

**YORK AREA UNITED FIRE AND RESCUE COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING**

**DECEMBER 16, 2008  
APPROVED**

The York Area United Fire and Rescue Commission held a Regular Meeting on Tuesday, December 18, 2008 at 7:00 p.m. at the Springettsbury Township Offices located at 1501 Mt. Zion Road, York, PA.

**MEMBERS IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Austin Hunt, Vice Chairman  
Thomas Warman, Spring Garden Commission Member  
Don Bishop, Springettsbury Commission Member

**NOT IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Bill Schenck, Chairman  
Nick Gurreri, Springettsbury Alternate  
John Fullmer, Secretary/Treasurer  
Richard Guyer, Spring Garden Commission Alternate

**ALSO IN**

**ATTENDANCE:** Steve Hovis, Solicitor  
Bob McCoy, Chief, YAUFR  
Barry Emig, Deputy Chief, YAUFR  
Sandy Ratcliffe, Finance Officer/Assistant Treasurer, YAUFR  
Linda Bayman, Administrative Assistant  
Don Eckert, Springettsbury Merger Committee  
Tom Stees, Victory Merger Committee  
Scott Curtis, Grantley Merger Committee  
Les Adams, Consultant  
Jean Abrecht, Stenographer

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

**A. Opening Ceremony**

**1. Pledge of Allegiance**

**HUNT** Vice Chairman Hunt called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. He led the Pledge of Allegiance and thanked everyone for coming. He indicated that a Quorum was present.

**12. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Les Adams – Proposals for service associated with DCED award.**

**HUNT** Mr. Hunt suggested that item 12A be addressed first in order to allow Les Adams to provide his input and travel home as early as possible. He introduced Mr. Adams.

**ADAMS** Mr. Adams stated that he had not come prepared to make a presentation. He provided some information concerning the work that he proposed to do, which points are summarized:

Application process –

- Developing criteria and establishing a process of recommendation to the Commission for other fire departments to join YAUFRR.
- Develop an eight-step process involving interviews, data collection, listing individuals, labor contract comparison charts.
- Providing separate comparisons for specific fire services.
- Using a six-month time frame, providing assistance for growth, a long-term vision which may include five battalions.

Reporting and Framework –

- Conceptual level included Manchester, York City and York Township as potential candidates.
- All three departments had indicated an interest in participation in YAUFRR.
- Providing comparison reports and laying groundwork for expectation of information.

**HUNT** Mr. Hunt noted that York Township includes very limited current career and almost entirely volunteer coverage. York City would include a very large organization, and Manchester would be a similarly-sized municipality. Each has unique organization issues to be included in the Scope of Services. YAUFRR needs a list of questions for each organization to begin discussions.

**WARMAN** Mr. Warman asked Mr. Adams to identify the deliverable. He earlier had thought it would be a “boilerplate” contract.

**ADAMS** Mr. Adams stated that the deliverable would develop as information and data is collected and comparisons can be made.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that it seemed as though the deliverable had diminished. He recalled extensive discussions about developing the actual process for a fire service that wanted to join YAUFRR.

**WARMAN** Mr. Warman thought it had expanded with analysis up front, along with some sample contracts.

**ADAMS** Mr. Adams responded that sample contracts would be provided as application documents. He will be working with Solicitor Hovis to put together a draft contract.

**WARMAN** Mr. Warman indicated that the Commission needed to provide input into the Scope of Services.

**ADAMS** Mr. Adams responded that the Commission and he will work on that together.

- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop noted that was a concern to him because the Commission typically would not be involved directly. If the Commission was asked to approve a contract with no deliverables and the plan is to develop as it evolves, he was not sure who would make those decisions and certainly not the Commission.
- WARMAN** Mr. Warman noted that the Commission would have to approve the contract.
- HUNT** Mr. Hunt recalled working closely with Mr. Adams in the early stages and he had confidence in Mr. Adams as a consultant to know that he will drive toward something of value. He asked Mr. Bishop what he would like to see.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop indicated that was nervous about the approach and the reason for moving ahead. He would prefer to have an agreement up front as to what will be done and the cost.
- WARMAN** Mr. Warman asked Chief McCoy if he thought the money would be well spent.
- MCCOY** Chief McCoy responded that he thought the money would be well spent. He stated that it was important to be able to identify the issues of concern with future joiners and what they would need to do to join, what will be required. There is a need to be prepared ahead of time as to what to present as far as the benefits and requirements.
- WARMAN** Mr. Warman asked whether the work done during 2009 would be valid in 2011 and/or would there be items that will change in between.
- ADAMS** Mr. Adams responded that the core items would not change, but some of the data, such as contract comparisons or fiscal information might change. The basic approach and merger application documents would not change much.
- WARMAN** Mr. Warman asked Mr. Adams whether he thought the money would be well spent.
- ADAMS** Mr. Adams responded that having experienced a merger with 19 organizations to one and seeing the benefits of that, the process and end result, as well as having a long-term image of what YAUFR could be 10, 15, 20 years into the future, he thought there was a good basis and would be money well spent.
- WARMAN** Mr. Warman asked whether there was a time constraint to spend the grant money.
- MCCOY** Chief McCoy responded that the time is three years and ends in July of 2011.
- HUNT** Mr. Hunt thought the information would provide a good checklist: what to think about, plan for, current fiscal condition, employees, core concepts, shift structures, volunteer station layouts, etc.

**WARMAN** Mr. Warman asked Solicitor Hovis what he would expect to see out of this proposal.

**HOVIS** Solicitor Hovis responded the fundamental purpose is to have Mr. Adams assist YAUFRR with other municipality departments joining the department. The information would identify huge red flags early in the process and provide an ability to focus on issues that need to be revised prior to joining.

**HUNT** Mr. Hunt noted that the three municipalities mentioned cover the three potential models: a pure volunteer, a equally-sized career or huge career staff. All the data would apply to any one.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop commented that it appeared Mr. Adams was willing to enter into a fixed fee contract without deliverables defined.

**ADAMS** Mr. Adams maintained that he needed some flexibility in the development of the contract with the first step being to clarify the work products. He indicated that by the end of the first month he would know the direction and specific products.

**WARMAN** Mr. Warman asked whether DCED needed to review the project.

**MCCOY** Chief McCoy responded that they had already approved the project.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop noted that DCED relied upon the Commission to spend the money responsibly. He agreed that the work would be of benefit but thought that the way it was proposed was really sloppy. When asked how he would do it differently, he indicated that he would write a contract where he knew what he was getting before agreeing to spend large sums of money. He suggested to begin with a \$7,000 figure to determine what is needed, and then the Commission can agree to spend \$43,000 more. He stated that Les' help is needed to develop the Scope of Services.

**ADAMS** Mr. Adams stated that he is working on a product much like an attorney provides time and produces products along the way. As a management consultant providing technical assistance, it is time, advice and developing documents and data analysis. The cost pays for the time and some general products. As the project moves forward, he planned to come to the meetings and keeping everyone informed as he had done in the previous project. Refinement of deliverables can be made during that process. Technical assistance is an area where the Commission would have to rely upon professional background, history and knowledge base to produce what is necessary.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that his fundamental problem was in reading the contract, he had no idea what it is that the Commission is engaging the firm to do.

**HOVIS** Solicitor Hovis noted that direction could be provided to both Mr. Adams and Chief McCoy that the Commission would like Mr. Adams to emphasize a specific bullet point. It could be more specific and identifiable; however, there is a track record of professionalism in the working relationship with Mr. Adams and the Buracher group.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop responded that in his business experience, good written agreements is one of the reasons why there are good relationships. He added that he thought things were moving in the right direction, but he wanted to do it right and describe it up front as best as possible.

**MCCOY** Chief McCoy indicated that, from his standpoint as Chief, he would like to know that if York City approached him tomorrow, he could pull out Mr. Adams' information and know exactly what the obstacles will be and what they would need to provide in order to join.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that was the kind of specific information that the Commission needed to be sure to get.

**ADAMS** Mr. Adams responded that he would be glad to revise the list and try to be more specific. He would want that to be somewhat flexible in order for adjustments to be made to the project.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop stated that flexibility was fine, but having some type of guideline to help get an end result is important. If it changes then the Commission at least knows the point where it changed.

**HOVIS** Solicitor Hovis suggested that, since there is no rush for approval, that Mr. Adams come back with a more definitive Scope of Services that would provide some comfort to the Commission.

**HUNT** Mr. Hunt asked Chief McCoy and Mr. Adams whether they could discuss the issues and come up with something more specific that would be flexible enough.

**ADAMS** Mr. Adams responded that he would do so.

**MCCOY** While we're still here with Les, and we're talking about changing language can we go ahead and move to the second project, the new project?

**HUNT** Mr. Hunt asked Chief McCoy to provide an introduction to the second item.

**MCCOY** Chief McCoy stated that

he second item, which is the \$14,000 document. Basically what happened was with DCED we submitted for approximately \$117, \$118,000 for professional services. That was

two proposals for Buracher, one for continuing consulting for a year. And the other one is the application process that we just discussed. DCED came back with a fixed number of \$63,000, so we had enough for the application process. It left \$14,000 because the other project that we had completed already was not subject to reimbursement because it was prior to July 1<sup>st</sup>, their cut-off dates for the grant. So basically what we're left with is we have \$14,000 remaining from the DCED grant. One of the discussions we had in the commission board meeting, or the agenda meeting, was whether we needed to delve a little bit more into the building aspect, the property aspect, and whether the three-station model or a four-station model, whether we just look at it from a Spring Garden and Springettsbury point. Or do we look at perspective members, future members, and try to get an idea of layers where we think future fire station locations should be. So I discussed it with Les because that was important to Chairman Schenck, and he put together a proposal to revisit the building aspect and you can see in the Scope of Services to look at the existing locations, proposals as far as where the future stations should be, or where the recommendations should be. So what I wanted to do was submit this tonight for everyone's review and approval because basically since it was not defined in the DCED application, we want to at least send this back to DCED and make sure we're going to get reimbursed for it before we sign anything. So it's basically just submitting it back to them, just explaining the situation with the amount that was awarded and that we are submitting another project.

WARMAN So this would look at existing and potential and future locations and current?

BISHOP In the current service areas only.

MCCOY If we look at the – one of the things that I talked to Les about is the existing service area, Springettsbury and Spring Garden, but what happens if some of the areas we identified as potential candidates were to join, and to have a little better perspective on the what-ifs. If we make a decision on construction of the building and then take on another municipality and then we're putting two fire houses on top of each other or we've created two large of a void by vacating another one. Those are the things that I was concerned with. And in all honesty, you can take the City scenario and the three station model Victory is identified as not being staffed to go down to a three-station model. If you were to absorb the City knowing that they already want to close City Engine 5, which is on the Market Street Corridor, if we do absorb them and now we have two empty fire houses, we have a large circle in the middle without a station. So those are things that I want to look at as well, and I think Mr. Schenck was looking at it more from the design and feasibility and I guess the construction aspect as well. But I also want to look at the locations that we should have. We should at least make a decision looking at potential candidates before we construct. And these are all things that Les and I have spoken about on the phone, and he felt that he could complete that task with what was left.

WARMAN so tonight you're looking for approval of that idea so that you can re-submit this to DCED and get them to say yes, we are going to fund this, and then Les will come back with a detailed Scope of Services and contract for us to approve and sign.

MCCOY the reason I bring it up now while we just got done with the other contract is to look at the Scope of Services now while he's here to see if there's anything else that we should add or review. I don't think for the merger that we can just look at Springettsbury and Spring Garden station locations and that's it. I think we have to potentially look outside.

WARMAN I just want to make sure that everything's covered because you mentioned that you're interested in the physical locations, and Bill Schenck – you mentioned that he wanted to know configuration and design and construction costs.

MCCOY we talked about all the aspects of the new building. Response time is going to be an area I'm looking at.

WARMAN Okay.

MCCOY I would hate to close one firehouse and absorb a department where one of the firehouses has to be condemned.

WARMAN well I approve of the concept.

HUNT IS THAT A MOTION?

WARMAN I would like to move to

HUNT well technically Chief Bob is asking us to endorse the concept for him to submit it to DCED for potential funding.

MCCOY or altering the original application that was approved by the Commission and the townships to go up. It's not costing the township's or YAUFRR any additional money because the money was actually reduced to what was available. But we are providing a brand new project that was not identified originally.

WARMAN so would we need to authorize you to present this new project to DCED.

MCCOY if you approve of the concept of the project and what we're looking for, then what I'll do is work with the Grants Coordinator and we will go back to DCED and say this is how we want to spend the balance of the money.

HOVIS I'm trying to clarify exactly what we're after here. Are you looking for the approval of the December 3<sup>rd</sup> proposal, because I hear you saying one thing and maybe you saying another. Are you okay with going to DCED and asking them to amend the grant saying, you know what, this is a proposal that my board sort of looked at and they think it's okay as long as it will get a little more clarification, and we want to amend the grant proposal based on that representation versus my board has approved this contingent upon the grant proposal being amended in order to accept this as an acceptable proposal under the grant.

MCCOY I just want to make sure that this is where the Commission wants to spend the balance of the money. We have a remaining balance that did not fall under the parameters of the other projects. If we feel that the \$14,000 should go to another item.

HOVIS okay, but then are you bringing this contract back to the board for later approval, or do you view this as the approval of the proposal.

MCCOY the approval of the submission to DCED. We would have to come back to you at a later time with the actual refined contract.

WARMAN so we'll get a contract at a later date that looks like this.

MCCOY yes. Les and I will work on finishing this through once DCED says if you do this we will reimburse you. We will probably come back to you within a few months with another contract.

HUNT So, Tom, breaking it down to the simplest form, we have \$14,000. We can give it back to DCED and say we don't need it. If we can think of something else that we can use technical assistance to solve, but chief has scratched his head and the biggest looming problem is we don't have any in-house resources to answer is studying location and programming for the heart, brick and mortar station houses.

HOVIS I'm okay with that.

WARMAN If that's what we're looking for, if that's what we need to do to approve the concept and authorize the Chief to present this to DCED for their approval to amend the grant.

HUNT We did some brainstorming on my second option, what else could we look at, and this just kept coming up. We keep talking about firehouses, firehouses, but we don't really have the hard concept of what we need, where it's going to be, and once we know what it is and where it's going to be, then we can start talking with townships on how to pay for it.

WARMAN Steve, put words in my mouth for a motion.

HOVIS Actually what you said right before that was almost technically exactly what you needed to say.

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO AUTHORIZE CHIEF MCCOY TO RE-SUBMIT TO DCED FOR THE REMAINING FUNDS BASED ON THE BURACHER DECEMBER 3, 2008 PROPOSAL. MR. WARMAN WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

## **2. ANNOUNCEMENT OF EXECUTIVE SESSIONS**

HUNT Mr. Hunt announced that an Executive Session had been held to discuss pending negotiations on the collective bargaining agreement. He stated that an Executive Session is scheduled to discuss personnel issues.



**3. COMMUNICATION FROM CITIZENS**

There were no citizen comments.

**4. MANAGEMENT/ATTORNEY REPORTS**

**A. Steve Hovis, Solicitor**

**HOVIS** Solicitor Hovis stated that he had nothing to add beyond what was on the Agenda.

**B. Robert McCoy, Fire Chief – YAUFRR**

**MCCOY** Chief McCoy stated that he had some action items mentioned in his report. He added that the Commission Meeting Dates for 2009 were re-submitted and Attorney Hovis will advertise the dates.

**HOVIS** Solicitor Hovis indicated the dates will be advertised during the week of December 21, 2008.

**MCCOY** Chief McCoy stated that he had submitted a holiday schedule for three YAUFRR employees which included him, Mrs. Bayman and Barry Emig. This action mirrored what Springettsbury has done. He thought it might be something the Commission should approve. He had intended to have Chairman Schenck approve the action.

**HOVIS** Solicitor Hovis noted that it did not need full Commission approval. It establishes the holidays.

**MCCOY** Chief McCoy stated that Ms. Ratcliffe had provided operational accounts for YAUFRR for 2008. The objective is to advise the Commission that the contract services are included and Ms. Ratcliffe needed to do some adjusting within the operational line items to make each category equal throughout the year in order to build historical data. There were lumps of money in different categories that would cover that cost, but it was charged to the line item that it would actually affect. Now that money needed to be realigned. He requested approval.

**WARMAN** Mr. Warman asked how it was different.

**RATCLIFFE** Ms. Ratcliffe responded that it is not different, just realigned. It is the same amount of money.

**HOVIS** Solicitor Hovis recommended that the Commission approve it. There are provisions in both the First and Second Class Townships that budget and transfers within line items be approved.

**HUNT** Mr. Hunt asked Ms. Ratcliffe to pick a row and step across telling how each column was calculated.

**RATCLIFFE** Ms. Ratcliffe provided a detailed explanation of the transfers. She indicated that there still will be a negative with contracted services, wages and benefits, which related to Spring Garden's salaries. She had reviewed this with Greg Maust to determine where the difference originated.

**HUNT** Mr. Hunt noted that it was a large number, \$210,000.

**MR. WARMAN MOVED TO ACCEPT THE AMENDED CHANGES TO THE BUDGET.**

**HOVIS** Solicitor Hovis suggested the establishment of a policy indicating that any line item transfer of a specific number would not need Commission approval.

**BISHOP** Mr. Bishop noted his concern that all the members of the Budget Subcommittee were not present, and if there was no rush, that it would be better to act on this when there was a full complement. There are items in there that are not understood, such as the \$210,000. A lot of time and effort was spent in getting the budget right.

**RATCLIFFE** Ms. Ratcliffe indicated that the numbers could be off from Spring Garden due to Linda Keller being on vacation. Mr. Maust stated that he would respond with some new numbers.

**WARMAN** Mr. Warman noted that she anticipated being able to clear that up.

**MR. WARMAN WITHDREW HIS MOTION, WHICH DIED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.**

**HOVIS** Solicitor Hovis suggested that the Commission members be thinking about a threshold or limitation where these types of items come to you versus administratively having the Chief or the Treasurer or someone deal with approval of the transfers. Ultimately that would be a decision by the Commission.

**HUNT** Mr. Hunt stated that he would prefer to see more rather than less. Two years down the road where there is no need for action, then an alternative decision could be made.

**Consensus was to take no action at this time.**

**MCCOY** Chief McCoy commented on the incident count. In January the officers will move to monthly totals, yearly totals and inception totals. He asked whether the three totals would assist the Commission to see those numbers from inception.

- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop noted that since inception it is a weird number, which would not compare with anything when it's partial.
- MCCOY** Chief McCoy asked whether the Commission still wanted to see percentages dating back to May 5, 2008.
- WARMAN** Mr. Warman responded at some point it would become a non-useful number.
- HUNT** Mr. Hunt stated for clarification that what is meant by inception means reporting a 13-month, 14-month and 15-month total.
- MCCOY** Chief McCoy responded that he was correct. In five years the third category is going to be five years' worth of data. Eventually that will be useful for future planning.
- HUNT** Mr. Hunt indicated that everything envisioned in the Charter Agreement was annual numbers, not a total of the 72-month span. The yearly budget is based, eventually after five years, by the previous year's incident and not a total split.
- MCCOY** Mr. McCoy was under the impression at the end of five years it was based on the previous year, not based on the entire five years.
- BISHOP** Mr. Bishop thought that it would not hurt to have the information.
- HOVIS** Solicitor Hovis read from the Charter Agreement, "The annual proportionate share of Spring Garden and Springettsbury shall be based after 45/55, basing the average on the prior five fiscal years, call history and allocation.

**Consensus was it was an average rolling five year figure. .**

- HUNT** Mr. Hunt noted that was not what he envisioned when it was written; however, not that he heard Solicitor Hovis read it that's exactly what is being implemented. He requested an email copy.

**5. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE**

**A. Payable Listing as of November 30, 2008**

**MR. WARMAN MOVED TO APPROVE ACCOUNTS PAYABLE. MR. BISHOP WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**6. BIDS, PROPOSALS & CONTRACTS**

There were none for action.

**7. COMMUNICATION FROM COMMISSIONERS**

There were no Commissioner communications.

**8. SUB COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**A. Budget Subcommittee**

There was no report.

**B. Negotiation Subcommittee**

**HUNT** Mr. Hunt stated that the Negotiations subcommittee would provide an update during the Executive Session.

**C. Volunteer Subcommittee.**

**ECKERT** Mr. Eckert reported that the bylaws were drafted and distributed December 15<sup>th</sup> with a deadline for any additional input. They'll be taken back to the attorney's office. They have a target date by the end of the year, beginning of January to have the volunteer company functional.

**HUNT** Mr. Hunt asked who all had seen them as they had been circulated.

**ECKERT** Mr. Eckert responded that the three presidents, the Chief and Deputy Chief.

**HUNT** Mr. Hunt asked whether the general membership had a chance to review them.

**ECKERT** Mr. Eckert responded that he had provided them to the Springettsbury Township Volunteer Fire Company Board of Directors. They in turn, along with the committee, spent a lot of time discussing them.

**HUNT** Mr. Hunt asked whether Tom Stees' people had reviewed them.

**STEEES** Mr. Stees responded that the active people that had been through the station had reviewed them and provided two questions. He had another meeting with Chief McCoy and made mention of the questions. Between Chief McCoy and Don Eckert, the issue was corrected.

**HUNT** Mr. Hunt indicated he was pleased with the forward progress.

**HOVIS** Solicitor Hovis added that he wanted to thank Don Eckert, Tom Stees and Scott Curtis, all who sat down and met with Chief McCoy and him on the relationship that each volunteer company has with YAUFRR and the stations and how they hope to operate in the future. Solicitor Hovis thought it was very good conversation with all three of them and he appreciated them taking time to sit down and talk.

**9. RESOLUTIONS AND AGREEMENTS**

There were no Resolutions or Agreements for action.

**10. ACTION ON MINUTES**

**A. Approval of Minutes: November 18, 2008, Commission Meeting.**

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO APPROVE MEETING MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 18, 2008 COMMISSION MEETING AS SUBMITTED. MR. WARMAN WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.**

**11. OLD BUSINESS**

There were no old business items for action.

**12. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Les Adams – Proposals for service associated with DCED award.**

This item was acted upon earlier during the meeting.

**13. ADJOURNMENT**

**MR. BISHOP MOVED TO ADJOURN. MR. WARMAN WAS SECOND. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED. MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:25 P.M.**

**HUNT** Acting Chairman Hunt reminded the Commissioners of the Executive Session scheduled for immediately following the meeting to discuss the collective bargaining agreement.

Respectfully submitted,

John Fullmer  
Secretary

*These minutes were prepared in the absence of Mr. Fullmer by the Stenographer, Jean Abrecht.*