



Utah Fire Service Certification Council Meeting Minutes

September 18, 2024, at 10 a.m.

Utah Fire and Rescue Academy, Room 147

1. Certification Council meeting called to order, by Council Chair Scott Spencer

The meeting was called to order by Scott Spencer at 10:01 a.m.

2. Welcome council members and visitors, by Scott Spencer

Members in attendance: Scott Spencer, Ron Harris, TJ Brewer, John Evans, Jeremy Raymond, Ted Black, Rod Kearnl, Krista Horting, Merlin Spendlove

Members who attended online: Wade Snyder, David Youngberg

Members not in attendance: David Olsen, Chris Trevino

Guest: Brad Wardle

3. Declaration of a quorum, by Scott Spencer (at 10:02 a.m.)

4. Approval of Certification Council meeting minutes from July 17, 2024, by Scott Spencer

John Evans motioned to approve the minutes for July 17, 2024, it was seconded by TJ Brewer, and the motion carried.

5. Approval of the September 18, 2024, Certification Council agenda, by Scott Spencer

Merlin Spendlove motioned to approve the agenda for September 18, 2024, it was seconded by Jeremy Raymond and Rod Kearnl, and the motion carried.

6. Report from Forestry, Fire and State Lands, by Wade Snyder

Wade Snyder showed the latest fire map of Utah, which showed 1,129 fires totaling 57,106 acres. These numbers were up-to-date with reported fires (from the Utah Fire Information home page, which is maintained by PIOs) from Utah's CADS interagency dispatch centers used for wildland fires. Five of the centers are located throughout Utah. He demonstrated the interactive map that shows active fires and new fires: the Canyons district of Moab, the Elizabeth Fire, Fish Lake, Silver King, etc.

He explained how Utah has a lot of fine fuel components from the wet spring that are now drying out.

Wade was asked if this number of fires is high, low, or normal. Wade described the season summary, comparing the last five years at season's end. Fires may be higher in number this year because of the very heavy fuel loading. In consecutive years of drought, you do not have that fuel load growth (as there is less grass). And if we don't have grass, there are fewer human-caused fires.

Northwest Utah had a special advisory for heavy growth of grass, a large fuel bed. Any spark starts a fire, and connecting fuels allow for fire to grow and spread.

Overall, they had a good year of initial attack, and they were good at keeping unwanted fires small this year.

7. Report on testing, certification, failed skills, and upcoming exams (3 months), by Jennifer Lindley

Certification Report: Technical rescue levels have increased our list as students test and are certified. With the new FileMaker, we can now report/track recertifications. We had a total of **3,200** certifications AND recertifications last quarter, in May, June, and July (1,362 were certifications and 1,838 were recertifications).

Scott Spencer asked if the 1,362 number compared apples to apples with the previous years of **542** (2023), **1,006** (2022), and **848** (2021). (Yes.)

Wade Snyder: Wildland Firefighter I and II are certified through UFRA, which requires the same NWCG credentials (completed NWCG certificates, task book, etc. as prerequisites). UFRA does not issue red cards. Approximately 3,650 people are qualified for red cards each year (accounted from those with qualifying NWCG refresher training and red cards signed, etc.).

Jennifer Lindley: The Failed Skills Report includes: ADO-Aerial, ADO-Pumper, Firefighter I, Inspector I (this includes 1st and 2nd attempts), and Officer I (this includes 1st, 2nd, and 3rd attempts). The report period is April–June 2024.

8. Report on Fire Prevention Board meeting, by Scott Spencer

It was a good, short meeting.

State Fire Marshal Ted Black: For the 2024 codes for adoption in the 2026 legislative session, a group was appointed: the FPB (for the fire code and to represent the fire service) and the Fire Advisory and Code Analysis Committee.

9. Reappointment of council members Scott Spencer and Merlin Spendlove at FPB, by Jolene Chamberlain

At the September 10 FPB meeting, Jolene requested the reappointment of Scott Spencer and Merlin Spendlove to the council for three years, and the Fire Prevention Board approved.

10. Discussion and motion to approve/review the following submitted portfolios, by Scott Spencer

Jessie McKenna (West Jordan), Officer II portfolio, is to be reviewed by Krista Horting

Abigail Smith, Fire and Life Safety Educator portfolio, is under review by David Olsen

11. Discussion and motion on submitted petitions, by Joan Aaron

- Lehi Fire Department letter from Ricky Evans, for Landon Flack and Stephen L. Johnson (recertification/certification)

Joan noted that UFRA administration received a letter from Ricky Evans, a training officer from the Lehi Fire Department, requesting recertification/certification for Landon Flack and Stephen Johnson. UFRA has records that Landon Flack passed both the written and skills exams for Officer I in April 2015, while he was working for Lone Peak FD. LPFD never requested certification. Then he moved to Lehi FD and they submitted his past training records. Stephen Johnson passed Officer I on 2/28/2015 and Instructor I on 4/16/2015. His department never requested certification for those two levels. We have copies of Flack's and Johnson's training records. Their training records go back to January 2018.

Ron Harris made a motion to approve certification for Stephen Johnson and Landon Flack, it was seconded by Krista Horting, and the motion carried. None were opposed.

- Brandon Shumway, a division chief with the SLC Fire Department, sent a letter requesting reciprocity for Kurt Sunada for Hazardous Materials Technician.

Kurt Sunada earned his Hazmat Technician certification from the International Association of Fire Fighters in August 2019. SLC did not request reciprocity at that time, due to an oversight on their part. He is their lead instructor for Hazmat Awareness/Operations and is also a full time Hazmat Technician in their department. The department included his current Hazmat Technician training record and his training hours with their department from January 2019 to June 2024. They are requesting reciprocity and recertification for him.

TJ Brewer made a motion to approve reciprocity for Kurt Sunada, it was seconded by John Evans, and the motion carried. None were opposed.

12. Discussion and motion regarding an extension for site visit reaccreditation (Jared Sholly), by Jolene Chamberlain

Davis Technical College's site visit reaccreditation is due in November. They have requested a six-month extension to get ready for the site visit required by UFRA. Their issue is a memorandum of agreement with their local fire department. Once that is in place, they will submit a self-study for review.

Jeremy Raymond asked how far out we allow an extension. Jolene mentioned that IFSAC and Pro Board do allow extensions for site visits (up to 6 months), so an extension does follow guidelines. UFRA has never been asked for extensions before.

Ted Black asked why the agreement was not in place already. Jolene said they are currently going through an accreditation process with another agency for the college and they are working through the legalities. They need to have a memorandum of agreement with a department to do skills and use equipment. Jolene mentioned that their last site visit was fantastic and had no academic problems.

Ted Black made a motion to approve, it was seconded by Rod Kearn and Ron Harris, and the motion carried. None were opposed.

13. Review and discussion regarding the new certification fee structure (five Certification Council members and Jolene Chamberlain met to review fees and budget needs), by Jolene Chamberlain and Brad Wardle

- Director Brad Wardle thanked Merlin and Scott for committing to another term on the Certification Council.
- *Winter Fire School* is January 24–25, 2025. Brad encouraged the council to be there.
- *The ARFF program* is in the development stages, and the goal is to be teaching it a year from now. The bids are due in about 12 days for building the props.
- *Wildland*: Dan Cather is stepping down as Wildland program manager. It's a good opportunity to examine the Wildland program. UFRA is not stepping back from Wildland.
- *Cancer Update*: We are working with a medical doctor from the University of Utah, with a secured location for testing. Now we're looking for funding by going to our state capitol—in the way of cancer legislation for the fire service of Utah. We're asking for approximately \$3.5 million dollars for the goal of testing firefighters (5–6 different tests, depending on gender). This is for early detection, so they can get treatment early. There is a support group in place now to help those affected navigate medical doctors and/or counseling. The cost is approximately \$3,400 per firefighter.

TJ Brewer thanked Director Wardle for pushing through and “taking care of us.”

The Utah FF Cancer Initiative is now on UFRA's website. A task force is in place: about 25 individuals with expertise in finance, research, legislative efforts, advocacy, and support. If council members are interested in working with them, they should let Brad know.

UFRA has cancer initiative challenge coins to help market this at Winter Fire School.

- *Fees*: A fees committee was formed at the last council meeting: Scott Spencer, TJ Brewer, Ron Harris, John Evans, Dave Owens, Krista Horting, and Chris Trevino. All costs will not be recovered with the fee increases. We reinvest funds back into our program.

Jolene Chamberlain said that Brad wanted to know what UFRA was spending in certification and do a deep analysis.

Jolene presented a chart with the costs of attempts, recertification, reciprocity, exams given, etc.

- Recertification fees: the fee will be raised from \$5 to \$25 for all levels
- Reciprocity was \$20 for each level. We want to raise it to \$200 for each *application* per individual. (Jolene researched what other entities were charging for reciprocity.)

- Currently, we do not charge for first attempts. Many candidates pass on the first attempt. We're not covering our costs.
- There are 30 technical rescue levels, and 90 percent of candidates who take the technical rescue levels pass on their first attempt (for free).
- With specialty levels (ADO, Officer, Fire Investigator, Fire Inspector, etc.), the majority of people pass on their first attempt.
- Jolene reviewed our last fiscal year budget, which is not covering our costs.
- Increasing fees to **\$75 for each attempt** (1st, 2nd, 3rd) will generate funds to cover costs for all specialty levels.
- There will be an increase in first-attempt fees from **\$0 to \$10** for *Firefighter I and II and Hazmat Awareness and Operations levels only*. The second-attempt fee will increase from **\$40 to \$50** and the third-attempt fee will increase from **\$60 to \$75**.
- Jolene researched the ratios for testing as well as costs for the two hours for written exams, plus skills hours and travel stipends, mileage, etc.
- Jolene's new budget request is \$178,000. This will assist with Certification Council meetings, IFSAC accreditation, Pro Board accreditation, 120 new iPads (we currently have 40), database development, SME meetings, equipment, and travel costs.
- *Jolene Chamberlain*: We don't want to stop certifying. That is why we kept the fee lower for those four levels (first attempts for \$10). What they get when they're certified is what led us to come to the first-attempt cost.
 - \$8.50 for Pro Board seal
 - \$1 for IFSAC seal
 - \$6.50 for patches

We are not covering all our costs.

A discussion was brought up regarding the smaller departments and fee increases.

- *TJ Brewer* asked if we see a problem with smaller departments not certifying their people. When he asked smaller departments, one common answer he received was that "they will not certify their people, because they don't have a budget to do that."
- *Jeremy Raymond* asked about in-house department testers for written exams to help cover costs. He also asked about negotiation with the volunteer departments or an option to give an allowance or exception for volunteer or smaller departments. He will reach out to departments and find out what their operating budget, volunteer status, etc. are.
- *Scott Spencer* was concerned about smaller departments that struggle or don't have money. Can they come forward and say, "We can't afford it. What can you do to help me"? Another challenge is starting in the middle of the budget year. Departments are not prepared.
- *John Evans*: This increase will impact everyone. The departments will need to tell us what their budget is. This will affect everyone, big and small departments.
- *Ron Harris* talked about budgeting challenges. The \$25 recertification fee is going to hit hard. For example, Henryville has a \$2,500 budget per year.

Brad Wardle: Training will still be free. We'll find a mechanism to help smaller departments get certified and alleviate this financial burden. Smaller departments are one of my biggest concerns. We'll get criteria in place.

We'll come up with criteria to waive fees or reduce them. Jolene and the working group can put criteria together for the smaller departments.

Jolene Chamberlain: We'll discuss this in the working group and come up with criteria. The fees were scheduled to increase as of November 1, 2024. We will see how people accept this once November 1 hits.

Yes, department testers were calculated into the fees. There will be a letter that goes out to departments with an explanation of the fees.

Joan Aaron: The \$25 for recertification is internal. There are no tester costs associated with recertification. It could be waived.

Ted Black: We need to remember that there is value in certification. In life, we tend to find a way to afford what we value. It ensures a certain level of training. It provides a certain level of protection. I'm not opposed to offering waivers to those who cannot afford the change. Certification has value, and they need to try to afford the fee.

Rod Kearl: Why was November 1 chosen? It's a month and a half away. Can we give more lead time?

Brad Wardle: Maybe we'll move it to January 1, 2025. This will allow for more time to work out the waiver issue.

TJ Brewer: We need to get information out so departments can plan and budget for this.

Jolene Chamberlain: We will continue to use our current group. Would anyone else like to volunteer? (Ted Black and Jeremy Raymond volunteered.) The conversation needs to start as soon as possible.

Jeremy Raymond: Do we need UVU approval (for fee increases)?

Brad Wardle: Yes, I have talked to leadership. This is going to be tabled until further notice.

14. Review, discussion, and motion regarding ADO and Wildland, by Wade Snyder

Prior to this Certification Council meeting, Wade Snyder had asked about ADO certifications for wildland apparatus drivers.

They are looking to expand their heavy engine fleet. Six are on order from Boise Mobile (for delivery next spring). Currently they have a couple of heavy engines and other equipment located at Lone Peak Conservation Center.

He explained how previously, wildland firefighters have gone the CDL route, but it now has some additional requirements. Some fire departments in Utah have gone away from pursuing the CDL route and instead follow the fire exemption that is recognized in **Utah Code 53-3-102:**

(7)

(b) The following **vehicles are not considered a commercial motor vehicle** for purposes of Part 4, Uniform Commercial Driver License Act:

(iii) firefighting and emergency vehicles

Other Utah codes also point back to the Utah Certification Council for creating the standard for driver apparatus training. Currently, ADO certification is managed by this council. The ADO standard identifies the prerequisites of FF I, Hazmat Awareness, and Hazmat Operations. These prerequisites are a limiting factor for his wildland firefighters. Wade researched NFPA 1002 and couldn't find the same requirement for prerequisites. He asked if there is a good reason to require those prerequisites for ADO for wildland firefighters.

He proposed adding the word “or” (so it reads “*FFT1 or 2*”) for the wildland prerequisite for ADO. He mentioned that he reached out to Jason Earl regarding this subject, who told him about updates in 2025 to the ADO certification standard.

He said he would include extensive driver training in-house when taking the ADO route.

Joan Aaron: I also reviewed the new NFPA 1010 standard to verify what the NFPA prerequisite requirements are. (She showed a document that highlights the level and prerequisites for ADO.) ADO-Aerial does require FF I, but ADO-Pumper does not mention it. Also, in the new NFPA 1010, “Wildland Fire Suppression” requires chapters 4, 11, and 15, but does not include FF I.

Scott Spencer asked if they are looking at just ADO-Pumper for this group. (Yes.)

Krista Horting suggested adding WLFF I and II as prerequisites.

Ron Harris asked if WLFF I is the same as NWCG FFT1.

Rod Kearl answered that NWCG FFT1 is advanced, and is almost equivalent to our NFPA WLFF II. Rod proposed adding NWCG FFT1 as a prerequisite for wildland candidates needing ADO-Pumper. Then the candidate would have experience with a completed task book, awareness, a pumps class, hose lays—and they’d be ready to start driving.

Wade Snyder: They used to have an engine operator–type position qualification. This level would revive that for them. It is great for the boss position. It is a nice “in-between” qualification.

The council had a discussion about the update of the current ADO standard and timeline, and the upcoming NFPA standard prerequisites. It was decided that if no prerequisites for Firefighter I, Hazardous Materials Awareness, or Hazardous Materials Operations are required in the NFPA 1002 for ADO-Pumper, it is okay to add the additional “or” prerequisite of *NWCG FFT1* to the ADO-Pumper Utah standard.

TJ Brewer made a motion to approve the addition, it was seconded by Rod Kearl, and the motion carried. None were opposed.

Jeremy Raymond asked if this change will affect Pro Board.

Joan Aaron: As long as the current NFPA 1002 edition prerequisites don’t require FF I, the same as the new upcoming NFPA 1010 edition.

15. Review and discussion regarding a rubble pile and updates to the Structural Collapse standard

Is a rubble pile to be structural engineered before testing? Whose responsibility is that? It’s a matter of safety.

In the May Certification Council meeting, this topic was tabled for later discussion. Joan Aaron reviewed the previous technical rescue standard, which included the wording: “*The AHJ must have the capacity to provide an engineered structural collapse pile approved by the AHJ’s risk manager. A letter from the risk manager must be submitted with the Examination Request stating the pile has been approved.*” The current standard does not verbalize this, an oversight on our part. Also, samples of acceptable piles were in the old appendix.

Included in the council’s documents was a rough draft with the current explanation merged with the old—to include the “engineered” requirement, along with the risk manager’s letter. It was then opened for discussion and edits were made to clarify the following changes, which were agreed on:

For the evolution in this section, the AHJ must be able to provide a safe testing environment for the candidates and accept all liability for candidate safety. The AHJ must have the capacity to provide an engineered structural collapse facility/prop/simulator and/or pile, approved by the AHJ's risk manager. A letter from the risk manager or licensed engineer must be submitted with the Examination Request, stating that the structure/pile has been approved.

The prop/simulator and/or pile must provide the resource needs for the conditions and skill requirements (for example, wall/floor to breach, location to construct and set shores, area to search and locate victim, ability to entrap a manikin with masonry or light debris). See Appendix A.

Joan explained the second paragraph, noting that testers had complained that props/piles weren't adequate for testing. The department must ensure they have all the resources in the prop/pile to do the skills/evolution.

Joan mentioned that the previous Structural Collapse standard contained photos, and there are no pictures in the current standard. She asked the council if they want to add those pictures to our current standard.

John Evans: Pictures sometimes don't pass the engineer stamp of approval.

Ted Black: Have the art department design a rubble pile and then get an engineer to stamp approval of it and have the picture at UFRA as a permanent feature. You can't just have a rubble pile. In real life that's what we have to deal with, but for training that is not an acceptable level of risk for training. Look for an acceptable level for training.

The council agreed to leave the photos out of the new current standard, and to add the proposed wording from the box above.

Jeremy Raymond motioned to approve, it was seconded by Rod Kearnl, and the motion carried. None were opposed.

16. Review, discussion, and motion to update the Fire and Life Safety Educator I and II standard, portfolio, and skill wording (after Pro Board reviewed them and requested requirements for testing)

Joan Aaron: Pro Board had several questions regarding FLSE. Additions were added to meet the new NFPA requirements. Also, skills were categorized into their classifications: cognitive, psychomotor, product, process, and portfolio. Joan showed the portfolios for both FLSE I and II, with the needed changes, including removing the phrase "standards and training council" and changing "identify" to "describe."

Joan said that the New Fire and Life Safety Educator II and PIO were both approved by Pro Board.

Ted Black made a motion to approve the amendments, it was seconded by Krista Horting, and the motion carried. None were opposed.

17. Review, discussion, and motion to approve an update to the UFSCS Policies and Procedures Manual to meet Pro Board reaccreditation requirements

Joan explained that after reviewing Pro Board requirements and our policies and procedures, it was clear that changes were needed in our policies and procedures.

- a. Our Policies and Procedures Manual needs to note "how the current prerequisites for each NFPA standard are addressed." We need to insert additional wording in Section 11.10: "*These prerequisites include the current prerequisites for each NFPA standard for that level.*"
- b. We need a fee wording update in our policies and procedures.
 - 17.3 edits and 18.4 ID card update

We added the word "to" and updated 18.4 to read "*ID cards are available to print online from the UFRA website at no cost.*"

- There will need to be updates to the standards with the new fee language. We'll wait until Jolene's fee committee meets again, in case the fees change. This will be tabled until November 2024.
- The reciprocity form was updated to include the \$200 fee change.

This form was updated as an individual form application. We've also added the new \$200 fee language. The \$200 may be negotiable after Jolene and the committee meet. But, when they are finalized, we'll change "per level" to "*per application*" so there is no confusion.

c. Electronic exam: tester instruction wording updates

Updates were made to match the wording on our forms. We added "*and room security*" under section 1. Also, white board and pencil/marker language were added. Under number 5, "*Challenge Questions form*" was added.

d. Online Candidate Agreement form: added the challenging of a question

Pro Board asked how a candidate can challenge individual test items. For the online tests, we had not previously given students an option to challenge questions. On our online Candidate Agreement form, we've added: *I understand that if I have a challenge of a question, I must write the challenge question number on my scratch paper/white board at the time of the test. After the online exam, on the "Online Exam Challenge Questions" document (provided by the tester), I will write down my name, PID number, question number(s), and a comment regarding the challenge question(s). I understand that all challenges must be reviewed and approved by the Certification administration office.*

Candidates will write the challenge information on their scratch paper/white board. They need to write the question number and then their comment, and transfer that onto the challenge questions document given to the tester. They do not have to write out the whole question.

e. P&P updates will detail tester training for skills exams and test packet information.

12.29.1 was added: *Tester training procedures required for skills examinations (psychomotor, process, product, project, and/or portfolio) shall be taught at train-the-tester meetings and reviewed at the annual tester training seminar. "Spot check" skills sheets, grading rubrics, and/or grading methods will be provided securely to the testers prior to the exam.*

12.39.1 was added:

A skills "spot check" examination packet includes:

- *A cover sheet for each candidate to document their name, signature, date, department, and test site*
- *A consent form, to acknowledge the risks involved and provide other required information*
- *A tester skill sheet (used for grading), which includes the skill description, conditions, time allotted, and each of the skill steps required, with pass/fail options for grading*
- *A "tester comment" section is available as needed, as well as a "notice to testers" regarding first-attempt and second-attempt failures.*

Each packet is to be securely returned to Certification administration.

f. Portfolio Requirement forms. In the appeals process: remove the "Standards and Training Council" wording (see the Inspector II example).

g. Portfolio review: policy updates

In 12.43 we added: *"Conflicts concerning the portfolio review will be brought to the attention of the Certification Council for review and discussion."*

We added a new 12.43.1: *“Each candidate must complete a portfolio requirement form prior to submission of their portfolio. This form includes: name, department, job title, date, instructions to candidates, the appeals process, descriptions of the skills/knowledge, criteria, JPR references, and the signature of the applicant/candidate acknowledging that the portfolio is accurate and complete (from their job experience). The evaluator will use this form to check off completion of each requirement.”*

We added a new 12.43.2: *“Each portfolio candidate may receive consultation from the Certification Council member who is reviewing their portfolio, if there are additional questions or comments. Once the Council member finalizes the grading procedures, they recommend to the Certification Council approval or denial of the portfolio. The Certification Council may have a discussion, then a motion to approve or deny. Afterward, the candidate will receive a letter from the Certification program manager notifying them of the approval or denial of their portfolio.”*

h. Section 16: grading policy updates (due to online exams)

We updated section 16: examination grading/scoring/appeals.

- We edited 16.1: Examinations shall be graded by Certification administration, *an assigned certification tester/SME, or after submission of an online exam.*
- We added: 16.1.1: *“Online examinations will be automatically graded once submitted (unless accommodations were requested).”*
- We edited 16.2: *Hard-copy paper examinations (multiple choice, true/false) will not be graded in the field.*
- We added 16.2.1: *“Skills examinations (i.e., psychomotor, cognitive, product, process, project, and/or portfolio) will be graded by the subject matter expert or certification staff member assigned using a grading rubric, or by a qualified certification tester at the site of the skills exam.”*
- We edited 16.3: The scoring *of exams* shall be impartial.

i. A definition of an SME was added to our Policies and Procedures Manual for clarification.

Joan explained that the SME definition was not previously in our policies and procedures.

Ron Harris asked: Who makes the determination of who is an SME? We need to put that in policy.

Joan said she asks leaders for SMEs, so they are mostly determined by word of mouth from leaders, chiefs, and program managers; by credentials or FEMA training; or they are from our instructor/tester cadre.

Jolene Chamberlain said SMEs are approved by UFRA administration (Brad and Marc).

After a council discussion to modify the SME definition, the following was agreed on:

Subject Matter Expert: *a person with extensive professional knowledge, credentials, experience, and/or expertise in a particular field, topic, or procedure covered by the written exam or skill, and approved by UFRA administration*

Ron Harris made a motion to approve these updates, it was seconded by TJ Brewer, and the motion carried. None were opposed.

18. Old business, by Scott Spencer

- Updates to online testing: Joan Aaron

Sarah Head has put together online test packets. These packets are designed to stay with the department or tester who is assigned a packet. We thought it would be more cost effective to already have these packets stationed in locations across the state. When we mail out the lead tester letter, passwords, etc., they'll already have all the equipment (excluding the iPads). Sarah explained how she organized them.

Online test piloting: 2nd and 3rd attempts are online now.

Groups with less than ten people may be able to test online.

- Budget, equipment, etc.: Jolene Chamberlain

We are not covering our costs. We need to increase fees.

- Roberts Rules of Order, and the Utah Open and Public Meetings Act: speaking etiquette refresher

Please review the refresher for meeting etiquette.

19. New business, by Scott Spencer

- The Electronic Examination Request form will be on UFRA's website. It's in the works.

- UFRA portal: Jolene Chamberlain

Jolene explained how they are working on building a UFRA portal on the website. She is working with Academic Affairs at UVU. Certification and training will filter through the portal. Chiefs and training officers will be able to update department rosters.

Jolene has UVU's attention and help until December 31, 2024, to build and implement the portal.

- Other items needing to be discussed

The January 2025 Certification Council meeting was scheduled for the same week as Winter Fire School. It needs to be moved to the week before or the week after (January 15 or 29). It was agreed to move it to January 15, 2025.

20. The next Certification Council meeting will be on Wednesday, November 20, 2024, at UFRA.

Ted Black motioned to adjourn the meeting, Krista Horting seconded, and the meeting was adjourned at 12:16 p.m.