

FINANCIAL PLANNING DIVISION ANALYSIS FY 2012-13 Budget

Portland Fire & Rescue (PF&R)

Analysis by: Kezia Wanner

I. Overview

| Budget Summary | Revised FY 2010-11 | Revised FY 2011-12 | Request Base FY 2012-13 | Request Total FY 2012-13 | Percent Change |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Resources | | | | | |
| Budgeted Beginning Fund Balance | 0 | 7,121,000 | 5,762,000 | 5,762,000 | -19.1% |
| Licenses & Permits | 1,290,000 | 1,290,000 | 1,430,000 | 1,430,000 | 10.9% |
| Charges for Services | 1,200,000 | 1,200,000 | 1,190,000 | 1,060,000 | -11.7% |
| Intergovernmental Revenues | 1,062,107 | 1,387,539 | 1,755,000 | 1,755,000 | 26.5% |
| Interagency Revenue | 1,869,869 | 2,858,622 | 3,119,110 | 2,544,212 | -11.0% |
| Bond and Note Proceeds | 7,293,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | na |
| Miscellaneous Sources | 301,000 | 276,200 | 216,200 | 216,200 | -21.7% |
| General Fund Discretionary | 90,035,371 | 91,093,674 | 89,887,641 | 84,569,899 | -7.2% |
| General Fund Overhead | 182,657 | 175,141 | 71,451 | 71,451 | -59.2% |
| Total Resources | \$103,234,004 | \$105,402,176 | \$103,431,402 | \$97,408,762 | -7.6% |
| Expenditures | | | | | |
| Personnel Services | 81,074,246 | 84,072,925 | 84,604,445 | 78,763,009 | -6.3% |
| External Materials and Services | 6,383,473 | 6,430,421 | 6,194,148 | 6,051,204 | -5.9% |
| Internal Materials and Services | 5,529,629 | 5,817,722 | 5,595,809 | 5,557,549 | -4.5% |
| Capital Outlay | 2,953,656 | 4,684,108 | 7,037,000 | 7,037,000 | 50.2% |
| Contingency | 7,293,000 | 4,397,000 | 0 | 0 | -100.0% |
| Total Requirements | \$103,234,004 | \$105,402,176 | \$103,431,402 | \$97,408,762 | -7.6% |
| Total Bureau FTE | 745.00 | 754.00 | 739.00 | 663.00 | -12.1% |

Percent Change is the change from FY 2011-12 Revised Budget to FY 2012-13 Total Requested Budget.

II. Key Issues

Rapid Response Vehicle (RRV) Pilot Program

In November of 2010, the voters of Portland passed a measure authorizing the sale of General Obligation (GO) bonds to support various public safety infrastructure improvements. The GO Bond funds replacement of fire apparatus, construction of Fire Station 21, and the purchase of new rapid response rescue vehicles. The RRVs are intended to address the bureau's workload related to emergency medical services (EMS) calls which comprise the majority - approximately 70% - of the bureau's total calls. Currently the bureau uses all its response vehicles, including large apparatus (both ladder trucks and engines) to respond to EMS calls, which raises the issue of looking at using more nimble vehicles to both better utilize the bureau's vehicles and manage the EMS workload.

One of the primary reasons for implementing an RRV program is to use smaller response vehicles to respond to non-emergent EMS calls (those that are non-life threatening), that do not require immediate medical treatment (or ambulance service transport) that emergent calls do. Additionally the RRVs would increase response reliability (the percentage of time that units are available to respond to calls within their own FMA) as trucks and engines would be available more of the time for emergent call response because the RRVs would be covering non-emergent calls. An efficient

approach to manage non-emergent calls would be to “stack” them in a queue and the RRVs attend to the calls in the order they are triaged and dispatched by Bureau of Emergency Communications (BOEC). This approach would require significant revisions to the BOEC call-triaging protocols and PF&R operating procedures, and specifically Multnomah County Health would need to authorize the triaging changes. An issue that was raised during the course of the RRV implementation discussions has been PF&R using ladder trucks for EMS response, which is not typical of fire departments in other cities. Although the use of the ladder trucks for both fire and EMS is in some ways efficient, as the vehicles are not held in reserve until a fire or large event occurs, there is a risk of decreasing the useful life of the vehicles more quickly as they are in service as often as engines and rescues. FPD analyzed the costs related to maintenance and repairs of apparatus compared to RRVs and found that the annual cost for the engines and trucks is 8 to 11 times, respectively, higher than the maintenance and repair costs for RRV vehicles, which are essentially modified SUVs. To properly compare the costs of the apparatus versus the suburban vehicles, costs for the maintenance and repair of the apparatus specialized equipment need to be identified and removed from the equation, in order to have an equitable comparison of vehicles only. FPD intends to obtain more detailed costs from CityFleet during the FY 2012-13 budget process and anticipates that apparatus repair and maintenance costs will still be materially greater than the SUVs because of the size and complexity of the apparatus vehicles. In addition to lower costs for repair and maintenance of the SUV’s, there would be fuel cost savings by using smaller, fuel-efficient vehicles instead of the large apparatus.

| Annual Maintenance and Repair Costs | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|------------------|
| Ladder Truck | Engine | Suburban Vehicle |
| \$32,000 | \$22,000 | \$2,827 |

Council directed OMF and PF&R in a FY 2011-12 Budget Note to conduct a staffing and deployment study to evaluate the viability of implementing an RRV program in Portland; the study compared PF&R to other metropolitan fire and rescue departments and addressed the options of staffing the new vehicles with existing or new personnel. PF&R entered into a contract with the consulting firm TriData, who has performed three staffing and operational studies for PF&R over the past 20 years. A steering committee was convened to provide oversight to the project, the final report was produced in December 2011, and a Council work session was held January 24, 2012 to discuss the report’s findings and recommendations. The work session did not result in consensus among Council to move forward on any of the four staffing options identified in the TriData study, which included:

1. Hire additional personnel to staff the new vehicles
2. Reassign Staff from Rescues 11 and 19 to the new vehicles
3. Adjust the bureau’s traveler’s pool (employees who fill in for employees on vacation and sick leave)
4. Utilize two truck companies to staff the new vehicles on a limited daily basis

The bureau has determined that it was feasible to implement option #2 as a pilot project by reassigning staffing from two rescue units. They are currently moving forward on the purchase of the RRV vehicles and intend to begin the pilot program in April 2012. PF&R has submitted two decision packages (FR_23 and FR_24) to continue one-time funding for Rescues 11 and 19; the bureau has stated that if the requests are funded, the resources will be reallocated to fund the RRV pilot program in FY 2012-13 but if the requests are not funded, the pilot program will end on June 30, 2012.

FPD recommends partial funding of the bureau’s request for one-time resources in decision packages FR_23 and FR_24 to support the RRV program, in order to 1) fully evaluate the

effectiveness of the pilot program and, 2) to fulfill the voters' implicit intention in approving the 2010 Public Safety GO bond, to not only purchase rapid response vehicles, but also to use the vehicles strategically to achieve greater efficiencies.

Operations Changes for EMS Call Management

With EMS calls comprising more than 70% of the bureau's calls, PF&R has been working with regional partners to address issues and propose solutions related to the significant workload driven by EMS calls and repeat/chronic users of the 911 system. The parties involved in these discussions include BOEC, the agency that triages and dispatches 911 calls; Multnomah County Public Health Department, who develops the triaging protocols for BOEC; Multnomah County EMS, who manages the County's contract with the private ambulance transport service, American Medical Response (AMR), and other public and private health organizations. The goal of the group is to mitigate the drain that EMS calls and specifically mental health calls and chronic callers have on the 911 system so that public safety response agencies can use their resources more effectively.

The specific efforts that PF&R is currently engaged in are both internal and external. Internal efforts began April 2011 and entail the response review program which tracks mis-triaged calls and frequent 911 callers, using the bureau's Incident Reporting system. The bureau is working with Multnomah County Health to identify the number and type of mis-triaged calls, and the next phase of the review program will be to create and implement a type code protocol for PF&R responders review allows for the bureau operations Chiefs to make system improvements internally.; it is expected that all bureau responders will need additional training regarding the new type codes.

Chronic use of the 911 system is a problem currently being evaluated and addressed by BOEC, PF&R, Multnomah County Health, Portland Police, and other public safety agencies, together and independently. Many of the calls are non-emergent and/or mental health in nature but still require EMS response. One approach taken has been to identify the addresses of the most frequent callers for 911 services, in order to develop proactive solutions to mitigate the current workload on the agencies, and related cost to the public, for responding to these calls. More than 79% of the top 50 most frequent users (in calendar year 2011) of the 911 system are retirement/assisted living facilities, medical facilities, and social service-provider facilities, as illustrated by the table below.

| 50 Frequent Caller Addresses of the 911 System - Calendar Year 2011 (Reported by BOEC 911 Dispatch) | | | |
|--|--------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Property Type | Total calls | EMS Calls | # of addresses |
| assisted living | 1272 | 1163 | 12 |
| low income housing/apts | 874 | 296 | 10 |
| social services organizations | 823 | 850 | 5 |
| nursing home | 791 | 743 | 7 |
| private apartment complexes | 734 | 285 | 8 |
| medical facility | 435 | 381 | 3 |
| senior apartments | 193 | 97 | 2 |
| mobile home park | 141 | 71 | 2 |
| private business (Fred Meyer) | 96 | 50 | 1 |
| | 5359 | 3936 | 50 |

Some of these mitigation efforts that are being considered or are underway include: the hiring of a case worker by Multnomah County Health to coordinate options for appropriate care for frequent 911 callers, Central City Concern is considering hiring a case manager to accommodate their frequent caller client-base, and public agencies in the County and City are collaborating with private

health care organizations in development of a Community Care Plan which identifies governing protocols regarding 911 system abusers.

Retirement Projections for FY 2012-13

Fire Bureau projects their retirements for next fiscal year at 40 in total, which is consistent with the Fire & Police Disability & Retirement (FPDR) projection of 38 PF&R retirees in FY 2012-13. PF&R's retirement projection is based on the assumption that eligible sworn employees retire when they reach 55 years old and 29.7 years of service (which has been a relatively consistent average although has been trending upward) while FPDR bases their FY 2012-13 projections on FY 2011-12 activity. As of February 2012, PF&R has experienced 21 retirements, with 19 more anticipated by fiscal year end. The risk associated with the higher than normal levels of retirements is the large retirement payouts that are incurred; for 40 retirees at an average payout of \$61,618, the cost is \$2,464,720. PF&R budgets \$1 million for retirement payouts annually, so if the 40 retirements comes to fruition in FY 2012-13, the bureau will exceed their budget for that expense by approximately \$1.5 million. If the bureau does not have the capacity in their personnel services budget to absorb the additional costs, costs will need to be offset by PF&R's allocation of the City's Compensation Set-Aside, but it may not be sufficient. The uncertainty over timing and the number of retirements continues to pose a risk for PF&R in FY 2012-13. In the five-year financial forecast, the bureau projects that retirements "normalize" beyond FY 2012-13 to a magnitude of approximately \$1 million annually.

FPD recommends that PF&R and FPD together monitor the bureau's retirements and personnel services expenditures on a monthly basis throughout FY 2012-13 to stay ahead of, and make necessary operational adjustments to avoid, personnel services over-spending.

One-time Funding for Ongoing Programs

PF&R's Requested Budget includes requests for one-time funding to support one station and two rescue units. PF&R had requested these be funded with ongoing funding in FY 2011-12 but Council funded them with one-time resources. Financial Planning does not support the practice of funding ongoing programs with one-time resources, as per City Financial Policy FIN 2.06, but in the current fiscal constraints, FPD recognizes that there are limited options to this stop-gap approach. One option that we recommend, as ongoing funding is a diminishing resource, is evaluating and determining if the allocation of one-time funding should be reprioritized for ongoing programs across the City.

Budget Reduction Service Impacts

Council directed that City bureaus submit 4%-6%-8% reductions to their General Fund allocations (CAL Targets) for FY 2012-13. For the Fire Bureau, this translates to reductions of \$3,595,506/ \$5,393,258/ \$7,191,011. FPD is recommending ongoing reductions that total \$3,511,038 and 45.50 FTE, which totals a 3.9% reduction from the bureau's General Fund allocation. These reductions include closing two fire stations. FPD also recommends \$1,029,882 of one-time General Fund funding for station staffing and partial funding for a rescue unit. Realizing that most of the bureau's proposed reductions would, at some point, have an effect on service levels, FPD recommendations were made with preserving direct services in mind. Ultimately FPD's recommendations included all of the reductions that are administrative in nature, those that predominately affect internal processes of the bureau or City; most of the reductions that were operational, or those that are still internal process-related but indicate a change in the way the bureau will operate/structure its programs and efforts; and some, such as the closure of two stations and elimination of the bureau Public Information Officer position, which have a direct service impact and will affect the public noticeably and immediately.

PF&R operates as a unified system for emergency response and rescue, and diminishing the capacity of any of the work divisions/units can have cascading effects; this concept is made clear when a station, truck, engine, or rescue is taken out of service as the workload shifts to the surrounding responders. Closing a station may not only affect the Fire Management Area (FMA) that it resides in, but the whole of the organization, as other responders need to adjust operations to pick up the workload for the vacated FMA. Tri-Data projected, in their most recent study, that the response reliability in, and directly around, a vacated FMA could decrease significantly, with response taking an average of two minutes longer.

FPD recommends that the bureau evaluate ways to adapt the bureau's operations to continued levels of reduced funding, as the financial forecast does not indicate a restored level of General Fund resources. In light of the probability that the bureau will be required to reduce their levels of service, the consideration should be made whether station closures are preferable to implementing scalable adjustments to the existing system. Although PF&R has made the policy decision to not consider "brown-outs" because cost benefit of reduced staffing does not outweigh the negative operational impacts, other jurisdictions including Philadelphia, Sacramento City, Los Angeles, and San Diego, have implemented them temporarily in order to avoid complete station closures. Seattle and San Jose also proposed brown-outs as a cost-reduction strategy for FY 2011-12, but funding was restored and brown-outs were avoided. The concept of the brown-outs is to either reduce the hours that staff are on duty at a station or reduce the number of companies at stations that house two or more companies; organization management can then decide whether to redeploy the firefighters assigned to those companies/stations elsewhere in the system, or eliminate the positions. In some jurisdictions, the brownouts occur on a rotating basis at different stations throughout the jurisdiction. Although the brown-out concept can provide cost savings by reducing staffing levels, it is not generally considered the best way to adapt to decreased resources, as it tends to disrupt the consistency of operations which is the foundation for effective fire system operations. Ultimately, brown-outs may or may not make sense for Portland Fire & Rescue, but at this juncture the bureau needs to consider new approaches to the way business has been done in the past and prepare for a "new normal" of diminished funding. FPD recommends that Council direct PF&R in a budget note to provide a progress report on bureau strategic operational efficiencies and cost-cutting measures to Council by December 31, 2012, in time for the report to inform the FY 2013-14 budget process.

Fire and Rescue Training Facility

PF&R's current training center property was acquired from the Water Bureau in the 1990s and houses Training and Safety Division administrative offices, classrooms, academy space, drill/exercise areas, and Fire Station 2. The bureau's five-year financial plan states under "Major Risks and Challenges" that the current training center is inadequate and does not meet current and future training needs. PF&R specifically notes two deficiencies: 1) the facility does not accommodate a "modern, all-hazard emergency response organization, and 2) that the training center administrative building does not have adequate space for the division staff.

It appears from PF&R's budget narrative that the bureau has a vision of new capital funding to support either a new or renovated training center, but in the current climate of reduced funding, proposals should be as cost neutral as possible. FPD recognizes that training is a fundamental component of maintaining firefighter and emergency responder certifications, knowledge, and skills and thereby recommends that the PF&R enter into discussion with Portland Police Bureau (PPB) to evaluate what, if any, opportunities exist to co-locate some of PF&R's training operations at the planned Police Training Center. This option would likely incur some amount of additional Interagency Agreement costs for PF&R but how much is not known in advance of PF&R discussions with PPB.

City of Portland
Decision Package Recommendations
(Includes Contingency and Ending Balance)

| | Bureau Priority | Bureau Requested | | | | FPD Analyst Recommendations | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|
| | | FTE | Gen Fund Ongoing | Gen Fund 1-Time | Other Revenues | Total Expenses | FTE | Gen Fund Ongoing | Gen Fund 1-Time | Other Revenues | Total Expenses |
| Portland Fire & Rescue | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>Reductions</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FR_01 - Return to Work (RTW) Program | 01 | (10.00) | (300,000) | 0 | 0 | (300,000) | (10.00) | (300,000) | 0 | 0 | (300,000) |
| FR_02 - Eliminate landline phone accounts | 02 | 0.00 | (5,000) | 0 | 0 | (5,000) | 0.00 | (5,000) | 0 | 0 | (5,000) |
| FR_03 - Eliminate OSSIII position | 03 | (1.00) | (63,731) | 0 | 0 | (63,731) | (1.00) | (63,731) | 0 | 0 | (63,731) |
| FR_04 - Investigation Overtime/Standby Restructure | 04 | 0.00 | (70,000) | 0 | 0 | (70,000) | 0.00 | (70,000) | 0 | 0 | (70,000) |
| FR_05 - Overtime Reduction | 05 | 0.00 | (120,000) | 0 | 0 | (120,000) | 0.00 | (120,000) | 0 | 0 | (120,000) |
| FR_06 - Eliminate Recruiter FF Specialist | 06 | (1.00) | (111,930) | 0 | 0 | (111,930) | (1.00) | (111,930) | 0 | 0 | (111,930) |
| FR_07 - Eliminate Utility Worker position | 07 | (1.00) | (68,968) | 0 | 0 | (68,968) | (1.00) | (68,968) | 0 | 0 | (68,968) |
| FR_08 - Close Fire Station | 08 | (13.00) | (1,084,000) | 0 | (130,716) | (1,214,716) | (13.00) | (1,084,000) | 0 | (130,716) | (1,214,716) |
| FR_09 - Eliminate Training Academy Training Lieutenant | 09 | (1.00) | (113,808) | 0 | 0 | (113,808) | (1.00) | (113,808) | 0 | 0 | (113,808) |
| FR_10 - Eliminate Injury Light Duty/FPD&R Liaison | 10 | (1.00) | (50,998) | 0 | (50,998) | (101,996) | (1.00) | (50,998) | 0 | (50,998) | (101,996) |
| FR_11 - Eliminate Public Information Officer | 11 | (1.00) | (112,975) | 0 | 0 | (112,975) | (1.00) | (112,975) | 0 | 0 | (112,975) |
| FR_12 - Eliminate Code Enforcement Inspector | 12 | (1.00) | (55,480) | 0 | (50,000) | (105,480) | (1.00) | (55,480) | 0 | (50,000) | (105,480) |
| FR_13 - Close Fire Station | 13 | (13.00) | (1,084,000) | 0 | (130,716) | (1,214,716) | (13.00) | (1,084,000) | 0 | (130,716) | (1,214,716) |
| FR_14 - Eliminate Code Enforcement Inspector | 14 | (1.00) | (55,480) | 0 | (50,000) | (105,480) | (1.00) | (55,480) | 0 | (50,000) | (105,480) |
| FR_15 - Eliminate Hazmat Program Coordinator | 15 | (0.50) | (71,724) | 0 | 0 | (71,724) | (0.50) | (71,724) | 0 | 0 | (71,724) |
| FR_16 - Eliminate Harbor Master Insp Specialist | 16 | (1.00) | (84,468) | 0 | (30,000) | (114,468) | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FR_17 - EMS Battalion Chief | 17 | (1.00) | (142,944) | 0 | 0 | (142,944) | (1.00) | (142,944) | 0 | 0 | (142,944) |
| FR_18 - Close Fire Station - 6% | 18 | (13.00) | (1,084,000) | 0 | (130,716) | (1,214,716) | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FR_19 - Reduce Station Staffing - 6% | 19 | (9.00) | (713,752) | 0 | (87,972) | (801,724) | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FR_20 - Close Fire Station - 8% | 20 | (13.00) | (1,084,000) | 0 | (130,716) | (1,214,716) | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FR_21 - Reduce Station Staffing - 8% | 21 | (8.00) | (713,753) | 0 | (83,652) | (797,405) | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FR_25 - FPD alternative package | NA | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Reductions | | (89.50) | (7,191,011) | 0 | (875,486) | (8,066,497) | (45.50) | (3,511,038) | 0 | (412,430) | (3,923,468) |
| <u>Unfunded Ongoing</u> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FR_22 - Station Staffing - Unfunded Ongoing Svc | 01 | 0.00 | 0 | 669,809 | 0 | 669,809 | 0.00 | 0 | 669,809 | 0 | 669,809 |
| FR_23 - Rescue Funding - Unfunded Ongoing Svc | 02 | 6.50 | 0 | 601,730 | 85,294 | 687,024 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

City of Portland
 Decision Package Recommendations
 (Includes Contingency and Ending Balance)

| | Bureau Priority | Bureau Requested | | | | | FPD Analyst Recommendations | | | | |
|---|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| | | FTE | Gen Fund Ongoing | Gen Fund 1-Time | Other Revenues | Total Expenses | FTE | Gen Fund Ongoing | Gen Fund 1-Time | Other Revenues | Total Expenses |
| Portland Fire & Rescue | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Unfunded Ongoing</i> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FR_24 - Rescue Funding - Unfunded Ongoing Svc | 03 | 6.50 | 0 | 601,730 | 85,294 | 687,024 | 4.00 | 0 | 360,073 | 48,739 | 408,812 |
| <i>Total Unfunded Ongoing</i> | | 13.00 | 0 | 1,873,269 | 170,588 | 2,043,857 | 4.00 | 0 | 1,029,882 | 48,739 | 1,078,621 |
| Total Portland Fire & Rescue | | (76.50) | (7,191,011) | 1,873,269 | (704,898) | (6,022,640) | (41.50) | (3,511,038) | 1,029,882 | (363,691) | (2,844,847) |
| <hr/> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Summary by Decision Package Type | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Total Reductions</i> | | <i>(89.50)</i> | <i>(7,191,011)</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>(875,486)</i> | <i>(8,066,497)</i> | <i>(45.50)</i> | <i>(3,511,038)</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>(412,430)</i> | <i>(3,923,468)</i> |
| <i>Total Unfunded Ongoing</i> | | <i>13.00</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>1,873,269</i> | <i>170,588</i> | <i>2,043,857</i> | <i>4.00</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>1,029,882</i> | <i>48,739</i> | <i>1,078,621</i> |
| <i>Total Bureau Adds</i> | | <i>0.00</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>0.00</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>0</i> |
| <i>Total Realignments</i> | | <i>0.00</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>0.00</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>0</i> | <i>0</i> |
| Grand Total | | (76.50) | (7,191,011) | 1,873,269 | (704,898) | (6,022,640) | (41.50) | (3,511,038) | 1,029,882 | (363,691) | (2,844,847) |

III. Decision Package Analysis & Recommendations

Reduction Packages

Eliminate the Return to Work Program/FR_01, (\$300,000), (10.00) FTE, Bureau Priority #1

The Return to Work Program began in FY 2006-07 and was discontinued in FY 2010-11. The program was funded by a combination of resources from PF&R (25% of participants' salaries plus their full benefits costs) and FPDR (75% of the participants' salaries); the expenditures for PF&R for the prior two years total \$72,000. FPDR states that they will experience little to no impact from the reduction of this pilot program.

FPD recommends this reduction as 1) the program appears to have been under-utilized and over-budgeted for the level of use it has experienced, and 2) there is projected to be no service impact to the public.

FPD Recommendation: (\$300,000), (10.00) FTE

Eliminate landline phone accounts/FR_02, (\$5,000), Bureau Priority #2

The bureau requests, for the second year in a row, to reduce the bureau's use of land line telephone accounts with Bureau of Technology Services (BTS), in the circumstances where cell phones can be used to equal or better affect. This approach achieves bureau efficiencies in addressing technology redundancies, but ultimately the costs associated with reduction of landlines and a greater reliance upon cell phone may just be redistributed across other City bureaus. According to BTS, the City purchases cell phone minutes in "blocks" for distribution across City bureaus, so if there is a Citywide shift away from landlines and toward cell phones, this may have the effect of BTS needing to purchase higher quantities of minutes at more cost— these increased costs would then be built into BTS rates. The current proposal by PF&R is unlikely to tip the scales for the City to need to purchase more cell phone minutes, but this issue is something to be aware of as other City bureaus are looking at these same cost-cutting measures.

FPD Recommendation: (\$5,000)

Eliminate the OSSIII position in MSD/FR_03, (\$63,731), (1.00) FTE, Bureau Priority #3

The OSSIII position is currently filled with a temporary employee. The position performs receptionist duties and updates general orders, operational guidelines, and plans. These tasks will be assumed by two Senior Administrative Specialists in the Planning & Customer Service unit of the Management Services Division who work on Strategic planning and business plan updates. The most significant impacts of the reduction projected by the bureau, are decreased levels of customer service for people who call or visit PF&R administrative office at Fire Station 1, as well as delays in getting business documents and plan updates completed.

FPD recommends this reduction, acknowledging this reduction will affect customer service levels and potentially create delays in document and plan completion.

FPD Recommendation: (\$63,731), (1.00) FTE

Investigator Overtime/Standby Restructure /FR_04, (\$70,000), Bureau Priority #4

The bureau is proposing to restructure the Investigation Unit’s work schedules/assignments. The expectation is that the overtime and call shift work will decrease with strategic changes to schedules. This change needs to be bargained with the Local 43 union; bargaining is scheduled to begin in March and the outcome of the bargaining would not be known until July 1 at the earliest. Because it is unknown if this is a successful strategy, it is not a certainty if this reduction package would result in savings.

FPD recommends this approach to overtime reduction strategy, but would like PF&R to be prepared to submit an alternate reduction in the event that negotiations with the union do not produce a successful outcome for PF&R.

FPD Recommendation: (\$70,000)

Overtime Reduction/FR_05, (\$120,000), Bureau Priority #5

The proposed reduction includes the elimination of budget to support 2,400 hours of overtime for bureau staff to attend committee activities. Bureau staff participate in committee activities when they are off-duty and are thereby paid overtime. This reduction is part of the bureau’s larger effort to look at additional overtime controls. The reduction will limit staff opportunities to participate in bureau committees including Bureau/Budget Advisory Committee, strategic planning, safety, station improvement, uniforms, diversity development, continuous quality improvement, computer advisory, fire information systems, and website committees.

FPD supports the reduction as part of the bureau’s overall overtime management strategy. Based upon historical patterns it appears that the bureau can manage to the reduced level of overtime available for staff to attend committee activities, albeit with less frequency. PF&R has provided a greater level of detail in the composition of their overtime costs than the data available to FPD, and states that approximately \$600,000 of the annual overtime costs are incurred by employees working outside of their regular schedule. The bureau states that the \$120,000 reduction proposed in this decision package will come from this category of overtime, and represents a 20% reduction from their current levels of expenditures.

| PF&R TOTAL BUREAU OVERTIME | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| FY 2009-10 | FY 2010-11 | FY 2011-12 | FY 2012-13 |
| Actuals | Actuals | Budget | Requested |
| \$8,194,548 | \$6,847,822 | \$8,072,971 | \$7,703,575 |

FPD Recommendation: (\$120,000)

Eliminate Recruiter FF Specialist /FR_06, (\$111,930), (1.00) FTE, Bureau Priority #6

The bureau has had a person dedicated to recruitment since 1997. The position is responsible for the traditional recruitment activities including announcements, hiring process, testing/interviews, and background checks, but also has been focused on the bureau’s efforts to achieve greater diversity through recruitments. The position maintains relationships with, and does outreach into, Portland’s diverse communities. Over the past two years, women and minority recruits have comprised 26% of the bureau’s total recruits. Although the numbers shows progress in recruiting women and minorities, it is difficult to directly tie the results of the recruiter position efforts to the changing composition of PF&R employees, as the general trends of employment in this field has shown increasing levels of diversity.

Seattle Fire Department (SFD) is another jurisdiction that is proposing a similar operational change for 2012; as an efficiency measure, SFD intends to eliminate their one dedicated recruiter position, and alternately divide recruitment responsibilities between department's human resources staff and the department's Office of Race and Social Justice Change team members.

FPD recommends the reduction of the recruiter position, as the incumbent will still remain in PF&R and would be available to respond to limited and specialized recruitment needs, although if that option is used, it would incur overtime costs. Additionally, seeing potential value in implementing some aspects of the SFD approach, FPD recommends that the PF&R reach out to the Office of Equity and Human Rights (OE) to evaluate if OE can assist in recruitment efforts to under-represented communities.

FPD Recommendation: (\$111,930), (1.00) FTE

Eliminate Utility Worker position/FR_07, (\$68,968), (1.00) FTE, Bureau Priority #7

The request will eliminate one of two UWII positions assigned to Management Services Division. The position was responsible for courier services between the bureau's facilities, including Hazmat and bio-waste pickup. The position is also responsible, to a lesser degree, for tasks including grounds maintenance and minor equipment repairs.

FPD recommends this reduction as the position was created in the Fall BMP 2011 and has been vacant since that time.

FPD Recommendation: (\$68,968), (1.00) FTE

Station Closure Packages:

4% cut level Close Fire Station /FR_08, (\$1,214,716), (13.00) FTE, Bureau Priority #8

4% cut level Close Fire Station /FR_013, (\$1,214,716), (13.00) FTE, Bureau Priority #13

6% cut level Close Fire Station /FR_018, (\$1,214,716), (13.00) FTE, Bureau Priority #18

8% cut level Close Fire Station /FR_20, (\$1,214,716), (13.00) FTE, Bureau Priority #20

These four requests, in addition to the two packages for reduced station staffing, comprise the majority of PF&R's proposed reductions to meet Council's mandated 4-6-8% cuts. At the 8% level of cuts, the closure of approximately 5.3 stations equates to 90% of the cut target. What this shows is that the lion's share of the cuts that the bureau submitted have direct service impacts and will affect bureau response and reliability.

PF&R has identified the potential impact on response time, with 5.3 station closures at the 8% reduction level, as an average increase of almost 2 additional minutes. Reliability, in addition to response time, is a useful way to measure the impact of station closures on the system. Reliability represents the percentage of time that a unit is available to respond within the FMA in which they reside. At a system-wide level, the bureau projects the reliability percentage to decrease by almost 5% per station closure. For areas of the City that are geographically remote and/or are in or adjacent to the FMA's affected by station closures, PF&R projects that the response time might double from current service levels, to between 14 to 16 minutes. The difficulty in making decisions about which and how many stations to take off-line is that, without sophisticated modeling, there is very little dependability in projections of response time and reliability impacts. While it is not known what specific impacts would be felt in certain geographic regions of the City with station reductions/cuts, there is certainty of decreased service, and a strain on bureau response capabilities, particularly in circumstances where there are several events occurring concurrently, requiring the resources from surrounding FMAs.

The bureau is responsible to respond to EMS, Fire, HazMat, natural and manmade disasters, and other major events. Adequate staffing is necessary to be able to respond to EMS calls in a timely manner, using the average time within which cardiac arrest patient needs to be treated, which is 5.30 minutes as the upper limit goal for EMS response (the bureau is currently at 7.17 minutes average response time). It is also necessary to be able to have resources to respond on-scene to fires in a short period of time to mitigate flamespread and increased risk for loss of life and property. The bureau maintains resources to be ready and available for daily emergency response, as well as the confluence of major emergency events. Fire events do not comprise the majority of the bureau's workload, with only 2,000 on average occurring annually, but staffing needs to accommodate the low likelihood but high-risk potentiality of multiple fires occurring concurrently. This "perfect storm" has occurred twice in the past eight months, with four fires occurring the morning of June 2, 2011 and three fires occurring the night/morning of December 27/ December 28. The bureau reported that the three fires occurring at relatively the same time, "tapped nearly half of [their] fire crews [on duty] at once." This meant that approximately half of the PF&R resources would have been available for emergency medical calls, other fires that might have occurred, or other emergency events.

FPD recommends closure of two stations (FR_08 and FR_13) due to the significant shortfall in ongoing General Fund resources available. This is a challenging reduction in light of the goals articulated in City Financial Policy of "supporting the City's essential services" and "maintaining and protecting the City's infrastructure." The lack of available data creates difficulty in assessing the extent to which the closure of two stations will have a material impact on response and reliability. PF&R had two stations closed concurrently in 1991 but the bureau did not track data regarding the impact of the closures on response and reliability times. In the absence of available data, FPD recommends that the bureau model the operational impacts of closing stations to provide more precise data to Council during the FY 2012-13 budget process. FPD additionally recommends that after receiving this data, Council evaluate the distribution of General Fund resources across City bureaus to determine if larger reductions in other bureaus may be warranted to avoid some or all of the station closures.

FPD Recommendation: (\$2,168,000) general fund reduction, (\$261,432) reduction to FPDR LA revenue, (26.00) FTE

Eliminate Training Academy Lieutenant/FR_09, (\$113,808), (1.00) FTE, Bureau Priority #9

The elimination of the position will reduce the training capacity for new recruits and trainees. The responsibilities have been shared between a Captain and Lieutenant, and this reduction will mean that all of the academy training supervisory responsibilities will now be shifted to the Captain; the average span of control will increase from 1 supervisor to 8 recruits and doubling to an average of 1 supervisor to 16 academy recruits. U.S. Department of Homeland Security considers the recommended normal span of control at 1:5, with between 1:8 and 1:10 as acceptable span of control for larger-scale public safety operations (National Incident Management System guidelines, March 1, 2004, page 31). The projected impacts of the reduction are the elimination of, or diminished service levels in, instruction, performance observation, counseling, office coordination, exams, record maintenance, and apparatus inventories.

FPD recommends this reduction and additionally recommends that the bureau evaluate if there is the opportunity to restructure the workload across Training and Safety Division sections, to minimize the impact of the reduction.

FPD Recommendation: (\$113,808), (1.00)

Eliminate Injury Light Duty/FPDR Liaison/FR_10, (\$101,996), (1.00) FTE, Bureau Priority #10

The FPDR Liaison position has been in existence since 1994 and the primary functions have been 1) a communication conduit between PF&R members and FPDR and 2) to assist in placing eligible injured PF&R sworn members in temporary light duty positions. The position had been 100% funded by FPDR until FY 2010-11 when the position costs were split 50/50 between PF&R and FPDR. The most notable impact of the position reduction is projected to be the loss of consistent and timely information sharing between FPDR and PF&R staff. The elimination of the position will result in a \$51K savings to the General Fund and the same savings to taxpayers funding the FPDR Levy. FPD recommends that PF&R approach FPDR about paying for the full costs of the position again, and in the event they are unsuccessful in their negotiation with FPDR, eliminate the position.

FPD Recommendation: (\$50,998) reduction to the General Fund, (\$50,998) reduction to LA with FPDR, (1.00) FTE

Eliminate PIO /FR_11, (\$112,975), (1.00) FTE, Bureau Priority #11

This request will eliminate the single point of information for media contact, the bureau's Public Information Officer. The positions responsibilities include responding to media requests, news/media releases, and contributing to PIO staffing 24 hours a day/ 7 days a week. Additional duties are proactive safety messaging and public outreach. The anticipated impacts of eliminating the position is a less consistent approach to the bureau's media messaging, possible negative affects on the bureau's relationship with the media/press, and passing the PIO duties to other Public Information and Education section staff, which is projected to incur overtime costs. FPD recommends this reduction despite the bureau's projected negative impacts, and reallocating the work across the remaining 7.00 FTE positions in the Public Information and Education sections.

FPD Recommendation: (\$112,975), (1.00) FTE

Eliminate Code Enforcement Inspectors/FR_12, 14 (\$210,960), (2.00) FTE, Bureau Priority #12, #14

The bureau is submitting two identical requests to eliminate a total of 2.00 FTE Code Enforcement Inspectors. The inspectors inspect commercial and multi-family dwellings to ensure that codes are not violated. The program goal of inspections occurring every two years is currently not being met, as the average amount of time between inspections is 2.5 years; this time period between inspections is projected to increase with the decrease in available inspectors. The costs for the positions are recovered partially through fees at a cost recovery rate of 48%. The reduction of the two positions will bring the work unit's total FTE down to 20, with 17 inspector positions.

FPD recognizes the reduction of the two positions will further reduce the program's ability to meet inspection goals, furthermore that the reductions provide limited benefit to the General Fund as the positions are nearly 50% fee revenue funded. FPD recommends the reductions in light of limited General Fund resources currently available, but that the positions are restored if funding is made available either by 1) Council allocation of General Fund resources, or 2) new program revenues through increased program fees/fines. PF&R should evaluate if there are opportunities to raise fees and/or fines to bring in additional revenues as they currently achieve a cost recovery rate of 48% for the program, while, by comparison, the City of Seattle Fire Department was able to achieve a 68% rate of recovery for its inspection program in 2011 (City of Seattle 2012 Proposed Budget).

FPD Recommendation: (\$110,960) General Fund reduction, (\$100,000) program revenue reduction, (2.00) FTE

Eliminate Hazmat Program Coordinator/FR_15, (\$71,724), (0.50) FTE, Bureau Priority #15

The Hazmat Program currently is staffed by 1.00 FTE coordination position, and this package requests to reduce that position to 0.50 FTE. The position is responsible for managing the bureau's OSHA and hazmat training and certifications. Additionally the position is the bureau's contact point for City, state, federal, and local hazmat response issues, and implementation and coordination of any hazmat-related grant funding. The bureau projects the impacts of the reduction as less in-house training and, instead, outsourcing training, which may incur more costs. Additionally the reduction will mean that there will be limited resources available to coordinate with Portland Police Bureau specialty units, Multnomah County Health, and FBI's weapons of mass destruction team in incident training, exercise, and response.

PF&R has requested that Council considers funding 0.50 FTE Hazmat Program Coordinator position with General Fund overhead based upon the rationale that 50-60% of the position's time is spent providing assistance, coordination, and training to other agencies and other City bureaus, including the Portland Bureau of Emergency Management, BOEC, the Water Bureau, and Portland Police Bureau. FPD does not recommend funding the 0.50 FTE with General Fund overhead as it is a resource intended to fund programs/efforts that have general Citywide benefit, and for which benefit cannot be attributed to specific bureaus. Interagency Agreement funding from the benefiting bureaus would be more appropriate for this program.

FPD recommends this reduction and recommends that PF&R reach out to the benefiting bureaus to evaluate whether developing IAs is an appropriate option to backfill funding for the 0.50 FTE position.

FPD Recommendation: (\$71,724), (0.50) FTE

Eliminate Harbor Master Inspector Specialist position/FR_16, (\$114,468), (1.00) FTE, Bureau Priority #16

The Harbor Master has myriad of responsibilities which include inspections of docks, wharves, landings, vessels, and watercraft; regulation of fireworks displays on the riverfront; code enforcement at moorages; regulating barge safety zones; and coordination of the Rose Festival Fleet. Many of the duties are mandated by City Code Title 19, and if PF&R is no longer responsible for these, they will need to be taken on by another governmental entity; to date PF&R has not had discussions with any other agency to take over these functions.

One important and discrete function of the Harbor Master is the regulation of the types, quantities, and time allowed in port, of sensitive materials, and specifically hazardous materials, brought into the city via marine shipping. Some of the inspection functions may be appropriate for the Bureau of Development Services to assume, but some require the involvement and enforcement capacity of sworn public safety officers, so the responsibilities could not be shifted easily to other entities.

The position typically dedicates 100 hours of time, in advance and during the event, to assist coordination of the Rose Festival Fleet. One of the preparatory activities is traveling to San Diego to meet with the Admiral of the U.S. Navy Third Fleet. During the Rose Festival, all of the position's time is dedicated to the Rose Festival Fleet activities. If the Harbor Master position is eliminated and therefore does not coordinate the Rose Festival maritime fleet, the Rose Festival Association will need to assume the responsibilities.

FPD does not recommend this reduction because the majority of the position's regulatory responsibilities are designated by City Code, and to date no assessment has been done for the transfer of responsibilities to other entities. FPD recommends that PF&R will evaluate, and report on during the Fall BMP 2012, the options available for shifting position responsibilities either to

internally to other appropriate positions in the bureau, or other appropriate governmental entities that may be able to assume some of the regulatory functions currently articulated in City Code Title 19. FPD does recommend that the Harbor Master delegate any non-technical coordination tasks related to the Rose Festival Fleet to the Rose Festival Association.

FPD Recommendation: \$0

Eliminate EMS Battalion Chief/FR_17, (\$142,944), (1.00) FTE, Bureau Priority #17

The bureau is proposing to eliminate one of the bureau's 15 battalion chief positions from Emergency Medical Services section under the Training and Safety division. The position is responsible for coordinating the EMS training for all bureau sworn staff, is a liaison with Multnomah County Health and EMS and the point of contact with the County's private ambulance service, American Medical Rescue (AMR), and neighboring EMS responder agencies. The bureau projects that the position reduction will adversely impact EMS training, wellness and fitness, and planning and coordination and that the bureau will not actively participate in the review of the County's contract with AMR.

FPD recommends this reduction with the stipulations that 1) EMS training is not compromised as EMS response is a critical function of the bureau, and the largest workload of the bureau's responders, and 2) division reorganization efforts reassign the responsibility within PF&R to review and monitor Multnomah County's contractual arrangement with AMR, as the terms of the contract have direct operational impacts on PF&R emergency responders.

FPD Recommendation: (\$142,944), (1.00) FTE

6% & 8% cut level Reduce Station Staffing/FR_019, 21 (\$1,599,129), (17.00) FTE, Bureau Priority #19, #21

The two decision packages will reduce station staffing from 13 FTE to 4 in request FR_019 and from 13 to 5 in request FR_021. The impacts of the reductions would be the inability to staff any emergency response vehicles at the selected stations, which would mean that the station would operate with minimal functionality or the bureau may, after operational evaluations, decide to close the stations with reduced staffing and reallocate the resources elsewhere in the bureau.

FPD does not recommend these proposals to reduce station staffing, as the packages were submitted by the bureau in order to comply with the 6% and 8% cut targets, and do not support a sustainable strategy for realignment of the system.

FPD Recommendation: \$0, 0.00 FTE

Unfunded Ongoing Packages

City bureaus were directed for the FY 2012-13 budget process to only submit add packages that would continue funding for ongoing programs which had received serial one-time resources; PF&R has submitted three add packages for one-time funding. FPD has recommended a total of \$1.03 million in one-time resources for PF&R, \$670K for the station staffing and \$360K for partial rescue unit funding. FPD recognizes that the funding requested for the rescues is intended to be reallocated to the RRV pilot project, and supports that effort. Due to constrained one-time General Fund resources, FPD only recommended partial funding for one of the two rescue units, which effectively would reduce the funding available for the RRV pilot project/program. FPD recommends that the bureau 1) have the ability to split the recommended one-time resources between the station staffing and rescue unit requests in a way that will achieve the most optimal

operational impacts, and 2) report on their preferred allocation during the FY 2012-13 budget process.

One-time funding for ongoing programs is not a strategy supported by FPD as it directly conflicts with the City’s financial policies. Without any mitigating efforts, PF&R will be faced with the same budgetary deficiencies in FY 2013-14 that they are experiencing in FY 2012-13. To address these structural deficiencies, FPD recommends that during this budget process, the bureau identify 1) operational changes to adjust to sustained decreased resources, and 2) the services levels impacts of the reduced levels of funding. This will better inform Council as they evaluate the distribution of General Fund one-time and ongoing resources across the City bureaus.

Station Staffing/FR_22, \$669,809, Bureau Priority #1

This request is for one-time funding to continue current operations funded with one-time resources and specifically provide continued funding for permanent authorized positions. This package also includes increased salary and benefits costs for the requested staffing. In FY 2010-11 Council allocated one-time resources for partial funding to keep open a fire station, which was slated for closure. The one-time funding continued in FY 2011-12 to partially fund a station; the funding did not support one single station but was disbursed throughout the PF&R system to keep all stations open. FPD recommends the one-time resources again in FY 2012-13, in order to sustain adequate levels of service to the public.

FPD Recommendation: \$669,809

Rescue 11 & 19 Funding/FR_23, 24 \$1,374,048, 13.00 FTE, Bureau Priority #2, #3

Currently one-time funding is supporting operations of the Advanced Life Support (ALS) rescues located out of Station 11 in SE Portland (5707 SE 92nd Avenue) and Station 19 in East Portland (7301 East Burnside Street). The rescue units assist in responding to EMS calls, as the stations both have some of the highest call volumes in the PF&R system, with over 3,000 EMS calls each annually. Without the rescues, the EMS call burden shifts to the Stations’ engine company and reduces reliability (the percentage of time that a fire unit is available to respond to a call in their FMA) and increases response times in this and surrounding FMAs. PF&R has stated that they will reallocate one-time funding from the rescue units to support the bureau’s rapid response vehicle program in FY 2012-13, an approach that is supported by FPD.

FPD recommends one-time General Fund resources of \$360,073 to support 4.00 FTE. The package also includes \$48,739 in pension reimbursement revenue from FPDR. FPD recommends this request as the funding will be used to support the RRV program in FY 2012-13. If these packages are not funded, PF&R has stated that the RRV program will end on June 30, 2012.

FPD Recommendation: \$360,073 GF discretionary, \$48,739 FPDR LA revenue, 4.00 FTE

IV. Capital Improvement Plan Analysis & Recommendations

| Capital Plan Summary | FY 2012-13 | FY 2013-14 | FY 2014-15 | FY 2015-16 | FY 2016-17 | 5-Year Total |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Apparatus replacement | \$2,724,000 | \$5,762,000 | \$4,848,000 | \$767,000 | \$0 | \$14,101,000 |
| Capital Plan Total | \$2,724,000 | \$5,762,000 | \$4,848,000 | \$767,000 | \$0 | \$14,101,000 |

Public Safety General Obligation (GO) Bond

In FY 2010-11 the public approved a GO bond for the purchase of equipment and services to support City public safety bureaus, including PF&R. The purchases approved by the bond were \$19.8 million to fund Fire apparatus replacement for a fifteen-year period and \$7.9 million for the construction of Station 21. To date, \$42K of the Apparatus Replacement funding has been

expended. In the current fiscal year, the procurement process is underway for two fire boats (contract amount is \$5 million) and four SUV vehicles that will be used for the RRV program.

Station 21 is not included in the bureau’s CIP above, as it is managed by OMF Facilities. The Apparatus Replacement project budget was not subject to Council’s mandate that bureaus submit 4%-6%-8% reductions for FY 2012-13 requested budgets.

V. Performance and Accountability

Bureau Budget Advisory Committee (BAC)

The bureau convened their BAC for three meetings to prepare the bureau’s requested budget. The bureau’s BAC is one of the larger, if not the largest, in the City. The principal members number 35 and consist of: five private citizens, one stakeholder, eleven sworn bureau employees, four non-sworn bureau employees, two union representatives, seven members of bureau executive management, and five management support employees. Additionally there were 23 other bureau “participant employees” in attendance, who volunteered but were not selected to serve on the BAC and were invited to sit-in on the BAC meetings. The “participant employees” contributed as much to the discussions, if not more, than the formal members of the BAC.

The first meeting’s agenda included review of the programmatic and operational structure of the bureau, the City’s financial forecast, General Fund revenue sources and allocation, OMF Internal Services fee structures, and general brainstorming regarding possible reductions and new revenue proposals. The second meeting consisted of reviewing the reduction and new revenue proposals, with bureau management explaining the reasons that packages did or did not move forward in the process. The third meeting culminated the BAC process with Commissioner Leonard speaking about his priorities for the bureau’s FY 2012-13 Budget. One laudable aspect of the BAC meetings was that they appear to serve as an open forum for both BAC members and bureau staff in attendance to ask questions and make suggestions. The bureau seems to have achieved an environment of open communication between various levels of bureau staff, management, union representatives, and private citizens.

Changes to Bureau Performance Trends

The table below shows PF&R’s performance trends comparing their FY 2010-11 performance (the most recent year with actual data available) with FY 2012-13 targets including impacts of reductions at the 8% level. Several of the key measures by which the bureau gauges their performance show alarming trends. These include 1) response times for EMS, for Fire, and overall at the 90th percentile, which is projected to increase between 20-25%, 2) the number of fire incidents projected to increase by nearly 20%, 3) incidents per average on-duty emergency staff projected to increase by 16%, 4) and response reliability is projected to decline by 33%. The downward trends for the inspections program performance measures reflect the reduction of two Code Enforcement Inspection positions in decision packages FR_12 and FR_14.

| Performance Measure | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2012-13 | trends |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|
| | actuals | target | no dps | w dps* | |
| Percent of residents rating service good or very good | 87% | 90% | 90% | 80% | ↓11.1% |
| Total number of incidents | 67,212 | 70,000 | 69,000 | 69,000 | ↓1.4% |
| % of strategies completed in Strategic Plan out of number targeted for fiscal year | 61.0% | 80.0% | 80.0% | 60.0% | ↓25% |
| Response time (turnout & travel) at 90th percentile (Goal: 5:20 or 5.33 minutes) | 7.22 | 7.17 | 7.3 | 9 | ↑25% |
| Number of inspectable occupancies | 39,202 | 39,500 | 39,800 | 39,800 | stable |
| Number of structural fires in inspectable occupancies | 208 | 220 | 220 | 230 | ↑10% |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Number of structural fires in non-inspectable occupancies | 391 | 420 | 420 | 420 | ↑7.4% |
| # of structural fires per 1,000 inspectable occupancies | 5.31 | 5.57 | 5.53 | 5.78 | ↑8.9% |
| Average on-duty emergency staffing | 169 | 169 | 165 | 149 | ↓13.5% |
| Number of fire incidents | 1,673 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | ↑19.6% |
| Number of medical incidents | 47,958 | 47,500 | 49,000 | 49,000 | ↑2.2% |
| Number of other incidents | 17,581 | 20,500 | 20,000 | 20,000 | ↑13.8% |
| Incidents per average on-duty emergency staff | 398 | 414 | 418 | 463 | ↑16.3% |
| Total number of structural fires | 600 | 670 | 640 | 650 | ↑8.3% |
| Structural fires per 1,000 residents | 1.03 | 1.14 | 1.07 | 1.08 | stable |
| Total fires per 1,000 residents | 2.88 | 3.40 | 3.33 | 3.33 | ↑15.6% |
| Medical incidents per 1,000 residents | 82.48 | 80.71 | 81.67 | 81.67 | stable |
| Lives lost per 100,000 residents | 0.52 | 0.92 | 0.82 | 1.00 | ↑92.3% |
| Property loss as a percent of value of property | 0.4% | 0.7% | 0.8% | 1.0% | ↑250% |
| Number of frontline emergency vehicles | 81 | 81 | 79 | 78 | stable |
| Average age of frontline engines (in years) | 9 | 7 | 7 | 6 | ↓30% |
| Average age of frontline trucks (in years) | 11 | 10 | 11 | 11 | stable |
| Average miles on frontline engines | 81,228 | 71,600 | 75,000 | 65,000 | ↓20% |
| Average miles on frontline trucks | 76,973 | 68,000 | 70,000 | 70,000 | ↓9% |
| Code enforcement inspections | 15,693 | 15,700 | 15,800 | 14,300 | ↓9% |
| Code enforcement re-inspections | 4,635 | 6,300 | 5,300 | 5,000 | ↑7.9% |
| Percent of inspectable occupancies inspected within 27 months | 83.0% | 83.0% | 83.0% | 70.0% | ↓15.6% |
| Total code violations found | 14,412 | 16,400 | 15,300 | 14,000 | stable |
| Average violations per inspection | 0.92 | 1.04 | 0.97 | 0.98 | stable |
| Percent of violations abated within 90 days of detection | 57% | 60% | 60% | 50% | ↓12.3% |
| Percent of structural fires where flamespread was confined to room of origin | 81.1% | 83.0% | 82.0% | 70.0% | ↓13.4% |
| Response time (turnout & travel) at 90th percentile-EMS | 7.08 | 7.07 | 7.17 | 8.83 | ↑24.7% |
| Response time (turnout & travel) at 90th percentile-Fire | 7.03 | 7.00 | 7.03 | 8.50 | ↑20.1% |
| With patient time at 90th percentile (interval between dispatch and with patient in minutes) | 9.32 | 9.33 | 9.5 | 11 | ↑18% |
| Response reliability (overall-GO dates excluded) | 90.5% | 92.3% | 90.0% | 70.0% | ↓33% |
| # of requests for service in the city of Portland, regardless of the fire agency responding | 68,610 | 71,500 | 71,000 | 71,000 | stable |
| Total arson incidents per 10,000 population | 4.51 | 5.1 | 4.55 | 4.55 | stable |
| | | | | | |
| * with Decision Packages at 8% cut level | | | | | |