

2017

Utah Interagency  
Dispatch Review  
Committee

March 8, 2017



# Utah Interagency Dispatch Review Committee Recommendation

In October, 2016, USDA Forest Service (USFS), Intermountain Region, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Utah and Arizona, Utah Department of Natural Resources Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands (UDNR), Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) Western Region, National Park Service (NPS) Intermountain Region, and US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) Mountain-Prairie Region tasked a group, Utah Interagency Dispatch Review Committee (UIDRC) to evaluate workload, current operating costs and configuration of existing dispatch systems across the state of Utah and make recommendations for adjustment based on financial and operating efficiencies.

## Overview

There are five interagency dispatch centers in Utah providing dispatch and fire coordination needs for the land management agencies and local municipalities. The locations of the current dispatch facilities were established in the early 1990s based on agency boundaries, workloads, and technological capabilities in use at the time. The Eastern Great Basin Coordination Center was established in 1992 as part of the national dispatch coordination effort, a movement nationwide to streamline the dispatching process into an interagency environment.

The UIDRC was given the task to evaluate staffing, workload, and operating costs associated with a five center configuration, a four center configuration, and a three center configuration or other configuration that seemed reasonable to the UIDRC. Direction was provided from the Utah Oversight Committee which includes fire management leaders from Utah BLM, UDNR, USFS, NPS, FWS, and the BIA. A recommendation was to be brought forward to the Utah Oversight Committee in the winter of 2017.

The Utah Oversight Committee identified considerations to include feasibility, partnerships, workloads, locations, costs, benefits and drawbacks for each alternative, and a fair share cost estimation per agency for statewide dispatch services.

The UIDRC met with Utah Oversight Committee on February 3, 2017 to present a draft recommendation.

## Methodology of Study

UIDRC met with the Utah Oversight Committee, who requested and delegated the UIDRC to act on behalf of the State and Federal agencies to engage in a study of Utah's Wildland Fire Dispatch System. In the study, UIDRC evaluated each center's workload, current operating costs, and configurations of the existing systems.

The UIDRC traveled to each of the five centers to meet with employees face to face and gather information related to governance, current staffing, current workload (dispatch and non-dispatch), interagency relationships, improvements, agencies served, and the ability to recruit for vacant positions. During the course of these interviews the committee met with the fire center managers, FMO's, local agency administrators, radio technicians, local fire department, and elected officials. Interviews with personnel along with reviews of each center's documentation were utilized as the foundation for the analysis.

UIDRC received assessments from each dispatch center using FireOrg and received a cost summary based on financial plans from each center that included a breakdown of contributions by each agency. Operating plans, financial plans, organization charts, GBCC website, the SIT Report, and information from Fireorg were reviewed to build an understanding of the operations of each center as well as financial contribution from all agencies involved.

UIDRC developed three dispatch center organizational alternatives and then evaluated each alternative's effectiveness against current organizational situations and financial considerations. The team considered current financial allocations across the state and developed a fair share cost recommendation for consideration by the Utah Oversight Committee.

## FireOrg

Although FireOrg is the most adequate workload analysis tool currently available, it does have some limitations. The use of FireOrg is not supported by all agencies, although it is the most commonly used dispatch analysis tool across the nation. FireOrg does not address centers that are staffed 24 hours a day and only considers the workload associated with incidents that are analyzed. Some users of FireOrg believe it over estimates units/agencies within a dispatch center; those users noticed that there is a tendency for low workload volume agencies/units within a dispatch center to have a higher workload percentage than believed to be merited.

Several highlights of importance to note with FireOrg:

- Like suppression resources, dispatch is not staffed for the worst case scenario. FireOrg calculates the average fire season. It is implied the workload increases due to IMT1 or IMT2 orders or an exceptional season that is outside of the norm, that additional dispatch personnel would be ordered to handle the additional workload.
- FireOrg is not perfect and should be used as a starting point for negotiations with respect to the percentage of financial contribution per agency.
- FireOrg does not take into account “non-core” dispatch duties as identified by the Interagency Dispatch Implementation Project (IDOPP) – Final Report- September 2016, page 12.
- It may not be feasible to base FTEs on the percent for each agency. For example if one agency is showing a part of an FTE, perhaps it makes more sense for that agency to provide another agency with funds to fully fund that FTE, which then would equate to their fair share cost of supporting the center.
- FireOrg does not take into account extended staffing (working beyond 8 hours per day, 5 days per week), and agencies may need to use Relief Factor adjustments. Relief Factor adjustments indicate how many persons it takes to fill a single job position for a single shift taking into account vacation, sick leave, training days, off unit assignments, and other types of leave or scheduling. When time for holidays, leave, training, and assignments is subtracted from 2080. The “useable” hours for a FTE are about 1500-1700 hours per year. Other dispatch organizations, such as 911 dispatch, tends to use a standard relief Factor of 1.7. When the Relief Factor is multiplied by the number of FTEs produced in the FireOrg outputs a reasonable representation of the adequate staffing required for a dispatch/coordination center is obtained. IDOPP study utilized a Relief Factor of 1.5
- Location of the FireOrg user guide  
<https://forestsandrangelands.gov/WFIT/applications/IDIP/documents/tools/FireOrgUserGuideFeb222016.pdf>

## Current Staffing Situation

Fire and land management operations within the State of Utah are supported by five interagency dispatch centers scattered across the state. Located in Draper, Vernal, Moab, Richfield, and Cedar City, these five centers provide the core initial response dispatch coordination and serve as the critical link between the initial response forces on the ground and agency duty officers and line officers.

The following information and statistics generated were taken from the organizational charts and financial plans generated for each center for the summer of 2016 (FY 2016 budget planning documents) and represent a snapshot (Nov 2016) of the organizations and staffing levels (table A). One interesting note is the statewide vacancy rate; through our interviews we learned that filling dispatch positions can be extremely difficult, an observation not supported by the current level of positions filled. However, organizations can be quite dynamic over the course of a year or from year to year and a single vacancy can be burdensome to an organization. Be cautious of drawing conclusions from a single year's worth of data.

Statewide there are 46 employees staffing these centers during the summer fire season. Each of these centers provide support to extended attack, large fire, and to incident management teams when assigned through the utilization of an expanded dispatch organization. Additional dispatch personnel are brought in from neighboring centers or out of state to augment each center's staffing during these periods of increased fire activity.

The employees are sponsored by five organizations. The Bureau of Land Management (AZ & UT) hosted 20 positions (41%), the US Forest Service hosted 19 positions (41%), The Utah Department of Natural Resources, Division of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands hosted five positions (11%), and the National Park Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs each hosted one position (2%). The following information is current organization's characteristics of the dispatch centers across the State of Utah.

Table A

Unit	# of Disprs	% of Total	# of 9 & 11	# of 5 & 7	Leadership Ratio	# of Perms	# of Temps	# of Vacancies	Vacancy Rate	Calculated FTEs
NUIFC	13	28%	3	10	1:3.33	10	3	3	23%	8.40
UBIFC	5	11%	2	3	1:1.5	3	2	0	0%	3.35
MIFC	7	15%	2	4	1:2.0	4	3	0	0%	4.15
RIFC	7	15%	2	5	1:2.5	4	3	1	14%	4.15
CCIFC	14	31%	2	12	1:6.0	9	5	2	14%	9.00
<b>Totals</b>	46	100%	11	35	1:3.18	30	16	6	13%	29.05

Total Positions: 46, Total FTEs: 29.05

Leadership ratio (9 and 11 compared to 5 and 7): 11 positions to 35 positions (1:3.18)

Agency Mix: 20 BLM (41%), 19 USFS (41%), 5 FFSL (11%), 1 NPS (2%), 1 BIA (2%)

Perm to temp: 30 Permanent positions, 16 temporary positions

Vacancy level: 6 vacant positions for 13% vacancy rate of dispatch position statewide.

### Current Financial Situation

Dispatch operating costs were taken from the financial plans generated for FY 2016 budget planning documents. As part of the annual operating plans, each dispatch center generates an annual financial plan that estimates the budget needed for the year and the financial split between agencies for that year. These numbers represent planned costs for FY 2016 and do not represent the actual expenditures that occurred.

Table B displays the total personnel and operating costs planned for each dispatch center along with the percentage split across the state. The total of \$2,503,234 represents the total planned costs for dispatch operations across the state for FY 2016.

Table B, See Appendix 1 for greater detail.

Center	Planned Personnel Cost	% of Personnel Total	Planned Operations Cost	% of Operating Cost Total	Total	% of Total Planned Cost
NUIFC	\$628,525	32%	\$231,925	42%	\$860,450	35%
UBIFC	\$285,724	15%	\$44,166	8%	\$329,890	13%
MIFC	\$275,060	14%	\$79,093	14%	\$354,153	14%
RIFC	\$294,831	15%	\$86,547	16%	\$381,378	15%
CCIFC	\$466,534	24%	\$110,829	20%	\$577,363	23%
<b>State Total</b>	<b>\$1,950,674</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$552,560</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$2,503,234</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Fair Share Cost Recommendations

One of the tasks from the Utah Oversight Committee was to develop a fair share cost estimate on a per agency basis. To develop the cost estimate the team utilized the outputs from FireOrg and historical fire occurrence to develop the ranges. The ranges of suggested financial contributions can be used as a starting point for statewide discussions on fair share costs for dispatch services. Also included is the FY 2016's percentage of planned costs derived from each center's financial plan. Based on these ranges agencies are then identified as either over or under contributing in support of the 2016 dispatch program.

Table C summarizes by agency the workload and fire percentages and compares these estimates to the FY2016 planned contributions.

Table C

	<b>AZ BLM</b>	<b>UT BLM</b>	<b>UDNR</b>	<b>USFS</b>	<b>FWS</b>	<b>NPS</b>	<b>BIA</b>
<b>FY 2016 % of Planned Costs</b>	3.33% \$83,341	41.50% \$1,038,861	11.29% \$282,518	42.98% \$1,075,924	.19% \$4,700	.24% \$6,000	.5% \$12,500
<b>% of FireOrg workload by agency</b>	4.93% \$123,000	22.09% \$553,000	22.17% \$555,000	26.49% \$663,000	5.66% \$142,000	10.97% \$275,000	7.68% \$192,000
<b>FireOrg % split of fires by agency</b>	6.32% \$158,000	28.82% \$721,000	41.10% \$1,029,000	18.68% \$468,000	.07% \$2,000	1.99% \$50,000	3.01% \$75,000
<b>Under or Over funding</b>	Under funding	Over funding	Under funding	Over funding	Funding within the range	Under funding	Under funding

## Dispatch Center Configuration Alternatives

The committee developed each alternative based on staffing, economics, and workload. The Oversight Committee tasked the UIDRC to consider a five center alternative, four center alternative, and three center alternative.

### Five Interagency Dispatch Center Alternative

Maintain all five centers within the State of Utah. These centers include; Northern Utah Interagency Fire Center (NUIFC) in Salt Lake City/Draper, Uintah Basin Interagency Fire Center (UBIFC) in Vernal, Richfield Interagency Fire Center (RIFC) in Richfield, Moab Interagency Fire Center (MIFC) in Moab, and Color Country Interagency Fire Center (CCIFC) in Cedar City.

As part of this alternative the UIDRC is recommending that a new dispatch facility be secured for RIFC in Richfield. There have been issues with the current leased facility over the years including serious health related maintenance issue involving mold and rodents along with ongoing issues with heating and cooling of the building. There has also been instances of the landlord not paying utility bills which have resulted in discontinued utility services during periods of fire activity. The facility is currently leased through the USFS and is in extensions past the normal

leasing cycle. This facility upgrade was included in the cost calculations performed as part of the alternative cost analysis.

### **Pros**

- Maintain current statewide dispatching organizations, and staffing; this would alleviate disruptions to IT and radio systems, MAC group, FMO groups, other operating groups, and current relationships would be maintained.
- No implementation requirements.
- No impact to personnel.
- No additional workload associated with combining of SOPs, dispatch operations, and financial plans, etc.

### **Cons**

- Missed opportunities to become a more robust and efficient organization (ie, staffing, inoperability, redundancy become more difficult to accomplish).
- This alternative would be the most expensive, as all dispatch centers would be maintained resulting in the highest number of employees and facilities to operate.
- Vacant positions would have a higher impact on center operations particularly at the smaller centers
- More challenging to incorporating new ideas and technology consistently due to more and smaller centers with less depth in staffing.
- Fewer opportunities for career development of personnel (off unit assignments, details, and training) in the smaller centers. Smaller staffs make it more difficult to let people go on fire assignments or take extended details.
- Difficult to implement a statewide COOP Plan due to increased costs and individual center staffing sizes.

## **Four Interagency Dispatch Center Alternative**

Reduce to four centers by combining two centers into one. Keep NUIFC, CCIFC, RIFC, and combine UBIFC and MIFC. MIFC and UBIFC do not have the capacity to combine into either center; a new center would have to be constructed in order to accommodate staff and technology. Locations for this center would be Price or a different centrally located place.

This alternative also includes the addition of a new facility in Richfield for RIFC as described in the Five Center Alternative.

### **Pros**

- Cost savings realized.
- Possible increase of recruitment and retention of personnel, due to location and cost of living.
- There would be improved dispatch capacity allowing the center to be staffed adequately for seven day coverage minimizing dispatcher burnout. It could allow for a minimum of 2 dispatchers working at a time outside of core hours.
- Moving towards a higher degree of standardization of dispatch operations and financial plans in Utah.

### **Cons**

- Cost savings would take multiple years to realize the benefit.
- The effort needed to implement this alternative does not result in the maximum efficiency that could be realized.
- Less opportunities for career development of employees (off duty assignments, details, and training).
- Additional workload combining SOP's and other plans.

- Upfront cost involved in building or leasing two new facilities and the cost to move personnel; RIFC will still be in need of a new center.
- There would be relocation and disruption to personnel.
- Difficult to implement a statewide COOP plan due to increased costs and individual center staffing sizes.
- Time involved in establishing new dispatch procedures and protocols with customers.

### **Three Interagency Dispatch Center Alternative**

Reduce to three centers, combining three centers into one. Keeping NUIFC, CCIFC, and combine RIFC/UBIFC/MIFC. Build a state of the art dispatch center similar to NUIFC located in a centralized location such as Richfield. This new facility could be built in conjunction with the currently ongoing UDNR facility being constructed down the street from the current RIFC location.

#### **Pros**

- Cost savings realized.
- The need for two facilities as identified in the four center alternative would be reduced to one new facility which is similar to the five center alternative but more expensive due to the added number of dispatchers in the new facility.
- Opportunities for recruiting and retaining dispatchers would be maximized.
- There would be improved dispatch capacity allowing the center to be staffed adequately for seven day coverage minimizing dispatcher burnout. It could allow for a minimum of two dispatchers working at a time outside of the core hours.
- Combining dispatch personnel would increase depth and capacity providing for sufficient staffing during the fire season and allowing dispatchers to go off district on assignment to maintain qualifications and bring back new ideas.
- Higher potential for a higher degree of standardization of dispatch operations and financial plans in Utah.
- Dispatch center workloads would be more balanced across the state, facilitating standardization between the centers, sharing of personnel, and ideas.
- Standardization and economic benefits would be realized with implementation of a statewide COOP Plan.
- Fosters interagency cooperation across a larger geographic area.

#### **Cons**

- Two currently owned federal facilities would be vacated (most likely repurposed) while absorbing the cost of newly purchased or leased facilities.
- Additional workload combining SOP's and other plans.
- There would be relocation and disruption to personnel.
- Time involved in establishing new dispatch procedures and protocols with customers.
- Upfront cost involved in building a new dispatch center and the moving of personnel.

### **Summary of Alternative Cost Evaluation**

Alternative cost evaluations were conducted to provide a financial picture of the costs associated with implementing and maintaining each for the three alternatives. Costs are divided into either annual costs or one-time costs; annual costs include employee wages, facility operating costs and facility leases; while one-time costs include facility purchases, move in costs and employee transfer of station costs (TOS). Two sets of cost evaluations were performed, one with the assumption that facilities were purchased (increased one-time costs) and one with the assumption that facilities were leased (increased annual costs). Cost savings were then calculated between the

alternatives in the form of annual cost savings and increased one-time costs which could then be used to estimate return time periods before cost savings would be realized.

A complete description of the alternative cost summary is located in Appendix 2 which includes the inputs costs and assumptions used in the calculations. Table D below summarizes the annual personnel and operating costs associated with the three alternatives

Table D

Alternative	Number of Employees	Personnel Estimate Annual	Operating Estimate Annual	Total P&O Estimate Annual	Calculated FTEs	Cost/FTE
5 Centers	46	\$2,235,000	\$616,013	\$2,941,013	29.05	\$101,240
4 Centers	43	\$2,122,000	\$642,754	\$2,764,754	27.00	\$102,398
3 Centers	41	\$1,933,300	\$492,754	\$2,426,054	25.40	\$95,514

Facility upgrade costs were calculated for each alternative based on the needs to support the organizational changes identified. Each alternative recommends some type of facility change. In the case of the five center alternative there is a recommendation to seek a new facility to replace the current facility housing the RIFC. This facility is at the end of its lease period and there has been numerous issues associated with the building and with the landlord. To support the four center alternative, a new facility would need to be secured to house the combined UBIFC and MIFC in a new location such as Price, UT; in addition a replacement facility for the RIFC would also be needed. The three center alternative requires a facility to house UBIFC, MIFC and RIFC in Richfield. This facility would need to be of a similar size and configuration to the NUIFC or CCIFC.

Cost evaluations were conducted within each type of facility acquisition method, meaning purchase alternative evaluations are only compared to purchase alternatives and likewise, lease alternatives are only compared to lease alternatives. In both cases costs are identified as either an annual cost or a onetime cost which can then be compared to each other both in terms of potential cost savings over time minus the onetime costs required in the first year.

Table E represent the alternative costs associated with purchasing facilities while table F represents the costs associated with leasing facilities

Table E, Purchase Facilities Method

Alternative	Personnel Estimate Annual	Operating Estimate Annual	Total P&O Estimate Annual Costs	Facility Investments One Time	Move-in Costs One Time	TOS Estimate One Time	Total One Time Cost
5 Centers	\$2,325,000	\$616,013	\$2,941,013	\$1,200,000	\$75,000	\$0	\$1,275,000
4 Centers	\$2,122,000	\$642,754	\$2,764,754	\$3,600,000	\$175,000	\$250,000	\$4,025,000
3 Centers	\$1,933,300	\$492,754	\$2,426,054	\$2,500,000	\$150,000	\$250,000	\$2,900,000

Table F, Lease Facilities Method

Alternative	Personnel Estimate Annual	Operating Estimate Annual	Facility Lease Costs Annual	Total P&O&L Estimate Annual Costs	Move-in Costs One Time	TOS Estimate One Time	Total One Time Cost
5 Centers	\$2,325,000	\$616,013	\$90,000	\$3,031,013	\$75,000	\$0	\$75,000
4 Centers	\$2,122,000	\$642,754	\$240,000	\$3,004,754	\$175,000	\$250,000	\$425,000
3 Centers	\$1,933,300	\$492,754	\$240,000	\$2,666,054	\$150,000	\$250,000	\$400,000

The four and three center alternatives each have a cost savings associated with personnel salaries and operating costs (the result of fewer positions and fewer facilities to maintain). However, each of those alternatives also has a higher facility investment requirement and associated onetime cost of establishing the facility which would offset the savings accrued for a period of time. Over time each of these alternatives would eventually balance out at which point the cost savings in salaries and operating costs would theoretically result in reduced overall costs of the dispatching program statewide; utilizing the five center alternative as a baseline. The tables below compared the annual cost savings in salaries and operating costs along with the facilities investments either as an annual cost or a onetime cost. Annuity calculations indicate the theoretical point at which the onetime costs would be paid off and savings generated from the alternative would be realized. The term “theoretical” is used because the government generally doesn’t borrow money for one-time costs but is forced to pay them upfront which would create a larger drain on the first year’s budget, however this analysis does proved a context of the financial impacts to aid in decision making. For the purposes of this evaluation an assumed 2% annual interest rate was used.

An annuity formula was used to produce the following figures, please refer to: <http://www.financeformulas.net/Number-of-Periods-of-Annuity-from-Present-Value.html> for the formula.

Tables G and H displays the cost difference for annual costs and onetime costs between the five center alternative, four and three center alternatives for both the purchase facility method and the lease facility method.

Table G, Purchase Facility method

Alternative	Estimated Annual Cost Savings, Compared to 5 Center Alternative	Total one time cost difference above 5 Center Alternative	Years to break even
4 Centers	\$176,259	\$2,750,000	19 years
3 Centers	\$514,959	\$1,625,000	4 years

Table H, Lease Facility Method

Alternative	Estimated Annual Cost Savings, Compared to 5 Center Alternative	Total one time cost difference above 5 Center Alternative	Years to break even
4 Centers	\$26,259	\$350,000	16 years
3 Centers	\$364,959	\$325,000	1 years

## Recommendation

After careful consideration and review of workload, financial and staffing information the UIDRC recommends the three dispatch center alternative to the Utah Fire Oversight Committee. This alternative would create a combined center to cover the current centers of Uintah Basin, Moab and Richfield dispatch areas; leaving Color Country and Northern Utah Dispatch Centers as is. The dispatch center could be located in a central location such as Richfield and built in conjunction with other government owned facilities in order to save facility improvement costs.

The benefits that we consider significant enough to favor this alternate include

- Balance the workload of the dispatching function equally across the state into three larger organizations and facilities. This would provide greater organizational depth at each dispatch center making it easier for cover rotating schedules, days off and off unit assignments.
- In the long run the three dispatch center alternative is the most cost efficient to maintain and operate. Personal costs and facility operations costs are reduced by the need for fewer supervisory positions and occupying fewer facilities. It would also be easier to maintain state of the art dispatching equipment and facilities.

- Continuing of operations and interoperability between centers would be enhanced through the utilization of three equally sized organizations and equipped dispatch centers. It would be simpler and easier to focus interoperability process on a fewer number of centers while providing for a more robust process of moving capability between facilities.

Each of the alternatives considered are viable and would meet the dispatching needs across the state. The current organization, which is essentially the five center alternative is currently operating well and meeting the dispatch needs across the state and would certainly be the easiest to implement or in this case maintain. The UIDRC suggests that this alternative be evaluated alongside the Three Center Alternative as the most practical for implementation. The four center alternative would take effort to implement both in terms of moving personnel and securing facilities but the UIDRC felt this effort would not be worth the benefit gained. Implementing either of these alternatives would maintain imbalances across the state which would make it more difficult to achieve certain state wide objectives such as interoperability, standardization, recruitment, and retention of dispatchers.

### **Implementation Recommendation**

If an alternative other than the five center alternative is selected by the Utah Oversight Committee, it is recommended that a dedicated project manager be assigned for the implementation phase of the consolidation. The Implementation Team should be comprised of local stakeholders to include center managers, dispatchers, fire management officers, and agency executives. It is important to involve the correct mix of personnel, including management level personnel with decision-making experience and objectivity. The Implementation team should also involve personnel that have been a part of other consolidations for their expertise and lessons learned. Other critical positions that need to be involved early in the process to ensure that all things are considered:

- Agency Building/GSA for lease/building, etc.
- Agency IT.
- Agency Radio/Registered communication distribution Designer (RCDD) – ensure that communication portals are adequate and properly placed to meet the needs of radio communications for the Interagency Dispatch Center.
- USFS Facilities team planner or other agency equivalent – ensures that wiring for phones, data ports, electrical outlets are adequate and properly placed to meet the needs of an Interagency Dispatch Center.

Utilization of the Interagency Dispatch Optimization Pilot Project (IDOPP) National Tool Box as well as the IDOPP Lessons Learned is highly recommended to assist with the implementation process and to help avoid any major problems. [https://www.fs.fed.us/fire/management/assessments/idopp\\_national\\_toolbox.pdf](https://www.fs.fed.us/fire/management/assessments/idopp_national_toolbox.pdf).

### **Considerations**

UIDRC did not look at the interactions between dispatch and other fire functions such as fire cache facilities, local MAC groups, local Type 3 IMT, etc. We considered these items to be separate from the dispatch function and can occur either adjacent to or a distance from the associated dispatch center and should operate independently of the dispatch function.

As part of our recommendation, three center alternative, consider the option of a second assistant center manager at each of the three remaining centers to add more depth at the leadership level.

Combining two centers would mean relocation and disruption to personnel; however personnel that would not be able to retain employment due to staffing limitations could have the option to relocate to any openings at one of the other three centers in the state that have recruitment and retention problems.

UDNR needs to have a stronger presence in the dispatch centers; through personnel or additional oversight. The purpose of this would be to help the dispatch centers work through the UDNR statewide fire management program.

NPS/FWS/BIA should contribute more financially due to the different tasks the dispatch centers take on for those agencies, this includes but isn't limited to IQCS, fire reports, ROSS Orders, and dispatch participation in search and rescues for NPS.

Work with center managers to determine if a Relief Factor as described in the FireOrg section should be applied to the staffing levels.

Local FMO's and center managers need to work with radio personnel to create interoperability between dispatch centers for continuation of operations. During our review we found that there is great support for building such a plan and the current radio system has the capabilities to shift radio workload from one center to another.

If MIFC does absorb into another center, suggest that the old dispatch could be used for helitack instead of building new quarters.

The UIDRC did not review non-dispatch functions currently being performed by most of the dispatch centers, nor did the committee consider those tasks as part of the workload in the recommendation. It is our opinion that these non-dispatch function duties should be paid for separately by the agencies utilizing the services. These services include but are not limited to; IQCS, fire reports, RAWS stations, and other duties that some of the centers are taking responsibility for. Keep in mind that in the near future programs like IQCS, firestat, and other programs will no longer be something that has to be entered as IRWIN will simulate that data. MIFC and UBIFC dispatchers are responsible for those functions and their workload will not be as significant. With a lightened workload, the two centers can easily combine without carrying over a huge workload and unrelated dispatch tasks.

In reviewing the plans for the proposed dispatch add on to the state building in Richfield, it appears that while the space is perhaps adequate it would not meet the needs of an interagency dispatch center. If it is decided to utilize this space, it is suggested that the center manager, radio and IT personnel be involved in modifications to the plan.

- Bathrooms need to be adjacent to the IA floor.
- Expanded dispatch is not in close proximity and is currently slated for the conference room, which could create conflicts with the use of it during fire season for two to three months.
- Ensure there are enough ports for IT/radios/phones.

### **Human Capital**

During the inquiry portion of this review UIDRC interviewed members of each interagency dispatch center as well as members representing each of the partner agencies at the local, state, and regional levels. Without exception, each individual interviewed voiced concerns over potential adverse effects a consolidation would have on employees. Though these are certainly valid concerns, it is felt by the review team that these considerations are not appropriate evaluation criteria to be used in determination of a recommendation. The difficulties in quantifying a positive or negative effect of a changed work condition on an employee are beyond the capability of the UIDRC.

As part of the recommendation, UIDRC suggests that considerations be given to coordinate between management and affected employees and their official representation. Through these negotiations an appropriate implementation plan can be developed. UIDRC recommends that the implementation team not be tasked with employee negotiations since there are agency specific requirements and the process deals with

sensitive personnel information.

**Utah Interagency Dispatch Center Review Committee Member's,**

Gary Brown, Fire Specialist (Team Lead), USFS R4

Cathy Hutton, Center Manager, BLM Wyoming

Holly Arnzen, Assistant Center Manager, State of Idaho

**Appendix**

Appendix 1 Current Dispatching Organizations

Appendix 2 Alternative Organization Cost Analysis

DRAFT

# Appendix #1

## Current Dispatching Organization

Fire and land management operations within the State of Utah are supported by five interagency dispatch centers scattered across the state. Located in Draper, Vernal, Moab, Richfield, and Cedar City these five centers provide core initial response dispatch coordination and serve as the critical link between the initial response forces, agency duty officers, and line officers.

Statewide, there are 46 employees staffing these centers during the summer fire season. Each of these centers also provides support for extended attack, large fires and incident management teams. Additional dispatch personnel are brought in from neighboring centers or out of state to augment each center’s staffing during these periods of increased fire activity.

The employees are sponsored by five land management organizations. The Bureau of Land Management (AZ & UT) hosts 20 positions (41%), the US Forest Service hosts 19 positions (41%), The Utah Department of Natural Resources, Utah Division of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands (FFSL) hosts five positions (11%), and the National Park Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs each host one positions (2%). Approximately 2/3rds of these positions are permanent employees; leadership positions are permanent full time and the majority of the leads and dispatchers are career seasonals.

This information and the statistics generated were taken from the organizational charts and financial plans generated for each center for the summer of 2016 (FY 2016 budget planning documents) and represent a snapshot (Nov 2016) of the organizations and staffing levels. One interesting note is the statewide vacancy rate; through our interviews we learned that filling dispatch positions can be extremely difficult, an observation not supported by the current level of positions filled. However, organizations can be quite dynamic from year to year and a single vacancy can be burdensome to an organization; be cautious of drawing conclusions from a single year’s worth of data.

## Organizational Characteristic Summary

Table 1A summarizes the current organization’s characteristics of the dispatch centers across the state of Utah.

Table 1A

Unit	# of Disprs	% of Total	# of 9 & 11	# of 5 & 7	Leadership Ratio	# of Perms	# of Temps	# of Vacancies	Vacancy Rate	Calculated FTEs
NUIFC	13	28%	3	10	1:3.33	10	3	3	23%	8.40
UBIFC	5	11%	2	3	1:1.5	3	2	0	0%	3.35
MIFC	7	15%	2	4	1:2.0	4	3	0	0%	4.15
RIFC	7	15%	2	5	1:2.5	4	3	1	14%	4.15
CCIFC	14	31%	2	12	1:6.0	9	5	2	14%	9.00
Totals	46	100%	11	35	1:3.18	30	16	6	13%	29.05

Total Positions: 46, Total FTEs: 29.05

Leadership ratio (9 and 11 compared to 5 and 7): 11 positions to 35 positions (1:3.18)

Agency Mix: 20 BLM (41%), 19 USFS (41%), 5 FFSL (11%), 1 NPS (2%), 1 BIA (2%)

Perm to temp: 30 Permanent positions, 16 temporary positions

Vacancy level: 6 vacant positions for 13% vacancy rate of dispatch position state wide

## Dispatch Cost (FY2016 Planned Expenditures)

Dispatch operating costs were taken from the financial plans generated for FY 2016 budget planning documents. As part of the annual operating plans, each dispatch center generates an annual financial plan that estimates the budget needed for the year and the financial split between agencies for that year. These numbers represent planned costs for FY 2016 and do not represent the actual expenditures that occurred.

Table 1B outlines the FY 2016 planned costs associated with operating the five dispatch centers in the State of Utah and how the costs were split between the fire management agencies in the state. These numbers were taken from each dispatch center's operating plan, financial section.

Table 1B

	AZ BLM	UT BLM	UDNR	USFS	FWS	NPS	BIA	Total
NUIFC	n/a	\$357,712	\$116,575	\$382,663	\$3,500	\$0	n/a	\$860,450
UBIFC	n/a	\$130,274	\$28,911	\$157,505	\$1,200	\$2,000	\$10,000	\$329,890
MIFC	n/a	\$178,303	\$21,394	\$150,456	n/a	\$4,000	n/a	\$354,153
RIFC	n/a	\$159,872	\$58,109	\$164,007	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$381,378
CCIFC	\$83,341	\$212,700	\$57,529	\$221,293	n/a	\$0	\$2,500	\$577,363
Total	\$83,341	\$1,038,861	\$282,518	\$1,075,924	\$4,700	\$6,000	\$12,500	\$2,503,234
Percent	3.33%	41.50%	11.29%	42.98%	.19%	.24%	.5%	

Table 1C represents the FY 2016 percentages of planned cost distributed to each agency for each of the dispatch centers across the state.

Table 1C

	AZ BLM	UT BLM	UDNR	USFS	FWS	NPS	BIA
NUIFC	n/a	40.05%	13.80%	45.76%	.39%	0%	n/a
UBIFC	n/a	39.49%	8.76%	47.74%	.36%	.61%	3.03%
MIFC	n/a	50.35%	6.04%	42.48%	n/a	1.13%	n/a
RIFC	n/a	41.85%	15.21%	43.72%	0%	0%	0%
CCIFC	14.43%	36.84%	9.96%	38.33%	n/a	0%	.43%

Table 1D displays the workload percentage estimated by three of the five dispatch centers for FY 2016 based on past fire analysis efforts performed at each dispatch center (UBIFC and MIFC did not make these calculations locally). These locally generated numbers represent what each center considers a fair and equitable split based on their local workload. These numbers were taken from the operating plan, financial section.

Table 1D

	AZ BLM	UT BLM	UDNR	USFS	FWS	NPS	BIA
NUIFC	n/a	25.9%	34.0%	33.1%	5.0%	2.0%	n/a
UBIFC							
MIFC							
RIFC	n/a	28.5%	29.3%	37.2%	2.5%	1.5%	1.0%
CCIFC	18.5%	26.9%	15.7%	20.9%	n/a	11.9%	6.9%

Table 1E displays the total personnel and operating planned costs for each dispatch centers along with the percentage split across the state. The total of \$2,503,234 represents the total planned costs for dispatch operations across the state for FY 2016.

Table 1E

Center	Planned Personnel Cost	% of Personnel Total	Operations Planned Cost	% of Operating Cost Total	Total	% of Total Planned Cost
NUIFC	\$628,525	32%	\$231,925	42%	\$860,450	35%
UBIFC	\$285,724	15%	\$44,166	8%	\$329,890	13%
MIFC	\$275,060	14%	\$79,093	14%	\$354,153	14%
RIFC	\$294,831	15%	\$86,547	16%	\$381,378	15%
CCIFC	\$466,534	24%	\$110,829	20%	\$577,363	23%
State Total	\$1,950,674	100%	\$552,560	100%	\$2,503,234	100%

Cost per dispatch employee is calculated based on the number of employees at each center, divided by the cost of that center; this is summarized to display statewide averages. Table 1F represents the average cost per dispatch employee and per FTE currently operating in the state.

Table 1F

Center	# of Dispatchers	Cost of Center	Cost per Dispatcher	Calculated FTEs	Cost per Calculated FTE
NUIFC	13	\$860,450	\$66,188	8.40	\$102,434.52
UBIFC	5	\$329,890	\$65,978	3.35	\$98,474.63
MIFC	7	\$354,153	\$50,593	4.15	\$85,338.07
RIFC	7	\$381,378	\$54,483	4.15	\$91,898.31
CCIFC	14	\$577,363	\$41,240	9.00	\$64,151.44
State Total	46	\$2,503,234	\$54,418	29.05	\$86,169.85

## Dispatch Current Organization and Cost Allocation Comparison to FireOrg

### Current Organizations vs FireOrg Organization

The current fire organization is comprised of 46 employees for a calculated total of 29.05 full-time equivalents (FTEs). FTE is a unit that indicates the workload of an employed person in a way that makes workloads comparable across various contexts. FTE is often used to measure a worker's involvement in a project, or to track cost reductions in an organization.

The statewide FireOrg calculations recommended a total of 26.16 FTEs to manage the dispatching needs across the state. The difference between the current statewide organization and the model recommendation is 2.89 FTE's, a relatively small difference which would indicate that the model is fairly accurate in estimating organizational needs. Table 1G illustrates the current dispatch organizations represented by their FTE levels compared to the projected FTE levels for each dispatch center as calculated through FireOrg, and the number of fires identified in FireOrg for each dispatch center.

Table 1G

Center	Current FTEs	FireOrg FTE Estimate	FireOrg Fires
NUIFC	8.40	8.27	404
UBIFC	3.35	2.34	151
MIFC	4.15	3.87	206
RIFC	4.15	4.26	180
CCIFC	9.00	7.42	418
State Total	29.05	26.16	1359

FireOrg FTE estimates were also calculated by agency for each of the dispatch centers. These numbers when aggregated across the state help to paint a picture of what the total work load splits for personal (and ultimately funding) should be across the state. The percentage of FTE split for each agency is one indication of the funding level that the model suggests for each agency. Table 1H depicts the FTE estimates for each center along with the total FTEs per agency and percentage for each agency.

Table 1H

Center	AZ BLM	UT BLM	UDNR	USFS	FWS	NPS	BIA	Total
NUIFC	0	1.95	2.35	2.60	.69	.68	0	8.27
UBIFC	0	.41	.43	.46	.32	.32	.40	2.34
MIFC	0	.91	.86	1.08	0	.53	.49	3.87
RIFC	0	.80	.95	1.12	.47	.46	.46	4.26
CCIFC	1.29	1.71	1.21	1.67	0	.88	.66	7.42
Total	1.29	5.78	5.80	6.93	1.48	2.87	2.01	26.16
% of FireOrg FTEs by agency	4.93%	22.09%	22.17%	26.49%	5.66%	10.97%	7.68%	

Number of fires are an additional measure of the level of effort put forth by a dispatch center and can also be attributed to an individual agency and then utilized to estimate funding contributions for dispatch operations. Table 1I summarizes the total fires identified in the statewide FireOrg runs split by agency and the associated percentage of the total fires. These fires are essential part of the inputs used in making the FireOrg runs.

Table 1I

	AZ BLM	UT BLM	UDNR	USFS	FWS	NPS	BIA	Total
FireOrg Fires by Agency	86	392	559	254	1	27	41	1,360*
FireOrg % split of fires by agency	6.32%	28.80%	41.10%	18.68%	.07%	1.99%	3.01%	

\*Between the various FireOrg runs comparing agencies and dispatch centers there is a consistent 1 fire difference that we cannot seem to track down.

Utilizing the outputs from both the FTE distribution and the historical fire occurrence, a range of suggested financial distributions can be estimated. This may be a good starting point for statewide discussion on who pays for the dispatch services. Table 1J summarizes by agency the FTE percent and fire percent and compares that to the FY2016 planned contributions.

Table 1J

	AZ BLM	UT BLM	UDNR	USFS	FWS	NPS	BIA
FY 2016 % of Planned Costs	3.33% \$83,341	41.50% \$1,038,861	11.29% \$282,518	42.98% \$1,075,924	.19% \$4,700	.24% \$6,000	.5% \$12,500
% of FireOrg workload by agency	4.93% \$123,000	22.09% \$553,000	22.17% \$555,000	26.49% \$663,000	5.66% \$142,000	10.97% \$275,000	7.68% \$192,000
FireOrg % split of fires by agency	6.32% \$158,000	28.82% \$721,000	41.10% \$1,029,000	18.68% \$468,000	.07% \$2,000	1.99% \$50,000	3.01% \$75,000
Under or Over funding	Under funding	Over funding	Under funding	Over funding	Funding within the range	Under funding	Under funding

## 2016 Dispatch Center Organizations

### Northern Utah Interagency Fire Center

Position	Grade	Agency	Tour	Currently filled	Calculated FTEs
Center Manager	GS-11	BLM	PFT	yes	1
Asst. Center Manager	GS-9	BLM	PFT	yes	1
Asst. Center Manager	GS-9	USFS	PFT	no	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	BLM	CS	yes	.75
Dispatcher	GS-7	USFS	18/8	yes	.75
Dispatcher	GS-7	USFS	18/8	yes	.75
Dispatcher		FFSL	18/8	yes	.75
Dispatcher	GS-6	BLM	CS	yes	.50
Dispatcher	GS-6	USFS	13/13	yes	.50
Dispatcher	GS-6	USFS	13/13	yes	.50
Dispatcher		FFSL	temp	no	.30
Dispatcher		BLM	temp	yes	.30
Dispatcher		BLM	temp	no	.30

#### Organizational Characteristic Overview

Total Positions: 13, Total Calculated FTEs: 8.40.

Leadership ratio (GS-9 and GS-11 compared to GS-5 through GS-7): 3 positions to 10 positions (1:3.33).

Agency Mix: 6 BLM, 5 USFS, 2 FFSL.

Perm to temp: 10 Permanent positions, 3 temporary positions.

Vacancy Rate: 3 vacant positions for 23% vacancy rate for the organization.

### Uintah Basin Interagency Fire Center

Position	Grade	Agency	Tour	Currently filled	Calculated FTEs
Center Manager	GS-11	BLM	PFT	Yes	1
Asst. Center Manager	GS-9	USFS	PFT	Yes	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	USFS	18/8	Yes	.75
Dispatcher		BLM	Temp	Yes	.30
Dispatcher		USFS	Temp	Yes	.30

#### Organizational Characteristic Overview

Total Positions: 5, Total Calculated FTEs: 3.35

Leadership ratio (GS-9 and GS-11 compared to GS-5 through GS-7): 2 positions to 3 positions (1:1.5)

Agency Mix: 2 BLM, 3 USFS, (one USFS temp position was funded by FFSL)

Perm to temp: 3 Permanent positions, 2 temporary positions

Vacancy Rate: 0 vacant positions for 0% vacancy rate for the organization.

### Moab Interagency Fire Center

Position	Grade	Agency	Tour	Currently filled	Calculated FTEs
Center Manager	GS-11	BLM	PFT	Yes	1
Asst. Center Manager	GS-9	USFS	PFT	Yes	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	USFS	18/8	Yes	.75
Dispatcher	GS-7	BLM	13/13	Yes	.50
Dispatcher	GS-5	USFS	temp	Yes	.30
Dispatcher		FFSL	temp	Yes	.30
Administrative Supp		BLM	temp	Yes	.30

#### Organizational Characteristic Overview

Total Positions: 7, Total Calculated FTEs: 4.15

Leadership ratio (GS-9 and GS-11 compared to GS-5 through GS-7): 2 positions to 4 positions (1:2.0)

Agency Mix: 3 BLM, 3 USFS, 1 FFSL

Perm to temp: 4 Permanent positons, 3 temporary positions

Vacancy Rate: 0 vacant positions for 0% vacancy rate for the organization

### Richfield Interagency Fire Center

Position	Grade	Agency	Tour	Currently filled	Calculated FTEs
Center Manager	GS-11	USFS	PFT	Yes	1
Asst. Center Manager	GS-9	USFS	PFT	Yes	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	USFS	18/8	Yes	.75
Dispatcher	GS-6	BLM	13/13	No	.50
Dispatcher	GS-6	BLM	temp	Yes	.30
Dispatcher	GS-4	USFS	temp	Yes	.30
Dispatcher		FFSL	temp	Yes	.30

#### Organizational Characteristic Overview

Total Positions: 7, Total Calculated FTEs: 4.15

Leadership ratio (GS-9 and GS-11 compared to GS-4 through GS-7): 2 positions to 5 positions (1:2.5)

Agency Mix: 2 BLM, 4 USFS, 1 FFSL

Perm to temp: 4 Permanent positons, 3 temporary positions

Vacancy Rate: 1 vacant position for 14% vacancy rate for the organization

### Color Country Interagency Fire Center

Position	Grade	Agency	Tour	Currently filled	FTEs
Center Manager	GS-11	BLM	PFT	Yes	1
Asst. Center Manager	GS-9	BLM	PFT	Yes	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	BLM	PFT	Yes	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	BLM	PFT	No	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	USFS	PFT	Yes	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	USFS	PFT	Yes	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	NPS	13/13	No	.50
Dispatcher	GS-5	USFS	13/13	Yes	.50
Dispatcher	GS-5	USFS	13/13	Yes	.50
Dispatcher	GS-5	BIA	temp	Yes	.30
Dispatcher	GS-5	BLM	temp	Yes	.30
Dispatcher	GS-5	BLM	temp	Yes	.30
Dispatcher	GS-5	BLM	temp	Yes	.30
Dispatcher		FFSL	temp	Yes	.30

### Organizational Characteristic Overview

Total Positions: 14, Total FTEs: 9.00

Leadership ratio (GS-9 and GS-11 compared to GS-5 through GS-7): 2 positions to 12 positions (1:6.0)

Agency Mix: 7 BLM, 4 USFS, 1 FFSL, 1 NPS, 1, BIA

Perm to temp: 9 Permanent positions, 5 temporary positions

Vacancy Rate: 2 vacant positions for 14% vacancy rate for the organization

## Appendix #2

### Summary of Organization Characteristics Overview

The five center alternative maintains the current organization at each of the five centers; no change to organizational characteristics, relationships, or the FTE total of 29.50. The four center alternative reduces the number of positions across the state to 43 and the FTEs to 27.00. The three center alternative reduces the number of positions statewide to 41 and the FTEs to 25.40. The main difference between alternatives is the reduction of two positions between each successive alternative. In addition, one temporary receptionist position is dropped between the five center and four center alternatives.

Table 2A outlines organizational overview for each of the three alternatives. This information is the size of dispatch organizations across the state, number of leadership positions (GS-9 and 11), and dispatcher positions (GS-5 thru 7), leadership ratio, number of permanent and temporary positions and total FTEs per alternative.

Table 2A

Unit	# of Dispatchers	# of 9 & 11	# of 5 thru 7	Leadership Ratio	# of Perms	# of Temps	Calculated FTEs
Five Center Alt	46	11	35	1:3.18	30	16	29.05
Four Center Alt	43	9	34	1:3.78	28	15	27.00
Three Center Alt	41	7	34	1:4.86	28	13	25.40

### Alternative Organizations vs FireOrg Organizations

The current fire organization (five center alternative) is comprised of 46 employees for a total of 29.05 full-time equivalents (FTEs). FTE is a unit that indicates the workload of an employed person (or student) in a way that makes workloads comparable across various contexts. FTE is often used to measure a worker's involvement in a project, or to track cost reductions in an organization.

The statewide FireOrg calculations indicate a total of 26.16 FTEs is recommended to manage the dispatching needs across the state. The difference between the current organization and the model recommended organization is 2.89 FTEs, a relatively small difference which would indicate that the model is fairly accurate in estimating organizational needs. Table 2B illustrates the current dispatch organizations represented by their calculated FTE levels compared to the projected FTE levels for each dispatch center as estimated through FireOrg.

FireOrg runs were made to analyze the combinations of centers described in each of the alternatives. The four center alternative produced an estimated 27.00 FTEs while the FireOrg run calculated a needed organization of 25.55 FTEs. The three center alternative estimated an organization of 25.40 FTEs while the FireOrg calculated a needed organization of 24.11 FTEs.

Table 2B displays the number of employees in each alternative and the calculated number of FTEs

Table 2B

Alternative	Number of Employees	Calculated FTEs	Cost/FTE	FireOrg FTE Estimate	FireOrg Fires
5 Centers	46	29.05	\$101,240	26.16	1359
4 Centers	43	27.00	\$102,398	25.55	1359
3 Centers	41	25.40	\$95,514	24.11	1359

## Alternative Organization Cost Analysis

An economic analysis was conducted to evaluate the cost implications of the three alternative dispatch organizations. Cost estimates include estimated wages, operating costs, and facility upgrades as needed to support a particular alternative.

### Personnel Cost Estimates

In order to create a personnel cost estimate that could be used equally across all three alternatives a standard set of personnel costs were utilized based on the grade levels and tours of employees across the dispatch community in Utah. Personnel cost estimates were created to represent an “average” employee, in the mid-step levels and with an average set of benefit costs. This allows costs to be compared equally between alternatives since individual life situations are eliminated from the calculations. The best use of these costs is for general comparison between dispatch organization alternatives and for the general planning and agreement preparations.

Table 2C shows the cost estimates that were utilized for the alternative personnel cost estimates for this analysis.

Table 2C

Grade Level	Cost/Day	PFT Tour*	18/8 Tour*	13/13 Tour*	Temporary*
GS-11	\$400	\$104,000			
GS-9	\$350	\$91,000			
GS-7	\$280	\$72,800	\$50,400	\$36,400	
GS-6	\$250			\$32,500	
GS-5	\$220			\$28,600	\$22,000

\*Estimate 260 days for PFT employees, 180 days for 18/8, 130 days for 13/13, 180 days for BLM CS tour, and 100 days for temporary tour at a GS-5 grade.

Of note, the 2016 planned cost is \$1,950,674, while the estimated cost for the five center alternative resulted in a difference of \$374,325 above the 2016 cost estimate. The over projection is mostly due to showing positions funded in the projection that were not funded in the FY2016 planned costs. This includes a few positions that are on organization charts that are currently not planned to be filled and funding that is contributed from agencies outside of the dispatch function (agencies pay dispatchers to perform non-dispatch work).

### Assumptions

- All positions are filled and based upon a standard dispatch center organization.
- Cedar City Center Manager was based at a GS-11 to stay consistent with standard dispatch center organizations.
- Only positions reduced were GS-11, GS-9, and a receptionist.

### Operating Costs Estimates

Operating cost estimates generally used the 2016 planned cost estimates for each center unless there was a recommended facility upgrade associated with the alternative. Operating cost for each center is included in the final summary for each alternative and in the final summary table comparing all three alternatives.

### Assumptions

- Actual costs were used for centers that had no facility change.

- Operating costs were estimated by utilizing the FY 2016 planned costs for centers. In the case of facilities that were replaced as part of the alternative, those costs were estimated based upon an average cost of existing centers

## Facility Cost Estimates

In addition to the annual personnel and operating costs there is also a facilities upgrade cost associated with each of the dispatch organization alternatives. Each alternative would require some kind of facility improvement investment. There are two approaches to securing facilities, purchase or construction of a government owned building or leasing a private building. In the case of building a government owned facility these would be considered a one-time cost vs the cost of an annual lease. For the purposes of this alternative evaluation both methods will be calculated to provide the widest range of options for consideration.

The five center alternative recommends the construction or leasing of a new dispatch facility in Richfield. At the current time there is a proposal to construct an addition to a state owned building currently under construction, this would be the only facility investment needed for the five center alternative. In addition to comparing the purchase cost or a lease cost, the analysis also includes the situation where no facility changes are made, this would truly provide a no action alternative to compare facility costs.

The four center alternative would require the construction of one new dispatch facility and a proposed addition to an existing facility. The new facility would house the combined Uintah Basin and Moab centers; and the cost of an addition to an ongoing state government facility in Richfield to house the Richfield center.

The three center alternative would require the construction of one new facility that would house the Uintah Basin, Moab and Richfield dispatch centers. This center would be of a similar size and configuration to the Northern Utah center and would be located in Richfield and attached to the UDNR building that is currently under construction.

Move in costs were also estimate for each alternative. These costs are considered to be the same for both a leased facility and a constructed facility based on conversation with the Intermountain Regional office in Ogden. Move in costs include the new items that are purchased for new facilities out of projects dollars such as equipment needed for the new office configuration, appliances and in the case of dispatchers new radio/computer consoles.

Table 2D lists identifies the facility needs for each alternative along with the estimated purchase costs, lease costs and moving costs. In cases where they was different cost estimates from different agencies both costs are listed and the most expensive costs were utilized in the analysis.

Table 2D

Alternative	Facility Upgrades Associated With Alt	Facility Purchase Cost (one time)	Lease a Private Facility (Annual)	Move in Cost, Either Option (one time)
Five Center	RIFC new facility to support current operation	\$1,200,000 (UDNR)	\$90,000 Per Year (USFS)	\$75,000 (USFS)
Four Center	RIFC new facility to support current operation	\$1,200,000 (UDNR)	\$90,000 Per Year (USFS)	\$75,000 (USFS)
	Facility to house UBIFC and MIFC, in Price	\$2,400,000 (USFS)	\$150,000 Per Year (USFS)	\$100,000 (USFS)

	Alt Total	\$3,600,000	\$240,000	\$175,000
Three Center	Facility to house UBIFC, MIFC and RIFC, in Richfield	\$2,500,000 (UDNR)	\$240,000 (USFS)	\$150,000 (USFS)

**Assumptions**

- Used historical building costs to estimate new construction.
- Used a cost estimate from the State of Utah for the Richfield addition.
- New lease facilities is part of the Five Center Alternative due to issues with the current facility and the fact that the lease has expired.

**Transfer of Station (TOS) Cost Estimates**

Due to the nature of the dispatch function a prolonged implementation period for organizational changes may not be practical or feasible, which may necessitate the movement of current employees to different duty stations. These costs were captured in each of the alternatives, if personnel were required to relocate. An average TOS cost of \$50,000 was used for each employee for those centers to be relocated.

There is no TOS cost associated with the five center alternative since no personnel are moved as part of the alternative. The four center alternative results in an estimated TOS cost of \$250,000. For this alternative all personnel were assigned a TOS cost since neither of the two existing facilities are large enough to absorb the other; in all likelihood the combined center would be moved to a more central location.

The three center alternative also results in a TOS estimate of \$250,000. For this alternative one new facility was either purchased or leased in the location of one of the existing center locations. Personnel from two centers were relocated to the new facility that would be large enough to house all three centers. Table 2E displays the TOS costs used in the analysis

Table 2E

Alternative	Number of Employees	Estimated TOS Cost
Five Center Alternative	0	\$0
Four Center Alternative	5	\$250,000
Three Center Alternative	5	\$250,000

**Assumptions**

- The TOS presented is based on an average cost for each personnel relocation.
- Calculation was based on moving the maximum number of personnel to capture the highest cost.
- Under the three center and four center alternatives, it is assumed the dispatch center will be moved to a new location.

## Alternative Cost Comparisons

Four cost comparisons were calculated to provide a range of methods to evaluate the costs associated with either purchasing or leasing new facilities associated with each alternative. In all cases the four and three center alternatives are compared against the five center alternative for either purchasing all facilities or leasing all facilities. Facilities costs are summarized as either annual costs for leases or one-time costs for purchases.

### Purchase of New Facility

Table 2F summarizes the total expenditures associated with purchasing new facilities for each of the three alternatives. Annual costs and one-time costs are calculated for each alternative and totaled.

Table 2F

Alternative	Personnel Estimate Annual	Operating Estimate Annual	Total P&O Estimate Annual Costs	Facility Investments One Time	Move-in Costs One Time	TOS Estimate One Time	Total One Time Cost
5 Centers	\$2,325,000	\$616,013	\$2,941,013	\$1,200,000	\$75,000	\$0	\$1,275,000
4 Centers	\$2,122,000	\$642,754	\$2,764,754	\$3,600,000	\$175,000	\$250,000	\$4,025,000
3 Centers	\$1,933,300	\$492,754	\$2,426,054	\$2,500,000	\$150,000	\$250,000	\$2,900,000

The four and three center alternatives each have a cost savings associated with personnel salaries and operating costs (the result of fewer positions and fewer facilities to maintain). However, each of those alternatives also has a higher facility investment requirement and associated one-time costs which would offset the savings accrued for a period of time. Over time each of these alternatives would eventually balance out at which point the cost savings in salaries and operating costs would theoretically result in reduced overall cost of the dispatching program statewide. Utilizing the five center alternative as a baseline Table 2G compares the annual cost savings against the facilities investments one-time costs. Annuity calculations indicate that the four center alternative would take approximately 19 years to reach a balance point, while the three center alternative would take four years to reach this point, assuming a 2% annual interest rate. It is important to understand that this is only comparing the three alternative against each other because we are assuming that there is a need to replace the facility in Richfield.

An annuity formula was used to produce the above figures, please refer to:

<http://www.financeformulas.net/Number-of-Periods-of-Annuity-from-Present-Value.html> for the formula.

Table 2G

Alternative	Estimated Annual Cost Savings, Compared to 5 Center Alternative	Total one time cost difference above 5 Center Alternative	Years to break even
4 Centers	\$176,259	\$2,750,000	19 years
3 Centers	\$514,959	\$1,625,000	4 years

## Lease New Facilities

Table 2G evaluates the costs associated with each alternative should the facilities be leased from the private sector which move the cost of facilities to the annual section of the table.

Table 2G

Alternative	Personnel Estimate Annual	Operating Estimate Annual	Facility Lease Costs Annual	Total P&O&L Estimate Annual Costs	Move-in Costs One Time	TOS Estimate One Time	Total One Time Cost
5 Centers	\$2,325,000	\$616,013	\$90,000	\$3,031,013	\$75,000	\$0	\$75,000
4 Centers	\$2,122,000	\$642,754	\$240,000	\$3,004,754	\$175,000	\$250,000	\$425,000
3 Centers	\$1,933,300	\$492,754	\$240,000	\$2,666,054	\$150,000	\$250,000	\$400,000

The four and three center alternatives each have a cost savings associated with personnel salaries and operating costs (the result of fewer positions and fewer facilities to maintain). However, each of those alternatives also has a higher facility investment requirement and associated one-time costs which would offset the savings accrued for a period of time. Over time each of these alternatives would eventually balance out at which point the cost savings in salaries and operating costs would theoretically result in reduced overall cost of the dispatching program statewide. Utilizing the five center alternative as a baseline Table 2H compares the annual cost savings against the facilities investments one-time costs. Annuity calculations indicate that the four center alternative would take approximately 16 years to reach a balance point, while the three center alternative would take one year to reach this point, assuming a 2% annual interest rate. It is important to understand that this is only comparing the three alternative against each other because we are assuming that there is a need to replace the facility in Richfield.

An annuity formula was used to produce the above figures, please refer to:

<http://www.financeformulas.net/Number-of-Periods-of-Annuity-from-Present-Value.html> for the formula.

Table 2H

Alternative	Estimated Annual Cost Savings, Compared to 5 Center Alternative	Total one time cost difference above 5 Center Alternative	Years to break even
4 Centers	\$26,259	\$350,000	16 years
3 Centers	\$364,959	\$325,000	1 year

## No Facility Investment in RIFC; Purchase other Facilities

As a means of truly looking at a not action alternative, this part of the analysis considers the option of not adding a facility in Richfield for the current RIFC for either the Five Center Alternative or the Four Center Alternative, however it would consider the new facilities needed for the new combined centers in the Four Center Alternative and the Three Center Alternative. These costs assume facilities are purchased and added to the one-time cost section. Table 2I displays the associated costs

Table 2I

Alternative	Personnel Estimate Annual	Operating Estimate Annual	Total P&O Estimate Annual Costs	Facility Investments One Time	Move-in Costs One Time	TOS Estimate One Time	Total One Time Cost
5 Centers	\$2,325,000	\$616,013	\$2,941,013	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4 Centers	\$2,122,000	\$642,754	\$2,764,754	\$2,400,000	\$100,000	\$250,000	\$2,750,000
3 Centers	\$1,933,300	\$492,754	\$2,426,054	\$2,500,000	\$150,000	\$250,000	\$2,900,000

The four and three center alternatives each have a cost savings associated with personnel salaries and operating costs (the result of fewer positions and fewer facilities to maintain). However, each of those alternatives also has a higher facility investment requirement and associated one-time costs which would offset the savings accrued for a period of time. Over time each of these alternatives would eventually balance out at which point the cost savings in salaries and operating costs would theoretically result in reduced overall cost of the dispatching program statewide. Utilizing the five center alternative as a baseline Table 2J compares the annual cost savings against the facilities investments one-time costs. Annuity calculations indicate that the four center alternative would take approximately 19 years to reach a balance point, while the three center alternative would take six years to reach this point, assuming a 2% annual interest rate.

An annuity formula was used to produce the above figures, please refer to:

<http://www.financeformulas.net/Number-of-Periods-of-Annuity-from-Present-Value.html> for the formula.

Table 2J

Alternative	Estimated Annual Cost Savings, Compared to 5 Center Alternative	Total one time cost difference above 5 Center Alternative	Years to break even
4 Centers	\$176,259	\$2,750,000	19 years
3 Centers	\$514,959	\$2,900,000	6 years

## No Facility Investment in RIFC; Lease other Facilities

As a means of truly looking at a no action alternative, this part of the analysis considers the option of not adding a facility in Richfield for the current RIFC for either the Five Center Alternative or the Four Center Alternative, however it would consider the new facilities needed for the new combined centers in the Four Center Alternative and the Three Center Alternative. These costs assume facilities are leased and added to the annual cost section. Table 2K displays the associated costs

Table 2K

Alternative	Personnel Estimate Annual	Operating Estimate Annual	Facility Lease Costs Annual	Total P&O&L Estimate Annual Costs	Move-in Costs One Time	TOS Estimate One Time	Total One Time Cost
5 Centers	\$2,325,000	\$616,013	\$0	\$2,941,013	\$0	\$0	\$0
4 Centers	\$2,122,000	\$642,754	\$150,000	\$2,914,754	\$100,000	\$250,000	\$350,000
3 Centers	\$1,933,300	\$492,754	\$240,000	\$2,666,054	\$150,000	\$250,000	\$400,000

The four and three center alternatives each have a cost savings associated with personnel salaries and operating costs (the result of fewer positions and fewer facilities to maintain). However, each of those alternatives also has a higher facility investment requirement and associated one-time costs which would offset the savings accrued for a period of time. Over time each of these alternatives would eventually balance out at which point the cost savings in salaries and operating costs would theoretically result in reduced overall cost of the dispatching program statewide. Utilizing the five center alternative as a baseline Table 2L compares the annual cost savings against the facilities investments one-time costs. Annuity calculations indicate that the four center alternative would take approximately 16 years to reach a balance point, while the three center alternative would take two years to reach this point, assuming a 2% annual interest rate.

An annuity formula was used to produce the above figures, please refer to:

<http://www.financeformulas.net/Number-of-Periods-of-Annuity-from-Present-Value.html> for the formula.

Table 2L

Alternative	Estimated Annual Cost Savings, Compared to 5 Center Alternative	Total one time cost difference above 5 Center Alternative	Years to break even
4 Centers	\$26,259	\$350,000	16 years
3 Centers	\$274,959	\$400,000	2 years

## Five Center Alternative: Maintain Current Five Dispatch Centers

### Northern Utah Interagency Fire Center

Position	Grade	Agency	Tour	Cost Estimate*	Calculated FTEs
Center Manager	GS-11	Any	PFT	\$104,000	1
Asst. Center Manager	GS-9	Any	PFT	\$91,000	1
Asst. Center Manager	GS-9	Any	PFT	\$91,000	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	CS	\$50,400	.75
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	18/8	\$50,400	.75
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	18/8	\$50,400	.75
Dispatcher		Any	18/8	\$50,400	.75
Dispatcher	GS-6	Any	CS	\$32,500	.50
Dispatcher	GS-6	Any	13/13	\$32,500	.50
Dispatcher	GS-6	Any	13/13	\$32,500	.50
Dispatcher		Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher		Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher		Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
				Annual total estimate	FTE Total
				\$651,100	8.40

### NUIFC Organization Characteristics Overview

Total Positions: 13, Total Calculated FTEs: 8.40

Leadership ratio (GS-9 and GS-11 compared to GS-5 through GS-7): 3 positions to 10 positions (1:3.33)

Perm to temp: 10 Permanent positions, 3 temporary positions

### Uintah Basin Interagency Fire Center

Position	Grade	Agency	Tour	Cost Estimate*	Calculated FTEs
Center Manager	GS-11	Any	PFT	\$104,000	1
Asst. Center Manager	GS-9	Any	PFT	\$91,000	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	18/8	\$50,400	.75
Dispatcher		Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher		Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
				Annual total estimate	FTE Total
				\$289,400	3.35

### UBIFC Organization Characteristics Overview

Total Positions: 5, Total Calculated FTEs: 3.35

Leadership ratio (GS-9 and GS-11 compared to GS-5 through GS-7): 2 positions to 3 positions (1:1.5)

Perm to temp: 3 Permanent positions, 2 temporary positions

### Moab Interagency Fire Center

Position	Grade	Agency	Tour	Cost Estimate*	Calculated FTEs
Center Manager	GS-11	Any	PFT	\$104,000	1
Asst. Center Manager	GS-9	Any	PFT	\$91,000	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	18/8	\$50,400	.75
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	13/13	\$36,400	.50
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher		Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Administrative Supp		Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
				Annual total estimate	FTE Total
				\$347,800	4.15

### MIFC Organizational Characteristics Overview

Total Positions: 7, Total Calculated FTEs: 4.15

Leadership ratio (GS-9 and GS-11 compared to GS-5 through GS-7): 2 positions to 5 positions (1:2.5)

Perm to temp: 4 Permanent positons, 3 temporary positions

### Richfield Interagency Fire Center

Position	Grade	Agency	Tour	Cost Estimate*	Calculated FTEs
Center Manager	GS-11	Any	PFT	\$104,000	1
Asst. Center Manager	GS-9	Any	PFT	\$91,000	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	18/8	\$50,400	.75
Dispatcher	GS-6	Any	13/13	\$32,500	.50
Dispatcher	GS-6	Any	temp	\$25,000	.30
Dispatcher	GS-4	Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher		Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
				Annual total estimate	FTE Total
				\$346,900	4.15

### RIFC Organizational Characteristics Overview

Total Positions: 7, Total Calculated FTEs: 4.15

Leadership ratio (GS-9 and GS-11 compared to GS-5 through GS-7): 2 positions to 5 positions (1:2.5)

Perm to temp: 4 Permanent positons, 3 temporary positions

## Color Country Interagency Fire Center

Position	Grade	Agency	Tour	Cost Estimate*	Calculated FTEs
Center Manager	GS-11	Any	PFT	\$104,000	1
Asst. Center Manager	GS-9	Any	PFT	\$91,000	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	PFT	\$72,800	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	PFT	\$72,800	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	PFT	\$72,800	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	PFT	\$72,800	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	13/13	\$36,400	.50
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	13/13	\$28,600	.50
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	13/13	\$28,600	.50
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher		Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
				Annual total estimate	FTE Total
				\$689,800	9.00

## CCIFC Organizational Characteristics Overview

Total Positions: 14, Total Calculated FTEs: 9.00

Leadership ratio (GS-9 and GS-11 compared to GS-5 through GS-7): 2 positions to 12 positions (1:6.0)

Perm to temp: 9 Permanent positions, 5 temporary positions

## Five Center Alternative Summary

### Five Center Organization Characteristics Overview Summary

Unit	# of Disprs	% of Total	# of 9 & 11	# of 5 & 7	Leadership Ratio	# of Perms	# of Temps	Calculated FTEs
NUIFC	13	28%	3	10	1:3.33	10	3	8.40
UBIFC	5	11%	2	3	1:1.5	3	2	3.35
MIFC	7	15%	2	5	1:2.5	4	3	4.15
RIFC	7	15%	2	5	1:2.5	4	3	4.15
CCIFC	14	31%	2	12	1:6.0	9	5	9.00
Totals	46	100%	11	36	1:3.27	30	16	29.05

Total Positions: 46 Total Calculated FTEs: 29.05

Leadership ratio (9 and 11 compared to 5 and 7): 11 positions to 35 positions (1:3.27)

Perm to temp: 30 Permanent positions, 16 temporary positions

**Five Center Alternative Cost Summary**

Center	Personnel Costs	Operating Costs	Total Costs	FireOrg Fires	Calculated FTEs
NUIFC	\$651,100	\$231,925	\$883,025	405	8.40
UBIFC	\$289,400	\$44,166	\$333,566	151	3.35
MIFC	\$347,800	\$79,093	\$426,893	206	4.15
RIFC	\$346,900	\$150,000	\$496,900	174	4.15
CCIFC	\$689,800	\$110,829	\$800,629	418	9.00
State Total	\$2,325,000	\$616,013	\$2,941,013	1,359	29.05

\*Estimated operating costs for the two new dispatch facilities (RIFC and UBIFC + MIFC) at \$150,000 each per year. This estimate is in-between the two current centers of equal size.

DRAFT

## Four Center Alternative: Transition to Four Dispatch Centers

### Northern Utah Interagency Fire Center

Position	Grade	Agency	Tour	Cost Estimate*	Calculated FTEs
Center Manager	GS-11	Any	PFT	\$104,000	1
Asst. Center Manager	GS-9	Any	PFT	\$91,000	1
Asst. Center Manager	GS-9	Any	PFT	\$91,000	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	CS	\$50,400	.75
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	18/8	\$50,400	.75
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	18/8	\$50,400	.75
Dispatcher		Any	18/8	\$50,400	.75
Dispatcher	GS-6	Any	CS	\$32,500	.50
Dispatcher	GS-6	Any	13/13	\$32,500	.50
Dispatcher	GS-6	Any	13/13	\$32,500	.50
Dispatcher		Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher		Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher		Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
				Annual total estimate	FTE Total
				\$651,100	8.40

### NUIFC Organization Characteristics Overview

Total Positions: 13, Total Calculated FTEs: 8.40

Leadership ratio (GS-9 and GS-11 compared to GS-5 through GS- 7): 3 positions to 10 positions (1:3.33)

Perm to temp: 10 Permanent positons, 3 temporary positions

### Uintah Basin + Moab Interagency Fire Center

Position	Grade	Agency	Tour	Cost Estimate*	Calculated FTEs
Center Manager	GS-11	Any	PFT	\$104,000	1
Asst. Center Manager	GS-9	Any	PFT	\$91,000	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	18/8	\$50,400	.75
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	18/8	\$50,400	.75
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	18/8	\$50,400	.75
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher		Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher		Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher		Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
				Annual total estimate	FTE Total
				\$434,200	5.45

### New Center Organizational Characteristics Overview

Total Positions: 9, Total Calculated FTEs: 5.45

Leadership ratio (GS-9 and GS-11 compared to GS-5 through GS- 7): 2 positions to 7 positions (1:3.5)

Perm to temp: 5 Permanent positons, 4 temporary positions

### Richfield Interagency Fire Center

Position	Grade	Agency	Tour	Cost Estimate*	Calculated FTEs
Center Manager	GS-11	Any	PFT	\$104,000	1
Asst. Center Manager	GS-9	Any	PFT	\$91,000	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	18/8	\$50,400	.75
Dispatcher	GS-6	Any	13/13	\$32,500	.50
Dispatcher	GS-6	Any	temp	\$25,000	.30
Dispatcher	GS-4	Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher		Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
				Annual total estimate	FTE Total
				\$346,900	4.15

### RIFC Organizational Characteristics Overview

Total Positions: 7, Total Calculated FTEs: 4.15

Leadership ratio (GS-9 and GS-11 compared to GS-4 through GS- 7): 2 positions to 5 positions (1:2.5)

Perm to temp: 4 Permanent positons, 3 temporary positions

### Color Country Interagency Fire Center

Position	Grade	Agency	Tour	Cost Estimate*	Calculated FTEs
Center Manager	GS-11	Any	PFT	\$104,000	1
Asst. Center Manager	GS-9	Any	PFT	\$91,000	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	PFT	\$72,800	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	PFT	\$72,800	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	PFT	\$72,800	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	PFT	\$72,800	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	13/13	\$36,400	.50
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	13/13	\$28,600	.50
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	13/13	\$28,600	.50
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher		Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
				Annual total estimate	FTE Total
				\$689,800	9.00

### CCIFC Organizational Characteristics Overview

Total Positions: 14, Total Calculated FTEs: 9.00

Leadership ratio (GS-9 and GS-11 compared to GS-5 through GS- 7): 2 positions to 12 positions (1:6.0)

Perm to temp: 9 Permanent positons, 5 temporary positions.

## Four Center Alternative Summary

### Four Center Organization Characteristics Overview Summary

Unit	# of Dispatchers	% of Total	# of 9 & 11	# of 5 & 7	Leadership Ratio	# of Perms	# of Temps	Calculated FTEs
NUIFC	13	30%	3	10	1:3.33	10	3	8.40
UBIFC + MIFC	9	21%	2	7	1:3.5	5	4	5.45
RIFC	7	16%	2	5	1:2.5	4	3	4.15
CCIFC	14	33%	2	12	1:6.0	9	5	9.00
Totals	43	100%	9	34	1:3.78	28	15	27.00

Total Positions: 43 Total Calculated FTEs: 27.00

Leadership ratio (GS-9 and GS-11 compared to GS-5 through GS- 7): 9 positions to 34 positions (1:3.78)

Perm to temp: 28 Permanent positions, 15 temporary positions

### Four Center Alternative Cost Summary

Center	Personnel Costs	Operating Costs*	Total Costs	FireOrg Fires	Calculated FTEs
NUIFC	\$651,200	\$231,925	\$883,125	405	8.40
UBIFC + MIFC	\$434,200	\$150,000	\$584,200	357	5.44
RIFC	\$346,900	\$150,000	\$496,900	179	4.15
CCIFC	\$689,800	\$110,829	\$800,629	418	9.00
State Total	\$2,122,000	\$642,754	\$2,764,754	1359	27.00

\*Estimated operating costs for the two new dispatch facilities (RIFC and UBIFC + MIFC) at \$150,000 each per year.

This estimate is in-between the two current centers of equal size.

## Three Center Alternative: Transition to Three Dispatch Centers

### Northern Utah Interagency Fire Center

Position	Grade	Agency	Tour	Cost Estimate*	Calculated FTEs
Center Manager	GS-11	Any	PFT	\$104,000	1
Asst. Center Manager	GS-9	Any	PFT	\$91,000	1
Asst. Center Manager	GS-9	Any	PFT	\$91,000	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	CS	\$50,400	.75
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	18/8	\$50,400	.75
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	18/8	\$50,400	.75
Dispatcher		Any	18/8	\$50,400	.75
Dispatcher	GS-6	Any	CS	\$32,500	.50
Dispatcher	GS-6	Any	13/13	\$32,500	.50
Dispatcher	GS-6	Any	13/13	\$32,500	.50
Dispatcher		Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher		Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher		Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
				Annual total estimate	FTE Total
				\$651,100	8.40

### NRIFC Organization Characteristics Overview

Total Positions: 13, Total Calculated FTEs: 8.40

Leadership ratio (GS-9 and GS-11 compared to GS-5 through GS- 7): 3 positions to 10 positions (1:3.33)

Perm to temp: 10 Permanent positions, 3 temporary positions

### Uintah Basin + Moab + Richfield Interagency Fire Center

Position	Grade	Agency	Tour	Cost Estimate*	Calculated FTEs
Center Manager	GS-11	Any	PFT	\$104,000	1
Asst. Center Manager	GS-9	Any	PFT	\$91,000	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	18/8	\$50,400	.75
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	18/8	\$50,400	.75
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	18/8	\$50,400	.75
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	18/8	\$50,400	.75
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	13/13	\$28,600	.50
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	13/13	\$28,600	.50
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	13/13	\$28,600	.50
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
				Annual total estimate	FTE Total
				\$592,400	8.00

## New Center Organizational Characteristics Overview

Total Positions: 14, Total Calculated FTEs: 8.00

Leadership ratio (GS-9 and GS-11 compared to GS-5 through GS- 7): 2 positions to 12 positions (1:6.0)

Perm to temp: 9 Permanent positons, 5 temporary positions

## Color Country Interagency Fire Center

Position	Grade	Agency	Tour	Cost Estimate*	Calculated FTEs
Center Manager	GS-11	Any	PFT	\$104,000	1
Asst. Center Manager	GS-9	Any	PFT	\$91,000	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	PFT	\$72,800	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	PFT	\$72,800	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	PFT	\$72,800	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	PFT	\$72,800	1
Dispatcher	GS-7	Any	13/13	\$36,400	.50
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	13/13	\$28,600	.50
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	13/13	\$28,600	.50
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher	GS-5	Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
Dispatcher		Any	temp	\$22,000	.30
				Annual total estimate	FTE Total
				\$689,800	9.00

## CCIFC Organizational Characteristics Overview

Total Positions: 14, Total Calculated FTEs: 9.00

Leadership ratio (GS-9 and GS-11 compared to GS-5 through GS- 7): 2 positions to 12 positions (1:6.0)

Perm to temp: 9 Permanent positons, 5 temporary positions

## Three Center Alternative Summaries

### Three Center Organization Characteristics Overview Summary

Unit	# of Dispatchers	% of Total	# of 9 & 11	# of 5 & 7	Leadership Ratio	# of Perms	# of Temps	Calculated FTEs
NUIFC	13	32%	3	10	1:3.33	10	3	8.40
UBIFC + MIFC + RIFC	14	34%	2	12	1:6.0	9	5	8.00
CCIFC	14	34%	2	12	1:6.0	9	5	9.00
Totals	41	100%	7	34	1:4.86	28	13	25.40

Total Positions: 41 Total Calculated FTEs: 25.40

Leadership ratio (GS-9 and GS-11 compared to GS-5 through GS- 7): 7 positions to 34 positions (1:4.86)

Perm to temp: 28 Permanent positons, 13 temporary positions

### Three Center Alternative Cost Summary

Center	Personnel Costs	Operating Costs*	Total Costs	FireOrg Fires	Calculated FTEs
NUIFC	\$651,100	\$231,925	\$883,025	405	8.40
UBIFC + MIFC + RIFC	\$592,400	\$150,000	\$742,400	536	8.00
CCIFC	\$689,800	\$110,829	\$800,629	418	9.00
State Total	\$1,933,300	\$492,754	\$2,426,054	1359	25.40

\*Estimated operating costs for the two new dispatch facilities (RIFC + UBIFC + MIFC) at \$150,000 each per year. This estimate is in-between the two current centers of equal size.

DRAFT