



# *Pinellas Suncoast Fire & Rescue*

304 FIRST STREET  
INDIAN ROCKS BEACH, FLORIDA 33785-2587

(727) 595-1117 FAX: (727) 595-5879  
[www.psfrd.org](http://www.psfrd.org)

FIRE CHIEF  
T. MICHAEL BURTON

MINUTES  
MAY 17, 2018  
STAKEHOLDER TASK FORCE MEETING

Held at the Indian Rocks Beach Auditorium  
1507 Bay Palm Boulevard, Indian Rocks Beach, FL 33785

**WORKSHOP MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 9:00 a.m.**

**ROLL CALL:** Task Force members answering roll call were Fire Chief Mike Burton, Ms. Kelly Cisarik, Mr. John Yackowski, Mr. Raymond Piscitelli, Ms. Brigett Cerce, Mr. Mike Murray, and Ms. Katrena Hale. Commissioner Joe Bruni, Mr. Lynn Rives, Mr. Matt Loder, Sr., and District Chief Jeremy Sidlauskas were absent.

---

**DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

**1. APPROVAL OF MAY 3, 2018 MINUTES**

**Discussion:** Ms. Cisarik requested a correction in the minutes: Where the movement of Station 28 is discussed, the word “southwest” should be replaced with “southeast.”

**A motion to approve the minutes of the May 3, 2018 Stakeholder Task Force Meeting, with the appropriate correction.**

**MOTION: MS. BRIGETT CERCE SECOND: MS. KATRENA HALE**

**All in favor, motion passed unanimously.**

**2. OLD BUSINESS**

**a. FRACTILE RESPONSE TIMES**

**Discussion:** Chief Burton stated that the document contained within the agenda packet regarding fractile response times gives a good explanation of why fractile versus average response times are used, specifically when it comes to exceptionally high or low response times.

**b. PROPERTY BREAKDOWN WITHIN THE DISTRICT**

**Discussion:** Chief Burton stated that there was a request for a breakdown of properties within the

District, and the data in the included document came from the Property Appraiser's Office website. He added that the properties were broken down into "residential" and "other."

**c. EMS MILLAGE BY DISTRICT COMMUNITY**

**Discussion:** Chief Burton stated that approximately \$2.9 million is collected from the .9158 EMS millage rate throughout the various communities.

**3. MATRIX REPORT REVIEW**

**Discussion:** Chief Burton stated that the Matrix Report is included in the agenda packet and asked Ms. Cisarik if she would discuss it. Ms. Cisarik stated that a County Commission meeting on May 20, 2008 contained an independent report by the Matrix Consulting Group. The report was commissioned by Pinellas County and completed at the request of the PSFRD cities. It was also a part of the official oversight review process that started as early as 2004, and that review process is outlined in F.S. 189. At the time, the County had the legal authority to request the review, and they did so in 2006 which is when it began. Due to changes to F.S. 189, Pinellas County has since lost the ability to trigger an oversight review process. She added that there was an oversight review committee that was part of the process, and Mr. Rives sat on that committee. Ms. Cisarik stated that her involvement with the fire district only goes back two years, so she has had to recreate the history of this era through news stories, and offered to share those with any interested members. In 2003, PSFRD passed a referendum with a \$70 increase, bringing the assessment to \$190, which went into effect in 2004. Later that year, PSFRD made an attempt to modify the tax structure by adding a "per square foot tax" via referendum; this, and two other referendums between 2004 and 2006 were withdrawn before going to the voters. Two other attempts also failed in 2007. At this time, PSFRD was operating an EMS substation outside of its boundaries in Redington Shores, which drew a lawsuit involving government officials in Indian Rocks Beach. Ms. Cisarik continued to explain that there are a series of recommendations in the Matrix Report that relate to options for fire district consolidation or contracting of services out to other districts. After the review of the report, the County EMS and Fire Administration staff recommended that PSFRD not take any official action. In March 2008, a referendum passed, increasing the assessment from \$190 to the current rate of \$260. She added that Station 26 was closed for several years following the report, and it reopened in mid-2015. Ms. Cisarik stated that she is not aware of any other items in the Matrix Report that were ever implemented. She stated that she feels that the report has a lot of value for its reconfiguration and consolidation concepts, and for introducing the concept of contracting for service. She also stated that she feels it is worth studying it again as it relates to Stations 26 and 28, and how PSFRD could better partner with neighboring districts. Ms. Cisarik stated that the one concept in the Matrix Report that was never introduced is PSFRD's ability to gain revenue through growing the size of its service area, such as the unincorporated area around Station 28. She stated that she has developed a concept in which the District may be able to grow its service area in that region. She added that it is a timely idea now due to discussions for a new Seminole station in the Bay Pines area. She stated that Pinellas County could benefit from this and she would like to share more ideas about this at the next meeting.

Chief Burton stated that he has some views on the report that he would like to share. He stated that his general observation on the report is that it began in 2005, was completed in 2006, and went to the County Commission in 2008. He added that there was a background memo to the County Administrator at that time. It was placed on the consent agenda for the Board in May 2008 with no further action recommended. He explained that consent agendas contain items on which no discussion is anticipated.

In the background memo, the writer submits that Matrix did a comprehensive analysis of the District, even though the report did not provide any cost estimates for any of the proposed options. Their key findings were from 2001, making those 5 years old at the time and 17 years old now. The report asserts that “long term financial planning including revenue and expense forecasting has largely been absent in the District, potentially leading to fiscal ‘crises’ which result in significant rate increases (rather than annual increases)” and it does not give any significant acknowledgement that the District Charter prohibits those annual increases. The writer of the memo asserts that one savings option is to maintain the District as an entity but to contract for service with another provider, without any indication as to what the cost would be for those services, so the premise must be that someone will do it for free. The report suggests that the District appeared to be providing services outside of its boundaries in a manner which is contrary to the requirements of the Charter. The Charter is very clear in that the PSFRD is the sole provider of fire rescue and emergency medical services within the District, as it additionally also authorizes PSFRD to provide services outside of the District, provided that reasonable costs will be paid by the contracting party. The writer asserts that Station 26 could be closed without the system falling below current response time standards, which was later found to be inaccurate in 2013 by the Optima Study, which supported staffing Station 26 again and providing funding for it. The listing of the assistant fire chief / fire marshal and district chief of EMS are not reflective of the current staffing, as those positions have been vacant for a number of years. The writer states, “it is conceivable that all of these positions could or would be eliminated if the PSFRD service areas were reconfigured as previously described (either through contract, consolidation, or some other mechanism),” but this does not address the body of work which those individuals perform, how the work would be done, or any unpleasant impacts. It presumes that whoever assumes that body of work would do so with the excess capacity in their existing staff, and he stated that he cannot imagine who has that excess capacity – and, for a savings to be there, they would have to do it for free. The summary of the memo stated that the EMS and Fire Administration should continue to work with the District to research cost effective opportunities for improving the fire department, and that has been underway.

The Matrix Report acknowledges that the services provided are essential to the community, but adds, “while the services are essential, there is no requirement for PSFRD to provide them,” which fails to acknowledge that the District’s Charter states that PSFRD “is the sole provider of fire rescue and medical services within the district.” The Report states that “there appears to be less costly approaches for delivering the services currently offered by PSFRD, and a potential savings could be \$1.7 million annually.” The problem with this premise is that it does not address any service degradation, at any level, and assumes that these reductions have no impact. It doesn’t address where the total savings will come from, and does not describe any offsetting costs that would be required for contractual services. It presumes the only measure that PSFRD should consider is the County’s goal of reaching EMS scenes within 7 minutes 30 seconds, 90% of the time. It gave no consideration for firefighting services, aerial operations, water rescues, vehicle extrications, or any other services. It does not address responses for fire emergencies and does not appear to address any delays in response due to call concurrency – meaning simultaneous events, training, transporting to hospital, etc. There is no presumed methodology regarding how the contractual basis would be established by each of the four municipalities, as well as by Pinellas County. It fails to address how the body of work currently completed by the command staff would be accomplished, and again presumes the eventual contractor would have excess capacity and would welcome that work, as well as do it for free. Chief Burton stated that he finds the alternative proposed in the report to consolidate the District with Madeira Beach to be ill thought-out. The report indicates that the mainland portion of the District would be consolidated into either Seminole or Largo, but it is unclear whether this will be done by annexation or by Pinellas County placing that area into another district – if

they were successful in modifying the District's Charter. There are no projections as to what the cost would be to the residents if portions of the District were removed from the Charter and placed in another fire district, although those millage rates for unincorporated are readily available. Their plan stated that "Station 28 would be closed and could be shifted elsewhere in the region of the County (e.g., Bay Pines) if desired." The Chief explained that this is problematic on several fronts. If Station 28 were to close, any financial savings would be the District's, not the County's. If those resources were to be redeployed elsewhere, there would be no savings as alluded to. If they were redeployed to the Bay Pines area, that would be in an area served by neither Madeira Beach nor PSFRD, and also yield no savings. He added that he found it interesting that the consultant found an issue with operating Station 26 outside of the District's boundaries, but did not seem to have that same issue in operating Station 28 in a combined district that neither fire department was responsible for. He continued to explain that it fails to identify a portion of funding for the station that came from Pinellas EMS, so the District would be losing that revenue source. The potential savings discussed from such a shift would be less than \$80,000 annually if the station were relocated. Alternatively, it states that the formation of a "beach fire department" would provide a broader tax base with a service delivery mission focused on the "beach service requirements." The premise does not explore the tax base and fails to demonstrate how the tax base is broader, and it fails to address what is meant by "beach service requirements" and how that differs in any demonstrable way from the mainland. It does not address, from a tax base perspective, the three Redingtons, and establishes a "beaches fire department" with three independent cities in between the two agencies. It suggests that collective bargaining agreements would be eliminated and employees would either be employed by the successor organization or by another party. Fundamentally, if the employees who currently exist are going to be part of a successor organization or another party, then he explained that he is unable to see the savings. The Chief stated that it significantly simplified the arduous task of trying to address impacts on an employee base and how the pieces fit together, such as seniority and rank status, and most significantly in trying to merge organizations with different pension systems. Chief Burton stated that it is his opinion that the report was flawed when it was presented, and it is equally as flawed today. He added that some of the data used by the consultant was from 1991, which made it 15 years old at the time it was used and 25 years old now. He stated that he assumes the County saw the report for what it was, which is why it was placed on their consent agenda with no action recommended. The report took a shallow view on a provision of services on the Pinellas County EMS Authority's response time target as the only measure that was examined. It suggested that other agencies would, could, and should provide services at a lower cost with no substantiation whatsoever. The savings that were alluded to by means of consolidation or contractual services never accounted for the offsetting costs required to establish those services. He stated that he assumes the report met a need to examine things at the time but will not be useful today in trying to move forward.

Ms. Cerce stated that she agreed with everything Chief Burton said. She also mentioned that the County has a precedent of a split fire district and it does not work well. She explained that Lealman Fire District took over Tierra Verde, which is a 20 minute drive away, and they are consistently unable to cover their calls and require mutual aid. She stated that she does not feel it is a service to the citizens at all. She added that the only way a combination of PSFRD and Madeira Beach would be possible is if the Redingtons were also on board. She stated that she also agreed that there would be issues with positions, pensions, etc.

Ms. Cisarik stated that she was only interested in the Matrix Report for the concepts of contracting out or consolidating and that she is not suggesting that the report laid out a good plan to do either of those. She said that she feels there is a possibility of PSFRD expanding in the unincorporated area. Ms. Cisarik

discussed that the District got in trouble in the Redingtons because, while PSFRD is allowed to contract out for service in the Redingtons, it must receive compensation for it. Ms. Cisarik stated that the Charter reads, "the powers of the District may be exercised only for the purpose of providing services, equipment, and facilities within the District, and no expenditure may be made by the District that does not relate to that purpose; however, the District may enter into contracts to furnish District personnel and facilities for the purpose of providing additional services when such contracts provide that the reasonable cost of furnishing such personnel and facilities will be paid by the other contracting party." She mentioned that PSFRD is already doing this with Treasure Island for fire inspection services, and she feels contracting our services such as these should be looked at as a potential revenue source. Ms. Cerce stated that she agrees with that sentiment. She stated that, she thinks the issue with the Redingtons was that they were municipalities versus unincorporated, and that PSFRD would face a wall with this pursuit as that would mean that Seminole would lose the revenue in that area, but she does agree it is a good idea. Chief Burton asked Ms. Cisarik what she meant when she said that PSFRD "got in trouble" while operating in the Redingtons. Ms. Cisarik stated that there was a lawsuit, to which Chief Burton replied that the lawsuit was immediately dismissed. Ms. Cisarik stated that there was a lot of political pressure, to which Chief Burton replied was entirely possible, but there was no merit to the lawsuit.

Chief Burton concluded by re-stating that for any of the premises within the Matrix Report to yield any savings, the foundation must be that less people are doing the job, otherwise he explained that he does not know where the savings will come from, but it assumes there will be no change in service levels. He stated that he does not know how this would be accomplished. Ms. Cerce added that Pinellas County is already at capacity, with call volumes increasing significantly over the last 10 years, and PSFRD is operating with only two administrative chiefs, where there used to be several more. She stated that she does not know how service levels would not be affected. Ms. Cisarik stated that the cost savings is dependent upon the skill of the negotiating party when contracting out for services. She added that the Redingtons have been getting very good deals from Seminole and Madeira for years. Ms. Cerce mentioned that the 3,350 people who live on the mainland would be absorbed into Largo or Clearwater at a much higher millage rate and there is no negotiating that, so she stated that she would not be in favor of that idea. Chief Burton stated that PSFRD's cost of providing services is not much different from other departments, so if the District is currently struggling to meet its needs at \$260, he is not sure that other agencies would be motivated to try to provide those services for less than that.

#### **4. COMPARISON OF ADMINISTRATIVE STAFFS**

**Discussion:** Chief Burton began a PowerPoint presentation and hard copies were also provided. He began by stating that there are concerns that the District's staffing levels, pay, benefits, and other expenditures are inconsistent with other providers. He mentioned that he has heard several times that PSFRD has the "highest cost per EMS seat" by Pinellas County, and part of that is a creation of the formula that the County uses, and he said this will be looked at.

Chief Burton explained that the first slide included a comparison of administrative staffs of Pinellas County fire departments with four stations or less. Some are cities and some fire districts, and it is important to note that cities have assistance from city staff in the areas of finance, human resources, etc., whereas everything is done in-house in fire districts. PSFRD's administration includes a four people – fire chief, assistant chief, executive assistant, and finance director, indicating that PSFRD's staffing is somewhat low and not inconsistent with other districts. Ms. Cerce stated that Lealman has three stations, not two. She added that, like PSFRD, East Lake Fire District also has a wide range of property values.

## 5. COST CONTAINMENTS

**Discussion:** Chief Burton stated that the cost containment slides contain evidence of things that the District has deferred on. He explained that the inflatable vessel for water rescues in the Gulf is 22 years old, and Engine 27 is 8 years old with no current plan for replacement. There is a mechanism currently in place to replace the 16 year old ladder truck at Station 28 as it was included in the EMS settlement agreement to be considered for Penny for Pinellas funding. There is the possibility of getting that funding, even in incremental parts, ahead of the 2020 funding stream that comes from Penny 4. Ms. Cisarik suggested contacting the District's County representative, Karen Seal, as she is aware of another County representative who is trying to get Penny funding in advance for his district. Chief Burton stated that it is an uphill journey to get the funding ahead of time, but he will continue trying, and it may help that it was part of a settlement agreement. The Chief also mentioned that the ladder truck has been ordered under a lease purchase agreement and should arrive in the summer. Ms. Cisarik discussed that the current marine unit seems like it would be useful for beach rescues as it is light and maneuverable, and asked if it would be kept for the beach when a new boat is ordered. Chief Burton said that it will be kept, as the units will have separate purposes. The current unit just needs to be replaced due to age. He explained that the District's Penny funding priority in this week's meeting identified that the ladder truck will be the first priority, second will be the boat, and third will be the station.

The Chief explained that the District has had a number of collective bargaining agreements over the years. He stated that there has been one general wage increase since 2009 of 3%, a series of holiday bonuses based on the ability to pay, the highest being \$1,000 and the lowest being \$100 – and two years that there was no bonus at all. Ms. Cisarik stated that there was a gross wage increase in 2015 [which, after research, is the same increase Chief Burton identified]. Chief Burton stated that he will look into it. Chief Burton stated also that there was a single longevity bonus in 2013 that were in the maximum step within the pay plan, and the following year there was another single longevity bonus for that year. He stated that the contract from six years ago versus three years ago, they look virtually the same.

Chief Burton identified other costs that have decreased over the last several years, including bank charges, payroll processing, telephone services, office supplies, janitorial supplies, life insurance, postage, and electricity.

## 6. COMPARISONS OF COSTS WITHIN FIRE DISTRICTS AND TAXING AUTHORITIES

**Discussion:** Chief Burton stated, with regard to millage comparisons, that these would be the millage rates applied should the district be dissolved, because he does not know what would happen, but he wanted to provide examples of what the cost of operations of other organizations within the county are. If the fire district dissolved, Pinellas County and/or the cities would be required to contract with a new or existing provider. The County's Charter asserts that fire protection must be provided, and in the absence of a city providing that service, the County takes on that responsibility. He said he feels that it is a rational basis that the contract would be at or near the established millage rates that these districts already have in place if the current service level is to be maintained. In these comparisons, he explained that he did not include the three Redington cities, as they do not have a fire millage rate; at best, it can be determined from their budgets what their contractual relationship is with Madeira Beach and Seminole. He explained that the chart indicates an implied millage – if the \$260 assessment was converted to a millage, and assessed that to random properties in each area of the District. Discussion ensued regarding the differences in costs between rates of the 11 different fire districts. The Chief said that it is reasonable to

assume that the other agencies within Pinellas County have operating costs that are at or above PSFRD's, based on their millage rates. Discussion also ensued regarding the fact that non-ad valorem assessments are not affected by homestead exemptions. Ms. Cisarik stated that municipalities could be looked at and broken out into what they pay for annual fire budgets and extrapolate that. It is not necessary to only use millage rates for independent districts and unincorporated. Chief Burton stated that the complete assessed taxable value of a city could be looked at and broken down into cost per home or cost per capita, but he stated that he was attempting to take clean millage rates with no interpretation and no sharing of services.

## **7. COMPARISONS OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS**

*Discussion:* The next slide included comparisons of collective bargaining agreements. Chief Burton explained that the agreements are vastly different from one another, which makes it difficult to make a completely accurate comparison. The chart discusses comparisons between nine different agencies in the areas of base pay rates, holidays, longevity, tuition reimbursement, vacation accrual, sick leave accrual, education incentives, hours per work week, uniform allowance, pension plans, acting officer and driver incentives, and health care contributions. Chief Burton stated that does not find PSFRD inconsistent with any other agency. Discussion ensued regarding the similarities and differences.

## **8. METHODS OF RAISING REVENUE (PROS AND CONS)**

*Discussion:* Chief Burton stated that he reached out to several colleagues regarding funding methodologies and the three prominent methodologies include a flat fee basis, an ad valorem basis, and a square footage basis.

Flat fee basis – Chief Burton explained this is what PSFRD currently uses. The pros include: the funding is not subject to a decline in taxable values; it is not impacted by homestead exemptions; every parcel contributes; it is easy to explain. The cons include: it does not stay current with cost increases, unless an escalation model was built into the language or indexed to something else as to how it can be adjusted; there is no increase as property values increase; lower value properties perceive they are being assessed disproportionately; there is no relationship between fire risk and fees for residential properties.

Ad valorem basis – Chief Burton explained the pros to this model: taxing is consistent with nearly all other taxing entities in Pinellas County; it has the ability to increase as property values improve or homes are sold. The cons include: some properties would not pay any taxes due to exemptions; subject to decreases in home values; subject to additional exemptions being granted; property values can fall quickly, but recover slowly; higher value properties perceive they pay a disproportionate amount.

Square footage basis – Chief Burton explained that there is a case to be made between the level of risk and amount charged. The pros include: provides a rational basis between that level of risk and the amount charged; every property pays a minimum amount for readiness; owners of smaller properties may see this as being more fair, limits the perception of a “waterfront tax” for high valued waterfront properties; can provide incentives for residential fire sprinklers in the form of reduced fees; consistency with how commercial properties are currently assessed. The cons include: it is challenging to implement and get on a ballot; some opposition from larger homes; does not provide a mechanism to ratchet up with cost increases.

Ms. Cerce suggested the possibility of implementing an ad valorem tax in combination with one of the

other methods. She also suggested basing the millage rate on the area of the district and have a different millage rate that is applicable and fair for each area, which builds in a mechanism for cost increases, but higher value homes are not being charged unreasonably. She added that the other aspect of this could be that the different rates are based on home values, based on tiers. Discussion ensued regarding an ad valorem tax with a dollar amount cap. Ms. Cerce discussed that the flat rate has been successful but isn't working. Mr. Piscitelli stated that he believes it is working, but the problem is that the County isn't paying enough for EMS, and he feels the flat rate can be increased in small increments over a four year period. He added that there could be a mechanism in place for exemptions for economic hardships, or in an ad valorem structure, a cap could also be set. Ms. Cisarik stated that Ms. Cerce's suggestion of different levels is interesting, but she feels it would be too difficult to get onto a ballot, and an ad valorem with a cap would be more appealing.

Ms. Hale stated that the District has an immediate crisis and, with the previous success of increasing the flat fee, she feels that would be the more successful as long as the public is educated. She also suggested increasing the flat fee with a cost of living percentage each year built into the language. Ms. Hale also stated that a fundraiser is a possibility due to the immediate need. Chief Burton stated that he feels fundraisers would be a beneficial way to engage more effectively with the community, but is unsure of how much revenue it would generate.

Ms. Cerce stated that an \$80 increase per home would be necessary to make up the approximately \$1 million deficit. Ms. Cisarik stated that she feels the flat fee increase is the best idea because it is what the voters are accustomed to. She added that if the ad valorem referendum was more moderate last year, it may have passed, but since that referendum failed, there is not a favorable view toward the ad valorem basis. Chief Burton clarified that the referendum did pass, but was overturned later by the court; the voters approved the ad valorem component.

Chief Burton summarized the questions he needs to ask legal counsel's advice on, which included the following: Is it permissible to charge a different ad valorem rate by geographical communities? Is it permissible to charge a different ad valorem rate based on home value in a tiered structure? Is it permissible to set a "not to exceed" amount in an ad valorem model? Chief Burton asked if it would be helpful to take a series of dollar amounts and project those out over a four year timeframe to identify the actual amount of revenue those would produce, to which the group agreed it would be. He added that the commercial side also needs to be addressed at a future meeting. Mr. Piscitelli suggested increasing commercial properties' assessments by a set flat fee as well.

Ms. Cisarik stated that she feels there should be a conversation about Station 26 future scenarios, as she noticed there was a new capital project chart that eliminated a new Station 26, and whether or not Station 26 is going to be in operation makes a large difference in the cost structure. Chief Burton clarified for those unfamiliar, in the Penny for Pinellas plan, it seems reasonably likely that Pinellas County, Redington, and North Redington will jointly fund a three-component process at 174<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Gulf Boulevard that would contain a police substation, fire and EMS station, and lift station, but he is unaware of who will operate that station. He added that he would not anticipate that the County would fund an EMS seat at this new station and at Indian Shores, so the District currently has no plan to build anything at this time until more information on that project is available. Ms. Cisarik suggested that the Chief meet with Mayor Queen, as he believes they will break ground by the end of 2018. Mr. Murray inquired as to the cost of operating Station 26 and the potential effects of closing it. Chief Burton stated that it costs less than \$1,000 a year to operate the facility itself, as well as the one of two paramedic positions not funded



by the County. If the station closed, PSFRD would lose that position, and the Optima study indicated there were response time issues in that gap while Station 26 was closed. Ms. Cisarik stated that it was her understanding that the response time issue was in the Redingtons and not in Indian Shores. Chief Burton stated that funding the station benefited both areas. Ms. Cisarik stated the distance from the new North Redington station and the current Station 26 is 2.1 miles, and it is an additional 2.3 miles to Station 27, creating a 4.4 mile gap. She added that it is 5.4 miles to the station at the foot of the Sand Key bridge, so the gap will still be less from Station 27 to the North Redington Beach station. Ms. Cerce added that there are mainland stations that cross the bridge to cover in that gap, so it is not just related to Stations 44, 27, and 26. Ms. Cisarik asked if the move-up process could be placed on the next agenda. Ms. Cerce stated that move-ups are very rare, and stated that she is referring to automated mutual aid. This is when the unit remains in their station but is pulled up as the next due unit.

Chief Burton clarified that the next agenda should include the questions for legal counsel, future plans for Station 26, the cost to operate Station 26, a move-up overview, and added that he would also like to have an open, meaningful discussion about the Redingtons, as they continue to surface with comparisons.

Ms. Cisarik stated that she provided maps with EMS grids to Kimberly Fugate for the years 2015, 2016, and 2017, and recommended Chief Burton request those from the County, as she feels they would be valuable to look at. Chief Burton discussed that the beach communities are difficult to protect, as they are not surrounded by other fire districts, but rather are a linear district which is a quarter mile wide by 15 miles long, and there are challenges to that, particularly in the situation of concurrent calls. Ms. Cerce asked if they would be able to research the outlier calls that did not meet the response time goals to see where they are located and why the goal was not met, to which Chief Burton confirmed they could. Discussion also ensued regarding peak season months, which Ms. Hale stated was between Christmas and Easter. Ms. Cerce inquired as to if research could be done to determine how many properties claim the homestead exemption, to which Chief Burton confirmed it could. He added that he will also try to get information on call volume based on season.

The next meeting will be held June 7, 2018.

---

**GENERAL REMARKS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

Commissioner Gardella stated that he could see a lot of work and research went into this meeting and commended the members.

---

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:57 a.m.

**APPROVED:**

  
Fire Chief Mike Burton, Chair

6-12-18  
Date

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kimberly G. Fugate, Executive Assistant