

December 17, 2015

Regular Meeting

EMS Ad Hoc

Committee

Item #2b

EMS Workshop

Stacey Simon

Draft Agenda Item for Ad Hoc Committee Review

To: Mono County Board of Supervisors
From: EMS Ad Hoc Committee
Date: TBA
Subject: Committee Findings & Recommendations

I. Committee Formation

The Mono County Board of Supervisors expressed a desire to establish an expert committee to study and recommend a high quality, County wide, fiscally sustainable EMS model. On March 17, 2015 the Board approved the establishment of an Ad Hoc Emergency Medical Services Committee made up of members of the both the public and private sectors. The Committee was charged with the following goals:

- i. Analyze current model and cost
- ii. Gather expert input
- iii. Develop options/a recommendation that will support a high quality, countywide, and fiscally sustainable model for the future of EMS

II. Executive Summary

The Committee determined that there were three plausible models for delivery of EMS services in Mono County that meet the goals established by the Board of Supervisors. These are: (1) existing system with modifications that are targeted at enhancing fiscal sustainability while maintaining quality and extending services countywide; (2) EMS integration with Fire Districts; and (3) EMS privatization.

Of these three, the Committee determined that the existing system with modifications model is the preferred/recommended alternative. The other two models were deemed less desirable for reasons described in more detail below.

The Committee also concluded that the success of any of its recommendations depends highly on the execution of a structured implementation plan. Further detail is in the discussion below.

III. Committee's Understanding of the terms "Countywide," "Fiscally Sustainable" and "High Quality"

Insert the three shortened descriptions from 12/3 meeting. (Rooks)

IV. Description of Existing System

Paragraph describing system (to be written by Lynda and Rob and sent to subcommittee).

The sources of data for this information are:

--list presentations that fleshed out existing system (Rooks, Frievalt, Lynch, Flynn) with links to full presentations

V. Reasons Integration with Fire and Privatization Models not Preferred

A. **Private**

- Concern with standard of care/level of service
- Over time, subsidy increasing, oversight still required
- Examples from other jurisdictions, (Contra Costa)
- Difficult to go back
- EOA competitive bidding
- Previously was private –American Ambulance, wanted higher subsidies
- Less County control

Comment [SS1]: To be fleshed out into sentences/paragraph rather than bullets by Jack.

B. **Fire Based**

- Resource limitations of the individual districts (largely volunteer)
- Diverse districts with varied standards, capabilities, philosophies, governing boards, funding, . . .
- Limit to amount of integration without affecting the EOA
- Mono Chiefs not interested
- County has no authority over districts. Independent special districts.

Comment [SS2]: To be fleshed out into sentences/paragraph rather than bullets by Frievalt.

VI. Recommendation

The Committee recommends that the Board of Supervisors maintain the essential features of the existing system, but implement modifications that are targeted at enhancing fiscal sustainability while maintaining quality and extending services countywide. The recommended modifications fall into XXX categories, each set forth below.

Note that individual items listed below have not been analyzed to determine which may be implemented immediately, and which would be the subject of negotiations. If any particular item is to be pursued by the county, then that question needs to be answered.

A. *Modifications to reduce costs*

- List from 11/19 (Rick to put in understandable form with staff assistance Rob and/or Stacey)

B. *Modifications to enhance revenues*

- List from 11/19 (Rick to put in understandable form with staff assistance)

C. *Deployment modifications (including those presented by Paramedic Association)*

D. *Modifications to enhance management capacity*

VII. Limitations

- Didn't explore private thoroughly
- Didn't have a specific dollar figure for achieving fiscal sustainability
- 12 meetings, over 6+ months

Comment [SS3]: Frievalt to turn into short paragraph.

VIII. Implementation

Structured Implementation Plan

- a. Recruitment/Development of a Program Manager/Director
- b. Development of an Assistant Program Manager
- c. Integrated Organizational Performance Management Strategy
 - i. Review and consider adjustments to
 1. Personnel Evaluations
 2. Performance Awards
 3. Performance Improvement and Discipline
 4. Personnel Development
 - ii. Integrated Rolling 5 Year Strategic Plan
 - iii. Set Service Levels and budget for commensurate
 1. Staffing Levels
 2. Equipment
 3. Training
 - iv. Annually adjust strategic service level goals to strategic projections (e.g., tax revenues, negotiated labor costs, roll-ups, etc.) to create an annual operating plan (AOP).
 1. Compare "AOP" to year-end delivery metrics, evaluate +/- performance
 2. Align previous year performance with goals for next year-end strategic plan.
- d. Form Virtual Staff for Final Program Design
- e. Implementation Deliverables
 - i. Consider a managing consultant strategy (involved in the writing and execution of the deliverables over an 18-24 month period)
 1. Designed as a performance driven RFP
 - ii. Alternative Option
 1. Regional/Local retired/semi-retired personnel familiar with the Eastern Sierra EMS system
 2. Should include total cost, common PERS restrictions, and qualifications
 - iii. Upon conclusion of the 18-24 month period, transition program management from managing consultant to recruited Program Manager and Assistant.

Comment [SS4]: Frank and Bob to flesh out further, or condense as appropriate.

Discussion:

The primary goal of the Committee was to review the current EMS system within Mono County and recommend a Model that is “Fiscally Sustainable, High Quality and County Wide”. With this in mind the Committee developed three Qualifying Models that could meet these goals.

1. Qualifying Models
 - a. Existing System with Modifications
 - b. EMS Integration with Fire Districts in Mono County
 - c. Private Provider for ALS Ground Transport

The EMS System within Mono County does not involve one agency, but a multitude of agencies to provide both ALS and BLS services across the County. These agencies may provide these support services on either a paid, volunteer or mutual aid basis, while some make up the required State and Local mandates of providing EMS.

1. Mono County EMS System
 - a. Mono County Paramedics
 - b. East Fork Fire & Paramedic Districts
 - c. MWTC
 - d. Symons Ambulance
 - e. County Volunteer Fire Districts
 - f. MCSO Dispatch
 - g. Mammoth Hospital/Base Station
 - h. Public
 - i. Aircraft, Fixed & Rotary

Additionally when reviewing the qualifying Models, the one reoccurring objective for each of these Models, is to provide a strong management structure to oversee the System. For that reason and dependant on the Model ultimately chosen by the Board of Supervisors, the feasibility of restructuring management and the Department where the Paramedic Program is placed; needs to be considered.

Recommendation:

1. Pursue the “Existing System With Modifications” Model
 - a. Modifications
 - i. Fiscally Sustainable
 - ii. Enhanced Management Capacity

. Background:

1. Sources of information

- a. Presentations
 - i. Tom Lynch – ICEMA CEO
 - 1. State, Regional, and Local EMS Oversight
 - 2. Overview of EMS Trends
 - ii. Dave Fogerson – Asst. Chief, East Fork Fire & Paramedic Districts
 - 1. Fire Perspective of Fire/EMS System Integration in Douglas County
 - iii. Dr. Rick Johnson – MHOAC
 - 1. Survey of County EMS Systems w/ Less Than 40,000 Population
 - iv. Ray Ramirez – Asst. Chief, Ontario FD
 - 1. GEMT/IGT Reimbursement
 - v. Bob Rooks – Retired Division Chief, MLFPD
 - 1. History of Mono County Paramedic Program
 - vi. Judd Symons – Operations Manager, Symons Ambulance
 - 1. Private Perspective of EMS Delivery in Mono County
 - vii. Dan Flynn – EMT, Mono County Paramedic Rescue Association
 - 1. Association Perspective of EMS Delivery in Mono County
 - viii. Frank Frievalt – Fire Chief, MLFPD
 - 1. Integrated Operational Response Scenarios
- b. Professional Literature
 - i. Previous Consultant Reports
 - 1. 1991 – The Abaris Group; Draft II County of Mono EMS/Paramedic Program Business Plan
 - 2. 2012 – Fitch & Associates; EMS Assessment
 - ii. Pertinent articles – various sources
 - iii. Standards
 - 1. NFPA
 - 2. AAA
 - 3. AHA
 - iv. EMCC Annual Reports
- c. Agreements
 - i. Mono-Inyo-San Bernardino JPA
 - ii. EOA
 - iii. MOU
- d. Current EMS System and Paramedic Program Review
 - i. Fiscal Analysis
 - 1. Leslie Chapman - CFO
 - 2. Ralph Lockhart – Private Sector Health Professional
 - ii. Legal Analysis
 - 1. Stacey Simon – Mono County Counsel

Comment [SS5]: Each with summary and link to full presentation.

Lockhart comment: For each suggestion, explain what anticipated fiscal impact, and whether it can be implemented b4 new MOU or not (i.e., mgmt. right). Chart attached that accomplishes all or part?

