

Bigfork Fire District Trustee

Special Meeting

October 16th, 2019

Trustees: Dan Elwell, Robert Borges, Andrew Sliter, Gary Wilson

Guests: Cindy Norred, Jeremy Patton

Tracey Gembala, KC Cox, David Randall

1. Call Meeting to Order/Pledge of Allegiance: 17:06
2. General Public Comment: None
3. Update on Engine 331 Repairs: KC Cox with Montana Truck Works gave update and truck is back in service.
4. **Board Action on Complaints of Internal Procedures:** Going to convene to closed session and come back to this line item.
5. Convene into closed session pursuant to MCA 2-3-203 (3) 17:22 went to Close Session.
6. Convene back into open session: 18:37 back to open session.

Actions on #4:

Board: The board does not want Employee "A" to feel anything other than grateful from the board to bring these matters to their attention, Employee "A" did the right thing. It is a tough situation Employee "A" is in. Board explained they will go through the Findings and Rebuttal Employee "A" Grievance Step 2, 9/10/2019 one by one. Board will give Employee "A" a chance to speak at the beginning, the board may or may not respond, going to work their way through it, hopefully in a comfortable setting. Board explained that we are all here for the same reasons, we love this town, this department and everyone here has the right intentions.

Employee "A": Employee "A" explained the reason they did not want to speak with the chief is that they truly believe that he has called them a liar and accused Employee "A" of things

that they have not done, and Employee "A" feels that Employee "A" should not have to sit there arguing and having him do circles around Employee "A". Employee "A" just received the letter (Findings and Rebuttal Employee "A" Grievance Step 2, 9/10/2019) yesterday afternoon and has not really had any time really read over it. Employee "A" stated that they were never questioned or asked anything that happened to them from the first complaint. The board was given information only from the chief as to what happened between the chief and Employee "A". Employee "A" was never questioned by the board and was let down. Decisions were made that the chief could handle the whole situation. The chief has accused Employee "A" of going to the board if Employee "A" does not get their way. Employee "A" stated they never went to the board. The chief was the one that went to the board in March. Employee "A" explained they tried to work it out with the chief. Employee "A" explained that the chief never took care of the situation back in March, he never came to Employee "A", for two weeks, ignoring Employee "A" and then one morning Employee "A" told Employee "B" she could not do it anymore. Employee "B" had asked if Employee "A" wanted to have a meeting and Employee "A" said yes. Employee "B" had the chief and Employee "C" come in and Employee "A" explained in that meeting that Employee "A" couldn't do their job and needed to be backed up and work as a team. In the rebuttal it says Employee "A" never tried. Employee "A" explained that the board has no idea of the small pittance of things that have been going on and Employee "A" has let a lot of it all go. Employee "A" is trying to follow the SOGs and the state and Flathead County protocol. Employee "A" follows the state, flathead valley protocols and gets yelled at or in trouble for that. Employee "A" is told they are too stern, so Employee "A" has asked to please be told how to do their job. Employee "A" would like for it to be put in writing, because Employee "A" wants something to fall back on in case someone questions them so Employee "A" can show them what they are supposed to do. Employee "A" also wants direction, when Employee "A" has questions about HIPAA violations and PCR errors, Employee "A" is only trying to help keep people out of trouble. Employee "A" says the chief states that Employee "A" demands in the rebuttal. Employee "A" questions what kind of leader would allow a peon employee like Employee "A" to go and demand things of the chief and still leave Employee "A" with a job? Employee "A" explains that the rebuttal is full of lies and Employee "A" deals with it daily. Employee "A" deals with the chief telling Employee "A" one thing and then turning around and saying I never told that, that why Employee "A" wants something in writing. Employee "A" explained that the chief has allowed Employee "A" to do certain things and Employee "A" feels that they have tried to do a good job. Employee "A" asked what kind of leader will fault a good employee for doing a good job or doing something that isn't done. Employee "A" explained they have been dealing with this for over two years and never once came to the board. Employee "A" has tried to do a good job and work it out. Employee "A" asked, "what do I do?"

Board: Board appreciates from hearing from Employee "A". Board will go through each one and comment on it. Once done Employee "A" will be allowed a short statement at the end.

1. Board is willing to reevaluate the implacability of the operating environment within the SOG (335.02). A motion was made to place on board's agenda to receive in typical fashion commentary related to this SOG and revise or retain current language as necessary. Sliter (1st), Borges (2nd) all in favor, none opposed.
2. Compliant was handled. A motion was made to take no further action. Sliter (1st) Wilson(2nd) all in favor, none opposed.
3. Will not continue that practice. Correct action has been taken. A motion was made to take no further action. Sliter (1st) Borges (2nd) all in favor, none opposed.
4. SOG (110.05), (110.05.6) stands, our medical director strongly recommends ACLS. Actions have been taken. A motion was made to bring SOG (110.05), (110.05.6) to board for review for its current applicability. Sliter (1st) Wilson(2nd) all in favor, none opposed.
5. Board had followed up and Employee "D" was not allowed to do that. As to the certification of Employee "D", the board has considered this matter to be addressed and no further action is required at this time. Sliter (1st) Borges (2nd) all in favor, none opposed
6. Posting was an error. Should be noted that you have 30days to get your license. Language will be change. Board will further modify future job posing descriptions as appropriate for timing of licensure, giving possibility of no residence applications so move that those modification be made. Sliter (1st) Borges (2nd) all in favor, none opposed

Board explained they have addressed each one.

Employee "A": Employee "A" explained that it is their job to bring information to the chief if something is not correct on a PCR or violation. How the chief takes care of it is up to him. Employee "A" explained they were not trying to get any of the people in trouble. Employee "A" explained they were trying to show the board that SOGs are not being followed or enforced by the chief of this department. ACLS or CPR, it does not matter, the polices were not being followed. The chief did not follow, once I brought to the chief. Employee "A" got yelled at for trying to follow the SOGs. Feels that there is a problem at the top. On Employee "D", Employee "A" explained that they had notified the chief that Employee "D" had signed their own card, chief agreed he would let it go this time, but once his cycle came up again, Employee "D" would have to do it correctly. Employee "A" did not dispute the chief or demand nothing. That was the decision that the chief had made and that was the end of it. Once Employee "D" CPR card was expired, Employee "A" notified Employee "D" Employee "A" needed a CPR card and notified the chief that Employee "D" had an expired CPR card, that's all. Only was just notifying him of expired card. Employee "A" feels that the chief is picking and choosing who is going to follow or be or not held accountable for not following a SOGs. Employee "A" feels that is a discrimination to Employee "D", wants it to be noted. Employee "A" believes Employee "D" was not treated the same as Employee "E". As far as the ACLS, this is something that has been going on since 2016. This has been a discussion at tables multiple times. Employee "A" points out if SOG says that it needs to be done, it needs to be done, if the chief doesn't do it that way, he is the chief he can say we are not going to do it that way, then Employee "A" wants their job in writing. If the chief doesn't want Employee "A" to follow SOGs and do it that way, then requesting it in writing. Employee "A" stated they are not taking any responsibility for the chief not performing his job. Would like direction or correct SOGs, guidance and has asked multiple time and is not getting it. Employee "A" explains they are trying to do the very best that they can but is hitting a brick wall. Feels the chief is accusing Employee "A" of things and want to know if it is going to be addressed. Board stated that it is not going to right now. Employee "A" wants to know then what happens next, that it is false accusation on the rebuttal. Employee "A" stated that they would look at each one of the board members and state these are false, lies and that is fact.

Board: Board explained that at this time they are only addressing the original compliant letter.

Employee "A": Employee "A" explained that the chief has put it in writing (on Rebuttal) and wants it addressed. It is in writing and he has accused Employee "A" of doing false things.

Board: The Board explained that they hope that Employee "A" feels that they have listened to her complaints and understand there is a separate issue. This meeting was designed to address the complaints. Have had a motion on each one of the complaints. The board appreciates it and corrective actions have been done. This concluded this part of open session of internal procedures.

7. General Public Comment: NONE

8. Motion to Adjourn: Borges (1st) Wilson (2nd) all in favor, none opposed.

Meeting adjourned at 19:21.

Minutes Approved: , Chairman-Dan Elwell

N/A, Recorder-Cindy Norred

By direction from legal counsel, the meeting minutes have been amended. The alterations made were to protect individual employee privacy rights.