Response to the Report

"Fire and Fire Rescue Services Improvement Study"
for the Pinellas County
Charter Review Commission



Presented by the

Pinellas County Fire Chiefs' Association in Conjunction with the Pinellas Council of Firefighters

Layout of the PCFCA Response

- Introduction
- Scope of Work
- Report
- Verbal Discussion/Comments
- What's not in the report
- Summary

Introduction

- Initial Concerns
 - Key areas of the system not included
 - Hence the Key Areas where not included in the conclusions or findings
 - No defined minimum service delivery level
 - Benchmarks
 - Standards
 - Regulations
 - Public Expectations

Scope of Work

- Scope of Work was approved by the CRC
- Final Report does not include many of the tasks identified
 - Standards/Benchmarks
 - Communication Stakeholders
 - Best Practices
 - Identification of similarly situated systems

Scope of Work (Continued)

- Current Staffing
- Policies
- Evaluation of current abilities
- Research and make Recommendations on Each Major Study Area
 - Fire Response and Suppression
 - Training
 - EMS services
 - Code Enforcement
 - Specialized Teams (No Mention)

Scope of Work (Continued)

- Implementation strategies, Plan, and Timelines
 - specifying what should be done, primary responsibility, and schedule;
 - Ofiscal impact, consisting of a chart that lists each recommendation and the savings, implementation costs, and net fiscal impact.
- None of these important components are provided for the recommendations!

Final Report

- Demographics (Per MGT Report)
 - OMost Density
 - Higher than average Median Age
 - Higher than average disability status
 - Second highest County in nursing home population
- These facts support the system that we have

- Thurston County 911 Dispatch (Study)
- Misrepresentation of types of incidents due to categorization into medical and fire.
- Description of Current Costs lacks effective meaning without some comparisons to similar systems

- Total Responses 152,882
 - 75% of the incidents between 8AM and 10PM
 - This leads the author to recommend reductions in staff or units during non-peak hours.
- What is not Considered with this Recommendation
 - Seriousness of incidents increases at night.
 - More than half of residential fires <u>deaths</u> occur in fires that start from 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. The peak night hours are from 2:00 to 5:00 a.m. Further there is a noticeable increase in property loss from these fire between midnight and 6 AM. (United States Fire Administration)

- Mutual Aid Analysis
 - The correct term is Automatic Aid
 - The Rows with Totals are Reversed
 - Making the associated text and conclusions incorrect
 - Giving and received actually backwards
- Due to the serious errors in the documentation regarding Mutual (Automatic Aid), THE ENTIRE SECTION SHOULD BE REMOVED FROM THE FINAL DOCUMENT <u>BECAUSE IT IS FALSE</u> <u>AND MISLEADING.</u>

- Number of Fires requiring suppression activities < 500? (Chiefs and Pinellas Co)
 - Statement "Working Fire File < 500 times?"</p>
- However
 - Structural Fire Responses 3447
 - OBrush Fires 80
 - OCar Fires 799
- Water as a suppression method 771

- Major Study areas Lacking Substantial Research
 - Code Enforcement/Fire prevention
 - Training
 - FD Ambulance Transport Services
 - Specialized Teams (No Reference in Report)

- Number of Vehicles Responding
 - 3.5 Vehicles per Incident based on data analysis
 - ○522,000 vehicle responses
- Actual numbers of Fire vehicles and ambulances responded - 349,327
 - Balance are notification pagers and groups –
 NOT Vehicles
- Data is Good Analysis is incorrect

- Total Number of Incidents per Station
 - Misleading as the Exhibit shows only the incidents within a station's primary response area
 - It does not show the total number of incidents that a unit (s) from that station responded to

Engines, Resc Pumpers, and 2004						
2004 TSTATS			Dispatched	Dispatched	Arrived	Arrived
	MGT	DSTATS	E,R,S,T,P,W	Average	E,R,S,T,P,W	Average
	Total Calls	Total Calls	Total Units	Unit Per Call	Total Units	Unit Per Call
Totals	152,882	152,882	213,649	1.40	181,039	1.18

Selected Incidents

				Dispatch ed	Dispatch ed	Arrived	Arrived
		MGT	DSTATS	E,R,S,T,P, W	Average	E,R,S,T,P, W	Average
	Fire / Medical	Total Calls	Total Calls	Total Units	Unit Per Call	Total Units	Unit Per Call
Air Transport Incident	M	259	259	867	3.35	782	3.02
Auto Crash	М	15,851	15,851	33,352	2.10	26,446	1.67
Automatic Fire Alarm	F	7,253	7,253	18,158	2.50	11,061	1.53
Brush Fire	F	83	83	162	1.95	144	1.73
Extrication	М	80	80	345	4.31	238	2.98
Medical	М	108,566	108,566	121,734	1.12	111,745	1.03
Single Engine	F	9,064	9,064	10,125	1.12	9,174	1.01
Structure Response	F	3,447	3,447	21,263	6.17	15,203	4.41
		152,882	152,882	213,649	1.40	181,039	1.18

RECOMMENDATION: Due to these serious errors, THIS ENTIRE SECTION SHOULD BE REMOVED FROM THE FINAL DOCUMENT BECAUSE IT IS FALSE AND MISLEADING AND MAY LEAD A READER TO MAKE DECISIONS BASED ON TOTALLY INACCURATE **INFORMATION.**

- Average Hours/Day on Fire/EMS Incidents
 - Two hours is arbitrary
 - Involved time only
 - No consideration for other Activities
 - No consideration for location and response times
 - No implementation plan or ID of possible locations

Recommendation: This entire section should be removed from the final document because it is FALSE AND MISLEADING and may lead a reader to make decisions based on totally inaccurate information. Further, no discussion or action on the closing or relocation of any station, company, or personnel should be made until a complete in-depth review of the current level of service is undertaken, and the minimum expected level of service defined.

- Modification Scenarios
 - Lacks Substantiation
 - No Station ID
 - No ID of what level supervisory positions

Recommendation: this entire section should be removed from the final document because it lacks any substantive evidence and could lead a reader to make decisions based on information that is not verified. Further, no discussion or action on the closing or relocation of any station, company, or personnel should be made until a complete in-depth review of the current level of service is undertaken, and the minimum expected level of service defined.

ISO

- Based on the 1990 ISO Analysis the County Would have gotten a rating of 4. Some would be go up some would drop
- Station location or relocation as well as number of companies would have an impact.

- Priority Dispatch
 - Departments used as examples are not representative of the level of service currently provided or the complexity and call volume of our system
 - Priority Dispatch should send the closest unit
 - Ambulance cancelled or non-transport on 29,041 incidents

- EMS First Response
 - Studies that are cited do not compare well with our system
 - Four Alternatives provided
 - Two may not be possible
- No consideration for the cost effectiveness of dual role FF/PM/EMT's doing first response (Doing more than one job)
- No study or consideration for cost effectiveness of dual role for the transport system

Other Issues

- Appendices
- Verbal Statements
- What's Missing

Summary

- Regarding the MGT Report
 - Do not accept the report as it is incomplete and inaccurate
 - Accept but Remove areas as recommended
 - Accept but include the joint Position Paper as part of the Report
- We ask you not to make a decision that will affect the future of our system based on the MGT Report

What's Next

- American Assembly Recommendations
 - Assigned to County EMS/Fire Staff and the PCFCA
 - Already accepted by the County and Council of Mayors
 - Begin to work on the issues agreed upon
- Form an advisory type group to have input on Countywide Fire/EMS Service Issues?
- Put this MGT report behind us and move ahead

Questions and Comments

Thanks for the Opportunity!