

**From:** Jason Gibb  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 20, 2009 12:23:24 PM  
**Subject:** Chief Officer & Structure - Option 3 (possibility)

Julie Anne / Pat,

I would like to propose a possible third option for consideration by the board with respect to the Chief Officer/structure. For want of a better term I've called it - "Enhanced Flexibility - existing structure"

I have thought on this for a while, but it became much clearer to me last night.

-----  
As such, and as an example to illustrate,

I would like to thank Chief Danek and the Board for approving a few recent overtime hours for Craig Moilanen.

These additional hours allowed Craig and myself to meet last night and review the new Wildland Hose Packs and the use of such etc.

Without this time allocation it would have been very difficult for us to have meet.

The knowledge transfer provided by Criag I deemed as critical in understanding how best to utilize our equipment as well as plans to address wildland fires. Hence I took time off from work to meet with him to review this system. That is, why buy equipment and then skip the knowledge transfer needed to use it best.

The recent "Big M" wildland fire (above the M) which I responded to is a good example of great equipment but missing knowledge. We (the FFR crew) were fortunate that we were able to piece things together in a round about way, and successfully put out the fire, but we could have been much more effective had we all been on the same page with the use of such equipment - wildland hose packs.

-----  
Thus to my idea

### **Enhanced Flexibility Option**

At present we (FFR) run into the issue of training schedules being mixed between 8-5 M-F and post business hours. As such, this process leaves big gaps where either the paid staff or volunteers are unable to attend. Thus we end up with attempting to solve this issue via a type of train the trainer plan, where the paid staff impart knowledge to a volunteer who then tries to pass this along to other members - all given mixed individual availabilities.

I am sure you can see the inefficiencies in such an approach.

By enabling more flexibility in the work schedules of the existing paid staff (not adding more staff) via overtime allocations, sliding schedules or a combination of both, the department could

gain significant efficiencies with minimal cost increases. I believe that such gains could be qualified when coupled to specific goals or tasks, much like the example I provided above. Thus addressing any concerns about "staff getting paid for doing what"?

Such selective flexibility might also be used as a stop gap to assist the department with DO (Driver Operator) coverage in the short and or long term, ie until such time as additional Volunteer DOs are trained and authorized.

Between Craig, Dave and Jeanette we have three DOs unavailable to the department except during M-F business hours. Even if they each took on one night or weekend shift per month as a DO, this would be a big improvement over current DO availability, ie, what we have today.

Since the DO incentive proposal meet with some adverse responses from the FFR members, utilizing the paid staff in a more flexible manor seems to be a rapid way to take the pressure off such discussions - at least in my opinion.

Overall - if this option proved successful, it could possible evolve into Option 3 for the **Chief Officer Position** ie Chief officer remains unpaid, is appointed by the board (as per options 1 & 2) to maintain performance and alignment with board/community goals, but has enhanced capabilities via a more flexible existing "Command Staff" comprising Craig (Ops/DO), Dave (Fire Inspector/DO) and Jeanette (BM/DO). Each of these "Command Staff" positions would be tied to performance reviews as well ( which i am sure they already are).

#### Pros

This option has an advantage of being the least disruptive to the department of the three, and likely the least costly. It also provides the board with the visibility needed, ie board appointed Chief(s), and reduces or eliminates the prospect of requests for additional paid staff, which seems to be of significant concern with Option 1 - paid Chief.

This option could be put in place (trial) almost immediately and take pressure off the evaluation on Options 1 and 2. The board could also act on this (with Chief Danek) immediately, eliminating any need for pseudo approval from FFR members.

#### Cons

Increased hours for the existing paid staff (but this is spread across 3 staff rather than 1)

Increased admin (pay) costs (but should be less than Option 1 or Option 2)

Board would need to reconcile any issues with employment issues (existing staff) - these could be solved.

Many Thanks

Jason