

Regional Fire Authority Planning Committee



OLYMPIA TUMWATER REGIONAL FIRE AUTHORITY PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

Online via Zoom

Monday, May 23, 2022
5:30 PM

1. Welcome
 - [a.](#) Agenda
- [2.](#) Governance
- [3.](#) Comparison Structures
- [4.](#) Action and Question Log
5. 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

May 23, 2022

5:30 - 7:30 pm

AGENDA

1. Welcome
2. Debrief: May 19 Public Outreach Sessions (10 min.) - John/Jay
3. Governance: Review of options for Council consideration/input (40 min.) Karen R.
4. Wrap up

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.
- Reviewed finance and governance options.
- Doubled our meeting cadence to be sure we can submit a draft RFA plan to Councils this fall.

Olympia Tumwater RFA Committee

RFA Governance Issues and Options

Discussion Guide for April 25, 2022, May 9, and May 23 Committee Meetings

Marked to show input from Committee & others at the April 25 and May 9 meetings

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 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.

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

	Olympia	Tumwater
Fire Dept. share of operating budget (2022) (does not include a share of central city administrative costs) <i>Olympia's fire dept. budget is 2.3 times larger than Tumwater's.</i>	\$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

Committee input from April 25 shown in italics below.

1. What is important about the RFA Board and its role?

RFA Board

- *sets budget*
 - *hires and fires Chief*
 - *approved FTE head count*
 - *approves level of service*
 - *will be involved in labor negotiations*
 - *responsible for financial management*
 - *sets administrative structure*
 - *must understand the fire service at a pretty granular level, including NFPA standards*
 - *should be a visionary and good neighbor to adjacent fire districts and RFAs*
 - *will oversee community outreach and education*
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?
 - *Be a role model for future boards.*
 - *Confirm the administrative structure*
 - *Confirm the initial labor contract*
 - *Set up expectations about how the agency will be transparent going forward.*
 3. Over time, what are some of the mutually beneficial (RFA-Cities) efforts you can imagine taking place over time?
 - *Police and public works will interact a lot with Fire. This needs to be seamless.*
 - *This process sets the tone for inclusion between the Cities and neighbors*
 - *Ensure the Fire service remains connect with the community*
 - *FMO services on plan review, fire inspection are important*
 - *How do we do crisis response-fire, police, or something else? Cities will need to coordinate this with the RFA.*
 - *Need for ongoing community conversations about safety*
 - a. Can you foresee conflicts? What might they be?
 - *Regional board representatives*
 - *Competition for taxpayers attention*
 - *Development standards—will the RFA support what the City wants in fire inspections?*

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?
 - *An odd number would be nice to ensure no tie votes but would preclude each city appointing an equal number of representatives.*
 - *To get voter support for this, we will want to demonstrate that the RFA is an equal partnership.*
 - *We don't want the board to be so large that it includes a quorum from either city council.*
 - *5 people, even if one is absent, can still make good decisions.*
 - *2 people from each agency is too small*
 - *Equal number of appointees provides a nice start to the agency culture.*
 - *It is nice to be able to have labor representatives interact with us as elected officials*
 - *Only elected officials can serve on the board*
- 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)?
 - *Committee unanimous (5 of 6 present) agreement to recommend a start up board that includes 3 elected officials from Olympia and 3 elected officials from Tumwater*

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?

Pros:

- Relieve burden on councilmembers
- Board that can really focus on fire issues
- Unions would like a board dedicated to fire
- Could structure board to ensure voters have a say in selecting a majority of board

Cons:

- Need some connection to Cities to ensure seamless provision of public safety services
- Could have extreme geographic concentrations

- Planning nexus with cities is strong—land-use, street design, etc.
- Difficult to predict outcome – let a future board restructure after the initial transition board.
- Trust in the Cities is strong—that will benefit the RFA if there is City representation on the RFA Board

Other:

- Unsettling not to have a governance plan that ends after 2 years
 - Too much work to hand the new board the need to also redesign governance
- 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?

Pros of Districting:

- Ensure geographic diversity of where board members come from
- Equity concerns

Cons of Districting

- Too small districts can be a problem; a small group can take over the district
- Unintended consequences
- You would only vote on a minority of seats

Pros of At-Large:

- At large representation give more opportunity to vote on your representatives
- 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)?

SEE ATTACHED DRAFT TABLE

(KR note: we will want to bring forward more than 1 proposal to the City Councils)

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.

Governance Template – based on discussion from May 9

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
# of seats	5	6	7	7	7		
Appointed by Olympia	1	3	2	1	1		
Appointed by Tumwater	1	3	2	1	1		
Directly elected -- at large			3	5			
Directly elected -- by district	3				5		
Staggering of terms/initial term							
Voting							
Other							

Staggering:

Goal: To ensure Board doesn't turn over all at the same time.

Solution: Specify initial term for each seat -- 2 years, 4 years, 6 years.

Voting:

Any nonvoting elected officials?

Each board member has one vote?

Any items that should require a supermajority (RFA plans don't typically include anything here)

Matrix Comparing Governance Structures in Regional Fire Authorities (April 2021)

	Renton Region Fire Authority	West Benton Fire & Rescue	North Mason Regional Fire Authority	Puget Sound Regional Fire Authority (formerly Kent RFA)	Southeast Thurston Fire Authority
Original Member Agencies	City of Renton, King County FPD #25	City of Prosser, Benton County FD#3	Mason County FD #2 & FD #8	City of Kent, King County FPD #37	City of Yelm, Thurston County FPD #2 & #4
Year Est.	2015	2015	2014	2010	2010
Board Composition	Total: 6 + 1 non-voting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 Renton City Councilmembers • 3 FD 25 Commissioners • 1 non-voting member from KCFD #40. 	Total: 5 (4 districted seats + 1 at-large) <p><i>Originally:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 districted seats from within Prosser city limits • 2 districted seats from FD #3 territory • 1 at large. <p><i>Now:</i></p> Two formal districts established; anyone living in those 2 districts can run for office (2 seats per district), plus one at-large commissioner	<p><i>Initially:</i></p> 8 appointed members, reducing to 5 over 18 months. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All 3 FD #8 commissioners • All 5 FD#2 commissioners. Planned reduction to 5 members accomplished through vacancies. <p><i>Now:</i></p> 5 members elected at large.	Total: 6 + 3 non-voting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 Kent City Councilmembers • 3 Fire District 37 Commissioners • 1 non-voting from Covington • 1 non-voting from SeaTac • 1 non-voting from FD #43 (Maple Valley) 	Total: 6 <p><i>Originally:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 from Yelm • 2 from FD#2 • 2 From FD #4 <p><i>Now:</i></p> 3 districts; 2 members elected from each district.

	West Thurston Regional Fire Authority	South Whatcom Fire Authority	Riverside Fire Authority	Valley Regional Fire Authority	North County Regional Fire Authority
Original Member Agencies	Thurston County FPD #1 & FPD #11	Whatcom County FPD #2, #6, #9, & #10	Cities of Centralia, Lewis County FD #12	Cities of Algona, Auburn, Pacific	Snohomish County FPD #14 & #18, Stanwood and Arlington
Year Est.	2009	2009	2008	2007	2007
Board Composition	<p>Total: 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 from FPD#1 • 3 from FPD #11 <p>Has a mechanism to reduce to 5 elected (not appointed) positions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 districted from each former FD service area • + 1 at large from the RFA area <p>This has not been implemented.</p>	<p>Total: 5</p> <p>1 member each elected from 5 distinct districts</p>	<p>Total: 5</p> <p>Members elected at large.</p>	<p>Total: 9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Auburn Mayor + 2 Auburn Councilmembers • Algona Mayor + 2 Algona Councilmembers • Pacific Mayor + 2 Pacific Councilmembers 	<p>Total: 9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 Districted • 3 at-large • 3 from Arlington <p>Initially created with 2 fire districts: all 3 commissioners from each district on the board. Districts were later dissolved. Stanwood annexed in 2019; 1 board seat added. Arlington annexed in 2021 and 3 city councilmembers joined the board; they will transition to directly elected positions in 2 years and the board will shrink to 7 members over the next several years.</p>

	South Beach Regional Fire Authority	South Snohomish County RFA	Marysville Regional Fire Authority
Original Member Agencies	City of Westport, Pacific County FPD No. 5, and Grays Harbor County FPDs No. 3, 11, and 14	City of Lynnwood and Fire District 1	City of Marysville and Fire District 12
Year Est.	October 2017	October 1, 2017	October 1, 2019
Board Composition	5 Districted members, One from the City and one from each of the four participating fire districts.	Initial transition board: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 Fire District Commissioners • 2 City Councilmembers (or Mayor). This reflects the proportional population of the 2 agencies. Permanent board: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 districted positions (elected in primary by persons living in those districts. 2 districts encompassing Lynnwood; • 2 at-large positions.) Districted positions first elected in 2019; at-large positions in 2021. 	6 members: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 City council members • 2 of the 3 District 12 members (one of the 2 members is a non-voting seat)

Olympia Tumwater RFA Planning Committee

RFA Committee Action, Decision, Question Log

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		
Logistics notes in earlier slide with primary election before it is formed?	It would be 2025.	
If we had 2 from each city and 3 elected once they are formed is there anything in the future preventing them from becoming 100% elected? Who would consent to make that change?	Correct, unless we write something in the governance board but other RFAs have not done that. Depends on how you word it, could be the city.	
Districting, I don't want it to be too small, if we want to avoid all the fire commissioners coming from one city maybe they should just be the city limits. Support Jim in we should leave some latitude for the transition board, they will have a better understanding and community input. More directly elected commissioners with city involvement.	Districting if you decide to they have to be equal population size, not neatly track the boundaries. 2 year governance plan, 7 year financial plan, we can go longer than 2 years also.	

Compensation for fire commissioners can you explain?	No influence over compensation not to exceed 9-10K a year, no salary commission and no way to compensate for their time and brings diverse group of people to the table	
Have we heard feedback on how governance in other RFA has been working well or preferred?	Power of the rfa structure is to make what works to you locally so there are different models all across the board. Have not heard anything about not like the structure because they can change it. Most start with an initial board and then a transition board.	
Districts vs at large feelings?	Depends upon structure you choose, TCOMM model affects opinion 2 from each city and 3 elected would be at large. Agree with above. 7 vs 5 subcommittee work available. Equity in districting, where people have been elected in communities and low income communities that have no representation. Oly/Tum might not be big enough to district.	If districting is forced, does it apply to Fire? Jay Burney to follow up on this.
Financial Issues		
2023 funding for August through the end of the year. Is that paid back to the cities?	No, it will not be paid back.	
FBC the dollar for revenue as it is to our current revenue. What does the FBC and levy generate?	Will show in 3 more slides.	
Lott water alliance set a 3% increase to smooth out and not go back to the voters, is that what a FBC would allow?	Yes, size your financing to meet your needs over 7 years and the best way to get there. Plan is subject to change.	
Is square footage by parcel or unit?	Only on the structure, only applicable to structure so vacant land pays no FBC.	
State buildings, port buildings is that something considered in FBC or separate revenue stream?	Exemptions for FBC are the same as they are for property tax. Or if you just have land.	
Previous meetings if it's a privately owned building the state leases they would have to pay the FBC? Is that	Only exemptions are schools or churches, low-income housing. It's not a Tax it's a fee so limitations are similar in exemptions. Leases by the	

captured on what hasn't been paid and what could be paid?	state would be charged FBC potentially. And Neil as gathered that data.	
Do we need to examine if the state will withdrawal those payments or keep it since it applies differently under contract and the FBC may apply on top of what the state is already paying?	I think we need to separate the properties where they do pay for fire but not property tax, those private buildings are eligible for FBC and will need to sort through. Leave the model now and sort out the other properties.	
Would we have to negotiate public entities buildings? Capitol Campus as example		Neil to look at statute.
IS there a way to get a discount if a building is sprinklered? I think mobile homes are not the smallest considering ADUs also.	Yes, there is a discount for them.	
Moving forward, equity and what that looks like if we can define it with these tables that would be helpful.		All

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. At what level is the admin structure set up and when do they start and fill. Dedicated to understanding the fire service at more of a micro level than the city council members. Overall strategic planning, being a visionary and commissioners being good neighbors to our other RFA and working well with them.	
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.	
What are some of the mutually beneficial RFA-cities efforts you can imagine taking place over time? Potential conflicts?	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. FD oversight over building plan reviews, emergency management, inspections, fire plan review. 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. Community connection, RFA is part of the community and shows up at events that engage the community. It is important to keep that connection.	

	Representation of the RFA with other entities TCOMM911 representation. Competition going to the voters for funding. Street design and fire agency, building codes. Transfer facilities, capital and loans make sure those go smoothly.	
Initial startup board-first 2.5 years city council Members only available to be on the board. What do you see as the largest initial board size?	Even numbers, 6 makes sense. We are even numbers currently with same representation from both cities. 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	Jay- will talk with the chiefs re: what data is available.

	discuss after RFA conversation before annexation.	
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 version. Were they helpful? Another way to switch them up to make more helpful any feedback??	Likes color coding, improvement.	
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	

	<p>needed and prioritize to make it financially realistic.</p> <p>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.</p>	
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	Jay -Meeting with Tumwater/Olympia communication this week and work with communication strategies for outreach. 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.
--	--	---

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 Althausen, 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)