



ASRC BOD Minutes

13 January 2007

Title	Name	From	Present	Proxied To
Chair	Steve Weiss	SMRG	Yes	
Vice Chair	Keith Conover	AMRG	Yes	
Treasurer	Jen Clifton	BRMRG	Yes	
Secretary	Steph Bean	PVRG	No	N/A
Roster	Steve Weiss	SMRG	Yes	N/A
Webmaster	Evan Keto	PVRG	No	N/A
Ops	Bob Allam	PSAR	Yes	N/A
Asst. Ops	Alex McLellan	SMRG	No	N/A
ADC	Alex McLellan	SMRG	No	N/A
Asst. ADC	Rebecca Schooley		No	N/A
Medical	Roger Miller	SMRG	No	N/A
PA OMD	Keith Conover	AMRG	Yes	N/A
VA OMD	Marsh Cuttino	<i>none</i>	No	N/A
WV OMD	Carl Werntz	MARG	No	N/A
Comms	Keith Crabtree	SMRG	No	N/A
PIO	<i>vacant</i>			N/A
Safety	Carl Werntz	MARG	No	N/A
Infection Control	<i>vacant</i>			N/A
Training	William Dixon	SMRG	No	N/A
Group Reps	Name		Present	Proxied To
AMRG	Keith Conover		Yes	
BRMRG	Robert Koester		No	
BRMRG	Rob Lynch		No	
MARG	Carl Werntz		<i>proxied</i>	Doug Moore (MARG)
MARG	Pepper Broad		No	
M/SAR	Bill Andrews		No	
M/SAR	Andrew Dorsett		Yes	
PSAR	Bob Allam		Yes	
PVRG	Stephanie Bean		<i>proxied</i>	Andrew Dorsett (MSAR)
SMRG	Keith Crabtree		<i>proxied</i>	Steve Weiss (SMRG)
SMRG	Steve Weiss		Yes	
SWVaMRG	Chris Chesson		No	
SWVaMRG	Sarah Druy		No	
TSAR	Theresa Crossland		Yes	
TSAR	Kevin Brewer		Yes	
Non-Voting Groups				
DELMARVA	Jim Jackson		Yes	
At Large Attendance (Name, Group)				
Andrew Hower	AMRG		Pete Peterson	DELMARVA
Eric Fox	DELMARVA			

Summary of Motions from this meeting:

Motion	Section	Result
Minutes approved	2.2	Passed
Accept group status changes as presented by Chair	3.1.3	Passed
Promote Alex McLellan to IC1	6.1.1	Passed
Reimburse ASRC members \$50 for taking an ASRC-sponsored PSO course in calendar 2007	6.2.2	Passed
Accept proposed budget	8.3	Passed
Recommend the promotion of Delmarva SAR to the membership for the April General membership meeting	9.1	Passed

Minutes:

1. **The meeting was called to order at 1030.**
2. **Approval of minutes**
 - 2.1. As amended with addendum dated Dec 13, 2006 VAO6076 including the two motions passing by phone vote on conference call
 - 2.1.1. First thanking TSAR for prompt response to the ‘declaration of reprimand’ from VDEM.
 - 2.1.2. Second that the ASRC Chair draft a letter of apology to VDEM.
 - 2.2. Minutes of October BOD meeting **approved**, as amended.
3. **Chairs Report:**
 - 3.1. Group status changes
 - 3.1.1. There have been some changes in group class status for 2007. The Chair recommended the following for classification of each Group classification for 2007, based on current roster information.
 - 3.1.1.1.AMRG remains a B group
 - 3.1.1.2.BRMRG remains an A group
 - 3.1.1.3.MARG changes from an A to a B group
 - 3.1.1.4.MSAR remains an A group
 - 3.1.1.5.PSAR changes from a B to an A group
 - 3.1.1.6.PVRG remains a B group
 - 3.1.1.7.SMRG remains an A group
 - 3.1.1.8.SWVMRG changes from an A to a B group
 - 3.1.1.9.TSAR remains an A group
 - 3.1.2. The changes mean that MARG and SWVMRG loose one rep each for dropping classification and PSAR gains a rep for achieving a new classification. Current information should be posted on the ASRC website for reference. The Board as a whole will have one less member.
 - 3.1.3. Motion to accept changes as presented by Chair.
 - 3.1.3.1.Motion **passed**
4. Strategic Review postponed in view of operations report
5. Operational Report on Recertification
 - 5.1 Bob Allam had three others step up and help work on the 36-month group review process: Andrew Bickers, Keith Crabtree, and William Dixon

- 5.2 See attached handouts *BOD Deck.ppt* and *Recert Proposal.doc*. Some further discussion also appended. In summary: the new process is to test **operational** readiness rather than simple administrative compliance. Current group review checks that groups are conducting training, maintain a current roster, and conduct equipment checks. The ops group thought this process should include operational benefits as well as components to implement the ops manual through training, bylaws, etc.
- 5.3 The above documents are being presented as a basic proposal on what the right direction is for group recertification. By covering a basic set of right steps for future development of standards, it ensures that current and future ASRC groups are clear in their mission and operational readiness.
- 5.4 The evaluation process will be every 36 months, staggered amongst the ASRC member teams. Two concurrent groups will be evaluated annually on a rolling schedule, thus covering everyone in the ASRC over the course of a three year rotational period.
- 5.5 The rolling evaluation process will take into account the following seven topics:
- 5.5.1 Training
 - 5.5.2 Operational Standards
 - 5.5.3 Equipment
 - 5.5.4 Feedback from three (3) Local RAs
 - 5.5.5 Group Response to Missions
 - 5.5.6 Successful Completion of a Mission Exercise
 - 5.5.7 Adherence to ASRC By-laws and Administrative Procedures
- 5.6 As part of the evaluation process, a written ASRC test is proposed to be administered to 25% of the members based on current member classification (FTM/FTL) to hit at least one member at each operational level. This test, based on the operations manual, will be given to these randomly selected individuals and they will have 30 days to complete the exam, using the operations manual as reference. Questions would be pooled from all ASRC member teams to utilize concepts from the ASRC Ops Manual, however will be answers which you will need to use practical experiences and thought process to answer. The answers will be based on the operational concepts, but will exhibit unique circumstances and real life events over time to make the test-taker use practical skills in synthesizing information to answer questions.
- 5.7 Consensus in favor of having the Group Chair simply sign that the Group has all of its equipment rather than actually having an independent evaluator check the equipment.. Discussed the idea of requiring the Chair sign an actual full inventory, and could develop a guide for this inventory, including such things as:
- Expiration date
 - Condition: good, marginal, “replace within next year,” “replace now”
 - A signed statement that this meets the minimum ASRC requirements.
 - If a Group depends on some members’ personal gear to meet ASRC requirements, the Group might include a signed agreement from the member that the equipment.
- 5.8 Instead of asking RAs to fill out a survey (in MD, only 2 RAs and neither knows much about SAR; most RAs not interested in filling out surveys and probably won’t do), we could check off that someone from outside the Group has contacted local RAs and other SAR Groups to provide constructive feedback.
- 5.8.1 This done on a regular basis as part of mission follow-up; can simply check off that this has been done for a Group at the time of review.
 - 5.8.2 Dave Carter when Chair used to have a form that he gave to the RA at the end of the mission to get feedback. Could have FTMs fill out a form for feedback to FTLs, too.
- 5.9 ASRC is called to fewer and fewer searches in Virginia each year, which will affect our ability to attend missions as part of the requirements. Simulations might be substituted, but we would need different simulations to address different tasks (semitech, setting up base, etc.) and individualized to the Group’s capabilities. CQI again: Need to consider that this simulation would

13 January 2007

be as much a training exercise as a test. May want to combine the two groups being evaluated for the mission. Will also help develop interoperability.

- 5.10 Additional looks at how ASRC teams are doing outreach to RAs was discussed as part of the group recertification process. It will evaluate how individual local groups have reached out to RAs and worked with them to provide services. Hopefully groups will distribute surveys to their RAs following actual missions as part of a normal formal evaluation process. The ASRC can then potentially do follow-up phone calls to these RAs as part of the evaluation process.
 - 5.11 The other component to the evaluation process is mission response. The ASRC will look at missions in a 120 mile radius and see the number of missions the group teams are responding to. The evaluation process will expect teams to respond to at least 1/3 of all missions in the service radius. There was discussion about the student teams responding to missions during key times of the year (summer, finals, spring break) as well as discussion from multiple teams regarding ASRC missions vs. non-ASRC activations. Other discussion looked at the types of response, from rescue, semi-tech, technical, management, outreach, or dispatch and how these could potentially count for missions.
 - 5.12 Hopefully the evaluation process is strictly a CQI move – where the evaluation will not be as much of Pass/Fail criteria, however a QI feedback thing where the ASRC can assure that their teams are meeting a standard of excellence in order with the mission of the ASRC, and discussion to make its member teams better both administratively and operationally. If a member team ‘fails’, the operations section will have appropriate action, which hasn’t been clearly defined yet, however will most likely result in a committee to discuss process.
 - 5.13 It is the hope of the ASRC to then incorporate its lessons learned through “Lessons Learned Information Sharing” (LLIS.gov) for “best practices” in the Search and Rescue community.
 - 5.14 Status of NIMS compliance: no consensus, still need to get some groups to get more members to document compliance.
 - 5.15 Bob will have 1-2 phone conferences with the Group Ops officers, and some email work, and will have a formal complete proposal for an up or down vote at the next BOD, with plans for implementation in the fall.
- 6 Training Report:
- 6.1 Alex McLellan received favorable vote of ICs for IC-1/ACA by the ICs, sponsored by IC-1 Bob Allam and approved by Conference Training Officer William Dixon via phone call, and unanimous vote in favor.
 - 6.1.1 Motion **passed** to promote Alex McLellan to IC1
 - 6.2 PSO course
 - 6.2.1 Suggestion made that the ASRC fund \$500/course for up to two ASRC-centric PSO courses taught by Dave Carter. Noted that we have \$1500 set aside for PSO. Might be better to just give \$50/ASRC member for taking and to have ASRC “sponsor” the course in terms of relationship with other SAR Groups.
 - 6.2.2 Motion to reimburse ASRC members \$50 for taking an ASRC-sponsored PSO course in calendar 2007.
 - 6.2.2.1 Motion **passed** with two abstentions.
 - 6.2.3 William announced his resignation as the Conference Training Officer and will serve until the position is filled. Currently the ASRC CTO and the Webmaster are open positions which need to be filled.
 - 6.2.4 Discussion regarding the fact that Delmarva has standards that meet the ASRC standards but are above them. The ASRC Bylaws require that members can transfer between groups; Delmarva now has an ASRC member from another Group joining and will accept this member’s prior ASRC certifications.
- 7 Admin Report:

- 7.1 Chair met with Mark Eggeman in November who states, “No groups will be self-certified.” This leaves many questions, including: What about CQs? Maybe have an expiration date on CQ membership. What about certification? Says that you’ve passed certain tests, and met other requirements, and you have been accredited by an authorizing agency, which issues the credentials. Steve wants to see ASRC accrediting Groups to be able to test individuals to the standards. ASRC Groups then issue credentials to individuals. Need to revamp our language (even though our *process* is basically OK) to be more overtly NIMS compliant. Regarding NIMS: “We’re either going to get out in front or get run over.”
- 7.2 Will be reviewing the draft MOU that Mark Eggeman suggested as a model for new MOUs with VDEM. It lists the kind of services that an organization can provide under the state’s auspices. Might this be seen as limiting what SAR teams can do at the scene? No, this just limits what they can do *as a state resource with state workers’ compensation and liability coverage*. If we have responded as a VDEM state resource, and the RA asks to use one of our resources outside of what can reasonably come under the MOU with the state, we need to provide that resource quickly, efficiently and cheerfully, but have the RA sign that s/he understands that this resource is now no longer covered under the state MOU and will be covered by the RA’s liability and workers’ comp.
- 7.3 Kudos to Roger Miller and several people in BRMRG: team effort to get us a new OMD, got ASRC ALS license renewed for 2 years. New VA OMD is Dr. George Lindbeck, head of Thomas Jefferson EMS region in Virginia.
 - 7.3.1 Do we want to get ASRC licensed as an EMS agency in other states?
- 7.4 West Virginia requires a \$1,000,000 liability coverage by the ASRC as addressed as an issue from MARG.
- 7.5 AMRG is currently pursuing a license as a QRS (Quick Response Service) in Pennsylvania. Do we want to ask AMRG to consider doing this as the ASRC as opposed to just the AMRG? Consensus is yes, whenever possible do this so the whole ASRC is covered. Keith will forward to AMRG.
- 8 Finance Report:
 - 8.1 Report attached. We have about \$2500 with \$1500 allocated for PSO training. Just got a donation from a SAR team that has now disbanded. Projected dues receipts, about \$8000, with projected expenses of about \$7000, including insurance.
 - 8.2 Discussion from Chair to propose an increase for Web expenses to an even \$400 for updates for the secure section fees for the website in addition to an upgrade to \$250 for achievement pins.
 - 8.3 Motion to accept the projected budget.
 - 8.3.1 Motion **Passed**
- 9 Operations Report:
 - 9.1 Delmarva SAR proposed for full ASRC membership. Motion that the Board recommend the promotion of Delmarva SAR to the membership for the April General membership meeting.
 - 9.1.1 Motion **Passed**
 - 9.1.2 Need to have 1/3 of the members represented in person or by proxy at the ASRC General Membership Meeting so Groups are directed to *start collecting proxies now!*
 - 9.2 Discussed the need to demonstrate solvency; as this was right after a case of identity theft against one of the Delmarva members, they provided a redacted bank statement, with the numbers, individual entries, and other potentially compromising material blacked out, but with enough information to demonstrate solvency.
 - 9.3 A note was made to add to the ops manual to blank numbers and remote personally identifiable information as a potential solution and recommended procedure.
 - 9.4 ASRC General Membership Meeting April will be hosted by Delmarva SAR in NE Maryland, at Boy Scout Camp Rodney, near the town of North East (yes that’s the town name).
 - 9.5 PFD Discussions – Personal Flotation Devices (PFDs) were discussed including what types and numbers for each of the teams – more discussion will be needed to determine what requirements must be met. Due to recent events, PFDs will most likely end up as an equipment requirement.

13 January 2007

9.6 Operational Review of VA-067-06

- 9.6.1 First person on scene arrived expecting to be FTL, had her dog in the car (nobody to watch at home), and the RA found out that the dog was available and certified (though not in VA) as a trailing dog. RA was told that if he wanted to use the dog it would NOT be covered as a Virginia resource; RA understood and wanted to use the trailing dog anyway. At the RA's discretion, the trailing dog was dispatched, while another airscenting dog was held back; but this reportedly was because the task was appropriate for trailing but not airscenting. This apparently caused a complaint by the other dog handler, of a VA certified airscent dog, that resulted in a formal complaint and reprimand from the Virginia SAR Coordinator. However, this handler's SAR team has expressed its support for the ASRC and appreciation for its work on this mission. The two issues for which the member was disciplined as far as we are concerned were (1) not signing out appropriately (even though she verbalized she was doing this) and (2) not removing or reversing her TSAR shirt.
- 9.6.2 VDEM does not dispatch or authorize non-certified resources. For instance, if someone calls the state for a bloodhound, which is not listed or certified as a state resource, the state does not alert the bloodhound association, they act as a conduit to pass on the number for the bloodhound association.
- 9.6.3 As far as VDEM is concerned, this issue is reportedly closed.
- 9.6.4 We still need to formalize the process of "sign out as ASRC/VDEM, sign in as non-VDEM resource." Will discuss by email on the BOD list after the VSARCO meeting in a week.
- 9.7 There is a need to revisit insurance requirements, but no specific conclusions were reached.
- 9.8 Question regarding logging of pages:
 - 9.8.1 Are 332 pages sent to the ASRC website logged? Yes. Some of these are 30' callouts, and nobody is ever notified. They can be sent from the website to ASRC records and to the Operations Officer.

10. Next Meeting:

The BOD will meet before the General Membership Meeting on April 14, 2007 in North East, MD.

11. The meeting officially adjourned.

More detailed discussion regarding Ops Recertification proposal:

Keith Conover:

1. Instead of selecting a random member for a *written* test how about a *practical* test? Discussion of this, not much support. But Keith then suggested the idea of a multiple-choice test, with an extensive scenario before the question, focusing on real-life type examples. These could be at the CQ, FTM and FTL level, with different levels of question. Testing like this would:
 - a. maybe involve multiple principles and multiple parts of the Ops manual and some common sense in a single question.
 - b. this would prompt members who've taken the test (or heard about it) to review similar scenarios and debate how to deal with these scenarios (could post some as part of the online versions of the Ops manual, etc.)
 - c. we are really more interested in whether people handle scenarios
2. Keith suggested that we consider this as a CQI tool. Quoting from his email: *The idea that continuous certification is a better idea, in that it tends to avoid "cramming" and that it is essence, an implementation of CQI - Continuous Quality Improvement - is attractive. For example, for me, I have to take a "LLSA" (life-long self-assessment) test every year. It is an open-book online test, and they encourage you to take it with others, discussing each question before you answer it. The goal for ABEM/ABMS is not to fail anyone, but to motivate people to keep up their learning on a continuous basis. They do this by picking twenty articles from the medical literature each year and then you have to take the open book test based on these articles. Every 10 years you have to take a test, but compared to the previous 2-day written and oral extravaganza, the 10- year test is a simple 92-question multiple-choice test (although very, very tough multiple choice, based on some complex medical scenarios.) The point being that even these large, well-funded national organizations that are testing and certifying in a domain similar to SAR are moving away from massive infrequent tests to frequent tests to keep people up to date, as it works better, AND there is pressure from government agencies and nongovernmental organizations to use this kind of "continuous certification" as there is evidence it works better to protect the public.* Keith also suggested that we should consider the saying "Knowledge is knowing the rules, understanding is knowing how to break the rules, and wisdom is knowing *when* to break the rules" and the operations research/systems theory.
3. Discussed customer service aspects of testing. Customers: members, RAs, government bodies, potential new teams, subjects. Want to keep our profession restricted and high-quality.

Discussion ensued about making a test have interpretable answers which could be argued multiple ways. This needed more specific addressing by the Ops Section.

Also – a discussion about having a large question pool similar to the amateur radio exam from the FCC and then selecting random questions for the test administration. This has a benefit where you can't study for a given question, however would be very time consuming to compose.

Regarding simulations:

Doug: should we specify how many should show up at the sim? Bob: haven't addressed this yet. Keith: maybe we can offer "double credit" for individual members who attend. Will have many evaluators from other groups, each of which also gets credit for a simulation. Members of other Groups can show up and participate and also get credit.