

**Stanislaus County  
Emergency Medical Services Committee  
June 11, 2008  
Minutes**

---

Location: LifeCom Dispatch Center  
4701 Stoddard Road  
Modesto, California

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Committee Members Present: Cleve Morris, Paul Baxter, Gary Hinshaw, Karen Hall, Tom Burns, Mary Ann Lee, Gary Hampton, Bob Wikoff, John Cremin

Committee Members Absent: Niamh Harrington

Guests: Dan Bobier, Jared Bagwell, Ray Leverett, Chuck Coelho, Richard Reed, Sarah Gordon, Henry Benavides, Cindy Woolston, Alicia Hinshaw, Bob Watt, Stephen Mayotte, Mike Passalacqua

Staff: Steve Andriese – Executive Director, Marilyn Smith – Response and Transport Coordinator, Tina Casias - Executive Secretary, Tom Morton - QI Coordinator

---

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. by Chairman Baxter with a quorum of members present. Chairman Baxter asked that all meeting attendees introduce themselves.

**2. Review and Approval of Agenda**

**M/S/C** To approve agenda as submitted

**Vote:** Unanimous

**3. Correspondence**

There was no correspondence.

**4. Public Comment Period**

There were no public comments.

**5. Approval of the Minutes of December 11, 2008**

Gary Hinshaw referred to Page #7 of the December 11, 2008 minutes requesting to change Item # c-OES, line # 22, word 13 and 14 from 'Search and Call' to 'Certification and Qualification'.

Chairman Baxter referred to Page #5 of the December 11, 2008 minutes requesting to change line # 8, 2<sup>nd</sup> word from 'Burns' to 'Baxter'.

**M/S/C** (Cremin/Wikoff) To approve the minutes as amended.

**Vote:** Unanimous

## **6. Committee Reports**

### **a. System Status**

Cindy Woolston of AMR reported of an earlier meeting in which the Committee reviewed the standing items on their agenda as follows:

- 1) The System Status Plan was reviewed with no changes.
- 2) A review of EMSC agenda items and discussion concerning agenda item # 8- Ambulance Response Time Reports
- 3) A discussion concerning the purchase of MDT's for rural ambulance providers. The request for approval of the purchase of the MDT's will be submitted to the Board of Supervisors for their June 30, 2009 meeting.

### **b. SHEPC**

Mr. Andriese informed Committee members that neither Mr. Penner nor Mr. Buchanan was present to give a report on SHEPC.

### **c. OES**

Chief Hinshaw reported that the FY09 Homeland Security grant had been received by the County. The full allocation will be somewhere around \$1.1 million or \$1.3 million. There are very specific issues embedded in the Homeland Security grant that has not been established before. 25% of the allotment must fund planning exercises and training. This is a sizeable chunk of money. He asked the ambulance providers and fire based providers to contact their work group if they have not already been contacted. There is a 30-45 day window to create a work plan that will be sent to the approval authority some time in July.

Chief Hinshaw also reported that the County is in the last 1 ½ years of the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan. This does not apply to some of the ambulance providers. However, it does apply to districts, district hospitals, cities, counties, and fire districts. That plan is a five year renewal process that must be in place in order to be eligible for about 50 state and federal grants. The process has been started, and must be submitted 6 months before its due. The due date is January 6, 2011. That means the process will be started in about a month, and the County will invite everyone to participate. If you do not participate, you may be ineligible for future grants.

## **7. Revision of EMSC Bylaws**

Mr. Andriese began by stating that there had been some discussion over the past few meetings regarding the possibility of having alternates for each sitting committee member. The basis for the discussion was the difficulty in getting a quorum at some of the scheduled meetings. At the previous meeting in March 2009, a quorum had not been achieved, and at that time staff was directed to look into the possibility of changing the bylaws to incorporate member alternates.

Minutes - Stanislaus County EMSC  
June 12, 2009  
Page 3

Mr. Andriese proceeded to relate to the Committee some history on previous discussions on the subject of 'alternates'. At the time the Committee bylaws were initially formed and sent to the Board of Supervisors for approval, there were discussions at the County level as to whether or not to consider having alternates. A consensus was reached indicating that alternates would not help create the desired consistency in membership.

Based on the direction given to Staff, County Counsel was contacted to readdress this issue. At the same time, the County Counsel suggested other revisions to the bylaws. The proposed revisions were: (1) Re-labeling of some items so labeling would be consistent; (2) Clarification of EMSC member responsibilities; (3) The addition of 'alternate' members to the Committee.

Mr. Andriese turned over further explanation to Staff member Marilyn Smith. She indicated that many of the proposed changes had to do with committee member responsibilities. She indicated that when the responsibilities were originally written in the bylaws, each responsibility read that the Committee 'shall review and recommend approval' on any requested revision. This meant that whatever revisions were presented to committee members had to be approved. It is believed that this was not the original intent. The changes indicated throughout the responsibilities section of the document are that the committee 'shall review and make recommendations' for each area of member responsibility.

Another proposed revision was in the section on memberships. This was changed to read that *the County Board of Supervisors will appoint both members and alternates. The alternate will be appointed from the same sponsoring group as the original member. Regular committee members may be represented by their appointed alternate. If both the regular and alternate are in attendance, only the regular member shall have voting privileges.*

Marilyn Smith advised that all the proposed changes must be recommended for approval by the Committee to the Stanislaus County Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Andriese stated that the Board of Supervisors must approve the revisions to the bylaws with a two-thirds majority vote.

Chief Hinshaw referred to Article 4, Section 4 of the bylaws which states, "*If any member fails to attend two consecutive meetings, or a total of three meetings within one year, their membership may be terminated by a majority vote of the Committee.*" He then asked if this section also applies to alternates.

Marilyn Smith replied that she believed the *intent* of the statement was to encourage attendance by the regular members. The purpose was the assurance of regular attendance. The concern was that alternates would not be familiar with the issues

being presented before the Committee.

Steve Andriese interjected stating that he felt the statement was problematic.

Chairman Baxter stated that the Committee could go ahead and recommend approval of the current revisions, and Staff could discuss the questionable statement with County Counsel, and make revisions to it as appropriate prior to sending to the Board of Supervisors for approval.

**M/S/C** (Cremin/Wikoff) To approve as amended

**Chairman Baxter interjected and asked that the vote be cast with a show of hands. Nine votes for approval were cast by a show of hands.**

**Vote:** Unanimous

#### **8. Ambulance Response Time Reports**

Marilyn Smith referred Committee members to response time reports provided them in their packets under attachment # 3. These response time reports are for calendar year 2008. Overall, the ambulance providers met response time compliance obligations. Those providers and areas that did not meet compliance are as follows:

- a) AMR/Zone1-Blue - Did not meet urban requirements in March, April, and July.
- b) Hughson/Zone C - Did not meet response time compliance for the twelve month period. Actual compliance is 83.8%.
- c) Hughson/Zone D - Hughson provided service in Zone D from January to early May. They did not meet urban response time compliance for the 79 calls they ran during that time frame. Actual compliance was at 88.6%. They also did not meet rural response time compliance over a twelve month period. They ran 11 calls, and their actual compliance was at 81.8%.
- d) Oak Valley/Zone 4 - Did not meet suburban response time compliance over a twelve month period. They ran 111 calls, and their actual compliance was at 84.7%.
- e) Patterson/Zone 5 - Did not meet suburban response time compliance over a twelve month period. They ran 111 calls, and their actual compliance was at 81.1%.
- f) AMR/Zone 8 - Did not meet suburban response time compliance over a twelve month period. They ran 155 calls, and their actual compliance was at 85.8%.
- g) Oak Valley/Zone D - Did not meet rural response time compliance over a twelve month period. They ran 82 calls, and their actual compliance was at 80.5%.

Marilyn Smith referred to the response time reports for the months of February, March, and April 2009. The reports reflect response time compliance for the last twelve months or 500 call compliance. The packet also contains the exemption reports for the months of February, March, and April 2009. Current response time issues have been identified on the report as follows:

- a) Oak Valley/Zone D - 12 month rural compliance is 21:07. Actual compliance is at 79.2%. This is based on 96 calls. They were out of compliance in March and April.
- b) AMR/Zone 8 - 12 month suburban 90%ile compliance is 12:33. Actual compliance is 80.06%. This is based upon 170 calls. Compliance was missed by 1 call each month.
- c) Hughson/Zone C - 12 month urban 90%ile compliance is 8:40. Actual compliance is at 82.2%. This is based on 292 calls. Their monthly response times are an improvement over last reporting period.
- d) Oak Valley/Zone 4 - 12 month suburban 90%ile compliance is 14:13. Actual compliance rate is 81%. The 12 month compliance is based upon 116 calls. They were out of compliance in April.
- e) Patterson/Zone 5 - 12 month urban 90%ile compliance is 7:36. Actual compliance rate is 89.6%. They missed compliance by 1 call. They were out of compliance in March and April.
- f) Patterson/Zone 5 - 12 month suburban 90%ile compliance is 12:27. Actual compliance is at 81.3%. This is based upon 112 calls. This is an improvement over the last reporting period.

All other providers and zones were very much in compliance.

Member Tom Burns referred to Page 25 and 26 in the packet and questioned why response times were exactly the same for 5 months on page 25, and 8 months on page 26.

Marilyn Smith explained that the ambulance providers are given the opportunity to apply for exemptions. An exemption report was also included in the packet. If an exemption is granted, the call is given a time of 7:30.

Another member asked if there were certain criteria in order to be able to receive an exemption. Marilyn Smith gave some examples as weather, train, traffic, road construction, road closure, mutual aid, etc.

Member Tom Burns questioned how MVEMSA staff were calculating response times for calls that were granted an exemption. He objected to the fact that the call was being counted in the providers total call volume rather than not being counted at all. He felt this was better than placing an artificial time on the exempt calls.

Minutes - Stanislaus County EMSC  
June 12, 2009  
Page 6

Chairman Baxter requested a very small model report (a sampling of 1 or two providers) be provided for the next reporting period in order that the process can be understood. He also requested that MVEMSA Staff check State guidelines in case there is already statutes covering this.

Mr. Andriese explained that the formula was established by the former Executive Director, Ray Jester, who also was a statistician.

**9. EMS System Enhancement Fund Recommendations**

Mr. Andriese explained that this agenda item has been placed on the EMSC meeting agenda for the previous two meetings. Staff was directed to re-evaluate the criteria that had been established by this committee in June 2003, which established the criteria for the utilization of the System Enhancement Funds. Staff looked at the 2003 criteria, and made some recommendations to the Committee at the last EMSC meeting. There was some discussion at that time, but it was not voted on because there was not a quorum of members present.

The System Enhancement Fund currently has a balance of \$228,440. It has been the Staff recommendation that these funds, and any future funds that may be collected, be allocated in the following manner:

- 1) A minimum of \$50,000 be maintained in the fund as an 'Emergency Reserve' to be utilized only for emergency, non-planned EMS system needs, as determined by the EMSC, that may arise when no other funding source(s) are readily available.
- 2) An amount of the existing funds, to be determined by the EMSC based upon receipt of the final report and funding need recommendations of the CAD-to-CAD Project Committee, will be allocated for components of the CAD-to-CAD project providing a virtual linkage between SR911 and LifeCom Dispatch Centers.
- 3) Any funds not previously allocated may be awarded by the EMSC for capital expenditures, equipment and supply purchases, contractual services, funding of training programs, or any other purpose which benefits or enhances EMS services to Stanislaus County on a system-wide basis.

Mr. Andriese completed his assessment stating that these are the recommendations of MVEMSA staff.

After much discussion and comment it was decided to leave the policy intact as approved by the EMSC Committee in 2003 until such time as more information can be provided on various ongoing projects.

#### **10. Ambulance Providers Request to Increase Response Times**

Steve Andriese began by reminding Committee members of a presentation given at the last EMSC meeting by the Stanislaus County Ambulance Service Providers requesting an increase in response times for urban and suburban areas, and how that's measured.

Staff found that, in working with the ambulance providers and Fire Chiefs, they were able to develop three options to address the issue. The options are as follows:

- 1) Maintain the current response time criteria.
- 2) Maintain the current response time and exemption criteria with changes enacted.
  - a) Fines will be automatically imposed, only if the provider exceeds the 90%ile response time compliance four times in twelve reporting periods at greater than 7:30 in an urban zone and 11:30 in a suburban zone
  - b) If the 90%ile exceeds 8:30 in the urban zone and 12:30 in a suburban zone during any single reporting period, the fine schedule will be one and a half times the current rate and automatically imposed.
  - c) A reporting period will be revised to be: 500 calls or a month, whichever comes last.
  - d) Fines may be imposed on calls in a reporting period only once.
- 3) The 90%ile response time criteria will be revised to 8:30 for urban zones and 12:30 for suburban zones with the following changes:
  - a) Fines will be automatically imposed for calls not meeting response time criteria in a reporting period at one and a half times the existing fine schedule.
  - b) Fines may be imposed on calls in a reporting period only once.
  - c) Exceptions will only be allowed for calls delayed by dense fog.
  - d) A reporting period will be revised to be: 500 calls or a month, whichever comes last.

Marilyn Smith provided a handout to Committee members for a survey in which she polled all the EMS agencies in the State of California. There are only a couple of EMS agencies with systems similar to Mountain-Valley's. They are San Joaquin, San Louis Obispo, and Merced.

Barry Hurd provided a handout and proceeded to explain it's content to Committee members.

Steve Andriese explained the pros and cons of each of the options that were developed. He stated that the staff recommendation was as follows:  
*Staff recommends that the Committee approve Option # 2 with an amendment to '2a' which increases the fineable response times to 8:00 (urban) and 12:00 (suburban).*

After much discussion and possible legal consideration, it was decided to table this matter, and place on September's meeting agenda.

**11. EMS Dispatch Center Update**

Mr. Andriese explained that Cindy Murdaugh is the staff person who usually attends the CAD-to-CAD Operations meetings. However, she was unable to attend the EMSC meeting due to a conflict with another meeting.

Mr. Andriese reported that the goal of the CAD-to-CAD Operations Committee was to look at the virtual link between the two dispatch centers, and to reduce the amount of time spent for communications between both Cads while making the virtual link identical at both dispatch centers.

The CAD-to-CAD Operations Committee has established several stages that need to be accomplished before a virtual link can be completed. One objective being worked on at the policy level is how to determine what calls would be considered appropriate to respond to, and is that based upon EMD triage similar to what is currently being done at LifeCom; or, should there be another set of criteria that is used and then sent for EMD triage. There are many components to this, and details that need to be worked out.

One of the things being held up is the issue of what the cost will be for this virtual link. This is something that has been put on hold until SR911 fully implements their CAD.

The CAD-to-CAD Policy Committee is attempting to get all the policy level questions; meet with all the agency providers and different groups to make sure all the policy level issues and recommendations are addressed; and to be able to discuss these with the technical committee in order to be able to report back to the Steering Committee.

Mr. Andriese referred to Lucian Thomas of SR911 for an update on a timeline for the SR911 CAD implementation.

Mr. Thomas explained that this project is huge, and involves a CAD system that is over 20 years old. It is a huge endeavor, and SR911 wants it implemented correctly. The new implementation date will probably be in December 2009. If there are remaining unresolved issues, the implementation date may be pushed further back.

***Chairman Baxter referred back to Agenda Item #7-Revision of EMSC Bylaws and asked Mr. Andriese when the process of filling the alternate positions can begin assuming the Board of Supervisors approves the requested revisions.***

Minutes - Stanislaus County EMSC  
June 12, 2009  
Page 9

***Mr. Andriese stated that once the revisions are acted upon by the Board of Supervisors, the Agency will send out notifications to all the representative groups to identify alternates.***

***Tom Burns referred back to Agenda Item #10-Ambulance Providers Request to Increase Response Times and asked if once Agency staff comes back with their recommendations could a report be provided that would show how many providers would have fallen out under the new system?***

***Marilyn Smith asked for clarification.***

***Tom Burns replied stating that with the new recommendations how many providers would have had fines imposed on them based on the Agency's recommendations.***

***Marilyn Smith asked if there was a particular timeframe she should look at?***

***Tom Burns answered by stating 'over the last year'.***

***Marilyn Smith then suggested that she could provide a report beginning 06/01/2008 – 06/30/2009.***

***Tom Burns said this was fine.***

## **12. Report on CSUS Center for Public Policy for Stan County EMS System Study 1999**

Mr. Andriese informed members that this item was put on the agenda at the request of Committee member Tom Burns.

Tom Burns began by reporting that the aforementioned study had been done in February of 1999 by the Stanislaus County Center for Public Policy. It was a comprehensive study on the assessment of emergency medical services in the County of Stanislaus. Mr. Burns felt that since it had been several years since the last one had been done, it was time to request another study be done. He felt that this study would address some of the issues discussed earlier, possibly paying for it from System Enhancement Funds. He stated that this was his original purpose for putting the report on the agenda. However, now, after all the discussion, he felt it may be inappropriate to take any current action on this item.

Mr. Burns requested that the Agency look into the cost of funding such a study.

Minutes - Stanislaus County EMSC  
June 12, 2009  
Page 10

Mr. Andriese informed members that the study done in 1999 was funded by Stanislaus County costing approximately \$140,000, and included contributions by the EMS Agency and several other groups.

Chairman Baxter suggested contacting CSUS to see if they might be interested. An additional suggestion was to not limit it to CSUS.

**13. Date and Location of Next Meeting**

The date of the next meeting will be September 10, 2009. It was determined that the meeting will be held at LifeCom Dispatch Center.

**14. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 a.m. by Chairman Baxter.