

# Ambulance Performance/Operations Committee Meeting Agenda



**Thursday, February 15, at  
1:30PM 2995 McMillan Ave,  
Suite 178 San Luis Obispo, CA  
93401**

**Members:**

CHAIR: Chief Jonathan Stornetta, City of Paso Robles Fire  
 VICE CHAIR: Matthew Bronson, Grover Beach City Manager  
 Rebecca Campbell, Interim County Administrative Officer  
 Nick Drews, Health Agency Director  
 Dr. Penny Borenstein, County Health Officer  
 Jim Lewis, Atascadero City Manager  
 Chief Daniel McCrain, City of Morro Bay Fire

**EMS Agency Staff:**

Alyssa Vardas, EMS Admin Assistant

AGENDA	ITEM	LEAD
Call To Order	Introductions	Chairperson
	Announcements	
	Public Comment	
Action/Discussion	Emergency Transport Contract Status Update  Review of Jan 2024 response times	Chairperson
Committee Members Announcements or Reports	Opportunity for Committee members to make announcements, provide brief reports on their EMS-related activities, ask questions for clarification on items not on the agenda, or request consideration of an item for a future agenda (Gov. Code Sec. 54954.2[a][2])	Committee Members
Next Meeting	TBD	

# Ambulance Performance Operations Committee



## Meeting Minutes

1:30 P.M., January 18, 2024  
 2995 McMillan Way, Suite 178  
 San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

### Members

- CHAIR Jonathan Stornetta, City of Paso Robles Fire, Chief
- VICE CHAIR Matthew Bronson, Grover Beach City Manager
- Dr. Penny Borenstein, County Health Officer
- Daniel McCrain, City of Morro Bay Fire, Chief
- Rebecca Campbell, Interim County Administrative Officer
- Nick Drews, Health Agency
- Jim Lewis, Atascadero City Manager

### Guests

#### EMS Agency Staff

Alyssa Vardas, EMS Administrative Assistant

#### See Public Sign-In Sheet

- Chris Javine, San Luis Ambulance General Manager
- John Owens, CAL Fire
- Justin Kelton, San Luis Ambulance
- Rob Jenkins, CAL Fire
- David Goss, EMSA
- Bill Mulkerin, EMS Medical Director
- Rachel Oakley, EMSA
- Josh Taylor,

	<b>ACTION</b>
<b>CALL TO ORDER</b>	<b>1:33 PM</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	
<b>Announcements</b> None	
<b>Public Comment</b> No public comment	
<b>ACTION ITEMS/DISCUSSION ITEMS</b>	
<b>Approval of Previous Minutes</b> J. Stornetta requests a motion to approve the previous minutes with corrections to M. Bronson as Vice Chair.	Motion to approve: J. Stornetta / Second: M. Bronson.
<b>ACTION ITEMS/DISCUSSION ITEMS</b>	
<p><b>Emergency Transport Contract, Term 7/1/24 – 6/30/26.</b>                      There is an initial review of the Emergency Transport Contract and what the SLO EMS Agency brought to the last APOC meeting regarding renegotiating a new contract with SLA with several additions, changes, and deletions to the updated agreement.</p> <p>Discussion                      B. Mulkerin – Going over the draft contract and what we discussed at the last meeting, let’s discuss what the intent of APOC is and where we can go from there.                      J. Stornetta - What is the duration of the contract?                      M. Bronson - We are in a period of transition now and we are looking at a one-year set term with a one-year extension. Keeping to that 2-year time frame has some symmetry there. The city managers feel like this 1 and 1 would be advantageous to us. The 1-year set and 1 year extended.                      R. Campbell – If that Doesn’t work out, how much time would we need for an RFP?                      J. Stornetta – I worked with Vince on this, and it was already in the works.                      R. Campbell – Was there a consultant?                      P. Borenstein – There was a consultant, and they were put on pause.                      J. Stornetta - We are in a grey area where we keep extending the contract.                      P. Borenstein - Although this would be a new contract.                      J. Stornetta – We are under the board of directors, and we would have to go to the bylaws.                      M. Bronson - We will hopefully be able to complete this within the time needed.                      R. Campbell - Is there an automatic renewal? What’s reasonable? A six months notice?                      P. Borenstein - Is the reason for doing a 1 and 1 because we can't get out of a 2-year?                      B. Mulkerin - I think we would want to go into an RFP instead of terminating.                      D. McCrain - Because we are already into the RFP process, we thought the 1 and 1 process would be better.</p>	

	<b>ACTION</b>
<p>R. Campbell – My guess is we could make the time frames different. The alliance process could have a lot involved and we could have another RFP, what’s the worst case possible?</p> <p>M. Bronson - Am I hearing you say we could keep to the 1 and 1 model but if not, we could always ask for an extension?</p> <p>J. Stornetta – I will ask for the group’s comment on this contract of 1 year with a 1-year extension.</p> <p>C. Javine – Obviously, one year gives us some flexibility to complete our financial liabilities, and in my opinion, we would like to see two years.</p> <p>R. Campbell - Question-it will start on July 1<sup>st</sup>, and we will have to know next year if we will continue.</p> <p>P. Borenstein - Giving six months’ notice whether we are going to continue or not.</p> <p>D. McCrain – Option for two extensions is preferred.</p> <p>N. Drews - What if we have the option of a 2-year contract with the option to terminate within a six-month window?</p> <p>J. Stornetta – what if we say after a year we want to continue with the RFP?</p> <p>N. Drews – Exactly.</p> <p>P. Borenstein – In the contract, it says 365, how did we come to that?</p> <p>D. McCrain – Does that affect the RFP process at all?</p> <p>R. Campbell – I don’t think so.</p> <p>B. Mulkerin – Are we putting ourselves into a bind that we don’t need to be?</p> <p>N. Drews – Possibly.</p> <p>J. Stornetta – I think the two-year base wasn’t originally flexible enough for the RFP.</p> <p>N. Drews - Do you think the city managers or chiefs will have tension or pushback on 2 years?</p> <p>M. Bronson - Originally, we had the 2 years, but our preference would be the 1 and 1. There has been a tremendous amount of work on this in the past year.</p> <p>N. Drews – I don’t have a preference, but I think the two years has more leeway for the vendor.</p> <p>D. McCrain – I think the ending is the RFP.</p> <p>P. Borenstein – What is the thinking and timeline on that?</p> <p>J. Stornetta - We don’t see any problem with our due diligence being done in the year, then RFP. I want to make it clear that whatever happens, we want SLA to be the provider.</p> <p>N. Drews - I want to go in the direction of the city managers and chiefs.</p> <p>R. Campbell - My preference is the 2 years because I worry about controversy and having to invoke extensions.</p> <p>M. Bronson – You are proposing two years, six months?</p> <p>N. Drews – Two years, one extension, six-month termination clause. The reason being is if something happened, we will be able to invoke the extension.</p> <p>M. Bronson - Given the interest of wanting to push things forward I am willing to look at 2 years.</p> <p>R. Campbell - I would be in support of the 2-year contract with 1 year extension.</p> <p>M. Bronson - I could support that proposal with the focus of moving forward and that we have the goals of work.</p>	
<p>Motion to approve a two-year contract with a one-year extension, a six-month termination option, and a six-month extension notice.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>J. Stornetta - There was a lot in the contract, we will need to come back and save some for the RFP process.</p> <p>B. Mulkerin - There were too many priorities, and we want to get some accountability built in specifically, related to Time frames. Universal time is 9:59 not 10:59. We want to establish the key priorities in this contract.</p> <p>M. Bronson - Some of these proponents are best suited for a future RFP process. We want to look at the 10-minute time and want to phase in financial accountability, not create a large financial burden.</p> <p>D. McCrain - The Chiefs felt that the Time response would be the best thing to focus on.</p> <p>R. Campbell - The accountability piece is important, the 10-minute response time is important. Being sensitive to cost, what did the chiefs J.S. We agreed with a phased approach so that they have time to adjust. What does that look like in this contract?</p> <p>B. Mulkerin – That was what we wanted to talk about.</p> <p>J. Stornetta - My suggestion would be to form a sub-committee of APOC with the county and Chiefs to discuss the details.</p> <p>M. Bronson – That sounds great.</p> <p>P. Borenstein – Did you have any other items?</p>	<p>M. Bronson Motions / R. Campbell Seconds. All in Favor.</p>

	<b>ACTION</b>
<p>B. Mulkerin – The dispatch and the surveys because we could phase those in later.  R. Campbell – The surveys could help us with the RFP process.  J. Stornetta – I don't think there is anything concerning the surveys.  C. Javine - We are in the process of acquiring a survey company before this meeting. Our issue was of course with the penalties and if the penalties were financial in nature. We are certainly happy to go down the path of surveys. The company uses data with other companies and agencies.  M. Bronson – I think a survey is more to help inform how we are doing.  B. Mulkerin – I think maybe the survey could be for information gathering for the RFP and no penalties at first.  R. Campbell – Can you talk about the timeline for Sub Committee?  J. Stornetta – I thought it could start as soon as possible.  M. Bronson – We are looking for someone from the County.  N. Drews – It will be me.  M. Bronson – I can represent the city.  J. Stornetta – I can recommend Daniel.  R. Campbell – When is the next meeting?  J. Stornetta – February 15<sup>th</sup>.  R. Campbell – I will be out of town.  J. Stornetta – Open to public comment.  J. Taylor - Why would Dispatch Services not be a part of this contract? If there is no mechanism for dispatch center, we are going to have to find positions for that.  R. Campbell – I need more information.  R. Jenkins - We are meeting on Feb. 7th to discuss dispatch.  R. Campbell – What is existing?  R. Jenkins – Med Comm which is done at the expense of the sheriff's department.  J. Owens - They want to put it on Fire because they don't have direct funding for ambulance dispatching.  B. Mulkerin – I think the set rate is \$67.  D. McCrain – That is the ballpark.  R. Jenkins - EMD is our responsibility of the county, separate from Dispatch, and we need to take that into consideration.  J. Stornetta - Bringing back to committee. We want a survey with no penalties but full transparency, keeping to the standard of a 10-minute response time, Rebecca will look into Dispatch's side.  R. Campbell – What about liquidated damages?  D. McCrain – That will be the tiered approach to the penalties.  J. Stornetta – I would like to suggest a motion to approve the subcommittee to move forward.</p> <p>N. Drews makes a motion to approve the subcommittee.</p>	<p>N. Drews Motions / D. McCrain Seconds.</p>
<b>Committee Member's Announcements or Reports</b>	
<p><b>Announcements</b> None</p>	
<p><b>Next Meeting</b> Next meeting February 15<sup>th</sup> at 1:30 PM.</p>	
<p><b>Adjournment</b> The meeting adjourned at 2:36 PM</p>	J. Stornetta adjourns the meeting.