MEDICAL DIRECTION COMMITTEE
1041 Technology Park Dr, Glen Allen, Virginia
Conference Rooms A and B
July 9, 2015
10:30 AM

Members Present:	Members Absent:	Staff:	Others:
Marilyn McLeod, M. D. - Chair	Christopher Turnbull, M.D.	Gary Brown	Gary Critzer
Asher Brand, M.D.		Tim Perkins	Chad Blosser
E. Reed Smith, M.D.		Warren Short	Sam Dahl
George Lindbeck, M.D.		Debbie Akers	Michael Player
Allen Yee, M.D.		Greg Neiman	Rachel Dillon
Stewart Martin, M.D.			Dr. Michael Feldman
Paul Philips, D.O.			Cathy Cockrell
Scott Weir, M.D.			Ron Passmore
Tania White, M.D.			Jane Hornbeck
Theresa Guins, M.D.			Ed Rhodes
Cheryl Lawson, M.D.			Jamie Graff
Forrest Calland, M.D.			John Dugan
Charles Lane, M.D.			
Chief Eddie Ferguson			

Topic/Subject	Discussion	Recommendations, Action/Follow-up; Responsible Person
1. Welcome	The meeting was called to order by Dr. McLeod at 10:32 AM	
2. Introductions	No Introductions, Attendance as per sign-in roster See **Attachment 'A'**	**Meeting Sign-in Roster See Attachment 'A'**
3. Approval of Agenda		**Approved by consensus**
4. Approval of Minutes	Approval of minutes from the April 9, 2015 meeting.	**Approved by consensus**
5. Special Presentation	New Concepts in Burn Care PowerPoint presentation by Dr. Michael Feldman, Medical Director, VCU Burn Center. See **Attachment 'B' (Copy of PowerPoint presentation pending)**	**See Attachment 'B'**
6. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) & Board of Pharmacy (BOP) Compliance Issues		
7. Old Business		

Topic/Subject		Discussion	Recommendations, Action/Follow-up; Responsible Person
A	IAPB Paramedic Transport, CCEMPTP	Dr. McLeod reported the initial meeting will take place after today's meeting at 2:30 pm at 1001 Technology Park Drive. Invited anyone interested to attend.	
B	EMS Fatigue	Dr. McLeod continued discussion concerning EMS fatigue and no regulations/policies in place to address this issue. Intention is to address this with Health and Safety Committee. Asked for any input and opinions from committee.	**Dr. McLeod to meet with Health and Safety Committee.**
C	Support Letter for REPLICA	Dr. McLeod stated she is working on support letter and will forward to office for distribution and review.	**Dr. McLeod to provide draft that will be sent to committee for review.**
D	EMS Use of MOLST/POST	Dr. Lindbeck reported current status of use of POST form and it not being recognized in EMS regulations. Recent meeting attended by himself and Mike Berg with discussion concerning Board of Health recognition of the POST form and the recognition of the desires of the patient.	**Dr. Lindbeck to forward most recent POST form to office for distribution to committee.**
E	Trauma Presentation	Dr. Calland provided a PowerPoint presentation concerning the trauma committee, trauma triage plan and trauma performance reporting. Copy of PowerPoint presentation pending receipt. Requested input and participation from committee for the future of trauma reporting, designation and care in Virginia. Virginia will be evaluated in September for the entire trauma process and more information should be available in October.	
7. New Business			
A	Trauma Review/Trauma Protocol Requirement	1. Dr. McLeod stated that at a state meeting trauma data was reported that created embarrassment and false information that caused regions to appear to be performing subpar. Dr. McLeod has requested that Dr. Calland do a quarterly report to the MDC committee concerning the actions of the Trauma Committee. Request from committee to Dr. Calland that a representative from MDC be appointed to the Trauma Committee. 2. Dr. McLeod stated that Regional Councils received notifications that they were in contract violation with no previous notice from the Office of EMS. States that she has a level of disappointment that the Office of EMS would file a formal complaint without prior notification and that it creates a trust issues between the Regional Councils and the Office of EMS. Asked for clarification from Gary Brown concerning the notification that was received by the Regional Councils. 3. Trauma Protocol Requirement – Dr. McLeod brought up issue of a Regional Medical Director signing a contract with the Office of EMS concerning protocol decisions that reside with the Medical Direction committee for the region. Ask for clarification and input from other medical directors. Tim Perkins offered clarification concerning what is listed in the contract. Physicians stated they do not believe that the contract should have any language that applies to the protocols for their regions. Committee feels that language should be changed that would allow the Board of Directors of a Regional EMS Council to overrule the protocols approved by the Medical Directors. Gary Critzer stated that all Regional Medical Directors should inquire of their Regional Council the opportunity to review their regional contracts and become familiar with the language.	**Motion by Dr. Brand, 2nd by Dr. Martin that a contract amendment be initiated to address the trauma requirement. Motion carried.**

Topic/Subject		Discussion	Recommendations, Action/Follow-up; Responsible Person
		4. Gary Critzer stated that now might be the time to form a group that will review the entire Regional Council contract in regard to the section that addresses Medical Directors. Committee felt this would be appropriate.	**Drs. McLeod, Lane and Smith to serve on workgroup. Dr. McLeod to contact Greg Wood for council representation.**
B	Service Animal Discussion	Dr. Scott Weir brought up discussion about care of a working animal and service animal and the requirement to transport said service animal with patient. Discussion by committee. Warren Short advised committee that two sessions will be held at Symposium concerning the use of animals and the care of those animals when injured.	**Dr. Lindbeck to research care of working and service animals by EMS.**
8. Research Notes			
A	Research project discussion	Dr. McLeod wants to do a research project on joint reduction in the field. Dr. E. Reed Smith has program in place in Arlington and wants to participate. Dr. McLeod wanted to know if needs a variance or IRB that will allow the use of a lactate machine in the ambulance. Dr. Yee and Dr. Lindbeck stated would need an IRB. Dr. Lindbeck provided further information concerning IRB process.	
9. State OMD – George Lindbeck, MD			
A	Naloxone Update	Attended two day session concerning Naloxone and its distribution. Presented information from this session. FDA made a presentation and the possibility of it becoming an OTC distribution. One manufacturer presented an atomizer with .2mg/1ml. Virginia's new regulation specifically mentions law enforcement and firefighters. Should move administration to EMR level. Committee in agreement.	**Motion by Dr. Yee, second by Dr. Smith for EMRs to administer Narcan. Discussion held. Motion carried.**
B	Ocular Anesthetics/analgesics	Discrepancies in the procedures and formulary between ocular procedures and ocular medications. Scope needs to be changed to make this consistent.	**Motion by Dr. Yee to move ocular analgesics to the EMT level, seconded by Dr. Phillips. Motion carried.**
Office of EMS Reports			

	Topic/Subject	Discussion	Recommendations, Action/Follow-up; Responsible Person
A	BLS Training Specialist – Greg Neiman	1. EC Institute a. Last Institute was in June in conjunction with the VAVRS Rescue College in Blacksburg. 8 Candidates attended and 2 will need to return for the Adult Ed and Stand and Deliver as those portions were canceled for low enrollment b. Cognitive Deadline for next Institute is July 12, 2015 c. Practical Exam is scheduled for August 1 in the Richmond Area d. Next Institute is in the Winchester Area beginning September 12 2. Updates a. The DED Division will stay on the road for 2015. b. Held 2 Updates in the WVEMSC, one on Friday June 12 and Saturday June 13 c. Next Update is Saturday, September 12 in Frederick County Fire d. See the latest schedule on our Webpage: http://www.vdh.virginia.gov/OEMS/Training/EMS_InstructorSchedule.htm e. Looking to make changes to our EC Updates	.
B	ALS Training Specialist – Debbie Akers	1. NR Stats ‘**Attachment C’** a. Within 4% of National Registry first attempt and within 3 attempts statistics.	**See Attachment ‘C’**
C	Accreditation – Debbie Akers	1. Accreditation ‘**Attachment D’** a. Paramedic i. American National has suspended their accreditation ii. Historic Triangle has voluntarily retired their CoAEMSP accreditation iii. Germanna-Rappahannock EMS Council suspended their LOR b. Intermediate i. Paul D. Camp Community College ii. Henrico Fire in August iii. Site visit with Roanoke Regional Training Center c. AEMT i. 1st Accredited AEMT program in Frederick County d. EMT i. Frederick County now accredited ii. Chesterfield Fire and EMS now accredited iii. Finalizing Report on Harrisonburg Rescue Squad iv. CSEMS has 3rd alternative site	**See Attachment ‘D’**

	Topic/Subject	Discussion	Recommendations, Action/Follow-up; Responsible Person
D	EMSTF – Adam Harrell (given by Warren Short)	1. EMSTF **'Attachment E'** a. Report distributed. b. FY16 contracts are available on the web c. Guidance documents are also posted d. Instructor Pass statistics are posted for information regarding the 16^{th} Percentile	**See Attachment 'E'**
E	Division of Educational Development – Warren Short	1. EMSTF a. Significant issues of fraud have been identified and this has led to the current changes 2. CE Update beginning 2016 a. Anyone who has met their recertification criteria by April 1, 2016 will maintain it after transition 3. Symposium a. 2016 Call for Presentations (CFP) was released yesterday. Anyone who submitted from 2014 and 2015 will be notified of 2016 CFP. ECs and OMDs will be sent CFP announcement as well b. For 2015 there are 254 Programs and registration tentatively opening on July 15^{th}. 4. New course delivery process is up and running a. We are planning to track non-traditional vs traditional. Most have requested non-traditional in case of make-up b. Several programs have decided to go forward with an active non-traditional format	
F	Regulation and Compliance – Michael Berg	1. Ed Rhodes stated that the cleanup bill is complete and in effect.	
G	Other Office Staff	Nothing to report.	
PUBLIC COMMENT			
For The Good Of The Order		1. Eddie Ferguson expressed appreciation to Dr. McLeod and Warren Short for meeting with the VAGEMSA committee concerning I-99. He feels there is a better understanding of the role of I-99 in Virginia. 2. John Dugan stated that 6 EMS agencies were recognized by Project Lifesaver. Expanding out of hospital cardiac arrest. Will be announcing in 2016 the Stroke recognition.	
Future Meeting Dates for 2015		October 8, 2015	
Adjournment		1:27 P.M.	

Attachment A

7/9/15 – Attendance Roster

MEDICAL DIRECTION COMMITTEE MEETING ROSTER
July 9, 2015

Please sign in next to your name.

Region	Representative	Signature
SWVEMS	PAUL PHILLIPS, D.O.	
WVEMS	CHARLES LANE, M.D.	
BREMS(CHAIR)	MARILYN MCLEOD, M. D.	
TJEMS (OEMS)	GEORGE LINDBECK, M. D.	
CSEMS	ASHER BRAND, M. D.	
LFEMS	CHRISTOPHER TURNBULL, M.D.	
REMS	TANIA WHITE, M.D.	
NVEMS	E. REED SMITH, M.D.	
ODEMSA	ALLEN YEE, M. D.	
PEMS	CHERYL LAWSON, M. D.	
TEMS	STEWART MARTIN, M. D.	
MAL	FORREST CALLAND, M.D.	
MAL	SCOTT WEIR, M.D.	
EMS CHILDREN	THERESA GUINS, M.D.	
VAGEMSA	CHIEF EDDIE FERGUSON	

OEMS STAFF:

GARY BROWN		WARREN SHORT	
SCOTT WINSTON		DEBBIE AKERS	
MIKE BERG		GREG NEIMAN	
TIM PERKINS		ADAM HARRELL	

MEDICAL DIRECTION COMMITTEE MEETING ROSTER
July 9, 2015

OTHERS PRESENT: PLEASE PRINT YOUR NAME AND SIGN ON THE LINE NEXT TO YOUR NAME.

PRINT NAME	SIGNATURE
CHAD BLOSSEN	[illegible]
Sam Drill	[illegible]
Michael Mayer	[illegible]
Rachel Dillon	[illegible]
Michael Feldman	[illegible]
Cathy Cockrell	[illegible]
Ron PASSMAN	[illegible]
Jane Hornback	Jane Hornback
Ed Rhodes	Ed Rhodes
Gary Cutzer	[illegible]
Jamie Graff	Jamie Graff
ASHAR	
JOHN DUGAN	John R Dugan

Attachment B

Resuscitation of Severely Burned Military Casualties: Fluid Begets More Fluid

Resuscitation of Severely Burned Military Casualties: Fluid Begets More Fluid

Kevin K. Chung, MD, Steven E. Wolf, MD, Leopoldo C. Cancio, MD, Ricardo Alvarado, MD, John A. Jones, BS, BBA, Jeffery McCorcle, PA, Booker T. King, MD, David J. Barillo, MD, Evan M. Renz, MD, and Lorne H. Blackbourne, MD

Background: In November 2005, institution of a military-wide burn resuscitation guideline requested the documentation of the initial 24-hour resuscitation of severely burned military casualties on a burn flow sheet to provide continuity of care. The guidelines instruct the providers to calculate predicted 24-hour fluid requirements and initial fluid rate based on the American Burn Association Consensus recommendation of 2 (modified Brooke) $mL \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%$ total body surface area $(TBSA)^{-1}$ to 4 (Parkland) $mL \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%TBSA^{-1}$ burn. The objective of this study was to evaluate the relationship between the estimated fluid volumes calculated, either by the Modified Brooke or the Parkland formulas, and actual volumes received.

Methods: From November 2005 to December 2008, 105 patients were globally evacuated with >20% TBSA burns, of whom 73 had burn flow sheets initiated. Of these, 58 had completed burn flow sheets. Total fluids administered in the first 24-hour period for each patient were recorded. Chart reviews were performed to extract demographic and clinical outcomes data.

Results: Of the 58, the modified Brooke formula was used in 31 patients (modified Brooke group) to estimate 24-hour fluid requirements and the Parkland formula was used in 21 (Parkland group). In six, 3 $mL \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%TBSA^{-1}$ was used and were excluded from analysis. No significant difference was detected between the two groups for age, %TBSA burned, inhalation injury, or Injury Severity Score. Actual 24-hour resuscitation in the modified Brooke group was significantly lower than in the Parkland group (16.9 L ± 6.0 L vs. 25.0 L ± 11.2 L, $p = 0.003$). A greater percentage of patients exceeded the Ivy index (250 mL/kg) in the Parkland group compared with the modified Brooke group (57% vs. 29%, $p = 0.026$). On average, those who had 24-hour fluid needs estimated by the modified Brooke formula received a 3.8 $mL \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%TBSA^{-1}$ ± 1.2 $mL \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%TBSA^{-1}$ resuscitation, whereas the Parkland group received a 5.9 $mL \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%TBSA^{-1}$ ± 1.1 $mL \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%TBSA^{-1}$ resuscitation ($p < 0.0001$). No differences in measured outcomes were detected between the two groups. On multivariate logistic regression, exceeding the Ivy index was an independent predictor of death (area under the curve [AUC], 0.807; CI, 0.66–0.95).

Conclusion: In severely burned military casualties undergoing initial burn resuscitation, the modified Brooke formula resulted in significantly less 24-hour volumes without resulting in higher morbidity or mortality.

Submitted for publication January 13, 2009.
Accepted for publication April 30, 2009.

From the United States Army Institute of Surgical Research (K.K.C., S.E.W., L.C.C., J.A.J., J.M., B.T.K., D.J.B., E.M.R., L.H.B.), Fort Sam Houston, Texas; and University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio (S.E.W., R.A.), San Antonio, Texas.
The views herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Army Medical Department or the Department of Defense.
Address for reprints: Kevin K. Chung, MD, 3400 Rawley E. Chambers Avenue, San Antonio, TX 78234; email: kevin.chung@us.army.mil.

DOI: 10.1097/TA.0b013e3181ac68cf

Key Words: Burns, Resuscitation, Fluids, Complications, Military, Casualties, Parkland, Modified, Brooke, Formula.

(*J Trauma.* 2009;67: 231–237)

Adequate fluid resuscitation of the severely burned has long been considered as one of the major advances of burn care during the last century.[1] The multitude of resuscitation formulas developed during the years has been consolidated into a well-accepted "consensus" recommendation for burn care by the American Burn Association.[2,3] It is recommended that an initial fluid therapy consisting of crystalloid be determined by calculating the total predicted 24-hour fluid at a volume between 2 $mL \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%$ total body surface area $(TBSA)^{-1}$ and 4 $mL \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%TBSA^{-1}$, half of which is to be infused within the first 8 hours from the time of burn with the latter half to be infused during the next 16 hours.

The United States Army Institute of Surgical Research Burn Center, located in Fort Sam Houston, Texas, is the sole burn treatment facility serving active duty personnel in the Department of Defense. Military burn casualties from the war in Iraq and Afghanistan are transported across three continents, with one stop in Germany, to our burn center during 3 days to 6 days. The inherent challenges faced by our deployed providers caring for severely burned casualties undergoing global evacuation during the initial resuscitation period have been described previously.[4,5] Upon recognition of this challenge, on November 2005, a military-wide burn resuscitation guideline was developed and disseminated along with a burn flow sheet, requiring resuscitation documentation for all severely burned casualties being globally evacuated. Deployed providers were instructed to choose a 24-hour volume between 2 $mL \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%TBSA^{-1}$ and 4 $mL \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%TBSA^{-1}$ to derive an initial fluid rate and then to titrate the fluid rate to a urine output goal of 30 mL/hr to 50 mL/hr.

Close to 3 years since these guidelines were adopted, we observed that many of these patients were resuscitated using either a 2 (modified Brooke) $mL \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%TBSA^{-1}$ or 4 (Parkland) $mL \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%TBSA^{-1}$ calculation to derive the initial fluid rate. To our knowledge, there has never been a study directly comparing these two formulas. The purpose of this analysis was to determine whether we could detect any differences in outcomes between the patients who were resuscitated with either the modified Brooke formula or the Parkland formula.

PATIENTS AND METHODS

After obtaining approval from our institutional review board, we conducted a retrospective analysis of consecutive burn patients evacuated from combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan to the United States Army Burn Center at the Institute of Surgical Research in San Antonio, TX since November 2005. All resuscitations were performed by deployed military medical providers, each with various levels of expertise with burn care, at various sites across the evacuation route while using the military burn resuscitation guideline.[5,6] These guidelines recommend initiating fluid resuscitation of the burn patient using lactated Ringers solution at a rate of infusion derived by the limits of the modified Brooke (2 mL $\cdot$ kg^{-1} $\cdot$ %TBSA^{-1}) or the Parkland (4 mL $\cdot$ kg^{-1} $\cdot$ %TBSA^{-1}) formulas.[7,8] Initial fluid calculation was performed to approximate the total fluid to be administered during the first 24 hours after burn with initial fluid rates calculated by dividing the total fluid by two and estimating that half of the total fluid needs would be given during the first 8 hours. Resuscitation was then guided on all patients using a urine output goal between 30 mL/hr and 50 mL/hr. The burn resuscitation guidelines advised providers to consider albumin if the projected 24-hour resuscitation exceeded 6 mL $\cdot$ kg^{-1} $\cdot$ hr^{-1} near the 12-hour mark. They were also advised to initiate vasopressors if the mean arterial pressure dropped below 55 mm Hg. All resuscitations were begun at the presenting military medical facility continued during transport via helicopter to another theater hospital and completed during or shortly after air transport to the US military hospital at Landstuhl, Germany. Burn size, to include all partial-thickness and full-thickness burns, was determined at the initial presenting facility via the Lund-Browder chart per the guidelines, checked, verified, and corrected if necessary in Germany and confirmed at admission to our Burn Center by the admitting burn surgeon. All patients were subsequently transferred to our burn center for definitive burn care. Presence of inhalation injury was determined via fiberoptic bronchoscopy in Germany and confirmed with a repeat bronchoscopy at admission to our burn center.

A review of all the burn flow sheets initiated on evacuated military burn casualties was performed. From these, total fluids administered in the first 24-hour period for each patient was extracted. In addition, initiation of vasopressor, early albumin infusion, and transfusion of blood products, also recorded on the flow sheets, was extracted. A query of our Collector trauma database was performed to extract demographic and clinical data to include weight, %TBSA burns, % full-thickness burns, presence of inhalation injury, total evacuation time, Injury Severity Score (ISS), total intensive care unit (ICU) days, total hospital days, diagnosis of abdominal compartment syndrome (ACS), and death. We define "ACS" as all those patients who underwent decompressive laparotomy during their evacuation before admission to our burn center. Individual patient electronic medical records were reviewed to extract clinical and laboratory data of interest to include the ratio of the partial pressure of arterial oxygen to fraction of inspired oxygen ratio, serum blood urea nitrogen, serum creatinine, and ventilator-free days in the first 28 days from admission.

Data were analyzed using SPSS version 16.0 (SPSS, Chicago, IL). Comparisons were made between the modified Brooke group and the Parkland group. Data are presented as mean±SD. A multivariate logistic regression analysis was performed to determine the effect of age, %TBSA, %full-thickness TBSA, inhalation injury, weight, and formula used (Parkland or modified Brooke) on exceeding the Ivy index (as defined by a resuscitation by crystalloid exceeding 250 mL/kg during the acute resuscitation phase).[9] A second multivariate logistic regression analysis was performed to determine the effect on the risk of the ACS or death by the following variables: age, %TBSA, %full-thickness TBSA, inhalation injury, ISS, total infused volume, Ivy index, albumin, and vasopressors. Continuous variables were compared via paired Student's t test or Mann Whitney U test where appropriate. Chi-square testing or Fisher's exact test was used to compare categorical variables where appropriate. All testings were two tailed, with $p < 0.05$ considered significant.

RESULTS

Between November 2005 and December 2008, 105 patients were evacuated with >20% TBSA burns of whom 73 had burn flow sheets initiated. Of these, 58 had completed burn flow sheets. Of the 58 patients with completed burn flow sheets, the modified Brooke formula was used in 31 patients (modified Brooke group) to estimate 24-hour fluid requirements whereas the Parkland formula was used in 21 (Parkland group). In six patients, 24-hour fluids were calculated using 3 mL $\cdot$ kg^{-1} $\cdot$ %TBSA^{-1} equation and thus were excluded from the analysis. A comparison between the two groups is shown in Table 1. No significant difference was found between the two groups in terms of age, %TBSA burned, inhalation injury, weight, or ISS. All were men except one patient in the modified Brooke group. All but four patients, two in each group, none of whom had inhalation injury, were intubated and mechanically ventilated during transport. In the modified Brooke group, 61% had additional nonburn injuries requiring surgical intervention sometime

TABLE 1. Demographic Comparison

	Modified Brooke Group (n = 31)	Parkland Group (n = 21)	*p*
Age	25 ± 5	25 ± 5	0.86
Initial %TBSA	55 ± 20	47 ± 18	0.12
Corrected %TBSA*	55 ± 19	46 ± 17	0.11
Percent full thickness	46 ± 22	39 ± 20	0.24
Inhalation injury (%)	42	29	0.49
ISS	36 ± 13	30 ± 8	0.52
Weight (kg)	86 ± 19	92 ± 17	0.25
Time to evacuation	4.4 ± 1.2	4.0 ± 0.9	0.33
First base deficit	7 ± 4	4 ± 2	<0.05
Initial MAP	80 ± 15	85 ± 17	0.28

MAP, mean arterial pressure.
* Determined on day of admission to our burn center.

during the evacuation compared with 48% in the Parkland group (p = 0.94). These surgical interventions included splenectomy, nephrectomy, bowel resection, craniectomies, and limb soft tissue debridement and amputations. On average, all patients arrived to our burn center at 4.2 days ± 1.1 days from the time of injury. No difference in evacuation times was found between the groups.

Table 2 compares the data extracted from the burn flow sheets. Actual 24-hour resuscitation in the modified Brooke group was significantly lower than the Parkland group (17.0 L ± 6.0 L vs. 25.0 L ± 11.2 L, p = 0.003) (Fig. 1). A greater percentage of patients exceeded the Ivy index (250 mL/kg) in the Parkland group compared with the modified Brooke group (57% vs. 29%, p = 0.043). Figure 2 compares the weight-based fluid intake between the two groups. In both groups combined, 48% were initiated on 5% albumin infusion sometime during their 24-hour resuscitation, whereas 65% received a vasopressor infusion of vasopressin, norepinephrine, dobutamine, or neosynephrine. There was no difference in the mean dose of albumin received in the first 24 hours between the modified Brooke and Parkland groups (62 g ± 34 vs. 60 g ± 45 g, p = 0.91). Ten patients received albumin before the 12-hour mark during the resuscitation, six in the modified Brooke group, and four in the Parkland group (p = 0.98). Among those on vasopressors for a mean arterial pressure <55 mm Hg, there was no difference in average number of hours in the first 24 hours that necessitated vasopressor support of any kind (13 hours ± 5 hours vs. 12 hours ± 7 hours, p = 0.80). Those who received vasopressors had a mortality of 38% compared with a mortality of 7% in those who did not receive vasopressors. There was no difference in the total 24-hour urine outputs between the two groups.

Table 3 compares all secondary outcome measures between the two groups with no significant difference detected with respect to acute lung injury (ALI)/acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), acute kidney injury (AKI), ventilator-free days, ICU days, hospital days, ACS, or mortality. We chose admission ALI/ARDS and AKI as outcome measure, potentially reflecting over or under-resuscitation, given that these patients were admitted on an average of 4 days from the time of burn.

TABLE 2. Data Extracted From the Burn Flow Sheet

	Modified Brooke Group (n = 31)	Parkland Group (n = 21)	*P* Value
Total 24 fluids (L)	16.9 ± 6.0	25.0 ± 11.2	0.003
First 8 h (L)	7.4 ± 2.8	10.8 ± 4.6	0.003
Ivy index (mL/kg)(9)	211 ± 101	275 ± 119	0.026
>Ivy index (%)	29	57	0.043
$mL \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%TBSA^{-1}$	3.8 ± 1.2	5.9 ± 1.1	<0.0001
>6 $mL \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%TBSA^{-1}$ (%)	3	48	<0.0001
24-h urine output (mL)	1638 ± 477	1818 ± 455	0.18
Hours at goal (30–50 mL/h)	7 ± 4	7 ± 5	0.99
Hours over goal	9 ± 4	12 ± 5	0.11
Pressors (%)	68	62	0.66
Hours on pressors	13 ± 5	12 ± 7	0.80
Albumin (%)	45	52	0.61
Total albumin dose (g)	62 ± 34	60 ± 45	0.91
PRBCs (units)	5 ± 4	4 ± 2	0.85
FFP (units)	5 ± 3	4 ± 2	0.92
Second 24 h (L)	9.8 ± 3.3	11.7 ± 6.3	0.15

All data reflect the first 24 h unless otherwise stated.
PRBC, packed red blood cells; FFP, fresh-frozen plasma.



Figure 1. Total fluid intake in the first 24-hour postburn (*p = 0.003).



Figure 2. Absolute weight-based fluid intake in the first 24 hours. There is a significant difference between the modified Brooke and Parkland (*$p = 0.026$). The *solid line* represents the Ivy index (250 mL/kg).[9]

TABLE 3. Clinical Outcomes

	Modified Brooke Group (n = 31)	Parkland Group (n = 21)	*p*
Pa_{O_2}/Fi_{O_2} ratio*	382 ± 155	332 ± 149	0.27
ALI/ARDS (%)*	29	43	0.33
Blood urea nitrogen (mg/dL)*	23 ± 21	17 ± 6	0.62
Creatinine (mg/dL)*	1.3 ± 0.8	1.0 ± 0.3	0.51
AKI (%)*	19	10	0.33
Ventilator-free days in first 28 d	16 ± 10	16 ± 10	0.83
ICU days	49 ± 43	38 ± 36	0.30
Hospital days	92 ± 75	67 ± 39	0.13
Abdominal compartment syndrome (%)	11	5	0.45
Mortality (%)	18	14	0.73

Pa_{O_2}, partial pressure of oxygen; Fi_{O_2}, fraction of inspired oxygen.
* Determined on day of admission to our burn center.

On the first multivariate logistic regression, the combination of % full-thickness burns and Parkland group designation were predictive of over-resuscitation, as defined by exceeding the Ivy index (area under the curve [AUC], 0.882; CI, 0.79–0.98). On univariate correlations, we found significant correlations among exceeding the Ivy index, vasopressor use, and incidence of the ACS and death, respectively. (Spearman correlations = 0.435, $p = 0.001$; 0.404, $p = 0.001$; and 0.413, $p = 0.002$). On the second multivariate logistic regression analysis, we determined that exceeding the Ivy index was an independent predictor of death (AUC, 0.807; CI, 0.66–0.95) but not ACS.

DISCUSSION

The Parkland formula, first described by Baxter in 1974, has become most widely used formula for predicting burn resuscitation needs in the United States and the world.[1] In 1979, Baxter[10] reported that 12% (n = 53),of 438 resuscitated adults, required more fluid than predicted by the formula. Recently, several authors have reported that the Parkland formula appears to "underestimate" fluid infused in a significantly higher percentage of patients than originally predicted.[11–14] The concept of "fluid creep," as described by Pruitt[1,15] appears to have taken center stage in the burn literature. We think that our findings contribute a unique twist to our understanding of this phenomenon.

Major findings were as follows. First, our study demonstrates that fluid begets more fluid: a burn resuscitation that is begun at a higher fluid rate, results in more volume given during 24 hours. The Parkland group received more total volume (25.0 L ± 11.2 L vs. 16.9 L ± 6.0 L, $p = 0.003$) than the modified Brooke group. A larger percentage of patients in the Parkland group exceeded the Ivy index (57% vs. 29%, $p = 0.043$) compared with the modified Brooke group.[9] On average, those who had 24-hour fluid needs estimated by the modified Brooke formula received 3.8 $mL \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%TBSA^{-1}$ ± 1.2 $mL \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%TBSA^{-1}$ resuscitation, whereas the Parkland group received a 5.9 $mL \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%TBSA^{-1}$ ± 1.1 $mL \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%TBSA^{-1}$ resuscitation ($p < 0.0001$) (Fig. 3). The complex nature of the body's response to burn injury compounded by the variable response to resuscitation likely makes the starting point almost irrelevant. What is most important, as



Figure 3. Actual 24-hour resuscitation intake compared with predicted needs based on the modified Brooke formula (*dotted line*) and the Parkland formula (*solid line*) (*p = 0.0001).

most would agree, is the careful titration of the hourly fluid based on the compilation of various clinical end points by an experienced burn provider. Nearly half of the recorded hourly urine outputs were above the preset goal of 30 mL/hr to 50 mL/hr in both the modified Brooke and the Parkland (9 ± 4 and 12 ± 5, p = 0.11). This suggests that, in general, all the patients were not as tightly resuscitated as perhaps they should have been. This is not surprising given the wide variability in the degree of burn experience among the deployed providers as well as the often austere practice environment. Still, given that these conditions were equal in both groups, it is unclear why starting at a higher initial rate resulted in a higher resuscitative volume.

Second, the combination of % full-thickness burns and use of the Parkland formula predicted over-resuscitation as defined by exceeding the Ivy index. Cancio et al.[16] previously demonstrated similarly that burn size (positively) and weight (negatively) were associated with greater 24-hour volumes. However, in their analysis, they were not able to demonstrate a relationship between higher volumes and mortality. In this analysis, we demonstrate that a correlation exists between over-resuscitation, development of the ACS, and death. Additionally, logistic regression demonstrated that over-resuscitation was a significant independent predictor of death.

Finally, our data demonstrate that successful resuscitation can be accomplished with lower initial fluid volumes. One classic definition of "resuscitation failure" is death that occurs within the first 7 days after injury.[17] Of 31 patients in the modified Brooke group, none died before 7 days. Given that the average evacuation time exceeded 4 days in all the patients in this analysis, it is likely that some who died because of "resuscitation failure" were just not captured. During the entire study period, three patients died before arrival to our burn center. Burn flow sheets from these patients are not available. Shock and organ failure with a resulting longer length of stay because of under-resuscitation may also be a concern for those who choose to start at a higher fluid rate. A weak but significant correlation between vasopressor use and death was found. However, the number of hours in the first 24 hours requiring vasopressor support was similar between the two groups (13 ± 5 vs. 12 ± 7, p = 0.80). Furthermore, the modified Brooke group did not have a significantly higher incidence of AKI, ICU, and hospital length of stay. One possible confounding variable may be the encouraged use of early albumin in those who are predicted to have a higher resuscitation volume.[6] In the both groups combined, 40% of them received 5% albumin as early as 12-hour postburn. Despite some reservation with the use of albumin in the early phases of burn resuscitation, recent work by Cochran et al.[18] demonstrate a decreased likelihood of death. This practice may have led the decrease in "resuscitation morbidity" as we recently reported in this group of patients.[5] Regardless, the use of albumin was similar in both groups and whatever benefit it may have conferred was equally distributed.

A few findings were unanticipated. The most surprising finding was the lack of difference in selected outcomes between the two groups. Incidence of the ACS or death was not significantly different between the two groups (5% vs. 11%, p = 0.45; 14% vs. 18%, p = 0.73).[9] The incidence of the ALI/ARDS at admission was similar in both groups as was ventilator-free days in the first 28 days from the time of admission. The most likely reason for this lack of difference is that this study was underpowered. However, one would at least expect a trend toward a higher incidence of the ACS in the Parkland group, given that they received more fluid. This



Figure 4. Frequency distribution of patients based on percent TBSA burned. Comparisons performed between modified Brooke and Parkland at each quartile range (*$p = 0.05$).

did not exist. In fact the opposite is true, with nearly double the rate of the ACS in the modified Brooke group.

This may be explained by the slightly unequal distribution of burns, favoring the Parkland group. A frequency distribution of %TBSA broken out by four quartiles illustrates that the Parkland group has significantly more patients in the 21 to 40% TBSA range compared with the modified Brooke group ($p = 0.03$) (Fig. 4). The first base deficit recorded in the modified Brooke group was higher than the Parkland group (7 ± 4 vs. 4 ± 2, $p < 0.05$), which suggest a higher degree of subclinical shock. Additionally, three patients with burns greater than 90% TBSA were resuscitated using the modified Brooke. There were no patients with greater than 90% TBSA in the Parkland group. It is important to note that providers from our burn center are notified within moments of a casualties' presentation at a combat support hospital and provide close consultation throughout the evacuation process. In addition, an experienced burn provider is strategically located at the busiest combat support hospital in Iraq and provides real-time consultation. Thus, there is the unavoidable bias in favor of the modified Brooke group. More patients were resuscitated using the modified Brooke formula of the 58 completed burn flow sheets available for analysis. This bias may have resulted in more severe patients being placed in the modified Brooke cohort. There was likely a tendency among our burn staff to "tolerate" higher initial fluid volumes in the smaller burns.

Other obvious limitations exist because of the retrospective nature of this study. Missing or unavailable data were a significant issue. Of the 105 patients who should have had a burn flow sheet completed, only 58 (55%) did. Still, this compliance rate is remarkable given the often austere environment from which these patients originate. Most notable is that the unique military medical landscape has resulted in a study that mimics a randomized trial. Although the analysis was retrospective in nature, the clinical practice guideline that was disseminated and adopted by the military in November 2005 provided military medical personnel, with varying degrees of burn experience, an algorithm to follow. Many providers chose to follow the guidelines and calculate an initial fluid rate based on a formula that fell within the boundaries of the American Burn Association consensus 2 $mL \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%TBSA^{-}$ to 4 $mL \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%TBSA^{-1}$ recommendation. A significant number of these providers decided to derive the initial rate using a 2 $mL \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%TBSA^{-1}$ formula, whereas other providers chose to use a 4 $mL \cdot kg^{-1} \cdot \%TBSA^{-1}$ formula. Thus unintentionally, patients are seemingly "randomly" distributed.

Starting at a lower initial rate did not result in a "run-away" resuscitation as one would predict, as delayed resuscitation has long been implicated in a higher fluid requirement.[8] Thus, one could reasonably assume that giving some fluid is likely better, and vastly different, than giving no fluid early postburn. The ultimate goal of burn resuscitation is to provide the least amount of fluid necessary to avoid end-organ failure while avoiding the pitfalls of "fluid creep." Based on our experience, using the Modified Brooke formula to calculate the initial fluid rate did just that.

CONCLUSION

In severely burned military casualties undergoing initial resuscitation, resuscitation with a higher initial fluid rate resulted in a significantly larger fluid volume load in the first 24 hours. Starting at a lower initial volume rate based on a lower 24-hour fluid estimate (modified Brooke formula) results in less fluids being given in the first 24 hours without any detectible difference in outcome and is therefore preferred, especially in those with larger full thickness burns.

REFERENCES

1. Saffle JIL. The phenomenon of "fluid creep" in acute burn resuscitation. *J Burn Care Res.* 2007;28:382–395.
2. American Burn Association. Shock and fluid resuscitation. *Manual of Advanced Burn Life Support.* Chicago: American Burn Association; 2001:33–40.
3. Schwartz SI. Supportive therapy in burn care. Consensus summary on fluid resuscitation. *J Trauma.* 1979;19:876–877.
4. Chung KK, Blackbourne LH, Renz EM, et al. Global evacuation of burn patients does not increase the incidence of venous thromboembolic complications. *J Trauma.* 2008;65:19–24.
5. Ennis JL, Chung KK, Renz EM, et al. Joint Theater Trauma System implementation of burn resuscitation guidelines improves outcomes in severely burned military casualties. *J Trauma.* 2008;64:S146–S151; discussion S151–S152.
6. Chung KK, Blackbourne LH, Wolf SE, et al. Evolution of burn resuscitation in operation Iraqi freedom. *J Burn Care Res.* 2006;27:606–611.
7. Baxter CR. Fluid volume and electrolyte changes of the early postburn period. *Clin Plast Surg.* 1974;1:693–703.
8. Pruitt BA Jr. Fluid and electrolyte replacement in the burned patient. *Surg Clin North Am.* 1978;58:1291–1312.
9. Ivy ME, Atweh NA, Palmer J, Possenti PP, Pineau M, D'Aiuto M. Intra-abdominal hypertension and abdominal compartment syndrome in burn patients. *J Trauma.* 2000;49:387–391.
10. Baxter CR. Problems and complications of burn shock resuscitation. *Surg Clin North Am.* 1978;58:1313–1322.
11. Blumetti J, Hunt JL, Arnoldo BD, Parks JK, Purdue GF. The Parkland formula under fire: is the criticism justified? *J Burn Care Res.* 2008;29:180–186.
12. Cartotto RC, Innes M, Musgrave MA, Gomez M, Cooper AB. How well does the Parkland formula estimate actual fluid resuscitation volumes? *J Burn Care Rehabil.* 2002;23:258–265.

13. Engrav LH, Colescott PL, Kemalyan N, et al. A biopsy of the use of the Baxter formula to resuscitate burns or do we do it like Charlie did it? *J Burn Care Rehabil.* 2000;21:91–95.
14. Friedrich JB, Sullivan SR, Engrav LH, et al. Is supra-Baxter resuscitation in burn patients a new phenomenon? *Burns.* 2004;30:464–466.
15. Pruitt BA Jr. Protection from excessive resuscitation: "pushing the pendulum back." *J Trauma.* 2000;49:567–568.
16. Cancio LC, Chavez S, Alvarado-Ortega M, et al. Predicting increased fluid requirements during the resuscitation of thermally injured patients. *J Trauma.* 2004;56:404–413; discussion 413–414.
17. Baxter C. Fluid resuscitation, burn percentage, and physiologic age. *J Trauma.* 1979;19:864–865.
18. Cochran A, Morris SE, Edelman LS, Saffle JR. Burn patient characteristics and outcomes following resuscitation with albumin. *Burns.* 2007;33:25–30.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

It is commonly held that there are an infinite number of confounding variables that determine the volume and the composition of fluid needed to effectively and safely resuscitate virtually every patient with burns. The two formulas most widely used to estimate the volume of crystalloid fluid needed for the first 24 hours postburn (the Parkland formula [4 $mL \cdot kg$ body $weight^{-1} \cdot$ % TBSA {total body surface area} $burn^{-1}$] and the Modified Brooke formula [2 $mL \cdot kg$ body $weight^{-1} \cdot$ % TBSA $burn^{-1}$]) are the best used to calculate an arbitrary but reasonable starting an hourly volume of crystalloid, i.e., 0.125 $mL \cdot kg$ body $weight^{-1} \cdot$ % TBSA $burn^{-1}$ to 0.25 $mL \cdot kg$ body $weight^{-1} \cdot$ % TBSA $burn^{-1}$. Under resuscitation is unusual. However, as the surface area of the burn and the comorbid factors mount, the problems in resuscitation magnify. Over resuscitation has become an all too frequent and dangerous complication. "Fluid Creep"[1] has become the catch phrase to soften the fact that it commonly represents unphysiologic resuscitation management. This problem is often manifested clinically in progressive respiratory and renal failure and occasionally intra-abdominal hypertension, which may lead to the disastrous abdominal compartment syndrome.

My management scheme in the resuscitation of burned patients has been guided by Dr. Carl Moyer's recommendation that the volume of Ringer's solution with lactate infused should be based entirely on the patient's clinical response and not driven by formula protocol.[2] My scheme, which was initially based on a small prospective randomized controlled study that convinced me of the usefulness of colloid containing fluid,[3] has continued to evolve over the years as our knowledge in critical care has progressed. First, one should immediately correct the frequently occurring metabolic acidosis using blood gas data and intravenously given $NaHCO_3$ to normalize the pH to ≥7.35. Strict guidelines for the administration of and for the volume of fluid given as a bolus must be also established. Although those in burn care and emergency disciplines are adroit at increasing the fluid rate to compensate for evidence of inadequate vascular perfusion, more problematic areas include determining when albumin may be helpful in reducing the IV fluid rate. One should consider using albumin when an IV fluid rate increase produces no improvement in perfusion and/or urine flow. There is no time interval restriction on when this intervention may be effective. Fresh frozen plasma should be used to correct evidence of coagulopathy, a common occurrence among those with larger burns.

In the management of the intravenous fluid, it is important to recognize when it may be ill advised to continue fluid at an established rate. Furthermore, one must constantly assess whether the IV fluid rate can be decreased. Making a sudden large volume reduction in the IV fluid rate, as in the 8th hour reduction in IV fluid rate advocated in the Parkland and Modified Brooke formulae, is also ill advised. When a large reduction in volume is made, especially among those with larger burns, the patient will often gradually drift into systemic shock. To reduce the IV fluid rate, this author for many years has used a more tempered approach. When the patient is hemodynamically stable with a urine output ≥45 $mL \cdot hr^{-1}$ for adults and older children or 1 $mL \cdot kg$ body $weight^{-1}$ for younger children, for 2 consecutive hours, the IV fluid rate is decreased by 10% of the current total hourly IV fluid rate. This process is continued until the estimated insensible fluid loss from the burn ([25 plus % TBSA burn] times M2 body surface area = mL lost $\cdot hr^{-1} \cdot$ {Wilmore}) is equal to the sum of the total hourly IV fluid and enterally administered fluid rates.

In summary, the commonly used formulae that can be used to calculate a reasonable starting volume of crystalloid should not be applied in a rote fashion, but adjusted according to the patients' response to the burn and its treatment. Identify excessive resuscitation as early as possible and the value of colloid in the resuscitation of some patients needs to be recognized. The value of colloid in the resuscitation of some patients needs to be recognized. Finally, we need to take advantage of emerging computer-based technology to develop protocols and algorithms to move beyond using urine volume exclusively in the fluid management of burn resuscitation.[4]

C. Edward Hartford, MD
Department of Surgery
The Division of Pediatric Surgery
The Children's Hospital
University of Colorado Health Sciences Center
Aurora, CO

REFERENCES

1. Pruitt BA Jr. Protection from excessive resuscitation: "pushing the pendulum back." *J Trauma.* 2000;49:567–568.
2. Moyer CA, Margraf HW, Monafo WW Jr. Burn shock and extravascular sodium deficiency—treatment with Ringer's solution with lactate. *Arch Surg.* 1965;90:799–811.
3. Recinos PR, Hartford CE, Ziffren SE. Fluid resuscitation of burn patients comparing a crystalloid with a colloid containing solution: a prospective study. *J Iowa Med Soc.* 1975;65:426–432.
4. Salinas J, Drew G, Gallagher J, et al. Closed-loop and decision-assist resuscitation of burn patients. *J Trauma.* 2008;64:S321–S332.

Attachment C

National Registry Statistics

EMT Statistics
As of 07/07/2015

Virginia:

Report Date:	7/7/2015 4:04:14 PM
Report Type:	State Report (VA)
Registration Level:	EMT-Basic / EMT
Course Completion Date:	3rd Quarter 2012 to 3rd Quarter 2015
Training Program:	All

View Legend | Printer-Friendly Version

Show All | Show Only Percentages | Show Only Numbers

The results of your report request are as follows:

Attempted The Exam	First Attempt Pass	Cumulative Pass Within 3 Attempts	Cumulative Pass Within 6 Attempts	Failed All 6 Attempts	Eligible For Retest	Did Not Complete Within 2 Years
7242	65% (4713 / 7242)	75% (5434 / 7242)	76% (5481 / 7242)	0% (4 / 7242)	15% (1115 / 7242)	9% (644 / 7242)

National Registry Statistics:

Report Date:	7/7/2015 4:06:34 PM
Report Type:	National Report
Registration Level:	EMT-Basic / EMT
Course Completion Date:	3rd Quarter 2012 to 3rd Quarter 2015
Training Program:	All

View Legend | Printer-Friendly Version

Show All | Show Only Percentages | Show Only Numbers

The results of your report request are as follows:

Attempted The Exam	First Attempt Pass	Cumulative Pass Within 3 Attempts	Cumulative Pass Within 6 Attempts	Failed All 6 Attempts	Eligible For Retest	Did Not Complete Within 2 Years
196484	69% (135285 / 196484)	79% (155425 / 196484)	80% (156456 / 196484)	0% (145 / 196484)	14% (26549 / 196484)	7% (13412 / 196484)

Individual Instructor Statistics are available on the OEMS webpage at the following link: http://www.vdh.virginia.gov/OEMS/Files_Page/Training/EMTTestStats05-2015.pdf

Attachment D

Accreditation Report

Accredited Training Site Directory

As of July 7, 2015

Virginia
OFFICE OF EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES
Virginia Department of Health

This Page

Intentionally

Left Blank

Accredited Paramedic Training Programs in the Commonwealth

Site Name	*Site Number*	*BLS Accredited*	*# of Alternate Sites*	*Accreditation Status*	*Expiration Date*
***American National University*[1]**	77512	Yes	--	National – Suspended	CoAEMSP
Central Virginia Community College	68006	Yes	--	National – Continuing	CoAEMSP
Rappahannock Community College	11903	Yes	--	CoAEMSP – LOR	
***Historic Triangle EMS Institute*[3]**	83009	No	1	Voluntary Retired	CoAEMSP
J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College	08709	No	5	National – Continuing	CoAEMSP
Jefferson College of Health Sciences	77007	Yes	---	National – Continuing	CoAEMSP
Lord Fairfax Community College	06903	No	--	National – Initial	CoAEMSP
Loudoun County Fire & Rescue	10704	No	--	National – Continuing	CoAEMSP
Northern Virginia Community College	05906	No	1	National – Continuing	CoAEMSP
Patrick Henry Community College	08908	No	--	CoAEMSP – Initial	
Piedmont Virginia Community College	54006	Yes	--	National – Continuing	CoAEMSP
Prince William County Dept of Fire and Rescue	15312	Yes	--	CoAEMSP – LOR	
***Germanna-Rappahannock EMS Council*[2]**	63007	No	--	Suspended LOR	
Southside Virginia Community College	18507	No	1	National – initial	CoAEMSP
Southwest Virginia Community College	11709	Yes	4	National – Continuing	CoAEMSP
Stafford County & Associates in Emergency Care	15319	No	1	National – Continuing	CoAEMSP
Tidewater Community College	81016	Yes	4	National – Continuing	CoAEMSP
VCU School of Medicine Paramedic Program	76011	Yes	5	National – Continuing	CoAEMSP

Programs accredited at the Paramedic level may also offer instruction at EMT- I, AEMT, EMT, and EMR, as well as teach continuing education and auxiliary courses.

- [1]American National University has suspended their CoAEMSP accreditation for a period of up to 2 years.
- [2]Germanna-Rappahannock EMS Council has suspended their Letter of Review.
- [3]Historic Triangle EMS Institute voluntarily retired their Paramedic accreditation effective April, 2015. Current cohort of students will complete and test for their National Registry certification.
- Prince William County has completed their first cohort class and are awaiting their initial accreditation site visit.
- Rappahannock Community College has completed their first cohort class and will be working on the submission of their self study.
- Central Shenandoah EMS Council is in the process of accreditation at the paramedic level in Virginia which is described on the OEMS web page at: http://www.vdh.virginia.gov/OEMS/Training/Paramedic.htm

Accredited Intermediate[1] Training Programs in the Commonwealth

Site Name	Site Number	BLS Accredited	# of Alternate Sites	Accreditation Status	Expiration Date
Central Shenandoah EMS Council	79001	Yes	3*	State – Full	May 31, 2016
Danville Area Training Center	69009	No	--	State – Full	July 31, 2019
Dabney S. Lancaster Community College	00502	No	--	State – Full	July 31, 2017
Hampton Fire & EMS	83002	Yes	--	State – Full	February 28, 2017
James City County Fire Rescue	83002	No	--	State – Full	February 28, 2019
John Tyler Community College	04115	No	--	State – Full	April 30, 2017
Nicholas Klimenko and Associates	83008	Yes	2	State – Full	July 31, 2016
Norfolk Fire Department	71008	No	--	State – Full	July 31, 2016
Paul D. Camp Community College	62003	No	--	State – Conditional	May 31, 2016
Rappahannock Community College	11903	Yes	3	State – Full	July 31, 2016
Roanoke Regional Fire-EMS Training Center	77505	No	--	State – Full	July 31, 2015
Southwest Virginia EMS Council	52003	No	--	State – Conditional	December 31, 2015
UVA Prehospital Program	54008	No	--	State – Full	July 31, 2019
WVEMS – New River Valley Training Center	75004	No	--	State – Full	June 30, 2017

Programs accredited at the Intermediate level may also offer instruction at AEMT, EMT, and EMR, as well as teach continuing education and auxiliary courses.

- Henrico Fire-School of EMS initial self-study has been received and the site visit will be conducted in August, 2015.
- Roanoke Regional Fire-EMS Training Center's re-accreditation visit will take place in late May/early June.
- *Central Shenandoah EMS Council is now accredited at the BLS level and three alternative sites were approved to offer BLS education only.

Accredited AEMT Training Programs in the Commonwealth

Site Name	*Site Number*	*# of Alternate Sites*	*Accreditation Status*	*Expiration Date*
Frederick County Fire & Rescue	06906	--	State – Conditional	**July 31, 2016**

Accredited EMT Training Programs in the Commonwealth

Site Name	*Site Number*	*# of Alternate Sites*	*Accreditation Status*	*Expiration Date*
Navy Region Mid-Atlantic Fire EMS	71006	--	State – Full	July 31, 2018
City of Virginia Beach Fire and EMS	81004	--	State – Full	July 31, 2018
Frederick County Fire & Rescue	06906	--	State – Conditional	July 31, 2016
Chesterfield Fire & EMS	04103	--	State – Conditional	July 31, 2016

- Harrisonburg Rescue Squad site visit has been conducted and final report is being prepared.

Attachment E

EMSTF Report

Emergency Medical Services Training Funds Summary

As of July 8, 2015

EMS Training Funds Summary of Expenditures

Fiscal Year 2013	Obligated $	Disbursed $
19 Emergency Ops	$1,460.00	$675.00
40 BLS Initial Course Funding	$729,348.00	$369,101.72
43 BLS CE Course Funding	$125,160.00	$46,768.71
44 ALS CE Course Funding	$297,360.00	$77,402.50
45 BLS Auxiliary Program	$80,000.00	$16,200.00
46 ALS Auxiliary Program	$350,000.00	$170,620.00
49 ALS Initial Course Funding	$1,102,668.00	$624,125.61
Total	**$2,685,996.00**	**$1,304,893.54**

Fiscal Year 2014	Obligated $	Disbursed $
19 Emergency Ops	$1,120.00	$360.00
40 BLS Initial Course Funding	$780,912.00	$380,237.25
43 BLS CE Course Funding	$94,010.00	$39,182.50
44 ALS CE Course Funding	$224,950.00	$80,115.00
45 BLS Auxiliary Program	$130,000.00	$61,300.00
46 ALS Auxiliary Program	$304,000.00	$177,985.00
49 ALS Initial Course Funding	$1,188,504.00	$615,334.15
Total	**$2,723,496.00**	**$1,354,513.90**

Fiscal Year 2015	Obligated $	Disbursed $
19 Emergency Ops	$2,480.00	$540.00
40 BLS Initial Course Funding	$708,484.50	$354,375.75
43 BLS CE Course Funding	$56,780.00	$32,663.80
44 ALS CE Course Funding	$139,370.00	$66,236.75
45 BLS Auxiliary Program	$88,705.00	$17,960.00
46 ALS Auxiliary Program	$526,176.00	$141,720.00
49 ALS Initial Course Funding	$1,009,204.00	$591,193.05
Total	**$2,531,199.50**	**$1,234,689.35**