



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF THE EVERGREEN FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT
DECEMBER 11, 2012**

The regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Evergreen Fire Protection District was held on December 11, 2012 at the Administration/Training Building, 1802 Bergen Parkway, Evergreen, Colorado.

ATTENDANCE

DIRECTORS IN ATTENDANCE: George Kling, Charles Simons, Charles Dykeman, Jeff deDisse, David Christensen.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Daniel Koller, Josh Burnett, Michelle Parker, Russ Campbell, Paul Peil, Dan Murphy, Robert Gottsman, Evan Soibelman, Matt Swinden, Connell O'Brien, Cheryl Denbow, Mike Novick, Marlis Wadleigh, Jeff Ashford, Stacey Montague, Frank Dearborn, Bryce Lipson, Josie Klemmaier, Chris Johnson, Paul Saueracker, Nelson Parrish, Brandon Kuglin, Deborah Evens, Kevin Evens, Lynn, Ward, and Stephanie Rehkopf, Mike Weege, Brendan Campbell, Greg Meyerhoff, Anne Salisbury, Carol Hucker

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER: President Kling called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

TIME OF REMEMBRANCE AND REFLECTION: The pledge of allegiance was recited and a moment of silence was observed.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Director Simons requested that the agenda be amended under the Approval of Minutes to include the November 20, 2012 Special Meeting Minutes. Director Kling amended the agenda under the Public Hearing to place the 2012 Budget Amendment first and amended the Presentations to allow the Financial Report, Budget Resolutions, and Certifications to precede the Public Comment period. The spending authorization will be moved to Unfinished Business with the Training Building Update. Director Dykeman made a motion to approve the agenda as amended; Seconded by Director Christensen, unanimous approval.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Director Kling called the public hearing to order at 7:05 PM.

2012 Budget Amendment: Brendan Campbell explained that the 2012 budget Debt Service Fund Budget Summary as we go through the process to refinance the bonds this process was not included in the 2012 Budget. We need to allocate the appropriate expenditures and have sufficient appropriations to do this bond deal we need to amend the 2012 Debt Service Fund. The estimated Bond Proceeds for the 2012 estimated actual should be amended to \$6,080,000 and the Bond Debt principal due will be amended to \$6,325,000 from the original \$470,000 with interest amended to \$472,720. Two line items will be added the Cost of Issuance and Contingency. In essence with government accounting when you issue debt you have to consider the proceeds as revenue and then when you pay off the bonds you have to consider that an expense. Amending the 2012 budget will give sufficient appropriations to accommodate the refinance.

2013 Budget: The fund highlights (5) and budget related to each. One change from the draft budget was that the \$100,000 for the recall election can't be put in strategic capital so it has to go into operations budget. The tender purchase in 2013 was removed from the budget as the timeline for actual purchase won't fall until 2014 so this was removed from apparatus replacement. We did a review of bunker gear and anticipate replacing up to 40 sets of gear adding this to the operations budget under personal protective equipment. An additional \$120,000 was added to the volunteer pension. Specific to the debt service fund with the bond refinance our payment obligations decrease so this fund was adjusted to reflect the lower bond payments. The general obligation bonds mil levy is proposed to go from 1.666 mils down to 1.460 mils which is sufficient to cover debt service. For the taxpayer it means a decrease in their tax obligation reflected in this coming year's tax bill. Each manager has gone back to the budget to tighten up and get unreserved funds numbers back up over the past month.

The public hearing was closed at 7:10 PM.

PRESENTATIONS:

The October 2012 Financial Report: each month the same anomalies are seen. The only real over-cost is in communications in relationship to how UASI reimbursements are being tracked. It balances out. We are 90 - 95% up with the Sage transition and feeling comfortable with where it is now.

Motion to receive and place on file the Financial Report dated 31 October 2012 by Director Dykeman; seconded by Director Christensen; the motion carried.

Motion to approve Resolution 2012-0006 Amendment to the 2012 Budget from Director deDisse; seconded by Director Dykeman; the motion carried.

The Resolution 2012-0007 to adopt the 2013 budget varies from previous in relationship to the certification of tax levies. On the resolution a change has been made which allows the board to designate Pinnacle Consulting or a representative to prepare the certification of tax levies and file these with the state the day after the budget resolution is adopted. Motion to approve Resolution 2012-0007 Adoption of the 2013 Budget from Director Simons; seconded by Director Christensen; the motion carried. Certification of Tax Levies does not require board action. Pinnacle will file on 12/12/12.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

November 13, 2012 Regular Meeting Minutes – Comment from Director Simons to apologize publicly for not accepting an apology offered at that meeting from Mr. Gottsman. Mr. Gottsman thanked Mr. Simons and acknowledged that he also owed Mr. Simons an apology for words exchanged at this meeting.

Minutes were accepted as presented.

November 20, 2012 Special Board Meeting Minutes – accepted as presented.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

The Board will ask for a three minute limit on presentations unless the board asks the commenter a question in which case the time will be extended. Daniel Koller requested to change places with Lynn Rehkopf in the order of comments.

Lynn Rehkopf: I have come to propose a discussion instead of a presentation and ask the board forbearance. Since the November 20th meeting I have spent a lot of time talking to the board members and to the community members. I see lots of firefighter faces here so also tonight to be able to talk to the individuals that are the representative of the firefighters, their chief, and his duly designated captains and lieutenants to see if we can initiate a discussion about a long term plan for the fire building. As you know the community is largely opposed to the building being at station 2 for various reasons and a lot of those reasons have to do with the suitability of having a high intensity training building in such close relationship. We have all listened to myriads of hours of presentations on this. I firmly believe that there is always a middle ground, that there is always a place where the individuals who don't agree about something can come to a point of agreement. So I have been working really hard to try to find that middle ground. We're not there yet but we are closer than we were back in June when we had such a flamboyant meeting and Chris tried to make a presentation. And the crowd was so agitated that they didn't allow Chris to make the presentation. I will tell Chris that about 98% of the crowd wanted to listen to his presentation but there was so much energy in the room that we didn't get to see that. The idea that I have been working toward is that there is a short term solution and a long term solution to the problem. And so in my vision that is where the middle ground is but there is not total agreement with me on that but I do think there is a middle ground that we can get to, to have a discussion. If I stand up and pontificate to you then that is not an exchange of ideas or an opportunity to look for middle ground so what I then hoped to do was try to initiate that discussion. So I am asking for ideas about what you think might be middle ground. I have had some ideas from these gentlemen (the board members) and they may choose to engage in conversation with members of the community. But one of the things we haven't heard or heard from are the firefighters themselves. I would like to say I am interested in this.

Director Simons: Lynn thank you for all of your efforts and the time that you spent, the thought that you have put in to this. I think you very well may have come up with a long term solution that we all can live with. I know you and spent a long time discussing this one morning and I am sure you spent an equal amount of time with each board member. And it's appreciated. I am not quite sure how to proceed to get into the discussion so why don't you put it out and that will kind of kick off the discussion.

Lynn Rehkopf: The initial idea that I had was that while the committee this summer looked at a lot of different sites. At the time there were no really good sites. Each site had advantages that this one didn't have but it also had some drawbacks so the criteria that we has was that we did not want to move the

problems we are trying to resolve in this neighborhood to somebody else's neighborhood. And so we kind of beat our heads up against the wall and honestly there are some sites that are better than this one. Maybe not in terms of cost but in terms of what's available at the site for long term development of the site. And that is one of the concerns that I have about this site. Once you put the building in then you are pretty much out of space. So the training capability that you have once you put the building here does not allow you to expand. And Jeff (deDisse) mentioned what about the land where the transfer station is located. That is one idea so let's talk about that. There have been some changes with the sale of EDS to Waste Management so one of the ideas we has was to go out into that area to see if there is potential to use that site. Fire Department Special Districts have the right of eminent domain. Having worked for a company that laid pipe line and know a lot about eminent domain and know that the best thing to do is not to use it but to negotiate. Find some way that you can use or buy their land without doing that. Or offer something to give them benefits to selling the land. So that was an idea that we kicked around. What I think has been missing in some of the discussions that we have had is basically the board's approval to go ahead and do something like that to look for a long term solution. You need to draw people into the discussion that have not been involved in the discussions before. Some of those individuals might be you or real estate agents, MALT, private individuals who have lived here for a long time and know the area. So there are a lot of people that weren't involved this summer that I think could be involved and that we might be able to find a better site long term for this facility. The idea that I have thrown out, I don't know that there is necessarily buy in from you or buy in from the board but it is I think an intention for the middle ground. So that is my idea but that doesn't mean that sitting in this room there isn't a better idea. It was just an idea that I floated looking for the middle ground where we can all come together and make a decision where the firefighters get the training that they need, and the community feels like the building is located in a location that is not detrimental to the neighbors homes.

Director Dykeman: Lynn I want to make sure I understand your premise. You are asking us to secure eminent domain from Denver Parks?

Lynn Rehkopf: The first thing I am asking you to do is to put together, to sanction, a committee that has the right individuals involved with the right skill set to actually look for the right piece of property.

Director Christensen: Chick, from my discussion with Lynn, the notion was that the training building goes forward as is on site but we join in on an effort to find a better location if it will make everyone happier that we continue to look for another site. There are cost problems, site problems.

Director Dykeman: I didn't hear her say that. Is that correct Lynn?

Lynn Rehkopf: That is initially the discussion that I had and I have talked to members of the community and members of the community feel differently about that but the idea I had was that we go ahead with the building but we had said that the building is modular and movable so long term we look for a better solution. I honestly think and this is just a guesstimate, that we are talking about one year to 180 months to find a better site. And then to develop a raw site probably about \$1.5 million so it's a n increase in the money that is being spent but it's also if we find the right site, a site that can be further developed. Now I know that you guys hate when we say West Metro but Dave and I went down and took a tour and Charlie and Chick have been down there several times. When I took a tour of their site, I had actually stopped in their parking lot and used my GPS for that area and I saw their two training buildings but what I didn't realize was that there are 12 other locations on the 100 acre site where they train. So when we look at putting this building into this site yeah you can get a lot of training but I didn't realize because I am not a firefighter and have never done that work that there are so many other things that you can train on and so many other setups that you could put together that it almost seems a shame to take the first building that you need which is the class A training building and put it at a site where you can't expand and prevent some of the other items that would be a wonderful addition to a training facility. When you look at it from that perspective I think that there's a good long term plan and I would like to see if we are going to do it lets do it right.

Director Simons: Is Dan Murphy in here today?

Dan Murphy: Yes

Director Simons: I received your email about the win-win the bad situation for both side but we can make it win. And I very much appreciated that. You came up with some items which is what Lynn is basically talking to.

Dan Murphy: It's not just the two of us there are hundreds of people out there that want, do you mind if I read this?

Director Simons: I was going to.

Dan Murphy: Go ahead Charlie; you're a better reader than I am. But don't leave anything out. If I pat you on the back so be it.

Director Simons: Dan starts off: (*Note the text of the email is inserted here without interruption.*)

"Gentlemen: As far as I know there is not a bad guy among you. You have served the Evergreen community over many years with substantial success and then along comes this Burn Building issue which is jeopardizing the entire cohesiveness of this great community and your professional reputations. The latest incident at King Soopers should cause everyone pause because it clearly demonstrates how divided this community has become over this burn building issue. I will not criticize but I will offer some constructive solutions that I hope you will take some time to consider. My suggestions are from a big picture perspective and serve as a follow up to an earlier letter to the Canyon Courier entitled "A Win-Win Solution."

1. The real solution here is to build a burn building in Evergreen that all sides can rally around and end the controversy that is dividing our great community. The current location for this burn building is and will remain problematic.

2. All of us know that there is enough wealth in this community to build an uncompromised, gold standard burn building in the right location. We only have to look around us to see the millions of dollars donated by private citizens to preserve and protect this unique community.

3. Because Evergreen is unique and is both willing and able to build an uncompromised gold standard burn building in the right location, the current location should be placed on hold and a community wide donations campaign should be started whose purpose would be to obtain substantial funds to purchase a location for a burn building that is favorable to all sides. **Why build a "compromised" burn building in the current location when you could build a "gold standard" burn building in the right location?**

4. Everyone on the many sides of this issue should ask themselves if this controversy has now become personal to a point where we are battling each other versus finding the very best solution for the entire community. My home is not in close proximity to the current location and will not be impacted but I know deep down that the only real solution out there for this entire community of Evergreen is one that solicits private donations and then buys a property in an acceptable location for a "gold standard" burn building. A different location has been and continues to be the basis for any real solution that unifies the entire community.

5. I would ask you five good guys in a bad situation to take the high road by delaying the proposed burn building and announcing your support for a community wide donations campaign to purchase a property in an acceptable location for an "uncompromised" gold standard burn building around which the entire Evergreen community can rally. That my friend is the win-win solution that this community both needs and deserves. A "high road" decision on your part would also leave a lasting legacy that despite early controversy within its borders regarding various projects over time, Evergreen always rises to find a solution around which the entire community can rally and support. That's what makes Evergreen so special to all of us.

Dan Murphy
Evergreen, Co"

Director Simons: Now if I can read a memo that I wrote to the Board and the Chief and the memo concerns the putting off of this building for a year and what this (*compromise*) will do is give each of us probably about half a loaf if you accept what I am about to read. Bear in mind this was some months ago. My memo says:

"I see no reason to postpone the project. The exact same issues will come up again and we'll have to go through the same drill. We have approval from one of the most restrictive planning and zoning boards in the state and my vote is we take advantage of the approval process and move on. If the Evergreen community wants to raise money to buy land and move the prefab building to that location that is their prerogative and I will even help them. But that is highly unlikely to happen. Once the project is stopped the community will abandon any pretense of trying to raise money and its back to down the hill again." - That was my fear at the time and it probably being honest still is. - "I've always maintained that several home owners who object to any training at this site saw this issue as an opportunity to shut us down. We have to go back to the realization that we will continue to have training at Station 2 just as we have since 1985. The question the homeowners have to ask themselves is whether they want fire training on an open concrete pad or in a fire proof building because we simply don't have any other options or locations. I fail to see how live fire training 12 times a year, 6 of which will be in the winter months, when windows and doors are closed, can overly disrupt anyone's life style. If the district had not proposed to build a training facility a vast majority of the residents who are now complaining would never have known the difference." - What I should have added there is they wouldn't have known the difference with what we are doing now versus what we propose to do. - "We have compromised this facility to the point that any further adjustments to the building will negate the very real purposes for which

it is intended. Better training for our volunteers and better service to the community and as a district we have the obligation to be trained to handle whatever comes our way. There 40,000 other people who have a stake in this project let us endeavor to keep them in mind.”

That was my memo to me and to George and to Mike at the time. So I am not very far off what you are proposing. The difference is that we would like to go ahead and build the building. Have the long range group really look at this thing in a hard way to its accomplishment. I think that’s a good solution, what you propose. We need the training there is no doubt of that and I think that everyone has pretty well come to the realization that the training is needed. The fact that this building that we propose, the burning part of it is a very small part of the training that we will derive out of the building. It’s a minuscule part of what we will get out of this building. It’s movable. If we can come up with a group and one of my questions here is you were speaking Lynn about how we go about comprising the group. And that’s kind of our side and that is the community side and Dan thank you very much for the letter. It was well written and it’s appreciated.

Director Christensen: To throw another perspective in, one of the things that appealed to me about the conversation with Lynn and the prospect of going forward while looking for a long term site is that from a city planning perspective cities grow and there are frictions on the edges, it happens but the future is choice not fate. We don’t have to sit here and say we are going to put it here now and it always has to be here. There may be reasons why it makes sense for the community, there may be circumstances which come together which lead us to move some aspects over so I like the idea. It’s a life safety issue now we need to get the training going soon. But look for a long term.

Director Simons: Dave would you share with the audience your qualifications are, what your degrees in and what your life’s work has been?

Director Christensen: Masters in City Planning, Civil engineering undergraduate, though I confess I have spent more time in the technical and energy field but I have some experience in that area. I am not going to over tout it. Any city planners here are actually working for a living are more experienced but I can speak academically about it.

Lynn Rehkopf: So we haven’t heard from any of the firefighters.

Director Kling: I think they are a little gun shy unless you ask them a specific question. Do you want to respond Jeff?

Chief Ashford: Absolutely, I don’t speak for everybody but I do represent the volunteers and it’s my responsibility to make sure they are motivated and safe and have the right tools and equipment. This year we have had more than normal structure fires. After every fire we were better, the setup, the tactics, the tools and it’s a hard way to learn. We are good anyway, very good. But I am going to tell you, those things, the setup, the tactics, everything that’s required to go in, they know it’s valuable. This is why we train. You know this is the best use of our time, the best use of our training. I don’t think any one of us says I don’t want to do it (train). Raise your hand if you agree with that. Saves a lot of conversation.

Director Simons: What’s your attitude towards the long term idea that we are putting forward? If we could actually find a place and a piece of property and raise the money to build it would it meet, and we really have something that is really really good, is that acceptable?

Lt. Swinden: If it’s in district. The whole key issue is able to train in an appropriate facility, timely manner, that basically is efficient for us and our schedules and with the fire department. But to train in a facility that works for us that represents what we are fighting in right now. So as you know the shack down here just doesn’t cut it. If we can put a facility in there as a short term and find property somewhere that’s in the district where we can have live fire training more frequently than we do now, it’s like practicing football without a football. Defense is great but your offense sucks. So if we have live fire capabilities in a building that works for everybody in the district, we’ve talked about it, and we like the idea. That’s workable.

Lynn Rehkopf: So just to play devil’s advocate for a minute. Ward and Stephanie are here with me and they know I had a very colorful grandmother, so just a question. My grandmother or Dad would have said to me if you’re going to do it do it right. So are short changing ourselves by putting a building here and moving it or would we be better off waiting?

Many Voices: No, we don’t think so.

Capt. Gilbert: We are doing it right the first time. All of our equipment is here; we have training facilities in the back. We are doing it right the first time.

FF O’Brien: I appreciate what you are saying ma’am, but I also have to balance out the fact that for me it is a life safety issue to make sure I can get home to my family. We have the facility here and this is

where we train. Personally as a taxpayer and as a firefighter I would like that building as soon as possible. I also have to think about my family and the only way that I can do that is by training regularly. So I would suggest that we pursue the approach that you talked about and let's start with moving forward with the training facility, building it here and then looking at the long term plan. If a place can be found that is acceptable to everybody and is within the district that still gives me the opportunity to train.

Chief Johnson: We definitely do not feel that we are short changing ourselves with the building that we have proposed so far. We feel that it meets our training needs today and it was designed to meet our needs 30 years into the future. This wasn't a building that was designed to be obsolete in 5 years. We expect this to be fully operational and functional 30 years from now. We definitely don't feel like we are short changing at all, in fact we put a lot of things in there that will take us a long time into the future, but it is filling a need that we have now. We feel like there are sufficiency's and preparations that this building will solve and the sooner the better. We run into it time and time again and we've got plenty of examples to back it up from fires that we've been on. But we definitely feel it meets the needs of today and do not feel at all the we are short changing ourselves in the building that we propose. Now that doesn't mean that if it's a block from here or five miles from here, honestly that makes a difference because we like training here, this is our heart, this is the soul of the fire department. But if we can make that work five miles from here then that impact is minimal to none, so a different site location is fine. But we definitely have urgency, we feel like we need this building as soon as we can possibly get it. And that's why we don't want to wait.

Lynn Rehkopf: Dan, does the community have the energy to raise the funds for this?

Dan Murphy: If I was a firefighter what I would be looking at is a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush. Because if you postpone it a year, is the commitment there, that's an unknown. But the people that I've talked to, everybody just says why don't we build an uncompromised gold standard building so that we've got the finest training building in the mountains, so that we're not limited to 12 times per year. Rent the building out to other people and make it a money generator. There's all kinds of opportunity if you build the right building. Now a temporary building, yeah, but with that temporary building I think the other side will want to see a commitment that there's only going to be 12 live burns per year. As a firefighter you get in there and you do 12 and then you say I really need 18 or 24, because you really don't know.

Director Kling: We have 60 years of experience on what we can train. There are only so many hours in a day. We didn't feel like we gave it away at 12, we don't like the restriction, just because who would like a restriction? But that is more of a known than a guess.

Deborah Evens: Can I pose a question? In the long run are those people going to put their money where their mouth is? They say they would donate but well...

Director Simons: That's a good question and the essence of the problem. There is going to have to be some trust here in each side saying we will do what we say we'll do. You can't write a contract to that effect. All you can do is come to a meeting of the minds where everybody says this is one heck of a good idea, let's see if we can make it work and if we can raise the money and do the job, wonderful.

Director Kling: The other thing Charlie, to your point, based on trust, we have a track record with our last few strategic plans. I'd say that very few organizations with the economy and everything else have accomplished our last couple of strategic plans. So if this was part of the greater plan, I would bet on us. It's just like our bond sellers betting on us this week. We've done a pretty good job with a long term vision and turning it into 8 stations and 95 volunteers, and an ISO 5/6/10. So we do meet those long term goals, we have a history of it.

FF Novick: In my opinion the way to go about it is not fundraising but put a ballot issue on the next ballot for a 2 or 2.5 million bond issue and take it to the community and let them vote on it. You do fundraising, what if you only get ¾ of the way there. Then what do you do, give the money back, where does it go, or is it a separate 501c3? The board has the ability.

Director Christensen: Maybe it's not either or. Maybe it's both paths and preparing both paths.

FF Novick: I fully think that we need to go forward because it has in my opinion taken a couple years too long already to get to where we are today so delaying it even another day is too long but personally I would have no problem with a more desirable longer term solution but keep in mind that that costs a significant amount of additional funds just for the ground and take it to the community and float a bond issue out there for whatever we think it's going to be and see if it gets approved.

Director Simons: Not being overly educated on bond issues and so forth and so on, though I have been a part of groups that have passed them. Would it make any difference to the community one that we consistently come in under budget and two we've just undertaken a bond refinance which is going to

save us \$700 and some odd thousand dollars? Does this have any impact on how you go about selling a bond issue? And how does one go about comprising such a group? I don't know.

Dan Koller: Very interesting discussion. I think there are a lot of good points. If there needs to be money raised, I think that Mike's proposal probably flies better than donations. A vote on a tax increase is something that everybody participates and the community expresses a desire in, so its consensus. The other issue that I see is motivation, for the community to come together and by together there is better resolution. A gold standard building would eliminate a lot of concerns that people have. As you know besides being in the wrong place, it would also offer the quality and intensity of training that one could obtain at a different location. So it could mitigate that, and having that mitigated and having the motivation to have the building in a location where impacts are minimal, I have a feeling where that would be a position where a lot of these groups could kind of get their paths closer to each other again. However, I think it would be a big handicap if there were a burn building at station 2 already in the meantime. I am trying to combine all I hear, if we had postponed by a year and we could get as a tax levy together to vote in that year and make a commitment as a community then that would be a better situation than putting up the building then shoving the responsibility on the community that if they want to move that go get the money. You know what I mean.

Director Dykeman: Mr. Koller, do I hear you saying that you are not in favor of what we have been discussing?

Dan Koller: You must have misunderstood me.

Director Dykeman: You just said don't build the building.

Dan Koller: I said the combination of what I heard is to me build the biggest basis of a motivation for a community as a whole. That's what I said.

Director Christensen: To clarify, Dan, were you saying don't build this building but do the bond issue and build a different one elsewhere?

Dan Koller: Take the year proposal out of Dan's proposal, a year break or whatever, and within that year get the mill levy out, vote on it, get the money, and parallel to that evaluate the site whatever that entails and then

Director Simons: What you are saying is that is if the building is here already it will put a damper on our ability to sell the mill levy,

Dan Koller: It probably would maintain the division of the community as it is now and have the same effect on the mill levy discussions as you do now on the recall elections. So that is kind of a quick synthesis of what I heard.

Director deDisse: I guess I live the furthest away from this facility as anybody in the whole entire district I guarantee that. Jeff might have me beat. But I guess I have to ask what the other people that live in the district but outside of this general community on raising that bond levy and everything else whenever they say you've got the facility and now you're coming to us and asking for more when you said you could get it done correctly for half a million dollars. So I would really have to ask what the rest of the community would say about raising their taxes whenever it's not over there and then we decide to move it over there and we have the same fight again.

Director Christensen: To clarify, the response is that if the community puts this thing together collectively, we wouldn't go to the community; they would be part of it and represented.

Dan Murphy: Let's look at some numbers. This was going to be a million dollar building, and through various modifications we are down to a \$500,000 building. Now it was my understanding there was a million dollars in the budget for the building so there is \$500,000.

Director Kling: There was also a million dollars extra revenue the last four years.

Dan Murphy: Exactly so let me just take you down this road. There's \$500,000, the reliance is going to generate roughly \$700,000 there's 1.2 million sitting here already.

Director deDisse: We'll never see the \$700,000, that's not for quite a long period of time.

Dan Murphy: Yeah but what I'm saying is there is an awful lot of money available already so as far as your taxes going up, pick a number. \$20 or \$100 I don't know. So the other thing is you've got so many people on both sides of this issue that if all of a sudden you come up with something that everybody is going to agree on and that is we increase taxes \$50 per house or something and build a gold standard uncompromised burn building I think the whole community is going to get behind it.

Director Simons: I think you're correct.

Dan Murphy: And, let me just finish, the same people that are on opposite sides ought to be together on one committee to get this burn building, the gold standard burn building built, ie: get the mil levy passed.

Director Simons: Let me throw a white elephant in the room question. Supposing we can't come up with a place? What Lynn lit on when I first saw it I thought eh I don't know, and then I got to looking at it and thinking about it I thought you know it may take a while but that might be something that really would work and that's a plus if we can do it. Supposing we can't find any place? What do we do then? Are we back to the same fight?

Director Kling: Yes with a new board (laughter).

Director Simons: That's the white elephant.

Dan Murphy: But don't you think that there is a site out there that you can in fact buy?

Director Simons: No sir. I truly don't. Not that in what we looked at, I don't think so. I'm not an expert. I've got written down here real estate agents, service clubs, drawing good knowledgeable people out of your Kiwanis and Rotary. Get an attorney on board and that goes to how do you form this group. The question as to whether we can find a place would remain a great big question mark because I am not sure it's there and I don't think it is.

FF Novick: I thought that as part of the three month delay there was a group that looked at alternative locations. Maybe it wasn't as extensive as if we put this task force together that everyone is talking about but my understanding, I was not part of it, there was a group that looked at alternative locations in a short period of time and there weren't any.

Director Simons: Well basically what we looked at was property that the district already owns. We looked at property that we thought might be available; one across from El Rancho which happened to not be in our district by the way. And I don't know, not being an attorney, if that makes a difference or not. It was a good looking piece of property. The other was Bryant Drive where the old concrete plant was and there were some drawbacks to that. Plus there is the cost of cleanup and the price of El Rancho was expensive. When you look at the property at Bryant there would be EPA restrictions and studies with the cost of cleaning it up. All of that figures into the buy-ability of a piece of property and if it's feasible. If it's not then it's not but those are really the only two places that without putting it in somebody else's back yard that were available. Except Lynn coming up with what she has.

Russ Campbell: May I ask a question? I have been here for about 20 years and one of my great friends is Wayne Shephard who's been a great ally and friend which is why I am here for the first time. Basically kind of puzzled, because for me, I've been the city manager in Aspen and San Jose California, and we had so many difficulties trying to round up the community support for different institutions and I have been thrilled to see this project come about on this site. I have no idea of the origins but it seems to me the credit ought to be given to the firefighters themselves, those who devised this particular site, and parceled out the whole thing and analyzed it. Aren't those the more creditable opinions beyond my own or beyond anyone else outside in the civic sense that the combination should go to the people who designed the project, who thought it through, even though it is a little cramped. What has bothered me since back in March in the hysteria going on of people who have literally tried to infiltrate great fear in this community for what is probably the most significant project to come about in my 23 years here. This is a huge break through and I am puzzled as to why more credit is not being given to the firefighting community, they know perfectly well what is required for a burn building, what is required for every single technical dimension of the problem of firefighting. I don't, I am sure these people don't either. So I question whether we have an even boxing match here or not. Does that make sense? (Multiple people began speaking at once) I look at this community as one of the great communities of the front-range and over these years I've seen so many things that have caused like Albertsons and so forth, this is really something you can sink your teeth into. This is a wonderful break through aggregating 40,000 people and their interest in their property values into one consolidated position. I've talked to Wayne and he's given me information about the landscaping and I think we are not paying too much attention to the overall potential of this site in spite of the fact that there are people with outlandish, I don't need to name any people do I? These are people who have wholesale tried to eliminate any sense of progress in our community. They would like to have the whole thing abolished. About half of our community feels strongly that there should be no change at all. So I get worried about the back ground and the back drop of this whole thing. I think there was great integrity in bringing about this wonderful little village for the fire community. I have never seen anything like it Aspen or San Jose. We have nothing to equate in terms of the aggregation of functions for a wide variety of uses. So I worry about whether or not the subject has been changed and is not focusing on the great accomplishment that you are looking at.

FF Novick: I would like to just throw one other comment out there about the term gold standard. I want to reference the comment that Chris made, this building as I understand it will meet our needs long term. As I understand it the only thing we would do to make it gold standard would be to have the other level on it

to make it 4 story and get some additional ISO benefits. I don't think we would have done anything different to make it gold standard. So it is I think gold standard other than perhaps its location.

Dan Koller: What keeps it from being gold standard is the limited use. You restrict yourself in so many ways. The vehicle that kind of does serve the purpose but whenever you want to do something extra or invite other fire departments then there will be conflicts. Its kind of like you buy an expensive sports car and agree to only drive 45 miles per hour.

FF Novick: I don't know how but personally I don't think we ever should have agreed that we would only use it 12 times. I think we should have said we don't know how often we're going to use it and we're going to use it as often as we need to. I thought the 12 – 18 times initially. As a firefighter, training every Monday night, the ability to have maybe 24 potential would be ideal in my perspective but I understand that is one of the accommodations that might have been made.

Chief Johnson: Just to tag onto that a little bit. Remember in my perspective here I am a community member, I'm a tax payer, I'm a homeowner and I care deeply about this community. But I care much more about our firefighters and I care much more about the safety of them. So my entire focus in in keeping them safe and well trained. That's all I care about. And that is my goal in this community. That being said I'm not going to, so 12 times a year is triple what we do now, three times the live fire training that we do today and accepting limits is never fun but we wouldn't accept a limit that we felt wouldn't still give us sufficient training. That goes for the 3 story compromise as well. We did not feel that would impact our training. 12 times a year to actually accommodate 12 live burns a year is actually a significant burden on the fire department. It's a significant increase in terms of what we have to train for, prepare for. Live burn training is not simple. It's very very complicated. And we actually feel that first of all 12 is going to meet our needs significantly but on top of that is probably the upper limit of what we can actually accomplish as a volunteer department. We would be hard pressed to go past that because of the burden it puts on the entire training division of the department, the resources, everything that lines up to actually pull those off. So nobody is happy with giving up stuff and putting on limits but I can tell you from my perspective I would not be happy with a limit that I felt would in any way put our firefighters at risk or limit our training. That is a limit that we can live with and still gives access to triple the live fire training we have today. So it's not a limit that we felt uncomfortable with.

Director Christensen: Just a point here. If we build a building that we are perfectly satisfied with now and if the group comes together to look for an alternate site, we get another roll of the dice in 3 – 5 years we can evaluate that. That's the nice thing about this idea of building now and get the training and look for an alternate down the road.

Bob Gottsman: I really appreciate this kind of meeting I think it's really valuable because it is an open discussion; we live in the United States and we just take the government saying ...One of the questions I have is regarding training, first of all you've been doing this for 26 years. Second of all, in 2001 the strategic plan came out. And it talked about doing training buildings in marsh dale, being a 2 story building, and they raised money for mill levee, they raised money for bond issue, and all that money got spent, more than enough. And in 2005 they did a financial assessment. And if you read it carefully after you read the 2001 master plan, they found out they didn't figure the money correctly, they didn't have enough to pay for the operation, of billing and equipment. They made an emphasis on the emergency medical services they didn't have there. The hard part I have is if training was so critical, how do we go 25 years and 10 years, and now we're here saying we gotta do this now. It wasn't important before. I agree with Glenn. I'm thinking George proposed 3 options in the June minutes, and the third option was...no project at all. And to me what people are saying here, we need to get the emotionalism, frustration and the anger subside and then figure out how to proceed. But as I say, our political system is our system, it's our citizens and our taxpayers, it's not a church, it's not a school, not a business or militarism, it's got its own set of criteria and priorities. What I'm saying, I don't know what you meant when you said "no project at all" as the third option, and I'm not trying to put you on the spot, but when I read the other one, "proceed as planned", look at different options...But because it has gotten so emotional, frustrating and anger driving, that we need to put it down. The reality of building it here, the problem is just like you all know, they don't want it in Marshdale, they don't want it in caldale?. This past 3 weeks I've made a lot of phone calls, and I've talked to a lot of people and I talked to them because I finally realized none of us have talked to somebody to say, ya know "what's around here." I drove around the community, I know it pretty well, and I look but I can't judge who owns it or whatever. I also looked in and I understand the training thing, I spoke to the training directors at Arvada, Denver and West Metro, and we do get 15 % of the annual training that those people get. We get, their plan is about 240 hours, we get 36.

Director Simons: That was one of the topics that you and I were crosswise on back in November, and I looked at the training, and I'm going to let Mike answer that 15% because that's not correct.

Bob Gottsman: Well according to, and I appreciate what Mike said, and I misreferenced the ISO audit when it was done, that's why cause I had seen it someplace else, and I called the directors of Arvada, Denver. And I asked them, I told them who I was and what I was involved in and I straight asked "how do you do your training, how many hours do you put in" very nice people, just like you guys. And they were very open about what goes on. So, and I read, mainly to Mike this summer, I've been coming here for 3 years trying to understand what's going on. And that's why I come, I really appreciate it. But this summer we got a ton of information on the department that really wasn't easily acceptable to the general public. And I've processed about 1400 lbs of....

Director Simons: Mike...Now wait a minute, would you like to answer the training hour issue, because that seems to be something of a controversy and if I understood you correctly, the district is training 9000 hrs this year? Almost 10,000 so how does Bob's 15% weigh into that? I'm confused.

Bob Gottsman: I've done the math. I can do the math for you right now.

Director Simons: Ok, we can start right there in the back and go around the corner, and tell you how many hours of training we have and neither one of them is 36 hrs.

Bob Gottsman: Well that's the minimum. Mike, you said at the planning district meeting it was something like 7200 hours, and you also said 9000, and now you're saying 10,000.

Chief Weege: As of Monday night we added a bunch more hours, and it's on our website, it shows the ticker adding up the hours every time they're logged. And we're over 9500 hours right now.

Bob Gottsman: Well the math that I did, and I understand that...

Chief Weege: 93 firefighters, that's 100 hours each.

Bob Gottsman: and I agree with you, but what I'm saying is I don't know, because one of the goals of the community was and the goals of the fire department was to become a full service fire department, and I think in the 35 years that I've lived here. We've gone from a rural community to a full service fire department, and in my opinion, living here for 35 years, Evergreen Fire and Rescue has been a full service volunteer fire department. I've been very satisfied with what you people do. I feel you get the training, and I feel that you're all intelligent, not to go where you're going to be in danger. And you did have a number of major fires this year, and I've come to appreciate more of the area. To me living in Evergreen, living in the mountains, living in this community, is like living in a hurricane, if a wildfire were to come it's a major concern to the community, let's face it. These individual fires are uncomfortable. And I've realized where I live now, where you live too Charlie, we might as well get out, I don't want the firefighters going in if there's a wildfire, because its....

Director Simons: The fact is though, that a home fire can develop into a wild fire and very quickly.

Bob Gottsman: And I understand that, what I'm saying is, the big thing that I can't quite get my hands around is why it's a crisis after 26 years, after 10 years, after millions of dollars have been spent to satisfy the guys with the Oedipus complex who want to build buildings, people who want a lot of gear or whatever else, and equipment, and now the training is right up there on top its got to be done now, it's an emergency.

Director Kling: I would like to retort that. So, you said that we've talked about this since 2001, it's actually longer than that. There's a risk versus assets, that's why you'd like the board to manage that along with the volunteers, right? So the safest thing that we can do for the citizens, and the firefighters is get them and your insurance rate, is get more apparatus around the district. So if we can go out on upper bear to near Jeff's house to stop a waste basket fire before it becomes a full involved fire with people trapped inside, then we have met a huge safety thing for them. So it was chosen after the first mill levee increase and that bond that we would add 4 or 5 stations and numerous apparatus and training was unparallel with the inadequate facilities we have now, but it was always plotted that's what's most important, and that's what any business does, they look at their revenue, their assets, their available funds, and they say what's most important and it was deemed that that paid back in safety, paid back in your insurance premiums and it paid back in life safety, and most important in life safety, cause if we can get to your house with you trapped inside, with one truck and 2 people in few minutes, then we have a very high probability of saving you. Every few minutes past that point once it leaves that first room that goes off the chart to you're going to be dead even if you're 3000 square feet away in the smoke. So that's where that risk and reward was always at. We had that money and that's how we got here today. And it not right here right now Bob. You stood in the back of the room and said "Build the damn building" 20 months ago. To build the building in 6 weeks, and we've had 60 meetings and talked about it for at least 3 years,

when everybody keeps asking “when are you going to quit talking about it” but if anything we’re screwing up we’re screwing up by wasting our time and yours.

Bob Gottsman: What I do remember, is when Gary DeJong, said first it was a million dollar building, and we said “a million dollars?! What for?”, and then the next meeting he called it a million dollar burn building... And sarcastic me says, “Oh a million dollar, non-burn burn building.” And so I don’t know what the original concept was, I remember distinctly for months Gary wanted to call it a burn building. And I didn’t understand and somehow, I feel somewhat responsible for where this is.

Dan Koller: I think it’s nice to talk about the past but it’s more important to talk about the future, and where we are now. I understand there may be some...but it’s the past we can’t change that. I think there was potential for something that the community could help you know how many people try to get involved in a legal sense those people see a better opportunity to build a better building, I will talk to these people again

Director Simons: May I ask a question? You know we’ve had burning here for a long, long time, and it’s been out on an open pad. If we don’t build the building we’re going to continue to train here, this is the only place we have to train, and we’re going to continue to burn that way. Do all the constituents know that?

Dan Koller: Yes, we know you’ve been burning and training up here a long time. This has been tolerated, not necessarily approved or accepted, but tolerated. A few phone calls have been made once in awhile; there was too much going on or whatever. But generally it’s been tolerated. If that could be tolerated for another year or whatever it takes then I think that could be feasible... But if the only solution is something that ignites the community and prevents the current...I just think it’s right for this to be a controversial issue.

Director Simons: You know in any compromise both sides always go ...our half is agreeing to sit down and honestly and diligently look for another place, at the same time recognizing our commitment and our charge to our constituents. Your half though is you get us work to get half of the community to find another place. And frankly if we could find a place that’s more suitable, I’m all for it, I really am. If we can do that, good.

Dan Koller: But part of it is the motivation, or de-motivation

Director Dykeman: Are you saying we can’t work together if we go ahead and build this while looking for another place?

Dan Koller: What I’m saying, after talking to these people, is having the building and going in as planned is, for them, going to be like a wall above their heads, it’s going to be impossible to recall, I’m sorry.

Director Dykeman: Well I noticed from one of the many, many emails I’ve read there was a statement to the effect that “there shall be no burning here at this site under any circumstances”...Just a second, please...if that comes to pass, where do we go to train, what do we do?

Dan Koller: Again, I don’t have the information in my head to confirm that, with the basis of the people I’ve talked to. What I’m saying is we’ve been, part of the compromise is to keep the status quo for a certain amount of time, then I think there’s a good chance to work this out. That’s all I can say.

Russ Campbell: I’m just going to ask the board whether or not, it seems like this is the kind of conversation that should have occurred a long, long time ago. What’s puzzling me is where does the board feel, in view of the threat of a recall and in view possible long range damage that the divided community might yield, or might result in. Does the board feel that there is any potential for example to form, immediately, a small committee of citizens and board members that could hammer out these things rather than doing it tonight...I think she has some wonderful ideas...Is there some kind of formula that you could basically, and I’m not a touchy feely kind of guy, but there could be some way to come to grips with this sort of thing rather quickly rather than laboring for the next few years trying to raise money. It seems to me that it’s ready to go and there’s no reason why there can’t be a resourceful construction project right under way without trying to sabotage the relationship with the community. I’m just puzzled...Does that make any sense to you?

Director Dykeman: Russ, we did meet, and some of us have met on numerous occasions, for a number of hours with some really fine, young women to hammer out a final agreement of things that we could agree on (21 points). And then the minute that happened, that got shot down by the recall folks. So, we did...Lynn was part of it, they were wonderful we had a great 7 hours of discussion over 2 days. And only 2 of us can meet at a time. This time it was Charlie and I. And then after all that they said, oh well, it didn’t make any difference, they’re going to do it anyway.

Russ Campbell: I think the reason I came over tonight was not because of a factual basis but simply had you been in San Jose and California, and I was struck by how a divided community even on project 104

could linger for decades there is still talking about this, and I came about with this suggestion, and Wayne is way ahead of me on my thinking of this, but isn't there some kind of device where we can be brought to an end, brought to a conclusion and move forward with construction, and maybe we need the Canyon Courier to be more active in terms of presentation, but there are still so many people who are still angered over the burning and the smoke, and I'm just puzzled over why this has been labored over for so long, as a citizen. There has to be some formula, and end to this sort of thing. I can't believe anybody is suggesting fundraising in the middle of major recession in America, amazing, preposterous. Why would you want to go out and reinvent the thing, I still believe the firefighters know exactly what they need and what they've pined for a long time. Do you agree? Why do we need me or anybody to disagree, they're opinion is very valid, I'm just astounded this could labor on, I think people are just trying to buy time for other reasons frankly. I have to be careful what I say, I have to be diplomatic but I do think there are people who...I've seen it with the Albertson's project, defer defer, defer, nothing will happen, nothing will change, they want to keep the same community that they remember from the 1930s (or '67).

Director Dykeman: Russ I don't know how you get around here, I really don't

Russ Campbell: Well we get around it by building this project (laughter and applause).

Director Dykeman: I don't know what kind of city manager you were..

Russ Campbell: I was a very good city manager, I put in a mall and everything in 9 months....Why are we discussing this any further? I don't see the advantage in deferring this thing one more minute, it doesn't make any sense to me logically or fiscally. The ideas out here...Don't get me wrong, there are some long range objects but the some short range objective is to follow through with the bond issues that have been floating around, with the fiscal allocations, but I don't know why we've been lingering over this for so long. Don't get me wrong, I have the most respect for Wayne Shepherd he's one of the finest men I've met up here.....but to put a halt to this thing and pay the consequences. If there's a recall, there's a recall but it's not going to shut down the project. But I think there are good people involved who could participate in a committee or some other sort of action group to get this thing resolved in 30 days, otherwise it's just going to go on and on with more inventive deferment of a major project breakthrough in our beautiful little village here.

Lynn Rehkopf: I have two things I want to say...This is no disrespect to what you have said before, but I live in the area. This is considered an activity center, we have trails and bike paths and ball fields and as neighbors we have all accepted the activities going on at this facility. The problem is when you talk about putting a burn building in you're taking the most intense exercises and putting them into this site. The neighbors were already kind of exasperated with the lights and the noise and the smells and the odors going on, and it's not just the neighbors who live immediately adjacent, it's the people who are on the trails and over fishing in the ponds. So as a community we accepted what was going on here because we like our firefighters, but to bring in this very intense activity into the site I think that's what the community is objecting to. You've said, ok we're at this level and we can cope with it, but we're not sure we want to cope with this level anymore.

Russ Campbell: I saw another factor, I saw it in aspen too, there were people who were literally trying to scare the hell out of the community, they didn't give a damn.

Lynn Rehkopf: So my next question is to the men and ladies in the back, and also to the firefighters sitting here. I'm the one who started asking about the middle ground, where's the middle ground, and in the very nice letter written by Dan, the community thinks the middle ground is to wait and look for another facility, but you think that it's to go ahead and build. So we're close, but we're not quite at that middle ground I was talking about. So I guess the question is, how do we both take a step forward, is there a way to do that?

Lt. Swinden: Go ahead and build the training facility, put a committee together and look for a long term solution, like you said. There needs to be a couple things; from a financial standpoint, from an operational standpoint, from the communities standpoint as to where it needs to be. You talked about the EDS location, we were just chatting about that...it's a Denver Mountain Park area, that area is actually leased and not for sale. The question is, from a long term perspective, this might be incentive for the long term committee to find a good place. In the meantime, we get the training that we need. Everybody in this room is a firefighter, and we're the ones putting our lives on the line, we're the ones risking disability from an event every day. A Genesee firefighter lost her finger last Saturday. We're the ones who go in without question to fight the fire. We're asking the community, we're willing to put our lives at risk and we need to train, is that too much to ask?

Dan Koller: It's not a question of where and how. (To you it is). Coming back to... we can find a way to get back together, no more splitting, no more group against group, just working together to find a perfect location... So why not just do frequent burn training...

FF Wadleigh: How do we know how long that will take?

Dan Koller: But I'm saying if we set that as a common goal, we'll work this out... If you guys build your burn building here as motivation to find a long term solution then all the people seeking a long term solution would still feel that you were opposed to their building against your building.

Director Kling: We'll take 3 more comments and then we're moving on.

Deborah Evens: I guess what I don't understand, from what I've seen and what I've heard all the compromise has been asked of the district board and the fire department. I haven't seen those who are opposed to this training facility really stand up and try to make a compromise. And it was said a little bit ago, if we build the burn building, it's a training facility that will occasionally have burning done there, not every time we train there. But if we build there it was said earlier, then we won't get the support to find another location. Well to me that's saying that those opposed are not willing to make a compromise, that all the compromise needs to be on the department and the board, and I think when you talk about meeting in the middle somewhere, compromise isn't something that happens one sided. If we build this building and we look at other locations why can't that be a compromise? Because you are helping the firefighters get the training that they need. You are creating safety for the community at the same time. To me it's really simple. It doesn't have to be so complicated.

Michelle Parker: I am going to tag on to that. I didn't get involved in this process until the recall came about. I don't care where it the building is, I care about training, deeply. What benefit does this recall have?

Dan Koller: The recall is the only method the citizens that are strongly opposed to this project and are not happy with the direction of the EFDP have to try to have a say.

Michelle Parker: There has been only interaction for the last hour and 23 minutes.

Dan Koller: If you listened to what I said, it was they haven't been satisfactory.

Michelle Parker: They haven't been satisfactory to you and you alone.

Director Simons: Dan, let me ask you a question. What are you going to do if you are successful in the recall? What is your objective? What are you going to do if you are sitting up here on this board?

Dan Koller: I'm not the recall.

Director Simons: No but you are speaking to it. The reason I am asking the question let's assume the recall is successful. We're gone. The people that take our place are going to have to make some decisions and I think the community needs to know what those decisions are going to be. Are they going to ban all burning here? That's what I have seen proposed. The only alternative is to go down the hill to burn and train. These people are not going to go down the hill every Monday night to train. Within two years I guarantee you Evergreen will have a paid fire department and you talk about mil levy going up! That's why I am asking you the question. The people that are mounting the recall, what are they going to do, what do they have in mind? I think the community has a right to know.

Dan Koller: You know there are options. There is the option of changing the model from volunteer to mixed. That is something that nobody has talked about or wants to talk about.

Director Kling: Actually we discussed that very regularly.

Director Dykeman: You did talk about it. In an email on 8 December you said that you wanted to start managing the daily hours.

Dan Koller: I didn't say I wanted to start managing. I said, what I suggested was we find room to somehow work on schedules to allow firefighters to train at the existing facility.

Director Dykeman: I'm sorry, I just quoted you. (reading from printed copy) "managing volunteer daily hours and on call shifts." That came right out of your email.

Dan Koller: So now you are saying that implies I am talking about...(indistinct response)

Dan Murphy: I just want to say something. This is a perfect example of what this burn building has done to this community. It's so bad. I sent this letter out and what I put in that letter I believe and I got return emails one from an 82 year old woman telling me I am wasting my time because the board won't listen to you. This can't keep going on. It takes leadership, and what it amounts to is you need to form a committee composed of people on both sides and get out there, get realtors and the Rotary and find a place. Build something that is uncompromised. If you build that, this is going to go on and on. People are attacking people both ways. That's not what this communities about. So stand up and lead and stop this arguing and this controversy in this community. The firefighters need a burn building case closed. The only other thing you got to decide is where you're going to put it. Don't put it where its going to cause all

this damn controversy, and don't put it in somebody else's backyard. Go out and buy the land and put it up. That's what we are about here in Evergreen. We do things right. We rally around and support things. I sat here and watched a developer that had 300 acres that he had every right to build on and people decided that they didn't want that so he said make me an offer. So 1.7 million and 18 months later we bought it. That's what this community is about. Not this bickering that goes on and on. Let's get it done and do it. And all the other stuff, we don't have the money and we can't find a place. That isn't about leadership. It's about going out and finding it, and it's there. And if its not there that would be a very sad thing. But I know there's a piece of property out there. This bickering got to stop.

Director Kling: Dan you want our public comment?

Dan Koller: No

Director Kling: Paul?

Paul Peil: No I have no comment. (Mr. Koller and Mr. Peil left the meeting)

Director Kling: Mr. Gottsman?

Bob Gottsman: I've done enough bickering for tonight.

Director Kling: Mr. Novick?

FF Novick: I just want to provide a couple comments because I was at the King Soppers on Saturday, and I was accused of being confrontational. I just want to express to the board and the community that I was in no way confrontational. I did have a couple conversations and you told me point blank that you thought we should only train once every three years because that's all that was required. (Indistinct overlapping voices responded and countering each other) I also wanted to comment, Paul Peil, and it's too bad he left the room, he asked me to read a document that was on his tablet and I started reading it and it was full of lies and misinformation because that document accused this entire board of being appointed and that is not true. There's only two that were originally appointed and they have been subsequently elected either once or twice. Paul's document stated that every member had been appointed. My point is that the opposition has been full of misrepresentations in this scenario and I just wanted to say I was not confrontational in any way.

Chief Ashford: Most of you know that I do represent the leadership for the volunteer organization. You need to hear from the volunteers about this recall. I am looking at these guys right here (the board) and there is like 60 years of emergency services here. Someone said listen to the firefighters. These (the board) are also firefighters. Sunday morning at 3:30 we had 12 firefighter go to Genesee to help them out. That left 82 firefighters back in district. That is because this board's experience supports us, provides us the equipment. The 103 fire had 50 firefighters on a wildland fire that was going to take Soda Creek and all the way to Floyd Hill. We are the only department that can do that. I measure ourselves and compared to the other mountain departments we are the premier department. This board has provide the equipment, the support, and the emotional support. There are paid fire departments that wish they were us. So when I look at some of these lies and stupid things being said, the inferences, the emails, that want to dismantle this organization and replace some of these board members is a disservice, unwise, and is ***** stupid. I have been through different boards. These people are listening to us (firefighters). If we replace them with a couple of single issue people it's going to be devastating for this community. You can't have enough paid firefighters to sit around for an average of 6 calls a day. What a waste of money, and that's my money. I want the word to get out through Sandy, that it's a foolish thing for these people to do. It's a shame to waste this money. Build the building, if we can do something with it later, fine. When I have these people going inside burning buildings, you talk about our safety the biggest problem is going and getting Mr. Gottsman out of his second floor bedroom. It's idiotic to think of spending \$70,000 because of a single issue and put some uninformed people up here. It's going to have a dramatic impact. These people (the firefighters) will probably leave. They won't be motivated or supported. So lets build the building, let's get it done. That's leadership. Thanks.

Director Simons: My advice would be to do as Lynn has suggested and do it in a good faith manner. And let's get on with this project. We go and look for a place and we live up to our commitment and we'll do what we say we'll do. And if there's not a place then we will have our training building and our safety factor built in. Now that's my compromise and that's what I am going to do. (Applause)

Director Kling: That's the end of public comment. The division report is next.

DIVISION REPORTS:

Administration/ HR/ IT:

- 2013 Calendars have been printed and are available in Dispatch for those who want one. A box will be at the EVFD meeting for pick up.
- Email has gone out for Sexual Harassment Training, thank you Eva
- Radio project: microwave dishes have been installed along with equipment on Squaw and Buchanan sites. Contract is in the hands of UASI for the infrastructure. We are beginning discussions with Xcel regarding possible interference issues with our new Ch. 1 to resolve. We received additional grant funding through UASI for \$235,000 with Evergreen required to give a \$78,000 match. This will make up the cost overrun with the project. We received our waiver approved by the FCC, giving us a 6 month extension beyond Jan. 1 to narrow band.
- Bar coding program will be implemented in Jan. Abandoning Red Beam. We will start medical supplies. Radio equipment was used for the test of the system.
- Trisha Major will be helping Eva with payroll/administration duties.

Communications:

- 911 phone system/Cassidian cut over live date is December 12th.
- Looking at other applicants to hire and train for the part time employee slots.
- Training for the new reverse emergency notification program "CodeRED" Dec 7th and Dec 10th Will be implemented by the end of the year, giving us the ability to launch an emergency notification.
- 911 calls received for November = 329
- Admin calls received for November = 2058
- A Holiday Donation Box will be located in dispatch for EChO's Outreach Program.
- Evergreen will be involved in a study being conducted by JCECA and a consultant which will cover how to best handle the 9 dispatch centers in Jeffco.

Emergency Medical Services:

- Congratulation to Sylvia for completing her national certification in ambulance billing. She now is a certified coder through the National Academy of Ambulance Coding.
- St Anthony's has given the EMS division their blessing to be a pilot training site for their state certification EMT school. The EMS division, with Annie Dorchak heading it up, will be running and teaching the entire course starting in March. This will be Tuesday night, Thursday night and every other Saturday through July with all proceeds being retained helping to offset the financial EMS impact on the general budget.
- We will be planning a billing, documentation, and caller intake audit for Feb / March
- Tony and Doug are working on a school MCI exercise for January 12th to be held at Station 2.
- The State of Colorado is now doing all of our delinquent account collections with some very positive early results. In one month deposited 1/3 of what the private collections deposited in one year.
- CPR classes have taught nearly 700 community members CPR and AED since Feb. Great job!

Fire Prevention:

- Christmas with Fire Fighters, 15 Dec 12, at Wal Mart 10-noon.
- Jefferson County will be going to the 2012 International Building, Fire, and Residential Codes in Jan/Feb time frame. A resolution to the EFPD board to go adopt this code change will be brought to a public meeting once County Commission approves. Pond hockey Tournament, Evergreen Lake, 31 Dec 2012, 8 am to 2 pm.
- Skate the Lake, 31 Dec 2012, 6pm-midnight
- We will begin doing drawing reviews for Foothills Fire and will also be signing an IGA with Elk Creek to provide fire prevention services for them due to budget cuts in their district.

Maintenance:

- The enhanced ventilation system at station #4 will be completed the first week of December. The system will help to insure a constant exchange of air within the facility.
- HVAC control systems have been failing within the administrative facility. Enhancements have been made through the process of attrition that will reduce energy consumption while improving comfort. The costs will be recovered within 24 months.

- Following extensive testing utilizing state resources, the water quality at station #4 was found to be very good quality. Contaminant concentrations are safely below risk levels.
- Resumes for the third maintenance technician have been reviewed, interviews held, and a candidate selected. Colton Langlois will join the maintenance Division next week.
- In preparation for the sale of Tanker 2, EFR is attempting to retroactively acquire a title. The 1974 vintage apparatus was never titled and the process to do so now is laborious and frustrating. This process started with the state over a year ago and we don't see the light at the end of the tunnel yet. The goal is to have this document by April of 2013.
- The fleet of ambulances has been plagued by emissions related failures. The newer Ford chassis' are proving less reliable than anticipated primarily due to emission related equipment failure. While the majority of costs are covered by the manufacturer's warranty, the associated labor to porter the vehicles and down time are not. The performance of the Dodge offering is being monitored and may be considered in the future as an alternative.

Fire Operations:

- The Wildfire Risks continue in our district and throughout most of the state. Even with moderate moisture/snowfall, the fuel moisture rates are concerning long range. We have had several small wildland fires started by improper ash disposal habits, in addition to responding mutual aid to Dumont on a 4 acre fire. At the request of Jeffco EOC, We placed two rigs as available for the Fern Lake Fire.
- From JEFFCO Management this week: *"Latest update from Water Availability Task Force. The long term forecast shows decreased chances of precipitation throughout much of the state during the January through March time frame. The Climate Prediction Center also forecasts above average temperatures during the same time frame. This is consistent with a briefing by Jim Hubbard, USFS Deputy Chief for State & Private Forestry to the Governor's Office last week in which he expressed that the climatologists are predicting that next year's fire season (in Colorado) could be as bad as this year's... if not worse."*
- Comment by DCFO: The districts wildland fire skill sets have greatly sharpened in the last two years, the combat mind sets that we are now seeing reminds me of 2002. The wildfires we have responded to within and outside of our boundaries along with budgeted support of classes and equipment have made the difference. Something we do not want to lose
- The retired reserve's insurance will be under VFIS, this allows for coverage of any duty related injuries including deployments. Target is once this insurance line item budget is approved, to implement beginning at the first of the year. Size of this group will likely be 6-8 reporting to the DCFO. Another advantage is the majority of these experienced firefighters are their availability during day hours.
- In-House wildland certification (Crew/Engine Boss) training will be hosted in the first quarter by Evergreen to include neighboring agencies. The instructor will be Bill Maron.
- Draft SOG for use of the training building and procedures, record keeping, check off lists for safety. Doug Saba, Chief Marshall and Johnson, FF O'Connell all worked on this document based off of 1403 Live Fire Training.

BOARD MEETING TOPICS:

The topics were updated to move all December deadlines forward to January.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Bond Refinance – moving forward rapidly. Will have a rating from Moody's on the 12th. Bonds will be priced on the 18th and closing documents will be signed on the 21st in Evergreen with the goal of getting this done this year. We are looking at a 12% savings on the remaining 6 million in the bond.

The specification for the training building has been revised to reflect the removal of the 4th floor and has reduced the cost approximately \$7,500.

Director deDisse made an appropriation to approve spending authorization 2012-0017. Director Dykeman seconded; the appropriation passed unanimously.

The amount of \$186,000 will come from the bond capital fund which will close out the remaining amount from the bond issue. The balance will come from strategic capital.

Spalding has placed the two trees now and have notified us that the retaining wall will need to be revised into one island which will increase the amount of the retaining wall by approximately \$5,000. The cost will be applied to the total cost of the building. The retaining wall will assist in keeping the new trees from sliding down the steep slope and hold them at the base of the wall.

NEW BUSINESS:

None

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

Director Christensen: Let's keep perspective our job is life safety, property savings and fire. We don't start benefiting from better training and safety until we get the building up so let's go forward. If there is a better site that should come out we look at what it would take to make a better site. We look at it open minded, it's a win win. If that happens down the road we go forward. And thank you guys for being willing to go in those buildings for us.

Director Dykeman: I want to thank Chief Ashford for your comments. I will speak for me. I feel badly that this recall is going to happen. I don't think it should. I think the things that they have said about the volunteers are so far off the wall it just makes me mad too. It upsets me that they would call volunteers names on emails that are open to everybody. Poor Lynn has worked awful hard to try to come up with a plan that was satisfactory and I think she did but I just knew that sooner or later it would be said, that's a nice plan but we still don't want you to build. We don't do this for the pay and we represent 40,000 people and we have to make decisions that are best for the district. And we do that fiscally for sure or we wouldn't have the rating we've got. Obviously it takes Mike and finance staff and everybody but this is a great department. Well managed, well run, great people and they don't deserve this. This community does not deserve this.

Director Simons: We all worked very hard with Lynn and she is the one that is closest to this and she is working the hardest to see if we can come up with a viable plan. For my part I am going to continue what we can do to see if we can't put together what she envisions and I would like to ask the firefighters, the board, the community to really see what we can do. I stated my compromise and I am willing to work hard on behalf of a new site. Let's hope that everything in the community stays out and let's stop the back biting emails to each other.

Director Kling: First Merry Christmas and Happy New Year. It's been another great year in the safety that you provide the community and each other. In Mr. Murphy's comments he spoke of leadership and he had some valid points but it might have been a little late but his points were valid nonetheless. I want to say that I take 100% responsibility for the continuation of us trying to work with the community. I've thought a hundred times that it would have been better if we had just built the thing 6 months ago. I've always thought that reasonable people could get together and talk things to a better position. And I think when Charlie is done with this effort it's likely we might but I think it will be 4 to 5 years out and we've done a good job of long term planning. I will personally take, recall or not, the continuation of this process. We didn't get to where I would have liked us as a community for us to have gotten but it wasn't for lack of trying. It's been said many times that we sealed communication, that we didn't talk, but Chick counted up that there were 52 meetings before this week since the middle of last February. Dan was right it is leadership and in my opinion leadership was trying to get it as right as we could. I think the solution is when you heard it being discussed tonight, one half of the group is about esthetics and the other side is about safety. We were empowered and made the decision makers because we have to balance that. With the five up here, working with Mike and the rest of the organization we've done that and it's a little too late as a result but it was with good intentions.

Director deDisse: Being a volunteer I really appreciate your support and everything else you've come along with. The other people that supported this and everything that has gone since February, you came to us wanting the building and we fought back, you came to us again and we fought back, we're where we are now and I think we're making the right decision. We're just going to have to keep fighting for that decision.

Director Simons: Be it resolved that the Evergreen Fire Protection District Board supports the long term goals of finding a resolution to the training building site for improved training to be developed, compatible

and agreeable to the community with a long term view to building a training facility that meets the needs, and is acceptable to the fire department.

Director Christensen seconded the resolution; the resolution passed unanimously.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: Director Dykeman made a motion to go into executive session per 24-6-402(4)(f) CRS to discuss personnel matters pertaining to the Chief. The motion was seconded by Director Christensen; the motion passed. The Board went into executive session at 9:34 PM.

BACK IN SESSION: The meeting was back in open session at 9:54 PM.

MOTION TO ADJOURNED: Director deDisse made a motion to adjourn the meeting; Director Christensen seconded; the motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 9:55 PM.

NEXT METING DATES:

Regular District Board Meeting: January 8, 2013 – 7:00 PM in Training Room A & B

401a Pension Board Meeting: January 8, 2013 6:30 PM in Training Room A & B

Respectfully Submitted,
Carol Hucker
Senior Administrative Specialist