

GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (GMOC)

Threshold Standard Compliance Questionnaire

Fire and EMS – 2017

Review Period:

July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016 to Present Time and 5-Year Forecast

THRESHOLD STANDARD

Emergency Response: Properly equipped and staffed fire and medical units shall respond to calls throughout the city within 7 minutes in at least 80% of the cases (measured annually).

Note: For growth management purposes, response time includes dispatch, turnout and travel time to the building or site address.

Please complete the table below:

FIRE and EMS Response Times						
Fiscal Year	Calls for Service	% Responded to Within 7 Minutes (Threshold = 80%)	Average Response Time	Average Travel Time	Average Dispatch Time	Average Turn-out Time
2016	13,481	74.5	6:18	4:16	0:58	1:05
2015	12,561	78.3	6:14	3:51	1:12	1:10
2014	11,721	76.5	6:02	3:34	1:07	1:21
2013	12,316	75.7	6:02	3:48	1:05	1:08

Please provide responses to the following questions:

1. During the review period, were 80% of all calls responded to within 7 minutes? If not, please explain why.

Yes _____

No X

Chula Vista Fire Department did not meet Fire and EMS response times as identified by the GMOC. There was a 0.5% improvement over 2015. Over this past year there was also a significant increase in call volume of an additional 519 emergency calls for service equaling a 4% growth. Along with the compliance percentage improvement, department member performance improved tremendously. Average dispatch and turnout times decreased by 28 seconds with only a four second increase in average travel time, netting a 24 second decrease in average response times from last year (Note: the Average Response Time indicates a 25 second decrease due to rounding).

Improvements were attributed to the following:

- *Battalion Monthly Reports (Initiated October 2015)*
- *Auto-Dispatching (Initiated June 2015)*
- *Pulsepoint.*
- *Outfitted fire stations 2, 3, and 4 with transitional lighting for night responses to bring them up to current standards*

The Fire Department would need the following system adjustments in order to make significant improvements to be in compliance: (Bullet points 1 through 5 are from last year's report. The sub bullets indicate more detail and any progress/status).

- 1. Additional fire stations within the network (Millenia and Bayfront funding identified)*
- 2. Additional improvements in call for service dispatch processes*
 - *Auto-Dispatching Completed June 2015*
 - *Pulsepoint used by many personnel on personal devices (voluntary)*
- 3. Additional improvements in unit and station alerting*
 - *Outfit fire stations 5, and 9 with transitional lighting for night responses to bring them up to current standards (FS 2, 3, and 4 completed)*
 - *Provide turnout time count down clocks for each unit (not funded)*
 - *Replace all fire station alerting systems (not funded)*
 - *Provide smart phone for each seated position*
- 4. Improved management of response time performance to include interactive discussion with fire crews, use of mapping capabilities, and shared data with stakeholders.*
 - *Battalion Monthly Reports (Initiated October 2015)*
 - *Update response map books (not funded)*
- 5. Replacement of old and failing fire apparatus within the fleet (6 Engines, 2 Trucks, and 1 US&R need to be replaced)*
 - *2 Engines ordered Nov 2015*
 - *1 Truck ordered Aug 2016*
- 6. Pilot squad response program (not funded)*

2. During the review period, were the fire and medical units properly equipped? If not, please explain why.

Yes _____ No X

The fleet of apparatus used by the fire department continues to age and therefore plays a role in increased response times due to the lack of speed and maneuverability. Down time due to more frequent service repairs coupled with increased significant mechanical failures has an impact on response delivery.

We continue to see a marked degradation in our fleet to include more frequent major mechanical breakdowns. Last year the Fire Department reported to the GMOC that it would adopt a new standard for apparatus years of service. The new accepted years of service for fire apparatus has been changed to 17 years from 25 years.

3. During the review period, were fire and medical units properly staffed? If not, please explain why.

Yes _____

No X

The Fire Facility Master Plan calls for an increase to 4.0 staffing from the current 3.0 model. 4.0 Staffing allows for improved efficiency on medical calls by providing 2 personnel for patient assessment and care. 4.0 staffing will reduce fire company on-scene times, allowing units to be available for calls for service. 4.0 staffing will allow fire companies to remain in service in the event of firefighter assisted transports.

For fire responses, 4.0 staffing improves time of initial attack on the fire by 25% over a 3.0 staffed engine and fulfills the OSHA 2-in 2-out mandate as well as NFPA Standard 1710. It also allows fire companies to expedite the cleaning and preparation of used fire equipment and return it to ready and available status reducing out of service time.

4. Will current facilities, equipment and staff be able to accommodate citywide projected growth and meet the threshold standard during the next 12-18 months? If not, please explain why.

Yes _____

No X

Even though call volume continues to increase, the Fire Department made a half percent improvement since last year and is reporting a 78.8% (78.3% last year) overall response, it is a possibility that the goal of 80% may be attained. Until the fleet of apparatus is replaced to a suitable standard, there will continue to be an effect on response times.

Please see the recommended system adjustments in the answer to #1 above.

Future consideration:

The Fire Department partner agency, AMR provides ALS transport service. Effective September 15, 2016, AMR has deployed a new staffing model which decreases the number of paramedics on-scene of emergency medical calls. This is anticipated to increase fire company on-scene times. The change will also increase the number of firefighter assisted transports resulting in extended out of service time that will necessitate fire companies from other districts to cover calls for service.

5. Will current facilities, equipment and staff be able to accommodate citywide projected growth during the next five years? If not, please explain why.

Yes _____

No X

Without implementation of the recommended measures the response time threshold is not anticipated to be met.

However, projected growth of Millenia and the Bayfront will consist of additional fire stations, fire apparatus and personnel to meet the demand of said developments.

6. Please complete the tables below:

FIRE and EMS Response Times - By Geography																		
Fiscal Year	Calls for Service			% of All Calls Responded to Within 7 Minutes (Threshold = 80%)			Average Response Time for All Calls			Average Travel Time			Average Dispatch Time			Average Turn-out Time		
	E	W	E/W	E	W	E/W	E	W	E/W	E	W	E/W	E	W	E/W	E	W	E/W
2016	2,353	7,195	3,704	17.8	54.3	28.0	7:08	5:45	6:01	5:02	3:30	4:16	0:53	1:05	0:54	1:12	1:01	1:01
2015	2,014	6,970	3,577	58.4	92.5	73.3	7:48	5:40	6:27	4:53	3:21	4:15	1:36	1:13	0:58	1:19	1:06	1:14
2014	1,890	6,198	3,633	52.7	86.7	71.9	7:15	5:29	6:22	4:33	3:04	3:55	1:08	1:08	1:04	1:34	1:16	1:22

Note: "East" = Calls responded to east of I-805 (Fire Stations 6, 7 and 8).
 "West" = Calls responded to west of I-805 (Fire Stations 1 and 5).
 "E/W" = Calls responded to citywide (Fire Stations 2, 3, 4 and 9).

FIRE and EMS Response Times in FY 2016 - By Fire Station						
Fire Station #	Calls for Service	% of All Calls Responded to Within 7 Minutes (Threshold = 80%)	Average Response Time for all Calls	Average Travel Time	Average Dispatch Time	Average Turn-out Time
1	3432	88.4	0:05:43	0:03:16	0:01:30	0:00:57
2	753	77.5	0:06:05	0:04:11	0:00:55	0:00:59
3	554	76.4	0:06:00	0:04:06	0:00:56	0:00:57
4	655	78.5	0:06:06	0:04:10	0:00:53	0:01:06
5	2756	85.0	0:05:47	0:03:46	0:00:54	0:01:06
6	393	71.2	0:06:23	0:04:25	0:00:47	0:01:10
7	524	51.8	0:07:22	0:05:12	0:00:57	0:01:13
8	428	57.3	0:07:21	0:05:14	0:00:54	0:01:13
9	937	84.2	0:05:54	0:03:59	0:00:53	0:01:02

Types of All Calls Responded To % Change					
Fiscal Year	Total Call Volume	% Calls for Fire Service	% Calls for Emergency Medical Services	% Calls for Other Services	% Change
2016	19,626	1.8 (348)	67.8 (13305)	30.4 (5973)	6.1
2015	18,503	2.1 (400)	80.3 (12724)	17.6 (5379)	9.4
2014	16,918	2.5 (417)	70.2 (11875)	27.3 (4626)	5.7
2013	16,011	2.6 (419)	66.8 (10699)	30.6 (4893)	2.5
2012	15,613	2.4 (371)	64.3 (10045)	33.3 (5197)	1.5
2011	15,373	2.2 (334)	66.0 (10143)	31.9 (4897)	0.9
2010	15,234	2.3 (356)	64.7 (9852)	33.0 (5023)	

7. Please explain and/or provide information on what “emergency” or “Code 3” calls are. For instance, are sirens on or off? Are calls for life threatening situations only? Does the dispatcher determine how to classify the calls? If not, who does?

Emergency or ‘Code 3’ calls are synonymous and are responses that include a unit responding with lights and sirens and use of Opticom traffic control devices.

Data provided for the GMOC threshold reports emergency responses only, all other non-emergency calls are not included in the report.

Dispatchers use information from the caller to categorize the call for service using Emergency Medical Dispatch procedures. This determines the priority for the call and is dispatched accordingly.

8. The GMOC’s 2016 Annual Report recommended that the City Manager and the Fire Chief collaborate “in conducting a statistical analysis to provide more detailed information regarding specific station response times and the percentage of calls where there is cross-coverage, and to focus on improving the response times by fire stations 6, 7 and 8.” The response provided by the Fire Department was: “Staff met with software vendor, DECCAN INTL, to include this analysis as part of our annual update. Station and unit placement/coverage are to be examined and recommendations made. Responses are expected by summer 2016.” Please report on the progress that has been made.

Initial costs for the consultant analysis were \$5000 per scenario with an anticipated cost of \$15,000 for 3 scenarios. After additional conversations and research, the Fire Chief has chosen to delay the per scenario option. Due to future forecasting of department needs and the possibility of squad implementation a full purchase of the Optimizer software, at \$30,000, is a better investment. Owning the software outright will enable the fire department to use the software for numerous projects and analysis moving forward. A funding source needs to be identified.

9. Please explain if the roving response unit, which is being used in some other cities, might be beneficial in Chula Vista.

The Fire Department is exploring this option. With the purchase of the Optimizer software an in-depth analysis can be conducted to assist with the decision. Many other factors come into play and will all be considered (staffing, costs, equipment, vehicles, etc.).

10. One goal of Chula Vista’s Fire Facilities Master Plan is to comply with the National Fire Protection Association’s (NFPA’s) 1710 standards. Please complete the table below to report on Chula Vista’s efforts to comply with NFPA.

National Fire Protection Association 1710 Compliance Table – FY 2016					
	# of Calls	Dispatch	Turnout	Travel	Total Response
EMS - 1st Unit	12,973				
STANDARD		1:00	1:00	4:00	6:00
Average Time		0:59	1:03	3:55	5:56
% Compliant		80.1	51.4	61.9	63.5
Fire - 1st Unit	279				
STANDARD		1:00	1:20	4:00	6:20
Average Time		1:20	1:06	4:32	7:08
% Compliant		47.3	66.7	48.8	48.4
Effective Fire Force - 14FF	29				
STANDARD		1:00	1:20	8:00	10:20
Average Time		1:52	1:18	8:07	11:17
% Compliant		37.9	62.1	55.2	34.5

11. Please provide any other relevant information, recommendations or suggestions that you would like to relay to the GMOC and/or the city council.

A method for identifying and marking times to signify actual enroute start, and end time is desired to be implemented along with an update to MDC screens by adding an Acknowledgement button to the screen.

PREPARED BY:

Name: Jim Geering
 Title: Fire Chief
 Date: 10/12/16