

**NH Fire Protection Equipment Technician Certification Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes June 11, 2008**

Meeting opened by Deputy Farley with the following members present: Mr. Burns, Mr. Mango, Mr. Daniels, Mr. Mooney, and Mr. Deblois and in the visitor's gallery: Mr. Raincourt, Mr. Therieault and Mr. Eldridge.

Members Absent: Chairman Thibodeau, Mr. Musil, Mr. Hoisington, Mr. McCarthy and Mr. Burbank.

A review of the May 5, 2008 rules was conducted. There was some discussion about the lack of language for continuing education for sprinkler systems. Mr. Thibodeau and Mr. Musil were working on this.

Discussion about rule changes. No major oppositions were voiced for May edition.

There was some discussion about apprentices and proposed language to identify how someone gets into the certification program. Would a single renewal be enough? Two years would be sufficient to cover the entry level sprinkler certification but not the unlimited sprinkler. The discussion continued about the differences between someone who is coming into the program with no experience and someone who is coming into the program with lots of experience and no formal training. The consensus of the group is to have the provisional certification section broken into two sections that each deal with one group.

The discussion included thoughts that an apprentice should:

- work under the direct supervision of an individual certified in the specific discipline.
- Show proof of employment in the industry.

A question was posed as to whether or not an apprentice would have to work for a certified firm. Deputy Farley reminded the committee that the current rules would require that based upon the language of 1204.01(b) which states,

The technician individual certificate shall only be valid if he or she is in the employ of a firm with a current certificate of registration.

The consensus was then directed to removing the word "Technician" from 1204.01(b) which Deputy Farley will do. There was also some concern about the word "valid" and whether or not another term might be better.

Another question was posed about the status of an individual certification if the individual leaves a certified firm and goes to work for an uncertified firm. There were some that felt that a person should not be penalized for the lack of firm certification.

There was some continued discussion about the impasse of the fire alarm subcommittee regarding the RME. Some sub-committee members still want to meet to try to work on a resolution.

There was consensus on cancelling the July meeting and meeting in August. Next meeting scheduled for August 6, 2008 at the fire academy.