

Summary of Results from Kirkwood Fire and Emergency Services

Survey emailed to 640 KMPUD Customers, 173 responded

Question 1: What is your preferred level of emergency services from the 4 options in the May 23 presentation?

Answered: 168 Skipped: 5

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
▼ Option 1: Dissolve or shut down the fire department and have no in-valley service	0.00% 0
▼ Option 2: All Volunteer Service (Try to continue the current KVFD service)	28.57% 48
▼ Option 3: Hire 2 Full-time EMT/Fire 24/7 with volunteers assisting providing Defensive Fire Response but backup needed to enter building fire, and Full Emergency Medical	57.74% 97
▼ Option 4: Hire 4 Full-time EMT/Fire 24/7 + Battalion Chief with volunteers assisting providing Full Fire Response, and Full Emergency Medical	13.69% 23
TOTAL	168

Question 2: Should "maximum" population be a factor in cost allocation? That is, should commercial operations whose business depends on attracting people to Kirkwood be considered differently than residences?

Answered: 163 Skipped: 10

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
▼ Yes	74.85% 122
▼ No	25.15% 41
TOTAL	163

Question 3: If you responded "yes" to question 2, how should we weight the fees for each property between square footage of the building and population?

Answered: 135 Skipped: 38 Comments on Page 3 - 5

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
70% square footage and 30% population	17.78% 24
50% square footage and 50% population	23.70% 32
30% square footage and 70% population	27.41% 37
No preference at this time	31.11% 42
TOTAL	135

[Comments \(41\)](#)

Question 4: Is having full time, local Emergency Medical response a priority for you?

Answered: 170 Skipped: 3

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Yes	62.94% 107
No	37.06% 63
TOTAL	170

Question 5: If you have additional comments or recommendations, please add them below or email to info@kmpud.com

Answered: 63 Skipped: 110 Answers on Pages 6 - 11

If you responded yes to question 2, how should we weight the fees for each property between square footage of the building and population?
(Sorted in the order received)

Doesn't Vail rely on the medical service at the lodge ?

Off-season and shoulder season population at Kirkwood is a very small fraction of that during the ski season. Accordingly, a fraction of vehicles and cabins and houses with people in them.

I have no major preference for the funding; I realize just about any choice you make will be "unfair" to someone.

No -- I think cost allocation should be based on actual (not theoretical maximum) population, for example, based on recent historical data on lift pass/ticket scans (for Vail) and water/utility usage (for residences), with a base fee also for empty lots and unused residences. Large residences that sit empty for months do not pose the same risk as small rental units with high occupancy rates and turnover, so the fee allocation should reflect actual occupancy/usage.

Using 100% parking spaces seems wrong

Population is the single biggest driver. The vast majority of emergency medical calls are due to skiers from Kirkwood, NOT in valley residences. Cost should be allocated solely based upon Population, allowing for the thousands of daily skiers Kirkwood brings to the valley and allocating costs proportionately between residents/occupants and skiers.

I'd actually prefer this be based on actual data. Also medical calls probably skew differently than fire.

Vail staffs the medical clinic during peak hours, meaning that allocating emergency services for peak population would be double-dipping.

I think it should be weighted according to response history, medical/MVA/rescue vs. building issues, maybe review this and correct regularly

The population needing emergency services is mostly the people drawn in by commercial operations.

Sq ft should be based on the actual sq ft of each not based on the averages

Use actual square footage not average.

I don't think we should impose a huge burden on the resort that we depend on for our recreation as well as property values, but it seems it would be in Vail's and also KWP's interest to help fund reliable fire protection for its properties.

Prefer to take an additional year to focus on volunteer recruitment and if no success, go with a new lower dollar amount bond measure with a heavier allocation towards square footage.

Based on about 50% of calls EMS, 50% Fire related (alarms, fires, propane)

We think if you are charging by square footage (for both residential and commercial) it should be based on the square footage and not a proxy of it.

Daily skier visits and family triggers maximum need for medical and fire services, easily overwhelming even the most aggressive expansion of emergency services.

If any changes are made, I think this should be, in some way, negotiated with Vail. An adversarial relationship with Vail has already been created due to the changes to electrical billing. All of our property values and the value the resort delivers to the community relies on strong relationship with Vail. Kirkwood resort is why we are here and the ways the resort improves/grows over time, is a value that must be included in our decision making.

I am not sure what would be the equitable percentages here. I don't think homeowners should solely foot the bill, but should be shared as visitors to Kirkwood would benefit as well.

Square footage should not be used as a factor. This does not seem to be a good indicator, especially given that at peak times the bulk of the population are only daytime only users of the resort, which the resort should be fully responsible for, not the homeowners.

evenly distributed

I am not sure why you are locked into this methodology. I would like to know what percentage of our tax dollars go to Amador County Fire and receive a credit of some sorts to offset our costs of hiring Amador county firefighters. Also I do not understand why the allocation of our local tax dollars to the fire dept. remains flat when our taxes go up each year?

Use a method that results in single-family homes and condos having similar annual fees, e.g. Current SF + Measure E

I'm not sure I understand question 3, but think Vail should pay more for the thousands who come in and residents or property owners should not be responsible for paying for the thousands of people who come to Kirkwood/Vail throughout the year to ski, bike, hike. Vail should pay their fair share. Many don't lodge at Kirkwood and would not be covered by payments from residences who rent for example if you go only by residency.

I gave an answer, but I don't really feel I understand the issues well enough to call it an informed opinion.

KVFD, KMPUD and Vail need to work together to solve this with flexible qualified staff that may vary with the wildly varying population.

Allocation should be done based on assessed value and population

This is a difficult question to which to respond without relevant data being available.

100% Population

I don't know if this option has been considered or if it would be feasible, but how about Vail adds a service fee to each ticket and season pass sold. They are essentially hosting an "event" at Kirkwood for their customers. Seems reasonable that when companies or individuals host large events in the valley, that a service charge for fire and emergency services be accessed.

Saddling Vail with expense is not the answer. Nothing is said here about the parking place thing, but that would basically guarantee there will never be one additional parking spot put in for skier parking. No ski resort would be a very bad thing for everyone's interests.

Vail may not want to admit it, but they drive not only day trip skiers but most homeowners as well. We didn't buy our properties for the access to world class ice fishing. Vail must step up and equitably cost share for medical and fire, services they clearly benefit from!

100% on square footage

I think fire protection fees should relate to property while emergency service fees should relate to the population. A funding model that reflects those responsibilities would be agreeable to me.

I would model this but implement using Measure E and not a separate SF 218 process.

I would like to see the resort pay a larger portion

I don't feel that basing the maximum population on skiers is realistic since it's a transient group. How would you calculate maximum population for commercial property?

Vague because how you would determine "population" is not defined here.

Why isn't 100% square footage of the building the sole and exclusive measure? True, usage volume presents a frequency risk factor, but that is extremely hard to measure with any accuracy.

Max population is not appropriate given what Matt Jones shared about the clinic being available when parking spaces are used. Please do not divide the community and the resort operator by doing this.

I think this can be open for discussion. I have no preference on the percentage.

**If you have additional comments or recommendations,
please add them below or email to info@kmpud.com
(Sorted in the order received)**

My biggest concern is overworking myself clearing my own driveway and having a medical emergency. My driveway and the roads are frequently impassable because of poor snowplowing service.

Kirkwood Valley is not large enough to have full time fire/medical personnel. I would like us to focus on additional recruitment through current Vale personnel and increase pay and possibly pay for housing key volunteer personnel.

I believe the proposal includes an annual adjustment in taxes/fees based on inflation rate. There needs to be some clarification on that. Is there an annual cap on that increase? If so, what is it, and if not, there should be.

Appreciate the effort for community input.

Option 3 'emerged' in response to significant pushback of the current Option 4. We shouldn't expect it is set in stone. Why not Option 2+? Data regarding nature of calls, e.g. smoke alarms, worry calls, etc. vs. an actual acute medical necessity, as well as locations needs to be disseminated. The possibility of what can happen needs to be based on data, not conjecture.

I would support any option other than #1, really, but #3 seems the most likely to get support from the population. Thank you for all your research!

I would prefer something midway between options 2 and 3 for question #1. We can have less than full-time 24/7 professional coverage, for example, in May, September, October, and November -- approximately one third of the year. If those staff are not allowed to take other local jobs during those times, then they will be bored out of their minds -- but if they are taking simultaneous jobs, then they shouldn't be paid 24/7.

Thank you for all of your effort on this!

I am opposed to the ballooning expenses of a full time fire department in Kirkwood. KMPUD's responses to emails vary from hostile to unresponsive, I'm opposed to give it any more responsibilities.

they would sit around and play cards waste of \$\$\$\$

More clarity and transparency is needed around costs per home owner prior to implementation of proposed rules

The current proposal, basing taxes on parking spaces, makes zero sense. Historical data show only a few significant fires, equally split between community resources/resort structures and homes. Medical calls are the vast majority. Also, did I see that the proposal suggests a privatized fire department? Who benefits from this financially? I think we need a much better, EVIDENCE-BASED solution.

I've been an owner over 35 years....medical is much more important to me as I (and others?) age compared to how I used to feel

The fee division discussed at the meeting, having the homes charged for 2 parking places and condos 1, is unfair. We don't have a driveway or garage and the cul-de-sac in front of our cabin was rarely cleared this past winter. We are on Fremont Ct. and have to look for parking on Fremont Rd. Many condos have covered parking always available. Many cabins are rarely occupied and many condos are occupied almost all of the winter because of people renting them and quarter shares. A cabin across from us was not occupied even once this last winter. If the parking pads on our cul-de-sac were cleared there would be only 4 parking places for 4 cabins not the 8 we would supposedly have if there are 2 spaces per cabin.

Owners of land that have not built on the property should also be required to contribute to our fire safety team.

Voting no on E is shortsighted.

Sorry we were unable to attend the meeting, thank you for the detailed analysis. Would be great to boil this down to how much specifically we'd pay and how that would be collected.

I agree that closing up the fire department would cost us a lot more in increased insurance and potential lost property value. I support imposing a fee and wish this had been addressed years ago since a flat fee only returns less each year.

Has expanding the Barton clinic contract been explored?

Please enact a policy that requires a rigorous community process before raising the fire dept budget beyond that required for Option 3 above. The Board needs to do something to assure many that the \$1.9 million is not a threat, should Measure E pass.

It would be nice for trained medical personnel to be in valley during the times that Barton is closed. So something falling in between options 2 and 3.

How and Who provides Fire Services at Heavenly and North Star? What percentage of each is paid by Vail? Since Kirkwood is in two counties, how can KWD work with each to get more/better Fire support from each? Since our county property taxes are paying for fire services why not negotiate so we have one fire/emt on site at KWD full time for a month for six months a year alternating counties every other month?

The plan to base costs in part on the parking spaces is ludicrous. Especially with time-shares, condominium usage will be higher, as various owners maximize their individual usage, and the ease of renting without regard to clearing snow to doorways, garages as those in the neighborhoods are competing for suboptimal road maintenance. This is not to mention the ease of renting ski in ski out property. On our cul de sac, frequently there are no even four parking spaces for four residences, and at times there have been none on the day of a storm.

I would like to understand how we can work with the county to re-capture some portion of our property taxes. I would assume our home valuations are higher than those outside of the valley and we consume far less services to which those funds are attached. The county should allow us to bring more funds back locally due to the exceptional situation. Perhaps Vail can assist with a negotiation of this type. If indeed, we find that short term renters/vacationers use these services in a disproportionate manner, I think it would also make sense to explore a tax on short term rentals in the valley to fund increased services. Is this something we can implement? Can we work with the county to implement something along these lines?

1) I could not answer question 1 as my preferred option is missing: a paid fire chief with EMT training that must be in the valley while on duty AND on call. He would be present during all the high occupancy periods. He would be in charge of recruiting and managing volunteers.
2) Maximum population is unfair as this is not used for residential. Average population would be a better proxy for a fair allocation to all. 3) Fire assessment based on sf and medical assessment on average population, half and half. 4) Kirkwood valley occupation is too low for extended period of time to afford full time EMT service 24/7/365. Remoteness is part of Kirkwood and should be accepted. There are other communities closer to emergency services if this is important to some.

1) I would like to see an option between 2 and 3 with some full time, but fewer than proposed with option 3, supported by local volunteers. Ideally this would be a full time fire chief who would need to be on mountain during shifts and and when on call and 1 EMT/Firefighter on site to alternate shifts with the fire chief. These full time positions would be supported by local volunteers with improved recruitment and more training, similar to what was providing in the past. 2) I believe this should be based on the average population for commercial and residential activities alike, not maximum, to provide a fair rate for everyone. 4) Yes, I do feel EMS are important but do not expect these to be at the same level as if we were located in a city. This is a remote community and should not be expected to have the same services as in South Lake Tahoe or Truckee!!

If we need to pay for EMT/Fire personal, the cost should be bourn by Amador and Alpine county. If they won't do it, we should sue the counties. No reason that Kirkwood homeowners should pay double for the same service.

Full time trained EMS and fire service is mandatory 24/7/365

Given that the bulk of the population are truly visitors of the resort, Vail should be footing the vast majority of the EMS services. Homeowners of Kirkwood understand the remoteness of Kirkwood and it's limited services. We do not expect full EMS services comparable to SLT or Truckee. Putting this burden solely on homeowners, by some measure of square footage is too much is a burden, and makes zero sense. We already pay extremely high rates for utilities, and there is little to no room for additional fixed costs. 4 full time personnel is FAR too much, especially during times when the resort is closed and very few people are staying in Kirkwood.

If we don't have emergency services available in KW valley, we will ALL most likely loose our fire, etc. insurance. Additionally, we can hired 4 paid fireman in the future, if need be.

Question 2) should be based on the average population for commercial and residential activities alike, not maximum, to provide a fair rate for everyone. Question 3) we are in a remote community and do not believe the level of services to be equal to living in a city. It seems like being able to drive out of the valley (snow removal) is more important, so we can get to services.

I perhaps use my property no more than 8 weeks per year and feel that we are always subsidizing commercial enterprises at Kirkwood. I'm not sure why a straight \$x/ house, regardless of square footage cannot work, and something more equitable for the commercial enterprises. It would be interesting to know what percentage of calls for medical/rescue services were for residents vs visitors. I have not had time to read all source materials as we have a lawsuit going on and a wedding in a few weeks.

staffing level between options 2 & 3. Skip a fancy new building.

Since Kirkwood "demand" is largely seasonal, there will be so much downtime that perhaps the positions should be modified from traditional EMT/Fire roles. Adding other responsibilities to assist KMPUD such as coverage for specific operations that are not time-critical would provide more justification for adding employees.

Vail doesn't pay enough.

I think that it is imperative during the winter... as the summer usage grows I think it is important to offer local medical response

It seems the vast majority of services go to day trippers to "commercial services", and I'd like to seem them provide proportional resources.

If the ski resort requires 24/7 or even peak time services, they should pay for it. I think it is their choice. I am good with increasing our fees for minimal services to keep the current situation.

It is essential that there is full time fire and EMT in the valley given the fire danger and the high volume of outdoor sports enthusiasts who get hurt, lost, etc.

On question 1, my answer is really at least 3. I would consider 4 based on costs and funding.

Measure E asks us to fund "Medical Services", not just Emergency medical services. We need limited services to limit spending.

Fire and emergency services should be covered by county property taxes. Kirkwood residents get very little in return for their property taxes

I prefer Option 4 but Option 3 would be acceptable. Option 1 and 2 are unacceptable.

I don't know if this option has been considered or if it would be feasible, but how about Vail adds a service fee to each ticket and season pass sold. They are essentially hosting an "event" at Kirkwood for their customers. Seems reasonable that when companies or individuals host large events in the valley, that a service charge for fire and emergency services be accessed.

There is no good answer, answers are not what's wanted but we don't have the resource pool to pay for this. This applies to q4. Not desired but it seems cost prohibitive. Have we asked the county where property tax money goes and looked at moving all of Kirkwood into one county or the other? - the multiple county issue is one of the causes of some of our problems. This seems like a big decision that was rushed.

I appreciated the commenter on May 23 who said "Vail doesn't get to say no to cost sharing just because they don't want to." We realize Kirkwood is unique and communities around Vail's other 36 properties can tax a larger base and offer these services which provide safety for skiers and homeowners. We realize Vail wouldn't want to set a new precedent for cost sharing these services. However, in our case it's the right thing to do, it can comfortably come from Vail's profits, and if Vail were to finally build out the TC base lodge on the unsightly raw foundation and build better parking, the corporation would benefit yet further and more deeply from the cost sharing (not least because more skiers will come). Step up, Vail. We appreciate Vail and expect to have a good faith partner in you.

Expanding services could be appealing to me but not by funding them in this manner. The larger question for me is: How do our existing taxes fail to provide any of these essential

resources currently? It seems that Kirkwood functions as a tax profit-center for Alpine and Amador counties without receiving the services associated with paying those taxes.

Thank you to the board and staff for all you are doing to preserve Kirkwood's fire department and services.

In the mid-2000's the KVFD offered EMT classes for a cost. The class was taken by residents and employees of Kirkwood and many of them volunteered as a result. Why hasn't the KMPUD/KVFD been actively recruiting for volunteers?

I have not seen any explanation why the millions of dollars in property tax the valley pays to the counties brings so little in services. Why are we not getting more money from the counties? What has been explored to increase county funding to a level that is sustainable for the fire department? Also the financial figures provided do not mention the current large annual donations to the fire department will presumably vanish if a large tax is implemented.

There's already a bond measure from Alpine county that's increased the property taxes significantly. Not interested in additional taxes or fees.

Our HOA and electric bills are enough. There's nothing left.

Thanks for gaining insight from the community. It's unfortunate it's happening @ this juncture in the process. I didn't comment @ the video chat however, I could provide potential challenges with the paid plan. I'll add, the folks who spoke up in favor of a pd dept. seem to be short tenure owners not familiar with the system. Why would anyone not more protection? I'm a 33 retired firefighter. I recognize many of the politics and operations that take place. A paid FD is a business of customer service. It's expensive and for many, not easy to justify for the expense. Especially @ maybe 10 calls a month. Interestingly, alarms etc are grouped into fire/rescue with the other small portion being medical. A trouble alarm (is smoke detector triggered by low battery, cobwebs or paint etc) is an "event" many of the legit calls are out of the valley traffic related with pd. agencies responding to the detail which include CHP and Sheriff's who generally are EMTs with equipment, especially in rural areas where "they are the help" that's gonna mitigate until fire/transport are to arrive. If you have a time sensitive trauma, the helicopter is dispatched with flight nurses. EMTs are a pretty low level of life support and don't provide life saving/ stabilizing drugs for cardiac events etc. That's advanced life support ALS-paramedics and above. Any EMT will convey the relief that comes with the ambulances arrival. Is that what close to 2 million per year is worth with the other pending capital improvements issues lingering? Next issue not addressed was the coverage commitment. Typically, on any extended call or conflagration, slower, distant stations "move up" to cover the resources committed on the detail. Does that mean "our paid guys" are moving up and the kwood valley is left uncovered until incident is mitigated? Maybe, if Amador FD functions as a normal dept. Especially on extended wildland calls in the foothills etc. Next is the down right boredom working in a remote, slow call volume latitude. Firefighters want calls and action, that's what keeps you on your A game of proficiency. Not " we got lots of time, we're gonna train, train, train" doesn't work that way in reality. I believe this will create a "shift fill" with overtime environment. No ones gonna bid these spots in firefighting ranks except to get overtime. This will create a larger expense when that's realized. Additionally, a revolving door of experience that's unlikely to be familiar with their response area- alarms, elevators, locations etc. A civilian can learn the Airway-Breathing- Circulation standards of life support, again a lot of unwarranted expense to have "EMT's" protecting. Fire potential, I don't believe is the danger. Like Mobil homes and vehicle fires, it's likely to be an insurance Co. total loss. I've been @ kirkwood for the fire of nearly the last 40 years. I took the photos on chief Ansel's wall of Sun Meadows burning with Michael Sharp and the ski patrol fighting in a blizzard with 88 having been closed for 4 days. It was an unprecedented fire. Two additional pd EMTs will provide the

same 2 in 2 out OSHA requirement. 2 can still enter with a "known" or assumed rescue- IE, there's a car in the driveway @ 3 in the morning. There is still resources from outside responding, that's "autoaid" agreements within the county. In summary, I would never downplay the need for more firefighters or EMS services, however, I would like to see other options explored like recruiting @ the college, incentives for permanent staff or additional hiring within the PUD since permanent housed employees are what's required in this latitude. I recognize there's frustration with staffing levels and those dealing with the challenge. It's been the "norm" as long as I've been around the valley and now this is set in motion with no checks and balances to facilitate or control. The carts in front of the house @ this point and I believe Vail Corp whom is the reason we are all able to have snow sports and bull wheels turning, after two bankruptcies in the past- prior to putting Kirkwood in their portfolio should be way more involved with this. They have the power and resources to help facilitate this process. It shouldn't be "forced" on them regardless of their windfall of reported cash. They are in the development, operations business to make a profit for their shareholders, not be ordered around for deep pockets.

Question #1 presents limited and therefore false alternatives and cannot be rationally answered until KMPUD discloses the actual number of fire calls and their origins and specific descriptions, the actual number of medical aid calls and their origins and specific descriptions, and the actual number number of search and rescue calls and their origins, as I have requested KMPUD to publish to the Kirkwood community, for given periods of time.

The KMPUD has not gone about this in the right order and continuing with a method of funding that's not right and allowing this board or future boards to go unchecked and charge the maximum amount is a problem. The unwillingness to respond to residents calling this out or to even try to get additional volunteers now tells us the KMPUD is likely to charge the most it can going forward.

It's only common sense to have services.

Thank you for your work on this. I intend to vote yes on the ballot measure in July. I understand the concerns of some community members re the \$\$ amount in that measure. I appreciate the board members putting their time into Kirkwood; and am not concerned that you will do anything terrible. But after all if you do something terrible you can be voted out, so think community members should be more concerned about medical emergencies than the board's actions.

Paying a reasonable fee for this service is no different than the other services we pay for.

Fire protection is carved out of Homeowners coverage for residents in West Meadow. Fire coverage through the CA Fair plan is \$4,000+ per year. If increased local fire protection staff would get insurers to include fire coverage once again in their homeowners coverage, the savings to homeowners would more than off-set their cost of increasing the staff. This is worth exploring with companies insuring homes in Kirkwood.

Firefighters and EMT's should be paid to do their jobs. It is unreasonable to expect to rely on volunteers. Kirkwood property tax dollars help the fire departments in Amador, Eldorado and Alpine counties. It seems only reasonable that the responsibility be divided between the counties and not solely placed on the residents of Kirkwood. If someone's home or business is burning down or a family member is injured, I want Kirkwood property tax dollars to help individuals in those counties. I would assume that the counties would be willing to do the same for the residents of Kirkwood.