

Regional Fire Authority Planning Committee



OLYMPIA TUMWATER REGIONAL FIRE AUTHORITY PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

Online via Zoom

Monday, April 25, 2022
5:30 PM

1. Welcome
 - [a.](#) RFA Planning Committee Agenda
 - [2.](#) Governance Issues and Options
 - [3.](#) Boundary Change and Recommendations
 - [4.](#) Work Plan Outline
 - [5.](#) Fire Commissioners Salaries and Expenses
 - [6.](#) RFA Action & Question Log
 - [7.](#) Talking Points
8. Adjourn

Remote Meeting Information

To comply with Governor Inslee's Proclamation 20-28, the City of Tumwater meetings will be conducted remotely, not in-person, using a web-based platform. The public will have telephone and online access to all meetings.

Watch Online

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83567586987?pwd=TDg5MnJlYU94Zlc0bjZDYWhPb0dHZz09>

Listen by Telephone

Call (253) 215-8782, listen for the prompts and enter the Webinar ID 835 6758 6987 and Passcode 177489.

Post Meeting

Audio of the meeting will be recorded and later available by request, please email CityClerk@ci.tumwater.wa.us

Accommodations

The City of Tumwater takes pride in ensuring that people with disabilities are able to take part in, and benefit from, the range of public programs, services, and activities offered by the City. To request an accommodation or alternate format of communication, please contact the City Clerk by calling (360) 252-5488 or email CityClerk@ci.tumwater.wa.us. For vision or hearing impaired services, please

contact the Washington State Relay Services at 7-1-1 or 1-(800)-833-6384. To contact the City's ADA Coordinator directly, call (360) 754-4128 or email ADACoordinator@ci.tumwater.wa.us.



REGIONAL FIRE AUTHORITY PLANNING COMMITTEE

Apr. 25, 2022

5:30 - 7:00 pm

AGENDA

1. Welcome
2. **Discussion:** Feedback from City Councils (10 min.) JD/JB
3. **Discussion:** Next steps - initial public outreach session(s) (10 min.) JD/JB
4. **Presentation/Discussion:** Governance Options brainstorming, working towards initial option set (35 min.) KR
5. **Action:** Jurisdictional Boundaries of RFA (10 min) KR
6. **Presentation/Discussion:** Service Level recommendations for RFA Plan (25 min.) Chief John/Chief Hurley
 - Target: maintain and enhance current level of service
 - Issues/Options
7. Wrap up

RFA Governance Issues and Options

Discussion Guide for April 25, 2022 Committee Meeting

A major task for the Annexation Advisory Committee is to recommend the proposed governance structure for the RFA if the annexation is successful

In the three step process we have presented to the City Councils, the first step was the review of the Statement of Value and Principles. The second step is to share a set (4-6 options) of potential governance approaches consistent with the Values and Principles. The discussion on April 25 is the first discussion on this second step.

The third step is to identify a recommended governance option and then share that with the City Councils. The work plan calls for that to will happen in late June.

Part 1: Some food for thought

From the statement of values and principles:

- **Participatory Governance.** Jurisdictions which are part of the RFA should have a meaningful voice in the operating decisions of the RFA. The RFA Board should seek to make decisions by consensus whenever possible.
- The RFA Board will be committed to the success of the RFA and will be engaged in actively learning and understanding the work of the agency.
- We will strive to operate nimbly, with the ability to make decisions and respond quickly when necessary.
- We seek to understand and address the unique needs of the communities we serve. We strive to address these needs equitably in all operating and financial decisions.

(cont'd. below)

City Comparison:

	Olympia	Tumwater
Population (2022 OFM Est.) Olympia is approx. 2.2 times larger in population	55,000	25,360 (2021 OFM)
Square Miles Tumwater is 88% the size of Olympia	20.09	17.78
Assessed Value (Taxable) Olympia's A.V. is approximately 1.9 times that of Tumwater	\$8,991,702,610	\$4,649,454,436
Fire Dept. share of operating budget (2022) (does not include a share of central city administrative costs) Olympia's fire dept. budget is 2.3 times larger than Tumwater's.	\$18,812,866	\$8,178,028
Excess Levy Rate for Fire Capital Bond	\$0.1182	N/A

Calendar Notes

City Council elections, and RFA commissioner elections are held every 2 years, in odd years. In our schedule, the RFA will be created in August 2023.

Part 2: Basic Rules of Governance, revisited:

1. All board members must be **elected officials from a member jurisdiction** (RCW 52.20.080) or **elected directly** by the electorate of the RFA.
 - City Council members & Mayor (Tumwater) serve 4-year terms; elections are every 2 years.
 - Permanent appointed/designated positions by Cities would require the selected City elected officials to do double-duty—serve on both City Council and the Board of Commissioners
2. **Initial board seats need to be appointed**, since there won't be an election between the time the RFA is approved by voters and when it starts to meet.
 - The first election for elected officials after the RFA is created will be the August primary – less than a week after the RFA is created.
 - The next election is in 2025. This would be the first point at which Board members could be directly elected.
3. Board structure **may change over time**:
 - a. RFA Plans typically allow the governing board to change the governance structure in the future by majority vote of the board. The Plan can expressly limit this authority—supermajority vote requirement for change or require resubmittal to voters in order to change. But the risk is that if you retain too much control of the RFA governance, the member Cities could be held liable for its actions—which is why RFA plan give the RFA Board the right to determine its future composition.
4. There is no legal limit on number of members—but there is a practical limit. Typically, an odd-number of seats is preferred to reduce the likelihood of tie votes.
5. The Board can include **non-voting members**, appointed to the Board. Any non-voting members need to be elected officials.
6. RFA board members' terms may not exceed 6 years, and election terms must be staggered (RCW 52.26.080(3)(b)).
7. In an RFA with “districted” board positions, the candidates must **reside in the district**.
 - a. The **primary vote is by district** (to identify the top two candidates).
 - b. In **the general election vote, all voters in the RFA vote on all positions**.
8. As noted above, Board members may be a mix of “directly elected” and “appointed.” However, if the board is comprised of a majority of members who are **elected**, the *elected positions* are subject to the state constitutional **one person, one vote principle**.
 - a. “One-person, one vote” principle requires a relatively equal population base to be represented by each *elected* position.

b. How is an **appointed** position defined versus an **elected** position?

- (1) **Appointed:** Any situation where the Commissioners or Councils must select members from amongst the whole group of elected officials in their jurisdiction is considered an “appointed” position.
- (2) **Elected:** Any “**automatic appointments**” from the Cities or District to the RFA Board—e.g., “the Mayor” or “the Council President” or “Commission President”—or “**all commissioners**” are deemed to be “**elected**” positions, not appointed positions, because there is no discretion involved in the appointment process.

At the point at which a majority of members are elected, the elected members must be elected on a one-person, one-vote basis.

For example, “three elected officials from Olympia and three elected officials from Tumwater” would involve 6 **appointed** positions. No one-person, one-vote issue triggered.

Part 3: DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. What is important about the RFA Board and its role?
2. How about the initial start-up Board; what's most important in the starting time-period? What are the differences between the board's initial role and the role over time?
3. Over time, what are some of the mutually beneficial (RFA-Cities) efforts you can imagine taking place over time?

a. Can you foresee conflicts? What might they be?

4. Initial start-up board

The Initial board of appointed folks will need to serve about 2.5 years. With everyone doing double duty at the RFA and their City Council.

- a. What do you see as the largest workable **initial** board size? Why?
- b. Do you have some proposals for how this initial board might be structured? What do you see as the benefits of the proposal(s)?

(Cont'd.)

5. Should the initial board transition to a different configuration? Why or why not?

- a. What are the pros and cons of transitioning from an initial board structure to something with at least some members of the RFA board being directly elected by voters, rather than all appointed by the Cities?

- b. What do you see as the pros and cons of having districted board members versus at-large members? What about having a mix of both?

- c. Do you have some proposals for how the longer-term board might be structured? What do you see as the benefits of the proposal(s)?

Next steps:

Based on initial feedback from the Committee members on the questions above, the Consultant team will develop options for consideration at the next meeting. The goal is to develop several potential options for consideration to share with the City Council's for their input.

Apr. 25, 2022

Issue: RFA Boundaries

Background: The RFA Plan needs to identify the boundaries of the RFA and the implications if the cities annex areas in the future, as well as the RFA's ability to annex other proximate jurisdictions. The following language sets forth the recommended approach to confirming the RFA Boundaries and how they may change over time. The goal is to minimize the need for elections to accomplish annexations if such elections are not otherwise required by statute, and to confirm the RFA will have independent authority to seek to annex areas (requires voter approval). With support of the Planning Committee, language below will be inserted into the draft RFA Plan.

Staff recommendation: Approve the proposed language.

A. JURISDICTIONAL BOUNDARIES ON DATE OF FORMATION

1. On the Effective Date of the RFA, the jurisdictional boundaries of the RFA shall be the legal boundaries of the Participating Jurisdictions --- the City of Olympia and the City of Tumwater.

B. CHANGES IN JURISDICTIONAL BOUNDARIES AFTER FORMATION OF THE RFA**1. Boundary changes that do not require an RFA Plan amendment:**

1.1. City annexations of areas not included within current city boundaries. On the effective date of such annexation, the territory annexed shall automatically be included within the boundaries of the RFA pursuant to RCW 52.26.290. The territory added to the RFA by such annexation shall be subject to the taxation, charges, and bonded indebtedness (if approved as part of the annexation process) of the RFA. Any transfer of assets or employees that occurs because of annexation shall be between the transferring entity and the RFA.

1.2. RFA Annexations. Pursuant to RCW 52.26.090(g), the RFA shall have the authority to conduct annexations of unincorporated territory adjacent to the RFA pursuant to the statutory authority and procedures set forth in RCW 52.04.001 through RCW 52.04.051.

1.3. RFA Partial Mergers. Pursuant to RCW 52.26.090(g), the RFA shall have the authority to participate in the partial merger process under the authority and pursuant to the procedures set forth in RCW 52.06.090 and RCW 52.06.100.

2. Boundary Changes that require an RFA Plan Amendment.

2.1. Annexations of Adjacent Fire Protection Jurisdictions [including cities or fire districts in proximity to the RFA's boundaries]. Other fire protection jurisdictions that are adjacent to the boundaries of the RFA are eligible for annexation by the RFA. Upon Plan amendment and voter approval as provided in the annexation procedures of RCW 52.26.300, the boundary of the RFA will be expanded to include adjacent fire protection jurisdictions.

City of Tumwater – City of Olympia

RFA Planning Committee

WORK PLAN

v. 4.8.22

Core policy issues	
Major Policy Issues for Committee	Other Key Planning Issues
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Election date • RFA incorporation date, Levy start date • Financial Plan for RFA • Terms of asset transfers • Governance structure • Public outreach/communication plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project cost sharing • Projected Labor Costs • Org Chart upon merger • Standard of Cover/Level of Service • Assigning contracts • Admin services – how provided? Cost? • Fire Marshal services • City Emergency Management services

Schedule Summary	
RFA Planning Committee Submits RFA Plan to Councils for Action	October 2022
City Councils deliberate	October 2022-February 2023
Councils act to approve Plan and place RFA measure before voters	By Late February 2023
Election	April 2023
RFA Effective Date	No later than August 1, 2023
RFA taxes, charges imposed	January 2024

Council/Board/Other Check-ins:

- Monthly verbal check ins from Committee Members/City Manager/City Administrators with their Councils.
- Periodic formal presentations to Councils—seeking concurrence as decisions are made.
- Two rounds of public outreach
 - Email link on web for public to submit questions /comments at any time

Proposed RFA Committee Agendas and Report-outs to Council/Commission

*This assumes two 2- hour committee meeting each month targeting completion of deliberations in time for possible **April 2023** election.*

Meeting packets would go out 3 days in advance to committee; staff drafts due 1 week in advance of meeting. Staff meetings 2x month to prepare for the briefings.

Standing meeting items would include: approving written meeting summaries; updates from recent council/commission meetings, communications updates; response to questions from prior meetings.

Blue = process, schedule, outreach Green = financial Purple = governance Orange = Operations

February 28 | Meeting #1

1. Presentation: Overview of the RFA Planning Committee Role, Process, Timeline, Key Issues
2. Review of sample RFA plan
3. **Draft Work Plan**
 - a. Discussion: meeting cadence to complete work
4. Introduction: **Draft Charter**
5. Introduction: **Draft Communications plan**
 - a. Discussion: First point at which you will want formal presentation to City Councils about planning committee work?
6. Update from subcommittees

March 14 | Meeting # 2

1. *Review:* Project purpose statement from Chiefs/CM
2. *Possible action:* **Committee charter**
3. *Possible action:* **Communications plan**
4. Presentation: **RFA funding-- fire levy, other revenues, importance of RFA reserves, fund balance, Fire Benefit Charges**

March 28 | Meeting #3

1. **Finance Issues and Options: Continued Discussion**
2. Presentation/discussion: **Governance Options, sample Governance principles and values**
3. Review: **Chief's Statement**
4. Review: **Fire Department comparative data**
 - a. Staffing, assets
 - b. Current Service levels (response times, special programs)
 - c. Current budgets and levy rate equivalents

April 11 | Meeting #4

1. Action: [Approval of Work Plan](#)
2. Action: [Confirm Timeline](#)—when RFA Plan will be submitted to Councils, Proposed RFA Start Date, Levy start date.
3. Action: [Governance principles and values statement](#)
4. Presentation/Discussion: [Asset Transfers options & issues](#)
5. Presentation/Discussion: [Administrative services options, issues](#)
6. Discussion: [Initial public engagement](#) – approach, messages, timing
7. [Prep for Council presentations](#)

- **City Council Presentations (April 19)**

April 25 | Meeting #5

1. Discussion: Feedback from City Councils
2. [Finalize plan for initial public outreach session\(s\)](#)
3. Presentation/Discussion: [Governance Options, working towards initial option set](#)
4. Action: [Jurisdictional Boundaries of RFA](#)
5. Review/Discussion: [Approach to Projected Labor Costs, labor transition to RFA](#)
6. Presentation/Discussion: [Service Level recommendations for RFA Plan](#)

May 9 | Meeting #6

1. Continued Discussion: [Governance: Committee identification of 3-4 preferred options](#)
2. [Initial Draft Finance Plan Review](#): Costs to operate new RFA, incorporating projected labor costs, inflation assumptions, other
 - a. [Update on Fire Benefit Charge data collection and analysis](#)

- **May 19 Public Outreach Sessions– RFA 101 focus**

May 23 | Meeting #7

1. [Governance](#): discussion of Council/commission feedback and [recommendation](#)
2. Presentation/Discussion: [Asset Transfer proposal from Staff Team](#)
3. [RFA Name recommendations, selection](#)

June 13 | Meeting #8

1. Presentation/Discussion: **Financial Plan:**
 - a. **Fire Benefit Charge issues/options and Fire Levy Rate**
2. Presentation/discussion: **Organizational chart, administrative services recommendations**
3. Continued discussion: **Asset Transfers**

June 27 | Meeting #9

1. Continued discussion: **Financial Plan** —Council feedback, refine options
 - a. **Fire Benefit Charge Formula**
2. Continued discussion as necessary: **Asset Transfers**
3. Continued discussion as necessary: **Governance**
4. **Public Engagement Round two: proposed approach, content**
5. **Go – No Go Decision**
6. **Prepare for Council presentations**
7. Presentation Discussion: RFA Name—launch process to identify options
 - **Council Presentations:**
 - **Committee Recommendations: Governance, Org Chart, Asset Transfers**
 - **Update on Financial plan/approach**
 - **Plan for second round of public engagement**

July 11 | Meeting #10

1. **Review of public feedback**
 2. Continued discussion/Recommendation: **Financial Plan & FBC Formula**
 3. Discussion of Remaining Issues
 4. **Preparation for Council presentation**
- **Second Round Public Engagement Session(s)**

July 25 | Meeting #11

1. Discussion of Council input
 2. Discussion of remaining RFA Plan issues
 3. Schedule Review & Confirmation
- **Council Presentations: Public Feedback update, preferred finance option**

August 8 | Meeting # 12 [hold] –

August 22 | Meeting #13 [cancel] use for staff work.

September 12 | Meeting #12

1. Review **draft RFA plan**
 2. Election funding costs, public education plan & funding
 3. [Plan for Council session introducing RFA Plan, outreach/election issues](#)
 4. Process/timing for engaging election public outreach consultant
- **Council Presentations: Proposed RFA Plan, Discussion of public outreach plan/funding, election funding**

September 26 | Meeting #13

5. **Finalize draft RFA plan** based on Councils' input & direct staff to transmit for consideration
 6. Selection of [public outreach consultant](#) for election/public education phase
- **Council Presentations: Final RFA Plan, Election Schedule Confirmation**

October 10 | Meeting #14

1. Discuss Council feedback
2. Meet with [public outreach consultant](#)

October 24 | Meeting #15

Other items as needed

Committee may or may not continue meeting to oversee preparations for election/public outreach.

Fire Commissioners' Salaries and Expenses

RCW 52.14.010

- [RCW 52.14.010\(2\)\(a\)](#) relates to Fire Commissioners' salaries and expenses and provides that: “Each member of an elected board of fire commissioners shall each receive one hundred four dollars per day or portion thereof, not to exceed nine thousand nine hundred eighty-four dollars per year, for time spent in actual attendance at official meetings of the board or in performance of other services or duties on behalf of the district. Members serving in an ex officio capacity on a board of fire commissioners may not receive compensation, but shall receive necessary expenses in accordance with (b) of this subsection.” (Emphasis added.)
- The amounts of \$104.00 per day and \$9,984.00 per year are subject to [RCW 52.14.010\(4\)](#) which permits adjustment for inflation by the Office of Financial Management every five years, beginning January 1, 2019, based on changes in the consumer price index during that time period.
- Note that [RCW 52.14.010\(2\)\(b\)](#) also provides that “(b) Each member of a board of fire commissioners shall receive necessary expenses incurred in attending meetings of the board or when otherwise engaged in district business, and shall be entitled to receive the same insurance available to all firefighters of the district: PROVIDED, That the premiums for such insurance, except liability insurance, shall be paid by the individual commissioners who elect to receive it.” (Emphasis added.)
- There are other limitations set out in [RCW 52.14.010\(5\)](#) if the person holding office as a Commissioner holds positions for two or more special purpose districts or serving ex officio as commissioner as a member of the legislative authority of a city or town with regard to receipt of per diem compensation authorized by one of their official positions (in other words, no double-dipping of per diem).

Olympia Tumwater RFA Planning Committee

RFA Committee Action, Decision, Question Log

April 11, 2022**Councilmembers:** Yen Huynh, Michael Althaus, Lisa Parshley, Eileen Swarthout, Leatta Dahlhoff, Jim Cooper**Staff:** Erika Stone, Chief Brian Hurley, Olympia City Manager Jay Burney, Rian Winter for James Osberg, Tumwater City Administrator John Doan, Chief Mark John, Steve Busz**Consultant Team:** Karen Meyer, Karen Reed, Bill Cushman

Actions taken/actions needed	Assigned to	Update
Form Comparables ad hoc sub-committee	Steven Busz, James Osberg, Jay Burney	None
Form Capital Assets ad hoc sub-committee	Brian Hurley, Mark John, John Doan	None
Internal/External website, social media, news release discussion	John Doan, Jay Burney	John D. Doan- no emailed qx. Website, is up. Olympia links to that. Public workshop scheduled - May 19.
APPROVED Timeline as proposed, 6 Yes 0 No.		
APPROVED work plan with revisions Version 4.4.22, 6 Yes 0 No.		
APPROVED Shared Values and Principals with edits 6 Yes 0 No.		
Send updated Work Plan to Committee.	Karen R.	
Administration development-2/4 weeks and bring in Labor for discussion.	Jay/John/Chiefs	
Send salary statute - paying commissioners.	Karen R.	
Update Public Engagement PowerPoint with feedback from tonight.	Karen M./Karen R.	
Develop 'Why' slide to add to Public Engagement PP.	Jay/John/Chiefs	
Review Apr. 19 Councils PP for wording and voice.	Kellie B./Ann C	

QUESTIONS LOG		
Question	Answer	Follow-up/assigned to
Work Plan		
When is the “go, no go” in the schedule?	June 27 th (date has not changed) .	
Is there a second “go, no go” date?	No, we can stop at any point if there is impasse or not a good idea and can bring it back to council and they would formally take action to withdrawal from the process.	
In Timeline where is it that we talk about the needs and programs and how we are selling it and what we are offering such as admin services and how to identify? Brainstorming or needs assessment on what we can offer or build?	First opportunity comes at the next meeting and talks about service levels. Something we need to be thinking about what are the synergies coming together such as transports and cares unit.	
Crisis response unit as part of EMS program - is this a part of this RFA program as well?	That is intertwined in the conversation when finding the final structure and checking all the programs that may be better served through an RFA.	
When do we get the separate campaign team put together as we can't do that as elected?	We are getting too ahead of ourselves for this. We would bring this on and interview campaign consultants when the final plan goes to city councils. Have fall and early winter to get together and get messages out.	
Will there be a committee to discuss service levels, programs and labor?	Yes, this staff team will include union contacts and engage people when needed and prioritize to make it financially realistic. We had a meeting today looking at Lacey's admin model, additional staffing, capacity in org chart and find out how much it costs and how to factor that in moving forward. Involved the chiefs and needs to bring the union into that to discuss and talk about priorities.	
Asset Transfers (Conversation with John/Jay move assets as is, exceptions with bonds/Levy may have leases with a reversion that the city would get the asset back.)		

Keep capital facilities obligation to massage the numbers if it's too big of a sticker for the public?	It would have to tell the public about the cities' costs they are retaining.	
What will both cities do with the tax dollars we cost when we exit the city? (\$12.5 million on the citizens of Olympia, that was one of the points that was a cause for failure for Aberdeen/Hoq and the reduction of city budget and increase of taxes for public.)	Ultimately what the cities decide to do here but this is an important part of the discussion with voters—the net cost impact of the RFA. You may not be able to make this revenue neutral, and you may want to reserve some of the savings for other public projects. We will need to be transparent with the community about what the Cities will do when the FD comes off the books – will you reduce taxes or not, and if so by how much? If you are keeping some money, what will you use it for?	
Levy lid lift, Oly passed public safety when talking about people paying twice why wouldn't our levy go away?	It could still remain and that becomes part of this. The city must make a decision to keep, or reduce it. Levy Lift is not an EMS charge, its blended with property tax that is where the two additional fire engines planned to be funded by the Tumwater levy. This has to be worked out.	
Administration		
How do we know how many people we need? Is there a formula for it or how is it determined?	Given the workload, responsibilities, assistance they will need to determine what will be the most reasonable best guess. Rely on Lacey FD guide as a model and work through that, which is similar in size to what we are trying to achieve.	
Public Engagement		
Details of first public engagement?	May 19, 6pm virtual workshop, opportunity for questions and answers. Committee Members are welcome to attend and it will be a public meeting but spectators and not join conversations.	
Will we have briefing material on the website for dialogue outside of the meeting?	Suggest website link for questions/comments, we can spruce up in a public engagement process here is the link to submit Qs. We can advertise the email address after the	

	meeting. Olympia should share the engagement tool as well. Communications teams can link up for that.	
Is there a way to get feedback from those that would not want to do a zoom meeting? Can we do a poll before voting as well?	Polling is not built into the work plan but we can add it and get it funded. We have to come back and chat about that.	

March 28, 2022

Councilmembers: Yen Huynh, Michael Althaus, Lisa Parshley, Eileen Swarthout, Leatta Dahlhoff, Jim Cooper

Staff: Erika Stone, Chief Brian Hurley, Olympia City Manager Jay Burney, James Osberg, Tumwater City Administrator John Doan, Chief Mark John, Steve Busz

Consultant Team: Karen Meyer, Karen Reed,

Action taken/action needed	Assigned to	Update
Form Comparables ad hoc sub-committee	Steven Busz, James Osberg, Jay Burney	
Form Capital Assets ad hoc sub-committee	Brian Hurley, Mark John, John Doan	
Internal/External website, social media, news release discussion	John Doan, Jay Burney	<p>Jay-Meeting with Tumwater/Olympia communication this week and work with communication strategies for outreach.</p> <p>John-City of Tumwater webpage updates with meetings and packets. Tumwater committed to maintain on behalf and Olympia will just link to ours. Email address for questions on the website also.</p>

Questions:

Communications Plan

- Fire Chief Meetings in Thurston County can this be added to as a topic on one of these meetings?
 - There has been conversation amongst leadership and area departments and can bring this up on next meeting.

- When will we be going out to the public and is that on the work plan and when does that happen?
 - Four touches with the council and two outreach and has dates and periods for each touches in the work plan that we will review in next meeting.
 - Another outreach to inform the community about the RFA.
- Briefing before decision around campaign rules and planning committee, good as a reminder for the rules.

Financial Discussion

- Is there a way to get the voter approval numbers for the Fire Districts that started with an FBC charge and how much they won by (Generally 60% Minimum).
- Boundary of the RFA can we ask the voters to keep the boundaries or do we need to do annexations when cities grow?
 - Can only create RFA with your own jurisdictions.
 - As you annex the areas you annex are pulled into the RFA no need to get their vote can write this into the plan.
- Cities and other jurisdictions are putting in resiliency reserves is that something that needs to go into this?
 - Bill Cushman can speak to this, we can add in emergency reserve and size it with that in mind.
- Include in talking points moving along equipment replacements and the growth. Both cities do not have a good equipment replacement plan and that is one of the most expensive things besides personnel.

Chiefs Statement

- More on number 2, more context what does that mean one or two more sentences.
- More on number 1, what is the response time, examples, cultures and examples.
- If we can add a human element, response time, or staff and use that messaging and how we build upon that.
- Great one page, building on it some more for communication without losing our audience.
- Maximizing administrative and operational efficiency, using plain talking with some of the words.

Agency Comparison (intended audience is Committee, but may be used for communications plan)

- Big discussion point for Olympia to stay at a FSRB rate 2, is there a way to get reviewed as we go in to avoid a delay and rate increases? Important to tell this story and what it means for the public.
 - Brian has a meeting this week for this and was going to ask that question and get more information.
- Medic One BLS \$ is incorporated already in Tumwater \$2.7, remove \$50K
- Contract with the port for the airport?
 - Tumwater doesn't have a contract since 2007. Likely have an agreement in place soon.
- Would the revenue scenario for RFA include billing for transport?
 - It could, Olympia is working on a BLS transport proposal. Presenting the next 30 days to council BLS transport. Private ambulance transport has been unavailable and units are then held back to transport.
 - Adding a BLS transport would it help the response times? Would adding a 7th station help with this problem?

- Reduce call volume or add resources to the system. Will take time to determine how many resources would be needed. CARES program to help with some of these BLS calls and referrals from the system to reduce call volumes.
- Is the CARES program funded and reflected in the Olympia numbers above?
 - No it would be an additional program but there are state and federal tax dollars available for these programs. CMS ground transport through medicare funding available.
- Campaign plan and marketing for Tumwater as well BLS transporting need.
 - Mark John has shared information with Chief Hurley and if Tumwater started with Olympia's program it would be moved with the RFA.
 - Finance meeting in April will go over this some more, details and can send Lisa Parshley an email and get the email packet.
- FD CARES and BLS transport would be a priority for the FD and for both agencies.
 - Can add these especially with offsetting grant revenues and Karen Reed can model this to show it.
- Debt payments for Olympia is that in FD budget or a separate debt payment the city makes?
 - Its separate not part of the FD Budget.
- Discrepancies in vehicles are there different policy difference that is driving the disparity?
 - Per capita, and a good number of vehicles in Olympia are inspectors. Some are policy decisions made over the years with the inspection program in general. ASST Chief, Fire Marshall, and 3 inspectors.
 - Both do annual inspections, but Olympia does new construction review that Tumwater Community development does. That would be a nuance we would need to figure out.
 - Was that revenue accounted for in this document? Or would that need to be considered?
 - Sprinkler inspection in fire budget, part of building review fee is not separated out.
- Do we need to make all policy changes in advance before we give it to voters or do they come after the fact?
 - You could keep different policies in place, but would need to sort how the Fire Marshall services are handled and how financials work for the community. Does not have to be identical can remain local decision.
- Olympia- Staff Vehicles are 12, Battalion vehicles are 2.

Governance

- At large, can you set up a district or does it have to be at large?
 - If you have districts they have to be equal in population and encompass the RFA.
- Tumwater is not use to districting, we have to calibrate that as it goes which has costs included.
 - Roughly every decade, consultants are not terribly expensive and have to keep them up to date.
- If we set this RFA up and Lacey FD decides to join can you flip to districting at that point?
 - Yes you can.

Draft Statement of Shared Values and Principals

- #2 be #1 and #8 be #2, they are not numerically ranked.
- Public safety piece is not clear here, a lot of government jargon. Flesh out #2 that this is reason we are here is public safety.

- Governance board when it is all set, they are committed to the operations of the RFA. Benefit of RFA is become sole entity focused on public safety (FIRE & EMS), and educated and understands the work being done. Likes the document, it's important to help formulate the needs of everyone here.
 - Successful vote may include a few city council members at first, they are trusted faces
 - When we start it must be elected city officials.
- Builds on the chief's statement and these are covered in this document also.
- Agrees with moving values around, fire commissioners vs another committee and have a single focus and having people who do the work.
- Agree with reordering the principals so they flow differently. Mission and how it will be handled and end strong engagement with communities.

Talking Points for Council

- In communication plan, can we add an RFA corner in Tumwater newsletter?
 - Perhaps at a council work session.
 - Talking points to have the website added to it and discuss.
- Olympia end of council reports- tag teamed and some competing reports going on and some people are checked out and Jay does give an email update on it. Would love to see another avenue for updates, some prefer email and can read at their leisure.
- Olympia- Under announcements once a month RFA update real quick and what is coming up.

Actions: Work Plan and Project Timeline discussion held for April 11th meeting.

Follow Ups:

- Karen Meyer will try another format (Table preferred) for the Action Item lists for feedback at the next meeting.
- Karen Reed- Find out % of RFA that started with FBC and how the votes went.
- Brian & Mark- minor adjustments to the Chief statement with comments from above and send out in between meetings to get approved and on the website. ‘
- Draft Statement of Shared Values & Principals- Karen Reed to bring back updated with comments.
- Brian to share information from FSRB meeting from above questions.
- Talking points- add the website for the RFA.

March 14, 2022

Councilmembers: Yen Huynh, Michael Althaus, Lisa Parshley, Eileen Swarthout, Leatta Dahlhoff, Jim Cooper

Staff: Erika Stone, Chief Brian Hurley, Olympia City Manager Jay Burney, Rian Winter (fill in for James Osberg), Tumwater City Administrator John Doan, Chief Mark John, Steve Busz (fill in for Erin Johnson),

Consultant Team: Karen Meyer, Karen Reed, Bill Cushman

Action taken/action needed	Assigned to	Update
----------------------------	-------------	--------

Form Comparables ad hoc sub-committee	Steven Busz, James Osberg, Jay Burney	
Form Capital Assets ad hoc sub-committee	Brian Hurley, Mark John, John Doan	Karen R sent out spreadsheet for staff and teams have been working on that.
Internal/External website, social media, news release discussion	John Doan, Jay Burney	Jay -waiting on charter before announcing to public. Oly RFA site will link to Tumwater's page. John -updating our website with meetings and agendas. Looking at permitting and equipment with RFA.

Questions:

- Will we be doing a lot of communications to get the word out on this RFA?
 - Once finalized website is a good launch point for communications.
- Communications plan- we will be using certain platforms? Tumwater doesn't use Instagram and how do we reach each demographics?
 - PIOs within each city and how they want to handle that, coordinate sharing posts so we are not creating multiple messages.
 - Tumwater union has different protocols for postings vs. city pages.
 - We can re-share posts from other organizations to get the messages out to other people.
 - Steve- we have media branches within our state WSCFF, and have been very active from union side for portion of this. This is an option as well, Olympia and 2409 have twitter, Instagram, FB to reach a larger audience.
 - Jay—Locals should rebroadcast messages developed by the team rather than create their own messages, to avoid conflicts.
 - How do we reach out and engage people from both Olympia and Tumwater?
 - John- spoke with communications manager, suggested email account with questions. We need to do public meeting and afford the opportunity for the public to speak but we don't have enough answers right now.
 - Who is in the lead in communications so it's all co-branded and with one person?
 - This is not decided yet, will sort out in the coming days after this meeting.
- FAQs
 - Last question-will my fire station be closed?
 - Did not sit well, didn't answer the question.
 - Re-order put health, wellness and community FAQ first and then other items after.
 - Heart attach save rate and how we like to maintain that, continued partnership with TC Medic one.
 - Add question: how would I pay my benefit charge? Explaining paid similar to taxes via escrow.

- Add note about the Cardiac Save program being preserved.
- Committee agrees to revisions for Karen M.
- Work Plan
 - After discussion, the group agreed a Go-no-go decision should be added to the work plan at 2nd June meeting.
 - Did we talk about going to a lower turnout in April vs August?
 - Talked about the work plan and to go in April is to levy taxes for the following year.
 - Town meeting communications- windows for these are proposed in work plan dates are not set and include hybrid models.
- Charter revisions review & Approval
 - Charter approved as revised, with correction on quorum (4, not 5)
- RFA Financing Presentation
 - Benefit charges exemptions, state buildings in Tumwater are owned by private owners would not be exempt.
 - Estimate that 1/3 of state occupied buildings in Tumwater are privately owned.
 - State occupied building charges could be negotiated.
 - How do you pay the FBC bill, can it be worked into escrow how do you actually pay it?
 - Most have it worked out as part of their property tax bill (although the FBC is not a property tax).
 - How many other RFA came in with FBC?
 - Have seen some start with, some without.
 - Karen will provide data on what others have done.
 - Initial estimate is that we will need an FBC to fully fund current levels of service.
 - Please quantify how much we would need to cut to not use FBC.
 - Can we fund service improvements as well with this model?

ACTIONS:

- Communications plan - "Thumbs up"
- Jay - Mark Barber, City of Olympia has agreed to be legal counsel for this work. If outside legal counsel is needed, we will discuss and figure out cost-share.
- John Doan - Agrees to pay for the database consultant if needed. "Thumbs up" for hiring a database consultant. Rough cost \$10,000.
- Preliminary "thumbs up" on draft work plan - (correcting annexation date)
- Draft Charter: CM Lisa motion to approve draft charter, CM Michael seconds motion. 4 Aye, motion passes unanimously.

Follow ups:

- Karen M. will email Chief's draft purpose statement.
- Karen M. to revise FAQs and send to city administrators to review/post. If questions, changes then, let Karen M know.
- Karen R. - will add "go-no-go" on the work plan by end of June 27. Will bring revision for next meeting.
- Erika to add meetings in Sept, and Oct. 2nd and 4th Mondays per Karen R.

- Jay- work on Olympia's website for Agenda and Meeting materials (legistar)
- Karen M. - email talking points to council.
- Karen R. will go back and look at other RFAs to see how many started or added FBCs.

February 28, 2022

Attendees: Erika Stone, Karen Meyer, Karen Reed, Brian Hurley, Jay Burney, James Osberg, John Doan, Bill Cushman, Mark John, Faith Trimble, Steve Busz.

Councilmembers: Yen Huynh, Michael Althaus, Lisa Parshley, Eileen Swarthout, Leatta Dahlhoff

Action taken/action needed	Assigned to	Update
Form Comparables ad hoc sub-committee	Steven Busz, James Osberg, Jay Burney	Created preliminary spreadsheet.
Form Capital Assets ad hoc sub-committee	Brian Hurley, Mark John, John Doan	Financial spreadsheet updates, additional requests may be made by Bill.
Internal/External website, social media, news release discussion	John Doan, Jay Burney	

Questions:

- Tumwater and Olympia attorneys should have a discussion and discuss bandwidth and expertise. If not available, may need to look at hiring legal counsel
- Fire Benefit Charge requires 60% approval to create RFA. (Can County Assessor accommodate with timeline?)
- Can we consider a why/purpose statement for the RFA, for when public and staff ask questions? Who will be on point at each city to prepare talking points, FAQs, etc?
- Agenda- Suggest we add main talking points to the agenda (to prepare our report out to councils)

Follow ups:

- Jay/John
 - Finalize staff team
 - Meet with Chiefs and Bill C.
- Karen M.
 - Examples of RFA plans
 - Survey who would like a binder for RFA committee documents (Erika/Susan can assist with creating binders)
 - Send out revised draft communications plan; revised draft charter
- 2nd and 4th Monday for RFA meeting proposal
 - Karen M. to plan with John and Jay. (Erika to schedule extra meeting)

- Karen Reed- next mtg - come back with new draft charter
- Steve Busz- send spreadsheet to Bill, John and Jay from comparable sub-committee.

January 24, 2022

Action taken	Assigned to	Update
Form Comparables ad hoc sub-committee	Steven Busz, James Osberg, Jay Burney	
Form Capital Assets ad hoc sub-committee	Brian Hurley, Mark John, John Doan	

Questions/Follow up Requests:

- Work plan - facilitator (Karen M)
- Communication plan – facilitator (Karen M)

Talking points - Councils

A Regional Fire Authority Planning Committee started meeting in 2021 and has met 5 times. To date, the Committee has:

- Adopted a charter to guide our work.
- Adopted a work plan and project timeline
 - The work plan includes four check-ins with both city councils and two rounds of public engagement to gather information as we develop the RFA Plan
- Adopted an initial communications plan
 - We have a website hosted by Tumwater that includes all our meeting agendas and materials as well as FAQs for the public and an email for public inquiries
- Approved a statement of values & principles to guide our work
- Approved a plan for an initial round of public engagement
- Reviewed finance and governance options
- Doubled our meeting cadence to be sure we can submit a draft RFA plan to Councils this fall