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SJFD

Fire Engine
- Hose
- Water
- Pump

Fire Truck
- Ladders
- Rescue
- Search
- Ventilation
**Fewer Stations**
- Fewer Engines/Trucks
- Each station covers more square miles, operating more independently
- Each station covers more residents, running more calls
- Four-Person Staffing

**More Stations**
- More Engines/Trucks
- Each station covers less square miles, operatingly more dependently
- Each station covers fewer residents, running fewer calls
- Three-Person Staffing
Sworn Line Staffing

Incidents Handled

2016-17 Budget: 674 Firefighters
2009

- Hazardous Materials Team - CROSS STAFFED

- Truck Companies -
  - REDUCED 5 TO 4 FIREFIGHTERS
• Engine 30 - CLOSED
• Engine 33 - CLOSED
• Engine 35 - CLOSED
• Engine 34 - CLOSED
• Truck 4 & 3 -> T30 - NO WATER
• Engine 9 & 29 - BROWNED OUT
• Squads
SAN JOSE FIRE FIGHTERS

2016
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- Engine 30 - REOPENED
- Engine 33 - CLOSED
- Engine 35 - REOPENED
- Engine 34 - REOPENED
- Truck 4 & 3 -> T30 - WATER
- Hazardous Materials Team - CROSS STAFFED
- Truck Companies -
  - REDUCED: 5 to 4 FIREFIGHTERS
- SQUAD Companies - 5 & 26
As approved by the City Council, the Mayor Chuck Reed’s June Budget Message for Fiscal Year 2014-2015 included direction to the Fire Department and City Manager’s Office to undertake a comprehensive organizational review of the San Jose Fire Department.

The City of San Jose retained Citygate Associates to perform a Fire Department Organizational Review consisting of three “packages.”

I. Evaluation of Delivery of Fire Department Service
II. Evaluation of Technological Improvements as it Relates to Fire Department Response Time Performance
III. Evaluation of Potential Efficiencies in Fire Department Operations
Background -

Since the decision to space fire Stations apart, the City has experienced significant growth.

2000 - recommended adding 7 to 9 fire stations since then only 3 were opened.

13% growth in Population
85% growth in call volume
18% decrease in response time effectiveness

* – Citygate, Executive Summary, p.3
## City Gate Report

**Table 4—Fire Unit Staffing for the Ten Largest Cities in the U.S.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank by Size</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Fire Unit Staffing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>8,175,133</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>3,792,621</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>2,695,598</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>2,099,451</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>1,526,006</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>1,445,632</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>1,327,407</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>1,307,402</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>1,197,816</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>San José</td>
<td>1,016,479</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1: Top 20 US Cities: Firefighters Per 1,000 Residents**
City Gate Analysis of Response Times

“We find the City’s deployment system does not provide City Council-adopted and best practice desired response times, especially outside of the urban core as fire station spacing increases in the suburban areas.” *

SJ City Council-adopted fire unit deployment performance goal:

Fire unit *citywide* to arrive within 8 minutes to 80% of the most serious Priority 1 incidents

National Standard adopted by Citygate and the Commission on Fire Accreditation International [CFAI]

First-due fire unit should arrive within 7 minutes 90% of the time

* – Citygate, Executive Summary, p.3
### City Gate Report

### Table 2—Call to Arrival Time Analysis (14/15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Battalion/Station</th>
<th>Minutes (Incidents) at 90% Performance</th>
<th>Minutes (Incidents) at 80% Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department-Wide</td>
<td>09:45 (55,586)</td>
<td>08:30 (55,586)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battalion 01</td>
<td>09:30 (14,372)</td>
<td>08:13 (14,372)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 03</td>
<td>08:41 (2,343)</td>
<td>07:26 (2,343)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 07</td>
<td>09:24 (2,821)</td>
<td>08:10 (2,821)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 08</td>
<td>09:02 (1,222)</td>
<td>07:56 (1,222)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 26</td>
<td>08:47 (2,809)</td>
<td>07:29 (2,809)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 30</td>
<td>10:21 (3,380)</td>
<td>09:01 (3,380)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 33</td>
<td>09:30 (1,608)</td>
<td>08:25 (1,608)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battalion 02</td>
<td>10:30 (189)</td>
<td>09:18 (189)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 21</td>
<td>09:42 (12,768)</td>
<td>08:30 (12,768)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 16</td>
<td>09:53 (3,333)</td>
<td>08:41 (3,333)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 11</td>
<td>10:19 (1,040)</td>
<td>08:52 (1,040)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 19</td>
<td>09:41 (2,643)</td>
<td>08:26 (2,643)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 24</td>
<td>08:55 (1,352)</td>
<td>07:55 (1,352)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 31</td>
<td>09:35 (1,610)</td>
<td>08:38 (1,610)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battalion 04</td>
<td>09:51 (1,537)</td>
<td>08:36 (1,537)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 22</td>
<td>09:08 (1,253)</td>
<td>08:10 (1,253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 10</td>
<td>09:35 (10,952)</td>
<td>08:25 (10,952)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 06</td>
<td>08:59 (2,742)</td>
<td>07:57 (2,742)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 09</td>
<td>09:16 (1,692)</td>
<td>08:08 (1,692)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 10</td>
<td>09:45 (1,871)</td>
<td>08:30 (1,871)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 14</td>
<td>09:55 (1,932)</td>
<td>08:46 (1,932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station 15</td>
<td>10:08 (1,946)</td>
<td>08:51 (1,946)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battalion 13</td>
<td>09:15 (769)</td>
<td>08:24 (769)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battalion 13</td>
<td>09:45 (10,886)</td>
<td>08:35 (10,886)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# City Gate Report

## Table 1: Number of Residents and Number of Square Miles Covered by Each Fire Station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Serviced</th>
<th>Residents Per Fire Station</th>
<th>Square Miles Per Fire Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of San Francisco</td>
<td>18,889</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>18,700</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td>16,927</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>15,855</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>9,520</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San José</td>
<td>32,852</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* – Citygate, Executive Summary
San Jose by the Numbers 2014
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gap Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dimensions (Miles)</th>
<th>Road Miles Not Covered at 4-Min Travel</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Risk and Bldg. Fire</th>
<th>Second-Due Unit Travel and UHU %</th>
<th>Citygate Fill Priority Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Willow Glen</td>
<td>3 X 2.5</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>20,403</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cambrian</td>
<td>3 X 2.5</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>16,035</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vinci/Berryessa</td>
<td>2.5 X 2</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>11,162</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Oak Ridge</td>
<td>2.5 X 1.5</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>12,650</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>East Foothills</td>
<td>2.8 X 2.5</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>8,564</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>South San José</td>
<td>3.5 X 2</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>9,902</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Centerwood</td>
<td>2 X 1.75</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>14,012</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Westmont</td>
<td>1.5 X 1.5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>10,346</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>1.5 X 1</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>10,958</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* – Citygate, Executive Summary, p.3
City Gate Analysis of Response Times

“The straightforward problem is that the City’s large geography and non-grid road design outside of the older downtown core is simply too large to serve efficiently with a limited number of fire stations. The only way to maintain reasonable emergency unit travel times will be for the City to add more crews (both in the browned out (closed) stations and where a sufficient number of fire stations does not exist), and add at least four to six critically missing fire stations.”

* – Citygate, Executive Summary, p.3
Fire Station 37

Measure O 2002 (Neighborhood Security Act) authorized the City to issue $150 Million in general obligation bonds

- Improve response time performance in underserved areas.
- Fire Station 37 is the final station scheduled for construction as part of the Public Safety Bond Program.

- In 2008, the City Council directed the Administration to remove the sale of Fire Station 6 (including reallocation of staff) from the 2008-2009 Budget and from the 2009-2013 Capital Improvement Program until additional analysis regarding the potential impacts of the closure and sale of the station was completed. Connected to that action, the City Council also established a city-wide policy that prohibits the closure, sale, or relocation of a fire station as part of the City Budget without prior assessment, community outreach, and City Council approval.
Fire Station 37

Performance: 8 Minutes For All Calls - Current Deployment
Fire Station 37
Performance: 8 Minutes For All Calls
Add New Station 37 With One Engine (Engine 37)
Fire Station 37
Performance: 8 Minutes For All Calls
Move Engine 6 to Station 37, Closing Station 6
Conclusions:

**Does SJFD meet acceptable response time performance standards?**

“We find the City’s deployment system does not provide City Council-adopted and best practice desired response times, especially outside of the urban core …” - V1, Page 3

“The Department … had a 90% First Alarm travel time of 12:50 minutes/seconds. This is almost 5 minutes above the 8-minute national best practice publications for metro/urban areas. None of the battalions or station areas in San Jose met this goal.” – V1, page 20
Conclusions:

**Does SJFD meet acceptable response time performance standards?**

“The Department is not meeting its adopted 80% at 8-minute goal, or a 90% at 7-minute best practice goal, or the City General Plan goal of a 4-minute travel time.” – V1, page 17
Why does SJFD have poor response times?

“The straightforward problem is that the City’s large geography and non-grid road design outside of the older downtown core is simply too large to serve efficiently with a limited number of fire stations.” - V1, Page 3

“This study has identified four principal reasons for this situation: (1) too few stations; (2) traffic congestion; (3) high workload rates on many key companies; (4) movements for mandatory multi-unit training.” – V1, page 17
### Calls for Service 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOUNTAIN VIEW FIRE</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Fire Engines</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3699</td>
<td>Engine 4</td>
<td>2838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Rescue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2376</td>
<td>Engine 6</td>
<td>2677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Haz-Mat</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2790</td>
<td>Truck 30</td>
<td>3151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ladder Truck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5,703 INCIDENTS
Are 3-person engines the solution to SJFD response time performance?

“Given the building and wildland fire risks in San Jose, first arriving unit effectiveness, the safety advantages of 4-firefighter units, and the number of deployment gaps in the system, Citygate cannot recommend the City lower staffing from four to three per unit at this time.” – V1, page 15

“…just a dramatic ‘reshuffling’ of existing field personnel will not solve the City’s response time problems.” – V1, page 44

“There is no question from Citygate’s perspective, or the perspective of the San Jose Fire Department leadership over many decades, that a 4-firefighter unit is more effective and safer for the firefighter and the public being protected in San Jose.” – V1, page 13.
Are 2-person squads the solution to SJFD response time performance?

“Citygate has recommended squads in other cities, but the gaps were smaller, and the workload demands moved, so the squads could shift from core to suburban areas outside of the work week hours. However, San Jose is missing too many firefighting units before it even addresses the escalating EMS incident workload. Too many areas at peak incident demand hours of the day lack a timely response to potential fire problems that need hoses and water.” – V1, page 16
Are 2-person squads the solution to SJFD response time performance?

“…before even one incident occurs, the citywide system could be short upwards of 11 companies. While the current 2-firefighter squads help with responding to medical emergencies, they cannot be deployed to large deployment gaps where no fire engine exists.” – V1, page 16

“…the current squad staffing should be redeployed and additional funding from the 2014 SAFER Grant should be utilized to restore a 4-person company.” – V1, page 16
How to improve response times?

- Add more crews
- Add Fire Stations

“there is no way to appreciably lower emergency fire unit travel times without adding additional units or reducing incident demand from low acuity emergency medical services (EMS) incidents”
What do we recommend?

Adopt updated performance measures at the neighborhood level, reflecting national standards as outlined in the report. Although the department does not currently meet these standards, it should publish its performance against them and monitor improvements. (Recommendation #2-1, V1-p. 18)

Redeploy current squad staffing to restore one engine. (V1-p. 16)
What do we recommend?

Continue progress on the Fire Department’s work plan as Key prioritized projects should include:

- Base map update
- Navigation technology
- Fire communications staffing
- GPS unit tracking Closest unit dispatch
- Border drops with bordering partner fire departments
What do we recommend?

- Implement a new Fire Station Alerting System ($1.275M), which has been shown to reduce dispatching times. (Recommendation #3-10, V1-p. 29)
- Restore the dedicated Hazardous Incident Team at a total cost of $2.6 million, allowing Hazardous Materials emergency responses independent of Truck 29’s availability. (Not specifically identified in the report.)
- Work closely with the County EMS Agency to design a multi-tier system that properly prioritizes medical calls and dispatches the appropriate level of personnel and resources…. (Recommendation #2-8, V1-p. 19).
Key Recommendations to improve department performance:

“Recommendation 2-2: Restore, as soon as possible, the browned-out (closed) fire companies and fully fund the current five squads as stopgap reliever units ….” – V1, page 21

“Recommendation 2-3: Identify the funding and timing to add four to six of the most critically missing fire stations.” – V1, page 21

“Finding 3-5: The technology used for fire station alerting is slow and outdated. It should be replaced and doing so could save up to 30 seconds per dispatch transaction.” – V1, page 25
Citygate’s overall recommendation, if there are no constraints

(minimum staffing agreements, budget, response time standards, etc.)

“Overall Recommendation: Increase the Fire Department budget by 12.4%, which totals $22,732,000. This will add the identified headquarters positions …, the two closed fire companies (after the 2014 SAFER Grant) along with the necessary minimum staffing overtime, and five gap area companies. This increase should be the City’s near-term goal.
Evans Lane
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Fireworks

• In April 2016, the City Council approved higher fines for the sale, use, possession, or storage of fireworks.

• $500 for a first violation, $700 for a second violation, and $1,000 for a third violation.
• Increase enforcement for illegal fireworks use over the 4th of July holiday weekend.
Happy 97th Birthday
Willow Glen Resident Sam Siebert
Conclusion

Questions…