Right Sizing Navy Fire & Emergency Services

OR 680/SYST 798 Final December 8, 2011



Nellie Coronado Alan "Zip" Duda Ehsan Foroudi Amon Tarakemeh



Purpose & Agenda

Purpose

•Present results and methodology from the Fire & Emergency Services Effectiveness BaseLine Evaluator "FESEBLE" tool

Agenda

- Introduction
- •Background
- •System
- •Approach
- •Model
- •Results
- •Conclusion



Introduction

 "Secretary of Defense Robert Gates has set a goal of saving \$150 billion from the Pentagon budget over the next five years. \$35 billion of those proposed savings would come from the US Navy." - PRI's The World, January 10, 2011





Background

- Sponsor
 - Created FESPOM cost model to calculate resources required to meet policy requirements
 - Study needs to adjust to budget and model needs to explain possible effects of change
 - Requests loss function (L) as L = F(A, I)
 - A FE&S Asset, I Base Installation Features
- Problem
 - Develop a mathematical model of the expected loss at an installation given an application of F&ES resources
 - Determine the risk levels and minimize/level the fire and emergency risk against an enterprise budget
 - Altering the risk, resources, mix of F&ES capabilities across and within the Navy's 70+ installations



Goal

- Create an installation level simulation tool
 - Simulate the events, response, and loss
 - Vary the response due to changed resources





Assumptions

- Assumptions:
 - Requested resources to an event
 - Pre-determined time for resolving false alarm
 - Pre-determined response/priority to overlapping events
- Uncertainties:
 - Events time duration
 - Providing resources to an event (first 5 minutes)
 - Providing proper resources to an event



Existing Process



System Interactions



Alternatives

• 3 Alternatives

| | | Overall Familiari | | iarity | Availability | | | |
|-----------|----------------|-------------------|---------|----------|--------------|----------|---------------|--------|
| | Licensing/Cost | Power | Sponsor | Team | Sponsor | Team | Expandability | Legend |
| ExtendSim | \$\$\$ | | | | | Δ | | High |
| Arena | \$\$\$ | | | Δ | | | | Medium |
| Excel | \$ | \triangle | | | | | \triangle | Low |

- ExtendSim & Arena
 - Powerful, Expensive, Limited knowledge base, limited availability
- Excel (Chosen)
 - Slower processing power, cheap, widely available



Standards

- NFPA 1710 Organization and Deployment of Fire Suppression Operations, Emergency Medical Operations, and Special Operations to the Public by Career Fire Departments
- Minimum of 4 firefighters per apparatus
- Arrive within 4 minutes 1st company
- 8 minutes all companies for 1st alarm
- Process and notify in 1 min, 95% of the time



Approach

- Used grid to calculate location
- Fitness center, University hall, and Mason Inn renamed as Mason base fire stations
- Types/frequency of events and resources are based by reviewing Navy F&ES PCA data



Map



Data Collection

- Locations for Events and Stations
 - Longitude
 - Latitude
- Vehicles
 - Capability
 - Station
 - % maintenance

- Events
 - Type
 - Priority
 - Probability of False Alarm
 - Time Required
 - Frequency



Model Flow



- Identify vehicles required and current status
 - Send available vehicles, or
 - Reroute vehicles based on the distance and priority
- Determine Loss



Model Limitations

- Vehicle provide 1 capability
 - System Effect: Worst case assumption. Cross capable vehicles not modeled. Lowers benefit for some vehicles.
- Loss is binary: ALL vehicles must be at the event for the FULL duration
 - System Effect: Worst case assumption. The critical moments are the 1st 30 minutes.
- All vehicles are fully crewed
 - System Effect: Best case assumption. SMEs generally agreed with this assumption.



On-site station #1 with no loss



On-site station #2 with no loss



On-site station #3 with loss



3 on-site & off-site stations, no loss



No resources, loss



Off-site station with loss



On-site station #3 with no loss



On-site station #1 with no loss



Scenario Design & Runs

• Scenarios

| | Scenario 1 | Scenario 2 | Scenario 3 |
|---------|---|---|---|
| Design | 3 on-site stations 1 off-site station | 3 on-site stations 0 off-site station | 2 on-site stations 1 off-site station |
| Purpose | Real world configuration Baseline scenario | • Stress the capabilities of the base | • Cost savings measure (shut down 1 station) |
| | - Dasenne seenario | • Not all bases have a community station available | • Vehicles from the closed base were NOT relocated |

- Runs and Run Times
 - 1 year; 100 replications
 - 1 replication: 6 minutes; Full Model: 30 hours
 - For accurate distributions ~50 replications



Outputs

| Main Matrice | | Run 1 | | |
|------------------|---|---|---------------|------|
| | | Total Monetary | 124.2 | |
| – Monetary Los | S | Total Lives Los | 2 | |
| T T T | Lives Lost Median Arrival Time for the | Arrival Time for the 1 st | Median | 1.17 |
| – Lives Lost | | | 1st Quartile | 0.60 |
| – Median Arriv | | | 3rd Quartile | 2.19 |
| First Respond | er | Responder | μ | 2.23 |
| - # of Failed Fx | vents | | σ Median | 4.21 |
| | | Arrival Time | 1st Quartile | 0.61 |
| – # of Events w | hen lives were lost | for the Last | 3rd Quartile | 2.20 |
| | | Responder | μ | 2.27 |
| | | | σ | 4.28 |
| • Secondary Me | trics | Count t(1st Res | 2328 | |
| Counta when | 1st roomondor | #of Failed Even | ts | 93 |
| - Counts when | responder | #of Events Whe | 4 | |
| arrived late | | | ARFF | 0 |
| - Arrival Time | for the Last | | Battery Chief | 0 |
| Descender | Annual Time for the Last Responder Vehicles that were not available | | Hazmat | 0 |
| Responder | | Vehicles | Ladder | 0 |
| – Vehicles that | | | Rescue | 0 |
| | | | Structural | 95 |
| | | | Engine | |
| | | | Tanker | |

Results

- Scenario Results calculated from run outputs
- Monetary Loss Results
 - Scenarios 2 & 3 had higher average monetary loss and higher deviation
- Lives Lost Results
 - Scenario 2 had a significant increase in lives lost
 - Scenario 3 had a comparable lives lost value
- Scenario 2 had no community station so certain capabilities were unavoidable
- Scenario 3 had limited resources but the full range of capabilities





| | | Scenarios | | | |
|----------|---|-----------|-----|-----|--|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
| Monetary | μ | 110 | 341 | 362 | |
| Loss | σ | 16 | 106 | 28 | |
| Lives | μ | 1 | 28 | 2 | |
| Lost | σ | 4 | 5 | 1 | |

Results (cont.)

- Failed Events & Events when Lives were Lost
 - Scenario 1 performed the best (most resources)
 - Scenario 2 performed horribly
 - Metric rules Scenario 2 as an infeasible option
 - Scenario 3 had a high # of failed events but performed for high casualty events
 - Represents acceptable risk

| | | | # of Events when Lives | | |
|----------|-------------|----------|-------------------------------|------|--|
| | # of Failed | d Events | were lost | | |
| | μ | σ | μ | σ | |
| Scenario | | | | | |
| 1 | 94.77 | 15.50 | 1.87 | 4.09 | |
| Scenario | | | | | |
| 2 | 403.58 | 49.43 | 28.23 | 5.01 | |
| Scenario | | | | | |
| 3 | 366.21 | 25.53 | 2.54 | 1.53 | |



Conclusions & Recommendations

- Conclusions
 - Useful, accurate results based on the input data
 - Flexible, adaptable, and scalable
 - Additional metrics can be captured
 - All station and equipage assumptions are located in the spreadsheets; allowing for easy sensitivity analysis
- Recommendations
 - Continue to run model with different scenarios
 - User will comprehend the depth and breadth of the tool
 - Identify useful metrics and additional metrics needed
 - Improve on the input assumptions



Next Steps & Lessons learned

- Next Steps
 - Run for an actual base; site surveys
 - Expand the model
 - Vehicles with multiple abilities
 - Personnel as data
 - Training dependencies and cross-training assumptions
 - Maintenance assumption and model application
 - Degradation of Loss
 - Obtain the Fairfax County Automatic Vehicle Location data
- Lessons Learned
 - Quickly nail down the real problem and solution and vet it against the sponsor
 - Don't speak to the interviewees (SME) about the model
 - Programmers should use the same logic



Experts

- Fred Woodaman (Sponsor)
 - Principal Analyst
 - Innovative Decisions
- Captain Tom Arnold
 - Operations Bureau
 - Fairfax County Fire and Rescue
- Steve Burke
 - Volunteer Firefighter
 - 20 years experience



Questions

