

# 1. Tukwila Future Fire/EMS Service Community Advisory Committee

## Meeting 4

Tuesday, February 1, 2022 | 4:00 PM – 6:00 PM

The meeting will be conducted on Zoom.

Join Zoom Meeting: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/7558840726?pwd=d3NDRjhIQ0hYckpUUGNzRndpK2hqUT09>

Phone in information: (253) 215-8782 | Meeting ID: 755 884 0726 | Passcode: 482717

### Agenda

1. Welcome, Introductions Chair Verna Seal (10 min.)
2. Review of Agenda (1 min.) *Karen Reed, facilitator*
3. Review and approval of meeting summary from the January 4 Committee meeting (3 min.) *Karen*
4. Election of Vice-Chair (5 min.)
5. Response to questions asked at previous meeting (10 min.) *Staff Team*
6. Meeting 3 Re-cap/Continued discussion: (25 min.) *Karen*
  - Defining Fiscal Sustainability: Additional ideas? Preliminary consensus?
  - *New question:* What "Criteria" are important to you for comparing/evaluating options?
  - Initial list of options – questions? Comments?
7. Fire Labor relations 101 – union rights to bargain salaries, benefits, working conditions (15 min.) *Norm Golden*
  - Binding arbitration
8. Comparing the Options: Blank Template (5 min.) *Karen*
- break-- (5 min.)
9. **Options 1 and 2: Status Quo; Status Quo Plus Service adds** (35 min.)
  - **Questions? Pros / Cons** about these options that come to mind?
10. IAFF Union Comment (3 min.) *IAFF President James Booth*

Next Agenda/Adjourn (2 min.) *Karen*



## **Future of Fire/EMS Services Community Advisory Committee January 4, 2021**

Virtual Meeting due to COVID-19 Emergency  
4:00 p.m.

---

### **DRAFT MINUTES**

#### **Present**

*Committee members:* Jim Davis, Katrina Dohn, Jovita McConnell, Peggy McCarthy, Andy Reiswig, Dennis Robertson, Verna Seal, Sally Blake, Hien Kieu (*Absent: Ben Oliver, Ramona Grove, Abdullahi Shakul*)

*City staff & consultants:* David Cline, Laurel Humphrey, Norm Golden, Jay Wittwer, Vicky Carlsen, James Booth, Karen Reed, Bill Cushman

1. Welcome, Introductions, Review of Agenda  
Ms. Reed reviewed the meeting agenda.
2. Review and approval of December 14, 2021 Committee meeting minutes  
Ms. Dohn moved approval of the minutes and Mr. Davis seconded. The motion carried and the minutes were approved.
3. Responses to questions asked at previous meetings  
Ms. Reed reviewed a list of responses.
4. Recap of Meeting 2 Presentations  
Ms. Reed reviewed the presentations and roundtable responses.

#### Q&A:

- Are the reserve accounts outlined in the financial plan just starting this year?
  - *Half are in place and funded today*
- Is the overtime cost reflective of recent experiences or will ongoing overtime be needed in the future? Does the strategic plan carry over the same level of overtime?
  - *Overtime typically relates to minimum staffing levels covering people being out. Covid response (vaccinations, testing) also has impacted overtime costs, and this is reimbursable.*
  - *The strategic plan reflects an increase based on historical budgets, as opposed to amendments.*
- Is it correct that the city is only allowed to increase the tax rate a certain percentage per year?
  - *The maximum property tax rate allowed is \$3.60/\$1,000 AV, but property tax collections can only grow 1% per year plus new construction. As assessed valuation goes up—typically by more than 1% per year-- the levy rate goes down.*

- Isn't high overtime cost an indicator of understaffing?
  - *The staffing model is 18 per shift, allowing 4 off per shift – 2 vacation, 2 “Kelly” days, leaving a minimum of 14. The Fire Department strives to find the right balance and anticipate departures.*

*Information Requests:*

- *What cost saving recommendations in the CPSM study have been implemented or are being considered?*
- *Can we charge other fire agencies for responding to calls in their territory? Could this offset our costs?*

5. Committee Roundtable

Committee members each shared responses to “*What are your thoughts about enhanced services?*” and “*Should all or some be a priority to fund/provide in Tukwila, why or why not?*” Responses and **Q&A** included:

- Not clear which of the enhanced service options is more important. They seem equally important. We need to share resources with other agencies to fund this.
- **Q:** Can we do the public education officer in some other way, with existing resource, for example through the police department? **A:** Not likely; it is a requirement to become an accredited department.
- **Q:** Why were fire inspections discontinued? **A:** Staff were shifted to handling permits and duties with the south county training consortium
- CARES units seems to be the biggest bang for the buck.
- **Q:** What are the non- financial benefits of a CARES unit? **A:** It frees up firefighters to do more serious calls
- **Q:** Is there a capacity issue in addressing CARES type calls today? **A:** Yes. A CARES unit would help keep our vehicles on priority calls.
- We need these enhancements if we can afford them. We need to prioritize. I like the CARES unit, less interested in sharing it with other agencies. I liked having fire inspections done— would welcome restoring that.
- CARES unit is a priority for me. It eliminates work for firefighters. The Public education officer is very important but could we share this with another department, including the police department perhaps? I don't know how important the fire marshal office staffing is.
- All three are important. **Q:** Could we fund fewer additional staff for the fire marshal than the maximum 3 FTE? **A:** We could add incrementally to the fire marshal's office.
- All three are important. Fire inspections are needed in our multi-family housing stock. Is there some opportunity for creative financing here?
- CARES and Fire Marshal office staffing are my priorities—these have greatest public safety impacts.

Committee members each shared responses to “*How do you define financial sustainability?*”

Responses included:

- The Fire Department is over budget every year. How can we support all our services? There are many paths, but financial sustainability means sustaining what we have now—or better.
- We're in an economically active area. Can we handle what we have now? What will happen in the next 4-10 years? Demand will continue to increase because growth will continue. The level of service is high, and we should be able to sustain it. There will be fights over resources—you need to balance between what you have and what you can afford.

- The Fire Department’s role has evolved over time. More specialty services are provided, homelessness and mental health crises bring the need for new skills. We need to keep the level of service without increasing debt. We need to change with the times and combine resources with others—we could facilitate a higher level of service by joining others.
- The City is evolving. I don’t know how we can maintain service levels over time. Something has to change.
- Current revenues will not support growth in costs. Costs are growing faster than revenues. Fiscal sustainability question is whether you can afford the services you are providing within your revenues? Options are to find new revenues or cut. We need revenue unless we are willing to cut other departments.
- We’re in a tough spot. The Fire Department needs more revenue to do what they do now and there is a desire for enhanced services.
- 3.2% increase per year in revenue is reasonable for the City. We should keep funding within existing revenue and not ask the public for more money. Fire is a priority and should be funded.
- I agree with the comment about balancing our revenues to maintain services. Is general fund support dependable? What about big projects like the Allentown bridge? We need to be prepared for the unexpected. We need to look at additional funding.
- I agree with that—we need to sustain the level of service and understand what is critical. We need to be able to respond to current needs in a growing economy and be prepared for the unexpected. We need to be efficient within existing revenue and be strategic about asking for more.

6. State Law Options for Delivery of Fire/EMS Services

Ms. Reed presented a table comparing the statutory authority for Municipal Fire Departments, Fire Districts, and Regional Fire Authorities

7. Potential Fire/EMS Service Delivery Options

Ms. Reed presented an overview of potential options for future service delivery.

8. Union Comment

Captain Booth expressed appreciation for the work of the Committee members.

9. Next Agenda/Adjourn

Ms. Reed reviewed the February 2022 preliminary meeting agenda.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:03 P.M. by unanimous consent.

*Minutes by LH and KR*

## Future of Fire/EMS Services Community Advisory Committee (v. 1.4.21)

	Question Received	Question	Response / Status
1	Meeting 1	<i>Provide number of calls by type (EMS vs Fire) per day, per station Note that 2 stations were recently relocated which impacts relevance of per-station call data from before the present locations were active.</i>	Calls by station district provided on 12/14.
2	"	<i>Provide data/outcomes from other cities that joined a regional effort</i>	Pending (will be presented later)
3	Meeting 2	<i>Provide information on how much of their general fund budget/property tax the cities of Renton and SeaTac were expending on Fire before they formed an RFA (Renton) or contracted with an RFA (SeaTac)</i>	Provided in Meeting 3 packet
4		<i>Would additional <b>fire investigation</b> and <b>permitting/fire inspector</b> staff pay for themselves through fees? Generally, what can we expect in terms of Fire Marshal office generated revenue?</i>	Provided in Meeting 3 packet
5		<i>How many inspections does one inspector complete in a year on average?</i>	Provided in Meeting 3 packet
6		<i>Does the Fire Department and/or City have a preference/priority in terms of these enhanced services?</i>	Provided in Meeting 3 packet
7		<i>Where would the money come from to fund enhanced services?</i>	This will be discussed in Meeting 4 (Feb 4)
8		<i>What is the staffing model for a CARES unit?</i>	Provided in Meeting 3 packet
9	After meeting 2	<i>A summary of project future City revenue streams (particularly sales tax) for the next ten years or so.</i>	We can provide a 6-year forecast. (Vicky Carlsen)
10	"	<i>Definition of fiscal sustainability?</i>	This is a discussion item for the Committee
11	"	<i>Can you provide comparables for total salary, total compensation cost (TCC), retirement benefits and medical plan benefits in other fire service providers in South King County</i>	We will provide this data for Renton RFA and Puget Sound RFA when we explore those service alternatives.
12	Meeting 3	<i>Can you provide information on what the City has done with respect to the efficiency and cost reduction recommendations in the CPSM report?</i>	See response below.
13	"	<i>Can we charge other fire agencies for responding to calls in their territory? Could this offset our costs?</i>	See response below.

**Responses to questions asked at Meeting 3:**

**12. Can you provide information on what the City has done with respect to the efficiency and cost reduction recommendations in the CPSM report?**

The City has implemented many of the recommendations in the CPSM report. Other recommendations have been consolidated in the Enhanced Services document that breaks the suggestions into three areas of need (Fire Marshal's Office, Public Information and Education, and the CARES program). All of the suggestions are being evaluated and most of the suggestions will be presented to the Community Advisory Committee for consideration.

**13. Can we charge other fire agencies for responding to calls in their area? Could this offset our costs?**

The short answer is no. The Interlocal agreement (ILA) that all the Zone 3 agencies have entered into does not allow any of the member agencies to charge for providing services to other agencies. The agreement is a mutually beneficial arrangement that allows for appropriate resources to be immediately dispatched to a particular incident. This provides automatic aid to all areas in Zone 3 to ensure our community has an appropriate response that meets national standards. Most organizations in Zone 3 are not able to meet the national standards for a small residential fire on their own, but through this ILA, each agency, through reliance on back-up from their neighboring fire agencies, can meet the national standards not only for small residential fires but also for large commercial fires.



# Updates to Enhanced Services Costs

Meeting 4 / February 1, 2022

Enhanced services the Fire Dept would like to add if funding were available (in priority order):

- ▶ **CARES unit** (.33 FTE paid for – employee will work for another agency; grant offset part of costs)
- ▶ **Public Educator** (1 FTE)
- ▶ Additional staffing for **Fire Marshal's Office** (up to 3 additional FTE)



# Enhanced Service Costs are updated

- ▶ Reasons for updates:
  - ▶ Shift in assumption about how these positions will be staffed. Initial assumption was they would be civilian positions; new assumption (more realistic) is that they will be uniformed firefighters. This increases the cost of each position.
  - ▶ Shift in City practice for bringing in new vehicles to their fleet: from purchase to lease. Estimated annual lease cost added to the cost summary (earlier assumption was purchase and purchase price estimates were too low).
  - ▶ Jan. 31 version had incorrect data duplication in 2023-2028 vehicle costs – corrected February 1 version below.

# Updates to Estimated Costs, summary

## Initial Estimate

- ▶ 2022 Net Cost: \$791,489
- ▶ Equivalent levy rate: \$0.096

## January Estimate

- ▶ 2022 Net Cost: \$1,105,696  
\$313,207 increase / 40%
- ▶ Equivalent levy rate: \$0.13

**TABLE E: Estimated Cost of Enhanced Services (REVISED FEBRUARY 1, 2022)**

Job Title/Total Compensation Cost	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028
Public Educator (1 FTE)	132,222	136,453	140,819	145,325	149,976	154,775	159,728
Inspector-FF (1 FTE)	188,610	194,646	200,874	207,302	213,936	220,782	227,847
Inspector-FF (1 FTE)	188,610	194,646	200,874	207,302	213,936	220,782	227,847
Inspector-Cap (1 FTE)	204,012	210,541	217,278	224,231	231,406	238,811	246,453
CARES EMT-FF (.33 FTE)	62,241	64,233	66,289	68,410	70,599	72,858	75,190
Enhanced Programs (TCC)	775,696	800,518	826,134	852,571	879,853	908,008	937,065
Supplies/Equipment/Overhead							
Pub Ed Supplies/Equip	7,500	5,250	5,355	5,462	5,571	5,683	5,796
Vehicle Lease/Maint/Op	12,500	12,750	13,005	13,265	13,530	13,801	14,077
Inspector-Cap Supplies/Equip	7,500	5,250	5,355	5,462	5,571	5,683	5,796
Vehicle Lease/Maint/Op	12,500	12,750	13,005	13,265	13,530	13,801	14,077
Inspector-FF Supplies/Equip	7,500	5,250	5,355	5,462	5,571	5,683	5,796
Vehicle Lease/Maint/Op	12,500	12,750	13,005	13,265	13,530	13,801	14,077
Inspector-FF Supplies/Equip	7,500	5,250	5,355	5,462	5,571	5,683	5,796
Vehicle Lease/Maint/Op	12,500	12,750	13,005	13,265	13,530	13,801	14,077
CARES Unit Overhead & Ops	250,000	255,000	260,100	265,302	270,608	276,020	281,541
<b>TOTAL M&amp;O</b>	<b>330,000</b>	<b>327,000</b>	<b>333,540</b>	<b>340,211</b>	<b>347,015</b>	<b>353,905</b>	<b>361,034</b>
<b>TOTAL PROGRAM</b>	<b>1,105,696</b>	<b>1,127,518</b>	<b>1,159,675</b>	<b>1,192,782</b>	<b>1,226,868</b>	<b>1,261,964</b>	<b>1,298,099</b>
Equivalent Levy Rate (per \$1,000 AV)	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12



# Meeting 3 Re-cap and Continued Panel discussion:

1. Enhanced Services
2. Defining Fiscal Sustainability
3. What “Criteria” are important to you for comparing/evaluating options?

**Future of Fire/EMS Services Community Advisory Committee  
Meeting 4 – February 1, 2022**

# Enhanced Services

Public Educator    Fire Inspectors (1-3)    CAREs Unit

► *At meeting 3 Panel comments included:*

## **Services Priority**

No preference expressed (4)

All 3 equally important (2)

CARES unit & FMO are priority (2)

CARES unit is priority (1)

## **Funding Ideas**

*Fund public educator with other depts, agencies*

*Share resources if possible*

Additional thoughts?

# Enhanced Services, cont'd.

## *Preliminary voting...*

**Question 1: Assume no new funding is available, and adding these services will mean cuts in other city programs. Would you support adding any of these, and if so, which options?**

**Question 2: If new taxes would be required to fund these programs, which, if any of these options would you support:**

*Vote for ALL items you would support, not just your preferred option.*

### OPTIONS:

1. CARES Unit
2. 1-2 Fire Inspectors
3. Public Educator program
4. CARES Unit + 1-2 Fire Inspectors
5. CARES Unit + 1-2 Fire Inspectors + Public Education program
6. All 3 programs at full staffing

*Funding **all** programs in 2022 would cost about ~~\$0.10~~ **\$0.13**/\$1,000 A.V. in property tax or about ~~\$791K~~ **\$1.1M**.*

# Council has asked the Committee if the Fire Department's services are **financially sustainable**

- ▶ **How do you define financial sustainability?**
  - ▶ The definition is not the same thing as what we do in response.

# Fiscal Sustainability (cont'd.)

- ▶ *Information provided by the City:*
  - ▶ Each year, General Fund department costs overall grow faster than the growth in General Fund revenues (3% versus 5%)
  - ▶ Absent new revenues, the Fire Department's service levels can be maintained only by imposing cuts on other general fund department budgets.
  - ▶ The City is generally financially healthy.
  - ▶ It is very unusual in King County for a City-operated Fire Department to be wholly supported within a City budget without additional voter-approved measures for either fire operations or capital, or both. Tukwila has asked voters for capital funding support.



# Meeting 3 discussion on what is financially sustainable....

- ▶ Most comments focused on what the City should do to support fire department service levels over time – *balance multiple city needs and continue to cut elsewhere as needed; plan for the unexpected; consider new revenues.* **No consensus.**
- ▶ Most comments seemed to be based on the City's information that ***Fire Department service levels cannot be maintained over time within available revenues without cutting other department budgets.***
  - ▶ **Do you agree that this is the City's situation?**  
(Again, some are OK with this situation, others less so.)

# Possible definition of Fiscal Sustainability...?

- ▶ A fire agency is considered fiscally sustainable if it can maintain service levels within available revenues – in the City's case (as a government providing many services), this means maintaining fire/EMS service levels without negatively impacting services in other City departments competing for the same funding.
- ▶ Questions for later: How important is fiscal sustainability for the Fire Department? What's the preferred path to become fiscally sustainable? (New revenues or keep pulling money from other departments, or?)

# Initial Options List & Template

<p><b>Option 1: Status Quo</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Service Provider:</b> <i>City of Tukwila Fire Department</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Option 2: Status Quo “Plus” – Funding for enhanced services</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Service Provider:</b> <i>City of Tukwila Fire Department</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Option 3: Create a Tukwila Fire District, funded solely by property taxes (no Fire Benefit Charge)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Service Provider:</b> <i>A new governmental entity and taxing district, authorized by the voters, with boundaries co-extensive with the City: Tukwila Fire District.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Option 4: Create a Tukwila Fire District, funded by both property taxes and a Fire Benefit Charge</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Service Provider:</b> <i>A new governmental entity and taxing district, authorized by the voters, with boundaries co-extensive with the City: Tukwila Fire District.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Option 5: Partner with another fire service provider to create a Tukwila Regional Fire Authority—with a fire benefit charge</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Service Provider:</b> <i>Tukwila Regional Fire Authority, a new governmental entity and taxing district, created by voter approval to provide fire suppression and emergency medical response.</i></li> </ul> <p>Potential partners: adjacent fire districts or cities</p>
<p><b>Option 6: Contract for Service with Renton Regional Fire Authority (RRFA)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Service Provider:</b> <i>Renton Regional Fire Authority (RRFA), a separate municipal government and taxing district created by voters to provide fire suppression and emergency medical response.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Option 7: Contract for Service with Puget Sound Regional Fire Authority (PSRFA)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Service Provider:</b> <i>Puget Sound Regional Fire Authority (PSFA), a separate municipal government and taxing district created by voters to provide fire suppression and emergency medical response.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Option 8: Annexation into Renton RFA</b>          (Note: the RRFA has indicated it is not willing to have the City annex directly into the RFA without <b>first partnering in a service contract</b> capacity for some number of years. However, because it would be very difficult to reconstitute the Tukwila Fire Department after entering into a service contract (or annexing), it makes sense to analyze what annexation might look like as a longer-term option)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Service Provider:</b> Renton RFA (See <b>Option 6</b>)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Option 9: Annex into Puget Sound Regional Fire Authority</b>          (Note: the PSRFA has indicated it <i>may</i> be willing to entertain direct annexation of the City without first entering into a service contract; further discussion would be required. Because it would be very difficult to reconstitute the Tukwila Fire Department after entering into a service contract, it is important to consider how annexation might look as a longer-term option)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Service Provider:</b> Puget Sound Regional Fire Authority (See <b>Option 7</b>)</li> </ul>

Beginning at this meeting, we will start to review the City's options for future funding and operation of the Fire Department...

- ▶ What are some of the **CRITERIA** that **YOU** will apply in deciding which options presented are more or less preferable?
- ▶ *For example, **cost** is one criteria. **Response times** are another possible criteria. What else is important to consider?*

## **Fire Labor Relations Overview**

*Prepared for Future of Fire/EMS Community Advisory Committee by Deputy Chief Norm Golden, January 2022.*

Changes to the working conditions of the fire department employees will need to be bargained in good faith with the established representatives of those employees. The City of Tukwila enjoys a mutually respectful relationship with both labor groups found in the fire department.

The International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF) is the union that represents the uniformed members of the Tukwila Fire Department. The Teamsters Union represents the non-uniformed members; and the Fire Chief, Deputy Fire Chief, and Assistant to the Fire Chief are non-represented employees of the City. As a public employer, Tukwila adheres to the rules found in RCW [41.56 – Public Employees Collective Bargaining](#).

Collective Bargaining is the process in which the union members negotiate contracts with the City to determine the terms of employment. This includes pay, benefits, hours, leave, health issues, safety issues, and more. Some issues are Mandatory subjects to bargain, and others are Permissive subjects to bargain.

**Mandatory Subject** – Both parties (Union and City) have a statutory obligation to bargain these subjects. (Hours, Wages, and Working Conditions)

**Permissive Subject** – Both parties may choose to, or refuse to, bargain these subjects. (Internal union affairs, unit scope, selection of bargaining representatives)

**Illegal Subject** – Both parties must refrain from bargaining these subjects. (Can not bargain a subject that is *per se* illegal under the law. *e.g.* fire fighters do not need a driver's license to drive the fire engine would not be a valid subject to bargain (or agree to)).

Whether a subject is mandatory, permissive, or illegal is sometimes a debatable issue. Each subject must be analyzed to determine whether bargaining is appropriate. When evaluating changes to the fire service in Tukwila, it is a good practice to include all represented parties at the table. As an employer, the City retains Management Rights, whereby the Fire Department directs the workforce, promulgates Department rules and regulations, etc. This also includes budget modification, personnel decisions within the rules of Civil Service and the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), assignment of work and training requirements, among others. The City and Unions usually can agree on what needs to be bargained, and the steps required to reach an agreement.

Any disputes arising from the CBA will be resolved using the Grievance process outlined in the CBA. The Grievance process has several steps with each step designed to find resolution. The final step of the process is Binding Arbitration which will produce a resolution. In Binding Arbitration, a neutral third-party is chosen to hear the case and then renders a decision. Both parties agree to abide by this final decision.

Throughout this process it will be important to be cognizant of the need to bargain changes. The internal work group has included representatives of the City, Union, and Fire Department to create a unified approach to this process. The goal of collective bargaining is to promote mutually beneficial decisions and balance the inherent power imbalance found between the employer and employee. Strong labor relations lead to an efficient workplace that is safer, healthier, and higher performing.



# Fire Service Options

MEETING 4 PRESENTATION

FEBRUARY 1, 2022

# Fire Service Options List

Presented at Meeting 3

<p><b>Option 1: Status Quo</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Service Provider:</b> <i>City of Tukwila Fire Department</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Option 2: Status Quo “Plus” – Funding for enhanced services</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Service Provider:</b> <i>City of Tukwila Fire Department</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Option 3: Create a Tukwila Fire District, funded solely by property taxes (no Fire Benefit Charge)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Service Provider:</b> <i>A new governmental entity and taxing district, authorized by the voters, with boundaries co-extensive with the City: Tukwila Fire District.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Option 4: Create a Tukwila Fire District, funded by both property taxes and a Fire Benefit Charge</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Service Provider:</b> <i>A new governmental entity and taxing district, authorized by the voters, with boundaries co-extensive with the City: Tukwila Fire District.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Option 5: Partner with another fire service provider to create a Tukwila Regional Fire Authority—with a fire benefit charge</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Service Provider:</b> <i>Tukwila Regional Fire Authority, a new governmental entity and taxing district, created by voter approval to provide fire suppression and emergency medical response.</i></li> </ul> <p>Potential partners: adjacent fire districts or cities</p>
<p><b>Option 6: Contract for Service with Renton Regional Fire Authority (RRFA)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Service Provider:</b> <i>Renton Regional Fire Authority (RRFA), a separate municipal government and taxing district created by voters to provide fire suppression and emergency medical response.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Option 7: Contract for Service with Puget Sound Regional Fire Authority (PSRFA)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Service Provider:</b> <i>Puget Sound Regional Fire Authority (PSFA), a separate municipal government and taxing district created by voters to provide fire suppression and emergency medical response.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Option 8: Annexation into Renton RFA</b></p> <p>(Note: the RRFA has indicated it is not willing to have the City annex directly into the RFA without <b>first partnering in a service contract</b> capacity for some number of years. However, because it would be very difficult to reconstitute the Tukwila Fire Department after entering into a service contract (or annexing), it makes sense to analyze what annexation might look like as a longer-term option</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Service Provider:</b> Renton RFA (See <b>Option 6</b>)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Option 9: Annex into Puget Sound Regional Fire Authority</b></p> <p>(Note: the PSRFA has indicated it <i>may</i> be willing to entertain direct annexation of the City without first entering into a service contract; further discussion would be required. Because it would be very difficult to reconstitute the Tukwila Fire Department after entering into a service contract, it is important to consider how annexation might look as a longer-term option</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Service Provider:</b> Puget Sound Regional Fire Authority (See <b>Option 7</b>)</li> </ul>

# Template for comparing options

<b>Option:</b>
<b>Service Provider:</b>
<b>Brief description of option:</b>
<b>Overview of service provider (services, governance, finances (tax rates, % of budget received from FBC, other fees, taxes))</b>
<b>Timeframe: Earliest date on which this option could be implemented.</b>
<b>Major implementation steps (negotiation, council action, service provider actions, voter approval, etc.)</b>
<b>Current service metrics for service provider (response times)</b>
<b>Enhanced Services Options: staffing /cost</b>
<b>Operational Model options: Considering a model with fewer than 4 stations in Tukwila? Cost and service implications, implementation issues</b>
<b>Summary of estimated costs: cost components, estimated annual cost to City and/or taxpayers (Attachment A)</b>

<b>Staffing Implications</b>
<b>Facilities &amp; Equipment –disposition, future costs, debt, any new/different facilities to be deployed?</b>
<b>Oversight/Control – how will Tukwila Council/Mayor be involved in service and cost decisions affecting Tukwila going forward?</b>
<b>Summary of implications of this option</b>
<b>Cost:</b>
<b>Service Levels:</b>
<b>Oversight/Management Control:</b>
<b>Other:</b>
<b>Risks/Major unknowns:</b>

A financial/operational summary will be attached to each template – costs will be presented side-by-side with other options as they are available.



## Option 1: Status Quo

**Service Provider:** City of Tukwila Fire Department

**Brief description of option:**

- City retains the Fire Department and maintains current service levels as community grows.
- City could either continue to cut other departments to maintain service levels, or, to relieve funding pressure on other City departments and fund growth in costs of fire service, the City could pursue a variety of options, including:
  - (1) a voter-approved general fund property tax “levy lid lift” to support all general fund services; and/or
  - (2) A voter- approved levy lid lift dedicated to support the fire department.

**Overview of service provider (services, governance, finances (tax rates, % of budget received from FBC, other fees, taxes))**

- Tukwila is a city, a general purpose government responsible to provide a variety of services. The current city property tax rate is \$2.18 per \$1,000 A.V. The City does not impose a fire benefit charge. The City also collects a variety of other taxes and can also charge fees for many services.

**Timeframe: Earliest date on which this option could be implemented.**

- N/A, except to the extent additional voter-approved funding is recommended.
- If additional funding is recommended, a ballot measure can be submitted for voter approval at any election; new taxes are imposed effective January of the following calendar year. It would usually take several months to develop a plan for the resolution and engage in the public education effort in advance of the election.

**Major implementation steps (negotiation, council action, service provider actions, voter approval, etc.)**

- No action to maintain existing department.
- Additional funding could be secured by cutting other department budgets or seeking additional voter-approved funds.
  - Council action required to place a property tax “lid lift’ before the voters—raising the “lid” on the property tax rate above the 1% cap. Lid lifts typically require simple majority approval; they can be permanent or time limited; funds generated may be limited to certain purposes (fire/EMS) or general city purposes; time limited levies may also include an annual inflation adjustment. See **ATTACHMENT B**

**Current service metrics for service provider (response times)**

**In 2020:**

Fire turnout out time goal: **under 3:01**. Met 93.8% of the time.

EMS turnout time goal: **under 2:38**. Met 89.2% of the time.

Fire response time (combination of turnout and travel time) goal **under 7:59**. Met 86.2% of time

EMS response time goal: **under 7:52**. Met 86.3% of time

**Enhanced Services Options: staffing /cost**

- N/A – the status quo model assumes no enhanced services.

**Operational Model options: Considering a model with fewer than 4 stations in Tukwila? Cost and service implications, implementation issues**

As raised in the CPSM report, it is possible for the City to reduce the number of fire stations from 4 to 3 to save money with a modest impact on response times. Precise response time impacts have not been modelled and would depend upon whether there were corresponding reductions in staffing / available units staffed. Community concerns could be anticipated from any station closure.

Closure of a fire station, reduction in staffing and reduction in the number of response units on duty would all require union agreement; staffing level reductions are likely to be strongly opposed by the union. Without a reduction in staffing, savings from a station closure would be relatively modest.

**Summary of estimated costs: cost components, estimated annual cost to City and/or taxpayers**  
See **Attachment A**.

**Staffing Implications**

The status quo model would continue current staffing.

**Facilities & Equipment –disposition, future costs, debt, any new/different facilities to be deployed?**

N/A

City is planning to issue \$30M in bonds in 2027 to fund remodel of the remaining 2 city fire stations (Stations 53 and 54) The bonds will require voter approval.

**Oversight/Control** – how will Tukwila Council/Mayor be involved in service and cost decisions affecting Tukwila going forward?

Under this option, the Mayor and City Council remain full oversight authority over the department operations and funding

**Summary of implications of this option**

**Cost:** As modelled in the financial plan, the cost of the *status quo* option is expected to increase 3.2% on average per year over the next 7 years. This compares to a historical growth rate in City general fund revenues of 3%/year. Without additional revenue, the *status quo* option will require ongoing cuts/efficiencies in other (?) departments in order to fund the Fire Department at the current level of service.

The City does have the ability to seek voter approval for property tax increases to fund part or all of the fire departments costs going forward—or to support any or all general fund departments.

In addition, the City is considering seeking voter approval of \$30M (approx.) in bonds in 2026 from voters (tax collections would start in 2027) to fund remodeling of Stations 53 and 54.

**Service Levels:** The current service levels are among the best in South County, in terms of response times. This is largely due to the number of fire stations in the City.

**Oversight/Management Control:** The cost and level of service offered by the department are fully under the control of the City Council and Mayor, excepting that changes to working conditions must be negotiated with the fire union.

**Other:** The City currently participates in several regional cost-sharing programs for fire service. There may be future opportunities to increase cost-sharing, however, as a standalone department, there are limits to the economies of scale that the City can secure.

**Risks/Major Unknowns:** The City is financially healthy, but unanticipated events—such as the damage to the Allentown Bridge—force reprioritization of planned expenditures.

The City bears the cost risk associated with changes in fire department operating requirements.

Attachment A: Cost & Revenue Summary (Options 1 & 2)

Attachment B: Ways to increase funding for Fire Department.

## Option 2: Status Quo “Plus” – Funding for enhanced services

**Service Provider:** City of Tukwila Fire Department

### **Brief description of option:**

City retains the Fire Department and enhances service levels in (up to) three areas:

1. Fire Marshal (providing permit review, fire inspection, fire investigation services). Existing division has 4 employees; proposals including adding 1 to 3 additional FTE.
2. Public Education (providing education about fire prevention and fire safety in the community). Proposal includes adding 1 FTE to perform this function.
3. CARES unit. A low-acuity incident response unit. Because the City has so few calls of this nature, the proposal is to partner with adjacent service providers in the operation and funding.

Including 2 additional Fire Marshal employees, the public educator and CARES Unit would have a combined cost of approximately \$897K in 2022, increasing to \$1.05M by 2028, equivalent to an additional \$0.11 in property taxes in 2022. These programs could not be supported without reducing other City department budgets or securing additional revenues.

If the City chose to seek new revenue to specifically fund the service adds, a voter-approved levy lid lift is one funding option. That lid could also include authority to support other fire department costs. (See **Attachment B**)

### **Overview of service provider (services, governance, finances (tax rates, % of budget received from FBC, other fees, taxes))**

- Tukwila is a city, a general purpose government responsible to provide a variety of services. The current city property tax rate is \$2.18 per \$1,000 A.V. The City does not impose a fire benefit charge. The City also collects a variety of other taxes and can also charge fees for many services.

### **Timeframe: Earliest date on which this option could be implemented**

Additional funding to support fire and other general fund services can be submitted for voter approval at any election, with the property taxes imposed starting the following January.

### **Major implementation steps (negotiation, council action, service provider actions, voter approval, etc.)**

Council could impose cuts on other departments to fund these additional services. Alternately, additional funding could be secured by cutting other department budgets or seeking additional funds. Council action required to place a lid lift before the voters. Lid lifts typically require simple majority approval; they can be permanent or time limited; time limited levies may also include an annual inflation adjustment.

### **Current service metrics for service provider (response times) –**

See Option 1.

The proposed enhanced services will not change the current service targets or outcomes in terms of response times; they are designed to provide other benefits to the community.

### **Enhanced Services Options: All enhanced services are funded in this Option.**

- **Public Education** – one FTE to provide education about fire safety in schools.
- **CARES** – one FTE would support this unit with one-third of his/her time. This is proposed as a shared expense with adjacent fire service providers.

- **Fire Marshal**—up to three FTEs. Each FTE would cost approximately \$204K in 2022. Two FTEs are included in Option 2 pricing shown in Attachment A.

**Operational Model options: Considering a model with fewer than 4 stations in Tukwila? Cost and service implications**

See Option 1 discussion.

**Summary of estimated costs: cost components / estimated annual cost to City and/or taxpayers**  
See **Attachment A**

**Service/Performance Levels proposed**

There are no specific service levels associated with the three enhanced service programs.

**Staffing Implications**

As priced, there would be 3 additional FTE – one for the Public Education program and two new FTEs for the Fire Marshal Office. The partial FTE for the CARES unit would be an employee with a partner agency.

**Attachment A** models the Fire Marshal Office staffing with 2 additional FTE, rather than 3.

**Facilities & Equipment –disposition, future costs, debt, any new/different facilities to be deployed?**

Additional vehicles and equipment would be provided fore each additional fire inspector and for the public educator. These costs are included in the cost estimates.

**Oversight/Control – how will Tukwila Council/Mayor be involved in service and cost decisions affecting Tukwila going forward?**

Same as for Option 1 (status quo), excepting that the CARES unit would be jointly-funded with other agencies and so decisions around future funding/staffing would require agreement of those partners.

**Summary of implications of this option in terms of service level, oversight, cost.**

**Cost:** The cost for all enhanced programs, at 2 additional for Fire Marshal Office, is approximately \$897K in 2022, growing to an estimated \$1.05M in 2028. This annual cost would be added to the status quo Option 1 cost.

Adding these services without additional revenue will increase pressure for cost cutting and efficiencies on other City departments.

**Service Levels:** Each enhanced service program proposed provides different additional services to the community. Addition of these programs is not expected to change response times.

**Oversight/Management Control:** The Mayor and Council retain control over this option, subject to negotiation as required with the union.

**Other:**

**Risks/Major unknowns:** There is a risk that the CARES unit regional funding contribution, estimated to offset about 1/3 or \$100K of the CARES unit annual cost, could be eliminated.

Attachment A: Cost & Revenue Summary (Options 1 and 2)

Attachment B: Discussion of Funding Alternatives

Attachment C: Detail on Projected Cost of Enhanced Services, 2022-2028 (REVISED 2.1.21)

## Attachment A

All Figures for Year 2022 and all are ESTIMATES

### Comparing Option 1 & 2

Comparable Expenses	Option 2 Status Quo Plus	
	Option 1 Status Quo	Enhancements
FTE Count <sup>1</sup>	65	68
Wages & Benefits <sup>2</sup>	\$12,474,164	\$12,999,008
Admin Overhead	\$67,103	\$67,103
Facilities/Capital		
Reserves/Overhead <sup>3</sup>	\$113,077	\$113,077
Other O&M	\$1,563,820	\$1,936,061
Other Reserves	\$0	\$0
<b>SUBTOTAL W/O Enhanced Services</b>	<b>\$14,218,164</b>	<b>\$15,115,249</b>
<b>Enhanced Services &amp; FMO Detail</b>		
CARES	\$0	\$312,241
Public Education	\$0	\$152,222
Fire Marshal (status quo)	\$974,578	\$974,578
Fire Marshal (enhanced)	\$0	\$432,622
<b>TOTAL w/Enhanced Services</b>	N/A	\$15,115,249
<b>Retained Costs (Items for which the City will still be Responsible)</b>		
Debt Service on FS 51,52	\$1,870,128	\$1,870,128
Debt Service on FS 53,54 <sup>4</sup>	\$0	\$0
LEOFF 1	\$261,000	\$261,000
<b>TOTAL Retained City Costs</b>	<b>\$2,131,128</b>	<b>\$2,131,128</b>
<b>TOTAL Est. Cost of Fire Dept.</b>	<b>\$ 16,088,292</b>	<b>\$16,985,377</b>
<b>Comparable Revenues</b>		
General Fund Revenue/Property Tax Equivalent	\$15,791,748	\$16,558,033
Benefit Charge	\$0	\$0
Supplemental Revenue Options to Support Services (Dedicated Voter-Approved Property Tax)	\$0	\$0
Fees for Service/Ambulance Fee Policy	\$24,000	\$24,000
Other Offsetting Revenue	\$272,544	\$403,344
<b>Total Revenue</b>	<b>\$16,088,292</b>	<b>\$16,985,377</b>

### Detail on Incremental Cost in Option 2

Incremental Expenses	Option 2 Status Quo Plus	
	Option 1 Status Quo	Enhancements
FTE Count	0	3
Wages & Benefits	\$0	\$524,844
Admin Overhead	\$0	\$0
Facilities/Capital		
Reserves/Overhead	\$0	\$0
Other O&M	\$0	\$372,241
Other Reserves	\$0	\$0
<b>Estimated Inc. Costs</b>	\$0	\$897,085
<b>Incremental Costs by Program</b>		
CARES	\$0	\$312,241
Public Education	\$0	\$152,222
Fire Marshal (status quo)	\$0	\$0
Fire Marshal (enhanced)	\$0	\$432,622
<b>Est. Incremental Costs</b>	\$0	\$897,085
<b>Incremental Offsetting Revenue</b>		
CARES	\$0	\$100,800
Fire Marshal (enhanced)	\$0	\$30,000
<b>Est. Incr. Revenue</b>	\$0	\$130,800

**Notes:**

- (1) Option 2 assumes 2 FTE added for the Fire Marshal Office. The .33 FTE for the CARES unit is assumed to be provided by a partner agency.
- (2) Option 2 data includes wages and benefits for enhanced services FTEs, Employee costs are updated from the financial plan to assume Fire Marshal office staff are uniformed position, rather than civilian
- (3) Reserves/Overhead: Reserves shown are only those funded in the current city budget, not all the reserves in the financial plan.
- (4) Retained Costs: No cost is included for remodeling of Stations 53 and 54. There is a plan to seek voter approval for this project in 2026.

## Attachment B

**Subject:** Options to increase funding, with voter approval, to fully the fire department and not reduce services in other departments -- and/or providing funding to increase/enhance services provided by the fire department.

### Options include:

- **Voter approved excess property tax levy**
  - o For capital funding
  - o Requires 60% voter approval plus validation (minimum turnout of voters threshold must be met) for passage
  - o Taxes collected to pay debt
  - o Taxpayers who qualify for senior citizen/disabled person are exempted from this tax
  
- **Voter approved levy lid lift**
  - o Typically used for operational funding
  - o Simple majority vote for approval
  - o Time limited (6-years, permanent)
  - o Would allow the City to increase the regular property tax levy more than 1%
  - o Cannot exceed maximum levy limit
  - o Taxpayers who qualify for senior citizen/disabled person may be exempted from this tax

### How much money could be raised? Here are some quick rules of thumb:

Based on the City's current assessed value of \$8.031 billion,

- Each penny increase in the property tax levy rate will generate approximately \$80,000 in additional property tax revenue. A parcel of real property with an assessed value of \$500,000, would see a \$5 increase in the annual property tax bill for every penny increase in the property tax.
  
- A 10-cent increase in property tax would generate approximately \$800,000 in additional revenue in a year, and that same parcel valued at \$500,000 would realize a \$50 annual increase in property tax.



Table E: Estimated Cost of Enhanced Services (REVISED FEBRUARY 1, 2022)					OPTION 2 Attachment C		
Job Title/Total Compensation Cost	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028
Public Educator (1 FTE)	132,222	136,453	140,819	145,325	149,976	154,775	159,728
Inspector-FF (1 FTE)	188,610	194,646	200,874	207,302	213,936	220,782	227,847
Inspector-FF (1 FTE)	188,610	194,646	200,874	207,302	213,936	220,782	227,847
Inspector-Cap (1 FTE)	204,012	210,541	217,278	224,231	231,406	238,811	246,453
CARES EMT-FF (.33 FTE)	62,241	64,233	66,289	68,410	70,599	72,858	75,190
Enhanced Programs (TCC)	775,696	800,518	826,134	852,571	879,853	908,008	937,065
Supplies/Equipment/Overhead							
Pub Ed Supplies/Equip	7,500	5,250	5,355	5,462	5,571	5,683	5,796
Vehicle Lease/Maint/Op	12,500	12,750	13,005	13,265	13,530	13,801	14,077
Inspector-Cap Supplies/Equip	7,500	5,250	5,355	5,462	5,571	5,683	5,796
Vehicle Lease/Maint/Op	12,500	12,750	13,005	13,265	13,530	13,801	14,077
Inspector-FF Supplies/Equip	7,500	5,250	5,355	5,462	5,571	5,683	5,796
Vehicle Lease/Maint/Op	12,500	12,750	13,005	13,265	13,530	13,801	14,077
Inspector-FF Supplies/Equip	7,500	5,250	5,355	5,462	5,571	5,683	5,796
Vehicle Lease/Maint/Op	12,500	12,750	13,005	13,265	13,530	13,801	14,077
CARES Unit Overhead & Ops	250,000	255,000	260,100	265,302	270,608	276,020	281,541
<b>TOTAL M&amp;O</b>	<b>330,000</b>	<b>327,000</b>	<b>333,540</b>	<b>340,211</b>	<b>347,015</b>	<b>353,905</b>	<b>361,034</b>
<b>TOTAL PROGRAM</b>	<b>1,105,696</b>	<b>1,127,518</b>	<b>1,159,675</b>	<b>1,192,782</b>	<b>1,226,868</b>	<b>1,261,964</b>	<b>1,298,099</b>
Equivalent Levy Rate (per \$1,000 AV)	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12

Costs are revised from earlier estimate reflecting: (1) assumption that new FTEs will be uniformed staff, not civilian; and (2) new city policy on This table shows the cost of providing the described enhanced services if Tukwila is the service provider, with a partnership on the CARES unit. leasing rather than purchasing vehicles. *Note that Option 2 includes only 2 additional Fire Inspectors, not all 3 included here (and in the strategic financial plan).*