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Pat Hart, Fire Chief  Jim Whelan, Fire Chief
Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services  Stanfield Fire District
320 South 1st Street  285 West Coe Avenue
Hermiston, Oregon 97838  Stanfield, Oregon 97875

Dear Chiefs:

Enclosed please find the final report in response to your request to conduct a Regional Fire and EMS Consolidation Study for Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services and the Stanfield Fire District. The associates of ESCI have appreciated the opportunity to work with your communities, the employees, and the staff of both fire departments in preparing this study.

We present this report in five sections: Evaluation of Current Conditions; Fiscal Analysis; Future Opportunities for Cooperative Efforts; General Partnering Strategies; Options for Shared Service Delivery and Findings and Recommendations. A number of appendices are also attached that will provide supplemental information and guidance for the two agencies. Two are particularly noteworthy. Appendix B: Summary Table of Organizational Kudos summarizes the many positive attributes of the departments. Appendix C: Summary Table of Recommended Actions (Current Conditions) provides items to consider as part of evaluating collaboration opportunities with and between Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services and the Stanfield Fire District.

It is our intent to meet and exceed your expectations and to be available to you after the project is complete. Should you have questions do not hesitate to contact me at our headquarters office in Wilsonville, Oregon, at (503) 570-7778. It has been our pleasure to work with the professional and dedicated staffs of Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services and the Stanfield Fire District.

Sincerely,

EMERGENCY SERVICES CONSULTING INTERNATIONAL

Jack W. Snook
President, COO
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Executive Summary

Emergency Services Consulting International (ESCI) was engaged by Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services (HFES) and the Stanfield Fire District (SFD) to evaluate the feasibility of more efficient cooperation between the two agencies, up to and including strategies of consolidation. This report is the culmination of that evaluation.

ESCI thanks the staff of both HFES and SFD for their outstanding cooperation in the preparation of this report. All involved were candid in their comments and provided a great deal of essential information.

The study took into account the issues facing the two fire departments and how such matters affect the effort to construct a model for efficient service. Those issues identified were analyzed and specific recommendations detailed, as follows.

Evaluation of Current Conditions

The report begins with an analysis of current conditions of the two fire districts as they were observed by ESCI in the course of our field visit. The observations are catalogued in nine survey tables presented in a side-by-side chart format for simplicity of comparison. Each of the tables provides the reader with general information about that element as well as specific observations and an analysis of any significant issues or conditions that are pertinent to the topic discussed. Observations are supported by data collected during the information gathering process, through analysis of the collected data, and from the collective emergency services experience of the ESCI project team. This snapshot in time was used as the basis from which collaborative strategies for the two fire departments were developed.

The current conditions presented in the survey tables include an evaluation of each organization’s management, governance, staffing and personnel management, service delivery and performance, training programs, fire prevention programs, communications, Emergency Medical Services (EMS), capital facilities and apparatus, and fiscal health and practices.

Criterion used to evaluate the departments has been developed over many years. These gauges include relevant guidelines from national accreditation criteria, the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) standards, federal and state mandates for fire and EMS systems, recommendations by various organizations such as the Center for Public Safety Excellence (CPSE), and generally accepted best practices within the Fire and EMS industry.
Both fire departments exhibit a positive customer service ethic and desire to provide effective service delivery. Although the two agencies approach service delivery differently in some respects, they do so with a sharp focus on doing the right thing for their respective constituents. The departments provide services with limited financial and staffing resources. The communities of Hermiston and Stanfield receive quality service at a low cost.

Throughout the current conditions sections of the report, methodologies are compared between the two organizations. In addition, ESCI has noted strengths in service delivery approaches in the form of kudos listed in the summary tables. No organization is without room for improvement. To that end, ESCI has detailed specific recommendations for enhancement of operational and administrative practices throughout the evaluation portion of the report.

Identified strengths are also summarized in Appendix B: Summary Table of Organizational Kudos, and recommendations are listed in summary form in Error! Reference source not found.

Fiscal Analysis
Key to ESCI’s ability to develop appropriate future strategies is the completion of a careful analysis of the agency’s financial condition, which in the case of both fire departments is found to be poor. At current levels, expenditures in HFES are forecast to exceed available revenues by $1.1 million by 2017. Similarly, ESCI’s projections indicate that SFD will exceed its revenues by 43 percent in the same time period. Changes in spending practices will be necessary, potentially including making difficult service delivery decisions.

Short of reductions in service delivery, additional financial resources will have to be obtained if the agencies are to continue to serve their communities as they do today. ESCI offers guidance in the report on potential approaches to increasing revenue, many of which require voter approval of increased taxation.

Opportunities for Cooperative Efforts
This section of the report evaluates the resources, services, proximity, demand, and opportunities for HFES and SFD to contain costs, increase efficiency, or enhance service delivery through collaboration.

The report cites 21 separate General Partnering Strategies which, through increased collaboration, generally build an improved system by more closely aligning the fire departments.
Some of the strategies require investments to implement, but the vast majority do not necessitate an investment beyond soft costs, and yield economic or operational efficiencies.

Of the 21 identified strategies, 13 are found to most likely result in significant improvement to systems and/or programs and should be acted upon regardless of whether action is taken on any of the other feasible opportunities. They are:

- **Strategy A** – Enhanced Implementation of Mutual and Automatic Aid, page 170
- **Strategy C** – Develop a Joint Fire Prevention and Code Enforcement Program, page 178
- **Strategy F** – Develop Uniform Pre-Incident Plans, page 185
- **Strategy G** – Conduct Joint Strategic Planning, page 188
- **Strategy H** – Develop Common Standard Operating Guidelines, page 190
- **Strategy J** – Combine Volunteer and Paid On Call Recruitment and Training Programs for New Hires, page 196
- **Strategy L** – Consolidate Training into a Single Training Program, page 201
- **Strategy M** – Implement a Common Training Records Management System, page 204
- **Strategy N** – Develop Mutual Training Strategies, page 206
- **Strategy O** – Develop an Annual Shared Training Plan, page 209
- **Strategy P** – Develop and Adopt Training Standards, page 212
- **Strategy Q** – Create a Shared Training Manual, page 214
- **Strategy R** – Develop a Shared Fire and EMS Training Facility, page 217

Implementation of the feasible cooperative opportunities (as listed above) addresses a number of the administrative, support, and operational challenges. Pursuit of the recommended strategies begins the process of collaboration and is an important first step. However, it is not a final solution.

In addition to the above strategies, six *Overarching Strategies* are discussed that address organizational structure and governance:

- Status Quo (Continuation of Current Efforts of Cooperation only)
- Administrative Consolidation
• Functional Consolidation
• Operational Consolidation
• Legal Merger
• Legal Consolidation

Many of the elements of Administrative, Operational and Functional Consolidation are included in the listed General Partnering Strategies, moving HFES and SFD well along the path to increased collaboration.

The last two overarching strategies, those of legal merger and/or consolidation, become more complex. Even so, they warrant consideration. However, it is clear that merger or consolidation of HFES and SFD does not solve the financial challenges facing the two organizations.

ESCI views combining HFES and SFD as feasible, but only if doing so includes an increase in tax rates.

Findings and Recommendations
In the Findings and Recommendations section of the report, ESCI recommends that a combination of a Functional Consolidation overarching strategy and portions of an Operational Consolidation strategy be employed as first steps.

Included in the recommendation are the following areas be addressed:

• Prioritize the development of Standard Operating Guidelines on a cooperative basis between both departments
• Continue to combine training programs
• Combine Fire Prevention and Public Education efforts
• Consolidate Administrative Services
• Merge the agencies’ Volunteer and Paid On Call recruiting and training activities
• Establish Shared Capital Replacement Planning

The above steps offer increased efficiency and some financial savings. Once completed, HFES and SFD will be well positioned to move toward higher levels of collaboration and then actively pursue the analysis of additional strategies.
Evaluation of Current Conditions

Survey Table 1: Organization Overview

The feasibility study involves the Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services (HFES) and the Stanfield Fire District (SFD). The two fire districts are located adjacent to each other in northeastern Oregon, 30 miles west of the city of Pendleton, Oregon, and 43 miles to the south of the City of Pasco, Washington.

Both of the agencies involved in this project are organized as Rural Fire Protection Districts, as defined by Oregon Statute. They are each governed by a five-member board of directors, elected by the voters of each district. Day-to-day operations of the organizations are under the direction of a fire chief appointed by the board of directors.

The map in Figure 1 reflects the Hermiston and Stanfield District Boundaries.

---

1 Oregon Revised Statute Chapter 478 – Rural Fire Protection Districts
Figure 1: Service Area Map
Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services responded to 3,350 emergency incidents in 2011, serving a population of 25,000 citizens in a 103-square mile area. Stanfield Fire District covers a little more than 50 square miles, serving a population of approximately 2,600 and responding to 203 emergencies in 2011.

In addition, HFES provides ambulance transport services to an area that is larger than the district boundaries, including Stanfield and Echo, as well as some portions of Morrow County. Figure 2 outlines the ambulance service area.
Figure 2: Hermiston Ambulance Service Area Map
The area to which HFES provides ambulance transport services adds 360 square miles beyond the fire district’s boundaries.

Data provided by the participating fire agencies was combined with information collected in the course of ESCI’s field work and used to develop an overview of the subject organizations. The purpose of the following organizational overview is two-fold; first, it verifies the accuracy of the baseline information and ESCI’s understanding of each agency’s composition—the foundation from which the feasibility analysis is developed. Secondly, the overview serves as a reference for the reader who may not be familiar with the details of each agency’s operations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Organization Overview – Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Responsibilities and Lines of Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) head of governing body</td>
<td>Board Chair, 5-member board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) key employee of governing body</td>
<td>Fire Chief Patrick Hart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) meetings</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} Wednesday of the month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Elected official authority defined</td>
<td>As defined by state statute\textsuperscript{2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Fire Chief’s position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) hired by contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) term of contract</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{2} Oregon Revised Statutes Chapter 478
### Survey Component

#### iii) periodic performance evaluation

**Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services**
- Annual, informal not written. Tied to contract renewal. Prior to renewal of contract, the chief sends a questionnaire to employees to provide feedback on his performance anonymously.

**Stanfield Fire District**
- No

**Recommended Action**
- Both agencies: The respective Boards of Directors should complete an annual, written performance evaluation of the fire chief.

---

**Kudos:** The HFES Fire Chief is commended for his practice of distributing a questionnaire to personnel for feedback on his performance.

### Organization Overview – Observations

#### D. Fire chief/authority defined

- By employment contract as well as in department policy
- Only a limited list of qualifications in the SOGs (Standard Operating Guidelines)

**Stanfield Fire District**
- SFD: Create a policy statement that defines the role, responsibilities, and authority of the fire chief.

#### E. Policy and administrative roles defined

- Defined via job description. There are no administrative job descriptions currently, except for the newly hired clerk.
- Defined in the departmental policy manual

### 2. Attributes of Successful Organizations

#### A. Rules and regulations maintained

- A Rules and regulations manual is in place. There is also an employee handbook that addresses primarily 40-hour/week employees.
- Included in the departmental Policies and Guidelines manual

**Stanfield Fire District**
- As needed only

**Recommended Action**
- Both agencies: Establish a practice of regularly scheduled review of agency rules and regulations to ensure conformity with legal and organizational changes.

---

3 A written performance evaluation, including measurable goals, provides the board and the fire chief with a clear understanding of areas of excellence or needed improvement and future expectations of the board. This provides continuity as changes occur within the board or with the fire chief.

4 A list of qualifications for the fire chief’s position is reported to be unchanged since the chief originally assumed the position.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Organization Overview – Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Legal counsel maintained</td>
<td>Use Hermiston City Attorney or Special District’s Association of Oregon attorney as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) consultation available</td>
<td>Bruce Bischoff, Attorney, is on a retainer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) labor counsel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Financial controls</td>
<td>Defined in Policy 5.2.1 – “Financial Management – General”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) financial control system</td>
<td>The board approves expenditures. Bills are processed by the administrative assistant and assistant chief and referred by the fire chief to the board for approval. Approvals may be made post-payment in cases when bills need to be paid prior to the board meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) financial review</td>
<td>A monthly financial report is provided to the board at the monthly meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) auditor</td>
<td>Seydel, Lewis, Poe, Moeller &amp; Gunderson, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) frequency of review</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Governing body minutes maintained</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) availability of minutes</td>
<td>Posted in the stations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Organizational Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Organization Overview – Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Structure type</strong></td>
<td>Traditional top-down hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Descriptions of all jobs maintained</strong></td>
<td>Job descriptions are maintained for all positions except the administrative assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) job descriptions updated</td>
<td>As needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Employment agreements</strong></td>
<td>Fire chief only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Chain of Command

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Organization Overview – Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Span of control</strong></td>
<td>3 to 1 ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Hiring/Firing authority</strong></td>
<td>Fire chief</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Formation and History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Organization Overview – Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Organization formed</strong></td>
<td>The District was formed in 1950 and The City fire department was formed in 1907. The two were combined in 1998.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. History maintained</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Individual or group responsible</td>
<td>Internal staff assignment to a Battalion Chief. Up to date.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 By working together to align job descriptions where possible, opportunities for future efficiencies can be discovered.
## 6. Fire Department Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Organization Overview – Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Agency type</td>
<td>Rural Fire Protection District(^6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Area in square miles</td>
<td>103.7 square miles including 7.8 square miles within the City of Hermiston (Calculated using GIS software and the RFPD taxing district boundary)(^7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Headquarters</td>
<td>Hermiston Main Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Fire stations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Other facilities</td>
<td>1 metal building used for storage of training props at Station 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Emergency vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) engine</td>
<td>4 (2 are interface engines)                                                                (\text{A.} 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) engine, reserve</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) ladder truck</td>
<td>1 – 75’ Quint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) ambulance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) ambulance, reserve</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) command</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) boat</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii) water tenders</td>
<td>3 (1 is a pumper/tender)                                                                     (\text{ix) water tenders} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix) brush</td>
<td>1 Brush Unit and 2 Quick Attack Pickup trucks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x) Utility/rescue</td>
<td>1 Rescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. ISO rating</td>
<td>Class 4 in the City, Class 5 in the District if within 1,000 feet of a hydrant and 8B in the District if outside of 1,000 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) date of most recent rating</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) Rural Fire Protection District is defined in Oregon Revised Statute 478.

\(^7\) An additional 6.22 square miles is covered under contract with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Cold Springs National Wildlife Refuge. HFES additional Ambulance Service area is reported as 360 square miles.
### Survey Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Organization Overview – Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) maximum fire department deficiency points possible</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) relative classification</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) divergent reduction</td>
<td>-4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) total points</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Total fire department personnel, uniformed and civilian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) administrative and support personnel, full-time</td>
<td>4 + 3/5 FTE Mechanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) administrative and support personnel, volunteer</td>
<td>Part-time public education specialist @ approximately 20 hours/month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) operational personnel, full-time</td>
<td>19 line firefighters (FF) @ 56 hour/week and one FF Mechanic @ 24 hour/week as FF, 24 as mechanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) operational personnel, volunteer</td>
<td>29 paid on call (POC) plus 6 resident interns (RI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Financial Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Designated fiscal year</th>
<th>July 1 to June 30</th>
<th>July 1 to June 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Assessed property value, Fiscal Year 2012</td>
<td>$1,745,462,669</td>
<td>$158,574,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Revised 2011-12 general operating fund budget, fire department</td>
<td>$3,822,800, including $400,000 short-term internal loan</td>
<td>$680,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. General fund property tax, District levy FY 2012</td>
<td>$1,878,600</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) levy rate (FY 2001 through 2011)</td>
<td>$1.205/$1,000 TAV</td>
<td>$2.0651/$1,000 TAV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) general fund levy collection rate FY 2010-11</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Bonds, fire department</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) levy rate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 8. Demographics

### A. Current population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) percent urban/suburban</td>
<td>Calculated via GIS data as 67 percent (City of Hermiston-16,745, 2010 U.S. Census)</td>
<td>Calculated via GIS data as 79 percent (City of Stanfield-2,043, 2010 U.S. Census)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) percent rural</td>
<td>Calculated via GIS data as 33 percent (RFPD surrounding Hermiston)</td>
<td>Calculated via GIS data as 21 percent (RFPD surrounding Stanfield)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Total residential units, 2010

- Not reported
- Estimated: 850

### C. Businesses, 2010

- Not reported
- Estimated: 24

## 9. Alarms -2011

### A. Fires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) value of property exposed to fire, 2011</td>
<td>$9,818,750</td>
<td>$266,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) value of property lost to fire, 2011</td>
<td>$1,059,870</td>
<td>$17,900.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Rupture or explosion

- 3
- 0

### C. EMS/rescue

- 2,979
- 117

### D. Number of EMS transports

- 2,178
- SFD does not transport

### E. Hazardous condition

- 25
- 5

### F. Service call

- 53
- 2

### G. Good intent call

- 82
- 21

### H. False call

- 62
- 8

### I. Severe weather

- 0
- 0

### J. Other

- 4
- 0

---

8 Data is calculated using 2010 Census Bureau data and GIS software to develop the residential population within the RFPD taxing districts. HFES estimates Hermiston City population as 16,700 and the total District population as 33,000 to 35,000. Stanfield City was estimated at 1,950 and the Stanfield District as 2,850.
ESCI’s review of the organizational components of the districts finds that both are configured appropriately with most of the necessary policy and procedure elements in place. Some recommendations, listed in the above table, identify needs that ESCI found to be lacking, including the formal definition of authority, roles, and responsibilities of both the boards and the fire chiefs.

In developing an overview of the District's financial practices, ESCI found that both districts are funded primarily by property tax revenue and the tax rates differ considerably between the two. The tax levy for HFES is $1.205 per $1,000 of taxable assessed value (TAV), while the SFD rate is $2.065 per $1,000 TAV. Neither agency carries excessive levels of debt, having planned well for meeting capital needs.

Figure 3 and Figure 4 on the following pages diagram the organizational structure of both of fire districts.
Figure 3: Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services Organizational Chart
Figure 4: Stanfield Fire District Organizational Chart

- Fire Chief
- Assistant Chief
- Captains (2)
- Engineers (3)
- Firefighters (8)
Survey Table 2: Management Components

Fire department management coupled with organizational growth is a common challenge for fire service leaders. SFD and HFES are not immune to having the need for adequate management to meet current conditions. The modern fire department must address management complexities in areas that include the consistency and adequacy of response, maintenance of competencies, and recruitment of a qualified and diverse workforce. A forecast of continued growth in both population and response activity workload will necessitate changes in staffing to meet future service demand. A corresponding increase in organizational infrastructure is required to support operational personnel.

To be effective, management of a fire district needs to be based on multiple components. The elements of appropriate management begin as simply as identifying and institutionalizing the organization’s mission and vision and progress through a spectrum of essential mechanisms including the establishment of policy and operational documents, development of internal and external communications practices and implementing proper reporting and record keeping. Finally, one of the most critical components is that of establishing appropriate financial practices.

The size of an organization may be considered as a factor determining the degree to which the basic management components apply. However, all of the identified elements apply equally to any fire department, without regard to its size or complexity. For this reason, the analysis of management components is applied equally to Stanfield Fire District as a smaller organization and to Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services, being a larger one.

In the following report section, ESCI examines each agency’s efforts to manage the organization effectively and identifies measures that are missing and recommended for the future.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Management Components – Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Mission, Vision, Strategic Planning, Goals and Objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Mission statement adopted</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) displayed</td>
<td>Displayed in stations. “To protect the lives, property, and environment of all persons we service; to educate life safety with knowledge and fairness; to give the fullest measure of service for the cost”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudos: Both districts are acknowledged for defining an organizational Mission Statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) periodic review</td>
<td>Newly revised. The previous mission statement is dated 1990.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Vision established and communicated</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Core Values of staff established</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) organizational focal points</td>
<td>Overarching vision statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Strategic or master plan</td>
<td>A strategic plan is currently under development and nearly completed. No master plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) adopted by elected officials</td>
<td>Will be upon completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) published and available</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 A mission statement is important to an organization in that it publicly declares the agency’s purpose and reason for existing. A current, applicable statement, formally adopted and institutionalized, is important.

10 Personnel who exercise independent decision making naturally make better decisions when they understand the principles and values of the organization. Decisions are then made with the leaders’ intent clearly understood.
## Survey Component

### Management Components – Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iii) periodic review</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>SFD: Undertake a strategic planning process including the development of a statement of organizational vision and core values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Agency goals and objectives established</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) date developed</td>
<td>Developed annually with officers and staff</td>
<td>Not formally defined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) periodic review</td>
<td>Annual review, though informal</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) tied to division/personnel performance statements/plans</td>
<td>Only generally</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) objectives linked to programs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) performance objectives established</td>
<td>Somewhat, but most are generalized</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Both agencies: As a component of the strategic planning process, define agency goals and objectives, review annually, and tie to performance measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Code of ethics established</td>
<td>Not specifically, but addressed in the vision statement</td>
<td>A limited code of ethics is listed in SFD Policy Number 2.3.4</td>
<td>Both agencies: Establish a defined code of ethics for the organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Availability of SOGs, Rules and Regulations, Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Agency rules and regulations available</th>
<th>Hard copies are available in the stations. Revision/updates are communicated electronically</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District Policy and Guideline Manual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) last date reviewed</td>
<td>2009 – ongoing review as needed</td>
<td>Newly developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Copies of Standard Operating Guidelines (SOGs) available</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) regular update</td>
<td>5-year update schedule</td>
<td>Newly created in September 2010, update schedule is not established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) process for development of new SOGs</td>
<td>Drafts are referred to shift officers for comment. Finalized by the chief or assistant chief.</td>
<td>Board and staff involvement from creation to adoption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Survey Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Components – Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) SOGs used in training evolutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Policy manual available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) reviewed for consistency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ii) reviewed for legal mandates | As needed | As needed | SFD: Provide training on the district's Policy and Guideline Manual and require review by all members.  
| iii) training on policies provided | Yes | No |  

**Kudos:** Both organizations have made a commitment to the development of defined operating procedures, rules, regulations and policies

### 3. Critical Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Critical issues are identified</th>
<th>Informally</th>
<th>Informally</th>
<th>Both agencies: Develop a practice of annually identifying and recording current critical issues facing the organization.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) first critical issue</td>
<td>Ongoing and sustainable funding</td>
<td>Volunteer manpower shortage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) second critical issue</td>
<td>Maintaining appropriate staffing numbers</td>
<td>Financial sustainability; expenses are growing faster than revenues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) third critical issue</td>
<td>Maintaining internal communications and relationships</td>
<td>Meeting additional demands with limited staffing capacity (pre-incident planning, inspections, public education, fire prevention)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Challenges of the Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Challenges are identified</th>
<th>Informally</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Both agencies: Periodically identify organizational challenges.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) first challenge</td>
<td>Keeping up with community growth</td>
<td>Uncertain of looming issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

11 Field observations indicate that all personnel may not be fully knowledgeable about the content of the SFD Policy and Guideline Manual.
### Survey Component

**Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ii) second challenge</th>
<th>Meeting new and increasing standards: NFPA and EMS; Equipment and training mandates</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iii) third challenge</td>
<td>Maintaining effective outreach communications with the community</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Internal and External Communications

**A. Internal communications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) regularly scheduled staff meetings</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Officer meetings as needed, or once per quarter; most is done at the quarterly volunteer meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) written staff meeting minutes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) memos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most communications are verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) member newsletter</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) member forums</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) open door policy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) bulletin board</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii) vertical communication path clearly identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Generally defined only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix) e-mail</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x) employee mail boxes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi) voice mail</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii) issues taskforce</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. External communications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) community newsletter</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) website</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) advisory committee(s)</td>
<td>Budget Committee only</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Both agencies: Consider formation of citizen advisory committees if this feasibility effort is to move forward.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

12 The policy makers of both HFES and SFD have taken a big step toward discovering efficiencies by investigating the establishment of a closer working relationship. If the decision is made to move forward, the next logical step is to include community leaders (external stakeholders) to listen to concepts and provide guidance and feedback to the policy makers.
### Survey Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Management Components – Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) complaint process</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) email</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) community survey</td>
<td>Recently completed as a part of the strategic planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii) local community planning organizations</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix) focus groups</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Decision Making Process

**A. Preferred management methodology of the fire chief**
- Collaborative
- Collaborative, participatory

**B. Management process identified**
- No
- No

**C. Decision making process established**
- No
- No

Both agencies: Establish a defined process for making complex organizational decisions

### 7. Document Control

**A. Process for public records access established**
- No defined process
- Informal only

Both agencies: Initiate a formal process for the request and release of public records consistent with state law

**B. Hard copy files protected**
- Generally not locked. Personnel, payroll files are secured
- Secured

**C. Computer files backed up**
- Yes, redundant back up
- Yes, external hard drive, kept on site

SFD: Establish a process to back up computer files on off-site data storage for improved safety

---

13 Oregon Revised Statues (ORS) Chapter 192 – Records, Public Reports and Meetings
### 8. Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Management Components – Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Building security</td>
<td>Generally, but not at all times. Secured at night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Office security</td>
<td>Front offices are locked when not occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Computer security</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Vehicle security</td>
<td>Staff vehicles locked when parked. No defined policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Capital inventory maintained</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) asset security system used</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) inventory interval</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Monetary controls used</td>
<td>Controlled by the administrative assistant; $500 petty cash on hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) cash access controls</td>
<td>Cards are issued to the fire chief, assistant chief, fire marshal and board clerk. Expenditures are reviewed by the board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) credit card controls</td>
<td>No purchase order system is used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) purchasing controls</td>
<td>No purchase order system is used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9. Reporting and Records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Management Components – Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Records kept by computer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) type of platform</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) operating system</td>
<td>Windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Periodic reporting to elected officials</td>
<td>Monthly report to the board and posted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) financial report</td>
<td>Monthly report to the board and posted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) management report</td>
<td>Chief’s report monthly to the board and posted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Survey Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Components – Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### iii) operational report
- Monthly as a part of the chief’s report based on the assistant chief’s report
- At board meetings

#### iv) distributed to others
- Posted
- Board only

#### C. Annual report produced
- Yes
- No

#### i) distributed to others
- Distributed to the board and posted
- No

#### D. Required records maintained

1. **i) incident reports**
   - Yes
   - Yes

2. **ii) patient care reports**
   - Yes
   - No. Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services ambulance crew completes reports.

3. **iii) exposure records**
   - Yes
   - Yes

4. **iv) SCBA testing**
   - Yes, in house testing
   - Yes, outsourced

5. **v) hose**
   - Yes, conducted in-house
   - Yes, annually, outsourced

6. **vi) ladder**
   - Yes, outsourced
   - Yes, annually, outsourced

7. **vii) pump**
   - Yes, in-house
   - Yes, annual in house

8. **viii) breathing air**
   - Yes, twice per year
   - Yes, twice per year
   - Both agencies: Conduct testing of breathing air on a quarterly basis per NFPA Standards.\(^\text{14}\)

9. **ix) gas monitors**
   - Yes
   - Yes

### 10. Budgetary Controls

#### A. Designated fiscal year

1. **i) budget cycle**
   - July 1 to June 30
   - July 1 to June 30

#### B. Budget officer

1. District Clerk Gene Jorgenson and administrative assistant.
2. District Clerk Gene Jorgenson

#### C. Budget development process

1. **i) governance**
   - Board of directors and budget committee
   - Board of directors and budget committee

2. **ii) administration**
   - Fire chief develops
   - Fire chief develops

3. **iii) management**
   - Fire chief manages the budget
   - Fire chief manages the budget

---

\(^{14}\) National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Standard 1989
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Management Components – Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) staff</td>
<td>Fire chief consults with staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) community</td>
<td>Budget committee only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Budget adoption process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) budget approval</td>
<td>Budget committee meeting, budget hearings, then to board of directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) funding approval</td>
<td>Board of directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Financial control officer</td>
<td>Administrative assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) financial report</td>
<td>The administrative assistant prepares monthly report to the board of directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) financial review</td>
<td>Annual audit and monthly board review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Basis of accounting</td>
<td>Cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Purchasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) purchasing policy</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) credit cards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) purchase orders</td>
<td>Not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) open accounts</td>
<td>6 open accounts. Duplicate, signed receipts are required. Informal policy states that the employee signed receipt is mandatory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) petty cash accounts</td>
<td>$500, used infrequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) central supplies/logistics</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) joint agreements/ventures</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii) JPAs</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix) bidding</td>
<td>Over $5,000 requires three quotes. $150,000 and over requires three sealed bids.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁵ The amount of petty cash kept on hand should be reviewed in the light of actual need and reduced to a minimal level.

¹⁶ Oregon Revised Statue ORS 279 specifies threshold levels that trigger bidding and quoting requirements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Management Components – Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x) leases</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 11. Planning

**A. Strategic/Master planning**

| i) plan period  | 5 years | N/A |
| ii) periodic review | Just being completed | N/A |
| iii) goals        | Defined  | N/A |
| iv) funding       | N/A     | N/A |

**B. Capital improvement plan (CIP)**

| i) plan period        | 15-year replacement schedule is in place for apparatus and equipment | Unwritten 25-year replacement plan |
| ii) periodic review   | Yes, every 10 years | None |
| iii) projects         | None pending | None pending |
| iv) funding           | General Fund transfers, grants, sale of surplus equipment | General Fund only; no dedicated capital reserve fund |

### 12. Budget

**A. Service level defined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**B. Operating budgetary funds**

| i) organized by program or category | By category | By category |
| ii) sub accounts                   | Yes          | None        |

**C. Reserve funds**

| Capital Outlay Reserve Fund | Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services | Stanfield Fire District |

**D. Revenue funds**

| Yes | Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services | Stanfield Fire District |

**E. Enterprise funds**

| None | Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services | Stanfield Fire District |

**F. Adopted budget FD income accounts, 2012 actual amounts**

| Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services | Stanfield Fire District |

---
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### Survey Component | Management Components – Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) EMS transport revenue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Plan review &amp; permits</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Revised budget FD expense accounts, 2012 General Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) personnel</td>
<td>$2,885,975</td>
<td>$187,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) contractual</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) commodities (Materials &amp; Services)</td>
<td>$454,000</td>
<td>$211,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) capital outlay</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$222,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. Municipal Overhead

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) reserve fund contributions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) fleet rental charges</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) fleet maintenance charges</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) motor fuel charges</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) property/casualty insurance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) medical and dental insurance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) workers’ compensation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii) workers’ compensation mod rate</td>
<td>Mod rate is 1.05.</td>
<td>Not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix) volunteer pension plan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Debt

A. Bonded debt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Capital lease

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3 payments of $54,214 remaining on apparatus lease</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Unfunded liability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) pension fund</td>
<td>Oregon Public Employees Retirement System (PERS)</td>
<td>Oregon PERS for fire chief only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) workers’ compensation claims</td>
<td>No current claims</td>
<td>No current claims</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^\text{17}\) The HFES Fire Marshal invests considerable time in reviewing new construction and remodeling plans for code compliance. Assessing a fee for this work will enable the district to recover those costs.
### 14. Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Management Components – Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Tax levy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) limitations</td>
<td>Portions of the City of Hermiston are under statutory compression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Service contracts (list)</strong></td>
<td>Mechanic Income, Federal Contract reimbursement and State of Oregon for lease of Station 3. (lease ends 06-30-2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) contract administration/management</td>
<td>Oregon State Fire Marshal Administration Fee for Hazardous Materials. Reimbursement for team response only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Grants</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) recent awards</td>
<td>Special Districts Association Oregon awarded $3,000 in 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) outstanding applications</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Fundraising</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Foundation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Volunteer Association</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Fees for service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) ambulance transport fee structure</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) billing for fire response</td>
<td>Railroad response and car fires if the owner is not a district resident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) inspection fee</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) hazardous materials</td>
<td>Yes and the State of Oregon is billed then it reimburses HFES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) cost recovery -- external</td>
<td>State-declared conflagration only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) impact fee(s)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) school/student fee</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ESCI’s review of the agency’s management components finds that the two fire districts are appropriately managed. Both districts have established statements of their organizational missions but only HFES has identified its purpose, vision, and goals. While the process of setting a fire department’s mission, vision, core values, and future goals may seem to some to be only an esoteric exercise, it is important to establishing an agency’s foundation. Recommendations are offered to further develop this aspect of management in both districts.

Departmental policies, procedures and operating guidelines were also reviewed and found to be adequate and appropriate. To its credit, SFD recently developed a comprehensive Policy and Guidelines Manual that includes both organizational administrative policies and departmental Standard Operating Guidelines. However, ESCI observed that all members of the agency may not be fully versed on the content of the policies and guidelines. Training and placing a requirement on members to read the manuals is recommended.

Administration of contract services was reviewed, as listed in the project scope of work. The only service related contract in place is an operational agreement between HFES and the State of Oregon Fire Marshal’s Office. The agreement is for the operation of a hazardous materials response team by Hermiston and includes an administrative fee that is paid to the District. No other contracted services are in place and no concerns were found.
Both agencies were asked about critical issues, challenges and opportunities that were facing their organizations. Neither has an established or formalized process of identifying issues, but has a natural degree of awareness and appreciation for current concerns. The critical issues and challenges identified by interviewees are listed below in summary form:

- Maintaining sustainable funding
- Addressing manpower shortages and dwindling volunteer resources
- Meeting increasing demands and needs with available resources, both financial and staffing
- Keeping pace with community growth
- Keeping current with increasing state and national standards and requirements
- Maintaining effective outreach and communications with the community

It is recommended that both organizations establish a process for identifying issues and challenges in the future. Doing so is best accomplished when it is incorporated into the early stages of the annual budget development process.
The emergency services exist in a rapidly changing environment. Along with improvements in tools and methods used to provide service comes increased regulation of activities, new risks to protect, and other challenges that can quickly catch the unwary off guard. Only through continuous internal and external environmental awareness and periodic course corrections can an organization stay on the leading edge.

Both Hermiston and Stanfield perform fundamental, short-term planning in the form of their annual budget development process, which is used to define the activities and priorities identified for the upcoming year. Establishing a long-term planning perspective for the fire districts is important as well. Without a plan, it is impossible for an organization to know when it is reaching milestones or providing exceptional services to its constituency.

At the time of our field work for this project, ESCI learned that HFES was in the process of completing a strategic planning process. The components of that plan, currently in draft form, were provided for review and found to be well developed. The district is well on its way to establishing a good strategic plan and ESCI commends the agency for its efforts.

The following survey table details the current planning efforts in place by both HFES and SFD.

Survey Table 3: Planning for Fire and Emergency Medical Services

The components of the plan, currently in draft form, were provided for review and found to be well developed. The district is well on its way to establishing a good strategic plan and ESCI commends the agency for its efforts.

The following survey table details the current planning efforts in place by both HFES and SFD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Planning for Fire and Emergency Medical Protection– Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Organizing for the Planning Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Adopted planning process</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Long-range planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) master planning</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) strategic planning</td>
<td>Currently under way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 SFD: See the previous recommendation regarding completion of a strategic planning process
### Survey Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning for Fire and Emergency Medical Protection—Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### iii) capital improvement planning
- Yes
- Informal only. Attempts to leave funds available in ending fund balance
- SFD: Establish a defined vehicle replacement schedule and funding plan.

#### iv) financial planning
- Annual budget process
- Annual budget process

### C. Operational planning

#### i) response planning
- Limited - No run card system
- Limited. There is no run card system
- Both agencies: Work with the dispatch centers to establish pre-designated response protocols based on incident type to increase emergency dispatch effectiveness.

#### ii) Regional incident command
- Yes
- Yes

#### iii) mutual aid planning
- Yes
- Yes

#### iv) disaster planning
- At the county level only
- City of Stanfield and county plans. Largely developed internally with limited fire district input.

**Kudos: HFES is acknowledged for its initiative in undertaking the strategic planning process**

### D. Tactical planning

#### i) pre-fire planning
- Yes, by engine companies
- Very few occupancies are pre-fire planned

#### ii) specific hazard plans
- Yes
- No

#### iii) hazardous materials planning
- Yes, via State HazMat Team
- No

#### E. CFAI (CPSE) accredited agency
- No
- No

#### i) year agency accredited
- N/A
- N/A

### 2. Current Planning Process

#### A. Planning group established
- No
- No

#### B. Mission statement developed
- Yes
- Yes, in the district Bylaws

#### C. Current & future environmental analysis
- Current Strategic Planning process only
- None

#### D. Strategies formulated (goals)
- Yes
- No
### Survey Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning for Fire and Emergency Medical Protection– Observations</th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| E. Benchmarks (performance objectives)                        | Limited                              | No                      | Both agencies: Establish service delivery objectives and performance measures.  
|                                                               |                                      |                         | 19                |
| F. Performance statements by division                          | No                                   | No                      |                   |
| i) monitored                                                   | Limited                              | N/A                     |                   |
| ii) used in performance evaluations                           | Not generally                        | N/A                     |                   |
| G. Schedule for periodic evaluation and revision               | Undefined                            | N/A                     |                   |

#### 3. Interest Group Assistance In Planning Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Customer survey</td>
<td>Yes, as a part of the strategic</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>planning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Citizen involvement</td>
<td>Customer survey only</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Business community involvement</td>
<td>Customer Survey only</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Elected official involvement</td>
<td>For final plan approval only</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Staff participation</td>
<td>Strategic planning committee is in</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Both agencies: Establish an annual planning process, institutionalized in writing, incorporating involvement of both internal and external customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>place with representative membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4. Emergency Preparedness Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Preparedness and response (EOP, EAP, RMP, radiological preparedness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

19 This recommendation is being addressed, at least partially, in HFES Standards of Cover development that was under way at the time of ESCI's field work. A similar undertaking is recommended in SFD.
### Survey Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning for Fire and Emergency Medical Protection—Observations</th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) plans/documents</td>
<td>A Umatilla County emergency plan only</td>
<td>A City of Stanfield and a county plan are in place. The fire district has little involvement</td>
<td>Both agencies: Assert a higher degree of involvement in emergency planning activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) date developed</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) adopted by elected officials</td>
<td>At County level</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) published and available</td>
<td>The County plan is available on-line</td>
<td>County plan on-line. City plan in Chief’s office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) periodic review</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Emergency Management Resources

| A. Internal personnel resources | No dedicated Emergency Management staff | No dedicated Emergency Management staff |  |
| B. External personnel resources | Part-time Umatilla County Emergency Manager | Part-time Umatilla County Emergency Manager |  |
| i) professional organizations | None identified | None identified |  |
| ii) community notification system | Emergency Alert System only | Emergency Alert System |  |

As noted, HFES has initiated a commendable strategic planning process. In addition, the very subject of this study, that of evaluating the feasibility of cooperative service delivery is an important planning effort. Undertaking the feasibility study process represents a positive commitment on the part of both organizations to take a critical look at their future.

To further build upon this effort it is advisable to formalize planning further and to create a foundation for planning that will cause the organizations to develop a habit of looking forward, as opposed to doing so only on an informal or as-needed basis. Undertaking some form of planning process at least annually and involving external stakeholders as well as internal ones will prove to be beneficial.
Currently, emergency planning and management is largely left to Umatilla County with limited involvement by either fire district. It is not uncommon for this work to be deferred, but fire agencies need to recognize that plans developed by county, state, or other agencies are always going to call for the use of fire district resources when an incident occurs. If plans are written absent the fire organization’s input, they are not likely to work well during an emergency. For this reason, it is recommended that the Hermiston and Stanfield increase their level of involvement.
Survey Table 4: Staffing and Personnel Management

Fire and EMS organizations must provide adequate staffing in three key areas: emergency response and operations, administration, and support. ESCI considered these elements when reviewing Hermiston and Stanfield staffing methodologies to assure that an appropriate balance between the three is maintained given the realities of available local resources.

Several standards address staffing issues. Specifically, the OSHA Respiratory Protection Standard 29 CFR 1910.134; NFPA 1710 Standard for the Organization and Deployment of Fire Suppression Operations, Emergency Medical Operations, to the Public by Career Fire Departments; and NFPA 1720 Standard for the Organization and Deployment of Fire Suppression Operations, Emergency Medical Operations, and Special Operations to the Public by Volunteer Fire Departments are frequently cited as authoritative documents. In addition, the Center for Public Safety Excellence (CPSE) publishes benchmarks for the number of personnel required on the emergency scene for various levels of risk.\(^\text{20}\)

However, numbers and deployment of people are not the only considerations. Careful attention must be paid to managing the workforce to achieve maximum productivity for the organizations as well as maximum satisfaction for the individual. A safe working environment, fair treatment, and recognition for a job well done are key components to job satisfaction.

It is also important that the organization’s members know to whom they should go when they have a problem, question, or issue related to their relationship to the organization. In large organizations, a human resource department typically handles this function. Staff within such a department address questions, issues, and tasks related to appointment, benefits, performance, discipline, promotion, or termination of employees. These duties are often combined with other responsibilities in smaller organizations, as is the case with both Hermiston and Stanfield.

\(^{20}\) CPSE: formerly the Commission on Fire Accreditation International (CFAI).
### Survey Component | Staffing and Personnel Management – Observations
---|---
| **Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services** | **Stanfield Fire District** | **Recommended Action** |

#### 1. Policies, Rules, Regulations, and Operational Guidelines

| A. Human resources manager | Fire chief | Fire chief |
| B. Personnel policy manual maintained | Yes | Yes |

  **i)** manual provided at initial hiring
  Rules and Regulations, Policies and Standard Operating Guidelines are available in the stations and provided to each new employee at time of hire.
  Policy and Guidelines documents are provided
  Both agencies: During development and revision, consider aligning policy and procedure between both districts for consistency.  

  **ii)** training provided
  Personnel are directed to read

  **iii)** periodic review & update
  As needed – new in 2010

| C. Rules and regulations provided | Available in the stations | In policy manual |
| D. Operational guidelines provided | Available in the stations | Yes |

| E. Position descriptions current/accurate | Descriptions are not in place for all positions. Those that are in place are current and accurate | Limited. The policy manual lists minimum requirements only |

| F. Desk manuals | No | No |

| G. Retention program established | None | LOSAP (Length of Service Awards Program) is in place |

HFES: Consider the implementation of a LOSAP23 program to enhance volunteer retention.

#### 2. Compensation, Point System, and Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Career and paid-on-call compensation, hourly</th>
<th>Top Step (top base pay potential)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

  **i)** Fire chief
  $8,512/month
  $5,400/month

  **ii)** Assistant chief
  $7,600/month
  $5/call

  **iii)** Battalion chief
  $6,839/month
  N/A

  **iv)** Fire marshal
  $7,537/month
  N/A

---

21 Should future cooperative efforts occur, alignment of policy and procedure along the way will ease the transition process.

22 SFD: See the previous recommendation regarding establishment of job descriptions for all positions.

23 LOSAP: Length of Service Awards Program.
### Staffing and Personnel Management – Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v) Captain</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$5/call + $15/hour for mechanical work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) Lieutenant</td>
<td>$6,452/month</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) Firefighter</td>
<td>$5,384/month</td>
<td>$5/call</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii) Entry firefighter</td>
<td>$3,860/month</td>
<td>$5/call</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix) Firefighter paramedic</td>
<td>$6,030/month</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x) Volunteer (POC) firefighter</td>
<td>$13.49/hour</td>
<td>$5/call</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi) Volunteer (POC) basic</td>
<td>$22.24/hour</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii) Volunteer (POC) intermediate</td>
<td>$23.50/hour</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii) Volunteer (POC) paramedic</td>
<td>$27.43/hour</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiv) Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>$4,376/month + bonus for assisting board clerk</td>
<td>Secretary/Treasurer: $1,500/month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv) Clerk</td>
<td>$3,224/month</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. Additional compensation

i) EMT premium pay

(emphasis removed, additional compensation items are repeated)

#### 3. Reports and Records

A. Personnel records maintained

i) application retained

Yes

ii) historical records retained

Yes

iii) performance evaluations retained

Yes

iv) injury and accident records retained

Yes

v) health and exposure records maintained

Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Staffing and Personnel Management – Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Disciplinary Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Disciplinary policy established</td>
<td>Listed in a Rules and Regulations document that is currently under revision and by collective bargaining agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Disciplinary process communicated</td>
<td>In the Rules and Regulations and collective bargaining agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Appeal process provided</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) recent litigation</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) pending litigation</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Counseling Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Critical incident stress debriefing (CISD)</td>
<td>Available from trained personnel internally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Employee assistance program</td>
<td>Through CISD for career personnel and limited for Paid On Call members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Intervention program</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. The Application and Recruitment Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Recruitment program</td>
<td>Advertising and word of mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Application process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) qualification check</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) reference check</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>24</sup> SFD Policy 2.10.1 discusses an Employee Assistance Program; however, the program is reported to be inactive at the time of this writing.

<sup>25</sup> An Employee Assistance Program (EAP) is a confidential, self-referral program typically made available to members and their families. The programs are provided by contract with providers external to the organization, are inexpensive and highly beneficial.
### Survey Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iii) background check</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>LEDS criminal history check</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) physical standards established</td>
<td>CPAT based</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) knowledge testing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) interview</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, with Chief only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) medical exam required</td>
<td>Per NFPA 1582 standards for career members; drug testing and respiratory testing only for POC</td>
<td>Urinalysis completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii) psychological exam required</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SFD: Establish a more comprehensive process for new volunteer applicants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Testing, Measuring and Promotion Process

#### A. Periodic competence testing
Annual skills performance required
Annual skills evaluation needed to maintain certification levels
Both agencies: Assure that physical competence is evaluated annually and/or incorporated into the annual skills evaluation process.

#### B. Periodic physical competence testing
Annually
No

#### C. Periodic performance review
Incorporated into ongoing training
Annual as above

#### D. Promotional testing
Yes; established process for lieutenant and battalion chief promotions.
No

### 8. Health and Safety

#### A. Medical standards established
Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services and Stanfield Fire District, Oregon
Cooperative Efforts Feasibility Study

### Survey Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing and Personnel Management – Observations</th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) periodic medical exam</td>
<td>Every other year paid by OSFM for HM team members; other career as benefit of medical insurance; none for POC</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Both agencies: Provide responders with annual medical evaluation in compliance with standards and requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Safety committee established

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i) membership</th>
<th>Representatives of career, paid on call, and command staff</th>
<th>Assistant chief/board representative and 2 Firefighters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii) meetings</td>
<td>Meetings are held monthly</td>
<td>Safety section in monthly business meeting serves as Safety Committee meeting. Quarterly safety inspections also completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) meeting minutes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minutes are kept of safety section in the monthly business meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9. Administration and Other Support Staff

| A. Fire chief | 1 | 1 (Career) |
| B. Assistant fire chief | 1 | 1 (Volunteer) |
| C. Fire marshal | 1 | 0 |
| D. Office assistant | 1 | 0 |
| E. Billing clerk | 1 | 0 |
| F. Part time education and safety | 0.25 FTE | 0 |
| G. Total administrative & support staff | 5.25 | 2 |
| H. Percent administrative & support to total personnel | 14.7% | 16% |

---

26 Annual medical examination requirements are established both in OHSA Respiratory Protection Standard 1910.34 and NFPA Standards 1500 – Standard on Fire Department Occupational Safety and Health Program and 1582 – Standard on Comprehensive Occupational Medical Program for Fire Departments

27 For this calculation, Paid On Call staffing numbers are calculated at a 3:1 ratio relative to full time career employees.
Operational staffing models differ between Hermiston and Stanfield. SFD is a volunteer organization with the exception of a paid fire chief, depending entirely on non-paid responders to answer emergency alarms. The volunteers receive a per-call stipend when they respond to an incident. HFES is described as a combination fire department. Core staffing is provided by full-time employees with additional manpower resources for emergency calls coming from non-career personnel, referred to as Paid On Call members. These responders are similar to volunteers and commonly referred to as such internally but are paid an hourly rate when responding to emergencies.

Due to the different staffing approaches, personnel management needs also differ. Many of the components relating to career employees that are identified in the survey table for HFES are not needed and do not apply to SFD given its volunteer configuration.

The number of available volunteer or Paid On Call members is a critical component of a fire department's staffing equation. The importance is particularly significant in an organization that is comprised completely or largely of volunteers, which may have difficulty
mustering enough responders when an emergency occurs. ESCI conducted a comparison of volunteer and Paid On Call personnel on a per 1,000 population basis in the two agencies, relative to each other as well as to national and regional statistical medians. The result is shown in Figure 5.

**Figure 5: Volunteer/Paid On Call Firefighters per 1,000 Residents**

HFES and SFD report a lower number of firefighters per 1,000 residents than both regional and national medians as defined by the National Fire Protection Association. It is expected that Hermiston ratios would be somewhat lower, given that career personnel are also used in the district. However, Stanfield ratios are considerably lower, indicating a higher degree of dependence on outside resources in the form of mutual aid to meet manpower needs.

---

28 NFPA report *U.S. Fire Department Profile- 2010* (latest available).
Availability of sufficient numbers of career personnel directly correlates to an agency’s ability to meet emergency response staffing needs. A similar comparison of Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services paid firefighters per 1,000 population relative to national and regional medians was conducted and is detailed in Figure 6.

Figure 6: Career Firefighters per 1,000 Residents

The use of national and regional medians is highly subjective and the relevance of the data comparisons should to be viewed as only a single piece of information that can be considered along with many other measures. An agency’s identified response needs, as well as its financial capacity, drives staffing decisions, not necessarily what is being done by other fire departments.
HFES paid staffing numbers are lower than the listed medians. The number is lower because the NFPA data used to generate the comparison includes only full-time career personnel. In Hermiston, Paid On Call personnel are added into the staffing equation and, if they were factored into the above chart, the numbers would more closely approximate the medians.

Analyzing the ratio of administration and support positions to the total departmental positions facilitates an understanding of the relative number of resources committed to this function. The appropriate balance of administration and support positions to the operational component is critical to the department’s ability to fulfill its mission and responsibilities. Although no formal studies have been conducted to identify the optimum personnel mix, it has been ESCI’s experience that the typical ratio of administrative and support staff to total personnel in career departments fall within the 10 to 15 percent range. Both organizations fall within this range.
Survey Table 5: Service Delivery and Performance

The delivery of fire suppression, rescue, and emergency medical services is no more effective than the sum of its parts. It requires a timely response from well-located facilities, in appropriate apparatus, with sufficient personnel to mitigate the emergency. The service delivery and performance analysis below provides a baseline from which further analysis of response capability can be performed and upon which Hermiston and Stanfield can base future service delivery decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Service Delivery and Performance – Observations</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
<td>Stanfield Fire District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Risk analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) target hazards identified</td>
<td>Identified in Standard of Cover (SOC) document and through inspections</td>
<td>Not documented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) geographical call distribution by type/severity</td>
<td>Yes, via pin map</td>
<td>Not tracked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) fire flows identified</td>
<td>Yes, in inspections and preplans</td>
<td>Not documented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) call distribution by time of day/day of week</td>
<td>Tracked</td>
<td>Information is available in Fire Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) effective reach identified</td>
<td>No formal station response zones</td>
<td>Single station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) geographical barriers/gaps identified</td>
<td>Personnel local knowledge</td>
<td>Personnel local knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) inefficient overlap of response areas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Apparatus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) vehicles appropriate to risk</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) pumping capacity effective for initial attack</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) ladders appropriate for rescue/elevated operations</td>
<td>Ground ladders and ladder truck</td>
<td>Ground ladders and ladder truck available through Mutual Aid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The information in the table above is an abbreviated summary of basic service delivery components. A detailed discussion and analysis of the two agencies’ current service delivery performance is provided later in this report.
Survey Table 6: Support Programs – Emergency Services Training

Firefighters operate in a complex, dangerous, and dynamic environment, as demonstrated by over 100 fatalities and 3,000 serious injuries annually. Firefighter training is the single most important factor that prepares them to meet the challenges of the situations and environments in which they work. The delivery of safe and effective fire and emergency medical services is, therefore, clearly dependent on a well-trained response force. The International Fire Service Training Association (IFSTA) states:

...regardless of the particular system used, an effective training program will include: (1) the continuous training of all levels of personnel in the organization; (2) a master outline or plan; (3) a system for evaluating the scope, depth, and effectiveness of the program; and (4) revising the program, as required, to include changing state and federal mandates, advances in equipment, products, and operational techniques.

Without a comprehensive training program, emergency outcomes are compromised, response personnel are at risk, and the district may be exposed to liability for the actions of its employees. Training and education of personnel are critical functions for both Hermiston and Stanfield Fire Districts. Anthony Granito, author of Fire Service Instructor’s Guide, makes the following statement:

A good training program is undoubtedly the single most important factor producing and maintaining a high proficiency in any fire department. It not only produces high efficiency initially, but also affects future efficiency when we consider that the rawest recruit now being trained may be chief of the department or at least a senior officer in 20 or 30 years.

The function of a training program is not merely imparting personal knowledge and technical skills to an individual, it is developing the self-confidence to perform correctly under stressful if not hostile conditions. A training program must be systematic and must provide positive feedback to the trainee, firefighter, or officer. The goals of training should always focus on performance, never merely on acquiring a certain number of training hours.

Today’s industry standards outline certain areas that are considered integral to effective training programs. The program should include the following:

- General training competencies
- Training administration and scheduling
The Hermiston and Stanfield Fire Districts both reflect a healthy appreciation for the importance of training and its correlation to the safety of their firefighters. The Hermiston Assistant Chief, whose primary responsibility is that of training, demonstrates a positive outlook and considerable enthusiasm towards educating his responders. Similarly, the Stanfield Fire Chief is strongly committed to training, providing instruction to other fire agencies around the state and is supported by a volunteer captain who is similarly dedicated. The programs are reviewed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Emergency Services Training – Observations</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
<td>Stanfield Fire District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. General Training Program Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Incident command system – certification levels defined?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, some command staff are trained to Advanced (400) level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Accountability procedures</td>
<td>Yes, Passport system is used</td>
<td>Yes, Passport system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Policy and procedures</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Recently implemented-trained when put in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Safety procedures</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Recruit academy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Special rescue (high angle, confined space, etc.)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Training facilities and resources
- Training procedures, manuals, and protocols
- Record keeping (records management system)
- Organizational priority to training
- Training program clerical support services
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Emergency Services Training – Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Hazardous materials</td>
<td>Awareness and Operations. plus some Technician Level for the State Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Wildland firefighting</td>
<td>S130/190 Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Vehicle extrication</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Defensive driving</td>
<td>Yes, EVOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Use and care of small tools</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Radio communications &amp; dispatch protocol?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. EMS skills and protocol?</td>
<td>Yes, all EMT levels and CPR to all employees annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kudos: Both organizations have designed training programs that effectively address the appropriate baseline content**

### 2. Training Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
<th>Captain Dean Marcum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Director of training program</td>
<td>Assistant Chief Scott Stanton</td>
<td>Captain Dean Marcum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Education or background</td>
<td>NFPA Instructor III, President of the Regional Training Association, EFO, Training Program Manager</td>
<td>NFA-Instruction Methodology, Instructor 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Goals and objectives identified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>SFD: Set annual goals and objectives for the district’s training program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Governing body support and concurrence</td>
<td>Well supported</td>
<td>Good support from board and chief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Personnel knowledge and understanding</td>
<td>Well informed, knowledgeable, enthusiastic</td>
<td>Understands district needs and Oregon requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Training Facilities and Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) live fire prop</td>
<td>Live fire prop is under construction at Station 3</td>
<td>Regional prop at Hermiston Station 3</td>
<td>under construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Survey Component

### Emergency Services Training – Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) fire and driving grounds</td>
<td>Adequate space at the Training Center under development</td>
<td>High school parking lot is used</td>
<td>Both agencies: Continue efforts to develop a regional training facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Classroom facilities</td>
<td>Classrooms at Station 1 and Station 3</td>
<td>Meeting room serves as classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. VCR, projectors, computer simulations</td>
<td>Adequate equipment at Stations 1 and 3</td>
<td>All present at station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Books, magazines, instructional materials</td>
<td>Complete materials, adequate resources</td>
<td>Magazines, books available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Training Procedures Manual

| A. Manual developed and used | In process | None | Both agencies: Develop a training manual that identifies training procedures and details program content as a reference for instructors.29 |
| B. IFSTA, Jones and Bartlett, Delmar manuals used | IFSTA Manuals | IFSTA Manuals | |

### 5. Methodology Used for Training

| A. Manipulative | Yes | Yes |
| B. Task performances/frequency | Annual evaluation | Annual evaluation | |
| C. Annual training hours | 120 hours for paid personnel. 72 hours for paid on call | Minimum 60 hours annually | Both agencies: To the extent feasible, strive to align volunteer and paid on call annual training hours requirements to those applied to career personnel. |
| D. Use of lesson plans | Yes | Yes |
| E. Night drills | Yes | Yes |

---

29 Development of a training manual should be considered a high priority. Doing so jointly is appropriate given the current shared training efforts.
Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services and Stanfield Fire District, Oregon
Cooperative Efforts Feasibility Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Emergency Services Training – Observations</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
<td>Stanfield Fire District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Multi-agency drills</td>
<td>Yes, with Stanfield(^{30})</td>
<td>Yes, primarily with Hermiston. Also regional disaster drill and wildland training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kudos: HFES and SFD have made positive strides with their recent efforts to train together and combine their training programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. Inter-station drills</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. Physical standards or requirements</td>
<td>Physical Ability Test annually, tied to job function</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Annual performance evaluation conducted

- On all career staff and about 50% of the paid on call
- Yes

Both agencies: Conduct annual skills performance assessment on all personnel.

6. Operations and Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Disaster drills conducted</th>
<th>Annual, all agency drill</th>
<th>Annual, all agency drill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Attention to safety</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Post incident analysis</td>
<td>Yes, CISD and After Action Reports</td>
<td>Nothing formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Priority by management toward training</td>
<td>High priority and support from fire chief and board</td>
<td>High priority and support from fire chief and board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Recordkeeping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Individual training files maintained</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Records and files computerized</td>
<td>Yes, via Firehouse Software®</td>
<td>Yes, via CertRight and hard copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Daily training records</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Company training records</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Training equipment inventoried</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Lesson plans used</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Pre-fire planning included in training</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{30}\) Hermiston and Stanfield held the first of what is planned to be regular joint training during this study period. The practice is encouraged.

\(^{31}\) It is important to train periodically with neighboring agencies with whom mutual aid is exchanged only occasionally.
### Emergency Services Training – Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Personnel Trained</td>
<td>A. Training objective (who, level, etc.)</td>
<td>Yes, by rank and certification level</td>
<td>Nothing formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Employee development program used</td>
<td>No defined program but required for advancement</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Administrative Priority</td>
<td>A. Budget allocated to training, 2011-12</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Adequate funding for training</td>
<td>Adequate, but no room for expansion</td>
<td>Yes, never a problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Using certified instructors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Annual training report produced</td>
<td>Yes. Monthly and annual</td>
<td>Reported to Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Adequate training space/facilities/equipment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Marginal in-district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Maintenance of training facilities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10. Training Program Clerical Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Support Staff</td>
<td>Uses Office Assistant and Billing Clerk as needed</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Records computerized software used</td>
<td>Yes, Firehouse Software®</td>
<td>Yes, CertRight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Adequate office space, equipment, and supplies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Limited space at station, but adequate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

HFES has initiated the process of developing a training facility at Station 3 with considerable potential. Approaching further development of the site as a regional effort, including Stanfield Fire District, Umatilla Fire District, and others will increase the likelihood of success in seeking grant funding.
ESCI was impressed with the level of commitment that both of the study agencies have made to assuring that their emergency responders are effectively and adequately trained to deal with the kinds of emergencies that they can expect to be confronted with. As detailed above, program content in both agencies addresses the necessary fundamental subject areas sufficiently.

Training program content is generally developed around the requirements for continuing education for emergency medical response certifications, as well as the coursework necessary to maintain Firefighter, Pumper/Operator, Wildland Firefighter Fire Officer and Incident Command certification levels. Creating the ongoing educational program around these requirements is appropriate and should be further developed in the form of establishing a training manual. A manual, if properly composed, serves as a reference for instructors when they are assigned to conduct a training session. It also accommodates standardization so that all members are trained to do things the same way.

ESCI was pleased to learn that both agencies have decided to merge their training programs into one. In fact, while we were conducting our on-site field work, the districts held their first combined drill event. Since firefighters in Hermiston and Stanfield find themselves working together on emergency scenes frequently, it only makes sense that they should train together. Not only will the efficiency and effectiveness of emergency operations improve as a result, but the safety of the responders will be enhanced, as well.

When fire agencies are first beginning to consider the possibilities of working together, the training ground is the best place to start. As members work with each other in a learning environment, not only are skills developed, but interpersonal relationships begin to grow as well. In later sections of this report, training will be identified as one of the most important components of a cooperative service delivery plan. The efforts initiated by Hermiston and Stanfield in blending their training programs is viewed as an excellent effort and guidance on additional steps that can be taken will be offered.
Survey Table 7: Support Programs – Life Safety Services - Fire Prevention

An aggressive municipal risk management program, through active fire and life safety services, is a fire department’s best opportunity to minimize the losses and human trauma associated with fires and other community risks.

*The National Fire Protection Association recommends a multifaceted, coordinated risk reduction process at the community level to address local risks. This requires engaging all segments of the community, identifying the highest priority risks, and then developing and implementing strategies designed to mitigate the risks.*

A fire department should actively promote fire resistive construction, built-in warning and fire suppression systems, and an educated public trained to minimize their exposure to fire and health issues and to respond effectively when faced with an emergency.

Hermiston and Stanfield approach fire prevention and life safety practices differently. HFES has a Fire Marshal on staff and a part-time employee that works on public education. SFD does not have a Fire Marshal position and, instead, utilizes the services of the Oregon State Fire Marshal’s Office (OSFM) for most fire prevention needs. Employment of the OSFM resources to address fire prevention in SFD is appropriate given the district’s limited staffing, however, only limited code enforcement services are derived from the practice. The Deputy Fire Marshals do not inspect all levels of occupancy type for fire and life safety compliance, a concern that will be discussed in further detail at the conclusion of this survey section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Life Safety Service Fire Prevention – Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Code Enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Fire codes adopted</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) code used – year/version</td>
<td>2010 Oregon Fire Code, adopted by ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Local codes or ordinances adopted, amendments</td>
<td>None; enforced as adopted by the State of Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sprinkler ordinance in place</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Life Safety Service Fire Prevention – Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. New Construction Inspections</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Consulted in proposed new construction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Perform fire and life safety plan review</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sign-off on new construction</td>
<td>No; the fire marshal has input on plans to the Building Official in the City of Hermiston for in-city permits and the State of Oregon Building Official for permits outside of the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Charges for inspections or reviews</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. General Inspection Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Perform existing occupancy inspections</td>
<td>The fire marshal completes all inspections; engine companies do not conduct inspections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Special risk inspections</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Storage tank inspections</td>
<td>No. OSFM completes storage tank inspections. The fire marshal attends the inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Key-box entry program in place</td>
<td>Supra system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Hydrant flow records maintained</td>
<td>No. The permit applicant is required to provide flow test records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Pre-incident planning</td>
<td>The engine companies pre-plan all target hazards and HazMat crews pre-plan hazardous materials exposures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34 The State Fire Marshal’s Office is only able to inspect schools, institutional and certain high or special hazard occupancies. As a result, many occupancy types do not receive periodic safety inspections. SFD should seek to address the shortcoming, possibly via contractual agreement with HFES and/or a future combined effort.
## Survey Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Life Safety Service Fire Prevention – Observations</th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. Self-inspection program in place</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Today</td>
<td>Both agencies: Consider a self-inspection program for low risk occupancies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Frequency of inspections</td>
<td>All occupancies are inspected every two years. Schools annually. Except Type B and M occupancies which are inspected every 3 to 4 years. All new businesses are inspected on opening</td>
<td>N/A, processed by SFM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Inspection program</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>None internally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Citation process in place and formally documented/adopted</td>
<td>No, requires an administrative warrant</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) court cited to</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Inspections computerized</td>
<td>Yes, Firehouse Software®</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Community feedback system in place</td>
<td>End of the year evaluation of public education program in schools by the Fire Marshal. Monitors success and issues with the car seat program</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Number of personnel devoted to program</td>
<td>1 Fire Marshal (full time) 1 School Public Educator @ 20 hours/month. 1 Paid On Call Firefighter conducts pub ed. and car seat programs @20 hours/month On-duty crews also participate</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Fees for specialty inspections</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Kudos: The HFES Fire Marshal is commended for operating an effective and well developed fire and life safety inspection program*

### 4. Fire Safety and Public Education

| A. Public education/information officer in place | A part-time public educator leads the program under the direction of the fire marshal. The fire marshal is responsible for public information. | Limited. When requested by a teacher. An annual library activity is conducted with kids during Fire Prevention Week |
| B. Feedback instrument used                     | No                                                | No                                    |
### Survey Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Public education in the following areas:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) calling 9-1-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) EDITH (exit drills in the home)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) smoke alarm program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) fire safety (heating equipment, chimney, electrical equipment, kitchen/cooking, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) injury prevention (falls, burns/scalding, bike helmets, drowning, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) fire extinguisher use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) fire brigade training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii) elderly care and safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix) curriculum used in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x) baby-sitting classes offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi) CPR courses, blood pressure checks offered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Life Safety Service Fire Prevention – Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internally developed, including components from the State of Oregon Schools Curriculum</td>
<td>State curriculum used by teachers in all the schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, the fire marshal is certified in intervention.</td>
<td>Via HFES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, provided via the Northwest Passage Fire Cooperative</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kudos: The HFES Public Education program is well organized and effective
### 5. Fire Investigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Life Safety Service Fire Prevention – Observations</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Fire origin and cause determination</strong></td>
<td>The Battalion Chiefs conduct initial assessment. If they are unable to determine a cause or suspect arson, the fire marshal is engaged.</td>
<td>Cause and origin by chiefs or line officers. Also use SFM deputy who is also a volunteer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Arson investigation and prosecution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) arson investigation training provided</td>
<td>Line personnel are trained as a part of Fire Officer I and II, supplemented by in-house training.</td>
<td>Yes, personnel have had training but are not certified. SFM deputy is certified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Person responsible for investigations</strong></td>
<td>Fire marshal</td>
<td>Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Local FIT (fire investigation team) membership</strong></td>
<td>A two-county FIT team is in place</td>
<td>A two-county FIT team is in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Process for handling juvenile suspects</strong></td>
<td>County Juvenile Court</td>
<td>County Juvenile Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Liaison with law enforcement</strong></td>
<td>Fire marshal</td>
<td>Fire chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. Scene control practices in place</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H. Photographer available</strong></td>
<td>Fire marshal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Adequate and appropriate equipment issued/supplied</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J. Evidence collection process in place</strong></td>
<td>Handled by law enforcement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K. Release required for entry</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L. Reports and records of all incidents made</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M. File, record, and evidence security</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>With fire report in chief’s office and on Fire Bridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Statistical Collection and Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Life Safety Service Fire Prevention – Observations</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Records kept by computer</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) type of operating platform</td>
<td>PC/Windows</td>
<td>PC/Windows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) software used</td>
<td>Firehouse Software®</td>
<td>Fire Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Information collected in the following areas:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) fire incidents</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) time of day and day of week</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ESCI was impressed with the HFES fire prevention program. The fire marshal operates a robust program that includes all of the appropriate components of an effective fire and life safety code enforcement and prevention division. Additionally, a well-developed public education program is administered by the fire marshal’s office, providing an excellent level of outreach to the community.

In SFD most code enforcement and fire prevention activity is performed by the Oregon State Fire Marshal’s Office. OSFM is only able to inspect schools, institutional, and certain high or special hazard occupancies. As a result, many occupancy types do not receive periodic safety inspections. SFD should seek to address the shortcoming, possibly via contractual agreement with HFES and/or a future combined effort.
Survey Table 8: Support Programs – Emergency Communications

Communication center operations are essential, directly affecting fire/EMS response times, service levels, overall service delivery, and customer satisfaction. Dispatch operations are integral to a successful emergency operation, starting with the initial “alarm” and continuing until units are available for redeployment.

Hermiston and Stanfield agencies are dispatched from two separate 911 centers. Depending on the location from which an emergency call originates, it may be received by either the Umatilla County Sheriff’s Department 911 Center or the City of Hermiston Police Department 911 Center. Rather than one dispatch center assuming responsibility for dispatching of all for a particular agency, in this instance, the dispatch agency that receives the call also processes it.

ESCI reviewed current emergency communications and dispatch functions and analyzed the impact of various service delivery options including:

- Communications overview
- Management and Staffing
- Facilities
- Training
- Performance Benchmarks

ESCI toured each of the dispatch centers involved, reviewed their operations, and interviewed center managers. The following table summarizes observation of the Umatilla County Sheriff’s Office 911 Center (UCSO) and the City of Hermiston Police Department (HPD) 911 Center.
## Survey Component

### Emergency Communications – Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>City of Hermiston Police Department Dispatch Center</th>
<th>Umatilla County Sheriff’s Office 911 Center</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Communications Provider</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Emergency Dispatch Agency</td>
<td>Hermiston Police Department</td>
<td>Umatilla County Sheriff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) population served</td>
<td>16,865</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) 9-1-1 PSAP – (public safety answering point)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) surrounding bordering PSAPs</td>
<td>Umatilla County, Morrow County</td>
<td>Hermiston Police Department, Milton-Freewater, Union County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Organizational structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) mission statement, goals, and objectives</td>
<td>Same as Hermiston Police Department</td>
<td>Same as Umatilla County Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) work schedule</td>
<td>40 hour work week (5 8-hour shifts) 8 employees</td>
<td>40 hour work week (5 8-hour shifts) 15 employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) minimum staffing policy</td>
<td>Usual staffing is 2 per shift. Can go to 1 due to vacancies</td>
<td>Usual staffing is 3 per shift with a minimum staffing of 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) state requirements for public safety dispatchers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) union representation</td>
<td>Hermiston Police Association</td>
<td>Umatilla County Law Enforcement Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Communications Facility &amp; Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Facility</td>
<td>Facility is inside the Hermiston Police Department building; ID cards are required for entry</td>
<td>Facility is inside the Umatilla County Criminal Justice Center; ID cards are required for entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Computer aided dispatch (CAD)</td>
<td>Sunridge Systems CAD and RMS</td>
<td>CIS (Computer Information Service)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) geo data base</td>
<td>Orion MapStar®</td>
<td>Orion MapStar®</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Emergency power</td>
<td>Auxiliary generator and UPC</td>
<td>Auxiliary generator and UPC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Telephone equipment</td>
<td>Vesta®</td>
<td>Vesta®</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Radio system</td>
<td>450 megahertz</td>
<td>450 megahertz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Radio control</td>
<td>Motorola</td>
<td>Motorola</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Recording equipment</td>
<td>Higher Ground</td>
<td>Higher Ground</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Survey Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>City of Hermiston Police Department Dispatch Center</th>
<th>Umatilla County Sheriff's Office 911 Center</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. Workstations</td>
<td>3 consoles</td>
<td>4 consoles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Mobile communications devices</td>
<td>Tone and voice pagers</td>
<td>Tone and voice pagers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Fire/EMS notification system</td>
<td>Tone and voice pagers</td>
<td>Tone and voice pagers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Alarm monitoring/fire systems</td>
<td>No external monitoring</td>
<td>No external monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Back-up plan/center operations</td>
<td>Handoff to Umatilla County Dispatch</td>
<td>Handoff to Morrow County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Emergency notifications</td>
<td>Reverse 911</td>
<td>Code Red (Pendleton)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Other duties</td>
<td>24-hour window at Hermiston PD</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Communications/Dispatch Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Availability of performance standards and/or benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) 9-1-1 time standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) call processing/dispatch time standards adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Evaluation of dispatch activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) by time/day/month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) by incident type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Standard operating procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Quality assurance program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Training program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Emergency medical dispatch (EMD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Position descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Workload activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) 9-1-1 calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) 10-digit incoming calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) average speed of answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) average telephone processing times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) law enforcement activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) fire/EMS calls initiated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both dispatch centers operate in a similar manner is most respects. However, ESCI observed a key difference between the two with regard to the use of performance standards and benchmark measurements related to dispatch efficiency. The UCSO 911 Center was able to identify performance measures, as are listed in the survey table. Conversely, the HPD 911 Center indicated that, while performance data is tracked, no standards or benchmarks have been adopted. The establishment, measuring and enforcement of performance standards and benchmarks should be in place.

A complete assessment of dispatch center management, administration, protocols and operations is beyond the scope of this study. An analysis of actual call processing performance and comparison to best practice and industry standards was not included in the project planning. However, ESCI made the following observations that are offered for future consideration:

Numerous best practices and standards are in place that can and should be incorporated into dispatch center operations, including:

- National Emergency Number Association (NENA)
- Associated Public Safety Communications Officials (APCO)
- National Fire Protection Association (NFPA)
- Commission on Fire Accreditation International (CFAI)
- Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA)\(^\text{35}\)

The use of two, separate dispatch centers to process incidents can result in problems, including:

- Duplication of workload and call processing efforts.
- Duplicate dispatching of incidents
- Lost efficiency due to phone calls between agencies during an emergency and call relay/transfers
- Increased risk of call handling errors or confusion between multiple centers

\(^{35}\) CALEA is the parent organization providing accreditation for Public Safety Communications Centers.
- Absence of standardization of dispatching procedures
- Information recording and data retrieval conflicts
- Potential for overall adverse effects on response performance

The current dual-dispatch center configuration has developed as a result of past efforts to transfer calls from one center to the other. The process was reportedly ineffective and insufficient information was often relayed in the transfer process. HFES agreed to the current approach, understanding that it is less than optimal, but viewed as an improvement over the previous approach.

It is apparent that having multiple dispatch centers serving a single fire department, absent any form of effective coordination, is inefficient and presents the potential for serious dispatching errors. Even in our site visits, ESCI experienced challenges related to data availability and retrieval resulting from the fact that the fire agency’s incidents were processed through different centers.

**Recommendation:**
Future consideration to the use of a single dispatch center for the Hermiston and Stanfield Fire Districts is recommended
Survey Table 9: Capital Assets, Capital Improvement, and Replacement Programs

Three basic resources are required to successfully carry out the emergency mission of a fire department — trained personnel, firefighting equipment, and fire stations. Because firefighting is an extremely physical task, the training and capacity of personnel resources is a vital concern. However, no matter how competent or numerous the firefighters, the department will fail to execute its mission if it lacks sufficient fire equipment deployed in an efficient and effective manner.

Fire Stations

Fire stations play an integral role in the delivery of emergency services for a number of reasons. A station’s location will dictate, to a large degree, response times to emergencies. A poorly located station can mean the difference between confining a fire to a single room and losing the structure. The location of a station can even make the difference between saving and losing a life.

Fire stations need to be designed to adequately house equipment and apparatus, as well as meet the needs of the organization, its workers, and/or its members. It is essential to research need based on call volume, response time, types of emergencies, and projected growth prior to making a station placement commitment. Locating fire stations is also a matter of the greater community (region) need.

Consideration should be given to a fire station’s ability to support the department’s mission as it exists today and in the future. The activities that take place within the fire station should be closely examined to ensure the structure is adequate in both size and function. Examples of these functions may include:

- The housing and cleaning of apparatus and equipment
- Residential living space for on-duty crew members (male and female)
- Administrative or management office(s)
- Training, classroom, and library areas
- Firefighter fitness area
While this list may seem elementary, the lack of dedicated space compromises the ability of the facility to support all of these functions and can detract from its primary purpose.

**Apparatus**

Other than the firefighters assigned to stations, response vehicles are probably the next most important resource of the emergency response system. If emergency personnel cannot arrive quickly due to unreliable transport, or if the equipment does not function properly, then the delivery of emergency service is likely compromised.

Fire apparatus are unique and expensive pieces of equipment, customized to operate efficiently for a narrowly defined mission. An engine may be designed such that the compartments fit specific equipment and tools, with virtually every space on the vehicle designed for function. This same vehicle, with its specialized design, cannot be expected to operate in a completely different capacity, such as a hazardous materials unit or a rescue squad. For this reason, fire apparatus are very expensive and offer little flexibility in use and reassignment. As a result, communities across the country have sought to achieve the longest life span possible for these vehicles.

Unfortunately, no piece of mechanical equipment can be expected to last forever. As a vehicle ages, repairs tend to become more frequent, parts are more difficult to obtain, and downtime for repair increases. Given the emergency mission that is so critical to the community, downtime is one of the most frequently identified reasons for apparatus replacement.

Because of the expense of fire apparatus, most communities develop replacement plans. To enable such planning, communities often turn to the accepted practice of establishing a life cycle for the apparatus that results in an anticipated replacement date for each vehicle.

The reality is that it may be best to establish a life cycle for use in the development of replacement funding for various types of apparatus; yet, apply a different method (such as a maintenance and performance review) for actually determining the replacement date in real life, thereby achieving greater cost efficiency when possible.
Fleet managers of the districts have a concern of the aging of the fleet and the current replacement schedule. As the frontline units are aging, the fleet will experience higher costs and more down time associated with necessary repairs and routine maintenance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Capital Assets, Capital Improvement, and Replacement Programs – Observations</th>
<th>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</th>
<th>Stanfield Fire District</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Fire Stations/Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Replacement plan maintained</td>
<td></td>
<td>No station replacement plan is in place</td>
<td>No station replacement plan is in place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) period of plan (from – to)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) funding mechanism</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Construction or improvement plans</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Apparatus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Plan maintained</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013 – 2027</td>
<td>No written plan</td>
<td>SFD: Establish and fund an apparatus replacement plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) period of plan (from – to)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) funding mechanism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funded via transfers from the General Fund to a Reserve Fund based on a pre-determined schedule</td>
<td>Financed from the General Fund on an as needed basis</td>
<td>HFES: Establish a funding plan for the apparatus replacement schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Support Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Plan maintained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) period of plan (from – to)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Included in 30-year apparatus and equipment replacement schedule</td>
<td>No written plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) funding mechanism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer from the General Fund at varying levels per the schedule</td>
<td>Financed from the General fund on an as needed basis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Kudos: The maintenance, upkeep, cleanliness, and organization of fire apparatus is a positive reflection of the organizational culture of both fire districts.*

*Kudos: HFES has established a capital replacement schedule and included small equipment in the plan.*
## 4. Methods of Financing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Component</th>
<th>Capital Assets, Capital Improvement, and Replacement Programs – Observations</th>
<th>Recommended Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
<td>Transfer from the General Fund are used to finance capital replacements as needed</td>
<td>Financed from the General fund on an as needed basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanfield Fire District</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanfield Fire District</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
<td>No current bonded debt</td>
<td>No current bonded debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanfield Fire District</td>
<td>No current bonded debt</td>
<td>No current bonded debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
<td>No current lease debt</td>
<td>A lease for capital apparatus has three remaining payments of $54,214 each.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanfield Fire District</td>
<td>When available</td>
<td>When available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</td>
<td>When available</td>
<td>When available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanfield Fire District</td>
<td>When available</td>
<td>When available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The average age of Stanfield apparatus is 10.83 years. The district’s primary engine and water tanker are relatively new (purchased in 2007 and 2010, respectively) and in excellent condition. One brush engine exceeds 20 years in age and the 1994 engine is within two years of what is generally accepted as a maximum service life of 20 years.
The average age of Hermiston apparatus is 8.62 years and 15 vehicles are less than ten years of age. Overall the apparatus in the fleet falls within acceptable age ranges. Three units are close to or have reached 20 years of service. Of those, two are lightly used vehicles, a rescue and a support vehicle, but one is an engine. The only engine at Station 3 was purchased in 1993 and has seen 19 years of use. The engine should be considered for replacement in the near future.

Fire departments establish apparatus service lives based on how they deploy vehicles to responses and level of activity. Typically, a fire engine is expected to last 15 years in front line service and five additional years in reserve status. A water tender may be expected to be in service for up to 25 years, five of which are in reserve. However, in departments with lower call volumes service lives may be extended.

HFES has developed an apparatus replacement schedule. ESCI’s review of the document reveals that it accurately identifies expected life span and projected replacement date, along with anticipated replacement cost. Commendably, the plan also accounts for the replacement of the equipment that is needed on the fire apparatus, a factor that is often overlooked when planning to meet vehicle needs.
The replacement plan is not fully funded. It is used as a guide and funding is set aside when possible, but the full cost of future vehicle and equipment replacement is not accounted for in the form of reserve funds or other funding mechanisms.

SFD has not developed a written capital replacement plan or schedule. However, the district does have an established practice by which it cycles vehicles and was able to articulate the anticipated apparatus purchases planned for the next several years.

A replacement plan is important. Fully funding a plan is extremely difficult, especially if funding has not been set aside in the past to prepare for future needs. It is best if, on the day that a new fire engine arrives, the agency starts setting aside dollars for its replacement. In reality, however, it is rarely achievable. Later in this report, a sample vehicle replacement schedule is provided for both agencies, detailing funding that should already be in reserve and the necessary annual financial contributions.

In the following figures, ESCI provides a review of each of the agencies’ facilities.
## Survey Components

### 1. Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Construction type</th>
<th>Original structure is block construction. A 2005 addition is standard frame construction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Date</td>
<td>Original structure was built in 1972. New living quarters and administrative areas were added in 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Seismic protection/energy audits</td>
<td>None documented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Auxiliary power</td>
<td>Automatic auxiliary generator provides uninterrupted power to building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Condition</td>
<td>The building and grounds are well maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Special considerations (ADA, mixed gender appropriate, storage, etc.)</td>
<td>Administrative and living areas are ADA compliant, Living area is mixed gender appropriate. There is adequate storage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Square Footage</td>
<td>Administrative and living areas are approximately 6,000 square feet. Apparatus bays are approximately 8,000 square feet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Facilities Available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Exercise/workout</th>
<th>No designated workout area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Kitchen/dormitory</td>
<td>Kitchen area is modern and adequate for current staffing. 6 individual sleeping areas with 9 beds and lockers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Lockers/showers</td>
<td>Separate male and female shower rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Training/meetings</td>
<td>Large training and meeting room well equipped with AV equipment. Room also serves as an Incident Command Post.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Washer/dryer</td>
<td>Washer and dryer available. Extractor available for cleaning and decontamination of PPE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Protection Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Sprinkler system</th>
<th>Living and administrative areas protected with sprinklers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Smoke detection</td>
<td>Heat and smoke detectors are present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Security</td>
<td>Building is secured with key code locks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Apparatus exhaust system</td>
<td>Bays are not equipped with exhaust removal system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:** The HFES Main Station is located in the central core of Hermiston. This station serves as the headquarters station for HFES, housing the chief officers, administrative staff, and the career line staff-consisting of an engine company and EMS company (ambulance). The HFES aerial apparatus is located at this station and is cross-staffed by the engine company or volunteers. The station is well located to service the City of Hermiston and the surrounding area.
Survey Components

1. Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Construction type</td>
<td>Block construction with metal roof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Seismic protection/energy audits</td>
<td>None documented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Auxiliary power</td>
<td>Automatic generator provides uninterrupted power for building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Condition</td>
<td>Structure generally appears well maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Special considerations (ADA, mixed gender appropriate, storage, etc.)</td>
<td>Downstairs public area is ADA compliant. Living quarters are mixed gender appropriate. There is adequate storage for current use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Square Footage</td>
<td>Building is approximately 5,600 square feet. Living area is approximately 1,000 square feet on the second floor with 4,600 square feet on the ground floor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Facilities Available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Exercise/workout</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Kitchen/dormitory</td>
<td>Kitchen is adequate for current staffing. Separate sleeping areas with lockers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Lockers/showers</td>
<td>Separate male and female showers and restrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Training/meetings</td>
<td>Day-room and living area available for training and meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Washer/dryer</td>
<td>There is a washer and dryer available for staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Protection Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Sprinkler system</td>
<td>The building is protected with a sprinkler system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Smoke detection</td>
<td>Smoke detectors are present in the office and living areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Security</td>
<td>Building is secured with key code locks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Apparatus exhaust system</td>
<td>Building is equipped with an exhaust removal system but it is not generally used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Station 2 is located east of the City of Hermiston in the rural fire district. The station is well situated on one of the main transportation routes through the HFES service area. Living quarters for three resident volunteers are available at this station. Station 2 is not networked on the City and HFES computer network. This has been identified by HFES staff as creating a communication and records management bottleneck. The station houses a structural engine, brush engine, water tender, and a HazMat decontamination trailer. Station 2 is manned by volunteer responders or call back career staff.
Figure 11: Hermiston Fire & Emergency Services Station 3

Survey Components

1. Structure
A. Construction type
   The structure is a metal pole building with metal siding and roof.
B. Date
   Constructed in 2002.
C. Seismic protection/energy audits
   None documented.
D. Auxiliary power
   Structure has an automatic auxiliary generator that provides uninterrupted power.
E. Condition
   The building is well maintained.
F. Special considerations (ADA, mixed gender appropriate, storage, etc.)
   Building is ADA compliant. Living quarters are mixed gender appropriate. There is adequate storage for current use.
G. Square Footage
   Total square feet: approximately 9,500; 7,500 square feet on ground floor and approximately 2,000 square feet in upstairs living area and office space.

2. Facilities Available
A. Exercise/workout
   No designated exercise area.
B. Kitchen/dormitory
   Kitchen area is adequate for current use. There are separate sleeping rooms with lockers.
C. Lockers/showers
   Separate restroom and showers are available.
D. Training/meetings
   A large training room is utilized as a regional training site. It is well equipped with AV equipment.
E. Washer/dryer
   A washer and dryer are available for duty crews.

3. Protection Systems
A. Sprinkler system
   None
B. Smoke detection
   Smoke detectors are present in the living area and training room.
C. Security
   Building is secured with key code locks.
D. Apparatus exhaust system
   Apparatus bays are not equipped with an exhaust removal system.

Comments: HFES Station 3 is positioned west of Hermiston, with good access to the portions of Interstate 82 and Interstate 84 within the HFES service area. The station is located on a large piece of property that serves as the HFES training ground and there is a large training room in the building. Station 3 houses a structural engine, brush engine, water tender, and reserve ambulance. There is also a mechanical repair area at this station and the HFES mechanic is based at this station. Living quarters for resident interns are in the station which is staffed by volunteers or call back career staff.
Figure 12: Stanfield Fire District Main Station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Structure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Construction type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Seismic protection/energy audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Auxiliary power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Special considerations (ADA, mixed gender appropriate, storage, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Square Footage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Facilities Available</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Exercise/workout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Kitchen/dormitory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Lockers/showers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Training/meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Washer/dryer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Protection Systems</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Sprinkler system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Smoke detection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Apparatus exhaust system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:** The Stanfield Fire Department Fire Station is located within Stanfield, just off of a main transportation route through the city. The station is well positioned for responses within Stanfield and the surrounding area. The station has four apparatus bays, three of which are double depth bays. One of the apparatus bays is utilized for storage of turnout gear. All SFD fire apparatus are housed in this building. There is a meeting room and two small offices. There are no living quarters at this station. The station is staffed by volunteer personnel.
**Service Delivery and Performance**

In this section, an analysis is presented of current conditions as they relate to the Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services (HFES) and Stanfield Fire District (SFD) facility distribution, service demand, and performance.

*Distribution Study*

The following map displays the service areas of HFES and SFD. The service area is calculated with GIS (Geographic Information System) software, using data provided by the clients. The service area calculations include the area within the city limits of Hermiston and Stanfield. The calculation does not include areas served by special contract or the HFES ambulance service area (ASA). The population estimate is derived from 2010 U.S. Census Bureau data and refers to the residential population within the districts.
Figure 13: Service Area Map
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Estimated Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HFES</td>
<td>103.7 sq. miles</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>51.7 sq. miles</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Figure 14, ESCI uses 2010 U.S. Census Bureau data to display population density within the study area.

**Figure 14: Study Area Population Density, 2010 Census**

As evidenced in the figure above, HFES and SFD fire stations are well distributed to serve the most densely populated areas within the two jurisdictions.

The Insurance Services Organization (ISO) is a national insurance industry organization that evaluates fire protection for communities across the country. A jurisdiction’s ISO rating is an important factor when considering fire station and apparatus distribution since it can affect the cost of fire insurance for fire district individuals and businesses. To receive maximum credit for station and apparatus distribution, ISO recommends that all “built upon” areas in a community be within 1.5 road miles of an engine company. Additionally, a structure should be within five miles of a fire station to receive any fire protection rating for insurance purposes. In Figure 15, ESCI examines fire facility distribution by distance over the existing road network.
GIS analysis shows that approximately 73 percent of the road network in the City of Hermiston is within 1.5 miles of HFES Station 1. Over 95 percent of the roads in Stanfield are within 1.5 miles of the SFD station. In the rural area around Hermiston, 95 percent of the existing road network is within 5 miles of a HFES station; 85 percent of roads around Stanfield are within 5 miles of the SFD station.

HFES operates an aerial (ladder company) apparatus that is located at Station 1. For ISO purposes, the service area of aerial apparatus is measured at 2.5 miles of travel distance from each ladder company on existing roadways, within the built up areas of the community. Figure 16 demonstrates the ISO aerial apparatus service area for Hermiston.
Using the ISO criteria for ladder company placement, the current location of the HFES aerial apparatus meets the current needs of the community.

**Demand Study**

In the demand study, ESCI reviews current and historical service demand by incident type and temporal variation for both HFES and SFD. GIS software is used to provide a geographic display of demand within the overall study area. Both HFES and SFD provided ESCI with historical data from their National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS) software. The data is presented in the following figures.
Figure 17: displays historical service demand for HFES and SFD from 2008 through 2011.

![HFES and SFD Total Service Demand, 2008 through 2011](image)

Service demand for both jurisdictions has increased since 2008. HFES experienced a 9.1 percent increase and SFD experienced a 33.6 percent change. In the next two figures, ESCI presents historical service demand summarized by incident category for each agency.

Figure 18 demonstrates that EMS workload has increased annually and comprised 88.8 percent of HFES service demand in 2011.
In Figure 19, EMS demand decreased as a portion of the 2011 total service demand within SFD.

A temporal analysis of incidents reveals when the greatest response demand is occurring. The following charts examine service demand based on various time measurements. Figure 20 displays service demand by month.

Service demand by month varies throughout the year for both jurisdictions. The range for HFES is a low of 7.5 percent in February to a high of 9.4 percent in July. Similarly, SFD’s demand is
also lowest in February (5.6 percent) and highest in July (13.6 percent). Figure 21 examines service demand by day of the week within the study area.

**Figure 21: Study Area Service Demand by Day, 2008 through 2011**

Although demand varies throughout the week for both agencies; the range is quite narrow. There is only a one percent variance for HFES and 2.9 percent difference between lowest and highest demand by day in SFD. The last temporal measure of workload is an examination service demand by hour of the day.

**Figure 22: Study Area Service Demand by Hour of Day, 2008 through 2011**
A primary driver for service demand is population activity. Figure 22 demonstrates how increased activity during the day affects demand for emergency services. Approximately 65 percent of the service demand occurs in the time period between 7:00 in the morning and 7:00 in the evening in the study area.

**Geographic Demand**

In addition to the temporal analysis of workload, it is useful to examine the geographic distribution of service demand. ESCI uses GIS software to plot the location of HFES and SFD 2011 incidents and illustrate incident density in the study area. In this analysis, Low Density is considered one to two incidents per square mile and High Density is greater than 70 incidents per square mile.

The map in Figure 23 demonstrates that service demand is concentrated within the communities of Hermiston and Stanfield. There are also areas of higher demand along the
primary transportation routes through the area. HFES provides EMS transportation for the community of Echo and Echo Rural Fire District; which accounts for the moderate incident density in that area. A high number of EMS incidents in Figure 23 may overshadow the distribution of other incident types, most importantly fire incidents. For this reason, the following figure examines the incidents coded as “fires” in the 2011 NFIRS data, which includes all fires, not limited to structure fires.

**Figure 24: Study Area Fire Incidents, 2011**

Fire incidents display a similar pattern to the previous map that shows call density for all incidents.
Concentration Study
In the concentration study, ESCI provides a geographic display of the response time necessary for an effective response force to arrive at the scene of an emergency incident. Figure 25 displays the six-minute travel time from all stations within the study area.

Figure 25: HFES and SFD Six-Minute Travel Time Service Area

Approximately 70 percent of the existing road network in HFES is within six minutes travel of a HFES station. In SFD, 55 percent of the road network is within six minutes of the station. The areas labeled “2 Stations” in the map legend to the east and west of HFES Station 1; refers to areas that are within six minutes travel of two HFES stations.

The next figure displays the eight-minute travel time service area for all study area fire stations.
GIS analysis reveals that approximately 44 percent of the HFES road network is within eight minutes travel from two or more stations. Nearly 87 percent of HFES roads are within eight minutes travel of a HFES station. The SFD eight-minute service area covers 64 percent of the road network in the jurisdiction. As displayed above, portions of SFD to the north and west of the community of Stanfield are also served by an HFES station within eight minutes travel.

Reliability Study

The workload of emergency response units can be a factor in response time performance. Simultaneous incidents and the number of resources assigned to an incident can affect a jurisdiction’s ability to muster sufficient resources to respond to an additional, or concurrent, emergency. Figure 27 displays the percentage of simultaneous incidents (concurrent incidents) for HFES in 2011.
Nearly 65 percent of HFES service demand occurs as a single incident. Over 35 percent of the time in 2011 there were two or more incidents occurring at the same time. It is ESCI’s experience that this call concurrency rate is similar to other fire agencies that provide EMS transport service. Figure 28 presents the call concurrency rate for SFD in 2011.

It is not surprising that the small call volume experienced in SFD does not generate a high call concurrency rate. Another method of looking at workload is a count of the number of resources committed to emergency incidents. The table in Figure 29 displays the count of apparatus per incident in HFES during 2011.

The high number of EMS responses (which usually require a single ambulance) tends to overshadow the number of fire apparatus committed to incidents. In Figure 30 ESCI displays the resource draw down for fire apparatus excluding ambulances.
Incidents requiring a fire apparatus to respond accounted for just over 11 percent of HFES service demand in 2011. However, these incidents require a higher percentage of multiple apparatus responses to safely mitigate the incident. The figure below illustrates the number of apparatus per incident in SFD during 2011.

The number of single and multiple apparatus responses in SFD is similar to other departments with of similar size and call volume. With a single station and a limited number of volunteer personnel; SFD must depend on mutual or auto aid apparatus to send adequate resources to high hazard, complex incidents.

Unit hour utilization (UHU) measures the amount of time that a piece of apparatus is actually committed to an incident. Figure 32 analyzes the amount of time HFES fire apparatus were committed to an incident during 2011 and expresses this as a percentage of the total hours in a year.
Unit 1404 displays the highest UHU in 2011. This is the duty officer’s vehicle that responds to both fire and EMS incidents. The career staffed engine (1425) at the HFES main station has the next highest UHU. The ambulance UHU in this figure (1472, 1473, 1475 and 1476) represents ambulance responses as part of a fire incident. The total unit hour utilization for fire related responses in 2011 is 961.5 hours or 11 percent UHU.

The data used in the figure above (2011 NFIRS) does not include calls for ambulance service. In Figure 33, ESCI displays the UHU rate for HFES transport units (ambulances) in 2011.

As evidenced in the figure above, ambulance UHU ranges from a low of 2.7 percent for Unit 1474 (reserve ambulance at Station 3) to a high of 12.1 percent for Unit 1473. Other than 1474, all HFES ambulances are stationed at the HFES main station. In ESCI’s experience, UHU rates
above 25 to 30 percent for fire based EMS units, can lead to paramedic burnout and response reliability issues.

HFES is the EMS transport (ambulance) provider for the communities of Hermiston, Stanfield, Echo and the surrounding area. The figure below displays the HFES ambulance service area (ASA).

Figure 34: HFES Ambulance Service Area

As seen in the figure above, the HFES ASA encompasses approximately 517 square miles. This results in a substantial time commitment for EMS personnel and apparatus. Examination of HFES EMS records for 2011 shows approximately 190 EMS responses outside of the Hermiston RFD into the HFES ASA. The time that resources are committed to EMS incidents can compromise fire response performance and needs to be monitored closely. Figure 35 summarizes the total UHU rate for HFES fire apparatus and EMS transport units.
As seen in the figure above, the total UHU rate for HFES apparatus is over 45 percent (4,010 hours). Ambulance responses represent 76 percent of the total UHU. As the sole EMS transport provider, HFES provides non-emergency transfer service within their service area. These calls for service comprised slightly over 57 percent of the ambulance UHU in 2011.

Currently response performance does not appear to be adversely affected by the high number of non-emergency transfers. However, ESCI is concerned that the activity level is approaching and could, in the future, compromise response performance.

**Recommendation:**
HFES: Closely monitor Unit Hour Utilization levels for adverse impacts on response performance

The data provided to ESCI by SFD (2011 NFIRS) does not include individual apparatus response data. ESCI calculates that the total UHU rate for SFD in 2011 was 2.5 % or approximately 217 hours.

**Recommendation:**
SFD: Include individual apparatus times as part of the NFIRS data reported to the Oregon State Fire Marshal
Performance Study
In this section of the report, ESCI examines emergency incident response time performance for Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services and Stanfield Fire District. The data used in this summary of response performance is 2011 National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS) data for fire apparatus responses; and EMS records maintained in the HFES records management software (FireHouse™). Non-emergency and mutual aid responses have been removed from the data set. For this study, response time is defined as the time interval from when the fire department is notified of an emergency (alarm time); to when the first apparatus arrives on scene (arrival time). Figure 36 displays emergency response time frequency for all HFES incidents in 2011.

![Figure 36: HFES Response Time Frequency, 2011](image)

The most frequently recorded response time in the HFES service area is in the five minute range. The average response time is 6 minutes 18 seconds (06:18). 90 percent of emergency responses were answered in 10:55 or less. Figure 37 displays the same response time information for SFD.
The average response time for SFD emergencies in 2011 is 06:26. The most frequently recorded response time is also in the six-minute range. SFD units arrived at the scene of emergency incidents in nine minutes or less, 90 percent of the time in 2011.

Response times can vary by time of day due to service demand workload, traffic congestion, or weather, to name but a few. In the next set of figures, response performance is summarized by time of day. Response times are grouped into three time periods: midnight to 0800, 0800 to 1600, and 1600 to midnight. Average and 90th percentile response times are calculated for each time period. HFES 2011 response performance by time of day is illustrated in the following figure.
Both of the figures demonstrate an increase in response times during the period of midnight to 0800. This can be attributed to volunteers responding from home after being awakened, career personnel navigating stations from sleeping quarters to the apparatus bay, or any other number of factors. HFES response performance appears comparatively consistent during the rest of the day. Note that the best response performance for SFD is the time period from 1600 to Midnight.
This corresponds to the time when volunteer responders are less likely to be working and unavailable for emergency responses.

Response times may vary depending on the type of call reported. The following figures illustrate response time performance by incident type for the HFES and SFD. The following figure shows HFES response performance summarized as fire or EMS incidents.

**Figure 40: HFES Response Performance by Incident Type, 2011**

![HFES Response Performance by Incident Type, 2011](image)

**Figure 41: SFD Response Performance by Incident Type, 2011**

displays the same information for SFD in 2011.

![SFD Response Performance by Incident Type, 2011](image)
HFES emergency response performance fluctuates slightly between fire and EMS responses, but not significantly. However, the SFD data demonstrates a noteworthy degradation in response performance between EMS and fire responses. Slower fire response times may be attributed to longer driving times for volunteers to reach the station, the need to assemble a minimum number of members before departure of an engine and fewer numbers of available volunteers. SFD does not measure or report turnout time (the time interval between “alarm time” and “en route time”); therefore ESCI is unable to determine if a delay in turnout time is negatively impacting response performance for fire incidents within the SFD service area. ESCI again recommends that SFD develop a methodology to collect and record accurate and complete apparatus times for all responses.

Community Risk Analysis

The fire service assesses the relative risk of properties based on a number of factors. Properties with high fire and life risk often require greater numbers of personnel and apparatus to effectively mitigate a fire emergency. Staffing and deployment decisions should be made with consideration of the level of risk within geographic sub-areas of a community.

A community’s risk assessment is developed based on potential land use within its anticipated future boundaries. These potential uses are generally found in city and county development plans and zoning designations. Risk is then translated into land use maps (potential scale and type of development within geographic sub-areas) that show categories of relative fire and life risk.

- **Low Risk** – Areas zoned and used for agricultural purposes, open space, low-density residential and other low intensity uses.
- **Moderate Risk** – Areas zoned for medium-density single family properties, small commercial and office uses, low-intensity retail sales, and equivalently sized business activities.
- **High Risk** – Higher-intensity business districts, mixed use areas, high-density residential, industrial, warehousing, and large mercantile centers.

ESCI uses Umatilla County, City of Hermiston, and City of Stanfield comprehensive planning data and maps to categorize risk by zoning designation within the study area, as illustrated in the following map.
Figure 42 demonstrates a moderate level of risk in the older central core areas of both Hermiston and Stanfield. Higher risk is displayed in areas primarily designated as industrial development near the railroad right of ways through both jurisdictions and in the southeast corner of the City of Hermiston around the airport. It is noted that the data used in this figure is derived from comprehensive planning documents and data; and may not correspond to current land use.

**Incident Control and Management**

Both HFES and SFD utilize the Incident Command System (ICS) for tactical incident management. The two agencies use ICS for emergency scene management when operating together during joint operations. ICS and the National Incident Management System (NIMS) are widely accepted industry standards and are incorporated appropriately into the operations of HFES and SFD. Both jurisdictions have a fire ground accountability system (Passport) in place.
**Mutual and Automatic Aid**

There are numerous mutual aid agreements, both formal and informal, in place between fire, police, and emergency medical agencies in Umatilla County and surrounding areas. Mutual aid is typically employed on an “as needed” basis where units are called for and specified one by one through an Incident Commander. HFES and SFD have signed an Automatic Aid agreement, under which the departments have agreed to a “dual response” practice, wherein units from more than one district are dispatched to certain types of calls. The table below displays the amount of mutual or automatic aid received or given by both jurisdictions in 2011.

**Figure 43: HFES and SFD Mutual/Automatic Aid, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mutual/Automatic Aid</th>
<th>Given</th>
<th>Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HFES</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noted that HFES ambulance responses into SFD are not included in this table. HFES is the designated EMS transport provider for the Stanfield Fire District and parts of the Echo RFPD. As such, SFD is part of the HFES ambulance service area. Also not included in the table are approximately 70 HFES ambulance responses into the Umatilla Fire District. These responses should be considered as mutual aid responses; Umatilla FD is the designated EMS transport provider within UFD and HFES responds when requested by UFD.
Comparables

ESCI has developed a series of comparisons that help the organizations to appreciate several aspects of how they function relative to each other, as well as to national and regional comparators.

**Figure 44: Capital Resources per 1,000 Residents**

On a national comparison, HFES has a parallel number of capital resources relative to fire departments serving a similar population, between 25,000 and 49,999. SFD has fewer resources, when compared to its median population range of 2,500 to 4,999. HFES has one aerial ladder truck, while SFD does not, having appropriately chosen to rely on mutual and automatic aid.

Figures are derived from national median resource rates per thousand population

**Figure 45: Emergencies per 1,000 Residents**

The number of calls to which the departments respond is in the mid-range of that experienced by similar agencies. SFD is nearly equal to the regional median for departments serving its statistical population base.
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Figure 46: Fires per 1,000 Residents

HFES experiences fires at a level that is close to the urban high range of medians for similar sized communities. SFD reports 50 fires in 2011, which results in a very high ratio on a per 1,000 basis.

Figure 47: Volunteer/Paid On Call Firefighters per 1,000 Residents

SFD and HFES attract a lower number of Volunteer and Paid on Call firefighters per 1,000 residents when compared to national and regional medians for fire departments serving a similar population base.
Fiscal Analysis

This section of the report provides a comparative snapshot of historical financial results and a projection of what each organization will look like assuming that the organization structure and working conditions remain unchanged. The objective is to focus on the financial position of the fire districts including historical, current, and future revenue and cost. We calculate the likely financial outcomes of cooperative service proposals to help judge the fiscal viability of alternatives now and in the future. To conduct this analysis, ESCI uses the financial documentation provided by the two districts including the current budget documents and the districts’ annual audits. In addition, sources such as the Umatilla County Assessor are consulted. Before exploring possible options, the methodology employed for the analysis is described.

Introduction

Financial analysis is an important part of the evaluation of cooperative efforts. To this end, we develop a computer-driven model budget for each of the fire districts. A modeled budget is designed to fairly represent the monetary policies of each agency equally, to neutralize the normal differences usually found in unilateral fiscal practices, and to account for any financial peculiarities (such as budgetary back loading). The modeling technique assures that an "apples to apples" comparison is made of the agencies, which allows an estimation of the public cost of each district’s operation, and provides a means for financial evaluation of the outcome of integration. The modeled budget yields a baseline estimate of the public cost of service; but in addition, the methodology also provides the ability to project the outcome of the consolidation into the future. In this case, we establish a financial baseline for 2012.

Property Tax

Property taxes in Oregon are collected by the counties and distributed to individual taxing entities (schools, cities, county agencies, fire districts, road districts, public utilities, and other districts). The amount of property tax paid basis is (1) the assessed value of a property and (2) tax rates and bonded debt service of the taxing district.

Generally, an increase in assessed value is limited to three percent unless changes have been made to a property. The county assessor compares the real market value (how much the property is worth, as determined by the assessor, as of January 1 each year) to the maximum
assessed value (the 1995 value reduced by 10 percent, plus any changes that were made to a property, increased by three percent each year after 1997). The lower of the two values is called the assessed value (AV).

Taxes may increase by more than three percent with a voter-approved ballot measure. Taxes can also increase or decrease due to other changes, such as the amount a taxing district needs to pay for voter-approved bonded debt or property annexations. There are a number of factors that influence governmental revenues, not the least of which are the tax limitation measures known as Measures 5, 47, and 50. These initiatives have had the net effect of limiting government spending by restricting property tax resources. The tax limitation measures have been problematic for nearly all local governments and especially for special districts. Special districts generally have fewer sources of revenue.

The process of identifying taxable property and assigning a value to it is termed appraisal. Property subject to taxation includes all privately owned real property (e.g., land, buildings, and fixed machinery and equipment), manufactured homes, and personal property used in a business. There is no property tax on household furnishings; personal belongings and automobiles; crops; orchards; business inventories; or certain intangible property such as stocks, bonds, or bank accounts.

The value of the property is determined as of January 1 of each year. The AV is the value upon which property taxes are based. AV is the lower of the RMV (Real Market Value) and the MAV (Maximum Assessed Value). MAV was established by Measure 50 as passed by voters in 1997. The MAV was set in 1997 for all existing properties by taking the 1995 RMV and reducing it by ten percent. Increases in MAV each year are three percent annually, unless changes were made to the property; new construction, partitions, or removal from special assessment or exemption programs. For property that did not exist in 1997, the MAV is established by the using a change property ratio which brings the MAV down to the same general level of property that was established prior to 1997.

Because RMVs have grown significantly over the past years and the MAV only increases three percent annually, there has been a disparity between RMV and MAV. The majority of property owners in Umatilla County have a taxable AV that is much lower than the RMV.
**Oregon Tax Limitation Issues**
In the mid-1990s, the voters of Oregon passed a constitutional tax initiative aimed at curbing and then limiting property taxes. Since then, each non-school taxing entity of the state is limited to levying property taxes at (or less than) the agency’s state-assigned permanent tax rate. In addition, the law specifies that no property may be taxed at more than $10.00 per $1,000 AV for general government (non-school) purposes.\(^{36}\) If the combined tax rates of governmental entities exceed the $10.00 limit in any taxing zone, the assessor must lower the effective tax rates of all entities in that zone to the statutory limit, thereby putting that zone in tax “compression.”

**Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services Financial Overview**
Fire districts derive operating revenue from a limited number of sources, with ad valorem taxation being the most common. In the municipal environment, a fire department typically is allocated a portion of the city’s general fund, which generally is funded from a variety of sources. While HFES and SFD do not compete directly for revenue like a municipal fire department, HFES has a better position financially with the revenue received from EMS transport. For this reason and to the greatest degree possible, we recommend that any new iteration of the agencies or collaborative effort should maintain the broadest base of revenue possible for greater financial stability.

**Recommendation:**
Any new iteration of the agencies should work to maintain or expand current sources of revenue.

**HFES Historical Assessed Valuation**
A component of projecting AV (assessed valuation) growth is the valuation of property in each agency’s area of responsibility. ESCI first examined the AV of HFES from 2008 through 2012 (Figure 48).

**Figure 48: HFES Historical Assessed Valuation, 2008 – 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levy Rate</td>
<td>1.2025</td>
<td>1.2025</td>
<td>1.2025</td>
<td>1.2025</td>
<td>1.2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Value</td>
<td>1,601,580,536</td>
<td>1,682,457,085</td>
<td>1,679,227,578</td>
<td>1,701,410,183</td>
<td>1,745,462,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy</td>
<td>1,925,901</td>
<td>2,023,155</td>
<td>2,019,271</td>
<td>2,045,946</td>
<td>2,098,919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{36}\) Constitution of Oregon, Section 11b. Property tax categories; limitation on categories; exceptions, (1) and (3b), 2002 ed. Taxation to retire general obligation debt for the purpose of capital construction or improvement is exempt from the limit.
Between 2008 and 2012 the AV of HFES increased at an average annual rate of 2.19 percent while revenue was increasing 2.25 percent annually.

**HFES Historical Debt**

Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services carries no bonded or lease debt. The District has a lease for Fire Station No. 1 of $1.00 per year with the City of Hermiston.

**HFES Fee Schedule**

HFES charges a fee for services with a significant segment of revenue being received from EMS and EMS transport services. Figure 49 shows the ambulance fee schedule adopted by the District effective August 2008.

**Figure 49: HFES Ambulance Fee Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>In District</th>
<th>Out of District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Rate – BLS</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Rate – ALS</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Rate – ALS2</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mileage (Patient Mile)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid Call (Treatment without Transport)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HFES Historical Revenue**

Figure 51 lists the source and historical amount of revenue for HFES from fiscal year 2008 through 2012.\(^{37}\)

**Figure 50: HFES Source and Amount of Revenue, 2008 – 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actual 2008</th>
<th>Actual 2009</th>
<th>Actual 2010</th>
<th>Actual 2011</th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance Revenue</td>
<td>1,155,685</td>
<td>1,025,618</td>
<td>1,125,262</td>
<td>1,117,621</td>
<td>1,080,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>1,632,540</td>
<td>1,894,826</td>
<td>1,947,338</td>
<td>1,960,722</td>
<td>1,948,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Fire Income</td>
<td>103,820</td>
<td>142,792</td>
<td>81,433</td>
<td>24,846</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA Grant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45,079</td>
<td>176,170</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FireMed</td>
<td>59,475</td>
<td>67,473</td>
<td>69,580</td>
<td>70,168</td>
<td>66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-District Fire</td>
<td>22,476</td>
<td>13,764</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>5,652</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Rental</td>
<td>8,022</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>9,750</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HazMat Income</td>
<td>23,008</td>
<td>9,222</td>
<td>34,589</td>
<td>13,268</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>27,953</td>
<td>19,199</td>
<td>14,844</td>
<td>11,671</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>59,749</td>
<td>168,202</td>
<td>60,434</td>
<td>32,954</td>
<td>28,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,092,728</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,394,875</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,520,091</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,246,652</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,172,800</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately 61.42 percent of revenue is from property taxes and 38.58 percent is non-tax revenue budgeted in fiscal year 2012. Ambulance revenue accounts for 34.04 percent of

\(^{37}\) TAN (Tax Anticipation Note) of $400,000 excluded from HFES budget 2012 revenue.
revenue, with FireMed contributing another 2.08 percent. HFES pays Springfield Fire Department $36.00 per billing claim submission for billing services. EMS billing is moving in-house and expected to be operational March 1, 2012.

In the following figure, HFES's revenue from EMS and the annual average (includes FireMed) is shown for fiscal years 2008 through 2012. EMS revenue for fiscal year 2011 is based on actuals while 2012 is the budgeted amount.

![Figure 51: HFES EMS Revenue, 2008 – 2012](image)

There has been very little fluctuation in the revenue dollars from EMS for HFES over the five-year period. Revenue has averaged $1,167,376 per year.

**HFES Historical and Current Operational Costs**

Figure 52 shows the historical annual expenditures of HFES from fiscal year 2008 through 2012. The amount for fiscal year 2012 is based on the adopted budget. Annual expenditures are inclusive of personal services, materials and services, and capital outlay.

![Figure 52: HFES Annual Expenditures, 2008 – 2012](image)
Fiscal year 2010 was the year with the highest total expenditures. Total expenditures have averaged $3,272,429 for the five-year period.

ESCI used HFES’s 2008 through 2012 five-year history of revenue and expenditures to forecast costs and income. The average annual percent of change in expenditures and revenues was applied to the 2012 budget and forecast forward. Capital expenditures and grant revenue were excluded from the formula.

**Figure 53: HFES Forecast Revenue and Expenditures, 2013 – 2017**

Expenditures are forecast to exceed revenue by $1.1 million by 2017. While it is unlikely that HFES would maintain this level of spending given a diminished revenue growth, it points out the challenge of creating a balanced budget in future years.

It is also important to consider the additional costs that are associated with future replacement of fire apparatus. These costs are in addition to the expenditures reflected in the chart above and need to be factored into the overall financial picture.

Figure 54 provides a summary of the costs to fully fund a capital apparatus plan for HFES.
Figure 54: HFES Vehicle Replacement Plan Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle ID</th>
<th>Purchase Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Service Life</th>
<th>Years Left as of 1/1/2012</th>
<th>Replacement Cost</th>
<th>Reserve Required as of 01/01/2012</th>
<th>Annual Reserve Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1425</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>HME Engine</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1442</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>International Engine</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1427</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>International Engine</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1444</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>International Engine</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1429</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>HME Quint</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1454</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Brush Engine</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1452</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Brush Engine</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1458</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Brush Engine</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1462</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Pumper/ Tender</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1461</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Water Tender</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1463</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Water Tender</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>121,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1471</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Rescue</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>18,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1472</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Ambulance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1473</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Ambulance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>112,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Ambulance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1476</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Ambulance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1474</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Ambulance (Reserve)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Annual Funding Requirement $4,450,000 $2,402,000 $260,333

Implementation of the above plan, if it were to be fully funded, would require an initial fund balance of $2,402,000 and an annual accrual/budget of $260,333 adjusted for inflation each year.

Stanfield Fire Protection District Financial Overview

SFD Historical Assessed Valuation

A component of projecting AV (assessed valuation) growth is the valuation of property in each agency’s area of responsibility. ESCI examined the AV of SFD from 2008 through 2012.

Figure 55: SFD Historical Assessed Valuation, 2008 – 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levy Rate</td>
<td>2.0651</td>
<td>2.0651</td>
<td>2.0651</td>
<td>2.0651</td>
<td>2.0651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Value</td>
<td>132,423,728</td>
<td>138,051,227</td>
<td>146,089,931</td>
<td>153,919,010</td>
<td>158,574,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy</td>
<td>273,468</td>
<td>285,090</td>
<td>301,690</td>
<td>317,858</td>
<td>327,473</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Between 2008 and 2012 the AV of SFD increased at an average annual rate of 4.61 percent while revenue was increasing 4.94 percent annually.

**SFD Historical Debt**
Stanfield Fire Protection District carries no bonded debt. A lease for capital apparatus has three remaining payments of $54,214 each.

**SFD Fee Schedule**
SFD charges a fee for service for responding to out-of-district motor vehicle accidents and unauthorized burns. Billing for response and reimbursement to railroad fire and conflagration incidents is reported to be inconsistent.

**SFD Historical Revenue**
Figure 56 lists the source and historical amount of revenue for SFD from fiscal year 2008 through 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actual 2008</th>
<th>Actual 2009</th>
<th>Actual 2010</th>
<th>Actual 2011</th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>265,299</td>
<td>273,019</td>
<td>293,432</td>
<td>311,509</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1,827</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>10,147</td>
<td>11,408</td>
<td>2,170</td>
<td>2,578</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Contributions</td>
<td>57,031</td>
<td>43,647</td>
<td>39,700</td>
<td>86,619</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Contracts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>334,304</strong></td>
<td><strong>328,569</strong></td>
<td><strong>335,612</strong></td>
<td><strong>401,002</strong></td>
<td><strong>580,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In fiscal year 2012, approximately 51.68 percent of revenue is from property taxes and 48.32 percent is non-tax revenue.

**SFD Historical and Current Operational Costs**
Figure 57 shows the historical annual expenditures of SFD from fiscal year 2008 through 2012. The amount for fiscal year 2012 is based on the adopted budget. Annual expenditures are inclusive of personal services, materials and services, and capital outlay.
**Figure 57: SFD Annual Expenditures, 2008 – 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actual 2008</th>
<th>Actual 2009</th>
<th>Actual 2010</th>
<th>Actual 2011</th>
<th>Budget 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>135,868</td>
<td>134,498</td>
<td>155,224</td>
<td>160,156</td>
<td>187,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Services</td>
<td>133,042</td>
<td>102,937</td>
<td>114,609</td>
<td>102,897</td>
<td>211,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay and Capital Lease</td>
<td>137,162</td>
<td>79,706</td>
<td>63,562</td>
<td>87,943</td>
<td>222,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Contingency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>406,072</strong></td>
<td><strong>317,141</strong></td>
<td><strong>333,395</strong></td>
<td><strong>350,996</strong></td>
<td><strong>680,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fiscal year 2012 is budgeted to have the highest total expenditures over the five-year time frame. Total expenditures have averaged $417,621 for the period.

ESCI used SFD’s five-year history of revenue and expenditures to forecast costs and income. The average annual percent of change in expenditures and revenues was applied to the 2012 budget and forecast forward. Capital expenditures and grant revenue were excluded from the formula.

**Figure 58: SFD Forecast Revenue and Expenditures, 2013 – 2017**

Expenditures are forecast to exceed revenue by approximately 43 percent in 2017. While it is unlikely that SFD would or could sustain this level of spending given a slower rate of revenue growth, it points out the challenge of creating a balanced budget in future years.

It is also important to consider the additional costs that are associated with future replacement of fire apparatus. These costs are in addition to the expenditures reflected in the chart above and need to be factored into the overall financial picture.
Figure 59 provides a summary of the costs to fully fund a capital apparatus plan for SFD.

**Figure 59: SFD Vehicle Replacement Plan Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle ID</th>
<th>Purchase Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Service Life</th>
<th>Years Left as of 1/1/2012</th>
<th>Replacement Cost</th>
<th>Reserve Required as of 01/01/2012</th>
<th>Annual Reserve Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1211</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Central States Engine</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>252,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1212</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Rosenbauer Engine</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1251</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Brush Engine</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Brush Engine</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1261</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Water Tender</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>11,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1262</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Water Tender</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>112,000</td>
<td>11,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Annual Funding Requirement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,360,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$624,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$66,400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation of the above plan, if it were to be *fully funded*, would require an initial fund balance of $624,400 and an annual accrual/budget of $66,400 adjusted for inflation each year.

Comparison of operating costs along with other indicators (such as services provided, level-of-service, fire loss, and value of property protected), provides a financial measurement of a fire department’s services. In Figure 60 the cost per capita for operating the two fire districts is shown compared the total budget and less non-tax revenue.

**Figure 60: Comparable Operating Costs per Capita, Fiscal Year 2012**
Measuring the non-tax revenue per employee provides another view of the financial benefit that a fire department is netting outside of property tax receipts. Figure 61 shows the budgeted non-tax revenue per employee for fiscal year 2012.

**Figure 61: Comparable Non-Tax Revenue per FTE, Fiscal Year 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HFES</th>
<th>SFD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTEs</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue per FTE</td>
<td>61,210</td>
<td>280,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-tax revenue has an impact on the ability of the two fire districts to provide service.

**Economic Indicators**

Economic indicators specific to the State of Oregon, Umatilla County, and the local area will provide the historical basis for projecting future costs that impact the operation of each organization. Information in this section is provided to substantiate the forecast and projected increases in taxable assessed value, revenue, and expenditures. This will be accomplished by reviewing historical home retail sales information (the basis for establishing property appraised valuation), a ten-year historical review of CPI-U, and unemployment in for the area.

In the following figure the number of home sales and the median value by quarter from January 2006 through September 2011 for the City of Hermiston is shown.

**Figure 62: Home Sales in Hermiston, 2006 – 2011**

---

The figure depicts that housing sale prices have held their value and been consistently between $120,000 and $140,000 since 2006. From a peak of 165 home sales in the third quarter of 2007, the number of homes sold has trended downward. During the third quarter of 2011, 60 homes were sold, a decrease from the same quarter in 2007 of approximately 64 percent.

Figure 63 shows the number of home sales and the median value by quarter from January 2006 through September 2011 for Stanfield.

Home sale prices in Stanfield have varied widely since 2008. The variation in price is most likely related to the relatively few home sales occurring in any given quarter.

Annual Inflation Rate
Inflation is also an important consideration when forecasting cost. For the purpose of this analysis, ESCI will use the average Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers (CPI-U) reported for the 2001 through 2010 period for the Portland-Salem, OR-WA Area, as compiled by the U.S. Department of Labor. The information is displayed in both table and graphical format in the following figures.

---

Figure 64: Historical and Average CPI-U Table, 2002 – 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CPI-U</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3.71%</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The historical ten-year average CPI-U 2002 to 2011 was 2.11 percent. It should be noted that this rate will be used for analytical purposes during this review; actual CPI-U for a given year could be higher or lower.

The CPI-U average of 2.11 will be applied to the revenue and expense categories of the 2012 selected revenue and expenditures line items to develop a forecasted impact on HFES and SFD finances and cooperative efforts.

Figure 66 depicts the impact on future costs based on the historical ten-year average annual CPI-U increase.
Applying the forecast ten-year CPI-U to fiscal year 2012 expenditures results in a 23 percent increase in operating costs for the fire districts.

**Annual Unemployment Rate**
ESCI completed a review of the unemployment statistics for the Hermiston – Stanfield area to determine the financial stability of the area and the ability to support the fire districts operations. The figure below shows the annual and ten-year average unemployment rate.\(^{41}\)

**Figure 67: Pendleton-Hermiston, Oregon Unemployment Rate (Tabular Format), 2002 – 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate</th>
<th>Ten-year Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>7.71%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>8.21%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>8.05%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>7.89%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>6.68%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5.74%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6.47%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>9.48%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>9.84%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between 2002 and 2011, the annual unemployment rate in the Pendleton – Hermiston, OR, metropolitan area has averaged 8.00 percent.

\(^{41}\) Reference data is from the Bureau of Labor Statistics website http://www.bls.gov. The data is not seasonally adjusted (LAUMC41378203).
The next figure is a graphic presentation of the same historical unemployment data for the Pendleton – Hermiston, OR metropolitan area.

Figure 68: Pendleton-Hermiston, Oregon Unemployment Rate (Graphic Format), 2002 – 2011

Unemployment in the Pendleton – Hermiston, OR, metropolitan area is at the highest level in the most recent ten years. Continued increases in unemployment could negatively impact the ability of property owners to pay property taxes and fund operation of the fire districts.

Creating a Financial Baseline

The process to convert the financial records of each agency to a model budget requires certain conventions and assumptions. First, the annual budgets of two fire districts are reformatted. We categorize the line item accounts of each into three major classifications: personal services, materials and services, and capital outlay. The classifications are further sub-divided to permit the tracking of program cost (such as fringe benefits, maintenance, and capital purchases). All jobs are identified and indexed to compensation paid during the baseline year (2012). Each position is extrapolated to the model budget based on the costs associated with the job (salary and benefits) for a full year and expressed in FTEs (full-time equivalent).

We identify all non-tax revenues and subtract them from agency expenditures to produce the estimated general operating tax requirements of each jurisdiction. We consider that the resultant sum fairly estimates the amount of public tax support that each agency requires to
sustain the current level of fire and emergency medical services, regardless of the source of the jurisdiction’s tax revenues. A corresponding modeled property tax rate is generated for the fire districts by applying the calculated general operating requirements of the organization against the assessed (taxable) value of the current year.

Note that the model tax rate is calculated to permit the comparison of the effects of the proposed action only. The model tax rate may not match the actual tax rate of the agency for a number of reasons. For example, any back-loaded program or position will increase the model budget and resultant tax rate because each is calculated on a full year of services. On the other hand, the accumulation of fund balances tends to drive down the modeled tax rate in comparison to the actual rate. We do not intend that the ESCI model budget exactly mimic the agency’s current or future budget. Instead, the modeling process provides a stable base by which to measure and compare the effects of a proposed change.

Generally, we use a set of standard conventions when combining the modeled budgets of the individual agencies for analysis. Depending on local situations, we may apply other special protocols to our calculation of the financial impact of restructuring. Regular and special conventions observed in this study are:

- **Jobs**: To facilitate the analysis, we assume that in combining agencies, programs, or divisions an agreement is reached in which all full-time positions are preserved but not necessarily converted to exactly the same jobs in the new organization.

- **Job Classifications**: Differences exist between the job classifications and structure of the two fire districts. Although we combine some functions of the two districts and carry out financial analysis based on the existing organizations, we note that in the long term the districts may need to restructure their administrative and support sections to better suit the new character of any consolidated divisions or agencies.

- **Staffing**: The model assumes that the current staffing levels continue, with an equivalent number of FTE positions.

- **Volunteer Membership**: Volunteer membership generally equals the sum of the rosters of the combining agencies, but is indexed to increase as residential population grows. In our experience it is prudent to budget in this manner, however any change as significant as consolidation usually results in at least a temporary loss of some volunteer positions. We assume that as an outcome of consolidation, one volunteer association is formed to represent the interests of the members of the restructured district. Elected officers such as president, vice president, and secretary/treasurer head the association. The fire chief appoints operational officers (such as assistant chief, captain, and lieutenant) based on qualifications.

- **Compensation**: Some job classifications may have more than one level of compensation assigned. If we are not able to identify the actual salary that is paid in such cases, we usually weight our compensation estimate to about 90 percent of the high-end of the
salary scale to allow for a tendency (over time) for a group of workers to reach maximum wage. In this case, we were able to use payroll reports to identify existing salaries; consequently, the model makes compensation assumptions that are very close to the actual amounts paid. When merging organizations, we assume that the highest salary paid to similar classifications prevails.  

- **Volunteer Costs**: Costs associated with volunteers are identified for each agency within the model, and a per-member expenditure is calculated. When combining agencies, volunteer cost is estimated based on the highest per-member cost of the involved agencies times the total number of volunteer members in the action.

- **Created Positions**: In most circumstances, the salary costs for the jobs of a unified program are calculated on the highest compensation level of current (or similar) positions. We may assign an assumed compensation to new positions created for the purposes of analysis. Occasionally, some employees or groups are compensated at a rate much higher than comparable positions in the other agencies. In these cases, we usually assume that pay for the higher position is “red circled”; essentially holding the current employee at that level until normal increases in other classifications close the gap. When compensation levels appear to be very much higher than comparable positions, we may assign (what we consider to be) a normally expected rate of compensation to avoid adversely weighting the model.

- **Governing Board Expense**: Expenses for governance of municipal fire departments is normally absorbed or prorated to the various city departments. Districts usually maintain line item accounts associated with governance expenses (mileage, per diem, reimbursement, elections, insurance, and meetings). When districts are combined in integration, such duplicated expenses are eliminated creating direct savings. Governing body expenses are not factored out of modeled budgets when an alliance is considered.

- **Unusual Expenses**: Existing (but reformatted) agency budgets are used as the basis for the estimation of service cost in each district. Some occasional or one-time expenses and revenue sources (such as the award of a grant) are factored out of the model.

- **Capital equipment and Facilities**: Financial analysis assumes the existing facilities and apparatus are maintained after a consolidation of the agencies, program, or division.

- **Revenue**: When a partnering strategy involves unification of the districts through a merger, consolidation, or a new organization (such as forming a single fire protection district), the non-tax revenues of the districts is combined. In some instances however, agreed upon terms (IGA, contract) dictate how revenue is collected and distributed.

- **Merged Model Budget**: We use the model budget as a template in the process of generating a merged budget. Budgetary modifiers are assigned to line items depending on factors that are likely to change that allocation after a consolidation. Each modifier adjusts the corresponding line item in proportion to the overall impact of merging the

---

42 Specifically, if each agency has the same job classification (e.g., fire chief) but those positions are paid different salaries, we assume that the compensation of that job in the merged department will be paid at the highest former rate.

43 Integration: Includes organizational changes at the corporate or governance levels and may consist of the creation and/or dissolution of one or more organizations.

44 Alliance: Intergovernmental cooperation via contract for any function or activity the agencies have authority to perform.
agencies. For example, the allocations of certain line items (such as uniforms) are largely dependent on the number of volunteer members; consequently, a modifier for those line items will adjust the corresponding line items of the merged budget in proportion to the change in the number of volunteers. The ESCI budget model includes modifiers for career administrative staff, career operational staff, volunteer members, career operational staff plus volunteer members, career administrative staff plus career operational staff, total personnel, stations, offices, engines, medic units, ladder trucks, vehicles, emergencies, assessed value, and population. Not all of the modifiers are applicable in this case.

The baselining process described above provides the ability to provide a “snapshot” of the fiscal effects of consolidation as if the action took place during the 2012 fiscal year. The baseline permits a comparison of the existing fiscal policies of the agencies with the budgetary and taxation changes relating to the cooperative model. This methodology yields a comparison of the “what if” of a merger against the baseline of current taxation.

**Calculated Service Cost**

A primary reason for this report is to explore the feasibility of cooperative efforts and the feasibility of various options for delivering fire and EMS services to areas served by HFES and SFD. A key issue in determining the feasibility of any of alternative efforts revolves around the cost of service. This section of the report provides the baseline information on the cost of service as well as other factors that may ultimately influence conclusions and decisions.

We emphasize one point. This analysis provides a “snapshot” estimate of the public tax cost for the current budgetary year, fiscal year 2012. Many forces may act to change the level of tax support in the future including changes in law, revenue, politics, or contracts. Our process uses current revenue and appropriation to generate an estimate of the amount of tax support relative to existing levels of fire and medical services. The analysis allows comparison with the predicted cost of cooperative efforts between HFES and SFD; it does not predict actual tax rate, current or future. The following table lists the estimated equivalent tax support for HFES and SFD.
ESCI developed a combined budget for providing consolidated or merged emergency services. Figure 70 is a modeled baseline budget for a consolidated HFES and SFD.

**Figure 70: Consolidated Baseline Budget (Modeled), 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Budget</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>508,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>1,527,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime</td>
<td>26,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>1,295,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Services Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials and Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>117,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>737,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Services</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>108,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials and Services Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>222,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>142,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Requirements</strong></td>
<td>4,686,981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consolidated budget above does not include funding for future capital replacement. It will be important that the agencies remember to factor in the future replacement cost of capital assets.

**Financial Issues of Consolidation**

The same service at reduced cost is always desirable. Increased cost accompanied by better or more service is frequently acceptable; but sometimes, increased cost becomes a political lightning rod if accompanying benefits are perceived as few. Whether that happens or not in this case depends greatly on how the citizens of the area see the change and how fire
department and municipal politics drive the issue. Certainly, one of the most frequently mentioned “killer” issues raised during the stakeholder interviews for this project was increased cost.

The consolidation of the two fire departments does accrue benefits to the communities. The volunteer membership of HFES and SFD is low relative to potential need and melding the two makes it easier to staff emergency apparatus with sufficient numbers of firefighters. A ten-year projection of the operational cost of this model suggests that integration may require slightly less budgetary resources over time than if the agencies do nothing.

**Areas of Short and Long-Term Cost Avoidance**

Areas of short-term cost avoidance involve:

- The efforts of the fire chiefs of HFES and SFD represent a degree of duplication.
- Unilateral oversight of the fire departments is replicated in both departments.
- Both fire departments maintain separate documentation such as mission, vision, rules, guidelines and standards. All represent duplicative work that could be used more effectively elsewhere.
- HFES and SFD have supported unilateral firefighter training programs in the past, recently taking steps to combine them. Training that is more specialized could result from combining and standardizing the programs.

The single area of long-term cost avoidance is in the acquisition of capital apparatus. A consolidated agency would require fewer reserve apparatus. As a conceptual example, ESCI combined the two agencies’ apparatus replacement schedules, developed with the assumptions used earlier and removing one fire engine and one water tender from the calculations.
A consolidated capital vehicle replacement plan with one less fire engine and one less water tender would leave a first out engine for each fire station and a single reserve pumper, instead of two, along with an adequate number of water tenders. Reducing the number of pumpers and water tenders by one each results in a net annual cost avoidance of approximately $15,000 and a lowered calculation of reserve funds that are required as of 01/01/2012, based on the replacement cost and life expectancy figures listed in the table, by $226,000.
Future Opportunities for Cooperative Efforts

Having completed the previous Evaluation of Current Conditions, ESCI is now armed with an understanding of the subject fire districts, their operations, management, strengths and challenges. Having benefited from the process of developing a full appreciation for where the organizations stand today, we are now able to look toward ways in which they can work together more effectively in the future.

The following section discusses the various concepts that are applied to identifying and analyzing partnership opportunities. Potential strategies are listed and evaluated for their applicability to Hermiston and Stanfield. General partnering strategies (overarching) fall in a range from remaining autonomous to the creation of a new organization. Strategies are further broken down into short, mid and long-term implementation horizons.

Partnering Concepts

Most public agencies are experiencing a period of transformation generally which has been accelerated by recent financial declines. Rapid economic change in virtually every sector of the nation is driving increasing demand for more collaborative and sophisticated fire and EMS protection. Many fire departments that have existed virtually unchanged for decades today find themselves challenged to anticipate and provide acceptable emergency service delivery with progressively constricting revenue.

As communities that are in close proximity to each other, like Hermiston and Stanfield, grow, their economies and emergency service demands become progressively more interdependent. A smaller city like Hermiston relies on rural or suburban residents to support the city’s economy, while outlying residents like those of the Stanfield and Umatilla communities depend on the city for jobs and commerce. The loss of a business to fire or disaster in one community now directly affects the quality of life in another.

The notion of cooperative service delivery is not a new one and has been undertaken in private industry for many years. Public providers of emergency services have sought ways to work more closely together only in relatively recent years and to a lesser extent. Those that have been reluctant to work together and have instead held to independent and territorial practices are being forced by new economic challenges to reconsider their outlook.
Compounding the impact of the economic downturn experienced in 2008, numerous states have experienced a public service funding crisis brought on by tax limitation laws or other policy shifts that squeeze the ability of communities to unilaterally finance and manage needed change. Oregon has been no exception. Even those rare communities not directly experiencing a funding crisis are pressured by residents and others to lower cost and increase service.

Beyond the financial considerations it has become clear that, rather than autonomous service delivery by stand-alone entities, emergency response needs are more effectively met by a larger, regionally based, fire protection agency. This is because the successful outcome of an emergency is highly dependent on the rapid mobilization of significant numbers of personnel and equipment. Regionalized fire protection strategies inherently have the ability to field greater numbers of emergency workers and equipment while capitalizing on economies of scale in management and oversight.

Today, fire departments are sophisticated and indispensable channels for all forms of emergency service, including natural and man-caused disaster management, fire and accident prevention, and pre-hospital care. In the process, the role of many fire agencies has transformed to regional emergency service providers. An example is Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services’ operation of a regional hazardous materials response team in partnership with the Oregon State Fire Marshal’s Office.

Combining fire and EMS service delivery providers by way of merger, consolidation, or any of the many other available approaches is frequently viewed as a cost-saving initiative. While financial advantages are often realized, ESCI’s experience had been that savings are usually modest when smaller agencies pool their resources because the economies of scale found when large organizations are merged do not exist. However, what is gained when small agencies cooperate is significant in terms of increased efficiency, long-term cost avoidance, and increased depth of resources. In looking at ways to blend HFES and SFD, the latter will prove true.
Processes for Collaboration

The potential efficiencies to be gained by pursuing higher levels of cooperation between Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services and Stanfield Fire District can be described on a continuum. Identified partnering strategies fall in a range, from remaining autonomous to the creation of a new organization encompassing both agencies. These general strategies are further broken down into short, mid and long-term implementation horizons.

General Partnering Strategies

A number of policy options exist for integrating the fire and emergency services of Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services and Stanfield Fire District. The various partnering strategies are described, beginning with a do-nothing approach and ending with complete consolidation of the agencies into a new emergency service provider. The following alternatives will be evaluated and discussed:

- Complete Autonomy
- Administrative Consolidation
- Functional Consolidation
- Operational Consolidation
- Legal Unification or Merger

Complete Autonomy

This is a status quo approach in which nothing changes. While often viewed negatively, in some cases the best action is no action. In this case, SFD and HFES simply continue to do business as usual, cooperating with and supporting each other as they do today, but with no change to governance, staffing or deployment of resources. Current collaborative practices are not altered.

This approach carries with it the advantage of being the easiest to accomplish as well as maintaining the independence of the organizations and local control. That is, the currently elected boards continue to oversee their individual agencies as their electorate desires without the complication of considering the views of a different constituency. It creates the least stress on the organizations and does not necessitate reorganization. What it lacks is long term commitment and the virtues that can be gained in terms of increased efficiency that are realized in a cooperative service delivery environment.
In today’s environment, taxpayers typically hold their elected officials accountable for delivering a quality level of service at an affordable rate and expect creative thinking to solve problems or achieve those ends. While “maintaining the status quo” is easy and involves the least amount of impact to the two agencies, it may well be one of the riskier decisions to make politically.

**Administrative Consolidation**

Under an administrative consolidation, the two agencies remain independent of each other from a governance standpoint but they blend some or all of their administrative functions. The result is often one of increased efficiency in the use of administrative and support personnel. Overhead costs are typically reduced and duplication of efforts is eliminated.

The advantages of such a model include reduced overhead costs by eliminating administrative duplication; a gradual alignment of otherwise separate operations under a single administrative head; less resistance to change by the rank and file in the operational elements than other consolidation options; and singularity of purpose, focus, and direction at the top of the two organizations. This strategy lends itself well to a gradual move toward a single, consolidated agency where differences in attitude, culture and/or operation are otherwise too great to overcome in a single move to combine.

The disadvantages include potential conflicts in policy direction from the two boards, potentially untenable working conditions for the fire chief (“one man, two bosses”), and increased potential for personnel conflict as separate employee groups vie for dominance/supremacy.

An administrative consolidation is most effective in larger organizations where duplication exists and workload assignments can be re-aligned to gain efficiencies. In Hermiston and Stanfield, due to their smaller size and limited number of administrative and support personnel, opportunities for gains with this approach are limited. Overarching Strategy 2 – Administrative Consolidation, evaluates the opportunity in further detail.

**Functional Consolidation**

A functional consolidation maintains separate agencies with their governing boards and administrations left unchanged. The approach is focused primarily on the response agency’s programs, as opposed to its operations or administrative composition. It may be applied to nearly any program or practice and is commonly applied to training, fire prevention and similar programs that are of a common interest and need in both fire districts.
The initiative is often found to increase efficiency and make better use of limited resources. Advantages often realized are elimination of duplication or more effective use of staffing. Direct cost savings may be limited however long-term gains can be anticipated. Overarching Strategy 3 – Functional Consolidation explores the initiative in detail.

**Operational Consolidation**

The Operational Consolidation strategy takes the next step in the continuum of closer collaboration development. In this case, all operations are consolidated under a single organization that serves both agencies. The two districts remain independent agencies from a legal standpoint, but from a service delivery perspective they operate as one. An Operational Consolidation, accomplished through a written agreement between the two agencies, requires a significant commitment toward a full consolidation and is usually undertaken as a segue toward complete integration. The level of trust required to implement operational consolidation is very high, since independence and autonomy have been willingly relinquished in favor of the preferred future state of a complete integration.

In Hermiston and Stanfield, some operational aspects are already being shared. Specifically, mutual aid and automatic mutual aid is exchanged freely between the two. As a result, the responders have become accustomed to working with each other on the emergency scene. Additionally, the two agencies have started to combine their training programs which will prove advantageous to operational consolidation efforts.

**Legal Merger**

In the State of Oregon, complete integration of two fire districts can be accommodated in one of two ways by statute: merger\(^{46}\) or consolidation\(^{46}\).

A merger is a complete integration of the two agencies into one. One is absorbed into and becomes part of the other agency. For two fire districts to merge, one ceases to exist (merging agency) and the other becomes the surviving entity (merger agency). The employees and volunteers of the merging agency are transferred to the merger agency, and the elected positions are either eliminated from the merging district or brought into the merger district through an agreement to re-configure the composition of the board of directors.

---

\(^{45}\) Oregon Revised Statute 198.705(14).

\(^{46}\) Oregon Revised Statute 198.705(5).
Tax rates become a key factor in a merger. In this case, the taxing authority of the surviving agency may be applied to the entirety of the newly merged district. However, while the taxing authority is expanded, the Board of Directors of the new district choose whether they will levy the full taxing authority to the constituents of the district or some lesser amount based on identified needs and the willingness of the voters to agree.

A merger between Stanfield Fire District and Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services would require a decision as to which agency will be the surviving agency and which agency will dissolve into the surviving agency or, more simply, a new fire district is formed. The merger is subject to approval of the respective boards and the community’s voters.

**Legal Consolidation**

Differing from a merger, a consolidation occurs when both fire districts cease to exist and an entirely new fire district is formed. Like under a merger, employees and volunteers become members of the newly formed fire district. Existing elected officials positions are replaced by newly elected members of the established district.

The primary difference compared to a merger is that a new tax rate is established as a component of the initiative’s presentation to the electorate. Rather than applying an existing rate from one district to the other, as in a merger, a new maximum rate is established.

As with a merger, a consolidation requires approval of the district’s voters.
Options for Shared Service Delivery

Strategies for shared service delivery are listed in the next section of this report. They each fall into one of the general partnering strategies listed above, and represent various steps along the partnering continuum. Some are dependent upon others and some can be implemented independent of other actions. They are categorized into the following major headings:

- Level of cooperation, i.e. Functional Consolidation, Operational Consolidation, Merger
- Timeline for completion
- Affected section, i.e. Administration, Operations, Support Services
- Affected stakeholders
- Objective(s)
- Summary of strategy
- Discussion of strategy
- Guidance
- Fiscal considerations

Timelines are described as short, middle, or long term. Short term is considered to occur within one year to 18 months; middle term is from three to five years; and long term is generally thought of as anything beyond five years. The timelines are flexible because most partnering strategies are interdependent, which necessitates cross-strategy integration of planning and implementation.

It is important to point out that HFES and SFD are already working to implement some of the listed strategies and concepts. Regardless of the existing level of implementation, we offer additional information on all strategies to provide the reader with a complete picture of the cooperative potential. For example, both organizations have agreed to combine training efforts; however, we include a discussion of the strategy as an element of the report because the initiative is new and is not yet fully developed. Additional strategies are discussed that involve areas in which Hermiston and Stanfield are already working together because not including these discussions within the framework of the report would yield an incomplete depiction.

A summary table listing each of the strategies with the objective, level of cooperation, timeline, organization section, and affected agencies precedes the detailed discussion.
**Overarching Strategies**

The discussion begins with the presentation of six overarching strategies that are broad in scope. They define varying forms of consolidation or merger of the agencies, each possessing different approaches with individual advantages and challenges. The overarching strategies incorporate many of the General Partnering Strategies, which are listed in the second table. The six overarching strategies are listed below:

**Figure 72: Summary Table of Overarching Strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Strategy (See page for detail)</th>
<th>Objective(s)</th>
<th>Level of Cooperation</th>
<th>Timeline Short, Mid, Long</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Affected Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Strategy 1 – Status Quo (Continuation of Current Efforts of Cooperation) See page 141</td>
<td>Maintain the independence of both fire districts for the greatest local control. Capture efficiencies of selective functional strategies.</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Strategy 2 – Administrative Consolidation See page 143</td>
<td>Combine the administrative elements of both agencies into one Administrative Services Division, which promotes improved efficiencies by eliminating duplication in Both agencies.</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Strategy 3 – Functional Consolidation See page 147</td>
<td>Combine specific operational and support elements of both agencies into singular functions, to promote improved efficiencies by eliminating some duplication.</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Mid Term</td>
<td>Support Services and Emergency Operations</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Strategy 4 – Operational Consolidation See page 154</td>
<td>Combine all operational elements of both agencies into a singular function to promote improved efficiencies by eliminating some duplication.</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Mid Term</td>
<td>Emergency Operations</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Strategy 5 – Legal Merger See page 158</td>
<td>Combine the two organizations into one to improve efficiency by eliminating some duplication.</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>All Sections, all Divisions</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Strategy 6 – Legal Consolidation See page 168</td>
<td>Combine the two organizations into a single agency by dissolving both existing districts and establishing a new district.</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>All Sections, all Divisions</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following the discussion of the identified Overarching Strategies, ESCI lists identified General Partnering Strategies. These are more specific approaches to sharing of key elements of service delivery that have been identified as opportunities for collaboration between the two agencies. It is important to understand that the partnering strategies can be implemented individually on a stand-alone basis or they may be incorporated as components of one or more of the identified Overarching Strategies. Identified General Partnering Strategies are listed in Figure 73:

**Figure 73: Summary Table of General Partnering Strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnering Strategy (See page for detail)</th>
<th>Objective(s)</th>
<th>Level of Cooperation</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Affected Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy A – Enhanced Implementation of Mutual and Automatic Aid – See page 170</td>
<td>Refine and enhance the application of mutual aid and automatic aid practices to improve response effectiveness.</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Emergency Operations</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy B – Develop Joint Support and Logistics See page 173</td>
<td>Develop shared Support Services practices that promote improved operational readiness and achieve procurement efficiencies by eliminating duplication in the acquisition and distribution of supplies.</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Emergency Operations</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy C – Develop a Joint Fire Prevention and Code Enforcement Program See page 178</td>
<td>Reduce the threat to life or property from fire and to provide uniform prevention services to the region.</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>Fire Prevention</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy D – Establish Shared Public Education/Public Information See page 181</td>
<td>Provide Public Education and Public Information services for the combined service area.</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Mid Term</td>
<td>Administration and Fire Prevention</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy E – Develop a Regional Juvenile Fire Setter Intervention Network See page 183</td>
<td>Provide an effective means for intervening in juvenile-set/caused fires.</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Mid Term</td>
<td>Fire Prevention</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy F – Develop Uniform Pre-Incident Plans See page 185</td>
<td>Provide a system of shared operational plans for use during emergencies and non-emergent incidents.</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Emergency Operations</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnering Strategy (See page for detail)</td>
<td>Objective(s)</td>
<td>Level of Cooperation</td>
<td>Timeline Short, Mid, Long</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Affected Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy G – Conduct Joint Strategic Planning See page 188</td>
<td>Provide for Incident Command (IC) supervision of emergency operations.</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Mid Term</td>
<td>EMS, Emergency Operations, and Training</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy H – Develop Common Standard Operating Guidelines See page 190</td>
<td>Provide guidelines for operation during emergencies and non-emergency incidents and activities.</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Emergency Operations</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy I – Provide Joint Standards for Service Delivery See page 192</td>
<td>Establish a joint Standards for Service Delivery Policy, defining services, service levels, and response times to the 90th percentile so that adequate system planning can take place.</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Short to Mid Term</td>
<td>EMS and Emergency Operations</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy J – Combine Volunteer and Paid On Call Recruitment and Training Programs See page 196</td>
<td>Combine existing volunteer cadre into a resource pool for Both agencies to utilize.</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Mid Term</td>
<td>Emergency Operations and Training</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy K – Combine Administrative Services See page 199</td>
<td>Consolidate the completion of administrative tasks into a single operation with shared resources and management practices.</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Mid Term</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy L – Consolidate Training into a Single Training Program See page 201</td>
<td>Create a single unified training program to eliminate duplication and increase training efficiency.</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy M – Implement a Common Training Records Management System See page 204</td>
<td>Implement the use of a single, commonly shared training records management system (RMS).</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Mid Term</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy N – Develop Mutual Training Strategies See page 206</td>
<td>Provide purpose and direction for training program management and delivery by combining strengths and resources to overcome current training obstacles.</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Short to Mid Term</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy O – Develop an Annual Shared Training Plan See page 209</td>
<td>Provide standardized and consistent training and a long-term vision and direction for training delivery.</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnering Strategy (See page for detail)</td>
<td>Objective(s)</td>
<td>Level of Cooperation</td>
<td>Timeline Short, Mid, Long</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Affected Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy P – Develop and Adopt Training Standards See page 212</td>
<td>Adopt uniform training guidelines and uniform certification standards.</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Q – Create a Shared Training Manual See page 214</td>
<td>Provide consistent, standardized training procedures.</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy R – Develop a Shared Fire and EMS Training Facility See page 217</td>
<td>Provide training facilities readily available to Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services and Stanfield Fire District.</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Mid Term</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy T – Develop Uniform Fees for Service See page 224</td>
<td>Establish a uniform schedule of fees for service.</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Mid Term</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Both agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overarching Strategy 1 – Status Quo (Continuation of Current Efforts of Cooperation)

**Level of Cooperation**
- Functional

**Timeline for Completion**
- Short Term

**Section**
- Operations

**Affected Stakeholders**
- Both agencies

**Objective**
- Maintain the independence of both fire districts for the greatest local control
- Capture efficiencies of selective functional strategies

**Summary**
This is a do-nothing strategy. While typically viewed negatively, in some cases the best action is no action. In this case, maintaining status quo means that essentially nothing changes. SFD and HFES are neighboring agencies who already interact routinely and at many levels. Mutual Aid assistance is exchanged freely. Training is conducted cooperatively between the two agencies as are other operational and support programs. Under this strategy, current collaboration remains unchanged and the organizations remain completely independent.

**Discussion**
The advantages of this approach are that it is the easiest strategy to implement, creates the least amount of work or stress on the two organizations, and does not necessitate any reorganizing. One additional consideration is that it maintains local control; the currently established boards continue to oversee their individual agencies as their electorate desires without the complication of considering the views of a different constituency.

The disadvantages of this approach are that the fiscal and operational difficulties that may be facing both organizations are not changed and opportunities for efficiency (either financial or operational) through greater collaboration are not realized, so some duplication and overlap continues.
In today’s environment, taxpayers typically hold their elected officials accountable for delivering a quality level of service at an affordable rate, and expect creative thinking to solve problems or achieve those ends. While “maintaining the status quo” is easy and involves the least amount of impact to the two agencies, it may well be one of the riskier approaches from a political standpoint.

Conclusion
The two districts have made positive strides in developing their current efforts to work cooperatively with each other. Maintaining those efforts and continuing to leverage them has merit and will provide short-term benefits. The disadvantage of this kind of relationship is that it is absent a long-term commitment so that either organization may withdraw from the partnership at any time. With time, as governing bodies and administrations change, financial challenges arise, or organizational visions are modified, a breakdown in cooperative efforts is likely to result. It is ESCI’s experience that for mutual benefit to be sustainable, a regional vision and more formalized cooperative relationship has greater potential for long-term success.
Overarching Strategy 2 – Administrative Consolidation

Level of Cooperation
- Administrative

Timeline for Completion
- Short Term

Section
- Administration

Affected Stakeholders
- Both agencies

Objective
- Combine the administrative elements of both agencies which promotes improved efficiencies by eliminating duplication.

Summary
An administrative consolidation occurs when two or more agencies maintain their separate legal status and separate operational elements, but combine some or all of their administrative functions. Examples include combining the administration under one fire chief, and combining clerical, HR, IS/IT, and/or financial functions while maintaining separate operational activities. An Administrative Consolidation is accomplished legally through an Intergovernmental Agreement between the two organizations.\(^{47}\)

The following discussion addresses the concept of an Administrative Consolidation. However, the idea is also reviewed as a stand-alone initiative, stopping short of an actual consolidation and re-structuring in Strategy K – Combine Administrative Services in the General Partnering Strategies section of this report.

Discussion
HFES has a fully developed administrative component. Although much smaller, Stanfield Fire District shares many of the same fundamental administrative needs, but has only the single fire chief’s position to perform the needed tasks. Assimilation of these needs into a consolidated administration may be advantageous.

The advantages of such a model typically include reduced overhead costs by eliminating administrative duplication and increased efficiency; a gradual alignment of otherwise separate

\(^{47}\) Oregon Revised Statute Chapter 190.
operations under a single administrative head; less resistance to change by the rank and file in the operational elements than other consolidation options; and singularity of purpose, focus, and direction at the top of the two organizations. This strategy lends itself well to a gradual move toward a single, consolidated agency where differences in attitude, culture, training, and/or operations are otherwise too great to overcome in a single move to combine.

An additional advantage may be found in the fact that the existing governing bodies are preserved. The executive staff of the combined fire districts report to each political body, usually through a joint oversight board established expressly for the purpose. The political entities prepare and adopt separate budgets and retain responsibility for overall policy and taxation. The unified fire district’s funding is specified under terms of the IGA, usually through the melding of individual budgets or by the apportionment of cost in accordance with a predetermined formula.

The disadvantages include potential conflicts in policy direction from the two fire district boards, potentially difficult working conditions for the fire chief (“one employee, two bosses”) and increased potential for personnel conflict as separate employee or volunteer groups vie for dominance/supremacy. An administrative team finds itself reporting to two political bodies and is at risk of being torn between conflicting desires, goals, and directives. Even so, many IGAs are in effect throughout the nation, successfully centralizing the administrative services of fire departments and districts.

ESCI analyzed the application of the concept of an administrative consolidation involving Hermiston and Stanfield Fire Districts. Existing administrative staffing configurations in both agencies were reviewed in an effort to identify opportunities for increased efficiency.

Similar administrative needs exist in both organizations, though to a higher degree of detail and complexity in Hermiston. HFES is staffed with more administrative personnel due to its larger size and career personnel configuration, while SFD’s administrative component consists essentially of the fire chief. While we are often able to find ways to re-align or, in some cases, reduce positions in the administrative consolidation setting, the small size of the organizations in this case offers limited options. Based on the existing configuration, ESCI was unable to identify excess staffing capacities that would result in the gain of significant opportunities or efficiencies.
Only one prospective option was identified. The approach would involve eliminating one fire chief’s position and re-assigning that person to a role of Assistant Chief, establishing a second Assistant Chief’s position. One Assistant Chief would be responsible for training, a role that has increased in significance, and workload, as a result of the newly developed joint training program. The second Assistant Chief would be assigned to operations.

The initiative provides an opportunity to re-align positions and responsibilities that may be of value. However, in this instance we do not find an excess capacity with the current number of personnel and we do find that the workload is of a level that will still require that the same number of positions be in place. As a result, no cost savings are realized.

This conceptual re-distribution of work load for the Assistant Chiefs achieves a more balanced and more effective flow of responsibilities. The concept is detailed in the organizational chart in Figure 74.

Figure 74: Conceptual Organizational Chart – Overarching Strategy 2
Restructuring the administrative organizational chart as shown above is likely to result in some operational benefits and increased efficiencies. It does not, however, result in any cost reduction. Although command level positions are being modified, the total number of Full Time Equivalent (FTE) positions does not change under this model, so cost savings, if any, will be minimal.

Figure 75 details the changes to the administrative and support staff positions under this approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative and Support Positions</th>
<th>HFES</th>
<th>SFD</th>
<th>Total Current</th>
<th>Adjustments</th>
<th>Total FTEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Chief</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Chief – (existing)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Chief – Training (new)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Chief – Training (volunteer)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Marshal</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billing Clerk</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Educator (part time)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Admin FTEs</strong></td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

An administrative consolidation would provide some degree of streamlining of training program administration and would free one Assistant Chief to be dedicated fully to operations and related tasks. No financial advantages will be realized by the change and two, separate response entities would still need to be managed by two separate governing boards.

In ESCI’s experience, the complexities of managing separate operational units and a lack of long-term commitment for future alignment of the agencies makes this strategy better suited to being transitional versus long-term. Frustrations of maintaining separate organizations and answering to multiple policy boards is inefficient and defeating. Implementation of this strategy is envisioned potentially as an intermediary step only, working toward a more unified fire and EMS agency.
Overarching Strategy 3 – Functional Consolidation

Level of Cooperation
- Functional

Timeline for Completion
- Mid Term

Section
- Support Services, Training and Fire Prevention/Public Education

Affected Stakeholders
- Both agencies

Objective
- Combine specific operational and support elements of both agencies into singular functions to promote improved efficiencies by eliminating some duplication and standardizing practices.

Summary
Under a functional consolidation, the two agencies continue to exist separately, but they combine certain functions into a common resource, such as combining training activities into a single program. A functional consolidation is accomplished legally through a written cooperative agreement between the two districts, as provided for by statute. This strategy requires alignment of standard operating guidelines, policies, procedures, and certain operational aspects to make the consolidated function perform properly.

A structure of shared decision-making is typically created as it relates to consolidated function(s). Doing so requires that policy-makers and administrators forfeit their authority to unilaterally make changes or declare direction in the consolidated function area(s) in favor of a collaborative approach. This strategy does not necessarily reduce costs significantly but tends to increase efficiency; moreover, it usually creates a positive impact on service delivery and depth of service to both agencies.

Discussion
The advantages of this strategy are greater opportunities for efficiency; an opportunity to reinvest redundant resources into those areas lacking in resources (e.g., transferring a duplicate training officer back to a line [operations] function, increasing line strength), and a closer working relationship between members of the two agencies in the consolidated function(s) that
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can spill over to other unrelated activities in the two agencies. Perhaps of greatest importance, this type of consolidation may serve as a segue to greater levels of cooperation. Barriers can be broken down as members of one agency realize that the members of the other agency and its personnel “aren’t so bad after all”.

Some disadvantages can be found with this initiative. Functional consolidations require a much greater level of collaboration between the two agencies than the previously discussed partnering strategy; numerous details must be worked out in advance of such a consolidation, including but not limited to work rules, employee assignments, compensation, office location, logos, asset allocation, authority and even the name of the consolidated function; and independence and autonomy are diminished in the areas of consolidation, even bleeding over into other seemingly unaffected areas.

HFES and SFD differ in terms of size, scope, and service delivery approaches. While some of the support functions for each agency are interchangeable, others are not. The differences between the two and the fact that SFD has only one employee limit the tasks that can be combined to gain efficiency.

Despite the dissimilarities, there are several functions that lend themselves well to a functional consolidation. Those found to be most suited are in the areas of training programs, support programs, fire prevention programs, and public education/public information.

Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services and Stanfield Fire District have already consolidated a number of the functions that are typically considered as components of a functional consolidation. For example, at the beginning of this study the two were already combining their training programs – a commendable step. This and other initiatives are developed in further detail in the Options for Shared Service Delivery discussion later in this report.

Training

In considering functional consolidation opportunities in Hermiston and Stanfield, the most significant gains that present themselves involve training. Along with the improved skills and increased safety that will result, barriers can be broken down as members train together, use similar apparatus and equipment, and learn to perform emergency tasks together. When members of the two departments interact with each other on a daily basis, not just during emergencies, differences begin to diminish and stronger relationships begin to form.
Hermiston and Stanfield Fire Districts have recently initiated some shared training practices. In fact, as ESCI was conducting our initial field work for this project, the two agencies were holding their first joint training class, an effort that is viewed as a very positive step. The shared training initiative can be developed further, addressing needs that are common to both organizations and improving the quality of training that is delivered to responders.

To further the effort, a training program functional consolidation would involve unifying training policies, standards, plans, manuals, record keeping, and training facilities. These changes are detailed in the following strategies:

- Strategy L – Consolidate Training into a Single Training Program
- Strategy M – Implement a Common Training Records Management System
- Strategy N – Develop Mutual Training Strategies
- Strategy O – Develop an Annual Shared Training Plan
- Strategy P – Develop and Adopt Training Standards
- Strategy Q – Create a Shared Training Manual
- Strategy R – Develop a Shared Fire and EMS Training Facility

Some of the above initiatives cross over between each other. They can be modified, consolidated, rearranged, or otherwise re-configured as deemed necessary by the districts. The discussion of General Partnering Strategies addresses each of the above initiatives in detail.

**Support Services**

Consolidation of support services activities may include centralized purchasing; coordinated specification and purchase of fire apparatus, equipment and personal protective equipment (PPE); and combined apparatus, equipment and facilities maintenance functions, detailed in the following strategy:

- Strategy B – Develop Joint Support and Logistics Practices

**Fire Prevention and Code Enforcement**

A weakness was identified in SFD’s ability to deliver fire prevention and public education because of manpower limitations. Concurrently, strength was identified in the program that exists in HFES, which is strong and effective. Taking advantage of that strength to address a shortcoming in the other program is the basis behind the following strategies:

- Strategy C – Develop a Joint Fire Prevention and Code Enforcement Program


- Strategy E – Develop a Regional Juvenile Fire Setter Intervention Network

Public Education Programs
Opportunities to consolidate public information/public education functions include community outreach, agency marketing, communication strategies, fire prevention, injury prevention, and emergency preparedness education. HFES has a part time employee assigned to public education and outreach. Those efforts may be appropriately expanded. The approach is discussed in further detail in Strategy D – Establish Shared Public Education/Public Information.

Implementation of a shared public education strategy in Hermiston and Stanfield is viewed as providing greater opportunities for efficiency, increased depth of service, and a closer working relationship between the members of the two agencies. As an additional benefit, improved relationships that will be developed in working on consolidated function(s) can spill over to other unrelated activities in the two agencies and can serve to segue into greater levels of cooperation.

An additional component of the fire prevention and public education discussion is that of juvenile fire setter intervention. Fires that are started by children have become an increasingly difficult and unfortunately frequent challenge in recent years and carefully developed techniques are necessary to address the problem. A detailed discussion of the importance of establishing a regional juvenile fire setter intervention network is provided in Strategy E – Develop a Regional Juvenile Fire Setter Intervention Network.

Additional Considerations
While conducting stakeholder interviews during our initial field work, ESCI looked for cultural differences that may exist between the two districts. These subtle yet critical variations are often found, especially between fully volunteer agencies and partially or fully paid ones and are often manifested as lacking respect, personal relationships, and confidence in each other’s capabilities. Differences in organizational culture, to an extent that would be problematic in a functional consolidation, were not observed in these two agencies. To the contrary, relationships, both personal and professional, are positive and will be further strengthened by increased interaction on the training ground.
The challenge of a functional consolidation is that it requires greater collaboration between the two agencies than other partnering strategies. Numerous organizational details must be worked out in advance and are addressed in greater detail in the next section.

**Critical Issues**

- **Policy level**
  - A close review of the policies of the two agencies related to training, support services (logistics), fire prevention and public information/public education must be performed by the Boards of Directors, in close consultation with the two fire chiefs, to address policy issues. There will likely be new policies required for this type of consolidation.

- **Staff level**
  - Consideration of the skills and abilities of current staff members assigned to these functions to determine best fit and greatest advantages from an efficiency standpoint. Assign the best qualified individuals based on knowledge, skills and abilities related to the task.
  - Engaging existing staff who will be directly affected by this consolidation from the start is critical. Current training officers, in particular, must be involved. They possess knowledge about the work they do beyond what is typically recognized, even by their supervisors. Ensuring that job nuances are identified is an important step in a successful consolidation. Staff should not, however, be burdened with structuring the new consolidated functions themselves. Recommendations can be solicited, but these decisions must be made by the fire chiefs in consultation with their boards. Often staff members cannot separate self-interest from the decisions they would make.
  - The workload placed on the HFES Fire Marshal and part-time Public Educator will need to be reviewed and care exercised to avoid exceeding capacities.

**Financial Considerations**

- Alignment of Paid On Call member pay practices for training in HFES and volunteer compensation in SFD may need to be considered, since the practices differ.

- Specific positions affected for the training division consolidation could flow as follows:
  - Training Officers: Both agencies currently have Training Officers. One is a paid Assistant Chief and the other is a volunteer Captain.
  - Line Officers and other members would likely have modified roles in training delivery.
  - Limited financial savings are gained in this approach, as both agencies use line personnel for training delivery. However, this structure does provide enhanced depth in training and fire prevention work, beyond what is currently being accomplished separately.
  - Reconfiguring the training function short term is mostly an exercise in logistics; namely, which facility provides the office space, classroom space and field training
grounds to implement a consolidation with the least expense and greatest effectiveness.

- Specific position impacts for the support services consolidation are not significant because those tasks are performed by existing career and Paid On Call personnel on an as-needed basis.

**Guidance**

- Conduct regular joint fire chief meetings for the purpose of establishing the parameters of the training consolidation. This includes workload analysis to ensure greatest effectiveness while maintaining proper balance.

- The two fire chiefs should convene a training steering committee with a purpose of developing proposed joint training policies, standards, plans, and a training manual.

- The new training division adopts and implements training records software, and advocates for an adequate joint training facility, which is currently under development.

- The two chiefs develop a list of anticipated equipment, apparatus and supplies to be purchased for the upcoming year. Identify expenses that are common to both organizations and develop a plan to write common specifications where applicable and purchase jointly.

- Fire prevention and public education practices are reviewed to identify similarities and opportunities for shared delivery. A sub-committee is appointed to pursue shared prevention and public education activities.

**Operational Challenges: Training**

The proposed consolidation functions will provide limited on-going financial savings. However, one-time costs could be incurred to establish the new structure. Operational challenges are as follows:

- Jointly standardizing training goals, objectives, standards and delivery methodologies

- Developing a shared training manual

- Establishing common training attendance requirements and equal enforcement

- Agreeing to a common weekly training night

**Operational Challenges: Support Services-Purchasing**

The creation of this function will not result in increased costs. Cost efficiencies and future cost avoidance may be accomplished. Challenges may include:

- Agreement on standards and specifications for apparatus and equipment purchases

- Coordination and planning of future purchasing to coordinate between agencies
**Operational Challenges – Support Services – Fire Prevention/Public Education**

Minimal, if any, cost will be incurred. Potential challenges could include:

- Agreeing to levels of fire prevention and public education involvement
- Establishing common goals and objectives
- Integrating periodic public outreach events
- Coordinating release of information to the press and public to assure a common message is communicated

**Conclusion**

A functional consolidation of the two agencies will result in minimal financial benefit in the short term. Individual positions and duty assignments will be modified under the approach to achieve the efficiency gains identified. However, opportunities do not present themselves to reduce or re-deploy employees in the interest of cost reduction.

While costs may not be reduced, efficiencies are gained. Training program management and delivery will be streamlined and standardized which will prove to be beneficial over time. Other efficiencies are likely to be realized in regard to support and logistics services and fire prevention effectiveness will be enhanced, particularly in Stanfield.
Overarching Strategy 4 – Operational Consolidation

Level of Cooperation
- Operations

Timeline for Completion
- Mid Term

Section
- Emergency Operations

Affected Stakeholders
- Both agencies

Objective
- Combine all operational elements of both agencies into a singular function to promote improved efficiencies by eliminating some duplication.

Summary
Operational consolidation is the combining of two or more agencies at the operational level while the agencies themselves continue to exist separately. In this case, emergency services are provided by the collective emergency resources of the two agencies. An operational consolidation is accomplished legally through a cooperative inter-governmental agreement between the agencies. This strategy requires alignment of virtually all emergency operational elements, including training, standard operating guidelines, staffing levels, and apparatus deployment. In effect, the combined emergency resources (staffing, equipment, and facilities) of the two agencies are configured as if they were one.

This consolidation type is the most advanced stride in the continuum of steps toward a full merger of the two agencies. A structure of shared decision-making is typically created as it relates to consolidated function(s). If the previous consolidation approaches have already been implemented, this strategy tends to provide the greatest potential for increased efficiency and service delivery.

Discussion
As neighboring agencies, HFES and SFD respond to the same incidents many times a year and there is a high degree of familiarity between the operational crews on the street. While there may be differences in approach to incidents between the field crews, they are each proud and capable service providers.
The advantages of this form of consolidation are that the greatest opportunity for efficiency is typically in the operational element where the expense is greatest; and the level of trust and cooperation required to make this strategy successful implies a near-readiness to take the next step to full consolidation.

The disadvantage is that administrators and policy-makers must share power and gain consensus where they once had unilateral authority to control and implement decisions.

Partly due to the pride in the service they provide and the culture that follows, changing the way service is delivered at the operational (line) level poses the greatest challenge. However, a close examination of possible redeployment models does provide for an improvement in the efficiency of service delivery to both communities. A number of partnering strategies are rolled into this overarching strategy. They include:

- Strategy A – Enhanced Implementation of Mutual and Automatic Aid
- Strategy F – Develop Uniform Pre-Incident Plans
- Strategy H – Develop Common Standard Operating Guidelines
- Strategy I – Provide Joint Standards for Service Delivery
- Strategy J – Combine Volunteer and Paid On Call Recruitment and Training Programs

Other partnering strategies should be reviewed and considered for inclusion in the list above and the strategies identified in the earlier overarching strategies are assumed to have been completed, as well.

**Critical Issues**

- **Policy level**
  - To the extent applicable, work rules, employee assignments, compensation, service level standards, and operational practices must be consistent between the jurisdictions. Any policy differences which impact the delivery of service to the public must be invisible to the line personnel. This includes policies and procedures, scope of job descriptions, rules of conduct, and discipline.
  - A close review of all aspects of service delivery must be performed by the two fire chiefs and unified decisions announced. There will likely be new practices required for this type of consolidation.

- **Staff level**
  - A common set of rules, regulations, and procedures related to emergency operations must be published and the line personnel trained and oriented to them.
Engaging all line personnel who will be directly affected by this consolidation from the start is critical. They possess knowledge about the work environment beyond what is typically recognized, even by most supervisors. Ensuring that job nuances are identified is an important step in a successful consolidation.

Financial Considerations

Alignment of Paid On Call hourly rates and benefits in HFES and volunteer per-call compensations in SFD can be an issue if they are not equalized. The fire chiefs will need to take steps to align pay scales.

Guidance

- Conduct regular joint board and fire chief meetings for the purpose of establishing the policy changes as outlined above. This includes a detailed fiscal analysis.
- Conduct regular command staff meetings for the purpose of establishing rules, regulations, and procedures,
- Engage member groups in regular discussions and field questions regularly. Reassure Paid On Call employees and volunteers to the extent possible, but always be honest. Don’t speculate but express your collective intentions. There is no such thing as over-communicating in this instance.
- Consider establishing a focus group of external stakeholders, including city representatives, to use as a sounding board on the concept of an operational consolidation. Select people of influence and keep them engaged. Listen carefully to their advice and concerns. As with employees, be honest and don’t speculate, but express your collective intentions.
- Develop a communication strategy to keep the citizens of the combined service area informed if implementation appears a possible outcome of discussions.

Fiscal Considerations

Implementation of this strategy independent of the previous overarching strategies makes the staffing and procedural changes more complicated. If this strategy is implemented sequentially after a functional consolidation occurs, the reporting relationships, staffing and procedural changes are easier to implement.

With operations personnel working together closely, the districts should equalize compensation methods for Paid On Call and volunteer personnel between the two agencies. Stanfield operations personnel are paid on a per-call basis, at a flat rate of $5 per call. However, Hermiston Paid On Call members receive an hourly rate, based on certification levels, when they respond to calls. The base pay scales are further subject to upgrade in the form of
financial incentives for years of service and additional certifications. As a result, pay levels between the Stanfield volunteers and Hermiston Paid On Call members differ considerably.

Were an operational consolidation to be pursued, it would likely be necessary to equalize pay scales so that all response personnel are treated equally. Equalized pay, assuming that SFD pay scales are raised to meet those of HFES will result in increased overall labor costs. However, given the number of responders and responses affected, the cost will be small and likely offset by the advantages gained.

**Conclusion**

While the operational consolidation carries merit it does not save money. Because current staffing levels are relatively small, few opportunities exist to decrease costs by way of redeployment or reduction of staffing. Although costs will not be diminished, what is gained by the strategy is the advantage of increased efficiency, safety, and response effectiveness on the emergency scene.

The strategy warrants consideration by the agencies and, at a minimum, the partnering strategies listed can and should be implemented.
**Overarching Strategy 5 – Legal Merger**

*Level of Cooperation*
- Organizational

*Timeline for Completion*
- Long Term

*Section*
- All Sections, all Divisions

*Affected Stakeholders*
- Both agencies

*Objective*
- Fully combine the two organizations into a single agency to improve efficiency by eliminating duplication.

*Summary*
A merger would have one district absorb the other, eliminating it as a legal entity. All resources, assets, and liabilities would transfer to the surviving district. The terms of a merger would be worked out in advance of the issue being presented to the voters of both of the agencies being merged. The details of the merger can be the result of negotiation between the two agencies in advance. An organizational structure would be agreed upon, the status of all career, volunteer and Paid On Call employees being transferred would be addressed (including rank, assignments, and seniority) and the status of the boards of directors of the merging district addressed if there is any room on the merged board.

When two districts merge in Oregon, the maximum taxing authority of the surviving agency may be applied to the entirety of the newly merged district. However, the Board of Directors of the prevailing district makes a determination of actual financial need and then decides on the amount that is actually to be levied. Legally they may levy the full taxing authority or, alternatively, a lesser amount. The decision is based on identified needs of the new organization, but must also take into consideration what the voters are likely to accept.

The SFD maximum tax rate is higher than the HFES rate by a substantial margin. Merging the two and applying the Stanfield tax rate to Hermiston taxpayers is not likely to receive voter
support. If merged, a rate would be identified that meets operational needs and results in a tax decrease to Stanfield residents and an increase in Hermiston.

Discussion
With the administrative, functional, and operational consolidation strategies listed previously, coordination, consultation, negotiating and shared decision-making are all processes required to implement and sustain the consolidation. In a full merger, those processes are required to implement the merger, but are not required to sustain it. Once the merger occurs, it is a majority-rule board. In the other consolidation strategies, there is a natural tension between the two equal boards as they discuss and make decisions about the consolidated service component. They are bound together by a contract that can be broken, and care is taken to find acceptable compromises and find creative solutions. Some of this tension is positive and adds to the process. The tension is significantly diminished when it is a single board making majority rule decisions about a single agency. The merging department negotiates what it can before the fact and turns everything over to the surviving department. The merger department's policies, procedures, practices, name, manner of business, and culture becomes the prevailing environment.

Challenges are presented when a smaller organization becomes the surviving entity, absorbing a much larger one, as would be the case if Hermiston Fire became the merged agency with Stanfield Fire the surviving entity. All aspects of the surviving agency become those of the merged organization including policy, procedure, administration and operations.

The resource pool is larger as a result of a merger, but so too is the demand for service.

Critical Issues
- Policy level
  - The policies, procedures, and legal constructs of the merger (surviving) agency prevail. Some will undoubtedly need to change as a result of the merger and many others may not exist in the smaller organization. It is critical that these events are anticipated and action taken as appropriate.
  - Even though they are vacated in the merger, it is prudent to review the merging department's policies and practices to capture best practices and incorporate them into the merger department as a matter of good business practice.
- Staff level
  - A full merger will afford the combined agency a unique opportunity to evaluate the entire structure of the department and make necessary adjustments. Performing
critical task analyses of all positions and functions is a key first step to the new structure. Maintaining an appropriate span of control for each supervisor in the new organization is critical, preferably no more than 5:1, with 7:1 being the extreme maximum effective ratio.

- Engaging the staff of both agencies from the start is critical. Rumors will develop, and a communication strategy that keeps people informed every step of the way is necessary to maintain calm. Opportunities to debunk rumors should be taken advantage of, and outlets created to capture and respond to those rumors quickly.

Financial Considerations

- Alignment of salaries, benefits and Paid On Call hourly rates is required for those employees transferring into the merger district. Employees who are represented by a union have an advocacy structure. Those who are non-represented or at-will employees will need to be treated fairly and appropriately, based on the needs of the service.

- The tax rate of the surviving entity becomes the tax rate of the new, merged district. Care must be taken to determine whether the revenue coming into the combined agency, at a minimum, will meet the debt and annual expense obligations.

Guidance

- Conduct regular joint board and fire chief meetings for the purpose of conducting merger discussions. This includes a detailed fiscal analysis, staffing and deployment analysis, and a work plan for implementation should the merger be adopted.

- Engage all employee groups in regular discussions, fielding questions frequently and answers repeatedly. Reassure employees to the extent possible, but always be honest. Don’t speculate, but express your collective intentions. There is no such thing as over-communicating in this instance.

- Engage a committee of external stakeholders, including city representatives, to use as a sounding board on the concept of a merger. Select people of influence and keep them engaged. Listen carefully to their advice and concerns. As with employees, be honest and don’t speculate, but express your collective intentions.

- Consider publishing a newsletter at a point in time that it becomes clear a merger of some type is likely to occur. It should be informative and informational, with an opportunity for citizens to sound off on the issue. Conduct community public forums in key areas of the community to solicit feedback.

The following figure is one concept of an organizational structure of a merged district (Figure 76).
In the above conceptual organizational chart, all administrative positions remain unchanged with the exception of a reduction from two fire chiefs to one. In this instance, the displaced fire chief is assigned to the position of deputy chief and assigned to a training role.

Staffing of fire stations and fire apparatus is unaffected in the example. Because of the limited number of employees and paid on call members in both organizations, opportunities do not exist to eliminate positions in the interest of cost savings.

**Fiscal Analysis**

A merger of the two agencies may provide some financial benefit, although savings will be limited because of the volunteer and part-time nature of the Hermiston and Stanfield response staffing configuration. In the following table, the merger is depicted with adjustments to administrative and support position titles and headcount:
The outlined structure does not make any attempt to identify individuals to fill specific positions but provides the structure to handle the tasks currently being performed by each organization. Any conceptual staffing reductions or modifications will best be accomplished via attrition or voluntary personnel re-assignments.

In this instance, ESCI did not find excess administrative and support staffing capacity that would accommodate a reduction in total personnel numbers in an effort to reduce costs. As a result, though some titles change in the table, the total number of FTEs is unchanged. No significant cost savings result.

**Merged HFES and SFD Fiscal Analysis**

2012 budget data provided by the clients was used to create financials for a merged district of HFES and SFD, detailed in the following discussion.

**Merged HFES and SFD Forecast Consolidated Taxable Assessed Value**

Projected increases in new construction and AV of existing property use the same assumptions contained in the current conditions section of this report. Figure 78 provides a forecast of the consolidated AV for a merged district.
A five-year history of the AV for HFES and SFD was used as the basis for forecasting. SFD's AV has been increasing at slightly more than double HFES’s. In fiscal year ending 2017, the combined AV is forecast to be $2.14 billion.

Merging would require one agency to dissolve, turn its assets over to the surviving jurisdiction, and adopt the permanent tax rate of the surviving fire district. ESCI forecast the revenue dollars based on the permanent tax rate and forecast the results for five years. The two assumptions are that HFES merged into SFD and SFD merging with HFES. Figure 79 shows the revenue results of the two options and the dollar difference for each year.

If HFES were merged into SFD, the taxpayers of SFD would see no difference in the dollar amount they pay for fire and EMS while HFES property owners would have an increase. Were SFD to merge into HFES, SFD taxpayers would pay less. Merging HFES into SFD and levying less than the permanent levy rate would still generate more revenue than the districts as independent agencies. The next figure (Figure 80) forecasts the amount of property tax
revenue that would be generated for an assortment of levy amounts; all under SFD’s permanent levy rate of $2.0651.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levy Rate</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3000</td>
<td>2,534,499</td>
<td>2,595,279</td>
<td>2,657,632</td>
<td>2,721,604</td>
<td>2,787,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4500</td>
<td>2,826,942</td>
<td>2,894,735</td>
<td>2,964,282</td>
<td>3,035,636</td>
<td>3,108,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6000</td>
<td>3,119,384</td>
<td>3,194,190</td>
<td>3,270,932</td>
<td>3,349,667</td>
<td>3,430,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7500</td>
<td>3,411,826</td>
<td>3,493,645</td>
<td>3,577,582</td>
<td>3,663,698</td>
<td>3,752,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9000</td>
<td>3,704,268</td>
<td>3,793,100</td>
<td>3,884,232</td>
<td>3,977,730</td>
<td>4,073,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0500</td>
<td>3,996,711</td>
<td>4,092,556</td>
<td>4,190,882</td>
<td>4,291,761</td>
<td>4,395,267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is essential to explain that the revenues calculated in the table above do not take into account the effect that is realized from tax compression. Compression results from tax limitation legislation that has occurred in Oregon in recent years which establishes maximum revenues that can be generated in defined circumstances. The issue is complex, and important. A detailed explanation of tax compression and the effect that it may have in the context of a merger is included in Appendix D: Tax Compression Analysis and Discussion.

A levy rate of $1.45 in 2013 is forecast to produce an estimated $339,432 in additional property tax revenue. A $1.45 levy rate is $0.6151 below what property owners in SFD currently pay and $0.2475 above the HFES permanent tax rate. Each $0.01 above HFES's permanent tax rate equals $19,496 in additional property tax revenue in 2013 for a combined district under SFD.

**Merged HFES and SFD Forecast Revenue**

Initial development of revenue was established to combine the 2012 budget data into a consolidated statement. This consolidation is detailed in Figure 81. Adjustments to the financial data include:

- Elimination of $250,000 in grant revenue and expenditure for SFD. It was not determined if an application has been submitted for grant funding and eliminating the budgeted and expenditures are offsetting.
The consolidation of the two fire districts results in a combined budgeted revenue of $4,152,800 for fiscal year 2012.

**Merged HFES and SFD Forecast Expense**

The following fire district expense calculations merge the 2012 budget data into a consolidated statement, with no changes to personnel costs, representing a status-quo budget. The combined budget is shown in Figure 82.

### Figure 82: Merged HFES and SFD Budgeted Expense, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>HFES  Budget</th>
<th>SFD  Budget</th>
<th>Eliminations &amp; Adjustments</th>
<th>Consolidated  Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>1,950,000</td>
<td>82,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,942,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits and Taxes</td>
<td>935,975</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>971,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>115,300</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>688,200</td>
<td>131,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>819,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair and Maintenance</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>82,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Services</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>222,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>222,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>82,825</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>142,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,822,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>680,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,503,300</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the consolidated revenue calculated to be $4,152,800, compared to the combined expenditure calculation of $4,503,300, this strategy would result in a budget deficit of $350,500 in the first year. As detailed in the Financial Analysis section earlier in this report, expenditures in both HFES and SFD are exceeding revenues currently. The consolidated budgeted revenues and expenditures listed above do not offer a financial solution that is sustainable.

49 The $222,500 SFD capital line is grant dependent and may not be realized as receivables or expended.
In an attempt to find a more viable approach, ESCI developed the following alternative strategy which includes a reduction in staffing to try to develop a sustainable budget. Modification of the staffing configuration resulted in 1 FTE less (fire chief), and 0.4 less FTE (clerk). Personnel and fringe costs changes are negligible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>HFES 2012 Budget</th>
<th>SFD 2012 Budget</th>
<th>Eliminations &amp; Adjustments</th>
<th>Consolidated 2012 Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>1,950,000</td>
<td>82,800</td>
<td>(90,084)</td>
<td>1,942,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits and Taxes</td>
<td>935,975</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>(16,617)</td>
<td>971,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,885,975</strong></td>
<td><strong>134,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>(106,701)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,914,074</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>115,300</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>688,200</td>
<td>131,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>819,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair and Maintenance</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>82,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Services</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>222,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>222,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>82,825</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>142,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,822,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>680,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>(106,701)</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,396,599</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, any conceptual staffing reductions will best be accomplished via attrition or voluntary reassignments.

Total cost avoidance under the model budget for the baseline year 2012 is forecast to be slightly more than $100,000. Even with the staffing reductions, projected expenditures exceed revenues by $243,799. The alternative approach is not financially sustainable.

If a sustainable merger is to occur, SFD, as the surviving entity, will have to select an amount to levy from within its permanent tax rate and at a level sufficient to meet current needs. Rates and resultant revenue are listed in the table in Figure 80 on page 164. If done, SFD tax rates would decline and HFES taxation would increase. To do so, voter approval is required, declaring the amount that is to be levied within the SFD permanent tax rate.

**Conclusion**

A merger of the two fire districts is only viable if HFES is to merge into SFD as the surviving agency. Doing so is only financially sustainable if the merger is configured in a manner that assumes a tax rate at a level that increases the taxes levied upon residents of the current Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services District while still falling within the SFD permanent tax rate.
Voter approval is required from both districts to complete the merger and a ballot measure would need to include a declaration of the levy rate. Voters in SFD would see a decrease in their taxes, but those in HFES would see an increase. Some voters may not approve a lower levy understanding that increases in the rate would require only a vote of the newly elected board of directors.
Overarching Strategy 6 – Legal Consolidation

Level of Cooperation
- Organizational

Timeline for Completion
- Long Term

Section
- All Sections, all Divisions

Affected Stakeholders
- Both agencies

Objective
- Combine the two organizations into a single agency by dissolving both existing districts and establishing a new district

Summary
The strategy results in the formation of a wholly new Rural Fire Protection District in place of the two that currently exist. Staffing and administrative configurations will be combined and streamlined, where feasible and personnel will become employees of the new district. However, instead of selecting a levy rate from within the surviving agency’s permanent tax rate, as in a merger, a new permanent tax rate is established.

Discussion
A consolidation, in many respects, is similar to a merger. Where the approach differs is that under a consolidation, an entirely new fire district is formed and both existing fire districts cease to exist. Concurrently, a new Board of Directors is elected, consisting of five members representing the new district and replacing the existing members.

The primary difference compared to a merger is that a new tax rate is established as a component of the initiative’s presentation to the electorate. Rather than applying an existing permanent tax rate from one district to the other, as in a merger, a new maximum rate is established. The process and authority for completing a consolidation of fire districts is detailed by Oregon Statute.⁵⁰

---

⁵⁰Oregon Revised Statute 198.705(5).
Fiscal Analysis
In applying the consolidation methodology to HFES and SFD, the staffing and financial considerations discussed in Overarching Strategy 5 – Legal Merger are the same. The combined revenues and expenses explained in the previous Overarching Strategy are applied here. Rather than repeat the previous analysis, we refer the reader to the previous discussion.

What also remains unchanged is the fact that, under a consolidation scenario, at current funding levels, revenues are insufficient to meet projected expenditures on a sustainable basis. To develop a viable scenario, a tax rate would need to be established that will meet future needs but will result in an increased cost to HFES tax payers.

As with a merger, a consolidation requires approval of the district’s electorate. The difference here is that the pre-existing permanent tax rate, in this case from SFD, is no longer applicable. Instead, the consolidating agencies select a tax rate that meets its needs and submit the initiative to the voters to include a newly adopted rate.

The new permanent tax rate is subject to the constraints of Oregon tax regulations, as described on page 107. The key difference is that the new district cannot increase its taxation upon the residents without voter approval, whereas, with a merger, taxes can be increased by the Board of Directors, subject to the permanent tax rate ceiling. The difference may be sufficient in the eyes of the residents to result in voter approval.

Conclusion
The consolidation strategy mirrors merger in terms of organizational structure, staffing and financial factors. The challenge remains in that a consolidation at current funding levels does not result in a sustainable financial solution.

It differs in that the approach results in the formation of an entirely new fire district and that a new permanent tax rate is established. The taxation consideration may be more likely to gain voter approval as compared to the higher theoretical taxing authority that would result from a merger.
General Partnering Strategies

Moving on from the Overarching Strategies, the discussion continues with the presentation of General Partnering Strategies that are specific to a variety of identified areas of need. Any number of the approaches may be implemented on a stand-alone basis, or they may be considered as components of the Overarching Strategies discussed above. They are not listed in any order of priority and should be evaluated and prioritized by the fire districts as they move forward.

Strategy A – Enhanced Implementation of Mutual and Automatic Aid

Level of Cooperation
- Operational

Timeline for Completion
- Short Term

Section
- Emergency Operations

Affected Stakeholders
- Both agencies

Objective
- Refine and enhance the application of mutual aid and automatic aid practices to improve response effectiveness.

Summary
One of the most fundamental elements of cooperative service delivery is that of the sharing of valuable resources, both equipment and people. A primary means for sharing resources is by the use of Mutual Aid and Automatic Aid. Mutual Aid involves establishing agreements under which a fire department can request and receive equipment and personnel support for an emergency incident from a neighboring fire department. Automatic Aid is the same, with the exception that it is automated based on dispatch protocols, absent the need for an incident commander to request the assistance.

Discussion
Implementation of Mutual and Automatic Aid practices enhances the speed and effectiveness of response to emergencies. Additionally, future cost avoidance can be gained by maximizing the use of existing resources rather than incurring the expense of adding stations, equipment and/or
personnel to meet growing response coverage demands. The provision of assistance by one agency to another is intended to be reciprocal in nature and should be exchanged with roughly equivalent frequency.

Hermiston and Stanfield have already established Mutual Aid procedures including the other fire departments in Umatilla, Morrow and Gilliam Counties. Mutual aid is exchanged frequently and freely between the participants.

Automatic aid procedures are in place as well, however, the practice is not fully developed. Currently, the only criteria used to determine when assistance is to be dispatched from an adjacent agency is whether the incident is reported to be in a rural area, or within the city of Hermiston. For a system to be fully effective, response zones are defined and apparatus assignments are made based on a variety of criteria including location, incident type, fire flow demands, and availability of fire hydrants vs. dependence on water tenders. The established assignments are made upon dispatch of the alarm via “run cards”, usually electronically created, that tell the dispatcher what units are to be notified. The practice eliminates the time delay inherent to the current practice and assures that an adequate number of the proper type of response units are quickly dispatched to the call.

The current system is adequate but could be developed further. HFES and SFD are encouraged to develop a full function automatic aid system. In addition, they should further review the existing procedures using a boundary-less approach to response planning for the purpose of assuring that the closest available resource is sent to an incident, without regard to which jurisdiction the emergency is located in.

The best use of mutual and automatic aid is dependent on the agencies working well together. To be most effective, the following should be considered:

- Fireground operations must be conducted in a similar manner and should be based on common Standard Operating Guidelines.
- Firefighters must know how to work in concert with personnel for another agency, based on common training programs and procedures.
- Dispatch procedures should be in place that clearly define which response types and locations are to receive Automatic Aid response.
- Procedures for the request of and provision of mutual aid should be clearly established in the Mutual Aid Agreement.
- Personnel should be fully trained on mutual and automatic aid practices and informed of changes to response plans when they are made.

Mutual and automatic aid provision should be reciprocal in nature with an approximately equivalent balance of responses. That is, an agency receiving aid on a routine basis should be returning similar assistance with about the same frequency. If provision of assistance is unbalanced, the agency providing a disproportionate level of response may wish to seek contractual reimbursement for some or all responses.

**Guidance**

- Review mutual aid procedures that are currently in place to identify opportunities to increase effectiveness.
- Establish automatic aid procedures and complete the implementation process.
- Review response times, including the maps provided in this report, to identify areas in which automatic aid can be initiated to enhance response.
- Do not limit consideration to Hermiston and Stanfield, but include review of station locations and travel times from the Umatilla Fire District and other neighboring fire departments.

**Fiscal Considerations**

The cost to each fire department to provide mutual and automatic aid is predicated on:

- Number and frequency of response
- Volume of equipment and personnel sent to incidents outside of the agency’s jurisdiction

The cost of implementing these practices is generally offset by the fact that a similar level of assistance is provided by another agency in return. As a result, an organization may be able to avoid costs if mutual or automatic aid resources are made available instead of adding new stations, apparatus, and personnel to provide coverage in a response area.
Strategy B – Develop Joint Support and Logistics Practices

Level of Cooperation

- Functional

Timeline for Completion

- Mid Term

Section

- Support Services

Affected Stakeholders

- Both agencies

Objective

- Develop shared Support Services practices that promote improved operational readiness and achieve procurement efficiencies by eliminating duplication in the acquisition and distribution of supplies.
- Create a uniform set of standards for apparatus, small equipment, PPE (personal protective equipment), emergency supplies, and IS/IT services.
- Develop a joint preventative maintenance and repair service program for physical assets, apparatus, small equipment, and IS/IT systems.

Summary

Throughout nearly every public or private emergency organization, the state of readiness and effectiveness is highly dependent upon support services. Support services assure the equipment, materials, and supplies necessary to keep an agency operational and functioning are available. Both districts participating in this study provide some form of support services within their organizations, although on a smaller scale in Stanfield. Support services offered under a joint support and logistics division can be modular and may include:

- Standardization of apparatus, equipment, and PPE
- Standardization of fire/EMS/rescue supplies
- Centralized purchasing and distribution
- Centralized fleet and equipment maintenance
- A preventative and safety maintenance program for facilities, apparatus, equipment, and other physical assets

The purchasing program can create joint bids for supplies and equipment offering advantages of economies of scale and can achieve additional benefits such as integrated inventory of supplies that can accommodate lag times in deliveries from manufacturers and suppliers.
Discussion

Support Services Division – At the heart of any fire department are the activities and functions that support the delivery of emergency services. Support Services keep agency assets in operational readiness and ensure that enough supplies, tools, and equipment are available for emergency workers to mitigate an emergency. Both agencies in this study dedicate a certain level of daily effort in maintaining emergency apparatus and equipment, stations and supplies.

Although emergency services providers, Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services and Stanfield Fire District are also businesses that spend thousands of dollars each year to ensure emergency mission readiness. Like all businesses, fire departments need to be receptive to new practices to maximize the effectiveness of budget dollars. Such practices may take the form of economies of scale, administrative efficiencies, paperwork reduction, technological advances, and innovative cost saving concepts.

Acquiring and maintaining physical assets (facilities and grounds), IS/IT systems, vehicles, and equipment is an expensive and labor intensive process requiring good policies and attention to detail. The procurement and distribution of routine supplies is also an important behind-the-scenes process that needs hands-on work and meticulous record keeping. These support services are currently provided by a variety of members in SFD and HFES, based on individual skills and interests. Meeting the demand for support services is a constant necessity in any organization and vital to ensure the operational readiness of the agency. Key elements of establishing joint support and logistics services are:

- Assessment of current assets
- Assessment of current levels of support service activities
- Standardization of apparatus, equipment, and supplies
- Standardization of preventative maintenance programs and recordkeeping
- Centralization of apparatus and equipment repair and maintenance
- Centralization of supply and equipment acquisition and distribution
- Development of a combined facilities and grounds maintenance program
- Standardization of IS/IT services

As listed above, a key to realizing the benefits of shared support services is standardization of apparatus, equipment, and supplies. In this exercise alone, standardization assures greater
financial and operational efficiency and effectiveness. Fundamentally, this is the most important aspect of implementing a joint support approach.

Standardizing specifications for the purchase, repair, and maintenance of apparatus, SCBA (self-contained breathing apparatus), communication devices, and miscellaneous equipment often equates to less out-of-service time. Support personnel will need to be certified for repairing and maintaining fewer apparatus and equipment types. Fewer parts need to be stocked for repair and maintenance. Such practices are described as “economies of scale.”

NFPA 1911 points out that repairs by qualified technicians may provide longer apparatus life, safer operations, and the early detection of maintenance and repair problems. The result is often a short and long-term saving on rolling stock and small equipment. A centralized repair and maintenance facility cooperatively organized as a support services division ensures that routine maintenance and repairs of physical assets are completed in a timely manner.

Logistics Services – A multi-agency purchasing program can improve management of the two agencies’ supply chains and lends itself well to expansion to other agencies in the region for even greater efficiency. Understanding that even combining Hermiston and Stanfield purchasing practices creates only a slightly larger program, the agencies can reach out to Umatilla Fire District and other providers in the area, offering to allow them to participate and increasing the combined purchasing power. The program would follow state and organizational purchasing guidelines and make supplies and equipment available to all of the member agencies.

Distribution can be managed internally or through agreements with suppliers to gain the advantages of collective purchasing and supply: 1) a larger, collective bid process for supplies can achieve lower prices and attract additional competitors, 2) the agencies can negotiate terms of the conditions of the sale that might not be available to smaller purchasing centers, and 3) it can conduct collective bidding processes that are applicable to all of the agencies.

Coordination is important to the success of a joint purchasing program. Both Hermiston and Stanfield currently conduct purchasing of virtually all supplies and equipment independently. As such, a joint effort will reduce the work required by any single agency to provide purchase and provide supplies.

Critical Issues

- Coordination issues
- A cross-functional committee of district personnel responsible for purchasing can work together to design standardized purchasing rules for each participating agency
- The committee can provide a standardized equipment list for the agencies. They can then share bidding processes so that the bidding procedure used by the purchasing agent can be used by both agencies and, potentially, other participants.
- Fire agencies should have agreements in place to specify inventory and purchasing plans

Guidance

- Develop a cross-functional committee with representation from both Hermiston and Stanfield to explore a joint purchasing process
- Work with the boards of directors to adopt purchasing requirements that help the agencies meet purchasing goals and guidelines
- Establish standards for fire and EMS system equipment and supplies
- Establish inventory standards and methods for distributing equipment and supplies
- Develop specific standards for apparatus, equipment, PPE, SCBA, communication equipment, and supplies
- Inventory and evaluate current physical assets, apparatus, equipment, and operational/facility supplies
- Determine support components necessary to add regional partners, if desired, ensuring that incremental costs are borne by joining agencies and economic benefit is quantified for each participant over the long term
- Ensure that all aspects of a joint support division are based upon recognized local, state, and national standards as well as manufacturers’ recommendations for repair and maintenance
- Determine the most efficient and effective location for support functions

Fiscal Considerations

- Marginal costs of creating system-wide purchasing infrastructure should be compared against the reduced level of effort of individual agencies
- Cost savings can be achieved through reducing inventory carrying costs, reducing transaction costs, and achieving economies of scale through larger volume purchasing
- Any soft costs in the form of hourly wages for POC personnel generated by cross-functional committee meetings necessary to accomplish objectives of the program
- Incremental costs of transitioning to standard apparatus, PPE (Personal Protective Equipment), SCBA (Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus), and small equipment
- Expected cost savings and operational benefits will result from:
  - Elimination of duplication of services, administration, supplies, parts, and equipment
  - Standardization of equipment, parts and operational/facility supplies
  - Effective acquisition, accountability, and distribution of supplies and equipment
  - Bulk purchasing
  - Preventive maintenance of physical assets, apparatus, and equipment for optimum safety and readiness
  - The elimination or reduction of “outside” costs for repair, maintenance, and servicing of physical assets and equipment
Strategy C – Develop a Joint Fire Prevention and Code Enforcement Program

Level of Cooperation
- Functional

Timeline for Completion
- Mid Term

Section
- Fire Prevention

Affected Stakeholders
- Both agencies

Objective
- To reduce the threat to life or property from fire.
- To provide uniform prevention services to the region.

Summary
Fire prevention is a specialized discipline that requires personnel with the knowledge, skills, and abilities acquired over a long period of time. Public educators have the skill set of a teacher, plans examiners are detail oriented, fire investigators have tenacity, and fire inspectors are diplomatic. Singly the departments do not have the ability to staff and maintain a comprehensive fire prevention division. Collectively the organizations have the workload and the trained personnel with the experience to support a prevention program.

Discussion
The components of an effective fire prevention program, generally, should include the following:
- Fire Code Enforcement
  - Proposed construction and plans review
  - New construction inspections
  - Existing structure/occupancy inspections
  - Special risk inspections
  - Internal protection systems design review
  - Storage and handling of hazardous materials
- Fire and Life Safety Education
  - Public education
  - Specialized education
  - Juvenile fire setter intervention
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- Prevention information dissemination
- Fire Investigation
  - Fire cause and origin determination
  - Fire death investigation
  - Arson investigation and prosecution

As noted in the Evaluation of Current Conditions section of this report, HFES has a well-developed fire prevention and code enforcement program under the oversight of a full-time Fire Marshal. SFD does not have the resources to operate a similar program and instead depends on the OSFM (Oregon State Fire Marshal’s Office) to provide these services. The drawback realized with the exclusive use of the OSFM to conduct prevention and enforcement operations is that the state personnel are only able to deal with high risk occupancies such as schools, institutional and some special hazard facilities. Other commercial and multi-family residential occupancies do not get inspected for fire and life safety concerns.

This strategy suggests that a joint program be developed for fire prevention and code enforcement and that the programs and practices in place in HFES be expanded to include SFD’s boundaries. The initiative will enhance the safety of SFD residents and will mitigate the fire risk throughout the district. However, doing so will increase the workload on the Hermiston Fire Marshal, who is currently working at nearly maximum capacity. While this strategy carries with it obvious benefits, ESCI underscores the importance of taking workload capacity into consideration in its implementation.

**Guidance**

- Develop a work group to assess the need for enhanced prevention activity in SFD
- Inventory the number of occupancies in SFD that would be subject to inspection and code enforcement activities
- Conduct a workload analysis on the HFES Fire Marshal’s position to determine whether sufficient capacity exists
- Evaluate opportunities for cost recovery, including plan review and related fees, to potentially provide funding with which to supplement the Fire Marshal’s staffing
Fiscal Considerations

- Any soft costs in the form of hourly wages for the Fire Marshal
- Costs associated with increased workload and potentially adding personnel
Strategy D – Establish Shared Public Education/Public Information Activities

Level of Cooperation
- Functional

Timeline for Completion
- Mid Term

Section
- Administration and Fire Prevention

Affected Stakeholders
- Both agencies

Objective
- Provide Public Education and Public Information services for the combined service area.

Summary
Public Education is an essential component of a fire prevention program. Educating and empowering a community’s citizens to help prevent fires from occurring enhances their safety as well as that of firefighters. Prevention education is also cost effective because an emergency response is an expensive endeavor. Thus, an incident prevented is a significant expense avoided.

Discussion
Both HFES and SFD make Public Education outreach efforts, but at differing levels. Hermiston’s Fire Marshal is actively involved in public education outreach and the district is fortunate to also have a part-time employee assigned to the endeavor on a one-fourth time basis. SFD, on the other hand, does not have the staffing resources to actively address public education, but does so to the best of their ability on an as requested basis. Combining the two existing programs into one that serves both agencies allows for the strengths of each to be aligned to increase effectiveness.

Guidance
- Evaluate the needs of the combined service area and develop a list of skills required to meet those needs.
- Compare current public outreach activities to identified needs
• Realign the individuals currently performing their tasks for the separate organizations into the tasks that best match their skill sets, consistent with the organizations need, while balancing the workload.

**Fiscal Considerations**

• No significant financial considerations.
Strategy E – Develop a Regional Juvenile Fire Setter Intervention Network

Level of Cooperation

- Functional

Timeline for Completion

- Short Term

Section

- Fire Prevention

Affected Stakeholders

- Both agencies

Objective

- Provide an effective means for intervening in juvenile-set/caused fires.

Summary

Statistical analysis nationwide clearly demonstrates the growing problem of juvenile fire setting. While fires set by juveniles have always been a problem, fire cause determination and fire data reporting systems have not always been adequate to identify the extent of the phenomenon. Many jurisdictions simply do not realize the extent of juvenile-set fires in their community.

A lack of collective involvement by fire departments, law enforcement agencies, mental health professionals, schools, juvenile court, and other affected interests will limit the effectiveness of the overall fire prevention efforts of the individual departments.

Discussion

Juvenile fire setter intervention is a fragile undertaking that must be approached carefully to make sure that a situation is not further complicated by inappropriate intervention. Training and certification of personnel involved in the intervention program is critical.

The HFES Fire Marshal has been trained in juvenile fire setter intervention and is appropriately certified. When needed, he is able to address a concern and SFD makes use of his skills when it has a situation involving a juvenile. As a result, intervention, on the rare occasion that it is needed, is handled well. However, multiple examples exist of communities that have taken the initiative to a higher level.

Regional “Juvenile Fire Setter Intervention Networks” have been established that go well beyond the basic intervention performed by fire personnel. These programs encompass
broadened disciplines, providing not only intervention, but also education and referral systems for problem juveniles. The scope of the programs is expanded beyond fire service personnel to establish a partnership that includes law enforcement and mental health professionals.

Expanding the current efforts in addressing the juvenile fire setting problem has the potential to positively impact the safety of the Hermiston and Stanfield communities and should be expanded on a regional level. Fortunately, the agencies have ready access to one of the country’s most respected and effective state-wide programs for establishing networks, which is that of the Oregon State Fire Marshal’s Office Juvenile Fire Setter Intervention Program.

**Guidance**
- Develop a regional program modeled on already established and successful JFSI networks
- Include all the needed professional disciplines
- Provide important, on-going training
- Involve only those fire agency personnel who desire to participate
- Formally organize the structure of the network for long-term sustainability

**Fiscal Considerations**
- Reduced fire loss to the community through reduction in juvenile-caused fires.
- Potential increased training requirement and cost.
- Potential overtime for training and for intervention.
Strategy F – Develop Uniform Pre-incident Plans

Level of Cooperation

- Functional

Timeline for Completion

- Short Term

Section

- Emergency Operations

Affected Stakeholders

- Both agencies

Objective

- Provide a system of shared operational plans for use during emergencies and non-emergent incidents.

Summary

Pre-incident plans are an important part of the emergency response system to provide essential information on specific structures and processes. Through timely planning, strategy and tactics can be developed before an emergency occurs. Pre-incident planning involves evaluating protection systems, building construction, contents, and operating procedures that may impact emergency operations.

The development of a pre-incident planning practice is viewed as particularly important in Hermiston and Stanfield. Since this organization’s response crew members are not involved in routine fire and life safety inspections like many fire departments, personnel do not routinely see what buildings look like internally and are not necessarily familiar with special hazards and access considerations.

Both Hermiston and Stanfield currently conduct some pre-incident planning on specified, high hazard occupancies. However, the practice is limited in scope and, based on the above consideration, this strategy is offered in the interest of enhancing efforts and standardizing practices between the two fire departments.

Discussion

A firefighter typically works in an alien environment of heat, darkness, confusion, and extreme danger. Often, a firefighter’s first visit to a building is when he or she is summoned to an emergency at the facility; the very time that the internal environment of the structure may be at
its worst. A lack of familiarity with the layout of a structure can easily cause a firefighter to become disoriented and subsequently suffer injury.

It is important that firefighters and command staff have accurate information readily at hand to identify hazards, direct tactical operations, and understand the proper use of built-in fire resistive features of some structures. This can be accomplished by touring structures, developing pre-incident plans, and conducting tactical exercises, either on-site or tabletop.

An ideal pre-incident planning system uses standardized forms and protocols. Data is collected in a consistent format. Information is presented in a manner that permits commanders and emergency workers to retrieve it quickly and easily. All require the use of consistent methods for collection, verification, storage, presentation, and update of emergency plans.

Pre-incident plans should be a quick and easy reference tool for company officers and command staff. The plans should be formatted for easy adaptation to electronic media. At a minimum, a pre-incident plan should include information on but not be limited to:

- Building construction type
- Occupant load
- Fire protection systems
- Water supply
- Exposure hazards
- Firefighter hazards
- Utility location and shutoffs
- Emergency contact information

Completely revised and upgraded from a recommended practice to a standard, the 2010 edition of NFPA 1620: Standard for Pre-Incident Planning provides criteria for developing pre-incident plans for use by personnel responding to emergencies. Pre-planning is a key component of first responder effectiveness, and NFPA 1620 spells out the process and provides excellent information on the development and use of pre-incident plans and should be used as a reference. NFPA 1620 addresses the protection, construction, and operational features of specific occupancies to develop pre-incident plans. The 2010 edition also contains pre-incident planning case histories and information addressing special or unique characteristics of specific occupancy classifications, as well as sample forms for pre-incident planning.
Personnel should receive regular familiarization training using the completed pre-incident plans. The plans must be made available on all emergency apparatus of both agencies. Routine use of pre-incident plans by all responders will assure that the plans are correctly used at major emergencies.

**Guidance**

- Inventory current pre-incident planning development in each agency
- Evaluate commonality between current systems of pre-incident planning
- Consider the establishment of a committee to develop building criteria and data for inclusion in pre-incident plans
- Develop a timeline for the implementation, completion, and review of pre-incident plans

**Fiscal Considerations**

The cost to each fire department for developing uniform pre-incident plans will be predicated on:

- Current hardware and software assets and cost to upgrade or purchase hardware and software, if desired
- Number of facilities/buildings with existing pre-incident plans versus those yet to be developed
- The pace of new construction requiring pre-incident plans
- Personnel costs to gather and assemble plans if not assigned to line crews and/or paid on call and volunteer personnel
- Unquantifiable potential for prevention of injury or death to emergency responders and the public
Strategy G – Conduct Joint Strategic Planning

Level of Cooperation
- Functional

Timeline for Completion
- Mid Term

Section
- Administration

Affected Stakeholders
- Both agencies

Objective
- Enable the two agencies to develop Mission, Vision, Values and Guiding Principles that are common to both organizations.
- Empower the districts to identify needs and establish plans to meet them, including shared organization goals and objectives.

Summary
A strategic planning process takes the organizations through the steps of articulating a mission statement, a vision statement, and the organization’s guiding principles. Once established, a clearly defined set of organizational goals is defined, along with specific objectives that identify how each goal is to be accomplished.

Discussion
In order for any organization to reach its full potential, it must have a plan. An organization that knows where it is going, knows the environment in which it must operate, and identifies how it is going to move forward has the best chance to meet the needs of the community and achieve its goals.

Hermiston is already in the process of developing a strategic plan, an effort that was under way at the time that ESCI conducted its field work. We commend HFES for taking this important step. Whether conducted as a part of the current effort or initiated once the Hermiston plan is finished, it is appropriate that Stanfield Fire District be brought into the strategic planning process. The initiatives and options provided in this report will change the way that both organizations do business and, assuming that efforts are combined in some manner, the strategic planning process should be collaborative.
When the agencies involved in this study decide on their course of action, whether it is a full unification, variations of consolidation methods, or simply the implementation of some of the functional strategies discussed here, a strategic plan will be an important next step.

**Guidance**

- Establish a joint planning committee
- Schedule and arrange for facilitation of development of a strategic plan that encompasses all agencies
- Establish methodologies for implementing, tracking and measuring plan goals and objectives
- Plan for annual review and revision of the strategic plan

**Fiscal Considerations**

- Each agency should be completing an annual strategic plan. Duplication of effort is eliminated when both can plan cooperatively.
- Good planning results in effective operations. Increased efficiencies that can be realized from effective planning will prove to be more cost effective.
Strategy H – Develop Common Standard Operating Guidelines

Level of Cooperation
- Functional

Timeline for Completion
- Short Term

Section
- Emergency Operations

Affected Stakeholders
- Both agencies

Objective
- Provide guidelines for operation during emergencies and non-emergency incidents and activities that are common to both Hermiston and Stanfield Fire Districts.

Summary
Standard operating guidelines (SOGs) are used at the operations level of the fire department. They are analogous to a playbook, providing direction yet allowing for individualized company officer adjustments to situations.

Standard operating guidelines are organizational directives that establish a standard course of action; they are written guidelines that clearly spell out what is expected and required of personnel during emergency response and non-emergency activities. They provide a mechanism to communicate legal and administrative requirements, organizational policies, and strategic plans to the members. A comprehensive set of SOGs displays in significant detail how the department intends to operate.

Discussion
Standard operating guidelines will improve on-scene safety, efficiency, and effectiveness of personnel. With personnel from both agencies trained in using the same procedures, they can approach an incident with an understanding that everyone will proceed in a similar fashion. This will greatly reduce or eliminate the confusion that can lead to delays in the delivery of service.

Additionally, the standard operating guidelines must reflect any legal mandates affecting the department. A robust, and frequently reviewed set of SOGs will lead to organizational
consistency, more efficient administrative controls, improved expectations by personnel, and greatly reduce or eliminate potential organizational confusion.

Currently, both departments have developed SOGs; however, they differ in content. Hermiston is currently updating and revising its SOGs. Stanfield’s guidelines were just completed in the past year and ESCI observed that all personnel were not necessarily fully familiar with their content yet. This may be an opportune time to collaborate and jointly develop a set of shared SOGs for ease of incident and daily operational synchronicity.

**Guidance**

- Keep the guidelines in electronic format for ease of updating
- Give initial and recurring education to personnel in their use
- Provide for continual use of the SOGs during routine incidents and at each training session
- Provide for a periodic appraisal of the guidelines to maintain currency with changes in tactics, strategy, and equipment
- Consciously keep guidelines non-specific to allow for adaptation to particular incident situations by the supervisor

**Fiscal Considerations**

- The elimination of duplicated staff effort in the creation and updating of standard operating guidelines will reduce soft costs
- Instructional time will be optimized during multi-agency training sessions by excluding time devoted to adapting to differing procedures
**Strategy I – Provide Joint Standards for Service Delivery**

**Level of Cooperation**
- Functional

**Timeline for Completion**
- Short to Mid Term

**Section**
- EMS and Emergency Operations

**Affected Stakeholders**
- Both agencies

**Objective**
- Establish a joint Standards for Service Delivery Policy, defining services, service levels, and response times to the 90th percentile so that adequate system planning can take place.
- Develop a system-wide reporting structure to standardize the collection and reporting of relative compliance with the Standards for Service Delivery Policy.

**Summary**
Response times are one of the most frequently used methods of measuring system performance. Fire agencies and policymakers require a gauge by which to measure the effectiveness of the system and a method by which to make decisions. Because the economic cost of providing emergency services is highly sensitive to response times, a small change in response time requirements may cause a significant change in cost. Policymakers must therefore carefully consider the balance between the economic cost and community risk.

**Discussion**
In conducting research for the Commission on Fire Accreditation International, Inc. (now under the larger heading of Center for Public Safety Excellence), members of the initial task force spent considerable effort toward examining the factors that make up the time required to be notified of and respond to a fire emergency. A thorough understanding of the relationship of time and the progression of an emergency was fundamental to defining optimum service levels.
In the process of this work, the task force noted that many fire departments are collecting data on emergency response but are not necessarily using that data to measure performance.\textsuperscript{52}

Commonly, a problem occurs when fire departments use different timeframes in collecting and reporting response time statistics. For example, if a department does not include alarm processing or turnout time in its definition of response, the department’s response statistics may be unfairly weighted because only travel time to the emergency is measured and reported. On the other hand, a department that does include alarm time and processing time in its collection of data may be compared unfavorably to a department that does not.

Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services has established target performance criteria which is stated in a draft Standards of Cover (SOC) document which is currently under development. The response time goals, by percentile breakdown are summarized in Figure 84.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>80th Percentile</th>
<th>90th Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnout</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.5 minutes or less – Career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 minutes or less – volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Fire – City</td>
<td>10 Minutes – full assignment of 10 personnel</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Fire – Rural</td>
<td>14 minute total reflex time for full alarm assignment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent EMS Incident</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4-minute arrival of first due unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Emergency Incidents</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4-minute arrival of first due unit and/or full alarm assignment in 12 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Attack</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Commence attack within 2 minutes of assembling a response force</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is ESCI’s understanding that the Standards of Cover document developed by Hermiston is not yet complete and has not been formally adopted. The effort is viewed as positive and we encourage the continued development of the SOC to completion is encouraged.

Stanfield has not ventured into the process of establishing an SOC, which is understandable, as doing so is a time consuming and labor intensive undertaking. As the agencies continue to ponder opportunities for cooperative service delivery, expanding the current HFES SOC development process to include SFD is logical. Some additional background information and guidance is provided below.

\textsuperscript{52} Creating & Evaluating Standards of Response Cover for Fire Departments, Fourth edition, Chapter 2, page 1, Commission on Fire Accreditation International, Inc, 2003, Chantilly, VA.
The International Association of Fire Chiefs (IAFC) makes recommendations for response times and has established a “Cascade of Events” to assist responders in understanding response intervals for emergency operations. Irrespective of the standard used, system regulators establish an appropriate response time reporting method for their local communities. While call processing and dispatch functions are external for both agencies, those dispatch functions should also be measured and monitored by the system and standards for dispatch should be established.

Figure 85: Emergency Operations – Cascade of Events

- Event Initiation
  - Emergency Event
    - [9-1-1] Notification and Alarm Processing
      - [FD] Notification and Alarm Processing
        - Unit Notification and Turnout Time
          - Travel Time
            - On-Scene Time
              - Initiation of Action
                - Termination of Incident
Critical Issues

- Data issues
  - The districts should collaborate with the two dispatch centers to ensure that the data points can be captured. Doing so will be more problematic due to the dual dispatch center configuration.
  - The dispatch centers should develop methods to report on the response performance using industry standard fractal reporting methods. Since data collection at both centers is limited, the districts will need to assist in this effort.

- Performance considerations
  - Both agencies should establish differential standards for response performance for urban, suburban, and rural deployment areas, as applicable. HFES has already started the process in the draft SOC.
  - Both agencies should determine valid and reliable performance reporting methods for response performance.
  - Both agencies should report to the community and cities served annually via an open public meeting on the actual performance as measured against the performance objectives. Contained in this report are:
    - the geographic areas and circumstances in which the requirements are not being met
    - the predictable consequences of any deficiencies
    - the steps that are necessary to achieve compliance

Fiscal Considerations

- Marginal costs of providing data collection and processing
- Reporting will require additional resources from both agencies and from dispatch
Strategy J – Combine Volunteer and Paid On Call Recruitment and Training Programs for New Hires

Level of Cooperation
- Functional

Timeline for Completion
- Mid Term

Section
- Administration, Emergency Operations and Training

Affected Stakeholders
- Both agencies

Objective
- Combine existing paid on call and volunteer cadre into a resource pool for both agencies to utilize.
- Develop a recruit training program for future hires.

Summary
Both agencies are financially unable to hire career personnel to meet all fire suppression and EMS response needs. Instead they depend heavily on what are generally referred to as volunteers but are in actuality part-time employees utilized on a paid on call basis in Hermiston and volunteers paid on a per-call basis in Stanfield. As a result of using this staffing approach, the communities served receive valuable response coverage from dedicated firefighters at a minimal cost.

These groups can be combined and expanded to provide greater benefit to both agencies, while reducing the administrative and training workload currently expended by maintaining separate groups.

Discussion
Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services has 25 operational personnel on their roster of paid on call personnel, along with six resident interns. Stanfield Fire District has 11 operational volunteers and one volunteer assistant chief. The compensation methodologies differ in that the Hermiston non-career members receive hourly rate at a progressive scale relative to certification and time in service. Stanfield volunteers are simply paid $5 per call. Recruiting, training, and probationary practices are similar between the two.
Paid on call and volunteer programs can be readily joined into a single undertaking. However, doing so will necessitate that all non-career members be compensated in a manner that is equalized, resulting in additional cost. A starting point is the recruitment process, which both Hermiston and Stanfield currently conduct by a combination of word-of-mouth communication, posting of recruiting signs and periodic newspaper advertisements. The same activities can be conducted but recruiting occurs for both agencies rather than one or the other. Benefits are multiplied and costs reduced.

Similarly, training of new members can be combined effectively. As discussed in the Current Conditions section, both Stanfield and Hermiston use a combination of internal and external instruction sources for training their new personnel. Doing so is necessary to keep precious training hours available for ongoing drills for the balance of the districts’ personnel.

ESCI has seen highly successful approaches to recruit training managed as a cooperative effort by multiple agencies. All fire departments share the same challenge in this regard, so it would be advantageous for Hermiston and Stanfield to develop a recruit academy together and to also consider bringing neighboring agencies such as the Umatilla Fire District into the undertaking. Effective use of scarce training time and resources is achieved and personnel receive relevant, department-specific, training by this method.

Taking the concept a step farther, paid on call personnel can be shared in a joint pool. Members are cross-trained on both departments’ equipment and under shared Standard Operating Guidelines, as discussed in Strategy H – Develop Common Standard Operating Guidelines. They can then be utilized in either organization and an additional benefit is realized by the fact that when a member is located in the neighboring agency’s response area at the time of an alarm, he or she can respond with that fire department, supplementing available staffing resources.

**Guidance**

- A paid on call and volunteer coordinator should be appointed to serve as a combined recruiter, cheerleader, enforcer, problem solver and administrator. This position is critical to the success of such an endeavor.
- A joint committee should be appointed to identify opportunities for shared recruiting, training and probationary practices.
- The effort is dependent on the development of common standard operating guidelines.
**Fiscal Considerations**

- The equalization of payment methodologies for paid on call and volunteer members will increase costs.
- Potential increase in personnel costs if the volunteer coordinator is a full or part-time paid position.
Strategy K – Combine Administrative Services

Level of Cooperation

- Functional

Timeline for Completion

- Mid Term

Section

- Administration

Affected Stakeholders

- Both agencies

Objective

- Consolidate the completion of administrative tasks into a single operation with shared resources and management practices.

Summary

Hermiston and Stanfield both share common administrative needs to some extent. Primarily because Stanfield has only one paid employee, its support functions are not as complex as those in Hermiston.

Many administrative functions are performed by the fire chiefs and the Hermiston Assistant Chief, as is appropriate. Other financial, clerical, record keeping and related tasks are performed by the Hermiston Administrative Assistant and Billing Clerk. In Stanfield, all of these needs are met by the Stanfield Fire Chief. Some advantages can be realized by combining these functions.

Discussion

If clerical, financial, purchasing, reporting/record keeping and other functions and procedures are combined, workload may be reduced on the Stanfield Fire Chief, who may then be freed to provided other services in exchange to both organizations.

Currently, support functions in both districts are performed differently with regard to routine administrative tasks. They use differing computer programs and accounting systems and work from separate locations. Opportunities exist to combine administrative functions as assigned to the HFES administrative staff and the Stanfield Fire Chief in the following areas:

- Billing and accounting activities
- Processing of routine correspondence
- Budgeting and budget monitoring
- Reporting - incident, financial and others including maintenance of state incident records
- Maintenance and management of department records
- Contract management
- Administrative support to the Boards of Directors
- Human Resources records management

The concept would be advantageous in that it would reduce the workload on the Stanfield Fire Chief. However, it would increase the workload placed on HFES staff correspondingly. To address the imbalance, one option is for Stanfield to pay a service fee to Hermiston for the assistance. Assuming that the cost of doing so would be problematic, an alternative is for services to be exchanged reciprocally. The Stanfield Fire Chief possesses multiple skills (in training as just one example) which could be exchanged to beneficially impact the workload currently placed on the Hermiston Assistant Chief.

**Guidance**

- Identify the skills required for the tasks at hand first, then evaluate the capacity of existing staff members to complete those job functions for Both agencies
- In collaboration with the Hermiston Administrative Assistant and Billing Clerk, identify tasks that are common to both fire districts but performed differently or separately
- Identify tasks that are performed for one district and not for the other. Determine whether those functions are needed in the other organization.
- List needs, in terms of equipment, software and policy/procedure changes that need to be made to perform common functions.
- Evaluate skills and abilities of administrative personnel in both agencies and identify area in which capabilities may be exchanged reciprocally

**Fiscal Considerations**

- Training costs may be incurred initially
- Some costs may be incurred for office equipment or software
Strategy L – Consolidate Training into a Single Training Program

Level of Cooperation
- Functional

Timeline for Completion
- Mid-Term

Section
- Training

Affected Stakeholders
- Both agencies

Objectives
- Eliminate duplication in training emergency responders to increase effectiveness.
- Create a single unified training division.

Summary
Responsibility for fire department training programs is often assigned to either one person or a group of people. Two typical forms of providing training are: 1) a training division with assigned personnel in a larger organization or, 2) a company officer or other paid on call individual is assigned training responsibilities, often in combination with other duties.

Training programs for Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services and Stanfield Fire District have been managed and operated independent of one another until recently. As of early January, 2012, the two districts decided to combine their training programs – a commendable initiative.

Understanding that the merging of the training programs is already under way but only recently implemented, ESCI chose to offer the following information and guidance in support of what has already been initiated. Further, six subsequent strategies are identified following this one to enhance the current efforts.

Discussion
To varying degrees, most fire department training programs display strengths and weaknesses. The weaknesses are commonly a result of two basic problems influencing agency training officers – multiple responsibilities and a lack of time to “do it all”. This is particularly problematic for volunteer and paid on call personnel.
Stanfield assigns training responsibilities to a volunteer captain, supplemented by the fire chief. Both have multiple other responsibilities. In Hermiston, the Assistant Chief is charged with training, but he, too, has many additional tasks to perform.

The districts have taken a positive step toward managing the training workload consolidating their training programs. Training is scheduled on a common drill night for non-career members and planning of training is coordinated.

Since the effort has just started, it is unknown how effective it will prove to be. The districts are encouraged to monitor progress closely and be open to making adjustments as time goes on. Assuring that the program is well managed is essential to truly consolidating programs and gaining the rewards that can be found in establishing a single training system.

The current efforts address only continuing firefighter training at the fundamental levels. Advanced levels of education and training for company officers and command officers are not included in the program at this time. The focus is primarily placed on providing the training needed to meet annual continuing education needs at the Firefighter I and Firefighters II levels, leaving little room for advanced training content. Expanding the program in the future to include additional training levels is advised.

Given the resources and expertise within the agencies, there exists an opportunity to eliminate duplication by consolidating the training into a single program, as the districts have recognized. The mission of the training program will be to coordinate the administration, management, and delivery of the ongoing education and skills development for the two districts. Combining the existing fiscal, supplies, services, and personnel resources would provide greater efficiency and enhanced training effectiveness.

**Guidance**

- Establish a single training program.
  - Provide for the administration of training delivery.
  - Provide opportunities with regular meetings for both agency representatives to coordinate training activities.
  - Establish a commonly accepted training plan (See Strategy O – Develop an Annual Shared Training Plan) based on a shared training manual (See Strategy Q – Create a Shared Training Manual)
  - Provide adequate training facilities and office space for training staff. (See Strategy R – Develop a Shared Fire and EMS Training Facility)
- Combine the training staff under a single Training Officer.
  - The Training Officer should report to one supervisor.
  - The Training Officer should have overall training program administration, supervision, and management responsibilities.
- Provide adequate personnel and prioritization of training activities based on common training goals including:
  - A joint recruit academy. (See Strategy J – Combine Volunteer and Paid On Call Recruitment and Training Programs for New Hires)
  - Recurrent training for Firefighter I and II and Fire Officers.
  - Officer level training and career development.
  - Apparatus operator/engineer skills and engineer development.
  - Administration and coordination of the emergency medical services training and recertification program.
  - An RMS (records management system) for tracking individual, company, and department training. (See Strategy M – Implement a Common Training Records Management System)

**Fiscal Considerations**

- Increased efficiencies can be realized by eliminating duplication of staff effort in managing individual training programs
- Potential for increased instructional capacity through pooled instructors
- Cost may be incurred to develop and or modify existing training facilities
- Cost of purchasing any additional training aids
- Maintenance and capital replacement costs
Strategy M – Implement a Common Training Records Management System

Level of Cooperation
- Functional

Timeline for Completion
- Mid Term

Section
- Training

Affected Stakeholders
- Both agencies

Objective
- Implement the use of a single, commonly shared training Records Management System (RMS).

Summary
Computerized RMS provides for ease of data entry, retention, and accessibility. A training RMS is important to document information regarding an individual, company, station, and department training status. Both fire districts track training activities individually using paper sign-in sheets, subsequently transferring the data to an RMS system. However, each uses a different software program to do so. Use of a single, common RMS for training data management will be valuable in accommodating other training related strategies.

Discussion
Hermiston and Stanfield have developed internal methods for recording training activities and the methods used are adequate, but differ. HFES uses Firehouse Software®, while SFD uses the CertRight® program. Data entry in both programs is similar, but they do not produce the same results.

A number of initiatives listed here address enhanced training interaction between Hermiston and Stanfield. If those efforts are to be successful, record keeping is a must. The use of a standardized RMS will be invaluable to the efforts.

The ability to track and assess training information will prove valuable in the development of a unified training manual and an annual training plan. Future enterprises will also benefit from a single RMS, including recruit training, career development, in-service, officer, and specialized
training programs. A RMS for training will also aid the districts with budget planning, training delivery, and resource and risk management.

**Guidance**

- Establish a work group that includes at least one training representative from each district.
  - Identify system requirements and needs of each department.
  - Evaluate the recording systems currently used by each department, including justification for their use.
  - Evaluate other available RMS systems, if necessary.
  - Select an RMS that most adequately satisfies mutual requirements, needs, and budget. It is most likely that simply adding SFD training records to the existing HFES Firehouse Software® data base will be sufficient.
- Each department should share in the cost of an individual to administer and manage the training RMS, including:
  - Training RMS management.
  - Oversight of hardware and software installation.
  - Providing for the initial and on-going RMS training for end users.
- Determine server requirements for training RMS.
- Provide for RMS maintenance and troubleshooting services.

**Fiscal Considerations**

- A reduction in duplicated effort (reduces soft costs)
- Economies of scale in the use and maintenance of a single RMS
- Cost to purchase, administer, maintain, or modify existing network
- Personnel costs associated with RMS committee, training, and implementation
Strategy N – Develop Mutual Training Strategies

Level of Cooperation
- Functional

Timeline for Completion
- Short to Mid Term

Section
- Training

Affected Stakeholders
- Both agencies

Objective
- Provide purpose and direction for training program management and delivery.
- Combine strengths and resources to:
  - Overcome current training obstacles and deficiencies.
  - Provide a comprehensive and integrated training structure.
  - Develop a mutually beneficial training program.
  - Train and certify a cadre of knowledgeable and skilled emergency responders.

Summary
Agreements between public agencies to functionally consolidate certain programs are becoming increasingly common, including in Oregon. Such cooperative initiatives are a means to mutually increase efficiency through reduction or elimination of duplication; something not usually achievable by a single entity. We believe that mutual training strategies for Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services and Stanfield Fire District will accomplish that.

Discussion
Certain individuals are assigned responsibility (the HFES Assistant Chief and the SFD Training Captain) for development and delivery of their department’s training program. Hermiston and Stanfield’s training programs have historically been carried out, in large part, independently, with varying levels of program development, content, and quality. The recent implementation of shared training classes is a significant step toward standardizing training between the two. Building on that success, further defining a mutually established training strategy will enable SFD and HFES to develop greater consistency and improve overall training results.
With shared resources, shared expertise, and geographical proximity, Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services and Stanfield Fire District are well positioned for training collaboration. Developing a clear plan for firefighter training in both departments is the next step.

Both departments were able to articulate their training goals in general terms – focusing on meeting the basic requirements for continuing educations for the Firefighter I and Firefighter II certifications primarily, with additional focus on Pumper/Operator, Wildland Firefighter and Fire Officer levels as defined by the State of Oregon. However, neither organization has established a strategic training plan. A strategic training plan evaluates current training levels and individual capabilities and determines future training needs, goals and objectives. The process includes identifying the existing type and level of emergency services, followed by an audit of the certification and skills of emergency workers. Strategies are created to develop curriculum, obtain resources, and produce a training schedule. A combined strategic training plan drives consistency and continuity within each agency and between the two.

As part of the combined training strategy, a system of competency-based training and skills evaluation is recommended for all suppression and EMS personnel. Competency-based training helps firefighters achieve and retain the required skills for specific jobs. The term “skill” is defined in Merriam-Webster as “A learned power of doing something competently: and a developed aptitude or ability.” We recommend that mutual training strategies include the annual, or preferably, semi-annual evaluation of individual and company proficiency. Results of the evaluations may then be used to continuously re-evaluate the training strategy and identify areas of weakness that necessitate additional training focus.

**Critical Issues**

- Any variations existing between current programs used by the two agencies may initially require personnel to receive additional training
- Personnel involved in the development of a combined training manual should also be involved with development of mutual training strategies

**Guidance**

- Establish a work group to evaluate and develop common training strategies:
  - Identify and define training program goals and establish objectives
  - Set benchmarks for measuring progress
- Evaluate the other related training topics found in this section:
  - Annual training plan
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- Shared training manual
- Training facilities
- Training standards
- Record keeping
- Encourage creativity to apply existing strategies in new and different ways and to develop new strategies
- Provide for a periodic appraisal of the training strategy, evaluating relevancy, effectiveness, and compatibility with current need
- Keep strategies in electronic format for ease of updating

_Fiscal Considerations_
- No significant financial considerations exist in this strategy
- Some additional staff time will need to be committed to the initiative
Strategy O – Develop an Annual Shared Training Plan

Level of Cooperation
- Functional

Timeline for Completion
- Short Term

Section
- Training

Affected Stakeholders
- Both agencies

Objectives
- Provide standardized and consistent training.
- Provide a well-trained emergency workforce.
- Provide long-term vision and direction for training delivery.

Summary
The 2007 version of NFPA 1500 states, “The fire department shall provide training and education for all department members commensurate with the duties and functions that they are expected to perform.”

A formalized training plan provides the guidance for meeting training requirements. The plan and subsequent training is used to ensure that firefighters are competent, certified, and possess the ability to safely deal with emergencies. Training priorities are established by evaluating responder competencies to training mandates, requirements, desired training, and with the emergency services being delivered. Contemporary training delivery often revolves around performance or outcome-based training.

An annual training plan should reflect priorities by identifying the training that will occur. Training topics, general subject matter, required resources, responsible party, tentative schedule, and instructors are all covered in the plan. Rationale for why certain topics were chosen (or not chosen) is also included in the plan.

---

**Discussion**

Planning is essential to a successful training program, functioning much like the rudder of a ship. To efficiently plan the direction of a training program, complex factors must be considered including: training mandates, department type, personnel development, unanticipated needs, priorities, and finite training time. Successfully charting a course through such issues can be a daunting and overwhelming task for the lone training officer.

Until recently, each agency has dealt individually with the same or similar fire training responsibilities and issues resulting in inefficiencies. HFES and SFD have recognized the problem and taken the first step toward a fully combined training program by scheduling drills together. An important additional step is that of composing a single training plan. The plan presents an opportunity to combine intellectual resources to exploit the strengths and assets of each department for mutual benefit.

_Efficient training systems are those that identify what they do well and take advantage of the opportunities provided by other systems to supplement their efforts. Inefficient systems are those that try to be all things to all people, and in doing so, squander resources._

This is not to say that the two organizations do not adequately plan their training activities. Both have been able to clearly articulate their training needs and intentions and they operate a good program. Their efforts can be further enhanced, however, by the development of a formalized and institutionalized shared training plan.

Determining the level of training that will be supported is crucial. Develop the annual training plan accordingly and deliver the training that directly supports those levels. For example, training could be directed at supporting certifications of Firefighter I and Firefighter II, as it is currently in Hermiston and Stanfield. It may be further directed to include Fire Officer I, and Apparatus and Pump Operator certifications. A pool of instructors who are experts in that subject can be developed from those with the interest, qualifications, and expertise.

Developing and following through with a well-conceived and coordinated training plan can improve on-scene safety, efficiency, and effectiveness of personnel. With personnel from both agencies trained from the same plan, an emergency incident may be attacked with an

---

expectation as to the level of training and skill set of the responders. The training plan will also
assist in the planning and tracking of employee development and certifications.

**Guidance**

- Establish and maintain a training committee that meets regularly. Include at least one
  training representative from each department:
  - Develop an annual training plan
  - Publish, distribute, and implement the plan
  - Provide an orientation for personnel of each department regarding the plan's
    purpose and contents
  - Publish monthly training schedules based on the plan
- Schedule regular multi-agency, multi-company manipulative skill drills
- Place the annual plan and monthly schedules in electronic format for distribution and
  ease of updating
- Provide for periodic reviews and adjustments to the plan
- Direct all curricula towards risk management
- Include all hazards in the training plan rather than solely fire-related incidents

**Fiscal Considerations**

- An elimination or reduction in duplicated staff effort (reduced soft costs) in the creation
  and updating of multiple training plans
- Instructional time is increased during multi-agency training sessions with personnel
  trained to selected certification levels
- A reduction in costs through coordination of shared training resources and equipment
Strategy P – Develop and Adopt Training Standards

Level of Cooperation
- Functional

Timeline for Completion
- Short Term

Section
- Training

Affected Stakeholders
- Both agencies

Objective
- Adopt uniform training standards, practices and guidelines
- Adopt uniform certification standards

Summary
Training standards provide the benchmark for training. They define and specify the quantity and quality of training for achieving levels of competency and certification. Certain standards are mandated by governing or regulating agencies such as the State of Oregon. Others are considered industry standards developed by organizations like the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA). Occasionally, locally developed standards are adopted to address circumstances unique to that area. Manufacturer’s recommendations and certifications are often applicable to the use of specialized equipment. Training records should consist of:
- Daily training records
- Company training records
- Individual training records
- An inventory of training equipment assigned to the training department
- A complete reference library

Discussion
Both Hermiston and Stanfield use IFSTA (International Fire Service Training Association) manuals as their baseline training resource, making it the logical standard to adopt. By collectively adopting a set of training standards, both participating departments are foundationally prepared to move forward with a shared program as described in Strategy L – Consolidate Training into a Single Training. The adoption of common standards provides
unification throughout the training delivery system and improves interagency compatibility. It further simplifies development of a shared training manual, annual training plan, data entry, and data retrieval from computerized training records. Adoption will provide for uniformly trained and certified responders and will assure increased emergency scene compatibility, efficiency, effectiveness, personnel confidence, and safety.

**Guidance**

- Utilize a training committee as discussed in other training related strategies herein. Task the committee to:
  - Identify mandated training standards.
  - Assess all other standards currently used by each fire department, including the rationale for their use.
  - Develop a process for the adoption of training standards.
- Provide for continual use of training standards throughout the training delivery system.
- Maintain standards in a readily available format.
- Provide for periodic evaluation and updating of training standards.
- Address and resolve any personnel certification issues that may be created by new standards and certifications.

**Fiscal Considerations**

- A reduction in duplicated staff effort (reduces soft costs) to develop similar but separate programs based on the same standards.
- A potential for reduced specialized training costs through a larger pool of personnel.
- Responders trained to the same standard provide a more cohesive workforce, increasing efficiencies.
Strategy Q – Create a Shared Training Manual

Level of Cooperation
- Functional

Timeline for Completion
- Short Term

Section
- Training

Affected Stakeholders
- Both agencies

Objective
- Provide consistent, standardized training procedures.

Summary
Fire department instructors use manuals based on local, state and national standards as a resource to develop lesson plans for classroom and field training. A properly developed manual assures that the techniques that personnel train on is consistent throughout the organizations so that everyone is training to perform tasks in the same manner. Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services has initiated the process of developing a training manual, but it is not yet completed. Hermiston and Stanfield should now cooperatively develop a training manual for adoption by both agencies.

Discussion
Until recently, both fire districts unilaterally selected training materials from a variety of options. However, both primarily use IFSTA (International Fire Service Training Association) manuals as the basis for their curriculum development.

A standardized training manual goes beyond simply including the coursework content from manuals like IFSTA. It also includes practices specific to the partnering district’s training programs including internal training requirements, scheduling, goals and objectives, attendance standards and instructor qualifications, to list a few. The use of a standard training manual will provide for more consistent training, better on-scene coordination, and improved firefighter safety.

Care should be exercised to prevent the development process from taking too long. To expedite progress, ESCI recommends adopting material from existing model training manuals,
hose evolutions, and standard operating guidelines. Many are already on hand in the IFSTA materials that Hermiston and Stanfield have in their training libraries.

In addition to IFSTA, model fire department training material is available through the Fire Department Training Network (FDTN), Thomson Delmar, and Oklahoma State University and Fire Protection Publications (FPP). Both have been longstanding producers of training manuals, course curricula, and audiovisual aids for fire departments. NFPA recommended practices and standards can also assist with the development of the training manual. Relevant standards include:

- NFPA 1401, Recommended Practice for Fire Service Training Reports and Records
- NFPA 1403, Standard on Live Fire Training Evolutions
- NFPA 1404, Standard for Fire Service Respiratory Protection Training
- NFPA 1410, Standard on Training for Initial Emergency Scene Operations
- NFPA 1451, Standard for a Fire Service Vehicle Operations Training Program

**Guidance**

- Establish and maintain a training committee that meets regularly and includes at least one training representative from each department
- Develop and adopt a single training manual building on the current partial development that has been initiated by HFES
- Place the training manual in electronic format for easier updating and to allow access by firefighters
- Provide for coordinated training of both agencies
- Provide for regularly scheduled multi-agency drills
- Provide for a regular evaluation and review of the training manual for applicability to pertinent laws, industry standards, and regional standard operating guidelines
- Seek out existing procedures for use in development of the training manual

**Fiscal Considerations**

- The elimination of duplicated staff effort (reduces soft costs) in the selection, development, and updating of separate training manuals.
- Instructional time is likely impacted during multi-agency training sessions by reducing or eliminating the time devoted to adaptive or remedial training.
- An emergency workforce trained under a cooperative system is more efficient and effective in reducing property damage and loss during emergency incidents.
- A workforce trained to operate under universal standards will experience fewer emergency scene injuries.
Strategy R – Develop a Shared Fire and EMS Training Facility

Level of Cooperation
- Functional

Timeline for Completion
- Mid Term

Section
- Training

Affected Stakeholders
- Both agencies

Objectives
- Provide training facilities readily available to Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services and Stanfield Fire District.
- Develop and maintain the knowledge and skills of emergency services personnel.

Summary
Classroom instruction is an essential component of preparing emergency responders with knowledge and skills. A training facility or drill ground is a second indispensable element. Training facilities provide a controlled and safe environment to use to simulate emergencies, developing and testing the skills of emergency workers.

HFES has used foresight in starting the process of developing a training ground, including obtaining property and preliminary training props. The effort should be further developed as a cooperative venture with Stanfield and other area fire agencies.

Discussion
NFPA 1402: Guide to Building Fire Service Training Centers, is a standard that addresses the design and construction of facilities for fire training. The document covers the features that should be considered when planning a fire training facility. Absent the availability of suitable training facilities, some fire departments may forego essential training.

Proficient emergency responders have confidence in their own abilities to handle the emergencies they encounter. Best practices suggest that emergency workers have regular

---

access to training grounds for repetitive drills and to develop new skills. An effective and continuous training program results in safer, more efficient, and effective emergency operations.

Constructing a modern training facility to comply with industry standards concerning classrooms, practice grounds, training tower, live-fire building, and training props is a significant investment of capital. In addition, the on-going cost of operating and maintaining a training facility further advances the case for joint ownership.

Hermiston has been able to get an excellent start by obtaining a large parcel of property adjacent to Station 3 that is intended to be used for the development of a training ground. The site consists of over five acres of space in what was formerly a gravel pit. The station that is located on the site has been planned and built to include good classroom space for didactic sessions which can be readily supplemented by hands-on practice outside of the building. The site has a great deal of potential, but needs to be further developed. The photograph in Figure 86 indicates the site layout.

**Figure 86: HFES Training Site**
Hermiston is and will continue to be challenged to finance the full build out of the training facility on its own, but alternatives are available: First, entering into a cooperative partnership with regional perspective, including not only Stanfield, but Umatilla Fire District and other neighboring agencies can be valuable by sharing costs. Secondly, grants and private funding combined with in-kind denotations can be pursued. The likelihood of success in receiving grants is dramatically increased when an effort is cooperative and inclusive of regional partners.

Examples of recently constructed basic fire training facilities illustrate (in the Figure 87) that these facilities need not be complicated or ornate to be quite functional.

**Figure 87: Sample Training Grounds**

With in-kind donations and grant funding, these fire departments were able to construct the basic buildings with very limited agency expense.

**Critical Issues**

- Seek the participation of neighboring regional partners
- Determine whether an environmental assessment should be performed
- Conduct a needs assessment before design and construction of a training center
- Consider community and environmental impact of training grounds and training props when determining locations. Pay particular attention to access and egress routes
- Select an architect, engineer, and vendor familiar with fire department training centers for oversight of the project. A number of companies have extensive knowledge and expertise in developing complete fire training facilities. Manufacturers of fire training facilities also offer lease packages for financing
Guidance

- Establish a steering group that meets regularly to include at least one training representative from each participating fire agency
- Consider neighboring jurisdictions as additional funding partners
- Visit other regional fire training centers for ideas for the training facility
- Provide a borderless plan for maintaining adequate emergency response coverage for crews attending training at the new site
- Secure adequate support for facility and grounds maintenance, and improvements
- Include plans for live fire training if at all possible, an important element when developing plans for a fire training facility
- In addition to a live training prop, the purchase of a flashover training prop should be given strong consideration
- Establish policies and procedures for safe and effective use of the facilities
- Address how the agencies will insure against accident and liability

Fiscal Considerations

- The cost of new construction of the facility.
- Anticipate an increase in fuel consumption and vehicle maintenance caused by travel to and from the training facility.
- The shared costs for the use, support, and maintenance of facilities.
- The shared cost of management of the facilities.
Strategy S – Develop a Single Apparatus Refurbishment/Replacement Plan

Level of Cooperation

- Functional

Timeline for Completion

- Long Term

Section

- Emergency Operations

Affected Stakeholders

- Both agencies

Objective

- Create a single set of emergency apparatus specifications.
- Provide single-source uniform emergency apparatus for Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services and Stanfield Fire District.
- Provide for shared use of reserve apparatus.
- Establish a jointly planned and managed apparatus replacement schedule.

Summary

Both fire districts use and maintain a variety of emergency apparatus types. Among the common types of apparatus, each department uses equipment of different makes, models, and configurations. A standard specification and procurement process for each apparatus type would result in lower cost, faster production, and training efficiencies.

Procurement of uniform fire apparatus can translate into lower purchase prices, reduction in maintenance costs, and less money, time, and effort spent training drivers and maintenance personnel. Other benefits include greater interoperability, a potential for reducing driver training, and greater confidence and skill level among operators.

Discussion

The apparatus fleet of the two departments is diverse. Fire apparatus are categorized by function, including pumpers, water tenders, brush units and staff vehicles. While there is an identifiable need for vehicles from each category in more than one configuration, acquiring and maintaining standard apparatus creates desirable efficiencies.
The cash price of a pumper often exceeds $500,000. The reasons for such prices are due to the specialized nature of fire apparatus and new and evolving emissions standards. However, customization, add-ons, and options tend to make each fire apparatus a "one of a kind" vehicle.

Fire apparatus useful service life varies generally depending on the rate of use, the environment, operating conditions, and the frequency and level of preventive maintenance. A fire pumper with average to heavy use can reasonably be expected to have a 10 to 15-year service life. With light to very light use, as is experienced in Hermiston and Stanfield, service life can reach 20 years; very heavy use may reduce service life to as few as ten years.

Factors influencing fire apparatus service life include technology and economics. At a given time the cost to operate and maintain a fire apparatus passes the economics of rehabilitation, refurbishment, or replacement.

A trend is developing within the fire apparatus manufacturing industry. Several manufacturers now offer a line of stock fire apparatus built on custom chassis in addition to a more traditional line of fully custom units. The cost savings of purchasing a stock unit is often 20 percent or more when compared to a custom vehicle.

Safety should always be the main consideration when purchasing and operating emergency fire apparatus. When developing emergency fire apparatus specifications and operational procedures, NFPA and other industry standards should be used. Additional guidance on fire apparatus safety devices, response, and training can be found in the *Emergency Vehicle Safety Initiative*.\(^{56}\)

**Guidance**

- Assemble data on current department apparatus, including: age, mileage, operating hours, maintenance costs, cumulative down time, and annual test results. Use the information to create a single apparatus refurbishment/replacement plan and schedule.

- Determine the replacement interval and projected life expectancy of each apparatus.

- Examine the merits of extending the useful service life of apparatus through rehabilitation and refurbishment.

- Develop an emergency apparatus prescribed load list (standardized inventory) for use by both agencies.

• Mark apparatus in a standard format with striping, decals, and department name following NFPA standards and recommendations from the *Emergency Vehicle Safety Initiative*.\(^{57}\)

• Create Standard Operating Guidelines for the operation, maintenance, and recordkeeping of apparatus. A resource for obtaining sample documents may be found at the National Fire Service Library website.

• Outfit reserve apparatus with the same complement of equipment as frontline units.

**Fiscal Considerations**

• Time and effort savings by preparing fewer bid specifications.

• Effort avoided by conducting fewer bid processes.

• Investigate the letting of apparatus bids for periods longer than one year.

• Cost savings in acquiring emergency fire apparatus.

• Consider the purchase of stock versus custom apparatus.

• Consider leasing versus outright purchase of emergency apparatus.

Strategy T – Develop Uniform Fees for Service

Level of Cooperation
- Functional

Timeline for Completion
- Mid Term

Section
- Administration

Affected Stakeholders
- Both agencies

Objective
- Provide participating fire departments with a uniform schedule of fees for service.

Summary
Aside from ambulance transport fees, Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services and Stanfield Fire District both charge fees for services to a limited extent. Fees are charged for services to residents that do not live in the districts, in some instances, as well as for backyard burning ban responses and some event standby fees.

Fees are not levied for special standby charges or for out-of-district responses. Some departments will charge fees for non-routine services to recover costs due to extraordinary or unusual events. Examples include response to and standby for hazardous materials incidents and recurring false automatic alarms.

HFES has entered into service contracts that include a fee structure.

Discussion
The departments could charge fees for non-routine services to recover costs due to extraordinary or unusual events. Below is a description of representative fee types:

- Stand-by Charges – A fee charged for cost necessitated by a one-time or on-going need for general public safety. For example, a fire department may charge a stand-by fee to post a first aid crew at a local sports event.
- User Fee – A fee based on actual cost incurred for any service performed by a fire department where these costs require a recall of fire personnel above normal staffing.
- Charge for Service to Non-Tax Supporting Institutions – A fee for the total cost incurred by a fire department for service provided to any non-tax supporting institution.
• Plan Review Fee – A fee charged to review plans for multiple dwellings, commercial, manufacturing, or public assembly units. The fee can be based on a percentage of the total estimated construction cost per structure. This fee off-sets expenses incurred by a fire department during the planning phase of any development or construction.

• Fire Cause Determination Fee – A fee that recovers the fire department’s cost of providing service resulting from a violation of the Fire Code.

• Permit Fee – A charge for a fire department permit for special or short-term events.

There are good reasons for developing uniform fees for services; foremost of which is the reduced time, effort, and cost of developing independent fee schedules. Beyond duplicated effort and expense, however, a consistent fee schedule across the region creates a more coherent public service image to the citizens, cities served, businesses and taxpaying communities.

Critical Issues
• Fire agency partners should design a standardized procedure for billing. For example, the process may establish a collection policy for non-payment, billing cycle, recordkeeping, billing service allowance, and oversight rules for the program.

• The agencies should constantly review fees for service for improvements and to capture potential sources of new revenue that may become available.

Guidance
• Evaluate any existing fee for service schedules used by neighboring fire departments. If possible, use one as the basis for developing uniform fees for service.

• Evaluate whether all potential sources of revenue are included in the fees for service schedule.

• Format the fees for service schedule for adoption by each organization as a uniform fee.

Fiscal Considerations
• No significant financial considerations.
Findings and Recommendations

Having completed the analysis of current conditions present in the Stanfield Fire District and Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services and identifying the ways in which the two organizations can work more effectively together, ESCI is now armed with the information necessary to offer specific findings. Following the identified findings, a discussion of recommendations for how the departments should move forward is provided.

Findings

During this process, ESCI found that HFES and SFD had many characteristics that are found in progressive emergency service agencies. A listing of a few characteristics includes active and free flowing exchange of mutual aid resources and the recent steps that have been taken toward joint training. Much of the responsibility is directly related to the positive efforts and working relationship fostered by the current leadership. Fire Chief Pat Hart and Fire Chief Jim Whelan have created an atmosphere that is benefiting the public, the employees, the volunteer and paid on call members and the two organizations overall.

Based on evaluation of current conditions, fiscal analysis, and our experience with other projects of similar character and scope, we draw certain conclusions regarding Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services and Stanfield Fire District, the region, and the opportunities for collaboration. A summary of those findings follows.

- **HFES and SFD are Interdependent** – The fire districts serve adjacent areas and depend upon each other, along with neighboring departments, for mutual aid and automatic aid assistance during emergency incidents. As stand-alone fire departments, neither would be able to effectively combat a major fire or other incident without each other's assistance.

- **HFES and SFD Value Customer Service** – During the work leading to this report, both fire districts consistently demonstrated a focus toward serving those who live, work, and play in the area.

- **HFES and SFD Strive to Meet the Expectations of the Communities Served** – The agencies make considerable efforts to assure that they provide acceptable levels of service to their districts and the cities within them. Stakeholder interviews with the cities served by both districts indicated that expectations are generally being met.

- **Existing Partnerships Reduce Duplicated Effort And Can Be Further Developed** – HFES and SFD have eliminated some regional duplication through active interagency cooperation. Specifically, automatic/mutual aid practices are being implemented and a shared training program has been approached. However, the training effort is new and yet to be fully developed.

- **Both Organizations Share Common Administrative Needs** – Similar administrative needs were identified in both organizations, though to varying degrees.

- **Volunteer and Paid On Call Responders Play a Critical Role in Fire Protection** – Volunteer and paid on call firefighters are an essential part of both fire departments. HFES and SFD both maintain a roster of committed paid on call firefighters who are the sole source of response manpower in Stanfield and a critical component of response staffing in Hermiston. The need for paid on call firefighters in the fire departments will not be reduced or eliminated by any of the partnership opportunities detailed in this report. Rather, the intent of one option in particular is to administratively support and strengthen the volunteer program (See: Strategy J – Combine Volunteer and Paid On Call Recruitment and Training Programs for New Hires, page 196).

- **Other Organizations Should Be Included in Partnership Initiatives** – Organizations outside of HFES and SFD should be included when developing a partnership plan. With multiple fire departments serving adjacent boundaries, opportunities for cooperative service delivery and advantages of doing so present themselves. The districts should continue to reach out to Umatilla, Echo and other area fire districts to encourage consideration of working more closely together as partnering plans are developed.

- **The Umatilla County Region is Politically Diverse** – The varied geography and demography of the Umatilla County area influences where and how people choose to live. Consequently, the cities and unincorporated communities gain their political identity from the people who live in it and who participate in the governance of those areas. It is no surprise, therefore, that the culture and politics within individual communities of the area are as varied as the topography.

- **Cultural Differences Do Not Exist Between HFES and SFD** – Organizational culture is one of the most important factors impacting the success or failure of a cooperative effort. It is also, without question, the most difficult aspect to evaluate and it is challenging to predict the affect that differing internal cultures will have on the collaborative strategies.

For an integration of two organizations to be successful, the membership must share similar attitudes and outlooks on not only the delivery of emergency services, but also on how they view each other and each other’s organizations. ESCI often finds cultural differences between groups that are problematic to cooperative efforts. We are pleased to report, however, that these differences do not appear to be an issue in this case.

Maintenance of positive cultural interaction will be essential to the long range efforts to work together. Building and continuing good relationship is best accomplished, based on ESCI’s experience, on the training ground. This consideration has resulted in the multiple training related strategy recommendations herein.
• **A Consolidation of HFES and SFD has Local Political Support** – The governing bodies of HFES and SFD appear to be genuinely interested in improving the efficiency and quality of fire protection. Officials are open to virtually any suggestion of interagency collaboration that would maintain or improve service without an increase in the financial burden on the citizens. City government leadership was found to be open to the concepts as well.

• **HFES and SFD are Both Experiencing Financial Shortfalls** – In analyzing current and future financial forecast models, ESCI finds that both agencies are currently experiencing increasing costs at a pace that is not sustainable. To varying degrees, expenditures are already in excess of available revenues and are projected to worsen in the near future.

• **HFES and SFD Policymakers Should Develop a Plan to Implement Partnership Opportunities** – Fire district administrators and staff have created a foundation for partnerships by conducting this study. Without a clear commitment from policymakers, progress on valuable initiatives may eventually falter. HFES and SFD decision makers will need to adopt a plan to move ahead with aligning the processes, services, and operations of the fire departments wherever possible.

• **Opportunities Exist for Cost Avoidance** – An ability to reduce duplication and/or increase efficiency exists for the two fire departments. Such opportunities include savings as a result of standardized specifications for fire equipment, the creation of a joint fire training division, administrative services, and sharing of other resources and unified programs. However, the opportunities present only modest savings but offer increased efficiency.

• **Most Aspects of Administrative, Functional and Operational Consolidation of HFES and SFD Are Feasible** – HFES and SFD should share management resources. An agreement would result in reduced duplication and increased efficiency at the administrative level. In time, extending the agreement to merge additional organizational aspects of the fire districts can be expected to reduce the complexity of managing two independent organizations, and enhance the ability of the agencies to plan and manage fire and emergency medical service in the region. Some cost savings will be realized, though limited.

• **Legal Merger or Consolidation of the Districts is Feasible Only If Accompanied By Increased Tax Revenue** – The two districts can merge into a single entity, or dissolve both agencies and form a new, consolidated, fire district. Efficiencies exist in doing so; however, the approach does not provide a sustainable level of funding moving forward without an associated increase in tax revenue, specifically to the citizens of the Hermiston Fire District.

• **All Other Cooperative Opportunities are Feasible** – Without exception, all other identified General Partnering Strategies are feasible.
Strategic Recommendations

It is common for those in the fire service to tout themselves or their department in terms such as “a pride-driven organization that is at their best every day,” and “the best by test,” or more simply, “the best.” The true mark of quality of the best fire departments however, is those that work continuously for measurable improvement in organizational performance. By undertaking this study of collaborative opportunities, the leadership (directors and administrations) of HFES and SFD have begun the task of organizational and system evaluation that is necessary to plan for and reach the goal of truly being the best.

“Success is peace of mind, a direct result of self-satisfaction in knowing that you did your best to become the best that you are capable of becoming” — John Wooden

We intend no suggestion that HFES and SFD are not already operating at a high level. In fact, they do a good job with limited resources. However, areas of needed improvement have been identified. In keeping with the notion of continuous improvement wherein an unending loop of performance, measurement, and evaluation leads to important system enhancements, we offer recommendations to assist the chiefs and boards to implement the collaborative strategies that will best benefit the citizens served by Hermiston and Stanfield.

The success of adopting and implementing cooperative opportunities depends on many things. In our experience with dozens of functional, operational, and legal unifications, leadership is the single factor that most frequently determines success. Nearly always, a key staff member, internal or external advocate, or board member champions the concept garnering the support of the various affected groups (political, member, and community). Strong leadership fosters an organizational culture receptive to planning, calculated risk taking, and flexibility.

The manner in which leaders promote a trusting relationship between all groups and aid two-way communication between them is essential. From these issues, research by Kohm, Piana, and Gowdy identifies five factors that most often seem to contribute to the successful implementation of a partnership or consolidation:

- A leadership that believes strongly in the partnership and demonstrates this belief, often by acting selflessly to maintain it.

---

Multiple forms of communication to keep all persons (governing board, staff, members, and community) up to date about plans, problems, and benefits concerning the partnership.

Face-to-face communications with partner organizations in the form of meetings, training, and other forums to build trust and understanding among staff.

Flexibility through an expectation that even in the best-planned partnership unforeseen issues will arise, mistakes will be made, and alternative paths will be identified.

Early evidence of benefit to assure everyone that they are on the right track, such as better or less expensive employee benefits or improved facilities.

Kohm, Piana, and Gowdy term the establishment of an ongoing relationship between two or more independent organizations as strategic restructuring. The relationship is generally created to increase the administrative efficiency and/or further the programmatic mission of one or more of the participating agencies through shared, transferred, or combined services, resources, or programs. Restructuring may be thought of as a continuum that ranges from jointly managed programs (such as automatic aid agreements) to complete organizational merger.

Moving Forward

Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services and Stanfield Fire District should promptly and systematically implement as many of the feasible General Partnering Strategies as they find to be appropriate and achievable. The initiatives may be implemented independently of the listed Overarching Strategies, or may be viewed as in incremental approach to accomplishing one of the more broadly based options.

It is important that the respective boards of directors exercise assertive management of the process, but it is also important that decision makers refrain from getting bogged down by bureaucracy. Long-term success of many of the initiatives may depend on short-term evidence of improvement and benefit. Consequently, the use of an oversight board or steering committee is recommended to assure that the process moves forward without delay.

Establish an Oversight Board to Plan and Manage the Implementation of Feasible General Partnering Strategies – We recommend that the HFES and SFD empanel an oversight board comprised of agency representatives and other affected parties, including labor, volunteer groups and the cities of Hermiston and Stanfield. The group should assume responsibility for prioritizing, and determining the sequential order for implementation of all feasible collaborative opportunities. The oversight board should have the authority and accountability to initiate all opportunities within established budgetary and governance limitations.
The following recommendations are judged as being most likely to result in significant improvement to systems and/or programs. These initiatives should be acted on regardless of action on the remaining General Partnering Strategies and Overarching Strategies:

- **Strategy A** – Enhanced Implementation of Mutual and Automatic Aid, page 170
- **Strategy C** – Develop a Joint Fire Prevention and Code Enforcement Program, page 178
- **Strategy F** – Develop Uniform Pre-Incident Plans, page 185
- **Strategy G** – Conduct Joint Strategic Planning, page 188
- **Strategy H** – Develop Common Standard Operating Guidelines, page 190
- **Strategy J** – Combine Volunteer and Paid On Call Recruitment and Training Programs for New Hires, page 196
- **Strategy L** – Consolidate Training into a Single Training Program, page 201
- **Strategy M** – Implement a Common Training Records Management System, page 204
- **Strategy N** – Develop Mutual Training Strategies, page 206
- **Strategy O** – Develop an Annual Shared Training Plan, page 209
- **Strategy P** – Develop and Adopt Training Standards, page 212
- **Strategy Q** – Create a Shared Training Manual, page 214
- **Strategy R** – Develop a Shared Fire and EMS Training Facility, page 217

**Overarching Recommendation**

Implementation of the General Partnering Opportunities as recommended above addresses a myriad of the administrative, support and operational challenges identified in the course of this study. Pursuit of the recommended strategies begins the process of collaboration and is an important first step. However, it is not a final solution.

The Partnering Strategies also provide some financial advantages in the form of future cost avoidance. Cost savings, however, are not large. What is gained is improved efficiency and streamlining of operations.

The long-range financial outlook in both agencies is poor. Both agencies are currently seeing expenditures that are in excess of available revenues. Expenditures in HFES are forecast to exceed revenues by $1.1 million by 2017 and SFD is projected to exceed its revenues by 43
percent in the same time period. While it is likely that the districts will curtail future spending to align with available funding, the projections make the agency’s financial challenges clear.

Given the financial projections, the districts will soon be forced to find an alternative approach. One option, which should always be considered, is to modify how services are provided in order to align them with available funding. In the case of SFD, there are few ways to reduce service delivery, if any. In HFES, a reduction would most likely have to be in the form of discontinuing the provision of ambulance transport services which would be a difficult challenge, at best.

If service delivery adjustments options are not implemented, the only remaining alternative is to increase financial resources. As independent agencies, options that exist for increasing revenues include but are not limited to:

- Requesting voter approval of a local option levy for operations
  - An operations levy would be limited to a term of five years
- Requesting voter approval of a local option levy for capital purchases (bonds)
  - A bond levy would be limited to a term of ten years
- Aggressive pursuit of grant and foundation funding
  - The small community of Cascade Locks, Oregon recently funded 90 percent of the cost of a new fire station with grant and foundation financing from the Ford Foundation, Providence Medical Center, Hood River Lion’s club and a number of others. The agencies should look beyond the typical funding sources like DHS to foundations and large corporations for assistance.
- Increase or expand fees for services, where viable
- Investigate options for financial support of HFES EMS transport services
  - The Ambulance Service Area served by HFES includes a large geographic area that results in considerable workload, for which no baseline funding is received other than transport fees. Oregon statutes do not provide for the formation of EMS districts; however one alternative to consider is the formation of a Health District, specified for the purpose of providing ambulance transport. Analysis of the alternative is beyond the scope of this study, however the option warrants consideration. A similar approach is used in neighboring Morrow County.

Merger or consolidation of HFES and SFD, in and of itself, does not solve the financial challenges at funding levels similar to what they are currently. ESCI views a merger or consolidation as feasible, but only if the initiative includes an increase in tax rates to Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services taxpayers. An integration of the two should be considered. An
additional consideration should be the inclusion of the Umatilla Rural Fire Protection District in the formation of a new organization. Getting to that end, however, will need to be accomplished incrementally if it is going to succeed.

ESCI recommends that Overarching Strategy 3 – Functional Consolidation, and Overarching Strategy 4 – Operational Consolidation be viewed as the first course of action as follows:

1. *Prioritize the development of common Standard Operating Guidelines on a cooperative basis between both districts:* This is a need that exists in both organizations and is an essential step in the interest of firefighter safety and fire ground effectiveness. Because both organizations have the same need, it is a logical area for collaborative efforts.

   The SOG manual details how various fire ground functions are to be performed, assuring that all players on the emergency scene are working from the same play book. SOGs must be incorporated continually into departmental training activities and the ways in which certain tasks are performed, based on the SOGs, should become second nature to on-scene personnel.

2. *Continue to combine training programs:* The strategies listed with regard to the merger of training programs should be implemented, maintaining the momentum already achieved by the recent joint training efforts. Any weaknesses identified with regard to the training programs will best be addressed by bringing the two together, adopting shared practices and standards and, perhaps most importantly, getting the members working together on a regular basis.

3. *Combine Fire Prevention and Public Education efforts:* The HFES Fire Prevention and Public Education is robust and effective. SFD is only able to address prevention and education on a limited basis due to staffing limitations. Extending HFES services in these area to include SFD will prove to be in the best interest of both agencies in that it will reduce the risk of fire incidents overall.

4. *Consolidate Administrative Services:* Strategy K – Combine Administrative Services provides the opportunity to streamline some administrative functions and gain efficiencies. As the two districts work more closely together at the administrative level, further opportunities to blend reporting, record keeping and associated administrative tasks will be realized.

5. *Merge the agencies’ Volunteer and Paid On Call recruiting and training activities:* Multiple advantages may be realized by developing a common program via which Hermiston and Stanfield recruit new members and train them as discussed in detail in Strategy J – Combine Volunteer and Paid On Call Recruitment and Training Programs for New Hires. These undertakings can be combined and the result will be reduced work load and overall efficiency. The need is common to both organizations.

6. *Establish Shared Capital Replacement Planning:* The primary gain that will be realized by combining efforts to plan for future capital replacement is the opportunity to retain fewer pieces of reserve fire apparatus by sharing reserve vehicles, as explained in Strategy S – Develop a Single Apparatus Refurbishment/Replacement Plan. Both
districts are currently under-funded with regard to future vehicle replacement so any efforts to reduce costs in this area will be valuable.

While the above steps are being completed, Hermiston and Stanfield should be actively evaluate their ability to fully combine the organizations. Recognizing that a merger or consolidation will require voter approval for an adjustment in tax rates, a plan and process for educating the electorate of the need to do so should be implemented well in advance. Completing the above initiatives will take time to accomplish. As time passes, the current conditions of expenditures exceeding revenues will further deteriorate. Plans need to be made to achieve immediately to implement the first steps toward a long term, sustainable, solution.
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## Appendix C: Summary Table of Recommended Actions (Current Conditions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both agencies: Develop a written statement that defines the role, responsibility,</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and authority of the Board of Directors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both agencies: The respective Boards of Directors should complete an annual,</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written performance evaluation of the fire chief.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD: Create a policy statement that defines the role, responsibilities, and</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authority of the fire chief.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both agencies: Establish a practice of regularly scheduled review of agency rules</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and regulations to ensure conformity with legal and organizational changes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD: Post board meeting minutes in the station to establish increased transparency</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the organization and public.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both agencies: Establish job descriptions for all positions in the organization.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further, consider reviewing and updating job descriptions together, aligning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>functions where possible, and facilitating future integration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both agencies: Schedule a review of job descriptions.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD: Maintain a written history of the organization.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFES: Revise incident reporting practices to eliminate potential duplication of</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD: Review and update the district’s mission statement collaboratively with all</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members. Seek adoption of the document by the Board of Directors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD: Publicly display the organization’s mission statement.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both agencies: Schedule a review of the organization’s mission statement every year.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD: Adopt organizational guiding principles or values for all personnel.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD: Undertake a strategic planning process including the development of a</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statement of organizational vision and core values.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both agencies: As a component of the strategic planning process, define agency</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goals and objectives, review annually, and tie to performance measures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both agencies: Establish a defined code of ethics for the organization.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD: Provide training on the district’s <em>Policy and Guideline Manual</em> and require</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>review by all members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both agencies: Develop a practice of annually identifying and recording current</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical issues facing the organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both agencies: Periodically identify organizational challenges.</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both agencies: Consider formation of citizen advisory committees if this feasibility</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effort is to move forward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both agencies: Establish a written citizen complaint process.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both agencies: Establish a defined process for making complex organizational</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both agencies: Initiate a formal process for the request and release of public</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>records consistent with state law.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD: Establish a process to back up computer files on off-site data storage for</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both agencies: Conduct testing of breathing air on a quarterly basis per NFPA Standards.…..28
HFES: Reduce the amount of petty cash kept on hand...................................................29
HFES: Verify that current practices are consistent with state statute..................................29
HFES: Consider adopting a fee schedule for fire and life safety plan reviews.......................31
SFD: Establish a defined vehicle replacement schedule and funding plan...........................36
Both agencies: Work with the dispatch centers to establish pre-designated response protocols based on incident type to increase emergency dispatch effectiveness............................36
Both agencies: Establish service delivery objectives and performance measures..................37
Both agencies: Establish an annual planning process, institutionalized in writing, incorporating involvement of both internal and external customers.................................................................37
Both agencies: Assert a higher degree of involvement in emergency planning activities........38
Both agencies: During development and revision, consider aligning policy and procedure between both districts for consistency.................................................................41
HFES: Consider the implementation of a LOSAP program to enhance volunteer retention.....41
Both agencies: Assure that a clearly defined disciplinary policy and procedural guideline are in place.........................................................................................................................43
SFD: Awareness of disciplinary policy is limited. Take steps to communicate the agency’s disciplinary practices......................................................................................................................43
Both agencies: Initiate an externally contracted Employee Assistance Program for all career and Paid On Call members .....................................................................................................................43
SFD: Establish a more comprehensive process for new volunteer applicants......................44
Both agencies: Assure that physical competence is evaluated annually and/or incorporated into the annual skills evaluation process.........................................................44
Both agencies: Provide responders with annual medical evaluation in compliance with standards and requirements.................................................................45
SFD: Establish a practice for training new recruits. Doing so in partnership with HFES is appropriate.................................................................53
SFD: Set annual goals and objectives for the district’s training program.................................54
Both agencies: Continue efforts to develop a regional training facility..................................55
Both agencies: Develop a training manual that identifies training procedures and details program content as a reference for instructors.................................................................55
Both agencies: To the extent feasible, strive to align volunteer and paid on call annual training hours requirements to those applied to career personnel.................................................................55
Both agencies: Establish a practice of training with all agencies with which mutual aid is exchanged.................................................................................................................................56
SFD: Establish some form of annual physical ability evaluation on all personnel........................56
Both agencies: Conduct annual skills performance assessment on all personnel....................56
Both agencies: Establish an officer development program to cultivate future leadership........57
Both agencies: As a regional effort, seek grant funding to further develop and complete the planned training ground at Station 3.

Both agencies: Pursue the highest achievable level of engagement in the plan review process.

SFD: Take steps to accomplish fire and life safety inspections of occupancies not inspected by the State Fire Marshal.

SFD: Complete pre-incident plans on all target hazard occupancies.

Both agencies: Consider a self-inspection program for low risk occupancies.

Future consideration to the use of a single dispatch center for the Hermiston and Stanfield Fire Districts is recommended.

SFD: Establish and fund an apparatus replacement plan.

HFES: Establish a funding plan for the apparatus replacement schedule.

HFES: Closely monitor Unit Hour Utilization levels for adverse impacts on response performance.

SFD: Include individual apparatus times as part of the NFIRS data reported to the Oregon State Fire Marshal.

Any new iteration of the agencies should work to maintain or expand current sources of revenue.
Appendix D: Tax Compression Analysis and Discussion

Tax Compression Impact on Special District Formation

Is there currently an impact in Umatilla County from tax compression on the revenue of existing taxing districts, and what impacts would a new taxing district have? If the question of a new fire district or merger of existing districts is presented to voters and approval is gained to form a new taxing district, will there be enough head room with tax compression? The short answer is—it depends. If the tax levies of the combined general government taxing districts exceed $10 per $1,000 on any tax lot then, yes, there would be an impact.

To understand the current structure of Oregon’s property tax system and tax compression it is helpful to view the system in a historical context. Although governments in Oregon began taxing property before statehood, the structure of the tax changed very little until the 1990s, when two statewide ballot measures dramatically altered the system. To understand how property tax limits might affect property tax revenue, a brief history of property tax limitation in Oregon is necessary.

Property Taxes Pre Measure 5

Oregon had a pure levy-based property tax system until 1991 – 1992. Each taxing district calculated its own tax levy based on its budget needs. County assessors estimated the real market values of all property in the state. Generally speaking, the full market value of property was taxable; there was no separate definition of assessed value. The levy for each taxing district was then divided by the total RMV (real market value) in the district to arrive at a district tax rate. The taxes each district imposed equaled its tax rate multiplied by its RMV. Consequently, there was no difference between imposed taxes and tax levies under this system. Most levies were constitutionally limited to an annual growth rate of six percent, and levies that would increase by more than six percent required voter approval.

Property Taxes Measure 5

The first property tax limitation was Ballot Measure 5, a landmark piece of legislation, passed by Oregon voters in 1990. Measure 5 was an amendment to the Oregon Constitution (Article XI, Section 11) and established limits on Oregon’s property taxes on real estate.

---

59 A Brief History of Oregon Property Taxation, Oregon Department of Revenue, 150-303-405-1 (Rev. 6-09).
Measure 5 introduced limits on the taxes paid by individual properties beginning in 1991 – 1992. The limits of $5 per $1,000 RMV (real market value) for school taxes and $10 per $1,000 RMV for general government taxes apply only to operating taxes, not bonds. If either a school or general government tax exceeds its limit, then each corresponding taxing district had its tax rate reduced proportionately until the tax limit is reached. This reduction in taxes is called “compression.”

Measure 5 resulted in a system that is a hybrid of levy-based and rate-based systems. For properties where school and general government taxes are below the limits, the process resembles a levy-based system; taxes imposed depend on levies. For properties where calculated taxes exceed the limits, and hence the tax rates are fixed at the limits, the process more closely resembles a rate-based system because the taxes imposed depended on assessed values.

**Property Taxes Measure 50**

The 1997 Oregon Legislature drafted Measure 50 in response to the passage of citizens’ initiative Measure 47 in November 1996. Measure 47 would have rolled back property taxes (not assessed values) to 90 percent of the 1995 - 1996 level for each property in the state. Measure 50 repealed Measure 47. This legislatively referred measure was drafted to correct a number of technical problems with Measure 47 while replicating its tax cuts.

The objective of Measure 50 was to reduce property taxes in 1997 – 1998 and to control their future growth. It achieved these goals by cutting the 1997 – 1998 district tax levies and by making three changes: switching to permanent rates, reducing AVs (assessed value), and limiting annual growth of AV.

While Measure 5 simply limited the tax rates used to calculate taxes imposed, Measure 50 changed the concepts of both AVs and tax rates. AV is no longer equal to RMV. For 1997 - 1998, the AV of every property was reduced to 90 percent of its 1995 – 1996 AV. Because growth in value has not been uniform throughout the state, this change has had varying impacts. Properties that had experienced the greatest value growth between 1995 – 1996 and
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60 The limit for school taxes was $15 per $1,000 assessed value in 1991-92. It was reduced by $2.50 each year until it reached a rate of $5 per $1,000 assessed value in 1995-96.

61 In 1995 – 1996, AV and RMV were equal.
1997 – 1998 received the greatest cuts in AV and, consequently, in taxes. For new properties that did not exist in 1995 – 1996, such as business personal property or improvements, the AV is calculated as a percentage of its RMV.

For existing property, Measure 50 limits the annual growth in assessed value to three percent. This limitation made predicting future AVs much simpler. For new property (e.g., newly constructed homes), assessed value is calculated by multiplying the new property’s RMV by the ratio of AV to RMV of similar property. This approach to assigning values to a new property assures that it is taxed consistently with similar existing properties. Measure 50 also stipulates that AV may not exceed RMV. As a result, if the RMV of a property falls below its AV, the taxable value is set at the RMV.

Before Measure 50, local governments and voters set levies, and tax rates were the result of dividing levies by AV. Under Measure 50, permanent tax rates replaced most levies, making the permanent rates central to the property tax system. There are three types of property taxes that taxing districts may impose: taxes from the permanent rates, local option levies, and bond levies. Only the permanent rates are fixed. Bond levies typically are approved in terms of dollars and the rates are calculated as the total levy divided by the AV in the district. Local option levies may be approved either in rate or dollar terms. If a local option levy is in dollar terms, then rates are calculated the same way as for bond levy rates.

1997 – 1998 Compression of Consolidated Levy Rates
Compression is the process used to reduce property taxes to the Measure 5 limits. Prior to Measure 5, compression did not exist. Reductions in taxes due to compression are the difference between what taxing districts wish to raise through property taxes (tax extended) and the amount they actually raise (tax imposed).

The following language—found in ORS (Oregon Revised Statutes) 310.242—explains the process for calculating levy rates under tax compression.

(1) For each property, the assessor shall adjust the pre-compression consolidated rates for each category determined under ORS 310.236 (Determination of taxing district 1997-1998 operating taxes and permanent and statutory rate limits for tax years after 1997-1998) including any special levy under ORS 310.240 (Calculation of taxes imposed on urban renewal increment for 1997-1998) (5) (and as further modified by ORS 310.234 (Nonschool taxing district 1997-1998 operating tax adjustment for timber offsets)) to be rates per $1,000 of real market value.
(2) The assessor shall compare the pre-compression consolidated rates for each category as modified under subsection (1) of this section with the rate of $5 per $1,000 of real market value of the property for the public school system category and $10 per $1,000 of real market value of the property for the other government operations category.

(3) If a pre-compression consolidated category rate for a property, as modified under subsection (1) of this section, exceeds the $5 or $10 per $1,000 category rate limits set forth in subsection (2) of this section (whichever is applicable), the consolidated category rate shall be compressed as provided in subsection (4) or (5) of this section.

(4)(a) If local option taxes in the category for which compression is being determined have been adopted by one or more taxing districts that impose taxes on the property, the reduction ratio shall be calculated under this subsection and applied only to the local option taxes imposed on the property.

(b) The numerator of the reduction ratio shall be the amount obtained, but not less than zero, by subtracting the property’s pre-compression consolidated category rate of ad valorem property taxes that are not local option taxes from the maximum rate of ad valorem property taxes for the category.

(c) The denominator for the reduction ratio shall be the total rate of all local option taxes for the category.

(d) The assessor shall multiply the reduction ratio determined under this subsection by the rate of each local option tax in the category to which the property is subject. After reduction, the assessor shall recompute:

(A) The rates per $1,000 of assessed value for the property;
(B) The total amount of local option taxes to be raised in the code area; and
(C) The local option tax rates per $1,000 of assessed value for the code area and incorporate those rates into the consolidated rate for the code area.

(5)(a) If no local option taxes have been adopted by a taxing district in the category in the code area or if all local option taxes have been eliminated as a result of application of the reduction ratio calculated under subsection (4) of this section, and the pre-compression consolidated category rate as modified under subsection (1) of this section or following further adjustment under subsection (4) of this section exceeds the $5 or $10 per $1,000 category rate limits set forth in subsection (2) of this section (whichever is applicable), the reduction ratio shall be determined under this subsection.

(b) The numerator of the reduction ratio shall be the maximum rate permitted for the category.

(c) The denominator of the reduction ratio shall be the pre-compression consolidated category rate as modified under subsection (1) of this section or following further adjustment under subsection (4) of this section, if applicable.

(d) The assessor shall multiply the reduction ratio determined under this subsection by each taxing district item of ad valorem property tax that is a component of the consolidated category rate for the code area. The sum of the rates so reduced within the category shall
be the consolidated rate for the category for the property. After reduction, the assessor shall recompute:

(A) The rates per $1,000 of assessed value for the property;
(B) The total amount of local option taxes to be raised in the code area; and
(C) The total amount of taxes in each category to be raised in the code area. [1997 c.541 §35]

*Property Taxes and Urban Renewal Agency Revenue*

Another wrinkle in an already complex calculation for property taxes and possible limitation is for URAs (urban renewal agency). URAs receive the bulk of their revenues through a tax increment financing mechanism. When an urban renewal plan is created, the assessed value of the property within its boundaries is locked in time or frozen at the amount calculated from the last certified tax roll prior to the plan’s approval. The agency then raises revenue in subsequent years from any value growth above the frozen amount; this value growth is referred to as the increment. The tax rate used to calculate taxes imposed for the urban renewal plan is the consolidated tax rate for the taxing districts within the geographic boundaries of the plan. These urban renewal taxes, referred to as “tax off the increment”, are calculated as the consolidated tax rate multiplied by the value of the increment.

*Property Taxes and Urban Renewal Agency Revenue Pre-Measure 5*

Before Measure 5, urban renewal agencies received taxes that would have been imposed by each taxing district on the excess value of property within each urban renewal plan area (an agency can have more than one plan area). Technically, only the properties within the urban renewal plan area paid taxes to the urban renewal agency. However, all taxpayers in taxing districts overlapping the plan area paid urban renewal taxes because the removal of urban renewal excess value from the tax rate calculation caused tax rates to be slightly higher for everyone in the taxing district.

*Property Taxes and Urban Renewal Agency Revenue Measure 5*

The legislation passed to implement Measure 5 made a number of changes to tax increment financing in URAs to avoid potential inequities among taxpayers. If Measure 5 tax limits had been imposed under the old urban renewal system where only properties inside the plan areas paid urban renewal taxes, those properties could have paid taxes that were dramatically
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differed from surrounding properties’ taxes. If an agency used its revenue to finance bonds outside the limits, the properties in the plan area could pay far higher taxes than similar properties outside the plan area. Likewise, if the agency used the revenue for non-bond purposes, then properties inside the plan area would have relatively more of their taxes subject to the Measure 5 rate limits and could pay far lower taxes than similar properties outside the plan area.

**Property Taxes and Urban Renewal Agency Revenue Measure 50**

Measure 50 returned the structure of urban renewal financing to the same form it had prior to Measure 5, with one exception. Urban renewal agencies do not have permanent rates and continue to raise revenue primarily through tax increment financing. Under certain circumstances, urban renewal agencies were allowed to raise additional revenue, beyond what they raised from their increment, via special levies. Starting in 1997 – 1998, if an existing urban renewal plan received less revenue from its increment under Measure 50 than what it would have received under the pre-Measure 50 tax system, the agency could impose a special levy to make up the difference. The special levy is imposed on all properties within the boundaries of the urban renewal agency (either a city or a county), not just on properties in the plan area. New plan areas (established after 1996) receive tax increment financing revenue only; the agency may not impose a special levy for new plan areas.

The second new change in 2002 – 2003 resulted from the court case, *Shilo Inn vs. Multnomah County*, and clarified that all urban renewal revenues must be considered in the general government category for the purpose of meeting the constitutional tax limitations, regardless of what type of district was the source of the division of tax revenue. Previously, the tax reduction to meet the constitutional limitations was calculated based on the type of district the division of tax came from. If a school district had faced division of tax, the amount of tax divided for urban renewal was reduced with the other education category taxes at the $5 per $1,000 limit. The court case changed this so the division of tax from the school district would be grouped with all other general government revenue for testing against the $10 per $1,000 general government limit.

**Property Taxes and Urban Renewal Agency Revenue Measure 50: After 2001 – 2002**

Two substantial changes took effect in 2002 – 2003. One was a result of new legislation in the 2001 legislative session: Oregon House Bill 3215. This established that certain plan areas
could not divide taxes from local option or bond levies that were passed by voters after October 6, 2001. These plan areas are either option 1 or option 2 plans, or are new plans that were adopted after October 6, 2001. All other plan areas adopted before October 6, 2001, divide taxes from local option and bond levies like in the past, without regard to when the voters approved the levies.

Property Tax Relief
During the past 30 years, the Oregon Legislature has created six property tax relief programs. Currently, only two of these programs remain: the Elderly Rental Assistance (ERA) and the Homestead Deferral programs. The two programs include property tax deferral for seniors (62 years and older) and disabled homeowners, and a special assessment deferral program for seniors.

Impact of Tax Limitation
What do the tax limitations mean for taxing districts?

- Measure 5 limits depend on the type of taxes
  - Subject to limit – permanent rate, local option, gap bond, pension levy, urban renewal plan taxes
  - Not subject to limit – bond levies for capital construction

ESCI calculated that there are 11 taxing code areas in Umatilla that exceed the $10 levy limit for general government. Three of them are within the City of Hermiston and eight in other municipalities that do not impact HFES or SFD. The general government levy for the three code areas, total levy amount and AV are shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Area</th>
<th>Total All Levies</th>
<th>AV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>10.8455</td>
<td>734,683,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>811</td>
<td>11.7081</td>
<td>56,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6112</td>
<td>10.8503</td>
<td>48,398,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total AV</strong></td>
<td><strong>783,138,675</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taxing districts in Umatilla County were unable to collect a total of $1,998,000 in voter authorized revenue because of tax compression in tax year 2011 – 2012. HFES was unable to collect $26,000 of voter authorized revenue in tax year 2011 – 2012 and $16,000 in tax year 2010 – 2011 because of tax compression. Properties in tax compression are all located within

the city limits of Hermiston. No properties in the District outside of Hermiston are in compression. Approximately 45 percent of HFES AV is for property in Hermiston.

**Summary of the Effects of Tax Compression on a New Special District**

With some properties in the Umatilla County general fund taxing districts already experiencing tax compression, adding or increasing a levy would have the net effect of reducing revenue proportionally on all local option taxes. Since each property (tax lot) is calculated individually, it is impossible to determine precisely how many new construction or additional existing properties would be in tax compression until the tax roll is completed each year.

ESCI recommends that a levy rate for a merged fire district be determined that would allow for long-term sustainable operation. Once a sustainable levy rate is determined, the current cost for operations can be compared to the cost projection.
## Appendix E: Summary Table of Stakeholder Interviews

### Stakeholder Interview Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Affiliation or Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Internal, Hermiston Fire and Emergency Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Pat Hart</td>
<td>1/17/12</td>
<td>HFES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Matt Fisher/Corey Gorham</td>
<td>1/17/12</td>
<td>HFES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Board of Directors</td>
<td>1/17/12</td>
<td>HFES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. HFES Paid on Call group</td>
<td>1/17/12</td>
<td>HFES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Scott Stanton</td>
<td>1/17/12</td>
<td>HFES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tom Bohm</td>
<td>1/17/12</td>
<td>HFES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Internal, Stanfield Fire District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Jim Whelan</td>
<td>1/16/12</td>
<td>SFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gene Jorgenson</td>
<td>1/16/12</td>
<td>SFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dean Marcum</td>
<td>1/16/12</td>
<td>SFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Board of Directors</td>
<td>1/16/12</td>
<td>SFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Eldon Marcum</td>
<td>1/16/12</td>
<td>SFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Stanfield Volunteers</td>
<td>1/17/12</td>
<td>SFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. External</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Marc Rogelstad</td>
<td>1/17/12</td>
<td>Boardman Fire Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ed Brookshier</td>
<td>1/17/12</td>
<td>City of Hermiston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mike Roxbury</td>
<td>1/17/12</td>
<td>Umatilla Fire District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Jason Edmiston</td>
<td>1/17/12</td>
<td>Hermiston Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Scott Pingel</td>
<td>1/18/12</td>
<td>City of Stanfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>