



Steering Committee

July 29, 2015

CRFPD Headquarters

Steering Committee Attendees: Joe Enzer, Michael Kennedy, Leslie Lamont, Mark Chain, Chuck Torinus, Hank van Berlo, Laura Van Dyne, Michael Hassig, Carl Smith, HP Hansen, Ray Sauvey, Tom Flynn and Joanne Teeple.

Absent: Jason Sewell

Others present: Stuart McElhaney, Mick Tucker, Keith Chapman, Kat Bernat, Ron Leach, Brandon Deter, Killian Deter, Jim Pidcock, Chris Pearson, Logan Piccolo, Vicki Smith, Davis Farrer

Minutes:

Lamont called the meeting to order at 6:35pm; Lamont thanked everyone for being here and stated the minutes from the 7/22 meeting would not be adopted this evening because we wanted them to have time to review them first. Lamont stated that the 25 points from the 7/22 meeting were given to Almont and that she would like to focus on the Almont presentation of the draft Master Plan. Lamont stated that Almont made a presentation to the Board of Directors at noon today and that Almont is committed to having a final Master Plan by Monday 8/3/15.

Lamont stated that there are public comment sections to the agenda and when presentation sections are finished and after the Steering Committee members had the opportunity to ask questions and discuss each section, the public would be allowed to comment. She commented to the Steering Committee that there are four sections to the presentation and that the Steering Committee should hold comments and questions until after each section. Lamont also stated that Chain has discussed with Almont how to integrate Chain's work into the Plan and that at the end of the night we may want to change the meeting on 8/4 to 8/5 so the Steering Committee had plenty of time to review the final Master Plan.

Mike Tucker with Almont stated it was good to be back and started with a slide presentation on the highlights of the draft Master Plan. Tucker stated that Carbondale Fire is at the end of a previous 10 year Master Plan and Almont, Chain and Lamont have come together to provide an updated Master Plan doing extensive work from meeting with staff, department members and Board of Directors to meeting with external stakeholders like business owners. Two SWOT assessments were done (Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, Threats) as well as community and neighborhood meetings. Tucker thanked Bill Gavette and Rob Goodwin for the tremendous amount of data that they provided and the quick turnaround in which it was provided was very helpful. He then gave a brief background on himself, stating he has 30+ years of fire service experience, Chapman has 20+ years of fire service experience and McElhaney has 20+ years of experience.

In reference to Special District authority and benefits, Tucker explained that Special Districts capture what service level to provide and that taxpayers determine what they want to fund. A Board of Directors hire staff to make things happen. Tucker stated that the Master Plan contains a “Strategic Plan”; the Master Plan is longer term and covers an overall perspective. The Strategic Plan is a 3-5 year plan driven by goals and objectives that was put together using data obtained from internal and external stakeholders, the SWOT analysis and response time expectations and the Strategic Plan can be re-evaluated with new goals/objectives every 3-5yrs, etc.

Tucker continued with a slide that referenced the strengths and concerns portion of the SWOT analysis, stating that they matched closely. In regards to response time, Tucker stated the district doesn’t have the resources to provide response time in less than 5 minutes and that a challenge to the Board of Directors in convincing the community what level they want to fund.

The SWOT analysis concluded that in general the fire district is doing a good job and that policies and leadership do not seem to be a problem. Tucker went on to explain that the current Mission Statement for the fire district was not reflective of what it actually does and stated that a modified Mission Statement was introduced to make volunteers and paid staff equally important and embraces the future direction of the District. Tucker also commented on the Core Values the district currently has in place and stated it was reduced to four to accurately reflect true values instead of 36 values and adjectives.

Tucker explained the model in which the Master Plan and Strategic Plan involved the 11 different strategies that line up with the international accreditation model. Tucker stated that the vision and implementation portion of the Master Plan (page 38) is a description of what the agency should look like in 2021. He stated that the measure of progress is the accountability part of the Master Plan and that external stakeholders should be consistently informed of the District’s successes and accomplishments.

Keith Chapman with Almont continued the presentation by discussing community risk reduction stating that the current software is only being utilized at 40% of its capabilities and that the district should tailor emergency response to high at risk buildings. Chapman stated that the maintenance people at Carbondale Fire are outstanding and don’t have enough resources to meet best practice standards. Chapman also stated that every department has safety issues, even his.

Some of the safety issues identified for Carbondale Fire were:

- SCBA Maintenance/fit testing/ grooming standards- not following recommendations
- N95 masks- need to fit test
- Seasonal staffing- current maintenance staff is at their limit

Chapman went on to discuss the inter-agency and governmental agreements. Chapman stated the involvement with other agencies gets the department valuable experience, knowledge and skills they would not get locally. Chapman stated that although Carbondale Fire has agreements in place with multiple agencies, responsibility levels should be made clear and agreements for areas like Lead King Basin, etc. need to be implemented and all agreements should be reviewed annually.

In regards to the Board of Directors he stated the Board makes policy level decisions and the staff makes it happen. Chapman also stated during the SWOT analysis they found there were questions regarding Board members being volunteers. Chapman stated that legal consultation should be brought in to discuss and give input on this matter to the Board of Directors as most agencies do not allow this practice and referenced Doctrine of Incompatibility. Chapman went on to discuss staffing stating that the 48 hour shift was a common and acceptable practice across the United States. Other highlights for staffing issues included:

- Administrative staff including Chief/Deputy Chief's, etc. responding to calls, there are operational costs because when responding to calls other job duties don't get done
- There are two NFPA standards that can be utilized for staffing- 1710 or 1720- Pick one standard and adhere to that standard
- There are no staffing mandates in this country
- Response times and reaction times should be evaluated using fractile reporting- which measures each component so you can see where changes need to occur

Mike Tucker touched on several other topics including:

- GIS mapping and call locations: refers to task time from time of page to back in service.
- Local Trends: population, call volume increase by 2% annually, segments of population don't have primary care will rely on EMS
- State Trends: Colorado will continue EMT-I but NREMT will not revise testing,
- National Trends: Grants will become less likely
- ISO ratings: Never use ISO model as tool, lower ISO rating does impact insurance premiums but lower ratings should not be chased
- In comparison to National Standards: CRFPD is compliant, could do more online FF1 to move people to FF2 level

Comments, questions and discussion from the Steering Committee included:

- We couldn't do this without volunteers, how do you address development of volunteers and retention? A: FFI is on IFSTA website where they can do at their own pace, more online training, developing training that meets them where they're at, need to create environment that supports and encourages volunteers, when volunteers don't feel valued, volunteers go away
- Regarding GIS mapping and average response times: is this true time reporting a friend or foe given the size of our district? A: You don't make numbers what you want them to be, the accreditation model compares Carbondale Fire to other rural fire departments.
- Is the GIS modeling a geographic representation? A: It is driven by the defined response area, its value is to give community an understanding of where they are in relation to a fire station, it is a visual representation of the best case scenario and an ideal baseline response time.
 - Need realistic numbers, reality is station 81 responds to all calls and apparatus will come from there not from stations 84/85-very rare. A: Fractile reporting will give you real times
 - Diagrams don't reflect reality; need to clarify so it doesn't represent a false impression of response times. A: Almont will clarify, good opportunity to describe outlying station

scenarios i.e. maybe different level of service for outlying areas, more people need to be hired, etc. Need to quantify level of service to public.

Stuart McElhane, began his section of the presentation talking about the revenue trends and taxes as well as economic models. He touched on the following points:

- Ambulance revenue is pretty good, could optimize
- Maintain financial viability in the district
- Could combine the GF and CF, but that's a policy decision
- Minimum reserve needed, policy decision
- Could form a Cash Reserve, this is a reserve you don't touch otherwise known as a contingency fund, for wildfires, emergency services, etc.

Comments, questions and discussion from the Steering Committee

- Regarding the economic model charts: bring the projection timeline out past 5 year scenario so people can see the revenues/expenditure lines meet back up
- Did you make corrections to call volume (call volume numbers were stagnant at 652 each year in the Master Plan) A: Almont/ yes, they were raised by 1.2% each year
- Is there a scenario we are trying to zero in on? A: Almont/the Master Plan is a tool to use, decision and policy making is the Board of Director responsibility, urgency is there because it will get worse, you have the tools to work with staff to come up with a comfortable assumption for mill levy
- How many staff would need to be cut to keep things running as is? A: Leach stated 2 people would need to be cut
- Which two positions would you cut? A: Leach stated he did not know which two positions it would be
- General distrust of government across the nation
- What does it cost to hire a Fire Chief? \$15-20,000 of operating cost
- What will it save the district if two people were let go? A: Leach stated approximately \$120,000
- Need to come up with a Plan that is good for the fire department and palatable to the community
- According to what I see the fire department is not being miss-managed, is not overstaffed, and is doing the best they can, people have made the department look bad with rumors and unfounded accusations
- Master Plan comes from fire department need, what is willingness and ability of taxpayer to pay more money
- Mill levy increase would be better in 2016 to take effect in 2017
- The Master Plan graphs stop at 5 years, if a 10 year Plan, then should the graphs be 10 years?
- Was an evaluation of how we are using people or doing a restructuring of job duties, etc. done? A: Almont/ staffing functions are based on board policy
- What are your thoughts on paid per call benefits to augment staff? A: Almont/ they work, logistics would need attention and the Board would need to analyze.
- This Plan and evaluation of the Department was not available at the last election. The information in it can be used to help educate people. Maybe one could estimate how it affects

the public if some more staff is cut. Previously, there was a perception that the Department was overstaffed- Does not appear to be.

The following comments were made by the public:

- When looking at staffing, sometimes I have been asked to evaluate how we are using employees and is that the best use of their time
- Is there demographic section in the Master Plan?
- ISO is not always the end-all and be-all. The ISO rating does not always relate back to the actual insurance premium that one pays as part of their insurance bill.

Leach gave a brief description of the Board meeting earlier in the day today. He stated that the Board of Directors would have an evening meeting on 8/12 to discuss the Master Plan and the Steering Committee recommendations and that on 8/19 there would be a special meeting to discuss accepting the Master Plan and make a decision regarding putting a question on the 11/15 ballot. The deadline to put a question on the ballot is 8/25. County clerks will not do voter lists so it must be done internally. A request was made to order the lists so we can be ready if a question is put on the ballot, so the work load is not so difficult later. The Board voted 3-1 in favor to order the lists.

Questions that followed Leach's comments:

- When will the Board accept the Master Plan?
- When is the Board looking for the Steering Committee to give recommendations?

In regards to those questions, Lamont gave a list of dates for the Steering Committee to consider:

- 8/3- The final Master Plan packet will be out
- 8/5- The Steering Committee meets to discuss the packet and make recommendations
- 8/12- The Board will discuss the final Master Plan
- 8/19- The Board will discuss and perhaps accept the Master Plan
- 8/25- Board will make decision for November ballot question

Lamont stated in September she and Chain will take the Master Plan to the public.

Public comment that followed:

- There is so much in the Plan that plays into future decision making
- Don't do public process after the document is accepted. That would be a fatal flaw. Plans usually change once the public sees them and provides input.

Adjourn: 9:45pm

