



MEETING RECORD

Attending: Jim DeTienne, Kyle Thornton, Greg Brown, Keith Wages, Tom Nehring, Dia Gainor, Scott Winston, Gary Brown, Rob Seesholtz, Donnie Woodyard, Andy Gienapp, Dale Adkerson

Workplan – Reviewed, no discussion.

Advocacy Guide – Shortly before the meeting, members were supplied with a copy of an NRHA Advocacy Guide. Members generally felt that such a guide might be useful for NASEMSO to develop, but more time is needed to review the document and consider how a NASEMSO version might look. Further discussion was tabled until the next meeting.

Position papers / Liaisons – Jim observed that NASEMSO does not do position papers as much as some other organizations do; it's more common for NASEMSO to sign on to positions other organizations undertake. The question was asked if NASEMSO should be proactive in developing positions? Andy observed that state health officers lean heavily on anything ASTHO publishes (as an example). It seems that positions NASEMSO would take could also carry weight and benefit the states.

Jim transitioned to a discussion about who those key partners should be (FAA, DEA, ASTHO, FARB and government affairs staff from other associations were listed on the agenda). Keith suggested adding AAA and Andy recommended NOSORH, NGA, CSG, and NCSL. Dia described how FARB keeps us wired into federal legislation and Supreme Court cases. Tom Nehring suggested the National Rural Resource Center, NREMT, ACEP, AAMS and CoAEMSP.

Gary echoed Andy's comments and reflected that NASEMSO used to have an alphabet soup list of other organizations - some we still have a liaison role with; others not. Question was raised if we're tracking our liaisons? This might be a function of the GIC? Jim described that he built a database back when he was the President-Elect and he can go find the file and generate a report for the GIC to look at and discuss what liaisons are important to maintain for advocacy and collaboration.

EMS Field Bill - Jim invited restarting the discussion about the Field EMS Bill since NAEMT is certain to try to get it re-introduced. It's been controversial and divisive but question was raised how NAEMSO should engage members in a discussion about what our position is on the bill. Someone responded we need a larger discussion. Keith said he didn't think we have been on the wrong course to talk deliberatively and cautiously about it. We have relationships with federal agencies that would be impacted is a unique element of our discussions. Jim provided some historical perspective that NASEMSO supported through Advocate for EMS for some time. Putting all funding and activities of AEMS into the Field EMS Bill was part of Advocates undoing. Jim will talk to Paul about continuing on NAEMT's committee for that purpose. NAEMT and IAFC jointly facilitated a meeting to express the fire chiefs' interests and what would garner more support from their ranks.

EMS on the Hill Day – NAEMSO has typically contributed \$500-\$1000 for EMS on the Hill Day support. Dia asked about what the GIC's expectation for staff involvement. See item 9.

Committee discussed if NASEMSO staff and some members are able to interact with members/staff of Congress? Some directors related that they would never get the clearance to do so; their state's position is that's why they have national associations. Jim observed that because directors are nervous about doing it, maybe that's why we're nervous about doing it as an association. Dale observed that Dia could do it well, but what about the skill set of the next person? Discussion centered on the fact that our Articles of Incorporation preclude lobbying, but there are certainly times when some education through correspondence, a telephone call or a visit with a staff member may be appropriate. If Dia is asked to engage in such activities, she needs to know what process to go through for approval. Rob observed that collaboration with other organizations could get very big very fast, so we should prioritize. For significant partners like NAEMSP, we send staff to keep our ears to the ground about their issues and activities.

REPLICA - Jim reflected on the question raised at the December Board Retreat about Dia helping a state EMS director if they have a legislator who needs education. Andy said he said it's a great idea. One of the benefits of the association is being able to get information quickly. Having the ability for a state director to bring in a national expert (such as Dia for REPLICA) is an asset. Jim asked for a recap of REPLICA related inquiries. Dia shared that most questions have been technical in nature about bill drafting and connecting the states with CSG. Other states have asked Dia if she would interact with sympathizers, and in the case of requests from non-state EMS organizations, she will provide presentations, etc. but only with the permission of the state EMS director. Jim asked for consent that Dia's availability be documented in a memo approved by the Board and sent to state EMS directors.

Dia asked the GIC to consider discussion at a subsequent meeting about the evolution of the REPLICA Commission (or decide it is not in the scope of the Committee). Gary and Donnie weighed in that it's relevant. Committee recommended that GIC house a "legislative Q&As about REPLICA" web page as an asset to other states. For example, Gary could provide example of questions he is getting after Virginia's legislation goes through its process.

The recurrence of the meeting was reinforced and adjourned at 4:10 pm EST