

Summary Minutes

Meeting of the
Emergency Medical Services Regulatory Board
10:00 a.m., January 21, 2010
2829 University Avenue Southeast
4th Floor, Conference Room A
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Members Present

James Rieber, Chair
Dawn Bidwell
Lisa Consie
Bonnie Engen
Michael Gormley
Kathleen Haney
Michael Jordan
Rep. Jeremy Kalin
Paula Fink Kocken, M.D.
Pat Lee
Kevin Miller
Gary Pearson
Paul Satterlee, M.D.
Mark Schoenbaum
Matt Simpson
Marlys Tanner
Mari Thomas, M.D.

Members Absent

Brenda Brown
Sen. Gary Kubly

Guests

Rachel Callanan
Suzanne Gaines
Curt Ireland
Frank Langer
Dr. Charlie Lick
Victoria O'Brien
Gwen Kleven Olson
Darel Radde
Dr. Raveendrum
Scott Reiten
Lance Ross
Josh Salzman
Bill Snoke
Julie Sanford
Imo Sunderland
Martin Van Buren

Staff

Katherine Burke Moore
Talia Landucci
Melody Nagy
Robert Norlen
Rose Olson
Debby Teske
Keith Wesley, M.D.
Mary Zappetillo

I. Call to Order

Mr. Rieber called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m.

II. Introductions

Mr. Rieber said that Michael Jordan, Gary Pearson, Pat Lee, and Marlys Tanner, were reappointed to the Board and Sheriff Michael Gormley was appointed to the Board. Mr. Rieber asked Sheriff Gormley to introduce himself. Sheriff Gormley provided information on his experience as sheriff and with the local ambulance service.

Mr. Rieber asked Board members and guests to introduce themselves.

III. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Rieber said that there will be a presentation from Take Heart Minnesota added to the agenda. Mr. Schoenbaum moved approval of the revised agenda. Dr. Thomas seconded. Motion carried.

IV. Approval of Minutes

Dr. Satterlee moved approval of the November 19, 2009 minutes. Ms. Engen seconded. Motion carried.

V. American Heart Association Survey Proposal

Ms. Burke Moore provided a handout from the American Heart Association (AHA) and said MAA and EMRSB are partnering to assist the AHA. Mr. Ross from MAA will be surveying

the STEMI EMS capacity in different regions of the state. Dr. Raveendrum, representing AHA, presented the benefits of completing this assessment with MN ambulance services.

Mr. Ross said that he has been working with this group for a year and a national survey was conducted that Minnesota did very well on. We are now seeking information that is Minnesota specific.

Mr. Rieber asked what is the Board's role in this process. Ms. Burke Moore replied that the Board should support this effort and the results of the assessment will be provided to the board at the end of the project. Mr. Rieber said that we want to partner and support these programs but must live within our limited resources. He noted that the EMSRB does not mandate protocols for ambulance services. He asked that information be provided to the Medical Direction Standing Advisory Committee (MDSAC) on this project.

Ms. Burke Moore said that she has asked Dr. Wesley to encourage medical directors to participate in the survey.

VI. Take Heart Minnesota Program

Dr. Charlie Lick provided information to the Board on the Take Heart Minnesota Program. He provided a sample training manual as an available resource. Dr. Lick said our group is launching this effort in Minnesota to improve cardiac survival rates. He said that he has hired two staff with grant funds. Mr. Rieber said that this was discussed at MDSAC. Dr. Thomas said that this was supported as an educational effort and was very well accepted. Dr. Wesley said that high performance CPR was also discussed. Dr. Lick said that there are two communities implementing pilot projects. He said that tool kits are being developed to be distributed in Minnesota. Mr. Rieber said that information should be provided to MDSAC for review. Mr. Rieber offered to post information on the EMSRB website.

VII. Chair's Remarks

Election of Executive Committee Officers

Mr. Rieber said that the election of Board officers must occur in the first meeting of each even number year according to the Board's Internal Operating Procedures.

Mr. Rieber asked for nominations for Vice Chair.

Mr. Lee nominated Mr. Miller. Dr. Satterlee seconded. Mr. Rieber asked if there were any other nominations and repeated this three times. Ms. Engen moved to accept the nomination. Bidwell seconded. Motion carried. (Members cast unanimous ballots for Mr. Miller.)

Mr. Rieber asked for nominations for the At Large position.

Dr. Thomas nominated Dr. Fink Kocken. Mr. Simpson seconded. Mr. Rieber asked if there were any other nominations and repeated this three times. (Members cast unanimous ballots for Dr. Fink Kocken.)

Mr. Rieber asked for nominations for Treasurer.

Mr. Rieber explained that Ms. Brown could not be here today. Mr. Pearson was nominated by Ms. Bidwell. Ms. Engen seconded. Mr. Miller asked if Ms. Brown was interested in retaining the position. Mr. Rieber said that he thought she was. Mr. Miller nominated Ms. Brown. Dr. Fink Kocken seconded. Mr. Rieber asked if there were any other nominations and repeated this three times. (Mr. Pearson was elected treasurer.)

Mr. Rieber asked for nominations for Secretary.

Ms. Tanner nominated Mr. Lee. Mr. Miller seconded. Mr. Rieber asked if there were any other nominations and repeated this three times. (Members cast unanimous ballots for Mr. Lee.)

Mr. Simpson left the meeting.

Committee Appointments

Mr. Rieber said that he will announce committee assignments by February 1. He asked that Board members notify him of their interests. Mr. Rieber explained committee activities. He said that the Legislative Committee and Executive Committee will have regularly scheduled conference call meetings during legislative session.

Board Goals

Mr. Rieber said that the Executive Committee met prior to the meeting today. He said that one thing the Board is lacking is Board goals to develop a work plan. He said that this Board is both a regulatory agency and an advocacy group. The Board will need to make decisions on what we should focus on with our limited resources. The Board should set some global goals and then the Executive Committee will refine these goals. Mr. Schoenbaum said that the classic way to accomplish this is a strategic planning session. He said that Department of Administration - Management Analysis Division provides this service and but there is a cost involved. He suggested that the Executive Committee have a consultation with Management Analysis. He suggested asking them for a discount on their services.

Mr. Rieber commented that this is the last year of his term as Board Chair and he said that he thought it would be unfair to have a new chair named in the middle of this process. He said that he would like to see something short term to start the process.

Mr. Jordan agreed with Mr. Schoenbaum's suggestion. Mr. Jordan said that our primary focus is regulatory and our statutes would define the tasks that must be accomplished and then we would match this against our financial constraints. He said that he is aware of the plan to recoup our funds but is doubtful that will occur during this legislative session.

Mr. Rieber quoted the first paragraph of the Board IOP that defines the goals of the Board. He suggested that the Executive Committee meet with the Executive Director to refine these goals. He said that this will give us a better format for evaluation of the Executive Director. He said that we want to be fair in our review of the Executive Director. Mr. Miller said that he would like to add a goal of a formal communication process.

Rep. Kalin said that this legislative session includes a profound budget deficit and we will have a new Governor next session. The EMSRB will have to make its case to the Governor on the mission of the Board and its accomplishments. He asked that staff bring an analysis of what the Board is doing and what can be accomplished.

Mr. Pearson said a communication plan is a part of the work plan not part of the Board goals. Mr. Rieber said that this should also include Board communication.

Mr. Schoenbaum moved that the Executive Committee and Executive Director develop one year goals for 2010 to present to the Board for action by the Board and in doing so they consult the IOP and the statutes. The goals should be directed at meeting statutory responsibilities and agency management. Board members should be asked to provide input to the Executive Director for consideration by the Executive Committee and that it be discussed at the next

Board meeting . (A suggestion was also made that a timeline be set for a product to be provided to Board members so it can be reviewed before the next meeting).

Ms. Burke Moore said that she can develop an operational work plan. Mr. Rieber said that the four goals from the IOP would be the Board's goals and the Executive Committee would develop a work plan from the goals. Mr. Jordan seconded the motion.

Mr. Miller said that the motion authorizes the Executive Committee to develop goals with the Executive Director. Ms. Engen asked if there would be Board member input. Mr. Schoenbaum said that input would be provided to the Executive Director.

Rep. Kalin asked for a deadline for a product to be provided to Board members for review before the next meeting. Mr. Schoenbaum asked that this be added to his motion.

Mr. Jordan said that the four statutory obligations should be the basis for the work plan. The communications plan will be a tool to provide information. He said that we need an extrapolation of what we do now (an explanation of what is being accomplished) within the statutory requirements and what is being accomplished that is extra.

Ms. Burke Moore said that these are two different but related documents – goals and a work plan. Mr. Jordan said that the goals are in place and the Executive Director should develop the work plan and report to the Board on its accomplishments within its statutory authority. Mr. Schoenbaum said that the goals are broad and we would like to see more detail.

Mr. Rieber restated the motion: To have the Executive Committee and Executive Director meet and provide a document back to the Board members three weeks before the next Board meeting. The motion was seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Lee repeated that we need input from Board members. Mr. Rieber asked that comments be provided to Ms. Nagy. Rep. Kalin said that we need to stay within the legislative auditor's requirements.

Ms. Burke Moore said that Mr. Norlen and Ms. Teske would be involved in development of the work plan.

Review of the Internal Operating Procedures

Mr. Rieber said that the review of the Board's Internal Operating Procedures must occur in January each year.

Dr. Thomas asked about an item on page 10 that refers to having a non-board member physicians consult on Board decisions. Mr. Rieber asked that this language be changed. He said that we need a clarification on eligibility for voting for the Medical Direction Standing Advisory Committee.

Dr. Thomas said that this committee does not make decisions but makes recommendations. A quorum is not needed because it is just recommendations. Mr. Rieber said that the committee makes decisions on recommendations to the Board. Mr. Rieber said that the committee membership should be reviewed. Dr. Thomas said that the IOP does not identify the membership clearly. It identifies the minimum number of members. Dr. Satterlee said that the goals defined are very restrictive. The goal he sees for the MDSAC is an advocacy group for

the Board. He suggested re-defining goals for the committee. Dr. Fink Kocken said that she would like to see representation from all areas of the state. She suggested conference call meetings to seek more representation. Mr. Rieber said that the MDSAC should review their mission and provide information in the next year to the full Board. Mr. Rieber said that the IOP can be amended at any time. Dr. Satterlee asked who should define the committee membership. Mr. Rieber said that the Board looks to MDSAC for medical opinions. Dr. Thomas said that the membership must be defined by the Board. Mr. Rieber asked that the three physician Board members provide a report to the Board at the next meeting.

The four statutory requirements that the EMSRB should fulfill are listed in the introduction of the IOP. Ms. Burke Moore noted that goal three is an advocacy role to work with the legislature and to provide information and serve the public by assuring an effective EMS delivery system. Mr. Jordan said that he is all for advocating but the ability to execute this is another question. The Board's first focus is regulatory and then we add on the advocacy. Rep. Kalin said that the Board's role is to regulate and make recommendations to the legislature .

Ms. Tanner reminded the Board that they removed the term limits language on page three. That change was voted on at a previous board meeting. No vote was taken; the Board agreed that the previously approved change needed to be included in the updated version of the IOP.

APPOINTMENTS/TERMINATIONS p.3

Current language: "No member appointed may serve consecutive terms, except for initial Board members whose terms are for two or three years...[Per motion term limit language is removed and language will be added that there are no term limits.]

Mr. Rieber said that he has several recommendations for changes to the IOP. He said that one suggested change is to remove that language on page 3, 2nd paragraph under OFFICERS, Chair: that current language "the chair may take emergency action in concert with the chair of the MDSAC" be changed by replacing the word "concert" to state "consult" *with the MDSAC Chair*". Ms. Engen asked for clarification. Mr. Rieber explained that this only has happened once before.

Ms. Burke Moore said that this change can result in Board policy being interpreted and determined by one person, the Chair. The IOP already includes the ability for an emergency Executive Committee meeting to discuss Board policy. Mr. Miller said that his comment is that the Governor sets the membership of the Board and names the Chair of the Board. He said that direction by the Board Chair is not unreasonable. Mr. Jordan said that the Executive Committee should discuss policy issues and bring recommendations to the Board. Mr. Rieber said that the Executive Committee cannot meet without giving a three day notice. He cited an example of an issue with the past Executive Director being insubordinate, testifying at the legislature and the Board Chair disagreeing on policy. Ms. Burke Moore reminded the Board that there is authority in the IOP for an emergency Executive Committee meeting without a three day notice.

Mr. Rieber asked for a motion to change the language to "consult". Dr. Fink Kocken moved approval of this change. Dr. Thomas seconded. Motion carried.

OFFICERS, CHAIR p. 3, 2nd paragraph

The chair will set an agenda for each meeting. The chair will call Special Meetings of the Board and Executive Committee as needed. The chair may take emergency action on behalf of

*the Board in ~~concert~~ **consult** with the Chair of the Medical Director's Standing Advisory Committee.*

Mr. Rieber asked that the word "not" be removed from the language on 3 regarding the authority of the Chair. Mr. Miller moved approval of this change. Ms. Tanner seconded. Ms. Burke Moore said that she is concerned about how this could affect the Executive Director in the day-to-day management and administration of agency operations. Supervision of the Executive Director is the executive committee role and not that of only the board chair. Mr. Pearson said that the work plan will address this issue more fully.

A roll call vote was requested and the members voted as follows: Ms. Bidwell yes, Ms. Consie yes, Ms. Engen yes, Mr. Gormley yes, Ms. Haney no, Mr. Jordan no, Dr. Fink Kocken yes, Mr. Lee yes, Mr. Miller yes, Mr. Pearson yes, Mr. Rieber yes, Dr. Satterlee yes, Mr. Schoenbaum no, Ms. Tanner yes, and Dr. Thomas yes. Motion carried.

p. 3 Chair, 3rd paragraph, 4th bullet

- *Chair authority does ~~not~~ include supervising , interpreting Board policy to, or otherwise directing the executive director.*

Mr. Rieber referred members to page eight of the IOP under item A. He said that he wants to add language "except for the Chair and the Executive Committee". Mr. Miller agreed that the Executive Committee is often tasked to take action on behalf of the Board.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Code of Conduct, Item 2. A. p.8

2. Board members may not attempt to exercise individual authority over the agency except as explicitly set forth in board policies.

*A. Board members' interaction with the executive director or with staff must recognize the lack of authority in any individual member or group of Board members, **except for the Chair and the Executive Committee.***

Mr. Lee moved to accept this language change. Mr. Pearson seconded. Mr. Schoenbaum said that the authority is to act independently in between Board meetings except to represent a position of the full Board. Mr. Jordan suggested changing the language to "except the Chair and the Executive Committee". Mr. Rieber said that the intent is not to direct the staff. Mr. Jordan said that if you have an insubordinate issue with the staff this would be an opposite situation. How do you keep consistency? This motion is just the opposite of the one you approved a moment ago. Ms. Burke Moore said that she would be concerned that the staff would receive conflicting information; who is the lead of office operations? Ms. Burke Moore said that the Board has the authority to address the Executive Director performance at any time. Mr. Rieber called for a vote on the motion.

A roll call vote was conducted as follows: Ms. Bidwell yes, Ms. Consie no, Ms. Engen yes, Mr. Gormley no, Ms. Haney no, Mr. Jordan no, Dr. Fink Kocken no, Mr. Lee yes, Mr. Miller yes, Mr. Pearson yes, Mr. Rieber yes, Dr. Satterlee no, Mr. Schoenbaum yes, Ms. Tanner no, Dr. Thomas no. Motion failed.

Mr. Rieber referred members to page eight item C and recommended changing the language to: "except as outlined in the Board IOP process". Ms. Burke Moore said that this would provide

clarity by removing everything after “as that”. Dr. Satterlee moved approval of this change. Mr. Gormley seconded. Motion carried.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Code of Conduct, p. 8, C.

*C. Board members shall make no judgments of the executive director or staff performance, **except as outlined in the IOP process**, as that performance is assessed against explicit Board policies by the official process.*

Mr. Rieber said that changes can be made to the IOP at any time by a vote of the majority of the Board members. He said that we must develop a new work plan and a Board annual self assessment.

Mr. Rieber commented that before the last legislative session the Board voted to grant the Executive Committee authority to act on behalf of the Board without an end date to this authority. (See language on page nine of the IOP.) He asked what is the wish of the Board. Mr. Jordan said that at the May meeting a discussion occurred regarding teleconferencing meetings. The constraint for the Executive Committee could be restored if there is an option for the Board to meet by teleconference. Ms. Burke Moore referred to the statute regarding teleconferencing. Rep. Kalin said that electronic meeting authority was granted to all state agencies but there must be public access. Ms. Burke More said that only issue can be the cost of the phone access. Rep. Kalin said that he would be open to suggestions for changes to the teleconference meeting requirements to add authority for emergency meetings.

Mr. Jordan said that he is concerned that the Executive Committee would be making decisions without input from the full Board. Mr. Rieber said that in the past the Executive Committee has deferred matters to the full Board if they are not time sensitive, but during legislative session these decisions must be made immediately. Mr. Rieber asked for clarification for the IOP and then suggested tabling this for future discussion. He asked that Ms. Nagy find this portion of the minutes.

Mr. Rieber referred members to page 11 of the IOP regarding review of the Executive Director’s performance. Mr. Rieber said that all Board members are to provide information to the Board Secretary and that this information is held in confidence. He said that all Executive Committee members should be able to review all the information from all board members, not just summary information. He also suggested that all information be held for more than one year in agreement with state statute. Ms. Teske said that we must follow state human resource guidelines. Mr. Rieber said that the “Executive Committee”, acting as the supervisor, should have all the data to review the Executive Director’s performance. Mr. Miller asked what is the difference? Mr. Rieber said that he does not know if all Board members responded previously and what the comments were from which Board members. The Executive Committee only received scoring of the evaluation forms. Mr. Rieber suggested removing the other statement regarding “examples given for factors rated a 1 or 5.” Mr. Rieber said that the Board Secretary maintains the forms for one year. He said that this should be removed and the state policy should be referred to or for the length of the employment of the Executive Director. The sentence stating that “summaries of the evaluations are tabulated by the secretary and presented to the Executive Committee.” would also be removed. Ms. Bidwell moved to accept this motion. Mr. Jordan seconded. Dr. Thomas said she would like to amend the motion to include removal of Board member names. Motion carried.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR EVALUATION, p 11

The Executive Committee is responsible for the evaluation of the executive director in January of each year. All Board members complete an evaluation form. The evaluation forms are held by the Board secretary in confidence. Examples or statements should accompany each performance factor ~~when the executive director is rated a 1 or 5. If the Board members do not have knowledge or observation of performance within a specific factor, they leave that rating blank and state "no direct knowledge."~~ The overall performance rating is based on only the factors completed. All evaluation forms are returned to the Board secretary. The secretary maintains the forms for ~~one year~~ the length of employment of the executive directors or per state policy, at which time they are replaced with the current evaluation forms. ~~Summaries of the evaluation are tabulated by the secretary and presented to the Executive Committee.~~

Mr. Rieber said that the evaluation forms are to be held by the Board Secretary in confidence and after removal of names the full document including comments will be shared with the Executive Committee. Ms. Engen moved approval of this motion. Ms. Consie seconded. Motion carried.

Mr. Rieber referred to page 12 of the IOP in the second paragraph regarding goal setting. The Executive Director evaluation is based on the goals set by the Board. Mr. Rieber said that the evaluation process would also be determined by the Board. Mr. Jordan suggested that this also be added to page 11. The evaluation form will be based on the Board goals. Ms. Burke Moore said that the position description should also be considered. Mr. Rieber said that he would suggest adding this language to page 11: "after January of each year language for evaluating board goals". The Executive Committee will set the performance measures for the Executive Director's performance evaluation. Mr. Jordan moved acceptance of this change. Ms. Bidwell seconded. Motion carried.

Executive Director Evaluation p. 11

The Executive Committee is responsible for the evaluation of the executive director in January of each year based on board goals.

**VIII. Executive Director's Report
Education Standards Workgroup Update**

Dr. Satterlee reported that the Education Standards Workgroup met and discussed adoption of the national standards. The workgroup discussed the Kansas model and how these changes will affect Minnesota. A gap analysis is being reviewed and we are identifying what will work in Minnesota from the national standards.

Rep. Kalin left at 12:10 p.m.

Budget Update

Ms. Burke Moore distributed a copy of a memo from Minnesota Management and Budget (MMB) that provided instruction regarding additional budget reductions state agencies were asked to calculate. She said for FY2010 the formula required that a 3% reduction be calculated on the unspent funds in the current budget. However, grant and contract line items were to be reduced by 6%. She provided an example of a budget reduction. She said this reduction affects all line items.

Ms. Burke Moore said that for FY2011 we must also reduce each line item and the cuts will be greater. Because no funds have been spent in the upcoming year, the 3% cut is deeper – taken

from the total amount of each line item. A report was provided to MMB describing EMSRB reductions. Ms. Burke Moore said that she included in her response to MMB the previous reduction of \$450,000 from the agency funds. The detailed information has been provided to the Finance Committee and Executive Committee members. Ms. Burke Moore said that this budget information is non public data although the memo spelling out the process is public. The Executive Committee has been provided the non public budget information. Ms. Burke Moore said we do not know what the final decision will be regarding the reduction proposal. There is only a possibility that the Legislature will restore the \$450,000. She has had conversations with MMB suggesting that the EMSRB should not incur another reduction since \$450,000 has already been cut from our budget and put into the general fund. Ms. Burke Moore assured the Board that she will provide additional information as soon as it becomes available.

New Board Member Orientation

Ms. Burke Moore said that we have a number of new Board members that have not participated in a new Board member orientation session. She said that dates will be suggested by email for new Board members to attend a one day session.

Medical Director's Report

Dr. Wesley said that he has no items to report. Mr. Rieber said that we are working with Dr. Wesley to identify the duties to focus on within the existing contract.

IX. Trauma & Triage Guidelines Implementation

Mr. Rieber said that there was a conference call discussion about this process and there needs to be a clarification. The process should be that every ambulance service must submit guidelines to the EMSRB for approval. The template is provided by the STAC. If there are no deviations the guidelines can be blanket approved by the Board. If there are deviations the deviation review panel would review these and make a recommendation to the Board. Mr. Rieber asked for volunteers for the panel. The following members volunteered: Ms. Consie, Mr. Pearson, Dr. Satterlee, Mr. Schoenbaum, and Dr. Thomas. Mr. Norlen asked that Mr. Held be asked to participate.

Mr. Schoenbaum said that the Board recommended to the trauma advisory council that they review the trauma triage flow sheet. The Board thought that the indications of physiological details should be removed. The STAC agreed with this recommendation and produced a revised document.

Mr. Reiten asked when the guidelines must be submitted to the Board for review and what is the process for reviewing an exception. Mr. Rieber said that there is no authority to grant an exception. Mr. Rieber recommended that the guidelines should be submitted by March for review. Mr. Norlen said that the recommendation given to ambulance services was February 1 for ample time to review by staff. Mr. Norlen clarified that the deviation process would need to be reviewed at the March meeting. Mr. Reiten said that all hospitals are not designated. Mr. Rieber said that for his service they are not designating a specific hospital "just the closest trauma center". Mr. Miller asked that a clarification be provided to ambulance services. Ms. Burke Moore said that the form can be reviewed and clarified as needed. Mr. Miller said that process is outlined in statute so how does staff judge the document provided by each ambulance service. Ms. Burke Moore said that the document contains a process for ambulance services to use. Mr. Norlen said that this template was developed to help ambulance services go through the process. Mr. Miller said that staff must review compliance with the statute. Ms. Burke Moore reminded the board that they must delegate the task of reviewing and approving

guidelines to the board staff. Mr. Ireland said that some ambulance services do not have an active medical director – how does this affect that ambulance service. Mr. Rieber said that this is a statutory requirement. Dr. Thomas said that this can be included with the ALS/BLS guidelines.

Mr. Rieber asked for a motion to approve authority for staff to review the guidelines. Mr. Pearson moved that staff review the guidelines. Dr. Thomas seconded. Motion carried.

X. Complaint Review Panel Report

Ms. Bidwell said that the Complaint Review Panel met on December 14, 2009, and January 11, 2010. Ms. Bidwell reported that that panel the completed the following activities:

- 68 disclosure files were reviewed (58 passed with no further action, more information was requested for six cases, one conference invitation was issued, and three registration/certifications were denied.)
- 4 complaints/mandatory reports were reviewed and one was closed with no further action needed.
- The attorney general's office was represented to prepare a Stipulation and Consent Order for one case.
- The attorney general's office was requested to prepare a petition to suspend for one case.
- 3 conferences were scheduled and attended and the attorney general's office was requested to prepare an agreement for corrective action for one case and two cases will require additional information.

XI. Finance Committee Report

Ms. Tanner reported that the Finance Committee met on January 7, 2010, and discussed the budget reduction process. Ms. Burke Moore provided information on the reduction formula to the Committee. She said that the reductions do not affect contracts/grants. Ms. Burke Moore restated that contracts and grants are reduced as well. However, any program, including grants that funded by federal funding is not reduced. The minutes of this meeting were provided to Board members.

XII. Executive Committee Report

Mr. Rieber reported that the Executive Committee met in June and discussed the Red River Flood, budget issues, and flu planning. Mr. Rieber said that during the January meeting the Committee discussed the budget reduction process in more detail. He stated that this budget information must be kept confidential at this time.

XIII. Other Business

Mr. Jordan asked about the evaluation of the Executive Director. He asked who the forms should be submitted to and what is the deadline? Mr. Rieber said that the forms will need to be submitted to Pat Lee by February 1, 2010. Ms. Burke Moore stated that evaluations would be submitted by mail.

XIV. Public Comment

The EMS Advocacy day at the Capitol is February 18 from 11:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.

XV. Adjourn

Ms. Engen moved for adjournment. Mr. Lee seconded. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 12: 38 p.m.

Reviewed and Approved by:



Pat Lee, Secretary

2/18/2010

Date

James Rieber, Chair

Date