

**TAB 2A
EVALUATION OF SERVICE DELIVERY ALTERNATIVES
FIRE SERVICES**

EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL FOR SHARED SERVICES: FIRE, TRAINING				
Criteria	Potential			Implementation Considerations
	High	Medium	Low	
Purpose to be Accomplished				
Potential for cost savings	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A shared Coordinator could result in savings by elimination of one of these positions, or alternatively, the placement of one of the positions in a station to increase the number of fire response personnel.
Potential for efficiency and/or effectiveness		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neither Fire Department possesses a mature, well managed training program. Rock Island is currently focusing on basic firefighting skills, primarily in the field. Likewise, Moline's Fire Department is in the process of formulating its goals and working toward conformance to ISO guidelines. This appears to be an opportune point in time to develop the training program and the information systems related to training courses and hours by firefighter in both departments.
Potential for expanded customer service			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development of the training program is an internal effort and does not directly affect the customer.
Basis for Shared Services				
	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There have been numerous joint training sessions and drills in previous

**EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL FOR SHARED SERVICES:
FIRE, TRAINING**

Criteria	Potential			Implementation Considerations
	High	Medium	Low	
History of shared services				years; more so since the event of Sept. 11. Specifically, both departments (as well as others in the surrounding communities) participate in joint HazMat training once per month.
Community support		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unknown
Commonality of approach to service	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a primary benefit of the sharing of training and/or the adoption of a single Training Coordinator in the two departments. Training could be standardized and administered under the oversight of a single position, with input from both Departments. A “hurdle” to overcome in this regard is the differences in apparatus used, the differences in response protocols, and the differences in equipment used, such as hose types, air packs, etc.
Geographical efficiency			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is not viewed as a significant impediment to the consolidation of the training effort.
Organizational structural efficiency			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The elimination of a Training Coordinator position is not viewed as an impediment, although it must be determined which of the two departments the position would reside within, as well as the level of authority the position would exercise in the evaluation of the degree to which each department met its performance objectives.
Potential Approach to Shared Service				
Departmental Merger			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This singular service would not warrant departmental merger.

**EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL FOR SHARED SERVICES:
FIRE, TRAINING**

Criteria	Potential			Implementation Considerations
	High	Medium	Low	
Functional Mergers of Units	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The functional merger of the training function between the two departments has the advantages of both cost savings as well as fostering a common approach to training.
Contract Services			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
Distribution of Services			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This approach may have some merit if each of the departments possess specific skills in a particular area.
Implementation Priority				
	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The potential cost savings (or related increase in station staffing through transfer of one of the Training Coordinator positions to the field), as well as the standardization of the training function make this shared service a relatively high priority.

**EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL FOR SHARED SERVICES:
FIRE, EMERGENCY MEDICAL COORDINATION**

Criteria	Potential			Implementation Considerations
	High	Medium	Low	
Purpose to be Accomplished				
Potential for cost savings	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sharing an Emergency Medical Coordinator could result in the cost savings related to the elimination of one of these positions, or alternatively, the placement of one of the positions in a station to increase the number of firefighting personnel at the scene.
Potential for efficiency and/or effectiveness		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The consolidation of the Emergency Medical Coordinator position allows the reduction in force, and would permit one of the organizations to reallocate the position to the field.
Potential for expanded customer service			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordination of medical response, the identification of training needs, the coordination with the medical director of the program (which is, incidentally, the same for both departments), and other related items only indirectly affect the customer. Therefore, there are no opportunities to expand customer services through the consolidation of the positions.
Basis for Shared Services				
History of shared services		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project team is unaware of any specific history of cooperation in the medical response area, although there likely have been instances of combined training in the past.
Community support		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unknown.

**EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL FOR SHARED SERVICES:
FIRE, EMERGENCY MEDICAL COORDINATION**

Criteria	Potential			Implementation Considerations
	High	Medium	Low	
Commonality of approach to service	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a primary benefit of the sharing of training and/or the adoption of a single Emergency Medical Coordinator in the two departments. Training, quality assurance and response procedures could be standardized and administered under the oversight of a single position, with input from both Departments.
Geographical efficiency			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is not viewed as a significant impediment to the consolidation of the emergency medical effort.
Organizational structural efficiency			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The elimination of an Emergency Medical Coordinator position is not viewed as an impediment, although it must be determined which of the two departments the position would reside within, as well as the level of authority the position would exercise in the evaluation of the degree to which each department met its performance objectives.
Potential Approach to Shared Service				
Departmental Merger			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The analysis does not indicate that merger of the units would be beneficial.
Functional Mergers of Units	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The functional merger of the emergency medical coordination function between the two departments has the advantages of both cost savings as well as fostering a common approach to response and quality assurance.
Contract Services			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract services would be less effective than having a single point of supervisory responsibility
Distribution of Services			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This service needs to have a specific organizational consistency that a distribution arrangement would not have.

**EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL FOR SHARED SERVICES:
FIRE, EMERGENCY MEDICAL COORDINATION**

Criteria	Potential			Implementation Considerations
	High	Medium	Low	
Implementation Priority				
	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The potential cost savings (or related increase in station staffing through transfer of one of the Emergency Medical Coordinator positions to the field), as well as the standardization of the training function make this shared service a relatively high priority.

**EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL FOR SHARED SERVICES:
FIRE, STATION SHARING**

Criteria	Potential			Implementation Considerations
	High	Medium	Low	
Purpose to be Accomplished				
Potential for cost savings		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There may be some potential cost savings available through the sharing of stations; however this is not viewed as the primary benefit. The project team utilized “FLAME” service location software to model hypothetical placements of shared station locations and determined that coverage areas can be significantly improved through a variety of placements, allowing each City to place units and personnel at a more central location at the border. • Details of the FLAME analysis have been reviewed with the Joint Project Steering Committee. • The limited cost savings could accrue to one or both cities under a variety of scenarios presented in the FLAME exhibits, primarily as they relate to the closing of one or more stations in favor of centralizing personnel and equipment at a more centered station location. It should be noted, however, that the project team believes that there are greater benefits accruing to both cities collectively through the joint placement of a station at the border of the two cities.

**EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL FOR SHARED SERVICES:
FIRE, STATION SHARING**

Criteria	Potential			Implementation Considerations
	High	Medium	Low	
Potential for efficiency and/or effectiveness	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The placement of a joint station at a more centralized location allows the arrival of more personnel and equipment to a larger geographical area within a shorter time period than is currently the case. The FLAME analysis indicates that there is a potential for service effectiveness with a commonly located station, but the level of analysis is insufficient to identify one specific location as being optimal.
Potential for expanded customer service	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The delivery of services to a greater proportion of the population within a shorter time period and with more equipment and personnel is a major benefit to the creation of a joint station location.
Basis for Shared Services				
History of shared services		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project team understands that there have been discussions in the past regarding a joint station location; however it is also our understanding that these discussions did not result in any action on the parts of the two jurisdictions.
Community support			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Station location issues are historically controversial.

**EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL FOR SHARED SERVICES:
FIRE, STATION SHARING**

Criteria	Potential			Implementation Considerations
	High	Medium	Low	
Commonality of approach to service		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both departments provide a standardized service from their respective stations. This is not viewed as a primary benefit or impediment to the sharing of services. It must be noted, however, that the project team noted significant differences in the two cultures within the two departments. This is considered to be a somewhat significant barrier to actual implementation of a joint approach to service delivery and must be overcome prior to any decision.
Geographical efficiency	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The delivery of services to a greater geographical region within a shorter time period with a greater number of resources is a primary benefit to a joint station location.
Organizational structural efficiency			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no proposed changes to either city's organizational structure as a result of the placement of a joint station location at the border.
Potential Approach to Shared Service				
Departmental Merger			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no proposed alteration to either Fire Department through the joint placement of a station at the border.
Functional Mergers of Units			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The analysis does not indicate that functional merger of the units would be beneficial.
Contract Services			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The analysis does not indicate that contractual service relationships, other than existing mutual aid agreements, would be beneficial.

**EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL FOR SHARED SERVICES:
FIRE, STATION SHARING**

Criteria	Potential			Implementation Considerations
	High	Medium	Low	
Distribution of Services	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The presence of personnel and equipment of both cities at a centralized location allows both cities' departments to respond to calls for service within the boundaries of the other's region, both jointly as well as a single entity.
Implementation Priority				
	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are a number of options, both for the placement of a station at a joint, centralized, location, as well as more centralized locations within the boundaries of the two cities. Although, as noted above, the cost savings are minimal, the efficiencies gained through the placement of a greater number of resources within a shorter period of time to a larger proportion of the two cities' populations is a major benefit.