

**SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM**

DATE: July 8, 2018

FROM: Brian O'Connor and John Kelly, Ottosen Britz Kelly Cooper Gilbert & DiNolfo, Ltd.

SUBJ: Assessment of Service Proposals presented by the City of Lake Forest-Village of Libertyville and the Village of Lake Bluff

Ref: Memorandum, May 14, 2018, same subject

President Rogers asked that I solicit comments from Rockland Fire Protection District (District) Board of Trustees (collectively Board, individually Trustee) and our firm assess supplemental service proposals received from the City of Lake Forest-Village of Libertyville (City) revised June 26, 2018, and the Village of Lake Bluff (Village) and the Village of Lake Bluff dated July 6, 2018. Copies of the City and Village supplemental proposals are attached.

The original assessment Memorandum (Memo) referenced above noted three concerns of the District's Board discussed in public meetings on May 8, 2018 (for the original City proposal) and May 10, 2018 (for the original Village proposal), namely:

- **Cost** to the District pursuant to the proposal,
- **Response** to the District for services addressed in the proposal, and
- **Sustainability** by the District of each proposal.

For reasons stated below, the Memo's recommendation to maintain status quo stands pending clarification of details in each proposal noted below.

**Cost.** Both the City and Village proposals provide for an aggregate agreement cost. The City proposal suggests its proposal is calculated from the City perspective as the "fair share" for the services to be provided. The Village proposal similarly offers only an aggregate cost for the services provided under the proposal.

While "fair share" of costs is a proper consideration, so are other considerations not addressed in either City or Village proposals: what is the cost to provide the services?

- What is the current level of services provided by the District, City and Village at what annual cost?
- What is the fiscal year budget to provide services? City and Village should include the fire department's "fair share" of other municipal support provided: finance, human resources, legal, etc.

Proper assessment requires the following data for FY 17/18 (May 2017 through April 30, 2018):

Entity	Fire Calls	EMS Calls	Tech Rescue & HazMat Calls	MABAS Responses Provided	MABAS Responses Received	Fire Dept. FY Budget
District						
City						
Village						
	Cost per Call	Cost per Call <sup>1</sup>	Cost per Call <sup>2</sup>			
District						
City						
Village						

<sup>1</sup> – Note if Including/Excluding "Treatment and Transport" Reimbursement

<sup>2</sup> – Note if Including/Excluding "Tech Rescue" and "Special Rescue" and "HazMat" Reimbursement

**Response.** This topic requires further clarification. The response times provided for all proposals addressed in the Memo's assessments presume identified fire stations are staffed and equipped. Diversion of staff and equipment from a listed station will dramatically impact response times for any of the Memo's three options.

Review of the response times provided in the Memo suggest optimal response is achieved with staffed and equipped engine and ambulance companies at the District's fire station and Libertyville Fire Protection District's Station #3 (Station #3) or as an alternate possibility from North Chicago Fire Station #2.

Option 1 (status quo: District fire and tech rescue, Libertyville EMS).

- District fire and tech rescue/HazMat response is provided by daytime paid-on-premise (POP) and evening POP/paid-on-call (POC) staff responding with District equipment from the District's station.
- District EMS response is provided by contract with the existing and functional Village of Libertyville fire department.
- This option optimizes coverage for the southeastern and southern portion of the District.
- Response to the District north of the Elgin, Joliet and Eastern Railway (Railway), including the Sanctuary Subdivision, may be compromised by unexpected railway traffic.
- Support from Station #3 would enhance response to the northern portions of the District and help minimize risk posed by presence of the Railway. North Chicago's Fire Station #2 might alternately provide coverage although with slower response due to distance from the District.
- Note Option 1 does not address the concern posed by Ill. Dept. of Transportation's (IDOT's) announced but unscheduled reconstruction of the US-41/IL-176 intersection.

Option 2 (joint District and Village fire, EMS and tech rescue, from District's station and Village's station).

- District fire and tech rescue/HazMat response is jointly provided by unstated District and Village POP and POC staffing from District's station and Village's station. Staffing details for each station to-be-established.
- District EMS response is provided by a to-be-established joint staffing of a jointly-owned ambulance, to be based at the District's station (daytime) and Village's station (evenings).
- This option continues to focus response to the southern areas of the District south of the Railway and is subject to same limits as posed by the Railway in Option 1.
- This option provides an alternative in the event of IDOT reconstruction action,

Option 3 (fire, EMS and tech rescue to District north of Railway by Village of Libertyville but south of Railway by the City of Lake Forest).

- Fire, EMS and tech rescue/HazMat response by full-time staff from Libertyville or Lake Forest stations.
- Response to northern District good from Station 3, but less so from other Libertyville stations.
- Response to southern District not as good from Lake Forest as from District or secondarily Village.
- Response to District is divided between jurisdictions.
- Provides built-in back-up response.
- Provides an alternative in the event of IDOT reconstruction action,

### **Sustainability.**

- All options require District continued financial commitment.
- Option 1 is sustainable with continued availability of qualified POP/POC staffing and equipment, and absent action by IDOT for reconstruction.
- Option 2 is sustainable with continued availability of qualified POP/POC staffing and equipment, and offers an alternative with action by IDOT for reconstruction.
- Option 3 relies on continuation of adequate financial resources to the District and offers a possible solution in the event of action by IDOT for reconstruction.

### **Other considerations.**

- Services start date(s).
  - Need to be agreed upon and coordinated well before date of implementation.
  - Staff needs planning time to implement new response regimes, coordinate communications and dispatch procedures, coordinate EMS system approvals, etc.
  - Perhaps as phased approach with fire and tech rescue/HazMat preceding EMS services?
- Service term.
  - A multi-year approach by both Village and City is realistic and probably essential for all parties.
  - Annual term coincide with District fiscal year (May 01 through following April 30)?
- Termination/Opt-out.
  - Agreement needs an opt-out for parties, in the event of global changes, but opt-out needs to provide adequate lead-time for notice: perhaps not less than one calendar year from date non-terminating party receives notice from terminating party?
- Stations and staffing.
  - Clarification/definition needed.
  - Which services will be provided from which stations?
  - What level of normal station staffing (acknowledging possibility of conflicting prior calls)?
  - What equipment at stations?
  - Both proposals suggest 24/7 staffing either by POP/POC (in Village proposal) or full-time (in City proposal).
- Supplementary revenues.
  - Need to incorporate/address supplement reimbursements from treatment and transport, tech rescue and HazMat fees in proposal cost structures.