

January 2014

Pinellas CARES Evaluation
Pinellas, Florida



FITCH & ASSOCIATES, LLC

2901 Williamsburg Terrace #G § Platte City § Missouri § 64079

816.431.2600 § www.fitchassoc.com

CONSULTANT REPORT

INTRODUCTION

Pinellas County commissioned Fitch & Associates to assist the County in fine tuning the CARES model in order to deliver an implementable plan for the County. This subsequent assistance arose from the original work that was delivered by Fitch & Associates on July of 2013. When the County originally retained Fitch & Associates in 2012/2013 the firm was to evaluate two plans and create a third and potentially optimal plan to deliver emergency services in the County. The third plan affectionately named the CARES (**Community-wide Alignment of Resources for Efficiency and Service**) plan was able to maintain or improve service delivery within the County and reduce the overall system cost by \$6.3 million.

The challenge in the implementation of the CARES plan for the county was in the payer mix. Fitch and Associates was not originally retained to analyze the various sources that fund Fire/Rescue services which include municipal funds for fire protection, unincorporated fire district, independent fire district and countywide EMS funds (payer mix) but rather system costs. This means that some of the vehicle hours that were not required under CARES were hours that were not paid for by the county. Thus, when the County initiated negotiations with the cities on realignment of financial support for the delivery of emergency services it became difficult for the County to reduce financial support for assets that they were not financing. The County, wanting to implement the CARES model and find some of the efficiencies in the system, now needs to analyze the CARES model from the payer mix perspective.

METHODOLOGY

County staff looked at the EMS system in fundamentally the same way that Fitch & Associates used to develop the CARES model with the caveat of payer mix inclusion. The County where possible left the CARES model intact and modified only the areas in which the payer mix was in dispute. In the areas where the payer mix was in dispute the County had a simple yes or no inclusion criterion. If the area could meet the performance objectives that exist in the County without County financial support then no additional resources or financial support was given to that area. If the area could not meet the performance objective that exists in the County then the County evaluated how many additional resources would be required by that area to meet the performance objective and the County would financially support those resources. Fitch & Associates partnered with Optima Corporation which used the same simulation technology as was used in the first report in order to evaluate the system performance of the new model.

BACKGROUND FROM THE ORIGINAL STUDY

There were key findings in the first report that have bearing in the design of CARES:

- § Pinellas County's emergency medical services (EMS) system is widely recognized as one of most clinically sophisticated in North America. Thus the core of the system needed to remain intact
- § The county is concerned with the system's financial sustainability , a plan had to be designed to normalize short, mid and long term costs
- § The intent of the third plan was to align community-wide resources to enhance efficiency, maintain service levels and result in a more efficient system, position the system for anticipated "accountable healthcare" funding models, while also facilitating long-term financial sustainability.
- § Maintaining the current system's high level of pre-hospital care for patients and fire protection for the public was a top priority in all cases.

A note about the EMS system as a whole, the system outperformed the simulated (Optima) model by a percentage point. This was primarily due to the fact that Optima had only one year of data to fine tune the behavior of the system. With the true performance of the system coming in a little better than the predictor model Optima was able to further refine the simulation creating an upper bound limit. In Attachment 1 Optima presents both the conservative outputs of the original model and the upper bound model outputs to give a better idea of the current performance.

CHANGES FROM THE ORIGINAL CARES MODEL (OPERATIONAL AND FINANCIAL)

The County's model changed the funding approach for some cities while leaving the vast majority of the cities either fiscally whole or in a better fiscal position than in the current situation. The major shift is that the County is funding only the resources that the County believes are required to meet the County prescribed response criteria.

No Impact	Increased Funding	Decreased Funding
Dunedin	Palm Harbor	Clearwater
East Lake	Seminole	Largo
Gulfport	Tarpon Springs	Lealman
Madeira Beach		Pinellas Park
Oldsmar		St. Petersburg
Pinellas Suncoast		
Safety Harbor		
South Pasadena		
St. Pete Beach		
Treasure Island		

This funding change is in line with the CARES model in the reductions but adds additional coverage to some of the beach front difficult to service areas.

This funding reduction is achieved by two different ways:

- 1) By creating a New Baseline cost model called CARES 2 and changing the funding model
- 2) Begin the reduction of \$2.3 million dollars in the 2014-2015 fiscal year

Current	
Rescue Truck X 2 personnel X 24 hours =	48 hours of funding
Proposed	
Rescue truck X 2 personnel X 14 hours =	28 hours of funding
Engine X 1 personnel X 10 hours =	10 hours of funding
	38 hours of funding

Agency	FY 2014	CARES 2	New Base	FY 2015 Reduction	FY 2015 Payment
Clearwater	\$5,787,934	-\$669,690	\$5,118,244	-\$223,230	\$5,564,704
Dunedin	\$1,302,283	\$0	\$1,302,283	\$0	\$1,302,283
East Lake	\$1,385,987	\$0	\$1,385,987	\$0	\$1,385,987
Gulfport	\$400,007	\$0	\$400,007	\$0	\$400,007
Largo	\$4,282,689	-\$527,566	\$3,755,123	-\$175,855	\$4,106,834
Lealman	\$2,164,487	-\$285,454	\$1,879,033	-\$95,151	\$2,069,336
Madeira Beach	\$363,043	\$0	\$363,043	\$0	\$363,043
Oldsmar	\$430,034	\$0	\$430,034	\$0	\$430,034
Palm Harbor	\$1,913,608	\$240,740	\$2,154,348	\$240,740	\$2,154,348
Pinellas Park	\$2,328,686	-\$504,789	\$1,823,897	-\$168,263	\$2,160,423
Pinellas Suncoast	\$660,815	\$0	\$660,815	\$0	\$660,815
Safety Harbor	\$845,114	\$0	\$845,114	\$0	\$845,114
Seminole	\$2,016,700	\$143,945	\$2,160,645	\$143,945	\$2,160,645
South Pasadena	\$771,767	\$0	\$771,767	\$0	\$771,767
St. Pete Beach	\$1,317,862	\$0	\$1,317,862	\$0	\$1,317,862
St. Petersburg	\$13,144,183	-\$1,069,369	\$12,074,814	-\$356,456	\$12,787,727
Tarpon Springs	\$958,106	\$381,531	\$1,339,637	\$381,531	\$1,339,637
Treasure Island	\$370,920	\$0	\$370,920	\$0	\$370,920
TOTALS	\$40,444,225	-\$2,290,650	\$38,153,575	-\$252,739	\$40,191,486

This materially translates to an apparatus funding change represented below

Resource type	Current	Cares 2
24 hour		
Engine/Truck/Squad	40	41
Rescue	22	8
14 hour Peak load		
Rescue	0	14
Squad	0	2
Off Peak		
Engine/Truck/Squad		12
Total	62	77
Total Positions	84	79.28

This demonstrates a key understanding about the core value of the CARES model which is to better match supply and demand. The County has diversified the funding to increase the amount of apparatus it can fund by changing the funding model from 24 hours to a model that funds the specific needed hours. This change increases the number of apparatus but diminishes the amount of full time equivalencies that the County funds which ultimately diminishes the cost burden for the County. This is a demonstration of doing “more with less” which is a core value in achieving fiscal harmony.

CONCLUSION

The County staff used system design logic that built upon the original CARES model; it not only enhanced service areas that needed additional resources to meet response times but was able to generate significant savings for the County. The methodologies that were used and outputs that were generated by the County were confirmed using the same process and program of the original CARES model. The Optima software was applied to the model that was designed by the County and found that the model was able to maintain or improve the response time to all the areas in the County. Optima used a conservative approach to determine whether the system would conform to the County wide requirements and found the new system to perform as well and in some cases better than the original CARES model. Some of the monies that were savings in the Original CARES model are still available to the individual cities that would like to change some of their deployment models.

ATTACHMENT 1



Optima US Ltd
13785 Research Blvd.
Suite 125
Austin, Texas 78750
United States
Phone: (855) 777-9111
www.theoptimacorporation.com

PINELLAS COUNTY EMS SYSTEM

MODELING AND ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED 2014 RESCUE
CAPABLE (ALS) FIRST RESPONSE SYSTEM



PINELLAS COUNTY SAFETY AND EMERGENCY SERVICES

Document Version 1.0

January 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	2
2	SYSTEM MODIFICATIONS EVALUATED	3
	2.1 DETAILED SYSTEM CHANGES MODELED	3
3	MODELING RESULTS	6
	3.1 CARES-2 RESPONSE TIME PERFORMANCE-SYSTEM WIDE	6
	3.2 CARES-2 RESPONSE TIME PERFORMANCE-REPORTING DISTRICTS	6
	3.3 RECOMMENDATIONS: UNIT DEPLOYMENT	8
4	WORKLOAD ANALYSIS	9

© The Optima Corporation 20134. All rights reserved.

Optima, Optima live™, Optima predict™, Optima NET™ and the Optima logo are trademarks of The Optima Corporation

This document remains property of The Optima Corporation and is not to be given to any unauthorized individual, vendor or company or any copies of duplicates made without express written permission of The Optima Corporation. The information in this document is subject to change without notice and should not be construed as a commitment by The Optima Corporation. The Optima Corporation has taken great effort to verify the accuracy of this document but assumes no responsibility for any technical inaccuracies or typographical errors.

1 INTRODUCTION

The Optima Corporation has undertaken a series of evaluations to assist Pinellas County with evaluating the current and future state of EMS response capability within Pinellas County. This analysis work is being conducted using the existing Optima predict™ Pinellas County model, using a data set encompassing October 1, 2010 to September 30, 2011 with an addition of a 4% Incident Volume increase using the Optima predict Call Generator functionality to estimate 2013 incident volume.

This analysis will be indicative of the scope of change in performance that can be expected should one or more of these changes be implemented.

2 SYSTEM MODIFICATIONS EVALUATED

Pinellas County Safety & Emergency Services requested a series of system deployment modifications be modeled in order to assess the overall impact of the changes on the performance of the emergency medical services system as a part of the planning and evaluation of the EMS Rescue Capable (ALS) First Response System. The modeling within this report evaluated the entire service area using a unit configuration proposed by Pinellas County Safety & Emergency Services and building upon modeling previously conducted to address specific areas of performance concern. The proposed deployment is also based upon modeling done in support of the CARES proposal contained within the Fitch & Associates consulting report, submitted in 2013. The proposed configuration is referred to as CARES-2 throughout the document.

2.1 DETAILED SYSTEM CHANGES MODELED

The following changes were modeled for this analysis. The changes were modeled in aggregate to evaluate of initial state of the system with the suggested configuration. No changes were made to the existing Sunstar Paramedics deployment/unit hours plan for the purposes of this analysis.

- Rescue Capable Unit Modifications: Full-time, Peak and Off Peak Units

2.1.1 CARES-2 RESCUE CAPABLE (ALS) FIRST RESPONSE APPARATUS

The following units were modeled with Rescue Capability (ALS) for the durations noted in the table. All other first response apparatus were modeled with only a BLS capability.

Agency	Apparatus Name	Station	Hours In Service
Clearwater	E44	44	24/7/365
	R45	45	24/7/365
	R46P	46	8a-10p Daily
	R47P	47	8a-10p Daily
	R48P	48	8a-10p Daily
	R49P	49	8a-10p Daily
	E50	50	24/7/365
	E51	51	24/7/365
	E46O	46	10p-8a Daily
	E47O	47	10p-8a Daily
	E48O	48	10p-8a Daily
	E49O	49	10p-8a Daily
Dunedin	E60	60	24/7/365
	E61	61	24/7/365
	E62	62	24/7/365
East Lake	E56	56	24/7/366

Agency	Apparatus Name	Station	Hours In Service
	S57	57	24/7/367
	E58	58	24/7/368
Gulfport	E17	17	24/7/365
Largo	E38	38	24/7/365
	E39	39	24/7/365
	E40	40	24/7/365
	R41P	41	8a-10p Daily
	E41	41	24/7/365
	R42P	42	8a-10p Daily
	E43	43	24/7/365
	T420	42	10p-8a Daily
Lealman	E18	18	24/7/365
	R19P	19	8a-10p Daily
	E19	19	24/7/365
	E21	21	24/7/365
Madeira Beach	E25	25	24/7/365
Oldsmar	E54	54	24/7/365
Palm Harbor	E65	65	24/7/366
	E66	66	24/7/367
	T67	67	24/7/368
	E68	68	24/7/369
	S65P	65	8a-10p Daily
Pinellas Park	R33P	33	8a-10p Daily
	R34P	34	8a-10p Daily
	E330	33	10p-8a Daily
	E340	34	10p-8a Daily
	T35	35	24/7/365
Pinellas Suncoast	E27	27	24/7/365
Redington Beach	E26	26	24/7/368
Safety Harbor	E52	52	24/7/365
	T53	53	24/7/365
Seminole	E29	29	24/7/366
	S29P	29	8a-10p Daily
	E30	30	24/7/365
	E31	31	24/7/366
	E32	32	24/7/367
South Pasadena	R20	20	24/7/365
St. Pete Beach	E22	22	24/7/365
	R23	23	24/7/365
St. Petersburg	R1	1	24/7/365
	R3P	3	8a-10p Daily
	R4P	4	8a-10p Daily
	R5	5	24/7/365

Agency	Apparatus Name	Station	Hours In Service
	R6P	6	8a-10p Daily
	R7P	7	8a-10p Daily
	R8	8	24/7/365
	R9	9	24/7/366
	R10	10	24/7/367
	R11P	11	8a-10p Daily
	E12	12	24/7/367
	E13	13	24/7/368
	E14	14	24/7/369
	E3O	3	10p-8a Daily
	E4O	4	10p-8a Daily
	E6O	6	10p-8a Daily
	E7O	7	10p-8a Daily
	E11O	11	10p-8a Daily
Tarpon Springs	E69	69	24/7/365
	E70	70	24/7/365
	T71	71	24/7/365
Treasure Island	E24	24	24/7/365

Notes:

1. Units with a 'P' designation indicate a Peak Load Rescue Capable (ALS) Unit
2. Units with an 'O' designation indicate an Off-Peak Rescue Capable (ALS) Unit
3. E26 is stationed in Redington Beaches Station 26.
4. T71 is stationed at the proposed Tarpon Springs Station 71.

3 MODELING RESULTS

3.1 CARES-2 RESPONSE TIME PERFORMANCE-SYSTEM WIDE

At the system-wide level, response times were very good using the conservative model. The system was able to meet the goal of 7:30 for 90% of all EMS incidents and surpassed that level of performance.

System Wide Average Response Time:	5:05
System Wide 50 th % Response Time:	4:56
System Wide 90 th % Response Time:	7:17
System Wide % Compliance with 7:30 Goal:	91.49%

Response time is defined at Available for Dispatch to First Arriving Rescue Capable Unit.

3.2 CARES-2 RESPONSE TIME PERFORMANCE-REPORTING DISTRICTS

When using the Conservative Model, performance within each of the reporting districts is reasonable and generally consistent with the initial CARES proposal. CARES-2 results in slight variations in performance at both the Average and 90th% levels but results in substantial performance improvements in Tarpon Springs and the beach communities of Redington Beaches, Pinellas Suncoast, Madeira Beach and St. Pete Beach. The area with the most substantial negative performance change was Oldsmar, which showed an increase in performance of 51 seconds at the 90th percentile.

The response time performance in the model is deliberately conservative and has traditionally understated the actual performance achieved in the system.

This is well illustrated using an upper bound model (modifications were made to the mobilization time resulting in faster out of chute times based upon reports of actual performance from 2012) which results in performance that clearly shows all reporting regions well within the performance requirements. Though specific estimates of the actual performance will be achievable with an updated model and new tuning (using 2012 incident/response data and an updated road network and calibration), it is clear that the performance of the system using the CARES-2 deployment plan should provide desired levels of service to the Pinellas County community.

Table 3.2a Performance: CARES-2 by Reporting District

Reporting Districts	Conservative Model				Upper Bound Model			
	Avg	50th%	90th%	% 7:30	Avg	50th%	90th%	% 7:30
Belleair/Belleair Bluffs	5:04	4:55	7:38	89.15%	4:23	4:18	6:35	94.65%
Clearwater	5:20	5:13	7:41	88.27%	4:28	4:21	6:35	95.59%
Dunedin	5:17	5:08	7:44	88.06%	4:33	4:21	6:48	94.37%
East Lake	5:37	5:29	8:04	86.07%	4:40	4:42	6:55	94.27%
Gulfport	4:29	4:24	6:09	98.01%	4:29	4:24	6:09	98.01%
Largo	5:02	4:55	6:57	93.99%	4:09	4:04	5:48	98.34%
Lealman	4:55	4:48	7:02	93.49%	4:03	3:58	5:54	97.84%
Madeira Beach	5:12	5:06	7:21	90.80%	4:15	4:04	6:12	97.57%
Oldsmar	5:02	4:43	7:44	88.25%	4:19	3:53	7:09	91.26%
Palm Harbor	5:09	4:59	7:18	91.49%	4:15	4:07	6:08	97.61%
Pinellas Park	5:00	4:55	7:07	93.03%	4:11	4:05	6:07	97.72%
Pinellas Suncoast	5:05	5:01	7:25	90.69%	4:12	4:11	6:17	97.58%
Redington Beach	4:11	4:10	6:07	96.88%	3:16	3:16	5:04	99.44%
Safety Harbor	5:41	5:42	8:07	83.17%	4:48	4:47	6:59	93.91%
Seminole	4:57	4:43	7:09	92.25%	4:04	3:50	6:11	97.16%
South Pasadena	4:28	4:20	6:22	96.19%	3:34	3:26	5:16	98.64%
St. Pete Beach	4:24	4:05	6:43	93.53%	3:31	3:09	5:36	97.04%
St. Petersburg	5:00	4:51	7:07	92.51%	4:10	4:00	6:03	96.94%
Tarpon Springs	5:21	5:11	7:44	88.46%	4:30	4:17	6:35	94.21%
Tierra Verde	4:14	3:57	6:22	95.24%	3:24	3:07	4:59	97.20%
Treasure Island	5:00	4:45	7:48	87.92%	4:10	3:53	6:41	94.57%

Table 3.2b Change in Performance: CARES to CARES-2 by Reporting District (Conservative Model)

Reporting District	Δ Average (seconds)	Δ 90th% (seconds)
Belleair/Belleair Bluffs	0:05	-0:01
Clearwater	0:16	0:20
Dunedin	-0:01	-0:16
East Lake	-0:01	-0:08
Gulfport	0:04	-0:07
Largo	0:08	0:05
Lealman	0:09	0:10
Madeira Beach	-0:03	-0:28
Oldsmar	0:26	0:51
Palm Harbor	0:01	-0:08
Pinellas Park	0:09	0:04
Pinellas Suncoast	-0:10	-0:12
Redington Beach	-2:28	-2:39

Reporting District	Δ Average (seconds)	Δ 90th% (seconds)
Safety Harbor	0:02	0:02
Seminole	0:03	-0:05
South Pasadena	0:06	-0:02
St. Pete Beach	-0:01	-0:26
St. Petersburg	0:11	0:07
Tarpon Springs	-0:20	-0:45
Tierra Verde	0:05	-0:13
Treasure Island	0:01	-0:02

Notes: A negative value indicates an improvement in response time performance while a positive value indicates worse performance.

3.3 RECOMMENDATIONS: UNIT DEPLOYMENT

Based upon the analysis of response time performance, Optima would make no strong recommendation for additional Rescue Capable (ALS) units. The sole region in which additional capability may make a substantive difference would be Oldsmar. Adding a second Rescue Capable Resource (R54) as a Peak unit (8a to 10p) resulted in the following performance improvement (using the conservative model):

- Average Response Time decreased from 5:02 to 4:46
- 50th % Response Time decreased from 4:43 to 4:32
- 90th % Response Time decreased from 7:44 to 7:10
- % Compliance with 7:30 Standard improved from 88.25% to 92.49%

There were also associated improvements in performance in both East Lake and Safety Harbor adding additional value to the unit hours.

4 WORKLOAD ANALYSIS

A final component of the modeling analysis was to evaluate the workload of the Rescue Capable Units to detect any possible workload issues that may arise. The workload of all units is contained in Table 4a. The majority of the highest activity units are Rescue Units working either 24 hours shifts (e.g. R1) or Peak Load Shifts (e.g. R41P, R19P).

Table 4a Unit Workload

Unit	Assigned Incidents	Workload	Mileage
R1*	7066	30.14%	17178 miles
R41P	3204	28.29%	8894 miles
R19P	3254	26.69%	8994 miles
R7P	2977	26.40%	9371 miles
R33P	3105	25.87%	8864 miles
R3P	3568	25.52%	9612 miles
R42P	2830	25.42%	8698 miles
R48P	2693	25.11%	9477 miles
R4P	2957	24.29%	9129 miles
R47P	2847	23.72%	8484 miles
R49P	2695	22.07%	7495 miles
E18	4708	20.99%	14807 miles
R34P	2258	20.44%	7254 miles
R11P	2271	20.31%	6923 miles
E65	3272	18.23%	9575 miles
R6P	2385	18.14%	6707 miles
E38	3428	17.55%	10405 miles
R10	3803	17.05%	11623 miles
E41	2942	17.00%	8369 miles
R45	3725	16.96%	8365 miles
E60	3421	16.62%	8816 miles
E48O	1213	16.57%	4519 miles
R8	2970	16.18%	9489 miles
R9	2938	16.15%	8300 miles
E19	3181	15.90%	9026 miles
E40	3166	15.85%	10668 miles
E29	3223	15.69%	8883 miles
E33O	1251	15.45%	3669 miles
E3O	1662	15.40%	4339 miles
T42O	1185	15.22%	3891 miles
E62	3029	15.18%	9476 miles
E7O	1308	15.10%	3948 miles
E4O	1315	14.85%	3938 miles
E39	2796	14.83%	8348 miles

Unit	Assigned Incidents	Workload	Mileage
E47O	1284	14.78%	3825 miles
R5*	3051	14.70%	7686 miles
E50	2651	14.69%	9158 miles
R20	2707	14.64%	6075 miles
E13	2922	14.60%	11722 miles
E32	2903	14.46%	7813 miles
E51	3000	13.61%	8206 miles
E17	2995	13.32%	7419 miles
E43	2225	12.95%	7097 miles
E30	2774	12.80%	8118 miles
E49O	1094	12.77%	3181 miles
E52	2341	12.75%	8323 miles
E11O	1017	12.29%	2927 miles
E69	2215	11.94%	6052 miles
E34O	941	11.75%	2928 miles
E6O	988	10.34%	2654 miles
E14	2052	10.19%	8605 miles
E61	1699	10.17%	6642 miles
S65P	1000	9.99%	3004 miles
T53	1727	9.91%	7068 miles
T67	1874	9.85%	5382 miles
E56	1819	9.73%	6549 miles
E31	1763	9.28%	5214 miles
R23	1690	9.20%	3913 miles
E54	1695	9.14%	4786 miles
E25	1840	8.74%	5907 miles
R46P	954	8.71%	1852 miles
E66	1613	8.24%	5142 miles
S29P	790	7.68%	2539 miles
E24	1623	7.66%	4144 miles
E70	1326	7.59%	4417 miles
E27	1605	7.58%	4802 miles
E12	1200	6.51%	3573 miles
E3	1142	6.33%	2980 miles
T35	1053	5.93%	4522 miles
S57	1050	5.56%	3848 miles
E22	1031	5.24%	4967 miles
E4	964	5.21%	2834 miles
E33	888	5.14%	2476 miles
E7	860	5.06%	2754 miles
E26	959	4.87%	2679 miles
E49	806	4.82%	2249 miles
E46O	371	4.79%	701 miles

Unit	Assigned Incidents	Workload	Mileage
E44	960	4.73%	2406 miles
T71	784	4.32%	2546 miles
E48	761	4.15%	2597 miles
E68	752	4.00%	2632 miles
E34	631	3.87%	2081 miles
E11	686	3.79%	2034 miles
T42	585	3.72%	2258 miles
E6	708	3.66%	1819 miles
E47	654	3.61%	1816miles
E58	608	3.30%	2509 miles
E21	493	2.75%	2224 miles
E46	249	1.64%	599 miles

Notes:

- *R1/R5 workloads are likely closer together, a limitation in the current model logic related to two units in the same location results in R1 being dispatched first if available. This limitation is eliminated in an updated version of Optima predict™.
- If a unit appears twice (e.g. E11 and E11O) it represents the two different operational configurations of the unit (BLS and ALS respectively). These units are shown in direct relation to one another in Table 4b.

An additional analysis was done to evaluate the impact of transitioning select units from BLS to ALS capability. This was done using the Engines that were designated to serve as ALS units during Off Peak hours within the system. Table 4b contains these apparatus and shows the difference in workload when the unit operates as BLS (e.g. EXX) vs ALS (e.g. EXXO).

Table 4b Same Unit Workload Analysis BLS vs ALS

Unit	Assigned Incidents	Workload	Mileage
E11	686	3.79%	2034 miles
E11O	1017	12.29%	2927 miles
E3	1142	6.33%	2980 miles
E3O	1662	15.40%	4339 miles
E33	888	5.14%	2476 miles
E33O	1251	15.45%	3669 miles
E34	631	3.87%	2081 miles
E34O	941	11.75%	2928 miles
E4	964	5.21%	2834 miles
E4O	1315	14.85%	3938 miles
E46	249	1.64%	599 miles
E46O	371	4.79%	701 miles
E47	654	3.61%	1816 miles
E47O	1284	14.78%	3825 miles
E48	761	4.15%	2597 miles

Unit	Assigned Incidents	Workload	Mileage
E48O	1213	16.57%	4519 miles
E49	806	4.82%	2249 miles
E49O	1094	12.77%	3181 miles
E6	708	3.66%	1819 miles
E6O	988	10.34%	2654 miles
E7	860	5.06%	2754 miles
E7O	1308	15.10%	3948 miles
T42	585	3.72%	2258 miles
T42O	1185	15.22%	3891 miles

ATTACHMENT 2

Net differential in Vehicle Changes

Agency	Apparatus Name	Station	Change from CARES
Clearwater	E45	45	BLS Only Unit
	E46	46	Off Peak ALS Only: 10p to 8a
	E47	47	Off Peak ALS Only: 10p to 8a
	E48	48	Off Peak ALS Only: 10p to 8a
	E49	49	Off Peak ALS Only: 10p to 8a
Largo	S38	38	BLS Only Unit
	R39	39	BLS Only Unit
	T420	42	Off Peak ALS Only: 10p to 8a
Oldsmar	E54	54	T54 is now E54, ALS 24/7/365
	R54	54	BLS Only Unit
Pinellas Park	E16	16	BLS Only Unit
	T33	33	E33 out of service, Off Peak ALS Only: 10p to 8a
	S33/S35	33	BLS Only Unit
	E34	34	Off Peak ALS Only: 10p to 8a
	R35	35	Formerly R37, BLS only
Pinellas Suncoast	S37	27	BLS Only Unit
	T28	28	BLS Only Unit
Redington Beach	E26	26	New Unit, ALS 24/7/365
St. Petersburg	E1	4	BLS Only Unit
	E5	5	BLS Only Unit
	E8	8	BLS Only Unit
	E9	9	BLS Only Unit
	E10	10	BLS Only Unit
	E3	3	Off Peak ALS Only: 10p to 8a
	E4	4	Off Peak ALS Only: 10p to 8a
	E6	6	Off Peak ALS Only: 10p to 8a
	E7	7	Off Peak ALS Only: 10p to 8a
	E11	11	Off Peak ALS Only: 10p to 8a
	E14	14	New Unit, ALS 24/7/365
Tarpon Springs	T71	71	T69 now T71, ALS 24/7/365