

**Excelsior Fire District Board
EFD Governing Board Meeting
Wednesday, December 15, 2004**

**24100 Smithtown Rd.
Lower Conference Room
6:00 P.M.**

MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Skrede called the meeting to order at 6:05 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Excelsior Fire District (EFD) Boardmembers: Chair Skrede; Boardmembers Bauman, Bolles, Hill, and Love

Also: EFD Chief DuCharme; EFD Captain Heiland, Firefighter Hoo, and Fire Marshal Anding

Also present: Deephaven: Administrator Young; Greenwood Administrator Whipple; Shorewood: Administrator Dawson and Tonka Bay Administrator Irvine

Absent: EFD Deputy Fire Chief George; and Captain Berglund

2. AGENDA APPROVAL

Chair Skrede reviewed the Agenda for the meeting. Boardmember Bolles requested Item 7B, Discussion by Mr. Bolles, be added to the Agenda for the evening.

Love moved, Hill seconded, approving the EFD Board Meeting Agenda as amended. Motion passed 5/0.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. November 15, 2004, EFD Board Meeting Minutes

Bauman moved, Love seconded, Approving the November 15, 2004, EFD Board Meeting Minutes as amended on Page 3, Item 6A, Paragraph 2, Sentence 2, change “V-8 gasoline engineer” to “V-10 gasoline engine, and on the same page, Paragraph 6, throughout the paragraph change “chassis” to “utility box” and on Page 8, Item 7A, Paragraph 8, Sentence 2, change “thus, would” to “thus, the installation of the duct would” Motion passed 5/0.

4. REPORT AGENDA

A. Monthly District Review for October, 2004

Chief DuCharme reviewed the monthly call data by city, noting the total number of calls for the District was 56 for the month of November and 729 total calls for the year.

B. Operating Committee Meeting Minutes of December 8, 2004

Chief DuCharme noted the Operating Committee meeting minutes reported Administrator Young and he had reviewed documents from Kraus-Anderson related to outstanding issues of dispute. He stated a detailed report would be made available to the Board later in the meeting.

EFD GOVERNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

December 15, 2004

Page 2 of 11

Love moved, Hill seconded, Approving the Report Agenda as presented. Motion passed 5/0.

5. MATTERS FROM THE FLOOR

Captain Heiland questioned the process utilized by the Board regarding seeking firefighter membership input on the Fire Chief's performance review.

Chair Skrede stated there were two avenues made available for feedback, with the first opportunity for feedback being reported through the EFRA trustees. The second opportunity was at the discretion of any firefighter wishing to contact a Boardmember directly. Boardmembers also contacted random firefighters to seek input as well.

Boardmember Love stated the consensus of the Board, after beginning the Fire Chief performance review process, was that a formal communication process needed to be a part of the review process for next year.

Chief DuCharme stated he thought the process could be clarified for the membership at the October or November EFD General meeting of the membership to explain the process for collecting firefighter input.

Boardmember Bauman stated a simple form reflecting the criteria included in the Fire Chief's performance review should also be made available to all firefighters. Firefighter Hoo agreed.

Mayor Love stated the communication process should be discussed as a matter of process. He suggested this item should be placed on a future Agenda of the Board so that all parties wishing to discuss the communication process could be present prior to the process being implemented for next year.

6. FIRE CHIEF REPORT

- A. General Report**
- B. Operating Report by the Deputy Chief**
- C. East, West, Navarre**
- D. Fire Marshal**
- E. Items and Tasks from the Previous Meeting**

Fire Chief DuCharme stated Agenda Items 6A through E could be discussed as part of the General Report. He also noted the Report would begin with Station and Fire Marshal reports.

Deputy Chief Heiland provided the East Station report noting there were thirteen firefighters reporting directly to that Station, and three members would be taking an Emergency Medical Training (EMT) test in January. The EFD had received applications for five new firefighters for the East Side Station, however, none of them lived close to the Station, and Firefighter I classes would begin January 18, 2005. He also noted the matters remaining to be fixed at the East Side Station, such as the truck fill, had been ordered by Chief DuCharme and would be operational soon. In addition, the Utility Vehicle for the East Side Station had been ordered, and it would be available in February 2005. The price for the chassis was \$24,457.00, and the box for the truck had been ordered at a cost of \$7,070.00.

Fire Marshal Anding next provided a monthly information report on the Prevention Division statistics for the month of November 2004.

EFD GOVERNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

December 15, 2004

Page 3 of 11

In the absence of Deputy Chief George, Chief DuCharme reported the EFRA held its annual "Visit with Santa", and Deputy Chief George had wished to express gratitude on behalf of all firefighters for this outstanding fun family event. He also explained repairs had been made to Boat 11, and this boat remained in service at this time as there was open water on the lake. Firefighters were also scheduled to receive tuberculosis testing as part of the Health Surveillance protocol for the District. He also noted a position of Captain would be posted for application. This appointed position included a two year term of service.

In the absence of Captain Berglund, Chief DuCharme reported on the activities of the Navarre Station. He explained there were fourteen possible recruits for the Navarre Station with an agility test taking place in the next week as the first step in the firefighter training process.

With regard to the General Report of the Fire Chief, Chief DuCharme reported on matters related to General Conditions to be fully discussed in Item 7 of the Agenda this evening. In addition, Chief DuCharme reported he had spoken with several local banks regarding financing options available for the utility vehicle to be purchased for the East Side Station.

Discussion ensued by the Board regarding potential financing options available. Administrator Dawson suggested it might be prudent for the District to work with a financial advisor on this matter.

Fire Chief DuCharme next explained the need for an updated Cooperative Agreement between the EFD and the Lake Region Mutual Aid Association for Fire Personnel and Equipment.

Love moved, Bauman seconded, Adopting RESOLUTION NO. 2004-12, "A Resolution Approving the Agreement for Joint and Cooperative Use of Fire Personnel and Equipment."

Boardmember Hill noted the wording in the fourth paragraph of the Resolution needed correction. He noted the words "Mayor and City Manager" should be changed to "EFD Governing Board Chair and Fire Chief" and the "Adopted By the City Council" clause immediately following that paragraph should be changed to "Adopted by the EFD Governing Board." Boardmember Hill also stated it would be prudent to have an attorney review this document for legalities. Chief DuCharme stated this document had been reviewed by the League of Minnesota Cities' legal counsel and he personally did not believe it necessary to go to the expense of an attorney.

Without objection of the seconder, the maker of the motion amended the motion to Adopt Resolution No. 2004-12, subject to the language changes noted and contingent upon legal review of the liabilities section of the Agreement. Motion passed 5/0.

Lastly, Chief DuCharme stated there would be a Work Session Meeting of the Board on January 12, 2004 at 6:30 P.M. at the West Side Station for discussion of 2005 Goals and Objectives of the Fire Chief. Boardmembers should submit topics for discussion and other Agenda items to Boardmember Bauman prior to that meeting.

Boardmember Hill questioned the information provided by Braun Intertec regarding the floor capacity test results for Station 2. He noted the testing information requested pertained more to the quality of the concrete flooring rather than testing the design of the floor, and for this reason, he thought this question should be answered by the architect responsible for the project that was present this evening.

EFD GOVERNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

December 15, 2004

Page 4 of 11

Mr. Ruehl, of TSP One, Inc., stated while he did not have specific statistical data on this matter with him this evening, he would provide the answer to the Board at the next Regular Governing Board meeting held at the end of January 2005.

With regard to the paging malfunction from Hennepin County, Chief DuCharme shared several communications with the Board related to the technical aspects requiring remedy for the system. He noted representatives working on this matter at Hennepin County had recognized the problem and were working to solve the remaining technical issues. Concern still remained for appropriate redundancies in the system and the County had been working on notification of the Fire Chiefs for an alternative paging process.

Discussion ensued by the Board regarding this matter. Boardmember Bauman stated it would be prudent to have the Chief review the process of redundancies to be utilized as it was still being established by the County and simply report back on this matter at the next Board meeting.

Chief DuCharme then reported the water fill mechanisms would be installed in the next few days at the East Side Station.

With regard to the solution shared by TSP One, Inc., for remediation of the air intake louver, Boardmember Bolles stated he thought the design to be conceptually better, however, he thought it was still lacking in two areas. Specifically, he thought the design lacked long-term durability in dealing with the elements of weather, and he was concerned for issues related to the color clad painting necessary to match the rest of the building. He stated he thought modifications were still needed and should have been taken care of in the original design.

Mr. Ruehl stated Mr. Schuelke, the architect responsible for this issue, stated he had agreed with Boardmember Bolles at the onset of the project, however, the Board had specifically requested alternatives be utilized to provide cost saving measures. He noted there were several options available for modification to the louver at an increased cost. One such option included the interior baffle system, as suggested by Boardmember Bolles; however, it would cost twice as much as what had been utilized. The design utilized had been used in many projects; however, it had not been designed with snow in mind. He noted improvements could be made to the design of the louver, and repainting would be necessary in seven to ten years. He also stated there were several solutions that could be staged at various points in the life span of the building.

Chief DuCharme stated he, Boardmember Bolles, and the architects from TSP One, Inc., could continue to meet to bring resolution to this issue.

Boardmember Love stated he would prefer this matter was handled in that process, as he thought it was important to have concerns met, however, he did not wish to review this item any further for micromanagement purposes.

With regard to the 2004 Apparatus Usage chart provided by Chief DuCharme at the direction of the Board, Boardmember Hill stated he would be happy to meet with Chief DuCharme to provide additional criteria for analysis of the apparatus, such as hours of usage for each piece of apparatus, as this information was not part of the report provided.

With regard to the financing options for the purchase of the utility vehicle currently ordered by the District, Chief DuCharme stated it would be helpful to meet with the Operating Committee for a full review of the financing options and come to the Board with a recommendation on how best to proceed at the January 26, 2004, Governing Board meeting.

EFD GOVERNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

December 15, 2004

Page 5 of 11

Chief DuCharme stated he had an additional request for expenditure for the District for a thermal imager. He stated this piece of equipment was extremely beneficial at the scene of a fire as it allowed the firefighters to quickly assess a fire and plan the best method of attack. He stated this request had been brought forward by the EFD Officer group, and he fully supported the recommendation. He noted the EFD currently owned one thermal imager, but thought it important to have one at each Station to better handle firefighting duties.

Love moved, Bauman seconded, Purchasing the Thermal Imager, and holding discussion on funding options at the January 26, 2004, EFD Governing Board meeting.

Boardmember Hill stated, while the need for the equipment was beyond reproach, he would like to see a proposal for purchase prior to funding.

Discussion ensued regarding the best method of funding for the thermal imager.

Without objection of the seconder, the maker of the motion amended the motion to include purchase of the thermal imager from EFD District funds. Motion passed 5/0.

Fire Chief DuCharme thanked the Board for support of this purchase. Firefighter Sweeney agreed.

Without objection from the Board, Chair Skrede moved forward with Item 8A1, Relief Association.

Doug Sweeney, President of the Excelsior Firefighters' Relief Association (EFRA), shared revised SCO4 forms submitted to the State from the EFRA. He explained the Orono monies allocated by the Board could not be included in the accounting forms due to the State by August 1, 2004, as a result of the chronology of events regarding that allocation. He then explained the revised forms and Year to Date totals as of December 10, 2004, for the firefighters' pension fund to the Board. Mr. Sweeney explained he was present this evening, on behalf of the EFRA membership, to request the Board approve an increase in the base pension for the EFRA firefighters from \$4700 per year to \$5000 per year. He stated the fund could easily accommodate the increase and he had reviewed several accounting options for various allocations and still found the fund could support the increase.

In response to Boardmember Bauman's question of history of liability for the fund, Mr. Sweeney stated, of the ninety-three year history of EFRA, there were only three instances, in the past three years, where the financial markets had required the EFRA to request member municipalities to make contributions to the fund.

Boardmember Love stated when the EFD was formed; the EFRA had shown its support for the formation of the District throughout the training, recruitment, and retention process. He noted there was a ninety year history with the fund that had sustained itself through various market inconsistencies. Attrition would also help the fund to grow, and it was important to remember the dedication and loyalty the firefighters consistently demonstrated to the member cities throughout the years.

Love moved, Bauman seconded, Authorizing the EFRA to increase its member benefits for the EFD membership from \$4700 per year of service to \$5000 per year of service with the increase to be effective January 1, 2005.

Boardmember Bolles stated he was concerned for the future projections based on the inclusion of the Orono monies, as that money would not be available after 2007.

EFD GOVERNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

December 15, 2004

Page 6 of 11

Mr. Sweeney stated he had calculated several projections for the fund and no deficit was shown until 2008 with the increase to \$5000, and related increases in benefit of \$150 per year of service over the \$5000.

Chair Skrede stated he was uncertain why this had not been presented to the Operating Committee for recommendation. In addition, he stated he was not certain if the projected 2008 shortfall was due to the funding from the Orono monies or the two percent contributions allocated as part of the formula for current funding.

Motion failed 2/3, with Bolles, Hill, and Skrede dissenting.

Boardmember Bolles stated the Excelsior City Council had questioned whether the EFRA would accept a smaller increase of \$200 per year at this time.

Bolles moved, Authorizing the EFRA to increase its member benefits for the EFD membership from \$4700 per year of service to \$4900 per year of service with the increase to be effective January 1, 2005.

Boardmember Bolles stated the EFRA needed to be fiscally responsible to all member cities. Mr. Sweeney explained interest estimates of 3% were included in the EFRA accounting, which was considered very conservative and most likely inaccurate as the market typically provided higher yields than 3% on invested monies.

Motion failed for lack of a second.

Boardmember Love stated he thought this issue should appear on an Operating Committee Agenda prior to review by the Board for future requests. Chief DuCharme stated this issue had been part of the Operating Committee Agenda prior to August 1, 2004.

Chair Skrede stated his vote reflected the views of his Council. In principle, the Deephaven City Council was not opposed to the increase; however, it believed the timing of the increase would be better handled at the end of 2005 when numerous issues, such as staffing, were settled out.

Skip Sweeney, also of the EFRA, questioned what specific concerns would change to appease the Council next year. Chair Skrede stated the equipment expenditures would be resolved, as would a firm number of firefighters for the East Side Station versus full staff and the amount of training expenses related to new recruiting measures. He also noted the approval date would not necessarily impact the start date of the increased pension as it could be retroactive to any start date deemed appropriate.

Boardmember Love stated there were no East Side or West Side firefighters within the District, only District firefighters.

Chair Skrede stated the issue of concern was not an East Side or West Side issue; rather it was one of training and understanding the financial impacts of a fully staffed department. He stated the Deephaven City Council wished to have resolution of those issues prior to approving an increased pension amount that would have a substantial impact on the future.

Boardmember Bauman stated, he too, did not want to place the community service area in a liability position. However, he also noted there had been a ninety-three year history with many years of municipal contributions not needed. He stated he would like to think this issue was not one of politics. He stated he based his vote on past history and what he believed to be a fair

EFD GOVERNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

December 15, 2004

Page 7 of 11

compromise to all parties involved. He stated he was concerned about the optimal number of firefighters, as well as what was needed by the District and how many were serving the District.

Boardmember Love stated there was a bit of history to this issue that many newer Boardmembers might be unaware of at this time. He went on to explain that upon the inception of the EFD, the Board and EFRA heard concerns expressed regarding the expansion and subsequent related pension issues as a result of that expansion. He stated the Board and EFD took on the responsibility of increased pensions and firefighters at the time the decision was made to form a District through the Joint Powers Agreement. In addition, he did not see the firefighters requesting a huge increase; rather it was within realistic parameters for all parties.

Boardmember Bolles stated while it was true there were only three years where contributions were requested from member cities, the requests had come in the past three years. He stated the vote by the Board this evening was not "fatal", as the EFRA could return at any time and make the request. He stated the City of Excelsior Council was willing to support an increase at a reduced amount.

Mr. Sweeney stated he was extremely disappointed in the action of the Board, as the EFRA has been sitting stagnant for the past four years with no increases to pensions. He stated he was a bit confused because the member cities were not contributing to the EFRA through the cities' budgets for the firefighters' pensions. He questioned what more the Board representatives would want the EFRA to provide to mitigate concerns.

Firefighter Hoo, Trustee for the EFD and EFRA, stated there were a number of discussions held when the Task Force met at the time of formation of the EFD regarding the idea that member cities might not want to approve an increase in benefits due to expansion. All parties involved at that time took on an obligation and responsibility to provide benefits to firefighters. He stated he was also extremely disappointed in the Board's action this evening, as the EFRA had requested a very modest increase in benefit. He stated the District had been very fortunate to have the Orono contract to soften the monetary contributions for the member cities, and even without that money, the EFRA would be present this evening with the same request. He stated the EFRA had gone to a lot of effort to justify and explain this issue to all parties in recent months, and the Board's action did not demonstrate a great deal of support for the firefighters.

Chief DuCharme stated he supported the EFRA request for increased benefits. This increase presented itself as a recruiting tool, and through the years the EFRA had been told it could come forward with this request. He stated he applauded the EFRA for its realistic request, and he thought the Board needed to take this into consideration. He stated an increase would provide a huge morale booster for the firefighters and would demonstrate enormous support for the firefighters from the Board and its representative cities.

Boardmember Bolles stated he would like to see some adjustment made; however, he thought the District was putting a lot of money into morale at this point.

Shorewood Administrator Dawson stated he was aware of the past history with the EFRA and the EFD Board at the inception of the District. He stated even at that time the EFRA was being careful to ask for realistic increases. He stated the EFRA continued to work on this same principle as demonstrated by the fact the program would be fully funded after adjustments were made, and still the EFRA did not seek the statutory maximum allowed.

Chair Skrede stated he would report this discussion to the Deephaven City Council at the next regularly scheduled meeting of that Council.

EFD GOVERNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

December 15, 2004

Page 8 of 11

Mr. Sweeney stated the Board had stated it understood the issue, and explanations had been supplied to all with questions. There were no member city contributions being requested at the end of the year, and he questioned the real issue remaining.

Chair Skrede, on behalf of the Board, thanked him for his time and attention to this matter.

7. FACILITIES

A. TSP and Kraus-Anderson

Chief DuCharme explained there had been several letters of correspondence from Kraus-Anderson, and TSP One, Inc., regarding the General Conditions as well as remaining invoice amounts for construction of the East and West Side Public Safety Facilities. He stated he had met with Deephaven City Administrator Young and reviewed boxes of documents associated with the General Conditions questions posed by the Board. He also stated he was concerned because Staff had reviewed the documents and attempted to provide answers to the Board through the information presented this evening, and he did not believe there was anything more that could be done at a Staff level to remedy the remaining issues of dispute. He stated Staff had met with representatives of Kraus-Anderson as explained in their letters regarding the General Conditions issues, and at this point, he believed the final invoice submitted was accurate and should be paid. He went on to state the invoice submitted for the General Conditions amount had been "payroll driven."

Chief DuCharme then reviewed a spreadsheet of hours worked for each member of the management staff on the project, noting the overlap in project hours for East and West Station construction. He stated Staff had no answer for the increase in General Conditions other than the project took longer than originally estimated, and General Conditions for the project were time-driven.

Chair Skrede recessed the meeting at 9:47 P.M., and reconvened at 9:55 P.M.

Chief DuCharme stated the question before the Board was whether the timeline justified the change in General Conditions.

Boardmember Hill stated the Board had contested an item, and at this point in time, he still thought the item remained a contested item of dispute. He questioned whether the Board had a legitimate dispute.

Chief DuCharme stated at this point in time, Kraus-Anderson could make a legal claim that would place the EFD in binding arbitration. He noted he was not certain the SLMPD would support the EFD in arbitration, since the contract for the project was essentially time and materials. He stated he was uncertain of the stance to be taken by the Shorewood Economic Development Authority (EDA); however, the Board had heard from EDA representatives in the past that the EDA would not put the City of Shorewood at risk for the project.

Discussion ensued regarding the best method of moving forward on this issue of dispute.

Hill moved Love seconded, to table the discussion on Item 7A and move to Item 7B, and 7C, and then return to Item 7A for further discussion. Motion passed 5/0.

B. Discussion by Mr. Bolles

EFD GOVERNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

December 15, 2004

Page 9 of 11

Boardmember Bolles stated he and other representatives of the SLMPD Coordinating Committee, and the EFD had met earlier in the construction process to review change orders. He stated at this point in time he wanted to bring to the mind of the Boardmembers two specific change orders for additional discussion. The first change order was for the ice and water shield associated with the roof of the West Side Station. He noted there were three or four invoices for this item that did not match up in information provided for services. He noted the Board had approved payment for this item twice, with different amounts being paid each time. He noted there was no detail provided on the receipt for services rendered, and he did not believe the EFD was receiving credit for approximately \$3000.

Administrator Dawson explained the EDA had issued two memoranda on this matter explaining the billing for this item.

Chair Skrede questioned whether the Board was satisfied with the level of detail provided for the charge for services.

Boardmember Hill stated he thought the contractor should have paid for this error rather than having it be paid from the contingency portion of the project.

Boardmember Bolles stated the second change order issue involved the 300 foot handrail for the West Side Station. He noted several discussions were held with the architect, Tom Schuelke, for the project, with regard to whether the handrail could have been constructed as designed. Boardmember Hill stated he thought the way the change order was handled with unacceptable and the Board agreed to payment on this issue too easily.

Chair Skrede stated this issue had been raised two months ago in an attempt to bring remedy to the situation. The question remained if what had been designed would have worked, than why was a change order necessary. He then questioned the Board whether these items should be pursued.

Boardmember Love stated he appreciated and admired Boardmember Bolles' attention to detail, however, he believed that the macro process of change orders as established by the Board earlier in the process had handled these matters appropriately. He also stated the Board had responded to each of these change order issues raised by Boardmember Bolles on two previous occasions.

Love moved, Bauman seconded, Closing the Discussion on all Change Orders, with the exception of procedural audits, etc. Motion passed 3/2, with Bolles and Skrede dissenting.

C. Consideration of Construction Invoices

Love moved, Bauman seconded, Accepting the Invoices and Paying the Bills for closeout of the construction project for the East and West Side Public Safety Facilities, subject to any procedural audits deemed necessary.

Boardmember Bauman stated he had heard facts and speculation regarding various aspects of the project; however, he was not sure of the truth being told in all cases.

Boardmember Love clarified for the Board his intention in the motion to mean that sometimes audits can come forward and claims filed, and the intention of the motion was to allow those actions to take place. Furthermore, he stated he heard interesting points regarding the process, however, there was not anything heard to stop the payment of the bills. He thought the Board's time should be spent moving forward with other Board business items, and it was time to move onward.

EFD GOVERNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

December 15, 2004

Page 10 of 11

Boardmember Hill stated he really appreciated the concept that all parties wanted to pay the bills and move forward, and he also appreciated closing the construction aspects of his responsibilities as a Boardmember and moving forward with the duties of the EFD Board outside the construction arena. He also stated it was important to recognize that construction was not complete on West Side Station and there were remaining issues of dispute on the East Side Station, however, as long as the EFD was not prevented from filing any necessary claims on the project in the future, he thought it was the correct action to take by the Board.

Boardmember Bolles stated to prove anything more than what the Board was currently aware of would be very difficult.

Without objection from the seconder of the motion, the maker of the motion moved that the motion be amended to include the understanding that any claim on behalf of the EFD, could be filed as suggested in Item 4, Paragraph 1 of the Operating Committee Meeting Minutes dated December 8, 2004.

(For clarity the paragraph being referenced in the motion was stated as followed:

If [the EFD Chief and Administrator Young] were not able to make sense of the information provided, it is recommended that the Board request an auditor to review the information. It is also recommended that the Board seek an opinion of legal counsel as to the grounds for an arbitration case and the financial obligations of such action, to include the effect it may have on the Shorewood Economic Development Authority.)

Motion passed 4/1, with Bolles dissenting.

1. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Old Business

1. Relief Association

This item had been discussed prior to Item 7 on the Agenda this evening.

B. New Business

There was no new business presented this evening.

C. Fire Chief Review

1. Executive Session

2. Personnel Issues

9. NEXT MEETING

A. Board Meeting January 26, 2005; 6:30 P.M. WEST SIDE STATION

B. Work Session, January 12, 2005, 6:30 P.M

Chief DuCharme noted the dates of the next Board meeting and the upcoming Work Session meeting in the month of January, 2005.

10. ADJOURNMENT

EFD GOVERNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

December 15, 2004

Page 11 of 11

Love moved, Hill seconded, Adjourning the EFD Governing Board Meeting of December 15, 2004, to Executive Session at 11:00 P.M. Motion passed 5/0.

Chair Skrede convened the Executive Session Meeting to order at 11:10 P.M. All Boardmembers and Chief DuCharme were present.

Without objection from the Board, Chair Skrede proceeded with the Agenda for the Executive Session Meeting. Chair Skrede noted the purpose of the meeting was to complete the review of the Fire Chief.

A discussion was held by the Board and Chief DuCharme regarding personnel issue regarding the resignation of Fire Marshal Scott Anding. Fire Marshal Anding announced he would be leaving the District on January 28, 2005 for family opportunities in Ohio.

Bauman moved, Love seconded, Adjourning the Executive Session Meeting to the Regular EFD Governing Board Meeting at 11:35 P.M. Motion passed 5/0.

Bolles moved, Hill seconded, Adjourning the Regular EFD Governing Board Meeting at 11:35 P.M. Motion passed 5/0.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Sally Keefe,

Recording Secretary