

From: [douglas buonaccorsi](#)
To: [Patrick Slayter](#); [Neysa Hinton](#); unaglass.seb@sonic.net; [Sarah Glade Gurney](#); [Diana Rich](#); [Mary Gourley](#)
Subject: FIRE
Date: Monday, May 16, 2022 3:52:35 PM

Let's be clear of the situation here. We are not against consolidation as the firefighters group. Or having more daytime firefighters available for daytime responses. What we are against is not being included or using the expertise of the membership for consolidation or not conducting a full scale study of the issue and solutions and supplying the options showing in-depth analysis and data supporting the findings to the taxpayers. This is just a knee jerk reaction because the fire chief is retiring at the end of the year. There is plenty of qualified people within this department that could step up and assist on the day to day needs. There are many ways to save money for the taxpayers and still fulfill our obligations to the citizens. The city manager has been talking to GRFPD for almost 2 years with out any input from us the membership and without making a decision so why is it so important now. Is it because they are promising service that you never found in the budget such as having more daytime staff, newer apparatus or providing proper maintenance. We shouldn't have to solicit donations from the public to put new hose on the engines but we have. Do you do the same when you need something for the police department or public works ?

History and the actions of the city council has always shown that the fire department comes last to being supported financially through the city budget. The idea of having 24/7 coverage comes with cost and trouble of its own. If we were employees and had a union you wouldn't be able to do whatever you want

Douglas P Buonaccorsi

33 year veteran of this department and a 40 year veteran of the fire service in Sonoma County.

Sent from my iPhone