

Ambulance Performance/Operations Committee Meeting Agenda



Thursday, March 21, 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	Approval of minutes: Feb 15, 2024 (attached)	
Action/Discussion	Emergency Transport Contract Status Update Review of Feb 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



DRAFT Meeting Minutes

1:30 PM February 15th, 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, San Luis Obispo Fire

Justin Kelton, San Luis Ambulance

Kris Strommen, San Luis Ambulance

Rob Jenkins, CAL Fire

Ryan Rosander, EMSA

Bill Mulkerin, EMS Medical Director

Rachel Oakley, EMSA

	ACTION
CALL TO ORDER	1:33 PM
Introduction	
Announcements None	
Public Comment No public comment	
ACTION ITEMS/DISCUSSION ITEMS	
<p>Emergency Transport Contract, Term 7/1/24 – 6/30/26.</p> <p>N. Drews gives an update on the Ambulance contract and the challenges that have been identified in the subcommittee. The challenges include transitioning of response times which will require an overhaul of business models, The fee structure and how we need to work on what fees will be and add in exceptions/reviews and an expanding period of time, and the issue of the reimbursement model. Can overcome this by continuing secondary subcommittee to finalize contract and work on details of fee structure and reimbursement model.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>J. Stornetta - Okay, so it is an action item. So motion to approve the subcommittee to continue negotiations?</p> <p>J. Stornetta - We'll move to our next action item is review of 2024 response times and I think that'll be Ryan, Rosander who is going to take us through that, okay.</p> <p>R. Rosander– I did the response and calculation to the previous draft. And the response times over the month of January, I calculated I also compared it with Sherman's response times with the margin of error of one two, there's, I think one or two calls by 2%, which case ours was higher than theirs. So it's about 1% margin were calculated pretty much exactly the same way, there is probably the margin of error that falls in what is excluded, versus what's included, as far as I know, the dunes are excluded in response times. And getting down to some of the other boundary parameters that I feel is probably where the 1% is coming from. However, for the response times, I think they're included in the packet. And up to date summary with the response times as the current draft of anywhere under 85%, is 3,085.9 to 85%, is \$2,500 86.9, to 86% 2,087.9, to 87% 1500 88.9 to 80% 1000. And from 89.9% 89 is \$500 with the extended response times being 500 and then 750. So at that point, with everything calculated for the urban zone, we have a total with the previous draft of 22,000. The suburban area, they're in compliance, so there's no response times there, or no fees there. We're at 3000 for one area, which is the Shandon area, the remote, remote area where we're out of compliance in and it is the three calls that one of them was missed drops it down to his 66%, which adds 3000 there. And excuse me, the extended response time was a level two fines.</p> <p>M. Bronson – Report brings back what the current compliance under the 10 Minute standard is correct. And what the fine amount would be right under this scenario. That's correct.</p> <p>N. Drews – So multiply that by 12. And that's what your annual fee is. And where are you going with 959 or 1050? Not? Not so.</p>	

	ACTION
<p>R. Rosander - I have to go back and look at David's analysis whether he adjusted but I pretty sure he did. And I think that number was 425,000 Wouldn't roughly based on last year's analysis, so for not to double check to see well, I'm pretty sure that's with the adjustment at 959.</p> <p>J. Stornetta - Right. You mentioned something that I hadn't heard before the dunes or exclusion zone? That's correct. Was that identified as an exclusion zone? Because I don't recall ever seen that contract? If it's not, maybe we need to make sure that's in.</p> <p>R. Rosander - Exactly. If there is some in going into the previous coordinator's work. There was some exclusions there, the dunes being one of them, meeting a response time out there, having responded out there in 20 minutes, which is pretty much unless it's right on the dunes or right on the sand, but with the inflation going out there, it's pretty much impossible. Moreover, it's unsafe to have rigs there and try to meet response time. So I think that was excluded there. I did. I didn't see it anywhere in the contract. I was just going off of what he was doing previous. So I think that, as Nick was saying, go in and define in the areas for the exclusion zones would be beneficial to more accurately display an analysis.</p> <p>P. Borenstein - Yeah, and if I'm not mistaken, though, it may not be in the contract. But look, Rob seems to remember that report from 2014. I think when they did that analysis, it was not excluded. Okay.</p> <p>R. Jenkins – It was not excluded.</p> <p>M. Bronson - That is related to our subcommittee discussions with San Luis ambulance about the exceptions, there are certain areas that have really unique features because of how long it takes to get there and deflating tires. In this case, valleys that are getting we don't want to exclude coverage from anywhere in the county is a county wide service. But in terms of the compliance standards, there may be some exceptions that are reasonable for us to include in this update contract money out another one.</p> <p>R. Jenkins – So I will echo what Matt Bronson said there that that's our area. Those are some of our sickest trauma patients out there. And I think coming up with a reasonable response time is probably a better approach to that. I wouldn't want to be waiting out there as a paramedic for hours because we're worried about leading response times in other areas, there shouldn't be a discussion about what's a reasonable amount of time to get out California Valley sustainably.</p> <p>K. Strommen – How do we analyze the new methodology using Imagetrend, some of the numbers that come across are inaccurate.</p> <p>B. Mulkerin – That is something we will need to work on.</p> <p>R. Rosander - Yeah, and that will be probably an ongoing challenge. And so we'll need to figure out because some of those stuff we used to do, we're not going be able to do anymore, or in many cases, synapses and sending stuff to the state because some of the old ways of doing it from a data capture standpoint, get they basically fail when they get to the state and can't do it. So we probably need to work on that.</p> <p>J. Stornetta - So to me, that's pretty fixed in the industry, and you can just write a script.</p> <p>J. Stornetta – Let me go back to my agenda here. Alright, so those were the only two action items that we had. But what I did not see agenda did not have time for approval of previous minutes. So I have a couple of clarifications of minutes, and if we go over some of the action items discussion in the minutes, go down to I think it's third spot for me, Maybe the fourth, where it says we are under the board of directors, we are under the Board of Supervisors. So, thank you. And then one other point of clarification is if we go to the next box, where it says Johnson and Campbell motion, that first sentence, yeah, approve Motion approved two-year contract with a one year extension. Termination and it shouldn't say clause.</p> <p>Motion to Approve Minutes with Changes</p> <p>J. Stornetta – If we have nothing else, the next meeting is big and we usually shoot for the second Thursday of the month so we are for the 21st of March. Okay, and everyone's good with that. If there's nothing else to add, I will entertain a motion to adjourn.</p>	<p>J. Stornetta Motions / M. Bronson Seconds</p> <p>J. Stornetta Motions / All in Favor.</p>
Committee Member's Announcements or Reports	
<p>Announcements None</p>	
<p>Next Meeting Next meeting April 18th at 1:30 PM.</p>	
<p>Adjournment The meeting adjourned at 2:04 PM</p>	<p>J. Stornetta adjourns the meeting.</p>