

**ROCKVILLE/SPRINGDALE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT
SPECIAL MEETING
P.O. Box 159
Springdale, UT 84767
April 07, 2015
Rockville Community Center**

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL** – Chair Luci Francis called the meeting to order at 4:20 p.m. with the following members of the Rockville/Springdale Fire Protection District Board present: Adrian Player, Chuck Passek and John Callahan. Louise Excell arrived at 4:35 pm. District Clerk Elaine Harris recording.
2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** – Adrian Player moved the agenda be approved. John Callahan seconded the motion and a roll call vote indicated all those present voting in favor of the motion.

At this time, Chair Francis read a letter from Springdale resident Michael Plyler and that letter is attached to the minutes.

3. **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION CONCERNING WHETHER A FEASIBILITY STUDY OF THE RSPFD SHALL BE PERFORMED INTERNALLY, INDEPENDENTLY, OR NOT AT ALL** – John Callahan felt we didn't have but one option due to the deadline on the proposal we discussed last month. The rest of the options are gone because of the time factor. If we are going to go for this one and it is not going to cost us anything more than \$15,000, we need to do it now. Adrian Player confirmed John was referencing the grant application.

Adrian would support an independent study as he feels it is the smart thing to do. The timing is perfect, as Mr. Plyler indicates in his letter. The Chair has done the footwork for finding at least one organization that would do the study.

Adrian Player moved to have someone do an independent study. Chuck Passek seconded the motion and a roll call vote indicated all those present voted in favor of the motion.

4. **IF THE ABOVE ITEM RESULTS IN A DECISION TO PERFORM A FEASIBILITY STUDY, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION CONCERNING THE SCOPE, FUNDING SOURCES, AND SELECTION OF AN INDEPENDENT ORGANIZATION TO PERFORM SAID STUDY** – Relative to alternatives that had been brought up at the last meeting, Chuck Passek researched the possibility of a school and was unable to find anything that would meet our needs. Chuck also checked FEMA and there wasn't anything available there either.

John stated his son is an inspector for the City of Long Beach and John discussed the issue with him. His son indicated these things are few and far between as there is so much competition for any of these grants. His advice was to pursue the grant. As far as the company (ECSI) being considered, he doesn't know enough about them to say whether they are any good or not.

Chuck felt we had determined the Board does not have the expertise to do a study ourselves, so we are going to have an independent study done. The question is whether we contract for some paid-for study or whether we find someone that will do it for us for either free or at a less cost.

Chuck felt the other issue was the logistics of dealing with somebody (a retired Chief, for example). Would we get the same thing as we would get from a corporate group? He would lean towards someone who has done these kind of things before.

The Chair stated that when she looked into ESCI's background, read the reviews on them, the studies they have done, and the comments from people that they have done studies for, they are reviewed pretty highly. They are sort of the industry leader and what she particularly liked about

them is that their specific focus is on emergency services. There are a lot of companies that do feasibility studies that have the business/economic growth oriented background that can look at the financial information, etc., but ECSI understands fire/EMS. When you read through the scope of the study, it indicates the depth of their knowledge in fire/EMS.

In answer to John's question regarding any other companies the Chair had researched, she stated she couldn't find any. She attempted many ways of searching. She did find an organization back East but they were back East; to get them to come out here may be difficult. They had just completed a study on one fire department and it wasn't similar to what we have seen from ECSI.

John found it hard to believe Chief Kuhlmann was the only one near us that could do this sort of thing. The Chair reminded John that Chief Kuhlmann wasn't going to do it himself; he had a brochure which indicated a list of names that he would employ, pro bono.

John suggested instead of doing a 20-year plan, could we cut our scope of work services down by requesting a five-year plan and reduce the cost? Chair Francis responded that they will do what we ask. Part of their scope is that they don't necessarily put years on it, they have short-term, mid-range, and long-range strategic plans and how to implement them and even how much it will cost us for each level. We determine the scope. From what she understands, because they are professionals, there are core elements in each of the studies they do that are required; just the baseline amount of analysis that's needed, regardless of which direction is desired or how far in depth you want to go. There are additional things that can be added or substituted.

Phase 1 is project initiation and the development of a work plan. They meet with us and they will converse with us.

Louise arrived at this time and distributed a handout listing the reasons she believes the District needs to perform a study and did not remain for the remainder of the meeting.

During Phase 1 there is a discussion relative to costs and scope. Chair Francis reviewed the following aspects of the study. We do have time to look at ECSI's information, pare it down, and see where we would like to go with it; whether the focus is going to be on our staffing model or the needs of the future regarding apparatus, substations, etc. Those are for the Board to determine.

From what the Chair sees in the scope, the last pages consist of the optional sections. She doesn't know that we really need any of them.

Adrian felt if there was to be a motion on Item #4, it should include a condition upon the funding source. We don't want to pay the full dollar cost of this study. The Chair responded we could potentially know the results on our application by July.

Chuck questioned if, in entering into contracts with entities such as this, don't we need to have so many different vendors for comparison? Do we need to go through a bid process? Do we need to indicate in the grant application process that we sought out more than one vendor? Our purchasing policy will be reviewed for the answers to these questions.

It was agreed that we need to confirm the process by which we select a vendor.

Since there are so many things we need to have researched and given guidance on and goals that need to be set determined by information gathered, Chair Francis felt that is why it was important for a long-range study, not just five years.

It is important that before we have our first meeting with the firm, everyone does their own research and think about what is important and what we really need to know and have a clear understanding of our goals and objectives.

We can wait until after we have funding to enter into a contract. We just need to keep in mind that Chief Averett is scheduled to leave us September 1, 2015. We will either have to approach him about the possibility of staying a little longer or make a decision about what we are going to do regarding a chief.

John stated we need to know what our procurement policy states and we can't make a decision without that information. Regarding bidding, Chair Francis stated the fact that each member of the board has researched and tried to find an organization and we were not able to find other organizations that provide the same service. That would need to be documented. Hurricane was another option and they declined.

If we pursue the grant, we have to advertise a public hearing no later than April 15 and have the public hearing during the board's regular meeting on April 22. The minutes from the public hearing have to be ready to submit with the application which is due June 1. We do have the opportunity to submit the application to Gary Zabriskie at Five Counties a week or two in advance for him to review for completeness and compliance. At the July CIB meeting, we request a "suspend and fund" of our grant. At that time, we would know whether or not we would receive funding and when.

If it is decided the Board wants to proceed with ECSI, based on the funding and our procurement policy, we can then contact ECSI, setup the initial project initiation meeting and they would like 10% down and then there would be a progressive billing as each phase is completed.

In April or May Springdale will begin their budget work meetings for the next fiscal year. We can be present at those meetings and think about how we may want to request possibly having some help meeting our matching portion of \$15,000.

The representative from ECSI felt the cost could be pared down to \$30,000. Five Counties has increased our grant amount to \$20,000 so we should be covered.

Chuck reviewed the facts: We want to do a study with a private, independent contractor. The payment (50%) for that study will be through applying to CIB for a matching grant. For the public hearing we need to indicate that there are expense items in the budget that will not be totally expended before the end of the year (Chief's salary and benefits) and those funds can be utilized to pay for the study (\$15,000). Per our purchasing procedures, we will seek a vendor to conduct the independent study of the operations of the RSFPD and would commit to a down payment (signup fee) then assess the different funding sources for the project as it goes forth.

Chair Francis has been told by Gary Zabriskie of Five Counties that the chances of the District not acquiring this grant are pretty remote. There is always a chance, so we should have a contingency plan and if we state our intent to fund it ourselves that does show our resolve in having it done. We would need to reconvene and determine options for alternative funding.

Chuck summarized we will go forth, seek out a vendor, apply for the grant. If the vendor requests a down payment to initiate the process, some non-refundable amount, we would commit to that, but if we did not receive a matching grant, knowing that we may end up losing the down payment, we would reassess and seek alternative funding sources to include the District's budget.

Chuck moved that since the Board has agreed to seek an independent study of the operations that we seek out a private contractor with qualifications in the relevant subject matter areas in order to obtain an evaluation of the RSPFD. Chair Francis commented that was what was decided in the last motion. The motion died for the lack of a second.

Discussion took place in order to formulate a motion relative to: the District's purchasing policy, contracting with an independent vendor, various forms of funding, possible non-refundable deposit required by the vendor

Chuck Passek stated that being that the Board has agreed to have an independent study done, Chuck moved that we find a private contractor with expertise in the appropriate subject matter areas in order to do the study of the RSFPD. Adrian Player seconded the motion and a roll call vote indicated all those present voted in favor of the motion.

Chair Francis's understanding of the action just taken was for the Board to look at our procurement policy; if we find others we can get the bids (or what is required by the policy). Basically, the only reason we are not saying we want ECSI is because we are not quite sure of our procurement policy and we need to get it in writing that we have been turned down by Hurricane (that's one bid), and perhaps we need one more.

Chuck Passek stated in order to fund the previous motion, Chuck moved that we present our proposal for the independent study to the Five Counties, Town of Springdale, Town of Rockville, and any other appropriate funding sources in order to find matching funds to assist the RSFPD in paying for the above study. If the vendor asks for a down payment in order to initiate the studies, we would agree to pay that non-refundable fee in advance of receiving any grants from anyone else.

John Callahan requested to amend the motion to not include the down payment in the motion because that obligates us to somebody that we haven't found yet, or the concept. The concept may be totally different. Company A may require 50% down; Company B may not require anything down. Chuck clarified that we leave that part out and then if we go through the process and find the appropriate company then we just talk to them. If they say that is their contract then we can vote on the concept.

Chuck Passek accepted the amendment to the motion. Chair Francis requested amending the motion to include all available funding. Chuck Passek accepted the amendment to the motion. John Callahan seconded the motion and a roll call vote indicated all those present voted in favor of the motion.

5. **ADJOURN** – Adrian Player moved the meeting be adjourned. Chuck Passek seconded the motion and a roll call vote indicated all those present voted in favor of the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Minutes typed by:
Elaine M. Harris
District Clerk

APPROVED:

Luci Francis
Luci Francis, Chair