when the district might need to consider acquiring a third ambulance if this type of increase became a pattern.

After the meeting, Trusty told OCN that the 2.514 total calls in 2016, TLMFDP had about 796 fire calls and 1,775 EMS calls.

The board of directors was that TLMFDP had a good working relationship with the City of Colorado Springs Fire Department and its contracted ambulance service, American Medical Response (AMR). Trusty said TLMFDP has responded into Colorado Springs sometimes to help when it is busy there, but Trust and Secretary Mike Smaldino said a mutual benefit occurs, since the city will also move an ambulance farther north just in case it might be needed when TLMFDP is very busy.

**Call volume disparity with Wescott discussed**

TLMFDP sent a letter to Trusty in December notifying TLMFDP of Wescott’s decision to begin charging TLMFDP for a portion of the automatic aid Wescott provides. They suggested TLMFDP and Wescott sign an IGA where the per call fee would be $230 for certain calls, with an implementation date of Feb. 1. Burns estimated that Wescott provides automatic aid on all levels of EMS calls to the southern end of TLMFDP’s territory along Baptist Road about 100 times a year. See related DW- FPD article on page 8.

After the meeting, Trusty explained that automatic aid is defined as an arrangement where a neighboring jurisdiction will respond automatically into another jurisdic tion to be the primary responder into a defined area. It can be fire or EMS. Mutual aid is where that other jurisdiction will only come in if the original jurisdiction either needs additional help or its resources are not current available.

AMR is also Wescott’s outsourced ambulance service, but Wescott provides the driver for that ambulance as part of its contract.

Trusty’s memo to the board offered six possible responses to DW-FPD. He said the staff recommended Option 4, below. “We don’t feel like we are going to put people at risk by not putting Wescott on those certain call types,” Trusty said.

**OPTION 1: Accept request as is: PRO: Quickest response by a unit of some type for all calls. CON: District will incur an expense that at the moment is not budgeted.**

**OPTION 2: Deny request completely: PROS: More consistent responses from TLMFDP resources. No additional expense. CON: Longer response times on some calls including life-threatening calls.**

**OPTION 3: TLMFDP units are solely dispatched with an officer’s ability to add Wescott units as necessary.** PROS: DW-FPD could be added on an-as-needed basis and may have quicker response times. TLMFDP manages responses. Reduced or no additional expense. CONs: Additional dispatch time could make DW-FPD unnecessary due to loss of time advantage.

**OPTION 4: TLMFDP units are dispatched on all District 4 calls and Wescott would be dispatched only in all the most serious, life-threatening calls (cardiac arrest and other Level E calls). PRO: Quickest response on most severe calls.**

**OPTION 5: TLMFDP units are dispatched on all District 4 calls that are clearly not urgent (such as “lift assists” when a person has fallen and cannot get up). Sends a Wescott unit on all calls except for clearly non-serious calls. PRO: Quicker response to calls that are clearly emergency calls. Call volume reduced so that there is reduced or no additional expense. CON: Non-serious calls would have longer response times. Distinguishing these types of calls alone could be a challenge due to CAD flexibility.**

**OPTION 6: Hire/assign a staff member to run off of TLMFDP offices during normal business hours. PROS: Certain hours would allow a TLMFDP response unit. Additional administrative help. CON: Additional personnel cost depending on hours.**

Equipment costs.

Trusty told the board that TLMFDP “could significantly reduce the call disparity between TLMFDP and Wescott,