



Memorandum

TO: PUBLIC SAFETY, FINANCE, AND
STRATEGIC SUPPORT COMMITTEE

FROM: Robert Sapien, Jr.

SUBJECT: SEE BELOW

DATE: April 10, 2018

Approved

Date

4-12-18

**SUBJECT: FIRE DEPARTMENT "48/96" WORK SCHEDULE PILOT PROGRAM
QUARTERLY REPORT**

RECOMMENDATION

Accept the quarterly report on the Fire Department "48/96" work schedule pilot program metrics to determine favorable and/or unfavorable changes that may be attributed to the pilot program.

BACKGROUND

The Department provides around-the-clock all-hazard emergency response through the deployment of three platoons (A-Shift, B-Shift, C-Shift), each working approximately 122 shifts annually. Each shift is 24 hours in length.

While there are many schedule configurations possible for achieving three-platoon/around-the-clock coverage, the 48/96 Work Schedule (48/96) has trended higher in recent years, inclusive of fire departments within Santa Clara County. To ensure adequate understanding of the organizational impacts of a schedule change, the City agreed to conduct a two-year 48/96 Work Schedule Pilot Program (Pilot Program).

In May 2016, the City and the International Association of Fire Fighters, local 230 (IAFF) agreed to the terms for implementation of a two-year 48/96 Work Schedule Pilot Program through a side letter agreement¹. The Pilot work schedule applies to all emergency response personnel assigned to the 56-hour per week work schedule excluding Arson Investigators.

Under the 48/96 schedule, emergency response personnel continue to work the equivalent number of hours. However, work tours are reduced to two consecutively scheduled 24-hour shifts, hence the "48" in the moniker. Previously, under the work schedule known informally as "3s & 4s," work tours were 72 hours comprised of three 24-hour shifts scheduled with 24-hour off-duty periods between each shift. The 96-hour (or four-day) rest period between work tours is

¹ Side Letter Agreement: <http://www.sanjoseca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/56574>

April 10, 2018

Subject: Fire Department 48/96 Work Schedule Pilot Program Quarterly Report

Page 2 of 20

unchanged. The table below reflects the first month of the 48/96 Work Schedule Pilot Program, effective on January 1, 2017.

JANUARY 2017						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
1(C)	2(A)	3(A)	4(B)	5(B)	6(C)	7(C)
8(A)	9(A)	10(B)	11(B)	12(C)	13(C)	14(A)
15(A)	16(B)	17(B)	18(C)	19(C)	20(A)	21(A)
22(B)	23(B)	24(C)	25(C)	26(A)	27(A)	28(B)
29(B)	30(C)	31(C)				

For comparison, the table below reflects the permanent (or prior) “3’s & 4’s” work schedule as it was in January 2016.

JANUARY 2016						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
					1(A)	2(C)
3(A)	4(B)	5(A)	6(B)	7(C)	8(B)	9(C)
10(A)	11(C)	12(A)	13(B)	14(A)	15(B)	16(C)
17(B)	18(C)	19(A)	20(C)	21(A)	22(B)	23(A)
24(B)	25(C)	26(B)	27(C)	28(A)	29(C)	30(A)
31(B)						

The agreement between the City and IAFF on the 48/96 Pilot Program included, among other items, evaluation of a series of metrics during the term to determine favorable and/or unfavorable changes that may be attributable to the 48/96. Per the agreement, these metrics are defined in the San José Fire Department 48/96 Pilot Program Manual², and are listed below.

48/96 Work Schedule Pilot Program Metrics	
(a) Overtime Costs	(b) FLSA Compensation
(c) Relief Personnel	(d) Sick Leave
(e) Vehicle Accidents	(f) Employee Injuries
(g) EMS/Patient Care	(h) Near-Miss Occurrences
(i) Employee Removal for Fatigue	(j) Mandated Compliance
(k) Station/Equipment Maintenance	(l) Turnout Time
(m) Fire Prevention Inspections	(n) APA Completion
(o) NFIRS & PCR Completions	(p) Residency Data
(q) Absence Rates	(r) Disability Costs

The 48/96 Pilot Program metrics were selected to provide information to assess whether the schedule change has a positive, negative, or neutral effect on organizational productivity, quality, safety, and cost. Some of these metrics were previously tracked while others are new. New

² Pilot Program Manual: <http://www.sanjoseca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/65939>

metrics may need refinement for relevance and reliability; however, ongoing refinements are expected to provide the Department with better information. Under the Pilot Program, the Fire Department is to provide quarterly updates to the Public Safety, Finance, and Strategic Support Committee (PSFSS), including comparison of the data on the metrics from the prior similar time period and the effective date of the 48/96.

This is the fifth quarterly report of the 48/96 Pilot Program. The analysis below will describe data and provide continued assessment. The first four Pilot Program quarterly reports are available online³.

ANALYSIS

The Fire Department has reviewed data for the agreed-upon metrics for the first quarter of calendar year 2018 (January 1, 2018–March 31, 2018) and compared it to data from the same time frame from 2016, when the “3s & 4s” work schedule was in place. Additionally, a full year of Pilot data is now available to compare against calendar year 2016.

The Pilot Program metrics, the Fire Department’s assessment of that data, and the sources of that data are as follows:

(a) Overtime Costs: The Department will monitor and report on the Overtime costs to determine if the new schedule has any impacts.

1) A comparison of quarterly aggregate overtime costs:

Q1 2016 vs Q1 2018	January 1, 2016 – March 31, 2016	January 1, 2018 – March 31, 2018	Difference	Difference as %
Overtime Costs	1,269,712	2,361,254	1,091,542	85.97%
Overtime Hours	23,696	41,473	17,777	75.02%

Cumulative Pilot Period Comparison 2016 to 2017	January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016	January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2017	Difference	Difference as %
Overtime Costs	\$8,182,212	\$10,704,517	\$2,522,305	30.83%
Overtime Hours	148,865	188,094	39,229	26.35%

³ April 20, 2017 report: http://sanjose.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?meta_id=628753
 August 17, 2017 report: http://sanjose.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?meta_id=648829
 October 19, 2017 report: http://sanjose.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?meta_id=670205
 February 15, 2018 report: <https://sanjose.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5795761&GUID=8E1157CA-6EE9-47C2-A3F6-7C02A7B98A89>

It should be noted that the figures above are based on an updated methodology for calculating overtime costs that reflect aggregate overtime during the reflected time periods, including the prior quarters reported for 2016 and 2017.

Note: A 3 percent general wage increase for IAFF represented employees became effective on June 19, 2016. An additional 3 percent general wage increase for IAFF represented employees went into effect on June 18, 2017.

2) Assessment: No Impact / Possibly Unfavorable

Personnel assignments and staffing balances amongst the three platoons are unaffected by the Pilot Program. For example, personnel holding bid assignments on Engine 1 A-Shift continue in that assignment and are scheduled the same number of 24-hour shifts per year in the “48/96” schedule as they would under “3s & 4s” work schedule. Because both schedules are virtually the same relative to distribution of personnel, other variables must be evaluated to understand comparative increases and decrease in the overtime costs metric.

Daily vacancies resulting in overtime costs and overtime hours are influenced by a variety of factors including position vacancies, employees expending accrued leave time, unavailability of personnel due to disability or modified duty restrictions, and augmented resource levels. Augmented staffing levels occur during high hazard periods such as red flag warnings or active emergencies (e.g. 2016 floods, statewide deployments, FEMA deployments).

The recent quarter of fiscal year 2017-18 realized an increase over the same quarter of the base year (2016-17), and overtime hours increased by 17,777. The primary driver for the increased overtime was the increase in personnel vacancies. Twenty additional vacancies in this period equated to 14,560 hours which required backfilling. Less significant drivers included increases in sick leave, disability, and statewide mutual aid deployments.

3) Source: PeopleSoft and Telestaff

(b) ***FLSA Compensation: The Department will monitor and report on the amount of FLSA pay to ensure the new schedule is not systematically increasing FLSA compensation.***

1) Comparison of aggregate FLSA compensation:

Q1 2016 vs Q1 2018	January 1, 2016 – March 31, 2016	January 1, 2018 – March 31, 2018	Difference	Difference as %
FLSA Compensation	\$413,526	\$592,907	\$179,381	43.38%

Cumulative Pilot Period Comparison 2016 to 2017	January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016	January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2017	Difference	Difference as %
FLSA Compensation	\$1,901,726	\$2,016,622	\$114,896	6.04%

2) Assessment: Possibly Unfavorable

The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) compensation attempts to determine whether the Pilot schedule affects the City’s exposure to FLSA costs. It should be noted that there was a 3 percent general wage increase for IAFF represented employees became effective June 19, 2016. An additional 3 percent general wage increase for IAFF represented employees went into effect on June 18, 2017.

3) Source: PeopleSoft

(c) ***Relief Personnel: The Department will monitor and report on the utilization of Relief Personnel to determine if the new schedule has any impacts.***

1) Analysis of relief personnel placement relative to vacancy rates:

Q1 2016 vs Q1 2018	January 1, 2016 – March 31, 2016	January 1, 2018 – March 31, 2018	Difference	Difference as %
Relief Personnel Placement	100%	100%	0	0

Cumulative Pilot Period Comparison 2016 to 2017	January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016	January, 2017 – December 31, 2017	Difference	Difference as %
Relief Personnel Placement	100%	100%	0	0

2) Assessment: No Impact

The Relief Personnel metric attempts to measure whether the schedule change effectively utilizes the relief pool. This metric seeks to understand whether daily staffing vacancies are adequately filled by relief personnel to effectively stem overtime costs and also avoid unnecessary staffing overages. This metric, combined with overtime hours, could provide insights into how the schedule change affects behaviors related to accrued leave usage.

When current vacancy rates are combined with the number of personnel unavailable for duty due to disability and/or modified status, the result is that 18 relief personnel are available for assignment, or 6.0 per shift. Under these conditions, the Relief Personnel metric may not be a good indicator of employee behavior changes due to the 48/96 because the frequency of placement of relief personnel is invariably at 100 percent. Relief personnel currently provide minimal offset of daily vacancies. Sick leave utilization for this period alone would result in approximately 9 daily vacancies, while allowable vacation leave would result in up to 28 daily vacancies. The chart below compares calendar year 2016 (before the implementation of the 48/96) vacancies to 2018 (to date) vacancies.

Q1 2016 vs Q1 2018	2016 Avg. Vacancies	2016 Avg. Vac. Rate	2018 Avg. Vacancies	2018 Avg. Vac. Rate	Difference	Difference as %
Q1	39	5.99%	59	8.44%	20	2.45%

Cumulative Pilot Period Comparison 2016 to 2017	2016 Avg. Vacancies	2016 Avg. Vac. Rate	2017 Avg. Vacancies	2017 Avg. Vac. Rate	Delta Vacancies	Delta Rate
Q1	39	5.99%	48	7.03%	9	1.04%
Q2	44	6.75%	55	8.00%	11	1.26%
Q3	34	5.03%	56	8.15%	22	3.12%
Q4	40	5.81%	56	8.20%	16	2.39%

The Department will continue to track and review the utilization of Relief Personnel to determine if any significant changes are attributable to the 48/96 Work Schedule.

3) Source: PeopleSoft and TeleStaff

(d) ***Sick Leave: The Department will monitor and report on the use of Sick Leave to determine if the new schedule has any impacts.***

1) Comparison of aggregate sick leave usage:

Q1 2016 vs Q1 2018	January 1, 2016 – March 31, 2016	January 1, 2018 – March 31, 2018	Difference	Difference as %
Sick Leave Hours	14,502	16,839	2,337	16.12%

Cumulative Pilot Period Comparison 2016 to 2017	January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016	January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2017	Difference	Difference as %
Sick Leave Hours	70,983	66,846	(4,137)	(5.83%)

2) Assessment: No Impact / Possibly Unfavorable

The Sick Leave metric attempts to measure whether the 48/96 affects sick leave utilization rates. Sick leave directly influences the overtime costs metric and can potentially provide insights into health and wellness impacts of the schedule change, and possibly FLSA influences. Multiple variables may make identification of causation of comparative distinctions difficult. For example, a dramatic increase in sick leave usage may match regional trends during a particular flu season. Data over multiple quarters may provide for increased analytical reliability for this metric.

It should be noted that the Sick Leave rates shown above are for those on a 56-hour work week and subject to the 48/96 Work Schedule, and does not include Sick Leave usage for all sworn personnel in the Department.

3) Source: PeopleSoft

- (e) **Vehicle Accidents:** *All company officers and personnel assigned to driving and operating emergency response vehicles will continue to ensure that personnel fatigue is closely monitored. Personnel who are deemed to be too fatigued to operate a vehicle safely will be removed from emergency response duty and remain in quarters until directed by their respective Battalion Chief. Instances where fatigue is determined to cause or potentially cause an unsafe driving condition will be reported immediately to the Duty Chief via the chain-of-command.*

The Department will monitor and report on vehicle accidents to determine if the new schedule has any impacts.

- 1) Comparison of number of Department-involved vehicle accidents per quarter:

Q1 2016 vs Q1 2018	January 1, 2016 – March 31, 2016	January 1, 2018 – March 31, 2018	Difference	Difference as %
Vehicle Accidents	4	3	-1	(25.00%)

Cumulative Pilot Period Comparison 2016 to 2017	January 1, 2016 – December 30, 2016	January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2017	Difference	Difference as %
Vehicle Accidents	52	35	(17)	(32.69%)

- 2) Assessment: No Impact

All Fire Department-involved vehicle accidents are followed up by an accident investigation conducted by a supervising Battalion Chief and processed via the chain of command. These reports are evaluated individually and collectively to identify trends and opportunities for training and/or policy changes. For the purposes of the Pilot Program, the Department will closely evaluate each accident investigation report to determine whether the circumstances may be attributable to the schedule change.

None of the accidents were determined to be related to driver fatigue or otherwise related to the Pilot Program.

- 3) Source: Department Vehicle Accident Tracking Worksheet

- (f) **Employee Injuries:** *All company officers and personnel assigned to emergency response duties will ensure that personnel fatigue is closely monitored. Personnel who are deemed to be too fatigued to function safely will be removed from emergency response duty and remain in quarters until directed by their respective Battalion Chief. Instances where fatigue is determined to cause or potentially cause employee injury will be reported immediately to the Duty Chief via the chain-of-command.*

The Department will monitor and report on employee injuries to determine if the new schedule has any impacts.

1) Comparison of number of injuries occurring per quarter:

Q1 2016 vs Q1 2018	January 1, 2016 – March 31, 2016	January 1, 2018 – March 31, 2018	Difference	Difference as %
New Injury Reports	76	86	10	13.16%
Injuries Resulting in Lost Time	34	44	10	29.41%

Cumulative Pilot Period Comparison 2016 to 2017	January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016	January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2017	Difference	Difference as %
New Injury Reports	279	323	44	15.77%
Injuries Resulting in Lost Time	144	53	(91)	(63.19%)

2) Assessment: No Impact / Possibly Unfavorable

A “New Injury” report is a work-related injury reported by an employee for which the employee does not have a current open workers’ compensation claim. “Injuries Resulting in Lost Time” indicate injuries for which an employee missed work due to the injury. These injuries differ from those that may require simple medical treatment and result in no time missed from work.

Like vehicle accidents, each employee injury is investigated and reports are reviewed by the respective Deputy Chief (DC). The reviewing DC evaluates for trends, opportunities for training and/or policy changes, and directs further actions specific to each occurrence. The number of reported injuries will be compared to the same quarter of the previous year. Additionally, DCs will also evaluate each report and flag those that are possibly attributable to the schedule change for further evaluation. Employees are required to report all injuries or possible injuries and supervisors are required to investigate each occurrence. No Supervisor’s Accident Investigation Reports (SAIR) for this period determined causal relationship to the Pilot Program.

3) Source: Department Tracking Excel Worksheet (based on Employers First Report of Injury, Medical Reports and Department Worker’s Compensation Reports)

- (g) ***EMS/Patient Care (Medical Call Reviews): All company officers and personnel assigned to patient care as EMT or EMT-P will ensure that personnel fatigue is closely monitored. Personnel who are deemed to be too fatigued to function safely in this capacity will be removed from emergency response duty and remain in quarters until directed by their respective Battalion Chief. Instances where fatigue is determined to cause or potentially cause a compromise in patient care will be reported immediately to Med 30, and reviewed by the EMS Division through the standing CQI process. Fatigue related Medical Call Reviews will be collected and reported to BFO throughout the pilot period.***

The Department will monitor and report on EMS Quality Assurance, including any Quality Improvement actions that may result, to determine if the new schedule has any impacts.

1) Comparison of number of Medical Call Reviews initiated:

Q1 2016 vs Q1 2018	January 1, 2016 – March 31, 2016	January 1, 2018 – March 31, 2018	Difference	Difference as %
Medical Call Reviews	4	5	1	25.00%

Cumulative Pilot Period Comparison 2016 to 2017	January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016	January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2017	Difference	Difference as %
Medical Call Reviews	27	20	(7)	(25.93%)

2) Assessment: No Impact

The Department responds to more than 70,000 Emergency Medical Services calls annually, providing Advanced Life Support level of care by providing a Firefighter/Paramedic and Firefighter/EMT personnel on each apparatus. The standard of care is determined by the California Emergency Medical Services Agency with local oversight provided by the Santa Clara County Emergency Medical Services Agency. The Department provides an internal Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) function partly through the Medical Call Review process.

Medical Call Reviews may be triggered through clinical performance discrepancy discovered through a variety of sources including internal patient contact record (PCR) screening, base hospital referral, supervisor referral, or complaint originating from any source (County EMS Agency, ambulance transport provider, civilian, or patient). Call Reviews are non-punitive inquiries seeking to understand specific details of patient care toward Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI). Call reviews may result in no action or remediation actions (advanced training, PCR auditing, peer mentoring, etc.), and possible referral to the Department Emergency Medical Services Directing Physician. None of the Medical Call Reviews conducted in the 2017 reporting period were deemed to be related to fatigue or otherwise related to the Pilot Program. Variations in the number of call reviews, in a given time period, can correlate to the number of newly accredited Firefighter/Paramedics in the field.

3) Source: Image Trend, EMS PCR Program

(h) Near-Miss Occurrences: *Near-miss reporting will continue as outlined in the SJFD Injury and Illness Prevention Plan manual.*

The Department will monitor and report on Near-miss reporting to determine if the new schedule has any impacts

1) Comparison of number of Near-miss reports submitted:

Q1 2016 vs Q1 2018	January 1, 2016 – March 31, 2016	January 1, 2018 – March 31, 2018	Difference	Difference as %
Near-Miss Reports Submitted	0	0	0	0%

Cumulative Pilot Period Comparison	January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016	January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2017	Difference	Difference as %
Near-Miss Reports Submitted	0	0	0	0%

2) Assessment: No Impact

The Department’s Injury and Illness Prevention Plan (IIPP) requires that near-miss occurrences be reported in the same manner as actual injuries through the SAIR. Given the hazardous conditions confronting first responders on a daily basis, it is likely that near-miss occurrences are unreported. The Department is currently preparing a training module for dissemination to remind and encourage employees to utilize this method to report occurrences. This effort will likely skew comparative data; however, the Department recommends maintenance of this metric for its value in identifying possible safety issues related to the Pilot Program.

3) Source: Department Accident Investigation Report.

- (i) ***Employee Removal for Fatigue: The Department will not compromise the safety of employees nor the public in the implementation of an alternate work schedule.***

The Department will monitor and report on the number of instances where an employee is removed from the line due to fatigue to determine if the new schedule has any impacts.

1) Instances where supervisors intervened due to concerns for excessive employee fatigue:

Q1 2016 vs Q1 2018	January 1, 2016 – March 31, 2016	January 1, 2018 – March 31, 2018	Difference	Difference as %
Excessive employee fatigue reported	0	0	0	0%

Cumulative Pilot Period Comparison 2016 to 2017	January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016	January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2017	Difference	Difference as %
Excessive employee fatigue reported	0	0	0	0%

2) Assessment: No Impact

This metric was included to signal immediate safety concerns due to employee fatigue observed by supervisors or peers. Procedurally, battalion chiefs who are made aware of safety concerns due to fatigue are directed to immediately contact the Duty Chief for action and investigation. The Duty Chief is directed to immediately contact the Assistant Fire Chief in this circumstance. The Department will continue to monitor this metric and the possible related impacts caused by employees being required to work increased overtimes, and to determine if any increases in employee fatigue is attributable to the Pilot Program.

3) Source: Senior Staff

(j) ***Mandated Training/Testing/Evaluation Compliance: Annually, the Department strives to achieve completion of mandatory training, testing, and evaluation for all sworn personnel. Instances where personnel miss their scheduled events and subsequently miss scheduled make-up dates are costly to the department in terms of staff time and efficiency.***

The Department will monitor and report on completion of mandatory training, testing, and evaluation for all sworn personnel to determine if the new schedule has any impacts.

1) Comparison of compliance with mandated training assignments:

Q1 2016 vs Q1 2018	January 1, 2016 – March 31, 2016	January 1, 2018 – March 31, 2018	Difference
% of Mandated Compliance	45.48%	61.30%	15.82%
Cumulative Pilot Period Comparison (Average)	January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016	January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2017	Difference
% of Mandated Compliance	37.87%	56.03%	18.16%

2) Assessment: No Impact / Possibly Favorable

This metric seeks to capture productivity level changes in mandated training compliance attributable to the schedule change. Ongoing Department training is delivered in a variety ways including in-person/in-service didactic and manipulative training, on duty online (Target Solutions) training, in service company/battalion level training, off-duty career development training, and required training on overtime. Records are kept for required course work as well as miscellaneous professional certifications and continuing education (CE) credited work. A review of the source records found inaccuracies within individual records. For example, some personnel training records were found to include “self-assigned” courses which, when selected (or self-assigned), create a due date. Personnel not completing these non-mandated training modules are counted as non-compliant in the metric. The accuracy

of this metric may be improved in the upcoming quarters as records are updated and obsolete assignments and “self-assigned” courses are removed.

3) Source: Target Solutions

(k) ***Station/Equipment Maintenance: Personnel safety and response readiness are highly dependent on the condition of equipment and stations. Equipment and station maintenance standards will not be compromised during the 48/96 pilot period.***

The Department will monitor and report on equipment and station maintenance to determine if the new schedule has any impacts.

1) Observations regarding fire station and equipment maintenance:

Q1 2016 vs Q1 2018	January 1, 2016 – March 31, 2016	January 1, 2018 – March 31, 2018	Difference
Station and Equipment Maintenance	N/A	100%	N/A

Cumulative Pilot Period Comparison 2016 to 2017	January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016	January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2017	Difference
Station and Equipment Maintenance	N/A	100%	N/A

2) Assessment: No Impact

Department senior managers conduct four formal inspection tours annually at each fire station to assess care and maintenance of fire stations, fire apparatus, uniforms and personal protective equipment, and operational readiness.

The Department will continue to track and review the care and maintenance of fire stations and equipment to determine if any significant changes are attributable to the Pilot Program.

3) Source: Senior Staff

(l) ***Turnout Time: The Department will continue to monitor all aspects of response time performance. Turnout time is the response time segment that is most controllable at the company level.***

1) Comparison of Turnout Time performance levels:

Q1 2016 vs Q1 2018	January 1, 2016 – March 31, 2016	January 1, 2018 – March 31, 2018	Difference
Priority 1	70.56%	76.23%	5.67%
Priority 2	69.13%	74.78%	5.65%

Cumulative Pilot Period Comparison (Average)	January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016	January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2017	Difference
Priority 1	73.51%	76.43%	2.92%
Priority 2	71.57%	74.62%	3.05%

2) Assessment: No Impact / Possibly Favorable

The Department has reinforced the importance of improved response times through ongoing messaging to emergency responders and implementation of the “early dispatch” protocol. The Q1 2018 quarter results reflect an improvement of over 5.6 percent in comparison to the Q1 2016 Turnout Time performance levels. The overall cumulative 2017 reporting period reflects a 3 percent improvement in Turnout Time performance. The Department believes that, in addition to the response time improvement initiatives, there is modest benefit from greater efficiency created by having 50 percent fewer shift changes. Emergency responses occurring at shift change (0800 hours) can be delayed as personnel remove personal protective equipment from fire apparatus to allow oncoming personnel to take over.

The Department will continue to track and review the Turnout Time performance levels to determine if any significant changes are attributable to the Pilot Program.

3) Source: Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD)

(m) ***Fire Prevention Inspections: The Department maintains and will continue an aggressive line occupancy inspection program including educational facilities (E) and multiple housing units (R).***

The Department will monitor and report on these life safety programs to determine if the new schedule has any impacts.

1) Comparison of Fire Prevention inspection performance levels:

Q1 2016 vs Q1 2018	January 1, 2016 – March 31, 2016	January 1, 2018 – March 31, 2018	Difference
Educational Facilities (E) Assigned	N/A	0	N/A
Educational Facilities (E) Initiated	N/A	5	N/A
Educational Facilities (E) Completed	N/A	39	N/A
Multiple Housing Units (R) Assigned	N/A	1	N/A
Multiple Housing Units (R) Initiated	N/A	46	N/A
Multiple Housing Units (R) Completed	N/A	335	N/A

Cumulative Pilot Period Comparison	January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016	*January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2017	Difference
Educational Facilities (E) Assigned	173	177	4
Educational Facilities (E) Initiated	48	44	(4)
Educational Facilities (E) Completed	176	111	(65)
Multiple Housing Units (R) Assigned	5,037	5,083	46
Multiple Housing Units (R) Initiated	438	728	290
Multiple Housing Units (R) Completed	4,270	4,051	(219)

2) Assessment: No Impact / Possibly Favorable

The Fire Prevention Inspections metric was included in an effort to capture any productivity differences attributable to the Pilot Program. Unfortunately, the inspection cycle changed for this reporting period and will therefore result in unreliable comparative data. Previously, Educational facility (E) line inspections were assigned in the month of September and were to be completed by December 31. Residential (R) line inspections were assigned in the month of March and were to be completed by February 28 of the following year.

In July 2017, inspections will align with the fiscal year for improved budget performance reporting. In Fiscal Year 2017-2018, both E and R inspections will be assigned on July 1. The Department will continue to report on this metric to capture progress on the current inspection cycle.

**Beginning in July 2017, the Department initiated reporting under the new inspection cycle.*

3) Source: Fire House

(n) ***Annual Performance Appraisal Completion: Personnel performance and future performance objectives are captured and memorialized in the Annual Performance Appraisal (APA) process. Personnel performance tracking and supervisor feedback is provided in order to develop employees and to set future objectives. This process will continue during the pilot period.***

The Department will monitor and report on the Annual Performance Appraisal (APA) process to determine if the new schedule has any impacts.

1) Comparison of APA completion levels:

Q1 2016 vs Q1 2018	January 1, 2016 – March 31, 2016	January 1, 2018 – March 31, 2018	Difference
Percentage of APAs Completed (averaged)	63.00%	61.00%	(2.00%)

Cumulative Pilot Period Comparison 2016 to 2017	January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016	January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2017	Difference
Percentage of APAs Completed (averaged)	69.29%	66.34%	(2.95%)

2) Assessment: No Impact/Possibly Unfavorable

This metric was selected to capture any productivity changes relative to Annual Performance Appraisal (APA) completion possibly attributable to the Pilot Program. The metric provides the percentage of completed APAs between January 1, 2016, and March 31, 2016, and between January 1, 2018, and March 31, 2018 respectively. As has been previously noted, there is a full year of Pilot Program data (for calendar year 2017) available to compare against calendar year 2016.

3) Source: Department Annual Performance Appraisal Excel Worksheet

(o) ***National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS) & Patient Care Report (PCR) Completions: Accurate and timely completion of emergency response reports is a critical department function and required in policy.***

The Department will monitor and report on the accurate and timely completion of emergency response reports to determine if the new schedule has any impacts.

1) Comparison of NFIRS and PCR completion performance levels:

Q1 2016 vs Q1 2018	January 1, 2016 – March 31, 2016	January 1, 2018 – March 31, 2018	Difference	Difference as %
Completed NFIRS Incident Reports	19,667	20,561	894	4.55%
% of Completed NFIRS Reports	89.72%	87.70%	(2.02%)	(2.02%)
PCRs Completed	14,637	17,815	3,178	21.71%
% of PCRs Completed	72.24%	99.02%	26.78%	26.78%

Cumulative Pilot Period Comparison	January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016	January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2017	Difference	Difference as %
Completed NFIRS Incident Reports	78,417	85,330	6,913	8.82%
% of Completed NFIRS Reports	87.80%	87.87%	(0.07%)	(0.07%)
PCRs Completed	59,090	69,881	10,791	18.26%
% of PCRs Completed	73.47%	91.34%	17.87%	17.87%

2) Assessment: No Impact/Possibly Favorable

The NFIRS and PCR completion metric was selected to capture any changes in productivity levels possibly attributable to the Pilot Program. These records are created on two separate records management system software platforms. NFIRS are created on FireHouse hosted by the Department, and PCR are created on Fieldbridge hosted by the County EMS Agency. Data reliability is challenged by variables in reporting requirements, user input errors and incomplete entries. Additionally, limited staff availability results in little quality assurance oversight. Training efforts have previously resulted in improved reporting quality, and will continue to be a Department priority. Comparative results for this reporting period reflect improved PCR completion rates which may be partly attributable to the recently implemented electronic tablet based reporting or “E-PCR.”

In an effort to more accurately collect and report on PCR completion criteria, Fieldbridge was utilized to collect and evaluate the data reported above, and will be the data source utilized going forward.

3) Source: FireHouse, Fieldbridge, and Computer Aided Dispatcher (CAD)

(p) ***Residency: Per the City’s personnel records as of January 1, 2017, Department members reside in a geographically disperse area.***

The Department will monitor and report on the firefighter residency proximity to the Department to determine if the new schedule has any impacts.

In addition, as a condition of employment, all employees hired during the term of the Pilot Program shall reside within one hundred and twenty (120) minutes travel time from the nearest City of San Jose fire station.

1) Comparison of residency locations for IAFF employees:

Q1 2016 to Q1 2018	January 1, 2016 – March 31, 2016**	January 1, 2017 – March 31, 2017**	January 1, 2018 – March 31, 2018**	2016 to 2018 Difference	2016 to 2018 Difference as %
% City of SJ	19.25%	17.94%	17.13%	-13 Employees	(2.12%)
% Santa Clara County	12.56%	12.40%	13.38%	+5 Employees	0.82%
% Adjacent Counties to Santa Clara	39.48%	38.99%	38.33%	-7 Employees	(1.15%)
% Outside of Santa Clara County (not adjacent)	28.71%	30.67%	31.16%	+15 Employees	2.45%

** It should be noted that the residency data is based on the last date of the quarter, and not the date range shown above. Accordingly, the residency data that is available is comparing the same employees’ residency information from March 31, 2016, versus March 31, 2017, and March 31, 2018. The Department will continue to review the data to determine if there is a better method to compare employees’ residency information.

Employees represented by IAFF, Local 230 beginning March 31, 2016 (the end date of the first quarter this metric was measured against), through March 31, 2018. The residency data below compares employees who were employed in an IAFF represented classification on March 31, 2016, and who continue to be in an IAFF represented classification through March 31, 2018.

Cumulative Pilot Period Comparison	3/31/16	6/30/16	9/30/16	12/31/16	3/31/17	6/30/17	9/30/17	12/31/17	3/31/18
San Jose	118 (19.25%)	114 (18.60%)	115 (18.76%)	111 (18.11%)	110 (17.94%)	110 (17.94%)	108 (17.62%)	104 (16.97%)	105 (17.13%)
Santa Clara County (Not San Jose)	77 (12.56%)	77 (12.56%)	79 (12.89%)	74 (12.07%)	76 (12.40%)	75 (12.24%)	76 (12.40%)	79 (12.89%)	85 (13.38%)
Adjacent to SCC	242 (39.48%)	241 (39.31%)	237 (38.66%)	240 (39.15%)	239 (38.99%)	242 (39.48%)	239 (38.99%)	238 (38.82%)	235 (38.33%)
Non-Adjacent to SCC	176 (28.71%)	181 (29.53%)	182 (29.69%)	188 (30.67%)	188 (30.67%)	186 (30.34%)	190 (30.99%)	192 (31.32%)	191 (31.16%)
Total Employees	613	613	613	613	613	613	613	613	613

	March 31, 2016 through March 31, 2018	
	Employee Difference	Percentage Difference
San Jose	-13 Employees	(2.12%)
Santa Clara County (Not San Jose)	+5 Employees	0.82%
Adjacent to SCC	-7 Employees	(1.15%)
Non-Adjacent to SCC	+15 Employees	2.45%

2) Assessment: No Impact / Possibly Unfavorable

Personnel separations (i.e. voluntary resignations, terminations, and retirements) or personnel being promoted out of a classification represented by IAFF may have an impact on residency information. Accordingly, the figures in (1), above, include only employees who were employed in an IAFF-represented classification during the periods noted above. They **do not** include any employees who were not employed by the City in an IAFF-represented classification as of March 31, 2016, or employees who left City service, or who were promoted out of an IAFF-represented classification after March 31, 2016.

Santa Clara County data in the table above does **not** include employees who reside in the City of San José. Adjacent counties include Alameda, San Mateo, Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito, Merced, Stanislaus, and San Joaquin. It should be noted that, as part of the Pilot Program, a Community Response Readiness requirement mandates that all new hires during the term of the Pilot Program, as a condition of employment,

reside within 120 minutes' travel time from the nearest City of San Jose Fire Station. This Community Response Readiness requirement information will be included in any academies that commence after March 2017.

3) Source: Data in (1) is based on the City's PeopleSoft records.

(q) ***Absence Rates: The Department will monitor and report on absence rates to determine if the new schedule has any impacts.***

1) Comparison of absence rates:

Q1 2016 vs Q1 2018	January 1, 2016 – March 31, 2016	January 1, 2018 – March 31, 2018	Difference
Absence Rate: Overall	16.00%	15.44%	(0.56%)
<i>Absence Rates: Sick</i>	3.65%	3.92%	0.27%
<i>Absence Rates: Vacation</i>	5.80%	5.49%	(0.31%)
<i>Absence Rates: Other</i>	6.34%	6.03%	(0.31%)

Cumulative Pilot Period Comparison 2016 to 2017	January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016	January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2017	Difference
Absence Rate: Overall	17.94%	17.09%	(0.85%)
<i>Absence Rates: Sick</i>	4.04%	3.76%	(0.28%)
<i>Absence Rates: Vacation</i>	7.06%	7.24%	0.18%
<i>Absence Rates: Other</i>	6.84%	6.09%	(0.75%)

2) Assessment: No Impact / Possibly Favorable

The absence rates metric was included to identify general absence behavior changes possibly attributable to the Pilot Program. Absence rates are a ratio of total scheduled work hours compared to the total employee leave hours utilized. "Other" absences shown above include compensatory time, funeral leave, jury duty, disability/modified duty, FMLA, and military leave.

This metric was selected to capture employee absence changes possibly attributable to the Pilot Program. Data reflects slightly lower absence rates as compared to the same time period in 2016. This outcome may support that current vacancy rates are the principal driver for the increased overtime costs identified in metric (a) as there are fewer personnel available to fill even normal vacancies.

The Department will continue to track and review Department Absence Rates to determine if any significant changes are attributable to the Pilot Program.

3) Source: PeopleSoft

(r) ***Disability Costs:*** *The Department will monitor and report on the disability leave costs to determine if the new schedule has any impacts.*

1) Comparison of absence rates:

Q1 2016 vs Q1 2018	January 1, 2016 – March 31, 2016	January 1, 2018 – March 31, 2018	Difference	Difference as %
Disability Leave Costs	\$927,356	\$1,045,378	\$118,022	12.73%
Disability Leave Hours	24,658	30,651	5,993	24.30%

Cumulative Pilot Period Comparison 2016 to 2017	*January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016	*January 1, 2017 – December 31, 2017	Difference	Difference as %
Disability Leave Costs	\$4,644,031	\$4,215,554	(\$428,477)	(9.23%)
Disability Leave Hours	120,742	105,587	(15,155)	(12.55%)

2) Assessment: No Impact / Possibly Favorable

The Disability Costs metric was included to identify health, safety, or cost attributable to the Pilot Program. The Disability Costs metric represents disability earnings and hours and does not include modified duty work hours or earnings. The Department anticipates that this metric will require several reporting periods in order identify actual trends, as there are multiple variables influencing disability leave costs.

3) Source: PeopleSoft (report from HR) *For this reporting period, the data source was changed from TeleStaff to a PeopleSoft report from HR. This has proved to be a more accurate data source, and will be utilized for all subsequent reports.

CONCLUSION

As the Fire Department 48/96 Work Schedule Pilot Program progresses, the Department anticipates having additional data on the above mentioned metrics to evaluate and to assess if any significant changes are attributable to the Pilot Program. The Department will continue to provide quarterly reports to determine favorable and/or unfavorable changes attributed to the Pilot Program.

/s/
 Robert Sapien, Jr.
 Acting Fire Chief
 Fire Department