

12-13-17 – Yager to BOT, et all Asst. Fire Chief – Maint. Tech – New Job

**Robert Yager**

---

**From:** Robert Yager <yagerra@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 13, 2017 12:11 PM  
**To:** Frank Ferriolo (fferriolo@oaklandtownship.org); Jeanne Langlois (jlanglois@oaklandtownship.org); John Giannangeli (jgiannangeli@oaklandtownship.org); Karen Reilly (kreilly@oaklandtownship.org); 'Imangiapane@oaklandtownship.org'; Michael Bailey (mbailey@oaklandtownship.org); Robin Buxar (rbuxar@oaklandtownship.org)  
**Cc:** Paul Strelchuk (pstrelchuk@oaklandtownship.org); Lou Danek (ldanek@oaklandtownship.org)  
**Subject:** Assistant Fire Chief / Maintenance Tech New Job  
**Attachments:** img20171213\_10154825.jpg

Board of Trustees

cc: Dale Stewart, Paul Strelchuk, Lou Danek

I think yesterday's arguments about agenda item #6, Budget Amendments, could have been avoided. But that is not the worst consequence of the "rush to decide" on 11/14/17.

Here is how I see it.

FACT - The Township Manager presented a proposal to hire Mr. Danek as a full-time employee 75/25 Maintenance Technician / Assistant Fire Chief at 11/14/17 Board meeting.

UNSUBSTANTIATED SUPPOSITION – The proposal he read was not authored by Mr. Stuart. Neither the words nor logic fit what we have seen from him in the past. He was likely "strong-armed" by the Fire Subcommittee and read a proposal they wrote for him.

FACT – If the Fire Subcommittee deliberated by any method, to reach a conclusion to "strong-arm" Mr. Stuart, they have violated the Open Meetings Act

FACT – Treasurer Langlois suggested 11/14/17 that the full and detailed budget impact be known before deciding.

FACT – She was ignored. She was not even being given the courtesy of recognizing her position and making an argument against it.

FACT - Ignoring another Board Members arguments by not even commenting on their position is not acceptable to me.

OPINION - Ignoring another Board Members arguments by not even commenting on their position will not be acceptable to the majority of residents, if given an opportunity to consider this issue.

OPINION – This was an extremely important change with long term effects on OTFD cost and morale.

OPINION – There was no urgency to decide immediately at the same meeting it was presented for the first time.

FACT – No argument was presented to support a level of urgency that required an immediate decision.

FACT – Attached data says that in 2016 had 525 EMS/Rescue incidents and only 33 fires. With Mr. Danek's minimal Medical First Responder (MFR) qualification he cannot help provide the one paramedic and one EMT minimum needed for an incident. In fact he will not be in charge of the patient in any incident. The ranking paramedic will be in command of Mr. Danek's actions toward the patient's care. This was not recognized nor debated.

OPINION – Fire Subcommittee did now know the above, but should have.

OPINION - The main mission of OTFD is our Advanced Life Support EMS service.

FACT – Mr. Danek has been POC at OTFD since 1995.

QUESTION – If Mr. Danek values the OTFD ALS mission, why has Mr. Danek has not pursued EMT qualification during that 22 years?

QUESTION – What has been the effect of elevating Mr. Danek in this way on OTFD morale?

FACT – Unlike a the 3/26/13 Board meeting considering making Mr. Strelchuk permanent Chief, we heard from no members of OTFD on their views, including hearing nothing from Chief Strelchuk.

OPINION – That is simply not acceptable.

OPINION – Filling this job should have followed a disciplined process of posting, interviewing and selecting.

FACT – I have seen instances in my industrial career where a job description was created to attempt to reward an individual and in a disciplined hiring / job filling process demanded by HR, there emerges a stronger candidate, with better overall impact on the organization.

SUGGESTION: Revisit this decision.

Bob Yager

### **Incident Summary by Incident Type**

**Date Range: From 1/1/2016 To 12/31/2016**

**Incident Type(s) Selected: All**

Incident Type	Incident Count	Used in Ave. Resp.	Average Response Time hh:mm:ss	Total Loss	Total Value
Fire	33	25	00:05:43	\$131,010.00	\$131,010.00
EMS/Rescue	525	480	00:06:01	\$0.00	\$0.00
Hazardous Condition	29	19	00:07:18	\$0.00	\$0.00
Service Call	95	15	00:07:12	\$0.00	\$0.00
Good Intent	148	28	00:07:02	\$0.00	\$0.00
False Call	86	67	00:07:26	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>Totals</b>	<b>916</b>	<b>634</b>		<b>\$131,010.00</b>	<b>\$131,010.00</b>

"PRINTED 12/11/07"

---

INC020 (3.00)

Page 1 of 1

Printed: 12/11/2017 15:15:14

**Note:** The incident count used in averages does not include the following:  
Not Completed incidents, Mutual Aid Given, Other Aid Given, Cancelled in Route, Not Priority, Fill-In Standby, No Arrival and Invalid Dates/Times.