



STAFF REPORT

ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE FIRE SERVICES IN THE BELMONT FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT, PUBLIC MEETING #4 JANUARY 10, 2006

Honorable President and Board Members:

Summary

Currently, Fire and Emergency Medical Services are provided to the City of Belmont and unincorporated areas of the Harbor Industrial Area by the South County Fire Protection Authority, a joint powers authority (JPA) with the City of San Carlos. The Belmont Fire Protection District (Board) and the San Carlos City Council have voted to terminate the JPA effective June 30, 2006. Both Belmont and San Carlos are now in the process of soliciting proposals from fire services providers to replace the South County Fire Authority by July 2006. A comprehensive report and associated consultant report was presented to the Board at two meetings in October, October 11 and October 25. At the second October meeting, the Board removed Menlo Park, one of the potential service providers, from further consideration and directed that a third meeting be scheduled in November to hear a presentation on the proposal submitted by Firefighters Local 2400. At the third meeting November 22, 2005, staff, consultants and firefighters Local 2400 presented information on the Firefighters concept paper.

Tonight is the fourth in a series of five public meetings planned in Belmont regarding alternative proposals for providing fire service to the District. The balance of this report will be devoted to updating the Board on the status of each alternative, identify their advantages and disadvantages and recommend a course of action for Board consideration.

The remaining tentative schedule is as follows:

- January 2006 -- Belmont Fire Subcommittee evaluates staff recommended course of action
- January 2006 -- Belmont Fire Protection District Board deliberates on recommendation
- Public Meeting #5 -- February 28, 2006 (Final selection decision by the Belmont Fire Protection District Board)

NOTE: This February 28 date is a change from the previously published schedule

- March-June 2006 -- Selected alternative implemented

No action of the Board is being requested by district staff at this meeting. A final policy decision by the Board will be requested at public meeting number five on February 28, 2006. Tonight, the Board may wish to discuss the alternatives presented, request additional information and take additional public testimony.

Background

Five reports are attached:

- District staff report #1 dated October 11, 2005
- District staff report #2 dated October 25, 2005
- District staff report #3 dated November 22, 2005
- Revised/Updated Maze & Associates consultant report dated January 4, 2006
- Generic Fire Department Staffing analysis "Individual Belmont Fire Department Design Issues" prepared by Citygate Associates for the Belmont Fire Protection District

Subsequent to the completion of the original Maze report (dated September 15, 2005):

- Menlo Park FP district withdrew from the process;
- A standalone District Fire Department (Belmont Fire Department) alternative has been articulated. This standalone department has been developed based on data available for the South County Fire Authority, consulting assistance from Maze & Associates as well as fire consulting expert Citygate Associates.
- Firefighters Local 2400 submitted a proposal late in the District's evaluation process. Because the District's consultant had not had an opportunity to evaluate the Local 2400 proposal, the Board directed staff to have the City's consultant, Maze & Associates, evaluate the Local 2400 proposal utilizing the same criteria as was used in evaluating the original four proposals. To the extent possible, this has been done and is transmitted herein in a new consultant report. The Board is advised, however, that this fiscal analysis is incomplete. The Chief Officer Command staffing and support costs were not provided and are therefore not reported in the Maze analysis.

Discussion

The attached Maze report dated January 4, 2005 is the ***third version*** of this report. The latest version includes financial estimates of the time remaining under each option before significant fiscal stress re-emerges. The report also estimates the cost of a standalone Belmont Fire Department and refines the Firefighters Local 2400 concept, but still considers it incomplete.

The Maze report compares proposals received from San Mateo, Redwood City and CDF with the benchmark South County Fire Authority as well as a standalone Belmont Fire Department. The Firefighters Local 2400 proposal is included in the new comparison from a scope of services standpoint, but is excluded from a complete cost analysis because it did not include sufficient

cost information to determine total costs. Specifically, the Local 2400 proposal excluded chief officer and support function costs. The City of San Carlos attempted to solicit this information from providers. In a written response to the City of San Carlos, the cities of Redwood City and San Mateo both formally declined to respond to this request.

Description of the Six Possible Options For Belmont Fire Service Plus Advantages and Disadvantages of Each

1) California Department of Forestry CDF)

Summary Description of Proposal:

This proposal indicated it would serve one or both cities. It would be possible to contract directly with the State, or through the County for CDF services. This was easily the most comprehensive and complete proposal received. This proposal provides significant cost saving. Workforce issues are significant with this proposal. Highlights include:

- Broad range of services
- CDF currently has over 130 cooperative agreements in 35 counties. Cities include Oroville, Hamilton City, Madera, Pebble Beach, Truckee, Auburn, Rocklin, Murietta, Chino, Yucaipa, Pismo Beach, Weed, Red Bluff and Marysville. CDF also serves as the County Fire department in 19 counties.
- Statewide, CDF has 63 advanced life support units, 38 truck companies and 12 Hazmat units
- Contracting agency, in this case Belmont, would determine the level of service. Modifications can occur annually
- Included assumption of Hazardous Materials response unit
- Participation in the San Mateo County ALS JPA, Belmont/San Carlos Hazmat JPA, and the Fire Net6 JPA would be uninterrupted.
- Safety employees would be members of CDF Local 2881. They would not be members of IAFF Local 2400.
- 72 hour standard work week for Local 2881 employees
- Suppression staffing assumes two 3 person engine companies and the potential for a truck company. This would be a higher level of service than the current South County Fire model.
- CDF Chief prefers a "Quint" (ladder truck with water) rather than the current tiller truck (driver in rear).
- CDF provided two compensation models. One model converts South County employees to the CDF compensation system. The other model "Red-Circles" existing employees freezing their salary at current levels until the CDF salaries catch up to the red-circled south county salary levels. New employees would be hired under the normal CDF compensation system
- Provides 3.7 persons per engine company, potentially a higher level of service

- Utilizes Fire Net 6 dispatch
- Willing to provide service to Belmont only
- Proposal offers the option to simply make Belmont a subcontract of the existing San Mateo County cooperative agreement with CDF
- Maze “standard” cost \$ 3.99 mil, a 23% savings compared to the current South County cost

Advantages:

- Significant financial savings compared to current cost
- Santa Cruz is the CDF jurisdiction that would manage the Belmont contract for services. The CDF unit Chief is the key to a successful contract with CDF. Responsiveness depends on the local unit Chief. Local CDF Chief John Ferreira is very responsive
- The State CDF work schedule results in a higher level of firefighter staffing per engine company (3.0 per engine vs. 3.7 per engine)
- Large organization that can draw resources from a very large State pool
- Significant experience contracting with local agencies for fire services
- Excellent staff training model
- No longer a need to be involved in personnel management and labor relations
- Given the topography of Belmont, fighting wildland fires is important. CDF is expert at wildland firefighting
- CDF offers a very competitive benefits package with spousal retiree health coverage
- Bill agencies for costs in arrears each quarter providing significant cash flow benefits
- Future personnel assigned to Belmont will be brought in under the State’s CDF compensation model at potentially lower cost, thus providing further cost reduction opportunities. This potential savings is dependent upon the State CDF labor agreement not changing materially.

Disadvantages:

- Over time, there is likely to be substantial personnel changes as State CDF employees transfer to other locations for promotional opportunities
- Loss of local control through contracting with the State of California when compared to a contract with a local entity governed by local elected officials
- If local CDF Chief is transferred, responsiveness could be affected
- The State Director of CDF just resigned
- Some question about CDF’s experience providing ladder truck service in an urban environment
- CDF members are not members of Local 2400 IAFF, but rather are members of State CDF Local 2881.
- Current employees would be resistant to a transition to CDF

- Out year cost adjustments will be driven by the State of California labor settlements with local 2881. Belmont will have no say in these negotiations
- Will require continuous monitoring of performance under the contract

2) City of Redwood City Fire Department

Summary Description of Proposal:

This proposal indicated a preference to serve both cities or just San Carlos, but not Belmont alone due to logistical reasons (although this was later softened in meetings and may be negotiable). This proposal is unclear as to its cost savings, but they are estimated to be minimal. The Redwood City proposal would minimize workforce issues. Highlights include:

- Redwood City offered six cost model alternatives based on six different service configurations.
- Redwood City describes their proposal as a “preliminary response.” Figures represent a financial “worst case” set of scenarios.
- Redwood City is prepared to refine their cost assumptions and deployment model once Belmont refines its exact desired level of protection and deployment requirements.
- Out year adjustments would be “pass-through” of the Redwood City cost structure.
- Proposal excludes additional unknown “markup” that will be required for approval. Agreement would be cost plus some additional fee that was not given.
- Excludes potential savings internal to Belmont due to elimination of need to perform administrative support functions to South County Fire
- Emphasized savings to Belmont cannot be at the expense of regional participants in automatic aid and regional pre-hospital care agreements
- Utilizes Fire Net 6 dispatch
- Suppression staffing assumes 3 person engine companies and prorate portion of a 4 person Redwood City truck company
- Proposal does not address the HazMat unit currently operated by South County, however they anticipate having the opportunity to keep it operational as it currently exists
- Replaces the Fire Marshal with a Deputy Fire Marshal
- Emphasized the importance of transition planning and identifying workforce issues. Assumes re-employment of South County employees after discussions with the employee labor organizations and participating agencies.
- 56 hour standard work week for IAFF employees
- Proposal costs are “Go-Forward” costs. No transition costs are included
- Looking for a five (5) to ten (10) year contract, prefer ten. Two Council Members

from Redwood City would be involved in negotiations

- Suggests a Belmont to San Mateo and San Carlos to Redwood City scenario may be the best way to balance workload between the two existing agencies
- Truck service in Belmont may come from San Mateo under a separate agreement between Redwood City and San Mateo
- Maze “standard” cost \$ 4.92 mil, a 5% savings compared to the current South County Fire cost. However the Redwood City representatives indicated an unknown “markup” would be added to this figure, thus possibly minimizing or eliminating the savings.

Advantages:

- The City of Redwood City Fire Department is an excellent department with a solid reputation
- Similar organizational cultures, with shared training
- Redwood City currently provides service to Redwood Shores on the City’s eastern border.
- Redwood City’s City Council and City Manager are considered professional and business like
- There will tend to be a stable cost structure with a larger City Fire Department
- No longer a need to be involved in personnel management and labor relations
- Redwood City’s Fire Chief Gerald Kohlmann is experienced and well respected
- Will provide truck service at less cost than the current South County model

Disadvantages:

- Significant loss of local control
- Out year cost adjustments will be driven by Redwood City labor settlements with local 2400. Belmont will have no say in these negotiations. Costs are essentially pass through costs. Belmont’s cost structure would be Redwood City’s cost structure
- Redwood City is only provider with binding arbitration which could further limit local control
- Redwood City’s City Manager and Fire Chief have yet to provide administrative cost overhead charges
- Command staff has a greater distance to travel to arrive on scene for a major structure fire event
- Redwood City has indicated a preference to service both San Carlos and Belmont or just San Carlos. Their proposal indicated they were not inclined to serve Belmont only due to logistical reasons
- Will require continuous monitoring of performance under the contract

3) City of San Mateo Fire Department

Summary Description of Proposal:

This proposal indicated a preference to serve both cities, but would be willing to serve either. This proposal provides attractive cost savings potential. The San Mateo City proposal would minimize workforce issues.

Highlights include:

- Indicated the proposal could be modified during contract negotiations
- Emphasized San Mateo's long history of interagency and regional cooperation agreements, as well as stable leadership.
- Emphasized a regional approach to maximize efficiency and effectiveness by eliminating duplication
- Assumes retention of some, if not all, of the existing South County employees
- Suppression staffing assumes 3 person engine companies and prorata portion of a 4 person San Mateo Truck Company
- Out year adjustments is negotiable
- Prefer long term contract of 10 years
- Utilizes Fire Net 6 Dispatch, but under a standalone contract with the County
- Willing to provide service to Belmont only
- 56 hour standard work week for IAFF employees
- Maze "standard" cost \$ 4.72 mil, a 9% savings compared to the current South County Fire cost

Advantages:

- The City of San Mateo Fire Department is an excellent department with a solid reputation
- San Mateo borders Belmont on the City's northern border
- San Mateo's City Council and City Manager are considered professional and business like
- San Mateo's City Manager has indicated on several occasions the City of San Mateo is desirous of serving Belmont and looks forward to doing so
- The San Mateo Fire Chief Brian Kelly is experienced and well respected
- With a contract for service, there is no longer a need to be involved in personnel management and labor relations
- There will tend to be a stable cost structure with a larger City Fire Department
- Command staff has a shorter distance to travel and can arrive on scene to a major structure fire event faster than other proposers
- Predictable future cost. Provides for a fixed annual charge plus an annual CPI inflator in the out years for a defined number of years
- Will provide truck service at less cost than the current South County model

Disadvantages:

- Significant loss of local control
- Out year cost adjustments will be driven by San Mateo labor settlements with local 2400. Belmont will have little or no say in these negotiations.
- Will require continuous monitoring of performance under the contract

4) Re-Establish a Standalone Belmont Fire Department

Summary Description of Concept:

This concept was developed after significant input from Citygate & Associates, a consulting firm with expertise in the area of fire services design, deployment and consolidations. Highlights include:

- A full-career two-station 21 Firefighter Belmont Fire Department (18 minimum staffing plus 3 additional Firefighters to backfill for training, vacation, sick leave, etc). The Fire Department would be a City department with the Fire Chief reporting directly to the City Manager.
- Advanced Life Support medical capability on each engine during every shift.
- Minimum command structure of 1- Fire Chief, 1- Fire Marshal, 3- Battalion Chiefs to provide 24/7/365 incident command and station supervision/training in accordance with standards established by the Commission on Fire Accreditation and the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA deployment guideline #1710)
- Fire Marshal could also serve as a Battalion Chief
- One office support position
- Personnel and Finance provided by the City of Belmont using standard support charges
- One Fire prevention inspector
- Total staffing of 28 positions
- Truck service contractually purchased from a neighboring agency (use the 25% San Mateo cost figure)
- Employment model subject to negotiations, but similar in scope to existing South County Fire Authority
- According to Citygate & Associates, “given the fire and emergency medical risks in Belmont, at a minimum, the City needs the two existing fire stations each staffed per day with a crew of 3-career firefighters. This will only provide an initial attack force for small fires and medical emergencies. The balance of an effective response force will have to come from the surrounding agencies. A building fire at a minimum will require 3-engine companies, 1-truck company and a Battalion Chief.” “National norms are that 14-15 or so firefighters including an incident commander are needed at serious building fires if the expected outcome

is to contain the fire to the room of origin and to be able to simultaneously and safely perform critical tasks. If Belmont can only deliver two three person engine companies to a structure fire, the additional firefighters “will have to come from the adjoining community stations under an on-going cooperative relationship.”

- Fire Dispatch contracted through Fire Net 6
- Training contracted through an adjoining community or provided by the 3 Battalion Chiefs
- Maze “standard” cost is \$ 4.95 mil, a 5% savings compared to the current South County Fire cost

Advantages:

- 100% Fire District local control of Public Safety policy and cost issues
- A Belmont Fire Department would likely receive significant support from the community, which may result in long term funding stability for safety services
- Many existing South County Firefighters could elect to come to work for the new Belmont Fire Department
- Firefighter first responders would become more knowledgeable regarding the community and thus more operationally effective.
- Vacancies will be filled by new hires at lower cost

Disadvantages:

- A two-station Belmont Fire Department would be dependent on neighboring agencies. As stated above, a two-station department is “short” an engine and a truck for structure fire response. Neighboring agencies may require compensation to support the Belmont department as Belmont cannot respond in kind.
- A two-station Fire department would not be cost effective because significant and costly overhead for a minimum of five command staff plus support personnel could only be allocated to two companies when they normally would be allocated to many more stations
- Institutionalizes high exposure, high frequency risk into relatively small City of Belmont organizational structure. Potential for risk to “spill over” into other cost centers, such as retirement plan, workers’ compensation program, liability coverage, etc.
- Highest cost option
- Effective response to significant events requires cooperation of neighboring agencies which could evolve into additional contract for service costs.
- Recruiting timeline for Firefighter, Command staff and a Fire Chief by July 1, 2006 could be problematic and 3% at age 50 retirement formulas has thinned the ranks of experienced Fire Chiefs in California.

5) Local 2400 Proposal

Summary Description of Proposal:

The Firefighters Local 2400 proposal or “concept” did not include complete cost estimates for Command and Support staff. Instead, Local 2400 proposed savings by contracting out the following South County Fire Protection Authority (SCFA) internal positions: Fire Chief, Deputy Fire Chief, Fire Marshal, all three Battalion Chiefs and one Administrative Clerk. The internal SCFA cost savings were estimated at \$ 1,173,918 annually, however the additional costs of contracting out those services was not included in the original proposal. In a later revision labeled the “Hybrid Concept”, the Firefighters provided cost estimates for certain of these contracted out services.

Advantages:

- Two jurisdictions continue to maintain policy control over SCFA
- Minimal transition issues other than finding a contractor to run the department
- Proposal acknowledges “unfunded liabilities” and addresses long term funding of these liabilities
- Keeps experienced South County Firefighters in the District
- Suggests reorganization of SCFA

Disadvantages:

- Costs are estimates. Proposal is a concept, not a set of hard cost figures
- Proposal lacks a contracting entity
- Contract for leadership muddies command and control lines of authority
- Both Redwood City and San Mateo have declined to bid on San Carlos’ request for a provider to “manage” the entity
- Retains significant high risk, high frequency exposure from smaller fire agency
- Temporary solution. Requires on-going effort to achieve stabilization through consolidation or merger

6) Resurrect South County Fire

Certain members of the San Carlos City Council have publicly called for an effort to retain the South County Fire Protection Authority as the legal entity responsible for delivering fire service to both San Carlos and Belmont. Belmont Fire Subcommittee members have stated the deteriorating financial condition of the district is not acceptable and that partnership terms and conditions between the two cities need to be renegotiated.

The Authority cannot be financially constrained over time without material changes to either revenues, costs or both. Both jurisdictions have previously voted to terminate the joint powers agency effective June 30, 2006. Absent affirmative action to the contrary by both jurisdictions’ elected bodies, the Authority will dissolve. In accordance with direction from the two elected bodies, staff from the two jurisdictions are working with legal council on the legal steps necessary to dissolve the Authority. The Authority staff

is commissioning studies to define liabilities related to worker's compensation, retirement, retiree health and rolling stock. Should elected officials wish to consider a reversal of the previous action, following are the pros and cons of this option:

Advantages:

- 50% local control. This percent could be increased for each jurisdiction if the JPA were modified to require full Fire Board/City Council approval from both jurisdictions for important policy decisions such as labor contracts, hiring of the Fire Chief, etc. This form of JPA is referred to as a "Shared JPA" from the standpoint that day to day small operational decisions are made by the JPA Board, but pre-defined important policy decisions require approval of both jurisdiction's full board/Council.
- No transition to a new provider is necessary
- Loyal South County employees, some of whom have served the two cities for decades, would be humanely treated
- Sub-regional shared fire services can be the most cost effective way to deliver a minimum 14-15 Firefighters to a structure fire
- The issue of who will provide Hazardous Material response is resolved

Disadvantages:

- Joint Powers Authority (JPA) structure needs changing. For example, the Fire Chief should report directly to the JPA Board. Important defined policy decision should be ratified by both jurisdiction's full board/Council.
- Financial shortcomings of the existing district are still operative. The funding formula needs to be re-negotiated. Further, existing revenue streams are insufficient to sustain the Authority in either the short or long term
- Unfunded liabilities need to be identified, recorded and funded over time.
- The Authority is currently a "high cost" provider. The Authority's cost structure needs to be more in line with other agencies in the region
- Conflicts between the two jurisdictions have not been resolved. A neutral third party facilitator should be considered should a "2X2" meeting of the two cities be convened.
- Hazardous Material response team funding remains unresolved

Status of Contract Negotiations with Proposers

- A model contract is being developed by staff
- Staff has met with each of the providers twice to discuss terms and conditions of a proposed contract. Further meetings will be necessary.
- Staff may not conclude negotiations by February 28; however, a conceptual framework for an agreement with major deal points agreed upon is anticipated.

Status of Dissolution of South County Fire Authority

Staff from San Carlos and Belmont have been meeting monthly to affect the dissolution of the District. The two City Managers, the District Fiscal Officer, District Personnel Director, District Legal Council and Special Council representing each of the parties are methodically identifying actions necessary to dissolve the district.

- Steps necessary to dissolve the District are proceeding on schedule.
- Staff will begin presenting reports to the South County Fire Authority Board this month.
- Special technical studies related to worker's compensation and unfunded retirement and retiree health costs are underway. These studies will be considered by the South County Board of Directors when available. Belmont and San Carlos will each be responsible for 50% of these liabilities. Payment options will be developed in conjunction with the studies.
- Chief Lowden has officially retired effective December 29, 2005. He is willing to continue as Chief for up to 960 hours or ½ year. The City Managers from Belmont and San Carlos will negotiate terms and conditions of the Chiefs continuation during the first week in January. In the meantime, Battalion Chief Doug Fry will be the Acting Chief until the new contract is ratified by the South County Fire Authority Board of Directors on January 11, 2006.
- Staff continues to meet with the Belmont Fire Subcommittee of the BFPD Board.
- The San Carlos Mayor is expected to call for a meeting of the two cities to consider resurrecting South County Fire Authority.

Next Steps

Next steps call for staff to:

- 1) Conduct additional meetings with the Belmont Fire Subcommittee (Warden & Feierbach)
- 2) Consider request from San Carlos Mayor Grocott to hold meetings between the two jurisdictions to discuss saving the South County Fire Protection Authority. *Consider doing this with a "2x2" of elected officials designated by each body.*
- 3) Conduct meetings with a contract finalist to negotiate a final contract based on the service configuration previously approved by the Board. This service configuration includes:
 - Two 3 person advanced life support/basic life support engine companies
 - A portion of a truck company to be determined in negotiations with providers
 - Termination of the Countywide HazMat unit. This function would then become a responsibility of the County. Belmont would continue to pay its fair share of the Countywide costs
 - Fire Marshal, fire prevention, building inspection and plan check services equivalent to what currently exists in the District
 - Term of contract to be a minimum of five years with an 18-month cancellation clause
 - Need to finalize payment terms and cost control issues for operational items other

than personnel wages and benefits.

Fiscal Impact

There is no direct fiscal impact to this report. Funds necessary for legal counsel and other expenses related to terminating the JPA have been accounted for in the Mid Year Budget Review. Consultants retained as part of this analysis are being paid from existing professional service budgets.

Maze & Associates issued a consulting report which attempts to put each proposers cost estimates on an “apples to apples” basis. The estimated annual comparable “standard cost” of the alternative proposals contained in this report can be found in the Maze & Associates report attached. Following is summary estimated *comparable* cost information developed by Maze & Associates:

Maze “standard cost” comparison (Existing level of service) for a 1½ three person engine companies and ½ of a four person truck company are as follows:

CDF	\$ 3.99 mil, a 23% savings
City of Redwood City	\$ 4.92 mil,
	plus unknown overhead cost
City of San Mateo	\$ 4.72 mil, a 9% savings
Resurrect the South County Fire Authority	\$ 5.19 mil
Standalone Belmont Fire Department	\$ 4.95 mil, a 5% savings

Nominal costs shown in each of the proposers written proposals are shown below. Since each proposer used a different methodology to arrive at their cost figures, they are not apples and apples comparisons. They do, however, indicate what the proposer intends to charge the District for Fire service

“Nominal” costs (as presented in the proposals) for the District desired standard of service of two three person engine companies and 25% of a four person truck company configuration are as follows:

CDF	See Footnote
City of Redwood City	\$ 5.16 mil
City of San Mateo	\$ 4.96 mil
Standalone Belmont Fire Department	\$ 5.21 mil

Footnote: CDF does not currently provide Truck service in San Mateo County and therefore cannot provide 25% of Truck service without another Fire service partner. To staff’s knowledge, CDF does not currently have such a partner under contract and this cost sharing arrangement is subject to approval by the County of San Mateo. CDF has proposed a 60/40 cost sharing

relationship between the CDF and the District for Truck service. If another partner participated, CDF proposes a cost sharing relationship of 33 % each. Absent a third partner, their proposal states they could provide Belmont desired service levels for an annual cost of \$ 4.87 mil

Public Contact

A copy of this report was sent to the three proposers, Firefighters Local 2400, the South County Fire Chief, the Battalion Chiefs, the Fire Marshal, and the City of San Carlos. The item was posted on the agenda as required by law. Copies of the proposals to serve Belmont were made public at a South County Fire Protection Authority Board meeting. Articles appeared in local newspapers following the South County meeting.

Recommendation

After reviewing the alternatives in detail, considering the advice of expert consultants and balancing the needs of the community, the Fire Board and employees, staff recommends the following course of action:

- 1) Receive this report, along with the Maze & Citygate reports, taking no action at this time.
- 2) In deference to recent public overtures from the San Carlos Mayor regarding preservation of the South County Fire Authority, give notice to the City of San Carlos that direction to consummate contract terms for fire service is planned for February 28, 2006, and that any proposals by their Council for re-establishing the Authority must be presented and concluded by February 18, 2006. Should there be interest, staff recommends utilizing a professional facilitator or someone experienced in the current JPA design to assist in the discussion/negotiations. Conclude these discussions by February 18, 2006.
- 3) Should formal discussions, if any, take place with the City of San Carlos and prove to be unproductive, then prepare on February 28, 2006 to direct staff to negotiate a final agreement for service with the City of San Mateo. The City of San Mateo proposal stood out from all other proposals in the following ways:

The City of San Mateo management and employees have embraced the proposal. Accordingly, District staff have the highest degree of confidence that the contract will be successfully implemented

- a. The fixed fee cost structure is the most stable and therefore, predictable, over time.
- b. Other than CDF, San Mateo provides the greatest long term savings
- c. Incident control response times are the lowest due to the relative lower distances

- one must travel
- d. San Mateo will accommodate truck service by relocating their equipment to Station No. 27 which is closer to Belmont
 - e. Existing Authority Firefighters hired by San Mateo will be easily transitioned into their Fire Department as they are part of the same organized labor entity, IAFF Local 2400
- 4) Prepare on February 28, 2006 to direct staff to notice the other proposers of this action. Thanking them for their efforts and considerable time devoted to this endeavor.

Alternatives

1. Creation of a stand alone Belmont Fire Department
2. Implement a contract for service with California Department of Forestry

Attachments

- A. District staff report #1 dated October 11, 2005
- B. District staff report #2 dated October 25, 2005
- C. District staff report #3 dated November 22, 2005
- D. Revised/Updated Maze & Associates consultant report dated January 4, 2006
- E. Individual Belmont Fire Department Design Issues report prepared by Citygate Associates for the Belmont Fire Protection District

Respectfully submitted,

Jack R. Crist
Interim District Manager

Staff Contact:

Jack R. Crist, Interim City Manager
(650) 595-7410
crist@belmont.gov