

City of Marysville, City of Arlington and Fire District 12

RFA Planning Committee Meeting

July 27, 2017

5:00 – 7:00 PM

Arlington Council Chambers

Meeting objectives: Share results of individual council and commission deliberations and decide whether to proceed, review outline of next phase of work; receive informational briefing about levels of service today and if an RFA is implemented

Proposed Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions (5 min.) Mayor Nehring and Mayor Tolbert
2. Review of Agenda; and Goals for meeting; approval of agenda (3 min.) Mayors
3. Approval of Meeting Summary of June 26 (3 min.) Mayors
4. Discussion: Council and Commission Meetings Deliberations on whether to proceed discussion (45 min.) Karen Reed
 - Each agency will be asked to have a representative make a summary presentation of their deliberations; written statements to be circulated in advance
 - Questions/Comments about agency positions
 - Process issues
5. **Action Item:** Does the Planning Committee agree to continue to work through the remainder of 2017 to explore the feasibility and advisability of an RFA encompassing all three jurisdictions that will provide the same or better levels of service to the public, and to explore the terms and conditions under which such an RFA should be proposed? (10 min.)
6. Discussion: Developing a Statement of Shared Values and Principles (25 min.) Karen
7. Outline of proposed approach for the next phase of effort (August – December) (15 min.) Karen
8. Time permitting: Measuring Current Levels of Service (LOS), and anticipated immediate changes in LOS if an RFA were created (25 min.) Chiefs
9. Next steps / Next meeting
10. Adjourn

Marysville / Arlington / FPD 12 Regional Fire Authority Committee

Meeting

Marysville City Council Chambers

June 29, 2017

5:00 p.m.

Welcome and Introductions

Mayor Nehring called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m. and invited everyone to introduce themselves.

Marysville Mayor:	Jon Nehring
Marysville City Council:	Steve Muller, Jeff Vaughan, Jeff Seibert
Marysville CAO:	Gloria Hirashima
Marysville Finance Director:	Sandy Langdon
MFD Finance Manager:	Chelsie McInnis
Arlington Mayor:	Barbara Tolbert
Arlington City Admin.:	Paul Ellis
Arlington Finance Director:	Kristin Garcia
Arlington City Council:	Marilyn Oertle, Chris Raezer, Jesica Stickles
Marysville Fire Dist:	Tonya Christoffersen
Marysville Fire Chief:	Martin McFalls
Arlington Fire Chief:	Bruce Stedman
Marysville Alternate CM:	Kamille Norton
Facilitator/Consultant:	Karen Reed

Review of Agenda and Goals

Marysville Mayor Nehring reviewed the agenda. He noted that all councilmembers from both cities were invited to this meeting because it is such an information-heavy agenda.

Interview Results and Discussion

Consultant Karen Reed thanked everyone for filling out a survey. She reviewed the results of the surveys as outlined in the packet distributed prior to the meeting and available on the RFA website. She summarized that, overall, there are a few strong

supporters of this on both city councils, a few people who are fairly opposed to it, and a majority of councilmembers who appear to be looking for more information before they can make a decision. The three fire commissioners from Fire District 12 were more supportive, but still also had concerns and questions about the process and what the outcome might be. There are a lot of questions still on the table. After this meeting her recommendation is that they each go back to their respective jurisdictions, have a discussion in the next month, and reconvene in late July to make a decision about whether they want to move forward together on a plan.

Ms. Reed continued to report that most people felt that the public supports the fire and EMS services they receive and perceive those as good services. Many people observe that the public doesn't know the challenges in delivering that service. The most highly rated idea was the goal of securing a sustainable model for affordable fire and EMS service delivery. The catch is determining what is affordable and what is sustainable. This will be a discussion to work through. Everybody, except one person, placed a strong value on securing opportunities for efficiencies if they move ahead with an RFA. Most of the city-elected officials expressed concern that the efficiencies and cost-savings have not been demonstrated to date to their satisfaction.

Developing a sustainable model for affordable service delivery received the highest score for motivation by everyone that responded. Other important values were: improving service levels and stabilizing service levels through funding over time. Marysville folks did not express concern about the pressure on the City's General Fund, but they did express concern that the current situation was not a sustainable financial situation. In contrast, Arlington expressed a notably stronger concern about the pressure on the City's General Fund. In terms of opportunities for efficiency, pretty much everyone thought it was important to get service efficiencies through regionalization. In terms of governance, most people felt that an equitable structure to the governance board was important. There was no consensus over the issue of local control over fire.

Regarding the overall level of support for creating an RFA, Arlington folks appear to be a little more skeptical of the RFA than the Marysville folks. This may be because the Marysville folks have been at this a little longer in discussions with the District. District 12 commissioners are strong supporters of the RFA, but raised some concerns about the process and potential outcomes. She stressed that she spoke with the fire chiefs several times over the last month. Both fire chiefs strongly support the RFA. They believe it can deliver immediate service level improvements, and over time it will provide a lot of cost avoidance and efficiencies. They both believe that it will take \$2 to adequately support an RFA.

Regarding the process, folks observed that there were some tensions in relationships between Marysville and the Fire District probably mostly due to the last round of RFA discussions which ultimately did not succeed in reaching agreement. There was a general sense that people haven't been able to have a really frank and productive discussion at the table. There is an overall view from most of the elected officials that

the chiefs have not been able to make the case about why an RFA is going to either improve service levels or, over time, provide cost-avoidance or efficiencies.

Regarding governance, city elected officials were divided on the question of local control. There was no consensus on this issue. A strong majority of Marysville and Fire District 12 folks said proportional governance is the right and appropriate outcome. In contrast, Arlington folks never mentioned the issue of proportional representation. Overall, Ms. Reed thinks more discussion with the Arlington folks about what their interests and priorities are around governance is going to be needed. Some of the most frequently used words around the governance issue were: *accountability, communication, transparency, respect, sustainable, efficient, and affordable.*

There is a lot of concern around funding. A small number of people said there needs to be immediate savings or they will not support an RFA. Most folks felt like this needs to be looked at as a longer-term proposition. Most people observed that no matter what funding method they choose, they need to be able to make a case to the public about why that is the right method and what they are going to get from it.

In terms of the funding level, a lot of folks in Marysville, in particular, expressed concern about going to the \$2 funding level (\$1.50 from the fire levy and \$.50 for EMS). The Arlington officials did not express a similar position. They were more focused on the question of sustainable funding. One person from Arlington and one person from Fire District 12 said that they need \$2.

In terms of facilities and services, there were a lot of ideas from people about what they might be able to do to save money, consolidate facilities, or provide better service improvements if there was an RFA. People said frequently that they don't have the data to back their ideas.

Moving forward, Ms. Reed stated that she doesn't think this is impossible, but it won't be easy. There is a lot of skepticism and unanswered questions that need to be worked through. There are some important shared values and shared priorities that they can work on as a foundation for those discussions. The question of sustainable and affordable service delivery would be a good place to start. She recommended looking at internal divergences around the governance issues, funding issues, and service issues that need to happen for people to feel comfortable. The proportional governance issue seems to be fairly well settled with Marysville and the District, but Arlington may need to still sort this out. She suggested that the police and staff really answer questions about efficiencies and service levels. She recommended that each entity discuss the following questions before the next meeting:

- *Is the jurisdiction willing to continue this discussion?*
- *What are values and principles that are most important to your Council and Commission?*
- *What process challenges do you foresee?*

Discussion Questions:

Question 1: *What are your top of mind thoughts about the interview summary just shared?*

- Maryville Mayor Jon Nehring said he appreciated the interview process. He commented that there weren't any great surprises. The only mild surprise from Arlington was the governance issue. He was curious about their thoughts related to this.
- Arlington Mayor Barbara Tolbert commented that there were no big surprises. Arlington simply hasn't gotten to the topic of governance yet. She agrees that there is not a lot of dialogue at the table.
- Arlington Councilmember Jessica Stickles also noted that there were no surprises. The outline seems consistent with the discussions. She agreed that governance hadn't been discussed because they aren't to that point yet. She clarified that they didn't receive this handout prior to the meeting.
- Arlington Councilmember Chris Raezer concurred that there were no surprises and that they were not ready to talk about governance yet.
- Arlington Councilmember Marilyn Oertle agreed with previous comments about governance. She commented that this is so overwhelming it is difficult to even speak about.
- Arlington City Administrator Paul Ellis commented that this is a good exercise. It is promising to see that there is some common ground.
- Marysville CAO Gloria Hirashima agreed that there were no surprises.
- Marysville Fire Chief McFalls commented that the common ground was really revealed here. He spoke to the strong public support, strong expectation for service levels. He didn't think there were any surprises. It boils down to cost, control, and sustainable models.
- Arlington Fire Chief Bruce Stedman commented that he was surprised because he thought they were further apart than they really are.
- Marysville Fire District Commissioner Tonya Christoffersen said she was also surprised that they are as close as they are. Regarding the process, she was surprised about the comments about Marysville and the Fire District tensions. She stated she also left the last meeting feeling like they were all in different ballfields. The conclusion section highlighted some areas that are important to talk about in order to explain to constituents what is in it for them.
- Marysville Councilmember Steve Muller commented that this is what he expected with three organizations trying to merge with their own histories. He agreed that there is consensus because they all have the same concerns about their organizations. The stumbling block is what the RFA will look like.
- Marysville Councilmember Jeff Seibert stated he was surprised by the response by Arlington regarding the governance issues. He recalled differently from the resolution that they sent which said governance would be based upon population or assessed value.
- Arlington Mayor Barbara Tolbert commented that Arlington has felt stymied by the process so far with other topics such as service levels, deliver, cost,

improvements, etc. and hadn't even gotten to the governance issue yet. It just isn't something that is on their radar screen yet.

- Marysville Councilmember Jeff Vaughan expressed appreciation for the summary. He thinks this is a good place to start in moving forward with discussions.

Question 2: *Are there points of agreement that were noted that you think will be important?*

- Marysville Mayor Nehring commented that everyone wants high service levels.
- Arlington Mayor Tolbert asked if they are focusing on a service level approach or a funding level approach.
- Arlington Councilmember Stickles pointed to the desire for a high level of service and wanting to be able to justify the cost
- Arlington Councilmember Raezer agreed with previous comments. He noted they are three very different organizations. He commented that Arlington will be giving up the most because they would be giving up their own fire department to this entity. As far as governance, they haven't gotten to that point yet because they are still figuring out the other items. He is keeping an open mind about this.
- Arlington Councilmember Oertle also agreed with previous comments and added that they all have to feel good about what they get for what they are charging the public for. She is not there yet, but she is open to discussion.
- Marysville Fire District Commissioner Christoffersen commented on the need to be sustainable and affordable.
- Marysville Councilmember Muller agreed with previous comments.
- Marysville Councilmember Seibert referred to sustainability.

Question 3: *Were there any points about disparities that you are concerned about?*

- Marysville Mayor Nehring did not see any, but expressed appreciation to Arlington for their frankness.
- Arlington Commissioner Oertle commented that Arlington has a long history with its fire department, and people are very attached to it.
- Marysville Fire District Commissioner Christoffersen expressed concern that it doesn't seem like they are all on the same page as far as receiving the same information.
- Marysville Councilmember Muller hopes they will have more disagreement because that is how they will ultimately move forward.
- Marysville Councilmember Seibert asked CAO Hirashima if the minutes and other info are available on the website. She affirmed that they are. She also noted that all the information was emailed to everyone at the same time. Regarding the fire district, Councilmember Seibert agreed with Arlington Councilmember Marilyn Oertle that it is a big deal to feel like you are giving up your fire district.
- Marysville Councilmember Vaughan commented that there were similar feelings back when the Marysville Fire District was formed. He believes that the way it was drafted helped Marysville and the District feel good about joint ownership. He thinks it is the same with forming the RFA. He agrees that affordability versus

sustainability would be a good discussion to have. He also thinks it is important to talk about definitions.

- Arlington Mayor Tolbert said she is looking forward to discussions about what sustainability really means. She noted that she hears only positive comments from the citizens of Arlington about the fire and EMS services. She has never received a complaint on service, but feels the pressure of the staff. She is confused by what they mean by “good service levels” and thinks it is hard to have a conversation about having an RFA without understanding what those components are.

Review of Current Fire & EMS Cost and Fund Information

Ms. Reed reviewed the *FD 12 – Marysville – Arlington: Comparative 2017 Expenditures/Levies* spreadsheet contained in the packet and asked for observations.

- Arlington Mayor Tolbert commented that it was helpful to see how comparable Marysville and the Fire District are. This is the first time she has seen some cost effectiveness.
- Arlington Councilmember Raezer noted that this is only telling what each agency is spending, not what they are actually buying. Ms. Reed concurred.
- Marysville Councilmember Seibert asked about the difference between the \$1.87 and the \$2.24. Marysville Fire District Finance Manager Chelsie McInnis reviewed this.
- Marysville Mayor Nehring agreed that it is eye-opening that they are closer than he thought.
- Arlington Councilmember Oertle agreed that they are closer than she thought.
- Arlington Councilmember Muller asked about Arlington’s transport costs. Staff replied that it has to do with contracts with the airport. Marysville Fire District Finance Manager Chelsie McInnis added that levy figures are applied to the formula. The assessed value of Arlington is a lot lower so it takes less of an ambulance revenue to create a higher levy.
- Arlington Councilmember Oertle asked if contract revenue would continue. Staff explained they would still have the ability to do the contracts, but that is something the governance board of the RFA would make a decision on.

Ms. Reed noted that this is all good information for her. She commented that if they did this, the levy rate for Marysville and FD 12 people would be the same, and for Arlington people it would be two cents less.

What have other RFA’s done?

Ms. Reed reviewed the *RFA Comparison Chart* in the packet and noted that the jurisdictions are very different in almost all categories. She summarized that there is a lot of flexibility in the process.

Side-by-Side Current Operations Data

Marysville Fire Chief McFalls and Arlington Fire Chief Stedman reviewed the comparison of operating budgets, staffing, population trends, total incidents versus total fulltime firefighters, 2016 average response time, 2016 mutual aid data, apparatus and vehicles, and capital facilities. Clarification questions about the details followed.

Marysville Councilmember Seibert commented that by combining the departments they would save money with the mutual aid calls by having only one unit going out. Chief McFalls concurred and further explained how this would improve efficiency.

Marysville Mayor Nehring commented that this is some of the first tangible data they have seen regarding the efficiencies. He pointed out that Arlington would be gaining some things that they don't have right now. He expressed appreciation for this type of data to show the benefits of an RFA. Marysville Chief McFalls concurred and noted that Marysville would also be gaining full time staff that they desperately need.

Arlington Mayor Tolbert pointed out that this information shows that there would be efficiencies and is a great place to start.

Discussion and Direction to Staff:

There was consensus to have the jurisdictions confirm in the next few weeks that they want to proceed and then meet in July to dive deeper into questions, concerns, timelines, and definitions.

Arlington Mayor Tolbert asked the chiefs to take a look at the service proposals to see if anything changed by looking at the side-by-side information.

Marysville Mayor Nehring thanked all the staff who worked on all this information. He expressed appreciation to board members and council members.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Jon Nehring
Chair

Barb Tolbert
Chair

Recording Secretary

City of Marysville, City of Arlington, Fire District 12

June 29, 2017

Recommended Next Steps

Prepared by Karen Reed

Based on the feedback in the surveys and interviews of the two City Councils and the Fire District Commissioners, the Chiefs, and lead City staff, I recommend that in the next month, each legislative body convene to discuss the following three questions, and be prepared to discuss their views at the July RFA Planning Committee Meeting.

1. Is your jurisdiction willing to continue the RFA discussion with the other two jurisdictions? Knowing what you know, do you see enough positive potential for an RFA to be willing to work over the next several months to develop an RFA plan involving all three jurisdictions?
2. What values and principles are important to your jurisdiction in this discussion?
3. Are there any process changes you would recommend to make future deliberations more constructive?

Addendum: At last evening's RFA Planning Committee meeting, the group agreed that it would be most helpful if each jurisdiction could share their answers to these three questions in writing with one another in the next couple of weeks so that, assuming all three want to proceed, we can make the July meeting as productive as possible.

To: Karen Reed

From: Barbara Tolbert

At the July 10 Council workshop the City Council members of Arlington considered the report from the survey results at the June RFA joint meeting. They also discussed the next steps questions sent to us in your follow up. Below represents the thoughts of the Arlington City Council in response to the questions.

1. Is your jurisdiction willing to continue the RFA discussion with the other two jurisdictions? Knowing what you know, do you see enough positive potential for an RFA to be willing to work over the next several months to develop an RFA plan involving all three jurisdictions?

The Council agreed unanimously to continue the discussions and examination with District 12 and the City of Marysville on the potential of an RFA. The Council hopes the discussion will clarify what sustainable means in respect to future operations, both in level of service and cost effectiveness

It is the Councils desire to see a clear business plan for joint operations that also addresses future growth as the City populations and businesses expand. They hope to see agreement on levels of service, cost of service and appropriate funding to meet the service needs.

2. What values and principles are important to your jurisdiction in this discussion?

Arlington City Council has great pride in the members of the Arlington Fire Department and feel a culture of civic pride is important. Questions were brought forward in how forming an RFA could meet the vision of expanding the existing teams as opposed to perceptions of a take over.

More efficiency in terms of resources, opportunities for training and staff development.

The ability to have strategic and growth plans in place to move to a more proactive planning of fire and EMS services.

Meeting the expectations of the tax payers in service provision and civic engagement.

The Council also expressed the desire to be able to fully articulate to the Arlington tax payers the advantages of an RFA, both in service levels and

sustainable funding. (the discussion indicated that more definition than just saying better service is needed)

The Council values an organization that is appropriately balanced for service delivery and administration.

With respect to governance, it was important to Council members that Arlington's interest would be represented fairly in an expanded Regional Organization.

3. Are there any process changes you would recommend to make future deliberations more constructive?

The Arlington Council is favorable to a facilitated process, indicating a need to continue to contract with Karen Reed for consultation.

SNOHOMISH COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

12

Providing Emergency Services Through Regionalization As A Member Of
The Marysville Fire District

July 19, 2017

Consultant Karen Reeds Recommended Next Steps

1. Is your jurisdiction willing to continue the RFA discussion with the other two jurisdictions? Knowing what you know, do you see enough positive potential for an RFA to be willing to work over the next several months to develop an RFA plan involving all three jurisdictions?
 - a) Yes, District 12 is willing to continue the RFA discussions with the other two jurisdictions.
 - b) Yes, District 12 sees the positive potential of developing an RFA; the opportunity to work as a unit to provide a better level of service for all three communities.
2. What values and principles are important to your jurisdiction in this discussion?
 - a) District 12 sees value in the three agencies working together maintaining their mission and identities while increasing their core values and principles.
3. Are there any process changes you would recommend to make future deliberations more constructive?
 - a) District 12 would like to see two meetings per month. One being a work session followed by a regular meeting for taking actions. In addition, to help with communication, we would also like to see the entire elected bodies at benchmark meetings.



District 12 Chairperson Bontrager



DATE: July 25, 2017

TO: RFA Committee Members

FROM: Marysville City Council

SUBJECT: Response to Questions for 7/27/17 Meeting

1. Is your jurisdiction willing to continue the RFA discussion with the other two jurisdictions? Knowing what you know, do you see enough positive potential for an RFA to be willing to work over the next several months to develop an RFA plan involving all three jurisdictions?

With the concurrence of city of Arlington and Fire District 12 to continue the discussions, Marysville would also like to continue to study the RFA. The last meeting advanced the discussion with good information coming from the Fire Chiefs.

2. What values and principles are important to your jurisdiction in this discussion?

Among the objectives for the RFA are better service or cost savings. We would like to know the RFA is sustainable, not necessarily requiring continuous levy increases. The Council would like to see increased financial stability, improving the current situation. We value a governing structure that provides for an accountable board that considers the impact of taxation on citizens.

3. Are there any process changes you would recommend to make future deliberations more constructive?

The facilitator has been helpful. We would like to hear from cities that have both formed and rejected RFA's in recent years. There were varied opinions on the current monthly schedule. Some members felt that meeting once a month was sufficient at this time. Others felt that increasing the meeting frequency might be helpful, particularly if there was increased momentum favoring formation of the RFA.

Proposed Approach for Next Phase of RFA Planning Effort

August –December 2017

Prepared by Karen Reed, July 12, 2017

If the two City Councils and the Fire District Commission agree to continue deliberations on an RFA, the proposed approach for the remainder of this year is as follows:

1. One (1) planning committee meeting per month.
2. Discussions will focus on confirming process issues, and then determining desired service levels, costs, and governance for a sustainable and affordable RFA.
3. At the end of this phase, the goal is for the Planning Committee to be able to issue a short statement of findings and recommendations, based on briefing materials presented, confirming:
 - whether the Planning Committee believes an RFA could provide the same or better service levels as compared to current operations, based on specific assumptions about staffing levels, facilities, equipment and funding;
 - the understanding of the RFA Committee about potential cost savings, efficiencies and avoided costs from an RFA in the near term and over time;
 - a proposed approach to reach agreement on governance and the other components of an RFA Plan; and
 - a recommendation to the respective governing bodies of each of the 3 jurisdictions whether work should continue to the next phase of work, which would be the completion of an RFA Plan.

If there is agreement to continue beyond December, the schedule would be structured to complete the RFA Plan in time for the August 2018 primary election.

Discussion Guide

At the meeting on Thursday evening, the plan is to take a few minutes to start to build a common set of values and principles between the three agencies. The sample statement of shared values and principles below is intended as just that: a sample. The discussion questions are:

- What values and principles in this sample document are important to you that you think we should adopt for this project?
- Are there ideas you disagree with?
- What would you add?

City of Lynnwood – Fire District 1 RFA

Statement of Shared Values and Principles

As approved by the Planning Committee, November 28, 2016

This document, as approved by the Planning Committee, will be forwarded for review and approval by the City Council and Board of Commissioners as part of the ongoing communication process as the RFA plan is being developed.

The City of Lynnwood and Fire District 1 endorse the following statement of shared values and principles for the operation of a Regional Fire Authority (RFA) encompassing the territory of their two jurisdictions.

Values and Principals are not presented in rank order of priority.

Our Shared Values Include:

1. **Providing high quality service to citizens and first responders.** We seek to meet or exceed all regional and national standards in the delivery of fire and emergency medical services as adopted by the Board of the RFA.
2. **Making data-driven decisions.** We take strategic action based on the facts after a thorough and objective analysis of the issues.
3. **Being an effective and efficient steward of public funds.**
4. **Participatory Governance.** Both member agencies should have a meaningful voice in the operating decisions of the RFA. We make decisions by consensus whenever possible.

5. **Promoting interagency collaboration, communication and strong working relationships.**

We seek to act in the collective best interests of all our public safety partners, not just those served by the RFA. We are open and honest with each other.

6. **Continuous Improvement.** We are committed to continuously tracking changes in customer and public needs and the public safety environment and finding and implementing ways to better meet those needs.

Our Shared Operating Principles Include:

- A. We strive to operate nimbly, with the ability to make decisions and respond quickly when necessary.
- B. We seek to understand and address the unique needs of the communities we serve. We strive to address these needs equitably in all operating and financial decisions.
- C. We work to attract, develop and retain high quality staff.
- D. We strive to employ rigorous quality control and reporting practices.
- E. We manage agency budgets to control or reduce costs.
- F. We seek to limit spikes in budgets from year to year, by use of planning capital investments over time, developing reserves and other means.
- G. We commit to being transparent, accessible and responsive to our customer agencies and the public.

MARYSVILLE FIRE DISTRICT ARLINGTON FIRE DEPARTMENT

Year 1 RFA Operations—Anticipated Service Levels and Avoided Costs/Efficiencies

PREPARED BY:

Martin McFalls
Fire Chief
Marysville

Bruce Stedman
Fire Chief
Arlington

DATED: July 27, 2017



Year 1 RFA Operations—Anticipated Service Levels and Avoided Costs/Efficiencies

July 27, 2017

Purpose of Discussion** is to answer this question: **In the near term – 1 year or sooner – without investments in additional staff, equipment or facilities, what can we expect in the way of improvements in Level of Service, Cost Savings, Efficiencies and Avoided Costs if we form an RFA?

Part 1: Introduction/ Re-cap of information from last presentation:

A. Current Response Time

Departments track response time for each type of call. By far the most frequent call type is Basic Life Support (BLS). In 2016, 56% of the Arlington responses and 53% of the Marysville responses were BLS.

	BASIC LIFE SUPPORT (BLS)	ALL CALL TYPES
Arlington	0:06:06	0:06:06
Marysville	0:06:41	0:06:38

Note: The average response times listed above include only those emergent responses within each agency's geographic service area of responsibility. Non-emergent call types have been excluded.

B. Current Staffing

STAFFING BREAKDOWN

MFD	Line Staff	AFD
4	Battalion Chiefs	0
20	Captains	6
2	Medical Services Officers	0
19	Paramedics	12
40	Fulltime Firefighters	9

MFD	Administrative Staff	AFD
1	Fire Chief	1
1	Deputy Chief Operations	1
1	Deputy Chief Technology, Fleet, Facilities	0
1	Battalion Chief Training	0
1	Battalion Chief Medical Services Admin	0
1	Human Resource Manager	0
1	Finance Manager	0
1	Administrative Assistant Payroll	0
1	Accounting Technician	0
1	Administrative Assistant	1
2	Maintenance Shop	0

MFD	Fire Prevention	AFD
1	Deputy Chief/Fire Marshal	0
1	Assistant Fire Marshal	0
1	Inspector	0
1	Pub Ed/ PIO	0
101	TOTAL FULLTIME PERSONNEL	30

32	Partime Firefighters	30
----	----------------------	----

C. Mutual Aid

	Total Mutual Aid Call Count	% of Total Calls	Total Commit Time	No Arrival Call Count	No Arrival Commit Time	Arrived Call Count	Arrived Commit Time
MFD mutual aid calls into AFD service territory	835	6%	172:16:07	571	32:42:36	264	139:33:31
AFD mutual aid calls into MFD service territory	721	13%	232:22:14	492	30:07:28	229	202:14:46

Part 2: Defining Terms:

Proposed baseline definitions for RFA Study

Category	Definition	Examples
Cost Savings	Cost cuts or deferrals that lead to reductions in the budget	Reducing consultant costs; deferring a capital project to later years
Efficiencies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantifiable • Unquantifiable 	Improved productivity. Less wasted effort.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff productivity • Technological improvements
Avoided Costs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantifiable • Unquantifiable 	Costs that are not incurred but are not “efficiencies”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capital investments that result in less maintenance spending • Economies of scale that reduce costs as compared to prior separate agency costs
Level of Service	Programs and services provided, defined by quantifiable metrics.	Call response time. Programs available to serve the public.

Part 3: Anticipated First Year of Consolidated Operations under an RFA, No New Investments

4 immediate operational adjustments would be recommended by the Chiefs:

#1: Consolidate operations at Stations 63 and 48.

- **Action:** Move into Station 63.
- **Rationale:** *eliminate lease fee (\$51K/yr.); Stations very close to one another: maximizes opportunity to reduce duplication in call responses.*
- **Cost:** Will require minimal adjustment to facility—additional housing accommodations for employees and apparatus.
 - Estimated cost and timeline (extremely rough estimate): \$50,000 and 3 months.
- **Service level impact:** Responses times may slightly increase in the low demand area north of Station 48—but response times in this area are expected to still be below the City current average response time of 6:06 minutes. Rest of area served by Stations 63 & 48 should see improved response time.

#2: Dedicated staffing for 1 ladder truck

- **Action:** Redeploy existing staff to make this possible.
- 2nd ladder truck will be cross-staffed; 3rd ladder truck can be sold.
- **Rationale:** Improve service levels by having this specialized apparatus available 24/7
- **Cost:** Neutral
- **Service level impact:** Provides entire service area with a dedicated ladder truck, as opposed to the two cross-staffed ladder trucks that are many times out of service due to utilization of the corresponding unit (M48, A62).

#3: Dedicated staffing of an additional BLS / transport unit

- **Action:** Redeploy existing staff, to staff existing BLS vehicle.
- **Rationale:** cost neutral way to increase service capacity to serve community.
- **Cost:** Neutral
- **Service Level impact:** Provides a dedicated Basic Life Support (BLS) transport unit in the Smokey Point region. This reduces the number of times that Stations 65 or 62 are removed from their respective service areas for BLS Transports.

#4: Move staff and hazmat unit to Station 47

- **Action:** Redeploy existing staff to increase staffing at Station 47.
- **Rational:** Improved service levels by providing fire and hazmat responses out of station 47
- **Cost:** Neutral
- **Service Level Impact:** Provides for the addition of fire suppression capabilities to the fast growing southeast region of Arlington with a cross-staffed engine/aid. Shifting the hazmat response vehicle to station 47 places it closer geographically to the region most likely to have hazardous materials incidents for both agencies (Industrialized South Arlington and North Marysville).

1. Response Time: Service Level Improvement

Defined as: Response time is composed of 3 main components: **alarm handling time**, which is the time a call is received at the 911 center to the time of dispatch; **turnout time**, which is the time it takes responders to don protective gear and begin responding in their vehicle(s); and **travel time**, which is the time it takes from the vehicle rolling to arrival on the scene.

	Marysville Fire District	Arlington
Current situation	2016 average response time was 6:36	2016 average response time 06:06
Expected year 1 situation:	<p>Expect slightly improved response times overall.</p> <p>Multiple variables make it difficult to determine an expected change to response times.</p> <p>Full capitalization of response efficiencies may not be fully realized until station relocation can occur.</p>	<p>Except in the low demand area north of Station 48, expect slightly improved response times overall.</p> <p>Multiple variables make it difficult to determine an expected change to response times.</p> <p>Full capitalization of response efficiencies may not be fully realized until station relocation can occur.</p>

Why/how we could achieve these improvements:

- The change in deployment model dedicating a ladder truck in the Smokey Point region and having a dedicated BLS transport unit will help to drive down response times.
- The concentration of units in Smokey Point should allow for less reliance on outlying stations (Station 65) to cover second and third calls in Smokey Point.
- Reduction of duplicated responses (cancelled in route) in Smokey Point through GPS dispatching should allow for efficiencies in response.
- Additional engine capacity by adding Engine 47 to the response network significantly reducing response time to highly populated areas of South East Arlington.
- Response times/service capacity will improve as combined resources can be deployed in event of multiple simultaneous events, or large-scale events.

2. Program Offerings: Service Level Improvement and Cost Avoidance for Arlington

Defined as: Programs that support the mission of the regional fire authority.

	Marysville Fire District	Arlington
Current situation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 24 hour Command and Control 2. 2 Medical Services Officers, plus a Medical Services Division/Administrator 3. Fleet/Facilities and Support services Division 4. Fire Prevention Services <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Fire Marshal b. Plan Review c. Inspection d. Public Education/ Public Information 5. Public Information Officer on staff 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Day-time Command and Control 2. Medical Services officers on all shifts 3. Fleet/Facilities support: Contracted through Fire District 7 (\$70K budget) 4. Fire Prevention Services <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Limited Fire Inspections b. Investigations contracted with County Fire Marshal c. On-Shift Public education 5. City provided Public Information Officer
Expected year 1 situation:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 24 hour Command and Control <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Battalion Chief Services b. Greater response of Chief Officer Support. 2. Medical Services Officers on all shifts <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Medical Services Administrator provides oversight 3. Fleet/Facilities and Support services Division 4. Fire Prevention Services <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Fire Marshal b. Plan Review c. Inspection d. Public Education/ Public Information 5. Technology Support provided by City of Marysville Public information officer on staff 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 24 hour Command and Control <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Battalion Chief Services b. Greater response of Chief Officer Support. 2. Medical Services officers on all shifts <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Medical Services Administrator 3. Fleet/Facilities and Support services Division – services will be provided in-house 4. Fire Prevention Services <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Fire Marshal b. Plan Review Program c. Inspection Program d. Public Education/ Public Information Officer 5. Technology support provided by City of Marysville 6. Public information officer on staff

Why/how we could achieve these improvements:

- Consolidation of Administrative services provide efficiencies for both organizations as well as additional programs for the Arlington Fire Department.
- Current command and control staffing has the capacity to absorb service demands of Arlington. Second Chief position will move to Deputy Chief Position (can re-evaluate at the time).
- Marysville has capacity to absorb Fleet and Facilities service for Arlington Fire.
- Combining Medical Services Officers from both agencies would provide for an MSO on each of the 4 shifts, improving daily emergency medical service oversight and response.

3. Firefighter Training: *Cost Avoidance, Efficiencies and Service Level Improvement*

Defined as: Fire and EMS initial, ongoing and specialty training required to provide firefighter safety, and overall incident effectiveness. Overall training levels improve.

	Marysville Fire District	Arlington
Current situation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One Training Battalion Chief 2. Snohomish County Training Consortium Partner 3. Joint Apprenticeship Training Committee (JATC) Members 4. Individually Run Part-time Firefighter Academy (3 per year) 5. Training separate from Arlington 6. Blue Card Instructors 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On-shift Training Officer 2. Training separate from Marysville 3. Red Card Wildland Training 4. Blue Card Training Certification for all Officers
Expected year 1 situation:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Two (2) Dedicated Training Officers 2. Consistent, standardized, combined training 3. Snohomish County Training Consortium Partner 4. Joint Apprenticeship Training Committee (JATC) Members 5. Jointly Operated Part-time Firefighter Recruit Academy 6. Red Card Wildland Training 7. Blue Card Training Certification for all Officers 8. Blue Card Instructors 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Two (2) Dedicated Training Officers 2. Consistent, standardized, combined training 3. Snohomish County Training Consortium Partnership 4. Joint Apprenticeship Training Committee (JATC) membership 5. Jointly Operated Part-time Firefighter Recruit Academy 6. Red Card Wildland Training 7. Blue Card Training Certification for all Officers 8. Blue Card Instructors

Why/how we could achieve these improvements:

- Deputy Chief would become a second training officer to support a combined training division.
- Combining training division allows for standardizing of training which results in improved firefighter safety as well and incident effectiveness.
- Increases capacity to train staff without as much reliance on overtime.
- Arlington Wildland Fire Instructor would help to provide training not currently provided in the Marysville Fire District.
- Combining of Part-time Recruit classes would eliminate duplicate efforts being made by both agencies to plan, host and implement separate recruit academies multiple times each year.
- There would also be a financial savings with eliminating duplicate personal protective equipment expenses.

4. Number of Apparatus in Service: *Efficiency, Service Level Improvements*

Defined as: Units for each agency and the status as either dedicated or cross-staffed, before and after creating an RFA (Year 1).

	Marysville Fire District	Arlington																																						
Current situation	<table border="1"> <tr><td>Aid - Dedicated</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Aid - Cross Staffed</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr><td>Medic -Dedicated</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>Medic –Cross Staffed</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>Engine Dedicated</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>Engine Cross Staffed</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>Ladder Cross Staffed</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Boat-Cross Staffed</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Tender -Cross Staffed</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Rescue-Cross Staffed</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Hazmat -Cross Staffed</td><td>1</td></tr> </table>	Aid - Dedicated	1	Aid - Cross Staffed	3	Medic -Dedicated	2	Medic –Cross Staffed	0	Engine Dedicated	2	Engine Cross Staffed	2	Ladder Cross Staffed	1	Boat-Cross Staffed	1	Tender -Cross Staffed	1	Rescue-Cross Staffed	1	Hazmat -Cross Staffed	1	<table border="1"> <tr><td>Aid - Dedicated</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Aid - Cross Staffed</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>Medic -Dedicated</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Medic - Cross Staffed</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Engine Dedicated</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Engine Cross Staffed</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>Ladder Cross Staffed</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Brush truck Cross Staffed</td><td>1</td></tr> </table>	Aid - Dedicated	1	Aid - Cross Staffed	0	Medic -Dedicated	1	Medic - Cross Staffed	1	Engine Dedicated	1	Engine Cross Staffed	0	Ladder Cross Staffed	1	Brush truck Cross Staffed	1
Aid - Dedicated	1																																							
Aid - Cross Staffed	3																																							
Medic -Dedicated	2																																							
Medic –Cross Staffed	0																																							
Engine Dedicated	2																																							
Engine Cross Staffed	2																																							
Ladder Cross Staffed	1																																							
Boat-Cross Staffed	1																																							
Tender -Cross Staffed	1																																							
Rescue-Cross Staffed	1																																							
Hazmat -Cross Staffed	1																																							
Aid - Dedicated	1																																							
Aid - Cross Staffed	0																																							
Medic -Dedicated	1																																							
Medic - Cross Staffed	1																																							
Engine Dedicated	1																																							
Engine Cross Staffed	0																																							
Ladder Cross Staffed	1																																							
Brush truck Cross Staffed	1																																							
Expected year 1 situation:	<table border="1"> <tr><td>Aid - Dedicated</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>Aid - Cross Staffed</td><td>*4</td></tr> <tr><td>Medic -Dedicated</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr><td>Medic - Cross Staffed</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>Engine Dedicated</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>Engine Cross Staffed</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr><td>Ladder Dedicated</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Ladder Cross Staffed</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>*=2 Aid ALS Intervention Capabilities</td><td></td></tr> </table>	Aid - Dedicated	2	Aid - Cross Staffed	*4	Medic -Dedicated	3	Medic - Cross Staffed	0	Engine Dedicated	2	Engine Cross Staffed	3	Ladder Dedicated	1	Ladder Cross Staffed	1	*=2 Aid ALS Intervention Capabilities		<table border="1"> <tr><td>Boat-Cross Staffed</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Tender -Cross Staffed</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Rescue-Cross Staffed</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Hazmat -Cross Staffed</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Brush truck Cross Staffed</td><td>1</td></tr> </table>	Boat-Cross Staffed	1	Tender -Cross Staffed	1	Rescue-Cross Staffed	1	Hazmat -Cross Staffed	1	Brush truck Cross Staffed	1										
Aid - Dedicated	2																																							
Aid - Cross Staffed	*4																																							
Medic -Dedicated	3																																							
Medic - Cross Staffed	0																																							
Engine Dedicated	2																																							
Engine Cross Staffed	3																																							
Ladder Dedicated	1																																							
Ladder Cross Staffed	1																																							
*=2 Aid ALS Intervention Capabilities																																								
Boat-Cross Staffed	1																																							
Tender -Cross Staffed	1																																							
Rescue-Cross Staffed	1																																							
Hazmat -Cross Staffed	1																																							
Brush truck Cross Staffed	1																																							

Why/how we could achieve these improvements:

- Redeployment of resources allows for several service improvements including:
 - The dedication of a Ladder Unit (no longer cross-staffed).
 - An additional dedicated Aid unit.

- Combined paramedic staffing would allow some BLS units to have ALS intervention capacity on some days—increasing ALS service capacity to the community.

- Cost savings/avoidance
 - Reduction of Arlington’s back up ladder truck (Combined there would be two ladder trucks instead of three)
 - Reduction of Maintenance costs
 - Redeployment of M48 crew may delay or eliminate the purchase of an EMS apparatus.

5. Mutual Aid Responses in each other's jurisdiction: *Efficiency and Service Level Improvements, Avoided Costs*

Defined as: Mutual aid responses are defined as resources allocated to another agency's incident.

	Marysville Fire District	Arlington
Current situation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently there are calls for service, which the closest appropriate unit is not being dispatched, or is being dispatched and cancelled due to the border between the two agencies. 	
Expected year 1 situation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eliminating the border between the two agencies will allow efficiency of deployment using the Global Positioning System (GPS) dispatch with the closest appropriate unit being dispatched. Greatly reduce number of times and hours that units are dispatched and then cancelled by other responding units. 	

Why/how we could achieve these improvements:

The creation of a Regional Fire Authority between the agencies would eliminate mutual aid between Marysville and Arlington.

The adjustment of the Fire Response Plans (FRPs) would eliminate the border between the agencies and ensure that the closest appropriate unit is dispatched to Calls for Service. This will greatly reduce the number of times and hours that units spend being dispatched and then cancelled by other responding units (Approximately 60 hours of out of service time in 2016). It is anticipated that this should also reduce the overall unit(s) hourly utilization time.

6. Shifting of Apparatus: Service Level Improvements, Avoided Costs

Defined as: Current deployment model in comparison to the deployment model for the initial formation of the RFA.

Current Staffing Configuration of Both Agencies

Station 66 Cross-Staffed A66/E66 Captain FF FF	Station 61 Captain FF PT M61 Medic Medic FF PT A61	Station 62 Cross-Staffed L62/A62 Captain FF FF BC B61	Station 63 Captain FF PT M63 Medic Medic	Station 48 Cross-Staffed L48/M48 Captain FF Medic	Station 47 PT PT A47	Station 46 Captain FF PT M46 Medic Medic	Station 65 Cross-Staffed E65/A65 Captain FF Medic
--	---	---	--	---	-------------------------------	--	---

Combined Staffing Configuration

Station 66 Cross-Staffed A66/E66 Captain FF PT	Station 61 Captain FF PT M61 Medic Medic FF PT A61	Station 62 Cross-Staffed L62/A62 Captain FF Medic BC B61	Station 63 Captain FF FF M-63 MSO1,2,3,4 Medic A-63 FF PT	Station-48	Station 47 Cross-Staffed E47/A47 Captain FF FF /HM61	Station 46 Captain FF PT M46 Medic Medic	Station 65 Cross-Staffed E65/A65 Captain FF Medic
--	---	--	--	------------	---	--	---

Why/how we could achieve these improvements:

Combining resources would immediately result in improvements for all agencies involved in the Regional Fire Authority. Some of these improvements include the following:

- Dedication of a Ladder Truck
- Station 48 resources would be redistributed:
 - Personnel and apparatus would be distributed to station 63 and station 47
 - Hazmat 61 would move from station 66 to station 47 moving it much closer to the industrial areas of both jurisdictions.
 - This would require minor modifications to station 47 and station 63 to accommodate apparatus and employee housing.

What this means for service levels:

- Dedication of a Basic Life Support unit in Smokey Point, improving service in that region.
- Aid 65 and E65 will be in service more often, improving service in Lake Goodwin area.
- The addition of a cross staffed Engine/Aid/Hazmat in a fast growing industrial part of Arlington (Station 47)
- Medical Services Officers (MSOs) centrally located to ensure quality assurance and evaluation of systems.

Part 4: Unresolved Issues

This presentation addresses a 1-year look at operations if an RFA is formed, without investing in new staff, facilities or equipment. It does not address longer-term sustainability challenges, specifically around issues such as

- Aging facilities
- Aging equipment
- Ability to further enhance response time by relocating a combined Stations 63 and 48 to a new location
- Population growth
- Expansion of current services
- Personnel Attrition
- Limitations in growth of property tax as compared to inflation in salaries, benefits, other costs

Station 48 Calculated Drive Times

Legend

- Station 48
- Other fire stations
- 2016 call locations (SNOPAC)
- Streets
- 4 minute drive time
- 6 minute drive time
- 8 minute drive time
- Arlington
- Marysville
- Fire districts



Scale: 0 3,700 7,400 14,800 Feet

Date: 1/12/2017

File: Station48DT_11x17_16

Cartographer: kdh

Maps and GIS data are distributed "AS-IS" without warranties of any kind, either express or implied, including but not limited to warranties of suitability for a particular purpose or use. Map data are compiled from a variety of sources which may contain errors and users who rely upon the information do so at their own risk. Users agree to indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the City of Arlington for any and all liability in any future arising out of or resulting from the lack of accuracy or correctness of the data, or the use of the data presented in the maps.

