New Service Delivery Strategies: collaboration, shared services, and more -- webinar
2:00 – 3:30 p.m. PT, Thursday, September 13, 2012
Cal-ICMA Coaching Program

*** Advance registration required for this no-charge webinar:
https://www1.gotomeeting.com/register/709448873

Presenters:
* Bob Bell, City Manager, Redwood City, CA
* Regina Falkner, Director, Los Gatos-Saratoga Recreation Dept., Los Gatos, CA
* Demetrious Shaffer, Interim Fire Chief, Alameda County, CA

Panel Discussion Topics:
1. What are new models for agencies to deliver services?
2. What roles can collaboration, shared services, and contracted services play in these plans?
3. How do you engage your community and staff in considering these models?
4. What are the nuts and bolts of developing and implementing new service delivery models?
5. What are important lessons learned and key factors for success?
6. What resources are available to help local agencies evaluate the opportunities and develop their approaches?

We’ll be using webinar tools (including real-time questions and live polling) to make this a great opportunity for audience interaction.

Audience: all employees

1. Register in advance for the webinar:
There is no charge for participating in the webinars, but each requires advance registration.
*** Advance registration required for this no-charge webinar:
https://www1.gotomeeting.com/register/709448873

2. Connect with the webinar and audio:
Use your logon information from the email confirmation you receive via email from GoToWebinar. We recommend the telephone option dial-in number provided by GoToWebinar for sound quality. Depending upon your internet connection, VOIP option for audio (computer speakers) can have delays or sound quality issues.

3. Ask questions:
You may submit questions anonymously via email to Cal-ICMA@DonMaruska.com in advance or via the webinar during the panel discussion. As moderator for the session, Don Maruska will pose the questions.
4. Presenters’ presentation materials:
We post these with the agenda at “Live Audio & Archives” tab of www.cal-icma.org/coaching. The PPT will be available about 2 hours before the webinar.

After a webinar occurs, a digital recording along with the PowerPoint materials and results of the polling questions will be available within 24 hours at the "Live Audio & Archives" tab of www.cal-icma.org/coaching.

Post-Webinar Group Discussions

Many agencies are organizing groups to participate in the webinars (live or recorded) and discuss the topics among themselves after the webinars. Some are summarizing their discussions and distributing them to managers throughout their organizations. Use the Cal-ICMA Coaching Program as an effective way to enhance professional development in your agency. Here are some discussion starters for this session.

1. What new service delivery strategies sound promising for our agency?
2. What have we learned about key factors for success that would be relevant for us?
3. What are next steps for tapping resources and exploring our interests?

MORE RESOURCES--See the "Coaching Corner" at www.cal-icma.org/coaching for valuable resources to boost your career. Sign up for the complimentary email list to keep informed of future sessions and resources at www.cal-icma.org/coachingList.

We appreciate the sponsors for the Cal-ICMA Coaching Program. They include:
Platinum Sponsors: CA Communities Joint Powers Authority, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, and Chevron
Gold Sponsor: California City Management Foundation
Silver Sponsors: California Redevelopment Association, Colorado City and County Management Association, County Administrative Officers Association of California, Municipal Management Association of Northern California (MMANC), Public Agency Retirement Services (PARS), and Granicus
Bronze Sponsors: California Special Districts Association, Carl Warren & Company, County Personnel Administrators Association of California (CPAAC), Davenport Institute for Public Engagement at Pepperdine’s School of Public Policy, Liebert Cassidy Whitmore, Municipal Management Association of Southern California (MMASC), Stone and Youngberg, and the Arizona City/County Management Association

Enjoy the resources and support to thrive in local government.

Don Maruska, Master Certified Coach
Director, Cal-ICMA Coaching Program
See "Coaching Corner" at www.cal-icma.org/coaching
Biographical Sketches provided by presenters:

**Bob Bell**, City Manager of Redwood City

Bob Bell has over 20 years of management and human resources experience in both the private and public sectors. Before being appointed as Redwood City’s City Manager, he served as Assistant City Manager from 2005 through 2007, and then Interim City Manager from November, 2010, until his appointment in April, 2011.

During his career, he has held a variety of Human Resources leadership roles, specializing in the areas of recruitment, benefits and workers’ compensation, classification and compensation, and employee relations. Bob took over management the Human Resources Department in Redwood City in 2005 where he and his staff began expanding the City’s efforts in workforce planning, succession planning, and development initiatives.

Bob has a Bachelor’s degree in Organizational Behavior from the University of San Francisco, a Master’s degree in Public Administration from Cal State Northridge, and a PhD in Organizational Leadership from the University of San Francisco. He holds a Master Certification in Labor Relations from the California Public Employee Relations Association, was honored as the top municipal Human Resources Director in California when he was awarded the 2004 Career Leadership Award by the League of California Cities, and has been designated a Senior Professional in Human Resources from the Society of Human Resources Management.

**Regina Falkner**, Interim Executive Director, Los Gatos Recreation

Regina Falkner started her 30 year career in local government as a lifeguard at the City of Fremont’s Swim Lagoon. After two years in the City of Santa Clara’s Planning Department, she began work with the Town of Los Gatos in its Community Services Department. It was there that Regina honed her skills as a generalist. She served the Town as the Community Service Director for over 20 years managing a broad spectrum of services including: para-transit, housing rehabilitation, grant administration, public art, solid waste management, household hazardous waste management, affordable housing, volunteer coordination, special events, sustainability, and senior services.
Last year Regina was appointed as the Town’s Deputy Town Manager responsible for special projects. She is currently on loan to Los Gatos-Saratoga Community Education and Recreation as its Interim Executive Director. Regina has also represented the Community Services Department on the League of California Cities Board of Directors. Among her recent accomplishments Regina counts sending her daughter off to college, riding her bike from Tahoe to San Francisco, and swimming from Alcatraz three times.

Demetrious Shaffer, Interim Fire Chief, Alameda County

Interim Fire Chief Demetrious N. Shaffer has been a lifelong resident of the Bay Area where he currently lives with his wife Alicia and three children ages 2, 3 and 8. He has earned four degrees including an Associate’s in Fire Science Technology, Bachelor’s in Fire Prevention, Bachelor’s in Fire Administration, and a Master’s in Public Administration. Chief Shaffer is a State certified Chief Officer, Instructor, and Fire Investigator.

During his more than twenty years in the California fire service, Chief Shaffer has promoted through the ranks from Reserve Firefighter with the City of Campbell to Fire Chief with the City of Newark. Through his advocacy for regional fire services, the Newark Fire Department recently merged with the Alameda County Fire Department where Chief Shaffer is now serving as Interim Fire Chief.

As a fire service professional, Chief Shaffer has spoken before the State Senate Rules Committee, Assembly Appropriations, and the State EMS Commission, and he regularly serves as the emcee for large community events and fundraisers. He has worked on campaigns to stop domestic violence, raised money for the local hospital district, and has worked with youth as a high school tutor and mentor for several years.

Chief Shaffer currently serves as the President of the California Fire Chiefs Association, President of the Washington Hospital Healthcare Foundation and is the immediate past President of the Alameda County Fire Chief’s Association and the League of California Cities Fire Chiefs’ Department. Additionally, he has been an adjunct faculty member at Cogswell College since 2006 teaching Community Risk Reduction and Advanced Fire Administration and serves on the Board of Directors for the League of California Cities.

In his spare time, Chief Shaffer enjoys tinkering with classic muscle cars, riding and building motorcycles, and putting his skills to the test in carpentry. His favorite way to spend his time is with his wife and children who mean everything to him.
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Polling Question #1

How many people are participating at your location?
Overview of Session

1. What are new models for agencies to deliver services?
2. What roles can collaboration, shared services, and contracted services play in these plans?
3. How do you engage your community and staff in considering these models?
4. What are the nuts and bolts of developing and implementing new service delivery models?
5. What are important lessons learned and key factors for success?
6. What resources are available to help local agencies evaluate the opportunities and develop their approaches?

Bob Bell, City Manager, Redwood City, CA

Regina Falkner, Interim Exec. Dir., Los Gatos-Saratoga Recreation

Demetrious Shaffer, Interim Fire Chief, Alameda County

Don Maruska, Director, Cal-ICMA Coaching Program

…and polls and questions along the way.
Polling Question #2

What topics are of particular interest to you?
NEW SERVICE DELIVERY STRATEGIES
Models, Framework & Key Learnings

Bob Bell
City Manager
City of Redwood City
1. Share a common definition of new service delivery models.

2. Define types of new service delivery models.

3. A framework for evaluating new service delivery opportunities.

4. Give 3 real world examples of new service delivery models and the process we went through and are going through here in Redwood City.

5. Share some lessons learned.
Any Internal or external service delivery collaboration that is both more effective and efficient than current practice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODEL</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Functional consolidation</td>
<td>Jointly operate a service or sub service without formally merging or combining.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Single service JPA/district</td>
<td>Multi-agency service provider that provides service throughout region. Typically has it’s own governance structure, by-laws, and agreements with member agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Contract for service</td>
<td>Where one or more cities/districts contract with one other city or private company for provision of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Public-Private Partnership</td>
<td>Public agency collaborative with a private firm to provide services to community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organizational adaptive change models</td>
<td>Creating culture of organizational assessment /presentation and process improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Polling Question #3

Which of the new service delivery model types are of interest to your agency?
FRAMEWORK FOR NEW SERVICE DELIVERY MODEL

ID PROBLEM OR SERVICE AREA

DESired STATE

STAKEHOLDERS

DATA & INFORMATION NEEDS

PROJECT TEAM

INTERESTS & VALUES

RESOURCES

POLICIES/MOU’S SWOT ANALYSIS

ANALYSIS RECOMMENDATIONS EVALUATIONS
NEW SERVICE DELIVERY MODEL FRAMEWORK

STAKEHOLDERS
- LIKELY PARTNERS
- POLITICAL
- COMMUNITY
- ORGANIZATION
- UNIONS

DATA NEEDS
- FINANCIAL
- HR
- PERFORMANCE MEASURES
- LEGAL

PROJECT TEAM
- SERVICE EXPERTISE
- FINANCIAL
- LEGAL
- PROJECT MANAGER
COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS

BENEFITS OF SHARED SERVICES

• Potential for cost savings, increased efficiency, and maintaining or improving services.

• Opportunities for cities to learn from one another and share their particular expertise/equipment.

• Enhanced communications and cooperation among cities.

• Allowing closest emergency service provider to respond regardless of jurisdiction.

• Opportunities for creative approaches and innovative thinking.

• Opportunity to consolidate management and rethink expensive entitlements.

• Smaller cities especially might have access to better service equipment.
COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS
CONCERNS OF SHARED SERVICES

- Will savings pan out, and/or will service levels go down?
- Loosing local control of identity
- Fall out from culture clashes
- Losing jobs, good employees with useful skills
- How will combined services represent divergent values/philosophies of cities involved?
- “Little fish in bigger pond” phenomenon can de-motivate staff; lower staff morale
- Could be unfair if one city benefits more than another
- Could lose institutional knowledge
COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS
GUIDING PRINCIPLES

• Maintain or improve service levels and quality
• Engage residents (ongoing) to inform the process, reduce anxiety, ensure smooth transition
• Start small, go slowly, make sure it will save money and not have unintended consequences
• Look for successful models/best practices first, do cost benefit analysis
• Each city sharing services should pay their fair share each year
• Try to minimize negative impacts on local jobs and economy
• Explore and protect core issues/vision/desires for each involved
• Consider human as well as financial impacts
• Put residents first; make sure it's the best way to meet the needs of the community
NEW SERVICE DELIVERY EXAMPLES:

- Functional Consolidation
  - San Mateo County Regional Training & Development Consortium

- Public/Private Partnership
  - Redwood City and Silicon Valley YMCA joint, multi-generational facility analysis

- Organization Adaptive Change Models
  - Employee Cohorts
Functional Consolidation
San Mateo County Regional Training & Development Consortium
ORGANIZATION ADAPTIVE CHANGE MODELS

Employee Cohorts
Four Cohorts include:

The 4 topics assigned to each cohort include:

- Administrative Processes
- Budgeting & Purchasing
- Technology
- Employee Engagement
KEY LEARNINGS

• Know what you’re trying to accomplish

• Assign a project manager/leader and give them the resources they need to analyze/implement

• Relationships are key- partnerships

• Know what your Council and Community will tolerate/accept and what they won’t!

• Establish performance measures/indicators and feedback
LIST OF MATERIALS

• Annual Report Training Consortium
• Report on Community Shared Services Sessions
• Contract For Services – Fire Management Services
NEW SERVICE DELIVERY STRATEGIES

Regina Falkner
Deputy Town Manager
Town of Los Gatos
Interim Executive Director
LGS Recreation
WEST VALLEY CITIES – 
A COLLECTION OF SMALL CITIES

West Valley Cities – a collection of small cities

- Town of Los Gatos (pop. 30,000)
- City of Campbell (pop. 40,000)
- City of Monte Sereno (pop. 3,400)
- City of Saratoga (pop. 30,400)

Challenge: how to provide spectrum of services with small staff and limited budgets
COOPERATIVE MIND-SET

- Police Services provided to Monte Sereno under contract
- Joint street pavement projects
- Exploring shared use of major equipment
- Fire Safety services provided by the County through agreement

Cooperative MOUs and Joint Powers Agencies
FOUR JPA’s:

Paratransit Services
Community Development Block Grant Program
Solid Waste Management Services
Community Education and Recreation
PARATRANSPORT SERVICES

- Three cities JPA
- Council Board
- Government funded
- Town staff
- Van services
- Centralized dispatch
- Personal service

COUNTY ISSUED RFP

- JPA responded
- Not the successful bidder
- Resulted in lay-offs
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM: COUNTY LEAD

- County Supervisors and City Council members
- Citizens Committee
- Staff Technical Advisory Committee
- Agreement stated revenue allocation
- County staff
- Agreement of fund split
COUNTY DETERMINED SIGNIFICANT SUBSIDY

- Performance audit
- Purchased and installed software
- City staff trained
- Consolidated advisory bodies, reduced meeting frequency
- Changes result in less city control—significantly less work
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT SERVICES

• Each of the 4 West Valley Cities in 20 year contracts
• Different city priorities
• Recycling Services added piecemeal – didn’t allow for economies of scale

BEFORE ISSUING NEW RFP DEVELOPED A JPA

• Consistency in programming and rates
• Addition of services
• Board reviews regional policies
LOS GATOS-SARATOGA COMMUNITY  
EDUCATION AND RECREATION

• JPA formed by three school districts in 1955 to provide swim lessons (Swim to Live); started Children’s holiday parade, and other recreational activities
• Seven member board includes three superintendents, four community members
• Expanded services in late 1970’s to include adult education, after school sports, summer school and camps; eventually added child care
• Initially tax supported; now fully self-funded, fee based: $7.5 million budget

Serve children and families:
• Over 1,500 children participated in academic or enrichment summer school this year
• Approximately 1,900 children are served at 13 child care sites
• Approximately 1500 children and adults participated in summer aquatics program
PARTNERSHIPS

Partner with school districts and Town for facility construction/operation:
• $100,000 for community swimming pool; LGSR staff manages all High School aquatics programs and agency aquatics program
• $800,000 community room; used for an array of recreation classes after school hours
• Enter land lease agreement with schools to locate and operate child-care facilities

Partner with Non-profit agency:
• Provide staff for local teen center

Partner with Town:
• Provide recreational activities at Town events such as the 4th of July celebration
• Borrow Town staff!
Welcome to Los Gatos - Saratoga Community Education and Recreation!

Come join the fun. With our amazing range of exciting programs and classes you and your family can participate in community activities of all kinds. There are hundreds of options that can enrich everyone at all ages and stages of life.

OUR MISSION:
Building a healthy community through enrichment, innovation and fun!

Youth Recreation Office Hours
120 East Main Street Los Gatos
Monday - Friday 8:00AM-5:00PM
Saturday & Sunday CLOSED
(408) 354-4979

Adult Recreation Office Hours
200 East Main Street Los Gatos
Monday-Friday 8:00AM-5:00PM
Saturday & Sunday CLOSED
(408) 297-4904
ADVANTAGES

• Avoid duplication of effort
• Better pricing – economies of scale
• Opportunities for service expansion

DISADVANTAGES

• Loose some control
• “Collaboration,” by some definitions, implies that the partners give something-up
AGREEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

• Identify Agreement. Consider spectrum of possible partners. Doesn’t need to be a neighboring city.
• Who serves on the Board of Directors? How are elected officials involved?
• Is there a lead participant? Is there a staff advisory board?
• Does the agency hire staff? (Strong staffing is key!)
• Are the participants assigned responsibilities?
SUGGESTIONS

- Hire good staff!
- Clearly state participant’s responsibilities
- Consider this a growth opportunity for staff to support council
  Collect data to measure performance
- Be clear about who assumes liability
- Include dissolution terms
- Include regular opportunities for review/evaluation
Polling Question #4

How have your agency’s new service delivery efforts performed?
Regional Fire Services Through Consolidations

September 13, 2012

Presented by:
Demetrious N. Shaffer, Interim Fire Chief
Objectives

• Discuss Regional Fire Service Delivery Models

• Identify the benefits of consolidated fire services

• Identify the key components in the decision to consolidate

• Identify the steps necessary to consolidate fire services
Fire Service Delivery Models

- Contract Fire Services
- Joint Powers Authority (JPA)
- JPA “Light”
- Full, Partial, or Functional Consolidation
Contract Fire Services

“The ACFD Way”

Contract Fire Services

• Dependent Special District formed in 1993
  • District overlays unincorporated areas of the County
  • Contract services provided to San Leandro, Dublin, Newark, Union City, Emeryville, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
Contract Fire Services
“The ACFD Way” (cont.)

Key Components

• Contract can be terminated at any time with approximately 1 year notice

• Contracting agency retains ownership of fire stations, apparatus, and equipment

• ACFD participates in the agency’s processes (budgeting, planning, meetings, etc.) as their former FD had

• ACFD uses a Direct Cost Allocation in combination with a Shared Cost Allocation

• Services, to an extent, can be customized

• Local identity is maintained
Benefits of Consolidated Fire Services

- Unified response
- Economies of scale
- Maintain local control
- Unmatched retention rate
- Eliminate duplication of effort
- Ability to provide specialized resources
- Unmatched depth and breadth of resources
- Broad-based funding and cost containment
- Centralized management of resources and training
- Standardized training, equipment, and radio interoperability
- Highly knowledgeable staff with a wide range of direct experience in an all-risk environment
Benefits of a Consolidated Fire Services (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire Departments Before the ACFD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden Consolidated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Fire Patrol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeryville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castro Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire Departments After the ACFD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Fire Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore - Pleasanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decision to Consolidate

- Agency must determine
  - Jurisdictional needs
  - Community goals
- Pros and Cons
- Fiscal Impact
  - One-time startup
  - Annual ongoing costs
  - Future CIP/Equipment Replacement
  - Unintended impacts to remaining departments
  - Future OPEB and Pension Liabilities
- Capacity of staff to manage the project
Decision to Consolidate (cont.)

Are the key stakeholders in alignment?
Have they been engaged (asked and educated)?

**City**
- Governing Body
- Community
- City Management
- Fire Management
- Labor

**Fire Department**
- Governing Body
- Community
- Partner Agencies
- Fire Management
- Labor
Polling Question #5

Is your agency interested in new service delivery models for police or fire?
Steps to Consolidate
[After the Decision to Consolidate]

- Joint labor management steering committee
- Determine if consultant is needed
- Identify concerns to be addressed early
  - Governance structure
  - Policy and decision making
  - Service level determination
  - Cost containment/control
  - Cost allocation methodology
  - Local identity
Steps to Consolidate (cont.)

[After the Decision to Consolidate]

- Establish performance measures
- Set post consolidation expectations
- Determine contract length and negotiate the critical terms
  - Employment
  - MOU provisions
  - Termination clause and timing
  - Equipment and CIP ownership
  - Your voice
Lessons Learned

- Do not underestimate the impact of emotions the closer to the “go-live” date and post consolidation
  - Fire and other employees of the consolidating City
  - Existing fire department employees
  - Community volunteers
- A “pencil – to – pencil” comparison is not effective
- Organizations on both sides must be prepared to adjust cultural expectations as the new entities are formed
- Do not underestimate the impact on staff time and workload
- Develop realistic timelines for implementation
Polling Question #6

How was the webinar of value to you?
Other states: Are you interested in an ICMA Coaching Partnership?

Some opportunities for State Associations:
1. Plug into proven infrastructure to serve you.
2. Suggest topics and invite volunteer presenters for participation in co-sponsored webinars.
3. Use template for state Coaches Gallery.
4. Use template for speed coaching at association and area managers’ meetings.
5. Customize with your own YouTube channel.

share your thoughts on the post-webinar survey.
Contacts for Today’s Session

- **Bob Bell**, City Manager, Redwood City, CA; bbell@redwoodcity.org
- **Regina Falkner**, Interim Exec. Dir., Los Gatos-Saratoga Recreation, CA; rfalkner@lgsrecreation.org
- **Demetrious Shaffer**, Interim Fire Chief, Alameda County, CA; Demetrious.Shaffer@acgov.org
- **Don Maruska**, Director, Cal-ICMA Coaching; Cal-ICMA@DonMaruska.com
Upcoming session

Adapting and Thriving Amidst Change

Cal-ICMA Coaching Program
2:00 – 3:30 p.m., PT, Wednesday, October 17

Registration is now open:
https://www1.gotomeeting.com/register/894524905
Resources and Feedback

Go to “Live Audio & Archives” tab at web sites for recordings of this webinar and other professional development resources.

www.cal-icma.org/coaching

Please complete the follow up survey.

Follow us online
Regional Training & Development
Consortium for Public Agencies
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I. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

Given the current budget crisis, there is a compelling and immediate need to share services among public sector agencies to save money while continuing efforts to develop the workforce. Unfortunately, during economic downturns, staff development and training programs become a lower priority and are often sacrificed to the long-term detriment of cities and the county.

As a result, twelve cities and the County of San Mateo collaborated on the design, formation and development of a Training Consortium. We believe that there are many benefits to such a Consortium in addition to saving time, resources and money. The Consortium enables agencies to:

- Continue to offer mandated and non-mandated programs at reduced costs and efforts to employees.
- Take advantage of more online programs.
- Improve enrollment and tracking of training participation.
- Improve collaboration and communication among member agencies.
- Create and sustain an environment for ongoing education.
- Continue the focus on succession planning and development.
- Improve budget forecasting for training needs.

II. MEMBER AGENCIES

Belmont  Foster City  San Carlos
Brisbane  Half Moon Bay  San Mateo
Burlingame  Hillsborough  South San Francisco
County of San Mateo  Pacifica
Daly City  Redwood City

Additionally, several agencies participated in consortium programs for a higher fee (Menlo Park, San Bruno, Pacific, Colma, Central County Fire)
III. STAFFING AND SUPPORT

The Working Committee, which meets monthly, supports the Consortium by conducting training needs assessments; developing policy recommendations to the governing body; seeking input from stakeholders and implementing programs and policies consistent with member agencies’ needs.

Representatives Rebecca Burnside, Foster City and Shawnna Maltbie, Daly City currently chair these meetings. Members include:

Cora Dino, City of Belmont,
Maria Saguisag-Sid, City of Brisbane
Leah Lockhart, City of Redwood City
Linda Spady, City of San Mateo
Teresa Henderson, San Mateo County.

These meetings are staffed with an Analyst and a contracted Facilitator:

Mary Welch – Contractor/Facilitator – Facilitation/Minute Taker/Develops Agenda
Anne Weiss, San Mateo County - Support to Facilitator and members

Both the Analyst and Facilitator are at no cost to the Consortium and are provided in-kind by San Mateo County. Additionally, several member agencies donate facilities for training courses and provide executive staff as course instructors.

The Governing Board provides leadership, and policy direction to the consortium. They meet quarterly and are responsible for evaluating and approving the fee structure and approving the annual work plan of the consortium.

The Board is composed of two members from the City/County Manager Association and two Human Resources Directors from the County Human Resources Association:

Tony Constantouros, Town of Hillsborough
Clay Holstine, City of Brisbane
Bob Bell, Redwood City
Donna Vaillancourt, County of San Mateo.

Additionally, the City of Redwood City serves as the Fiscal Agent to the Consortium and Leah Lockhart, Human Resources, is responsible for the billing, tracking and reporting, grant work and enrollment and evaluation functions.
IV. ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Key accomplishments during 2010-11 include:

- Developed and implemented governing structure and fee structure
- Designated a fiscal agent
- Secured membership agreements from the county and twelve cities
- Developed and conducted the following consortium training programs:
  - Public Sector Leadership Academy
  - Public Sector Supervisory Academy
  - Mastering Difficult Conversations
- Offered training to 198 local government employees, resulting in 5,144 hours of training
  - 99.7% of participant survey respondents rated overall satisfaction with services as good or better
  - 100% of participants are utilizing skills or reporting change in behavior after attending training classes
- Conducted a Request for Proposal and selected EmTrain for the Preventing Sexual Harassment online program
- Initiated the learning management system pilot for six cities
- Awarded a $25,000 grant from Cooperative Personnel Services (CPS)/IPMA-HR for innovative services (description below)

V. CPS/IPMA-HR INNOVATION AWARD

The Consortium received the 2010 CPS/IPMA-Human Resources Innovation Grant. The grant program is to “…support excellence in HR through recognition of contributions to public service that foster quality, fairness, equity, and solutions to organizational needs.”

The grant application included:

- Consortium History and Mission
- Current Challenges and Summary of Innovative Program
The Consortium was awarded this grant to continue efforts to fully implement, including:

- Developing and executing a contract for LMS vendor
- Finalizing timeline for LMS implementation
- Planning, developing and conducting consortium pilots
- Evaluating results of program

As the award-winning program, the Consortium will be announced at the IPMA-HR International Training Conference in October 2011 in Chicago Illinois, and will have the opportunity to present a session.
VI. LEARNING MANAGEMENT SYSTEM PILOT

In September 2010, the Consortium, through an existing agreement between the County of San Mateo and Cornerstone OnDemand, began implementing a Learning Management System (LMS) for its member-cities to provide easy access to all training and development programs for all entities. LMS offers several features including the capability of effectively tracking employee-training registrations/enrollments, providing employee transcripts and specialized reports.

There are currently six-member agencies participating in the LMS pilot: Belmont, Brisbane, Daly City, Foster City, Redwood City and San Mateo. Each city has designated two System Administrators to become subject matter experts for their respective city. The roles and responsibilities of the System Administrators include but are not limited to:

- Participating in Cornerstone/Consortium planning and design meetings
- Serving as the primary contact for LMS support for their employees
- Conducting regular and on-going user/system maintenance (e.g., password reset, transcript management, and proxy enrollment)
- Creating and managing any city sponsored training
- Running required reports, as necessary
- Conducting initial training on LMS and on-going training updates
- Troubleshooting/resolving LMS end-user problems

In December 2010, Cornerstone OnDemand representatives met with the six participating cities to review Cornerstone OnDemand’s work plan for training and implementation. And, in January 2011, Cornerstone OnDemand began offering and conducting weekly meetings with the City LMS System Administrators. The system “go live” date is set tentatively July 5, 2011.
VII. TRAINING PARTICIPATION

**PUBLIC SECTOR LEADERSHIP ACADEMY (2 OFFERINGS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th># of Participants</th>
<th>Training Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central County Fire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Mateo</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly City</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster City</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Moon Bay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacifica</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Participants</strong></td>
<td><strong>138</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,864</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUBLIC SECTOR SUPERVISOR ACADEMY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th># of Participants</th>
<th>Training Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Mateo</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly City</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster City</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacifica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,184</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MASTERING DIFFICULT CONVERSATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th># of Participants</th>
<th>Training Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Mateo</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>276</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII. COURSE EVALUATIONS

Public Sector Leadership Academy

99 - Percent of participant survey respondents rating overall satisfaction with services as good or better

92 - Percent of training participants rated training as very good (4) or excellent (5)

100 - Percent of participants utilizing skills or reporting change in behavior after attending training classes

Public Sector Supervisory Academy

100 - Percent of participant survey respondents rating overall satisfaction with services as good (3) or better

92 – Percent of training participants rated training as very good (4) or excellent (5)

100 - Percent of participants utilizing skills or reporting change in behavior after attending training classes

Mastering the Difficult Conversation

100 – Percent of training participants rated training as very good (4) or excellent (5)

100 – Percent of participants utilizing skills or reporting change in behavior after attending training classes
## Detailed Course Evaluations

### PSLA Cohort 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Course Date</th>
<th>Total # of Students</th>
<th>Total # of Students Completing an Evaluation</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
<th>QUALITY</th>
<th>OVERALL COURSE SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learned something applied back at job</td>
<td>Didn't learn something they could apply</td>
<td>% Learned VS. # Of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>May 6, 2010</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Principles &amp; Leadership</td>
<td>May 20, 2010</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>June 3, 2010</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>June 17, 2010</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Budget</td>
<td>July 1, 2010</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>July 15, 2010</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Trends &amp; Leadership Skills</td>
<td>July 29, 2010</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stump the “Chumps”</td>
<td>August 12, 2010</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTALS: (PSLA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td><strong>217</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>75%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of customer survey respondents rating overall satisfaction with services as Good (3) or better: 98%

Percent of training participants rating training as Very Good (4) or Excellent (5): 92%

Percent of participants utilizing skills or reporting change in behavior after attending training classes: 100%
### PSLA Cohort 2

**Percent of customer survey respondents rating overall satisfaction with services as Good (3) or better:** 99%

**Percent of training participants rating training as Very Good (4) or Excellent (5):** 89%

**Percent of participants utilizing skills or reporting change in behavior after attending training classes:** 100%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Course Date</th>
<th>Total # of Students</th>
<th>Total # of Students Completing an Evaluation</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
<th>QUALITY</th>
<th>OVERALL COURSE SATISFACTION</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># Of Students Rating Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good or Better Rating VS. # Of students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>February 3, 2011</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Excellent</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Good</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Principles &amp; Leadership</td>
<td>February 17, 2011</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Excellent</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Good</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Good</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Building</td>
<td>March 3, 2011</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Excellent</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Good</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Good</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>March 17, 2011</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Excellent</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Good</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Good</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Budget</td>
<td>March 31, 2011</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Excellent</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Good</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Good</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>April 14, 2011</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Excellent</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Good</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Good</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTALS: (PSLA)</strong></td>
<td>269</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Regional Training Consortium

#### PSSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Course Date</th>
<th>Total # of Students</th>
<th>Total # of Students Completing an Evaluation</th>
<th>Learned something applied back at job</th>
<th>Didn't learn something they could apply</th>
<th>% Learned VS. # Of Students</th>
<th># Of Students Rating Class</th>
<th>Good or Better Rating VS. # Of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision and Leadership: Building Effective Working Relationships</td>
<td>October 19, 2010</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10 3 0 0 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching for Top Performance</td>
<td>November 9, 2010</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10 0 0 0 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management &amp; Progressive Discipline</td>
<td>December 7, 2010</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9 1 0 0 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution &amp; Problem Solving</td>
<td>January 11, 2011</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8 1 0 0 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organizing for Supervisors</td>
<td>February 2, 2011</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Customer Service</td>
<td>February 16, 2011</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15 10 0 0 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Politically Astute Supervisor</td>
<td>February 16, 2011</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9 2 0 0 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor as Change Agent: Leadership and Innovation in Challenging Times</td>
<td>March 8, 2011</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6 0 0 0 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed Mentoring, Goal Setting, Evaluation</td>
<td>March 29, 2011</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTALS: (PSSA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>323</strong></td>
<td><strong>201</strong></td>
<td><strong>201</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>17 0 0 0 0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percent of customer survey respondents rating overall satisfaction with services as Good (3) or better:**

100%

**Percent of training participants rating training as Very Good (4) or Excellent (5):**

92%

**Percent of participants utilizing skills or reporting change in behavior after attending training classes:**

100%
## Cohort 1: Managing Difficult Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Course Date</th>
<th>Total # of Students</th>
<th>Total # of Students Completing an Evaluation</th>
<th>% Learned something applied back at job</th>
<th>% Didn’t learn something they could apply</th>
<th>% Good</th>
<th>% Excellent</th>
<th>% Poor</th>
<th>% Poor</th>
<th>OVERALL COURSE SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing Tough Conversations</td>
<td>October 27, 2010</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percent of participants utilizing skills or reporting change in behavior after attending training classes:** 100%
IX. **Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>FY 2010-11 Budget</th>
<th>Actuals to Date (As of March 2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consortium Fees</td>
<td>$37,616</td>
<td>$36,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy Fees*</td>
<td>34,500</td>
<td>9,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Revenue</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Management license &amp; implementation</td>
<td>34,632</td>
<td>34,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$131,748</strong></td>
<td><strong>$106,508</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornerstone Learning Management System</td>
<td>$34,132</td>
<td>$29,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Consultants</td>
<td>35,500</td>
<td>15,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Other</td>
<td>12,050</td>
<td>5,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Support</td>
<td>33,750</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$115,432</strong></td>
<td><strong>$51,311</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Balance                                        | $16,316           | $55,197                           |

* The first session’s Leadership Academy revenues were collected by County to offset expenses directly posting to County’s budget.

The funding and cost sharing arrangement among member agencies is intended to equitably fund programs, facility rental, and equipment, technology, and staff costs. Each agency paid $4.00 per employee and a $200.00 consortium fee for the training courses in Fiscal Year 2010-11. Additionally, there was a participant fee for the Academies (either $200 or $275). The six cities that launched the learning management system paid license and implementation fees.
2011-12 RECOMMENDATIONS

I. OVERVIEW

The Consortium Working Committee has recommended the following courses be offered in 2011-12 based on current demand, emerging issues and stakeholder input:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Course Length</th>
<th># Times Offered</th>
<th>Available slots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Supervisor Academy</td>
<td>32 hours</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60 (30 ea session)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Leadership Academy</td>
<td>28 hours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastering Difficult Conversations</td>
<td>12 hours</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with Difficult People</td>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Writing</td>
<td>12 hours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastering Effective Communication</td>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Management</td>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional goals for the consortium in 2011-12 include:

- Increase the number of participating agencies
- Launch Phase II implementation of the learning management system (LMS)
- Expand LMS (limited) use for Phase I participating agencies (performance module)
- Explore expansion of consortium to other local governmental agencies
- Explore sustainable staffing model
- Increase on-line training resources
II. COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED TRAINING CONSORTIUM PROGRAMS FOR FY 2011-12

Program Name: Public Sector Supervisory Academy

Target Audience: New and experienced first-line supervisors and high-potential employees aspiring to a supervisory role

Length: 8 days held once every three weeks

Number of Participants: 30

Trainer(s): Various internal and external trainers

Program Description: This Academy is designed for public sector employees seeking to develop their leadership skills and essential core competencies for supervisors. Led by experienced public sector leaders and management development experts, each session is designed to incorporate interactive exercises and real-world case studies exercises to apply fundamental concepts of supervision. Sessions include:

- Supervision and Leadership: Building Effective Working Relationships
- Coaching for Top Performance
- Performance Management and Progressive Discipline
- Conflict Resolution and Problem-Solving
- Planning and Organizing
- Managing Customer Service
- The Politically Astute Supervisor
- Supervisor as Change Agent: leadership and Innovation in Challenging Times
- Speed Mentoring, Goal Setting and Evaluation

Program Name: Public Sector Leadership Academy

Target Audience: Managers

Length: 8 half-day sessions held every two weeks

Number of Participants: 60

Trainer(s): County and City Managers, some retired

Program Description: The Academy is designed to give public sector management employees the opportunity to hear the newest and most innovative concepts and practices from top leaders in our community. Participants will have the opportunity to hear and learn the dynamics and context of leading and managing in the public sector in order to be more strategic and effective in the development and
implementation of quality public policy and programs. Speakers for the Academy are current and retired local City and County Managers. Sessions include:

- Public Policy
- Public Sector Principles and Leadership
- Community Building
- Civic Engagement
- Hard Times Bring Opportunities and Require Change
- Human Resources
- Future Trends and Leadership Skills
- Asking Leaders Critical Questions

**Program Name:** Having the Difficult Conversation

**Target Audience:** Supervisors and Managers

**Length:** 1 and ½ days

**Number of Participants:** 30

**Trainer(s):** Joanne Schultz

**Program Description:** Business is all about relationships. Relationships help actualize work results, but there are times when relationships falter, misunderstandings occur, conflict arises and/or we just don’t see eye-to-eye. These moments need tough conversations to get to the heart of the matter in order to move forward effectively. This workshop helps participants understand successful work relationships; analyze their communication style when stressed, and techniques for engaging in tough conversations. Participants will have the opportunity to practice applying effective techniques to real-life issues in a safe, comfortable, team environment. Participants will:

- Appreciate the connection between good relationships and work success and the effect of emotional and social intelligence skills
- Analyze their communication style when stressed
- Make commitments going forward to master tough conversations

**Program Name:** Dealing with Difficult People

**Target Audience:** Any Employee

**Length:** 1 day

**Number of Participants:** 25

**Trainer(s):** Zakiya Khalfani

**Program Description:** The easiest way to deal with difficult people is to stay as far away from them as you can, suggests Robert Bramson Ph.D., organizational psychologist, management
consultant, and author of Coping with Difficult People.

Great advice for those who work by themselves at home; it's a doable option. But the vast majority of people can't avoid interactions with a wide range of personality types, including some who are inconsiderate, stubborn, incorrigible, inappeasable, indecent, or downright sleazy. In fact, success sometimes depends on your ability to work well with all the above.

At the conclusion of this workshop, participants will:

- Recognize how their own attitudes and actions impact others
- Find new and effective techniques for dealing with difficult people
- Develop coping strategies for dealing with difficult people and difficult situations
- Identify those times when you have the right to walk away from a difficult situation
- Learn some techniques for managing and dealing with anger

**Program Name: Report Writing**

**Target Audience:** Supervisors and Managers

**Length:** 1 and ½ days

**Number of Participants:** 25

**Trainer(s):** Not selected (Possible trainer Barbara Nelson)

**Program Description:** Because reports play an essential role in the public sector, they need to be read, understood, and often, acted upon. Unfortunately, most of us have too much to read and too little time to plough through all of the paperwork that lands on our desks.

If writers include too much information or too many words, they produce reports that are lengthy, wordy and difficult to read; if they use overly formal language and an inconsistent or inappropriate layout, their reports will be unappealing and unclear.

This program shows participants a systematic approach to report writing so that they are able to write clear, logically structured reports in less time. Participants will:

- Use a number of easy-to-learn report writing techniques
- Ensure their reports are well structured, flow logically and look professional
- Make their reports easier to read and understand
- Make essential parts of the report stand out
- Produce documents that enhance the image of both the writer and the organization

**Program Name: Mastering Effective Communication**

**Target Audience:** Any Employee

**Length:** 1 day
Number of Participants: 25

Trainer(s): Joanne Schultz

Program Description: Effective communication is essential for success in business and life. This workshop will help participants fortify their skills and breakthrough into a new level of communication mastery. Through a self-assessment of participant’s communication style, reflection, and group interactions they will gain practical experience initiating and responding to various forms of communication. Real-life work scenarios will be used to model emotionally intelligent behavior for self and relationship management, sharpens communication tools, and craft messages that stick. Participants will leave this workshop mastering a flexible, genuine and self-confident approach that fosters collaboration with others. Participants will:

- Understand their communication style and the application to viewing the style of others.
- Practice applying their communication style knowledge and tools to real-life work scenarios.
- Appreciate the connection between emotional intelligence and effective communication.
- Value crafting messages that stick, representing their needs and accounting for the needs of others.
- Apply workshop learnings to trouble-shoot tough situations.

Program Name: Change Management

Target Audience: Managers

Length: 1 day

Number of Participants: 25

Trainer(s): Not selected (Possible trainers include Marilyn Manning or Diane Faieta)

Program Description: This workshop will help participants assess and develop some of the skills necessary to work and lead in an organization reeling with change, regardless of whether the change is generated from within the organization or from other sources. Techniques to help execute and respond to change are presented and applied to participant’s situation. To do this well requires the ability to understand how the individual personally responds to changing priorities. Suggestions are given to anticipate, identify and overcome resistance to change in oneself and others. Participants will:

- Identify how their role may continue to change in the next few years.
- Describe how participants react to transitions.
- Use three strategies to recover from a loss.
- Identify the steps to create a success cycle and be seen as successful by others at work.
- Identify ways to maintain a positive attitude and deal with transitions in a productive manner.
- Identify strategies to help challenging team members perform at an optimum level.

Program Name: Preventing Sexual Harassment

Target Audience: Supervisors and Managers
Regional Training Consortium

**Length:** 2 hours

**Number of Participants:** Voluntary participation by Member Agency

**Trainer(s):** Online, interactive program

**Program Description:** This online interactive program complies with AB 1825, which mandates two hours of Preventing Sexual Harassment Training for managers and supervisors every two years.
III. PROPOSED BUDGET*

The proposed budget for 2011-12 will remain at 2010-11 levels with a per employee fee of $4.00 and a $200.00 per agency fee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>FY 2011-12 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consortium Fees</td>
<td>$38,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy / Course Fees</td>
<td>59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Revenue</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Management license</td>
<td>36,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance/Prior Year Carry-Forward</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$159,062</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornerstone Learning Management System</td>
<td>$36,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Consultants and On-Line Training</td>
<td>71,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Other</td>
<td>25,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Support</td>
<td>8,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Costs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$145,015</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$14,047</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consortium Fees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County/City Employees</th>
<th># EE's</th>
<th>@ $4.00 per employee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>$540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>1,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Mateo</td>
<td>5600</td>
<td>22,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly City</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>2,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster City</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Moon Bay</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacifica</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>2,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>2,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>1,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per employee fee @ $4.00</strong></td>
<td>8,983</td>
<td><strong>$35,932</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency Fee @ $200.00 Ea</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,600</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Consortium Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$38,532</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Course Offerings Costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Offerings</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Mat'l</th>
<th>Revenue offset (course fees)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Academy</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>8,160</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>(16,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Leadership Academy</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having the Difficult Conversation</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with Difficult People</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Writing</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastering Effective Communication</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Management</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-line Classes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing Sexual Harassment*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Training (IIPP, MSDS)*</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(32,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>71,950</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,235</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,550</strong></td>
<td>(59,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview

Cities across California and nationwide are adapting to new fiscal realities, and are exploring ways to continue providing high quality services despite several years of declining revenues. In San Mateo County, a group of city managers have been meeting for some time to explore new ways of providing city services in light of continuing budget shortfalls. Building on a tradition of deliberative public engagement in the region, and thanks to Library Services and Technology Act Grant funding, this group of city managers collaborated with consultants from the Common Knowledge Group and The Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center to hold two exploratory community forums in September of 2011 on the topic of sharing municipal services.

Hosted at the Daly City and City of San Mateo libraries, each community forum involved 50 residents from cities across the county. Participants shared dinner, learned about the “new normal” fiscal realities that cities are facing, how they are adapting, and choices they are facing, including greater sharing of services across jurisdictions. After a question and answer session with city staff, facilitated small group discussions gave participants a chance to vocalize and more thoroughly explore what they saw as possible benefits of shared services as well their concerns. These initial dialogues were not meant to provide final or representative public input to city managers in San Mateo County considering shared services and other alternatives. They were instead designed to further each cities understanding of how best to educate and engage residents in the issue of alternative service delivery strategies and to provide some initial guiding principles for cities to keep in mind.

The hundred community members were active participants throughout the three hour session. Most were very positive about the value of the forums and indicated interest in the cities continuing to provide this kind of public education and engagement. They also demonstrated interest in taking additional steps such as sharing the results of the forum with others and attending a city council meeting. The hosting City Managers elected to pursue a grant to enable additional forums that built on these initial sessions.
ATTENDEES

Participating cities in San Mateo County were asked to invite and confirm a specified number of residents in proportion to their population. Some city managers sent invitation letters to randomly selected voters, while others chose to invite graduates of citizen academies or others who might be interested in participating. While some cities were more successful than others in recruiting participants, this approach was successful in generating a fairly representative mix of north county residents at a meeting in Daly City on September 8th and south county residents at a meeting in the City of San Mateo on September 13th. Residents from Daly City, Pacifica, South San Francisco, Brisbane, Colma, San Bruno, Millbrae, Hillsborough, Burlingame, Redwood City, Menlo Park, San Carlos, Belmont, and San Mateo participated in the forums. City managers and staff from many of these cities also attended the meetings in order to share information, answer questions, and listen to what people had to say.

AGENDA

At each three hour evening community forum, residents gathered at a library and were provided dinner before they were welcomed by the local city manager and thanked for their participation. Next, they were introduced to some basic ground rules for civil community dialogue, and asked to react to and agree to these ground rules. After a brief opportunity to share their interest in the session and what they valued most about their city with a partner, a city finance director gave a short presentation on city services and revenue sources, alternative ways that cities could provide services in order to maintain service levels with reduced revenues, and an explanation of and several examples of sharing city services already in place in San Mateo County. Participants asked some clarifying questions, and then were randomly assigned to tables of eight, each with a trained neutral facilitator tasked with collecting resident input on the topic of shared services. Most of the meeting time was used for these facilitated small group dialogues. High level city staffers were available to answer questions during these discussions, but they mainly listened to lively discussions among residents. At the end of each forum, a representative from each table shared a few key ideas that had surfaced in their discussion.

RESIDENT INPUT

At each meeting, participants were asked to share:
- What they saw as benefits of sharing services between cities/ other jurisdictions
- Concerns they had about shared services
- What other information they felt was needed to offer more informed input about shared services in San Mateo County
• Some guiding principles that they would like their city leaders to consider as they explore sharing services, and
• Other ideas that cities could consider in order to address budget shortfalls

Facilitators captured participant input on flip charts (see appendix B for complete flip chart input from both meetings), and attendees were also asked to share input in writing via individual worksheets. Notably, 99 of 100 total forum participants turned in a worksheet with feedback and an evaluation of their experience.

The following briefly summarizes the input collected in the small group discussions and is provided to show the range of ideas shared as well as the most prevalent. This is not meant to be a definitive synthesis of public perspectives; rather it represents the range of reactions and levels of understanding demonstrated at the two forums.

**Benefits of Shared Services**

• Potential for cost savings, increased efficiency, and maintaining or improving services
• Opportunity for cities to learn from one another and share their particular expertise/equipment
• Enhanced communications and cooperation among cities
• Allowing closest emergency service provider to respond regardless of jurisdiction
• Combining purchasing power for better pricing and access to expensive equipment
• Opportunities for creative approaches and innovative thinking
• Opportunities to think and address issues on a regional scale
• Consistency and continuity of service across region, realization that “we are all interdependent”
• Opportunity to consolidate management and rethink expensive entitlements
• Consolidated departments could provide more advancement opportunities for staff
• Could coordinate recycling efforts across the county
• Smaller cities especially might have access to better services and equipment

**Concerns about Shared Services**

• Will savings pan out, and/or will service levels go down?
• Losing local control and identity
• Fallout from culture clashes
• Losing jobs, good employees with useful skills
• How will combined services represent divergent values/philosophies of cities involved?
• Will it take longer for fire/police to respond if I have an emergency? Will they know my area?
• What if both cities sharing an emergency service have crises simultaneously?
• “Little fish in bigger pond” phenomenon can de-motivate staff; lower staff morale
• Could be unfair if one city benefits more than another
• Staff will need to move and have new training, which could be expensive
• Staff could have longer commutes
• Will a service provider from another city care as much; will service become impersonal?
• Some equipment may not be appropriate for other cities
• Could lose institutional knowledge

**Questions/ Other Information Needed**

• Is sharing services different from outsourcing?
• How will we evaluate the effectiveness of sharing services; can we undo if it is not effective?
• Who would be in charge if multiple cities share a service?
• Has a long term cost benefit analysis been conducted? How much will we save?
• Will we end up paying people more for the same service; will salaries increase?
• How will the needs of my city be represented in a consolidated entity?
• How are libraries funded, and how was the Peninsula Library System formed?
• What criteria determine what cities will combine what services?
• If the economy keeps getting worse, what would the next step be?
• Does each city need a city manager?
• Why not explore new revenue sources?
• How will you communicate changes related to sharing services to the public?

Guiding Principles to Consider when Exploring a Shared Services Agreement

• Maintain or improve service levels and quality
• Engage residents (ongoing) to inform the process, reduce anxiety, ensure a smooth transition
• Start small, go slowly, make sure it will save money and not have unintended consequences
• Look for successful models/ best practices first, do cost benefit analysis
• Each city sharing services should pay their fair share each year
• Try to minimize negative impacts on local jobs and economy
• Explore and protect core issues/vision/desires for each city involved
• Consider human as well as financial impacts
• Have an exit strategy (analogous to a “pre-nup”)  
• Develop ways to measure long term sustainability; consider how this will evolve over time
• Annual reviews of effectiveness, performance and safety of shared services
• Train staff to help them adapt and collaborate successfully and merge organizational cultures
• Put residents first; make sure it’s the best way to meet the needs of the community

Other Ideas for More Efficient & Effective Service Delivery

• Work to increase resident volunteerism/ use more volunteers and interns
• Collaborate more with nonprofits
• Consider sharing services with the county or on a county level or contracting at that level
• Share equipment among cities or administration, set up joint purchasing agreements
• Identify alternative revenue sources
• Allow residents to donate for a specific service or park maintenance and beautification
• Reduce street sweeping where possible
• Change retirement benefits package system; ask employees to contribute
• Incentivize community service, ask large orgs. to provide matching grants for volunteers
PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK

Overall, participants gave positive feedback on the forums as a valuable way to inform and engage the community in the decisions cities are facing. Many volunteered comments that they appreciated that the community was being included in the planning. Participants demonstrated keen interest in learning more about city finances, especially costs associated with employee benefits and retirement. The fact that sharing services across jurisdictions has been so prevalent was new information for some and most wanted to see more specific information and “case studies.” See appendix A for a more detailed report on participant feedback.

NEXT STEPS

City Manager Pat Martel of Daly City has taken the lead on applying to the Davenport Institute (formerly Common Sense California) for additional funding to support four additional educational community meetings across San Mateo County in order to continue to engage the public as cities consider shared services agreements. The scope and plan for these meetings is to be determined, but there has been some discussion of the meetings being an open invitation, with supplemental recruiting through local organizations to ensure representative participation. The model of breaking bread together and then using a brief educational presentation with more in-depth facilitated small group dialogues in public libraries was successful (almost every participant stayed actively engaged throughout the three hour meetings and 99 of 100 turned in a worksheet/evaluation form), and would be improved up on in subsequent events. Greg Keidan (Keidan Consulting and The Common Knowledge Group) and Shauna Wilson-More (PCRC) have committed to continue collaborating in supporting next steps pending available funding.
APPENDIX A: PARTICIPANT FEEDBACK REPORT
9/8/11 Daly City & 9/13/11 San Mateo
Exploratory Community Forums on Sharing of Services

Participant feedback about the process and information provided
Note: Due to the small sample sizes, quantitative measures must be used with caution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Participation</th>
<th>9/8/11 Daly City</th>
<th>9/13/11 San Mateo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total attendees (excluding observers/facilitators)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total evaluation forms turned in</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Participant Knowledge (self-assessed)</th>
<th>9/8/11 Daly City</th>
<th>9/13/11 San Mateo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How familiar you are with the following topics (5= very familiar, 4 = somewhat familiar; 3 = in the middle; 2 = not very familiar; 1 = not at all familiar):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the condition of city finances in San Mateo County</td>
<td>Most 3’s or 4’s</td>
<td>2’s, 3’s and 4’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the concept of “sharing services” between cities</td>
<td>Most 3’s or 4’s</td>
<td>Most were 4’s, then 3’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the quality of the conversations, it appeared that the many of the participants in the 9/8 Daly City forum had slightly less exposure to the topic than those in the 9/13 session. They were somewhat more likely to say the presentations increased their understanding of the issues. In the 9/13 session, participants were slightly more likely to rate the dialogue as helpful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-Forum Evaluation</th>
<th>9/8/11 Daly City</th>
<th>9/13/11 San Mateo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How helpful was tonight’s meeting in helping you understand the following: (5= very helpful, 4 = somewhat helpful; 3 = in the middle; 2 = not very helpful; 1 = not at all helpful)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the condition of city finances in San Mateo County</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ways that cities in my area are addressing budget shortfalls</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• what “shared services” is and how it works</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How helpful were the following portions of this evening’s forum:

| • the presentation about city finances in San Mateo County | 4.2              | 4.0               |
| • the presentation about shared services | 4.2              | 3.8               |
| • table discussion #1 about your reactions to shared services | 4.0              | 4.1               |
| • table discussion #2 about guidelines and other suggestions | 3.7              | 3.9               |
| • large group closing discussion | 3.7              | 4.0               |
Other Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How did you feel about the information that was presented tonight?</th>
<th>9/8/11 Daly City</th>
<th>9/13/11 San Mateo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information was too complicated.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information was somewhat complicated.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information was just about right.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information was somewhat oversimplified.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information was very oversimplified.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of these next steps are you likely to take? (multiple answers invited)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>9/8/11 Daly City</th>
<th>9/13/11 San Mateo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Look up my city’s budget online</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share the discussion with family and friends</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend another forum about this issue in a few months</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a city council meeting</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open Ended Questions

Q. What was the most important thing you learned this evening?

REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS from 9-8 Daly City

- That City Managers are meeting/working together and involving citizens
- The public has a role
- Others share my views
- That cities are in crisis
- How little money comes in from sales tax
- That it’s possible to serve residents’ needs at less cost
- The concept of shared services
- We need to join together to save money and services
- I met Peninsula neighbors
- It was an honor to be included

REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS from 9-13 San Mateo

- Regional planning is better than insular planning
- That cities are facing a financial crunch.
- That shared services is not as bad as it seems.
- Shared services are very much needed.
- Who is already sharing services.
- Other citizens’ concerns were excellent and really made me think.
- Hearing issues about other cities.
- That we residents are all worried about the same thing
- Considerations of local cultures/identities
- The county has thoughtful intelligent citizens.
- The issues are complex but there are many good ideas for dealing with them.
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The need to distinguish between outsourcing and shared services.

Q. What do other people in your community need to know about this issue?

REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS from 9-8 Daly City
- More specific success stories about what was gained from shared services.
- It’s better to share than lose.
- Not to be scared.
- How involvement will help them.
- They need to know the numbers we are dealing with. Many think cities are hiding money. Not true.

REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS from 9-13 San Mateo
- How city government works.
- Case studies of shared services over the long term.
- Basic government overview as well as finance overview – and how Prop 13 fits in.
- More about city versus county services and incorporated versus unincorporated
- Structural problems in city budgets.
- Impact of changes.
- How this is going to affect their community.
- Where we are in the process.

- There is a lot of fear – and most if it stems from lack of knowledge of how already existing merged services have played out. My group has about 20 concerns, none of which have transpired in reality in any of the local already executed service mergers.

Q. Do you have any other suggestions?

REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS from 9-8 Daly City
- More information on salaries and benefits
- Use volunteers
- Need public education on this topic
- More groups like this
- Have smaller groups for the discussion
- Thank you for engaging the community in this process and enabling us to be better informed and better citizens. EVERY community should do this.

REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS from 9-13 San Mateo
- Shared services for green policy.
- Great meeting!
- Find other forums like this for people to get together for benefit of county.
- Provide more information about funding for pensions and health benefits.
- The format of this discussion was very effective.
- Put results in the local newspaper so all residents know what is being looked at.
- Find some way to get larger numbers of residents involved in the process.
- Outreach!!
APPENDIX B: FLIP CHART/ EASEL NOTES (COMPLETE)

Note: The following is a complete transcription of all notes taken by facilitators or volunteer scribes on the large flip charts/easels at the 9/8/11 and 9/13/11 library dialogues. Items in () were added by the editor in an attempt to clarify intended statements, and items where the meaning was unclear to the editors were marked with an asterisk (*).

Additional individual input was collected in the form of worksheets that 99 of 100 participants handed in at the end of the meetings. Some of this input has been summarized in Appendix A. Complete copies of the 99 worksheets (and originals) are available to the city managers who collaborated in this public engagement effort by request.

Shared Services Community Forum #1, Daly City Library, 9/8/11

Table 1

Benefits
- Save $
- Reduce overhead and admin costs and redundancy
- Greater opportunities for employee career path and more varied work
- More employee experience
- Better communication between cities; increase experience
- More job opportunities
- Could lead to increased service levels
- More cost effective and efficient
- Can allow closest service provider to respond regardless of jurisdiction
- Can share resources
- Keeping service public may increase accountability but may increase costs

Concerns
- Loss of control
- Don’t know until you try it if it’s more efficient
- Could lead to job losses in community
- May cause longer commutes
- Can service be as responsive if combined?
- Will we be paying people more for same service?
- May not realize savings if salaries go up
- May make communication more difficult
- Need time consuming and costly infrastructure to manage larger infrastructure
- Fear that critical services might not still be delivered smoothly

Questions
- How was Peninsula Library System formed?
- Could cities share landscaping services? (Can we model other shared services on this?)
• How are libraries funded?
• Can we test this with recreation, less essential services?

Considerations/Guidelines
• How can we find a balance to find the best in local control and also reap benefits of a larger system?
• Don’t raise salaries and negate savings of consolidation
• Each city involved should pay fair share; keep checking this each year to keep fair
• Try to minimize negative impact on local jobs and economy
• Use some savings to create more local jobs
• Use savings to improve infrastructure or improve education

Table 2

Benefits
• Cost savings
• Get rid of redundancies
• Efficiencies
• Better, expanded, more responsive services
• Promotional opportunities

Concerns
• Some services (pool classes) may be impacted
• Easier to combine some than others
• Less responsive
• Loss of jobs
• Financial control/complications
• Does amount paid justify the benefit?
• Resistance to change
• Lack of credibility
• Would my city get its fair share?
• Less personal- more bureaucratic

Questions
• How do cities determine which cities to team with? -what criteria to use?
• If economies continue to decline- what’s the step beyond sharing services (merge?)

Considerations/Guidelines
• Is it geographically feasible?
• All savings there?
• Are savings equally shared?
• Is technology compatible? (computer, radio)
• Determining cost distribution
• Administration

Other Ideas
• Consider how cities can control recycle-theft i.e. bottles/cans stolen out of trash
• Consolidating garbage services
• Where possible reduce street sweeping
• Identify alternative revenue sources
• More volunteers

Table 3

Benefits
• Best of each city; learning and sharing others needs
• Community grows
• Awareness of hardships
• Learning to share
• Saving money
• More efficiency
• Employees/benefits
• Equipment
• Group purchasing power
• Tech expertise
• More best practices/standard costs?

Concerns
• Will sharing services result each city involved bringing their best assets to bear?
• House numbers
• Idiosyncrasies; learning curve
• Confusion of services
• Losing services or promptness of delivery of services
• Loss of trust/caring
• Spreading resources too thin
• Could lose employees and benefits
• Fear of change
• Instead of improvement, might be deterioration
• Dispatchers confused (relates to house numbers comment above?)

Questions
• What savings will be realized with shared services
• Pensions/retirement funds of city workers
Considerations/Guidelines
- Use Best Practices as benchmark *(consolidation fits?)*
- Improvement, not deterioration
- Strive to maintain best service level
- Evaluate cost and benefits of services
- Use historical trends of city support costs versus services
- Demographics – elders services versus child services

Other Ideas
- Insurance savings by joint purchase
  - Property, etc.
  - Liability
- Lower fees for investment

Table 4

Benefits
- NCFA has turned out to be “good” *(what is NCFA?)*
- NCFA savings in cost
- Efficiencies=consistency of combining functions
- Fire & police, especially whoever is near
- Access equipment & tech that would otherwise be too expensive
- Do with planning, etc. (other groups as % of budgets increase, may get more power, although these may be outsourced now) *?
- Streamline permits & enhance responsibility

Concerns
- Will subgroups get lost?
- Benefits must be explained, otherwise may not be accepted
- Some equipment may not fit (e.g.: Daly City fire trucks too big for Brisbane)
- Will we (as the minority stakeholder) get the same access to services?
- Staffing concerns: which persons hours are we eliminating?

Question:
- Are the services to be combined the same across cities?

Considerations/Guidelines
- Is each side financially solvent?
- Education to/with the public, to prevent bias.
• Provision for supervising contractor
• Comparing costs between shared services vs. other options
• There should be some commonality between cities sharing services, like scale and philosophy
• How to share costs (could base on employee numbers, level of service required, etc.)
• Maintaining core values
• Be careful of outsourcing: cost and oversight

Other Ideas
• Insourcing
• Combine street sweeping

(Table 5 was merged into other tables)

Table 6

Benefits
• (ability to provide) what everyone needs
• Saves money
• Eliminates deficits
• Services don’t have to be cut
• Broader range of and access to services
• Improve services
• Cuts waste

Concerns
• Harder to access services?
• Loss of jobs, (department) closures
• Will we lose any safety services?
• Lose local identity
• Service becomes impersonal
• Lack of understanding about community being served (cultural and ethnic)
• More bureaucratic

Questions
• Define “shared” – upper management? Buildings? Will shared departments have same job rules?
• Double dipping? Would it be prevented?
• Who is accountable for the quality of management?
• What are the retirement benefits for city employees? What happens to them?

Consideration/Guidelines
• How would you determine how much money each city contributes? Could have negotiations, be based on population, how many jobs are being saved, how much $ is saved by each city
• What are the core issues for each city? Will they be protected?

Table 7

Benefits
• Cost savings
• Efficient
• Employee retention
• Less management
• Better training
• Equity better spread across cities services

Concerns
• Loss of identity
• Representation of individual cities in consolidated entity
• Loss of knowledge at local level, mix ups.

Considerations/Guidelines
• Demonstrate savings
• Look to other cities with successful models.
• Level of service needs to be maintained
• Look to community to inform the process and ensure a smooth transition

Ideas
• Use of internships across cities
• Larger scale consolidation
• Merge administration

Table 8

Benefits
• Better than losing services
• Saves $ in challenging times – Peninsula library system is a good example
Better services
Increased service
Cross pollination
Can bring new approaches – creative thinking
Cooperation could generate better service possibilities
Valuable to have community input up front/ appreciate opportunity to give feedback

Concerns
Institutional knowledge could be lost
Too much focus on profit and loss bottom line rather than best practices
Things could fall through the cracks – poorly defined responsibilities
Job loss – people impacted
How to balance delivery of services
Balance of equitability, will one town have more expenses without as much benefit?
Each city has it’s own priorities
Maintaining personal identity
Losing a personal touch – knowing who you are talking with
Service providers may not be as familiar with our town/community

Consideration/Guidelines
Size of shared services: start small – city to city/ not entire county
Maintain within sound financial benefit
Go slowly, no broad strokes- e.g. Brisbane fire fighters join North County, incorporate current employees into shared services
Customize changes to fit each city
Keep people involved & invested- ask the community for input
Keep being mindful of customer service
Anything we could share should be considered for sharing
Obligation for each city to fund core services/assessments
Insurance on your community
Could be voted on
Encourage citizen responsibility and obligation for funding services

Other Ideas
Adopt a park model for services (beautification)
Emphasize volunteerism
Credits for community service
• Big institutions (could provide?) matching grants for community service credits
• Option to permit people to fund specific beautifications or areas or services – donating to specifics rather than general fund

End of Session Group Report Out

Benefits
• Saving money!
• Cost savings
• Public libraries/ No county fire as examples
• Efficiency
• Consistency
• Makes sense
• Better standards
• Efficiencies created thru sharing of services

Concerns
• Loss of control
• Subgroups lost? What happens to small communities? And community feel?
• Loss of jobs
• How much money are we actually saving?
• Will services be as effective? Able to access? Think about cultural issues?
• Loss of identity. Loss of local knowledge. Loss of institutional knowledge.
• Better to combine than lose altogether

Guidelines/Considerations
• Look at models of shared services
• Find balance between local control
• Equity across cities
• Services will improve, not deteriorate
• Evaluate costs and benefits
• Capital investment – joint with other cities
• Look for commonalities in sharing of services
• Broader services? Access to those services?
• Cultural/ethnic considerations
• Maintain personal touch
• Compatible equipment
• Oversight of contracts with outside vendors
• Allocation of assessments particular to a community – Keep in mind
• Refer to examples of shared service models (and note that San Mateo County is actually a national leader in this work)

**Ideas**
- Are there things (street sweeping) we can reduce?
- City employee contribution to retirements

**Shared Services Community Forum #2, San Mateo Library, 9/13/11**

**Table 1**

**Benefits**
- Maintaining service levels
- Cost mitigation
- Regional vision better than insular planning
- Consider what’s best for region
- Better meet citizen’s needs
- Span of control – management – consolidate positions
- Reliability, predictability of service throughout region – McDonald’s hamburger is defined – known quantity
- Level of service can go up (San Mateo/ FC fire)
- Consistency with one standard
- Economies of scale
- Regional planning

**Concerns**
- Losing City identification
- Risk of failure
- Impact on other services (eg Recology if goes on strike)
- Domino effect on other (unshared) services
- Will savings pan out?
- Accountability? Effective?
• Poor service delivery
• How to collectively determine essential services? How define? What qualifies?
• Will level go up or down? Will level meet expectations?
• Level of service can go down?
• How do shared services adjust to changes in a city’s social/demographics – needs change
• Are we talking shared services or outsourcing? Outsourced employees not as well cared for
• Growth strategies are different from one city to another, micro-regions

Questions

• Does every city need a city manager?
• Does one size fit all?
• When do shared services make sense? Must everything be a shared service?

Considerations/Guidelines

• Define which service(s) should be shared
• Develop SLAs *(note: WHAT IS AN SLA?)*
• Make sure it’s cost effective – saves money
• Have a back out plan (with arbitration process)
• Ongoing annual review of the shared service to make sure it’s delivering
• One city with special services can earn revenue by providing to other cities – would encourage cities to develop expertise
• What studies have been done by consultants? What are best practices?

Other Ideas

• Possibilities of self-funding, e.g.: health care insurance, (Stanford University is doing), car insurance, etc.
• Red street lighting

Table 2

Benefits

• More efficiencies
• Cost savings
- Improved service
- Lower taxes
- The best level of service is not necessarily the city level

**Concerns**

- Reduced services
- Worse service
- Evaluation – is it worth it? How to do it?
- Measurement of goals
- Who’s in charge
- Loss of local control
  - Difficulty in deciding which city gets what – conflict resolution
  - Deciding what services to consolidate to receive most benefit

**Questions**

- How do you decide which city gets what?
- Emergency – FIRE, POLICE, MEDICAL – response coordination. WHO’s in charge?
- How do you distinguish between what is important and what is TRIVIAL
- Where is the money going to come from – i.e.: Who funds/how financed?

**Considerations**

- Consolidate trivial things, not important things
- Identify secondary or unintended consequences, ie: rating of fire insurance/flood insurance levees before the sharing occurs
- Certain services (ie: transit/environmental/bay levees) may have a higher level of delivery and/or coordination than cities can provide

**Good Ideas**

- (Use more) Volunteers
- Collaborate more with non profits
- Plan capital projects so that services are actually delivered, ie: library

**TABLE 3**

**Benefits**
Utilize specialists
Lower costs (operating)
Greater efficiency
Opportunity for innovative thinking and ideas
911 calls centralized
Specialized areas
Could combine IT departments
Change to Recology > $ saving purchasing power

Concerns

- Lack of control (when consolidating)
- Reduced services
- What if it doesn’t work out?
- Culture clash
- Lack of control over costs, personnel benefits to whole spectrum
- Loss of good people and skill sets
- Competition
- No long term cost/ benefit analysis
- Losing control over negotiations
- Loss of identity
- Could be hidden costs, unfunded liabilities that cities might not know about
- Cost allocation formula
- Relationship problems between Belmont and San Carlos, as people changed it got worse
- Using a cookie cutter formula in cities with different values
- What if a city doesn’t want to share?
- Its unknown if there are really benefits, need more recent examples from cities> need more case studies
- If fire services are shared, will it take longer for a response in an emergency?
- Services are part of what makes cities unique (parks and rec. example)
- People involved in decision-making will change
- Loss of service level/ performance
- Can they handle the number of calls? What if there is a crisis at the same time in the two cities sharing a service?

Questions

- Would sharing services lead to greater efficiency?
- If my city merges a service with a smaller city, what does the smaller city have to offer?

Guidelines
• Consider human as well as financial impact
• Evaluate safety and performance 1 year after
• Need carrots and sticks
• Define how you share authority/ control
• Maintain current service levels and aim to improve them
• Need an exit strategy
• Don’t jeopardize property values
• Each cities vision should not be jeopardized over or because of shared services
• Consider aesthetics
• Keep quality of parks and rec., provided participation is high

Other Ideas

• Identify other special services
• What can you consolidate behind the scenes?
• Rework retirement packages

TABLE 4

Benefits

• New efficiencies and ideas
• Joint conversations
• Cost savings
• Flexibility on unknown economic conditions
• Learning experience to expand on concept
• Better Access to Expensive Services
• Better response to local catastrophes (response time, health, police, etc.)
• Necessity to have shared services
• Reduce personnel costs
• Procurement benefits
• Eliminates boundaries (way of thinking and physical)

Concerns

• Savings will be used up
• Better response to local catastrophes (response time, health, police, etc.)
• Less local control of service
• Lower performance
• Overtime prioritization of larger cities
• Loss of city culture; identity
• Increased unemployment
• Financial liability of cities sharing service

**Question**

• How do we define “more efficient”

**Guidelines**

• Identify a service delivery plan
• Solid analysis
• What is the exit strategy
• Contingency planning
• Know what each city wants before sharing services
• Look beyond cost savings, e.g. how will service levels be affected
• How will financial status of residents affect relative services

**Other Ideas**

• Eliminate or modify Prop. 13
• Contract police, fire services
• General sharing of fire services, have map that shows every firehouse in county
• Share by county, not city to city
• Overlap with the county services, not just between cities
• Consider incorporating unincorporated areas

**Questions**

• How will it be implemented?

**TABLE 5**

**Benefits**

• Cost savings
• Improved services and opportunities
• Less management
• Improve services
• Reduce maintenance costs
• New ways to provide services
• More cross training

**Concerns**
• Lack of local knowledge & attachment
• Displacement of personnel, resulting in less efficiency
• “Little fish in big pond” phenomenon which de-motivates staff
• Losing community outreach
• Less community pride
• Decreased quality of service, e.g. longer response times for fire, EMT, police
• Disruption to lives of city employees
• Poor morale and high turnover of staff
• More work, less pay for staff
• Need time to implement and communicate changes and to achieve maximum efficiency
• Need for retraining (added expense)
• Expense of moving locations

Questions

• Why not explore more revenue sources?
• How to communicate shared services (changes?) to the public?
• Will costs increase as a result of shared services and be passed on to citizens?

Guidelines

• Develop ways to measure the long term sustainability.
• Consider modeling on a larger entity that successfully shares services
• Maintain local control
• Maintain service quality standards (important)
• Out source open positions
• Importance of implementing well
• Maintaining community connections (important)
• Solicit input from staff (on-going)

Other Ideas

• None recorded on flip charts

TABLE 6

Benefits

• Saving $ (fire, police)
• Higher level of service
• Higher efficiency
• More cost effective than status quo
• Greater sense of continuity across cities; “we’re all interdependent”
• More utilization of high value & limited resources
• More negotiating power with cable, electric utilities
• Buy smarter and better (not just cost)- making better choices
• Larger pool of personnel (police)
• Police- more patrols/eyes/vehicles, better response/action, more resources and communications related to crime
• Sense of “mutual aid”

Concerns

• Unfair if one city benefits more
• Less personal service
• Unwanted services bundled vs. a menu of services to choose from
• Can we get out of this arrangement if it doesn’t work?
• It could turn out to be less efficient
• Can cities agree on performance criteria
• Less familiarity with neighborhood routes could increase response times (fire, police)
• Increased departmental responsibilities could lead to more stress and less efficiency
• Layoffs
• The Sheriff’s Dept are less familiar faces than city police
• Reduced civic/city pride and identity
• Citizens need to know

Questions

• What does shared library services mean?
• How can we get out of this arrangement if it doesn’t work?
• How recast cost over time? *not sure what this means
• Can small towns survive?
• What about edges of cities and “between geographic limits” *(unincorporated areas?)
• Can we still have city specific services?
• Can we maintain ownership/ city logo?
• Would we respond to fire, police the same
• Accountability/ Identity

Guidelines

• Consider a short contract to try things out
• Consider Identity- local/ countywide branding
• Educate the public on changes to reduce anxiety, address negatives, show results, pros and cons
• Address rationales and philosophy of services in each community involved.
  o Serve and protect
  o Enforce
  o Fire protection vs. medical
• Train staff how to share across cities; have new training to ease transition
• Merge corporate cultures; develop a new mission statement (collaboratively)
• What about utility work/public works/waste services might be easier?

Other Ideas

• Other services
• Changing rules for cable services- more cities = more strength in negotiations, power, voice
• Ala carte approach not appreciated- user fees for residents
• Using volunteerism
• CERTs
• Analytical worth
• Community outreach

TABLE 7

Benefits

• Reduced costs
• Standardized service
• Higher efficiency
• Higher quality service
• Bargaining units can’t play one against the other

Concerns

• Level of responsiveness
• Clarity about boundaries
• (shared services) might not account for distinctions, e.g. is equipment appropriate to terrain, hills vs. flatlands
• Cultural differences
• Are administrators trained to consider and negotiate?
• Standardized training
• Consistency of communication
• Equitable financing from socioeconomically different cities

Questions
• How is this different from TAC 1 Tac 2 etc? *don’t know what this refers to
• Who will analyze this data?
• How can we focus on the revenue side?

Guidelines

• Train administrators in a standardized way, including about cultures of different cities involved
• Research best practices and do evaluation- establish criteria and create a matrix, figure our what worked before moving forward
• Do a cost/ benefit analysis, consider quality of customer services, responsiveness
• Keep the public informed: communication and education
• Keep in mind socioeconomic and cultural considerations
• Consider human factors
• Consider how this will evolve over time
• It is helpful to have a community policy. Consider how that will change
• Youth and police might have a relationship?

Other Ideas

• Contracting at the county level
• Sharing equipment among cities
• Cities could pay proportionally for shared services
• Small business incubators... example of Comcast wiring buildings in San Mateo

TABLE 8

Benefits

• Cost savings
• F.C. (Foster City?) model. Benefits of training residents and citizen engagement (e.g. CERT)
• Restructuring might be an opportunity to address concerns about too many supervisors & entitlements in place (e.g. police) and to improve services (e.g. fire)
• Could be an opportunity to coordinate recycling services (school districts)
• Eliminating levels of management
• Less front line service providers

Concerns

• Relationships
• Look at benefits to residents, not politics
• Politicians’ fear of losing power
• It might be a wrong assumption that consolidating saves $
• Preparation for a large catastrophe
• F.C. (Foster City) example of too many supervisors (police) and entitlements in place

Guidelines

• Make sure it is the best way to respond to the perceived needs of the community
• City commits to put residents first- above employees; public benefit is job #1; cities are too prone to cut services to residents rather than entitlements
• Work on generating public will
• Address traffic problems on a regional basis

Other Ideas

• Could have one fire and one police department for the county

End of Session Group Report Out

Benefits

• Table 1: Reliability, consistency, predictability
• Table 2: Cost savings, efficiencies
• Table 3: Cost efficiency. Using specialists
• Table 4: Ability to be flexible – economic and natural disaster conditions
• Table 5: Cost savings – opportunity for smaller cities to get more/better services
• Table 6: Cost savings – better purchase/use of critical resources
• Table 7: Cost efficiency/ community relationships across shared services
• Table 8: Reduce cost and maintain service level

Concerns

• Table 1: Define essential services; equity and consistency of services across communities
• Table 2: What services to consolidate – how to decide; and loss of local control
• Table 3: Don’t lose values; what drew people to each community
• Table 4: Loss of local control and identity, unique programs
• Table 5: Loss of quality, standards, community attachment
• Table 6: Philosophies of service need to align across communities
• Table 7: How to split financing equitably
• Table 8: Politicians and others losing power will take it out on citizens

Considerations/Guidelines

• Table 1: Clear definition of shared service
• Table 2: Identify secondary consequences
• Table 3: Current guidelines remain in place, not worsen benchmark
• Table 4: Good exit strategy
• Table 5: No loss of standards; keep quality
• Table 6: Address identity; clear who is represented
• Table 7: Follow best practices; capacity of volunteerism; focus on increasing revenue
• Table 8: Put residents first- above employees
• Level of service
• Collect data from cities who are/have shared services, learn from them
• Define service level agreements, annual review to manage/monitor agreement
• Training employees on merging cultures
• How manage retirement funds

Themes – Other

• Changing level of services – police uniform and trust/confidence, some gain/loss trust
• Already more service/activity w/ city sheriff vs. San Carlos
• Document results of existing share agreements/data
• Lessons from Belmont/San Carlos dissolution, waste agreements – case studies
• Review/monitor progress
• Some standards that differ “don’t matter”, focus on those
• Pay attention to merging two cultures; process plan for integration/training
• Defined SLA with annual review – monitor performance
• Some differences don’t make a difference. Some do. Some things can’t be standardized, some shouldn’t (community value-based)
• Cities have different retirement plans. How to deal with shared services in HR?

Questions

• How to manage pension plans- 10%/5% if consolidate/if split? (See Brisbane; San Carlos; Pacifica)
• Looking at examples of existing, county long-term shared services – What worked, what didn’t. Why?
AGREEMENT BETWEEN
CITIES OF REDWOOD CITY AND SAN CARLOS FOR FIRE & EMERGENCY SERVICES

This Agreement ("Agreement") is entered into as of __________, 2011, by and between the City of Redwood City a charter city and municipal corporation of the State of California (the “REDWOOD CITY”), and the City of San Carlos, a municipal corporation (“SAN CARLOS”), collectively “Participating Agencies.”

RECITALS

WHEREAS, the Participating Agencies are public corporations organized and operating under the laws of the State of California; and

WHEREAS, the Participating Agencies have the authority to perform fire protection activities, emergency medical services, and other related activities for their respective agencies; and

WHEREAS, the Participating Agencies agree that San Carlos will maintain at its sole cost a Fire Department sufficient to provide certain emergency and non-emergency services as more fully set forth herein and that Redwood City will provide management and administrative support to the San Carlos Fire Department as more fully set forth herein; and

WHEREAS, this contractual arrangement is intended to achieve an effective and efficient delivery of service to the benefit of both cities; and

WHEREAS, the Participating Agencies desire to formalize the delivery of certain fire and emergency services pursuant to this Agreement.

Now therefore, the Participating Agencies, for and in consideration of the mutual benefits, covenants and agreements set forth herein, agree as follows:

1. Scope of Services.

   (a) San Carlos agrees to retain a fire department including certain personnel and infrastructure at its sole cost sufficient to provide certain emergency and non-emergency services, as more particularly described in Exhibit “A” attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

   (b) Redwood City agrees to provide to San Carlos certain fire and emergency services such as fire administration and support, fire prevention, investigation, and training, as more particularly described in Exhibit “A” attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.
2. Compensation.

(a) San Carlos shall pay Redwood City a fee for the services described herein pursuant to the compensation schedule described in Exhibit "A", attached hereto and incorporated by reference. No other compensation for the Services will be allowed except for items covered by subsequent amendments to this Agreement in writing.

(b) The total cost of this service will be reviewed annually and amended to reflect actual increase or decrease in cost, except that in no case shall the increase or decrease exceed three percent (3%) each year. An annual review shall occur in January of each year.

(c) The City shall submit quarterly invoices to San Carlos pursuant to the Agreement and payments shall be made within thirty (30) days of invoice.

3. Relationship of the Participating Agencies.

(a) Redwood City’s Fire Chief shall act as Fire Chief over the Redwood City Fire Department and San Carlos Fire Department with all the powers and responsibilities entrusted to him by law. Redwood City’s City Manager alone shall exercise supervisory authority over the Redwood City Fire Chief.

(b) San Carlos will provide Redwood City and its Fire Chief with all necessary regulations, policies, procedures, manuals, and other information, to facilitate supervision of San Carlos Fire Department employees. Grievances, claims, and causes of action that may develop or accrue relating to San Carlos Fire Department employees will be addressed and handled by San Carlos personnel and Redwood City personnel shall have the duty to cooperate. Personnel decisions of the Redwood City Fire Chief may be appealed to or reviewed to the San Carlos City Manager or other designated person as specified by San Carlos Municipal Code or by contract.


(a) The Redwood City Fire Chief, and any other officers, agents and employees of Redwood City are not, and shall not be deemed, San Carlos employees for any purpose. Redwood City shall be solely responsible for all salary, benefits, workers’ compensation, and insurance for its personnel providing services pursuant to this Agreement, and said personnel shall be considered solely employees of the City of Redwood City for all supervisory, disciplinary and other employment related purposes.

(b) The officers, agents and employees of San Carlos are not, and shall not be deemed, Redwood City employees for any purpose. San Carlos shall be solely responsible for all salary, benefits, workers’ compensation, and insurance for its personnel providing services pursuant to this Agreement, and said personnel shall be considered solely employees of San Carlos for employment related purposes, except that the Redwood City Fire Chief and officers shall supervise San Carlos Fire Department employees and shall apply the applicable labor agreement between the City of San Carlos and San Carlos Firefighters for purposes of discipline and grievances.
(c) The Participating Agencies acknowledge and agree that nothing within this Agreement for providing the services creates a “special relationship,” as that term may be defined by law, is created or established, with the other agency, or their officials, officers, employees, or successors, or with any third party as a result of this Agreement. Further, nothing in this Agreement is intended to or shall in any manner affect or limit the privileges or immunities or other protections accorded to Redwood City or its employees under federal law or state law or other law or to San Carlos or its employees under federal law or state law or other law.

5. Termination.

Unless earlier terminated, the term of this Agreement will commence upon the date first above written and shall expire on ______, 2016. This Agreement may be terminated without cause by any Party upon giving written notice thereof one (1) year or more prior to September 30. The effective date shall be set forth in the notice of termination, provided however, if such effective date is not set forth in the notice of termination, then in that event the effective date of termination shall be one (1) year after deliver or posing of said notice.

6. Indemnification.

(a) In performing services under this Agreement, the Fire Chief or designee will direct the two departments as separate entities. When the Fire Chief is directing Redwood City Fire Department activities or personnel, Redwood City is responsible for liabilities arising out of his or her services. When the Fire Chief is directing San Carlos Fire Department activities or personnel, Redwood City is responsible for liabilities arising solely out of his or her functions or services. When the San Carlos Fire Department is performing any functions or services not directed by the Redwood City Fire Chief or designee, San Carlos is responsible for liabilities arising solely out of those functions and services.

(b) When the Designated Fire Chief or designee is directing both Participating Agencies’ departments or employees and in the event that San Carlos and Redwood City are concurrently negligent and are proximate causes of the alleged injury or damage giving rise to the claim, then the liability of any and all such claims for injuries or damages shall be apportioned under California’s law of comparative negligence.

(c) Other than expressly provided for in Section 7(a) in this Agreement, no Participating Agency shall be responsible for the acts or omissions of the other Participating Agency’s officers or employees, nor shall any Participating Agency incur any liability arising out of the services of any other Participating Agency’s officers or employees. Accordingly, the Participating Agencies hereby expressly agree to waive the pro rata risk allocation contained in Government Code section 895.6.

7. Insurance.

Consultant shall obtain and maintain for the duration of the Agreement and any and all amendments, insurance or an equivalent through a pooled risk group mutually acceptable to the Participating Members against claims for injuries to persons or damage to property which may arise out of or in connection with performance of the services under this Agreement.
(a) Coverages and Limits. Each Participating Agency, at its sole expense, shall maintain the types of coverages and minimum limits indicated below.

(b) Commercial General Liability Insurance. $1,000,000 combined single-limit per occurrence for bodily injury, personal injury and property damage. If the submitted policies contain aggregate limits, general aggregate limits will apply separately to the services or work under this Agreement or the general aggregate will be twice the required per occurrence limit.

(c) Automobile Liability. $1,000,000 combined single-limit per accident for bodily injury and property damage.

(d) Workers' Compensation and Employer's Liability. Workers' Compensation limits as required by the California Labor Code and Employer's Liability limits of $1,000,000 per accident for bodily injury. Workers' Compensation and Employer's Liability insurance will not be required if Consultant has no employees and provides, to City's satisfaction, a declaration stating this.

(e) Additional Provisions. Consultant will ensure that the policies of insurance required under this Agreement contain, or are endorsed to contain, the following provisions:

(f) For Commercial General Liability Insurance and Automobile Liability Insurance: each Participating Member, its officers, agents, volunteers and employees will be named as additional insureds of the other.

(g) This insurance will be in force during the life of the Agreement and any extensions of it and will not be canceled without thirty (30) days prior written notice to the other Participating Agency sent pursuant to the Notice provisions of this Agreement.

(h) Providing Certificates of Insurance and Endorsements. Prior to execution of this Agreement, each Participating Member will furnish certificates of insurance and endorsements to City.

(i) Submission of Insurance Policies. City reserves the right to require, at anytime, complete and certified copies of any or all required insurance policies and endorsements.

8. **Litigation Support.**

The Participating Agencies will make their employees available to testify in any litigation brought regarding work or services performed under this Agreement.

(a) Should Redwood City request that San Carlos's employee testify in litigation following the termination of this Agreement, Redwood City shall compensate San Carlos for employees' costs and expenses in preparing for, traveling to, and testifying in such matters at the employee's then current hourly rate of compensation, unless such litigation is brought by San Carlos's employees or is based solely on allegations of San Carlos's negligence or wrongdoing.
(b) Should San Carlos request that Redwood City’s employee testify in litigation following the termination of this Agreement, San Carlos shall compensate Redwood City for employees’ costs and expenses in preparing for, traveling to, and testifying in such matters at the employee’s then current hourly rate of compensation, unless such litigation is brought by Redwood City or is based solely on allegations of Redwood City’s negligent performance or wrongdoing.

9. Not a Joint Venture or Joint Powers Authority. The Participating Agencies intend by this Agreement to establish only a cost sharing arrangement of the Participating Agencies with regard to supervision and scene management, fire administration and support, training, shared Fire Chief services, Battalion Chief services and truck services, and do not intend to create a joint powers agency, partnership, joint venture, or joint enterprise of any kind.

10. No Third Party Beneficiary. This Agreement is only for the benefit of the Participating Agencies as corporate entities and shall not be construed as or deemed to operate as an agreement for the benefit of any third party or parties, and no third party or parties shall have any right of action or obtain any right to benefits or position of any kind for any reason whatsoever.

11. Notices. All notices required or permitted to be given under this Agreement shall be in writing and mailed postage prepaid by certified or registered mail to the appropriate address indicated below.

To San Carlos:

San Carlos City Manager
600 Elm Street
San Carlos, CA 94070-1309

To Redwood City:

Redwood City City Manager
1017 Middlefield Road
Redwood City, CA 94063

12. Waiver. No failure on the part of any Participating Agency party to exercise any right or remedy hereunder shall operate as a waiver of any other right or remedy that any Participating Agency may have hereunder, nor does waiver of a breach or default under this Agreement constitute a continuing waiver of a subsequent breach of the same or any other provision of this Agreement.

13. Amendment. No modification, waiver, mutual termination, or amendment of this Agreement is effective unless made in writing and signed by all of the Participating Agencies.
14. **Mediation of Disputes.** Should any dispute arise out of this Agreement, the parties shall first meet and confer. If after fourteen days the dispute has not been resolved in a mutually satisfactory manner, the parties shall meet in mediation and attempt to reach a resolution with the assistance of a mutually acceptable mediator. Neither party shall be permitted to file legal action without first meeting in mediation and making a good faith attempt to reach a mediated resolution. The costs of the mediator, if any, shall be paid equally by the parties. If a mediated settlement is reached neither party shall be deemed the prevailing party for purposes of the settlement and each party shall bear its own legal costs. If a party refuses or fails to participate in mediation in good faith prior to filing a lawsuit, then that party shall be barred from recovery of attorneys fees and costs of suit.

15. **Dispute.** In dispute over any aspect of this Agreement, the prevailing party shall be entitled to reasonable attorney’s fees and costs, up to a maximum of ten thousand dollars ($10,000).

16. **Governing Law.** This Agreement, regardless of where executed, shall be governed by and construed to the laws of the State of California. Venue for any action regarding this Agreement shall be in the Superior Court of the County of San Mateo.

17. **Entire Agreement.** This Agreement constitutes the complete and exclusive Statement of the Agreement between the Participating Agencies. No terms, conditions, understandings or agreements purporting to modify or vary this Agreement, unless hereafter made in writing and signed by each Participating Agency to be bound, shall be binding on any of the Participating Agencies.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Participating Agencies have executed this Agreement as of the date indicated on page one (1).

City of Redwood City, 
A charter city and municipal corporation of the State of California

By: [Signature] 
Bob Bell, City Manager

ATTEST: 
By: [Signature] 
City Clerk, Silvia Vonderlinden

City of San Carlos, 
A municipal corporation of the State of California

By: [Signature] 
Jeff Maltbie, City Manager

ATTEST: 
By: [Signature] 
City Clerk, Christine Boland

Approved as to Form: 
By: [Signature] 
Pamela Thompson, City Attorney

Approved as to Form: 
By: [Signature] 
Greg Rubens, City Attorney
EXHIBIT A: SCOPE OF SERVICES
TO AGREEMENT BETWEEN CITIES OF REDWOOD CITY AND SAN CARLOS
FOR FIRE & EMERGENCY SERVICES

1. San Carlos Fire Department

The City of San Carlos will hire and maintain a Fire Department with fire fighting personnel sufficient to deliver emergency and non-emergency services in conjunction with the management and other services to be provided by Redwood City. Minimum staffing includes two fully staffed Advanced Life Support (ALS) companies. A fully staffed ALS company means a fire captain, firefighter paramedic, and firefighter. The San Carlos Fire Department will staff and maintain Fire Station 13 located at 525 Laurel Street and Fire Station 16 located at 1280 Alameda de las Pulgas. The City of San Carlos will also hire a Fire Inspector and an Emergency Services Coordinator.

2. Redwood City Fire Department

Redwood City will assist the City of San Carlos to provide a full array of fire, emergency medical, and other emergency and non-emergency services. Such services will include the following, and as more specifically described below:

- Fire suppression coordination
- Incident command
- Manage fire administration and support
- Emergency Medical Advanced Life Support (ALS) non-transport response management
- Vehicle and technical rescue coordination
- Manage training and personnel development
- Emergency management
- Code enforcement, plans review, inspections, fire scene investigation, public education

A. Fire Administration and Support

Services will include a full array of administrative and support activities to include budget administration, records management, incident reporting, quarterly data analysis of emergency and non-emergency activities, personnel administration (i.e. time sheet approval, processing leave requests, coordination with payroll and the City of San Carlos Human Resources Division as applicable), cost accounting, and other services necessary to administer a full-service emergency service system. A Command Staff member will be available to attend San Carlos City Council meetings, and represent the City’s interests at other meetings regarding emergency response issues as necessary.
The control of administrative oversight, emergency operations and routine fire service functions for the City of San Carlos will be managed by the Redwood City Fire Chief. As an employee of Redwood City, the Fire Chief reports directly to the City Manager of Redwood City. The San Carlos City Manager will give direction to the Fire Chief as it relates to services provided in the City of San Carlos.

In addition to the Fire Chief oversight, a Deputy Fire Chief will oversee the additional workload required to effectively manage the City of San Carlos Fire operations. The time allocation and cost share for the first year of this contract will be as set forth in the chart below. At the annual review this allocation model will be evaluated and modified as necessary pursuant to the terms of the Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Chief</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Chief</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Analyst</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>SAN CARLOS SHARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin Support</td>
<td>$877,346</td>
<td>$292,448 (1/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Chief</td>
<td>$255,642</td>
<td>$191,732 (3/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$484,180</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Command and Operational Support**

Services will include the initial response of a qualified command officer (Battalion Chief or higher) to all incidents requiring response under the protocols used by Fire Departments located in San Mateo County. A command officer will be available 24/7 with a response travel time average not to exceed ten minutes absent unusual circumstances. In addition to response activities, the command officers will coordinate the daily staffing of the two fire stations located in San Carlos and supervise station personnel during emergency and daily routine activities. The command officer oversight will include any personnel issues including staff assignments, discipline, leave approval, etc. The command officer will coordinate and work with the City of San Carlos Human Resources Division as applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battalion Chief</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>SAN CARLOS SHARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Command and Operations</td>
<td>$792,750</td>
<td>$264,250 (1/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$264,250</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Truck Company Services**

Truck service is essential to emergency response and will be provided by Redwood City “Truck 9” out of Fire Station 9. Typical responsibilities of Truck Company personnel include conducting primary search, rescuing trapped victims, ventilation, forcible entry, laddering the fire building, checking for fire extension, accessing concealed spaces, providing ladder-pipe water application, providing above ground access, extricating victims from vehicle collisions with the
Jaws of Life, performing complex rope and other technical rescue operations. Truck Company functions are essential to support suppression efforts of Engine Company personnel. Truck response is required for structure fires in the region. At the annual review this allocation model will be evaluated and modified as necessary pursuant to the terms of the Agreement. An analysis of the feasibility of an alternate method of providing Truck service (i.e. Quint) will be conducted at the end of year one and delivered to San Carlos for consideration and possible implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>SAN CARLOS SHARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truck Services</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Fire Prevention, Code Enforcement and Investigation Services

Fire prevention oversight and management will be provided by the Redwood City Fire Marshal located at Fire Administration in Redwood City. One fulltime Fire Inspector employed by the City of San Carlos will work under the direct supervision of the Fire Marshal and will be located in San Carlos. The fire prevention workload for the City of San Carlos will be analyzed to determine if additional capacity is required to fully serve the needs of the City of San Carlos. Some of the services to evaluate are; plan checking, permit management, fire code enforcement, public education, fire investigation services etc.

The following specific activities will be provided:
- Wild land urban interface inspections and enforcement
- State and local mandated fire and life safety inspections
- Plan Checking
- New construction inspections
- Builder consultation
- Coordination and management of Company Inspection Program
- Develop and provide public education services
- Fire cause and origin determination and investigation of fires within the City of San Carlos

- Inspection, clearance, and issuance of fire permits
- Serve as a staff member within the San Carlos emergency operations center during EOC activations and training exercises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Marshal</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Prevention Secretary</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Prevention Officers</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>SAN CARLOS SHARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Prevention</td>
<td>$642,891</td>
<td>$214,297 (1/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>$214,297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Emergency Preparedness Coordinator

One fulltime Emergency Preparedness Coordinator employed by the City of San Carlos will work under the direct supervision of the Fire Marshal and will be located in Redwood City. The emergency preparedness workload for the City of San Carlos will be analyzed to determine if additional capacity is required to fully serve the needs of the City of San Carlos. Some of the services to evaluate are; emergency planning, Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) coordination, EOC management, public education etc. The City of Redwood City will pay for 50% of the full-time position and payments will be made to the City of San Carlos on a quarterly basis.

The following specific additional services will be provided:
- Develop plans and evaluate emergency planning disaster preparedness
- Develop, train and maintain CERT
- Manage the Emergency Operations Center (EOC)
- Monitor public awareness and evaluate training needs
- Develop and provide public education services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>SAN CARLOS SHARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
<td>$54,000 (1/2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL: $54,000 |

*San Carlos employee, Redwood City to pay the City of San Carlos $54,000 for this service

F. Training

Training services will include a full array of mandatory training including, but not limited to personnel development, fireground operations, emergency management, confined space, apparatus operations, safety, live fire training, and other subject matter as needed by the organization. The City of San Carlos will establish a training budget for any non-mandatory or City of San Carlos specific training (i.e. State Fire Training classes, fire service and management seminars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>TE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training Battalion Chief</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>SAN CARLOS SHARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>$222,298</td>
<td>$74,000 (1/3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL: $74,000 |
Guiding Principles- All

- Take appropriate risks
- Utilize department heads as business consultants
- Focus on a few priorities
- Be comfortable working with ambiguity
- Be supportive of one another
- Cross boundaries and create partnerships
- Focus on learning
- Be action oriented
- “Barn raising”- people will be active participants
- Plan for and create short term wins
- Communicate what we are working on!
- Process will be on-going
- Develop easy ways to measure our success
- We are all shaping the vision
- Ambassador of initiatives
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Guiding Principles</th>
<th>Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology</strong></td>
<td>• Innovation&lt;br&gt;• Adaptable&lt;br&gt;• User-friendly&lt;br&gt;• Engage community&lt;br&gt;• Leading edge&lt;br&gt;• Feedback loops&lt;br&gt;• Make strategic investments</td>
<td>• Self service features&lt;br&gt;• Social networking for community&lt;br&gt;• “Real time” report ability&lt;br&gt;• Meaningful data for decision making&lt;br&gt;• Reduce processing times&lt;br&gt;• Emergency response&lt;br&gt;• Digital record keeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget/Purchasing</strong></td>
<td>• Best pricing&lt;br&gt;• Streamline processes&lt;br&gt;• Balanced budget&lt;br&gt;• Measured savings&lt;br&gt;• Inter-Relatedness of decisions&lt;br&gt;• Automation&lt;br&gt;• Good stewards of public funds&lt;br&gt;• Cross boundaries&lt;br&gt;• Don’t overlook assets</td>
<td>• Achieve best pricing for common purchases&lt;br&gt;• Streamlined and uniform purchasing process&lt;br&gt;• Budget reports and performance metrics&lt;br&gt;• Determine amount of savings in purchasing each year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee Engagement</strong></td>
<td>• Involve employees&lt;br&gt;• Management support&lt;br&gt;• Pilot/test&lt;br&gt;• Cross boundaries&lt;br&gt;• Invest strategically&lt;br&gt;• Promote learning and relationships</td>
<td>• Increase morale&lt;br&gt;• Develop skills and relationships&lt;br&gt;• Reduce turnover&lt;br&gt;• “Climate” survey with increased employee satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Services</strong></td>
<td>• Flexible&lt;br&gt;• Engage stakeholders&lt;br&gt;• Open to new ideas&lt;br&gt;• Pilot/test&lt;br&gt;• Cross boundaries &amp; create partnerships&lt;br&gt;• Focus on learning</td>
<td>• Reduce overlap&lt;br&gt;• Equitable admin support cross organization&lt;br&gt;• Enhanced knowledge, skills and abilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit A

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 25, 2012

TO: Mayor Aguirre and Council Members

FROM: Robert Bell, City Manager

RE: Contingency Funds

At the June 11, 2012 Budget Study Session, Councilmember Foust read a statement from Council Member Ira who was absent from the meeting. In the statement, Councilmember Ira suggested that the City Manager be given a one-time, contingency fund allocated from the City’s reserves of $250,000 to be used for organizational change and efficiency initiatives. After a brief discussion on this suggestion, Council Members Bain and Pierce suggested the City Manager bring back information for the Council regarding what initiatives or programs the proposed funding could be used for and also if the $250,000 amount was a reasonable figure based on organizational need.

In response to that discussion, the City Manager reviewed recommendations that were compiled by four employee cohort groups that have been working for more than 6 months on organizational efficiencies. In addition, the City Manager looked at other activities going on in the City and organization that may benefit from additional resources and support. The following information is provided as examples of items that would be considered for contingency funding over the next year. From both a financial and human resource perspective, not all items could be done in the next year, so staff will be developing the ideas further and prioritizing what should be completed in the next fiscal year.

**Employee Cohorts:**

The employee cohorts, which are comprised of a cross-section of employees from various departments and levels in the organization, have been assessing organizational needs and efficiencies in four key areas. Those areas include: technology, administrative services, budgeting and purchasing, and employee engagement. Although not all their suggestions and ideas have been fully vetted, some of the initiatives that the City would seriously consider with available funding in the next year include:

*Build a Great Community Together*

**Excellence:** Passion To Do Our Best In Each Moment  
**Integrity:** Do The Right Thing, Not The Easy Thing  
**Service:** We Care And It Makes A Difference  
**Creativity:** Freedom To Imagine And Courage To Act
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Services</td>
<td><em>Kiosks in City Hall Lobby</em></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation:** A Kiosk for the City Hall lobby and the potential to expand to other City facilities. These kiosks would be like a virtual City Hall. A freestanding, interactive system used to provide information or enable City transactions; one-stop self-service to conveniently access City information, for example: paying utility bills, registration for classes, a one-stop permit center and payment processing, pay library fees, apply for jobs on CalOpps, etc.

| Technology                  | *Customer Relationship Management Software* | $35,000        |

**Explanation:** A City-wide software package providing a self-service web portal enabling citizens to interact with the City, and report issues or request services. One-point of entry reduces the need for individual department “reporting” tools; reduces redundant/repeat requests; provides self-service tools reducing the time spent by staff answering questions; provides updates to citizens on pending requests; routes service requests to the proper department. May also track workflows and measure performance.

| Technology                  | *Mobile Applications*                   | $75,000        |

**Explanation:** A Redwood City mobile app that can include such features as a parking space location finder, registration to City classes, and general information about City programs and events. Also, we would look at development of an employee app that could be integrated with our payroll and finance system to automate internal process related to payroll/timecards, purchasing and budgeting. Some of these features could be developed in advance of launching the new City website, a project which is ongoing, and would then be integrated into the new site.

| Employee Engagement         | *Online Performance Management*          | $20,000        |

**Explanation:** Automates the performance management process and provides a better tool to use in the appraisal process. The performance management module being considered is part of the Learning Management System (LMS) that the City gained access to when it partnered with San Mateo County and formed the regional training consortium. One function of that system that was not included in the consortium membership is the online performance management tool. It would save time in writing evaluation and also enable a better tool to be used in documenting performance and developing employees.

*Build a Great Community Together*

*Excellence: Passion To Do Our Best In Each Moment*  
*Integrity: Do The Right Thing, Not The Easy Thing*  
*Service: We Care And It Makes A Difference*  
*Creativity: Freedom To Imagine And Courage To Act*
• Employee Engagement  Succession Planning Competency Module  $20,000

Explanation: This is another feature of the Learning Management System (LMS) that is not utilized by the City. The system established core and job specific competencies that can be used for employee development, recruitment, performance management, and training programs. The competency model would serve as the “backbone” of the City’s human resource programs and succession plan. The City had developed core competencies and this system would allow them to be tested and revamped and then included in a fully automated succession program. They would also be included in the aforementioned online performance management program.

Other Programs and Initiatives:
In addition to the cohort ideas, contingency funds could be used for outside assistance with the following initiatives in the City:

• Consultant services in evaluating and examining the City parking program

• Assistance in evaluating and reorganizing administrative functions in City Hall:

  With a critical vacancy in Human Resources, the City Manager would like to re-evaluate the structure and reporting relationships of that department and other administrative functions in the City and retain outside assistance in developing job specifications and designing recruitment activities for new positions that may arise from this analysis.

• Evaluation of efficiencies in our Budget, Finance and Human Resources Information Systems

  In order for our organization to move forward and advance these initiatives, some additional funding and resources are needed on a one-time basis. If any of the above programs require on-going funding, the City Manager and Executive Team would ensure that any ongoing costs associated with these efforts are funded within the parameters of a balanced budget.

  At tonight’s meeting, the City Manager is seeking confirmation to amend the budget proposal for a one time contingency account of no more than $250,000 in FY 12/13 to use for these initiatives. If approved, the City Manager would update Council at mid-year on the progress as it relates to these programs.

Build a Great Community Together
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DATE: February 16, 2010

TO: John Becker, City Manager

FROM: Demetrious N. Shaffer, Fire Chief

SUBJECT: CONTRACT FIRE SERVICES – REPORT

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

In October 2008 Council authorized the City Manager to sign an agreement with Citygate Associates to conduct a joint feasibility study for consolidated or contractual fire services with the City of Union City. The agreement also required the consultant to evaluate and make recommendations regarding any other fire service delivery options. The primary purpose of this study was to address critical service delivery challenges previously identified in a Strategic Plan and Standards of Cover (SOC) analysis completed by the Newark Fire Department in March 2008.

After detailed analysis, Citygate concluded that a consolidation between the Union City and Newark Fire Departments would result in little to no savings for Newark at current service levels and would cost additional money to reach desired SOC staffing levels. However, Citygate did identify and recommend that the City pursue a model that showed the potential to reduce current fire service costs while providing Newark with the means to meet SOC level staffing on critical incidents. This model involved a contract for fire services with the Alameda County Fire Department.

In April 2009, staff was authorized by Council to request a formal proposal from the Alameda County Fire Department for fire protection. An initial draft proposal was submitted by ACFD in August 2009 with an updated proposal submitted in September 2009. An analysis and summary of that proposal was presented to Council at a work session in November 2009. Based on the findings and recommendations, Council directed staff to negotiate a contract for fire services with ACFD and present the results to Council for further action. Staff subsequently worked with ACFD to develop a comprehensive contract and scope of work for fire service delivery. The purpose of this report is to present a summary of the contract (Agreement) for services and request authorization for the Mayor to sign the Agreement.

THE AGREEMENT

Following Council’s direction, staff was able to negotiate the terms of a five-year agreement wherein the ACFD would provide fire services within the corporate boundaries of Newark. The Agreement was modeled from agreements ACFD has had in place with the Cities of Dublin and San Leandro for approximately 12-15 years. The Agreement is similar to other contractual
services agreements historically used by the City in that it addresses the term of the relationship, services to be performed, who will perform the services, insurance and indemnification, billing and reporting, contract termination, dispute resolution, and overall responsibilities of the parties.

The Agreement and Scope of Work are attached to this report. The following is a description and analysis of critical components of the Scope of Work (Exhibit 5 in the Agreement) and other notable contract provisions.

**Scope of Work**
The core services section of the Scope of Work outlines ACFD’s all risk response capabilities such as: Fire suppression, advanced life support, hazardous materials response, heavy and technical rescue, wild land urban interface, disaster preparedness, and Emergency Operations Center (EOC) management. ACFD will also utilize and position all available and necessary ACFD resources and personnel during an emergency in the City.

ACFD will provide these services with a fire suppression staff consisting of three fire companies (one Quint and two Engines – each with a Captain, Fire Engineer, and Firefighter; one of which will be a certified Paramedic) and a Fire Prevention staff (one Deputy Fire Marshal and one Fire Code Compliance Officer) per day. In addition to the suppression and prevention staff that is dedicated to the City, the costs of one shared Deputy Fire Chief, one shared Emergency Preparedness Manager, one shared Plans Checker, and the share of ACFD’s existing staff are calculated into the price of the Agreement. The total cost of salaries and benefits (excluding City provided half-time clerical support to the Fire Prevention staff at a cost of approximately $26,000 per year) for year one is approximately $7,160,000.

The Scope of Work also accounts for all non-capital services and supplies, county overhead allocations, and dispatch services. The City of Newark will continue to own the infrastructure (i.e., fire stations and frontline emergency response vehicles) and onboard equipment. The replacement and maintenance of the capital equipment will be the responsibility of the City; whereas, routine maintenance and small equipment replacement will be handled by ACFD. The total year one cost for services, supplies, annual dispatching and overhead allocations is approximately $424,000.

The Agreement also includes one-time costs associated with the transfer and training of personnel, apparatus identification, information technology hardware and software, and uniforms which totals approximately $141,000. There is also a one-time fee of approximately $30,000 to buy into the infrastructure of the Alameda County Regional Emergency Communication Center (ACRECC) because all fire department related dispatching will be transferred from the Newark Police Department to ACRECC. Additionally, Newark will incur a one-time cost of approximately $25,000 to pay off any remaining vacation and general leave balances associated with transferring employees. The total one-time startup costs considering all of these items are approximately $196,000.

The total contract price in year one including annual ongoing, one-time startup costs, and remaining City expenses is approximately $7,800,000.

**Other Considerations**
In addition to startup and ongoing costs, Council expressed concerns regarding future cost
containment and governance associated with contracting out fire services. The Scope of Work and Agreement address these concerns and is summarized below.

**Cost Containment**
ACFD provided a five-year (FY 10/11 thru FY 14/15) cost projection that is included as Exhibit 6 to the Agreement. The five-year projection includes a 3.07% (approximate) average increase per year based on projected future costs not controlled by the ACFD. However, due to higher employee benefit levels, the agreement with ACFD does have the potential to experience higher future personnel costs that exceed the projected annual increase. ACFD has stated a commitment to keeping costs as low as possible and have agreed to a fixed-price agreement for any items that fall within their control. For example, ACFD cannot predict the future cost of PERS or healthcare and thus cannot identify a fixed amount; this holds true for the City as well. However, ACFD has made a commitment to the City that they will not take a proposed budget to the Board Supervisors without each agency’s input and buy-in.

**Governance**
ACFD is a dependent special district that is not funded out of the County’s General Fund. The County Board of Supervisors (BOS) serves as the Board of Directors (BOD) for ACFD in order to provide policy direction and overall governance. Although ACFD is governed ultimately by the BOD, they have demonstrated a strong commitment to working closely with all contract agencies to ensure a level of local control of services is maintained while simultaneously allowing each agency to take full advantage of regional fire services. To accomplish this goal, two advisory committees are utilized to provide guidance and direction to ACFD.

The first is a nine member Fire Advisory Commission. Six members of the Commission are citizens appointed by the BOD and the three remaining members are elected officials appointed by, and from, the contract cities. As per the Agreement, a position will be added to the Fire Advisory Commission to ensure that the City occupies a seat on the Fire Advisory Commission. The Commission meets bi-monthly, and its primary purpose is to encourage and create a forum for citizen input, advice and consultation regarding all fire service programs and activities administered by ACFD.

The second is the Executive Management Oversight Committee (EMOC) which consists of the County Administrator, the City Managers from each contract city, and a manager from each of the national laboratories currently contracting for services with ACFD. The primary purpose of the EMOC is to gain consensus from contract agencies and the County Administrator prior to making recommendations or requesting BOD approval on administrative and operational issues. As per the Agreement, the City Manager will be added as a member of the EMOC.

In addition to the advisory committees, if both Newark and Union City enter into agreements with ACFD the contract cities will make up the largest portion of ACFD’s budget. This is important when considering the impact on decisions that the cities will retain. Due to the shared cost provisions of the ACFD model, it is in the best interest of all participants to maintain a highly cooperative relationship and continually work to contain all costs.

**Implementation**
The two-step initial transition process will begin immediately if both Council and the Board of Directors sign the Agreement. If this occurs, staff will work with ACFD to transfer employees,
conduct initial employee orientation required for former Newark personnel to function within the ACFD structure, and install the requisite dispatching infrastructure – this process is step 1 of the initial implementation and is anticipated to take no more than 90 days. Step 2, contract execution, will begin as soon as step 1 has been completed and will signify the beginning of the five-year Agreement.

Once the contract is executed, it will take an additional eighteen to twenty-four months to complete the full transition. During this phase, ACFD staff will work to incorporate City policies and procedures into fire department operations and previous City of Newark firefighters will complete training programs necessary to seamlessly operate out of any ACFD fire station; conversely, existing ACFD personnel will be trained to function seamlessly within the City of Newark.

**CITY OF NEWARK CURRENT STAFFING AND COSTS**
The Newark Fire Department currently consists of an Operations Division, Fire, Life, and Environmental Protection Division (Fire Prevention), and an Administrative Division. These divisions work together to provide a wide variety of emergency and non-emergency services to the community. The current cost to the City to provide this level of service is approximately $8,500,000 per year. This cost is less than the $9,500,000 that is shown in the annual budget because it does not include costs that will remain, regardless of who provides fire protection services, such as lease payments for the apparatus, existing Worker’s Compensation liabilities, and internal service fund (ISF) charges.

As previously identified, ACFD will provide a Fire Prevention staff and daily operational staffing level of three paramedic fire companies and a Battalion Chief each day. There will be a total of ten fire personnel on duty each day within the boundaries of Newark as opposed to the twelve (ten resulting from current brownouts) staffed today. This is a reduction of two firefighters on duty per day and a total line staff reduction of six firefighters with all three shifts considered. Additionally, another three Newark firefighter positions that are used for vacation, sick leave, and other leave coverage will be eliminated because ACFD staffing levels do not require daily over hire positions for leave relief. ACFD offer employment to all Suppression and Prevention Division employees, including those affected by the elimination of positions. These employees will be absorbed into ACFD, in lieu of hiring for a recruit academy this year, at no additional cost to the City.

**Cost Comparison**
Including $196,000 in one-time startup costs, the estimated savings for the first year is approximately $600,000. With the exception of year two where the savings increases to nearly $900,000, the savings in each subsequent year averages approximately $400,000. The total estimated savings over the five-year period is approximately $2,700,000. If Union City also contracts with ACFD the savings for the City over the same five years is approximately $3,400,000. Table 1, below, shows the existing cost of fire services as provided by the City and the comparable proposed cost from ACFD for a five-year period.
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>ACFD ($)</th>
<th>Newark ($)</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>PERS Cost ($)</th>
<th>Side Fund Contribution ($)</th>
<th>Annual Total ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>7,804,530</td>
<td>8,511,270</td>
<td>(706,740)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>117,000</td>
<td>(589,740)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>7,804,062</td>
<td>8,824,295</td>
<td>(1,020,233)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>121,000</td>
<td>(899,233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>8,077,594</td>
<td>9,000,781</td>
<td>(923,188)</td>
<td>361,973</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>(436,214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>8,394,848</td>
<td>9,270,805</td>
<td>(875,957)</td>
<td>373,737</td>
<td>129,000</td>
<td>(373,219)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>8,627,948</td>
<td>9,548,929</td>
<td>(920,981)</td>
<td>385,884</td>
<td>133,000</td>
<td>(402,098)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 Year Total Savings (2,700,504)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service Levels
As identified in the Strategic Plan and Standards of Cover analysis, three fire companies (each staffed with three trained personnel) housed within Newark each day is sufficient to handle more than 95% of the approximately 3,000 calls for service per year. Response statistics from 2008 indicate that larger-scale incidents (mainly structure fires, large hazardous materials incidents, and multiple patient vehicle accidents) comprise approximately 3 percent of the total calls for service. Large scale incidents are those that require all three pieces of equipment to respond to a single-site incident at the same time. Additionally, Newark Fire has more than three incidents working at the same time less than 1% of the year.

To address the remaining 3%-5% of incidents that require a minimum of thirteen fire personnel responding on the initial dispatch, ACFD has identified that units responding from Union City can reach approximately 80 percent of Newark’s jurisdiction (everything north of Mowry Avenue) within a standard response time of eight minutes, and the remainder of the calls within nine minutes. This means that all units based in Newark will continue to arrive on scene within the eight minute standard, but the remaining Union City unit necessary to reach thirteen personnel on scene would arrive within nine minutes. This becomes possible by significantly improving call processing time (i.e., receipt of a 911 call and the subsequent dispatch of emergency units) by having both Newark and Union City units dispatched from ACRECC. The quicker response of Union City fire units is realized whether Union City contracts with ACFD or not because Union City units are currently dispatched out of the same center as the rest of ACFD units. Newark units are currently dispatched out of the Newark Police Dispatch Center. Dispatching out of different centers creates delays of up to several minutes before resources from Union City, or any other partnering fire agency, are dispatched as compared to when Newark makes the request. Response times for second, third, and greater alarm incidents will decrease as well.

In addition, ACFD will move fire and special response units from the mid county area into the City of Newark upon the initiation of multiple responses or incidents requiring multiple units. This will result in a reduction in the amount of time Newark fire stations are not staffed due to multiple or large incidents. ACFD will also send additional suppression, special response and reserve units to incidents within the City as requested by the incident commander.

**BENEFITS OF CONTRACTING**
The primary benefits of contracting with ACFD include:
- Significant cost savings over the term of the Agreement;
• the elimination of the need to staff back three frozen firefighter positions in fire suppression;
• the elimination of the need to staff back three to five frozen or eliminated positions in fire administration;
• the elimination of the need to add back browned-out resources;
• the functionality of a fully staffed administration for all divisions (administration, training, suppression, prevention, and communications); and,
• the elimination of the need to bring employee salaries back up to pre-cut levels (i.e., 2% for Newark Fire Association members and Battalion Chiefs, and 5% for all others).

In addition to these benefits, ACFD is a full-service fire department that has the highest available hazardous materials response capability recognized by the State, full disaster response capabilities (e.g., heavy rescue, trench rescue, confined space rescue) with a dedicated role in the County’s EOC, and a 100 member fire reserve program designed to expose aspiring firefighters to the profession while providing additional support at public education events and emergency incidents alike.

A large portion of the savings comes from a reduction in personnel. This reduction translates directly to short and long-term savings to the City by eliminating salaries and benefits, reducing all current and future liability costs associated with the larger workforce, and reducing capital expenditures (e.g., less fire apparatus and staff vehicles are necessary). Because of the size and staffing levels at ACFD, Newark would benefit from increased economies of scale for equipment purchases, a greater depth of resources to draw from, the ability to fully staff public education events, shared dispatching, immediate access to specialized resources, full service emergency medical services, more comprehensive department training, and administrative staff necessary to meet regulatory requirements. For department personnel, there will be expanded horizontal and vertical career opportunities and a greater depth of experience at each rank.

The City will also see a reduction in the time and commitment required by other City departments to support the Fire Department (e.g., Human Resources for workers compensation administration, recruitment and retention, and promotional exams). While this most likely will not translate to the reduction of positions in other City departments, it does significantly increase the amount of time each department has to support other City functions. There will also be some additional savings in other departments primarily from the reduction or elimination of contract services currently provided to the Fire Department.

CONCLUSION
Based on the analysis, it is staff’s position that the Agreement meets the operational, service, and budgetary needs of the City. As such, it is recommended that the City Council, by Resolution, authorize the Mayor to sign a five-year Agreement between the City of Newark and the Alameda County Fire District to provide fire and emergency response services.
Benefits of the Regional Model

- Unified response
- Economies of scale
- Maintain local control
- Unmatched retention rate
- Eliminate duplication of effort
- Ability to provide specialized resources
- Unmatched depth and breadth of resources
- Broad-based funding and cost containment
- Centralized management of resources and training
- Standardized training, equipment, and radio interoperability
- Highly knowledgeable staff with a wide range of direct experience in an all-risk environment

Formed on July 1, 1993 as a dependent special district, the Alameda County Fire Department provides all-risk emergency and non-emergency services to the unincorporated areas of Alameda County, the cities of San Leandro, Dublin, Newark, and Union City, the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, and the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. The Department provides a wide array of services to an ever expanding and diverse population. These services include:

- Advanced Life Support
- Urban Search and Rescue
- Disaster Preparedness and Response
- Fire Suppression
- Water Rescue
- Fire Prevention and Code Compliance
- Hazardous Materials Mitigation
- Community Education
- Regional Dispatching Services
Will it cost more for the City to contract out Fire Services to the Alameda County Fire Department (ACFD)?

No. In fact, most jurisdictions that contract for services with the ACFD save 10% or more. The exact amount of savings is dependent on the services and amount of overhead requested by the City but savings in the range of 10% has been a constant outcome of contracting for services with the ACFD.

What if Alameda County faces significant budget cuts, will that negatively impact fire department response within the City?

No. ACFD is a “Dependent Special District” and not a county department that is funded out of the County’s General Fund. Funding for ACFD comes primarily from property taxes in the unincorporated areas of the county and from agencies to which services are provided through contract. As such, the City will only be directly impacted by budget cuts within the City.

How will spending and performance be monitored?

ACFD staff will provide reports to the City on a regular basis that account for expenditures and revenues as they relate to the City and the rest of ACFD. Additionally, ACFD will provide an Assigned Chief Officer (ACO), who is a senior member of the ACFD Command Staff, to the City. The ACO will be responsible for direct and ongoing contact with the City Manager to ensure the contract is being administered as intended by both parties.

Will there be longer fire department response times?

No. Response times for the units stationed in the City will remain as they are today (pre-contract). However, resources coming into the City to assist with fire department operations can be much quicker since resources would be dispatched from the same dispatch center.

How long is the Agreement for?

The typical term of the Agreement is for five years.
What happens at the end of the Agreement?

Toward the end of the five-year agreement, staff from ACFD and the City will meet to discuss past performance and work to negotiate the terms of a future agreement. This information will be presented to the City Council so that a decision can be made to renew the agreement or consider other options.

What about disaster preparedness programs such as Community Emergency Response Team (CERT), Personal Emergency Preparedness (PEP), and the City’s Emergency Operations Center (EOC)?

Disaster Preparedness Programs currently administered by the Fire Department will remain in place throughout the term of the agreement. In fact, ACFD will bring an enhanced ability to support these programs because of the size of the organization. There will be a larger pool of instructors, greater resources, and additional staff to administer these and other programs. Disaster preparedness will continue to be a priority and is fully supported by ACFD.

How does this agreement affect relationships with other Fire Departments?

The ACFD maintains strong relationships with surrounding community fire departments. ACFD is committed to maintaining mutually beneficial automatic aid and mutual aid agreements as the end result is enhanced response capabilities to the communities we all serve and improved firefighter safety.

Will any firefighters lose their job?

No. ACFD remains committed to hiring all current firefighters.

Will the fire department continue to participate in community events?

Yes. The community will see an enhanced presence and ability to participate in community education events. ACFD has a Community Outreach Officer and a Reserve Firefighter cadre of approximately 100 members that are available to participate in an array of services from supporting emergency response to community education.

Will I notice a reduction in service if I call 9-1-1?

No. In fact, a community member calling 9-1-1 will receive a vastly improved level of service starting with quick access to pre-arrival instructions; this is when the dispatcher walks the caller through a series of questions and provides direction on how to provide initial treatment to the patient prior to fire’s arrival. Additionally, the private ambulance provider, Paramedics Plus, will be dispatched out of the same center as all Alameda County Fire Department agencies. This will provide for better coordination and quicker response times of the private ambulance to emergency incidents. ACFD also provides greater overhead support for large incidents and disasters, firefighters responding with an enhanced level of service, a greater depth of day-to-day and large-scale incident resources, and a quicker response of specialized resources (e.g., hazardous materials team and heavy rescue team) will also be realized.
What will happen to the City-owned fire stations and emergency response vehicles?

The City will continue to own and maintain existing fire stations and emergency response apparatus. ACFD will operate this equipment as outlined in the Agreement.

During the term of the agreement, who makes decisions on the level of fire services within the City?

The City Council will remain as the governing body for service level determination within the City.

What happens to our local firefighters? Will existing ACFD firefighters “bump-out” our firefighters resulting in a loss of local knowledge?

The majority of existing firefighters will remain in the City for as long as they would like. It will take approximately 18-24 months for all personnel to be cross trained which will mean that any firefighter within ACFD (including previous City employees) is qualified to work at any of the 28 ACFD fire stations. After this training period, ACFD employees are allowed to bid [open] positions anywhere in the system on a seniority basis. However, there must be an open/vacant position for a bid to occur; no employee can be force-bid out of his/her position which means existing firefighters that wish to stay in existing fire stations may do so.

What about fire prevention activities?

In addition to the daily staffing in the fire houses, fire prevention personnel (the number of whom is determined by the City based on need) will be permanently housed in the City. In addition, the City will benefit from oversight and assistance from the ACFD Fire Marshal and other fire prevention personnel throughout the ACFD organization.

When will the Agreement be effective?

It will take approximately 60-90 days, assuming the Alameda County Board of Supervisors approves and signs the Agreement, to conduct an initial implementation. During this time, employees are separated from the City and rehired with ACFD, office locations are moved, and critical operational infrastructure such as all items required to dispatch units on day one are put in place and all personnel receive appropriate training.

Will the number or location of the fire stations change?

Yes and No. The location of the fire stations will remain the same, but the station number will be changed to be in line with the other ACFD fire stations. This is to ensure there is only one station 1 or station 3. The physical identification on the outside of the station may or may not be changed depending on discussions with the City. However, a typical ACFD Fire Station is identified by listing the City of ‘X’ (Line 1); Alameda County Fire Department (Line 2); Station # (Line 3).
If the County Board of Supervisors serves as the Board of Directors (governing body) for ACFD, how will the City provide input and direction?

Although ACFD is governed ultimately by the BOD, they have demonstrated a strong commitment to working closely with all contract agencies to ensure a level of local control of services is maintained while simultaneously allowing each agency to take full advantage of regional fire services. To accomplish this goal, two advisory committees are utilized to provide guidance and direction to ACFD.

The first is a fifteen member Fire Advisory Commission. Six members of the Commission are citizens appointed by the BOD and the nine remaining members are elected officials appointed by, and from, the contract cities. As per the Agreement, a position will be added to the Fire Advisory Commission to ensure that the City occupies at least one seat on the Fire Advisory Commission. The Commission meets bi-monthly, and its primary purpose is to encourage and create a forum for citizen input, advice and consultation regarding all fire service programs and activities administered by ACFD.

The second is the Executive Management Oversight Committee (EMOC) which consists of the County Administrator, the City Managers from each contract city, and a manager from each of the national laboratories currently contracting for services with ACFD. The primary purpose of the EMOC is to gain consensus from contract agencies and the County Administrator prior to making recommendations or requesting BOD approval on administrative and operational issues. As per the Agreement, the City Manager will be added as a member of the EMOC.

Will the fire engines/trucks look different? What about uniforms, badges, etc.?

Yes and No. Fire apparatus will continue to be owned by the City and used primarily for service within the community. However, there will be some identification added to the apparatus to indicate that service is being provided by the Alameda County Fire Department in partnership with the City.

Identification for personnel will look very similar to what is in place today. The uniforms will look the same, and the badges are very similar but will read Alameda County Fire Department. In either case, the community will notice very little, if any, change.

What happens to any existing fire related contracts or agreements that the City currently has in place?

ACFD will administer, on the City’s behalf, any existing agreements that need to stay in place for any particular reason. If an agreement is no longer needed, it will be ended.
Polling Results from “New Service Delivery Models” – webinar

September 13, 2012

163 locations; 334 participants in live audience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>How many people are listening on your line?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75% 1 – just myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17% 2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% 6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% 11-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% 21 or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Which topics are of particular interest to you?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65% Approach to analyzing opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57% Structure and mechanics of developing and implementing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52% Addressing public interests and concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54% Addressing employee concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57% Managing new service delivery programs effectively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Which of the new service delivery model types are of interest to your agency?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51% Functional consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37% Single service JFK/district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48% Contract for service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58% Public-Private partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69% Organizational change models</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>How have your agency’s new service delivery efforts performed?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14% exceeded objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34% met objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32% mixed results, short of objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7% unsuccessful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26% not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How was the webinar of value to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>How was the webinar of value to you?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57% provided a helpful framework for analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67% identified key issues to consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% described useful examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% offered helpful resource materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% other (please share comments)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>