

MT. ANGEL–MONITOR FIRE DISTRICT

FORMATION FEASIBILITY STUDY

Prepared for the Boards of Directors

Mt. Angel Fire District

Monitor Rural Fire Protection District

Proposed Ballot Date: November 3, 2026

Proposed Formation Date: January 1, 2027

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Purpose
3. Authority and Legal Framework
4. Description of Existing Districts
5. Community and Risk Profile
6. Service Demand Analysis
7. Operational Capabilities
8. Staffing Plan
9. Facilities Overview
10. Apparatus Inventory
11. Financial Baseline Analysis
12. Revenue Modeling
13. Five-Year Financial Forecast
14. Twenty-Year Capital Improvement Plan
15. Alternatives Considered
16. Governance Structure
17. Transition Plan
18. Final Findings and Recommendation

Appendices

- A. Detailed FY2027 Budget
- B. Assessed Value and Revenue Modeling Tables
- C. Apparatus & Equipment Inventory
- D. Sensitivity & Risk Analysis
- E. Legal Authority References
- F. Reserve Policy Framework
- G. Legal Description of proposed District
- H. Map of Proposed District

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Feasibility Study evaluates the proposed consolidation of Mt. Angel Fire District and Monitor Rural Fire Protection District into a single rural fire protection district to be known as the Mt. Angel–Monitor Fire District. The proposed formation date is January 1, 2027, subject to voter approval in November 2026.

The combined districts currently serve approximately 72.15 square miles and protect an estimated 7,909 residents. Over the past three years (2023–2025), the districts have responded to an average of approximately 1,200 emergency incidents annually. Approximately 70 percent of these incidents are EMS-related, with the remaining 30 percent consisting of fire suppression, rescue, and other emergency responses.

Both districts rely primarily on volunteer staffing. Like many rural fire agencies, weekday daytime response reliability has declined due to workforce commuting patterns.

This study evaluates whether consolidation:

- Improves staffing reliability and operational deployment
- Stabilizes long-term revenue through a unified permanent rate
- Supports structured apparatus and equipment replacement
- Eliminates levy dependency risk
- Maintains long-term fiscal sustainability

Under the proposed permanent tax rate of \$1.97 per \$1,000 assessed value and a FY2027 assessed value of \$917,283,527, projected FY2027 revenue is approximately \$1,807,049. The proposed FY2027 consolidated budget totals \$1,363,564, resulting in an initial projected operating surplus of approximately \$443,484.

Five-year financial modeling (FY2027–FY2031) demonstrates that the consolidated district maintains positive operating margins under conservative two percent assessed value growth, even after phased staffing expansion and the addition of a fourth firefighter in FY2031. Annual apparatus reserve contributions of >\$300,000 are maintained throughout the forecast period. Higher growth scenarios further strengthen long-term capital sustainability.

Based on the operational analysis, financial modeling, legal authority, and long-term capital projections, consolidation is determined to be operationally justified, financially sustainable, and legally feasible.

1.1 Existing Conditions

Mt. Angel Fire District and Monitor Rural Fire Protection District collectively serve an estimated 7,909 residents. Based on the most recent three-year data, the combined districts respond to approximately 1,200 emergency incidents annually.

Both districts operate combination systems supported by volunteer personnel. Volunteer turnout remains strong during evenings and weekends; however, both districts experience reduced volunteer availability during weekday business hours. Increasing regulatory requirements, apparatus replacement costs, EMS demand, and personnel-related expenses have placed sustained operational and financial pressure on both organizations.

Monitor Rural Fire Protection District currently operates under a permanent tax rate of \$0.53 per \$1,000 of assessed value, supplemented by a \$0.50 local option levy that expires in 2027. The levy represents a significant portion of Monitor’s operational funding. Absent structural change or levy renewal, Monitor would experience a substantial reduction in available operating revenue.

Mt. Angel Fire District operates under a permanent tax rate of \$1.0146 per \$1,000 of assessed value. When compared to more than 20 fire districts across Marion and Clackamas Counties, both Mt. Angel and Monitor maintain the lowest two permanent tax rates in the region.

The proposed consolidated permanent rate of \$1.97 per \$1,000 of assessed value would move the new district closer to the regional median among comparable fire districts. This adjustment is intended to provide stable, long-term funding for staffing reliability, apparatus replacement, and operational sustainability.

A primary objective of this structure is to avoid future bond measures with associated interest costs and to eliminate reliance on temporary operating levies. By establishing a sustainable permanent rate and building structured capital reserves annually, the new district can plan for major apparatus replacements and operational needs with the goal of not returning to voters for recurring funding measures over the next 20 years. Apparatus follow a NFPA recommendation of 20-year replacement cycles, which provides confidence in our 20-year plan.

1.2 Purpose of Consolidation

The proposed consolidation is intended to:

- Improve daytime staffing reliability with increased staffing
- Strengthen emergency medical capability by adding Advanced EMT or Paramedic coverage
- Eliminate duplicated administrative structures
- Create a unified capital replacement plan
- Stabilize long-term financial sustainability
- Provide consistent operational standards and training

- Enhance organizational resilience

Consolidation would allow the combined district to transition from two independent tax bases and governance structures into one unified entity capable of strategic long-term planning.

1.3 Proposed Service Model

The proposed consolidated district would:

- Operate from three existing stations (Mt. Angel, Monitor, and Yoder)
- Maintain a volunteer-based 24/7 response system
- Implement three full-time daytime firefighter positions (8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. Monday–Friday) in Year 1
- Establish a long-term objective of four-person engine staffing during peak hours
- Maintain the current Mt Angel retired / half-time Fire Chief position initially as additional cost saving measure and district formation, with transition to full-time leadership as operational demands warrant.

This phased staffing model addresses the most significant operational vulnerability—weekday daytime response—while remaining fiscally responsible.

1.4 Financial Summary

Based on a combined 2026 assessed value of approximately \$899,297,575 million and a proposed permanent tax rate of \$1.97 per \$1,000 of assessed value, assuming a two percent increase for 2027, the consolidated district is projected to generate approximately \$1.8 million in annual property tax revenue in its first year of operation.

The proposed operating budget is estimated at \$1.36 million annually, which includes a \$300,000 capital outlay line item reserved for potential apparatus or equipment purchases if needed, along with a \$50,000 contingency reserve. Because the new capital outlay allocation represents spending authority rather than a required annual expenditure, any unspent portion may carry forward into reserves at the end of the fiscal year.

Under this conservative budgeting approach, the district is projected to generate a minimum annual surplus of approximately \$443,484 with the potential for additional surplus depending on the amount of capital outlay funds that remain unspent. Over five years, cumulative projected surpluses could reasonably range from approximately \$2.2 million to more than \$3.9 million, allowing the District to:

- Establish dedicated apparatus replacement reserves
- Fund turnout gear and SCBA replacement cycles
- Avoid reliance on future bond measures
- Build operating reserves to industry-recommended levels
- Phase in the hiring of additional daytime firefighters

For a typical home with an assessed value of \$250,000 (roughly 50% \$500,000 real market value), the estimated impact of the proposed rate is an increase of approximately \$20 per month.

1.5 Findings

This feasibility analysis concludes that formation of the Mt. Angel–Monitor Fire District is:

- Operationally justified due to documented daytime staffing gaps
- Financially sustainable under conservative growth assumptions
- Structurally efficient compared to maintaining two separate districts
- Strategically aligned with long-term service demands and capital needs

Consolidation provides a stable governance framework, predictable revenue structure, and scalable service model capable of protecting life and property for both communities into the future.

2. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

2.1 Introduction

Mt. Angel Fire District and Monitor Rural Fire Protection District have provided fire protection and emergency response services to their respective communities for decades. Both districts operate under Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) Chapter 478 and rely primarily on volunteer firefighters supplemented by limited paid staff.

Over the past several years, both districts have experienced increasing service demands, rising operational costs, and evolving regulatory requirements. At the same time, volunteer availability—particularly during weekday daytime hours—has declined due to employment patterns, commuting distances, and demographic shifts.

Recognizing these shared challenges, the Boards of Directors for Mt. Angel Fire District and Monitor Rural Fire Protection District initiated a formal evaluation to determine whether forming a single consolidated district would strengthen long-term service delivery, operational reliability, and financial sustainability.

This Feasibility Study presents the findings of that evaluation.

2.2 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine whether consolidation of Mt. Angel Fire District and Monitor Rural Fire Protection District into a single rural fire protection district is:

- Operationally necessary
- Financially sustainable

- Legally feasible
- Strategically beneficial to the communities served

This study provides a structured, data-informed assessment of:

- Current service levels and response demand
- Staffing capacity and deployment challenges
- Facilities and apparatus inventories
- Financial baselines and revenue stability
- Capital replacement needs
- Governance structure and statutory requirements
- Long-term fiscal projections

The study is intended to provide the Boards of Directors, county officials, and the public with a comprehensive understanding of the impacts—both positive and negative—of district formation.

2.3 Scope of Evaluation

This feasibility analysis examines both current conditions and projected future needs. Specifically, it evaluates:

Operational Factors

- Incident volume and call-type trends
- Response performance and coverage areas
- Staffing models and daytime response reliability
- Training standards and regulatory compliance
- Mutual aid and automatic aid relationships

Financial Factors

- Current revenue sources and tax rates
- Projected revenue under a consolidated permanent rate
- Personnel cost projections
- Capital improvement and apparatus replacement planning
- Five-year and long-term fiscal sustainability

Governance Factors

- Statutory requirements under ORS 478
- Board composition and transition procedures
- Asset and liability transfer considerations
- Administrative consolidation impacts

This study does not pre-determine the outcome of the ballot measure. Instead, it provides factual analysis to support informed decision-making.

2.4 Background Context

Both districts currently operate independently but share common operational realities:

- Increasing reliance on EMS response
- Rising apparatus replacement costs (engines exceeding \$1 million)
- Elevated insurance and compliance expenses
- Growing training standards and certification requirements
- Volunteer recruitment and retention challenges

Monitor’s local option levy, which contributes a significant portion of its operational funding, expires in 2027. Without renewal or structural change, the district’s financial capacity would be materially reduced, and one of the two paid firefighters would be eliminated leaving just one Firefighter EMT on duty during the week.

Mt. Angel Fire District maintains a higher permanent tax rate and ISO Class 3 rating but also faces long-term apparatus replacement and staffing sustainability challenges.

The two districts already collaborate informally and through shared operational practices, and a training officer / firefighter EMT position IGA. Consolidation represents a formal structural evolution of that cooperation.

2.5 Study Methodology

This feasibility study was developed using:

- Three-year call volume averages
- Assessed value data from Marion County
- Assessed value data from Clackamas County
- Current adopted budgets from both districts
- Projected inflation assumptions for personnel and capital costs
- Industry benchmarks for reserve and capital planning
- Comparative analysis of similar Oregon district consolidations
- NFPA staffing and equipment standards

Revenue projections assume a conservative two percent annual assessed value growth rate. Personnel and operational cost projections reflect realistic inflation trends experienced by Oregon fire districts over the past five years.

2.6 Decision Framework

The decision to consolidate should ultimately be based on the following questions:

1. Will consolidation improve service reliability?
2. Will consolidation strengthen long-term financial stability?
3. Will consolidation improve capital planning and reduce future bond reliance?

4. Will consolidation create a more resilient organization capable of meeting future demands?

This feasibility study is structured to provide clear, objective answers to those questions.

3. AUTHORITY AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Statutory Authority

The proposed formation of the Mt. Angel–Monitor Fire District is governed by the Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS), primarily:

- **ORS Chapter 478** – Rural Fire Protection Districts
- **ORS Chapter 198** – Special District Formation, Boundary Changes, and Mergers
- **ORS Chapter 222 (as applicable)** – Territory transfers and city relationships
- **ORS 294 & 297** – Public budgeting and audit requirements

Under ORS 478, a rural fire protection district may be formed, merged, or reorganized following statutory procedures, including:

- Adoption of resolutions by the governing bodies
- Submission to the county for review
- Public notice and hearing requirements
- Referral to voters within the proposed district boundary

The consolidated district would operate as a single rural fire protection district under ORS 478 with full taxing and operational authority.

3.2 Formation Structure Options

There are two legally recognized structural pathways available:

Option A – Formation of a New District

Both existing districts dissolve, and a new district is formed through voter approval. Assets, liabilities, and operational authority transfer to the newly formed entity.

Characteristics:

- New district name and identity
- New governing board established
- All assets transferred
- Clean statutory formation process
- New permanent tax rate is set

Option B – Merger into One Existing District

One district absorbs the other through statutory merger procedures.

Characteristics:

- One district remains as the surviving entity
- The other district dissolves
- Assets and liabilities transfer to the surviving district
- Fewer administrative resets required
- The surviving district permanent tax rate is applied

The Boards must determine which pathway best serves governance clarity, asset transition simplicity, and public transparency.

3.3 Voter Approval Requirements

Formation of a new district or merger requires approval by a majority of voters within the affected territory.

The ballot measure must include:

- Legal boundary description
- Proposed permanent tax rate
- Effective date of formation
- Identification of initial governing board structure

Only voters residing within the proposed consolidated district boundary are eligible to vote on the measure.

3.4 Governance Structure Under ORS 478

Upon voter approval, the consolidated district will be governed by a five-member Board of Directors elected at large.

Board responsibilities include:

- Establishing district policy
- Adopting annual budgets
- Setting tax levies (within permanent rate authority)
- Hiring and supervising the Fire Chief
- Approving capital expenditures
- Ensuring compliance with public meeting and public records law

Board members serve staggered four-year terms unless otherwise specified during initial formation.

3.5 Taxing Authority

Under ORS 478, a rural fire protection district may levy property taxes up to its voter-approved permanent rate.

The proposed permanent tax rate for the Mt. Angel–Monitor Fire District is:

\$1.97 per \$1,000 of assessed value

Once approved, the permanent rate becomes part of the district’s tax base and does not require renewal unless modified.

The district would remain subject to:

- Measure 5 constitutional compression limits
- Measure 50 assessed value growth limitations
- County tax collection procedures

3.6 Asset and Liability Transfer

Upon consolidation:

- Real property, apparatus, and equipment transfer to the consolidated district
- Cash reserves and capital accounts transfer
- Outstanding obligations (contracts, debt, leases) transfer
- Employment agreements transition under new district authority

3.7 Personnel Transition

All paid employees and volunteers would transition to the consolidated district without interruption of service.

Key considerations include:

- Employment classification
- Accrued leave balances
- Insurance coverage transition
- Workers’ compensation coverage
- Oregon PERS
- Payroll system consolidation
- Volunteer liability and coverage continuation

Personnel policies will be reviewed and adopted by the new governing board.

3.8 Intergovernmental Agreements

Existing agreements with:

- Oregon State Fire Marshal
- Fire Defense Board
- METCOM 911
- Mutual aid partners

will either transfer automatically or require re-execution under the new district name.

No interruption in dispatch services or mutual aid coverage is anticipated.

3.9 Compliance Requirements

Upon formation, the consolidated district must:

- Adopt Bylaws and board policies
- Establish banking and accounting systems
- Adopt a fiscal year budget
- Conduct annual independent audits
- Comply with Oregon Public Meetings Law
- Maintain Oregon Government Ethics compliance

3.10 Legal Findings

Based on statutory review, formation of the Mt. Angel–Monitor Fire District is:

- Authorized under ORS Chapters 478 and 198
- Subject to voter approval
- Structurally viable under either merger or new district formation pathways
- Capable of seamless asset and operational transition with proper planning

No statutory barriers have been identified that would prevent consolidation.

4. DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING DISTRICTS

4.1 Combined Service Area Overview

The districts protect a combination of urban-density housing within the city limits, including commercial occupancies, schools, churches, and light industrial properties, as well as widely dispersed rural homes, farms, and outbuildings throughout the countryside. The response area includes key transportation corridors, critical infrastructure, and community gathering locations, creating a broad risk profile that ranges from structure fires and EMS calls to wildland-urban interface incidents and motor vehicle crashes.

4.1.1 Estimated Population

Estimated combined population: 7,909 residents

This estimate reflects current county population data and includes incorporated and unincorporated areas within both districts.

4.1.2 Geographic and Risk Characteristics

The service area includes:

- Urban residential development within the City of Mt. Angel
- Rural residential, industrial and agricultural occupancies
- Highway corridors (Highways 211, 213, and 214)
- Wildland-urban interface areas
- Schools and community facilities

These mixed occupancies create diverse response demands requiring both EMS capability and structural firefighting readiness.

4.1.3 Call Volume and Service Demand

Three-year combined average call volume (2023–2025):
Approximately 1,200 emergency incidents annually

Annual totals:

- 2023: 1,188 calls
- 2024: 1,148 calls
- 2025 (estimated): 1,276 calls

Call distribution (approximate):

- 70% EMS-related incidents
- 30% Fire suppression, rescue, hazardous conditions, or service calls

Call volume has demonstrated moderate growth over the past five years, consistent with regional population growth and increasing EMS utilization.

4.1.4 Staffing

Current staffing model includes:

- 0.5 FTE Fire Chief
- 2 Full-Time Firefighters
- 1 Administrative Secretary
- Approximately 57 Volunteer Firefighters

Operational model:

- Volunteers provide 24/7 coverage
- Paid staff primarily support daytime response and training
- Daytime staffing depth is improved but remains limited to available personnel

The district has strong volunteer participation but faces increasing challenges in weekday daytime response reliability.

4.1.5 Facilities

Mt. Angel Fire Station & Storage Shop Building

Year	Built	Description	Sq. Ft.	Total Cost	Cost / Sq. Ft.	Funding
1993	1994	Station 450	10,014	\$425,000	\$42.44	City Bond
2025	2025	Storage / Shop	3,000	\$640,000	\$213.33	11 years of Conflagration reimbursements and savings

- Provides primary response coverage to City of Mt Angel, as well as southern and western district territory
- Serves as administrative headquarters
- Houses administrative offices and Fire Chief office
- Provides training and meeting space
- Contains primary apparatus bays
- Serves as primary staffed daytime response location

This facility functions as the operational hub of the district and supports both administrative and frontline response activities.

Monitor Fire Station

Year	Built	Description	Sq. Ft.	Total Cost	Cost / Sq. Ft.	Funding
1996	1996	Station 980 Monitor	9,288	\$950,000	\$102.28	1/3 was Paid from Budget and 2/3 was FEMA Funds

- Located in the Monitor community area
- Houses engines, brush and water tender apparatus
- Provides primary response coverage for central northern and eastern district territory
- Volunteer-supported response station

- Critical for rural water supply operations and highway corridor response

The Monitor Station ensures geographic equity in service delivery and reduces travel times to rural residential and agricultural areas. The Monitor Station is 4.2 road miles from the Mt Angel Station.

Yoder Substation

Year	Built	Description	Sq. Ft.	Total Cost	Cost / Sq. Ft.	Funding
1974	1974	Station 990	2,400	\$50,000	\$20.83	Paid for by Budget Funds

Property was donated by the Yoder Family; the Yoder Substation was built in 1974, and the cost of construction was \$50,000.

- Located in the Yoder community area
- Volunteer-supported station
- Provides rural response coverage to northern and eastern portions of the district
- Currently undergoing seismic retrofit improvements

Yoder enhances travel time performance and strengthens rural coverage depth across the consolidated district. The Yoder Station is 10.3 road miles from the Mt Angel station, and 6.1 road miles from the Monitor Station.

4.2 Monitor Rural Fire Protection District

4.2.1 History and Organizational Overview

Monitor Rural Fire Protection District serves unincorporated territory east and north of Mt. Angel. The district operates under ORS Chapter 478 and is governed by an elected Board of Directors.

Monitor operates as a primarily volunteer fire district with no full-time operational staff.

4.2.2 Service Area

- Approximately 35.28 square miles
- Predominantly agricultural and rural residential
- Highway 213 corridor
- Highway 211 corridor
- Scattered rural dwellings and farm structures
- WUI exposure areas

Estimated population: approximately 2,800 residents

4.2.3 Call Volume and Service Demand

Three-year average call volume: approximately 412 calls annually

Call distribution:

- Approximately 65–70% EMS
- Approximately 30–35% Fire and Rescue

Call volume trends have been relatively stable but are expected to grow gradually with residential development patterns.

4.2.4 Staffing

Current staffing model includes:

- Volunteer Firefighters: approximately 20
- No full-time operational staff
- Administrative functions supported through district structure
- Shared daytime staff from Mt. Angel Fire District

Daytime weekday response capacity is limited and highly dependent on volunteer availability.

4.3 Comparative Summary

<u>Category</u>	<u>Mt. Angel</u>	<u>Monitor</u>
Service Area	36.27 sq. mi.	35.28 sq. mi.
Population	~5292	~2617
Annual Calls	~792	~412
Permanent Rate	1.0146	0.53
Local Option	None	0.50 (exp. 2027)
Volunteers	37	20
Full-Time Staff	2.5 FTE + admin	0
ISO Rating	Class 3	Not rated

4.4 Baseline Observations

1. Both districts rely heavily on volunteers.
2. Both experience daytime staffing limitations.
3. Monitor faces levy expiration risk in 2027.
4. Apparatus replacement costs are rising rapidly.
5. Both districts serve largely rural, agricultural, and WUI communities.

These baseline conditions form the foundation for evaluating consolidation in subsequent sections.

5. COMMUNITY AND RISK PROFILE

This section evaluates the demographic, geographic, economic, and hazard characteristics of the territory served by Mt. Angel Fire District and Monitor Rural Fire Protection District. Understanding community risk is critical in determining appropriate staffing levels, apparatus configuration, and long-term capital planning.

5.1 Geographic Characteristics

The combined service area lies in northeastern Marion County and portions of southern Clackamas County, Oregon, within the northern Willamette Valley. It includes the City of Mt. Angel, the rural Monitor community, and surrounding agricultural lands.

The area reflects a blend of small-town urban development, rural residential properties, and intensive agricultural operations. Elevations are generally moderate but include prominent features such as Mount Angel Abbey, which serves as both a cultural landmark and a high-elevation response consideration.

The district includes:

- Incorporated urban neighborhoods within the City of Mt. Angel
- Agricultural lands and farm structures
- Rural residential developments
- Wildland–Urban Interface (WUI) areas
- Major transportation corridors and rail lines
- Creek and floodplain zones

The terrain consists primarily of rolling farmland with scattered wooded areas. Although not mountainous, extended travel distances and rural road conditions—including narrow roadways, limited shoulders, and bridges—can affect response times, particularly during inclement weather.

5.2 Population and Development Patterns

Estimated Population:

- Mt. Angel: ~5,200 residents
- Monitor: ~2,600 residents
- Combined: ~7,900 residents

Population growth in the region has been gradual but steady. Development patterns include:

- Infill housing within Mt. Angel city limits

- Scattered rural residential construction
- Continued agricultural operations
- Occasional light commercial and industrial development

Aging housing stock in certain areas increases structural fire risk due to:

- Older electrical systems
- Lack of residential sprinkler systems
- Wood-frame construction

5.3 Major Risk Categories

5.3.1 Residential Risk

The majority of emergency responses are residential in nature, including:

- Medical emergencies
- Cooking-related fires
- Heating equipment fires
- Electrical malfunctions

Rural residences often lack hydrant coverage, increasing reliance on water tenders and tanker shuttle operations.

5.3.2 Agricultural and Industrial Risk

The district contains numerous:

- Barns and outbuildings
- Grain storage facilities
- Equipment sheds
- Agricultural processing structures

Agricultural occupancies present unique hazards including:

- Combustible dust
- Heavy machinery entrapment
- Chemical storage
- Fuel storage tanks

Loss potential in agricultural structures can be substantial.

5.3.3 Transportation Risk

Primary corridors include:

- Highway 211

- Highway 213
- Highway 214
- Rail corridor serving agricultural and commercial transport

Risks include:

- Motor vehicle collisions
- Commercial vehicle incidents
- Hazardous material transport accidents
- Vehicle vs. pedestrian incidents

Traffic-related calls represent a consistent portion of non-EMS emergency responses.

5.3.4 Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) Risk

Portions of both districts include vegetated areas adjacent to residential development. WUI risk factors include:

- Seasonal drought conditions
- Agricultural field fires
- Wind-driven grass fires
- Limited access roads in rural areas

Although the area is not classified as high forest risk, grass and field fires can spread rapidly during summer months.

5.3.5 Water and Flood Risk

Pudding River, Butte Creek, Abiqua Creek, and smaller waterways run through portions of the district. Flood risk exists during heavy rainfall events.

Risks include:

- Water rescues
- Flooded roadways
- Swift-water hazards in certain conditions

Water rescue capability remains limited and typically supported through mutual aid.

5.4 Emergency Medical Demand

Emergency medical services represent the majority of responses within both districts. Common EMS call types include:

- Cardiac and respiratory emergencies
- Falls, particularly among older adults
- Motor vehicle collision injuries

- Behavioral health crises
- Lift assists

Demographic trends, including an aging population, are expected to increase overall EMS demand in the coming years.

5.5 Water Supply and Hydrant Coverage

Urban Mt. Angel benefits from municipal hydrant coverage.

Rural Monitor and Mt. Angel surrounding areas rely primarily on:

- Water tenders
- Drafting operations
- Mutual aid tanker shuttle

Water supply limitations significantly impact fire suppression strategy in rural areas.

5.6 Insurance Services Office (ISO) Considerations

Mt. Angel Fire District maintains an ISO Class 3 rating.

Monitor is not ISO rated.

ISO classification influences:

- Commercial insurance premiums
- Industrial risk underwriting
- Community economic development attractiveness

Consolidation could potentially support long-term ISO improvement opportunities for currently unrated territory.

5.7 Critical Infrastructure

Critical facilities within or near the proposed district include:

- Schools
- Assisted living facilities
- Churches and large assembly occupancies
- Agricultural processing facilities
- Municipal water and wastewater systems

Protection of these occupancies requires sufficient staffing depth and apparatus reliability.

5.8 Risk Trend Observations

1. EMS demand is increasing faster than fire demand.
2. Rural residential growth increases service area coverage requirements.
3. Apparatus cost inflation is outpacing traditional capital funding methods.
4. Daytime staffing reliability presents the greatest operational vulnerability.
5. Agricultural and WUI risk requires maintained tender capacity.

5.9 Summary

The Mt. Angel and Monitor communities present a mixed urban-rural risk profile characterized by:

- Predominantly residential and EMS demand
- Agricultural and industrial exposure
- Transportation corridor hazards
- Rural water supply limitations
- Increasing regulatory and insurance expectations

This risk environment supports the need for:

- Reliable daytime staffing
- Adequate water tender capacity
- Structured capital replacement planning
- Unified operational standards
- Funding mechanism to support

The next section analyzes incident demand and call volume trends in greater detail.

6. SERVICE DEMAND AND CALL ANALYSIS

This section analyzes emergency incident demand for Mt. Angel Fire District and Monitor Rural Fire Protection District and evaluates how call volume, call type, and service trends influence staffing, deployment, and long-term planning for the proposed consolidated district.

6.1 Overview of Emergency Demand

Emergency call volume in both districts reflects broader statewide trends: increasing EMS demand, steady fire-rescue activity, and growing service calls associated with an aging population and increased roadway traffic.

Combined call volume places the proposed consolidated district in the mid-range of Oregon rural combination districts by annual demand.

6.2 Call Volume by Year

The following totals are based on district incident counts provided for the three most recent years.

Mt. Angel Fire District Call Volume

- 2023: 823
- 2024: 756
- 2025: 797

Monitor Rural Fire Protection District Call Volume

- 2023: 365
- 2024: 392
- 2025: 479

Combined Call Volume

- 2023: 1,188
- 2024: 1,148
- 2025: 1,276

Three-Year Combined Average: Approximately 1,204 calls annually

6.3 Call Type Distribution

Incident activity across both districts is primarily medical in nature, with the remaining responses involving fire suppression, rescue, hazardous conditions, and other service calls. This pattern reflects the workload profile typical of modern rural fire districts, where emergency medical services account for the majority of responses and staffing demand.

Operational Implication: The high volume of medical calls underscores the need for consistent daytime staffing, as peak call activity occurs during weekday business hours when volunteer availability is generally reduced.

6.4 Trend Analysis and Key Observations

6.4.1 Overall Demand

Total combined incident volume increased from 1,148 in 2024 to an estimated 1,276 in 2025, representing an approximate year-over-year increase of 11%.

Monitor’s call volume increased significantly in 2025. A portion of this increase is attributable to a small number of high-frequency EMS users, along with potential

influences such as reporting practices, population shifts, traffic patterns, and overall EMS utilization trends.

Regardless of the contributing factors, the upward trend underscores the importance of proactive staffing and capacity planning across the entire district boundary.

6.4.2 EMS Growth Pressure

EMS demand is the dominant workload driver. Even when fire incidents remain stable, EMS calls continue to increase due to:

- Aging population trends
- Increased chronic medical conditions
- Increased roadway traffic and collision frequency
- Behavioral health and public-assistance calls

6.4.3 Fire and Rescue Demand

Fire incidents represent a smaller percentage of total calls but require substantially greater staffing, command capacity, and training. Structural fire response readiness is driven by infrequent but high-risk events where outcomes depend on immediate staffing depth.

Operational implication: Even with lower frequency, structural fire readiness requires staffing plans that support OSHA two-in/two-out principles and safe interior operations when conditions warrant.

6.5 Daytime Demand and Staffing Alignment

Both districts identify weekday daytime response reliability as the most significant operational vulnerability.

Factors contributing to this challenge include:

- Volunteers commuting outside the district for work
- Limited availability during standard business hours
- Increased call volume during daytime hours
- Concurrent incidents requiring multiple staffed resources

Consolidation benefit: A unified district enables shared paid staffing to cover peak demand periods districtwide, rather than duplicating limited staffing resources under separate budgets.

6.6 Deployment Implications for the Consolidated District

Given current demand, the proposed consolidated district service model should be designed to:

- Maintain 24/7 volunteer response capability
- Provide consistent daytime staffed response (initially 8:00 AM–5:00 PM)
- Ensure a predictable minimum staffing baseline for EMS and fire initial attack
- Reduce turnout delays and improve first-unit arrival reliability
- Support simultaneous incident coverage when volunteer turnout is limited

A phased deployment model is consistent with observed demand patterns, allowing staffing expansion as budgets and reserves stabilize.

6.7 Call Volume Projection

Assuming modest annual growth, consistent with regional trends, combined call volume is projected to continue increasing over the next five years.

A conservative planning assumption for workload modeling is 2–4% annual call growth. Under that assumption:

- A 1,250-call baseline would become approximately 1,380–1,520 calls annually within five years.

Planning implication: The district should maintain staffing and capital plans that scale with demand increases without requiring crisis-driven funding measures.

6.8 Summary

Key conclusions from service demand analysis include:

1. Combined call volume is approximately 1,200–1,275 calls annually.
2. EMS incidents represent the majority of demand and drive staffing needs.
3. Fire incidents, while less frequent, create the highest staffing-risk exposure.
4. Daytime staffing gaps are the critical performance vulnerability for both districts.
5. Consolidation supports a districtwide deployment model that aligns staffing with peak demand and improves reliability.

7. EXISTING OPERATIONAL CAPABILITIES

This section evaluates the current operational capacity of Mt. Angel Fire District and Monitor Rural Fire Protection District, including response model, staffing deployment, apparatus configuration, mutual aid relationships, and training standards. The purpose is to establish a realistic baseline of service capability prior to consolidation.

7.1 Response Model Overview

Both districts operate under a traditional volunteer response model supplemented by limited paid staff.

Mt. Angel Fire District

- Combination department with daytime support
- Volunteers respond from home or workplace
- Volunteer response dependent on availability
- Two full-time firefighters provide weekday support
- 0.5 FTE Fire Chief provides administrative and command oversight

Monitor Rural Fire Protection District

- Primarily volunteer department
- No full-time operational staff
- Volunteers respond from home or workplace
- Volunteer response dependent on availability
- Administrative oversight through elected board structure and contract services with Mt. Angel Fire District.

In both districts, volunteers remain the backbone of emergency response coverage.

7.2 Staffing and Response Depth

Mt. Angel Fire District

Strengths:

- Higher volunteer roster size
- Daytime support from two paid firefighters
- ISO Class 3 rating
- More frequent training exposure

Limitations:

- Daytime depth still dependent on volunteer turnout
- Limited ability to guarantee minimum interior staffing without recall

Monitor Rural Fire Protection District

Strengths:

- Dedicated rural volunteer base
- Strong community support
- Water tender capability

- Shared daytime Firefighter response with Mt. Angel

Limitations:

- No paid operational staff
- Limited guaranteed daytime response depth
- Greater vulnerability to low turnout during weekday hours

7.3 Fire Suppression Capability

Both districts maintain the ability to perform:

- Structural fire attack
- Rural water supply shuttle operations
- Wildland and grass fire suppression
- Vehicle extrication
- Basic rescue operations

However, interior structural firefighting operations depend heavily on turnout numbers. OSHA two-in/two-out requirements and safe fireground practices necessitate sufficient staffing before committing to interior attack.

Consolidation would allow staffing resources to be pooled and deployed districtwide.

7.4 EMS Response Capability

Emergency medical incidents comprise the majority of responses within the district and represent the primary driver of operational demand. These incidents include:

- Cardiac arrest and acute cardiac events
- Respiratory emergencies
- Falls, particularly among older adults
- Motor vehicle collision injuries
- Lift assists and other medical service calls

Current Level of Service

- Volunteer responders certified at the EMR and EMT levels
- Coordination with transporting ambulance providers
- No guaranteed advanced-level (AEMT or Paramedic) staffing during weekday daytime hours

Operational Considerations

- Simultaneous medical calls can strain available volunteer resources
- Advanced-level care is not consistently assured on every daytime response

- Daytime coverage is impacted by reduced volunteer availability due to work and commuting patterns

This capability profile reflects a common rural service model; however, increasing EMS demand and call concurrency highlight the importance of evaluating sustainable staffing solutions to maintain response reliability and patient care continuity.

7.5 Water Supply and Tender Operations

Urban Mt. Angel benefits from municipal hydrant infrastructure.

Monitor and rural areas rely primarily on:

- Water tenders
- Drafting operations
- Mutual aid tanker support

Both districts possess water tender capability, but effective rural fire suppression requires sufficient personnel for shuttle operations, pump operation, and attack lines simultaneously.

7.6 Mutual Aid and Automatic Aid

Both districts participate in:

- Marion County Fire Defense Board
- Mutual aid agreements with neighboring districts

Mutual aid supports large incidents but does not replace the need for reliable initial response staffing.

Consolidation would not eliminate mutual aid but would strengthen initial attack capacity before additional resources arrive.

7.7 Command and Incident Management

Incident command is provided by:

- Fire Chief's and available volunteer and paid company officers
- Senior volunteers
- Officers responding to scene

Current command capacity is adequate but can be strained during concurrent incidents or extended operations.

A consolidated district would provide:

- Unified command structure
- Clear officer hierarchy
- Standardized SOGs and ICS protocols

7.8 Training and Certification

Both districts maintain training programs consistent with Oregon DPSST standards.

Training requirements include:

- Structural firefighting certification
- Wildland training
- EMS continuing education
- Driver/operator training

Challenges include:

- Scheduling volunteer training around availability
- Maintaining consistent multi-company training
- Coordinating joint drills

Consolidation would further enhance standardized districtwide training under unified leadership.

7.9 Equipment and Apparatus Readiness

Both districts maintain functional apparatus fleets; however:

- Replacement cycles are approaching for major apparatus
- Cost of new engines exceeds \$1 million
- SCBA and turnout gear replacement cycles require structured funding
- Increasing regulatory standards affect equipment purchasing

Capital planning under separate districts is more constrained than under a unified reserve model.

7.10 Operational Strengths

- Strong volunteer commitment
- Established community trust
- Mutual aid integration
- Functional facilities
- Combination staffing experience in Mt. Angel

7.11 Operational Vulnerabilities

1. Weekday daytime staffing reliability

2. Limited guaranteed interior structural staffing depth
3. Aging apparatus replacement exposure
4. Separate administrative systems limiting financial flexibility
5. Levy expiration risk for Monitor

7.12 Summary

Both districts currently provide effective emergency response within the constraints of a volunteer-based model. However, operational vulnerability during weekday daytime hours represents the most significant service reliability risk.

The proposed consolidation would not replace volunteer response; rather, it would reinforce it through shared paid staffing, unified command, and structured capital planning.

8. STAFFING ANALYSIS AND DEPLOYMENT MODEL

This section evaluates current staffing levels, identifies operational gaps, and outlines the proposed phased staffing model for the Mt. Angel–Monitor Fire District. Staffing is the single most important factor influencing response reliability, firefighter safety, OSHA compliance, and overall service delivery effectiveness.

8.1 Current Staffing Baseline

Mt. Angel Fire District

- 0.5 FTE Fire Chief
- 2 Full-Time Firefighters (40-hour schedule)
- 1 Administrative Secretary
- Approximately 37 Volunteers

Monitor Rural Fire Protection District

- Approximately 20 Volunteers
- No full-time operational staff

Combined Volunteer Roster: ~57 members

The current model relies heavily on volunteers responding from home or workplace. While effective during evenings and weekends, weekday daytime response reliability is variable.

8.2 Identified Staffing Gap

The most significant operational vulnerability identified in prior sections is:

Weekday Daytime Staffing Reliability

Contributing factors:

- Volunteers commuting outside district boundaries
- Limited availability during standard business hours
- Increased daytime EMS demand
- Occasional concurrent incidents

Operational risk:

- Delayed minimum staffing for interior structural fire attack
- Reduced EMS response depth
- Increased reliance on mutual aid for initial attack staffing

8.3 Regulatory and Safety Considerations

Structural firefighting operations are subject to OSHA two-in/two-out requirements. Interior attack requires:

- Two firefighters entering together
- Two firefighters outside ready for rescue

While volunteer response may eventually meet this requirement, guaranteed minimum staffing at time of arrival is not always assured during daytime hours.

Safe and defensible fireground operations require predictable staffing baselines.

8.4 Proposed Consolidated Staffing Model

The proposed staffing model is phased to align with financial sustainability.

Phase 1 – Year 1 (Formation Year: 2027)

- Maintain volunteer 24/7 response model
- Implement 3 full-time daytime firefighters
- Schedule: 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m., Monday–Friday
- One position filled by Advanced EMT or Paramedic

Objectives:

- Guarantee minimum daytime response staffing
- Improve EMS capability
- Reduce reliance on volunteer-only response during peak hours
- Provide training leadership and volunteer support

Phase 2 – Years 2–5

- Evaluate and expand daytime coverage to 7 days per week if necessary

- Consider weekend upstaffing model with increased volunteer stipend
- Maintain 3-person daytime crew
- Evaluate call volume growth and financial performance
- Continue building apparatus replacement reserves

Objectives:

- Consider improved weekend daytime coverage
- Increase EMS reliability
- Stabilize staffing without exceeding sustainable budget levels

Long-Term Target Model

- 4-person engine staffing during peak daytime hours
- Retain volunteer augmentation model for evenings and nights
- Transition Fire Chief position to full-time as operational demands justify

This model provides structural scalability while maintaining fiscal discipline.

8.5 Deployment Strategy

Under consolidation, staffing would be deployed districtwide rather than divided by historic boundary lines.

Key principles:

- Districtwide coverage model
- Unified station staffing strategy
- Balanced apparatus placement

Deployment decisions would be driven by:

- Call density
- Travel time modeling
- Apparatus readiness
- Volunteer turnout patterns

8.6 Staffing Cost Model

Current estimated personnel budget for consolidated district: \$652,518 annually

This includes:

- Fire Chief
- 3 full-time firefighters
- Administrative support
- Benefits and PERS

- Volunteer program support

The financial model supports this staffing level while maintaining annual surplus capacity for capital reserves.

8.7 Volunteer Sustainability

Consolidation does not replace volunteers. Instead, it:

- Enhances volunteer support
- Provides daytime career support to reduce burnout
- Improves training consistency
- Stabilizes leadership structure

Volunteer members remain essential to:

- Evening and overnight response
- Major incident staffing
- Community engagement
- Wildland mobilization

8.8 Staffing Risk Reduction

The proposed model reduces risk by:

- Guaranteeing minimum daytime response personnel
- Improving EMS care level
- Supporting safer structural fire operations
- Reducing response delay variability
- Enhancing supervision and accountability

8.9 Summary

The current volunteer-based model remains strong but is increasingly strained during weekday daytime hours. The proposed phased staffing plan:

- Is financially sustainable
- Directly addresses the identified operational gap
- Aligns with modern fire service staffing expectations
- Supports long-term service reliability

9. FACILITIES OVERVIEW

This section evaluates the current fire station infrastructure serving Mt. Angel Fire District and Monitor Rural Fire Protection District, assesses geographic coverage, and examines long-term facility considerations under a consolidated district model.

9.1 Overview of Existing Stations

The proposed consolidated district would operate from three existing facilities:

1. Mt. Angel Main Station
2. Monitor Station
3. Yoder Substation

These facilities collectively provide geographic coverage across approximately 72.15 square miles of rural and semi-urban territory.

9.2 Mt. Angel Main Station

Location

Located within the City of Mt. Angel, this station serves as the administrative and operational hub for the district.

Functions

- Primary response station for city and adjacent rural areas
- Administrative offices
- Training and meeting space
- Apparatus storage
- Equipment maintenance area

Condition

- Functional and operationally sound
- Adequate bay space for existing fleet
- Supports current staffing model

Capacity Considerations

The facility can support the proposed initial daytime staffing model. Long-term planning may evaluate:

- Sleeping quarters if expanded staffing occurs
- Expanded training or storage space
- Modernization upgrades

9.3 Monitor Station

Location

Located in the Monitor community area.

Functions

- Primary response station for northern and eastern district territory
- Houses engine and tender apparatus
- Volunteer response-based station

Condition

- Functional and operational
- Limited administrative infrastructure
- Supports rural coverage effectively

Capacity Considerations

With consolidation, this station remains essential for rural coverage. No relocation is currently proposed. Capital improvements may include:

- Minor modernization
- Equipment storage upgrades
- Facility hardening as needed
- Facility upgrades to support resident volunteers

9.4 Yoder Substation

Location

Provides coverage to northern and eastern rural territory.

Condition

- Undergoing seismic retrofit improvements
- Structurally maintained

Role

- Volunteer-supported station
- Enhances travel time performance in rural zones

Continued investment ensures coverage reliability in geographically dispersed areas.

9.5 Geographic Coverage and Travel Time

The three-station model provides distributed coverage across:

- Urban core (Mt. Angel)
- Rural residential areas
- Agricultural zones

- Highway corridors

Consolidation supports a districtwide deployment strategy rather than a boundary-limited response model. Closest-unit dispatch enhances travel time efficiency.

No station closures are proposed.

9.6 Facility Adequacy for Consolidated Model

The current station footprint is adequate to support:

- Phase 1 staffing implementation
- Volunteer-based 24/7 coverage
- Apparatus housing needs
- Training operations

No new major construction projects are planned in the initial five-year forecast.

9.7 Long-Term Facility Planning Considerations

Over a 10- to 20-year horizon, the district may evaluate:

- Facility modernization needs
- Sleeping quarters for expanded staffing
- Apparatus bay expansion
- Energy efficiency improvements
- Security upgrades

These considerations will be addressed in the 20-year Capital Improvement Plan section.

9.8 Financial Impact of Facility Strategy

Maintaining and utilizing existing stations:

- Eliminates immediate capital construction costs
- Preserves community presence in each area
- Maximizes return on prior infrastructure investment
- Supports geographic equity in service delivery

Consolidation does not require new facility construction.

9.9 Summary

The existing three-station model provides effective geographic coverage for the proposed consolidated district. Facilities are functional and capable of supporting the phased staffing model without major new capital expenditure.

10. APPARATUS AND EQUIPMENT INVENTORY

This section provides a consolidated inventory of frontline and support apparatus currently operated by Mt. Angel Fire District and Monitor Rural Fire Protection District. It evaluates fleet age, operational condition, and long-term replacement planning considerations.

Apparatus replacement represents the single largest capital exposure facing rural fire districts. Modern Type 1 fire engines now exceed \$1,000,000 per unit, with build times often exceeding 24–36 months.

10.1 Structural Engines (Type 1)

Current Inventory: See Appendix C.

Operational Assessment:

Current front line engines remain functional and operational. However:

- The 2008 unit is approaching 20 years of service.
- The 2009 units are mid-life and entering higher maintenance phases.
- The two 2012 units remain within reasonable lifecycle range.

Industry Benchmark: NFPA and industry best practices typically assume 20-year frontline service life (10–15 years frontline, 5–10 years reserve).

10.2 Wildland / WUI Apparatus

Inventory: See Appendix C.

These units support:

- Grass fires
- Agricultural fires
- Initial attack in WUI areas
- Off-road responses
- Conflagration deployment

The 2006 units are approaching lifecycle replacement within 5–8 years.

10.3 Water Tenders

Inventory: See Appendix C.

Water supply is critical in rural portions of the district lacking hydrants.

The 1999 tender is beyond typical 25-year apparatus planning horizon and should be considered for replacement planning within 5–7 years.

The 2019 and 2023 tenders provide strong rural water capacity and represent relatively new capital assets.

10.4 Rescue and Support Vehicles

Rescue Units: See Appendix C.

The 1996 rescue unit is beyond normal lifecycle and represents a long-term replacement priority. Operational efficiency shifts include phasing out these vehicles as type 1 engines are able to fill those requirements.

Command Vehicles: See Appendix C.

Command fleet is generally serviceable.

Support Units: See Appendix C.

Several support vehicles are aging and may require phased replacement planning.

10.5 SCBA and Turnout Gear

Structural firefighting protective equipment must follow replacement cycles:

- Turnout gear: 10-year lifecycle per NFPA guidance
- SCBA: Typically, 15 years depending on manufacturer support

The district is currently pursuing Assistance to Firefighters Grant (AFG) funding for turnout gear replacement, with SCBA replacement anticipated in subsequent funding cycles.

Structured reserve planning reduces dependence on grant uncertainty.

10.6 Communications and Radios

Modern fireground safety depends on:

- Reliable portable radios
- Mobile apparatus radios
- Interoperable communications

Radio systems require long-term capital planning and eventual replacement aligned with countywide system upgrades. Marion County Public works is launching a countywide emergency service grade radio program that both police and fire agencies plan to migrate to in November, 2026.

10.7 Apparatus Replacement Risk Exposure

Major fleet replacements projected within 10 years include:

- 2 Type 1 Engines
- 1 Type 3 Wildland Engine
- Replacement of 1999 tender

Estimated capital exposure for these replacements could exceed:

\$3.5–5.0 million over a 10- to 15-year horizon

Without structured reserves, such costs would likely require bond measures or emergency levies.

10.8 Consolidation Impact on Fleet Management

A consolidated district improves fleet management by:

- Establishing unified capital replacement schedule
- Building consistent annual apparatus reserve contributions
- Eliminating duplicative fleet redundancy
- Allowing fleet standardization
- Increasing purchasing leverage

Annual projected surplus under the consolidated financial model provides the ability to dedicate approximately >\$350,000 annually toward capital reserve without reducing operational stability.

10.9 Apparatus Lifecycle Summary Table

<u>Apparatus Type</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Replacement Priority</u>
Type 1 Engines	4	2030–2035
Wildland Engines	3	2028–2033
Water Tenders	3	2027–2035
Rescue Units	2	2026–2032
Command/Support	Multiple	Ongoing phased replacement

10.10 Summary

The consolidated fleet is functional but entering a period of significant capital exposure. Over the next decade, multiple major apparatus replacements will be required.

Consolidation provides the financial scale and reserve-building capacity necessary to manage these costs responsibly without reliance on emergency borrowing.

11. FINANCIAL BASELINE ANALYSIS

This section establishes the current financial condition of Mt. Angel Fire District and Monitor Rural Fire Protection District. The purpose is to evaluate revenue stability, expenditure patterns, reserve capacity, and structural vulnerabilities prior to consolidation.

11.1 Revenue Structure Overview

Both districts rely primarily on property tax revenue derived from their voter-approved permanent tax rates. Secondary revenues include conflagration reimbursements, grants, interest income, and miscellaneous fees.

11.2 Mt. Angel Fire District Financial Baseline

Permanent Tax Rate

\$1.0146 per \$1,000 assessed value

Revenue Characteristics

- Stable permanent rate
- No local option levy currently in place
- Predictable property tax revenue stream
- Supplemented by volunteer response to wildfire mobilization reimbursements

Expenditure Characteristics

Primary cost centers include:

- Personnel (career staff, benefits)
- Volunteer program support
- Insurance and dispatch
- Training
- Fuel and maintenance
- Equipment replacement

Financial Observations

- Mt. Angel maintains stronger permanent rate stability than Monitor.
- Personnel costs represent the largest budget category.
- Capital replacement exposure exists but can be managed with structured reserve planning.

11.3 Monitor Rural Fire Protection District Financial Baseline

Permanent Tax Rate

\$0.53 per \$1,000 assessed value

Local Option Levy

\$0.50 per \$1,000 assessed value
(Expires 2027)

Effective Current Rate

\$1.03 per \$1,000 assessed value

Revenue Characteristics

Monitor’s operational capacity currently depends significantly on the local option levy. Without renewal, the district’s permanent revenue would decrease by nearly 50%.

Financial Risk

If the levy expires without replacement:

- Revenue reduction would materially impact operations.
- Apparatus replacement planning would be severely constrained.
- Staffing IGA would be financially infeasible.

Monitor’s current financial model is structurally dependent on temporary voter approval.

11.4 Combined Assessed Value

Combined 2026 Assessed Value (AV): **\$899,297,575**

Assessed value growth assumption used in modeling: **2% annually conservatively**

Assessed value forms the basis for projected revenue modeling under a consolidated permanent rate.

11.5 Current Combined Budget Baseline

Estimated Consolidated Operating Requirement: **\$1,363,564 Year 1**

Breakdown:

Personnel Services – \$652,518

- Fire Chief
- 3 Full-Time Firefighters
- Administrative staff
- Volunteer support
- Benefits and PERS

Materials & Services – \$361,046

- Dispatch
- Insurance
- Training
- Utilities
- Fuel and maintenance

Capital Outlay – \$300,000

- Apparatus reserve contributions

Contingency – \$50,000

11.6 Financial Strengths

1. Mt. Angel Fire District has a stable permanent rate structure.
2. Combined assessed value base provides strong tax foundation.
3. Current budgets are conservative relative to projected consolidated revenue.
4. No major outstanding long-term debt reported.

11.7 Financial Vulnerabilities

1. Monitor Rural Fire Protection District levy expiration risk (2027).
2. Rising apparatus replacement costs.
3. Increasing personnel cost inflation (PERS, healthcare).
4. Limited capital reserves under separate structures.
5. Potential exposure to Measure 5 compression (to be analyzed).

11.8 Structural Comparison: Separate vs Consolidated

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Separate Districts</u>	<u>Consolidated District</u>
Revenue stability	Uneven	Unified permanent rate
Levy dependence	Monitor dependent	Eliminated

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Separate Districts</u>	<u>Consolidated District</u>
Capital planning	Independent, limited scale	Unified, scalable
Staffing flexibility	Restricted	Districtwide deployment
Administrative overlap	Duplicate governance	Unified board

11.9 Financial Conclusion

Maintaining two independent districts creates:

- Revenue disparity
- Uneven staffing capacity
- Fragmented capital planning
- Levy dependency risk

Consolidation under a unified permanent rate of \$1.97 per \$1,000 assessed value:

- Stabilizes long-term funding
- Eliminates Monitor Rural Fire Protection District’s levy risk
- Supports structured capital reserve growth
- Enables phased staffing expansion

12. REVENUE MODELING

12.1 Proposed Permanent Tax Rate

The proposed permanent tax rate for the consolidated district is:

\$1.97 per \$1,000 of Assessed Value (AV)

This rate replaces:

- Mt. Angel Fire District permanent rate: \$1.0146
- Monitor Rural Fire Protection District permanent rate: \$0.53
- Monitor Rural Fire Protection District local option levy: \$0.50 (expiring 2027)

The consolidated rate will provide stable, permanent funding without requiring periodic levy renewals.

12.2 Revenue Projection – Year 1

Combined 2027 Assessed Value (AV): **\$917,283,527**

Revenue Calculation:

$917,283,527 \div 1,000 \times 1.97 = \$1,807,049$ (approx.)

Projected Year 1 Revenue: \$1,807,049

12.3 Five-Year Revenue Projection

Assumes conservative 2% annual AV growth.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Projected AV</u>	<u>Projected Revenue</u>
2027	\$917,283,526	\$1,807,048
2028	\$935,629,197	\$1,843,189
2029	\$954,341,781	\$1,880,053
2030	\$973,428,616	\$1,917,654
2031	\$992,897,188	\$1,956,007

Five-Year Revenue Growth:

Annual revenue increases from \$1.8 million to approximately \$1.95 million, representing an increase of approximately \$148,959 by Year 5.

12.4 Projected Surplus Under Consolidation

Estimated Annual Operating Budget: **\$1,363,564 (Year 1)**
(Includes a \$300,000 capital outlay allocation and \$50,000 contingency.)

Projected Year 1 Surplus: **\$443,484 (Minimum)**

Five-Year Cumulative Surplus: Approximately \$2,202,580

Because the operating budget includes a \$300,000 annual capital outlay allocation reserved for potential apparatus or equipment purchases, any unspent portion of this amount may carry forward into reserves. If the capital outlay allocation were not utilized in a given year, the district could retain an additional \$300,000 annually, or approximately \$1.5 million over five years, resulting in a potential total reserve growth approaching \$3.5 million.

These projections assume conservative annual cost increases of 4% for personnel and 3% for materials and services, while revenue growth is based on an estimated 2% annual increase in assessed value to truly stress test our estimates.

This surplus allows:

- Apparatus reserve contributions
- SCBA and turnout replacement
- Operating reserve stabilization
- Phased staffing growth

12.5 Homeowner Tax Impact Analysis

Mt. Angel Fire District Property Owners

Current Rate: \$1.0146

Proposed Rate: \$1.97

Increase: \$0.9554 per \$1,000 AV

Example: \$250,000 Assessed Value

$$250 \times 0.9554 = 238.85$$

Annual Increase: **\$238.85**

Monthly Increase: **~\$20**

Monitor Rural Fire Protection District Property Owners

Current Effective Rate: \$1.03

Proposed Rate: \$1.97

Increase: \$0.94 per \$1,000 AV

Example: \$250,000 AV

$$250 \times .94 = 235.00$$

Annual Increase: **\$235**

Monthly Increase: **~\$20**

12.6 Assessed Value vs Real Market Value

Oregon property taxes are calculated on Assessed Value (AV), not Real Market Value (RMV).

Due to Measure 50 limitations:

- AV typically grows at 3% or less annually
- AV is often 45–50% of RMV

This reduces the effective dollar impact compared to what homeowners might assume based on market value.

Example:

If a home has:

- Real Market Value: \$500,000
- Assessed Value: \$250,000

Tax impact is based only on \$250,000.

12.7 Measure 5 Compression Considerations

Oregon Constitution limits total property tax rates:

- \$5 per \$1,000 AV for education
- \$10 per \$1,000 AV for general government

Fire districts fall under the \$10 category.

Preliminary review indicates:

- Minimal compression exposure expected
- Further county-level verification recommended

If compression exists, it would slightly reduce collected revenue below projected gross totals.

12.8 Sensitivity Analysis

If AV Growth Slows to 1%

Revenue growth reduces modestly but remains above baseline budget.

If AV Growth Increases to 3%

Additional revenue strengthens surplus and capital reserve acceleration.

The model remains sustainable under conservative assumptions.

12.9 Structural Advantage of Permanent Rate

Consolidation eliminates:

- Levy renewal cycles
- Eliminate Future equipment bond and interest
- Election risk for operational funding
- Structural revenue uncertainty

Provides:

- Predictable multi-year budgeting
- Stable capital planning

12.10 Revenue Modeling Conclusion

Under the proposed \$1.97 permanent rate:

- The district is financially sustainable
- Staffing expansion is supportable
- Apparatus reserve funding is achievable
- Levy dependency risk is eliminated
- Taxpayer impact remains moderate and predictable

13. FIVE-YEAR FINANCIAL FORECAST

This section integrates projected revenue, operating expenses, staffing costs, and capital reserve contributions into a structured five-year financial model for the proposed Mt. Angel–Monitor Fire District.

The forecast is based on:

- Permanent tax rate: **\$1.97 per \$1,000 AV**
- Beginning Assessed Value: **\$917,283,527**
- AV growth assumption: **2% annually** (conservative)
- Baseline operating budget: **\$1,363,564**
- Personnel inflation assumption: **4% annually**
- Materials & services inflation assumption: **3% annually**

13.1 Year-1 Baseline (Formation Year – 2027)

Projected Revenue: \$1,807,048.55

Projected Operating Budget: \$1,363,564

Year-1 Surplus: \$793,484

This surplus is critical for establishing capital reserves and strengthening long-term sustainability.

13.2 Five-Year Revenue vs Expense Projection

Revenue Projection (2% AV Growth)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Projected Revenue</u>
2027	\$1,807,048
2028	\$1,843,189
2029	\$1,880,053
2030	\$1,917,654
2031	\$1,956,007

Expense Projection (Inflation Adjusted)

Starting baseline: \$1,363,564

<u>Year</u>	<u>Projected Expenses</u>
2027	\$1,363,564
2028	\$1,400,496
2029	\$1,438,797
2030	\$1,478,518
2031	\$1,519,714

(Expenses increase primarily due to personnel cost growth and materials inflation.)

13.3 Projected Annual Surplus

<u>Year</u>	<u>Surplus</u>
2027	\$443,485
2028	\$442,693
2029	\$441,255
2030	\$439,135
2031	\$436,292

Five-Year Cumulative Surplus: Approximately \$2.2–3.9 Million
(Conservative expense growth modeled.)

Even with inflation adjustments, the district remains structurally solvent.

13.4 Surplus Allocation Strategy

The financial strategy prioritizes:

1. Capital apparatus reserve
2. SCBA and turnout replacement reserve
3. Operating reserve stabilization
4. Staffing expansion evaluation

13.5 Operating Reserve Policy

Best practice for rural fire districts recommends maintaining:

20–25% of annual operating budget

Target operating reserve: Approximately \$275,000–\$350,000 minimum

By Year 3–4, this level is achievable without reducing capital contributions.

13.6 Staffing Expansion Sustainability

Under current modeling:

- Phase 1 staffing (3 daytime firefighters) is fully sustainable.
- Phase 2 expansion to 7-day daytime staffing remains sustainable within projected growth.
- Long-term 4-person engine staffing requires evaluation but is potentially achievable once capital reserves stabilize.

Expansion should occur only after reserve benchmarks are achieved.

13.7 Capital Sustainability Outlook

Over five years, projected capital reserve contributions are expected to total approximately \$2.1 million at a minimum, and could reasonably exceed \$4.7 million depending on annual budget carryover, capital spending decisions and the extent to which the \$300,000 annual capital outlay allocation is utilized.

This level of reserve growth positions the district to:

- Replace three Type 1 engines without bonding
- Purchase a Type 3 engine
- Replace the 1999 apparatus currently approaching the end of its service life
- Fund SCBA replacement cycles
- Maintain stable capital planning and avoid emergency levy measures

13.8 Conclusion

The proposed consolidated district is financially viable, inflation-resistant, and capable of funding both operational improvements and long-term capital needs within five years of formation.

14. TWENTY-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

This section outlines the long-term capital replacement strategy for apparatus, major equipment, facilities, and infrastructure over a 20-year planning horizon. The purpose is to ensure predictable lifecycle replacement without reliance on future bond measures or emergency levies.

Capital planning is based on:

- Current fleet age and condition
- Industry-standard lifecycle assumptions
- Estimated apparatus cost inflation (6–8% annually historically)
- Projected annual reserve contributions of approximately \$400,000

14.1 Capital Planning Philosophy

The consolidated district will adopt a “**reserves-first**” capital strategy, prioritizing:

1. Annual dedicated apparatus reserve contributions
2. Structured equipment replacement cycles
3. Lifecycle-based replacement scheduling
4. Avoidance of debt whenever possible

This model provides long-term fiscal discipline and protects taxpayers from large, unpredictable funding requests.

14.2 Apparatus Lifecycle Assumptions

See, Appendix C.

14.3 SCBA and Turnout Gear Replacement

Turnout Gear

- 10-year replacement cycle
- Estimated cost: \$3,500–4,500 per firefighter

For 60 members, full replacement cycle:
Approximately \$240,000–300,000 per 10 years

SCBA

- 15-year replacement cycle
- Estimated cost: \$8,000–10,000 per pack

Full fleet replacement estimate: \$500,000–700,000 depending on configuration

Structured reserve contributions eliminate the need for emergency funding.

14.4 Radio and Communications

Portable and mobile radios must align with county system upgrades.

Estimated lifecycle: 10–15 years

Estimated full fleet replacement exposure: \$250,000–400,000

14.5 Debt Avoidance Strategy

The district’s financial model is structured to:

- Avoid large bond measures
- Avoid emergency levy requests
- Maintain stable permanent tax rate
- Build equipment lifecycle funding internally

Bonding remains available as a tool but is not projected as necessary under current modeling.

14.6 Fleet Standardization

Consolidation allows:

- Standardized engine specifications
- Reduced parts inventory
- Shared maintenance protocols
- Improved operational consistency

Standardization lowers long-term maintenance costs.

14.7 Facility Capital Planning

No immediate new station construction is planned.

Future considerations (10–20 years):

- Modernization upgrades

- Energy efficiency improvements
- Potential sleeping quarters buildout
- Apparatus bay expansion if fleet grows

Facility projects will be evaluated separately from apparatus replacement.

14.8 Long-Term Capital Sustainability Conclusion

The 20-year capital outlook demonstrates:

- Apparatus replacement exposure is significant but manageable
- Annual reserve contributions provide sufficient funding stability
- Consolidation creates financial scale necessary for predictable lifecycle replacement
- Long-term financial planning avoids abrupt taxpayer impact

15. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

This section evaluates reasonable alternatives to full consolidation and explains why formation of the Mt. Angel–Monitor Fire District is recommended as the most sustainable long-term solution.

The Boards considered multiple structural options before recommending consolidation.

15.1 Alternative 1 – Maintain Status Quo (Separate Districts)

Under this Option:

- Mt. Angel Fire District and Monitor Rural Fire Protection District remain independent
- Each district maintains its own board, tax structure, and capital planning
- Monitor renews its local option levy in 2027

Advantages:

- No structural change
- No new district formation process
- Maintains historic governance boundaries

Disadvantages:

- Continued daytime staffing vulnerability
- Uneven revenue capacity between districts
- Ongoing levy renewal election risk for Monitor
- Duplicate administrative governance
- Fragmented capital planning
- Limited ability to scale staffing

Conclusion:

Maintaining separate districts does not resolve structural staffing and long-term capital challenges.

15.2 Alternative 2 – Levy Renewal Only (Monitor)

Under this Option:

- Monitor renews its \$0.50 levy in 2027
- Mt. Angel maintains its current permanent rate
- Informal cooperation continues

Advantages:

- Short-term revenue stability for Monitor
- Avoids consolidation vote

Disadvantages:

- Levy remains temporary and subject to voter renewal
- Does not address unified staffing model
- Does not eliminate governance duplication
- Does not create long-term capital stability
- Staffing improvements remain limited

Conclusion:

Levy renewal partially addresses Monitor revenue but not structural operational challenges.

15.3 Alternative 3 – Contract-for-Service Model

Under this Structure:

- One district contracts with the other for staffing services
- Governance remains separate
- Tax bases remain separate

Advantages:

- Partial operational cooperation
- No full consolidation required

Disadvantages:

- Complex intergovernmental financial arrangements

- Continued dual governance
- Ongoing inequities in tax base
- Long-term capital planning remains fragmented
- Contract renegotiation risk

Conclusion:

Contracting improves cooperation but does not eliminate structural duplication or long-term revenue disparity.

15.4 Alternative 4 – Full Consolidation (Recommended Option)

Under this Structure:

- Formation of a new unified district
- Single permanent tax rate
- Unified governance
- Districtwide staffing deployment
- Integrated capital planning

Advantages:

- Eliminates levy dependency
- Stabilizes long-term funding
- Strengthens staffing reliability
- Enhances capital reserve growth
- Improves administrative efficiency
- Creates scalable service model

Considerations:

- Requires voter approval
- Requires transition planning
- Requires unified policy adoption

Conclusion:

Full consolidation provides the strongest long-term operational and financial stability.

15.5 Comparative Summary

Factor	Status Quo	Levy Renewal	Contract Model	Consolidation
Revenue Stability	Uneven	Temporary	Uneven	Permanent
Staffing Reliability	Limited	Limited	Moderate	Strong
Levy/ Bond Risk	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

Factor	Status Quo	Levy Renewal	Contract Model	Consolidation
Governance Duplication	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Capital Planning	Fragmented	Fragmented	Fragmented	Unified
Long-Term Sustainability	Moderate Risk	Moderate Risk	Moderate Risk	Strong

15.6 Rationale for Recommendation

The evaluation demonstrates that consolidation:

- Addresses both financial and operational vulnerabilities
- Eliminates reliance on temporary funding mechanisms
- Provides unified governance and accountability
- Strengthens firefighter safety and staffing reliability
- Enhances long-term capital planning capacity

While consolidation requires careful planning and public approval, it represents the most responsible long-term solution for both communities.

16. GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

This section outlines the proposed governance framework for the Mt. Angel–Monitor Fire District following voter approval and formation. The governance model is designed to ensure transparency, accountability, fiscal responsibility, and long-term stability.

16.1 Legal Organization

The consolidated district will operate as a Rural Fire Protection District under **ORS Chapter 478** and applicable provisions of **ORS Chapter 198**.

The district will function as an independent special district with full authority to:

- Levy property taxes up to the approved permanent rate
- Adopt and manage an annual budget
- Enter into contracts and intergovernmental agreements
- Acquire and manage real property and equipment
- Employ personnel
- Establish district policies and procedures

16.2 Governing Board Composition

The proposed governance structure includes:

- Five-member Board of Directors
- Elected at-large within the consolidated district boundary

- Four-year staggered terms

At-large elections promote unified districtwide representation rather than geographic division.

Initial board member appointments and term staggering will follow statutory formation procedures to ensure continuity of governance.

16.3 Board Responsibilities

The Board of Directors will serve as the policy-making body of the district and will be responsible for:

- Adopting the annual budget
- Setting the annual tax levy (within the permanent rate authority)
- Establishing financial and reserve policies
- Approving capital expenditures
- Hiring, evaluating, and supervising the Fire Chief
- Adopting district policies and standard operating guidelines
- Ensuring compliance with Oregon Public Meetings Law and Ethics statutes

The Board will not engage in day-to-day operational command functions.

16.4 Administrative Oversight

The Fire Chief will serve as the administrative and operational head of the district and will be accountable to the Board of Directors.

Responsibilities of the Fire Chief include:

- Operational command and service delivery
- Personnel supervision
- Budget preparation and financial oversight
- Strategic planning
- Capital improvement planning
- Volunteer program leadership
- Regulatory compliance

Initially, the current half-time Fire Chief position will be retained. Transition to full-time Chief status may occur as operational demands increase.

16.5 Policy and Financial Controls

The consolidated district will adopt formal policies including:

- Reserve policy (operating and capital reserves)
- Procurement policy

- Personnel policy
- Ethics policy
- Capital replacement policy
- Risk management policy

Financial safeguards include:

- Annual independent audit
- Public budget process under ORS 294
- Public meeting transparency
- Internal controls and segregation of duties

16.6 Public Accountability

As a public special district, the consolidated district will remain subject to:

- Oregon Public Meetings Law
- Oregon Public Records Law
- State ethics requirements
- Annual budget hearings
- Voter oversight through elected board positions

Public transparency remains central to district governance.

16.7 Advisory Committees (Optional Consideration)

The Board may establish advisory committees to support:

- Capital planning
- Volunteer recruitment and retention
- Community outreach
- Strategic planning

Such committees serve in advisory capacity only and do not hold policy authority.

16.8 Governance Benefits of Consolidation

Consolidation improves governance by:

- Eliminating duplicated boards
- Reducing administrative redundancy
- Creating a single-policy framework
- Strengthening long-term planning consistency
- Aligning fiscal and operational authority under one structure

Unified governance enhances clarity for residents, employees, and partner agencies.

16.9 Governance Summary

The proposed five-member elected board model provides:

- Stable leadership
- Transparent financial oversight
- Clear administrative accountability
- Unified district representation

17. TRANSITION PLAN

This section outlines the structured process for transitioning from two independent districts to a single consolidated Mt. Angel–Monitor Fire District. The objective of the transition plan is to ensure uninterrupted emergency service delivery, legal compliance, financial continuity, and operational stability.

17.1 Proposed Timeline

Target Ballot Date: November 2026 General Election

Target Formation Date: January 1, 2027

The transition timeline includes the following phases:

Phase 1 – Pre-Ballot (2026)

- Board resolutions supporting feasibility study
- Public outreach and community education
- Legal review of formation pathway
- Boundary confirmation
- Financial validation
- County coordination

Phase 2 – Ballot Approval (November 2026)

- Voter approval of formation and permanent tax rate
- Certification of election results

Phase 3 – Organizational Transition (November–December 2026)

- Formal asset and liability transfer documentation
- Board elections
- Policy harmonization
- Budget adoption for new district
- Banking and accounting system transition

Phase 4 – Operational Launch (January 1, 2027)

- Official formation of Mt. Angel–Monitor Fire District
- Activation of unified tax structure
- Unified administrative and operational structure

17.2 Governance Transition

Upon voter approval:

- The newly formed district becomes the governing entity
- Existing district boards dissolve in accordance with ORS procedures
- Initial governing board assumes policy authority
- Board terms are staggered for continuity

The Mt Angel Fire Chief remains in position to provide operational continuity.

17.3 Asset Transfer

All assets from both districts will transfer to the consolidated district, including:

- Real property (stations and land)
- Apparatus and equipment
- Reserve accounts
- Capital accounts
- Inventory and supplies

A comprehensive asset inventory will be completed prior to effective date.

No asset liquidation is anticipated.

17.4 Liability and Obligation Transfer

All lawful obligations transfer to the consolidated district, including:

- Vendor contracts
- Service agreements
- Insurance policies
- Equipment leases (if applicable)

No known long-term debt obligations have been identified; verification will occur prior to formation.

17.5 Personnel Transition

All current employees and volunteers will transition to the consolidated district without interruption of service.

Transition considerations include:

- Payroll system integration
- Benefits continuation
- PERS reporting
- Workers' compensation coverage
- Volunteer coverage and liability insurance

No layoffs or workforce reductions are anticipated as part of consolidation.

17.6 Financial System Consolidation

Prior to formation:

- Bank accounts will be reconciled
- Budget structures unified
- Chart of accounts standardized
- Reserve accounts established under new district

An independent audit may be conducted during transition year to ensure transparency.

17.7 Policy Harmonization

The consolidated Board will adopt unified:

- Personnel policies
- Standard Operating Guidelines
- Financial policies
- Capital replacement policies
- Safety and compliance policies

Existing policies from both districts will be reviewed and integrated where appropriate.

17.8 Operational Continuity

Emergency response will continue uninterrupted during transition.

Key continuity measures:

- Dispatch configuration remains unchanged
- Apparatus assignments remain operational
- Mutual aid agreements remain in effect
- No change to station locations

The public should experience no disruption in emergency services.

17.9 Communication Strategy

Transition success depends on transparent communication.

Key stakeholders include:

- Residents and taxpayers
- Volunteers and employees
- County officials
- Mutual aid partners
- Insurance and regulatory agencies

Clear messaging will emphasize:

- Service continuity
- Financial stability
- Improved staffing reliability

17.10 Risk Mitigation During Transition

To minimize transition risk:

- Financial reconciliation completed prior to effective date
- Clear delegation of authority during transition period
- Legal counsel review of formation documents
- Defined leadership continuity plan

The transition is administrative in nature and does not require operational restructuring of stations or apparatus.

17.11 Transition Summary

The consolidation transition can be completed:

- Within statutory framework
- Without service interruption
- Without workforce reduction
- Without new facility construction
- Without new debt issuance

With structured planning and clear communication, transition risk is low.

18. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

This Feasibility Study evaluated the operational, financial, governance, and capital implications of consolidating Mt. Angel Fire District and Monitor Rural Fire Protection

District into a single rural fire protection district to be known as the Mt. Angel–Monitor Fire District.

The analysis included review of service demand, staffing models, financial baselines, apparatus replacement exposure, statutory authority, governance structure, and long-term sustainability projections.

18.1 Operational Findings

1. Daytime staffing reliability represents the most significant operational vulnerability for both districts, as volunteer availability decreases during weekday business hours.
2. Overall call volume remains stable with gradual growth trends, with emergency medical incidents comprising the majority of responses and driving staffing demand.
3. Structural fire incidents, while less frequent than medical calls, require adequate minimum staffing to ensure firefighter safety, effective incident command, and compliance with operational standards.
4. Volunteer participation remains strong and committed, particularly during evenings and weekends; however, predictable weekday coverage gaps create response variability.
5. A unified staffing model enhances system-wide reliability by allowing coordinated deployment of paid daytime personnel across the entire district, while preserving and strengthening the volunteer-based service model.

Consolidation enables districtwide allocation of daytime staffing resources, improving response consistency, EMS coverage, and structural fire suppression capability throughout the service area.

18.2 Financial Findings

1. The combined assessed value of approximately \$917 million provides a diversified and stable tax base across urban and rural properties.
2. A permanent tax rate of \$1.97 per \$1,000 assessed value is projected to generate approximately \$1.8 million annually in the first full year of operation (November 2027).
3. Projected annual operating surpluses allow for structured capital reserve growth, reducing reliance on future bonding.
4. The five-year financial forecast demonstrates sustainability under conservative assessed value growth assumptions.
5. The 20-year capital improvement plan indicates that major apparatus replacements can be funded through disciplined annual reserve contributions rather than debt issuance.
6. The City of Mt. Angel contains a significant proportion of tax-exempt property, including institutional and nonprofit holdings. A unified district structure broadens the funding base across the full service area, improving revenue stability

and reducing structural imbalance associated with concentrated tax-exempt valuation.

7. Monitor’s expiring local option levy presents a structural funding risk if consolidation does not occur.

Conclusion:

Consolidation stabilizes revenue, reduces levy dependency, diversifies the tax base, and strengthens long-term financial planning across the entire district.

18.3 Capital Planning Findings

1. Multiple apparatus replacements will be required within the next 10–15 years.
2. Engine replacement costs now exceed \$1 million per unit.
3. SCBA and turnout gear replacement cycles require structured reserve funding.
4. Independent districts face greater difficulty building sufficient reserves at scale.

A consolidated district provides the financial capacity necessary to sustain long-term capital replacement without abrupt taxpayer impact.

18.4 Governance Findings

1. A unified five-member board provides clear accountability.
2. Consolidation eliminates duplicated governance structures.
3. Administrative oversight becomes streamlined.
4. Policy adoption and capital planning become unified and consistent.

The governance framework is legally authorized and administratively feasible under ORS Chapters 478 and 198.

18.5 Alternatives Evaluation

Alternatives considered—including maintaining separate districts, renewing Monitor’s levy, and contract-for-service arrangements—do not resolve:

- Revenue disparity
- Levy dependency risk
- Fragmented capital planning
- Staffing reliability limitations

Full consolidation provides the most comprehensive and sustainable solution.

18.6 Risk Assessment

The proposed consolidation:

- Does not require new facility construction

- Does not require workforce reduction
- Does not create new debt obligations
- Does not disrupt emergency service continuity

Transition risk is administrative and manageable.

18.7 Overall Conclusion

Based on operational analysis, financial modeling, capital planning evaluation, and statutory review, the formation of the Mt. Angel–Monitor Fire District is:

- Operationally justified
- Financially sustainable
- Legally authorized
- Strategically beneficial
- Structurally sound

Consolidation provides a modern, scalable emergency service model capable of protecting life and property for the residents of Mt. Angel, Monitor, and surrounding rural communities into the future.

18.8 Formal Recommendation

It is the recommendation of this Feasibility Study that:

The Boards of Directors of Mt. Angel Fire District and Monitor Rural Fire Protection District proceed with referral to the voters for formation of the Mt. Angel–Monitor Fire District under a permanent tax rate of \$1.97 per \$1,000 assessed value, with a proposed effective date of January 1, 2027, and begin collecting tax revenue November 2027.

APPENDIX A

Detailed FY2027 Consolidated Budget

Personnel Services – \$652,518

Category	Amount
Fire Chief (0.5 FTE)	\$52,000
FICA	\$30,218
Group Health Insurance	\$75,000
Accident & Disability	\$11,700
PERS	\$79,000
Office Administrator	\$60,000
Volunteer Program	\$49,050
Workers Comp	\$11,500
3 FTE Firefighters	\$210,000
Supplemental Labor	\$1,050

Materials & Services – \$361,046

Includes:

- Dispatch – \$72,396
 - Insurance – \$55,000
 - Financial Management – \$37,000
 - Compliance Standards – \$28,600
 - Vehicle Maintenance – \$28,000
 - Fuel – \$20,000
 - Utilities – \$20,000
 - Training – \$17,000
 - Turnouts – \$12,000
 - Technology – \$8,500
- Plus administrative, supplies, elections, and operational expenses.

Capital & Contingency

- Capital Outlay: \$300,000
- Contingency: \$50,000

Total FY2027 Budget

\$1,363,564

APPENDIX B

Assessed Value & Revenue Modeling

Base AV FY2027

\$917,283,526.77

Permanent Rate: \$1.97

Scenario 1 – 2% Growth

Year	AV	Projected Revenue
FY2027	\$917,283,527	\$1,807,049
FY2028	\$935,629,197	\$1,843,190
FY2029	\$954,341,781	\$1,880,053
FY2030	\$973,428,617	\$1,917,654
FY2031	\$992,897,189	\$1,956,007

Five-Year Revenue Increase: \$148,959

Scenario 2 – 3% Growth

Year Revenue

FY2027 \$1,807,049

FY2031 1,993,970

Five-Year Increase: \$186,921

Scenario 3 – 4% Growth

Year Revenue

FY2027 \$1,807,049

FY2031 2,072,540

Five-Year Increase: \$265,461

APPENDIX C

Apparatus Inventory & Replacement Planning

Year	Acquired	Unit	Description	Price	Funding Source	Replacement Schedule
2022	2022	C451	Ford Pickup Chief Vehicle	\$45,747	OSFM Grant	2042
2020	2020	R464	John Deere Gator	\$15,000	Donated	2040
2019	2019	B457	Ford F550 Brush T5	\$110,000	Conflag Reimb.	2039
2014	2013	E455	Pierce Engine T1	\$490,000	2012 Bond	2033
2014	2013	E465	Pierce Engine T1	\$490,000	2012 Bond	2033
2012	2012	SQ463	Chevy Squad	\$33,016	Budget Savings	2032
2008	2025	E475	KME Engine T1	\$400,000	Donated (Salem FD)	To be phased out by current 1st out fleet
2007	2007	R454	Freightliner Rescue	\$170,250	District Budget	To be phased out of service
2006	2020	HB458	Intl. Heavy Brush T4	\$300,000	Federal Excess Property	2036-2040
2000	1999	T459	Freightliner Tender	\$210,000	1998 Bond	2035 TBD
1999	2017	DC461	Ford Pickup	\$9,000	Used - Budget	To be evaluated
1996	1996	R983	Ford Light Rescue	\$58,000	Budget Savings	To be evaluated
2010	2010	E985	Pierce Engine T1	\$297,000	Serial Levy	2030
2011	2011	E995	Pierce Engine T1	\$310,00	Serial Levy	2031 to be evaluated
1986	1986	E986	Western States (Converted to a brush truck)	\$118,000	Budget Savings	To be phased out by current 1st out fleet
2019	2019	T998	US Tanker Tender	\$290,000	Budget Savings	2045
2023	2023	T989	Us Tanker Tender	\$310,000	Budget Savings	2043
2006	2024	B987	Ford F450 T6	\$185,000	Donated (Ashland FD)	2036
1992	2010	B997	Chevy 3500 T6	\$100,000	Donated (FEPP)	To be evaluated
2008	2024	C981	Chevy Tahoe Chief Vehicle	\$10,000	Budget Funds	To be evaluated

Mt. Angel–Monitor Fire District | Formation Feasibility Study

2004	2006	SQ994	Ford F250 Squad	\$15,000	Budget Savings	To be evaluated
------	------	-------	-----------------	----------	----------------	-----------------

Replacement Timeline (Projected)

2029–2035: Replace 2008/2009 Engines

2035–2040: Replace 2012 Engine

2040+: Tender lifecycle replacements

Estimated 20-Year Apparatus Exposure: \$8–10 million (inflation-adjusted)

APPENDIX D

Sensitivity & Risk Analysis

Variable 1 – Slower AV Growth (1%)

Revenue growth reduced ~50% from conservative model.
District remains solvent but capital growth slows.

Variable 2 – Higher Personnel Inflation (6%)

Expense growth increases ~2% annually above model.
Operating surplus narrows but remains positive.

Variable 3 – Major Apparatus Purchase Year

Capital reserve allows significant cash contribution.
Bonding may supplement but not fully required.

APPENDIX E

Legal Authority References

ORS 478 – Rural Fire Protection District formation

ORS 198.780–198.955 – Special District consolidation

ORS 310.060 – Tax rate certification

Oregon Constitution Article XI, Section 11b – Measure 5

APPENDIX F

Reserve Policy Framework (Recommended)

Operating Reserve Target

20–25% of operating budget

Target Range: \$275,000–\$350,000

Apparatus Reserve Policy

Minimum \$300,000 annual contribution

Equipment Reserve

Turnout Gear: 10-year cycle

SCBA: 15-year cycle

Capital Planning Standard

Maintain 5-year projected apparatus replacement funding visibility at all times.

APPENDIX G

Legal Description for Mt. Angel Fire District / Monitor Fire District

Beginning at a point in the center of the Oregon Highway 213 where the Abiqua creek crosses said road and running thence along the center of said road in a northeasterly direction for approximately 13,984 ft (2.65 mi) to the east line of Marion County;

Thence northeasterly along the centerline of said highway for approximately 24,734 ft (4.68 mi) to the east line of Township 5 South, Range 1 East, Section 26, Willamette Meridian,

Thence, north along the east line of said Section 26 for approximately 2,304 ft to the Northeast corner of said Section 26,

Thence, west along the north line of said Section 26 for approximately 5,280 ft (1 mi) to the Northwest corner of said Section 26,

Thence, north along the east line of Township 5 South, Range 1 East, Section 22, W.M. for approximately 5,280 ft (1 mi) to the Northeast corner of said Section 22,

Thence West along the north line of said Section 22 for approximately 5,280 ft (1 mi) to the Northwest corner of said Section 22,

Thence, North along the west line of Township 5 South, Range 1 East, Section 15 for approximately 13,145 ft (2.49 mi) to the centerline of South Kropf Road,

Thence north along the centerline of said road for approximately 2,870 ft to the centerline of South Barnards Road,

Thence, West along the center line of said road for approximately 10,992 ft (2.08 mi) to the east line of Township 4 South, Range 1 East, Section 31, W.M.,

Thence, South along the east line of said section 31 for approximately 52 ft to the Northeast corner of Township 5 South, Range 1 East, Section 6, W.M.,

Thence West along the north line of said Section 6 and the north line of Township 5 South, Range 1 West, Section 1, W.M. for approximately 8,935 ft (1.69 mi) to the West line of Clackamas County,

Thence Southeasterly along the centerline of the west line of Clackamas County for approximately 18,879 ft (3.58 mi) to the point where it intersects with the south line of Township 5 South, Range 1 West, Section 11, W.M.,

Thence, west along the south line of said Section 11 and the south line of Township 5 South, Range 1 West, Section 10, W.M. for approximately 3,155 ft to the centerline of Union School Road,

Mt. Angel–Monitor Fire District | Formation Feasibility Study

Thence, southerly along the centerline of said road for approximately 7,319 ft (1.39 mi) to the centerline of Oregon Highway 214,

Thence, westerly along the centerline of said highway for approximately 4,904 ft to the section line between Sections 20 and 21, in Township 5 South, Range 1 West, W.M.;

Thence, south along the east line of said Section 20 for approximately 4,858 ft to the southeast corner of said Section 20;

Thence, west along the south line of said Section 20 for approximately 5,280 ft (1 mi) to the common corner between Sections 19, 20, 29 and 30, in Township 5 South, Range 1 West;

Thence, south along the Section line between Sections 29 and 30 in said Township 5 for approximately 5,280 ft (1 mi) to the common corner between Sections 29, 30, 31 and 32 in said Township 5;

Thence, west along the south line of Section 30 for approximately 5,280 ft (1 mi) to the southwest corner of said Section 30;

Thence, south along the west line of Section 31 for approximately 5,280 ft (1 mi) to the southwest corner of said Section 31;

Thence, easterly along the south line of Section 31 for approximately 481 ft to its intersection with Howell Prairie Road;

Thence, southerly along the center line of said last named road for approximately 21,424 ft (4.06 mi) to the south line of Section 24, Township 6 South, Range 2 West;

Thence, east along the south line of Section 24, Township 6 South, Range 2 West, W.M., and the south line of Sections 19 and 30, Township 6 South, Range 1 West, W.M. for approximately 12,577 ft (2.38 mi), to the southeast corner of Section 20, Township 6 South, Range 1 West;

Thence, north along the east line of Section 20 for approximately 3,893 ft to the center of Abiqua creek;

Thence, upstream along said creek for approximately 23,175 ft (4.39 mi) to the place of beginning.

APPENDIX H



Mt. Angel and Monitor
Fire Districts
Legal Description Map