



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Public Safety and Security
Department of Fire Services

P.O. Box 1025 ~ State Road

Stow, Massachusetts 01775

(978) 567~3100 Fax: (978) 567~3121

www.mass.gov/dfs



CHARLES D. BAKER
GOVERNOR

KARYN E. POLITO
LT. GOVERNOR

TERRENCE M. REIDY
SECRETARY

IAIN MCGREGOR
CHAIRMAN

CHIEF MICHAEL MANSFIELD
VICE CHAIR

**MASSACHUSETTS TECHNICAL RESCUE
 COORDINATING COUNCIL
 February 23, 2022
 Approved**

The Massachusetts Technical Rescue Coordinating Council held a hybrid meeting in accordance with the provisions of M.G.L. c. 30A § 20 on Wednesday, February 23, 2022, at 10:00 a.m. and open to the public virtually through WebEx videoconference.

Present at the meeting were the following Council members:

Iain McGregor, Chair
 Chief Michael Mansfield, Vice Chair
 Jeanne Benincasa Thorpe

Peter Ostroskey
 Chief Kevin Nord
 Peter Jerusik

Professional Fire Fighters of Mass.
 Fire Chiefs Association of Mass.
 Undersecretary for Homeland Security,
 EOPSS
 State Fire Marshal
 Fire Chiefs Association of Mass.
 Professional Fire Fighters of Mass.

Absent from the meeting were the following Commission members:

Russell Lewis

Member of the Statewide Tech. Rescue Team

DES Employees in Attendance:

Glenn Rooney, Legal Counsel
 Maribel Fournier
 David DiGregorio, Director

Korina Senior, Program Coordinator

Department of Fire Services
 Deputy State Fire Marshal
 Hazardous Materials Response and Special
 Operations
 Hazardous Materials Response and Special
 Operations

Other Attendees

Mark McCabe
 Neil Tuepker
 Jason Tierney

Region 1
 Region 1
 Region 2

Matt Belsito
Jason Saunders

Region 3
Region 4

1. Meeting Opening and Introductions

Iain McGregor, Chairman, opened the meeting at approximately 10:01 a.m. The Chairman introduced himself, followed by the introductions of the Council members, Department of Fire Services' employees, and public members in attendance.

2. Approval of January 26, 2022 Meeting Minutes

Chief Nord made a motion to accept the meeting minutes from the previous meeting held on January 26, 2022. The motion was seconded by Marshal Ostroskey. No discussion, unanimous roll call vote.

3. Discuss Tech Rescue Correspondence.

The Chair discusses an email that he sent to the Tech Rescue Leaders to encourage

4. Subcommittee Reports

- a. Joint Subcommittee meeting with the Training and Membership Subcommittees. Discussion on membership selection process and training qualifications of members. Send out to small groups within each region to discuss the needs of each region to come up with a points value when selecting members to select for the statewide team. Membership requirements may be modified once the initial members are selected. Some items may not apply as the program evolves. March 14th is the next joint meeting. Chief Nord references the motions made clarification email. Chair states it will be brought up in business.
- b. Equipment – Chief Mansfield mentions the next meeting is scheduled for February 28th and plan to have something to present to the council at the next meeting. HazMat equipment would not be needed for regional teams due to the resources from the statewide Hazmat Team. Director DiGregorio explains the resources available at a joint capacity.
- c. Policy – Unable to meet a quorum for both meetings scheduled. Committee members are working on incident reporting, accountability, operations, and team leader policies outside of meetings. This committee will need changes regularly as changes arise. Discussion on members commitment to the development of the program. Recommendation made to send a letter to the regions steering committees to find out if a member is no longer able to participate could they submit a new member in their place. Or an affirmation letter to the member to confirm if they can attend the meetings. Subcommittee chair to reach out initially. Chief Belsito suggests it may have more weight if a letter comes from the Chair or council. Peter to reach out to members again in a more official manner and then defer to the council if

needed.

5. Old Business

a. Waiting for data matrix recommendation from Policy Subcommittee.

Policy was not able to meet. The task is developing a policy for teams to report Tech Rescue response data in MFIRS and the council will vote.

6. New Business

a. Letter from Membership and Training Joint Subcommittee.

Drafted by Membership Subcommittee Chair, Russ Lewis, three motions made from January 13th meeting.

1. Members must be affiliated with a regional/district/County team. Those that have been dedicated should be given priority they have put in the time and dedication to the program already. Personnel have dedicated a lot of time training. At some point there may not be county teams to select members from. Question from Director DiGregorio, if someone from military or outside of a current team is interested would they be disqualified. Yes, at this time they would be.
2. Must be an active member of a fire department located in Massachusetts, unless an exception is voted on by a regional steering committee. Exceptions voted on to allow others such as doctors, engineers, etc. Marshal asked if there should be more specificity to the exceptions? Response: yes, there is concern that if it is too broad it may become an issue with having too many outside members on the team. Would we be able to bring in a subject matter expert for special situations? Yes, we have in the past. An industry expert for one time use is different than someone who would be on the team with a specialty to assist in a situation. Positions advertised at the national level would be filled by Fire Department level. If it is a capability a fire department has, the state tech rescue would not hire outside members for that task.
3. Form 80-member regional teams with emphasis on having balance across the region as determined by the regional steering committee. Discussed that each region would have a minimum number of people per specialty. Was there a matrix used to come up with 80? If you are going by financial matrix that is understandable. Geographical is significant. Population is different. 6 counties in southeast region, leaving only 13 per county. The northeast the population is doubled. Population geographically does not match the Chair states, 70 officially in the FEMA matrix for a type 1 team. Most other teams hold an 80-member team to keep the type 1 contingent. Question: why is a larger population needing a larger team? Due to the geography of region 1 and having the islands more members would be needed for island response.
There was a lot of discussion of the Western and Southeast are more geographically challenged areas for response.
Was historical call volume considered in the number of members per

region? Do we start with a set number across the state or a different number per region? Recommendation made to hold off on voting this until the subcommittee has a chance to review. There is concern it would be several months before we can know the call volume of tech rescue response per region. If we set to 80 members we could always come back and change it. Maybe coverage areas could shift in regions as the need arises. If we can settle on an initial number of members it would be a good starting point. Chief Nord feels it would restrict and lock in at 80 and is concerned the program would not be able to obtain additional funding as we found the need. Looking for 100 to be able to cover the needs and not be locked in at 80 due to future funding constraints.

Mark McCabe suggests the topic is sent back to the committee to discuss more on the other points like geography and population. Chief Mansfield agrees with the statement Mark made and add members to the 80 and discuss the second motion regarding the extra positions on the team. Items 2 and 3 are prohibiting us to do what we are doing now and will limit resources available. Marshal Ostroskey makes a motion to table this for further discussion at the subcommittee meeting. Seconded by Chief Mansfield. Unanimous vote.

Funding Review based on Membership Subcommittee Recommendations.

- **Justifications for requests.**
 - Equipment subcommittee is putting together their matrix recommendation.
 - Policy committee is putting together their team response policy.
 - Team membership sizes.
 - Defining what we want to use as benchmarks to get it done. Discussion about where we want to be at different times to plan and coordinate accordingly.
 - Marshal Ostroskey, we are getting a lot accomplished in the equipment and training subcommittees. If we can get a minimum status of each teams equipment and gather where the teams may be at and look at any grant opportunities to ensure the regions are trained and equipped to the minimum level.
 - HLS is looking for projects and turning to the council to find out what the teams need. It might be easier now to support HLS requests with the work the equipment subcommittee has completed.
 - Is there value pushing out to the steering committees? Are they having meetings? We need a better understanding of their meetings and what they are requesting. If the information came from them to us it

would be great to help with funding the regional steering committees. Chief Nord supports the request to reach out to the steering committees to find out what the local HLS paid out over the past 5 years.

- Are we in a position now to send the regional steering committees the baseline equipment list to communicate what we are looking for at a minimum? The equipment committee is taking a wholistic approach to put together a list of what is needed to respond safely as a team. Not looking at the regional needs individually currently.
- Training and Equipment are both important, but training seems more important since the teams are stacked with equipment. Project justifications submitted in 2021 have died off due to COVID. Joint training was approved and will be taking place. Funding request submitted 2 years ago, and the council looks at it for the needs for training.
- Motion made by Marshal Peter Ostroskey to send out communication to the steering committees, Seconded by Chief Nord. Peter Jerusik is no longer on the call. Unanimous vote.

b. Funding request plan/process.

7. Any matters not reasonably anticipated by the Chair.

Inquiry regarding ethic disclosure for two members of the council that also work for DFS.

8. Tasks/Assignments.

Subcommittee written reports as discussed in the meeting.

9. Future Agenda Items.

Council Disclosure.

9. Determination of future meeting date(s).

The next meeting will be Wednesday, March 30, 2022, at 10:00 a.m. Proposed having the meeting in person. Chief Nord agreed. No one opposed.

Chief Nord made a motion to adjourn. Chief Mansfield seconded. Roll call vote was made unanimously. Meeting adjourned at approximately 11:13 a.m.