

SUBJECTIVE APPROACHES TO JUDGING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF OPERATIONAL RESPONSE CAPABILITY
FOR FS 8 PROPOSED LOCATIONS

If no further requests for information will be made to the County as recommended for accomplishing an objective approach, the task force will need to judge the impact of any new location on response by using existing maps and data provided by the County. That can be done, but the conclusions will be less certain and will involve judgment. Again, I'll concentrate in fire emergencies only.

The key to evaluating the ability of each proposed site to satisfy the first two FD operational criteria that were included in the County's charge to the Task Force charge will be the same as described in the paper on an Objective Approach; that is, to provide for the greatest number of incidents (and fire loss, if possible) to be responded to within NFPA standards. The applicable NFPA standard for locating a station is a 4 minute travel time (assuming the County takes aggressive steps to reduce the 2 minute 90th percentile delay in call response and turnout times).

The net gain & loss of fire incidents from a move of FS8's location, and the associated fire loss, can be judged subjectively by looking at 3 variables - where the 4 minute line moves to, where the fire incident density is, and what associated fire loss data indicates. One level of judging the impact on operational response is discussed below, using information from the TriData 2012 Report:

1. Figures 19 and 25 in TriData's 2012 Report - show the current 4 minute travel time line for FS8, and the adjusted time line for the County's proposed location at Old Dominion and 26th St. It shows an area on both that is between Stations 2, 6 and 8 and is not covered by the 4 minute response time that is needed to avoid a sharp increase in risk. The 4 minute travel time line for any other potential sites would need to be estimated.
2. Figure 7, Fire Incident Density - shows the incidents per square mile. Overlaying the 4 minute curves in question on this map, and estimating the area gained and the area lost, and the incident density of each, will result in an approximate gain & loss, and a net number.
3. Table 4, Fire Risk Classification by Planning Area, 2009-2011 - shows the fire loss (property and contents) for each planning area. This information could be used to estimate a cost for any net gain/loss in fire incidents from a move.

If the above estimations are also deemed impractical, a third level approach would be to generally judge the gain/lost areas from the move of the 4 minute line. Then judge the general magnitude of any fire incident density and fire loss differences in each, and judge the significance of the net gain/loss in either incidents and/or fire loss.

A fourth level approach would be to look at planning areas for which service is improved, and those for which service is reduced, and compare known statistics to assess the wisdom of a move. For instance, FS8 is at the crosshairs between planning Areas 1, 2, 3 & 4. The County proposed move of FS8 to Old Dominion & 26th St. benefits planning Area 1, but reduces service to Areas 2, 3 & 4. Reviewing statistics in the 2012 TriData Report shows that Areas 2, 3 & 4 have 5, 6 and 4 times the fire loss per sq mile than

Area 1. In addition, 2010-2015 emergency incident data shows that the FS8 fire box areas in Area 1 have 1/4 of the emergency incident rate compared to FS8 fire boxes outside Area 1.

This would seem to show that moving FS8 NE into Area 1 towards fewer emergency incidents and lesser fire loss rates, and away from higher incident rates and higher fire loss rates, is not a wise action operationally.

Prepared by: Scott Wilson, PE