

**BOARD OF FIRE COMMISSIONERS
TRUCKEE MEADOWS FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT**

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

FEBRUARY 23, 2010

PRESENT:

David Humke, Chairman
Bonnie Weber, Vice Chairperson
Bob Larkin, Commissioner*
Kitty Jung, Commissioner
John Breternitz, Commissioner

Amy Harvey, County Clerk
Katy Simon, County Manager
Melanie Foster, Legal Counsel
Curtis Johnson, Division Chief

The Board convened at 10:20 a.m. in regular session in the Commission Chambers of the Washoe County Administration Complex, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada, and conducted the following business:

10-09F AGENDA ITEM 5

Agenda Subject: “Introduction of Reno Fire Chief Finalist.”

Donna Dreska, Acting City of Reno Manager, introduced Chief Michael Hernandez, the final candidate for the Reno Fire Chief’s position. She commended Acting Chief Tim Alameda for doing an outstanding job. Chief Hernandez indicated he looked forward to working with the Commission and was always interested in hearing suggestions about how to improve the level of service to the community. He agreed that Chief Alameda had navigated the Reno Fire Department through some pretty treacherous times and said the community owed him a debt of gratitude.

Chairman Humke welcomed Chief Hernandez to the community.

In response to the call for public comment, Sam Dehne said he was very impressed with Chief Hernandez.

There was no action taken on this item.

10:23 a.m. The Board reconvened as the Board of County Commissioners with Commissioner Larkin absent.

***10:41 a.m.** Commissioner Larkin arrived at the meeting.

11:33 a.m. The Board convened simultaneously as the Board of County Commissioners, the Board of Fire Commissioners for the Sierra Fire Protection District, and the Board of Fire Commissioners for the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District with all members present.

10-10F AGENDA ITEM 4

Agenda Subject: “Review and consideration of acceptance of final version of the January 2010 Fire and Fire Based Emergency Medical Services Master Plan and possible direction to staff to return to the March 23, 2010 meeting with a proposed implementation plan for the recommendations contained within the Master Plan. (All Commission Districts)”

Chief Kurt Latipow, Fire Services Coordinator, noted there was an addendum to the staff report that contained various emails and documents submitted by stakeholders. He said the submissions were not in any particular order and most were consistent with testimony heard at the recent Board of County Commissioners Special Meeting on February 22, 2010. He stated the Diamante study was never intended to include an in-depth analysis or development plan for each recommendation. After carefully reviewing the original scope of work that commissioned five tasks (see pages 2 and 3 of the staff report), he indicated the consultant’s contract was completed after submission of the Diamante study.

Chief Latipow explained his staff report organized the issues into seven major themes, with the study’s key recommendations and staff comments provided under each theme. For example, under the theme of governance he emphasized the key recommendation was to consider the development of some type of new unified fire services agency. He pointed out the financial analysis had changed since the consultants first looked at it and was subsequently re-reviewed with the assistance of County Financial Consultant Mary Walker. He cautioned the review was not an in-depth analysis and suggested there should be an in-depth analysis of all of the finances of any interested parties before moving ahead with anything related to financing. He commented the County was fortunate to have a very active group of volunteer fire agencies involved in daily operations and it was his opinion the volunteer program would also benefit from a unified approach. He requested staff direction to draft an implementation plan and bring it back for the Board’s consideration at their March 23, 2010 meeting. He observed such a timeline would allow staff about a week and a half to finish drafting a report.

Commissioner Larkin requested a brief sketch of Chief Latipow’s vision for the implementation plan. Chief Latipow said he envisioned drafting a spreadsheet-type document. As an example, he noted the study’s first recommendation was to pursue a shared governance model. Although the consultants used the term Joint Powers Agreement (JPA), he indicated the key recommendation was for some form of unified governance. He stated staff would work to identify the steps necessary to achieve each recommendation. The columns of the spreadsheet would identify such items as the length of time and associated costs for each item in the implementation plan. He anticipated

working with the Board to determine a “yes or no” for each of the items. He observed some of the recommendations were already on the verge of being accomplished. For instance, he said he was very proud of the teamwork that had gone into updating the building code, the wildland-interface code, and the fire code. He pointed out the code project was currently in the hands of the County’s legal staff and the next steps would include meeting with the City of Reno’s legal staff and the County’s external partners before bringing it back to the Board for consideration.

Commissioner Larkin indicated there had been several suggestions regarding emergency medical services (EMS) in general and the Regional Emergency Medical Services Agency (REMSA) in particular. He commented EMS issues were clearly outside the scope of an implementation plan because they fell under the jurisdiction of the District Board of Health. He suggested one of the implementation items might be to make a recommendation to the District Board of Health that they consider and elaborate on those issues. He observed the agenda item provided a good forum to discuss specific items for the implementation plan and suggested that Chief Latipow remain open to additional comments and considerations. Chief Latipow acknowledged there were items within the recommendations that would drive meetings and committees. He characterized the implementation plan as a basic road map rather than a “down in the weeds” document. He requested the implementation plan be kept at a fairly high altitude that would allow staff to get down in the weeds as more information was presented to the Commission and decisions were made.

Commissioner Larkin said it was his perception the project was still a staff-driven process. Although the Board of Fire Commissioners was interacting with staff, he indicated the project would not really be the Board’s work product until the implementation plan came back to the Board for consideration. He stated it was his suggestion the Fire Services Coordinator still needed to be the point of contact for specific recommendations and concerns.

Commissioner Breternitz said he wanted to make sure the implementation plan included objective discussion about setting a direction. He questioned whether the plan would include things such as the discovery of information and the generation of financial reports, or would just identify how the recommendations could be taken care of. He emphasized he was not completely sold on all the items contained within the Diamante study. County Manager Katy Simon replied it absolutely was not the proposal for the implementation plan to become a map for implementing all of the study recommendations. She suggested a better choice of words might have been an action plan to identify the steps needed to bring all of the information needed by the Board to make informed decisions about any of the recommendations addressed in the Diamante report. She emphasized there was no assumption to endorse or approve anything in the Diamante study. She clarified the requested Board action under the agenda item was to accept the report and give staff direction to spend more time bringing back each of the study recommendations, so the details of the financial analysis, operating impacts, and stakeholder input could be fully vetted and researched. She stated staff wanted the Board to have an opportunity to make individual decisions about any of the study

recommendations and the discussion might generate other options that were not in the Diamante report. Chief Latipow commented there were many recommendations in the study that were totally separate from the formation of a JPA. He noted there were things the Board might wish to consider even if nothing was done about a governance model.

Commissioner Breternitz pointed out it was possible to predetermine some things by how an implementation plan was put together. He observed there were a large number of people in the community who were very interested in the process. He expressed concern that a few staff people sitting in a room coming up with an implementation plan would cut off the ability to really pose the issues and the plans in the most beneficial ways. He said he wanted to know that the people who shared different points of view would be included so the Commission could make the best educated decisions. Ms. Simon indicated it was always staff's preferred approach to involve affected stakeholders in the implementation of any major initiative in Washoe County. She suggested a project team might be one of the components that staff could bring back for the Board's review. She explained Chief Latipow had been working with a team that included volunteer fire chiefs, chiefs from other fire service entities, and other stakeholders. She stressed that the team members were not making policy decisions but would bring proposals back for the Board to say "yes," "no," or "bring us something different." Although the policy decisions would be vetted at properly noticed public meetings, she did not recommend a committee structure that had to follow open meeting law, take minutes, and post notices just to do the staff level work. Commissioner Breternitz agreed it would be great to describe it as a project team. He stated it was his belief there would be a better final product if the people who shared different points of view helped to formulate some of the pathways to be taken in getting to a conclusion. He suggested REMSA and other such stakeholders should be on the project team.

Commissioner Jung agreed with staff that high altitude in the implementation or action plan was necessary so that staff and other special interests did not set policy for the Board of County Commissioners. She said she believed it was the responsibility of the Commission to make sure the process was deliberative, and that it migrated toward efficiency in terms of the issues noted in the study as well as in terms of fairness to the taxpayers. She appreciated the participation of different stakeholders and indicated those stakeholders could better inform the Commission as to whether the process was working for them or not. She observed it was clearly not for staff to set policy, but to show the Board the positives, negatives, and pathways of any given course of action. She commented that is what she thought Chief Latipow had intended.

Commissioner Weber also agreed the Commission needed to make the final determinations. She related a suggestion made to her by an audience member that a representative from each of the stakeholder groups, as well as some financial specialists, be put together in a room to discuss all of the issues. She indicated the stakeholders had the best knowledge of what could be done in the community. She expressed concern that a JPA would come out of the process, although Chief Latipow was not calling it that. She said she was afraid of a JPA. Commissioner Weber questioned why a report needed to be done by the meeting on March 23, 2010. Ms. Simon noted it did not need to be done by

March 23rd and staff was only trying to keep the process moving forward. She pointed out the Board had given direction to advance the questions and to appropriately advance the resolution of the questions. She said staff was also being responsive to a June 30, 2010 deadline related to the Interlocal Agreement with Reno and wanted everyone to have a chance to comply with their contractual responsibilities. She indicated staff would follow whatever process was directed by the Board. Chief Latipow said staff would be more than happy to go beyond March 23rd.

Commissioner Weber asked if there had been any explanation or discussion about all of the steps involved in the Interlocal Agreement. Ms. Simon recalled there had been an agenda item about six weeks past. Chief Latipow observed there was an upcoming item on the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) agenda that would facilitate more discussion. Commissioner Weber said it would be helpful to have some sort of bulleted list showing what has to happen with the Interlocal Agreement by what date.

Chairman Humke summarized there had been discussion about starting the process at the 40,000-foot level and progressing toward ultimate solutions, as well as having a team confer with stakeholders who would provide input to staff. He observed the commissioners all seemed to agree the process should be a staff effort that was not under the Open Meeting Law, but would include meetings without the elected officials present. He noted staff would periodically report back for Board direction concerning policy. He indicated the process would continue until the drop-dead date for the Interlocal Agreement, which might be renegotiated to alter the timelines. He urged that ordinary taxpaying citizens be brought into the process. Chief Latipow said he would refer to the plan as a draft action plan rather than a draft implementation plan.

Chief Latipow wondered if it was the Board's direction to have the plan put together by a committee. Commissioner Larkin said that was not the direction. In order to provide maximum flexibility, he indicated it would be a staff-driven process and Chief Latipow would employ the best practices that were necessary to get the job done. If that meant the formation of subcommittees or getting all the stakeholders in a room, then Chief Latipow should do what he felt was appropriate within the confines of what the Board had discussed. He stated those players who were relevant to moving forward with the process needed to be involved.

Chairman Humke agreed Chief Latipow was to be the staff point person who would determine when it was time to go before the Commission. He said he had previously described his vision in a private conversation with Chief Latipow. He listed the following agencies and stakeholders: North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District, Sparks Fire Department, Sierra Fire Protection District, Reno Fire Department, Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District, Airport Authority Fire Department, REMSA, Washoe County Volunteer Fire Association, dispatch personnel, and citizens. He described his concept as a huge table where the various agencies might or might not choose to take a chair. He stated it was not logical to exclude any agency that wished to adhere to the concept.

Commissioner Breternitz voiced concern about getting to the next Board presentation. He said he considered Chief Latipow to be like the CEO of the process and a good CEO took input from others. He agreed Chief Latipow would make the final decision as to what was presented to the Board but encouraged him to take advantage of the people around him in formulating the action plan. Chairman Humke observed there were no Commissioner objections to casting the process in that manner.

In response to the call for public comment, Robert Ackerman applauded the Diamante report's recommendations for a JPA as well as the construction and staffing of a new fire station in Arrowcreek. He said he was disappointed to see little or no discussion about the Joy Lake Fire Station. He observed the County agreed to pay Reno the cost of operating six fire stations in 2001, but had annexed a large portion of the County since that time. He wondered how many of the County stations had either been annexed or were surrounded by the City and should be sold to them. He supported termination of the current Interlocal Agreement with the City of Reno and the creation of a JPA that would ensure equal fire and paramedic protection for all of the citizens.

Steven Perez indicated whatever the County decided to do in the future would be different from the current Interlocal Agreement with the City of Reno, so the Board should make a separate decision concerning cancelation of the Agreement. He stated that he and other individuals in the Mt. Rose area thought it should be canceled. He advocated combining the Sierra Fire Protection District (SFPD) and the TMFPD, but allowing them to retain their autonomy as a County fire service.

Donna Peterson, a resident of St. James Village, talked about the importance of having a voice. She pointed out the SFPD was currently the only fire service that was accountable to the Commission. She observed the citizens had no voice as long as the Commission had no voice, and wondered how such governance could be in the citizens' best interests.

Dr. Bob Parker stated he was a Galena resident who previously supported an increase in his taxes to improve the SFPD. He indicated SFPD Fire Chief Michael Greene and his staff involved the residents, and the residents volunteered to help with data analysis, project management, and assistance with emergency evacuations. He discussed the contrasting difficulties in getting data from the TMFPD and EMS contractors. He noted that transparency, openness, respect, and trust were required for agencies to partner with the community. He suggested the Board had an opportunity to change the community's perception and to improve services.

Klark Staffan, representing the management staff at REMSA, reminded everyone that REMSA was a not-for-profit organization that operated with no tax support or other subsidy. He stated REMSA was heavily regulated and independently monitored on a regular basis by the District Board of Health. He indicated the dispatch inefficiencies observed in the Diamante report were very fixable with a dispatch center link that REMSA had been suggesting for quite some time. He pointed out there was nothing in

the federal privacy regulations that prevented such a dispatch link and there were no REMSA-created delays in getting resources to the scene. He said the recommendations previously submitted to the Board were based on scientific medical research on EMS systems and patient care. He encouraged the Board to continue an open dialogue among all the stakeholders to ensure that decisions were based on factual information and indicated REMSA was ready to participate in such a process.

Dr. Mary Anderson, Washoe County District Health Officer, provided a brief overview of the REMSA agreement and the oversight that was in place. She explained the well-regulated medical model that was currently in place evolved from a 1994 cooperative study by participants from all the governmental entities, fire services, and hospitals in Washoe County. She stated the oversight was provided through the District Board of Health, which was composed of elected and appointed officials from all three governing bodies and one member elected by other Board members. While no system was perfect and every system required ongoing evaluation to improve, she said it was her opinion the EMS system functioned with a high standard of professionalism and in the best interests of those who were served.

Marty Scheuerman identified himself as a resident within the SFPD who retired after 35 years with the TMFPD and Reno Fire Department. He noted he had been the last Fire Chief of the TMFPD before it merged with Reno. He applauded the Commission for their regional approach. He characterized the Interlocal Agreement with Reno as the first step in an evolutionary process. He stated the next step in the evolution of the region's emergency services would take the political will of the Commission and its partners to make it happen. He said he thought the Agreement with Reno had been good for the TMFPD as well as for the residents and visitors, and should be used as a bridge to the next step. He suggested it was extremely important for the Board to continue its due diligence and to look at everything. He pointed out the REMSA system would stand on its own and the decisions would be evident if the system was really that good. He emphasized the Commission owed it to the stakeholders and the public to make things better if they could.

Lee Leighton, a resident of Spanish Springs Valley, stated he had been a participant in public safety for a number of years before retiring. He agreed with former Chief Scheuerman's comments. He stated the scope of what the staff was being asked to do was a little overwhelming, and recommended the Board narrow the scope down. He observed governance seemed to be the number one issue and the rest of the issues in the report would come around if governance was dealt with. He noted it was important for the Commission and the citizens to have an equal say so. He thanked the Board for the work they were doing and for taking the opportunity to try to make some great changes.

Chairman Humke referenced the remarks of one citizen who suggested staff was being asked to do too much. He expressed confidence that Chief Latipow would be able to get it done and to prioritize the important stuff so that other items could fall into place.

On motion by Commissioner Larkin, seconded by Commissioner Breternitz, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the final version of the January 2010 Fire and Fire Based EMS Services Master Plan Analysis be accepted. Staff was directed to begin the development of an Action Plan to be completed by March 31, 2010 and to be brought back for consideration at the Board's first meeting in April 2010. It was further noted that the Action Plan was to contain a suggested timeline for each item.

12:34 p.m. The Board reconvened as the Board of Fire Commissioners for the Sierra Fire Protection District with all members present.

12:38 p.m. The Board reconvened as the Board of Fire Commissioners for the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District with all members present.

10-11F AGENDA ITEM 2

Agenda Subject: "Public Comment. Comment heard under this item will be limited to two minutes per person and may pertain to matters both on and off the Commission agenda. The District will also hear public comment during individual action items, with comment limited to two minutes per person. Comments are to be made to the Board of Fire Commissioners as a whole."

There was no response to the call for public comment.

10-12F AGENDA ITEM 3a

Agenda Subject: "Acceptance of volunteer/auxiliary report for December 2009 (including monthly operations report of Volunteer Fire Departments indicating response data, training activities/apparatus updates, administrative, radio communication and dispatch issues, etc.)"

There was no public comment on this item.

On motion by Commissioner Breternitz, seconded by Commissioner Larkin, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that Agenda Item 3a be accepted.

10-13F AGENDA ITEM 6

Agenda Subject: "Discussion and possible direction to staff to transmit a request to City of Reno regarding modification of the Interlocal Agreement for Fire Service and Consolidation, to include without limitation: the June 30 notice and renewal provisions; representation at Reno Fire Department labor contract strategy development and negotiations; recruitment and selection of the Reno/Truckee Meadows Fire District Fire Chief; Consolidated Budget process and contribution formula; levels of service; volunteer contracts and utilization of volunteers; data management and statistical documentation; dispatch agreements and scope of service; command staffing; and liability and insurance."

Chief Kurt Latipow, Fire Services Coordinator, referenced the section of the staff report outlining the history of the Interlocal Agreement (ILA) with the City of Reno. He stated the intent of the ILA was to operate the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) and the Reno Fire Department (RFD) as one consolidated agency from an operational and administrative perspective. The Board of County Commissioners, acting as the Board of Fire Commissioners (BOFC), retained control of the TMFPD General Fund and Capital Improvement budgets, as well as some of the secured funds within those budgets. He explained the 2000 ILA drove the financial arrangement that created a consolidated budget each year, which was administered by the City of Reno after approval by the BOFC. He explained the First Amended ILA was enacted in 2004 to incorporate changes to make the operation better, and the ILA was automatically renewed in 2007 with no protest.

Chief Latipow reviewed three options for changing the ILA. He stated the ILA provided for automatic renewal if no notice was given prior to June 30, 2010. The Board had a second option to notify the City of Reno that it no longer wished to enter into the ILA, which would begin a one-year termination phase on July 1, 2010. He indicated the purpose of the one-year termination phase was to unravel the partnership, fully account for everything, and figure out how to run the County operation. He noted the third option was to make changes to the ILA by mutual agreement of both parties, similar to the method that was used to amend the contract in 2004.

Chief Latipow said there had been significant discussion at meetings of the Joint Fire Advisory Board (JFAB), where a “bin list” of possible amendment items to be considered had been created. He pointed out the expiration date of June 30, 2010 was one of the listed items and staff was recommending the Board consider modifying the expiration date to allow for work that still needed to be done. He stated page 2 of the staff report contained a list of general topics from the bin list. He indicated staff was reaching a point where a cut-off date was necessary. He recommended the Board direct staff to transmit a request to the City of Reno to enter into discussion on amending the ILA in the specified areas, and potentially give direction to present a recommendation to the City for extending the notification date.

As the Board’s alternate to the JFAB, Commissioner Larkin said it was his recommendation the Board hold off on sending a letter to the City. He stated the JFAB was scheduled to meet every other week through April 19, 2010, with the goal of making more detailed recommendations to the Board. He was concerned that sending a letter to the City at the current time might prematurely cut off consideration of many items. He indicated the JFAB had invited other partners and collaborators into the process and needed time to complete its work before the Board gave notice to negotiate with the City.

Chairman Humke asked if notifying the City of a desire to negotiate ILA modifications would preserve the Board’s right to give notice to quit and begin the winding down process on June 30, 2010. Melanie Foster, Legal Counsel, replied that asking to look at modifications to the ILA did not in any way prevent the Board from

giving notice should it choose to do so by June 30th. Chief Latipow agreed with Commissioner Larkin that the JFAB was working very aggressively on the issues. He indicated conclusion by April 19th might make it difficult for staff to present recommendations and get language agendized for possible Board action in May.

Commissioner Jung requested clarification for the public as to the purpose of the JFAB. Chief Latipow explained the JFAB was commissioned by the City and the BOFC to oversee operational issues and concerns that might arise from the ILA. Commissioner Jung wondered how long it would take to draft a letter and suggested the BOFC could hold an emergency meeting if necessary. She agreed with Commissioner Larkin and expressed concern about circumventing the role and goals of the JFAB.

Katy Simon, County Manager, observed the purpose of a letter was to provide notice that there was an interest in possibly modifying the ILA. She indicated staff was only responding to the Board's stated desire that it wanted to be able to modify the ILA. Commissioner Larkin agreed the Board had asked for continuing dialogue but said he did not believe the timing was right for the Board to announce its intention. Although the JFAB was not a policy-making board, he pointed out it was a requirement of the ILA that the JFAB provide recommendations to the BOFC. He indicated it might be possible to get concurrence from both sides at the JFAB and bring recommendations to modify the ILA within the timeframe, as well as to extend the timeframe by mutual agreement. Additionally, he stated the parameters of what needed to be negotiated had not been fully determined. He suggested there should be a continuing agenda item at every BOFC meeting until the job was done.

Commissioner Breternitz agreed discussions should take place at the JFAB, including the extension of a deadline, and there should be an ongoing agenda item.

In response to the call for public comment, Marty Scheurman, a retired Chief from the TMFPD, said he thought there was a real willingness for the parties to work together. He discussed the history and intent of the ILA. He noted there was powerful language contained in the ILA that was put there to allow the parties to evaluate the effectiveness of the agreement and consolidated services while the TMFPD and the City jointly worked together to explore the benefits of a unified fire jurisdiction. He stated that is where he thought things were headed. He suggested the Board make a mutual agreement to negotiate changes and use the ILA as a bridge agreement.

Alex Kukulis said he did not encourage the unwinding of the ILA. He hoped work would continue and everyone would be motivated to move forward on many of the issues being discussed.

No action was taken on this item.

10-14F AGENDA ITEM 7

Agenda Subject: “Discussion of possible impacts on TMFPD services due to budget/staffing changes proposed for Reno Fire, with action to either approve a resolution, deny approval of the resolution, or direct staff and the Joint Fire Advisory Board to negotiate solutions which minimize impacts to TMFPD from budget reductions in the Reno Fire Department FY09/10 Budget.”

In response to the call for public comment, Alex Kukulis said he observed Chief Latipow’s presentation at a recent meeting of the Joint Fire Advisory Board (JFAB). He disagreed with the staff assessment that closing Engine 9 in Stead would not result in a service level change for Engine 13. He indicated Engine 13 was not going to be where it was supposed to be during the incidents it would cover for Engine 9.

Commissioner Larkin stated the level of service issue raised the question of whether or not moving trucks around was a violation of the Interlocal Agreement (ILA) between the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) and the City of Reno. He noted the language in the contract was vague and imprecise. He observed the presentation provided by Chief Latipow to the Joint Fire Advisory Board (JFAB) was based on technical data but the legal side of things was a separate component. He said one of the ideas at the JFAB was to move toward a more technical definition of level of service rather than trying to define level of service in a legal context within the ILA.

Chief Kurt Latipow, Fire Services Coordinator, stated the staff analysis of service level change was driven by the confines of the ILA. He conducted a PowerPoint presentation, which was placed on file with the Clerk. He provided some historical background on the budget situation and staffing reductions that resulted in a plan for browning out some Reno Fire Department (RFD) equipment and stations. He indicated a baseline analysis of fire resources was funded by the County in 2008 to provide a snapshot of unit locations, call volumes, and call distribution. He explained that unit utilization reflected how often each company was called on to respond and the maximum amount of workload an engine company could be expected to handle by itself in one year. He said he believed it to be useful when considering the addition, closing, or relocating of fire stations. Based on national statistics, he indicated fire stations running less than 1,000 calls per year did not have a unit utilization problem but those running in excess of 2,500 calls per year had a serious unit utilization problem. He cited problems with keeping up on training, engine company inspections and maintenance. He stated there was increased potential for simultaneous calls as stations approached 2,000 calls per year. Response times were longer when the closest units were already out on a call and the responding secondary or tertiary units were located further away.

Chief Latipow noted TMFPD Station 13 was the closest station with the potential to be impacted by reduced staffing or browning out of equipment at RFD Station 9 in Stead. He said a team approach was used to analyze the Stead area run data. Station 9 averaged 722 responses annually over a five-year period and Station 13 averaged 1,034 calls per year over the same five-year period. He observed the RFD

budget projected temporary brownouts of Engine 9 approximately 59 percent of the time. He showed the results of adding various percentages of the Station 9 call volume to Station 13. He concluded Station 13 would not reach maximum unit utilization even if all of the Station 9 call volume was added to Station 13. He cautioned the analysis was based strictly on workload capacity and did not consider run times or other criteria.

Chief Latipow explained the County's 2007 Comprehensive Plan set response time objectives based on land use categories. He displayed the expected response time objectives, which were 5 minutes or less for urban lands, 10 minutes or less for suburban lands, 20 minutes or less for some rural lands, and 20 minutes or more for lands designated as General Rural. He showed maps of response districts and response times for Stations 9 and 13. He noted there were two volunteer fire stations in the area, and it appeared that had been taken into account when the response time objectives were established. Based on unit utilization, run times, land use classification, the TMFPD response history, and the guidelines within the ILA, Chief Latipow stated it was staff's opinion the browning out of Station 19 would not have a significant impact on the TMFPD at the current time.

Chief Latipow talked about the Standards of Cover Deployment Analysis model, which considered travel, response times, workloads, risk assessments, call stacking, daytime versus nighttime scenarios, and other factors to provide a more comprehensive picture of system wide coverage requirements. He recommended the consideration of such an analysis prior to reducing staffing or browning out stations beyond what was currently proposed. He noted similar studies had been done by the International Association of Fire Fighters. He acknowledged the recommendation was difficult because it was pointed to the City of Reno, but observed the County was a contractual and operational partner along with the City. He pointed out the Resolution attached to the staff report included a request that the City develop a Standards of Cover Deployment Analysis.

Commissioner Larkin acknowledged Chief Latipow was on the right track with the Standards of Cover, which was the national standard for analysis. He indicated the Board did not yet know how Chief Latipow's technical analysis would be viewed in terms of the legal analysis requested by the JFAB. He remarked that browning out a station would clearly change something but no one was sure about the impact level of such a change. He indicated the JFAB asked Chief Latipow to work with the City of Reno in identifying any "black holes" that existed within the Standards of Cover analysis. He stated work had already been done for other areas of Washoe County and it was his understanding a discussion was to take place before the Reno City Council. He said there was an opportunity to integrate some of the volunteer fire services into a greater role. He requested the Commission allow the JFAB to continue its work and come back with a recommendation as to whether or not there was a level of service change.

Curtis Johnson, TMFPD Division Chief, indicated the issue was not yet on a Reno City Council agenda. He said there was a critical time element within the

RFD/TMFPD staffing plan that depended on the Board's action. Chief Latipow stated that was the reason legal staff had crafted a resolution for the Board's consideration.

Commissioner Weber asked what stations were already being browned out. Chief Johnson emphasized the current staffing plan involved closures of some apparatus but not of any fire stations. He noted Station 9 had not yet been affected because of the level of service question, and staff was looking for direction before moving forward with a staffing plan.

As a 27-year resident in the Stead area, Commissioner Weber said it was unacceptable to do anything with Station 9. She related the story of one of her constituents whose house was saved from a chimney fire by Station 9. She observed Station 13 would have taken three or four minutes longer to respond to that incident. She pointed out the Stead area community was densely populated and included mobile home parks, lower income houses, and apartment complexes. She stated it just did not make sense to say the level of service would not be affected. Chief Johnson replied that the depth of resources absolutely would be going down. He indicated the reductions were budget driven and the fire service professionals did not want reductions within their communities. He pointed out the fire service professionals looked at the TMFPD and the RFD as one body, not as two separate departments. He stated the plan was put together by a task force that had to deal with the budget cuts.

Commissioner Weber remarked that fire and law enforcement had to be priorities for the community.

Chief Latipow reiterated his analysis had been done within the constraints of the contractual relationship. He clarified no one had said anything about closing or moving anybody out of Station 13. He indicated Station 13 was a TMFPD station that was fully funded in the budget.

Commissioner Larkin suggested the Board take no action and keep the item on a future agenda until the JFAB brought back some substantive language to remove the question as to what constituted a level of service change. Chairman Humke said the reduction in effort language in the contract was essentially meaningless.

Chief Latipow observed some of the struggle with the level of service question was that there really was no science behind it. He indicated some of the reliance might or might not be on a Standards of Cover analysis as contract language was brought forward for the JFAB to consider. He stated it did not take a resolution to encourage a Standards of Cover analysis by the City of Reno, but the Board might wish to consider whether or not the City could get it done before July 1, 2010.

Commissioner Larkin asked if Board action would assist the dialogue with the Reno City Council. Chief Johnson said that it would. Commissioner Larkin suggested a resolution was not necessary but it would be positive for the Commission to use a

motion to suggest the City Council embrace the Standards of Cover concepts. Chairman Humke said he would vote for a motion that was styled to be helpful.

On motion by Commissioner Larkin, seconded by Commissioner Breternitz, which motion duly carried, the Board suggested that the Reno City Council embrace the Standards of Cover concepts.

10-15F AGENDA ITEM 8

Agenda Subject: “Review and acceptance of Wildland Fire Costs (\$294,328) from the 2009 Red Rock Fire, and direct finance to pay incurred costs from the Wildland Fire Contingency Fund.”

Chief Kurt Latipow, Fire Services Coordinator, explained there had been a large amount of mutual aid to assist with structure protection during the 2009 fire in the Red Rock/Rancho Haven areas. He indicated he and Division Chief Curtis Johnson worked during the initial stages of the fire to secure a tentative grant from the Nevada Division of Forestry (NDF). He stated the Fire Management Assistance Grant had been tentatively approved to allow reimbursement for up to 75 percent of the allowable costs. He noted the Commission had set aside \$1 million in a wildfire contingency fund for such events. He indicated there was a roster of bills included in Attachment A of the staff report. Board authorization would allow staff to immediately pay the bills and then submit paperwork to the State that would go on to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). He explained the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District would be a sub-grantee of the NDF and had to prove the bills had been paid before it could submit for reimbursement.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Breternitz, seconded by Chairman Humke, which motion duly carried, payments were approved to other agencies for the District’s share of wildland fire costs from the 2009 Red Rock fire, as shown in Attachment A to the staff report, and the Comptroller was authorized to process the same from the District’s Emergency Fund.

10-16F AGENDA ITEM 9

Agenda Subject: “Commissioners’/Manager’s Announcements, requests for information and identification of topics for future agendas. (No discussion among Commissioners or action will take place on this item.)”

Retiring Division Chief Curtis Johnson said it had been a privilege and an honor to serve in the fire service. Chairman Humke thanked Chief Johnson for his service and for helping him to bring into context the Interlocal Agreement with the City of Reno and how it had been negotiated. He indicated the Commission owed thanks to former

Commissioner Joanne Bond and former Reno Mayor Jeff Griffin for their part in that moment in history.

* * * * *

1:53 p.m. There being no further business to discuss, Chairman Humke adjourned the meeting without objection.

DAVID E. HUMKE, Chairman
Truckee Meadows Fire
Protection District

ATTEST:

AMY HARVEY, Washoe County Clerk
and Ex-Officio Clerk, Truckee Meadows
Fire Protection District

Minutes Prepared By:
Lisa McNeill, Deputy County Clerk