



KANSAS

DENNIS ALLIN, M.D., CHAIR
STEVEN SUTTON, INTERIM EXEC. DIRECTOR

MARK PARKINSON, GOVERNOR

BOARD APPROVED:
October 8, 2010

BOARD OF EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

MINUTES

BOARD MEETING

August 6, 2010

Board Members Present

JR Behan
Comm. Bob Boaldin
Dir. Deb Kaufman
Comm. John Miller
Rep. Vern Swanson
John Ralston
Sen. Jay Emler

Sen. Oletha Faust- Goudeau
by teleconference

Guests

Brandon Beck
Grant Helferich
Misty Jimerson
Chris Way
Rosa Spainhour
Mike Simmons
Chad Pore
Kerry McCue
David Stithem
Terry David
Jeb Burress
Jon Friesen
Kathleen Friesen
Jerry Slaughter
Mark Willis
Rocky Cramer
Randy Cardonell

Chy Miller
Bob Prewitt
Tim Stamm
John Hultgren
Dalene Deck
Jeff Smith
Gary Winter
Deb Brown
Derek Sobelman
Russell Walter
Kathy Dooley
Wendy Gronau
Pam Kemp
Ben Grimsley
Sarah House
Jerry Jo Deckert

Staff

Steve Sutton
Patti Artzer
Nicole Bradley
Dave Cromwell
Jerry Cunningham
Jim Reed
Joe Moreland
Marcus Herrera
Carman Allen
Jean Claude
Kandagaye

Board Members Absent

Rep. Cindy Neighbor
BC Rick Rook
Dr. Joel Hornung
Joe Megredy
Dr. Dennis Allin

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Allin called the meeting to order on Friday, August 6th, 2010 at 9:10 am.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The first order of business was to approve meeting minutes from the June 4, 2010, board meeting, July 19, 2010 Board Meeting Teleconference and July 28, 2010 Board Meeting minutes.

Motion: To approve June 4, 2010, meeting minutes, July 19, 2010 Board meeting teleconference and July 28, 2010 Board Meeting minutes. Moved by Representative Swanson, seconded by Commissioner Miller. Motion passed.

COMMITTEE REPORTS AND POSSIBLE ACTION

Planning and Operations Committee

Vice Chair Behan called upon Director Kaufman to give the Planning and Operations Committee update. Director Kaufman reported to the Board that the committee reviewed three (3) operational regulations; KAR109-2-1, 109-2-2 and 109-2-5. Director Kaufman reported that this group of regulations had been previously reviewed but because of the length of this meeting the committee was unable to review all the regulations.

Director Kaufman reported that it was the intent of the Committee to move forward with the proposed language changes. Director Kaufman reported that the remaining comments for regulations KAR109-2-6, 109-2-7 and 109-2-8 were submitted to board staff for further research.

Director Kaufman reported the committee had discussed holding a meeting in September before the October board meeting so that they may review the regulations. Director Kaufman also reported that there were only two (2) written reports submitted from KEMTA and Region II.

Education, Examination, Training and Certification Committee

Vice Chair Behan gave an update on the Education, Examination, Training and Certification Committee.

Vice Chair Behan reported to the board that there had been a public comment hearing on regulations KAR 109-5-1, 109-5-3, 109-11-1, 109-11-3, 109-11-4, 109-11-6 and 109-15-2 on August 4, 2010. There were fourteen (14) people present and only two (2) people spoke in favor of the regulations. The committee recommended that these regulations be adopted by the full board.

Vice Chair Behan reported that Chad Pore, EDTF, had provided an update to the committee. The EDTF met July 6th, 9th and 20th, 2010. Mr. Pore reported that the EDTF Committee recommended moving forward with the regulations as presented except for KAR 109-5-1, 109-5-7 and 109-10-6.

Vice Chair Behan reported that there had been multiple regulations recommended for approval of the board. After further discussion it was decided seven (7) Roll Call votes were to be taken.

Motion: To adopt KAR 109-5-1. Moved by Vice Chair Behan, seconded by Commissioner Boaldin. A roll call vote was requested:

<i>BC Rick Rook</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Comm. Boaldin</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Comm. John Miller</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Deb Kaufman</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Dr. Allin</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Dr. Hornung</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Joe Megredy</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>John Ralston</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>JR Behan</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Rep. Neighbor</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Rep. Swanson</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Sen. Emler</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Sen. Faust-Goudeau</i>	<i>Absent</i>

There were seven yes votes and zero no votes. Motion passed.

Motion: To adopt KAR 109-5-3. Moved by Commissioner Boaldin, seconded by Director Kaufman. A roll call vote was requested:

<i>BC Rick Rook</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Comm. Boaldin</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Comm. John Miller</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Deb Kaufman</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Dr. Allin</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Dr. Hornung</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Joe Megredy</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>John Ralston</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>JR Behan</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Rep. Neighbor</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Rep. Swanson</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Sen. Emler</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Sen. Faust-Goudeau</i>	<i>Absent</i>

There were seven yes votes and zero no votes. Motion passed.

Motion: To adopt KAR 109-11-1. Moved by Commissioner Boaldin, seconded by Director Kaufman. A roll call vote was requested:

<i>BC Rick Rook</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Comm. Boaldin</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Comm. John Miller</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Deb Kaufman</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Dr. Allin</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Dr. Hornung</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Joe Megredy</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>John Ralston</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>JR Behan</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Rep. Neighbor</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Rep. Swanson</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Sen. Emler</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Sen. Faust-Goudeau</i>	<i>Absent</i>

There were seven yes votes and zero no votes. Motion passed.

Motion: To adopt KAR 109-11-3. Moved by Vice Chair Behan, seconded by Director Kaufman. A roll call vote was requested:

<i>BC Rick Rook</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Comm. Boaldin</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Comm. John Miller</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Deb Kaufman</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Dr. Allin</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Dr. Hornung</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Joe Megredy</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>John Ralston</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>JR Behan</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Rep. Neighbor</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Rep. Swanson</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Sen. Emler</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Sen. Faust-Goudeau</i>	<i>Absent</i>

There were seven yes votes and zero no votes. Motion passed

Motion: To adopt KAR 109-11-4. Moved by Director Kaufman, seconded by Commissioner Boaldin. A roll call vote was requested:

<i>BC Rick Rook</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Comm. Boaldin</i>	<i>Yes</i>

<i>Comm. John Miller</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Deb Kaufman</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Dr. Allin</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Dr. Hornung</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Joe Megredy</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>John Ralston</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>JR Behan</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Rep. Neighbor</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Rep. Swanson</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Sen. Emler</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Sen. Faust-Goudeau</i>	<i>Absent</i>

There were seven yes votes and zero no votes. Motion passed

Motion: To adopt KAR 109-11-6. Moved by Vice Chair Behan, seconded by Board Member Ralston. A roll call vote was requested:

<i>BC Rick Rook</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Comm. Boaldin</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Comm. John Miller</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Deb Kaufman</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Dr. Allin</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Dr. Hornung</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Joe Megredy</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>John Ralston</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>JR Behan</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Rep. Neighbor</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Rep. Swanson</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Sen. Emler</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Sen. Faust-Goudeau</i>	<i>Absent</i>

There were seven yes votes and zero no votes. Motion passed

Motion: To adopt KAR 109-15-2. Moved by Commissioner Boaldin, seconded by Vice Chair Behan. A roll call vote was requested:

<i>BC Rick Rook</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Comm. Boaldin</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Comm. John Miller</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Deb Kaufman</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Dr. Allin</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Dr. Hornung</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Joe Megredy</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>John Ralston</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>JR Behan</i>	<i>Yes</i>

<i>Rep. Neighbor</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Rep. Swanson</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Sen. Emler</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Sen. Faust-Goudeau</i>	<i>Absent</i>

There were seven yes votes and zero no votes. Motion passed

Vice Chair Behan reported that Regulations KAR109-5-1, 109-5-7, 109-8-1, 109-10-1, 109-10-6, 109-11-1, 109-11-3, 109-11-4 and 109-11-6 should move forward as temporary regulations to follow with the scope of practice implementation.

Motion: To move forward with Regulations KAR109-5-1, 109-5-7, 109-8-1, 109-10-1, 109-10-6, 109-11-1, 109-11-3, 109-11-4 and 109-11-6 as temporary regulations. Moved by Vice Chair Behan, seconded by Commissioner Boaldin. Motion passed.

The committee recommended to the board to adopt the transition course curricula.

Motion: To adopt the Friesen Group Transition course Curriculum, with day two being optional. Moved by Commissioner Boaldin, seconded by Vice Chair Behan. Motion passed.

The committee recommended to the Board to adopt the Module Post- examination as validation of competency for successful completion.

Motion: To adopt Module Post- examination as validation of competency/successful completion. Moved by Vice Chair Behan, seconded by Board Member Kaufman. Motion passed.

Vice Chair Behan reported that it was the committee's recommendation that the transition courses be accepted as competency based.

Motion: To accept transition courses as competency based. Moved by Vice Chair Behan, seconded by Board Member Kaufman. Motion passed

Vice Chair Behan reported that the committee recommended

Vice Chair Behan reported that regulations KAR 109-6-1, 109-7-1, 109-8-2, 109-9-1, 109-9-4, 109-10-2, 109-10-3, 109-13-1, 109-15-1 and 109-15-2 will move forward and continue to be worked on.

Motion: To move forward and continue work on KAR 109-6-1, 109-7-1, 109-8-2, 109-9-1, 109-9-4, 109-10-2, 109-10-3, 109-13-1, 109-15-1 and 109-15-2. Moved by Board Member Kaufman, seconded by Commissioner Boaldin. Motion passed

Executive Committee

The Executive Committee met via teleconference this month to allow for the other committees to have more time to meet. There was no update this meeting.

Budget/Office Update

Vice Chair Behan called upon Mr. Sutton to give an office update. Mr. Sutton awarded a pin and certificate to Board Staff Patti Artzer for 30years of service with the State. Also Board Staff Jerry Cunningham was awarded a pin and certificate for 10years of service with the state.

Mr. Sutton also presented a power point slideshow in regards to the transition and the affect it will have on renewals of certifications. Mr. Sutton also reported to the Board that this year in legislation the Board and Staff need to address the Scope of Practice Bill. Also SB221 will also need to be reviewed and look at rewriting/rewording this bill. Mr. Sutton reported that there will possibly be six (6) bills that will go into legislation this year.

Mr. Sutton reported that the Board office needed to transfer \$125,000.00 as done previous years with Board Members consent to transfer funds.

Motion: To transfer funds of \$125K. Moved by Commissioner Boaldin, seconded by Vice Chair Behan. Motion passed.

Public Comment

Vice Chair Behan called upon Chy Miller, HCC, to speak. Mr. Miller thanked the EMS agencies and BC Rick Rook for their participation at the

Executive Session

There was an executive session called to be held starting at 10:45am ending at 11:00am.

Motion: To hold an Executive session for fifteen minutes to discuss non- elected personnel. Moved by Vice Chair Behan, seconded by Commissioner Boaldin. Motion passed.

The Board reconvened in open session at 11:00a.m. No binding action was taken.

Motion: To adjourn the board Meeting at 11:03 a.m. Moved by Dr. Hornung, seconded by Vice chair Behan. Motion passed.

Transcription of August 6th, 2010 board meeting minutes:

JR: if others come then we've got Rick and Joe available by telephone. We've got seven and eight on a conference call, so... probably the first thing we need to do is approve the minutes from, I have June 4th, July 19th and July 28th, is that, does anybody have something different than that? June 4th would've been the last board meeting and then the two teleconferences; or the one teleconference and the one meeting we had last week. OK. There's been a motion and a second is there any other discussion? Alright all those in favor signify by saying "I" any opposed ok.

Since rick is not here, Deb are you going to give the planning and coordination report from yesterday.

DEB: the planning and operations committee met and we addressed a group of operational regulations that had been previously reviewed some time ago in the hopes of moving them forward. The regulations we addressed were KAR 109-2-1, 109-2-2 and 109-2-5. Although it was our intent to move these forward, we did receive a lot of input from the regional representatives and the audience as well that was very good comments on the proposed language and due to the length of the conversation we did run out of time. We submitted the remaining written comments that we had prepared on 109-2-6, 109-2-7 and 109-2-8 to board staff. There are several issues that came up that will require some more research and so we requested that they do that research and make the changes that we had made today and once revised that they would identify that revision with date and draft and put them out on the webpage as well as email them to us. The regional representatives were also asked to solicit comments from their regions and bring those comments back. It was our intent to meet with the education chair to set up a date perhaps in September that we could look at them again and look at the new language and move them forward at that point so that we would have them ready for the October meeting. Due to the fact that we ran out of time we didn't have time to receive the reports from the regions or the organizations we did

receive two written reports from Region 2 and KEMTA and those were included in the board packets. Due to the volume of material that we still have to cover at the next meeting we would request that those reports be submitted to the board in time to get them out for the next October board packet. So with that we adjourned.

JR: Maybe Senator Emler could ask a fellow colleague to mute her phone.

STEVE: Senator Faust-Goudeau, were getting a lot of background noise.

JR: There we go. Maybe she just hung up. OK. That's it there's nothing that requires any action right. OK. Alright.

JR: DO WE HAVE ANY QUESTIONS FOR DEB THEN? OK. We'll move on then to the Education committee meeting that took a little over four hours and were still not quite done but done enough that we can report on stuff. We have about nine, well more than that, at least nine things that we need action on but the first thing, do you have the roll call certificates?

STEVE: YES I DO.

JR: The first thing I think we'll do we had a public hearing on Wednesday, August 4th, 2010 on some regulations. There were about 14 people who attended. Two people provided oral testimony on the regulations, both in favor of them. If somebody would like to look at them, I have them here. Since there was no opposition on Wednesday, it was the committee's recommendation for approval for those. Since these are the final draft, they'll all have to be approved by roll-call vote. If you want to look at them before, we can hand them around or if you're comfortable with that I think some of them were in the packet, three of them were a holdover from the December board meeting if we remember that there was one regulation we struck a couple lines out of and there were three subsequent regulations that referred to the one that we changed so, that's why we held those back but were ready to with all of those so. Would anybody like to look at them before we vote? We will have to do them all individually so. If not,

ok. The first one is KAR 109-5-1 and I would move that we approve it. SECOND? Is there any other discussion? Steve please call the roll.

STEVE: Dr. Allin – (absent), Behan: aye, Boaldin: aye, Emler: aye, Faust Goudeau: (No response – Telecon), Dr. Hornung: (absent), Director Kaufman: aye, Commissioner Miller: aye, Joe Megredy: (absent), Representative Neighbor: (absent), John Ralston: aye, BC Rick Rook: (absent), Representative Swanson: aye.

JR: The next regulation is KAR 109-5-3: is there a motion, is there a second:

DEB KAUFMAN: aye, Second.

JR: Motion and a second is there any other discussion?

STEVE: Dr. Allin – (absent), Behan: aye, Boaldin: aye, Emler: aye, Faust Goudeau: (No response – Telecon), Dr. Hornung: (absent), Director Kaufman: aye, Commissioner Miller: aye, Joe Megredy: (absent), Representative Neighbor: (absent), John Ralston: aye, BC Rick Rook: (absent),

REPRESENTATIVE SWANSON: Before I vote Mr. Chair, were we striking the executive director designee language for all of these? We are, so.

STEVE: Consistently throughout.

SWANSON: that would be aye.

JR: Because those aren't on this final approval those aren't stricken.

SWANSON: That's why I asked.

CARMAN: They will be stricken on the new versions.

JR: OK.

STEVE: Senator Faust-Goudeau were getting a lot of background noise,

SENATOR FAUST: Ok, but you can hear me?

STEVE: Yes mam. And we are doing roll call votes now for the regulations.

JR: OK the next regulation is KAR 109-11-1: Do I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER BOALDIN: So moved,

DEB KAUFMAN: I second

JR: We have a second, any other discussion? Steve.

STEVE: Dr. Allin – (absent), Behan: aye, Boaldin: aye, Emler: aye, Faust Goudeau: (No response – Telecon), Dr. Hornung: (absent), Director Kaufman: aye, Commissioner Miller: aye, Joe Megredy: (absent), Representative Neighbor: (absent), John Ralston: aye, BC Rick Rook: (absent), Representative Swanson: aye.

JR: OK. KAR 109-11-3: and I'll move that we approve it.

DEB KAUFMAN: Second.

JR: Motion and second is there any other discussion, alright.

STEVE: Dr. Allin – (absent), Behan: aye, Boaldin: aye, Emler: aye, Faust Goudeau: (No response – Telecon), Dr. Hornung: (absent), Director Kaufman: aye, Commissioner Miller: aye, Joe Megredy: (absent), Representative Neighbor: (absent), John Ralston: aye, BC Rick Rook: (absent), Representative Swanson: aye.

JR: The next Regulation is KAR 109-11-4;

DEB KAUFMAN: I would make a motion:

BOALDIN: I'll second.

JR: Motion and second any other discussion?

STEVE: Dr. Allin – (absent), Behan: aye, Boaldin: aye, Emler: aye, Faust Goudeau: (No response – Telecon), Dr. Hornung: (absent), Director Kaufman: aye, Commissioner Miller: aye, Joe Megredy:

(absent), Representative Neighbor: (absent), John Ralston: aye, BC Rick Rook: (absent), Representative Swanson: aye.

JR: OK 109-11-6; and ill move to approve that: SECOND: OK, motion and a second, Steve.

STEVE: Dr. Allin – (absent), Behan: aye, Boaldin: aye, Emler: aye, Faust Goudeau: (No response – Telecon), Dr. Hornung: (absent), Director Kaufman: aye, Commissioner Miller: aye, Joe Megredy: (absent), Representative Neighbor: (absent), John Ralston: aye, BC Rick Rook: (absent), Representative Swanson: aye.

JR: One more, 109-15-2 Commissioner Boaldin moved to, second. Steve

STEVE; Dr. Allin – (absent), Behan: aye, Boaldin: aye, Emler: aye, Faust Goudeau: (No response – Telecon), Dr. Hornung: (absent), Director Kaufman: aye, Commissioner Miller: aye, Joe Megredy: (absent), Representative Neighbor: (absent), John Ralston: aye, BC Rick Rook: (absent), Representative Swanson: aye.

JR: So all those pass right, seven to nothing. We've got another several sets of regulations and I think that some of those came in the Board packet but maybe was a little bit different this time because we have so many, but in order to implement the scope of practice and for us to be able to keep moving forward to our targeted deadline of January 15th, we had to get a lot of regulations. Some of them just changed a little bit of language, but some of them quite a bit of change. There are probably close to twenty, and all we were doing yesterday was just going through them and just visiting about them but just for a conceptual approval to get them started through the process but what I thought I'd do is list the temporary regulations that we went through, and Camille can we take these all as one, in one vote, we don't need to do them individually do we? It's not, this is not a final approval like we just did, we'll at least see these two more times in October and December hopefully if everybody's on task. These regulations are necessary to get the scope implemented by January. If anybody would like Carman or somebody to give a little overview of each of the temporary regulations, that's fine and if not then I can

just list them out and so that way they are reflected in the minutes and we could provide any board members that want a copy that didn't get one in their box of packet stuff could look at them. But there will be changes to most of them after that. After the committee looked at them, and Camille will review them, then we'll get those started in the process of review and approval. So, here are the ones for temporary approval consideration. KAR 109-5-1, 109-5-7, 109-8-1, 109-10-1, 109-10-6, 109-11-1, 109-11-3, 109-11-4, 109-11-6, so those are all the ones necessary to get temporary regulation status moving and then we'll follow those up with the final ones later on. Keep in mind KAR 109-5-1, 109-11-3, 109-11-4 and 109-11-6 we just approved for the final adoption but with the new scope there were some language changes that we had to do but we didn't want to hold anybody up from being able to conduct courses or anything like that we realize that these are going to, we're going to, adopt, we adopted these finally this morning but then were going to turn right back around and change them but if we didn't do this the way we've done it there was going to be a little bit of a gap and people need to be able to do courses and I didn't want to have to answer to that so that's the reason we did it so if anybody has a question Carman or Steve can answer it. I know this creates work for people and it's a little bit confusing as to why we just approved something but were I think in order to try and make our time lines this was about the only, this was about the best option so I will move that we approve those that I just listed to move forward in the temporary status. Ok. Is there any other discussion? So what's, I guess, my question were going to look at these and then, on a temporary regulation is there, there's not a public hearing is that right, on temporary?

STEVE: Correct.

JR: Ok.

CAMILLE: They can go into affect sooner because there isn't the sixty day public hearing requirement.

JR: Ok. And then how long can they be good for?

CARMAN: 120 days

JR: To get the others done right, ok.

CAMILLE: Just so everybody knows Representative Holmes is _____

_____. JR:
were not going to need them another hundred. Yea. Right yea.

JR: Well we just needed these though this, we just to get by to cover the gap in time were going to have.
Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER BOALDIN: I'll second

JR: Ok. Commissioner Boaldin. Is there any other discussion? Alright all those in favor signify by saying I, any opposed. Ok. Alright the next item is the adoption of the transition course curricula that the Friesen Group has been working on. It might have come on a cd in your packet or there were some hard copies around as well. It's the committee's recommendation to approve that curriculum that they've worked on and if there's, is that a motion to approve it, Ok, and I'll second it. Is there any other discussion or does anybody have any questions about it? Yes Camille:

CAMILLE: _____
_____.

JR: Any other discussion? I might say that it's about, cause I haven't done all the work, but it's been fun, or I think it's been a good working relationship with the Friesen Group and it's a very nice document, it's been well put together and I'm glad that we've done that so.

RALSTON: Do we need a motion to include a statement of that's how we're going to validate?

JR: I've got that on here about, you mean, the hours and the tests and the end of the module, the module post examinations?

RALSTON: Yes.

JR: I've got that.

RALSTON: as separate?

JR: Yea.

RALSTON: Ok.

SWANSON: Mr. Chair, and did we also agree that the contract even though it reads eight hours is going to be a two day sixteen hour session?

JR: Yea.

SWANSON: we've agreed with that?

JR: and I've got that in here, going to recommend that its two days with one day being, yea.

SWANSON: Thank you.

JR: Any other questions or discussion? Alright all those in favor signify by saying, any opposed? Ok.

CAMILLE: I just have one question I thought that to validate the _____ competency it was going to, the board could accept a statement from the instructor affirming that a student met those kind of competencies in relation to the level they were _____.

JR: Ok. My next, here's what I got, so just, on deck here, our next thing is that we recommend the adoption of the module post examination as the validation of competency for successful completion that was my next recommendation. And we can add with a signed statement from the instructor, is that what you're asking?

CAMILLE: _____ ?

JR: Remember we passed them around? I think its cleaner if we do each one of these so that it gets recorded and that everybody,

CAMILLE: I'm Joe.

JR: Ok, Alright our next recommendation as far as the transition courses go is that we adopt the module post examination as the validations of competency for successful completion and that would be, for the people that were here, was the exam that we passed it around at the room. It was one of the pages of the three or four that we passed around so. Is that going to be good enough?

SWANSON: Mr. Chair, to go along with what Camille was saying though, didn't we, do we assume, and I don't like that word, that the signature on the bottom of that post test by the instructor is that instructors certification that the student completed the necessary course work etc. etc. etc. and the

signature at the bottom as well as the post test would be then? Affirmed that the student had completed.

Is that what you're concerned about Camille?

CAMILLE: Well yea because I maybe I misunderstood that whole conversation because I thought that there was going to be like in, there was some conversation about that test didn't really, it was more for the instructors and whatever, and that there was, therefore was going to be the statement signed by the instructor saying I affirm that the person has met these competencies for purposes of transitioning to the AEMT, or.

SWANSON: Well then it seems to me that the signature by the instructor on the bottom of that would be that. I assume there's a signature block on that test.

RALSTON: And there will also be the signature on the certificate of completion that they completed the whole process, the test serves as a teaching tool in the whole process but the actual total validation would be a completion of the course with the signature of the instructor on the completion certificate.

SWANSON; Thank you.

JR: Any other questions? Alright all those in favor signify by saying I, any opposed? Alright our next recommendation is that the transition course be competency based with, I don't know if you remember but there was a little bit of discussion about should they have to be so many hours, and we got into that that it might be easier to make sure that those are competency based so that's our next recommendation I'd move that we approve that.

KAUFMAN; Ill second.

JR: Any other discussion? Alright all those in favor signify by saying I any opposed? Ok, our next recommendation is that on train the trainer courses that they be two days in length, with one day being the EMR and the second day being the advanced EMT. And let me ask, and I know we don't usually do this but are we, if I remember right, day two is still going to be optional, is that right? I think with the RFP, correct me if I'm wrong, and I don't want to, yea. I think day two, really with the RFP the way

that's worded we couldn't stop somebody from coming to day one and then going and teaching advanced EMT is that right? They might not be any good at it, but we couldn't prohibit it?

JON FRIESIN: Well, you are correct but, if those people tried to turn around and teach an AEMT bridge, I'm assuming, and I understand the assume thing, but I'm assuming that it wouldn't be approved because they had not been through _____.

CARMAN; we will take the rosters from completion from the train the trainer courses and that data will be entered into a database so we will be able to track whether they took EMR-EMT or EMR-EMT and AEMT train the trainer courses. If they have not completed then we would not allow approval for an AEMT Course if they hadn't taken the AEMT train the trainer course. That was our thoughts on it not that it can't be change, it's very easy to change but that was the direction we thought we were going with it.

JR: Any other discussion, what are we going to do I guess then either Camille or Steve, what are we going to do then with the RFP that says it can be, it has to be at least four but no more than eight hours and were going to require people now to go to two days>

CAMILLE: I don't know, yesterday was the first I heard about any of that so I really don't know any, enough about the contract or anything to say anything now.

CARMAN: Really the RFP is a contract between you and the vendor really has no relevance on what you require of somebody if the vendor has agreed to provide a service then you can identify regulatorily what service, how that service is going to be applied, I would think, Senator Emler, is that not appropriate?

SEN. EMLER: I would think so. JR: I think aren't most of the places that are hosting these plan on two days already? Ok. I know that might be a little bit more cumbersome for people to go to two days, of course the only people that have to go to the day two are the people that want to do the advanced EMT, so if you just want to do EMR and EMT you'd have to just go to one day anyway I mean right, that's the way I read it. any other discussion? Alright all those in favor signify by saying I, any opposed? Ok, our

other recommendation, we just got three more, the other recommendation is that only training officers and instructor coordinators be allowed to coordinate the training courses. So Ill move that we approve that.

KAUFMAN: Second. JR: Ok. Is there any other discussion? Alright, all those in favor signify by saying I, any opposed? Another bunch of regulations that we need to go ahead and move, it just conceptually, once again were going to, we will for sure see these, maybe not the temporary ones but we will for sure see these in October and probably again in December hopefully for the final approval. Once again the, our council as well as the staff is going to work on them and hopefully we can get some input from others along the way somehow or at, in the comment period either way so. Let me just list those out so that there recorded: 109-6-1, 109-7-1, 109-8-2, 109-9-1,109-9-4, 109-10-2 109-10-3, 109-13-1,109-15-1 and 109-15-2. I will add that 109-10-5 is being revoked and then, just as a note on 109-15-2 were going to just hold that until a decision is made on 109-10-1, which we were doing temporary, on the temporary regulations. Just that those are, we are, the committee looked at them and we spent, like I said, all of our four hours of a lot of time yesterday going over these there's been some people that at least have looked at them and conceptually or at least our intent is what some of those say. Is there a motion to approve those?

KAUFMAN: I would so move.

JR: is there a second?

BOALDIN: Ill second.

JR: Motion and a second, is there any other discussion?

RALSTON: did you include eleven ten in that?

JR: We tabled that on, that was listed in the temporary regulations and we tabled that is that right, 109-11-10? Ok. Any other discussion or questions? Alright all those in favor signify by saying I, any opposed? And probably the last thing that we talked about and just so that we, the board is ok with it were going to need a September meeting of some sort we probably could of used one before this one just

to go over especially if there's any more regulations or if we need just to be able to spend an hour and a half of our regular Thursday meeting going over things so we would like for the board, I don't know if we need a motion but if we would like to ask the board for permission at least for one special meeting in September or sometime before the next, before the October committee meetings just so that if there are things we need to work on in September, regulatory wise or to get the scope implemented if there are things we haven't thought about we'd like to be able to get together and so that we don't have to have four or five hours on Thursday to try to get it all decided and then turn right around on Friday and make a decision does anybody have a problem or an issue with that? One other thing that I did want to hand out just for the board members is on the transition there was a, this is just an overview of the transition flow, I know that there was some questions yesterday about , you know, if you're a first responder what do you do and so this is just kind of spelled out and it just, so that everybody knows what were doing so we don't need action or anything on it but just so you can keep it and read over it that way maybe better understand it so. And with that that is all we have. If you can believe that. Who is going to do the investigations report, senator Emler?

SEN. EMLER: Thank you Mr. chairman the investigations committee, subcommittee or whatever we are, committee I guess, met yesterday it was stated that we had two and a half members present since one hadn't never been there before and we reviewed seven cases, two were closed, two were dismissed, two were approved for certification, the issue there was a felony conviction, one was continued until the October meeting because according to the chairs interpretation of the paperwork and councils interpretation of the paperwork we couldn't interpret it so we thought that probably this person was actually still on post supervision, post release supervision, which meant that they hadn't quite completed all of the, all of their sentence and will be completed by October or I'm sorry let me rephrase that, it should be completed by actually the end of September so it would be appropriate to look at it again in October again. The final matter that we briefly discussed was the policy and that, for the investigations

committee and that's been sort of hanging fire for quite some time but again we only had three members there, one of whom had not participated on the committee in the past and the committee did not feel comfortable with only essentially half the folks there to approve a policy that was going to apply to the entire committee and so the chair recommended that we between now and the October meeting actually have a conference call and the balance the committee felt that was better than individually sending in our comments about the policy that way we can actually talk to each other and this, and of course this would be an open meeting that the public would be noticed about and then we can look at the policy finally at the October meeting and say yes or no. we just didn't feel comfortable with only three of us there approving a policy that could be as far reaching as the investigations policy. Stand for questions.

JR: Any questions for senator Emler? Steve do you want to, when do you want to do this?

STEVE: Actually why don't you let Jerry Slaughter.

JR: Ok. Ok.

J. SLAUGHTER: Thanks Steve. Senator how are you? First of all thank you, I know your busy I'll be very brief welcome the opportunity to meet with the board and number one express our delight that the legislation passed last year after uh quit a long process I understand having met with Steve a little while ago that there could possibly be some additions that are needed this year some tweaks to legislation uh we just like to uh say to you on behalf of the medical society were, we'd be delighted to work with you again this year, I think the sooner we uh, can sit down and look at proposed changes and go through them circulate them to our membership, the better we can avoid some of the delays that caused this legislation to have such a torturous path through the legislature. In addition, I think one of the things that uh resulted from the legislation last year that the advisory council which I know you've established I think they've just begun meeting, I think that'll be very helpful on matters that were interested in which really have to do with medical side of it left to do with the process and operational side of the agency and I think that as that medical advisory council matures and evolves and begins to get some experience, I think it'll be a real asset to the agency and will be a great point of contact for us working with the

agency on medical and related matters. I discussed with Steve briefly some of the things you're talking about doing they all look to us to be uh not controversial if things come up that need to be addressed that are beyond that we'd be delighted to work with you in any way that's appropriate I'm hopeful that if your legislation gets put together in advance of the session submitted to the health chairs I can't imagine there's going to be much that's controversial at least that of which I've seen thus far so again wed be delighted to work with you, we are I think as you do know, we've been working with a new association of EMS medical directors it's just really beginning to get it legs under it we also think that will be very helpful uh and were going to try to facilitate their continue to evolution we think that'll be very helpful for the agency as well as for the medical advisory council so I think a couple of good things have happened, I know you've got a lot of moving parts right now in EMS with this transition and the articulation of various attendant roles but uh and so there and not only going to be hiccups along the way but we are available and stand ready to help in any way we can and we'll work with your staff in any way that's appropriate, I'd be happy to respond to any questions or. JR: Any questions for Mr. Slaughter, Senator Emler?

EMLER: Thank you Mr. Chairman, Jerry you've gotten a copy of this when you met with Steve and doesn't appear to be any problem from your perspective, it's just clearing up, there are some things that that we have chatted about that probably need clarified because of our original intent, but you don't see any problems?

J. SLAUGHTER: No sir, I think it looks good.

EMLER: And I think your suggestion of getting it pre filed which can be done on the senate side not the house side but we could get it pre filed and uh only because they don't exist right now as you know, or wont shortly. LAUGHTER AND TALKING AMONGST PEOPLE: EMLER: and then if anything does come up handle it early on in the session, I think that's a good suggestion, be happy to help with getting it pre filed whatever we need to do. MULTIPLE GENTLEMEN TALKING.

JR: Thank you, any other questions, ok. You want to back up Steve and do your....

STEVE: In your packets you had a document that's labeled statutory revision considerations and I'd like to have an opportunity to discuss some of that and I gave you the actual copy of that, I put it in a format that's a little bit easier to follow. I've got a presentation that's going to try to describe one of the dilemmas that the language creates as far as the amount of time that attendants have to acquire their transition. If you look on page 3, on line 67, a lot of this language is duplicated. One of the things that was noticed was that the language that talked about validation of that transition program didn't carry forward on some of the attendant levels, so what you see in yellow on your copy is simply the addition of the same language that is consistent throughout as far as what needs to happen in order for the attendants to meet that requirement. Even this language could change based on yesterdays and today's discussion. I'll talk about that in a little bit when I show you the scheduling parameters that we've established, but all of it now is based on renewal and that's essentially what the yellow blocks in each of these documents wind up telling you at each of the attendant levels so our recommendation would be to make sure that is inclusive in all the attendant levels. Mr. Chair, the recommendation, or at least the possibility of the EMT-I course being included as part of the transition for the EMT-D, is something that could be added with the change of this language so that's still a very real possibility. On page 4 in line 84 you'll notice when it's talking about what attendants can do and uh this affects everybody other than a paramedic, the inference was that uh we could do this with medical protocols or uh direct radio communication well the word or wasn't in there so implication at this point is the fact that you need both in order to perform so our recommendation is the insertion of or any place its absent that I've identified that on the document.

JR: Steve, just real quick, and a couple in the audience probably really know what I'm talking about; I'm all about the shading of the colors and all that but what's the yellow versus the green and the red?

STEVE: The green ill, the green indicates that the language is based on renewal and that's highlighted because that's current language you'll notice that the term, renewal is identified and the after December 31st 2011 is one of the things that ill approach in the presentation.

JR: What's the red?

STEVE: Red is the next item I'm going to talk about. When we were looking at this the language says every place that an attendant can't function without protocols in place but in this particular statute it's got some language, and I know that its meant to serve as a Good Samaritan clause but if you look at the language and accept it just as it is, we can't preclude any person, certified as an attendant, from providing emergency medical services to persons requiring such service. We thought it might be a little contradictory in that Camille did some research for us and found out that this pretty much is good Samaritan language that the Board of Healing Arts actually has, and that's on page 13 of your document. This document actually has a clause in it that includes EMS attendants as well, but it only includes instructor coordinators not training officers. Our choice would be to eliminate the language that's in red to prevent that confusion or we can just eliminate the entire statute. My concern in eliminating the entire statute is obviously paragraph (a) and (c). This language provides some clarification about who can operate a service and what standards need to be met, but that's something that we should consider and decide whether or not we want to completely eliminate that statute, eliminate paragraph B, and go from there.

CAMILLE: It might be helpful if I explain section B. What I found out is this statute 65-6145, originally was part of a group of statutes that was a standalone first responder act and it made sense at that time to have something in the first responder act that said the first responder act doesn't preclude an attendant under the EMS act from acquiring services. Later in 1988 the first responder act was repealed and it was put into the EMS act and this statute was carried along even though it no longer made sense to say nothing in the EMS act which should preclude an attendant from providing emergency medical services so some kind of oversight it just got carried through and currently as Steve said within the healing arts act there's a good Samaritan statute that pertains not only to people licensed under the healing act but some others, such as the attendants also people who've completed American red cross first aid course and any way some other people so its, there's now one good Samaritan prevision that's within the

healing arts act but it covers attendants and instructor coordinators as well. I didn't realize that it covered attendants until I started checking this out, but there it is, I don't know, EMS people may not realize that but it is there providing coverage for good Samaritan acts, which is like when an EMS person is off duty and they see a car wreck and they stop and help, it says they're not going to be held liable for anything they do to try to help this person.

STEVE: The last issue deals with the language that is, as it exists in the statute that talks about the first and second renewal opportunity for those that aren't attendants, you may not understand that our state is actually broken in half into even and odd years. Our renewal cycle is a two year period so that you can see that for someone who renews in the 2004-2006 cycle they'll continue to march on every two years getting that full time to achieve their continuing education requirements and file for renewal, same thing applies with the odd numbers, uh what I asked Chrystine to do is to look at some of the numbers so that we could see what the impact would have on uh, in the way the statutory language is and what we did was forty, four thousand two hundred and fourteen represents the total number of attendants that renewed in 2004, December 31st 2004. Now that's the total number of attendants does that not include initial certifications, and if someone renewed late that wound up, as I understand, it gets carried to the next year. Because of the first responder EMT and the paramedic having only one year I've sort of focused the presentation on that because that's the ones, those are the ones that have the least amount of time to get this accomplished. Here you can see in 2004 we had three hundred and sixty two first responders, three thousand fifty three EMT's, if you follow that through the years you'll see that in the even number of years we wind up having about forty two hundred, forty two fifty, uh renewing every year, and again you can see the differences each year as look at uh the first responder and EMT uh population. If we're looking at an average to try see how this is going to impact all I've done is taken the three and averaged them together so were looking potentially at this year of having that number of renewals uh and those number of attendants renewing in those particular sections. This is the odd number data, and if you'll notice it's a little lower than the even numbers, uh and that's just because of the way initially when we broke the state up uh, we did it by zip codes as I remember and this wound up being the lighter of the two, in last year we had thirty nine thirty and again you can see a little bit of lower number of attendants in this whole cycle. The issue comes up that if you look at the total in 2009 is 3930 and were looking at a potential of 4248, the way Statute is written, at the implementation date, we're going to have some people caught in a short cycle, The way the statute reads right now, it is the first opportunity after the implementation of the law. For those attendants in a even renewal cycle, they wind up losing a month to transition which gives them twenty three months to get it done and that may

not be an issue. However, it may be a bigger issue for those services or fire departments that don't have aggressive training programs, but it's still quite a bit time to accomplish that. If you look at those cycles going out for the EMT and EMT-I and EMT-D, then you'll also see that it's shorted by one month, yet because they have two cycles, they have plenty of time to get through that transition. The issue is that you wind up having an odd cycle that you have some folks that only have eleven months upon completion, or upon implementation of this statute to get the transition, now for paramedic I don't think it's going to be a problem, again for the EMT and EMT what you're doing is you're giving them eleven months after they've already potentially gained some continuing education to get a transition course with the same amount of continuing education that would be required in a normal cycle. Again you'll see the odd number years wind up having and even less when you're looking at two renewal cycles because you can see the disparity and uh from forty eight to thirty five and those for those that are getting supposedly two cycles but again their not full cycles. We're looking at the completion of date December 2015 so what we're proposing is that we change the language and that would be when you're looking at your document JR, that goes back to the green, what we would say is if we wind up doing it on renewal what we would do, it is the first opportunity to renew after December 31st 2011 which would mean that when that starts everybody gets complete cycles. Here you can see uhm there's an eleven month difference in that as we've talked about before but once this starts playing out you'll see that everybody winds up having complete cycles, both even and odd, so nobody winds up having an unfair advantage or unfair disadvantage I guess, so when we were looking at this we thought well we could, the way the statute is built right now everything is based on renewal and if we wind up changing that date well make it a little bit fair but one of the things Carman's wound up getting some calls on and I've had some calls as well is what happens if I put an earnest effort in and get my entire staff trained uh within four months after everything goes in place, do we have to wait until their renewal cycle and I've got some that even and some that are odd? So we looked at the possibility of actually renewing people, to some degree, or at least validating their successful completion uh off cycle and here's some options that we looked at uh one is that if Carman and her staff wind up getting a packet of validation for an ambulance service what we could do is we would make sure that everything's kosher and at that point we could go on uh uh, have those names put on line and uh when you want to find out what your status is or as a service director you want to find out what your teams status is, then you could go and look up that individual and for the individuals what they could actually do is they could print off the slip of paper that winds up going with their card that essentially says that you met that transition requirement, you're a now a whatever, EMT,EMR Paramedic, and that slip of paper would be your validation of the uhm transition until your next renewal cycle and at which time you'd be issued a card. The other option

was that what we wind up doing is soon as we see that their validated we wind up issuing them a card uh that would be mailed out to them and the card would only uh identify, uh the purpose of the card would only be to identify their new attendant name which would indicate that according to board records they had transitioned it would in no way affect their renewal cycle though they'd be required to renew as they normally would but now as part of this renewal process it would be continuing education for that AEMT or whatever it happens to be uh and then we also talked about the idea of having a no fee certification non expiring card where it would just be a permanent card and very much like the board of nursing and what you would have to do is uh uh service directors and such anybody wanting to know your current status they'd have to go online to find out and they would be able to determine whether or not you were certified or not. uhm those are the actual processes, some of the steps of the processes that I've already explained uhm the online as I said it winds up sort of being a temporary document that slip of paper until they get to the next renewal cycle uh and the pros and cons of that really it meets what the board has planned as far as validation scheme it doesn't cost the attendant any money uh all it does is mimic the current renewal cycle and it's a fast process to get accomplished it would cost us a little bit to modify our database and also our, which we'll have to do anyway, but the cost associated with this particular plan is being able to allow someone to go online validate status and then print out that slip of paper. One of the issues in any of these plans by by transitioning upon validation may mean that uh we either uh allow individual attendants to do that so if someone winds up finding a training program outside of their community and they get validated early on if that service doesn't have protocols to support their certification level legally they can't operate because they can't operate underneath their old protocols or their old attendant level because their no longer that so that's one of the issues that this particular process raises as well uh the transition card it's just a new attendant card uhm and it would uh again mimic that cycle this winds up costing us about six thousand dollars we figured maybe a little less because it'll be the cost of generating cards and mailing them out to individuals, uhm again it it other than that it has the same pros in the sense that it mimics the current renewal cycle and winds up uh uhm getting them through that cycle. That's sort of what we're looking at what I would ask is uh the board and I, you've had the document, I don't know that it has been clear to you but we've got a couple of choices one is to extend that time frame so that it has an effective date in order to make sure everybody has an equal opportunity to transition, or uh or that green color that you ask about JR if you look at the document what we would wind up doing is everyplace it says upon renewal we would simply change the language, I say simply I'm not, that's bad choice of words, we would change the language so that it indicates that they would rather than upon renewal it would be upon it would be upon validation of their

transition and at that point that would give us the authority to uh confirm them at that attendant level.

JR: is that.

RALSTON; Steve if you do that based off upon validation of their attendant level do you have any sunset in there to where that can't extend this forever?

STEVE: I'm not sure what the question is?

RALSTON: Well upon renewal gives you an end to that time frame but upon validation.

STEVE: I see what you're saying.

RALSTON: doesn't give you an end to that.

STEVE: It would be an either upon renewal for the identified period, or upon transition.

RALSTON: Period.

STEVE: That's some of the issues that we'd have to address and crafting the language because our whole intent is to get this accomplished by our end date, everything were trying to do is based on that. If we crafted it John, upon transition we'd have to make sure that that caveat was in there.

RALSTON:_____.

STEVE: Yep.

JR: Any other questions for Steve? When do we need to have this done by, October probably?

STEVE; Well we need, if were going to pre file it we need to have it ready to go at that point and uh these are the things we've looked at uh the other thing I want to do is try to get staff together and some other folks and look at the AEMT the way that statutory language is been written because as Camille has recognized and trying to fit what we want those folks to do into the way the statutory language is written right now may require us to reword some of that stuff in order to give us that flexibility that we wanted to do that.

JR: Senator Emler, would that be ok if we, for your committee to work on by October, or what are your thoughts?

EMLER: Actually, what I'll do is just to pre file the bill I'll just file it personally and then it'll get assigned to the health care, one of the health care committees, wherever it was this year, I don't know which committee,

STEVE: Health and human services I think it was.

EMLER: So if it's going to be my committee that does it, it would have to wait til January, but I can personally pre-file it whenever it's ready. So if it's ready in October, it can be pre-filed, and it'll be on the docket in January when we come back.

JR: Would that be ok, Representative Swanson?

REPRESENTATIVE SWANSON: The Senator's right, we will have new leadership or some leadership changes and I think that probably he's right that it be pre-filed.

JR: Ok,

CAMILLE: Steve aren't you needing a decision on which way to go.

STEVE: Yes.

CAMILLE: I don't know if that came through or not?

STEVE: The first decision is if we want to open up the applicable statutes and make corrections and if so which corrections? The second is which avenue would you like us to pursue in order to craft the language to get it working?

JR: Well I think yes to the answer to the first question and then what's the, what is the board think as far as,...

STEVE: Renewal versus transition and making sure there's a lock date on it?

EMLER: Thank you Mr. Chair, first of all on the Good Samaritan, we probably ought to clean that up, my opinion so that we don't have that potential conflict. Secondly, I'll take probably the least liked option, I don't see any reason to, its eleven months. I don't see why they need to have additional time, they're on notice. I don't know that we need to extend that an extra year, basically is what we're doing is extending the statute an extra year, because inevitably, not the statute but the ability to get it done,

inevitably somebody's not going to get done and they're going to want a grace period. Well it's better to have the grace period at the end than at the beginning so if we want it done by 2014 or whatever that date was then I think we leave it the way it is and emphasize folks you need to get the job done now and then the ones that don't, they'll still have that little window at the end where we might be able to give them some time to get it done. Now the compassionate side says, oh no, let's give everybody the full amount time, I guess I'm not overly compassionate on this.

CAMILLE: What's your thoughts about having it tied to renewal versus having it tied to when someone completes the transition course cause they could complete it pretty quick but not be up for renewal for another year or so and.

EMLER: I'm not sure frankly, although if you get the transition courses done then why wait till renewal I guess, uh but if you want to wait till renewal to get the transition done why should we pull that away from them so, they have an option, I guess I'm ok with them having the option of if they want to do it when they get transition courses done fine, if they don't want to do it then want to wait till renewal that's ok too just get it done.

EMLER: Ok I threw it out there now let's talk.

JR: Deb do you have a comment,

DEB: I would agree with that I would think that if they went and made the effort to do the transition that they should be able to transition at that point rather than waiting till the end of their renewal cycle.

JR: so upon completion

DEB: Right.

JR: Ok.

STEVE: So both options is what you want, what we currently have and the addition of the language for upon completion of transition.

JR: That's what I'm hearing.

STEVE: Ok.

JR: Is that what everybody's saying?

EMLER: I guess that's ok I mean it seems to me to, just make sense that if you did the transition work you'd want to be able to do it right then but I can understand some people may want to wait until they absolutely have to get it done but

CAMILLE: So if it, said upon transition but no later than renewal and then renewal is defined,

JR: Right.

RALSTON: I think from a stand point of investigations wise we need to tie it to the process, either the transition or the renewal because if we do it to the renewal and they complete the course their not going to be able to use those skills until their renewal date. And if we do it to the transition then once their complete it they're through the transition then they can start using the skills and make it a little easier because it'll be documented when they completed that course.

BOALDIN: I don't know why you wouldn't want to do it when you finished the course instead of waiting myself, if I was taking it.

EMLER: But I think the way Camille suggested it, it puts a deadline on when you have to get it done by you can do it at this early point but you have to do it by this point.

BOALDIN: I understand that it's giving them an option of, but there is a dead line.

JR: Right.

CAMILLE: If I understood you right you're not in favor of renewal being a second opportunity after December 31, 2011but just the second opportunity to renew after the effective date.

EMLER: personally I wouldn't make the change.

CAMILLE: I just wanted to make sure.

EMLER: but if the, I don't feel really strongly about that, but I just, it's still almost a year and so I don't know that it needs to be changed for thirty days.

CAMILLE: yea I just wanted to make sure I was clear on that one.

BOALDIN: I guess if its working why fix it.

CAMILLE: We don't know if it is working, we haven't gotten there yet.

JR: We don't know. Well can we incorporate the changes that, incorporate his thoughts, and Camille you got that down right? Maybe we can look at it in October to look to see how it, exactly how it's going to work.

EMLER: And I would assume that we would get some public input after we kind of come forward with it, granted it's not the final draft that the revisers will put forth but the concepts are there.

JR: We could have something in October for your meeting, don't you think'? I mean, for the executive committee to look at again.

EMLER: Oh, for the executive committee,

JR: Incorporating your thoughts. EMLER: Provided we have one you mean.

JR: Provided we have one.

CAMILLE: Is there any problem putting the, in the, what you call it, the scope of practice, putting that or in there, because that was, I think truly a inadvertent comma that got put in instead of an "or" and so now it would require operating under medical protocols and at the same time being in direct communication and that just kind of defeats the whole purpose of.

EMLER: And actually Camille I think I noticed and I can't tell you where it was now but as I was reading through this I noticed another area where I think there's a word missing. I think it's in the yellow part here somewhere, but if you if diagram the sentence were missing a conjunction or something.

CAMILLE: there should be a, will be required to complete.

EMLER: Ya there ya go. I think it was a to.

JR: Anything else, well we can work on those changes Deb.

DEB: I would, you mentioned that we might have some comments from the public so I would encourage them to let us know what impact that would have on their services, cause quite frankly to date I've heard from services that plan on fast tracking this but I've not heard from services that don't plan on that and that feel that this would be a, almost impossible task for them to accomplish so if we could hear from them that would be helpful.

RALSTON: I would agree with that, because my biggest concerns for the AEMT people because I mean from the beginning we've talked two year, two year and the a AEMT's still in there as an two renewal cycle.

STEVE:

JR: Yes.

RALSTON: So it's not going to affect them?

STEVE: well it does in the original language because the odd number of years has thirty five months rather than forty eight in that cycle.

RALSTON: But it, ok so they're not going to have to get it done in twelve?

STEVE; no.

RALSTON: No, ok.

STEVE: AEMT is two years, or a two year cycle.

JR: Alright so well have that back for the October meeting. Or the executive committee meeting. Ok anything else. Are you, are we on the office update?

STEVE: Yes. I've got some awards I'd like to present to staff. If I can ask Jerry and Patti to come up please? We're recognizing Patti Artzer who's been with the state for thirty years and has been with us more than four years. Patti came to us from the Department of Revenue and she's done a great job in our office as far as keeping our budget straight and we'll talk a little bit about that in the remainder of our

office update. Patti on behalf of the Board and the State of Kansas, I would like to recognize your service with this certificate and this 30 year pin. CLAPPING.

STEVE: Jerry is being recognized for his 10 years of service to the State of Kansas and the Board of EMS. Jerry on behalf of the Board and the State of Kansas, I'd like to present this 10 year pin for your service.

STEVE; As far as the office update goes ill make this fast, on the end of this report I've identified some of the different processes that are being either looked at, revised or tweaked in order to support the changes that have incurred in processing uh attendant information and class information towards the transition. EIG Grant funds as you can see uh we actually wound up having to carry over forty seven thousand dollars for that grant and if you remember uh for those of you on the investigations case when we were talking about whose responsible for paying that money back, this is the amount of money that got thrown back into the hopper for us recycle as a result of those folks who didn't meet their obligations to us. Then that'll show you the FY eleven uh revenue as well with that carry over uh that should be a balance of about two hundred ninety seven thousand dollars. KRAF Grant has gone very well, were scheduled to have a meeting on August 24th, if that date works, uh were planning to involve not just the committee that's been working on this but also Patti, who is responsible for dealing with this in the office as well as a representative scientific, or Fischer Scientific or Fischer Safety whatever they are now to make sure that we can somehow we can streamline this process and eliminate some of the hiccups that we've experienced during this cycle. We have been lucky enough to buy everything except for three services, so we got that down that far into the list most orders have been met to this point and I think, one gentleman called me about a cot or emailed me about a cot and within two days it was delivered. The legislation update one of the things that were going to decide obviously our scope bill is something were going to have to address but some of the other issues if you remember senate bill two twenty one which uh changed the boards function in spoke about our involvement in homeland security when we pulled that bill uh we actually pulled some language out that dealt with our ability to enforce quality assurance. So we may have to redraft something to ensure that we uh include that so that we can deal with that particular issue, the back ground checks, the subpoena bill, the fine bill and then another bill that we had uh worked with Chris Alexander on uh to deal with protection of attendants exposed to communicable diseases uh we did not present that bill last year because of the scope and our focus on the other bills so that'll be an option for us to consider as well, as far as moving forward with that. So as far as the legislative session obviously you've seen some of the issues that were dealing with as far as

regulation and this winds up being that we may have about six different bills that are going forward for the next session. Lastly on that report just internally identify some of the issues in each of the sections of the changes in and revisions or review that were doing with processes to try to get ready for this big change that's going to hit us as well as everybody else. I'd entertain any questions that you have.

JR: Questions for Steve?

STEVE: The one thing I will have to have is a motion from you to transfer funds, into our operational budget because of our cash flow what were, what we have to do is move money from one area to another in order for us to be able to pay our bills, and our bills have gone up this last year so. We'll need a motion from the committee to do that. It is essentially to authorize staff to transfer funds for cash flow purposes and remit funds to pay back the transfers in twenty ten.

BOALDIN: I'd so move that

JR: I'll second it. How much was it again?

PATTI: a hundred and twenty five thousand.

RALSTON: Steve is that just like a cash transfer?

STEVE: yes.

JR: alright any other discussion? All in favor signify by saying, any opposed? Anything else, is that?

STEVE? That's it.

JR: alright public comment. Chy Miller.

CHY: I normally sing when it's a hand held mic. Good morning. I thank you for the opportunity to speak to you just for a few minutes. Two things on my agenda real quick; first off I want to remind everybody that the Kansas EMS Association conference is next weekend at the Wichita Marriott, there is still time to sign up and come join us for some good EMS education and good times good fellowship, good networking in Wichita, and we look forward to that. We do have some great pre-con sessions and some great speakers, some local talent we also have, where's John? Who's are key note, his name is Lieutenant Colonel Groves from Erwin Army, so we look forward to having him and he gets great reviews so we hope you can make it and if you want to go KEMSA.ORG is the website, and we can get you taken care of. I also wanted to take the opportunity to publicly thank some EMS agencies from the state of Kansas and also to board member Rick Rook, we completed at Hutchinson community college our joint community college field operations day the end of June, and we had three community colleges that joined us this year. It was Hutchinson community college, Garden City community college and Kansas City Kansas community college, all of their paramedic students came. We had just under thirty

paramedic students, we had them broken up into teams and between twelve and thirteen crews they ran almost a hundred calls the first day, which was just about a little under a twelve hour day so we kept them busy they ran all single patient calls, you name it, they got to deal with it, with simulation, it was a long day but it was a day of learning and a lot of fun. The second they ran two MCI's just two calls, but that was nearly eighty patients, every patient had to be transported to our emergency room, there had to be a biomedical communication with our medical director, with every single patient, and so those students also have to do documentation, they have to do the paperwork, turn that in, so it was a very busy day and uh we hope that they never see a day like that on the streets as a paramedic but if they do then we hope that they're a little bit prepared. Real quickly we wanted to say thank you to Junction City Fire and EMS, Riley County EMS, AMR Topeka, Rice county EMS, Reno County EMS, Pottawatomie County EMS, Sedgwick county EMS, Butler county EMS, Sedgwick county DMSU, Butler county BMSU, Allen county EMS, EMSA from Tulsa, Lawrence Douglas fire and EMS, Johnson County MEDACT, Region III Merge team, Eagle med and Life team. It was, all of those agencies participated for the most part two days they put a significant amount resources into our field ops to make to work with staffing and with ambulances and some of them even had some break downs and so they even incurred repair costs and so we wanted to say thank you to them publicly and there is a good amount of representation in this room for those that are on that list, and so we do say thank you. We generated almost twenty one hundred hours of continuing education in just two days so significant amount of involvement from people outside of those agencies as well. We also had our medical director involved and for the first time this year we had our medical director in the emergency room so all of the patients and all of the paramedic students had to make interface with the medical director and he's a former paramedic and so it's nice to have him on staff and we actually this year were able to move him out of the ER the second half and he actually did on seen response, so we were able to give them two different scenarios with medical direction both in the ER and in the field, so that was new this year but thank you for the time and thank you to all those agencies that helped us out.

JR: Alright, thanks Chy. With that, I think were right at the end of our agenda. I would like for us to go into executive session for discussion of non-elected personnel, from 10:40 to 11:00 o'clock, so for 15 minutes. This will include the Board Members plus Ms. Artzer and I'll move that we do that if there's a second. Ok is there any other discussion? Alright all those in favor signify by saying aye, any opposed.

Ok.

Transcription of August 6th, 2010 board meeting minutes: After executive session was held.

JR: Okay, We're are back in open session, there was no binding action was taken, in our executive session, so unless there's any more business to come before the board, is there a motion to adjourn?

PERSON: So moved.

JR: Ok, alright, motion and second any other discussion, alright all those in favor signify by saying aye, any opposed.

JR: We are adjourned.