times since we've had this discussion about health insurance, what exactly has those wellness benefits, I think it was 30 or 40 thousand dollars, were utilized for, since we had this conversation last year? And nobody probably knows it, and I'm not even really going to expect an answer from it. But, you know, to that point of Councilman Lawson's, I thought it would have been a great idea to do an on-site, you know, nurse practitioner, or at least a couple nurse practitioners, to come during working hours throughout the week. And at least that would almost address those primary care concerns.

Because if you're looking at the medical utilization, it's surprising to see that the medical utilization is exponentially increased in terms of pharmacy and medical. In fact, primary care visits have went down.

So, you know, I think it's important there's an overall health wellness perspective, to have gymnasiums. But, you know, from the standpoint of even, you know, I guess some of the requirements from our members in public safety and the collective bargaining unit and the random screenings that they have to go through. But what

25

that?

42 1 it appears is that we're looking at cancers, cancer 2 treatment, obviously medical, but the typical 3 services that you would come to think from medical insurance is not what we're seeing the increase in. 4 5 But my question that I'm going to ask is, 6 does anybody have those numbers on how many of our 7 members that participated in this Aetna plan are 8 actually employee only and how many are employee plus one or employee plus family? How many that 9 10 we're actually outright paying for, that the City 11 (audio interference). And even on that note, also 12 retirees; which I believe they pay the entire 13 portion, correct? 14 That is correct. CITY MANAGER EVANS: 15 COUNCILPERSON McCOY: Does anybody know how 16 many employees that we pay for? 17 CITY MANAGER EVANS: What was the question 18 again, Councilman? You're -- there was a little 19 bit of feedback. 20 COUNCILPERSON McCOY: I was interested in 21 finding out how many employees only do we have on 22 our current plan? 23 CITY MANAGER EVANS: I believe the Gehring

Group may have that. Christian, can you speak to

1 Yes. So there are currently MR. BERGSTROM: 2 around 525 total employees enrolled in the health 3 And -- let me just pull up my calculator. And 335 are employee only coverage. 4 5 COUNCILPERSON McCOY: Okay. So --112 families, and 65 have MR. BERGSTROM: 7 plus one. COUNCILPERSON McCOY: How many retirees? 9 MR. BERGSTROM: That is not broken out. That's included in that amount. 10 11 We can get reporting from Aetna, that we can 12 get back to you on, that would show where those 13 claims are, are occurring, if it's in the employee 14 population or the dependent population. 15 But when I do look at your -- I review your 16 large claims, and a majority of the large claims 17 are from employees, not dependents. 18 COUNCILPERSON McCOY: Okay. So if I can kind 19 of just step back to where we were. I know what 20 our FTE was for '19, '20. But how many actual -- I 21 quess this is the total amount then, what is 22 Let's see. Do you have the total -- 10, elected. 23 12, 7, 9 --24 MR. BERGSTROM: And those figures do include 25 the CRA.

COUNCILPERSON McCOY: Right. So that's 402, is what I calculated, those numbers that you gave me. But is there any incremental or marginal cost? Because what I just totalled, 335, 112 and 65, is 402. I have a number of 529. Is that what this plan is based on, 525 employees? Is it based on FTE?

MR. BERGSTROM: Yes.

COUNCILPERSON McCOY: Is there any incremental cost savings as, you know, as we add more employees?

CITY MANAGER EVANS: As we reduce employees?

COUNCILPERSON McCOY: No, no. So, for instance, if we had a labor workforce of FTEs of 700, would that -- I mean, because we have more employees on the plan, would that necessarily reduce the cost per member?

CITY MANAGER EVANS: It depends on claims to premium ratio. If you had 700 healthy employees that didn't utilize the plan, then we would see our numbers go down. But what happens is, you have a segment of our population that does have those -- some chronic illnesses, so it all depends on the actuarial science and, you know, they look and they calculate those numbers.

COUNCILPERSON McCOY: Well, I'm only asking because, obviously, there should be a cost savings if you had a group of 10 compared to a group of 300. And I'm just wondering where that's at. And how many of those individuals of the 525 FTEs belong to the CRA.

CITY MANAGER EVANS: We can certainly get that breakdown.

And Councilman, to your point, one of the things we discussed on the staff level is to say, okay, what if we put together a plan that allowed for individuals to opt out of our health insurance and we would pay them \$100 per pay if they opted out into another group plan, so maybe their spouse. Well, the challenge is the individuals that invariably would opt out are probably those that are healthy. And then if they opt into another plan, that plan benefits; and then we have a situation where based on our employee populations, the numbers go up. So you don't really benefit as it relates to the modification.

So we've looked at other situations and circumstances, how to, you know, tamper down those increases.

But Ms. Jackson from Aetna can kind of give

us a good perspective on what's being seen in the industry, and how challenging this has been for a lot of government entities, and what the industry is moving towards.

MS. JACKSON: Yes. Good evening. Thank you so much for allowing us to be here tonight. And we certainly appreciate your business, and we appreciate the opportunity to partner with the City of Riviera Beach.

You know, like the City Manager said, it is correct, when you offer or give employees the opportunity to opt out of our plan, then you run the risk of a healthier person taking the option to maybe take the money and enroll in their spouse's plan or not enroll in a plan at all. And so you always run that risk of what is the mix of membership that you're going to have. Are you going to have more women? Are you going to have more men? Are you going to have younger people? Are you going to have older people?

And then in municipalities, the unique thing about a municipality is most people stay and work for you a long time. Which is great. Which means they get older. And as we get older, we have health challenges.

But there are positives as well. Because you want to keep your employees, you want to give them rich benefits.

So as Councilman Lawson mentioned, you just can't keep absorbing the cost, I agree. So then what you have to do is explore avenues of how are we going to mitigate this cost? Are we going to reap benefits? Are we going to absorb some of the costs? And there's not just one magic bullet. You have to look at all of those things.

And so that's what I believe Christian was presenting tonight, was options of how to mitigate some of that cost. Will the City absorb most of it for the employees because they want their employees to enjoy rich benefits? On the other end they said we've got to try and tweak some of these benefits which are rich. And while they still are great benefits for your employees to enjoy, it's a way of spreading the cost without straining the City's budget and without putting too much on the employee as well.

Another thing that the City Manager mentioned is exploring the wellness initiatives. And while it's not going to change things immediately, it is something that you have to keep working at, you

have to keep bringing on initiatives, along with us, to give your employees incentives to live a healthy lifestyle, a better lifestyle, whatever is healthy for them.

While they may have comorbidities such as high blood pressure, diabetes, these are illnesses that you can live with and have a good lifestyle. And so you want them to take their drugs, you want them to remain outside of the hospital; and that's where the wellness fund comes in, to try and partner with these employees and help them to live a healthier life. While they're not going to be cured of that, they don't have to be as sick and end up in the hospital, which will increase your costs.

CITY MANAGER EVANS: And Councilman, and members of the Council, I'm actually drafting the elements associated with a wellness initiative, that we're going to look to release here probably by the end of the week, that speaks to some of the things that were discussed on this. Because I have -- there's approximately \$29,000 that HR has communicated to me that is available for the remainder of this fiscal year. So I'm definitely going to look to create a program that we can pay

in advance for employees to go get personal training, or what have you, to attend, you know, any of the local gyms in our community. And we would facilitate that, and then we would want to roster back as far as their attendance, et cetera, to, you know, track how active our employees are. It's, of course, being, you know, conscientious of the environment that we're in now as well.

So, note, nothing is off the table. But we know we have to do something, because we can't continue to sustain these types of increases.

MS. AGUIRRE: Council and City Manager, this is Cathy Aguirre; and I am the Market Head for Public and Labor for Aetna. And we are honored to be a partner. And I do want to make some additional comments. And we do appreciate your business.

And the last couple years have been challenging because we have seen your claims cost spike, we have been subsidizing your claims, and we do need to partner together to see what we can do to get folks more actively engaged and get in front of the member before they get sick. So from a high dollar claim perspective we are managing those patients. We need to work with the members to get

them to see the doctor before it becomes challenging. While you've had a lot of cancers, you've had a lot of conditions that are not normal in a group of your size. Typically, as Gehring said, it's four; and you all have a higher increase than the norm. So we need to actively -- and we are actively engaged, and so is Gehring, in deploying whatever resources you need to educate your employees and to create the incentives necessary to get them to a doctor quickly before it becomes a challenge.

And I -- you know, what the City Manager has said is so important, to get people engaged in their nutrition, in their activity, in their health. There's a lot of obesity, comorbidities. It's more than the cancers. The cancers, you can't control after you've been diagnosed. But if you find them early, at stage one, you can control the cost.

So we're here as partners to work together.

And we're here to continue to invest in your population. If you need additional resources than what we've already provided, we're here and open to provide them.

So I just wanted to share that and thank you

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

for your business. And we're open for suggestions. We're open to giving you suggestions, to working with Gehring and the staff to help folks engage and be healthier.

CITY MANAGER EVANS: And Madam Chair, you know, to that point, I can tell you, and I had conversations with representatives from Aetna, they are trying to steer our employees to make informed Unfortunately, our employees don't pick decisions. up the call or return the phone call; and that is probably about 40 to 50 percent of the problem that we have in addressing the escalating cost, is that when information is being attempted to be provided and the insurance provider is reaching out to say you may want to consider X, Y or Z, or consider a second opinion or what have you, we're getting little to no response back from the employees. And so that's why we're having some of the situations.

So now as you insert more consumerism into the situation, now that there is quote, unquote, more skin in the game, they're more likely to shop around and to listen to the advice and guidance that's being provided by other entities.

But we do have a significant problem with employees not listening or picking up the phone

1 when those types of calls are being made on 2 situations that in some cases can avoid, you know, 3 thousands of dollars of costs to the plan. 4 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you. 5 I think Ms. Lanier had a question. And Mr. McCoy, could you turn your mic off 7 when you're typing? COUNCILPERSON McCOY: That's not me, 9 actually. I just turned it on. 10 CHAIR BOTEL: You looked like you were 11 typing. Okay. 12 COUNCILPERSON McCOY: Someone is typing, and 13 I can't hear. 14 CHAIR BOTEL: I thought it was you. I can't 15 see any other mic on. So it must be someone who is 16 not, who is not on the screen. So would somebody 17 turn off their mic if they're typing. 18 Ms. Lanier. 19 COUNCILPERSON LANIER: I just wanted to make 20 a comment in regards to having the conversation 21 about, you know, thinking about going out for 22 another bid for the City. I don't think that that 23 would be good for the City, given that we have 24 triple the amount of catastrophic claims. We have 25 an exorbitant amount of illnesses among employees.

And going back out to try and find something lower, I'm afraid it will be higher given the fact that we're in the middle of a pandemic.

Secondly, as we're talking about wellness issues, we can, we can do -- I agree with my colleagues in some of the suggestions that they made about the different types of wellness programs. We have the City's -- the CRA has the -- and the City has, I think, their money for the Sow and Grow program, which is our, you know, growing your own vegetables. And that also can be offered to City employees.

We have, you know, free access to beaches in the City, which means that that's, you know, good walking and good exercise, for a program that can quickly be put together.

And also, you know, I know that Mr. Evans said that, you know, towards the end of the week he will be providing some outline of what they are going to do. But, you know, looking at -- you know, you don't have to reinvent the wheel, looking at bench practices and looking at other municipalities and other corporations who have successfully moved their employees from health -- from bad health to good health. You know, they

1 have even awards for corporations who do that. 2 there are, you know, materials and programs that 3 are out there, that we can mirror to be able to do the same thing with our workforce. 4 5 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you. Mr. McCoy. And then Ms. Miller-Anderson. 7 Thank you, Madam Chair. COUNCILPERSON McCOY: I heard the date of August -- late August. 9 Was that for us to solidify a plan? 10 Ms. Whittingham, was that you that said August 11 28th? 12 MS. WHITTINGHAM: We are targeting August 13 24th through the 28th to conduct your open 14 enrollment. That is considering this is approved 15 on August 19th, at that commission meeting. 16 COUNCILPERSON McCOY: Okay. So we're looking 17 at a 19 percent increase if we stay at the current 18 And then 15.9 percent increase if we adopt 19 what's being proposed here. You know, Members, I 20 think I --21 Councilman, it's 8.99 CITY MANAGER EVANS: 22 percent increase. 23 COUNCILPERSON McCOY: Where did I get 19 24 I thought I seen that on the first slide. percent? 25 19 percent was when we CITY MANAGER EVANS:

21

22

23

24

25

went and we -- when we got from 30, we went to 19.

Then there was discussions that we went to 15. And then we ultimately got it down to 8.99 percent.

COUNCILPERSON McCOY: Okay. But, Mr. Evans, I guess -- so let me back up. That's provided if we opt into this new plan that's being proposed today, the 8.99 --

CITY MANAGER EVANS: That's correct.

So that --COUNCILPERSON McCOY: Yeah. particularly, I don't care for that plan. I, I, I -- you know, what we're essentially doing, Members, is we're just shifting the cost on to our employees. While it's 8.9 percent, but there's a proposal -- which, you know, we haven't even got hashed out how that's going to work. That is going -- which I think is -- I'm not going to touch on too much, but it's irrelevant to -- or it's not germane, I should say, to exactly this conversation, but wages haven't increased at that same proportion. And, you know, I really hate to be given two weeks to try to figure out a way for us to really strategically figure out what in the budget we don't need.

Because I can tell you one thing, we've been in COVID now since March, so that's close to six

months, and just like every other business in the private sector, we're starting to realize perhaps we didn't need that job in the beginning, or we didn't need to take on that service in the beginning, because we're still finding a way to operate and provide our core services.

But I don't want to necessarily water down what we offer to our employees by making them pay more for now pushing everybody into a high deductible plan or buying up into the co-pay plan. That's just not something that I particularly like. Being that, you know, this discussion, I would have rather had much sooner.

Because I think that there are some things that we can cut. But I don't want the very people who -- many of the members -- actually, all of the members on this Board, except for me, decided that we weren't significant enough to have COVID-19 pandemic pay, but now we're going to turn around and increase the health insurance premiums, or force them to go into a plan.

So, you know, with only two weeks left, we're kind of leaving us no option. But I would like to see how we can really put our heads together and figure out what needs not to work because, you

know, again, these are the same people that because of their collective bargaining agreements weren't provided pandemic pay. And I don't think that this is -- I mean, we're doing what we have to do because of -- we're doing what we have to do because of the current situation.

But if we stay at this current plan, that would be a 1.3 million dollar increase. We spent that much in six months, in just pandemic pay costs alone; and much of which went toward salaries.

So, Members, I'm just asking you to think a little bit more before you begin to consider just going along with what's being proposed. I would like to give our employees -- if we can't always give them a three percent every year, or a cost of living adjustment every time we turn around, we should be able to at least look and see where we can kind of trim the fat in some programs that perhaps are obsolete or are better suited, you know, in another avenue.

But I don't want to sacrifice on health insurance, especially now; every employee, all 525 FTEs, know the importance of it just because of where we are in COVID-19. And I just don't support it in its current form. And I think that there's

more that we can do to work on this.

CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you, Mr. McCoy.

Ms. Miller-Anderson and then Ms. Lanier.

COUNCILPERSON MILLER-ANDERSON: Well, I think it's a perfect time for us to keep those things in mind as we go along with the budgeting. Maybe there is something that we can cut out as we're moving along. Because, like I said before, I really do not like that other option. It really puts a burden on the employees, in terms of what they have to pay out of their pocket. And I don't agree with that part, for sure.

So as we're moving along in the budget process, I mean this is the perfect time to identify some of those things we can probably do without, so that we don't have to pass the costs off to the employees.

I don't, I don't support having to do that.

I do understand, though, that this is probably not the time to try to go back out. But I just, you know, I don't like being put in a position where I'm being forced into the situation only because it's -- I mean, this is where we are right now, and we know that if we went out that no one would probably want to pick us up. Or if they did, it

would be just as high. So I understand that as well.

But I think this is the time now to really consider and think hard about what we're putting in the budget for different departments and for different items. Maybe there are some line items we need to cut out, you know, so that we're not having to pass that cost. So this -- I think this is the perfect time to try to figure this out.

I mean, I agree, two weeks may not be a whole long time, but we do have these budget meetings coming up, so we just really need to have a plan and think about what we're doing as we're moving along, so that we don't spend a whole lot of time and can get it done in the next couple weeks. I think we can do it, we just need to really focus.

CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you.

Ms. Lanier.

COUNCILPERSON LANIER: I agree with my colleagues in terms of looking to see how we can make it easier on our employees. I'm just afraid that, you know, going out to do another bid will definitely disrupt coverage of insurance and possibly even have increased costs.

But on the other hand, Colleagues, the CRA

21

22

23

24

25

1 still owes us some money, so we need to look at 2 We need -- if people are going to that as well. 3 look at trying to be able to make sure that 4 employees are not taking the brunt of these costs, 5 then there is monies that are there that we can look to help them with. But I just don't want to 7 be in a position where we are either trying to go back out to bid or we may have a situation where we 9 disrupt insurance coverage for our employees. 10 I certainly agree with looking at other ways in 11 which we can ease the burden for employees. And I don't think that -- and I would not 12 13 agree to make that decision tonight to move 14 I think that we need to look at how we 15 could do that. 16 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you. 17 Mayor Felder. And then I think Mr. Evans 18 wants to say something. 19 MAYOR FELDER: Okay. Mr. Evans, so if we do

MAYOR FELDER: Okay. Mr. Evans, so if we do nothing with the policy, the City has to front the 1.3 million?

CITY MANAGER EVANS: Yes, sir.

MAYOR FELDER: Okay. So as the colleagues say, do you see any way in the upcoming budget that 1.3 could be cut from other areas so that this

doesn't have to fall on the employees?

COUNCILPERSON LANIER: Yes.

CITY MANAGER EVANS: With regards to reducing that 1.3 million dollars, and just to provide a little bit of context, the money that was loaned to the CRA was 10 million dollars, and that came from the insurance fund. So there was a fund that was -- that had cash, and so in the event that the City is to collect that revenue, that would go back into replenishing that fund; and then premiums could be paid out of that and to help reduce the actual cost for the plan.

However, the one challenge that we have, if we don't make systematic changes to the plan design, the cost will continue to go up. And then it becomes a situation where we are probably one of the few employers that don't have employees contribute for single coverage, whether it's 3 percent or 1 percent or what have you. That's very rare.

The other side of it is, one of the things you could look at doing is Aetna has seeded a thousand dollars per family and five hundred for individuals. We can look as a city as to say we can seed some monies for the employees as well, to

have it to where all their out-of-pocket costs with the plan design changes, families may get 2,000 and individuals may get 1,000, and then once they hit that out-of-pocket max, then in essence they go to the co-pay situation. So there's ways to possibly make some changes; we're just going to have to bring some other options to the table.

But if we were to look to absorb that one million dollars, that is going to adversely impact our ability to -- there are certain operations and functions that will lose personnel, because we have every year for the last couple of years have seen the increase in health insurance. And so we have to do plan design changes to be able to stem the tide, because these plans -- we're not even close to what industry standards are, we're -- 80 percent is where we would want to be.

MAYOR FELDER: Madam Chair.

CHAIR BOTEL: Yes.

MAYOR FELDER: So you say the 10 million dollar fund from the CRA, is it possible to pull the 1.3 from that? Or is it there?

CITY MANAGER EVANS: The CRA has deferred payment and hasn't made any payment to the City as it relates to that. We did anticipate budgeting

1 that money into fiscal year 2020 to start the 2 process of reimbursing the City. But that money 3 would be utilized to offset the cost associated with the health insurance. 4 5 Now, does it take it down in its entirety? 6 And how that works, I'd have to, you know, work out 7 with Mr. Sherman, as far as what the numbers would 8 But as it stands right now, that money look like. 9 would have to go back into the same exact fund in 10 which it was taken from. 11 MAYOR FELDER: Okay. Thank you. 12 CHAIR BOTEL: Commissioner Miller-Anderson. 13 Your microphone. 14 COUNCILPERSON MILLER-ANDERSON: I was saying, Lawson, was he next? Or no? 15 16 CHAIR BOTEL: Oh. I'm sorry. Councilman 17 Lawson, you're next. 18 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: I think it was actually 19 Councilman McCoy, and myself, and then 20 Ms. Miller-Anderson. 21 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay. Thank you. Go ahead. 22 COUNCILPERSON McCOY: Thank you, Madam Chair. 23 And, you know, to that point, there is a lot 24 more comprehensive discussion that has to be made 25 aside from all of our insurance professionals on

the line.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But, you know, one of the things I want to point out is what was important in our analogy. Obviously, Mr. Evans, if you're going to propose a proffer, something like us providing those incentives is -- I guess when I was taking notes I was trying to figure out, and this is something that I would have asked that perhaps Aetna or the agent of record come back and tell us, you know, of that 402 that we currently have that's receiving coverage, at least for this current fiscal year, the number of employees like that have these high dollar claim amounts -- because on average I can only imagine that this is going to be a handful out of 402 -- and I'm just really speculating the numbers, shooting from the hip here -- we'd be lucky if we have probably 30 percent or maybe 30 percent of those employees that are really driving those costs that high. I don't generally see that we have that many employees that are running this -- basically, this cost to premium ratio that high.

So proposing something like that sounds good but if it's only a small amount or small population of the group, then how does that really benefit us

2

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

by adding an incentive when -- and I guess the tough part is trying to word it in then the small population that tends to get more medical treatment than, you know, the remaining 60 or 70 percent.

CITY MANAGER EVANS: Well -- and I would have to defer to Christian and Ms. Jackson, but the reason that we were able to reduce the cost from originally 30 percent down to 8.9 percent is really predicated on the plan design changes and more consumerism being inserted into the process. Because we have a situation, like we have the comorbidities, we have the high dollar claims amount, we have a situation where our employees are not responsive when they are being attempted to be coached on those issues. And so if we don't make some changes, invariably we're going to find ourselves next year talking about another 1.5 percent increase. And so it's going to -- and we are seeing local governments -- some local governments only offer a high deductible health plan and that's it, because of the cost for all the other buy-up elements.

So I would defer to the representative from

Aetna and Christian from the Gehring Group to talk

about those elements.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Rivera Beach City Council Budget Workshop 1 Well, sir, those plan design MR. BERGSTROM: 2 changes --3 MS. JACKSON: Go ahead, Christian. 4 sorry. 5 MR. BERGSTROM: Those plan design changes 6 were made in a thoughtful manner, is that those 7 plan design changes are only going to impact those 8 that are the high dollar utilizers in the plan, 9 versus those that are the low dollar, less frequent 10 users of the plan. So -- which is a majority. 11

So, as we saw, a majority of the claims are, are not being -- a majority of the people are incurring the least amount of claims. So there's very few people that are incurring the majority of So those were those individuals that the claims. we're impacting with these, with these changes.

MS. JACKSON: And also, when you make benefit changes you're predicting -- you're trying to do behavior changes, you're trying to catch these people in the sweet spot. So like Christian mentioned, the ones who are giving most of the costs at 20 percent, that are costing 80 percent of the cost, driving 80 percent of the cost, you want to share a little back out-of-pocket, push a little bit on them. But at the same time, you now want to

incentivize those who are not sick yet to have better steerage and choosing a lower cost setting, maybe having healthier habits; and so you're trying to catch these members before they get too sick.

When you talk about high cost claimants, people who have cancer, they need radiation, they need the high cost drugs, so they're not wasting, wasting money. However, the best way to do that is to try and manage them on one end; and then on the other end, when you have the healthier employees you want to try and mitigate them from getting sicker by helping them to go get their visits at the -- their physicals each year, take their drugs to make sure they stay out of the hospital. So benefit changes are meant to steer people into making better choices, but at the same time it's to share the cost with those who are costing the plan more.

CHAIR BOTEL: Anyone else?

COUNCILPERSON McCOY: Madam Chair.

CHAIR BOTEL: Go ahead. Who is talking? McCoy?

COUNCILPERSON McCOY: I just wanted to know where we go from here, Madam Chair.

CITY MANAGER EVANS: Madam Chair, the intent

behind staff is to obviously to share the elements associated with this. We hear the concern and the comments with regards to what the Board has articulated. We can look to be prepared to have the follow-up discussion with the Board again at your next regular meeting. Not maybe bringing something for you to execute but maybe something to have additional conversation, with additional documentation, to help provide a clearer picture on the plan design, how it would work and who would be impacted.

And then we can look to take it, take it from there based on the direction the Board provides to staff; as well as looking at what the fiscal impact would be if the City was to absorb the additional costs and not do any plan design changes or modifications.

CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you. Is this --

COUNCILPERSON McCOY: Madam Chair.

CHAIR BOTEL: Yes. Last thing.

COUNCILPERSON McCOY: So, Councilwoman

Lanier, I don't know that there's necessarily a

parallel or a relation between going back out to

bid and the cost increasing. Obviously, at this

point it's an industry trend. I mean, that kind

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of, in my opinion, doesn't necessarily -- I don't think that that was accurate.

And Mr. Evans mentioned that we're probably one of the only ones that don't require much buy-in by employees; and that's partly because we failed with cost of living adjustments. And also, what are the other things, the compensation study adjustment. And pay increases -- and a lot of these people are still, you know, fighting after 22 years, and they're probably making 40 to 45 thousand dollars less than some of our peer organizations. And I've seen that twice just this month alone. So that, I think, is what separates us and why we should really take a critical look. Because if we can't always offer a pay increase, at least I want to have benefits or at least our employees to feel confident that they have a solid plan and it's not going to cost them, you know, additional 10, 12 percent of their gross income to support a family plan every year.

And that's all I have.

CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you.

Mr. Evans, if there's nothing else, I think we can move on.

CITY MANAGER EVANS: Thank you, folks from

the Gehring Group, and Ms. Jackson from Aetna, and those that are on the line, we're going to go ahead and transition into the budget --

VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Sorry. Mr. Evans, I apologize. Just a quick interruption.

Madam Chair, we had myself, comments, and then I believe Ms. Miller-Anderson. And last minute, I believe Ms. Lanier just raised her hand as well. So --

CHAIR BOTEL: Oh. I'm sorry. Go ahead. I thought we were done. Go ahead, Mr. Lawson.

VICE CHAIR LAWSON: No problem. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mr. Evans -- or actually, I'm not sure if
Ms. Jackson or who would be able to answer this.
But are the costs based on the FTE counts or the
actual physical number of bodies on premises?

CITY MANAGER EVANS: The cost is predicated on claims to premium ratio, as well as FTEs. But also, if you reduce your FTE count and, you know, you have individuals that have high dollar claims, you're going to find a situation where you may see your costs actually go up, depending on the situation. Is that correct, Ms. Jackson?

MS. JACKSON: Yes, it is. And it's also

based on -- there's another component there, which is utilization. Which is what drives what your initial rate is. And then based on the number of employees you have enrolled in the plan, is how you spread the increase out.

So Mr. Evans is correct, depending on who actually stays -- if you have a bunch of healthy employees who leave off, and you have sick people remaining, your costs could still go up. But your -- you know, so all of those play a part in how you come up with the cost of what -- how the increase comes about.

VICE CHAIR LAWSON: So, if we could,

Mr. Evans, incorporate just the cost based upon -
I know there's going to be some positions that are

going to be eliminated from this budget cycle. I'm

not sure how many. Do you have an idea of how many

we're talking about of eliminating positions from

this next budget?

CITY MANAGER EVANS: The number will be shared in the next presentation. And I believe it is 46.

COUNCILPERSON McCOY: My calculation was 85 yesterday, based on the FTE count that was provided.

CITY MANAGER EVANS: No, it's 46, because probably the -- when you look at the benefits associated with it -- and I'll explain that in the next presentation.

VICE CHAIR LAWSON: So -- and then I guess my question would be, would this factor into our costs? And what would our costs be with these 46 eliminated positions; and if that would be beneficial? And that would kind of help make the determination if we need to go back out for a bid or not. So, if we could have that information as well.

CITY MANAGER EVANS: Yes, we can certainly provide that information. But you'll see that most of the positions are vacant so, you know, there may be, you know, some recalculations as it relates to the numbers; but I don't anticipate it reducing the cost any -- you know, by a large amount.

But I think we are paying close to -Christian, based on the plan that we have right
now, aren't we paying close to, I think, a thousand
dollars per employee per month?

MR. BERGSTROM: You're paying \$950 per employee per month.

CITY MANAGER EVANS: So in some cases we have

2

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

73

situations where we're paying more for health insurance than maybe even some employees make in their paycheck.

VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Evans.

CHAIR BOTEL: Councilwoman Miller-Anderson, did you have a question?

COUNCILPERSON MILLER-ANDERSON: Yes.

Mr. Evans or Mr. Gude, have we reached out to the employees -- like, I know you send out a lot of e-mails; and I can, for one, say a lot of times I don't always read them all, so I miss some things. I'm talking about coming from your department, because they're informative, but there is a lot. But do we reach out to the people and actually have a conversation with them in terms of, you know, what their costs are -- I know Mr. Evans said that Aetna tried to reach out to them. But, you know, it's a little different coming from the inside, if we're able to like -- I don't know. Are we able to do like a one-on-one counseling; or at least provide Aetna an opportunity to say, hey, can we -pre-COVID -- come to the office? But now, just being able to give that one-on-one counseling, sometimes I don't think people -- you have a card, you go to the doctor, you go to get your

prescription, and you don't really think about, you know, what you're doing, you just do it; but if it's really brought to you, sometimes you might think twice.

CITY MANAGER EVANS: Yeah. And I would defer to Mr. Gude to speak on that.

But I think the other side, about having
Aetna call, it's so personal that sometimes, you
know, they prefer to talk to somebody that's
outside of the agency versus -- but, Mr. Gude, if
you can speak to what you do in your particular
office.

MR. GUDE: I could also say that, I guess, basically one of the benefits of me working with the agency is I do have that one-on-one contact and I kind of know the posts of the people, our staff members. So a lot of times if they do have claim issues, or if they're trying to figure out what plan would be the best plan, or what route would be the best route, I work with them.

And then we have Juan, from Aetna, he comes out twice a month. So a lot of times we do set up a lot of one-on-one interviews -- not interviews, but one-on-one counseling sessions, to try to assist the members when they do know they're either

currently going to have a high surgery, or something like that, or either they're just looking to get healthier.

COUNCILPERSON MILLER-ANDERSON: And have we seen where that has been impactful? It hasn't made a difference or a decrease in anything?

MR. GUDE: I can see within the last year -and that's since we switched over to the high
deductible plan, the direction -- because the high
deductible plan is more of a consumer driven, so
the calls have gone up because a lot of times the
employees want to be informed before they make a
decision; rather, if they're going to have an
outpatient procedure or if they're going to go to a
hospital. So I can say on this end -- and if you
look at our plans, I believe it has helped us out a
lot.

COUNCILPERSON MILLER-ANDERSON: Okay. All right. I was just wondering if, you know, there was more that we could do in terms of the education piece, to kind of help people, you know, hey, you're getting to this point, maybe you want to look at doing this or -- you know, other than having a healthy lifestyle.

MR. GUDE: Pre-COVID, we had -- and we were

1 partnering with Aetna this year -- we had a very 2 aggressive wellness plan that we were working on. 3 And we even had set up, we were going to have a wellness committee and every department was going 4 5 to have their own little wellness coach. That was 6 pre, you know, the pandemic. But, you know, after 7 the pandemic subsides, we'll get right back to it. 8 But that's the goal. 9 With the high deductible plans, it's going to 10 be a two to three year, you know, goal to get the 11 group healthy again. It's not -- you know, there's 12 no magic elixer that's just going to happen 13 overnight. 14 But just what you're saying, they're going to 15 have to do the counseling. And with the 16 partnership with Aetna, it should be -- we should 17 be able to lower it. 18 COUNCILPERSON MILLER-ANDERSON: Okav. Thank 19 you. 20 CHAIR BOTEL: Mr. McCoy. 21 COUNCILPERSON McCOY: Just one word for 22 thought. Austerity. 23 That's all I have. 24 CHAIR BOTEL: Any other questions? 25 Ms. Lanier, go ahead.

COUNCILPERSON LANIER: Yeah. I just wanted to briefly say that, Mr. McCoy, you made an allusion to when I talked about if we go out to bid we could -- there could likely be an increase in cost anyway. And that's what I meant. I didn't say there was a correlation between the two. I said if we make the effort to go out to bid, that we can very well have increased costs based on our high, high cost of individuals who are sick.

We are in the middle of a pandemic. We have catastrophic claims at three times the normal amount. And that if we make that effort to go out, I'm not saying that we don't, or we don't have to, or that we can or not, I'm just saying that we still run the risk of higher cost.

COUNCILPERSON McCOY: There's no risk. I've never purchased for a car a sticker price, you can always negotiate; and especially with the internet.

COUNCILPERSON LANIER: Well, it's, it's -- I mean, you know what, Mr. McCoy, it's just like if you got, if you got car insurance and you keep having accidents, and you say my insurance carrier, I mean, Allstate, just keep -- you know, my premium is so high. You think I'm going to go get something different? It's going to be about the

1 same amount. And it might higher. Because this 2 happened to me before. 3 COUNCILPERSON McCOY: Right. But we still 4 have the 8.99 percent that's on the table. So it 5 doesn't hurt us that our agent of record --6 I did not, I did not COUNCILPERSON LANIER: 7 say that. I did not say that we could not go out. 8 I said that we still run the risk of it being 9 higher. 10 COUNCILPERSON McCOY: Of what? We have the 11 8.99 percent --12 COUNCILPERSON LANIER: Of it being higher. 13 COUNCILPERSON McCOY: And if it's higher, we 14 can always revert back to the 8.99 percent, is all 15 I'm saying. 16 CHAIR BOTEL: Is there anything else pressing 17 that we can --18 COUNCILPERSON McCOY: You know, it is 19 pressing. One last thing. I hate to say I told 20 you so, but I told you so. And that's all I got. 21 I wish I could really (audio interference) 22 but, really, this is what I tried to caution the 23 members on three, maybe four months ago, when we 24 thought it was okay to approve a policy -- well, 25 actually, we didn't approve a policy but we now

basically unbudgeted -- spent 1.6 million dollars, and now we're sitting here trying to figure out and gamble and roll the dice with our employees' health. So, you know --

COUNCILPERSON LANIER: No. Mr. -- and I'll say this, Mr. McCoy. Sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt you. But what I will say is that there's 10 million dollars sitting at the CRA, and while we're crying about higher rates, there's money over there that we can also use to be able to make up some of the difference. So, that is it.

CITY MANAGER EVANS: And Madam Chair, a point of clarity with regards to the pandemic. That was funded from existing budgetary funds in the fiscal year 2020 budget. So the insurance increase is predicated on actuarial (audio interference) and based on plan utilization and plan design; that's where the costs come from.

COUNCILPERSON McCOY: Oh, gosh. No. So now we really got to debate this, right? Because if it was in the existing budget for positions that weren't filled, you know what happens at 9/30, that money rolls over to the next fiscal year. So, obviously, there were positions that were vacant. But my point is that we have to look, going

forward -- obviously, the pandemic is still going on. In fact, we're probably not even a quarter or a third of the way in; and we're going to have more costs, we're going to have more people actually being diagnosed.

But now we threw away 1.6 million dollars in

But now we threw away 1.6 million dollars in the first five months, and we're here at this point.

And, you know, it's not a popular subject.

And I can say, I'm not a fair weather politician who cares about what people think. I just am convicted by my conscience in doing the right thing. And I just think that had we been a little more conscientious in our decisions, we wouldn't have so much heartburn about whether or not we increase it on employees that make \$25,000 a year and then asking them to pay more for their health insurance.

So, that's all I have. And I yield back.

CHAIR BOTEL: Can we move on to the next subject now, if there is no other question?

Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Evans.

CITY MANAGER EVANS: Yes. I'm loading up the PowerPoint right now, as we speak.

1 Okay. 2 COUNCILPERSON MILLER-ANDERSON: Madam Chair, 3 I have a question. 4 CHAIR BOTEL: I'm sorry. Yes. 5 COUNCILPERSON MILLER-ANDERSON: This second 6 part that we're doing, is this the one that has 116 slides? We're doing all this tonight? 7 8 CITY MANAGER EVANS: We're just going to try 9 to get through fire tonight. 10 COUNCILPERSON MILLER-ANDERSON: Okay. Thank 11 you. All right. 12 CHAIR BOTEL: Good question. 13 MS. WHITTINGHAM: Is it okay for the Gehring 14 Group to drop off? 15 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes. And thank you, Gehring 16 Group, for being here for an hour and 17 -- well, 17 it's more than that. Whatever. Thank you. Good 18 night. 19 CITY MANAGER EVANS: Well, Madam Chair, 20 Members of the Council, this is a continuation of 21 our presentation as it relates to the fiscal year 22 2020-2021 budget. 23 Brief overview, then we'll go into City 24 overview, go into departmental review budget 25 calendar, and question and answer. But we're going

to just stick to the fire department today.

So this is the slide that we shared with you-all earlier, to look at the historical millage rate, millage rate versus the linear line, showing that the millage rate has in fact decreased since 2009 -- or 1999 to 2020. But the taxable values in the City has gone up 295 percent.

This is the chart that we look at as it relates to FTEs. And I wanted to point this out, actual FTEs and budgeted FTEs. So if you look from fiscal year 2016, we had 134 budgeted FTEs, where you actually had 108. And so this is where you'll see the difference and the deviations.

Here in fiscal year 20 -- 2020, we had 500 FTEs; and, actually, positions filled, 425 FTEs.

In 2021 the number with the proposed reductions is 456.5 FTEs, and that's across all funds. So, as you can see, there is those gaps between what has been requested and positions that were vacant and have not been filled throughout the agency.

And what we also are going to do in subsequent budget cycles, that as attrition occurs in the organization, we would look to make modifications to possibly reduce those numbers.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 So this is the FTE position summary by 2 department. This is the changes per the department 3 wholistically. For the general fund departments you can see that in FY 2019-2020, it was a -- 500 4 5 was the complement, and that's going to go to 456.5, with a reduction of 43.5. And then when you 7 incorporate the other funds, you have a reduction of three persons, which brings your entire staffing 9 complement across your enterprise fund, the 10 government entity, at 526 and 50. 11 The chart that I showed you spoke to, 12 specifically, to the general fund, where you saw 13 the numbers that were reduced. 14 15 16

Moving into the next slide. And I think it's important for us to reiterate the point that 60 percent of the revenue collected by the City is ad valorem revenue. That is property taxes. That's a large portion of the revenue.

But some of the challenges that we experienced as a result of the pandemic are a 437,000 dollar reduction in intergovernmental revenue. But that's collected, that's collected from the state.

In our revenue sharing, you can see our investments earnings, we, you know, lost 56 percent

or \$325,000. And then miscellaneous revenues, you lost 10 percent. So the impact to the City was great with regards to those particular items, which got us into the point where we were in that budget shortfall of 1.9 million dollars, but was able to provide a balanced budget for the Board to consider.

The budget from fiscal year -- for the

The budget from fiscal year -- for the general fund, from fiscal year 2019-2020, is going from 77 million to 81 million; and it's an increase of approximately 4.69 percent.

This is the breakdown as it relates to the revenue projection, similar to what you saw yesterday. Property tax revenue being the lion's share; and the other revenue streams that the City collects, charges for fees or for services, which being another bulk of the revenue, general revenue that's collected.

When we look at our expenditures as it relates to departments, you can see a bulk of your expenditures are related to public safety, 19.1 percent; and PD, 27.86 percent. And then this breaks down all the other departments throughout the City and as well as transfer to debt service.

So going into the overview, the composition

of the organization, of course, the residents of the community, property owners and businesses, are on the top of the pyramid there. You have the City Council, the City Council in the City of Riviera Beach.

Whoa. I don't know what happened there. Let me go back. My apologies for that.

All right. So this is the org chart. It speaks to the four specific sectors. Just for the purposes of this org chart, administration, which includes finance, city clerk's office, human resources, procurement, information technology, public safety, it's police and fire, infrastructure, public works, development services, and utility district, and culture and recreation, parks and recreation, library, and the marina.

This is a projected expenditures for 2021 by department. So it goes from your police department, your largest department, to your smallest departments, would be procurement and the city clerk's office. So that's the expenditure amounts for your general fund departments.

And then we're going to get into a department overview. And at this time I'm going to turn the presentation over to Chief Curd. And Chief, you

1	should have full control over the presentation.
2	CHIEF CURD: Thank you, Mr. Evans.
3	Good evening, Council.
4	Can everyone hear me okay?
5	CHAIR BOTEL: Yes.
6	CHIEF CURD: Great. Thank you.
7	I want to be respectful of your time, but at
8	the same time I also need to make sure that I
9	articulate some very important points, if there's
10	going to be decisions made by the Council over the
11	next couple of weeks that are going to set the
12	trajectory for fire rescue over the next 20 years.
13	So I want to make sure that we go through this
14	information.
15	While I go through it as fast as possible, I
16	do (no audio). And these points here were a
17	culmination of different presentations that have
18	occurred over the last year.
19	Mr. Evans
20	CHAIR BOTEL: Ms. Miller-Anderson
21	CHIEF CURD: you have the control.
22	CHAIR BOTEL: Ms. Miller-Anderson might be
23	having a question, or trouble.
24	COUNCILPERSON MILLER-ANDERSON: Well, I'm not
25	having trouble.

1 Chief Curd is having trouble with his volume 2 so -- (all talking at once). 3 It's going on mute and cutting out. 4 CHAIR BOTEL: It was coming in and out. 5 And I also was wondering if Walter might be able to take the rest of us off camera so folks can 7 focus on Chief Curd. COUNCILPERSON MILLER-ANDERSON: No, we keep 9 everybody on here, make sure everybody stays on. 10 People disappear when we don't show it. 11 It holds us all accountable. 12 CHAIR BOTEL: All right. No, forget it, 13 Walter. 14 CITY MANAGER EVANS: Chief, is that you 15 controlling it? 16 CHIEF CURD: It's not quite allowing me to 17 get that full control. If you can take me back to 18 the beginning, I think I've been able to work it 19 out. 20 CITY MANAGER EVANS: Yeah, I think if you 21 just hit the arrow, the space bar, that may -- let 22 me get you to the top. There we go. 23 CHIEF CURD: That's fine. Yup. Thank you. 24 So, basically, what we're looking at here is 25 a culmination of presentations that have been made

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

going back to December. And, actually, some of these conversations have been had since Mr. Evans' tenure here; the first time with Chief Duren trying to move the organization in the right direction to come into compliance with some federal standards.

These are the basic four services: EMS, ocean rescue, fire prevention and inspections. Looking at this year's budget, what we've looked to do in budget modifications is an addition of three firefighters to maintain current staffing levels at station 89. Station 89 on Military Trail was never a fully staffed station. And after we had some of our issues with station 88, and movement of crews, we did recognize that there was some safety concerns with our firefighters and there was also some concerns with response times. Mr. Evans' blessing, and fortunately we were able to utilize monies from our existing budget, we did increase that station's staffing by three firefighters.

Now, when I say three, I'm only talking about one more every day, because we do run a 24/72 operation. This allows us to run an engine and a rescue to provide full service to zone 89, Military Trail.

23

24

25

We've created one executive assistant's position that was put in last year, Ms. Debonniya (phonetic) Jones, who has been providing an exceptional service to fire rescue and we couldn't be doing what we're doing right now without her.

We have looked to reduce the overtime budget. We do feel that if we can get all of our promotions in place and we can hire all of the firefighter vacancies that are needed, we can definitely reduce overtime. However, our overtime budget is out of whack this year because of COVID-19. We have a COVID response vehicle on the road, firefighters that were participating, and COVID testing, mass distributions, give-aways. So we're going to look to try to rein that in a bit. And come October 1st, because of the some of the budget reductions we will be pulling the COVID response vehicle off the road, because that is not a staff position; which was one of the positions that we'll be talking about throughout this presentation as an EMS captain.

We've also implemented a fire assessment fee fund, which we're talking about the possibility of how we're going to be able to fund our organization moving forward, to provide the service to our

community that we feel they deserve. It's not going to be an easy task. But one of the things that we do need to understand is our citizens have a very high demand on our service; and we'll see that as we go through some of these slides. But that is an option that we're going to be looking at, to look at options for additional funding.

When we look at our operating budget here to the right, we've seen our budget from -- change, going up, simply because of those three firefighter positions, because of the executive assistant's position.

And we've also built in the funds for negotiations that are occurring this year. So we are in the midst of contract negotiations.

Our personnel staffing, the FTEs, are operating as roughly in that same ballpark.

Capital has remained in that same ballpark.

But clearly there will be some significant capital costs when we talk about rebuilding these fire stations.

Our FTEs have gone up by four. That four is no more than the three firefighters we discussed and also the executive assistant's position in our front office.

Our goals for FY 2021, I am just going to be frank, it's going to be to continue to maintain the same level of service that we've been providing and to provide facilities for our firefighters. We are not going to be able to grow. We are not going to be able to seek accreditation. We are not going to be able to improve our ISO rating.

Three-quarters of our fire stations are barely inhabitable. No, two of them are barely inhabitable. One is in a trailer right now. And we have a fourth station that needs remodeling, that is approaching 25 years old; and we were just informed today that have major sewage backup in that station, the septic tank and the drain field needs to be replaced at that station. So these are some of the issues.

While the station 89 appears to be a newer station, that station was built, completed in 1998. That's a 25-year window. So it's going to need the same level of care we should have been providing to our other stations, so it doesn't fall into disrepair as those have.

Capital projects for this upcoming year are going to be construction of station 88, that is priority number one in my book; and I believe it is

from the information that I've gleaned from Council on where our direction for our firefighters is.

And also replacement of expired fire fighting bunker gear. We were successful in receiving \$350,000 in appropriation fundings that were submitted for a cancer reduction bill.

Unfortunately, when that made its way back to Florida, Governor DeSantis vetoed over two billion dollars worth of appropriations funding that included our firefighters bunker gear.

So we've actually shifted monies from the maintenance of station 89 to purchase bunker gear. So I have the tough decision to determine, do we replace the roof at station 89 or do I provide the firefighters with bunker gear that is suitable for the conditions that they're in. And as of right now, I've opted to go with the bunker gear needed for our firefighters.

Let me get to the next slide here. Okay.

Moving into this presentation that was given in

December, many of you all either attended the

workshop or, I'm sure, watched that workshop in

early December, that we had at the Clean and Safe

building. These were some of the items that were

discussed. I'm just going to touch over these

items and I'm not going to go in-depth. If you'd like me to, I could, but I'll keep it brief and to the point.

NFPA is the governing body that provides recommendations for fire departments as it relates to operations, staffing, tactics and strategies, so that is definitely something that we want to keep an eye on.

OSHA also provides guidance as it relates to workplace safety. One of the things that you can recognize right here is OSHA has what's known as the two-in two-out rule. So if we have two firefighters go in the structure, we need to have two firefighters on the exterior of the structure in the event that they become incapacitated due to building collapse or what have you, there is somebody on the outside to rescue these individuals.

Please understand, we only run two firefighters on an engine, two firefighters on a rescue truck. One of those firefighters on the engine is operating the pump panel. That leaves me with three firefighters. We don't have enough firefighters to initiate initial fire attack or perform initial search and rescue because by OSHA

standard we don't meet the two-in two-out rule.

I'm here to tell you today that our firefighters many a times tend to overlook OSHA's two-in two-out, knowing their backup is around the corner, and they're going to go in and initiate that fire attack or make that rescue should it be needed.

NFPA 1710 discusses occupancies and different types of occupancies. This is very important because depending upon the type of occupancies that are within your municipality, that drives the number of personnel and firefighters you should have on each unit; and it's clearly a low medium or high hazard occupancy.

Looking at our high hazard occupancies, we have 53 high-rise structures in our facility -- in our municipality. We have CSX and FEC railways that carry God only knows what in the middle of the night. Amtrak Railways with commuter transportation. We have an interstate. Three cold storage facilities. I don't need to read these to you. But we have power plants, port centers, all of those are considered high occupancy hazards.

High occupancy hazards are also considered high occupancy list targets. We have the

Department of Homeland Security -- and these facilities have been identified to us by the federal government on areas that we should pay particular attention to, that are considered high risk or valuable targets. So we have the Homeland Security facility in our city. We have the VA Hospital. We have the Port of Palm Beach. United States Coast Guard. And also a military contractor in Lockheed Martin.

Educational facilities in Riviera Beach. In seven square miles we have quite a few schools in our municipality. These are high risk targets that we must be mindful of within our community.

Medical facilities in Riviera Beach. We do have the VA Hospital, Edward J. Healey. We have assisted living facilities. We have Kindred Hospital, Palms Edge. You can see that there's definitely that concern of those medical facilities.

Oddly enough, places of worship are considered high value targets for people to look to bring, you know, chaos and mayhem to our community.

When we talk about medium hazard occupancies, these are all of our industrial areas. We have quite a few of them. Not to mention the Broadway

corridor. But these are -- all have been identified or these zones have all been identified as medium hazard occupancies.

One of the things we talk about in Riviera

Beach is we are a small city with big city

problems. We are going to have to make the

determination who we are and what are we going to

look like moving forward. Are we going to be that

little department that provides a base level

service or are we going to look to provide that

full service to our community moving forward.

Historical stopping concern discretions have been brought to the Council since 1991 with Chief Wester. He's brought that to Council multiple times. Chief Perry has brought it to Council.

Chief Duren has brought it to Council. And I'm now here bringing it to you, addressing these concerns, which are basically revolving around my firefighters' safety. And I take that very personal, when we're talking about their staffing levels and their safety.

ISO. ISO ratings are basically a classification done by an independent for-profit organization that determines insurance rates within our community. We've been very successful in

decreasing our ISO rating, which has brought insurance savings to our community. However, I can tell you, we have hit the ceiling at class two. We don't have the facilities nor do we have the firefighter personnel to be able to achieve class one rating.

At our fire stations, these are basic staffing models that we have at each one of our stations. Two engines, two -- or one engine, one rescue at each station; with two people on an engine, two people on a rescue.

These stations were built in 1972, 1978.

Here station 88 was built in '72, which is now gone. And we also have station 89 on Military

Trail that was built in 1998. And we have now up staffed that station to provide an engine and a rescue complement to our western community.

Recommended staffing models by NFPA standards. They give definitions of occupancies and different types of hazards that may be encountered. But our, basically our primary function is to bring firefighters and equipment to the scene to put out the fire and save lives.

NFPA 5.2311, there in the middle, these companies shall be stocked with a minimum of four

on duty members. I have two. We're at 50 percent of what they consider the minimum staffing. We do think we can be functional with three because our firefighters are exceptional. But you can see what these standards lay out.

And in jurisdictions with tactical hazards or high hazard occupancies, they're actually asking for six individuals per truck. So those are some of those bigger heavier rescue trucks that you see in other municipalities. We do know some of these numbers are unrealistic. But we definitely can do a lot better of a job trying to get to these numbers than we have been.

NFPA 1710 outlines EMS. EMS is going to be a minimum of two EMTs, two paramedics. While that's four individuals, we do feel we can get it done with three.

When we look at countywide unit staffing, you can see Riviera ranks at the bottom. We only have two people per rescue unit. And on the suppression unit we have two. And we have the three there because our aerial truck that does run out of station 87 does have a third person on that truck. But you can see all of these other municipalities, not only are they staffing with three most of the

time, their suppression units, their rescue vehicles are staffed with three, on occasion two. But even those departments staffed with two will up staff to three based on individuals being on vacation.

Most municipalities have EMS captains and rescue lieutenants, except for those smaller municipalities. So you can see again here we're kind of on this verge of we're bigger than a small department but we're smaller than a big department; and we need to find that happy medium for our community that we serve.

Palm Beach County provides a three engine,
three rescue service to all of these
municipalities. If these municipalities get it, I
don't see why our municipality can't provide it to
our residents.

We looked at annual call volume. In the last nine years we've increased our call volume by 27 percent. We are on pace this year again to run over 8,000 calls. And with COVID we could be approaching the 9,000 call mark. We have not increased significantly or proportionately to the number of calls that we've increased over a 9-year window, but we've been able to hold strong with

what we have.

Looking at our call volume, here we are right in the middle. We're bigger than Greenacres, we're bigger than the Town of Palm Beach and North Palm, but we're not quite Palm Beach Gardens or Boynton. There has to be a happy middle there. And right now we are providing services of these one, two and three station departments when we're truly a four station department.

But one of the things that's really interesting, and this ties into a slide you-all saw that Mr. Sherman presented yesterday, is the amount of money per resident that is charged for public safety. This is our calls per square mile.

Basically calls per capita. We lead Palm Beach County in calls per capita. Our community is very dependent on our services.

We just had a very long robust discussion about health insurance. When I grew up, I grew up in a community just like Riviera Beach, and if you had health insurance, where I came from you had one of those good jobs, one of those good jobs provided you health insurance. A lot of people in our community, which is a known fact and something that we're trying to make better, don't have those good