

## SINGLE PROVIDER MODEL

#140101I

Option No.	Single Provider Options	Description	Funding Mechanisms	Applicable Implementation Issues	Special Issues
1	Consolidated Services under GFR	Contract with leasing or sale of existing ACFR assets.	1. Direct contract from MSTU; 2. establishment of separate MSBU's in city and county urban area; 3. Special assessment funding.	1. Status of ACFR personnel; 2. Price protection for urban MSTU; 3. MSBU process if that model selected; 4. Require study to establish fire assessment fees if used.	EMS transportation
2	Consolidated Services under ACFR	All Fire/Rescue services would be consolidated under ACFR. GFR would cease to exist as a distinct entity.	1. Establish MSBU in city; 2. special assessment; 3. city contract with ACFR and fund from ad Valorem.	1. Bargaining unit issues of existing contract; 2. GFR personnel status; 3. Time/effort to establish special assessment or MSBU.	
3	Urban Area Contracted Management services provided by GFR	GFD would provide management services in the urban area. ACFR would own and staff its stations, but its personnel would report to a GFR chief. GFR would be responsible for operational planning, daily coordination and projecting future needs.	Direct contract from MSTU funds.	1. Future role of ACFR chiefs; 2. ACFR management – GFR management coordination	1. Interface of Alachua County Transport function (personnel management, deployment and training); and 2. Bargaining unit implications.
4	Urban Area Contracted Management services provided by ACFR	GFR would contract with ACFR for management services. ACFR would provide overall coordination of fire/rescue services county-wide; would be responsible for long-term planning and operational coordination	Direct contract from City to County	1. Role of GFR chiefs; and 2. management coordination.	1. Bargaining unit implications, and 2. ISO margins.
5	Urban Area Contracted Staffing services provided by GFR	AC would own and equip its stations, but staff them with contract employees provided by GFR. These staff would be under the supervision of ACFR chiefs, but would be assigned on a classification basis by GFR.	Direct contract from MSTU	1. Future of ACFR line staff; 2. quality control of provided employees; and 3. Bargaining unit issues.	

Option No.	Single Provider Options	Description	Funding Mechanisms	Applicable Implementation Issues	#1401011 Special Issues
6	Functional Consolidation	Operational units would remain separate, but common support functions would be; 1. provided by one entity for the other; 2. provided by a third party for both entities.	1. Identification of common functions appropriate to this; 2. decision as to provider, 3. How to handle different SOG's.	The specific services to be provided.	
7	Urban Area Special District for Fire/Rescue	Special district, dependent or independent, that would provide fire/rescue services in the urban area. It would have a joint policy board. All employees would be transferred to the District. The Board of the District would hire a fire chief/executive director that would report directly to the board.	MSBU ad Valorem or fire special assessment.	1. Selection of special district form, 2. Selection of funding mechanism. 3. Almost all of the issues in Chapter 6; 4. Board composition	EMS transportation (how to coordinate with county-wide system).
8	City of Gainesville/ MSTU Special District for Fire/Rescue	The difference in models 7 (above) and 8 is that the geographical scope would include all of the county except for the small cities which may join.	MSTU or special fire assessment.	1. Selection of special district form, 2. Selection of funding mechanism. 3. Almost all of the issues in Chapter 6; 4. Board composition; 5. Transport certificate (with adjustment to allow county-wide transport).	
9	Contracted Public Corporation	AC and City would jointly establish and own a public corporation chartered to provide fire/rescue services. A board of directors would comprise city and county commissioners. The Executive Director of the corporation would report directly to the board.	Contracts with AC and the City to provide fire/rescue services	1. Board composition; 2. Current employee status in new corporation 3. Bargaining unit issues; 4. Assumption of assets and liabilities; 5. Powers and authority of corporation; and 6. Transportation Certificate.	

10	City of Gainesville/ MSTU Special District Emergency Services	Focuses on rescue/fire model under assumption emergency health services and hazards management are wave of the future and that fire suppression will continue to decline in significance from a work load perspective. Services would be designed primarily around emergency medical responses and all hazards management. Transport would be integrated into the operations of the District. Other emergency responses would also be housed in the District as well as a common communications center potentially.	1. MSTU with transport fees and contracts for specialized services; 2. Fire assessment fee, transport fees and contracts; 3. contracts from each entity.	1. Selection of a special district form; 2. Selection of funding mechanism; 3. Transport certificate; 4. Almost all of the issues identified in Chapter 9.	
11	Gainesville Fire District			1. Selection of special district form, 2. Selection of funding mechanism. 3. Transport certificate 4. Almost all of the issues in Chapter 9.	

## References in Analytica Report:

Chapter 7 - All models were compared to the Designated Assistance Agreement.

Chapter 6 and Chapter 9 – Applicable Implementation Issue references.