

Regional Fire Authority Planning Committee



OLYMPIA TUMWATER REGIONAL FIRE AUTHORITY PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

Online via Zoom and In Person at
Tumwater Fire Department
Headquarters, Training Room, 311 Israel
Rd. SW, Tumwater, WA 98501

**Monday, September 26, 2022
5:30 PM**

1. Welcome
 - [a.](#) Agenda
2. Debrief Town Hall
- [3.](#) Projected 2023 Increase in Assessed Value
- [4.](#) FBC Formula Options
5. RFA Name
- [6.](#) Governance: Term length and staggering
7. Draft RFA Plan for Committee
- [8.](#) RFA Action Question Log

Meeting Information

All committee members will be attending remotely. The public are welcome to attend in person, by telephone or online via Zoom.

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.

9. Adjourn



REGIONAL FIRE AUTHORITY PLANNING COMMITTEE

Sept. 26, 2022

5:30 - 7:30 pm

AGENDA

1. **Welcome** and Review of Agenda - Chair Dahlhoff
2. Debrief Town Hall; Other updates (15 min.) - Jay, John
3. Projected 2023 Increase in Assessed Value (10 min.) – Jay, John, Karen R.
4. FBC Formula Options - (25 min.) - Jay, John, Bill, Neil
 - **Goal:** Select formula to move forward as recommendation
5. RFA Name (10 min.) - Chiefs Carson and Hurley
6. Governance: Term length and staggering (15 min.) - Karen R.
7. **Review:** Draft RFA Plan for Committee (15 min.) - Karen R.
8. **Adjourn**

Talking points

A Regional Fire Authority Planning Committee started meeting in 2021.

The Committee has met 14 times. To date, the Committee has:

- **Adopted a charter, work plan and proposed project timeline**
- **Set up a [website hosted by Tumwater](#) (directly linked from Olympia's website) that has all committee agendas and materials.**
- **Approved a statement of values & principles to guide our work.**
- **Completed 3 check- ins with the Councils and 3 with the community.**
- **Developed a governance recommendation.**
- **Developed a finance plan outlining 7 years of projected RFA expenditures and the needed revenue sources.**

The projected increase in 2023 Assessed Values makes it hypothetically possible for a \$1.50 Fire Levy model to generate enough revenue to support the RFA.

\$1.00 fire levy + FBC	\$1.50 fire levy, <u>no</u> FBC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need 60% to approve • Levy Lid lift vote in 2027 • Need to explain complexity of FBC • Residents with average home size/value pay <i>slightly more</i> under this scenario. • The financing structure is more stable than one that relies solely on property tax. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ FBC can keep revenues at sustainable levels in an inflationary period. ○ FBC can keep revenues sustainable in severe economic downturns that cut property tax revenues. • \$1.00 reduction in City Levy required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50% + 1 to approve • Levy lid lift vote in 2026 (one year sooner) • Don't need to talk about FBC a lot now (but need to keep authority in plan) • May well need an FBC in a few years (60% voter approval required) • Residents with average home size/value pay slightly less under this scenario • Financing structure less stable than with a two-prong structure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In inflationary periods, revenues can fall short. ○ In major economic downturns, revenues may also fall short. • \$1.50 reduction in City levy required. Not feasible.

Tumwater Olympia RFA Planning Committee

Fire Benefit Charge Factor Options

September 26, 2022

Tonight's discussion

1. Review new formula option “3 A” as requested by Committee
 - 6% shift away from residential sector to commercial sector,
 - 3 classifications of residential, weight increasing with house size,
 - Zero factor for mobile homes,
 - Incorporating new lower FBC target as a result of higher assessed values.
2. We have not re-run all the other formulas.
 - There is not an apples-to-apples comparison.
 - The new FBC target (\$10.5M) is about 28% lower than the prior target (\$13.5M).

FBC Formula

Fire Benefit Charge = **Fire Flow** x **Cost Per Gallon Factor** x **Bldg. Weight Factor** x Hazard Reduction Factors x Hazard Increase Factors x Exemption/Discount Factors

- **Fire Flow** = Square Root (Total Square Feet) x 18
- **Cost Per Gallon Factor** = Total FBC ÷ Fire Flow x .01
- **Building Weight Factor** = weight for building type/size

Hazard Reduction Factors

- **Sprinklers**
- Smoke Detectors
- Automatic Alarms

Hazard Increase Factors

- Flammable Materials
- Multiple Stories
- Response Density

Exemption/Discount Factors

- Religious facilities
- Low income housing
- Low-income seniors and disabled

The formula we are using does not have any **hazard increase factors**. All **exemptions/discounts** allowed by state law will apply.

Formula options

Option 1

FBC is distributed proportionately to the square footage of each building class, *e.g.*, 66% of total square footage is single-family residential so single-family residential pays about that same % of FBC. Includes sprinkler data for apartments and commercial. (This option has been shared previously).

Option 1-A

Option 1 with *residential sprinkler data added*. Revenue lost to the sprinkler discounts shifted to residential properties resulting in a slight increase in the Residential Building Class Weight, increasing to .582 from the original .58.

Option 2

Residential Sector share reduced by 6%; Commercial share increased by 6%.

Option 3

Divide residential into 3 classes, weights increasing with square footage. Breakpoints at 2000 and 3000 sq.ft. Residential and Commercial shares same as Option 2 (+/- 6% over Option 1-A)

Option 3A

Same as option 3, but use **lower target FBC collection amount**, eliminate fee for mobile homes

Option 4

Major reduction for Small Residential (1500 sq. ft. max) and Small Commercial (1000 sq. ft. max). Total Residential share lowered by 8% and Commercial share increased by 8% as compared to Option 1-A

Options Summary: Classifications, weights

	Option 1 (Original)	Option 1-A	Option 2	Option 3	Option 3 A	Option 4
	Bldg Weights approx. proportional to Square footage.	Add Sprinkler Data; Minor increase in Residential Weights	Larger decrease in Residential Bldg Weights; Larger increase in Commercial Weights	Differentiate Residential Weights, retain 6% shift from residential to Commercial	Same as Option 3, lower FBC target, zero charge for mobile homes	Major reduction in Small Residential and Small Commercial Weights
MH	0.450	0.450	0.450	0.450	0.0	0.450
Res 1	0.580	0.582	0.5466	0.510	0.38	0.300
Res 2	0.580	0.582	0.5466	0.550	0.43	0.500
Res 3	0.580	0.582	0.5466	0.590	0.48	0.650
APT	1.450	1.450	1.450	1.450	1.0	1.450
Com 1	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.7	0.500
Com 2	1.500	1.500	1.700	1.700	1.2	1.200
Com 3	2.000	2.000	2.500	2.500	2	2.500
Com 4	3.000	3.000	3.500	3.500	3	3.500
Com 5	4.000	4.000	4.500	4.500	4	4.500
Com 6	5.000	5.000	5.500	5.500	5	5.500

Fire Benefit Charge Factors and Totals for 2022

Fire District	OT	Factor	Max Sq Ft	Factor	Max Sq Ft	Commercial Subtotals					
Residential 1		0.38	2,000	Commercial - 1	0.7	1,300	Commercial 1	\$645,337.12	3,197,380		
Residential 2		0.43	3,000	Commercial - 2	1.2	611	Commercial 2	\$999,376.06	5,691,774		
Residential 3		0.48	No Max	Commercial - 3	2	145	Commercial 3	\$705,502.73	4,607,705		
Apartments		1		Commercial - 4	3	53	Commercial 4	\$557,287.28	3,595,337		
Mobile Homes		0		Commercial - 5	4	29	Commercial 5	\$565,352.85	3,743,373		
Balancing Factor		0.01		Commercial - 6	5	4	Commercial 6	\$138,793.85	998,374		
Cost Per Gallon		83.38									
Sprinkler		0.9									
Olympia Tumwater Both											
Both											
# Parcels		FBC \$		Square Feet		# Parcels		FBC \$		Square Feet	
20,246	Residential	\$6,390,398.93		51,887,243				Residential Subtotals			
2,142	Commercial	\$3,611,649.88		21,833,943		5,708	Residential 1	\$1,233,095.84	9,034,043		
454	Mobile Home	\$0.00		527,061		9,292	Residential 2	\$2,885,929.95	22,932,423		
354	Multi Unit	\$500,204.20		4,318,633		5,246	Residential 3	\$2,271,373.14	19,920,777		
23,196		Total District		\$10,502,253.00							
				78,566,880							

Option 3A
6% shift from
residential to
commercial, zero
fee for mobile
homes,
lower FBC target

Option 1A
(original +
sprinklers)

Fire District	OT	Factor	Max Sq Ft	Factor	Max Sq Ft	Commercial Subtotals				
Residential 1		0.582	1,500	Commercial - 1	1	5,000	1,300	Commercial 1	\$921,910.16	3,197,380
Residential 2		0.582	3,000	Commercial - 2	1.5	20,000	611	Commercial 2	\$1,249,220.08	5,691,774
Residential 3		0.582	No Max	Commercial - 3	2	50,000	145	Commercial 3	\$705,502.73	4,607,705
Apartments		1.45		Commercial - 4	3	100,000	53	Commercial 4	\$557,287.28	3,595,337
Mobile Homes		0.45		Commercial - 5	4	200,000	29	Commercial 5	\$565,352.85	3,743,373
Balancing Factor		0.01		Commercial - 6	5	No Max	4	Commercial 6	\$138,793.85	998,374
Cost Per Gallon		83.38								
Sprinkler		0.9								
Olympia Tumwater Both										
Both										
			</							

FBC Estimate Examples - caveats

The FBC estimates presented below are based on the current draft RFA budget and 2022 data.

- The RFA budget will change.
- The Assessed Value data will change (this impacts the share of the budget that will be funded from property tax versus FBC).
- New construction will add to the inventory of properties subject to the FBC – which will also change the FBC for all properties.
 - For example, several large commercial buildings are under construction in Tumwater.
- Option 3A is based on projected 2023 AV data enabling a lower FBC target.

How do the options impact estimated FBCs for various properties? Using examples from July...

Sample Residential				Option 1	Option 1-A	Option 2	Option 3	Option 3A	Option 4
Sample Residential	Bldg Value	Land Value	Structure Sq Ft	FBC-Original Presentation	FBC w/ Residential Sprinklers data added and Increase Res. Weight	Minus 6% to Residential; Plus 6% to Commercial	Residential weights grow with Sq. Ft. Same overall classification weight as Option 2	Same as Option 3, lower FBC target, zero charge for mobile homes	Small residential and commercial weights reduced; Minus 8% share for Residential overall; Plus 8% for Commercial
R3	158,500	97,000	1500	\$ 337	\$ 338	\$ 318	\$ 311	\$ 228	\$ 174
R4	268,400	106,400	2000	\$ 389	\$ 391	\$ 367	\$ 359	\$ 255	\$ 356
R6	300,600	100,200	2500	\$ 435	\$ 437	\$ 410	\$ 409	\$ 322	\$ 375
R8	438,600	111,800	3255	\$ 497	\$ 499	\$ 468	\$ 476	\$ 411	\$ 557
R10	854,900	200,000	4466	\$ 582	\$ 584	\$ 548	\$ 557	\$ 481	\$ 652
R11	572,800	113,800	6220	\$ 687	\$ 689	\$ 649	\$ 658	\$ 568	\$ 764

Apartments (5 Units +)

Sample Apartments				Option 1	Option 1-A	Option 2	Option 3	Option 3A	Option 4
Sample Residential	Bldg Value	Land Value	Structure Sq Ft	FBC-Original Presentation	FBC w/ Residential Sprinklers data added and Increase Res. Weight	Minus 6% to Residential; Plus 6% to Commercial	Residential weights grow with Sq. Ft. Same overall classification weight as Option 2	Same as Option 3, lower FBC target, zero charge for mobile homes	Small residential and commercial weights reduced; Minus 8% share for Residential overall; Plus 8% for Commercial
A2	7,493,500	3,936,300	1,484	\$ 838	\$ 838	\$ 838	\$ 838	\$ 578	\$ 838
A3	9,070,300	791,900	2,724	\$ 1,022	\$ 1,022	\$ 1,022	\$ 1,022	\$ 705	\$ 1,022
A4	4,063,200	966,000	5,100	\$ 1,554	\$ 1,554	\$ 1,554	\$ 1,554	\$ 1,071	\$ 1,554
A5	11,308,000	834,800	10,250	\$ 1,983	\$ 1,983	\$ 1,983	\$ 1,983	\$ 1,367	\$ 1,983
A6	221,800	53,300	21,120	\$ 3,163	\$ 3,163	\$ 3,163	\$ 3,163	\$ 2,181	\$ 3,163
A7	14,581,100	1,054,400	103,401	\$ 6,298	\$ 6,298	\$ 6,298	\$ 6,298	\$ 4,343	\$ 6,298

Mobile Homes (same for all scenarios except 3A)

Sample Mobile Homes				Option 1	Option 1-A	Option 2	Option 3	Option 3A	Option 4
Sample Mobile Homes	Bldg Value	Land Value	Structure Sq Ft	FBC-Original Presentation	FBC w/ Residential Sprinklers data added and Increase Res. Weight	Minus 6% to Residential; Plus 6% to Commercial	Residential weights grow with Sq. Ft. Same overall classification weight as Option 2	Same as Option 3, lower FBC target, zero charge for mobile homes	Small residential and commercial weights reduced; Minus 8% share for Residential overall; Plus 8% for Commercial
M1	96,600	-	576	\$41	\$41	\$41	\$41	\$0	\$41
M2	66,500	147,900	600	83	83	83	83	\$0	83
M3	14,100	108,700	432	140	141	140	140	\$0	140
M4	1,300	-	440	142	142	142	142	\$0	142
M5	3,300	159,800	952	208	208	208	208	\$0	208
M6	237,900	193,500	1572	268	268	268	268	\$0	268

Small Commercial

				Option 1	Option 1-A	Option 2	Option 3	Option 3A	Option 4
Example	Bldg Value	Land Value	Structure Sq Ft	FBC-Original Presentation	FBC w/ Residential Sprinklers data added and Increase Res. Weight	Minus 6% to Residential; Plus 6% to Commercial	Residential weights grow with Sq. Ft. Same overall classification weight as Option 2	Same as Option 3, lower FBC target, zero charge for mobile homes	Small residential and commercial weights reduced; Minus 8% share for Residential overall; Plus 8% for Commercial
Sample Commercial 1- (400-5,000SqFt)									
C1.1	267,700	229,900	450	\$ 318	\$ 318	\$ 318	\$ 318	\$ 222	\$ 159
C1.2	191,000	182,600	1500	\$ 581	\$ 581	\$ 581	\$ 581	\$ 406	\$ 698
C1.3	188,600	135,600	2140	\$ 694	\$ 694	\$ 694	\$ 694	\$ 486	\$ 833
C1.4	108,500	161,000	3000	\$ 822	\$ 822	\$ 822	\$ 822	\$ 575	\$ 986
Sample Commercial 2 (5,001-20,000SqFt)									
C2.1	474,700	288,400	5000	\$ 1,061	\$ 1,061	\$ 1,061	\$ 1,061	\$ 742	\$ 1,279
C2.2	374,200	258,900	9000	\$ 1,993	\$ 1,993	\$ 2,259	\$ 2,258	\$ 1,514	\$ 1,599
C2.3	1,122,600	473,500	15000	\$ 2,481	\$ 2,481	\$ 2,812	\$ 2,813	\$ 1,985	\$ 4,136
C2.4	1,208,800	2,037,700	19540	\$ 2,832	\$ 2,832	\$ 3,210	\$ 3,210	\$ 2,265	\$ 4,720

Medium Commercial

				Option 1	Option 1-A	Option 2	Option 3	Option 3A	Option 4
Example	Bldg Value	Land Value	Structure Sq Ft	FBC-Original Presentation	FBC w/ Residential Sprinklers data added and Increase Res. Weight	Minus 6% to Residential; Plus 6% to Commercial	Residential weights grow with Sq. Ft. Same overall classification weight as Option 2	Same as Option 3, lower FBC target, zero charge for mobile homes	Small residential and commercial weights reduced; Minus 8% share for Residential overall; Plus 8% for Commercial
Sample Commercial 3 (20,001-50,000SqFt)									
C3.1	1,237,800	667,200	20035	\$ 3,824	\$ 3,824	\$ 4,780	\$ 4,780	\$ 3,823	\$ 4,780
C3.2	1,441,700	636,100	36000	\$ 5,126	\$ 5,126	\$ 6,407	\$ 6,407	\$ 5,215	\$ 6,407
C3.3	5,892,700	593,500	44200	\$ 5,680	\$ 5,680	\$ 7,100	\$ 7,100	\$ 5,670	\$ 7,100
C3.4	6,476,600	595,000	49056	\$ 5,983	\$ 5,983	\$ 7,479	\$ 7,479	\$ 5,983	\$ 7,479
Sample Commercial 4 (50,001-100,000SqFt)									
C4.1	4,756,600	312,300	50333	9,091	9,091	10,606	10,606	\$ 9,091	10,606
C4.2	8,096,200	681,500	65834	10,397	10,397	12,130	12,130	\$ 10,347	12,130
C4.3	14,690,700	1,064,700	77369	11,271	11,271	13,150	13,150	\$ 11,271	13,150
C4.4	5,367,800	1,010,500	90804	12,211	12,211	14,246	14,246	\$ 12,210	14,246

Large Commercial

				Option 1	Option 1-A	Option 2	Option 3	Option 3A	Option 4
Example	Bldg Value	Land Value	Structure SqFt	FBC-Original Presentation	FBC w/Sprinklers and Increase Res. Weight	Decrease the Residential Weight and Increase Commerical Weights	Create 3 Residential Weights . Retain the new Comm Weights	Same as Option 3, lower FBC target, zero charge for mobile homes	Reduce small Residential parcel weights. Reduce small commercial parcel weights.
Sample Commercial 5 (100,001-200,000SqFt)									
C5.1	4,985,100	647,000	100778	\$ 17,152	\$ 17,152	\$ 19,296	\$ 19,296	\$ 17,152	\$ 19,296
C5.2	13,337,900	490,100	121671	\$ 18,846	\$ 18,846	\$ 21,203	\$ 21,203	\$ 18,846	\$ 21,203
C5.3	7,511,400	965,900	130094	\$ 19,488	\$ 19,488	\$ 21,924	\$ 21,924	\$ 149,487	\$ 21,924
C5.4	36,648,400	6,882,400	147156	\$ 20,726	\$ 20,726	\$ 23,317	\$ 23,317	\$ 20,726	\$ 23,317
Sample Commercial 6 (200,001+SqFt)									
C6.1	33, 738,200	1,414,300	214476	\$ 31,278	\$ 31,278	\$ 34,406	\$ 34,405	\$ 31,277	\$ 34,405
C6.2	3,919,800	1,701,000	247656	\$ 33,610	\$ 33,610	\$ 36,971	\$ 36,971	\$ 33,610	\$ 36,971

Discussion

- Questions?
- Does the Committee have enough information to make a recommendation on an FBC proposal?
 - If not, what additional information can the team provide?
 - If so, what is the Committee recommendation?

Staggering of Terms, Term Length

Topic: Governance: Initial Staggering of Terms

General Rules:

- Terms must be staggered
- Terms cannot exceed 6 years, but can be shorter
- RFA Commissioner elections occur every two years, in the same year as City Council elections (elections in odd-numbered years; terms start in even-numbered years)
- Vacancies are filled by the appointing authority; elected position vacancies are filled by the Board as a whole.
- Since city councilmember terms are 4-years, assume that Council appointments can be for a term of 2 or 4 years, but not more than 4 years.

Policy Goal

- Minimize turnover of board in any election year to minimize disruption in operation of RFA, using the Phased-in Option 4 (1 councilmember from each City plus 5 at-large commissioners)
- To minimize turnover, the best possible pattern is to have 2, 3 or 4 seats *maximum* turnover on any date.
 - For comparison, with 7 city council seats, the turnover pattern is 3-4.

Options

- Three scenarios are modelled below that minimize the turnover in any election year.
- The difference between the options is whether the Elected Commissioners serve a term of 4 years or 6 years.
 - One might expect the directly elected commissioners will prefer longer terms and they will have 5 seats on the board beginning in 2028.
- The initial election in 2025, for terms starting January 2026, could result in 7 new board members under any scenario. Four of those seats are arguably within the control of the city councils to minimize turnover of their appointed positions (assuming all appointees serving in 2025 are re-elected).

Interpreting the tables:

- Each row represents 1 RFA Governing Board Commissioner position (whether a city appointee or directly elected)
- Cells of same color (by row) represent 1 term for that commissioner. E.g., when the color changes in a row, that is a point of potential turnover.

Scenario A

- Option 4 Phase-in
- After phase-in: the 2 appointed councilmembers have 4-year terms, while directly elected commissioners have 6—year terms
- Initially, one of the 3 initial elected commissioners has a 4 year, rather than 6-year term.

Position	Appointing Authority / Voted Positions	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	2038	2039	2040
1	Olympia City Council																		
2	Tumwater City Council																		
3	Olympia City Council At Large Commissioner beginning 2028																		
4	Tumwater City Council At Large Commissioner beginning 2028																		
5	Olympia City Council At Large Commissioner beginning 2026																		
6	Tumwater City Council At Large Commissioner beginning 2026																		
7	-- At Large Commissioner 2026																		
Maximum Seat Turnover Possible at election years																			

Scenario B

- Option 4 Phase-in
- All elected commissioners have 6-year terms from the start.
- After phase-in: Councilmembers have 4-year terms, directly elected commissioners have 6—year terms

Position	Appointing Authority / Voted Positions	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	2038	2039	2040
1	Olympia City Council																		
2	Tumwater City Council																		
3	Olympia City Council At Large Commissioner beginning 2028																		
4	Tumwater City Council At Large Commissioner beginning 2028																		
5	Olympia City Council At Large Commissioner beginning 2026																		
6	Tumwater City Council At Large Commissioner beginning 2026																		
7	-- At Large Commissioner 2026																		
Maximum Seat Turnover Possible at election years																			

Scenario C

- Option 4 Phase in.
- After phase-in: Councilmember Terms at 4 years after transition
- After phase-in, elected commissioners also have maximum 4 years terms

Position	Appointing Authority / Voted Positions	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	2038	2039	2040
1	Olympia City Council																		
2	Tumwater City Council																		
3	Olympia City Council At Large Commissioner beginning 2028																		
4	Tumwater City Council At Large Commissioner beginning 2028																		
5	Olympia City Council At Large Commissioner beginning 2026																		
6	Tumwater City Council At Large Commissioner beginning 2026																		
7	-- At Large Commissioner 2026																		
Maximum Seat Turnover Possible at election years					7 (3)		3		4		3		4		3		4		3

Olympia Tumwater RFA Planning Committee

RFA Committee Action, Decision and Question Log

September 12, 2022**Councilmembers:** Yen Huynh, Leatta Dahlhoff, Michael Althaus, Eileen Swarthout, Jim Cooper, Lisa Parshley**Staff:** Erika Stone, Chief Brian Hurley, Olympia City Manager Jay Burney, Tumwater City Administrator John Doan, Chief Todd Carson, Steve Busz, James Osberg, City of Olympia Attorney Mark Barber**Consultant Team:** Karen Reed, Bill Cushman, Neil Blindheim

Actions taken/actions needed	Assigned to
Come back to the issue of an RFA name. This needs to be resolved prior to submission of an RFA plan.	Chiefs Carson and Hurley

QUESTIONS LOG		
Question/Comments	Answer	Follow-up/assigned to
FBC Formula		
Where does the number 18 come from in the FBC formula?	It comes from the ISO from the mathematicians that put the formula together. It relates to $E=mc^2$. The 18 relates to what the insurance folks looked at and evaluated how much fire flow and how to calculate it in respect to the building.	Provide report to Committee.
Equitable distribution in the formula, what if we had no weighting? Square footage calculation only?	Weighting factors is the initial premise is 80% of square footage is residential then 80% of revenue is made up from residential. Or you can make smaller properties pay less. Classed into low/med/high hazard if it's a 2,000 or 5,000 you get the same response as the fire is bigger you get a much bigger response to that.	
If there is a reason for the number 18 in the FBC ? And explain why we are letting		

the square root stand in a state of inflation and regressive calculations.		
Elaborate on the legal concerns about amending the formula if we do it differently there could be legal implications or subject to legal liability if we do adjust it.	Mark (Olympia Attorney)-you go into uncharted territory and use a FBC that has not been used by any RFA in the state. That will create issues and challenges. There has to be documentation to support this formula ISO is the insurance office, and information in regards to that factor can be provided.	Neil has that document and can send out after the meeting
Can you talk though the blue areas and how they play a factor?	<p>Hazard Reductions Factors: Sprinklers (10% discounts) can adjust more if want to, Smoke detectors district 40 in Renton had a discount not many districts do. Automatic alarms- Kent has given a range of discounts depending on type of alarms. We only have sprinkler discounts we don't have the data on other items.</p> <p>Hazard Increase factors: We don't have a lot of data on hazardous materials, few districts account for multiple stories, response density number of resources and how quickly we don't have data on this either (Kent has a lot of data on these)</p> <p>Exemption Factors: Churches, low income, seniors, disability (income based)</p>	On the one pager if we can have an infographic a worked example of what this means and common types of structures to include homes, apartments and commercial.
When we do a 10% discount for sprinklered, what do those numbers look like?	It's taking 10% off of the computed charge. In commercial it adds up to 280,000 and in residential is 30,000.	
Union conversation pieces that have been missed out on is that the FBC is meant to support our fires but we are hazardous mitigation (wildland etc.) the FBC how it is and the numbers and not having people being able to explain it, it will be hard for any campaign to sell this and increasing taxes with higher home values and don't know if the money we are asking for with the FBC will be an easy sell. When you talk about exemption	No, it is based on how the county has zoned those buildings. Those two exceptions are in the state law so we have to abide by it. If we are unable to use the FBC charge the 1.50 falls short of creating the RFA and supporting the RFA. Interested in maintain and enhancing the service levels the FBC in combination with a lower	

<p>factors with religious status we have an organization that manages several tiny villages and 5 story complex and apartments and since those are ran by religious organization will they be exempt?</p> <p>Most of the population know we respond to more of the people that meet those exemptions than single family homes.</p>	<p>property tax amount from the city is what will fund the RFA.</p>	
<p>Talking about the FBC and explaining your taxes would increase by \$X and them asking what do I get for that and how do we answer that?</p> <p>What are the implications if the RFA doesn't get approved and what is the implications from the city budgets?</p>		
FBC by classifications and weighting		
<p>What is the weight compared to the price per square foot?</p>	<p>It's going to be regressive. We are trying to make it less regressive with these other options.</p>	
<p>If we don't figure it out and get a cost per square foot it will be figured out in the messaging. Why 6/8 % why not 5%?</p>	<p>They are within the range of what others have done. The more you shift the more you have to go to commercial and ask them to pay more. It's a balancing act and policy decision based on what others have made.</p>	
<p>Will all these options maintain our same budget?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>With these options is this discussion based on comments with the regressive formula and equity piece so what factors are being in place for equity? If we give a discount to sprinklers but put the burden on older houses without them how is that equitable?</p>	<p>This formula is not well suited for social equity, it is for how many resources you need to have a on standby the law on exemptions.</p>	
<p>Messing with some portions of the formula can present some legal challenges but tweaking things is allowable based on how others have it? No kind of policy as to why 8% that the one that just works?</p>	<p>Correct.</p> <p>South County in Snohomish does 6% that is why we chose that.</p>	

Why are we assuming people who live in smaller houses are poor? Do we have data to support that?	This is about the benefit and the resources it's not about your income.	
Olympia class 2 department will transfer?	Olympia will stay a class 2, Tumwater could go to a 2.	
RFA Names		
Do we have to come up with a name prior to going to the ballot?	We need a name. Voters don't have to approve a name change later.	

August 8, 2022

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

Staff: Erika Stone, Chief Brian Hurley, Olympia City Manager Jay Burney, Tumwater City Administrator John Doan, Chief Todd Carson, Steve Busz, City of Olympia Attorney Mark Barber, James Osberg, Ann Cook, Aaron BeMiller,

Consultant Team: Karen Reed, Karen Meyer, Neil Blindheim, Bill Cushman

Actions taken/actions needed	Assigned to	Update
Aug 15 th - deadline for key messages edits	Ann Cook	

QUESTIONS LOG		
Question/Comments	Answer	Follow-up/assigned to
Slide 17 for Tumwater the Mayor assigns the person on the RFA board, would the council member also be on the ballot?	You won't vote for them as RFA and councilmember.	
Slide 17 Are we required by statute to do it that way?	The initial one is, initial structure must be composed of elected from the cities, but longer term moved to slightly different.	
Be ready for questions re the cities are doing this work does that mean the cities will scale down their departments?		
If only 2% of calls are based on fire, these FBC charges also pay for EMS/medics- we should be able to answer that.	The vast majority of responses are BLS/ALS/Smoke minor calls until it's not and you have to be prepared to have resources available.	
Is affordable housing available for discounts?	Nonprofit, low income, senior are all exempt.	

Commercial structures are 1/3 when we look at fire flow, vs residential. Do those costs look right?	Add a little more to commercial and take away from residential partially for vote and can adjust from there.	
Can we adjust the slider once we have a plan?	Yes, Neil can.	
Are we willing to tell city councils to continue going?	The consensus is yes.	

July 25, 2022

Councilmembers: Yen Huynh, Leatta Dahlhoff, Michael Althausen, Eileen Swarthout, Jim Cooper

Absent: Lisa Parshley,

Staff: Erika Stone, Chief Brian Hurley, Olympia City Manager Jay Burney, Tumwater City Administrator John Doan, Chief Todd Carson, Steve Busz, City of Olympia Attorney Mark Barber, James Osberg, Ann Cook

Consultant Team: Karen Reed, Bill Cushman, Karen Meyer, Neil Blindheim

Actions taken/actions needed	Assigned to	Update
CM Althausen Council moves to recommend and endorse option 4 with a six year phase in. Jim Cooper seconds motion. 4- Yes 1- No, Motion carries 4 to 1.		
Key Messages edits and revisions will be sent out and comments/changes need to be returned to Ann Cook by August 1 st .	Ann Cook	

QUESTIONS LOG		
Question/Comments	Answer	Follow-up/assigned to
FBC Follow Up		
Other jurisdictions have systems in place to show their systems are inspected annually.	They generally provide proof they have sprinklers to receive the 10% after that they are not required to have them inspected it would be up to the jurisdiction.	
Do we know how many residential homes and apartments and other buildings are required to have sprinklers?	We could work with permitting departments to try to get this information there is no information in regards to residential homes.	Karen Reed refine the database.
Is disability included in this model and description?	Yes, will update.	
Mobile Crisis response units	Don't exist in both communities yet. Haven't vetting information on	

	this topic yet and with all the unknowns don't want to add in right now.	
Mobile crisis unit should be included and build the budget that can improve level of service. I don't think we are done with this conversation on what we want in an RFA. We need a higher level of service than what is in the presentation currently.	First 7 years there is a lot of votes. If you feel the level of service is not where it needs to be we need to have that discussion. We are funding the cares and bls transport service.	
We can't start taking all of these individual programs that are currently working within other departments at the start. This is the pathway to begin to achieve these things that we can eventually add once we have a solid foundation. Neither one of the cities have a way to solve the service level issues currently.		
Communications Staff Need	In Admin structure thought there was some communications staffing and rely on contracting but move towards and admin staffing with communications. Admin structure was paired down.	Bring back to staff team for discussion.
Needs to be exec level person for communications and should be added if we can pull it off.		
Can we get rid of the word "assuming" with the \$1.00 reduction in property taxes the city plans to do.	Yes, we can use the word "intend"	
Key Messages		
Second Bullet unable to keep pace with growth needs re-worded.		
First bullet- focus more on stable funding or enhanced funding model.		
None of these first four bullets mention the needs of the community is shifting and changing and it is not shown here.	This is discussed in the providing 21 st century fire and emergency medical services to a growing community.	
Would like to see more of the positives and makes it more human and real and less bullets and more plain talk, clarify the last bold to say Labor Unions.		
RFA funding bullet not cost neutral		
We are shifting \$1.00 property tax to the RFA, it's not a brand new dollar is shifted		

from the cities so messaging or language to make that clear.		
Use Washington State Council of Firefighters instead of WA State IAFF		
Mention tax payers will not pay twice.		
FBC with warehouse containing hazardous materials we haven't agreed to charge extra for hazardous materials.		
		Ann will revise and send out for comments, use track changes or email comments by August 1 st .
Look at coordination for a combined mailer for the election as well. Cost for creating is set aside from Olympia/Tumwater and will circle with attorneys.		
Governance		
CM Dahlhoff, CM Huynh, CM Swarthout, Busz, Osberg, Chief Hurley, Chief Carson, agrees with option 4, CM Cooper, Althausen agrees with option 3		
Can we change governance over time?	Yes, it can be phased in over time to 5 at large.	
Messaging for the phasing in and why	Managing turn over to ensure institutional knowledge is not lost and to create smooth transitions.	
Outline of August 9 Council Presentation		
Will there be opportunity for discussion amongst outside of these meetings for a go or no go?	Go no go discussion we can do that at the next meeting and inform the council at the council meeting on the 9 th .	Include go no go discussion at next meeting August 8 th .
Tumwater city council liked the leading questions in regards to this topic.		
Bullet around reducing property tax, word reduce concerns them that's why we were leaning on shifting it.		
Not so much on annexation and fire station we don't need to be so draw a line in the sand right now.	Haven't modeled financial impact around annexations in this current plan.	
We have neglected 10M a year coming in under operating revenue which are service contracts with outside agencies.	We need to flag EMS revenue, and existing contracts continue and	

	revenue is increasing and can add that in.	
--	--	--

July 11, 2022

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

Absent: Chief Brian Hurley, Olympia City Manager Jay Burney, Karen Meyer

Staff: Erika Stone, James Osberg, Tumwater City Administrator John Doan, Todd Carson, Steve Busz, City of Olympia Attorney Mark Barber

Consultant Team: Karen Reed, Bill Cushman

Actions taken/actions needed	Assigned to	Update
Consensus ("thumbs up") on Asset Transfers	N/A	

QUESTIONS LOG		
Question/Comments	Answer	Follow-up/assigned to
Fire Benefit Charge		
Duplexes and Triplexes are they considered residential?	Yes, 5 units or more are considered apartments.	
Grow operations - do those have hazard surcharges?	No, we do not have any surcharges. Todd: Above average risk for occupants of grow operations.	
Break out hotels/motels from general commercial - was there follow up conversation on that?	We did discuss, we would have to be able to assign a rational basis for increasing the allocation the struggle is how much that should be. We can create two categories of hotels - 1 not residential hotels and 2 are like apartments. Or expand the definition of apartment to include residential hotels. Depending on size they may pay less being in the commercial zone.	Karen R. will look at the categories and see what she can do with the spreadsheet. Need recommendation from staff team if we should parse these out or include them.
Do nightclubs and theaters face more challenges if there is an emergency?	We would want some data to show how we made rational reason as to why we made this classification.	
Total RFA increase, for 1320sq they would only pay \$79 more but 2500sq would pay 400, seems like a large jump between rows. Could we use a median	Troy ran all these numbers	Can look back at this and see the reason for the jump in costs.

like 1600 sq ft that is a more average size?		Look at median square footages.
Do commercial properties on port properties that have a private lease are they exempt?	If the title is owned by the Port, it is exempt.	
Do commercial properties sanctioned as RV camps have an FBC?	If they are nonprofit, they are exempt. Churches are exempt. Tiny home villages do not meet the criteria so the FBC would not apply.	
Are structures under 400 sq feet exempt due to the size?	Yes, tiny homes would not have an FBC.	
What enhancements to level of service do we get with these FBC to sell this to the citizens?	Response times with BLS units, sustainability and financial stability is part of it. There will be more talking points prior to the public meetings.	
Is there new stations in this calculations?	There is no station addition in the model- would need to do a bond for it. It would be too much of a hit to use the FBC for this.	Parking lot comments how to message the improvements with the increase of FBC, what do you get for an extra \$500 a year.
Assessment and difference, certain property has more hot plates or more flammable items, Churches that have improvised tiny homes, times people may be assessed hire. Is there an opportunity to get an assessment and to get that leveled down?	FBC is based on square footage and fire flow, only thing to reduce is to sprinkler it or lower the square footage.	
Category types mobile homes shows only 400 and seems like Tumwater/ Olympia has more	Senior low income would not be subject to this and were taken out.	
Can RFA charge Fire impact fees for buildings under construction?		Will investigate this, not sure.
Messaging regarding our website are we getting emails?	We have not received any messages from the website so far.	Would like clear simple language regarding messaging.
New construction commercial buildings are coming to both cities and can look at changing the FBC once those are on as well.		
Organizational Chart		
Peer Support in conjunction with OPD - where will that fit in?	Peer support is embedded with the operations side.	
Is the training Admin who is managing the Mark Noble facility?	Yes, they take care of record management and contracts.	

Mental Health Response - Is that an EMS provision and not PD? Crisis response team for OFD and TFD>	Was not part of the conversation, CARES program there will be integration between the crisis response and cares.	Circle back and get clarification from the Chiefs.
Asset Transfers		
Debt service on facilities or equipment does that go to the RFA?	Both jurisdictions have ongoing debt we continue to make payments until they are paid off.	
Some of the uses for our station like meeting rooms, is there going to be anything about public uses of the spaces?	If that is a use that is ongoing I would have other RFA folks transfer agreement to use those rooms.	
Is there a dedicated communications FTE?	That task will be assigned to the assistant/deputy chief as needed It is possible to convert an Admin Asst to a comms person.	Karen to work with Bill to run numbers to add a Comms staff. Bill can add this into it. Staff team to revisit this topic it could be broader than being a PIO.
RFA Name		
Can the Chiefs get input from staff and bring it back to the team?	Sounds good to Committee.	Chiefs get input from staff on name and bring it back to August 8 th meeting.
Can we broaden the question for some characteristics or logos we could use that are important to them?		

June 27, 2022

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

Absent: Jim Cooper

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

Consultant Team: Karen Meyer, Karen Reed, Neil Blindheim, Bill Cushman

Actions taken/actions needed	Assigned to	Update
FBC Database	Neil B. will have an update by Wednesday June 29, 2022.	

QUESTIONS LOG		
Question/Comments	Answer	Follow-up/assigned to
Recap and Discuss June 21 Meeting: Governance		
Financial Plan		
Is this number digestible compared to all the others you've seen?	Going from 1.43- to 1.86 is sizeable – the voters are getting transport units + and the net impact will be based on policy decisions made after the vote. We are proposing a modest administrative structure with 8 staff.	
Fire Benefit Charge		
Is hazard factors standard in RFAs?	No, there is only a few that have hazard factors.	
Are discounts elective? We have a number of marijuana growers in the city - does that count?	Yes. Renton excluded marijuana as agriculture.	
Center hallway apartment has more hazard than a 3-story garden style apartment. Have you seen anywhere they break those apart?	No, one think Central Pierce does is make a delineation between duplexes. We are using just a one rate for apartments. Apartments start at 5 units and above.	
Residential in Tumwater we try to incentives under 1500 square feet can that be a break down if they are smaller than 1500?	Yes you can do a break down and change the square footage limits.	
If ADU is on the same parcel would it be all one bill?	Yes it would, you couldn't create a separate for the house and ADU they are added together.	
Are hotels considered a commercial use? Are they lower risk since they don't have kitchens?	Yes, they are commercial. We can create a whole new category to include those hotels with kitchens.	

Number of state buildings - do they pay differently?	If the state continues to pay by contract and can ask them to pay a FBC. Same for the port, can't charge them but can ask them. If the state office in a leased privately owned building they will be charged a FBC.	
--	--	--

June 13, 2022

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

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

Consultant Team: Karen Meyer, Karen Reed, Bill Cushman,

Actions taken/actions needed	Assigned to	Update
Karen Reed to update a few slides based on feedback from meeting and bring back to the staff team and send to the entire group.	Karen Reed	
Send Bill Cushman's spreadsheet to group to gather questions/comments.		
Neil invite for meetings June 27 and July 11 th .		
Refreshed talking points	Karen Meyer	

QUESTIONS LOG		
Question/Comments	Answer	Follow-up/assigned to
Draft Governance		
Startup board recommendation not much of an explanation, Olympia would have more members than Tumwater due to size?	Back on slide 11 at bottom, mirrors current structure, maximizing equity and input from each city without involving quorum.	Copy and paste rationale to other slides as well.
Comment: Supports recommendation of 3/3 split, second bullet point speaks to why it makes sense. One concern in the community is that it's not the public perception and that it's equal partnership and representation.		
When this is presented to our councils, what is the best benefit for my city?	May also want to be prepared to answer why Olympia has the same amount of seats when they are	

Don't want to include that in slide but be prepared for that question. Would like more clarification on the presentation.	larger. This is preliminary and the startup board is 3/3 and will change over time but haven't honed in on over time except its 7 members.	
Adding what Jay said to streamline some slides, and knowing our councilmembers and do some clarify this slide (recommendation initial board Structure 2023-2025) to show this is our recommendation at the top.		If we had the prompts and questions in with the slide to better prepare councilmembers. Add some questions on startup board, more specific questions on what we are looking for.
Can we add the question on the slide with the information to show the rationale?	We can, just want to show them all the options we reviewed and will put together in one slide.	Update, staff team take a look at and email to group before we drop it in packets.
Finance Plan Overview- John Doan & Jay Burney		
Cash contribution is from what? The cost of what fire engine costs? What happens if that's today's dollars and in a few years its 3 million? For us as a city we don't have 2Mill in general fund so what would we do how do we finance that as a city? Levy lid lift in 2028, is that when the cities expires or a new revenue source in the future?	The RFA would be buying them, it around 2.1 today for two fire engines. By the time you make this payment there is close to 2mil in the levy lid lift fund. Has nothing to do with our levy lid lift, this would be one the RFA would make to recoup some of the tax rate.	
Any discussion with the LEOFF1(retired FF that are under earlier retirement system which the city has responsibilities for medical etc.)members attached to our dept.?	They will stay with Olympia and not go with the RFA. Same with Tumwater. They will stay with the city and not transfer to the RFA	
4 Mil loan from Olympia how will we pay for that or get that loan?	We have 2 reserves at 10% which is 8+Million and will loan from the budget stabilization loan and have it paid back as quick as possible.	
Comment: Emergency reserve, if there is 15Mil to fund things in the beginning they have the funds to do that, and push out things to the later years that didn't need to be done right away so the planning committee didn't have to make those decisions right away.		
Financial Model-Bill Cushman		
\$1.87, it's hard to understand that number outside of context. For an	There is not a way to do this, the 13.5Mil will be distributed	

individual homeowner if that 1.87 is there a way to look at a difference to what exists now?	throughout several different types of properties, commercial is broken down between different levels has nothing to do with the value. City councils have to weigh the properties for the FBC.	
Comment: Next piece of analysis is how we allocate that 13.5 over all the property types and will need to review that model as well. Once those decisions are made we can equate it back to a current residential now vs with a RFA.		
Comment: also depends on what the cities decide to do with that 1.00 property tax. If the citizen isn't paying twice on that dollar and it may play a decrease and increase for a homeowner.	The cities will have to give up 1.00 of their current property tax order. They concede that to the RFA.	
Does this model not include the cost of a cares or transport unit for Tumwater?	Correct it does not, only used Olympia for a model for Cares. Don't have the data from the FCS from Tumwater, what we had was guesstimates and didn't give the right picture.	
Comment: As we work through the financials on this and RFA sustainability the ability to grow the program into something bigger than 1-2 aid units but more robust and does become a better service in the long run. Longer we are in the RFA and address problems financially all programs will grow and become robust.		
Team would love to see a frozen copy of the spreadsheet to get feedback and questions from the group		Send spreadsheet from Bill out.
June 21 st Olympia governance and continue forward with finance conversation with Neil and both councils late July/early August. Second public outreach date needs to be figured out either Early August/September.	Jay Prefers Early August, work on a date. Group is good with the plan. June 21 st could be something jointly and need to circle back with.	
Talking Points-slides are not updated		Karen Meyer will update slides.

May 23, 2022

Councilmembers: Yen Huynh, Leatta Dahlhoff, Jim Cooper, Eileen Swarthout

Staff: Erika Stone, Chief Brian Hurley, Olympia City Manager Jay Burney, James Osberg, Tumwater City Administrator John Doan, Todd Carson, Chief Mark John, For 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	
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	
Send updated Work Plan to Committee.	Karen R.	
Administration development-2/4 weeks and bring in Labor for discussion.	Jay/John/Chiefs	

QUESTIONS LOG		
Question/Comments	Answer	Follow-up/assigned to
Where are we with the financial modeling?	They are in progress.	
Next Council Presentation?	Towards the end of June.	Jay/John will look tomorrow and find a date and coordinate.
Governance Review Options		
Do we have to add the districting in the plan?	We would just need to define in the plan how many districts we are proposing.	
Governance Template Options		Karen R. will write up what was discussed and

		options to review at the next meeting.
Can we have some sense of scale of what level this work will be? If its 40 hours a week we should know that so if we keep two councilmembers we will need to retool the councils to meet that need.	It will differ, Karen can reach out to South Snohomish County.	Karen will make a call about ongoing time.
Cooper-appointees would be the city council members, if your council wants to change mid-course then what do we do?	Can put language in the RFA that either the council can choose to replace the members or they won't change until elections.	
		Karen will write up what we have discussed and leave the staggering out for right now and bring it to the next meeting.
		Create a special meeting on a Tuesday night 530PM study session type meeting. (For meeting John/Jay is setting up) 1.5 Hrs, 45 mins for finance model and 45 mins for governance.

May 9, 2022

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

Staff: Erika Stone, Chief Brian Hurley, Olympia City Manager Jay Burney, James Osberg, Tumwater City Administrator John Doan, Chief Todd Carson (for Chief Mark John), Erin Johnson (For Steve Busz),

Consultant Team: Karen Meyer, Karen Reed, Bill Cushman, Neil Blindheim

Actions taken/actions 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	
Send updated Work Plan to Committee.	Karen R.	
Administration development-2/4 weeks and bring in Labor for discussion.	Jay/John/Chiefs	John- nothing from website.

--	--	--

QUESTIONS LOG		
Question/Comments	Answer	Follow-up/assigned to
Governance Issues and Options		

April 25, 2022

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

Staff: Erika Stone, Chief Brian Hurley, Olympia City Manager Jay Burney, James Osberg, Tumwater City Administrator John Doan, Chief Todd Carson (for Chief Mark John), Erin Johnson (For 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	Done
Form Capital Assets ad hoc sub-committee	Brian Hurley, Mark John, John Doan	Done
Internal/External website, social media, news release discussion	John Doan, Jay Burney	Ongoing
Send updated Work Plan to Committee.	Karen R.	Done
Administration development-2/4 weeks and bring in Labor for discussion.	Jay/John/Chiefs	Done/Ongoing

QUESTIONS LOG		
Question	Answer	Follow-up/assigned to
Initial Public Outreach Sessions		
Can the Planning Committee Chair/Vice Chair provide a welcome on at the May 19 th event? Can a union representative attend?	CM Huynh can attend.	James Osberg will attend from the union side and Erin Johnson will ask Steve Busz to attend.
Governance Issues and Options		
Election - is this a regional position?	It's considered local jurisdiction.	
What is important for the RFA Board?	Startup process, lot of negotiations and contracting, management of finances.	

	<p>At what level is the admin structure set up and when do they start and fill.</p> <p>Dedicated to understanding the fire service at more of a micro level than the city council members.</p> <p>Overall strategic planning, being a visionary and commissioners being good neighbors to our other RFA and working well with them.</p>	
Initial startup board first two years of agency.	Be a role model to other RFA, with FF and transparency with the community. Educating the community and carrying those voices of creativity from the community.	
<p>What are some of the mutually beneficial RFA-cities efforts you can imagine taking place over time?</p> <p>Potential conflicts?</p>	<p>Few conflicts interactions with police and public works, make sure it's seamless. How we do crisis response and mental health in the community is it fire or police and that may not be resolved.</p> <p>FD oversight over building plan reviews, emergency management, inspections, fire plan review.</p> <p>How will this RFA interact with communities' ongoing conversation with public safety? RFA will be critical in the conversation and how do we ensure it will be part of that conversation.</p> <p>Community connection, RFA is part of the community and shows up at events that engage the community. It is important to keep that connection.</p> <p>Representation of the RFA with other entities TCOMM911 representation.</p> <p>Competition going to the voters for funding.</p> <p>Street design and fire agency, building codes.</p> <p>Transfer facilities, capital and loans make sure those go smoothly.</p>	
<p>Initial startup board-first 2.5 years city council Members only available to be on the board.</p> <p>What do you see as the largest initial board size?</p>	<p>Even numbers, 6 makes sense.</p> <p>We are even numbers currently with same representation from both cities.</p>	

	Continue currently planning committee structure into the new agency.	
Boundary Changes and Recommendations		
	In Olympia, the south side has an annexation plan going. If they annex, they bring their FBC and taxes with them. If the city annexed Its UGA it would automatically happen most places have 10 years. Financial calculation impacts to the city if the RFA takes over fire service and what it looks like but it's doable. The city of Olympia would want to collaborate on annexations for impacts.	
Explanation re: annexation	If you annex another area of the city, it would be subject to any bonds, levy and FBC. Same charges everyone else pays no special exemptions because they were late.	
Service Level Presentation Olympia & Tumwater		
Tumwater- Does CPR Save Rates include Rochester Medic calls?	No, only engine responses.	
Good trend data for postulation if we can see that around cardiac save rates and BLS transport 10 years in a graph if we need to grow resources and go to the voters.		
Put those graphs together as if we annex SE Olympia	Financial analysis is happening now in this annexation and determine if they want to move forward. May need to discuss after RFA conversation before annexation.	Jay- will talk with the chiefs re: what data is available.
Tumwater annexation?	Will be on the book by Aug 2022 and we now respond to calls in those areas.	
Work Plan Outline-updated in the packet.		
Fire Commissioners Salaries and Expenses-in the packet.		
RFA Action & Question Log		
We are including this in each packet and are changing format from the last	Likes color coding, improvement.	

version. Were they helpful? Another way to switch them up to make more helpful any feedback??		
Talking Points-updated in the packet.		

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)