

MINUTES OF THE MAY 27, 1997 COMMISSION MEETING OF
THE COMMISSION ON FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL

The meeting was called to order at 9:37 a.m. by Chairman Carozza with the following members present: Commissioners Andresen, Haber, Kowalski, Milewski, Mullen, Munkenbeck, Peabody, Commissioner Johnson arrived at 10:19 a.m. Commissioners Chatfield, Gomeau, McCarthy, Nicol and Vendetta were excused. Staff members Morrissette, Colton-Reichler, O'Neil, A. Ouellette, A.T. Ouellete and Piechota were present.

Guests to the meeting were identified as Mr. Gary Pechie and Ms. Susan Prichard from the Department of Labor, Richard E. Morris, Fire Marshal, Town of East Lyme and Deputy Chief Chris Siwy, Fire Marshal, Town of Glastonbury.

Chairman Carozza asked if Commissioners had any questions regarding the minutes of the March 25, 1997 and April 29, 1997 meetings.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Kowalski and SECONDED by Commissioner Haber to approve the minutes of the March 25, 1997 meeting. Motion carried.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Kowalski and SECONDED by Commissioner Haber to approve the minutes of the April 29, 1997 meeting. Motion carried.

Chairman Carozza asked if Commissioners had any questions regarding the Staff Reports for March 15, 1997 through April 14, 1997 and April 15, 1997 through May 14, 1997.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Kowalski and SECONDED by Commissioner Peabody to approve the Staff Report for the period of March 15, 1997 through April 14, 1997. Motion carried.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Kowalski and SECONDED by Commissioner Peabody to approve the Staff Report for the period of April 15, 1997 through May 14, 1997. Motion carried.

Moving to item 4 a.) Mr. Morrissette reported that the Commission was notified by Governor Rowland's Office that Edward Gomeau, Finance Director for the Town of Stratford has been appointed a member of the Commission effective May 16, 1997.

Commissioner Kowalski inquired whether the Commission now had a full complement of members.

Mr. Morrissette replied affirmatively and added that he would report at the next meeting whether any Commissioner is coming up for reappointment this year and would notify the respective organizations.

Moving to item 4 b.) Mr. Morrissette gave an update on the DOT project to construct a larger airplane live burn prop. He stated that he had invited DOT to come before the Commission to make a presentation but was informed on Friday that they would not be attending today's meeting. He stated he would give a more detailed explanation of this project under New Business.

Mr. Morrissette reported that he had a discussion with the agency's Team Leader from the Department of Public Works (DPW) regarding concerns about the lack of a large meeting space at the Academy. DPW indicated that they would assist us with the necessary paperwork to begin the process of reviewing options. They recommended I obtain authorization from the Commission to initiate a request for a capitol project design and construction of a larger auditorium type room. Mr. Morrissette asked the Commission whether they support the idea of planning for an expansion.

Commissioner Peabody inquired about what room capacity the expansion would entail.

Mr. Morrissette stated that a rough guess would be in the 300 person size.

Commissioner Peabody inquired if the plan would be to be able to host an event such as a Fire Chiefs' Conference.

Mr. Morrissette stated this was something that the Commissioners had mentioned several times in the past. It has been noted during functions held recently at the Academy that we have been handicapped by the need to provide food service and our ability to use the multi-purpose room for larger assemblies.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Peabody and SECONDED by Commissioner Kowalski to authorize the State Fire Administrator to initiate a request for a feasibility study for an expansion of the CT Fire Academy auditorium . Motion carried.

Commissioner Kowalski stated there is no question a bigger auditorium is needed and that it would be nice to have a 400 seat capacity room or larger. We may be restricted by the food service operation. Food service requirements should also be taken into consideration in planning for an expansion.

Moving to item 4 c.) Mr. Morrissette gave an update of the Legislative Session. He stated that most of the bills relating to the fire service are for the most part dead. It appears that the cancer bill and truss or firefighther safety bill will be moved into a Legislative Task Force Study Committee and the Limited Access Task Force request for an extension should be approved.

Moving to item 4 d.) Mr. Morrisette stated the deficiency appropriation for the Limited Access Highway (LAH) account was approved. The funds have been posted to the Comptroller's ledger and the Business Office is already in the process of batching all the claims and anticipates taking care of all the backlog claims within the next two to three weeks. At this point the agency staff is estimating the possibility that some of the deficiency appropriation may be left over, possibly about \$10,000 to \$15,000. Our original estimate of the deficiency may have been a little bit on the high side, thus the agency will finish out the fiscal year with a zero balance in this account. This will be the first time in recent memory that the agency has been able to close out the fiscal year in a positive manner as it relates to this account.

Chairman Carozza gave an update on the Joint Council of CT Fire Service Organizations. The Council met with Lieutenant Governor Jody Rell on two separate occasions. On Thursday, May 22 the Council met with Lieutenant Governor Rell to express that the fire service was united on legislative issues and that they wanted to close the session ensuring she knew that the Council plans to be very active in the coming years. Also it was stressed that the Council could serve as a great resource to her and members of the General Assembly on fire service issues.

Moving to item 4 e.) Mr. Morrisette stated that at last month's meeting although a quorum was not available, a discussions was initiated concerning a review of the Certification Division fees for services. At that time, Mr. Piechota was directed to expand upon some issues relating to the general overview of fees. At this time the subject was re-opened for continuing discussion by the Commissioners.

Commissioner Peabody stated that it was the consensus of the Commissioners at the last meeting to go with option #3.

Mr. Piechota stated that option #3 was not part of the original proposal and a request was made that the proposal be expanded illustrating a \$7.50 increase. Option #3 and #4 were developed illustrating revenue vs. expense. Looking at the whole proposal, option #4 comes the closest to covering the expenses for this period of time.

Commissioner Kowalski stated that his primary concern at last month's meeting was regarding the fact that fees proposed reflected a 100% increase and the impact to the fire departments in the state. Now that additional information has been provided it is a lot more helpful to illustrate what the Commission wants to do is to basically cover its expenses in terms of these services. He indicated that he would be in favor of option #4 or #3. Those are the two options that seem to have the least impact on departments while still covering the costs incurred by the Commission.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Kowalski and SECONDED by Commissioner Peabody to approve option #4 of the Certification Fee Increase Proposal. Motion carried.

Moving to item 4 f.) Mr. Morrisette stated that at last month's meeting there was considerable discussion concerning the Minor Firefighter Training Standard Proposal and at that time he was directed to contact representatives from the Department of Labor to come before the Commission and answer questions. He then introduced the two

representatives from the Labor Department in attendance as Mr. Gary Pechie and Ms. Susan Prichard.

Commissioner Munkenbeck reported that there was a consensus reached between the various department and Commission representatives serving on the Committee. Thanks to their valued efforts, the Minor Firefighter Training Standard Proposal was drafted which generally meets both the Labor Department and fire service goals.

Commissioner Milewski stated that a lot of time and effort was put in because the group was very far apart when they first began to discuss this issue. The staff did an excellent job including bringing the Labor Department to the Academy to demonstrate some of the skills. He stated that he voted for recommendation of the proposal.

Mr. Morrisette reported that a couple of issues were brought up at the last meeting which address particular objectives within the training standard. There were some specific issues that need further discussion by the Commission. In addition, there were some questions relating to the regulatory aspect of authority the Labor Department has. This information was distributed to the Commissioners last week.

Mr. Morrisette introduced Fire Marshals Richard E. Morris from East Lyme and Chris Siwy from Glastonbury both serving as representatives on the Committee.

Mr. Pechie stated that Labor Department Deputy Commissioner Jean Zurbrigen sends her regrets for not being able to attend the meeting. He stated that the Deputy Commissioner conveyed to him that she is still very supportive as we all are in this process. This administration has directed us to come up with a working document and move this process along. The Labor Department wants to continue along with this process. They think this is something that can be accomplished. If we can come up with a document and bring consensus around it doesn't mean it can't be revisited. The Labor Department wants to continue this relationship of working together with the Commission and help with this program which is critical to the Commission's needs in addition to the Labor Department's concerns about the safety of minors.

Commissioner Peabody inquired about the issue of hazardous occupations being limited for the age group in question and where this was defined in the Labor Department regulations.

Ms. Prichard stated that it was her understanding that firefighters and trainees while training are covered under the municipality's workers' compensation insurance. For example, firefighters even though they are volunteers in many towns are covered under workers' comp. This relationship makes it an employer/employee relationship.

Commissioner Peabody asked for clarification concerning whether the employer/employee relationship depends on the way the department is organized. He inquired, what if a community brings in a group of minors for the sole purpose of training and education not firefighting or fireground work?

Ms. Prichard stated that even during the course of education, when minors are being educated in a hazardous occupation they have to go through the Department of Labor to

have waivers signed. Waivers were one thing the Committee discussed from the beginning. Thus, a 16 and 17 year old may be authorized to train or learn a hazardous occupation provided the Labor Commissioner signs off and provided the program itself has been approved by the Department of Education.

Commissioner Peabody inquired if this issue was covered in the Department of Labor regulations.

Ms. Prichard stated that this issue was explained in CGS 31-23 where it talks about school to career.

Commissioner Peabody stated that regulation 31-23 addresses the work, somewhere somebody has said education is equal to work.

Ms. Prichard stated that there are exceptions to the regulation under the hazardous section and the exception would be in school to career programs. School to career programs are first certified by the Department of Education and any hazardous work that's being done has to be reported to and signed off by the Labor Department. In addition it is continually monitored and audited.

Commissioner Kowalski inquired about the reference made in the proposal regarding power tools and allowing a trainee or cadet within a burn building while there is an active training fire. Could someone on the Committee give the definition of power tools?

Mr. Ouellette stated that what is meant by power tools as it applies to the training proposal is generally power saws or equipment which can cut or pry not necessarily generators,

Commissioner Kowalski stated that the reference to power tools should be defined and be more specific.

Commissioner Munkenbeck stated that the issue about power tools was addressed and the problem was with the bigger power tools like the jaws.

Commissioner Peabody inquired if a comparison was made in the use of power tools in a training ground vs. power tools in a vocational school.

Commissioner Munkenbeck replied affirmatively that there was a great deal of discussion on that subject. Again, the Committee reached a compromise which was basically that the generator was okay but some of the other equipment was just too hazardous.

Ms. Prichard stated that vocational schools are also an exception under regulation 31-23. The school to career programs run by public education institutions and vocational schools are two separate exceptions.

Commissioner Munkenbeck stated this issue is being looked into because the vocational colleges are getting into school to career programs with the fire service. It may solve some of the problem because we already have approved programs. This is something we have to do as a Commission. Fire Departments do not fall in this category unless they want to become educational facilities.

Commissioner Kowalski inquired about the Explorer programs

Commissioner Munkenbeck stated that this was discussed by the Committee. The Explorers are basically a club thus they are not subject to regulation.

Ms. Prichard stated that with the Explorers there is no employer/employee relationship. The Explorers are covered solely under the insurance of the Boy Scouts of America.

Mr. Morrisette stated that at last month's meeting he mentioned the definition of minor firefighter should not have included Explorers. Only cadet or junior firefighter programs should have been listed under the definition. In our discussion, it was determined that the Explorers are looked at as a more social organization rather than an employer/employee relationship.

Commissioner Kowalski stated if a department doesn't want to go by the proposed document they can establish an Explorer program.

Commissioner Munkenbeck stated that the Explorers have a very restrictive program. Some items are a little better but most things do not allow as much as we do.

Commissioner Kowalski inquired if the Committee reviewed the Explorer document during the process.

Commissioner Munkenbeck stated that the Explorer book was reviewed as part of this process.

Commissioner Kowalski inquired about the issue of overhaul and one on one supervision during a Class A burn.

Mr. Morrisette stated that in retrospect he felt once a scene is declared safe, minors should be permitted to perform overhaul. The Labor Department has not made a determination on this issue. A couple of issues which were brought up for discussion last month, may have been avoided if the staff was less conservative in their approach. We feel there is room for some relaxation.

Ms. Prichard stated that according to her notes from Committee discussions most of the training for topics such as overhaul is done by theory.

Mr. Morrisette stated as an example during the Academy's recruit class, overhaul training is done by theory. We don't take the recruit class and move them to towns that had a fire the previous day.

Commissioner Kowalski stated that he understood but one of the examples would be once an actual fire is out and the area is deemed safe as far as air quality and structural stability are concerned to allow the juniors/cadets to go in and have them help with overhaul. He inquired whether this is something that is unsafe or it's something we do not want minors to do.

Mr. Pechie stated that the Labor Department does not allow anyone under 18 to participate in the construction industry or any demolition work because it's a hazardous occupation. He said he would like to know more about exactly what the students (minors) will be doing and what type of structure we are talking about.

Commissioner Kowalski stated the other question would be for a Class A type burn within a burn building. Whether we could allow a trainee with breathing apparatus and one on one instruction to permit them to get a feel of the environment such as obscured vision and some heat.

Ms. Prichard inquired if this was in lieu of a maze.

Mr. Morrissette replied that it could be an option open for consideration.

A discussion period followed.

Commissioner Peabody stated under the training standard, the final authority is defined as multiple individuals, the Department of Labor and the Commission. He stated that he found that a little strange because one would think that it would be the fire chief. The enforcement of the training document is the sole authority that has jurisdiction. He stated that he recognizes that the Commission sets the standard for training and the Department of Labor enforces training but for this document it seems as though it would be just the fire chief. It seems also that we would be setting the stage for someone such as a fire chief when he is questioned about the standards he would refer the inquiries to the Labor Department and the Commission. The final authority on this document should be narrowed down to just one individual.

Mr. Morrissette stated that he agreed and that it was his responsibility to consolidate comments coming in from Committee members. This is why the document was identified as a draft. These are the comments we need to hear to make it more palatable to all sides.

Chairman Carozza inquired if either of the two Fire Marshals present had any comments to add.

Fire Marshal Morris stated that his comments were the same concerns being brought out in the discussions. He stated that he felt very strong in what was created and agreed it could be revisited. It is an experimental program with nothing quite like it. Given time and nurturing with feedback from fire chiefs, they will now have a tool to use and we'll make great strides. As we grow with this document and maybe revisit it within six months or a year we are going to achieve a great deal.

Commissioner Peabody stated that he recognizes the need to have a standard like this and fully recognizes, the value of compromise between two agencies trying to come up with a standard document. But he stated that he also recognizes that this document could become the very basis for civil liability for each individual fire department and fire chief. It may also become the very basis for denying insurance payments because the law that you refer to says if your willful and found negligent then you are not covered by workers' comp.

Ms. Prichard inquired about item 3-3.2 on page 5 of the proposal referring to “accountability” and about what exactly was expected from the minors.

Mr. Piechota stated that for example during the Academy’s recruit program, the Training Division has established an accountability system for almost every evolution they run. It is only a system to maintain organization.

Ms. Prichard inquired about item 3-8.2 on page 10 which may be clarified when power tools are better defined, but how is forced entry done and what kind of tools are being used. The last concern is on page 20 regarding haz-mat response meeting the requirements as defined in NFPA 472.

Mr. Ouellette stated that this standard applies to all public sector employees and incorporates only the awareness level. The ability to recognize hazardous materials, move to a safe position and call for help.

Fire Marshal Morris stated that he had been approached by some fire departments who are now going to a 28 foot ladder vs. the 24 foot ladder.

Commissioner Peabody recommended the proposal be forwarded to the fire service organizations for their input.

Commissioner Kowalski stated that he agrees with the recommendation but only after the proposal has been revised and presented to Commissioners at the next meeting.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Kowalski and SECONDED by Commissioner Munkenbeck to revise the Minor Firefighter Training Standard Proposal and present it to the Commission for final review before forwarding it to the fire service organizations for their comments. Motion carried.

Moving to item 4 g.) Mr. Morrissette gave an update on the “Introduction To The Fire Service” - Summer Camp for minors. He reported that additional criteria had been incorporated in the Academy’s selection process and asked Mr. Ouellette to explain.

Mr. Ouellette stated that because only 40 students can be accepted into the program an additional letter is going out to all fire chiefs who submit more than one application. The new criteria established is one candidate per department with a maximum of five per county and preference given to the 16 and 17 year olds.

Commissioner Peabody inquired whether any discussion concerning Labor Department Regulations would take place with the Chiefs.

Mr. Ouellette stated that we have to go by the current regulations and restrictions.

Commissioner Peabody stated that if we are going to tell the students in this program something about restrictions, laws or regulations we should also mail the information to their fire chief before they come to the program so that he is aware of it.

Commissioner Andresen inquired if this program becomes very successful whether there are plans to increase the number of programs delivered in a year.

Mr. Ouellette stated that it certainly is a possibility. We could increase it to any amount of classes provided we can cover the expenses. We can also look for funding from the outside.

Moving to item 5 a.) Mr. Morrissette stated that Department of Transportation (DOT) was tentatively scheduled to give a presentation to the Commission at today's meeting. In discussions with DOT last week they have asked for another reprieve for the presentation. To give an update, we had a meeting about three weeks ago which was billed as an assignment meeting with DOT, Bureau of Aviation Ports along with the Contractor who will serve as the planning engineer for the burn prop project. Much of the meeting was spent going over the requirements of the successful engineering company, the scope of work, boiler plate requirements, etc. Following the main meeting, Commissioners Kowalski, Nicol and myself had an opportunity to meet in a smaller group to bring forth a number questions and concerns to the Department of Transportation. Chief Duffy from Bradley Airport Fire Department has been the middleman between us and the DOT. He was surprised at the level of confusion amongst their own people. Ed Fojol, DOT Chief Engineer thought DOT had already done a presentation for the Commission and that the Commission was behind the project 100%. We explained that the presentation was not done. DOT appeared to be reorganizing and a presentation is expected for the June Commission meeting.

Commissioner Kowalski stated that the project team had made the assumption that the Commission was 100% behind this project. We were able to talk to the Consultant Engineer to expand the scope of work on the project. One of the issues that we asked be included was that the contractor report on long term costs for maintenance and ultimate replacement as well as what the long term expectancy of this mock up. This mock up will burn about 1,000 gallons of propane a minute which will create substantial wear and tear on the equipment. Also, we explained the Commission must be involved in all meetings and coordination during the consulting and construction period. The project team stated that this would be acceptable to them. It looks like the lease agreement would be amended to include the new mock up and associated land, we would have to negotiate what our liabilities would be vs. the airport's liability concerning cost, maintenance and future operations. Bradley is planning to eliminate the existing sand storage building and part of the contract will be replacing that sand building. The cost of this project will be high. There is a little bit of discrepancy as far as what this mock up will do. The engineering staff at Bradley stated that it will include only a circle pit fire. Chief Duffy and the Commission would like more specialized fire scenarios built into the project. We also asked for funding to come out of the consultant's fee to pay for three staff members to travel to various training facilities throughout the US.

Commissioner Peabody stated that he made a couple of observations in reading the document, that most specifically consideration should be given to the operating standards that apply to this type of scenario.

Mr. Morrissette stated that one of the discrepancies that Commissioner Kowalski had noted was the Airport Fire Chief's understanding that the plan would incorporate some

type of specialized fire scenarios be incorporated into the plan. DOT's position at the meeting was they only want to meet the minimum requirements. The problem is that a fuel spill fire is a money loser. The Project Engineer Consultant stated that he did not know of any fuel spill fire trainer that alone is generating revenue or at least covering its expenses. Specialized fire props are needed as a marketing tool to bring people in. In addition, there is much more room to incorporate a profit factor into these props. In discussion with Chief Duffy last week, he said he was sending a letter to the DOT Bureau Chief stating the FAA strongly recommends they look beyond just what the FAA required training incorporates. The more frequent incidents that the Airport Fire Department responds to include wheel brake or engine fire incidents, it's not typically going to be the large fuel spill fire

Commissioner Peabody stated that the every day type of operations as well as short and long term maintenance should be incorporated in their standards. A representative of the Commission should attend all of their meetings as well as a representative of the Academy's Safety Committee.

Mr. Morrisette stated that one positive aspect is that the engineering company contracted by DOT is the engineer of record on several other projects of this type. They have the greatest experience nationwide.

Commissioner Andresen inquired if the original plan had asked for the construction of an FAA training facility shouldn't this project be planned and built according to FAA regulations?

Commissioner Kowalski stated the issue is FAA training standards now only require a fuel spill of a certain size, so it's very generic. What the engineering staff at the airport is trying to build is just that. Because of the economics and training value of that type of prop, it is not really a good marketing point. We want to include some smaller mock ups within this project.

Commissioner Munkenbeck stated that he was in agreement that if we don't get these small mock ups we're going to find out that some airport somewhere else will have the smaller mock ups and we will have a mock up that can only be used for training the Bradley Airport Fire Department. He inquired whether they looked into what the competition looks like and how exclusive this scenario is going to be.

Commissioner Kowalski stated that DOT's engineering side was not receptive to our ideas. However when we discussed this with the Consultant he knew exactly what we were talking about. At one point we even discussed the feasibility issues of allowing outlets for the additional mock ups during a future installations. We would like to get the whole thing at once, but this project is on a fixed budget.

Commissioner Peabody inquired about the Commission's leverage in this project.

Mr. Morrisette stated what the Commission needs to do is meet with Bob Juliano, DOT Aviation and Ports Bureau Chief because his engineering staff is not as committed to this project as he appeared to be in the past. The Commission is always in a position to say we

do not want to be considered as the entity responsible to take control and operate this equipment once it's constructed.

Commissioner Peabody inquired if the agency felt they were in the driver's seat with the FAA project.

Commissioner Kowalski stated that the bottom line is we will not accept responsibility for the operation if it does not meet our requirements.

Mr. Morrisette commented that following today's meeting he would seek a meeting with the Bureau Chief and let him know where we stand.

Mr. Ouellette stated that if we are to market our ARFF Program, unless we have the larger airplane prop we will be at a great disadvantage.

Commissioner Peabody stated that he was concerned that DOT is not listening to us and we may end up building a typical state project that does not meet operational needs when it's completed. He stated he is also concerned about long-term maintenance.

Moving to item 5 B.) Mr. Morrisette asked the Public Education Director Cynthia Colton-Reichler to give a brief overview of the Juvenile Firesetting Business Plan.

Ms. Colton-Reichler stated that this document was authored by a Consultant who worked with the agency for about eight weeks in cooperation with the Public Fire Education Division. An intensive amount of information was gathered about the juvenile firesetter problem within Connecticut in addition to making phone inquiries. This document will be used to make a comparison with the Steering Committee recommendations. This document highlights both short and long term goals for the juvenile firesetting program. She then asked if the Commissioners had any questions about the Business Plan.

Commissioner Peabody stated that even though he was not able to go into every detail. It's obvious that a lot of hard work and effort went into preparing the document along with a lot of research. In addition, you were not afraid to say it the way it is. Certainly anybody could take this document and recognize the problems and know what to do about their juvenile firesetting problems.

Mr. Morrisette stated that in the future this document will give the Commission an opportunity to justify requests for program expansion.

Commissioner Peabody inquired about the distribution of the document.

Ms. Colton-Reichler stated that she has kept in touch with several individuals who know of the document and have indicated that they are interested in the outcome. One group she has been directly involved in helping is the North Central Program which is serving as our model. She meets on a regular basis with the fire marshals of that town. The policies and procedures portion of the administration manual is approaching final completion and we are now looking toward implementation. In order for some of the items to be fully implemented we needed to add a bit of weight to the juvenile firesetter issue. This plan will indeed help them.

Commissioner Peabody inquired if individual names could be taken out of the document before it's distributed to anyone.

Ms. Colton-Reichler stated that she and the Administrator have discussed at some point distributing this document to all Fire Marshals and Fire Chiefs. The removal of names can be accomplished.

Commissioner Haber read a letter from Ms. Ann B. Alling, Labor Relations Specialist, DAS thanking Mr. Piechota, Director of Certification for all his assistance in reaching a settlement on a grievance involving a training issue at Bradley Airport.

Mr. Piechota gave an overview of his participation in the grievance hearing. In addition, he also indicated that he had received a subpoena from the US Federal District Court to testify in a suite filed by the NAACP against the Town of East Haven regarding the validity of test questions the agency furnished the town.

A short discussion period followed.

Commissioner Peabody inquired if a long-term maintenance account had been set up yet.

Mr. Morrisette stated that this plan had not been set up, but he and the staff recognize and agree that this is a worthwhile project.

Commissioner Peabody complimented the State Fire Administrator and his staff on behalf of the State Fire Marshal's Office for their assistance during their one-week program held in May at the Academy. He stated that he and his staff want to express their thanks for all the assistance of the staff, for the way they were treated and the way the facility is run. The excellent facility and excellent staff has everyone leaving with a great impression.

Mr. Piechota gave an overview of a map of the state which shows the location of communities where certification examinations were conducted during the last reporting period. This information is always given in written form on the monthly staff report. This is an optional way for the Commission to be able to look at the agency's activities. He asked for input from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Peabody stated that this map format could be very helpful.

Mr. Morrisette stated that he had contacted representative from IFSAC for future consideration of accreditation. Program Manager Bob Fenner indicated that a representative of their Board would very much like to come to Connecticut and make a presentation. He asked whether the Commission would be interested in such a presentation and indicated that June would be a good time.

Commissioner Peabody inquired if there was a demand from our customers for this type of certification.

Mr. Morrisette stated that he did not think that our customers know enough about what accreditation is or what it provides or supports. More or less it's internally driven and is an

educational issue. Accreditation comes into play more often when we interact with other states from a reciprocal credit standpoint especially when people are moving into Connecticut and trying to transfer credentials or when people from Connecticut are moving out and trying to transfer credentials to another state.

Commissioner Peabody inquired if this would be an expense to the Commission.

Mr. Morrisette stated that due to the various fee structures IFSAC has, they have implemented a process whereby for a test period of one year they would permit the agency to market the system the same way we market the Pro Board's national certification/ accreditation. All we currently do is place an application in the envelope with a students state certificate and leave it up to the individual to apply if they so choose.

Commissioner Munkenbeck stated that it would be worthwhile for the Commission to hear what IFSAC has to say and to hear what the financial burden would be.

Commissioner Peabody inquired if IFSAC normally asked for a one year trial.

Mr. Morrisette stated that IFSAC will look at what activity has been generated from the State of Connecticut. After a year, another option is for the Commission to pay a \$3000 annual accreditation fee, IFSAC would provide seals for our certificates. If the Commission does not elect to go with that option the other option would require participation by individuals who would need to generate the \$3000 plus a certain percentage.

Commissioner Kowalski stated that the military works basically on the IFSAC system. If the Commission were to get Pro Board and IFSAC we would have a better chance of bringing in their people for FF-I and FF-II practicals and examinations.

Mr. Morrisette stated that Mr. Ouellette has made a request to him that the Commission recognize Jim Scavetta, The Academy's Quality Craft Worker for a job well done in totally reconstructing the SCBA maze resulting in a significant savings to the agency. Unfortunately his father passed away yesterday and he could not be with us today.

A MOTION was made by Commissioner Kowalski and SECONDED by Commissioner Milewski to recognize Jim Scavetta, Jr. for his work on the maze. The motion was unanimously approved by all Commissioners. Motion carried.

Chairman Carozza adjourned the meeting at 11:24 a.m.

Dated: _____

Secretary, Commission on Fire
Prevention and Control