



## White Salmon Special Joint Meeting - Fire District 3

### A G E N D A

June 28, 2023 – 5:00 PM

119 NE Church Ave and via Zoom

Meeting ID: 893 8521 8806 (No Password)

Call in Number: 1 (253) 215-8782 US (Tacoma)

#### I. Open Meeting

- City of White Salmon Call to Order
- City of White Salmon WKRFA Committee Members Roll Call
- KCFD#3 WKRFA Committee Members Call to Order
- KCFD#3 WKRFA Committee Members Roll Call

#### II. Business Items

- A. West Klickitat Regional Fire Authority Final DRAFT Plan – Planning Committee
  1. Discussion Items - mHc Decision Matrix
  2. Beginning WKRFA levy rate language

#### III. Public Comments

#### IV. Next WKRFA Planning Committee Meeting

#### V. Adjournment

**File Attachments for Item:**

A. West Klickitat Regional Fire Authority Final DRAFT Plan – Planning Committee

1. Discussion Items - mHc Decision Matrix

2. Beginning WKRFA levy rate language



# 2023 WKRFA PLANNING COMMITTEE

## DECISION MATRIX

<i><b>DRAFT</b></i>	<b>June 2023</b>	

WKRFA Plan Section	COMMENT; QUESTION: PROPOSED LANGUAGE	Submitted By	ACTION TAKEN
Section 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Page 8, #3, reword to:</b>  <i>"To streamline economies of scale, and diversify revenue options, the City of White Salmon and Klickitat County Fire Protection District #3 are better served by combining all functions and services provided by the two jurisdictions into a single entity as a regional fire authority."</i> </li> </ul>		<input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board
Section 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Effective Date, change to September 30<sup>th</sup>, 2024.</b></li> <li>❖ <i>Can we put this on the ballot for the November election and have the effective date for the RFA be Sept. 30 2024 and operational date of January 1, 2025 with both White Salmon and KCFD 3 funding their respective departments through Dec 31, 2024?</i></li> <li>➤ <b>I would like to see that the 'Cultural Training / Planning' be a specific designated part of the RFA formation process</b></li> </ul>	Jim  W/S Chief  Vols	<input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board  <input type="checkbox"/> Question  <input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board
Section 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C.1: Is there value in calling out here explicitly that there can be planning for the RFA prior to the effective date?</li> <li>• C.2: Does this mean we transition effectively to the WKRFA leadership, and one fire chief, on the effective date?</li> <li>• If a member of the WKRFA Board is elected at large, how does that impact the anticipated effective date and full governing operations?</li> </ul>	Jim  Jim  Jim	<input type="checkbox"/> Question  <input type="checkbox"/> Question  <input type="checkbox"/> Question

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>C.3: Add a sentence calling out that the RFA Planning Committee can decide to pursue a revised plan for two additional elections should voters not approve.</li> <li>C.4: Can we discuss how KCFPD3 would exist after the effective date? When would it dissolve and do we call that out in the implementation plan here? Also, what do we want to say happens after that dissolution in regard to the governing board representation?</li> </ul>	Jim	<input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board
		Jim	<input type="checkbox"/> Question
Section 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>C.1.d: <i>Proposed language change, needs legal review</i>: On the effective date of such annexation, the territory annexed shall automatically be included within the boundaries of the WKRFA pursuant to RCW 52.26.090. The territory added to the RFA by such annexation shall be subject to the taxation, charges, and bonded indebtedness (if approved as part of the annexation process) of the WKRFA.</li> <li>C.1.e: <i>Proposed language change, needs legal review</i>: Pursuant to RCW 52.26.090(g), KCFD#3 shall have the authority to participate in the partial merger process under the authority and pursuant to the procedures set forth in RCW 52.06.090 and .100. On the effective date of such partial merger, the territory merged into KCFD3 shall automatically be included within the boundaries of the WKRFA. The territory added to the WKRFA by such partial merger shall be subject to the taxation, charges, and bonded indebtedness of the RFA in the manner specified in chapter 52.06 RCW. Any transfer of assets of employees as a result of a partial merger shall be between the merging district and the WKRFA.</li> </ul>	Jim	<input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board
		Jim	<input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board
Section 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>B.3: <i>Proposed discussion</i>: 6 voting members, 3 commissioners and 3 council members for the first year of the RFA, then move to a 3 member elected board after that. Alternative: 2 commissioners, 2 council members, 2 at large elected members. The intent here is to show the community that there's no interest from either party to stack the cards for the future. That is obviously on one's intent, but this makes it obvious.</li> <li>❖ <i>The governing board is currently 3 fire commissioners and 2 city council members. Can this be amended to a new fully elected board? Or maybe write into the plan that we start with this initial board and within 2 years (or sooner)there will be elections for a new board and spelling out commissioners terms? FD 3 has a bond until 2038 and will not be a part of the RFA, Could the RFA board administer this bond</i></li> </ul>	Jim	<input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board
		W/S Chief	<input type="checkbox"/> Question

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Better description of Governing board structure in the future. It says the governance and organizational structure can be amended after 2 years by a majority vote of the WSRFA Governance board. If the Governing board actions are seen as neglecting the needs of the City of WS, what recourse does the City or firefighters have?</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Should have FF reps (2 of them) on the board with one specifically from FF level staff</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Should be a newly elected board - not just having KCFD#3 commissioners move over. Feels like (strictly a perception) a KCFD#3 take over</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Required input and involvement from volunteer firefighter force</b></li> <li>➤ <b>How the commissioners are chosen, who is representing whom, The commissioners should be voted in, not appointed, changes to the RFA should be made with a vote of the member volunteers taken into consideration with one vote per so many volunteers(i.e. 1 vote/10 volunteers),</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Appointed governing body &amp; chief (should be duly elected &amp; hired)</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Avenues of appeal and/or input for decisions by the Governing Board</b></li> <li>➤ <b>I do think equal Board Representation is important. I'd like to see 2 FD3 / 2 WS City / 1 'Independent' . This will avoid tie votes and allow equal Rep for both historic Fire Departments</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Vols</b></p> <p><b>Vols</b></p> <p><b>Vols</b></p> <p><b>Vols</b></p> <p><b>Vols</b></p> <p><b>Vols</b></p> <p><b>Vols</b></p> <p><b>Vols</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board</p>
Section 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ B.1.a: <b>discussion</b> of whether we put a cap on the ad valorem property tax. Example: Even though it is worded where we can go as high as 1.50, we cap it at 1.15 (for example), so that the governing board can't go above that without voter approval.</li> <li>➤ B.1.a: Further discussion on the levy rate in general and how we make sure we are going to deliver the headcount recommended by the task force AND make sure there is enough funding for the unfunded liabilities. I like the ability to preserve some flexibility for the RFA to determine the rate, but also a cap so people know we're not going to go to the 1.50 rate (at least not without voter</li> </ul>	<p>Jim</p> <p>Jim</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board</p>

	<p>approval).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ C.1: update dates</li> <li>➤ C.2: update dates</li> <li>➤ C.3: update dates</li>   <li>➤ E: Is there a scenario where the RFA takes over the management of the general obligation bond being repaid without White Salmon taking on the additional \$.46? Thus making the dissolution of FD3 easier?</li>   <li>➤ F.7.e: Can we define what "minor repair and maintenance costs" means here? It would benefit all to be extra clear on the line.</li>   <li>➤ F.7.e: <b>Change last sentence to read</b> "The City of White Salmon, as the owner, shall remain..."</li>   <li>➤ F.7.f: <b>Change the first sentence to read</b> "Utility costs for the upper floor portion of the fire station shall be negotiated..."</li>   <li>➤ F.9: How will this work if we transition to the RFA on 9/30/24? How will we know that both volunteer groups agree? Should we define the timeline for that agreement and what "agreement" even means here?</li>   <li>➤ Can we add F.11 to say: Risk of Loss. All buildings and equipment that have been transferred to the RFA, shall be operated, insured, and maintained at the expense of the RFA.</li>   <li>➤ <b>Section 6f #7 - There needs to be a timeline to remove city council from the station if at all possible</b></li>   <li>➤ <b>The city should vacate the lower portion of WSFD station so that the fire department can utilize those areas.</b></li>   <li>➤ <b>Reduce the new hires. Only hire one new officer</b></li>   <li>➤ <b>Clearer understanding of how the tax rate will affect what we will really get operationally</b></li> </ul>	<p>Jim</p> <p>Jim</p> <p>Jim</p> <p>Jim</p> <p>Jim</p> <p>Jim</p> <p>Jim</p> <p><b>Vols</b></p> <p><b>Vols</b></p> <p><b>Vols</b></p> <p><b>Vols</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Question</li>   <li><input type="checkbox"/> Question</li>   <li><input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board</li>   <li><input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board</li>   <li><input type="checkbox"/> Question</li>   <li><input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board</li>   <li><input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board</li>   <li><input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board</li>   <li><input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---

Section 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B.5: <b>update the date</b>. Also, is the Master and Deployment Plan exercise the same as the "implementation plan"?</li> <li>• B.6: <b>update the date</b>. Also, is it realistic to have this goal happen in the first year? It should perhaps be reworded that staffing positions be filled once tax revenue starts coming in in mid-2025?</li> <li>• B.10.a: Do we have a clear understanding of the costs associated here, particularly prior to a White Salmon 2024 budget is adopted (which would include 3 months of the RFA).</li> <li>• Not sure if this is the right section, but is there a way to call out that the main station of the RFA is best located geographically to serve the largest population? What I'm getting at is there a way to say that the city of White Salmon would still have a fire station in city limits or just outside of it that ensures the city doesn't lose service or response time if the RFA decided to move further away? For example, a cost cutting measure scenario.</li> <li>❖ <i>Could there (or should there) be a section that states the RFA's main station will be in the fire station that geographically serves the largest population best?</i></li> <li>➤ <b>Page 21 #5 - The Master and Deployment plan being held after the vote should be explained. Voters should know what to expect BEFORE they cast a ballot.</b></li> <li>➤ <b>How the chief will be determined. Should be a new hire process if this is indeed a new entity.</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Clearer understanding of how the tax rate will affect what we will really get operationally</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Would prefer to see funding spent on something other retention/recruitment position...continue to fund prevention position. Recruitment/retention should be job of everyone.</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Volunteer committee for new chief probationary period, budgetary checks/balances, qualifying statements relative to Bingen &amp; Covid in task force data or omission of task force report altogether.</b></li> <li>➤</li> </ul>	<p>Jim</p> <p>Jim</p> <p>Jim</p> <p>Jim</p> <p>W/S Chief</p> <p>Vols</p> <p>Vols</p> <p>Vols</p> <p>Vols</p> <p>Vols</p> <p>Vols</p> <p>Vols</p>	<p>No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Question</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Question</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board <input type="checkbox"/> Question</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Question</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board</p>
-----------	--	--	--

Section 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>B.6: call out that this includes accounts payable, accounts receivable, and payroll as well.</li> </ul>	Jim	<input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board
Section 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>B.3: Should we call out there should be an improvement or increase here? Not just stay the same?</li> </ul>	Jim	<input type="checkbox"/> Question
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>B.4: Does KCFPD3 also need to do the same with the RFA? Seems like both entities would need to have interlocal agreements with the RFA.</li> </ul>	Jim	<input type="checkbox"/> Question
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Can we add B.6:</b> Other Service Providers: All current automatic aid and mutual aid agreements and any other contractual services agreements, documents, or memorandums currently in place with the City of White Salmon and WKFD3 shall be transferred over on the effective date to provide continuous, seamless readiness and emergency services coverage.</li> </ul>	Jim	<input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board
Appendix es	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix B: Can we be clear which positions listed on the chain of command include paid positions, full/part-time (hours), and which are new? As written it is unclear what is new, what is there today already, etc.</li> </ul>	Jim	<input type="checkbox"/> Add/Alter RFA Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Governance Board
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix A: Section C (Community Task Force Recommendations). How do we consider removing recommendation G? That is beyond the scope of the RFA (everything else is within the RFA). OR where do we call out that the planning committee is not taking that recommendation into consideration?</li> </ul>	Jim	<input type="checkbox"/> Question
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This was a piece of public comment that I think we should discuss: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parallel recommendations from both 2013 and 2023 reports include cadet program, volunteer coordinator, training standards, succession planning &amp; better tracking/reporting but these have not been implemented fully (or at all).</li> <li>We haven't seen anything in the task force report or proposed RFA plan that would specifically address those above issues in a manner that could not have been addressed with greater efforts at coordination in the past few years. I'm concerned about a consolidation effort when it appears that coordination hasn't been successful in the past in FD3.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Jim	<input type="checkbox"/> Question
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How do we or would we track the service by region (Husum, WS, Snowden) – presumably each region has their own volunteers and metrics to track? How each of these regions might tackle some of the task force recommendations would be different? Thinking recruitment, public education in particular.</li> </ul>		<input type="checkbox"/> Question



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lastly, perhaps we could consider a quickly created RFA Public Feedback Committee, consisting of volunteer firefighters from both agencies, the task force members (if they're willing go join), and any public members interested. Not thinking this is drawn out, but having that group capture the key concerns by end of June? So we can wrap up language in early July?</li> </ul>		<input type="checkbox"/> Question
--	--	--	-----------------------------------

## ADDITIONAL VOLUNTEER INPUT [9 Responses]

<b>What elements do you see as favorable in the RFA as it's currently designed/written?</b>	<b>What does the RFA need to include that would make you feel like it is well conceived and will be successful from your perspective as a firefighter?</b>	<b>What would an unsuccessful RFA look like to you from your perspective as a firefighter?</b>	<b>Are there any elements of the RFA, as it is currently written, that are of serious concern to you?</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Jurisdictional boundaries can be modified in the future.</li> <li>2. RFA protects FD3 from future annexation from the City.</li> <li>3. Dedicated funding for fire.</li> <li>4. Ability to contract with entities exempt from property taxes.</li> <li>5. Renting the fire station from the City puts the cost of major repairs on the City, not the department.</li> <li>6. Consolidated command structure and one set of policies and procedures.</li> <li>7. Priority is to fund paid staff positions to help with training and recruitment/retention.</li> </ol>	<p>Centered on supporting our volunteers to be better and brings training to us</p> <p>Inviting and focused on making members want to come and spend time</p> <p>Single new culture of KCRFA and it isn't based on WSFD or KCFD3 culture or operational protocols</p> <p>Growth potential, advancement and recognition of people not just based on data (i.e. # of calls run) but efforts to based on efforts to improve the department and better our community.</p>	<p>Mandatory training and must-attend events are the norm...feeling like a paid/career department</p> <p>All work...no play</p> <p>Turns into the feeling of being a KCFD3 take over: Their commissioners, their officers, their chief, their protocols, ...</p> <p>No advancement for those who can't be "living" down at the station and running every call - already feels like no one can advance beyond FF unless you get a crap ton of additional training away from home or are always down at the station</p>	<p>That there is very little transparency to the volunteers.</p>

		<p>RFA forgets we are volunteers and runs things like a career department</p> <p>Not enough officers to support FFs.</p> <p>Culture does not become "KCRFA" and ends up just being KCFD3 staff and WSFD staff working together</p>	
<p>White Salmon having a chief in 2024+</p> <p>Having enough money stored away to buy the equipment and apparatus we need.</p>	<p>More funding for training and training facilities.</p>	<p>No one coming to an agreement.</p>	<p>Lack of required consultation with Firefighters; a structure that empowers Governing Board without any checks or balances.</p>
<p>Dedicated training focus...not last minute by officers</p> <p>Broader team base</p> <p>Single entity to get away from us vs them.</p>	<p>A deadline free time frame so it may be done right and not hurried. If it gets done in time for a particular voting deadline, great. If not, catch the next one.</p>	<p>No one coming to an agreement.</p>	<p>Representation of FD3 is good, all active membership as Firefighters or staff. WS representation is poor at best. Mayor is informed by Chief. Chief does not consult FF's, and is the only route of information to both the Mayor and City administrator. It is the same as having one voice instead of 3. White Salmon only has 3 task force members who did not get much if any public input. District 3 and WS task force members were spoon fed what they were to come up with. RFA Planning committee members are ALL FIRE commissioners for FD3, the RFA Planning committee members for WS are ALL NOT fire savvy and not involved in the fire department until this appointment. In the RFA Plan, Question 1,F - information is False and misleading. Question</p>

			<p>2 use of "Emergency Services" if a VERY broad term that includes LE and EMS which are separate entities. In the background section, the idea that there is duplication of equipment purchases is misleading at the least. This indicates we could do with less equipment and I do not see how each department could do with less even if combined. Same with training, not duplicated currently. This section is filled with misleading or incorrect information. The amount of "Fear Mongering" is extremely concerning, along with the amount of misinformation included needs to be corrected and not put forward to build upon.</p>
<p>It is the best option to merge the departments and allow for a simple method to add others should they decide to participate.</p>	<p>Structural input from volunteers, checks/balances to possible power &amp; budget abuses, commitment to various specifics previously only promised to be addressed in future "implementation plan"</p> <p>We must get the situation with the City of WS and the WS Fire Station figured out in a congenial manner. The WS Station will be, for all intents and purposes the major meeting / training grounds for Fire.</p> <p>Also I believe strongly that Chief Long and the current KCFD3 Admin staff do an EXCELLENT job Leading and organizing. And,</p>	<p>Unsuccessful would be a merger into FD3, unsuccessful would be a takeover mentality rather than being all inclusive. Unsuccessful would be Not remembering that the VOLUNTEER firefighters ARE your departments. Unsuccessful would be Trying to bring a paid department culture into the volunteer department. Unsuccessful would be a Focus on control rather than fostering cooperation. Unsuccessful would not have full transparency to the Volunteer firefighters and/or the public. Unsuccessful would be using the task force report to base the RFA on. The task force report is based on false and missing information. Not much foundation can be built on that.</p>	<p>The power structure and generally vague budget.</p>

	<p>they have the best interests of both WS Fire and KC3 in mind 24/7. It seems some WS members want to have an "open" hiring process for these positions. Why would we waste our precious time and resources re-hiring for folks that are proven</p>	<p>"Regionalizing Emergency Services" is very broad and could include EMS (KCEMS Dist 1) or Law Enforcement (City and County). Unsuccessful would be an annexation rather than creating a new entity (RFA). Unsuccessful would NOT include taxpayers in the process. The "Governance Board" has ALL control and autonomy to run, change and execute however they wish. Unsuccessful would have a deadline of September 2023 if all issues have not been dealt with appropriately. Unsuccessful would be to hide the fact that this RFA funding started at over \$1.50, was brought down to \$1.05 and now is at \$0.76. How is it this is possible? All other debts outside of bonds and levies will be transferred to the RFA. These items need to be spelled out specifically for voters to understand. Unsuccessful would be to keep "The current areas of the upper floor [fire station] under current use as the City of White Salmon City Council Chambers shall remain in its current configuration for use by the City of White Salmon until such time that the City of White Salmon and the WKRFA Governance Board develop and approve a transition plan to relocate the City Council Chambers to another location to allow for expansion of WKRFA to meet its operational needs." in the RFA. This is not</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>for the success of Fire, but solely benefits the City with no END date and why would the RFA have to spend time/money developing and approving a plan for the City? Makes no sense. In appendix B, chain of command, "community members and visitors" instead of taxpayers are at the top, above and directing the Board? If the Chief of FD3 and the administrative staff are to remain in place, this is an annexation/take over, not a new entity. ALL of Section 8(B) is indicative of a take over, not a new entity.</p>	
Dedicated and protected budget	<p>Leaders and more than competent in their jobs ? Perhaps there will be space and time in the future both Open Hiring but for now we should use the folks we have that are committed, competent and very knowledgeable about both Fire orgs.</p>	<p>If it is simply a takeover by FD03 with their existing commissioners, chief and secretary. If it was not an honestly conceived best solution to a better specified series of problems.</p>	