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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

POLICY CHOICES FRAMEWORK

The Templeton Community Services District retained Citygate Associates, LLC to conduct an assessment of the Templeton Fire Department. The objectives of this study were to evaluate community risk, identify and assess current services, evaluate community demographics and future growth, and identify and provide a high-level analysis of alternative service delivery options.

OVERALL PERSPECTIVE ON STATE OF TEMPLETON FIRE SERVICES

In brief, Citygate finds that the challenge of providing fire services in Templeton is similar to that found in many smaller communities across the nation: providing an adequate level of fire services within the context of limited fiscal resources, competing needs, and limited growth.

The Templeton Community Services District has adequate fire station coverage because of its small geographic area and automatic mutual aid relationship with the San Luis Obispo County Fire Department. Citygate’s deployment study findings do not find a need for an additional fire station facility, but do identify challenges with the Department’s current deployment model to achieve desired outcomes. While the Templeton volunteer firefighters provide exceptional commitment, service, and value to the community, life and regulatory factors beyond their control, as described in this study, make it problematic to continue to rely primarily on them to achieve desired outcomes to emergencies within the community. This study provides a range of potential alternative service delivery models, both near-term as well as longer-term, for consideration by the District; however, the number of viable options within current fiscal resources are limited.

Citygate evaluated all aspects of the Fire Department during the deployment and Fire Department support systems review, and several challenges for the District emerged. To address each of these challenges, Citygate makes key findings and, where appropriate, specific action item recommendations that deserve specific and particular consideration. Starting in Section 5 on page 89, all the findings and recommendations are presented in together, in order. Overall, there are 22 findings and 12 specific action item recommendations.

It is important that the reader of this study understands that while there are issues to be planned for and improved upon in the Department, there is not a problematic, “won’t do it, can’t do it” culture to overcome. The Department is eager for a plan that gives direction and triages the existing resources to do an even-better job for the citizens of the District within the current economic constraints.
One can summarize the primary fire service challenges facing the District in two themes: 
(1) providing sufficient initial response staffing to achieve desired outcomes for even routine, 
non-serious emergencies; and (2) providing an adequate effective response force to achieve 
desired outcomes for moderate to significant emergency events.

Challenge 1: Initial Response Staffing and Deployment

Effective fire department deployment, simply stated, is about the speed and weight of the response force. Speed calls for first-due, all-risk intervention units (engines, ladder trucks and specialty companies) strategically located across a jurisdiction to arrive at the scene of an emergency within approximately 4-7 minutes of receipt of a 9-1-1 call to achieve desired outcomes for routine, less complex emergencies without escalation.

In the Deployment Analysis section of this study (Section 2), Citygate’s analysis reveals that the District is challenged to provide adequate initial response staffing to achieve desired outcomes for even routine, non-serious emergencies. As cited earlier, Templeton’s volunteer firefighters have historically provided excellent commitment, service, and value to the community. However, negative pressures on volunteerism nationwide, as well as increased regulatory requirements and service demand, all combine to make continued primary reliance on this initial staffing model not reasonably sustainable over the long term.

The District hired its first two full-time firefighters in 2011 to provide on-duty (immediately available) 2-person minimum staffing during daytime hours (8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.) at least five days per week. Supplemental voluntary scheduled staffing by District paid-call firefighters was intended to ensure minimum 2-person staffing initially during daytime hours Monday through Saturday, and eventually seven days per week. Citygate’s analysis indicates that this staffing model has been relatively successful over the last several months; however, it has not been able to maintain the desired minimum staffing level approximately 17 percent of the time.\(^1\) Additional full-time staffing is not feasible within current Department fiscal resources. In Citygate’s experience, reliance on such a small workforce to provide initial deployment staffing becomes significantly problematic in the event of even a single extended absence or unplanned resignation or retirement. Citygate considers this staffing model fragile at best over the long term, and also not reasonably sustainable. We suggest a shared-services partnership with a larger neighboring fire agency for full-time staffing where sensible to minimize this risk.

Because of these and other findings cited throughout this report, Citygate recommends that the District consider a contract with San Luis Obispo (SLO) County Fire Department / CAL FIRE to

\(^1\) Analysis of staffing levels from May 1, 2013 through October 15, 2013
relocate SLO County Fire Engine #30 to the Templeton CSD Fire Station as a shared County/District resource, and augment the 2-person CAL FIRE staffing of this engine with scheduled Templeton paid-call firefighters as available. Citygate views this alternative as the only viable option to enhance initial response times from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. and effectively resolve this initial response deployment challenge within existing District fiscal resources. This option would provide a 24-hours-per-day, 7-days-per-week, 2-person career-staffed engine in Templeton with an estimated service demand of approximately 1,400 calls per year, an average of 3.8 calls per day.

**Challenge 2: Effective Response Force for More Serious Emergencies**

The second critical component of effective fire department deployment involves the weight of the initial response force. This is about a sufficient number of additional units arriving at the scene of more serious emergencies such as a room and contents fire within a building, a multiple-patient medical emergency, a vehicle collision with extrication required, or a complex rescue or wildland fire incident. In these situations, a jurisdiction must assemble enough firefighters within about 8-11 minutes to perform the critical tasks necessary to achieve desired outcomes safely without further escalation.

While no single jurisdiction (even a large metropolitan city) can stand by itself and handle every possible emergency without assistance, desirable goals include: (1) the ability to field enough of an immediately-available response force to handle a community’s typical day-to-day responses for primary single-unit response needs equitably to all neighborhoods; and (2) the ability to provide an effective initial response force to moderately serious building fires, serious vehicle collisions and medical emergencies, and wildland fires.

Recognized industry guidelines and best practices suggest that a minimum of 10 firefighters and a qualified Incident Commander are required to perform the critical tasks necessary at a multiple-patient vehicle extrication or other specialty rescue, and a minimum of 14-15 firefighters plus an Incident Commander are required for even a modest, single-fire-hose residential building fire. A more serious fire in a two-story residential building or a one-story commercial or multi-story building would require, at a minimum, an additional two to three engines and an additional truck company and chief officer, for upwards of 27-28 total personnel.

The current Templeton deployment model includes an automatic mutual aid agreement with San Luis Obispo County / CAL FIRE for all types of emergencies requiring more than a single unit. This involves the immediate dispatch of SLO County Engine #30 with two personnel from Station #30 on Ramada Drive at the northern District boundary, and within 6 minutes travel time to all points of the District. The Department also has an automatic mutual aid agreement with the City of Atascadero for wildland fires only that provides a minimum of three firefighters. The current deployment model additionally anticipates a sufficient response of District paid-call
Firefighters to comprise the effective response force necessary to achieve desired outcomes for emergency incidents within the District. For the relatively infrequent serious emergencies, additional resources are usually available through the San Luis Obispo County Mutual Aid Plan, although the response times for those resources are longer and the expected outcomes would be more severe. Thus, the current deployment model anticipates that most of the effective response force for District emergency incidents will be comprised of paid-call firefighters.

Citygate’s analysis, however, suggests that only a few very dedicated paid-call firefighters are actually responding to emergency incidents on a regular basis, and are essentially keeping the deployment system functional to its current degree of effectiveness, with a significant potential of employee burnout. In Citygate’s opinion, this effective response force model is insufficient to achieve desired outcomes, and is also not reasonably sustainable over the long term. In addition, current personnel and operating costs slightly exceed current fiscal resources, and will likely require some continuing level of augmentation in order to maintain a balanced budget.

For these reasons as well as others explained in this report, Citygate recommends that the District: (1) aggressively pursue recruitment and retention of additional local paid-call firefighters; (2) develop an automatic mutual aid agreement with the City of Paso Robles; and (3) enhance the existing automatic mutual aid agreement with Atascadero. Implementing these recommendations will provide the effective response force necessary to achieve desired outcomes for moderately severe emergencies within existing District fiscal resources. Other longer-term alternatives worthy of consideration as District growth occurs and fiscal resources permit include:

- Providing additional full-time daily staffing on SLO County Engine #30.
- Contracting for staffing of a dedicated District engine.
- Sharing of administrative, support and/or operational functions.

In Citygate’s opinion, shared fire services among all of the north San Luis Obispo County fire agencies would maximize operational and fiscal efficiencies for all of the respective communities.

Table 27 below (shown in Section 4 of the report) summarizes the estimated costs of the various alternative service options against current Fire Department fiscal resources.
Table 27—Alternative Service Model Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Model Alternative</th>
<th>Current FD Budget¹</th>
<th>Estimated Contract Cost²</th>
<th>Ongoing District FD Costs³</th>
<th>Total Cost⁴</th>
<th>Budget vs. Total Cost Difference⁵</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Deployment Model</td>
<td>$784,790</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$807,230</td>
<td>$807,230</td>
<td>($22,440)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a Contract Relocation of E-30 to TCSD (2-person BLS)⁶</td>
<td>$784,790</td>
<td>$387,000</td>
<td>$263,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$134,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b Contract Relocation of E-30 to TCSD (2-person ALS)⁥</td>
<td>$784,790</td>
<td>$442,000</td>
<td>$263,000</td>
<td>$705,000</td>
<td>$79,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 E-30 with 3rd-person PCF staffing⁶</td>
<td>$784,790</td>
<td>$387,000</td>
<td>$353,000</td>
<td>$740,000</td>
<td>$44,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a E-30 with 3-person CAL FIRE staffing (BLS)</td>
<td>$784,790</td>
<td>$635,000</td>
<td>$263,000</td>
<td>$898,000</td>
<td>($113,210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b E-30 with 3-person CAL FIRE staffing (ALS)</td>
<td>$784,790</td>
<td>$670,000</td>
<td>$263,000</td>
<td>$933,000</td>
<td>($148,210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a Templeton engine with 2-person contract staffing (BLS)</td>
<td>$784,790</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$1,575,000</td>
<td>($790,210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b Templeton engine with 3-person contract staffing (ALS)</td>
<td>$784,790</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$2,025,000</td>
<td>($1,240,210)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Not including AFG Grant or transfers from reserve; assumes SAFER grant funding through 2015
² Estimated cost for contractual staffing
³ Ongoing District Fire Department operating expenses
⁴ Sum of estimated Contract Costs and ongoing District Fire Department expense
⁵ Difference between Current Budget and estimated Total Cost
⁶ Assumes District’s ability to maintain current SAFER grant funding

An additional alternative involves the District contracting for short-term interim administration and incident command oversight of Templeton Fire Department personnel and programs to allow the District additional time to evaluate the other alternatives. In considering this alternative, the District should conduct at least a preliminary evaluation of the longer-term options prior to negotiating an interim agreement with one of the prospective partner agencies. The three prospective partners all expressed some degree of reservation with this option if the District were not leaning toward a longer-term service partnership with them. Another option for the District to consider would be to contract with a recently retired local or California Fire Chief for interim fire chief services while the District evaluates its other options. If the District considers this option, it should ensure that the interim Chief possesses community services district or fire district experience, and possesses the appropriate training, certifications, and experience to provide effective transitional leadership and emergency incident management. Experience with shared service partnerships would also be beneficial.

**Key Findings and Recommendations**

Citygate’s key findings and recommendations are summarized below. For reference purposes, the finding and recommendation numbers refer to the sequential numbers in the main body of the report. Note that not all findings and recommendations that appear in the full report are listed in this Executive Summary, only those that are the most significant.
Finding #1: The Templeton Fire Department has provided exceptional commitment, service, and value to the Templeton community since its inception.

Finding #2: Templeton Fire Department’s first-unit deployment is minimally adequate to achieve desired outcomes for minor fire and medical risks in Templeton.

Finding #3: Templeton’s current Effective Response Force capability is inadequate to facilitate desired outcomes for even moderately severe emergencies requiring the arrival of 10-16 firefighters within a recommended 10:00 minute timeframe.

Finding #5: Templeton’s current initial deployment/staffing model incorporates a combination of full-time and volunteer paid-call personnel to provide 2-person minimum staffing during daytime hours. This is not effective approximately 17 percent of the time and is not reasonably sustainable over the long term.

Finding #14: A majority of Fire Department employees do not meet the minimum 259-287 hours of mandated and recommended annual training.

Finding #15: The Department does not have a designated Safety Officer, nor a Health and Safety Committee as recommended by NFPA 1500.

Finding #16: The District’s Injury and Illness Prevention Plan does not address many of the hazards specific to fire department operations.

Finding #17: The District benefits from its current dispatch services agreement with CALFIRE.

Recommendation #4: As soon as practical, the District should consider implementation of a shared-service alternative(s) identified in Section 4 that will provide enhanced on-duty (immediately available) staffing, ideally at the Advanced Life Support (ALS) level and within available fiscal resources. This will reduce first-due unit Call to Arrival response performance to achieve desired outcomes for minor routine fire and EMS emergencies.

Recommendation #5: As additional time and/or financial resources permit, the District should more fully explore the other shared-service opportunities identified in Section 4 that can provide enhanced operational and fiscal efficacy. This includes both first-due unit and Effective Response Force performance to achieve desired outcomes for up to moderately severe emergencies (emergency incidents requiring 16-28 firefighters).
SECTION 1—INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 BACKGROUND

The Templeton Community Services District retained Citygate Associates, LLC to conduct an assessment of the Templeton Fire Department. This study was commissioned to evaluate community risk and emergency fire response expectations, identify and assess current services, evaluate community demographics and future growth, and identify and provide a high-level analysis of alternative service delivery options. In its entirety, this analysis and its resultant findings and recommendations will allow the District Board to make informed policy decisions regarding future fire service delivery.

The challenges facing the Templeton Community Services District are not unique. Since the Proposition 13 property tax limitation measures and subsequent additional limitations on local government taxing authority, smaller communities such as Templeton find the property tax rate and other sources of local government revenue insufficient to support a modern fire service delivery system. This is not the District’s fault, as it must function within the highly restrictive fiscal rules that govern local government finance in California.

Just as Templeton cannot control state fiscal policy, it could also not know that the transition to a two-income, commuter-based society along with increased training and safety regulations would adversely impact volunteer-based fire services throughout California and the nation. Thus, the option of providing less expensive, volunteer-based fire services supported by a relatively small tax base is no longer viable in smaller communities like Templeton. Instead, they are now faced with the challenge of replacing the diminishing pool of volunteer firefighters with a combination of career and volunteer personnel, as well as meeting new state and federal training and safety regulations. Geographic distance from mutual aid partners, along with the cost and availability of housing limiting the market for potential volunteer firefighters, and the increased training and response commitments on volunteer firefighters, all combine to create a challenging environment in which to plan for and provide adequate and effective fire protection services that meet both the needs and expectations of the community.

1.2 PROJECT APPROACH AND RESEARCH METHODS

Citygate used several tools to gather and understand information about the District for this study. We started with a large documentation request to gain background information on costs, current and prior service levels, service-level decisions, and what other prior studies had to say.

Citygate followed up on this information with focused listening interviews of key community members, District Board members, the District General Manager, Fire Chief, and several Fire Department personnel. We reviewed key demographic information about the District from the
County General Plan and other sources. As information about the District was collected and understood, Citygate obtained response data from which to analyze current fire service deployment and response performance. Citygate also met with prospective local fire service partners to identify and provide a high-level analysis of alternative fire service delivery models for consideration by the District. This resulted in Citygate being able to propose a phased approach to improving fire services in the District that would meet reasonable community expectations at a small District level of expense.

1.2.1 Goals of Report

As the sections of this report impart information, findings and related recommendations are presented. There is a sequential numbering of all of the findings and recommendations throughout the first four sections of this report. To provide a comprehensive summary, a complete listing of all these same findings and recommendations in order is found in Section 5.

This document provides technical information about how fire services are provided, legally regulated, and how the Templeton Fire Department currently operates. This information is presented in the form of recommendations and policy choices for the Templeton Community Services District and community to discuss.

The result is a solid technical foundation upon which to understand the advantages and disadvantages of the choices facing the Templeton Community Services District leadership and community on how best to provide fire services, and more specifically, at what level of desired outcome and expense.

1.2.2 Limitations of Report

In the United States, there are no federal or state laws or regulations mandating a minimum level of fire service. Each community, through the public policy process, is expected to understand the local fire risks, their ability to pay, and then to choose their own level of fire services. If fire services are provided at all, then federal and state regulations specify how to do it safely for the personnel providing the service and the public.

While this report and technical explanation can provide a framework for the discussion of fire services for the Templeton Community Services District, neither this report nor the Citygate consulting team can make the final decisions or cost out in detail every possible alternative. Once final strategic choices are given policy approval, District staff can conduct any final costing and fiscal analysis as normally done in the operating and capital budget preparation cycle.
1.3 PREVIOUS TEMPLETON FIRE SERVICE STUDIES

A January 1998 Fire Service Study commissioned by the District and conducted by Hunt Research Corporation in Solvang, California made the following recommendations:

1. Continue the current TCSD volunteer Fire Department.
2. Implement intensive recruiting and testing for a new full-time Fire Chief.
3. Establish goals, objectives and programs and workload for the Fire Department and new Chief.
4. Continue the private ambulance agreement.
5. Expand the auto aid agreement with the California Department of Forestry (CDF) for EMS response in the north end of Templeton; equip volunteers in that area with EMS kits and radios.
6. Expand auto aid for confirmed structure or wildland fires to include Atascadero and Paso Robles.
7. Cease use of the Telesquirt fire apparatus; consider joint purchase of an aerial apparatus with Atascadero and/or Paso Robles.
8. Purchase a new Type-3 engine for use as primary response apparatus.
9. Utilize the current mini-pumper as a Duty Chief vehicle; replace it in 2004.
10. Have the water tender apparatus inspected and certified by the California Highway Patrol (CHP).
11. Plan for a second fire station in the area of Bethel and Vineyard within the next five years.
12. Obtain hazardous materials training for the Department.
13. Increase volunteer compensation; require response to 90 percent of calls.
14. Contract out the review of all detailed fire protection system plans.
15. Inspect all occupancies annually except for single-family residences.
17. Charge for excessive calls (more than 2 per month) to any occupancy.
18. Expand volunteer staff to 45.
19. Improve record keeping to meet ISO standards.
20. Continue CDF dispatch service agreement.
21. Increase developer fees to same level as surrounding communities.
22. Increase the department’s training and education budget.
23. Review/revise new development standards to require fire sprinklers in all new or remodels exceeding 50 percent.
24. Require Class “A” roofs for any new/50 percent re-roof adjacent to flammable vegetation.
25. Rename the department to “Department of Fire and Emergency Services”.
26. Test fire pumps and hose annually.
27. Install exhaust removal and emergency generator at fire station.

According to Interim Fire Chief Hewitt, all of the recommendations from this study were implemented with the following exceptions:

6. There is no automatic mutual aid agreement with the City of Paso Robles; they are available by request as available under the San Luis Obispo County Mutual Aid Plan.

11. Property has been acquired for a second fire station; however, it is no longer deemed the best location and is currently being held by the Board pending an appreciation in value.

15. The Department has not had the resources necessary to accomplish inspection of all non-single-family residential occupancies annually.

18. The Department has not been successful in meeting the target of 45 volunteer (paid-on-call) firefighters.

21. Any increase to developer fees requires a nexus study as required by California law.


25. The Templeton Community Services District Fire Department has not been renamed.

1.4 Legal Regulation Affecting the Fire Service

In addition to restrictions on local government finance, there have been a number of recent state and federal laws, regulations, and court cases that limit the flexibility of communities in determining their staffing levels, training, and methods of operation. These are given an abbreviated overview as follows:
1. 1999 OSHA Staffing Policies – Federal OSHA applied the confined space safety regulations for work inside tanks and underground spaces to America’s firefighters. This requires in atmospheres that are “IDLH” (Immediately Dangerous to Life and Health) that there be teams of two inside and two outside in constant communication, and with the outside pair equipped and ready to rescue the inside pair. This situation occurs in building fires where the fire and smoke conditions are serious enough to require the wearing of self-contained breathing apparatus (SCBA). This is commonly called the “2-in/2-out” policy. This policy requires that firefighters enter serious building fires in teams of two, while two more firefighters are outside and immediately ready to rescue them should trouble arise.

While under OSHA policy one of the outside “two-out” personnel can also be the incident commander (typically a chief officer) or fire apparatus operator, this person must be fully suited-up in protective clothing, have a breathing apparatus donned except for the face piece, meet all physical requirements to enter IDLH atmospheres and thus be ready to immediately help with the rescue of interior firefighters in trouble. However, these stipulations can also result in operational complications such as sending the incident commander inside to perform a firefighter rescue, which results in total loss of incident command and control and generates more safety problems.

2. May 2001 National Staffing Guidelines – The National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Standard on Career Fire Service Deployment was issued 12 years ago. While advisory to local governments, as it starts to become locally adopted and used, it develops momentum, forcing adoption by neighboring communities. NFPA 1710 calls for four-person fire crew staffing, arriving on one or two apparatus as a “company.” The initial company should arrive at the emergency within four minutes travel time, 90 percent of the time, and the total effective response force (first alarm assignment) should arrive within eight minutes travel time, 90 percent of the time. NFPA 1720, which establishes standards for Volunteer Fire Service Deployment, calls for arrival of the initial responding unit within 10 minutes of dispatch notification 80 percent of the time for suburban areas with 500-1,000 population per square mile with a minimum of 10 personnel for a structural fire in a low hazard occupancy such as a 2,000-square-foot two-story single-family home.

3. On-Scene Incident Commanders – The on-scene incident commanders at hazardous materials incidents must have certification compliant with NFPA 472,
Standard for Emergency Response to Hazardous Materials Incidents. This is also now an OSHA requirement.

4. **Cal/OSHA Requirements** – Among the elements required is a safety orientation for new employees, a hazard communications system for employees to communicate hazards to supervisors, the Cal/OSHA process for post-injury reviews, the required annual report of injuries, and a standard for safety work plans. Employers have many different responsibilities under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 and the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Initially OSHA focused its efforts on the private sector; more recently, it has turned its attention to the public sector and specifically the fire service.

### 1.5 **Negative Pressures on Volunteer-Based Fire Services**

While the Templeton Fire Department has historically been a volunteer-based system, and currently relies heavily on its “volunteer” paid-call firefighters (PCF) to supplement full-time staffing, following is a brief overview of the state of volunteer firefighters in California and across the nation.

All volunteer-based fire departments today are under great pressure to maintain an adequate roster. The reasons for this are not unique to any one type of community and are placing pressure on small community volunteer systems across the state and nation:

- **Economic pressures result in more two-income families and less time to volunteer.**

- **In a commuter economy, more jobs are clustered in metropolitan and dense suburban areas.** Communities like Templeton increasingly have residents who work elsewhere, and many of the younger residents who would consider volunteering are just too busy.

- **Due to the growth in society of complex systems and technology, the mission of the fire service has expanded to include additional services such as emergency medical services, hazardous materials response, and technical rescue.** This has *dramatically* increased the legally-mandated training hours for volunteers, causing many to drop out as the time commitments became unbearable.

- **This change, coupled with all the other factors, means that volunteer-based firefighter programs are drying up due to an insufficient number of members.** Additional training requirements and additional response volume mean a significant time commitment for “true” volunteers, who are serving for love of the community and to give something back. Most departments find that it takes 240-
480 hours of initial training, and 259-287 hours of annual training, to meet minimum mandated and recommended training requirements, and this is before a volunteer is able to respond to an emergency incident.

### 1.6 Templeton Community Description

Located along U.S. Route 101 in north central San Luis Obispo County, the unincorporated community of Templeton encompasses 7.8 square miles and is home to nearly 7,700 residents. Founded in 1886 when the Southern Pacific Railroad came to the area, Templeton has retained much of its historical character. At 721 feet above sea level, Templeton enjoys a mild Mediterranean climate characterized by mild winters and dry summers. Rainfall averages about 15 inches per year, generally occurring between mid-October and mid-April. Temperatures can range from a low of 10°-15°F in the winter to highs reaching over 100°F in the summer. The average daytime temperature is 60°F in January and 95°F in July, and the average nighttime temperature is 41°F in January and 55°F in July. Templeton enjoys mild winds averaging four miles per hour from the southwest.

Surrounded by rich agricultural lands producing primarily wine grapes, the topography of Templeton ranges from semi-flat to hilly. The community includes 3,000 housing units and approximately 370 businesses ranging from small retail and service businesses to mid-size commercial and industrial businesses in the commercial/industrial area on the north end of the District. Twin Cities Community Hospital, serving the entire North San Luis Obispo County area, is an 84-bed general medical/surgical acute care facility equipped with state-of-the-art technology and located in the central section of Templeton adjacent to U.S. Route 101. The Wilshire Foundation, a not-for-profit organization, operates a state-licensed 99-bed convalescent center / skilled nursing facility as well as Templeton Gardens, a 40-unit retirement apartment complex. Other notable employers within the District include Cal Trans, Southern California Gas, SBC Global, California Highway Patrol, and the San Luis Obispo County Sheriff’s Department. Almost a dozen churches and numerous service and community clubs also serve the area.

The Templeton Community Services District (TCSD) was formed in November, 1976 through a reorganization of several single-purpose districts, and provides water, sewer, storm water drainage, parks and recreation, fire protection and street lighting services to District residents and businesses. Table 1 below provides significant demographic data for Templeton.

---

2 U.S. Census Bureau Data (2010)
3 Templeton Chamber of Commerce
### Table 1—Templeton Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>2011 Estimate</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>7,645</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 10 years</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>14.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 14 years</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>5.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 19 years</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>6.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 24 years</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>3.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 34 years</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>9.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 44 years</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>10.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 54 years</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>20.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 59 years</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>6.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 – 64 years</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>3.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 74 years</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>7.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 – 84 years</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 years and over</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>4.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>6,799</td>
<td>88.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>6.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more ethnicities</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>2.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied Units</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>66.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupants per Unit</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied Units</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>27.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupants per Unit</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Occupied Units</td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td>94.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Units</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>5.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>3,006</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Over 16 Years Old</td>
<td>5,951</td>
<td>77.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Labor Force</td>
<td>3,954</td>
<td>66.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Labor Force</td>
<td>1,997</td>
<td>33.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute to Work</td>
<td>3,535</td>
<td>59.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Commute Time (Min.)</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
1.7 **COMMUNITY GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT**

The 2013 San Luis Obispo County General Plan identifies the following land use issues relating to the quality of life, historical character, and livability of San Luis Obispo County:

1. Post-World War II development trends have emphasized large-lot, suburban, and rural development, which have resulted in a dependence on automobile travel. However, this type of development is too expensive for most existing County residents, making public transit inefficient and increasing dependence on single occupancy vehicle trips. This, in turn, increases energy consumption, contributes to air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, increases traffic congestion, and affects public health. Increasing real estate values also create pressure to convert agricultural and resource-rich land.

2. Partly due to the County’s setting and national reputation, a high market demand exists for this large-lot (low density) development, which is commonly called low-density “sprawl” development.

3. More compact forms of housing are not being built in sufficient quantity to provide homes that are affordable to people of all income levels, and this does not meet the broader housing needs of the population.

4. Increased “sprawl” decreases the amount of natural and agricultural areas that have been instrumental in the maintenance of the County’s small-scale character.

5. Low-density development does not encourage public transit, pedestrian or bicycle travel, although these are the healthiest and most energy-efficient forms of transportation.

6. Low-density development does not create an “eyes on the street” presence or an engaging civic life, so that isolation and low involvement in community affairs can result.

7. The “sprawl” pattern creates demands for funding infrastructure, roads, streets and highways that threaten the fiscal health of the County, by competing with financial resources needed to provide other public services and facilities.

8. The desirability of the County area, combined with shrinking government budgets, has resulted in minimal new park, recreation, and natural areas, as well as lagging street and sidewalk maintenance. Continuing to grow without providing these resources will impact the area’s quality of life.
9. Communities lack affordable housing and well-paying jobs. Communities may not have adequate land for multi-family housing and commercial development in appropriate locations.

10. The semi-arid climate within the County is subject to limited amounts of rainfall and “recharge” of groundwater basins and surface reservoirs. Most communities and rural areas have developed without avoiding eventual water shortages, so that currently five of the six major groundwater basins are in critical or overdraft conditions. To better manage water resources, the potential impacts of land use patterns and water consumption should be recognized, with the understanding that more compact residential development consumes less water per unit than large-lot development.

In response to these issues, the San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors has adopted the following “Smart Growth Principles” to better define and focus the County’s pro-active planning approach and balance environmental, economic, and social equity concerns:

1. Preserve open space, scenic natural beauty and sensitive environmental areas; conserve energy resources; conserve agricultural resources and protect agricultural land.

2. Strengthen and direct development towards existing and strategically-planned communities.

3. Foster distinctive, attractive communities with a strong sense of place.

4. Create walkable neighborhoods and towns.

5. Provide a variety of transportation choices.

6. Create a range of housing opportunities and choices.

7. Encourage mixed land uses.

8. Take advantage of compact building design.

9. Make development decisions predictable, fair, and cost-effective.

10. Encourage community and stakeholder collaboration.

11. Strengthen regional cooperation.

---

4 San Luis Obispo County General Plan, Land Use Element (2013)
In addition, San Luis Obispo County LAFCO Land Use Objectives include:

- Discouraging urban sprawl.
- Preservation of the physical and economic integrity of agricultural lands.
- Preservation of open space within urban development patterns.
- Orderly formation and development of agencies by shaping local agency boundaries.
- Minimization of agencies providing services to a given area.
- Utilization of Spheres of Influence to guide future development of agency boundaries.

The Salinas River Area of San Luis Obispo County,\(^5\) which includes the community of Templeton as well as the cities of Paso Robles and Atascadero, grew rapidly in population due to favorable economic conditions from about 37,000 in 1980 to 54,000 in 1990 (69 percent growth). The majority of this population (77 percent) lived in the two incorporated cities. This is in contrast to a 26 percent population growth throughout the rest of the County during the same period. Table 2 shows the change in population of Templeton since 1980, as well as the projected population for the next twenty years to 2032.

**Table 2—Templeton Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2,887</td>
<td>137.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3,710</td>
<td>28.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>7,674</td>
<td>106.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>22.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>13,385</td>
<td>42.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau (1980-2010)
SLO County General Plan (2015-2032)

\(^5\) San Luis Obispo County Salinas River Area Plan (2009)
Table 3 shows potential housing units for Templeton.

**Table 3—Potential Housing Units by Land Use Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Acres Zoned</th>
<th>Housing Unit Density</th>
<th>Potential Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1 per 10 ac.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Rural</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>1 per 5 ac.</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Suburban</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>1 per 5 ac.</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Single-Family</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>1-7 per ac.</td>
<td>2,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Multi-Family</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1-38 per ac.</td>
<td>1,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,105</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,013</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. SLO County General Plan - Land Use Element
2. SLO County Salinas River Inland Area Plan

Table 4 shows current and projected housing units in Templeton.6

**Table 4—Templeton Housing Units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Housing Unit</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied Units</td>
<td>2,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupants per Unit</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied Units</td>
<td>828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupants per Unit</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Occupied Units</td>
<td>2,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Units</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Housing Units</strong> (2010)</td>
<td><strong>3,006</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Projected Housing Units</strong> (build-out)</td>
<td><strong>4,013</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. U.S. Census Bureau (2010 Data)
2. Table 3

Despite significant population growth over the past three decades, Templeton has managed to maintain a stable small-town atmosphere. Historically an agricultural service and residential community, Templeton has become an important regional medical center, yet continues to rely heavily on employment in other nearby communities. Due to its location in the center of an urban corridor, it has a large capacity for regional commercial and industrial development.

6 U.S. Census Bureau / SLO County General Plan Data
Commercial and industrial development has occurred in several areas of Templeton. Office and professional services are located in the downtown area, the northern end of the main business district, the Las Tablas Road area west of Highway 101, and Vineyard Drive west of Highway 101. The traditional retail shopping area has been downtown on Main Street, and this central business district can be expected to provide neighborhood and visitor shopping as the town and surrounding population grow. Another community shopping area is planned on North Main Street at the stockyard site to serve projected development, where large parcels will accommodate larger stores. Regional shopping districts are planned on Ramada Drive just north of the North Main and Highway 101 interchange and just south of Marquita Drive, with the purpose of serving the north county region with major commercial establishments and providing visitor theme destinations. Visitor-serving commercial areas are located at the North Main, Las Tablas and Vineyard Drive/Highway 101 interchanges to provide for traveler needs. Sites on Las Tablas Road are located near the Highway 101 interchange to provide traveler services, lodging and entertainment. The North Main Street site is adjacent to public land that is planned for a north county regional government center. The Vineyard Drive site west of Rossi Road is also intended to be neighborhood serving for convenience shopping. Neighborhood sites are also located on Las Tablas Road on each side of the office area to provide for daily shopping needs of nearby residents and employees.

Service and heavy commercial activities are appropriately located along the railroad tracks, the east side of Main Street, and on Ramada Drive. Traditional downtown uses include the very prominent Templeton Feed and Grain building. North of the downtown area, service commercial areas are located along the North Main Street and Ramada Drive corridors in front of industrial areas that are next to the railroad. Another area designated for commercial service uses is located on Cow Meadow Lane south of Marquita Avenue. As commercial service uses are established or restored, attention should be given to their visual impact from Main Street, Highway 101, and nearby residential and retail areas. The Templeton Design Plan and the Land Use Ordinance should be fully utilized for high quality screening, siting, architecture, and unobtrusive signing.

Industrial areas include the Templeton Stock Yard south to Gibson Street on North Main Street and a larger area north of Marquita Drive. These areas are suited to industrial development because they are fairly level, adjacent to the railroad, have easy access from the freeway, and have proximity to community services and facilities. Future industrial uses should not conflict with the residential qualities of Templeton or with adjacent commercial or agricultural uses. To prevent land use conflicts, industrial subdivisions should be oriented internally and provide substantial fencing and landscaped screening when located adjacent to other land use categories. Proposed industrial uses should be evaluated for possible off-site noxious effects when located in the proximity of other land use categories.
Existing public facilities include the Templeton Community Services District office, District fire station, a future north county regional center site at North Main/Highway 101, the Veterans Memorial Building at Main and Eighth Streets, and the Post Office on North Main Street. The Templeton Unified School District provides kindergarten through 12th grades at its present location north and south of Vineyard Drive on Main Street. A new elementary school on Vineyard Drive has been completed. Additional public facilities include the California Highway Patrol Station at Highway 101 and Las Tablas Road and Twin Cities Hospital on Las Tablas Road. The north county regional center site is located on a highly visible hill adjacent to Highway 101.

According to the SLO County General Plan and 2007 Salinas River Inland Area Plan, there is sufficient infill land available in Templeton to increase commercial development by 660 percent, office space by 300 percent, and industrial space by 360 percent. Table 5 shows acreage available for the various types of commercial/industrial development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Business Development</th>
<th>Acres Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Retail</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Service</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office / Professional</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SLO County Salinas River Inland Area Plan (2007)

Templeton’s domestic water supply is provided by wells extracting water from the Salinas River and from the Atascadero groundwater basin (Templeton sub-basin). The combined safe annual yield from these two sources is approximately 1,580 acre-feet. Current demand exceeds the safe annual yield for the entire Atascadero basin, and the Templeton Community Services District maintains a will-serve waiting list. To meet the County’s long-term projected community build-out estimates, the District is seeking an additional 1,475 acre-feet per year allocation from the Lake Nacimiento water project. Additional future water resource development will include feasibility analysis for water reclamation/reuse projects. The County General Plan estimates build-out water demand (9,400 population in 2015) to be 2,512 acre-feet per year. Until additional water supply is secured, future residential and commercial/industrial development will be severely constrained.

---

7 Templeton Community Services District Draft Water and Wastewater Master Plan Update (September 2013)
1.8 **DISTRICT FISCAL INFORMATION**

Services provided by the Templeton Community Services District are funded through a combination of property taxes, direct user fees, assessments, and other miscellaneous revenue sources. The Water and Sewer Departments are enterprise-funded, and the costs associated with those services are charged to the customers receiving the service. Recycling services are funded through a 10 percent franchise fee on gross receipts of the fees charged by the solid waste contractor. Storm water drainage costs are funded through revenue assessments paid by property owners subject to surface runoff mitigation. Street lighting services are funded by a combination of property assessment and general property tax revenue.

The Fire and Parks and Recreation Departments are predominantly funded by general property tax revenue. By law, property taxes can be used for any purpose the District is empowered to perform; however, the District Board of Directors has adopted a policy allocating the majority of these funds to the Fire and Parks and Recreation Departments.

The District receives 3.84 percent of ad valorem property taxes for real property located within the District (less exemptions), or about $881,600 for fiscal year 2013-14. Of that, the Fire Department is allocated 71.87 percent, or $633,600 for fiscal year 2013-14. Additional Fire Department revenues include: (1) a four-year $621,000 Staffing Assistance for Emergency Response (SAFER) grant through the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) / Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to fund a full-time Volunteer Coordinator; uniforms, personal protective equipment (PPE), medical examinations, and monthly stipends for ten Intern firefighters; and a remodel of the fire station living area to provide additional sleeping accommodations; (2) a $94,000 U.S. Department of Homeland Security / FEMA Assistance to Firefighters (AFG) grant to replace the Department’s self-contained breathing apparatus (SCBA); and (3) $15,800 in miscellaneous revenue. **Table 6** summarizes District property tax revenues over the past ten years, and **Table 7** summarizes Fire Department revenues over the past three fiscal years.
Table 6—District Property Tax Revenue by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Property Tax Revenue</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>$499,107</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>$637,198</td>
<td>27.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$814,654</td>
<td>27.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$873,830</td>
<td>7.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>$917,853</td>
<td>5.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$807,104</td>
<td>-12.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$865,316</td>
<td>7.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$850,390</td>
<td>-1.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>$857,528</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>$881,600</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Change: 7.21%
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Table 7—Fire Department Revenues by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2010-11</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2011-12</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2012-13</th>
<th>Budgeted 2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>$614,292</td>
<td>$630,000</td>
<td>$594,000</td>
<td>$633,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>$15,906</td>
<td>$13,800</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Income</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td>$22,300</td>
<td>$15,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Funds</td>
<td>$5,063</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$229,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers from Reserves</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$386,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$651,761</strong></td>
<td><strong>$662,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>$639,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,265,692</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Templeton CSD Finance Department

In January 1991, the District Board adopted Ordinance 90-5 establishing a District Fire Department Capital Facilities Charge on new development and a Fire Department Capital Facilities Users Charge for existing development. The Ordinance established a one-time Capital Facilities Charge of $606.24 per residential unit and $.34 per square foot of constructed space for non-residential buildings for new development, and an ongoing Capital Facilities Users Charge for existing development of $.84 per month for each residential unit, and $.84 per 1,800 square feet of constructed space for non-residential buildings. These fees were established to finance an expansion and remodel of the existing fire department facility, and to purchase a new fire engine. In May 2002, the Board adopted Ordinance 2002-3 amending Ordinance 90-5 and increasing the Fire Department Capital Facilities Charge (one-time mitigation fee) to $.50 per square foot of...
constructed space for all types of new or enlarged construction. This amended charge includes an annual Consumer Price Index (CPI) adjustment, and was imposed to finance upgrades to the Fire Department facilities and to purchase two new fire apparatus.

Then, in August 2007, the Board adopted Ordinance 2007-3 amending Ordinance 2002-3 and imposing an additional Fire Department Capital Facilities Charge of $.50 per square foot of constructed space in new or enlarged multi-story residential, commercial, industrial, and any other multi-story development to finance the purchase of an aerial fire apparatus. This Ordinance also includes an annual CPI adjustment, and is scheduled to sunset when sufficient funds are collected to cover the cost of the aerial fire apparatus. The Capital Facilities Users Charge of $.84 per month for each residential unit and each 1,800 square feet of non-residential constructed space continues in effect today. To date, revenues totaling $1,429,695 from Ordinances 90-5, 2002-3, and 2007-3 are held in a restricted capital account.

Table 8 summarizes Fire Department expenditures for the current and past three fiscal years.

Table 8—Fire Department Expenditures by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Category</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2010-11</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2011-12</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2012-13</th>
<th>Budgeted 2013-14</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>$452,100</td>
<td>$516,959</td>
<td>$459,040</td>
<td>$558,574</td>
<td>44.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>$102,650</td>
<td>$97,660</td>
<td>$109,750</td>
<td>$151,075</td>
<td>11.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of Admin. Costs</td>
<td>$45,826</td>
<td>$46,931</td>
<td>$49,237</td>
<td>$97,581</td>
<td>7.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Renewal / Repl.</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$117,225</td>
<td>9.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Reserve</td>
<td>$45,185</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$3,873</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERS Side Fund Payoff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$341,237</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$651,761</td>
<td>$662,300</td>
<td>$639,900</td>
<td>$1,265,692</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 summarizes Fire Department expenditures versus revenues for the current and past three fiscal years, exclusive of grant funding, transfers from reserves, capital outlay, and CalPERS side fund payoff.
Citygate’s analysis of Fire Department revenues and expenditures, exclusive of grants, capital renewal/replacement, and transfers from reserve, indicates that budgeted expenditures slightly exceed projected revenues for the current fiscal year, requiring a transfer from reserves to achieve a balanced budget.

A 2009 District ballot initiative to establish a Fire Suppression Assessment to fund fire suppression equipment and staffing to provide enhanced fire suppression services within the District failed to garner the requisite 66.66 percent majority vote. Of the 1,006 ballots received (42 percent of total ballots), 38.56 percent voted in favor of the initiative, and 61.44 percent voted against it.

1.9 **TEMPLETON FIRE DEPARTMENT BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The Templeton Fire Department was founded as the Templeton Hose Company in 1887, becoming the Templeton Fire District in 1909 until the formation of the Templeton Community Services District in 1977. The Fire Department has relied on volunteer firefighters since its inception, with the exception of a paid part-time Fire Chief from 1943 through 1998 when the District hired its first full-time Fire Chief. San Luis Obispo County Fire Department Engine #32 was also stationed at the Templeton Fire Department from 1982 until it moved back to its original location on Ramada Drive in south Paso Robles in 1995. San Luis Ambulance
subsequently became a tenant of the District fire station from 1997-2007 before moving to its current posting location on North Main Street. In 2004, the Department hired an Assistant Fire Chief until the position was eliminated subsequent to the incumbent’s retirement in 2011. In 2012, the District hired its first full-time Fire Engineer / Training Officer, and a second full-time Fire Engineer / Volunteer Coordinator was hired following award of a four-year U.S. DHS / FEMA SAFER grant.

The Templeton Fire Department provides fire, Basic Life Support (BLS) emergency medical (EMS), and basic rescue and hazardous material (HazMat) response services with a part-time interim Fire Chief and 22 Paid-Call Firefighter (PCF) employees in addition to the two full-time employees from a single station adjoining the District administrative office. Services are provided with one Type-1 structural fire engine, one Type-2/3 structural/wildland engine, one Type-4 rescue apparatus, one breathing air support apparatus, and one command vehicle. The Department also has a second Type-4 rescue apparatus that is minimally used.

Dispatching services are provided under contract by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) / San Luis Obispo County Fire Department. The Department has an automatic mutual aid agreement with SLO County Fire for all types of emergency incidents requiring more than a single unit response, and an automatic mutual aid agreement with the City of Atascadero Fire Department for wildland fires only. The Templeton Fire Department is also a party to the San Luis Obispo County Fire Mutual Aid Plan, and thus has access to additional countywide fire resources by request based on availability. The Atascadero and Paso Robles Fire Departments jointly provide regional technical rescue services, and a regional multi-agency team comprised of 30 members from CAL FIRE, San Luis Obispo City, Arroyo Grande Fire, Paso Robles City, Atascadero Fire, San Luis Obispo County Environmental Health, and the California Men’s Colony provides the specialized technical Hazardous Materials (HazMat) response services.

The District has an Insurance Services Office (ISO) Public Protection Class 4 rating for areas served by fire hydrants, and a Class 9 rating for those areas without fire hydrants. The ISO Public Protection grading schedule will be discussed in more detail in the Community Outcome Expectations sub-section of this report.
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SECTION 2—DEPLOYMENT ANALYSIS

This section serves as an analysis of the District’s current ability to deploy and meet the emergency risks presented in Templeton. The response analysis will use prior response statistics to help the District Board and community understand what the current response system can and cannot deliver.

2.1 GENERAL FIRE DEPLOYMENT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Center for Public Safety Excellence (formerly the Commission on Fire Accreditation International) recommends a systems approach known as “Standards of Response Coverage” to evaluate deployment as part of the self-assessment process of a fire agency. This approach uses risk and community expectations on outcomes to assist elected officials in making informed decisions on fire and EMS deployment levels. Citygate has adopted this methodology as a comprehensive tool to evaluate fire station location. Depending on the needs of the study, the depth of the components can vary.

Such a systems approach to deployment, rather than a one-size-fits-all prescriptive formula, allows for local determination of the level of deployment to meet the risks presented in each community. In this comprehensive approach, each agency can match local need (risks and expectations) with the costs of various levels of service. In an informed public policy debate, a policy board “purchases” the fire, rescue, and EMS service levels (insurance) the community needs and can afford.

While working with multiple components to conduct a deployment analysis is admittedly more work, it yields a much better result than any singular component can. If we only look to travel time, for instance, and do not look at the frequency of multiple and overlapping calls, the analysis could miss over-worked companies. If we do not use risk assessment for deployment, and merely base deployment on travel time, a community could under-deploy to incidents.

The Standard of Response Cover process consists of eight elements:

1. **Existing Deployment** – each agency has something in place today.
2. **Community Outcome Expectations** – what does the community expect out of the response agency?
3. **Community Risk Assessment** – what assets are at risk in the community?
4. **Critical Task Time Study** – how long does it take firefighters to complete tasks to achieve the expected outcomes?
5. **Distribution Study** – the locating of first-due resources (typically engines).
Effective fire department deployment, simply stated, is about the speed and weight of the response force. Speed calls for first-due, all-risk intervention units (engines, ladder trucks and specialty companies) strategically located across a jurisdiction to arrive at the scene of an emergency within about 4-7 minutes of receipt of a 9-1-1 call to achieve desired outcomes for routine, less complex emergencies without escalation.

Weight of the response force involves a sufficient number of additional units arriving at the scene of more serious emergencies such as a room and contents fire within a building, a multiple-patient medical emergency, a vehicle collision with extrication required, or a complex rescue or wildland fire incident. In these situations, a jurisdiction must assemble enough firefighters within about 8-11 minutes to perform the critical tasks necessary to achieve desired outcomes safely without further escalation of size or complexity.

Thus, small fires and medical emergencies require a single- or two-unit response (engine and ambulance) with a quick response time. Larger incidents require more companies. In either case, if the companies arrive too late or the total personnel sent to the emergency are too few for the type of emergency, they are drawn into a losing and more dangerous battle. The art of fire company deployment is to spread companies out across a community for quick response to keep emergencies small with positive outcomes, without spreading the stations so far apart that they cannot quickly amass enough companies to be effective in major emergencies. Thus, companies need to be located to provide prompt response to all areas of a community. When one or more areas grow beyond the reasonable travel distance of the nearest fire station, the choices available to the elected officials are limited: add more neighborhood fire stations, or tell certain segments of the community that they have longer response times, even if the type of fire risk found is the same as other areas.

While no single jurisdiction (even a large metropolitan city) can stand by itself and handle every possible emergency without assistance, a desirable goal is to be able to field enough of an immediately-available response force to handle a community’s typical day-to-day responses for primary single-unit response needs equitably to all neighborhoods, as well as to be able to provide an effective initial response force to moderately serious building fires, serious vehicle collisions, medical emergencies, and wildland fires.

Recognized industry guidelines and best practices suggest that a minimum of 10 firefighters and a qualified Incident Commander are required to perform the critical tasks necessary at a multiple-
patient vehicle extrication or other specialty rescue, and a minimum of 15 firefighters plus an Incident Commander are required for even a modest, single \-fire-hose residential building fire. A more serious fire in a two-story residential building or a one-story commercial or multi-story building would require, at a minimum, an additional two to three engines and an additional truck company and chief officer, for upwards of 27 total personnel.

For the purposes of this study, Citygate used the following five components of the Standards of Response Cover process (at varying levels of detail) to understand the risks in Templeton, how the community is staffed and deployed today, and historical response performance:

1. Existing deployment
2. Community outcome expectations
3. Community risk assessment
4. Historical response effectiveness
5. Overall evaluation.

The following subsections will cover District factors and make findings about each component of the deployment system. From these findings of fact about the District’s fire deployment system, the study is then able to make deployment change recommendations.

### 2.2 Existing Fire Service Deployment

For this study, and given that the District has not adopted a response time goal or policy, and because the Fire Department is primarily a paid-call-based (“volunteer) organization augmented by 2.5 full-time employees, the response time benchmarks used in this study will be consistent with those found in National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Deployment Guideline Standard 1720 for volunteer fire departments in suburban areas.

The benchmarks in NFPA 1720 are that a minimum of 10 firefighters will arrive at the scene of a low-hazard structural fire (such as a two-story, 2,000-square-foot single-family residence) in 10:00 minutes or less from the time of receipt of dispatch notification 80 percent of the time. Historically volunteer-based, the Templeton Fire Department has provided exceptional commitment, service, and value to the Templeton community since its inception in 1887. Beginning in 2011, the initial deployment model for the Templeton Fire Department provides for a combination of two full-time and scheduled paid-call firefighters (PCF) to provide a minimum of 2-person staffing of one District fire engine from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. Response to emergencies outside of these hours is provided by paid-on-call and off-duty full-time firefighters as available. Table 10 below summarizes the District’s current daily staffing plan.
This deployment model is minimally adequate for the immediate response to minor fire and medical risks in Templeton provided that sufficient initial response staffing is immediately available outside of scheduled staffing hours and additional staffing and resources are available either in Templeton or from nearby mutual and automatic mutual aid agencies within a reasonable timeframe to achieve desired community outcome expectations for more severe emergencies as described later in Section 2.4 of this report.

Finding #1: The Templeton Fire Department has provided exceptional commitment, service, and value to the Templeton community since its inception.

Finding #2: Templeton Fire Department’s first-unit deployment is minimally adequate to achieve desired outcomes for minor fire and medical risks in Templeton.

The District has automatic mutual aid agreements with San Luis Obispo County Fire and Atascadero City Fire Department. SLO County Fire Station #30 is located on Ramada Drive on the east side of Highway 101 at the northern District boundary, 2.2 miles (3.5 minutes) from the center of the District (Highway 101 at Las Tablas Rd.), and approximately 4.5 miles (6 minutes) from the southern District boundary. The automatic mutual aid agreement includes all types of emergencies requiring more than a single-unit response, and SLO County Engine #30 is staffed with a minimum of two career firefighters daily. Additional SLO County Fire mutual aid resources are available from Station #36 at Highway 46 and Branch Road (12.8 miles, 15 minutes), Station #43 in Creston (15.5 miles, 20 minutes), Station #40 in Santa Margarita (20 miles, 25 minutes), and Station #33 at Heritage Ranch (21 miles, 30 minutes).

Atascadero Fire Station #1 is approximately five miles (7 minutes) from the southern end of the Templeton CSD, and six miles (8 minutes) from the center of Templeton. Station #2 on the west...
frontage road of U.S. 101 is approximately 1.5 miles and 2 minutes additional travel time from all points in Templeton. The automatic mutual aid agreement with the Atascadero Fire Department is for *wildland fires only*, and Atascadero Engine #1 is staffed with a minimum of three career firefighters daily. Engine #2 is staffed with a minimum of two firefighters daily, except during the wildland fire season when minimum daily staffing is three.

Additional nearby mutual aid assistance is available from the City of Paso Robles. Paso Robles Fire Station #1 is approximately 3.5 miles (5 minutes) from the northern end of the Templeton CSD, and six miles (8 minutes) from the center of the District. Station #2 is located on the east side of U.S. 101 approximately one mile (1 minute) additional travel time to all points in Templeton. Paso Robles engines are staffed with a minimum of three career firefighters daily.

Based on analysis of available Templeton and northern San Luis Obispo County fire resources, Citygate concludes that there are *minimally* sufficient resources available within the recommended 10:00 minute arrival time to achieve desire outcomes for *moderate severity emergencies only*. Any emergency incident requiring additional resources will result in a more severe outcome.

| Finding #3: | Templeton’s current Effective Response Force capability is insufficient to facilitate desired outcomes for even moderately severe emergencies requiring the arrival of 10-16 firefighters within a recommended 10:00 minute timeframe. |
| Finding #4: | Any emergency incident requiring additional resources other than those arriving within 10:00 minutes will result in a more severe outcome. |

### 2.2.1 Services Provided

The Templeton Fire Department provides traditional fire protection services utilizing two engines, two rescue units, a breathing air support unit, and Fire Chief to respond to structural, wildland, vehicle, and other types of fires. All Templeton personnel are also trained to the Hazardous Materials First Responder Operational level as required by the California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA) regulations.

All Department personnel, except three, are trained to provide Basic Life Support (BLS) emergency medical services at the Emergency Medical Technician B (EMT-B) level, and the three non-EMT-B employees meet California Code of Regulations Title 22 requirements for public safety provider first aid training. San Luis Ambulance, a private ambulance company...
managed by the San Luis Obispo County Emergency Medical Services Agency, provides ambulance transportation in Templeton.

Specialized technical hazardous materials incident response is provided by the San Luis Obispo County Hazardous Materials Response Team, a multi-agency team comprised of 30 members from SLO County Fire, CAL FIRE, San Luis Obispo City, Arroyo Grande Fire, Paso Robles City, Atascadero City, San Luis Obispo County Environmental Health, and the California Men’s Colony.

Technical rescue services are jointly provided by the Paso Robles and Atascadero Fire Departments through the SLO County Mutual Aid Plan, and fire investigation services are provided upon request by the multi-agency San Luis Obispo County Fire Investigation Strike Team (F.I.S.T.).

2.3 STAFFING DISCUSSION

If the District provides fire services at any level, safety of the public and firefighters must be the primary consideration. Additionally, the on-scene incident commanders must be appropriately trained and competent, since they are liable for any mistakes that violate the law. An understaffed, poorly led, token response force will not only be unable to achieve desired community outcome expectations, but it also exposes the District to significant potential liability should the Fire Department fail to operate within legal requirements and recognized industry safety standards.

As stated earlier in this section, national norms indicate that 14-15 firefighters, including an incident commander, are needed at even smaller, less severe building fires if the expected outcome is to contain the fire to the room(s) of origin and to be able to simultaneously and safely perform all of the necessary critical tasks. The reason for this is that the clock is still running on the problem after arrival, and too few firefighters on-scene will mean that the fire will escalate faster than the efforts to contain it. Chief officers also need to arrive at the scene in a timely manner to provide necessary incident organization and command leadership, as well as critical decision making for the response organization.

The current District response plan for a building fire or other critical emergency calls for one Templeton engine, one SLO County Fire engine through automatic mutual aid, and the Fire Chief or paid-call Duty Chief. Thus, the initial response to critical emergencies in Templeton is a minimum of 4 firefighters (2 on Templeton engine and 2 on SLO County Engine #30), and one chief officer. To augment this initial response force, the Department relies on available paid-call firefighters and/or mutual aid from Paso Robles, Atascadero, and SLO County Fire. Given the low annual occurrence of building fires, the District can marginally field a sufficient number of
firefighters to a small or incipient building fire within a modest timeframe to achieve the desired outcome expectation.

The Department’s current staffing plan is predicated on the premise that paid-call firefighters (PCF) will voluntarily sign up for a maximum of two part-time shifts per week to maintain the desired 2-person minimum staffing level 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. This equates to 14 part-time shifts per week to augment the current full-time daytime staffing (two employees); however, over a 5½-month period examined for this study (May 1–October 15, 2013), the staffing level was below the desired level of 2 persons or more 17 percent of the time. During this period, the on-duty staffing level was only one person 8.5 percent of the time (28 shifts), and no personnel (unstaffed) 8.5 percent of the time (28 shifts). Additional analysis by Citygate suggests that only a small core group of paid-call firefighters are providing the majority of scheduled PCF shift staffing, as well as unscheduled responses to emergency incidents.

While discussing department staffing, it is important to note that of the 25 current Fire Department employees, only eleven (44 percent) live within the District. Of those eleven, five (20 percent) also work within the District. Seven other employees (28 percent) live within north San Luis Obispo County, and another seven employees (28 percent) reside beyond the north county area and are thus unavailable in a timely manner except for scheduled shift staffing.

Prior to 2011, the Department had a policy that all firefighters must reside or work within seven minutes travel time from the fire station. This policy was rescinded in 2011 in an effort to expand the number of paid-call firefighters. Of the current 25 employees, 14 (56 percent) do not meet the former proximity requirement, and are only available when they voluntarily sign up to work a daily shift. Another six employees who reside within the District work outside the District and are not available to respond during their workday hours. Only 11 of the 25 (44 percent) firefighters are eligible to work part-time shifts. It should also be noted that these employees are limited to a maximum of 960 hours of work per year under California Public Employees Retirement System rules, or the District is required to consider them full-time employees for purposes of public safety retirement benefits.

As a result of this analysis, Citygate finds that that current staffing model that relies on regular voluntary shift coverage by paid-call firefighters to maintain minimum 2-person staffing during daytime hours is not reasonably sustainable. Also, in Citygate’s experience, smaller career-staffed fire agencies are generally not operationally or fiscally sustainable over the long term due to potential long-term employee absences and/or an inability to recruit and retain a stable workforce. On top of this, to support a few career personnel there must be a robust volunteer and/or paid-call workforce, which is not the current situation in Templeton.
Finding #5: Templeton’s current deployment/staffing model incorporates a combination of full-time and volunteer paid-call personnel to provide 2-person minimum staffing during daytime hours. This is not effective 17 percent of the time and is not reasonably sustainable over the long term.

2.4 COMMUNITY OUTCOME EXPECTATIONS

The next step in the Standards of Response Cover process is to review existing fire and emergency medical outcome expectations. This can be restated as follows: for what purpose does the current response system exist? Has the governing body adopted any response time performance measures? If so, the time measures used by the District need to be understood and good data collected.

The community, if asked, would probably expect that fires be confined to the room or nearby area of fire origin, and that medical patients have their injuries stabilized and be transported to the appropriate care location in a timely manner. Thus, the challenge faced by the District is to maintain an appropriate level of fire service deployment to meet these outcome expectations. As such, fire deployment planning takes direction from policy makers as to the outcomes desired by the community.

The Insurance Services Office (ISO) Public Protection Classification (PPC) program, which evaluates the capacity of the local fire department to respond to and suppress structure fires, would like to see first-arriving fire engines spaced 1.5 miles apart and ladder trucks spaced 2.5 miles apart, which, given travel speeds on surface streets, is a 3- to 4-minute travel time for first-arriving engine and a 7- to 8-minute travel time for first-arriving ladder truck. National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 1720, Standard for the Organization and Deployment of Fire Suppression Operations, Emergency Medical Operations, and Special Operations to the Public by Volunteer Fire Departments, suggests a 10:00 minute response time for suburban areas (500-1,000 people per square mile) with a minimum of 10 personnel, 80 percent of the time.

ISO’s PPC program evaluates community fire protection according to a uniform set of criteria as defined in its Fire Suppression Rating Schedule (FSRS). Factors included in the FSRS evaluation criteria include a community’s fire alarm and communication system (10 percent), Fire Department staffing, equipment, and deployment (50 percent), and the community water system capacity (40 percent). Utilizing these evaluation criteria, ISO assigns a numeric Public Protection Classification rating from 1 to 10, with Class 1 generally representing superior fire protection, and Class 10 indicating that the area’s fire-suppression program does not meet minimum ISO criteria. One-third of all fire districts nationally are Class 9, the lowest recognized level of public fire protection. ISO conducts PPC reviews and updates the community PPC rating at
approximately ten-year intervals. The latest ISO PPC review for Templeton was conducted in February 2009, and resulted in a Class 5 rating for properties within five road miles of the fire station and having a fire hydrant within 500 feet, and a Class 9 rating for those properties beyond five road miles of the fire station or without a fire hydrant within 500 feet. Key factors preventing a higher rating were on-duty staffing and training.

For many reasons, it is not necessary for an agency to only deploy to meet the ISO measures. The ISO criteria are designed to evaluate a department’s ability to stop a building fire conflagration for insurance underwriting purposes. The ISO system does not address small fires, auto fires, outdoor fires, and emergency medical incidents. In addition, insurance underwriters today can issue fire premiums in Grading Schedule “bands” such as 3-5 and give safer buildings a single rating of Class 1 for example.

Thus, if an agency only tries to meet the ISO or NFPA station placement criteria, it does not necessarily deliver better outcomes, given the diversity of risk across American communities. Importantly within the Standards of Response Coverage process, positive outcomes are the goal, and from that company size and response time can be calculated to allow efficient fire station spacing. Emergency medical incidents have situations with the most severe time constraints. In a heart attack that stops the heart, a trauma that causes severe blood loss, or in a respiratory emergency, the brain can only live a maximum of 8 to 10 minutes without oxygen. Not only heart attacks, but other emergencies can also cause oxygen deprivation to the brain. Heart attacks make up a small percentage; drowning, choking, trauma, constrictions, or other similar events have the same effect on the brain and the same time constraints. In a building fire, a small incipient fire can grow to involve the entire room in a 4- to 5-minute time frame. The point in time where the entire room becomes involved in fire is called “flashover,” when everything is burning, life is no longer sustainable, and the fire will shortly spread beyond the room or area of origin.

If fire service response is to achieve positive outcomes in severe EMS situations and incipient fire situations, all of the companies must arrive, size up the situation and deploy effective measures before brain damage or death occurs or the fire spreads beyond the room of origin.

Given that the emergency started before or as it was noticed and continues to escalate through the steps of calling 911, dispatch notification of the companies, their response, and equipment set-up once on scene, there are three “clocks” that fire and emergency medical companies must work against to achieve successful outcomes:

◆ The time it takes an incipient room fire to fully engulf a room in 4 to 5 minutes, thus substantially damaging the building and most probably injuring or killing occupants.
When the heart stops in a heart attack, the brain starts to die from lack of oxygen in 4 to 6 minutes and brain damage becomes irreversible at about the 10-minute point.

In a trauma patient, severe blood loss and organ damage becomes so great after the first hour that survival is significantly reduced. The goal of trauma medicine is to stabilize the patient in the field as soon as possible after the injury, and to transport them to a trauma center were appropriate medical intervention can be initiated within one hour of the injury.

Somewhat coincidently, in all three situations above, the first responding company must arrive within 5 to 7 minutes of the 911-call to have a chance for a successful outcome. Further, the follow-on (additional) companies for serious emergencies must arrive within the 8- to 11-minute point. These response times need to include the time steps for the dispatcher to process the caller’s information, alert the stations needed, and the companies to then don OSHA-mandated safety clothing and drive safely to the emergency. The sum of these three time steps – dispatch, company turnout and drive time – comprises “total reflex,” or total response time. Thus, to get the first firefighters on-scene within only 5 to 7 minutes of the 911 call being answered is very challenging to all parts of the system, as this study will describe later in detail.

The three event timelines above start with the onset of the emergency. It is important to note the fire or medical emergency continues to deteriorate from the time of onset, not the time the fire engine actually starts to drive the response route. It is hoped that the emergency is noticed immediately and the 9-1-1 system is activated. This step of awareness—dailing 9-1-1 and giving the dispatcher accurate information—takes, in the best of circumstances, one minute. Then company notification and travel take additional minutes. Once arrived, the company must walk to the patient or emergency, size up the problem and deploy its skills and tools. Even in easy to access situations, this step can take 2 minutes or more. It is considerably longer up long driveways, apartment buildings with limited access, multi-storied office buildings or shopping center buildings such as those found in some parts of the District.

For safety, Federal and State Occupational Health and Safety Regulations (OSHA) mandate that firefighters cannot enter a burning structure past the incipient or small fire stage without doing so in teams of 2, one team inside and one team outside, ready to rescue them. This requires a minimum of 4 firefighters to initiate an interior fire suppression attack. The only exception is when there is a known life inside to be rescued.

Many fire department deployment studies using the Standards of Response Coverage process, as well as NFPA guidelines, arrive at the same fact—that an average (typically defined by the NFPA as a modest single-family dwelling) risk structure fire needs a minimum of 14-15 firefighters, plus an on-scene incident commander, to achieve the desired outcome expectation.
As another example, to confine a fire to one room in a multi-story building requires many more firefighters than in a single-story suburban family home. The amount of staffing needed at such an incident can be derived from the desired outcome and risk class. If the community desires to confine a one-room fire in a residence to the room or area of origin, that effort will require a minimum of 14-15 personnel plus an incident commander. This number of firefighters is the minimum needed to safely conduct the simultaneous operational tasks of rescue, fire attack, and ventilation plus providing for firefighter accountability and incident command in a modest, single fire hose residential fire. A significant fire in a two-story residential building or a one-story commercial or multi-story building would require, at a minimum, an additional two to three engines and an additional truck and chief officer, for upwards of 13 additional personnel (27-28 total personnel).

As the required fire flow gallonage increases, concurrently the required number of firefighters increases. Simultaneously, the travel distance for additional personnel increases creating an exponential impact on the fire problem. A typical auto accident requiring multiple-patient extrication or other specialty rescue incidents will require a minimum of 10 firefighters plus the incident commander for accountability and control.

For response time goals, current best practice nationally is to measure percent completion of a goal (i.e., 90 percent of responses) instead of an average measure, as many fire departments did in the past. Response goal measures should start with the time of fire dispatch receiving the 9-1-1 call to the arrival of the first unit at the emergency, and the measure should state what is delivered and what the expected outcome is desired to be.

Percent of completed goal measures are better than the measure of average, because average just identifies the central or middle point of response time performance for all calls for service in the data set. From an average statement, it is impossible to know how many incidents had response times that were considerably over the average or just over. For example, if a department had an average response time of 5 minutes for 5,000 calls for service, it cannot be determined how many calls past the average point of 5 minutes were answered slightly past the 5th minute, in the 6th minute or way beyond at 10 minutes. This is a significant issue if hundreds or thousands of calls are answered much beyond the average point.

When considering response time measures over the years, it was thought to take 1:00 minute for the communications center to process the call and alert the fire company and 1:00 minute to get the fire apparatus moving. However, NFPA 1221, Standard for the Installation, Maintenance, and Use of Emergency Services Communications Systems (2013 Edition) allows 120 seconds (2:00 minutes) for call answering and processing 95 percent of the time, and even 1:00 minute for company turnout is unrealistic, given the need to don mandated protective safety clothing and
to be seated with the seat belt fastened before the apparatus begins to move. Best practice recommendations for travel time in urban and suburban areas suggest a 4-minute driving time.

Thus, from the time of 9-1-1 receiving the call, an effective deployment system is **beginning** to manage the problem within 6-7 minutes total reflex time. As cited earlier, this is right at the point that brain death is becoming irreversible and the fire has grown to the point of leaving the room of origin and becoming very serious. Yes, sometimes the emergency is too severe even before the fire department is called in for the responding company to prevent escalation and achieve the desired outcome; however, given an appropriate response time policy and a well-designed system, then only issues like bad weather, poor traffic conditions, or concurrent emergencies will slow the response system. Consequently, a properly designed system will give the citizens hope of a positive outcome for their tax dollar expenditure.

An important element of this study included conducting listening interviews with community stakeholders as identified by the District and Fire Chief to enhance Citygate’s understanding of the issues surrounding this study and, equally important, to assess the community’s understanding of risk and its expectations relative to fire services. To accomplish that objective, we interviewed 26 Templeton community stakeholders as follows:

- District General Manager
- Interim Fire Chief
- Three current Board members
- Former Board member
- Four business owners
- Templeton Area Advisory Committee member
- Two District employees (non-fire)
- Eight current Templeton Fire Department employees
- Two former Templeton Fire Department volunteer firefighters
- Three other District residents.

As a result of those interviews, we found that opinions and perspectives relative to fire services in Templeton were fairly equally divided among three broad groups. The first group appreciates the sense of community and service level provided by a volunteer-based fire department and believes that it provides an adequate level of protection for the risks present in the community. Most members in this group would prefer to maintain a volunteer-based system; however, some
recognize the more recent challenges associated with maintaining an adequate number of volunteer firefighters, and suggest that strong leadership will be necessary to sustain this model.

The second group generally believes that the current combination of full-time staffing supported by volunteer (paid-call) firefighters is needed to provide an appropriate level of service during daytime weekday hours when the majority of the paid-call firefighters are not available. This group generally wants to see the current model sustained as a stand-alone department.

The third group recognizes some or all of the operational and fiscal challenges associated with maintaining either the former volunteer-only system or the current combination system. This group would also generally prefer to maintain a stand-alone fire department to serve the Templeton community; however, this group also generally recognizes that this is probably not practical or feasible within the District’s economic resources. The majority of members in this group are looking to this study to identify viable alternative service delivery models and their relative advantages and disadvantages to the community going forward, as well as a better understanding of the costs associated with each approach.

Some of the comments received during this process included:

◆ “We are very well served by the Templeton Fire Department.”
◆ “We need to evaluate all available options and their costs.”
◆ “We have lost a number of volunteer firefighters over the past few years.”
◆ “The Templeton Fire Department has a very good reputation for service.”
◆ “The challenge is not a lack of volunteers, it is a lack of leadership.”
◆ “The biggest issue we face today is adequate staffing.”
◆ “We do not seem to have a big fire problem here; it is mostly medical-related calls.”
◆ “The current system is broken.”
◆ “Where are the gaps in our current system?”
◆ “Response times are generally pretty good in town.”
◆ “Templeton Fire Department members are very dedicated and committed to the community.”
◆ “We are no longer a volunteer fire department.”
◆ “The current model is sustainable with strong leadership and adequate funding.”
2.5 CURRENT RESPONSE POLICY

The County’s General Plan Safety Element does not contain a specific response time goal policy. In Section 4 on Fire Safety it states, “Each fire agency should prepare and work to achieve their response time goal. This response time will be based upon density of development, and the value at risk contrasted with an acceptable level of risk.”

While the District has not adopted a specific emergency response time goal or policy, it has established building safety standards to lessen risks in the community. District ordinances require automatic fire sprinklers in new and significantly remodeled structures and wildland vegetation management to control the spread of wildfires.

Finding #6: The District does not have a complete and current fire deployment performance metric that is designed consistent with best practices and adopted by the Board of Directors to include a beginning time measure starting from the point of dispatch receiving the 9-1-1 phone call, and a goal statement tied to risks and outcome expectations. The deployment measure should have a second measurement statement to define multiple-unit response coverage for serious emergencies. Making these deployment goal changes will meet the best practice recommendations of the Center for Public Safety Excellence (formerly the Commission on Fire Accreditation International).

Finding #7: The District has adopted best practices building and fire safety codes that reduce building and wildland fire risks.

2.6 TEMPLETON RISK ASSESSMENT

This section provides an analysis of the various natural and human-caused hazards with potential to adversely impact property and/or people within the District. A hazard is defined as a condition that can cause or contribute to harm, such as a building fire, wildland fire, earthquake, flood, etc. Risk is the probability of occurrence of a specific hazard along with the severity of potential consequences if the hazard were to occur. Attributes are variables that can influence a hazard, such as building construction materials, built-in fire protection systems, hazard history, public preparedness, etc. A risk assessment is a fact-based objective study of local hazards and their associated risk to the community, and involves the following:

◆ Identification of credible potential hazards and their key attributes as they relate to the community.
Analysis of the probability of occurrence for each hazard identified.

Identification and assessment of the values at risk for each hazard.

Determination of the likely consequences of occurrence for each hazard.

Identification of the overall risk for each hazard present.

It is important to understand that, regardless of the methodology employed, every community risk assessment involves some element of subjectivity, and risk perception will likely vary from one person to the next. The important concept to remember is that every risk assessment is a chosen or perceived rating. This study included an assessment of the building and wildland fire risks in Templeton, and the remaining risks were extrapolated and reviewed for continued validity from the 2011 San Luis Obispo County Local Hazard Mitigation Plan:

- Earthquake
- Flooding
- Extreme Weather
- Hazardous Material Spill/Release
- Terrorism.

### 2.6.1 Building Fire Risk

The District has a low historic occurrence of building fires, particularly building fires of significant consequence. **Table 11** summarizes major building fires since 1960.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>American Legion Hall</td>
<td>805 S. Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Templeton High School</td>
<td>8th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Templeton Feed and Grain</td>
<td>405 S. Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Hope and Larry's Bar</td>
<td>520 S. Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Allen Lumber Yard Office</td>
<td>309 S. Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Muriel's Dress Shop</td>
<td>400 S. Main</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the past several decades, San Luis Obispo County has adopted the California State Building and Fire Codes with local amendments. These codes establish, among other things, building materials and methods, as well as emergency lighting, exit, and fire alarm and built-in fire.
suppression systems for public buildings to minimize the occurrence of fire and related life safety concerns. In addition, the District has adopted a local amendment to the California Fire Code requiring fire sprinklers in all new and majority remodel construction of all building types. An analysis of incident responses for the past three years reveals a total of 16 building fires (0.94 percent of all responses), only one of which resulted in a monetary loss estimated at $30,000.

Templeton’s building fire risk, like most communities of similar size, is a composite of low, medium, and high risk. Moreover, the bulk of this risk requires moderate fire flow and is in the form of single-family dwellings, multi-family buildings, and low-rise office and retail buildings. The majority of these structures are not equipped with fire sprinkler systems, except those constructed since 1994 when fire sprinklers became mandatory for all new non-residential construction, and since 1998 for residential construction. There is only one mid-rise structure, the Twin Cities Hospital, and the vast majority of the buildings are one or two stories. The County applies the California Building Code to determine appropriate construction type, which also limits the potential for fire spread. The commercial/industrial areas on the north end of the District include some medium and high hazard occupancies due to the types of materials and processes used.

Despite the low historic incidence of building fires within Templeton, a significant fire in any of the several large Templeton businesses or employers, including Twin Cities Hospital, California Department of Transportation, Southern California Gas, SBC Global, California Highway Patrol, or the San Luis Obispo County Sheriff’s Department, would result in a near-term economic impact to the community at a minimum.

Based on this analysis, Citygate concludes that the probability of occurrence of a building fire is low, and the potential consequences are moderate (see Table 14).

### 2.6.2 Wildland Fire Risk

A wildfire is an uncontrolled fire spreading through vegetative fuels, posing danger and destruction to property. Wildfires can occur in undeveloped areas and spread to urban areas where structures and other human development are more concentrated. These areas are referred to as Wildland Urban Interface (WUI), where human development meets or intermingles with wildland vegetative fuels. While some wildfires start by natural causes, humans are responsible for four of every five wildland fires, which are usually the result of debris burning, arson or carelessness. As a natural hazard, a wildfire is often the direct result of a lightning strike that may also damage or destroy personal property and public land areas.

The climate in northern San Luis Obispo County generally includes relatively cool, moderately wet winters and warm dry summers. Rainfall occurs primarily between November and April, and averages 15 inches per year. Summer temperatures range from the low 80°s to over 100° F in the
summer, with daytime temperatures averaging about 95°F during the peak summer months. Winds are generally mild in the Templeton area; however, on a windy day they can reach gusts of 15 miles per hour or more. Weather is one of the primary factors contributing to the ignition potential and spread of wildland fires, and the summer weather in Templeton contributes to this hazard. This weather pattern is also favorable to the growth of wild vegetative species, particularly annual weeds and grasses that die after the rainy season to become a natural wildland fuel. Because of this, the wildland fire risk is predominantly during the summer and early fall months prior to the onset of the rainy season.

While there have been numerous significant wildland fires in San Luis Obispo County over the past several decades, some of which have burned large areas and caused extensive property damage, none have directly impacted Templeton.

A comprehensive wildland fire risk assessment involves evaluating attributes across four separate but interrelated wildland fire hazard environments: the natural environment, the built environment, the social (human) environment, and the response environment. Examples of natural environment wildland hazard attributes include historic wildland fire occurrence, fire severity, fire cause, vegetative fuel species (including fuel type, class, characteristics, continuity, arrangement, and fuel loading), weather, topography, and others. Examples of built environment wildland hazard attributes include building codes, structural density, ignition-resistant building materials and construction methods, defensible space, access/egress routes, water systems, street/address signage, and essential lifeline utilities. Social environment wildland fire hazard attributes include community population demographics, percentage of rental properties, degree of absentee ownership, recent memorable wildland fire event(s), presence of an effective public wildland fire education program, as well as others. Response environment wildland fire hazard attributes include availability of wildland fire suppression apparatus and equipment, staffing levels, training, pre-incident planning, interoperable communications, cooperative assistance agreements, etc.

The Fire and Resource Assessment Program (FRAP) of the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) has evaluated the natural environment wildland fire hazard attributes throughout the state, including modeling potential fire behavior based on these attributes, and established “moderate,” “high,” and “very high” wildland Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZ) based on this assessment. The Templeton area of San Luis Obispo County is within a “moderate” FHSZ. Citygate evaluated other wildland fire hazard attributes as shown in Table 12 below to establish an overall “moderate” wildland fire hazard risk rating for the District.
Table 12—Wildland Fire Risk Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Rating Scale: No Risk = 0; Low Risk = 1; Moderate Risk = 2; High Risk = 3; Very High Risk = 4; Extreme Risk = 5

The following risk assessments were extrapolated from the 2011 San Luis Obispo County Hazard Mitigation Plan. These risk assessments were reviewed by Citygate and determined to remain valid for the specific risks identified for Templeton:

- Earthquake
- Flooding
- Extreme Weather
- Hazardous Material Spill/Release
- Terrorism.

2.6.3 Earthquake Risk

An earthquake is a sudden, rapid shaking of the ground caused by the breaking and shifting of rock beneath the earth’s surface or along fault lines. For hundreds of millions of years, the forces of plate tectonics have shaped the earth as the huge plates that form the earth’s surface move slowly over, under, and past each other. Sometimes the movement is gradual. At other times, the plates are locked together, unable to release the accumulating energy. When the accumulated energy grows strong enough, the plates break free causing the ground to shake. Most earthquakes occur at the boundaries where the plates meet, commonly called faults; however, some earthquakes occur in the middle of plates.

A fault is a fracture in the earth’s crust along which movement has occurred either suddenly during earthquakes or slowly during a process called creep. Cumulative displacement may be tens or even hundreds of miles if movement occurs over geologic time. However, individual episodes are generally small, usually less than several feet, and are commonly separated by tens, hundreds, or thousands of years. Damage associated with fault-related ground rupture is normally confined to a fairly narrow band along the trend of the fault. Structures are often not able to withstand fault rupture and utilities crossing faults are at risk of damage. Fault displacement involves forces so great that it is generally not feasible.
(structurally or economically) to design and build structures to accommodate this rapid displacement.

Liquefaction occurs when ground shaking causes the mechanical properties of some fine grained, saturated soils to liquefy and act as a fluid (liquefaction). It is the result of a sudden loss of soil strength due to a rapid increase in soil pore water pressures caused by ground shaking. In order for liquefaction to occur, three general geotechnical characteristics should be present: (1) ground water should be present within the potentially liquefiable zone; (2) the potentially liquefiable zone should be granular and meet a specific range in grain-size distribution; and (3) the potentially liquefiable zone should be of low relative density. If those criteria are present and strong ground motion occurs, then those soils could liquefy, depending upon the intensity and duration of the strong ground motion. Liquefaction that produces surface effects generally occurs in the upper 40 to 50 feet of the soil column, although the phenomenon can occur deeper than 100 feet. The duration of ground shaking is also an important factor in causing liquefaction to occur. The larger the earthquake magnitude, and the longer the duration of strong ground shaking, the greater the potential there is for liquefaction to occur.

A generally accepted axiom among emergency management planners is that earthquakes will occur where they have occurred previously. The central California coast has a history of damaging earthquakes, primarily associated with the San Andreas fault. However, there have been a number of magnitude 5.0 to 6.5 earthquakes on other faults that have affected large portions of the Central Coast. Historically, active faults are generally thought to present the greatest risk for future movement and, therefore, have the greatest potential to result in fault rupture hazards. Table 13 lists the major faults that have been mapped by the U.S. National Geodetic Survey (CGS) in San Luis Obispo County. The potential for fault rupture hazards along other inactive faults is generally considered to be low.
Table 13—Major Earthquake Faults in San Luis Obispo County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fault Name</th>
<th>Maximum Moment Magnitude</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Earthquake Hazard Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambria</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>Potentially Active</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casmalia</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Potentially Active</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Huasna</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Potentially Active</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Simeon-Hosgri</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Panza Fault</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Potentially Active</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Osos</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nacimiento</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rinconada</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Potentially Active</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Andreas (1857)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Andreas (1906)</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Andreas-Carrizo</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Andreas-Cholame</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Andreas-Parkfield</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Potentially Active</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Range</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Potentially Active</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Under Study</td>
<td>Under Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 San Luis Obispo County Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (2011)

The only mapped fault in the Templeton area is the western trace of the potentially active Rinconada fault system referred to as the Jolon fault which trends northwest through Templeton just south of the junction of Highways 46 and 101. Although there is evidence indicating movement along the Rinconada fault, the fault lacks any geomorphic features to suggest that the fault is active. Because the Rinconada fault is considered potentially active, it poses a moderate fault rupture hazard to the Templeton area. Also, due to the high potential moment magnitude, the potential severity of damage is considered high.

2.6.4 Flooding Risk

A flood is defined as an overflowing of water onto an area of land that is normally dry. Floods generally occur from natural weather-related causes, such as a sudden snow melt, often in conjunction with a wet or rainy spring or with sudden and very heavy rain fall. Floods can also result from human causes such as a dam impoundment bursting. For floodplain management purposes, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) will often use the term “100-year flood” or “500-year flood” to describe the size or magnitude. These terms are misleading. It is not a flood that occurs once every 100 or 500 years. Rather, it is the flood elevation that has a 1 percent chance of being equaled or exceeded each year. Thus, a 100-year flood could occur...
more than once in a relatively short period of time. The 100-year flood, which is the standard used by most federal and state agencies, is used by the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) as the standard for floodplain management and to determine the need for flood insurance. A structure located within a special flood hazard area shown on a map has a 26 percent chance of suffering flood damage during the term of a 30-year mortgage.

San Luis Obispo County has experienced severe flooding events that have resulted in extensive property damage. Flooding hazards are most likely to exist along major river and stream courses including the Salinas River, San Luis Obispo Creek, Santa Rosa Creek, Arroyo Grande Creek, Morro Creek and Huerhuero Creek. Areas that have been recently affected by flooding impacts are the areas most likely to be affected by future events. Therefore, a historical perspective of the effects of recent flood events can provide useful insight in land use planning and reduction of future flood hazard risks. Although a number of flooding events have occurred throughout the County over the past fifty years, none have seriously impacted Templeton.

Watercourses located in and near the community of Templeton include the Salinas River and Toad Creek. The 100-year floodplain of the Salinas River as it passes to the east of the community is confined to the river channel and does not significantly affect Templeton. The floodplain for Toad Creek is not extensive. The 100-year flood along this watercourse would have the potential to affect adjacent properties most notably along Salinas and Eddy Streets and an area between Route 101 and Main Street at the north edge of town. The resultant probability of occurrence for flooding within Templeton is low, as is the potential severity of damage.

2.6.5 Extreme Weather Risk

Extreme weather includes drought, freeze, hail, high wind, tornados, and thunderstorms.

A drought, or an extreme dry period, is an extended timeframe where water availability falls below the statistical requirements for a region. Droughts are not a purely physical phenomenon, but rather interplay between the natural water availability and human demands for water supply. The precise definition of drought is made complex owing to political considerations, but there are generally three types of conditions that are referred to as drought. Meteorological drought is brought about when there is a prolonged period with less than average precipitation. Agricultural drought occurs when there is insufficient moisture for average crop or range production. This condition can arise, even in times of average precipitation, owing to soil conditions or agricultural techniques. Hydrologic drought is brought about when the water reserves available in sources such as aquifers, lakes, and reservoirs falls below the statistical average. This condition can arise, even in times of average (or above average) precipitation, when increased usage of water diminishes the reserves. When the word “drought” is used by the general public, the most often intended definition is meteorological drought.
Wind storms result from air movement from areas of high pressure to those of low air pressure, wind storms can occur at any time of the year and can vary in strength and duration.

A thunderstorm, also known as an electrical storm, a lightning storm, thundershower, or simply a storm, is a form of weather characterized by the presence of lightning and its acoustic effect on the earth’s atmosphere known as thunder. Thunderstorms are usually accompanied by strong winds, heavy rain and sometimes snow, sleet, hail, or no precipitation at all. Those that cause hail to fall are known as hailstorms.

A tornado, often referred to as a twister, is a violent, dangerous, rotating column of air that is in contact with both the surface of the earth and a cumulonimbus cloud. Tornadoes come in many shapes and sizes, but are typically in the form of a visible condensation funnel, whose narrow end touches the earth and is often encircled by a cloud of debris and dust. Most tornadoes have wind speeds less than 110 miles per hour, are approximately 250 feet across, and travel a few miles before dissipating. The most extreme tornadoes can attain wind speeds of more than 300 mph, stretch more than two miles across, and stay on the ground for dozens of miles.

Hail is precipitation in the form of balls or irregular lumps, always produced by convective clouds, nearly always cumulonimbus. They can vary from pea size all the way up to that of a grapefruit in rare circumstances. Hailstones generally form in thunderstorms between currents of rising air called the updrafts and the current of air descending toward the ground, called the downdraft. Large hailstones indicate strong updrafts in the thunderstorm. The larger the hail, the stronger the updraft needed to hold it aloft in the storm.

In this mild Mediterranean climate area, a freeze refers to a particularly cold spell of weather where the temperature drops below 32°F, most typically in the early morning hours. Usually these cold spells will last only two or three days when the ocean influence will overcome the cold front returning and the early morning temperatures will return to the normal 45 to 55 degree range. Rainfall during these periods may result in snowfall in the higher elevations of the County.

Although there have been several extreme weather events in San Luis Obispo County over the past few decades, most of the resultant damage has been to agricultural crops, and there are no documented cases of injury or death to anyone in Templeton. Extreme summer heat in the inland portions of the County, including Templeton, can constitute a health hazard, particularly to vulnerable populations such as the very young and elderly; however, it is generally well mitigated with air conditioning and avoidance of prolonged direct exposure. Hailstorms constitute a minimal health and property risk. Other severe weather hazards are not relevant to San Luis Obispo County. The overall probability of occurrence for extreme weather in Templeton is low, as is the potential severity of consequences.
2.6.6 Hazardous Material Spill/Release Risk

Hazardous materials are utilized at some of the commercial and industrial businesses within Templeton, including Twin Cities Hospital and some of the associated medical offices. Large quantities of hazardous materials are also transported daily by truck or cargo container on U.S. Highway 101 bisecting Templeton, as well as by railcar on the Southern Pacific Railroad on the east side of the District. Although the probability of occurrence is low for an unintentional spill or release, the severity of consequence could be very high.

2.6.7 Terrorism Risk

The San Luis Obispo County Office of Emergency Services, responsible for emergency planning and preparedness in the unincorporated areas of the County, has completed a terrorism vulnerability and threat assessment of potential infrastructure targets for terrorism and sabotage. None of the identified vulnerable infrastructure assets are located in Templeton, thus the probability of occurrence is considered low. Resultant impacts of a terrorism event can vary widely; however, they are considered moderate for Templeton due to its proximity to U.S. 101 as well as the winds often present in the northern San Luis Obispo County region.

2.6.8 Risk Summary

Table 14 summarizes the risk potential for Templeton for the various hazards relevant to this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Probability of Occurrence</th>
<th>Potential Consequence Severity</th>
<th>Overall Risk Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Fire</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildland Fire</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Weather</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Material</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7 CURRENT STATION LOCATION

The District is served today by a single fire station adjoining the District Administrative Office in the east-central area of the District. Due to the District’s compact 7.7-square-mile area and
effective transportation network, travel times to emergency incidents within the District are not considered problematic. Also, given that Templeton’s current Sphere of Influence incorporates an additional area comprising less than about 1.5 square miles, Citygate does not see a need for a second fire station within the foreseeable future.

The District’s current station location is, however, approximately 3/4 of a mile (1.25 minutes) travel distance from U.S. 101 at Vineyard Drive in the southern part of the District, and approximately 1 mile (1.5 minutes) from U.S. 101 at North Main Street in the northern part of the District. This travel distance and related travel time influences the District’s response times for interdepartmental aid to other jurisdictions. As a longer-term strategic goal, an alternative fire station site located nearer to the center of the District’s Sphere of Influence with immediate access to U.S. 101, such as somewhere near the U.S. 101 / Las Tablas Road interchange, would be desirable from a regional fire service delivery perspective.

**Recommendation #1:** If/when the regular budgeted on-duty staffing model grows beyond two personnel per 24-hour period, and as fiscal resources permit, the District should consider relocating its existing fire station nearer the geographic center of the District with immediate access to U.S. 101 to enhance response times to all areas of the District, including the current Sphere of Influence, as well as to facilitate enhanced regional fire service delivery.

### 2.8 Current Workload

In this section of the study, prior response statistics are used to determine what percent of compliance the existing system delivers. Following is a summary of those comprehensive measures and findings.

In the real world, traffic, weather, and units being out of quarters on other business such as training or fire prevention duties affect response times. A complete Standards of Response Coverage study looks at the actual response time performance of the system from incident records. NFPA 1720 require that a District-wide performance measure of 80 percent of the historical incidents (not geographic) be maintained.

All measures, then, must be understood in the complete context of geography, risk, and actual numbers of calls for service that exceed the community’s performance measure. The Department’s response time performance must be compared to outcomes such as fire loss or medical cases and be contrasted to the community’s outcome expectations. A community could
be well deployed and have poor outcomes, or the reverse. A balanced system will avoid such extremes and strive for equity of service within each category of risk.

Fire departments are required to report response statistics in a format published by the U.S. Fire Administration called the National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS). Private sector companies have developed software programs to do this reporting according to state and federal specifications.

Response times for this study were measured from the time of receipt of dispatch notification at the Templeton fire station to arrival of the first unit. Total response time, including dispatcher call processing time, was estimated by adding the NFPA 1221 standard of 2:00 minutes (120 seconds) for call processing to the above response times. For suburban population density areas such as Templeton, NFPA 1720 recommends a 10:00 minute response time from receipt of the dispatch notification 80 percent of the time. This response performance standard does not include the call processing component of total reflex time. Allowing an additional 2:00 minutes for call processing, response performance aggregates to a 12:00 minute total reflex (customer) measure.

For this statistical review, we are modeling the Department’s prior performance and comparing the data results to the “ideal” per NFPA 1720 for volunteer fire service deployment, since the District has not adopted specific performance metrics.

### 2.9 **Historical Performance**

The Templeton Fire Department provided Citygate with NFIRS incident data for a three-year period spanning January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2012, and incorporating 1,695 incident responses. The dataset had some weaknesses, which will be addressed here and elsewhere in this study. They include:

1. The data does not include initial report time to allow calculation of call processing time. This creates a false sense of “total response time.” NFPA 1221 allows up to 120 seconds for call processing by a dispatch center. Citygate recommends that the Department track “total response time” to include call processing, crew turnout, and travel time components as recommended in recognized industry best practices.

2. Time data is recorded to the whole minute only; this can result in a time differential of up to 59 seconds from actual time. Citygate recommends that the Department track times to the nearest second as recommended by recognized industry standards and best practices.
Finding #8: Templeton Fire Department’s current incident reporting system does not include the initial report time.

Finding #9: Templeton Fire Department’s current incident reporting system does not record time data in minute/second increments.

Recommendation #2: Incorporate the initial 9-1-1 call receipt time into the Department’s incident reporting system to enable tracking of total response time to include call processing, crew turnout, and travel time components.

Recommendation #3: Maintain incident time data to the nearest minute/second.

2.9.1 Service Demand

Table 15 below summarizes annual service demand over the past three-year period. These counts are based on first apparatus arrivals so they represent incidents as opposed to apparatus responses. Note the 17.6 percent increase in demand for 2012 as compared with the previous two years.

Table 15—Service Demand by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next, Table 16 provides a breakdown of annual service demand by incident type. Notice the sharp increase in EMS-related demand in 2012 over the previous two years, as well as the slight trend increase for Fires.

**Table 16—Annual Service Demand by Incident Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident Type</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building fire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation fire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire, other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS call, excluding vehicle accident with injury</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle accident with injuries</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle accident, non-injury</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous condition</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service assistance</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatched and cancelled enroute</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False alarm or false call</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoke check</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential smoke or fire alarm</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarm system malfunction</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other calls for service</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>531</strong></td>
<td><strong>535</strong></td>
<td><strong>629</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 below expands the annual service demand to show specific incident types. Serious emergency types are shown in **bold**. Notice the percentage of EMS incidents in relation to the other call types.

**Table 17—Annual Service Demand by Incident Type**
2.9.2 Service Demand Over Time

Table 18 illustrates service demand by month over the three-year period. Note that service demand is fairly constant throughout the year except for somewhat lower call volume in January, February, and March, and is highest in December.

Table 18—Service Demand by Month

![Bar chart showing service demand by month over three years, with December having the highest demand and January, February, and March having lower demand.]

Next, Table 19 depicts service demand by day of week over the three-year period. Note that call volume is relatively constant throughout the week except for Sundays.

Table 19—Service Demand by Day of Week

![Bar chart showing service demand by day of week, with Saturday and Sunday having significantly fewer incidents than the other days.]
Finally, **Table 20** illustrates service demand by hour of day over the three-year period. Analysis of this response data shows that 57.7 percent of the calls occurred between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., and 42.3 percent from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. Note that the highest demand period is from about 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.

![Graph showing service demand by hour of day](image)

**Table 20—Service Demand by Hour of Day**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour of Day</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.10 Monetary Loss from Fire

Estimated monetary losses from fire are not highly accurate when fire department data sets are used. Local fire personnel use their knowledge of costs to crudely estimate the loss at the time of the fire. In the United States, once an insurance company completes their final insurance loss payments, there is no reporting of actual loss to individual fire agencies. As such, fire department data can only be used as a broad trend indicator. Further, the assessed value of the property not burned is not collected so it is all but impossible to quantify what was “saved” in any given period.

**Table 21** summarizes estimated monetary losses from building fires over the three-year dataset of this study. Notice only one building fire with monetary loss over the entire three-year period.

**Table 21—Estimated Monetary Losses from Building Fires**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Building Fires</th>
<th>Building Fires with Monetary Loss</th>
<th>Estimated Monetary Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.11 Response Time Analysis

Once the types of incidents and losses are quantified, incident analysis shifts to the time required to respond to those incidents. Fractile breakdowns track the percentage (and count the number) of incidents meeting defined criteria such as the first apparatus to reach the scene within progressive time segments.

Citizens measure the speed of fire department response from their request for assistance until assistance arrives. Here, Call to Arrival Time measures the total of Call Processing Time (120-second goal\(^8\)) and Crew Turnout and Travel Time (480-second goal\(^9\)). A 720-second goal (12:00 minutes) is used to measure compliance percentage for Call to Arrival for volunteer fire departments in suburban areas. The times below do not include the “dismount” time to leave the engine and walk to the patient or emergency situation, which in a large complex or multi-story building can take more than a minute.

Call Processing starts when the 9-1-1 Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) is notified of an emergency and ends when the appropriate emergency response resources are notified. No call processing data was available for this study, thus Citygate was unable to analyze call processing performance.

2.11.1 First Unit Dispatch to Arrival Time

Dispatch to Arrival Time measures both Crew Turnout and Travel Time to the emergency incident. While many fire departments track average response time, it is not highly regarded as a reliable performance measurement. One of the most commonly used criteria to measure response effectiveness is fractile analysis of response time. A fractile analysis splits responses into time segments and provides a count and percentage for each progressive time segment. Table 22 provides a fractile breakdown for Templeton Fire Department by year. Mutual and auto aid incidents outside of the District were not included in this calculation, nor were responses cancelled prior to arrival. Note that the District’s 80\(^{th}\) percentile response performance is 8:00 – 8:59 minutes, which is 1:00 minute (10 percent) better than the recommended response performance standard suggested by NFPA 1720 for volunteer fire departments of 10:00 minutes or less, 80 percent of the time. An important distinction to note here is that these fractile response times are for the first-arriving unit only, and do not include arrival of the total Effective

---


Response Force (additional units) necessary to prevent the escalation of other than minor fire and medical emergencies.

Table 22—1st Unit Dispatch to Arrival Time by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fractile Time</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:59 or less min.</td>
<td>17.81%</td>
<td>17.03%</td>
<td>22.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 - 4:59 min.</td>
<td>33.08%</td>
<td>29.02%</td>
<td>35.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 - 5:59 min.</td>
<td>49.62%</td>
<td>40.77%</td>
<td>49.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 - 6:59 min.</td>
<td>63.10%</td>
<td>52.04%</td>
<td>61.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 - 7:59 min.</td>
<td>77.61%</td>
<td>68.59%</td>
<td>75.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 8:59 min.</td>
<td>87.28%</td>
<td>83.45%</td>
<td>85.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 - 9:59 min.</td>
<td>93.64%</td>
<td>91.13%</td>
<td>90.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 -10:59 min.</td>
<td>95.67%</td>
<td>94.48%</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - 11:59 min.</td>
<td>97.20%</td>
<td>97.60%</td>
<td>96.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Templeton Fire Department NFIRS data

As noted earlier, response times are recorded by the District in whole minute increments, thus actually response times could be as much as 59 seconds longer. Another distinction noted earlier is that the response performance data shown above does not include the call processing time component of total response time. Assuming this meets recommended industry standards of 120 seconds or less 95 percent of the time, this means that the 80th percentile first unit response performance is closer to 10:00 - 11:00 minutes total response time, which is beyond the time that irreversible brain damage occurs and an incipient building fire has grown beyond the room of origin. The additional response time required to assemble an Effective Response Force for other than minor emergencies (more than 10 firefighters) will result in more serious outcomes for those types of emergencies.

2.11.2 Response Time Discussion

Given the above summary of Citygate’s response statistics analysis we offer the following deployment-related findings:

---

Finding #10: With a fire/EMS incident first-due unit Dispatch to Arrival performance of 9:00 minutes or less 80 percent of the time from receipt of dispatch notification, the current deployment system is delivering first unit response performance that exceeds the nationally-recognized best practice goal of 10:00 minutes, 80 percent of the time for suburban Volunteer Fire Departments.

Finding #11: With an estimated first-due unit Call to Arrival response performance of 11:00 minutes or less 80 percent of the time from time of receipt of the 9-1-1 call, the current deployment system still exceeds nationally recognized best practice performance goal of 12:00 minutes or less 80 percent of the time for a suburban volunteer fire department; however, that level of response performance will not achieve desired outcomes for even many minor fire and EMS emergencies. The additional response time required to assemble an Effective Response Force for more serious emergencies will result in more serious outcomes for those incidents.

Finding #12: The District benefits from the regional mutual aid response system.

2.11.3 Deployment Recommendations

Pursuant to the preceding deployment analysis, Citygate offers the following deployment-related recommendations:

Recommendation #4: As soon as practical, the District should consider implementation of a shared-service alternative(s) identified in Section 4 that will provide enhanced on-duty (immediately available) staffing, ideally at the Advanced Life Support (ALS) level and within available fiscal resources, to reduce first-due unit Call to Arrival response performance to achieve desired outcomes for minor routine fire and EMS emergencies.
Recommendation #5: As additional time and/or financial resources permit, the District should more fully explore the other shared-service opportunities identified in Section 4 that can provide enhanced operational and fiscal efficacy to include both first-due unit and Effective Response Force performance to achieve desired outcomes for up to moderately severe emergencies (emergency incidents requiring 16-28 firefighters).

2.12 Interdepartmental Aid

Interdepartmental aid quantifies the number of incidents in which the Templeton Fire Department received tactical assistance for other fire departments or provided assistance to other fire departments. As would be expected, nearly one-fourth of Templeton’s incidents involve interdepartmental aid as shown in Table 23:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Aid</th>
<th>Number of Calls</th>
<th>Percentage of all Calls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aid Received</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>11.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid Given</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>11.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>389</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.95%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23—Aid Given and Received

As Table 23 indicates, Templeton provides as much aid as it receives. Although no hard data on aid received was available for this study, Citygate understands that nearly all of the aid received is from SLO County Fire.

2.13 Deployment Analysis Summary

Templeton Fire Department’s existing deployment model utilizes paid-call firefighters working voluntary scheduled shifts to augment the District’s two full-time employees to provide 2-person minimum on-duty first-due unit response staffing during daytime hours (8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.) Monday through Saturday. Citygate’s analysis of this model concludes that it does not provide the intended staffing level 17 percent of the time, and is neither reasonably sustainable nor sufficient to facilitate desired outcomes for even routine, non-serious emergencies.

Additionally, Citygate’s analysis concludes that the District’s current reliance on its full-time and paid-call firefighters, automatic mutual aid with SLO County Fire for all emergencies requiring
more than a single unit response, and mutual aid with Atascadero for wildland fires, does not comprise a sufficient effective response force to ensure desired outcomes for even moderately severe emergencies.
SECTION 3—SUPPORT SYSTEMS

This section provides an assessment of the District’s systems that support the Fire Department’s emergency response function. We examined the fire station; fire apparatus and equipment readiness, maintenance, and testing; and also evaluated the training, safety and risk management, and dispatch systems. All of these are important components of a fire department operation and are critical to ensuring that needed resources can respond quickly and effectively. A number of main themes emerged, some of which deserve particular consideration while others only require the regular attention they currently receive.

3.1 OVERALL IMPRESSIONS

The Templeton Community Services District Fire Department is at a critical leadership crossroad, with strong, effective transitional leadership from both the District and the next Department leader necessary to ensure effective future fire service delivery in Templeton. In addition, over 75 percent of Department employees do not meet minimum annual training requirements.

3.2 MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION

National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Standard 1201 – Standard for Providing Emergency Services to the Public states in part, “the [department] shall have a leader and organizational structure that facilitates efficient and effective management of its resources to carry out its mandate as required [in its mission statement].

A fire department of Templeton’s size needs to have a management team that is properly sized, adequately trained, and supported. There are increasing regulations to be dealt with in operating fire services, and the proper hiring, training and supervision of line employees requires an equally serious commitment to leadership and general management functions.
Templeton Fire Department Organization Chart (September 2013)

The above organizational chart represents an organization sufficient to meet the needs of a department of the size and type of Templeton. However, as discussed here and in other sections of this report, the Department is at a critical leadership crossroads. The current interim Fire Chief is near the end of his allowable tenure under CalPERS retiree work rules, and the future status of fire service delivery in Templeton will be very much dependent on the transitional leadership provided by the District and the next Department leader.

One of the concerns noted by Citygate is the lack of professional education and certification at the Fire Chief and Company Officer levels. Even in a small department like Templeton, it is imperative that the Fire Chief and supervisors have the appropriate training and certifications to ensure effective management of the organization’s personnel and other resources, as well as ensure effective command of emergency incidents in conformance with NIMS, the Incident Command System (ICS), and recognized industry best practices.
Finding #13: The Fire Chief and Company Officers do not possess the professional education and/or certifications as recommended by nationally recognized best practices to ensure effective management of the organization’s personnel and other resources, as well as to ensure safe and effective command of emergency incidents in conformance with NIMS and ICS.

Recommendation #6: The Fire Chief should minimally possess Chief Officer certification from the California Fire Service Training and Education System (CFSTES) administered by the Office of the California State Fire Marshal, or equivalent; Company Officers (Captains) should be encouraged and provided the resources necessary to obtain Fire Officer certification.

3.3 Training

The job of a firefighter is extremely complex and the services a firefighter delivers must be done correctly every time. This is particularly critical for those tasks that are very hazardous, do not occur very often, or for which there is no decision time. Training in the fire service has two parts: vocational training, which teaches the skill sets necessary to perform the “hands-on” work required of firefighters; and education, which teaches the knowledge necessary to perform the “mental” work required of firefighters.

An effective training program is the keystone to effective emergency response. During emergency operations, time is always of essence and an effective training program can mean the difference between a fire contained to the area of origin and one that causes great damage or difference between effective CPR that starts on time and a patient that dies. The NFPA and Federal and Cal/OSHA have many recommended standards that cover the training arena. As an abbreviated overview:

- NFPA 1001 Standard for Fire Fighter Professional Qualifications
- NFPA 1002 Standard for Fire Apparatus Driver Operator / Professional Qualifications
- NFPA 1021 Standard for Fire Officer Professional Qualifications
Many of the tasks firefighters perform on emergencies falls into the relatively routine category. As long as everything goes well, there is no need for any specialized training. It is when the High Risk / Low Frequency, No-Decision-Time incident comes along that the routine training is not sufficient. The after action findings of the tragic furniture store fire in Charleston, South Carolina in 2007 where nine firefighters lost their lives bear this out, along with sadly multiple wildland firefighter fatalities.

Adequate, supervised, verified training is needed to prevent these types of tragedies, which have enormous long-term emotional and fiscal impacts on not only the firefighters and their families, but the agency and the community as well. Charleston had to completely replace its fire department executive leadership, bring in an outside training and leadership team, and totally revamp its entire training and incident management processes. Had Charleston maintained currency with the best practices of the fire service and required standardized, verifiable, ongoing, and realistic training, it is likely those nine firefighters would be alive today and firefighting in Charleston would be “business as usual.” Having said that, it is critical to remember that Templeton firefighters are neither cavalier nor casual about the way they conduct themselves during emergencies. They have good basic training. The issue is that there is no ongoing programmatic approach to ensure that current best practices in safety and training are taught, practiced, and instilled in the daily operations of the Fire Department.

The Department hired its first full-time Engineer / Training Officer position in 2012, and the position was recently upgraded to Captain. This is a 40-hour-per-week position that works 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. five days per week (either Monday through Friday or Tuesday through Saturday) and is a collateral responsibility in addition to the other responsibilities of a full-time employee including response to emergency incidents and facility and equipment readiness.

Table 24 below summarizes the annual training requirements for firefighters in California.
Table 24—Required Firefighter Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject or Skill</th>
<th>Annual Hours</th>
<th>Multi-Year Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMT - Continuing Education²</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardio-Pulmonary Resuscitation (CPR)³</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automatic External Defibrillator (AED)³</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloodborne Pathogens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HazMat First Responder Operational</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Exposure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory Protection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confined Space Rescue - Awareness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fire and Rescue Skills⁴</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment⁵</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>259</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Dowdle, M. & Schoonover, D. (2007) Training Mandates Study for the Fire Service. (San Jose Fire Department)
² Required every 2 years
³ Required every 3 years
⁴ To include 4 multi-company drills, 2 night drills, 16 hours officer training, and 12 hours driver/operator training
⁵ Supervisors only

As Table 24 shows, the Templeton Fire Department should be providing and requiring a minimum of 259 hours of training annually for every employee, and 287 hours of training on alternate years. For this study, Citygate reviewed Fire Department training records for the current and two prior years. Table 25 provides a breakdown of annual training hours per firefighter by year during that period:

Table 25—Annual Training Hours per Firefighter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Training Hours</th>
<th>Percentage of Firefighters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50 hours</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 -100 hours</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 -150 hours</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 -200 hours</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 -250 hours</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 250 hours</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Through first 8 months of year

Section 3—Support Systems
As Table 25 indicates, none of the firefighters met the minimum training requirement in 2011, 3 of 28 employees (11 percent) met the requirement in 2012, and 5 of 25 employees (20 percent) are on track to meet the requirement this year. Citygate also observed a semi-monthly training drill on August 19, 2013. The Department Training Officer conducted the drill in a small outbuilding near the Templeton Middle School. The drill was designed to simulate a small fire in a room of a one-story single-family residence. Sixteen of the current 25 Department members participated in the drill including both full-time employees, the interim Fire Chief, and 13 Paid Call Firefighters. Citygate observed two separate evolutions involving a small fire in an interior room with a simulated rescue. The drill was well organized and met all nationally recognized safety standards for a live-fire exercise. The Training Officer conducted a thorough safety briefing and building orientation prior to the exercises, and provided effective safety supervision throughout both evolutions. Participating employees were assigned to one of three apparatus for each evolution, and a fourth apparatus was kept staffed for immediate response to an actual emergency.

Citygate observed that the firefighters worked effectively under their assigned Company Officer and the overall incident command of the Fire Chief to safely accomplish all of the critical tasks necessary to stabilize the simulated incident. The first-arriving Company Officer provided a good size-up report, and conducted an exterior evaluation of the building prior to making any tactical assignments. A back-up Rapid Intervention Crew was appropriately established prior to another crew making entry into the building to extinguish the fire, and vertical building ventilation was effectively coordinated with the interior crew. Citygate observed no significant safety issues or concerns during either evolution of the exercise.

**Finding #14:** A majority of Fire Department employees do not meet the minimum 259-287 hours of mandated and recommended annual training.

### 3.4 Fire Prevention

The Templeton Fire Department provides a variety of fire prevention services, including new development and building plan review, fixed fire protection system inspections, non-residential occupancy inspections, hazardous weed abatement, pre-fire planning, and public education and information.

The Department’s Volunteer Coordinator is responsible for conducting fire safety inspection of all 370 non-residential occupancies within the District annually. As of the date of this report, approximately 227 (61 percent) of those have been completed for 2013. The Volunteer
Coordinator is also responsible for updating the Department’s pre-fire plans for all target hazard and other significant occupancies. For 2013, 227 (57 percent) of 400 pre-fire plans were updated.

The Fire Chief is responsible for review of new development and building permits, inspection of fixed fire protection systems, and the annual hazardous weed abatement program. For 2013, 50 new development/building permits have been reviewed to date (average of 1.2 per week), and 21 inspections conducted (average of 0.5 per week). The Department’s annual weed abatement program begins with an initial inspection of each of the District’s 3,207 parcels beginning in May, with notice of non-compliance to affected property owners by May 20. Follow-up inspections on non-compliant properties are conducted beginning June 1, and the District utilizes a private contractor to abate any remaining non-compliant parcels beginning June 10. For 2013, 99 notices of non-compliance were sent (3 percent of District parcels), and only 11 required abatement by the District (0.3 percent). This level of compliance is remarkable, and is one of the significant factors minimizing the District’s wildland fire risk.

Public education and information services are provided by a non-suppression volunteer, including a visit to every elementary and middle school classroom within the District during Fire Prevention Week each October. The Fire Chief also provides information and presentations to local businesses, senior living facilities, and service clubs as requested.

Public fire safety information is provided to District residents via the District’s bi-annual Activity Guide and monthly utility bill, including such topics as heat emergencies and hazardous weed abatement.

The San Luis Obispo County Fire Investigation Strike Team, consisting of trained fire investigators from several SLO County fire agencies, conducts fire origin and cause investigations upon request by the District as available. Any resultant criminal investigation and prosecution is coordinated through the San Luis Obispo County Sheriff’s Department.

### 3.5 SAFETY AND RISK MANAGEMENT

Although there are no mandates requiring that a jurisdiction provide fire protection services, if it chooses to do so, they must be done safely. Provision of firefighting and emergency medical services is risky. The goal of the risk management program is to ensure that firefighters arrive home safely at the end of each shift.

Among the necessary elements for a fire department is a safety orientation for new employees, a hazard communications system for employees to communicate hazards to supervisors, the Cal/OSHA process for post-injury reviews, the required annual report of injuries, and a standard for safety work plans.
While NFPA has a number of standards that focus to one degree or another on safety issues, NFPA 1500 *Standard on Fire Department Occupational Safety and Health Program* and NFPA 1501 *Standard for Fire Department Safety Officer* are the umbrella documents and they model the kind of umbrella approach that every fire department should take in regards to the safety and health of firefighters, which in turn impacts the safety and health of the public they serve.

NFPA 1500 states, “There must be a fundamental behavioral change in how fire fighters and fire departments address fire service occupational safety. In turn, they must continue to educate their members and, most importantly, the administration and citizens to what the hazards are of the fire fighting profession. The utilization and implementation of this standard can go a long way in reducing the staggering statistics involving fire fighter fatalities and injuries, *but only if given the training and resources to do so.*” [Emphasis added]

NFPA 1500’s Component Analysis Chart recommends the fire department’s risk management plan contain the following elements:

- Fire department organizational statement
- Risk management plan
- Safety and health policy
- Roles and responsibilities
- Occupational safety and health committee
- Record keeping
- Incident safety and health officer
- Laws, codes, and standards
- Training and education
- Accident prevention
- Accident investigation, procedures, and review
- Record management and data analysis
- Apparatus and equipment
- Facility inspection
- Health maintenance
- Liaison
◆ Occupational safety and health officer
◆ Infection control
◆ Critical incident stress management
◆ Post-incident analysis.

In addition to NFPA 1500, a number of other NFPA standards apply to firefighter safety and health:

◆ NFPA 1250 Recommended Practice in Emergency Service Organizational Risk Management.

◆ NFPA 1403 Standard on Live Fire Training Evolutions. This standard contains minimum requirements for conducting live-fire training.

◆ NFPA 1404 Standard for Fire Service Respiratory Protection Training. This standard establishes minimum training requirements for use of required respiratory protection equipment by firefighters.

◆ NFPA 1451 Standard for a Fire Service Vehicle Operations Training Program. This standard establishes the minimum training and record-keeping requirements for fire department emergency vehicle operations training.

◆ NFPA 1501 Standard for Fire Department Safety Officer. This standard contains minimum requirements for the assignment, duties, and responsibilities of a health and safety officer (HSO) and an incident safety officer (ISO) for a fire department.

◆ NFPA 1582 Standard on Comprehensive Occupational Medical Program for Fire Departments. This standard contains descriptive requirements for a comprehensive occupational medical program for fire departments.

◆ NFPA 1583 Standard on Health-Related Fitness Programs for Fire Department Members. This standard establishes the minimum requirements for the development, implementation, and management of a health-related fitness program (HRFP) for members of the fire department involved in emergency operations.

◆ NFPA 1584 Standard on the Rehabilitation Process for Members During Emergency Operations and Training Exercises. This standard establishes the minimum criteria for developing and implementing a rehabilitation process for fire department members at incident scene operations and training exercises.
NFPA 1403 Standard on Live Fire Training Evolutions. This standard outlines the procedures required for safe live-fire training.

NFPA 1404 Standard for Fire Service Respiratory Protection Training. This standard covers the proper use, inspection, maintenance, and program administration of SCBAs.

Although the Templeton Fire Department has not formally adopted NFPA 1500, it does use it as a guide. The Department does not have a designated Safety Officer, nor has it established a department Health and Safety Committee, both of which are recommended by NFPA 1500. In addition, the Department has not conducted a Health and Safety program compliance evaluation in accordance with NFPA 1500 Annex B.

**Finding #15:** The Department does not have a designated Safety Officer, nor a Health and Safety Committee as recommended by NFPA 1500.

**Recommendation #7:** The Department should have a designated Safety Officer.

**Recommendation #8:** The District should consider establishing a Health and Safety Committee, to include Fire Department representation, that meets regularly to review all job-related injuries, illnesses, and accidents as recommended by NFPA and industry best practices.

**Recommendation #9:** The Fire Department should consider conducting a Health and Safety program compliance evaluation in accordance with NFPA 1500 Annex B as a first step in executing a Safety and Health program.

In addition to applicable NFPA standards, California Code of Regulations Title 8, Section 3203 requires every employer to provide an effective written Injury and Illness Prevention Plan (IIPP). For high-hazard employers such as fire departments, the IIPP should minimally address the following topics:

- Confined space operations
- Lock-out / tag-out procedures
A review of the District’s 2011 Injury and Illness Prevention Plan revealed several shortcomings:

◆ The designated IIPP Administrator is no longer employed by the District.
◆ The Plan states that a copy shall be available at the Fire Department, although not all firefighters are aware of it.
◆ The Plan does not specifically address confined space operations, lock-out / tag-out procedures, power tool operations, fall protection, driver safety, respiratory protection, hearing conservation, hazardous chemical exposure, or biological hazards.

Finding #16: The District’s Injury and Illness Prevention Plan does not address many of the hazards specific to fire department operations.

Recommendation #10: The District should update its Injury and Illness Prevention Plan to include a current employee as the designated Plan Administrator, as well as to address the hazards specific to fire department operations.

3.6 Dispatch Services

Templeton contracts with the CAL FIRE San Luis Obispo Administrative Unit for dispatch services. The dispatch center is located at 635 North Santa Rosa Street in San Luis Obispo. This dispatch center processes over 13,500 calls annually, and provides dispatch services for Cayucos,
San Miguel, Santa Margarita, Cambria, Los Osos, Avila Beach, Pismo, and Templeton in addition to state-funded CAL FIRE resources. The CAL FIRE dispatch center is a secondary Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP), and calls for service within the areas dispatched by CAL FIRE are transferred from the primary PSAPs within the County (SLO Sheriff’s Department, California Highway Patrol, and the Cities of Paso Robles, Atascadero, and San Luis Obispo). The dispatch center is staffed 24/7 with a minimum of two qualified dispatchers, and there is ample surge capacity and call-back personnel to handle a major or multiple concurrent emergency incidents. The CAL FIRE dispatch center strives to comply with, but does not yet measure dispatch center performance against, NFPA 1221, *Standard for the Installation, Maintenance, and Use of Emergency Services Communications Systems* that establishes the following performance standards for emergency call processing:

- Ninety-five (95) percent of all emergency telephone calls shall be answered within 15 seconds, and 99 percent shall be answered within 40 seconds.

- Eighty (80) percent of emergency calls shall be processed and response resources notified within 60 seconds, and 95 percent shall be completed within 106 seconds, except that 90 percent of the following call types shall be processed within 90 seconds, and 99 percent of the calls within 120 seconds:
  - Calls requiring emergency medical dispatch questioning and pre-arrival medical instructions.
  - Calls requiring language translation.
  - Calls requiring the use of a TTY/TDD devise or audio/video relay services.
  - Calls of criminal activity that require information vital to the safety of emergency responders prior to dispatching units.
  - Hazardous materials incidents.
  - Technical rescue incidents.

- For calls transferred from a PSAP to a secondary answering point, the transfer procedure shall not exceed 30 seconds for 95 percent of all calls processed.

CAL FIRE charges Templeton a per-incident dispatch fee based on the salary and benefits costs of a Communications Operator and 2,500 calls per dispatcher annually (currently $42.22 per incident; $26,5176 for 2012). Citygate finds the District’s use of contract dispatch services from an experienced and capable fire dispatch provider such as CAL FIRE makes good sense, and recommends continuation of this model.
Finding #17: The District benefits from its current dispatch services agreement with CAL FIRE.

Recommendation #11: Continue utilizing contract fire dispatching services from a capable and experienced local fire dispatch provider agency.

3.7 Apparatus and Equipment

Fire apparatus needs to be properly maintained in order to ensure response readiness, safe arrival, effective operation, and return to readiness for the next assignment. Considering that a fire apparatus driver is entrusted with a 35,000-pound vehicle at speeds up to 65 miles per hour, often against prevailing traffic at controlled intersections, officials should doubly ensure that the maintenance, as well as the training program, meets all applicable legal and best practice standards.

The fire service generally groups fire apparatus into two categories: (1) engine companies, which are primarily responsible for pumping and delivering water and performing basic firefighting functions, including search and rescue; and (2) truck companies, which are primarily responsible for forcible entry, ventilation, search and rescue, aerial operations for water delivery and rescue, utility control, illumination, overhaul, and salvage work. Other types of apparatus include water tenders, which are primarily responsible for carrying large quantities of water; squads or rescue companies, which carry a variety of rescue and emergency medical equipment; medic units or ambulances; command vehicles; and other auxiliary apparatus. To be effective, fire apparatus must be of proper design, well equipped with the proper hose, appliances, tools, ladders, and other equipment necessary to perform the complex work of firefighting, rescue, emergency medical, and public service tasks.

There are two basic National Fire Protection Association standards that apply to fire apparatus:

- NFPA 1901 Standard for Automotive Fire Apparatus defines the requirements for new fire apparatus designed to be used under emergency conditions to transport personnel and equipment and to support the suppression of fire and mitigation of other hazardous situations. NFPA issued a Tentative Interim Amendment (TIA 09-1) to NFPA 1901 Standard for Automotive Fire Apparatus, 2009 Edition, which slightly changed the wording for the annual pump testing required of all fire department pumping apparatus.
NFPA 1906 *Standard for Wildland Fire Apparatus* defines the requirements for new fire apparatus designed primarily to support wildland fire suppression operations.

In addition to these standards having application for the development of purchase specifications, there are additional performance standards useful for evaluating in-service apparatus:

1. NFPA 1911 *Standard for the Inspection, Maintenance, Testing, and Retirement of In-Service Automotive Fire Apparatus*. This standard defines the minimum requirements for establishing an inspection, maintenance, and testing program for in-service fire apparatus. This standard also includes guidelines for fire apparatus refurbishment and retirement; it identifies the systems and items on a fire apparatus that are to be inspected and maintained, the frequency of such inspections and maintenance, and the requirements and procedures for conducting performance tests on components; it also provides sample forms for collecting inspection and test data.

2. There should also be a system of testing, maintenance, and repair, which ensures a high state of readiness of apparatus and critical equipment. In 2000, NFPA issued NFPA 1915 *Standard for Fire Apparatus Preventative Maintenance Program*, which defines the minimum requirements for a fire department preventative maintenance program. Under this standard, the personnel who conduct the preventative maintenance program should meet NFPA 1071 *Standard for Emergency Vehicle Technician Professional Qualifications*. This standard defines the minimum job requirements an emergency vehicle technician should possess. These include the ability to diagnose, maintain, repair, and test the functions of the apparatus.

The Federal Department of Transportation also has motor vehicle safety standards that are applicable to fire apparatus.
Table 26 below provides an inventory of Templeton Fire Department apparatus and vehicles.

**Table 26—Templeton Fire Apparatus and Vehicles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Radio Number</th>
<th>Chassis Manufacturer</th>
<th>Body Manufacturer</th>
<th>Year Purchased</th>
<th>Fire Pump Size</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Replacement Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-7185</td>
<td>Freightliner</td>
<td>KME</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1000 GPM</td>
<td>Primary Response Engine</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-7195</td>
<td>Freightliner</td>
<td>KME</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1250 GPM</td>
<td>Secondary Response Engine</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-7155</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Blanchat</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>110 GPM</td>
<td>Primary Rescue</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-7156</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Utah LaGrange</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>150 GPM</td>
<td>Reserve Rescue</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS-7145</td>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Breathing Air Support</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-7100</td>
<td>GMC</td>
<td>GMC</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Command SUV</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Replacement cost data provided by the TCSD Fire Department

Citygate conducted a review of District apparatus and vehicles, and found them to be in very good condition, very well maintained, and properly equipped for the risks they are expected to respond to. The fire apparatus are built on commercial chassis, and are very well suited to the fire and EMS risks in Templeton.

The California Vehicle Code requires that all who operate motor vehicles with a commercial license, including a Class C Firefighter license, participate in the Employer Pull Notice Program. Under this program, the employer obtains the driving record of new employees 30 days before beginning operation of a commercial vehicle, and every 12 months thereafter for all employees (CVC Section 1808.1 Employer Notification).

### 3.7.1 Maintenance Program

The Department’s preventative maintenance program includes daily vehicle inspections as required by Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (49 CFR, Part 396.13) which state, “Before driving a motor vehicle, the driver shall be satisfied that the motor vehicle is in safe operating condition,” and weekly inspections performed by Department personnel.

California Vehicle Code Section 34505.5a in part states, “Every motor carrier operating any vehicle described in subdivision (a), (b), (e), (f), or (g) of Section 34500, except those vehicles exempted under Section 34501.12, shall, as a part of the systematic inspection, maintenance, and
lubrication services required of all motor carriers, require the vehicle or vehicles for which it is responsible pursuant to Section 34501.12 to be inspected at least every 90 days, or more often if necessary to ensure safe operation. Vehicles, which are out of service for periods greater than 90 calendar days, do not require an inspection at 90-day intervals if they are inspected before operation on the highway. Fire apparatus fall under this CVC 90-day inspection requirement, and must be inspected by a qualified vehicle safety inspector. In addition, the California Vehicle Code requires all motor carriers, defined as the owners of specified vehicles including most fire apparatus, to participate in the Biennial Inspection of Terminals (BIT) Program, with a requisite site inspection by the California Highway Patrol every 25 months.

Ninety-day safety inspections and specialized maintenance of District commercial fire apparatus is performed by an independent mobile mechanic on an hourly basis. The interim Fire Chief states that this mechanic is an Automotive Service Excellence (ASE) certified Master Medium/Heavy Truck Technician and Emergency Vehicle Technician (EVT) Master Fire Technician. Citygate did not verify these credentials as part of this study. Routine preventive maintenance and minor repairs are performed by a local automotive repair shop, and all small engine service and repairs are performed by Department personnel with support from a local small engine shop as needed.

Fire pumps are tested annually in conformance with NFPA1911 Standard for the Inspection, Maintenance, Testing, and Retirement of In-Service Automotive Fire Apparatus.

### 3.7.2 Replacement Program

The District does not have a formal apparatus replacement plan or schedule. It does, however, have a restricted capital account that can be used to replace fire apparatus and equipment as needed. In addition to replacement of worn-out equipment, some becomes obsolete as updated and improved equipment becomes available. Having such a replacement fund is considered a best practice as the fire apparatus alone in the current plan have a purchase cost value of $1.23M dollars. The District needs to save and plan for these replacements in a timely manner.

### 3.7.3 Equipment Testing

Templeton Fire Department outsources annual ladder testing in conformance with NFPA 1932 Standard on Use, Maintenance, and Service Testing of In-Service Fire Department Ground Ladders. The current contractor utilizes a non-destructive testing process, and is certified by the major fire ladder manufacturers to perform necessary repairs.

In addition, all fire hose is tested annually in conformance with NFPA 1962 Standard for the Care, Use, Inspection, Service Testing, and Replacement of Fire Hose, Couplings, Nozzles, and Fire Hose Appliances.
Finding #18: District fire apparatus are appropriate for the fire and other hazardous risks in Templeton. They appear to be very well cared for, well maintained, and properly equipped.

Finding #19: The Templeton Fire Department fire apparatus maintenance program appears to meet all state and federal regulations and nationally recognized best practices.

Finding #20: All Department fire pumps, ladders, and fire hose are tested annually in conformance with nationally recognized testing standards.

3.8 Fire Station Facility

The Templeton Fire Department occupies a 3,888-square-foot building adjoining the TCSD Administrative Offices at Crocker and Fifth Streets. Remodeled in 1996, the station is located in the east-central section of the District with good access to arterial surface roads.

Citygate’s review of this facility revealed it to be clean and well maintained, and of adequate size and design to meet current and near-term functional needs. The building is stated to conform to the seismic safety requirements of essential services buildings as contained in Title 24, Part 1, Chapter 2, Sections 16000-16022 of the California Code of Regulations. The apparatus portion of the building has a vehicle exhaust extraction system installed, and the facility also has an emergency standby generator.

The second-floor living quarters over the office area can accommodate only two employees, thus the District will need to consider additional living space options if additional daily staffing is added.

Finding #21: The Templeton Fire Department facility is adequately sized and designed to meet the Department’s current needs.

Finding #22: The living space of the current Fire Department facility is inadequate for more than two people.

Recommendation #12: The District will need to provide additional living space at the fire station if night staffing exceeds two personnel.
This page was intentionally left blank
SECTION 4—ALTERNATIVE FIRE SERVICE DELIVERY OPTIONS

4.1 GENERAL DISCUSSION

As cited in the Executive Summary section of this report, Citygate finds that the challenge of providing fire services in Templeton is similar to that found in most smaller communities throughout California and the nation: meeting community needs and expectations relative to providing an adequate level of services within the context of limited fiscal resources, competing needs, and limited growth. Even many larger cities are facing similar challenges in light of the recent economic recession and the likely reality for many communities that their revenues will never rebound to pre-recession levels.

As a result, many cities and smaller rural communities like Templeton are evaluating and implementing alternative public safety service models in an effort to maintain critical services to their residents and businesses while continuing to strive to meet community needs and expectations in the most efficient and cost-effective manner possible. Many communities, both large and small, are evaluating and implementing some form of shared services as a workable solution to this challenge. The simplest application of this concept is mutual aid, where two or more jurisdictions or agencies agree to provide voluntary assistance to each other as needed upon request.

This sharing of critical fire protection resources across agencies has been widely adopted throughout California and the country for several decades. Most counties in the state have also adopted a countywide fire mutual aid plan, and California has a statewide plan as well. This model has been further refined in many areas with automatic mutual aid, where specified resources are automatically dispatched to another jurisdiction for specific types of emergencies.

The Templeton Fire Department has automatic mutual aid agreements with the San Luis Obispo County Fire Department for all types of emergencies requiring more than a single unit response, and also with the Atascadero Fire Department for wildland fires only. Templeton is a party to the San Luis Obispo County Fire Mutual Aid Plan, and thus has access to other fire resources throughout the County on request based on availability.

Another opportunity to enhance operational and fiscal efficiencies involves sharing common support services. Most fire departments have a Fire Chief, and many departments have one or more operational (shift) chief officers to provide daily shift and emergency incident management on a 24/7/365 basis, and administrative/clerical support. Mid-sized departments may also have an Assistant Chief, Fire Marshal, Training Officer and/or an EMS Manager. Every department also requires some level of dispatch, facility and vehicle maintenance, payroll and accounting, and human resource services to support the operational (response) resources. Smaller agencies in
relatively close geographic proximity can often share one or more of these support services without additional personnel or significant additional cost.

For example, In Citygate’s experience, one Fire Chief can effectively administer two or three small departments in close geographic proximity. Shared dispatch services, such as Templeton’s current agreement with CAL FIRE, is another example of reduced redundancy and enhanced operational and fiscal efficacy, as is sharing of operational chief officers for day-to-day management and incident command where feasible.

The ultimate shared-service model is consolidation of specific services among two or more agencies or jurisdictions. This alternative is gaining momentum nationwide as communities continue to struggle to balance community needs and expectations with declining revenues.

### 4.2 High-Level Analysis of Fire Service Delivery Options

A significant element of this study as identified by the General Manager, Interim Fire Chief, members of the Board of Directors, and other community stakeholders, was to identify and provide a high-level analysis of fire service delivery options for the District. As such, Citygate, in collaboration with community stakeholders, identified and met with three prospective fire service partners: San Luis Obispo (SLO) County Fire Department and the Cities of Atascadero and Paso Robles.

#### 4.2.1 San Luis Obispo County Fire Department

The SLO County Fire Department, under contractual administration of the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE), staffs 16 fire apparatus every day with a minimum of two career personnel from 15 stations throughout the County. SLO County Fire Station #30 is located on Ramada Drive on the east side of Highway 101 at the northern District boundary, 2.2 miles (3.5 minutes) from the center of the District (Highway 101 at Las Tablas Road), and approximately 4.5 miles (6 minutes) from the southern District boundary. County Engine #30 responds to approximately 860 calls annually, of which approximately 115 are within the Templeton Community Services District.

Other County fire stations in the northern part of the County include Station #36 at Highway 46 and Branch Road (12.8 miles, 15 minutes), Station #43 in Creston (15.5 miles, 20 minutes), Station #40 in Santa Margarita (20 miles, 25 minutes), and Station #33 at Heritage Ranch (21 miles, 30 minutes). In addition to staffed structural/wildland engines, SLO County Fire has two medium rescue units, four squads, one Hazardous Materials Response unit, one Breathing Air Support unit, two boats, two Aircraft Crash/Rescue apparatus, and three rescue watercraft. These additional resources are cross-staffed with on-duty engine personnel or reserve paid-call firefighters as needed or requested.
In addition to providing contractual administration and personnel for the San Luis Obispo County Fire Department, CAL FIRE has responsibility for wildland fire suppression throughout the County except within incorporated cities and federal or military lands. This is accomplished with state-funded resources including 12 Type-III wildland engines, three bulldozers, ten 17-person hand crews, one Air Attack airplane, and two Type-III Air Tankers. CAL FIRE maintains a local Administrative Headquarters on Santa Rosa Street in San Luis Obispo across from the Cal Poly campus. In addition to an administrative staff, CAL FIRE provides dispatch services, training, and fire prevention/investigation services from this office.

SLO County / CAL FIRE Chief Robert Lewin expressed a strong interest in providing shared fire protection services with the Templeton Community Services District.

4.2.2 City of Atascadero Fire Department

The Atascadero Fire Department serves a City population of approximately 28,000 residents over 26 square miles with a minimum daily staffing of six career personnel deployed from two stations. Station #1, located at 6005 Lewis Avenue, is approximately five miles (7 minutes) from the southern end of the Templeton Community Services District, and six miles (8 minutes) from the center of Templeton. Station #2 on the west frontage road of U.S. 101 is approximately 1.5 miles (2 minutes) additional travel time to all points in Templeton. Department staffing consists of a Fire Chief, Fire Marshal, six Captains, nine Engineers, three Firefighters, 15 Reserve Firefighters, one administrative clerical position, and one additional firefighter daily during the wildland fire season. The on-duty Company Officers (Captains) serve as the Incident Commander at emergency incidents in lieu of an on-duty chief officer.

The department has three Type-1 structural engines, three Type-3 wildland engines, one 100-foot Type-1 aerial platform (quint), one disaster/rescue/HazMat/MCI support trailer, and one four-wheel-drive ambulance. All staffed apparatus provide Advanced Life Support (paramedic) services. The department responds to approximately 2,800 calls annually, and is dispatched by the Atascadero Police Department. Atascadero has an ISO Public Protection Class 4 rating for areas served by fire hydrants, and a class 9 rating for those areas of the City not served by fire hydrants. The Atascadero Fire Department is a partner in the SLO regional Hazardous Materials (HazMat) Joint Powers Agreement with six Captains participating on the HazMat Team, and also provides technical rescue services in partnership with the Paso Robles Fire Department. In addition, Atascadero is providing shared Fire Marshal services to Paso Robles.

Atascadero Fire Chief Kurt Stone stated that his department would support a friendly partnership with Templeton and that they are willing to consider any staffing/deployment or shared-services model. He believes that there is already a strong connection between the two departments, and he sees a potential for other shared-service opportunities including dispatch, training, reserve/PCF and seasonal firefighting staff, fire marshal/prevention. He also stated that Atascadero’s
microwave linked repeater system for command and tactical communications is more than capable of covering Templeton. He advised that Atascadero is exploring future shared Battalion Chief services with Paso Robles, and he also envisions a window of opportunity to develop a single north SLO County fire agency concurrent with his and Paso Robles Fire Chief Ken Johnson’s planned retirements within the next few years.

**4.2.3 City of Paso Robles Fire Department**

The Paso Robles Department of Emergency Services (Fire Department) serves a population of 30,000 in a service area of 19.5 square miles with a minimum daily staffing of seven career personnel deployed from two stations. Station #1 (900 Park Street) is approximately 3.5 miles (5 minutes) from the northern end of the Templeton CSD, and six miles (8 minutes) from the center of the District. Station #2 at 235 Santa Fe Avenue on the east side of U.S. 101 is approximately one mile (1 minute) additional travel time to all points in Templeton. Station #3 at the Paso Robles Airport is not staffed.

Department staffing includes a Fire Chief, one operations Battalion Chief, six Captains, 15 Firefighters, and one Administrative Assistant. The Department has three Type-1 structural engines, one 105-foot Type-1 aerial truck, and one Heavy Rescue apparatus. The Department responds to approximately 3,100 calls for service annually, and is dispatched by the Paso Robles Police Department. The City has an ISO Public Protection Class 4 rating. The Department is a partner in the SLO regional Hazardous Materials (HazMat) Joint Powers Agreement, and also provides technical rescue services in partnership with the Atascadero Fire Department. In addition, the City receives shared Fire Marshal services from Atascadero.

Fire Chief Ken Johnson expressed a willingness to consider shared-service options with Templeton, including providing administrative and command oversight of the Templeton Fire Department and/or providing career staffing. He advised that there has not been any policy-level discussion relative to mergers or creation of a single North County fire agency to date, and he felt that Templeton would need to be able to provide a more equitable service level to both Paso Robles and Atascadero for that alternative to merit serious consideration.

**4.3 Prospective Service Delivery Options**

Following extensive review and analysis of the District’s current fire service delivery model, and discussions with prospective service partners, Citygate has identified the following five alternative fire service delivery options that effectively address the staffing and desired outcome challenges of the District’s current deployment model as identified elsewhere in this report. The alternatives are organized as follows:
4.3.1 Alternatives Achievable within Existing Available Fiscal Resources

1. Contract with SLO County Fire / CAL FIRE to relocate SLO County Engine #30 to the Templeton CSD Fire Station as a shared County/District resource; SLO County Fire / CAL FIRE to provide minimum 2-person daily engine staffing and administration and incident command oversight of Templeton Fire Department; maintain existing Templeton Paid Call Firefighter Program.

In this alternative, SLO County Fire Department would relocate Engine #30 from Station #30 in south Paso Robles to the Templeton CSD fire station, and the two current full-time Templeton CSD fire department employees would be absorbed into CAL FIRE employment within San Luis Obispo County. This alternative would provide a shared County/District engine in Templeton staffed with two career firefighters 24 hours per day, 7 days per week.

It is important to note that under this model, SLO County Fire Engine #30 would be a shared County/District resource that would continue to respond to emergencies throughout northern San Luis Obispo County as it does from Station #30 today. For 2012, Engine #30 responded to a total of 861 calls for service, 114 (13.2 percent) of which were in Templeton CSD. Assuming Engine #30’s County call volume remains about the same over the near future, annual service demand for Engine #30 would increase to about 1,400 calls for service annually, including an estimated 650 calls (46 percent) for service within the District and 750 calls (54 percent) outside the District.

This alternative presumes continuation of the existing Templeton Fire Department Paid Call Firefighter (PCF) program under the administrative and incident command oversight of SLO County Fire / CAL FIRE. Templeton PCFs would continue to respond to emergency incidents within the District, including staffing a Templeton engine whenever Engine #30 is out of the District as available.

The cost for this alternative would be estimated to be $400,000 per year including CAL FIRE dispatch services for BLS-level staffing of Engine #30, and approximately $450,000 for ALS-level staffing (one paramedic). These costs are exclusive of ongoing Templeton Fire Department operational and maintenance costs including PCF compensation and benefits, and apparatus and facility operations, maintenance, and replacement. This alternative could be implemented within approximately 60-90 days under a temporary agreement with the County pending a final contract with CAL FIRE within approximately 12 months.
2. **Same as Alternative #1, with Templeton PCFs providing scheduled 3rd person staffing of Engine #30 as available.**

This alternative service model is identical to the previous option with Templeton PCFs providing scheduled 3rd-person staffing of SLO County Engine #30 as available to augment the 2-person CAL FIRE staffing. Templeton PCFs, in collaboration with CAL FIRE, would establish a mutually agreeable work shift schedule, and compensation would be on an hourly or per-shift rate. This alternative could be implemented with an initial goal to provide 3rd-person staffing during daytime weekday hours (e.g., 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday), and expanded based on PCF availability. Assuming a $10.00 per hour benchmark and 3rd-person staffing 24 hours per day, seven days per week, this option would cost approximately $90,000 more annually than alternative #1 above. This alternative would require a very strong commitment and support from the Templeton PCFs, along with a more effective PCF recruitment and retention program to ensure program viability and sustainability.

4.3.2 **Longer-Term Alternatives Requiring Additional Fiscal Resources**

3. **Contract with SLO County Fire / CAL FIRE to relocate SLO County Engine #30 to the Templeton CSD Fire Station as a shared County/District resource; SLO County Fire / CAL FIRE to provide minimum 3-person daily engine staffing and administration and incident command oversight of Templeton Fire Department; maintain existing Templeton Paid Call Firefighter Program.**

Under this alternative, County Engine #30 would be staffed with a minimum of three career CAL FIRE personnel daily. This option also presumes continuation of the Templeton Fire Department Paid-Call Firefighter (PCF) program under the administration and supervision of CAL FIRE. Templeton PCFs would continue to respond to emergency incidents within the District, including staffing a Templeton engine whenever Engine #30 is out of the District as available. Annual cost for this option is estimated at $635,000 for BLS staffing, or $670,000 for ALS staffing, exclusive of ongoing District operations and maintenance costs. This option could also be implemented within 90-120 days under a temporary agreement with SLO County pending a final contract with CAL FIRE within approximately 12 months.

4. **Contract with Atascadero, Paso Robles, or CAL FIRE to provide minimum daily staffing of a dedicated Templeton Engine; retain current Templeton PCF program.**

Under this alternative, the District would negotiate a contract with one of the three prospective local fire service partner agencies to provide daily career staffing of a Templeton engine that would be committed solely to the Templeton CSD response area.
except for mutual aid or automatic mutual aid responses as approved by the District. This alternative also assumes continuation of the Templeton Fire Department Paid-Call Firefighter (PCF) program under the administration and supervision of the contract agency. Annual cost for this alternative is estimated to range from approximately $1,300,000 for 2-person BLS staffing to upwards of $1,750,000 for 3-person ALS staffing including necessary administrative, supervisory, and emergency incident command capacity. This alternative could likely be implemented within 12-18 months depending upon which agency the District selected to partner with for contractual services.

Following are other longer-term potential shared service options that the District may wish to explore in more detail once full-time staffing of an engine within the District is established:

◆ Fire Chief
◆ Operational Chief Officer(s)
◆ Training
◆ Fire Prevention
◆ PCF
◆ Apparatus/vehicle maintenance
◆ Reserve apparatus
◆ Dispatch services
◆ Emergency Response Services through:
  ➢ Nearest resource agreement(s)
  ➢ Response service contract(s)
  ➢ Consolidation
  ➢ Creation of a north San Luis Obispo County Fire Agency.

4.3.3 Short-Term Alternative

The following short-term alternative would allow the District additional time to explore the above longer-term alternatives in more detail:
5. **Contract for Short-Term Interim Administration and Incident Command Oversight of the Templeton Fire Department.**

Under this alternative, the District would retain its current combination fire service delivery model over the short-term and contract for interim administration and incident command oversight of Templeton Fire Department personnel and programs with SLO County Fire / CAL FIRE, the City of Atascadero Fire Department, or the City of Paso Robles Department of Emergency Services. This alternative would provide additional time for the District to evaluate the other longer-term service alternatives in more detail. A Chief Officer from the selected contract agency would provide the administration and incident command services, and would be on-site as available in addition to their other assigned responsibilities. The cost for this alternative is estimated to be approximately equivalent to the District’s current costs for its own Fire Chief, or about $7,500 per month ($90,000 per year). If the District considers this shorter-term alternative, Citygate recommends contracting with the preferred longer-term partner agency, and that the interim contract period not exceed 12-18 months. This alternative could be implemented within approximately 30 days by any of the three prospective partner agencies; however, for the two local area fire departments, this solution has not been fully designed, nor vetted with their administrators and elected officials.

### 4.4 **Analysis of Prospective Service Delivery Alternatives**

As cited in the current staffing discussion earlier in this report, Citygate finds that the Fire Department’s initial staffing/deployment model is not reasonably sustainable over the long term. In addition to the negative pressures impacting the availability of paid-call firefighters and the probability that Templeton will continue to experience a significant challenge maintaining a sufficient number of these firefighters to ensure a timely response to all emergencies, small combination departments like Templeton face significant staffing and fiscal challenges should one or more career employees become injured, leave employment unexpectedly, or otherwise be unable to work as scheduled. Extended absences require additional unplanned overtime expense, assuming a sufficient number of qualified employees available and willing to work the additional time to fill behind the absence. In very small career-staffed departments like Templeton, any significant illness or injury would adversely impact daily staffing and employee morale. Additional liability exists due to the lack of a safety program conforming to Cal/OSHA requirements and NFPA standards, as well as the lack of a qualified Incident Command and Safety Officer within the Department.

For these reasons, Citygate encourages the District to consider one of the above alternative fire service models to minimize these risks and provide enhanced initial response performance. If immediate response to fires and other life safety emergencies and their associated improved
outcomes is important to the Templeton community, then the contract alternative with SLO County Fire / CAL FIRE to relocate Engine #30 to the Templeton fire station as a shared County/District resource (Alternative #1) is the only viable option within existing District fiscal resources. This option would provide a 24-hours-per-day, 7-days-per-week, 2-person career-staffed engine in Templeton with an estimated service demand of approximately 1,400 calls per year, an average of 3.8 calls per day of which 43 percent are projected to be within the District. Assuming a one-hour average duration per call, Engine #30 is projected to be available within the District approximately 22 hours per day.

This model also envisions retaining the District’s existing Paid-Call Firefighter (PCF) program under CAL FIRE administration and supervision. PCFs would continue to provide augmented staffing for incidents within the District, as well as staffing of a Templeton engine as PCF employees are available whenever Engine #30 is out of the District for an extended period of time. This alternative would also provide for the transition of the District’s two current full-time fire employees to CAL FIRE employment upon meeting entry-level medical standards and successfully passing the CAL FIRE training academy within the first year of employment. It is important to note that with any of these alternatives, the District retains its latent fire powers and authority to determine levels of service and costs. Alternatives #3 and #4, although not considered feasible within existing fiscal resources, are worthy of consideration as District growth occurs and/or additional funding becomes available. In Citygate’s opinion, shared fire services among all of the north San Luis Obispo County fire agencies would maximize operational and fiscal efficiencies for all of the respective communities.

Each of these proposed alternative service delivery models should be considered an enhancement to the District’s current service model, particularly in terms of speed of response and the potential for improved outcomes for serious medical emergencies and incipient fire incidents from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. Monday through Saturday, and all day Sunday. Further, these models should be considered to have no impact on the weight of response to more serious emergencies assuming that a Templeton engine with at least two paid-call firefighters is available and arrives within the recommended 10-minute timeframe 80 percent of the time.

Under each of these alternatives, some support functions such as fire prevention, public education and information, and apparatus and facility maintenance could continue to be coordinated and/or provided by District paid-call personnel, or alternatively by the selected partner agency. Citygate recommends that other key support functions including dispatch, training, and safety be coordinated and performed by the selected partner agency.

Table 27 summarizes the estimated costs of the various alternative service options against current Fire Department fiscal resources.
## Table 27—Alternative Service Model Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Model Alternative</th>
<th>Current FD Budget ¹</th>
<th>Estimated Contract Cost ²</th>
<th>Ongoing District FD Costs ³</th>
<th>Total Cost ⁴</th>
<th>Budget vs. Total Cost Difference ⁵</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Deployment Model</td>
<td>$784,790</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$807,230</td>
<td>$807,230</td>
<td>($22,440)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a Contract Relocation of E-30 to TCSD (2-person BLS) ⁶</td>
<td>$784,790</td>
<td>$387,000</td>
<td>$263,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$134,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b Contract Relocation of E-30 to TCSD (2-person ALS) ⁶</td>
<td>$784,790</td>
<td>$442,000</td>
<td>$263,000</td>
<td>$705,000</td>
<td>$79,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 E-30 with 3rd-person PCF staffing ⁶</td>
<td>$784,790</td>
<td>$387,000</td>
<td>$353,000</td>
<td>$740,000</td>
<td>$44,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a E-30 with 3-person CAL FIRE staffing (BLS)</td>
<td>$784,790</td>
<td>$635,000</td>
<td>$263,000</td>
<td>$898,000</td>
<td>($113,210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b E-30 with 3-person CAL FIRE staffing (ALS)</td>
<td>$784,790</td>
<td>$670,000</td>
<td>$263,000</td>
<td>$933,000</td>
<td>($148,210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a Templeton engine with 2-person contract staffing (BLS)</td>
<td>$784,790</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$1,575,000</td>
<td>($790,210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b Templeton engine with 3-person contract staffing (ALS)</td>
<td>$784,790</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$2,025,000</td>
<td>($1,240,210)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Not including AFG Grant or transfers from reserve; assumes SAFER grant funding through 2015
² Estimated cost for contractual staffing
³ Ongoing District Fire Department operating expenses
⁴ Sum of estimated Contract Costs and ongoing District Fire Department expense
⁵ Difference between Current Budget and estimated Total Cost
⁶ Assumes District’s ability to maintain current SAFER grant funding

An additional alternative involves the District contracting for short-term interim administration and incident command oversight of Templeton Fire Department personnel and programs to allow the District additional time to evaluate the other alternatives. In considering this alternative, the District should conduct at least a preliminary evaluation of the longer-term options prior to negotiating an interim agreement with one of the prospective partner agencies. The three prospective partners all expressed some degree of reservation with this option if the District were not leaning toward a longer-term service partnership with them. Another option for the District to consider would be to contract with a recently retired local or California Fire Chief for interim Fire Chief services while the District evaluates its other options. If the District considers this option, it should ensure that the interim Chief possesses community services district or fire district experience, and possesses the appropriate training, certifications, and experience to provide effective transitional leadership and emergency incident management. Experience with shared service partnerships would also be beneficial.
SECTION 5—FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 DEPLOYMENT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Following are Citygate’s findings and recommendations relative to staffing and deployment of response resources:

Finding #1: The Templeton Fire Department has provided exceptional commitment, service, and value to the Templeton community since its inception.

Finding #2: Templeton Fire Department’s first-unit deployment is minimally adequate to achieve desired outcomes for minor fire and medical risks in Templeton.

Finding #3: Templeton’s current Effective Response Force capability is insufficient to facilitate desired outcomes for even moderately severe emergencies requiring the arrival of 10-16 firefighters within a recommended 10:00 minute timeframe.

Finding #4: Any emergency incident requiring additional resources other than those arriving within 10:00 minutes will result in a more severe outcome.

Finding #5: Templeton’s current initial deployment/staffing model incorporates a combination of full-time and volunteer paid-call personnel to provide 2-person minimum staffing during daytime hours. This is not effective approximately 17 percent of the time and is not reasonably sustainable over the long term.

Recommendation #1: If/when the regular budgeted on-duty staffing model grows beyond two personnel per 24-hour period, and as fiscal resources permit, the District should consider re-locating its existing fire station nearer the geographic center of the District with immediate access to U.S. 101 to enhance response times to all areas of the District, including the current Sphere of Influence, as well as to facilitate enhanced regional fire service delivery.

Recommendation #2: Incorporate the initial 9-1-1 call receipt time into the Department’s incident reporting system to enable tracking of total response time to include call processing, crew turnout, and travel time components.

Recommendation #3: Maintain incident time data to the nearest minute/second.

Recommendation #4: As soon as practical, the District should consider implementation of a shared-service alternative(s) identified in Section 4 that will provide enhanced on-duty (immediately available) staffing, ideally at the...
Advanced Life Support (ALS) level and within available fiscal resources. This will reduce first-due unit Call to Arrival response performance to achieve desired outcomes for minor routine fire and EMS emergencies.

**Recommendation #5:** As additional time and/or financial resources permit, the District should more fully explore the other shared-service opportunities identified in Section 4 that can provide enhanced operational and fiscal efficacy. This includes both first-due unit and Effective Response Force performance to achieve desired outcomes for up to moderately severe emergencies (emergency incidents requiring 16-28 firefighters).

### 5.2 Non-Deployment Functions Findings and Recommendations

Following are Citygate’s findings and recommendations for the non-deployment support functions of the Department:

**Finding #6:** The District does not have a complete and current fire deployment performance metric that is designed consistent with best practices and adopted by the Board of Directors to include a beginning time measure starting from the point of dispatch receiving the 9-1-1 phone call, and a goal statement tied to risks and outcome expectations. The deployment measure should have a second measurement statement to define multiple-unit response coverage for serious emergencies. Making these deployment goal changes will meet the best practice recommendations of the Center for Public Safety Excellence (formerly the Commission on Fire Accreditation International).

**Finding #7:** The District has adopted best practices building and fire safety codes that reduce building and wildland fire risks.

**Finding #8:** Templeton Fire Department’s current incident reporting system does not include the initial report time.

**Finding #9:** Templeton Fire Department’s current incident reporting system does not record time data in minute/second increments.

**Finding #10:** With a fire/EMS incident first-due unit Dispatch to Arrival performance of 9:00 minutes or less 80 percent of the time from receipt of dispatch notification, the current deployment system is delivering first unit response performance that exceeds the nationally-recognized best practice goal of 10:00 minutes, 80 percent of the time for suburban Volunteer Fire Departments.
Finding #11: With an estimated first-due unit Call to Arrival response performance of 11:00 minutes or less 80 percent of the time from time of receipt of the 9-1-1 call, the current deployment system still exceeds nationally recognized best practice performance goal of 12:00 minutes or less 80 percent of the time for a suburban volunteer fire department; however, that level of response performance will not achieve desired outcomes for even many minor fire and EMS emergencies. The additional response time required to assemble an Effective Response Force for more serious emergencies will result in more serious outcomes for those incidents.

Finding #12: The District benefits from the regional mutual aid response system.

Finding #13: The Fire Chief and Company Officers do not possess the professional education and/or certifications as recommended by nationally recognized best practices to ensure effective management of the organization’s personnel and other resources, as well as to ensure safe and effective command of emergency incidents in conformance with NIMS and ICS.

Finding #14: A majority of Fire Department employees do not meet the minimum 259-187 hours of mandated and recommended annual training.

Finding #15: The Department does not have a designated Safety Officer, nor a Health and Safety Committee as recommended by NFPA 1500.

Finding #16: The District’s Injury and Illness Prevention Plan does not address many of the hazards specific to fire department operations.

Finding #17: The District benefits from its current dispatch services agreement with CAL FIRE.

Finding #18: District fire apparatus are appropriate for the fire and other hazardous risks in Templeton. They appear to be very well cared for, well maintained, and properly equipped.

Finding #19: The Templeton Fire Department fire apparatus maintenance program appears to meet all state and federal regulations and nationally recognized best practices.

Finding #20: All Department fire pumps, ladders, and fire hose are tested annually in conformance with nationally recognized testing standards.

Finding #21: The Templeton Fire Department facility is adequately sized and designed to meet the Department’s current needs.
Finding #22: The living space of the current Fire Department facility is inadequate for more than two people.

Recommendation #6: The Fire Chief should minimally possess Chief Officer certification from the California Fire Service Training and Education System (CFSTES) administered by the Office of the California State Fire Marshal, or equivalent; Company Officers (Captains) should be encouraged and provided the resources necessary to obtain Fire Officer certification.

Recommendation #7: The Department should have a designated Safety Officer.

Recommendation #8: The District should consider establishing a Health and Safety Committee, to include Fire Department representation, that meets regularly to review all job-related injuries, illnesses, and accidents as recommended by NFPA and industry best practices.

Recommendation #9: The Fire Department should consider conducting a Health and Safety program compliance evaluation in accordance with NFPA 1500 Annex B as a first step in executing a Safety and Health program.

Recommendation #10: The District should update its Injury and Illness Prevention Plan to include a current employee as the designated Plan Administrator, as well as to address the hazards specific to fire department operations.

Recommendation #11: Continue utilizing contract fire dispatching services from a capable and experienced local fire dispatch provider agency.

Recommendation #12: The District will need to provide additional living space at the fire station if night staffing exceeds two personnel.