

Judith Basin Rural Fire District

February 17, 2015

Meeting called to order at 7:34 p.m. by Bruce. Present: Frank and Clayton. Tim and Bill were absent.

Also present: Steve Hedstrom, Kent Ridgeway, Dale Zuck and Fred Reed.

Agenda Approval: Add Pagers to new. Frank motion to approve 2nd Clayton, motion passed

Public Comment: Kent spoke to the board to recommend Fred as rural fire chief for Stanford. DES, upcoming trainings; board training on February 26th at 6:30 at town hall, and Traffic Incident Management (TIM) training in Hobson April 27th, Stanford April 28th and Geyser on May 7th.

Correspondence: Tim sent a white paper addressing the issues brought up at the January 2015 meeting.

Minutes: Clayton motion to approve 2nd Frank, motion passed.

Treasurer's Report: \$61,535.30

Unfinished business: Stanford, carburetor on tender is fixed. New DNRC truck will be here Tuesday.

Steve reported there is a brake light problem on tender, everything else good in Raynesford. Clayton reported for Clayton Annala, 3-4 weeks to get box from old tender to new tender changed over. It was decided to try to wire weld inside of tender tank to fix leaks. Still need radio for new brush truck, want to use radio that was in the Geyser ambulance. Turnout are in for John McCray. Clayton also mentioned Jeff Visocan asked about getting some "incident or accident ahead" signs, and more fire shelters.

Bring count for shelters to next meeting.

Geyser & Stanford Fire Chief Position: Discussion of job description, Motion by Frank to void and use as template, 2nd Clayton. Motion passed.

Frank made a motion to appoint Fred Reed as Stanford rural fire chief, 2nd Clayton. Motion passed.

Clayton made a motion to appoint Clayton Annala as Geyser Fire Chief, 2nd Frank. Motion passed.

Bring input for position description to next meeting.

Corral panels, Bruce posted on Craigslist. Listed for \$690, board approved Bruce to come down to \$600 if he receives an offer. If they haven't sold by next meeting, an ad will be put in JB Press.

Windham needs two new fire extinguishers. Frank made a motion to buy fire extinguishers, 2nd Clayton. Motion passed.

Board Training: Commissioner's wanted to know if Fire Board would pay half. Frank made a motion to pay half of board training 2nd Clayton. Motion passed.

Pagers: need 2 for city guys, 1 for rural. Frank made a motion to bill the city for two pagers and get them out, 2nd Clayton. Motion passed.

Sale of old Geyser truck- It was decided to place an ad in JB Press to sell by sealed bid. Minimum bid \$5,000, bid closing Monday before Fire Board Meeting.

Clayton made a motion to approve bills, 2nd Frank. Motion passed.

Clayton made a motion to adjourn, 2nd Frank. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

Feb. 10, 2015

Dear Board Members,

I apologize for not being at the meeting, but my job has demanded that I be at other functions.

Enclosed I have put together a White Paper entitled: Issues and Comments. The purpose of the paper is to give you some of my thoughts on Issues that were brought up at the board meeting in January.

I would request that the board take a few minutes to look through this paper. Some of the Issues that I have addressed in it you will be discussing at this February meeting.

Thank you.

Submitted by:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Tim Crosmer".

Tim Crosmer
Board Chairman

White Paper
Issues and Comments
About the January 2015 meeting

Produced by: Tim Crosmer, Board Chairman
Feb, 10, 2015

1. **Issue:** Appointment of the Geysler and Stanford Fire Chiefs. Are they qualified?

Comments: 1. No place in the by-laws does it state what the qualifications of the fire chief should be. Only thing the by- laws cover is the fire chief cannot be a board member.

2. Under policy title: Job- Description - Volunteer Fire Chief Second reading 1/21/14, **Attachment # 1** on the second page under Recommended Qualifications: It states completed or enrolled in a recognized Officer Training program or leadership program within one year. Both candidates for the positions have attended MT DNRC's Basic Wildland Training. In that course there is a section covered called L-180. By NWCG (National Wildfire Coordinating Group) standards the L-180 section meets certification of the national leadership course.

By completing this training the candidates have already preformed this obligation. Under the last part of the policy stating leadership program it does not say how much or what type or field of leadership training they had to get the training in.

Both individuals through other parts of their life have met this training: Clayton by being a member of the school board and as chairman of the board has had to take some kind of leadership training to be on the school board. Fred working for different grain companies and being a manager of said companies has also had to take training from these companies to be able to conduct business for them.

The policy states Recommended Qualifications not Required Qualifications. There is a difference.

Also policy is not law. A policy is the outline for a goal that an institution intends to accomplish. A law is an established procedure or standard that must be followed by members of society. Policies are used to guide the decisions of an organization or institution, while laws are used to implement justice and order. A policy is informal in nature and is typically a document that states the intentions of an institution, while laws are more formal in nature and are used to offer equity in society.

Finally both individuals meet the requirements to be chief. Both have been filling these positions for the last several months and proven through example and experience that they are capable of doing the job. I recommend they be appointed.

2. **Issue:** Parliamentary procedure or the way we are conducting our meetings?

Comments: For years the board has been conducting its meetings in a semi informal fashion. The job is being done. I would have you look at **Attachment # 2**. This document was taken from the MACO

Newsletter Jan. 2015 edition. Number 3 of this article pretty much states that if you have a small board that you should keep your meetings informal. Using formality when needed. Having formality in small meetings can cause it to hinder its business. The 2011 edition of Roberts Rules pretty much says the same thing.

It was brought up that we need to make our meetings move along quicker. For the last several months they have moved along fairly well. It is issues of procedure that have been taking up the board's time. If we do like RRO suggest by keeping the meetings informal they would move right along.

I would also think that MACO did their homework before publishing the newsletter knowing that what they put out would affect hundreds of organizations on the way they do business.

I would agree there are some areas that we could do a little tightening up on. These areas are not affecting the business of the board.

3. Issue: Sending out minutes 10 days after meeting.

Comments: I have done some checking with other board members that keep minutes such as: City Council, School Boards, church board, and other organizations. The majority of all of them told me they get there minutes usually 2-5 days before the next meeting. They stated they like getting the minutes then because it refreshes their memory about what took place at the last meeting and prepares them to be able to address the items on the upcoming agenda. This is usually sent out the same time the minutes are. If the minutes are sent out to early board members still have to go back and review them a second time before the meeting. This is wasting their time. If you need your memory refreshed earlier then you should be taking better individual notes at the meeting.

All the minutes are really used for are for recording motions and some business that was presented. The minutes are not for he said she said conversation. Once again this type of thought takes up the time of the board.

4. Issue: Rolling vote and illegal held special meeting.

Comments: 1. Rolling vote. In doing some research I can't find anyone or in RRO where it talks about rolling vote. Most people that I asked about it had never heard of such a thing. I would like to know where this came from.

2. Illegal special meeting. The meeting was held according to procedure. It was posted to board members and to the public. I brought up the issue that Bruce led us to believe he was not going to be there. See **Attachment # 3**. In this email Bruce "stated he will be gone on the 6th." This was the day of the scheduled meeting as stated in email dated Sept. 29th 8:34 am. His reply of not being there was sent at 9:18 am on the 29th. I don't know how else you would interpret this. Other then he wasn't going to be there. There was no other information sent to myself about Bruce being at the meeting between the 29th and the 6th. This was why we were surprised when he came walking in.

It was brought up that the meeting was not called to order. As the candidates arrived I informed them what the procedure was going to be. I asked any of them if they had a problem with this, they said no. I then went into the other room called the meeting to order. See **Attachment # 4**. This was sent to

Bonnie the 7th of Oct. It was not noted in the minutes but Bruce was late in getting there so how would he know if the meeting was called to order or not, as he made comment too. At the meeting everyone had a chance to comment on how the procedure and questions where going to be administered.

Minor changes were made. Then as the minutes state the interviews took place. There was no one else from the community in attendance for the interviews, or for the procedure to do the interviews.

Earlier in the day I had gone over with the County Attorney what I perceived as being the way the meeting should take place. He had no objections.

If issues of this nature are going to be brought up then they should be based on articles of fact and evidence to back them up.

Job Description - Volunteer Fire Chief Second Reading 1/21/14

Purpose of the Job:

Reporting to the Judith Basin Fire Dist. (JBFD) Board of Directors, the fire chief will administer, plan, direct and control all aspects of the fire company including administration, fire suppression, and fire prevention activities of the department as authorized by the JBFD. The fire chief will also administer applicable local, fire regulations. Administrative duties comprise planning, directing, and controlling all fire company activities including recruitment of personnel, and the assignment of personnel and equipment in cooperation and consultation with the JBFD. The fire chief consults with the JBFD on issues of policy and planning, purchase of equipment, control of expenditures and preparation of budget estimates but works independently in supervising technical operations.

Duties and Responsibilities:

- Plan direct and supervise through subordinate officers the activities of the fire department as specified in the Fire Department Establishment and Control Bylaw.
- Establish and implement Operational Guidelines based on best practices and OH&S regulations.
- Have training programs implemented in accordance with accepted standards to improve the understanding and skill of all staff in firefighting.
- Ensure adequate records are kept of all required maintenance and training.
- Submit an annual budget and long-range plan and make expenditures within approved limits.
- Revise a long-range capital plan to keep pace with development in consultation with the JBFD.
- Ensure that all local government policies and processes are adhered to.
- Maintain an effective working relationship with all local government departments and carry out such additional duties as requested by the JBFD.
- Ensure that inquiries and complaints regarding fire department activities or responsibilities are handled promptly, efficiently, effectively and with courtesy.
- Liaise with representatives of neighboring fire departments
- Participate in the local and regional emergency planning process.
- Ensure all equipment is maintained in serviceable condition for community protection.

Organizational Relationship:

- The fire chief reports to JBFD

Recommended Qualifications:

Education/Training:

- Secondary School graduation
- Completed or enrolled in a recognized Officer Training Program or leadership program within one year of appointment.

Recommended Experience:

- A minimum of five (5) years with a fire department.
- Progressive responsibility level within the fire service.
- Previous management experience is an asset.

Occupational Certification:

- Valid driver's license for the state of Montana.

Knowledge:

- Knowledge of Fire Department Operational Guidelines, policies, procedures and applicable local bylaws, provincial codes, regulations, acts and standards.
- Knowledge and training in Incident Command System (ICS) minimum ICS 200.
- Knowledge of the community and fire protection area.

Skills & Abilities:

- Ability to be an effective leader
- Ability to organize & delegate
- Ability to effectively administer the operations of a volunteer fire department
- Ability to effectively communicate verbally and in writing and maintain positive public relations for the fire department and the governing body.
- Ability to supervise and participate in the preparation of all necessary reports, records and correspondence.
- Willingness and commitment to participate in training programs and workshops.

Be responsible for ensuring that all communications are understood and acknowledged.



MACo News

Robert's Rules of Order: Ten Myths about Parliamentary Procedure

Thousands of meetings occur every day, many claiming to follow *Robert's Rules of Order* when transacting business. How is it we know so little about this book that's so essential to meetings? In this guide are ten well-known "facts" about *Robert's Rules of Order*. But as Mark Twain warned, "It ain't what you don't know that gets you into trouble. It's what you know for sure that just ain't so."

Myth #1: Parliamentary Procedure Doesn't Matter

Most organizations dictate that a certain parliamentary book will be followed when transacting business. State laws often require that certain groups (governmental bodies, homeowner and condominium associations, nonprofits) follow specific rules or even *Robert's Rules* during meetings. Ignoring or incorrectly applying these procedures can lead to embarrassment, hard feelings, and even lawsuits.

Myth #2: Any Robert's Will Do

There are lots of books with "Robert's Rules" in the title. However, most of these books are earlier editions of *Robert's* or knock-offs. There's only one official *Robert's Rules*. The current book is *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised (11th Edition)*, published in 2011. If you follow the "latest edition" of *Robert's*, this is your book. Each new edition brings changes to procedure (the 11th Edition has 120 listed changes.)

Myth #3: Rules Are the Same for All Meetings

Rules aren't one-size-fits all. Problems are common when large meetings behave too informally or small meetings behave too formally. Rules

should be like clothes—they should fit the organization they are meant to serve.

Most parliamentary manuals provide that board meetings and membership meetings are conducted differently. Large meetings must be fairly formal. However, formality can hinder business in smaller bodies. As a result, *Robert's* recommends less formal rules for small boards and committees that include:

- No seconds to motions.
- No limits on debate.
- The chair can debate and vote.

Smaller boards that dislike this informality may wish to follow more formal procedures. Even informal boards may choose to be more formal on important or controversial matters.

Myth #4: Seconds Always Matter

A second to a motion implies that at least one other person wants to discuss the motion. If there is no second, there should be no further action on the proposal, so seconds have their place. However, after any debate on an issue, the lack of a second is irrelevant. Seconds from the floor aren't even required in smaller boards or on motions from committees.

Myth #5: Debate and a Formal Vote Are Required

Many noncontroversial matters can be resolved without debate through "general" or "unanimous" consent. Using this method, the presiding officer asks, "Is there any objection to ...?" For example, "Is there any objection to ending debate?" If no one objects, you're done. Debate is closed. If a member objects, the matter is resolved with a motion and vote. Unanimous consent allows an assembly to move quickly through non-contested issues.

Myth #6: The Maker of a Motion Gets to Speak First and Last

The maker of a motion has the right to speak first to a proposal.

Continued on page 6...



MACo News

Robert's Rules of Order:

Continued from page 5...

After that, the maker has no more rights to speak than other members. In fact, the maker cannot speak a second time unless everyone else who wishes to speak to the issue has had a chance.

Myth #7: "Old Business"

Opening up the floor to "Old Business" is not proper parliamentary procedure, and should never be done. First, "Old Business" is not a parliamentary term; second, it suggests a revisiting of any old thing ever discussed. The correct term to use is "Unfinished Business," which makes clear that you are referring to specific items carried over from the previous meeting. A presiding officer never needs to ask, "Is there any Unfinished Business?" but simply states the question on the first item. Annual meetings generally have no unfinished business.

Myth #8: Yelling Out "Question!" Stops Debate

The Previous Question (or motion to close debate) is often handled wrong. Shouting "Question!" from the back of the room is not only bad form, it's ineffective. The motion to close debate is just another motion. A member wanting to close debate must be recognized by the chair. The Previous Question requires a second and a two-thirds vote. Only the assembly decides when to end debate.

Myth #9: "Lay on the Table" Kills Sticky Issues

The motion to "Lay on the Table" temporarily delays a matter when some other urgent issue has arisen. Once the urgent matter is over, the group can resume the tabled matter. Because the motion to Table is undebatable and only requires a majority vote, it should not be used to get rid of a matter. *Robert's* provides that the motion is out of order if the intent is to kill or

avoid dealing with a measure.

Myth #10: The Chair Rules the Meeting

The chair is the servant of the assembly, not its master. Put another way, the chair can only get away with what the assembly allows. If the rules of the assembly are being violated, any member can raise a "Point of Order." Once the chair rules on the Point of Order, a member can Appeal from the decision of the chair. If seconded, the Appeal takes the parliamentary question away from the chair and gives it to the assembly. The assembly is the ultimate decider of all procedural issues.

If you lead or attend meetings that conduct business, you should learn at least the basics of *Robert's Rules* of parliamentary procedure. The benefits of a well-run meeting go beyond legal concerns. Proper procedure can turn long, confrontational meetings into short, painless ones. Eliminating these myths and educating your membership will bring your meetings more in line with proper procedure and result in shorter, more effective meetings. Have a great meeting!

By: Jim Slaughter, author of *The Complete Idiot's Guide to Parliamentary Procedure Fast-Track*

MACo Conferences

2015 Midwinter Conference

February 9-12 - Red Lion Colonial Hotel, Helena

2015 Annual Conference

September 20-24 - Holiday Inn, Missoula



Special Board Meeting

Oct. 6, 2014

Purpose of meeting: Interview candidates for trustee vacancy

Present: Tim Crosmer, Bruce Evans, Frank Fielder, Clayton Kaiser, Chris Stice, Bill Neilson, Charlie Kolar

Meeting called to order, went over questions (see attached interview questions) and procedure with board members. Proceeded with interviews. Interviewed in this order: Chris Stice, Bill Neilson, Charlie Kolar. When it came time to interview Kolar he withdrew his name. Board thanked him for coming in and being a part of the process.

Board went into deliberation on the two interviewed. Discussion took place.

Motion: Brue made a motion to recommend Bill Neilson to commissioners to fill the vacant position, Second by Clayton. Vote was 4 for 0 against. Motion passed.

No further business meeting was adjourn at 20:30.

Submitted by:

Tim Crosmer
Chairman

Crosmer, Tim

From: Crosmer, Tim
Sent: Tuesday, October 07, 2014 2:10 PM
To: Ostertag, Bonnie
Subject: Minutes from meeting
Attachments: Special Board Meeting.docx

Bonnie,
Here are the minutes from last night. If you see or think I should change something let me know. Thanks.

Tim

Crosmer, Tim

From: Crosmer, Tim
Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2014 9:44 AM
To: 'Bruce Evans'
Cc: frankfiedler5544@icloud.com; Clayton & Fern; Ostertag, Bonnie
Subject: RE: change of time for interviews

Bruce,

Thanks for the comments. We will be leaving the interviews to be held on Oct. 6th. That was a good day for the majority of the people involved. As for the questions I have been working with the county attorney on this. I've also been involved in 5-7 state interviews so I have a pretty good idea what we can and can't ask. But will keep your questions in mind.

Tim

From: Bruce Evans [<mailto:geysermt@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, September 29, 2014 9:18 AM
To: Crosmer, Tim
Cc: frankfiedler5544@icloud.com; Clayton & Fern; Ostertag, Bonnie
Subject: Re: change of time for interviews

I will be gone for work on the 6th, the 9th or 10th will work for me. If not please remember they all should be asked the same questions. I think the first ones should establish if they are qualified for the position. Like: are you a registered voter, what is your background, why do you want this position?

~Bruce

From: Crosmer, Tim
Sent: Monday, September 29, 2014 8:34 AM
To: Bruce Evans
Cc: frankfiedler5544@icloud.com ; Clayton & Fern ; Ostertag, Bonnie
Subject: Re: change of time for interviews

We have changed the date to oct 6 for the interviews at 7:30
Sorry for the second message but didn't know if everyone got the first one.
Tim

On Sep 25, 2014, at 9:29 PM, Bruce Evans <geysermt@gmail.com> wrote:

due the resent death of Bill Nielson's father in law and the funeral next week. I think the interview meeting date should be rescheduled.

~Bruce

From: Ostertag, Bonnie
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2014 3:02 PM