Report of the

Fire District No. 2
Ad Hoc Advisory Committee

on proposals to

Expand the Fire Service
or
Merge the Fire Service

with District No. 1

Committee:

John Cannon
William J. Chaffee
John Cleary
Michael P. Hart
* Norman J. Moreau
** Robert Russell
*** Allan L. Simpson

March 14, 1990

* Chairman
** Vice Chairman
*** Secretary

72 Ferry Street
South Hadley, MA
March 27, 1990

Prudential Committee
Fire District No. 2
20 Woodbridge Street
South Hadley, MA 01075

Dear Committee Members:

On behalf of the Fire District No. 2 Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on proposals to expand the fire service or merge the fire service with District No. 1, I am pleased to submit the enclosed report.

To begin, I want to apologize for not having met the February 9th extended deadline date. However, I can assure you that the additional time was not wasted. It enabled the Committee to further investigate areas which under a shorter time frame would not have been adequately addressed.

You are to be congratulated regarding the selection of individuals asked to serve on the Ad Hoc Committee. They were outstanding! I could not ask for more dedication to the project at hand. Attendance at our weekly meetings was exceptional. Even though we did not agree on every issue, I can assure you, we worked very well together. Members not only did their "homework", but it was of top quality. I thank each one of them for their contributions and effort from the bottom of my heart.

Others to be thanked are the many individuals who attended our meetings and participated in the discussions. Their input was most valuable to our Committee and the report would not be the same without having had the benefit of their knowledge.

My special thanks go to Bob Russell, our Vice Chairman who filled in for me when I was absent, to Allan Simpson for his excellent work as Secretary and to Mike Hart and his Executive Assistant Ann Newsome for all their efforts in conjunction with the financial simulations, drafts of reports prepared for the Committee's review and the ultimate preparation of this, our formal report.

Our Committee has agreed to make itself available and respond to questions you may have regarding this report. In addition, we would make ourselves available for the Annual Meeting should that be appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

Norman J. Moreau

Norman J. Moreau, Chairman

INTRODUCTION

In October of 1989, the Prudential Committee of South Hadley Fire District #2 appointed an ad hoc advisory committee ("the Committee") to examine methods and enhancements of fire protection in the District. Furthermore, the Committee was instructed to examine past reports and correspondence relative to a possible merger with Fire District #1. The Committee was also asked to confer with a list of citizens from both Fire Districts before submitting a written report. To provide the maximum input from interested residents, the Committee met over a five month period in open weekly meetings. Guest attendance at these meetings was satisfactory with 3 - 6 observers who freely participated in discussions. A specific invitation to the public to attend the meeting of January 10, 1990 resulted in an audience of approximately 30 people. At that meeting, the Committee's chairman, Norman J. Moreau, recited the Prudential Committee's Charge which is as follows:

CHARGE
to
The Ad Hoc Advisory Committee
on Proposals to
Expand the Fire Service or Merge
the Fire Service with District No. 1

October 1989

The method of and the degree to which fire protection is to be provided to the residents of Fire District No. 2 in future years has been a concern of the Prudential Committee during the past two years. Since 1982, four different proposals have been received. In order to address these issues in a responsible, logical, and comprehensive way, the Prudential Committee would like to have the advice of and know the feelings of the people who are most affected by these services. In addition, we understand that there is some concern about ambulance service to the northerly portion of the Town. To these ends, we seek the advice of a Committee of interested and concerned residents and charge the Committee with the following task.

1. Convene under a Chair Pro Tem and elect a permanent Chair, Secretary, and such other officers as the Committee decides.

2. Review and evaluate:

   a. Report of the District Merger Study Committee Report - January 3, 1983;

   b. Fire Chief's Districts No. 1 and 2 - Letter of January 11, 1988;

   c. South Hadley Fire Department District No. 2 - Spring 1988;

   d. Fire Chief District No. 2 Recommendation - January 3, 1989.

3. Provide an opportunity for the following residents to voice their opinions on the subject:

   John Barry
   Michael Koske
   Joseph Long
   Henry Lukasik
   Ken McKenna
   Charles O'Connor
   William Selkirk

4. Explore such other options and alternatives as the Committee deems appropriate.

5. Recommend the process by which District residents should be informed about and decide on any recommendations and/or options and alternatives.

6. Submit a written report by January 12, 1990, including estimates of capital costs, pro forma operating expenses, and impact on the tax rate for any recommendation or alternative options.

In addition, the Committee may:

1. Seek the opinion of other residents of District No. 2, District officers, or Town officials.

2. Confer with Ken McKenna who, although a resident of District No. 1, is familiar with the Town's ambulance service and who has offered to be of assistance.

3. Confer with Wayne Alderman and Charles Kirkpatrick both of whom served on the 1982-83 Merger Study Committee and both of whom have offered to be of assistance. We encourage you to take advantage of those offers.

4. Hold such open meetings or public hearings (being careful to observe the requirements of any appropriate State laws) as you deem necessary.

The Prudential Committee would be pleased to meet with you at any time to review this charge or any other issue concerning the fire service. Please give sufficient notice so that the meeting can be properly advertised as required by State law and District By-Laws (normally 48 hours).

ISSUES EXAMINED

PERSONNEL

The District No. 2 fire department is comprised mainly of a call force of twenty-two (22) individuals who are supervised by a part-time, three-member, Board of Engineers. Appointed by the Prudential Committee, the Board of Engineers consists of one Chief Engineer and two Assistant Engineers. During Fiscal Year 1988-1989, one (1) full-time (weekdays only), permanent firefighter was added to the District's payroll. Also assisting the department is the five-member Mount Holyoke College Fire Brigade which is available for calls from 8:00AM to 4:30PM during weekdays only. Lastly, the district employs one (1) on-call mechanic for equipment maintenance.

EXISTING FACILITY/EXPANSION

Erected in 1963, the District Headquarters building houses both the fire and water departments. Consisting of a single-story structure with a full basement, the existing facility (approximately 8,500 square feet) is inadequate in terms of size. Currently, the water department utilizes most of the basement for storage of its trucks and equipment. Situated on the upper floor are the water department's office as well as a small public meeting room, two rest rooms, and the fire department's alarm and apparatus rooms. Besides being cramped in terms of space, the present building also lacks a dormitory room and a hose tower. Alternatives presented to alleviate the building's physical limitations included moving the water department to a new location and/or expanding the present facility with an addition that would include a hose tower, dormitory accommodations and additional office space. A professional architect provided the Committee with a preliminary construction estimate for the expansion alternative. (see Appendix, Exhibit IX)

AMBULANCE SERVICE

The Committee spent considerable time discussing the possible housing of an ambulance at the Woodbridge Street Station irrespective of a merger. Members generally agree that without a merger of the two present fire departments, the possibility of housing and operating an ambulance out of the District #2 Station is unlikely. Lastly, most Committee members felt that if a fire department merger were to eventually occur, the issue of ambulance service will need to be reviewed once more.

GROWTH PROJECTIONS

The Committee met with George Boyle, the town's planning director, to review recent growth and to assess where future growth is projected. Within the last five years, most of the town's growth has been residential in nature and has occurred within Fire District No. 1. Exceptions within District No. 2, include Mount Holyoke College's commercial development known as "The Village Commons", the Priestly Estates' residential sub-division, and housing construction along East Street. The town's planning director foresees future District development occurring in the Pearl Street/Lithia Springs area, as well as along Hadley Street and Amherst Road. Most of the growth is projected to be residential. The planning director contends, however, that future residential development within these areas may be limited by environmental regulations and political opposition to any proposed expansion of the town's sewer system to the aforementioned areas.

STATISTICAL AND FINANCIAL REVIEW

Since a majority of Committee members were unfamiliar with how District No. 2 operated in terms of both manpower and operating expenses, a considerable amount of time was devoted to reviewing the organization. This resulted in the compilation of statistical data which the Committee utilized in formulating its recommendations to the Prudential Committee. Statistical and financial information examined included growth projections; annual operating expenses; projected operating and capital expenditures; a comparison of past and current district tax assessments for both District No. 1 and No. 2; annual calls to the District and Mount Holyoke College; and a review of the average annual cost per call to District residents. The Appendix contains a detailed listing of these factors.

INSURANCE RATE IMPACTS

Of major concern to District residents is the impact of any expansion or merger with respect to the cost of fire insurance protection to individual homeowners based on the Grading Schedule for Municipal Fire Protection as determined by the

Insurance Services Office (ISO). Of benefit to homeowners is the fact that District residents do not pay any additional fire insurance premiums even though the District is comprised of a "call force" as opposed to permanent full-time firefighters. Moreover, based on the District's last grading schedule (1975), District residents presently have the lowest fire insurance premiums available for a Class Four community. Be advised, however, that the District was last graded fifteen (15) years ago. ISO's criteria for grading has probably changed since 1975 and the possibility exists that the District may not compare favorably with today's ISO standards. At present, the ISO has no specified schedule for returning to the District to evaluate its fire protection.

RELATIONSHIP WITH WATER DEPARTMENT

Although the Committee's charge did not specifically include the examination of the water department in relation to expanding the fire service or merging the fire department, Committee members found it prudent to include certain aspects of the water department in its review of the District's operation. The water department impacts the fire department in several ways. First, it occupies space within the building which possibly could be utilized by the fire department. Second, the department's annual expenditures are tied into the District's annual financial operation. Historically, the water department has operated on a self-sustaining financial basis, i.e., the annual costs of operating the water department have come from revenue generated from water bills to consumers. In recent years, however, the department has relied on other sources (e.g. one of the District's Reserve Funds) to balance its annual budget. This business practice is not unusual in that excess revenues from the water department in past years have been added to the District's Reserve Funds. However, as the District moves toward operating both departments on a more fiscally autonomous basis, the practice of commingling department funds should be examined closely.

RELATIONSHIP WITH COLLEGE

Much discussion was generated concerning the impact of Mount Holyoke College on the affairs of the District. A review of the statistical data compiled indicates that the college places a significant demand on the District's fire services. While acknowledging the existence of the college's Fire Brigade, as well as the college's modest financial contributions to the District in the past, Committee members feel that the college has, in return, received more than equitable compensation from the District. In fact, Committee members feel that it is imperative that dialogue begins between the college and the District for the purpose of ascertaining the college's proper role in relation to the District's annual operating budget.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

As mentioned previously, the Committee's principal responsibility was to examine the feasibility of expanding the District's current fire service or merging its operation with District No 1's fire service. In response to the Prudential Committee's charge, the Committee spent considerable time conferring with District and town residents before formally identifying possible alternatives. Based on the information gathered, the Committee agreed to consider the following options:

1. Allow the District fire department to retain its present composition with no changes made to its operation.

2. Allow the present District fire department to construct a hose tower and budget for increased permanent personnel as needed.

3. With no specific merger target date in mind, allow the present fire department to plan for the future by expanding its present facility. The expansion will include a hose tower, additional office space and dormitory facilities.

4. Merge the two district fire departments posthaste.

5. Expand the present facility so that it may accommodate full-time, permanent, coverage while acknowledging the probability that a merger between the two District fire departments today will likely begin with daytime permanent coverage in District No. 2.

Following the formulation of these options, the Committee then focused on the financial costs associated with each alternative. Pro-forma projections were prepared to assess the financial implications of the options. In particular, the Committee was interested in determining the financial impact to the average District taxpayer. Please refer to Exhibit I of the Appendix which illustrates alternative costs.

CONCLUSION

After engaging in considerable discussion and an extensive examination of the pertinent issues affecting District residents, members of the Committee were requested by the Chairman to formalize their positions relative to expanding the present fire department and/or merging it with District #1. Individual opinions were expressed formally by two votes taken on February 28, 1990. By a majority approval, the Committee first voted to recommend to the Prudential Committee that the two district fire departments merge. Second, by majority approval, the Committee voted to recommend that the proposed merger occur expeditiously. To facilitate a merger, the Committee strongly recommends that the Prudential Committee immediately contact their counterparts in Fire District #1 and formally request that a joint committee be established for the expressed purpose of consummating a fire department merger between the districts. Moreover, the joint committee's charge should be to formalize the process by which the merger should occur. With regard to the cost and implementation of a merger, the joint committee will be able to utilize the financial and statistical information included in the Committee's report.

As previously stated, a majority of Committee members favor a merger and that it occur as soon as practically possible. In reaching this conclusion, the majority feel that a merger will be beneficial for the following reasons:

First, the Committee feels that it is in the best interest of town residents to have a single fire department represent the town;

Second, the Committee believes that residents should receive twenty-four hour coverage from a fully equipped and manned full-time department;

Third, the Committee members believe that the financial cost associated with a merger is reasonable when compared to the added protection of full-time coverage.

Although the Committee voted to recommend merger, some Committee members voiced dissenting opinions. One member expressed his belief that District #2 residents will not approve a merger because of the financial costs associated with it. A second Committee member opined that the interests of the District would be better served by gradually expanding the department's physical facility and staff.

RECOMMENDATION

Irrespective of the final outcome of a merger, and notwithstanding the difference of opinions among Committee members relative to the recommended merger, the Committee jointly advises the Prudential Committee to adopt the following recommendations which evolved from the Committee's examination of the District:

1. That the Prudential Committee investigate the need of adding a second, permanent, firefighter in Fiscal Year 1990-1991.

2. That commencing in Fiscal Year 1990-1991, the Prudential Committee budget sufficient funds for a building addition. The expansion should include a hose tower, dormitory accommodations and additional office space. The current estimated expansion cost is $250,000. Funds needed for the expansion should come partially from the District's current reserve funds with the balance raised through the tax levy. The Committee recommends that the funds be raised over a two-year period and set aside in a separate interest bearing account.

3. That commencing in Fiscal Year 1992-1993, the District provides its residents with permanent daytime coverage while continuing its call force operation at night.

4. That, if legally enforceable, the District institute a fine for faulty alarm systems to compensate the District for the unnecessary expense incurred and to encourage better maintenance of alarm systems. The Committee recommends a $100.00 fine for the third, and each subsequent, annual offense.

5. That the Prudential Committee formally request in writing a new survey from the Insurance Service Office (ISO).

6. That the Prudential Committee meet with the water commissioners, and recommend that an annual inspection schedule for testing all District hydrants be implemented to include flushing and flow tests; and that the results of such inspections be included in the water department's annual report.

7. That the Prudential Committee implement accounting procedures which segregate excess tax levy funds of the District from those of the Water Department as compared to the current practice of commingling these excess funds.

8. That the Prudential Committee authorize representatives of the Committee to meet with Mount Holyoke College officials to discuss the implementation of an annual contribution from the College to the District as a contribution in lieu of taxes for fire service provided by the District on its tax-exempt properties. In accordance with Exhibit VII, the Committee recommends an annual contribution of $40,000.

9. That upon completion of the Prudential Committee's review of the Committee's report, the Prudential Committee disseminate the report to District residents.

APPENDIX

Exhibit I	Comparative Analysis of Typical Tax Assessments Under Various Assumptions
Exhibit II	Pro-Forma Projections and Combined Tax Rates
Exhibit III	Historical Tax Assessments and Valuations
Exhibit IV	Staffing Calculation For Full-Time Firefighting Coverage
Exhibit V	Fire District No. 2 Annual Calls
Exhibit VI	Fire District No. 2 Estimated Cost Per Call
Exhibit VII	Fire District No. 2 Value of Fire Service to Mount Holyoke College
Exhibit VIII	Fire District No. 2 Building Addition Fund
Exhibit IX	Architectural Estimate of Building Expansion

EXHIBIT I

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TYPICAL TAX ASSESSMENTS

UNDER VARIOUS ASSUMPTIONS

Year & Assumption	Total District Assessment	Tax Levy	Typical Assessment	Rate	Tax
1. 1990 Actual	$190,083,311	$201,027	$130,000	$1.06	$137.80
2. 1993 Stay As Is	$228,140,295[1]	$232,714[2]	$149,500[3]	$1.02	$152.49
3. 1993 Permanent Daytime Coverage	$228,140,295	$380,890	$149,500	$1.67	$249.67
4. 1993 With Merger (District No.1 & 2)	$887,272,392	$1,344,808	$149,500	$1.52	$227.24

1993 Typical Tax Increase To District No. 2 Residents After Merger $74.75 (Line 4 minus Line 2)

----

[1] Includes annual growth of 1.5% and 1992 revaluation + 15%.

[2] Includes annual inflation @ 5%.

[3] Includes revaluation in 1992 + 15%.

ASSUMPTIONS

INFLATION	0.05	RESERVE FUND CONTRIB		
GROWTH	0.015		1991	50000
REVAL.'92,'95,'98	0.15		1992	50000
BASE LEVY	201027	BLDG.DEPOSIT FUND:		
BASE SALARY	32000		1991	75000
BASE TAX RATE	1.06		1992	75000
BASE VALUATION	190083311		1993	0
AVG.HOME ASSESSMENT	130000		1994	0
			1995	0

FIRE DISTRICT NO.2
PRO FORMA PROJECTIONS

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
ANNUAL BASE LEVY	211078	221632	232714	244350	256567	269395	282865	297008	311859	327452
ADD FIREMEN	33600	35280	148176	155585	163364	171532	180109	189114	198570	208499
BLDG. EXPAN. FUND	75000	75000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CAPITAL EQUIPMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ANNUAL LEVY	319678	331912	380890	399934	419931	440928	462974	486123	510429	535950
VALUATION	192934561	224768763	228140295	231562399	269770195	273816748	277923999	323781459	328638181	333567753
TAX RATE	1.66	1.48	1.67	1.73	1.56	1.61	1.67	1.50	1.55	1.61
INCREASE OVER PR.YR.	0.60	-0.18	0.19	0.06	-0.17	0.05	0.06	-0.16	0.05	0.05
CUMULATIVE INCREASE	0.60	0.42	0.61	0.67	0.50	0.55	0.61	0.44	0.49	0.55
AVG.HOME ASSESS.	130000	149500	149500	149500	171925	171925	171925	197714	197714	197714
ANNUAL TAX DOLLAR INCREASE TO RESIDENT	77.60	62.29	91.13	99.73	85.38	94.61	104.16	87.27	97.51	108.09
NO.PERMANENT FIREMEN	2	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

EXHIBIT II
(Page 2 of 3)

FIRE DISTRICT NO.1
PRO FORMA PROJECTIONS

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
ANNUAL BASE LEVY	874302	918018	963918	1012114	1062720	1115856	1171649	1230231	1291743	1356330
CAPITAL EQUIPMENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ANNUAL LEVY	874302	918018	963918	1012114	1062720	1115856	1171649	1230231	1291743	1356330
VALUATION	542317012	639934074	659132097	678906059	801109150	813125787	825322674	961500915	975923429	990562281
TAX RATE	1.61	1.43	1.46	1.49	1.33	1.37	1.42	1.28	1.32	1.37
INCREASE OVER PR.YR.	0.03	-0.18	0.03	0.03	-0.16	0.05	0.05	-0.14	0.04	0.05
CUMULATIVE INCREASE	0.03	-0.15	-0.12	-0.09	-0.25	-0.21	-0.16	-0.30	-0.26	-0.21
AVG.HOME ASSESS.	130000	149500	149500	149500	171925	171925	171925	197714	197714	197714
ANNUAL TAX DOLLAR INCREASE TO RESIDENT	4.18	-21.74	-17.58	-13.34	-43.57	-35.71	-27.57	-59.41	-50.69	-41.67
NO.PERMANENT FIREMEN	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15

EXHIBIT II
(Page 3 of 3)

DISTRICTS 1 & 2
COMBINED TAX RATES

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
DISTRICT 2 LEVY	319678	331912	380890	399934	419931	440928	462974	486123	510429	535950
DISTRICT 1 LEVY	874302	918018	963918	1012114	1062720	1115856	1171649	1230231	1291743	1356330
COMBINED LEVIES	1193980	1249930	1344808	1412048	1482651	1556784	1634623	1716354	1802172	1892280
VALUATION DISTRICT 2	192934561	224768763	228140295	231562399	269770195	273816748	277923999	323781459	328638181	333567753
VALUATION DISTRICT 1	542317012	639934074	659132097	678906059	801109150	813125787	825322674	961500915	975923429	990562281
COMBINED VALUATIONS	735251573	864702837	887272392	910468458	1070879345	1086942535	1103246673	1285282374	1304561610	1324130034
DISTRICT 2 TAX RATE	1.66	1.48	1.67	1.73	1.56	1.61	1.67	1.50	1.55	1.61
DISTRICT 1 TAX RATE	1.61	1.43	1.46	1.49	1.33	1.37	1.42	1.28	1.32	1.37
COMBINED TAX RATE	1.62	1.45	1.52	1.55	1.38	1.43	1.48	1.34	1.38	1.43

EXHIBIT III
(Page 1 of 2)

SOUTH HADLEY DISTRICT NO. 2

Year	Amount To Be Raised	Estimated Receipts	Tax Levy	Valuation	Tax Rate	% Growth Over Prior Year
1983	$288,003	$166,448	$121,555	$83,831,450	1.45	-
1984	$272,190	$155,300	$116,890	$85,948,650	1.36	2.5
1985	$316,732	$192,500	$124,232	$86,875,500	1.43	1.1
1986	$325,990	$207,500	$118,490	$118,489,592	1.00	Revaluation
1987	$371,968	$229,200	$142,768	$118,973,226	1.20	0.4
1988	$370,691	$237,294	$133,397	$121,270,071	1.10	1.9
1989	$441,498	$273,050	$168,448	$187,164,549	.90	Revaluation
1990	$505,977	$304,950	$201,027	$190,083,311	1.06	1.6
						1.5 (average)

EXHIBIT III
(Page 2 of 2)

SOUTH HADLEY DISTRICT NO. 1

Year	Amount To Be Raised	Estimated Receipts	Tax Levy	Valuation	Tax Rate	% Growth Over Prior Year
1983	$905,999	$348,200	$557,800	$193,010,304	2.89	-
1984	$1,001,497	$478,114	$523,383	$195,292,324	2.68	1.2
1985	$1,084,056	$534,416	$549,640	$197,712,194	2.78	1.2
1986	$1,359,805	$762,500	$597,305	$271,502,100	2.20	Revaluation
1987	$1,263,513	$612,500	$651,013	$283,049,200	2.30	4.3
1988	$1,314,427	$610,583	$703,844	$293,268,198	2.40	3.6
1989	$1,470,558	$662,792	$807,766	$504,853,471	1.60	Revaluation
1990	$1,798,730	$966,061	$832,669	$526,531,371	1.58	4.3
						2.9 (average)

EXHIBIT IV

FIRE DISTRICT NO. 2

Staffing Calculation for Fulltime Firefighters Around the Clock

Working Schedule:

2 Days @ 14 Hrs. ea.	28	
2 Days @ 10 Hrs. ea.	20	
4 Days Off	0	
8 Total	48	48 Hrs./8 Days x 7 Days = 42/Wk.

Annual Productive Hours Per Firefighter:

Hours Per Year (42 x 52 Wks.)		2184
Less Non-Worked Hours:		
Vacation (2 Wks.)	84	
Holiday	84	
Sick	84	252
Annual Productive Hours Per Man		1932

Calculation of Required FTE's For Round The Clock Coverage With Two Men:

a.)	Hours To Cover (365 Days x 24 Hrs. x 2 Men)	17520 Hours
b.)	Annual Productive Hours Per Man	1932 Hours
c.)	Required Full Time Equivalents (FTE) (a/b)	9 Men
d.)	Required Full Time Equivalents (FTE) (Daytime Only)	5 Men

EXHIBIT V

FIRE DISTRICT NO. 2
ANNUAL CALLS

	1986			1987			1988			1989		
	TOWN CALLS	MHC CALLS	TOTAL CALLS	TOWN CALLS	MHC CALLS	TOTAL CALLS	TOWN CALLS	MHC CALLS	TOTAL CALLS	TOWN CALLS	MHC CALLS	TOTAL CALLS
JANUARY	2	5	7	4	11	15	5	9	14	3	2	5
FEBRUARY	6	4	10	1	10	11	5	4	9	3	2	5
MARCH	6	8	14	3	8	11	4	8	12	10	3	13
APRIL	5	6	11	7	12	19	6	13	19	8	15	23
MAY	17	8	25	7	5	12	7	11	18	4	4	8
JUNE	6	5	11	3	3	6	8	3	11	4	12	16
JULY	9	6	15	4	12	16	9	13	22	3	11	14
AUGUST	1	11	12	4	15	19	5	16	21	7	10	17
SEPTEMBER	2	16	18	4	9	13	7	5	12	4	11	15
OCTOBER	4	7	11	2	9	11	6	6	12	4	15	19
NOVEMBER	2	8	10	3	10	13	6	10	16	5	5	10
DECEMBER	5	16	21	2	12	14	6	9	15	6	3	9
TOTALS	65	100	165	44	116	160	74	107	181	61	93	154
ANNUAL %	39.4%	60.6%	100%	27.5%	72.5%	100%	40.9%	59.1%	100%	39.6%	60.4%	100%

EXHIBIT VI

FIRE DISTRICT NO. 2

Estimated

COST PER CALL

	July 1,1988 - June 30,1989			July 1,1989 - January 20,1990		
	No. Calls	Annual Cost	Cost Per Call	No. Calls	Annual Cost	Cost Per Call
TOWN CALLS	56	$6,351	$113	41	$5,230	$128
MHC CALLS	94	7,702	$82	55	5,514	$100
TOTAL CALLS	150	$14,053	$94	96	$10,744	$112

EXHIBIT VII

FIRE DISTRICT NO. 2

Value of Fire Service to Mount Holyoke College

Total Valuation for 1989

	$	%
Taxable Portion		
MHC	13,156,430	7
District Other	174,008,119	93
Total	$187,164,549	100
Tax-Exempt Portion		
MHC	69,349,400	85
District Other	12,239,000	15
Total	$81,588,400	100
Total Both		
MHC	82,505,830	31
District Other	186,247,119	69
Total	$268,752,949	100
Taxes Paid		
MHC	11,841	7
District Other	156,607	93
Total	$168,448	100

Imputed Tax Rate Based On Total Valuation:

$$\frac{\text{Tax Levy}}{\text{Total Assessments}} = \frac{168,448}{268,752,949} = .63$$

	Rate	MHC Total Valuation	Value To MHC
Value of Fire Service to MHC Based on 1989 Imputed Tax Rate:	.63	$82,505,830	$51,978
Less: Actual MHC Taxes Pd.			(11,841)
Difference			$40,137

EXHIBIT VIII

FIRE DISTRICT NO. 2

BUILDING ADDITION FUND

	Sources of Funds				
Fiscal Year	Tax Levy	Reserve Allocation	Total	Interest Earned[1]	Cumulative Balance
1990-1991	75,000	50,000	125,000	8,750	133,750
1991-1992	75,000	50,000	125,000	18,112	276,862

----

[1] Assumes funds invested for entire year @ 7% interest.