



Sedona Fire District

2860 Southwest Drive, Sedona, Arizona 86336
Telephone (928) 282-6800 FAX (928) 282-6857

SFD CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
Station #1 – 2860 Southwest Drive – Sedona – Multipurpose Room
Tuesday, May 2, 2017 / 9:00 AM

~ MINUTES ~

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

Committee Present: *Board Member* – Tim Ernster; *Citizens* – Gary Johnson; Lonnie Lillie; Gene McCarthy; Caryn Maxwell; Dave Watters; *Staff* – Firefighter Greg Eberlein; HR Manager Betty Johnson

Committee Absent: Wendy Tanzer; Captain Pat Ojeda

Others Present: Fire Chief Kris Kazian; Assistant Chief Jeff Piechura; Tricia Greer – Recorder to Committee; Gbe Buldra – Finance Director; Representatives from Core Construction; Dave Soto; Corrie Cooperman

II. Pledge of Allegiance to the United States of America

Committee Chairman Tim Ernster called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. Call to the Public

A. Public Forum:

- 1. Public Comments.**
- 2. Staff Response to Public Comments.**

There was no request to speak.

IV. Approval of Minutes

A. Discussion/Possible Action: Minutes of April 25, 2017

Dave Watters moved to approve the Minutes of April 25, 2017, as presented, and Lonnie Lillie seconded; the motion unanimously passed.

V. Open Dialogue/Review of Information Previously Presented/Questions

Chief Kazian is here to answer any questions committee members may have from previous meetings. Mr. Watters said after Telecommunications Manager Bob Motz's presentation, he thought about the telecom equipment that is antiquated and needing to buy parts on eBay and yet when questioned, Mr. Motz said he would not want all the equipment received and installed right now because technology might change and improve, which is always the case; Mr. Watters speculated SFD would want its communications up and running as soon as possible. Assistant Chief Jeff Piechura responded the capacity for systems to be installed and updated with contractors busy and our customized system is challenging to just replace parts and commercially designed "off the shelf" equipment would be tens of millions of dollars, as Mr. Motz told us last week and staff believes it can install the equipment in a balanced timeline, along with Mr. Motz trying to maintain the cost ratio piece of the system. His preference would be to have the money to put in the system in a balanced, redundant up-to-date method, but that would be \$20 to \$25 million; the next best alternative is staff to work at the best possible pace using the efficient purchase process Mr. Motz currently uses with primary links updated first, then secondary, and finally, tertiary components.

VI. Presentation/Discussion/Action – General overview of construction cost estimates for the station projects (Core Construction)

Core Construction representatives attending the meeting were Seth Beer, Ileana Beshaler, Nicole Kotsur, and James Faria. Core was asked to coordinate with the architect and engineer to come up with preliminary price estimates for the capital facility projects. Mr. Beer began the presentation which can be accessed by clicking here: <http://www.sedonafire.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/5-2-17-Core-Presentation-Sedona-FD-Station-Cost-Projections.pdf>.

Core has 17 offices in 8 states, and has been headquartered in Phoenix since 1982; their work is primarily for public sector agencies and in education. Core has 6 offices in Arizona with the main one in Phoenix; Core has served various fire districts and departments including Pinetop, Daisy Mountain, Kingman, Superstition, Casa Grande, and Florence. They have built 17 fire stations in Arizona and 40 stations across the country, and here in AZ. They were all built with a qualified procurement process, mostly using the Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) method.

Station cost projections – Mr. Beer said when Core starts a project without a complete design, but with a needs assessment and scope identified, they put together a responsible conceptual estimate starting with leveraging historical data. He said a benefit of that is to catalogue and carefully keep together historical costs broken down specifically to measure against other projects. Core uses the 10-Group Study and each column represents a different project (their example was six stations) including total cost, and square footage; each project is broken down into categories for demo, site work rough, site work finish, structure, enclosure, interior finishes, specialties, equipment, MEP systems, special systems, GCs and fees; the purpose is to keep the scope nicely organized from project to project to observe trends in how costs are driven. He said the sheet can be expanded to add other categories, which is helpful for new projects at the conceptual stage. This narrows down the process into a good estimate of what it would take to build a station. Mr. Beer said one thing to be aware of when looking at construction costs is not everyone shares the same definition of cost per square foot because it can be broken out in different ways – it could be just bricks and mortar, or include special systems or furniture; Core looks at it as what they deliver to their clients, which in most cases is considered turnkey – everything from demo to hazardous materials abatement to constructing and fitting out with special systems, data, AV, furniture systems, etc. and that is what the listed costs represent.

Additionally, Mr. Beer said the listed projects were built in various years and costs have not remained stagnant; they have been adjusted for cost/trends in the market. The second part of determining what a project would cost today is adjusting for current market conditions. Core uses different cost indexes and studies, as well as measuring against their own experience. He showed the national construction cost index of about 22% increase in the last 5 years, and Arizona was hit harder. There was a significant drop in construction employment, and now that the market has become busier, it is causing some challenges, especially finding qualified labor. He then showed a graphic of the Phoenix construction market with a steady 4.5% to 5% increase in construction costs simply by observing the materials market, vendors, and sub-contractor costs.

Iliana Beshaler reviewed the charts specific to SFD's projects; Core toured SFD's stations, took the needs assessment by LEA Architects, and studied particular items that jumped out at them; she noted that Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) was a big issue; they used LEA's preliminary concept drawings to create a detailed report; she then went through needs at each SFD station – Fire Station 1 renovations, Fire Station 3 renovations, Station 4 demo and rebuild, and Station 5 demo and rebuild. (Please see chart included in presentation.) Core uses the detailed information to quantify and arrive at a conceptual estimate range. Each SFD station is shown using the 10-group method. She said if projects are combined (for example, Stations 4 and 5 using the same contractor), there could be a cost benefit and savings. She also explained the Total High End Range Cost includes all "hopes and wishes" into a project; a Total Low End Range Cost could use more standard fixtures. She said when a project is in an early conceptual stage,

there are many factors not yet vetted. Renovation projects are on the lower cost per square foot range and in rebuilds such as Stations 4 and 5, cost per square foot can range from \$370 to \$412.

Ms. Beshaler said many other components go into the overall project costs and are not included, such as design and engineering fees, material testing and special inspections, geo-technical surveys, permit fees, development, impact fees, and those need to be considered as part of the overall project costs; she said Core typically provides rough-in for dispatch and alerting systems, but the systems would be additional. Ms. Beshaler said temporary housing during demo and rebuilding stations, such as Station 4, would also be more. Core's experience recommends using 10% to 15% factor on top of the construction costs to cover these types of items. Mr. Ernster asked if in looking at total low end and high end costs, and based on this information, should we be adding an additional 10%, which would mean another \$1.2 million; Ms. Beshaler responded, yes, the 10% would pay for architects, engineers, etc. Chief Kazian said there are some items listed that allow options for consideration and different alternatives. Mr. Watters asked if the committee or staff could "pick and choose" options or would everything listed, such as at Station 1, have to be done; Mr. Beer responded, yes, absolutely, and each agency has to figure out its priorities within the estimates presented.

Nicole Kotsur added it is important to reiterate this is very conceptual with no design yet and includes room for contingency and escalation; it is a conservative and conceptual number to make sure you understand what these costs include. Chief Kazian said the contingency placed on the SFD station projects are all at about 10% in the 10-group study; he asked if that is what was ended up using in contingency; Mr. Beer said yes, and by the time they get to the process of getting a guaranteed max price (GMP), new construction projects are entered with about 2.5% to 3% contingency with renovation being a little higher; this affords opportunities to include unknowns of projects not included in the scope. Ms. Beshaler said the reason Core starts with 10% is because this is a conceptual level; as they get more details, and 100% final drawings along with the design and engineering, that contingency would fall from 10% to maybe 5%, and as we get to construction documents, it would be at 2.5% to 3% for construction, which allows flexibility of design.

Chief Kazian asked if the low end range is without contingency and high end with contingency. Ms. Beshaler responded there is 10% contingency in both; however, with the high end and low end, there is a 10% difference in costs depending on level of finishes, etc. Mr. Beer said when they say high end and low end, to not take that as a connotation of quality – it just represents different priorities. Core's perspective is the client decides what the budget is and the scope priorities; Core's job is to bring it to reality. Mr. Beer said the next steps would be to verify priorities going forward including minimizing scope in certain areas and maximizing others and get consensus on the approach being taken in the community – especially if there is a bond to be passed, and to identify the correct procurement method. He said the vast majority of Core's experience is in CMAR, which seems to be the industry standard in the state for fire stations. CMAR is a project delivery system with the goal to meet the owner's big picture outcome in a manner that brings best value. It is a collaborative, team-based approach, which starts not after the design is complete, but from the beginning; this makes CMAR special – the team includes the owner, contractor, architect, and engineers and, sometimes, key subcontractors involved from the beginning – there is an opportunity for everyone's expertise to influence the process.

In a CMAR scenario, the owner has a contract with an architect and a separate contract with the contractor (the architect and contractor do not have contracts with each other); in Core's experience, this creates a healthy tension and respect for each role. Chief Kazian commented that Station 6 was built using the design/bid/build concept, which is an acceptable practice, but when drawings are done first, and then, a "hard bid" is requested, contractors sometimes react negatively to what they are asked to bid because it will be expensive and some things are not needed; this is avoided by using the CMAR collaborative

process from the beginning. He said SFD learned from that and definitely recommends using CMAR going forward to have a far better station built with more practicality and efficiencies.

Chief Kazian asked how CMAR is typically chosen, and said at this point, there is no guarantee that Core would be part of the projects; Mr. Beer agreed and then explained the process for CMAR from Request for Proposals or Request for Qualifications through completion of the project. He said rather than a “hard bid” process, CMAR allows for quality-based selections decided as a team. The beauty of the process is it protects the fee upfront; it changes the motivation of the process and has created success across the state. Mrs. Maxwell said when Station 6 was originally discussed, the Board at that time looked at the CMAR concept and she encourages the current Fire Board to consider it.

Mr. Beer stated the last piece of this process is understanding GMP means there are no surprises. The contract language states, based on what is reasonably inferred from the contract documents, the contractor will deliver this scope for this much money and no more. There are no change orders, other than if the owner wants to add additional scope to the project. It is the contractor’s responsibility and risk to understand if they missed something and sub-contractors cost more; all the savings goes back to the client in the end, which leads to best value – to spend available dollars to meet the outcome at the best possible price.

The committee discussed Station 5 and SFD working with Arizona State Parks to co-locate at Slide Rock State Park, as well as the Garland Family Trust wanting to eventually use the property to improve the infrastructure of their adjacent businesses; we will have to renegotiate the lease in 3 years; Chief Kazian said he does not believe the Garlands would ask SFD to leave in 3 years if a new station is not completed, but it is the time to explore options.

There was also brief discussion about including some sustainable features; Firefighter Eberlein asked how the LEED “green construction” certification would add to cost; Mr. Beer said in today’s world, it is not much, other than some of the increased management aspects; it does depend on circumstance, and some projects Core builds could achieve LEED, but the agencies choose not to go through the lengthy bureaucratic process. Core’s focus is to help make sustainable decisions that produce no cost or quick return on investment.

Chief Piechura distributed a score card for the committee to prioritize projects, and said in going through the notes by the committee and creating some sort of decision, staff went through the list of projects being considered for funding and narrowed those down to the projects listed on the score card; the total projects for buildings, fleet, and telecom pieces total an estimated \$17,051,000, which does not include the million for the maintenance bay/annex. Additionally, there is a \$50,000 public siren warning replacement, as the current system is outdated. He said staff will prioritize projects going forward, but the committee’s scoring will help guide staff. Mrs. Maxwell asked if the additional 10% to 15% pre-construction costs are included; Chief Piechura said the numbers for the buildings are the high end estimates, which is about \$1.2 million from the low end to the high, and if we do not want the maintenance bay, after prioritizing facilities, we could work within those numbers to accomplish what we need, noting that Station 5 will not be a “Taj Mahal” since it will not be in a high-pedestrian area – it will be nice looking, but built with efficiencies. Station 4 in Uptown has to be nice looking, and is in a “tight” space with unknown variables underground which will likely push it more towards the high estimate to make it work well; he said the committee could decide to add in another million dollars into the bond package as an option. Mrs. Maxwell said she does not want to be short-sighted in prioritizing needs.

Chief Kazian commented there is an opportunity to consider options and variables to prioritize and to simply add another million – which we would not take likely – because we need to do this right; he said Mr. Buldra’s financial presentation will help in deciding options, perhaps through funding capital improvement as a hybrid – bonding and pay/go. Chief Kazian said a neighboring agency bought an

existing commercial building for its new administration office, rather than new build to save funds, and perhaps, SFD could consider similar options. Ms. Beshaler said Core could break out some aspects, such as Admin from Operations' needs, to help the committee makes its decisions. Gene McCarthy asked if there had ever been consideration of consolidating fleet maintenance with an adjacent community; Chief Piechura said, yes, and it has not worked out because of the differences in needs and costs.

Some committee members said they did not want to micromanage staff; Chief Piechura said we are not looking for the committee to micromanage on these forms, but rather, we are seeking insight and input – not delegating back to you to make a decision. The committee also talked about their feelings about the critical needs of Telecom, and some felt they could be grouped together to let staff decide. It will help give us a feel of what the citizens think would help staff to bring the recommendation. Chief Kazian commented that even a project ranked at #16 does not mean it is not important – it still has to be done at some point, but it would help staff to know that buildings are most important, etc. Mr. Ernster asked if he understood correctly that pre-construction and design/engineering costs are in the \$12,156,000 number; Chief Piechura said the design costs are not – these are estimates on the construction and would have to be added in at some point in time; Mr. Watters said that is the \$1.2 million figure previously discussed. Mr. Ernster commented he would question if some projects belong in a bond program, such as the siren warning system and feels some things could be pulled out and worked into a future operating budget. Chief Piechura responded that some of these systems will last 15 to 20 years, which fits into the intergenerational equity payment method; the other piece is how we fund our capitalization and the levels that need to be on an annual basis to build the contingency fund appropriately and still put all the systems in play; he said Mr. Buldra will address this in his presentation.

Chief Kazian said some items were removed from the \$17 million listed on the score card including a \$400,000 Type 3 engine that is in the Capital Improvement Plan; other items were removed to be purchased on pay/go to help get the number down; it becomes a question of which ones to plug in or take out, and the bond question will not say which specific items – it will ask, will you approve a general obligation bond for public projects for the Sedona Fire District to include capital projects such as buildings, fleet maintenance, infrastructure, etc. as a broad scope; then, staff and the Board will ultimately decide what gets funded out of the bond. He also pointed out the 2007 citizens' committee priority list had changed over time because priorities and needs changed. Gary Johnson added that a concern for the Oak Creek Canyon station was a lack of available property and part of the concern in 2007 was if a piece of property was found, it should be bought quickly because even though the fire station may not be funded yet, the property would be secured for the future. Chief Kazian asked the committee to complete the priority forms and return them to either Chief Piechura or Ms. Greer.

VII. Presentation/Discussion – General overview of the process once election is called (Captain David Rodriguez)

Captain Rodriguez was unable to attend today's meeting; Firefighter Greg Eberlein spoke on Captain Rodriguez's behalf. He said the mission of this committee is to evaluate SFD's current and future capital needs, determine what financial methods meet those needs, and make a recommendation to give to the Fire Board. After that, if the Board decides to go forward with the bond proposal, a Political Action Committee (PAC) could be formed to promote the bond; there are many issues involved in an election, and PACs would fundraise for pamphlets, handouts, or ads in newspapers to endorse the bond. However, the fire district can only speak to factual items – not endorsements.

Firefighter Eberlein said he believes Chief Kazian felt some pressure to come up with an estimated figure of what would be needed to cover capital needs, and \$15 million was thrown out; he said his personal concern is if we now go and ask for \$18 Million or more, citizens will wonder why. Mrs. Maxwell asked how many people can be on a PAC; Firefighter Eberlein stated he believed as many as would like to participate; Wendy Tanzer is absent from today's meeting, but he said she is very knowledgeable about

PACs as she has worked on campaigns in the past. Chief Kazian commented he tried very hard to not “pigeonhole” an estimated number and that \$15 Million was just a starting point for discussion; at the time, he did not know what construction costs would be and his message has been that if it became a different number, the facts are what they are.

Mr. Ernster said at the beginning of this process, a lot of information was not available to the Chief and the committee until they heard the report about actual construction costs, which are, frankly, a lot higher than he expected even though it is based on solid information from Core’s previous projects. He said we are not “handcuffed” to \$15 million, and the committee has the ability to pick the number we believe is needed to fund capital improvements. The committee will need to make prudent fiscal decisions.

Gary Johnson said he feels it was beneficial to have a number to begin the discussion because it is hard to evaluate without knowing the potential cost; it was just used as a benchmark, and it gave the committee numbers to compare to what the mil levy would be if we needed \$15 million, etc.; he understands the challenge for the Chief, but feels the committee would have asked for an estimated number anyway, and he sees the number as a benefit. Firefighter Eberlein said his perspective is the public who just reads the newspaper and does not come to meetings or read the Minutes do not have the education about district operations and needs. Citizens who favor of a bond will be providing the public education going forward.

Mr. Watters said Finance Director Gabe Buldra will give us scenarios using different assumptions to help the committee understand what would be the best method to fund capital needs, whether it can be achieved by a bond of \$20 million, \$15 million, or whatever is determined – or help make the committee’s recommendation that some of the capital could be covered with pay as you go, and if so, what is the projection for what that would do to SFD’s mil levy. Mr. Watters wants to see realistic scenarios so the committee can project and show the public the financial impact of various scenarios and see why the committee came to its conclusions.

VIII. Presentation/Discussion/Possible Action – Financial impacts of funding the capital projects discussed by financing through legally permissible options up to and including General Obligation Bond (Finance Director Gabe Buldra)

Mr. Buldra said what he wants to illustrate today is the various impacts of taking things out of the operating budget and putting in the bond; ultimately, the list of needs is much higher than our available means in normal tax levy based on current projections; he said by starting with the mil levy of \$2.53, which is roughly what the Board will consider to adopt in the Fiscal Year 2018 budget – all the way out to FY 2027 at \$3.35 (10 cents over the cap rate); obviously, there are components that must be cut if we are limited to just the levy. Mr. Watters clarified that the projection is based on funding all projects on a pay/go basis; Mr. Buldra said, correct, and it is based on the full \$17 million plus all the other items included in the district’s Capital Improvement Plan; he said SFD has done a good job managing finances over the years, but there are things we could do better, such as to truly develop a capital fund and a funding mechanism within it. Mr. Buldra pointed out his figures include funding \$2.5 million to the capital budget every year; there would be pay/go purchases coming out, as well as lease purchase payments because we would not be able to pay cash up front for stations. He pointed out in the projections at the 10 year mark, that decision ability is gone because we would be over our legal cap.

Mr. Buldra stated if SFD does not bond, it would actually cost us 2 cents more because of the term of the debt; if we bond, our term of debt goes out to 20 years; most banks will not go out more than 15 years on a lease-purchase. When we take a \$17 million bond into consideration, our mil rate would drop down to \$3.14 at the 10 year mark; the bond rate would change as our assessed value (AV) grows and the savings would be about 2 cents over the 10 year window. He pointed out there would also be \$1 million going into capital fund, which would fund regular smaller projects, as well as developing a long-term capital improvement plan. Mr. Buldra said the AV assumption used in the scenario is using the average growth – not aggressive or worst case. He then asked for input from the committee to look at different scenarios.

Mr. Watters asked to see a scenario showing how the average home of \$345,000 would be impacted using pay/go versus bond; Mr. Buldra responded his charts would include scenarios showing how homeowners would be impacted by pay/go compared to the bond in the same period of time. He said in Fiscal Year 2024 the pay/go model would actually fund the \$17 million in capital projects at that point, as the mil levy rate would be capped. Mrs. Maxwell commented the point of the bond is intergenerational equity having everyone over the next 20 years pay – not just the people living here in the next 5 years pay for everything; Chief Kazian said if we decided on pay/go, it would increase the tax levy and for the next 6 years, everyone who is here pays for everything; it would be a free ride for the next 13 years for future residents.

Mr. Buldra said it would be cheaper because we would no longer be borrowing – in every other scenario, we are borrowing money with interest to pay. Mr. Watters asked to see scenarios of the impacts of the bond versus pay/go with interest rates, based on \$15, \$17, and \$20 million. Mr. Johnson commented the bond could be considered as a bridge – because we do not have enough money to fund our needs and we need a bridge to make that transition; in an ideal world, once the bond is paid off in the future, the only time we would need bonding would be to rebuild fire stations. Chief Kazian added that we would not see a huge decrease in the budget, but we would be accomplishing the projects that need to get done; if we used pay/go, the budget would increase that much more – the bond happens outside of the budget.

Chief Kazian stated we could look at taking out the apparatus and telecom, but we would need to “kick up” our capital budget funding by “X” amount to be able to fund those items by taxing today’s citizens at a higher mil rate; he said if the AV goes down any place we did not predict, it exacerbates the problem. Mr. Lillie said the bond would be for 20 years, and everyone would be paying equally over that time; when you add an engine or water tender with a shorter life span than 20 years, he begins to question if that is “bondable” because stations last more than 20 years. Chief Kazian said the shorter-term items would be paid off in bonding in 7 years; the water tender would be a 15 year asset and hopefully, with decent quality, it could serve for 18 years or more. He said if we just use the bond for buildings, then we will still have to figure out how to pay for the rest of the necessary projects, and that is without accounting for the unexpected \$700,000 increase to PSPRS, which was not caused by SFD and SFD has no negotiation ability to reduce or not pay it; it must be absorbed in the budget. He said we are working hard to be fiscally responsible – a bond that does not pass, does not help us in funding; so, the need will still exist without the bond.

Mr. Ernster said he has been on the Fire Board for almost 2 years, and in that time, there have been a few big “surprises” to the budget which were totally out of our control; his observation would be no matter how finely tuned your projections are, unpredicted things will happen, which is influencing his thought process. Chief Kazian said staff would recommend using a hybrid – we cannot get the “whole enchilada” of every piece of apparatus and telecom projects in a bond; he said Chief Piechura pulled out some items in the \$17 million and we can play with the numbers to try to find a “sweet spot”, but to be responsible, there has to be a hybrid approach and pay/go for some projects. He said the projections were using a moderate growth AV and no AV surprises included. Mr. Watters said even removing fire engines, the bond will be large to pay for facilities and some telecom needs.

IX. Discussion/Possible Action – Draft report of summary and recommendations to the Sedona Fire District Governing Board for long-term capital project funding needs

Mr. Ernster said since Mrs. Tanzer is absent and Mr. McCarthy had to leave early, today might not be the best time to discuss the draft report. Chief Kazian said time is of the essence, although the Fire Board could schedule a special meeting for the committee’s recommendation; the only real deadline is if the Board makes a decision to bond, it must call an election by July 10th; he believes it is critical for the Board to have time to ponder and for public input before the Board makes a decision. He said there are

two committee meetings scheduled for next week, if needed, to finalize the report, as well as one on May 15th, if necessary. He does not want to rush this process as it is too important. Mr. Watters stated based on information Core provided, there is a finding of fact that needs to be added to the recommendation. He could have a little more time to work on the report before the committee discusses it.

Mr. Ernster asked the committee what it would like to do; consensus of the committee was to meet on the 8th as scheduled, and keep the 11th available as well to finalize the report. Mr. Johnson stated he would be absent, but sent his comments on the initial draft to Ms. Greer. Mr. Lillie commented he also had quickly reviewed the preliminary draft and complimented Mr. Watters on a job well done. Mr. Buldra said he would get the updated numbers to us by Friday or Saturday of this week for the committee.

Chief Kazian asked the committee their feelings about Telecommunications and Fleet. Mr. Watters stated his bias under normal circumstances would be fire trucks at pay/go; however, he realizes that might not be possible. He noted after today's presentation, there will be another million to add that was not in the numbers; he also understands Telecom is a priority. Mr. Buldra said he would give scenarios of how \$15, \$17, and \$20 million would affect the mil levy at each level and would not specify what is being considered under bonding. Mr. Watters said that would be helpful showing the different scenarios and how much the regular tax rate and the bond rate would be.

Mr. Ernster said he believes the Board would be interested in knowing the committee's high and low priorities. He said the budget is the Board's responsibility every year. Chief Kazian said the Board and staff work hard to be as fiscally responsible as possible every day and for each purchase, we strive to do the right things right and whatever the "urban legend", the fire district is a "lean machine" that provides emergency services; if a bond is approved, we will continue to provide that level of care for every penny in the bond. He said cash/pay decisions will be made by the Board based on whatever the economy looks like, and even if a bond passes, that would just be the beginning – to make sure we are building the right stations for effective emergency responses and sustainable solutions.

X. Discussion/Possible Action: Future Meeting Dates, If Needed:

9th Meeting May 8, 2017 9:00 AM

10th Meeting May 11, 2017 9:00 AM

11th Meeting May 15, 2017 1:00 PM

As discussed, the committee decided they would definitely meet on May 8th and likely, May 11th. They will keep open Monday, May 15th in case additional time is needed.

XI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:08 PM

Original signed by Tricia Greer

Tricia Greer, Recording Clerk to the Committee

:tg