Robert Yager

From:	Robert Yager <yagerra@comcast.net>
Sent:	Friday, March 9, 2018 10:14 AM
To:	Dale Stuart (dstuart@oaklandtownship.org)
Cc:	Marty McQuade; Paul Strelchuk (pstrelchuk@oaklandtownship.org); Greg Ball (gball@oaklandtownship.org); Frank Ferriolo (fferriolo@oaklandtownship.org); Jeanne Langlois (jlanglois@oaklandtownship.org); John Giannangeli (jgiannangeli@oaklandtownship.org); Karen Reilly (kreilly@oaklandtownship.org); 'lmangiapane@oaklandtownship.org'; MIchael Bailey (mbailey@oaklandtownship.org); Robin Buxar (rbuxar@oaklandtownship.org)
Subject:	Average vs. Fractal 90% Response Time
Attachments:	The Meg Peters Citizen Online Article 11-27-2015.pdf; Houston EMS Response Time.ppt

Mr. Stuart,

With regard your comment –

"I am aware of no data that supports the idea that "EMS agencies generally agree that 90% fractal is a more useful number"

I refer you to

- Oakland County Medical Control Agency Protocol 6-18

- National Fire Protection Association NFPA Standard 1710

- CFAI – Commission for Fire Accreditation International Center (accrediting agency for EMS) – See example and explanation of 90% fractal for Houston Fire Dept. in attached powerpoint

- Reasoned Opinion of Rochester Hills Fire Chief in a news article attached by Meg Peters

Like Chief Strelchuk, Chief Sean Canto of Rochester Hills has his own

'Average response times can kind of be deceiving,? he said.

For example, one of his medical units could make several calls a week nursing home, tallying in 30 second response times each time. If they ten minutes or later to each call, by averaging the 30 second response average would turn out to be about five minutes.

'You've got to be careful when people say average, because what does average response times aren't good, but you want to look at the bigger not missing anything.?

Bob Yager