

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, Pinellas County Charter Review Commission –

Honorable Jim Sebesta
Honorable James Coats
Honorable John Bryan
Honorable Susan Latvala
Alan Bomstein
Karen Burns
Katie Cole
Ricardo Davis
Robert C. Decker
George Jirotko
Roy Harrell
Louis Kwall
Roger Wilson

FROM: Kurt Spitzer

DATE: May 21, 2005

RE: Update on Government Services Study

During your meetings of April 18th and May 3^d there was considerable discussion concerning the scope of the Government Services Improvement Study, which MGT of America has been engaged to undertake. The purpose of this Memorandum is to provide you with an update on the status of the MGT study.

To summarize your recent actions, the CRC first began to actively discuss the possibility of engaging MGT to update the 1992 study during your meeting of March 7, 2005. After authorization was obtained during your meeting of March 22nd, the Board of County Commissioners subsequently approved a contract on April 5th. The April 5th contract is to update the 1992 study at a price of \$147,940.

On April 18th Steve Humphrey and I met with representatives of the Fire Chiefs association and Firefighters union to discuss the April 5th scope and perceived flaws in the 1992 study. Later that day, those representatives also addressed the CRC during its evening meeting on the subject of the scope of services. There were numerous suggestions made, most of which added tasks to the scope.

Your decision to revise the scope of the study also occurred during your April 18th meeting. You voted to include only building and fire services in the examination but with the intent of being able to obtain a greater level of detail as relates to fire services. Since that time, the draft scope

Memorandum
Page two
May 21, 2005

of services has undergone several revisions in an effort to accommodate suggestions made by both the Fire Chiefs and county staff. Its most recent cost estimate is \$170,000.

A meeting of myself, Steve Humphrey, county staff and Fire Chiefs was held on May 19th. A consensus was not reached on the expanded scope, primarily (although not exclusively) for the following reasons:

- The Fire Chiefs believe that if a study of fire services is to be undertaken, it should be a full-blown, very comprehensive study. County staff believes that the county would not be willing to fund such an endeavor.
- Both county staff and the Fire Chiefs believe that actual implementation is unlikely concerning those types of study recommendations which would require subsequent legislative action or legislative action and a “dual vote”.

However, there was agreement on modifying the scope to examine issues related to water supply for fire protection, such as hydrant location, inspection, water flow, and specialized team response, such as technical resource, hazardous materials, marine rescue, etc. While such topics may have merit, they are not directly related to the work of the CRC and they are not the types of studies that will likely result in significant efficiencies being realized.

Thus, a consensus on the scope has not been reached but there is an existing contract with MGT. A spreadsheet is attached that describes the general options available to you.

Attachment

Government Services Improvement Study

| Subject | Description | Status | Cost |
|---|--|---|--|
| 1. General Update | General update of 1991-92 Study. Examines Fire, Police, Building, Water/Sewer and Library services. | Contract signed April 5 th . MGT has assembled project team and initiated general information gathering but limited those activities to Building and Fire Services, in reaction to CRC's expressed intent to only examine those program areas. | \$147,940. Approved by BCC. |
| 2. Building and Expanded Fire | Continues update of Building Services. Deletes Police, Water/Sewer and Library services. In response to requests from fire officials and than county staff, significantly increases the depth and breadth of the Fire services. | CRC directed staff to examine fire official's request, meet with interested parties to see if consensus could be reached and determine if expanded fire scope could be accomplished within \$147,940 as approved by BCC. Awaiting direction from CRC. | Initial estimate for expanded scope was \$182,500. Cost for subsequent revision deleting two tasks and modifying one is \$170,000. |
| 3. Building and Limited Fire (Water Supply and Specialized Response Only) | Continues update of Building Services. Examines only two areas of fires services: Water/Hydrants (supply, inspections, water flow, availability, etc.) and Specialized Response (Technical Rescue, Haz Mat, Marine Response, etc.) | During meeting of May 19 th , general consensus of fire officials and county staff was to not proceed with expanded fire study but to examine water supply and special services in depth. Awaiting direction from CRC. | To be determined. |
| 4. Building and Modified Fire | Continue Building services examination. Continue with fire services study as described in #2 but delete tasks so that cost is within amount approved by BCC. | Awaiting direction from CRC. | \$147,940. |

May 18, 2005

Mr. Kurt Spitzer
Project Manager
719 East Park Avenue
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Subject: Proposed Modification to the Work Scope of the MGT Proposal of
April 8, 2005, Regarding the Fire Services Study Plan

Dear Mr. Spitzer:

The purpose of this letter is to outline proposed modification to the work scope presented in the April 8, 2005, Proposal to Conduct the Fire Services Study and the Building Permitting/Zoning/Code Enforcement Update. The modifications are for the Fire Services Study and involve three issues in the specifications.

Two sets of specification were submitted to the Pinellas County Charter Review Commission and then submitted to MGT for consideration in the preparation of our proposal. One set was "Suggested Study Parameters for the 2005 MGT Study on Fire/EMS Delivery" submitted by the Pinellas County Fire Chief's Association. The second set was "Proposed Pinellas County Fire and Fire Rescue Service Study Parameters" submitted by Pinellas County's County Manager. While the two sets of specifications contained many similarities, each addressed issues either different or stated differently. In our proposal, we sought to include each of the proposed specifications. We also placed significant emphasis on thorough reviews of potential report data and information by both parties.

However, at the Charter Review Commission meeting of May 3, 2005, suggestions were made to revisit elements of the specification. The Pinellas County set of specifications did not include "Water Supply for Fire Protection" issues put forth by the Fire Chief's set of specifications. Also, the County specifications excluded the "future traffic, roadway, and transportation issues as they affect station location and response times" as set forth in the Fire Chief's specifications. A third point included in both sets of specifications addressed funding equity issues in unincorporated areas. The County proposal broadened this issue to include "countywide" costs. The Charter Review Commission directed the various parties to revisit these issues and return with appropriate scope and cost modifications at the May 23rd meeting. However, basic work was to be continued pending that discussion on both the Fire Services and Building/Zoning and Code Enforcement Study elements.

MGT has sought to examine these issues by discussions with representatives of the Fire Chief's Association, representatives of County management, the County's EMS and Fire Administration, and the Charter Review Commission's Project Manager. As expected, there is a wide range of opinions on the three issues. However, we believe that the following recommendations provide reasonable resolution to each issue.

Issue One – Funding Equity and Alternatives

We suggest that the County prepare a report outlining the current process and sources of fire service revenues and revenue distribution and provide this information to MGT. MGT will seek similar information from the Fire Chiefs, alternative funding comments, and any other relevant points that the Fire Chiefs believe relevant. We will then discuss all of this data and information with all parties to ensure its accuracy and creditability. MGT will then develop its own assessment for including in the report's recommendations. While this approach does not eliminate all costs relevant to this issue, it will have a financial impact of \$8,000.

Issue Two – Water Supply for Fire Protection

We recognize the importance of this issue. However, much of it could be more appropriately addressed in a separate study. We do understand that fire departments must commit important time to ensuring that water supply, fire hydrant inspection and maintenance, and system expansion are properly done. Therefore, we need to explore this part of the issue carefully and consider these points in our analyses and subsequent recommendations. Restricting our research and evaluation to just this point would allow a reduction of \$3,000.

Issue Three – Future Traffic Considerations

In our proposal preparation, our work plan focused on two sources of information to address this point. One was the Fire Chief interviews and the second was County, and perhaps FDOT, planners and plans. We estimate that not including these planning organization and their data would reduce overall cost by \$1,500. We do request that the County provide some insight into this issue for consideration as we develop our recommendations.

It is our opinion that the actions suggested would reduce the overall cost by \$12,500 and thus reduce the Charter Review Commission's additional funding request from \$34,560 to \$22,060. However, the overall proposal still carefully addresses almost all issues while retaining sufficient time for consultation with the Fire Chief's Association, County management representatives and Charter Review Commission representatives. We are, of course, open to other suggestions regarding our proposal.

Sincerely,



Stephen F. Humphrey, Jr.
Senior Partner
MGT of America, Inc.