to this. Conrad said that they appreciate this huge effort in this short period of time; it was long overdue and he asked the board if anyone had any questions. Conrad asked Thorne if he saw any of this to comment on it; Thorne said no. Guccion asked if all the Chiefs in the county participated and he asked Chief Baird if that has been an issue that there are some people not participating. Baird said they have never had 100% attendance but recently they have had a large group with the last 2 meetings, definitely more than a quorum. He went on to say that as they talked among the fire chiefs and why they lean towards a COG; they talked about getting their 501C3 or 501C4 and coming up with their own by-laws; the COG appeals to them because it provides much more permanence than what a fire chiefs organization; a fire chiefs organization tends to ebb and flow and a COG is much more permanent and it is more effective; not only because it can provide that administrative oversight but they can actually provide a fundraising mechanism with the COG. He said the reason the chiefs are going this way, and literally letting this go out of their directed control, they feel that for the sake of the county it is a better permanent solution to provide the team. He said the team is critical to the county, everyone in the county benefits from the Technical Rescue Team. He said the chiefs wanted to put it more into the control of the township themselves mainly because of the permanence. Guccion asked if they are satisfied that they got good response from the Chiefs. Baird said yes and Rommel said that a majority of them did vote and also through email they had good votes. Rommel said the COG can also expand and not just do the TROT or All-Hazards and go into other things like communications problems; whatever may come down the road. Potts said that once they began creating the document, the by-laws for the All-Hazards Team, the leaders of that team, Chief Haas and Chief Barrett have worked; and they all have had multiple conversations over the last three days; making edits to it, discussing it, they still want to work through it; Christina has been a valuable part of this by providing other concerns they need to address; this has been an eye opening experience and something that they have to continue to work on. Potts said the team does have Standard Operating Procedures, separate of those by-laws we do have SOPs that are part of our function and part

of our operation. He said they are available but did not think this was the forum to present them. Martha said she also thanks the chiefs for addressing the boards concerns. She said that EMA Executive Board is a COG if anyone is concerned with how a COG operates so it is basically an easy transfer. She asked how they would go about getting the communities on board that are not represented at this table. Baird said he made a connection with Rick Monroe and the fire Chiefs are going to be meeting with the township governments at their May meeting; they have invited us there and as a chiefs organization they voted to make their meeting consistent with them; once the chiefs make some headway here they, and get the feel from the EMA Executive Board, he is going to talk to Rick Monroe and float some of these ideas past him so he can float them past the township members. He said the chief's next opportunity will be at that meeting and he will work to lay groundwork prior to that meeting. He said that the chiefs have developed a Letter of Support for the COG and it was voted on unanimously by resolution; the idea of a Letter of Support came from Mr. Thorne when he spoke with them. He said that they would also like the EMA Executive Board, the Commissioners, the LEPC to consider providing a Letter of Support to the Medina County COG to demonstrate unity and the idea of COG to oversee the TROT team. He handed out a copy of the letter and restated it has been approved by the fire chiefs. Martha asked Thorne, with the discussions over the last couple meeting is how EMA would fund the TROT for this year; she asked him if he sees a problem with continuing with the way it has been done now that the chiefs are addressing the situation. Thorne said he is not sure how it got done. Martha said Christina has sent out allocation invoices to the townships. Guccion clarified that right now they are currently tabled. Baird said he already got his and Christina said that he received the EMA Cost Allocation. Thorne said he said the problem already exists and he does not see making the problem any worse so sending them out for another year isn't going to change anything. Adam asked if that is what we are looking to primarily address through this COG-Christina said there are a number of things that need addressed but right now this is an immediate point of order because invoices typically go out towards the first of the year; this is a priority issue now but there are a number of things that need to be addressed. Hiscock asked what the background issues are that trigger the need for a COG. Thorne agreed and said they talked about how they could do it and there were a number of ways to do it; one was a COG and apparently that is the way to go. Baird agreed with the COG statement and said there are a number of reasons; as a fire chiefs association-he does not believe they have the stability and long term attendance and participation to handle a revenue collecting, billing agency, handling the insurance to go along with it, having the titles of all the vehicles deeded over to them; he does not feel they are an organization that has the consistent, long-term stability to do that but the TROT is an organization that needs to be a consistent, long-term asset available to the county so they are trying to match up the permanency of the TROT with the form of government that is as permanent as the TROT will be. Potts said the Technical Rescue Team is the greatest example in Medina County of regional collaboration; it means that we are pooling our resources, both personnel and equipment, in the most cost effective way so that we do not have the duplicity of services in each individual community; it is something that should be embraced by each one of the municipalities by going ahead and providing a funding stream for it, addressing the issues of liability and concerns related to that, ownership of vehicles and a continuum of the program rather than that being something that is encumbered by the Medina County Fire Chiefs Association; he said it is not the place for the Fire Chiefs to be responsible for those issues; we will provide the manpower, the structure and the supervision but the administrative of

this team should fall amongst the COG, whether it be the EMA Executive Board or a COG separate. He said that broadening that farther; there are other regional concerns that need to be addressed as it relates to public safety and probably the greatest is communication and the fact that we lack a communication district. He said we are blessed in the fact that the Sheriff's Department and Sheriff Miller has accepted the responsibility for communications but he is shouldering the cost of that by himself with a county administration that is not fully funding it and we are kicking the can down the road as it relates to our communications problems; it needs to be taken care of long-term; so the COG is the most appropriate way that can be done as well. He continued with saying that COG as it relates to public safety, everyone can speak and look through the ORC and see what other benefits it can provide for this region in a number of different ways that the board may also have concerns in; the chiefs think this is the best way to do it; he does not know another way to do it; he and he does not think everyone else is comfortable with a simple MOU; it does not provide the full structure of what is needed for this type of team. Hiscock said that it sounds like the underlying issues are the operations of TROT; Potts said they can handle operations but it is the administration. Hiscock asked why a COG....

Baird said it was done backwards....they built an entire TROT on handshake agreements and it is to the point now where it truly is a countywide team, and the funding is countywide, but it comes without solid documentation. Baird said if his city council were to come to him and say 'show me the document that says it is ok to pay the TROT dues' he would have trouble producing that document and a COG would solve that. Hiscock said that is the funding issue that we have been talking about a little but now he is hearing about the communications issue, which he had heard a little about, but the benefit to a COG in that scenario seems to be a taxing district to be able to form a communication district? Potts said he thinks it provides with the means to provide support, whether that is financial support or administrative support in any other way; that is up to the COG to determine their level of funding; the chiefs can tell you what it takes to operate the team, and as the board has requested they can present that budget to the board, but it is not their responsibility, nor should it be their responsibility to determine the apportionment of each community contribution and how that is determined. Hiscock said we don't do that now; Potts said we do not do that now nor should it be and maybe it shouldn't be this COG either. It should be full representation of this entire county who are providing the participants to this team and determining the level of service; if you determine you want the chiefs to have a confined space team, collapse team, a hazmat team and a water rescue team, which they are envisioning right now and there is certainly a need for it, then you have to determine and should determine just like in your own communities, how much you want to fund that. Hiscock asked why we need a COG to do that. Martha said to Hiscock that she thinks he is looking at it from a city viewpoint where they already have a lot of structure already in place but if you look at 17 townships and villages that don't have the personnel and the structure in place and the funding for...we will use communications as an example, the funding or the communication for why we need to address this situation and talk about it at a township level can only come through something like a COG. She said they do not have communication people on staff like Brunswick and Wadsworth and Medina....we are very ignorant to this and we have to sit in on this because we are one of the entities affected and we have to be a funder to it. Christina explained to Hiscock that EMA functions right now with this COG if we did not have a COG and we were a direct commissioner department the funding for EMA as it exists today would be 30% of our current budget and 70% of what we do is funded by outside resources that this COG allows this countywide emergency

management agency to take advantage of. She said if there were not a countywide EMA that functions under a COG this agency would not be able to provide this county with the kinds of things grant wise, training wise, equipment wise, exercise wise that we are able to provide today; this board being able to provide the oversight for EMA is what the chiefs is envisioning the oversight for the TROT. Hiscock said he understands the benefits of it and he is trying to find out from the chiefs perspective because he has heard a lot of from the executive board perspective what the issues are because he is not sure there is an alignment of what the issues are; which leaves him to question why they are choosing a COG when there are other legal alternatives that are available to us. He said he understands that Chief Baird mentioned the models of Cuyahoga County and Summit County in terms of COG's in place there, but, of those COG's there are lots of COGs in Ohio that run TROT that are designed to handle some of the issues that have been mentioned, he only knows of 2 at this point, that are run through EMA COGs', that's the model that is used and he has not heard of anything as to why we need a separate COG. Christina asked of what other locations that has that function run through the EMA COG. Hiscock said there are other counties that do that but he cannot say what chiefs association is part of them because he is not familiar with those entities that make up the COGs. Hiscock said that we started this discussion at the EMA board level; he does not know how many of the chiefs know that; the same that they do not know the discussion at the chiefs meetings; he is not sure how many chiefs have been relayed exactly what the EMA board has been talking about; there is the issue of the transfer of funds and the purchases that are made and really it became a legal discussion that the EMA board has these funds the they are paying, essentially, a group of guys those funds; that group of guys happen to be our trusted chiefs which we trust to do jobs that we want them to do jobs in the county that benefits us all with the work that is done; but we can't just hand over the tax payer dollar to let them do that so that makes sense to him that the board needs to do something; so there was the discussion of the chiefs having some type of 501C but that is really just a taxing designation, it is not really a legal entity, although it is representative of an IRS designation so maybe that is not the best solution; so then we talk about a COG and he quite honestly sees the EMA COG as a very productive COG; he sees recommendations coming from the chiefs association; he does not know about how many chiefs are attending those meetings; he does not know about how many chiefs are attending the meetings where those recommendations are coming out of and there have been some concerns and discussions at the EMA level whether those recommendations represent the entire chiefs association thoughts or not and if all the communities are being represented; but that is a process that to him, if it was handshake agreements; has appeared to work; but if we are flying in the face of some legal requirement he agrees we need to solve the problem; the reality is, he asked Christina if maybe she can best answer this; If the TROT needs something, or any of the teams need something we rely on the chiefs to direct; they need a piece of equipment do we hand the money to the chief association and they go buy it; Christina said no; Hiscock said then we are not really giving that group of trusted individuals that we rely on to run those teams the money; EMA is paying it directly to the vendors upon recommendation and he asked why that is wrong. Potts said that is not wrong and they should not have the money; Hiscock said he agrees; so that resolves that issue; he thinks that we as a community are not giving our trusted chiefs; who are not a legal entity, money; he said he is missing the issue. Christina said the issue is there is nothing in writing that has allowed EMA to do that for one so when EMA accepted the responsibility of invoicing communities for Technical Rescue; which directly goes to the operation of the fire chiefs association; there is nothing on paper that allows EMA to do that

and actually there is a document from the Prosecutors Office that says we should not be doing that. Hiscock said he was confused with those comments and it goes right to what he is asking about he thinks; so Christina talked about those monies going directly to the operation of the chiefs association; how does that happen. Christina said that at the sub-committee level they make decisions for technical rescue, with training and equipment, and at that level there is a sub-committee that may at sometimes be only 2 or 3 chiefs that are making decisions for the whole association, which is where the issue comes from, they do not function by by-laws, they don't have a majority vote they don't make motions to buy equipment. She used the example of the purchase of the \$65,000.00 F550 3 years ago; there are chiefs that were in this county that had no idea that the purchase was being made until it was driving around the county, which just isn't acceptable. She said that this agency is part of a purchasing process that really is not a process not written on paper; the few chiefs at the sub-committee level who do not report back to the larger group so that larger group understood how that money is going to be spent; that is where the process has failed moving forward throughout the years; the sub-committee has made decisions for the bigger body without them knowing; there have been times throughout the year that I have been questioned what the purchases are and I shouldn't be questioned; from her perspective this has put EMA in the middle the position of being the information sharer and there should be a chain of command; we all understand NIMS; there should be a chain of command with how this money is being spent. She said she does not have a problem with emergency management administering the dollars, she has a problem with the process in which we administer the dollars. Adam said there is a process where EMA transfers dollars to the fire chiefs and goes to stuff that they use; and that process we want to formalize by making it an MOU or something; additionally, the fire chiefs association has said they want to formalize their structure and the vehicle that they think is the best way to formalize is the COG; from his prospective if a COG is what the fire chiefs want to do, and in the process of them forming a COG, the board formalizes the process of that revenue stream it solves the problem. Christina said that would solve the problem; Baird said without forming *another* COG. Adam said to Matts point; we could solve it with a COG at this level but if they have chosen to do something different at that level as opposed to the EMA level he does not see why the board would not want to honor that. Potts said that at the beginning they said it could be either one; they would prefer a separate COG but if the board is the one that will work because it is an already existing COG the chiefs are comfortable with doing that; as he understands it the EMA Executive Board or COG has never been defined in any other way by either the commissioners or any other entity as being responsible for this; the only thing they have providing authority under the ORC as it relates to hazardous materials and this has been a tag on to this structure in his opinion is improper and we should not be doing it. Thorne said that he did not personally research it but the office did when it was originally proposed; Frank Casper researched it-that they shouldn't do it and there is not authority under the COG; they do not have the authority to administer the funds and it was completely ignored and it went forward; the chiefs basically went forward in their own jurisdictions and got them to agree to give money and there had to be an entity to collect the money and they just started giving it to the COG even though they were told they did not have the authority to do it; there was never an audit finding against it being an improper procedure wise; as long as they contract the money for public good that is the most you would probably get but there could be a procedure audit that says you cannot do it anymore; he said he would have to research this COG if there is the authority to expand to include technical rescue; he said that Frank found originally that this COG did not have the

authority to do it. Adam said the one comment if there is a COG at the fire chiefs level whatever other level of service they want to provide then all the communities get the right to say they want the whole buffet or they want water and not collapse; they say and the input then comes from the communities up to their level of COG and the chiefs provide the service the communities want and nothing more.

Thorne said that a separate COG every township will be made a part of the COG and everyone would have an equal say. Guccion said that back in January the issue at the chiefs level; the participating was weak to poor and the sub-committees are driven by group A who didn't get along with group B and they didn't know what they were doing and there started to be an issue and that is what he thinks spurred the whole thing; some guys did not want to participate so whatever happened happened. Baird said that is true in the sense that if you don't show up to make your voice heard and there is still a quorum then you don't get a say in that; the main thing that happened was they were not formalized with what was occurring; the TROT would come to them and say we are thinking about this and as chiefs they would just so ok like it was general conversation. Winkler said that he served as President for the chiefs association the previous 3 years and the question surrounding the technical rescue team had been this was going on for several years, in various incarnations and he thinks what Guccion is bringing up what spurred action; there has been a changeover; Christina's concerns; there have been a number of things that have come forward that says we really need to get this nailed down; he thinks that is what prompted today's meeting. He said to Matt's questions about the COG; certainly one could look at this and the present COG can probably in the short term handle this situation and as we look forward is it really outside the scope of this COG that is here and at the same time, looking forward, if we are going to consider a COG do we need to establish something that is over reaching enough that it can address other things like communication issues; let's not limit ourselves to limit ourselves that we are going to solve the TROT problem today by doing 'this' but let's look at the bigger picture on a wider scale. Baird asked why this issue is beyond this COG reach to adopt the TROT and by-laws. Christina said that EMA should not be taking responsibility and ownership of people; that is the problem; LEPC can, they are a direct Commissioner department that EMA administers on their behalf and they have Hazmat team members but emergency management should not be intended to run operations; operations belongs to the fire chiefs; that is why the administrative part of TROT was pushed over the EMA because we were asked to do the paperwork and the book work but that is not the role of emergency management. Baird said that the intention was not to make EMA responsible for operations; Christina said having the people are the operations; Baird said EMA does not pay those people other than Wally; Christina said that is the reason personnel should fall under the chiefs because their departments are paying the personnel. Baird said he agrees. Adam asked why TROT is not managed under LEPC. Christina said that LEPC is a chemical inventory program that falls under the Community-Right-To-Know Act under SERC so there is a logical reason why only hazmat falls under LEPC and technical rescue are those other disciplines that communities might find that they need but hazmat is specifically for chemical inventory and transportation related spills; LEPC is not for any kind of planning that anyone wants to give them it is for hazmat specific incidents. Thorne said that he did not personally research this but Frank said it is outside the scope of what EMA does; can it be expanded today....he would have to go back and research the same statutes and see what is in the law. Matt said that he thinks this board and the foundational documents; it is a COG so we operate under the same statutory authority that the chiefs are proposing they operate under. Christina said that EMA operates under ORC 5502 and it is narrowly defined for

countywide EMA; Matt said he knows the code section but the board uses the same COG definitions and authorities referenced in the section so it should be essentially very similar depending on the organizational documents. Thorne said it depends on this COG has the authority to expand. Matt said he is not saying they do but conceptually it would be very similar. Martha said the gist of it is that if the chiefs get their community support they are well within their rights to establish a COG correct. Thorne said no- that is why they are looking for this boards support-they really do not have the authority to establish a COG they have to go back to their entities and say 'here is what we want to do'. Martha said exactly-with their community support. Thorne said the communities establish an independent COG; now they could do like the Drug Task Force-the COG could delegate authority to the chiefs to be the actual operators of the functions for that and report back but then that gives them the legal authority; everyone can be a member and decide how the funds get distributed and who holds the fund etc., etc. and there is a legal basis of who and what is done with the money. Christina clarified with Matt that when she brought this to the board's attention all she wanted was a process in place at the chief's level that allowed her and this board to understand that the technical rescue money was spent in a way where all of the chiefs understood where their dollars were going. Matt said that is admirable and a deserving request to us as a board and Christina as the Director; he just wants a discussion and a free discussion of the members of the chiefs association because we have looked at it from a different issue perspective; he agrees that communication in our county can be improved and he will leave it at that from a public safety aspect but he thinks that certain members of chiefs association might say they do not want fire chiefs making decision on the public safety police side; but that is way down the road. He said that think of communications, the issues and the hard work that he understands is being done behind the scenes in terms of trying to solve some of those issues that we have as a county was really part of this; we were worried that we were sending out bills and using that money to pay for things for those we entrust to run the teams, that we all benefit from and need equipment for, and there is nothing in writing-that scares him both as a member of this board and flies in the face of his training over the last 18 years; he gets the reason to do it; he said that as we do not always agree he does trust the chiefs and the benefit as a community and as a citizen, to run those teams and he does not want to be in the business of running those teams but administratively it seems that is how it has worked the way we are doing it; he told Christina he hasn't been in her shoes; hearing chief Potts, who does not want to be a part of the administrative aspect, we should not be delving into the chiefs association business in terms of people not being present to vote on issues; to him shame on those individuals; perhaps a COG is the right answer because they have someone who is on the board to vote for them. Adam said the concerns about the lack of participation; Matt said he does not have a concern with that; Adam said that is the chiefs concern and part of how the chiefs presented this morning explains how they intend to address that through the creation of a COG; he thinks that from an EMA board perspective if it formalizes the process of the revenue flow and that is the way they want to do it he does not care and he would fully support it. Conrad said that is the way it should be and he does not have a problem with it; we do not want to be responsible for everything on an individual basis ours is to get the money from point A to point B and actually they could start collecting for the TROT on their own. Thorne said the COG could have an organization that is a member of the COG could be the fiscal officers for it and take it out of EMA entirely. Matt said that is what we are talking about and that is what the issue is. Thorne said they would be a legally established entity to do it. Conrad said that would be the smartest route;

there has never been a question that the TROT is probably one of the most important functions out there; there has never been that question but he thinks the board is on the right track. Winkler said there is a perception that the chiefs are not involved or there is not a quorum that is not the issue here. This is to solidify everything else and come up with mechanisms. Potts said the ebb and flow of the organization is in part because of the way they are structured, many are part-time chiefs. He said this is not only for the chiefs to know what is going on with the TROT team but for the municipalities to know what is going on with TROT-there are probably some trustees that have no idea what the function of the team is or the cost associated with it and the COG will allow every community more involved, more aware and what the needs are; we need to improve upon this and address this now. Hiscock asked if they looked at anything other than a COG. Potts said that they considered an MOU but it did not provide the structure they want. He said there needs to be somebody above that chief's organization and above TROT that deals with the administrative functions that each municipality needs to work with. Baird said the COG is an agency that can produce revenue; a continuing stream of funding and the COG is the permanent way to do that regardless of the ebb and flow of the fire department-the team will always be there. Matt said a COG is a very powerful tool that has the ability to tax whether communities want it or not. Potts clarified they are not there to ask for tax. Discussion continued about revenue streams, liability, insurance, who should have what role and the debate over a COG/MOU/LLC for TROT. Potts asked if this board will investigate that the board could be modified to act as a Cog for TROT. Thorne said the chiefs have to go back to their own communities and explain to their elected officials what they want to do and they are going to have to decide what structure they can really agree on-he said they should bring it to their attention and they are going to have to meet, discuss it and organize it because they are going to have to agree on what it is. Adam said if the elected officials come back to the chiefs and say they would rather have EMA be the fiscal agent then the board will have to look at how to structure and determine the responsibility. Martha and Matt questioned if that should be done first but at the same time Bill should probably do research. Adam said both things can be done concurrently. Thorne said in 12 years there could be amendments that expand the authority of this COG. He said he will go back and update Franks research and the chiefs need to go back to their communities for what they would want. Baird said they have a committee for this task and their next stop is to talk to Rick Monroe rather than have the chiefs go do their own thing-they are working as a committee to do this. Conrad said the board appreciates the chiefs attendance and that this is exactly what the board wanted. The board agreed to have EMA send out the TROT invoices.

Matt made a motion to approve the January meeting minutes, approved by Martha and approved by all.

Adam made a motion to approve 2 members of the rope team to attend training for \$700.00, seconded by Painter and approved by all.

Adam made a motion to approve shelving and labor costs for 358-2 of \$1,204.00, seconded by Matt and approved by all.

Martha made a motion to adjourn at 9:45pm, seconded by Guccion and approved by all.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'A. L.', followed by a period.