

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES (EMS) FIRE TRANSPORT COMMITTEE
February 20, 2012

The EMS Fire Transport Committee met at the St. Petersburg College EpiCenter, Room 1-455, 13805 58th Street North, Largo, Florida, at 9:29 A.M. on this date with the following members present:

Senator (Retired) Jim Sebesta, Chairman
Commissioner Karen Williams Seel, Pinellas County Commission
(Alternate for Commissioner John Morroni)
Mayor Bill Foster, City of St. Petersburg
Chief Doug Lewis, Pinellas Park Fire Department
Captain Jim Millican, Lealman Special Fire Control District
Jay Ravins, City of Clearwater
Kelly Triolo, BayCare Health System

Not Present

Commissioner John Morroni, Pinellas County Commission

Also Present

Robert S. LaSala, Pinellas County Administrator
Maureen A. Freaney, Assistant County Administrator
Don S. Crowell, Senior Assistant County Attorney
Robert C. Swain, Senior Assistant County Attorney
Chief Joe Accetta, Safety Harbor Fire Department
Chief James Angle, Palm Harbor Fire Rescue
Norman Atherton, Palm Harbor Fire Commission
Michael Handoga, St. Pete Beach, IAFF, Local 2266
Craig A. Hare, Public Safety Services
Bill Israel, Emergency Medical Services Advisory Council
Sally Israel
Chief Tom Jamison, East Lake Fire Department
Joseph Lauro, Pinellas County Purchasing Director
Anne Lindberg, Tampa Bay Times
Chris Maine, Clearwater Fire and Rescue
Roland Martens, Jungle Terrace Civic Association
John Peterson, Sunstar Paramedics
Mark Postma, Sunstar Paramedics
Lieutenant Scott Sanford, Palm Harbor Fire Rescue
Deputy Chief Don Sayre, Tarpon Springs Fire Rescue
Matt Schad, City of Clearwater Firefighter/Paramedic
Debbie Vass, Sunstar Paramedics

February 20, 2012

Greg Woodrum, Public Safety Services
Other Interested Individuals
Michael P. Schmidt, Deputy Clerk, Board Reporter

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Approval of Minutes of February 3, 2012 meeting
3. Review of Final Draft Scope of Work
 - = Operational Study
 - = Accountant – Option 2
4. Determine Next Steps
5. Set Next Meeting Date

WELCOME

Chairman Sebesta called the meeting to order and welcomed those present; whereupon, at his request, the Deputy Clerk conducted a roll call of the members. A sign-in sheet has been filed and made a part of the record.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Seel moved, seconded by Ms. Triolo and carried, that the minutes of the February 3, 2012 meeting be approved.

REVIEW OF FINAL DRAFT SCOPE OF WORK

OPERATIONAL STUDY

Mr. Hare referred to the document titled *Operational Study Scope of Work*, a copy of which has been filed and made a part of the record, and reviewed proposed amendments to the Operational Study Scope of Work as suggested at the February 3 committee meeting and/or submitted thereafter, as well as comments and amendments proposed by County staff. At the request of Chairman Sebesta, the members confirmed their approval of each change with discussion and modifications as follows:

Page 1, Introduction, 3rd Paragraph – Mr. Hare indicated that the following paragraph was added to read: **“EMS Performance Standards have been adopted by the Pinellas County EMS Authority in Resolution 09-37.”**

Page 1, Introduction, 4th Paragraph – Chief Lewis suggested that the commonly-known industry term “Public Safety Answering Point” be added to the second sentence of the paragraph to improve clarity and assist the consultant; whereupon, Mr. Hare indicated that the sentence would be revised to read: **“All departments are dispatched through a single County operated 9-1-1 Public Safety Answering Point.”**

Page 2, Scope of Work, 1st Paragraph – Mr. Hare indicated that the paragraph was revised to read: **“Prior to conducting a study, the consultant will review documentation provided by the County as it pertains to the current operational performance and the cost of the existing EMS system, the Sanford/Millican Plan, and the IPS Study. All support materials will be provided on a resource CD-ROM. Consultant is to utilize Fiscal Year 2010-2011 financial and operational data.”**

Page 2, Scope of Work, 3rd Paragraph – Mr. Hare indicated that the paragraph was revised to read: **“Following the current system performance analysis, the Contractor will then provide an analysis based on the ALS Engine model recommendations from the IPS Study, as provided, and determine the optimal deployment model(s). This analysis will also consider and document the impact that medical first responder deployment has on countywide fire protection and the impact countywide fire protection may have on medical first response.”**

Page 2, Scope of Work, 4th Paragraph – Mr. Hare indicated that the first sentence of the paragraph was revised to read: **“The contractor will work with multiple stakeholders by facilitating a process to refine a deployment plan for fire department ALS First Responder units to meet: (a) a 7:30 response interval target with at least 90% reliability for each Fire District, and (b) a response interval target that is equal to the current response time performance for each Fire District.”** In response to queries by Chief Lewis, Mr. Hare indicated that the terms “Fire Districts” and “EMS Districts” had both been included in the section; and that to reduce confusion and provide clarity, the term EMS Districts was replaced with Fire Districts. Captain Millican related that confusion could still exist because EMS and Fire Districts do not match in all cases; whereupon, following discussion and at the suggestion of Chief Lewis, Mr. Hare agreed to

revise the verbiage to read: **“Fire/EMS Districts”** and to add maps and illustrations in the resource materials to reflect the boundaries and overlays of those districts, and no objections were noted.

Later in the meeting, Captain Millican referred to the aforementioned EMS and Fire District issues, and related that the term Fire/EMS Districts should be noted throughout the whole document, and Chairman Sebesta and Commissioner Seel concurred; whereupon, Mr. Hare agreed to make the change throughout the entire document.

Page 2, Deliverables, IPS Study Review – Chief Lewis related that the Sanford/Millican Plan requests that the contractor compare it to the current system of how services are provided, but that the Integral Performance Solutions (IPS) Study does not contain the same request; whereupon, Chief Lewis and Chairman Sebesta suggested that comparable language be included in the IPS Study. During discussion Mr. Hare indicated that the phrase “Evaluate and document the current level of Pinellas County’s EMS readiness and performance including the number and types of units assigned to each station and prepare percentile response time reports for FY 10-11, within each of the fire districts” picks up on the comparison concept; whereupon, Chief Lewis, with input by Captain Millican, related that the phrase “evaluate and compare” should be used rather than “evaluate and document”; and that the Sanford/Millican Plan and IPS Study should be similarly and fairly evaluated against the current EMS System of how services are provided.

Ms. Freaney related that while a clear delineation exists regarding comparing the current IPS Study and the Sanford/Millican Plan in the “Purpose of Study” portion of the document, prior discussion seems to indicate that the members do not feel that such information has been as clearly stated in the “Deliverables” section. Ms. Freaney suggested that a statement be included regarding the comparison of the IPS Study, the Sanford/Millican Plan, and the current EMS system, and the members concurred; whereupon, Mr. Hare agreed to place such a statement throughout the Scope and Deliverables portions of the document.

Page 3, Deliverables, IPS Study Review, Item No. 3 – Mr. Hare indicated that the following sentence was added at the bottom of the paragraph to read: **“Evaluate and document the potential positive or negative impact on each Fire District’s Insurance Services Office (ISO) rating.”** and, at the suggestion of Chief Lewis, Mr. Hare agreed to make the sentence a separate deliverable.

Page 3, Deliverables, IPS Study Review, Item No. 4 – Mr. Hare indicated that the paragraph was revised to read: “Include in the study a recommendation on **implementing a Medical Priority Dispatch System (MPDS), based upon national standards, to reduce** the number and types of units dispatched to medical emergencies. Show deployment model(s) **of a fully implemented MPDS approach as compared to the current system.**”

Page 3, Deliverables, IPS Study Review, Item No. 5 – Mr. Hare indicated that the paragraph was revised to read: “Review to further refine the proposed IPS ALS Engine deployment plan, as needed, including the number and types of units assigned to each station and the percentile response times projected within each of the **fire** districts. Recommend alternative deployment options, if indicated, to achieve optimal efficiency to meet: **(a)** a minimum seven minutes and 30 seconds response time, within each **fire** district, or 90% of emergency calls; **and (b) a response interval target that is equal to the current response time performance for each Fire District.**”

Page 3, Deliverables, Sanford/Millican Plan Review, Item No. 1 – Mr. Hare indicated that a second sentence was added to read: “**Evaluate and document the level of services and functions necessary to operate the Sanford/Millican Plan which is a multi-jurisdictional consolidated fire based EMS model including the integration of First Responder and Ambulance Services.**”

Chief Lewis, with input by Captain Millican, questioned the difference between multi-jurisdictional governance versus current governance, and indicated that the term “multi-jurisdictional” could be considered misleading since it gives the impression that Pinellas County would no longer be involved as the EMS Authority; whereupon, he indicated that while 18 jurisdictions currently hold Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity (COPCN), the County would be responsible for taxing, billing, and collections under a fire based system; and that the cities and districts would then be required to give up their COPCNs.

During discussion Mr. Hare related that the consultant would need to assess the entire situation holistically, review the governance structure, determine which central services would need to be enhanced on the County side, and evaluate issues such as scheduling or deployment planning; whereupon, Chairman Sebesta and Commissioner Seel indicated that the contractor should be allowed to autonomously review the situation and provide its recommendations to the members.

Page 3, Deliverables, Sanford/Millican Plan Review, Item No. 2 – Mr. Hare indicated that the paragraph was revised to read: “Fully develop an organization chart showing how multi-**jurisdictional** governance of **fire based EMS** Services would work. **Include the integration of current fire department organization charts to include the additional function of patient transportation using a fire based EMS model.**”

Page 4, Deliverables, Sanford/Millican Plan Review, Item No. 4 – Mr. Hare related that the language in Item No. 4 is identical to that in the IPS Study Review.

Page 4, Deliverables, Sanford/Millican Plan Review, Item No. 5 – Mr. Hare indicated that the item is in regard to response times, and includes language regarding a 60-minute response time for interfacility and non-emergency transports.

Page 4, Deliverables, Sanford/Millican Plan Review, Item No. 6 – Mr. Hare indicated that the paragraph was revised to read: “Evaluate and document the anticipated workload on ALS Engines, Rescue Units (24/7 transport units) and Peak Rescue Units to **ensure personnel workloads are safe and effective.**” In response to queries by Captain Millican, Mr. Hare related that it would be up to the consultant to take into consideration the different methods which ensure that personnel workloads are safe and effective.

Page 4, Deliverables, Sanford/Millican Plan Review, Item No. 8 – Mr. Hare indicated that a second sentence was added to read: “**Evaluate and document the potential positive or negative impact on each Fire District’s Insurance Services Office (ISO) rating.**”

Page 5, Deliverables, Sanford/Millican Plan Review, Item No. 13 – Mr. Hare indicated that a second sentence was added to read: “**The existing resources within the fire departments will be considered when integrating the transport function.**”

Page 5, Deliverables, Sanford/Millican Plan Review, Item No. 15 – Mr. Hare indicated that the paragraph was revised to read: “Ensure all plans and analysis include the following components: governance structure, administration/management, field supervision and coordination, all support services such as dispatch, patient business services, training/education, safety/risk, information technology management and support, materials management, scheduling, fleet

management, etc. **and compare to other multi-jurisdictional fire based EMS transport systems.”**

Page 5, Deliverables, Sanford/Millican Plan Review, Item No. 17 – Mr. Hare indicated that the following paragraph was added to read: **“For each category of transport of specialty services provided (9-1-1/Emergency, Non-Emergency, Interfacility, Critical Care, Mental Health, Critical Care, All Children’s Transport Team and Tactical EMS Service), evaluate the individual revenue stream and individual program cost.”** In response to queries by Chairman Sebesta, Mr. Hare indicated that each special service has been listed.

Page 5, Presentations and Reports – Mr. Hare indicated that the section “Presentations and Reports” was added to read:

1. **“Consultant shall provide a written draft final report and present preliminary findings at an EMS Committee meeting to be scheduled.”**
2. **“Consultant shall provide a written final report and present findings at an EMS Committee meeting to be scheduled.”**
3. **“Consultant shall provide a written final report and present findings at an EMS Authority meeting to be scheduled.”**
4. **“Additional meetings as requested by the EMS Authority and/or the EMS Committee.”**

Page 6, Proposers Qualifications and Relevant Experience – Mr. Hare indicated that Items (d) and (e) were revised to correct typographical errors and to add the word “multi-jurisdictional.”

Page 7, Timeline – Mr. Hare indicated that the timeline matches the Presentation section.

Ms. Freaney referred to the following verbiage located in the Purpose of Study section of the document:

“The Board of County Commissioners, sitting as the EMS Authority, desires to have both alternatives fully vetted from an operational perspective that would allow the full cost of each alternative to be compared with the existing EMS System’s operational performance and cost.”

Thereupon, Ms. Freaney related that the statement could be inserted at the beginning of the Deliverables section in order that it clearly is recognized as a deliverable in the mind of the consultant; and that it would only be for clarification purposes and would not change the wording. Chairman Sebesta indicated that he liked the idea and, at his suggestion, Mr. Hare agreed to place an Executive Summary in each major section of the document and include the above statement in the Deliverables section.

ACCOUNTANT – OPTION 2

Mr. Hare referred to the document titled *Accountant Scope of Work*, a copy of which has been filed and made a part of the record, and reviewed proposed amendments to the Accountant Scope of Work – Option 2 document as suggested at the February 3 committee meeting and/or submitted thereafter, as well as comments and amendments proposed by County staff. Items of discussion are as follows:

Page 1, Introduction – Mr. Hare indicated that the Introduction section is identical to that of the Operational Study Scope of Work. In response to queries by Captain Millican, he related that any earlier changes requested in the Operational Study would also be integrated into the Accountant Scope of Work.

Page 2, Scope of Work, 1st Paragraph – Mr. Hare indicated that a sentence was added to the end of the paragraph to read: **“Consultant is to utilize Fiscal Year 2010-2011 financial and operational data.”**

Page 2, Scope of Work, Item No. 1 – Mr. Hare indicated that the paragraph was revised to read: “The Contractor will evaluate and validate the cost of the IPS Study’s approach to fire engine based ALS First Responder Services as identified by the operational consultant. Contractor will utilize current budgets and operating costs, **and any other costs deemed to be appropriate**, to validate **and/or determine** the cost of this service delivery option.”

Page 2, Scope of Work, Item No. 2 – Mr. Hare indicated that the paragraph was revised to read: “The Contractor will evaluate and validate the cost of the Sanford/Millican Plan as identified by the operational consultant. Contractor shall review and validate the operational consultant’s proposed organization chart, human resources plan, deployment plan, capital plan and an operational budget. Such components will be assessed to maintain **the same level of service currently provided using a multi-jurisdictional fire based EMS system.**”

Page 2, Deliverables, IPS Study Review, Item No. 2 – Mr. Hare indicated that the first sentence of the paragraph was revised to read: “Contractor shall validate **each agency’s** personnel costs including salary and benefit costs of each position/function identified **as provided by each fire district.**”

Mr. Hare related that the previously mentioned Executive Summary would be placed in each major section of the Accountant portion of the document as requested in the Operational Study section and that the following statement would be included in the Deliverables section:

“The Board of County Commissioners, sitting as the EMS Authority, desires to have both alternatives fully vetted from an operational perspective that would allow the full cost of each alternative to be compared with the existing EMS System’s operational performance and cost.”

Page 3, Deliverables, Sanford/Millican Plan Review, Item No. 3 – Mr. Hare indicated that the paragraph was revised to read: “Contractor shall validate personnel costs including salary and benefit costs of each position/function identified. Approach must include the actual costs for existing personnel being repurposed to Fire transport; **entry level salary and benefits by fire department/EMT or Firefighter/Paramedic positions added;** and market rates for salary and benefit costs for **non-firefighter certified EMTs, Paramedics or management/support** personnel and positions added. **Total personnel costs incurred under this proposal must be calculated whether paid by County EMS funds (Ad Valorem or User Fees) or paid for by the fire districts. Contractor shall include the proposed pay ranges and benefit structure for all positions.**”

In response to queries by Chief Lewis regarding why the contractor is being asked to provide salary ranges, Mr. Hare indicated that a pro forma needs to be in place; and that the information would basically be used regarding clerical positions or information technology positions. Captain Millican stated that the paragraph language is confusing; and that some of the sentences seem to be in conflict with one another; whereupon, Ms. Freaney explained that 80 to 90 percent of the system’s costs are labor; that the system needs to be sustainable over time; and that by including the entire benefit and pay range structure, a complete picture would emerge regarding how the salary structure will function, and Mr. Hare related that his intent when writing the language was to summarize it since there

would most likely be in excess of 20 employers in the mix; and that the contractor would most likely reuse as many job descriptions and pay plans as possible.

Mr. Ravins suggested that the last sentence read as follows: “Contractor shall include the proposed pay ranges and benefit structure for all positions **as necessary to fully document all costs.**” He related that while the operational consultant would provide information as to the optimal plan, the accountant would fully document reasonable costs for salaries and benefits, and should have the leeway to review such information; whereupon, in response to queries by Chairman Sebesta regarding whether the members could learn from another County department that has already worked on a similarly-sized project, Mr. Hare indicated that the Department of Environment and Infrastructure recently merged three existing county departments – Public Works, Utilities, and part of Environmental Management; and that the Operational Study requests that the consultant compare multi-jurisdictional Fire and EMS systems which work together to provide a large service in a county containing multiple cities.

Page 3, Deliverables, Sanford/Millican Plan Review, Item No. 5 – Mr. Hare indicated that the paragraph was revised to read: “Contractor shall validate the operational budget including fuel, fleet repair and maintenance, uniforms, supplies and equipment and all other operational costs of operating a **multi-jurisdictional fire based EMS system.**”

“Ensure all plans and analysis include the following components governance structure, administration, field supervision and coordination, all support services such as dispatch, patient business services, training/education, safety/risk, information technology management and support, materials management, scheduling, fleet management, etc., **including an analysis of which of these components are already in place in the current first responder agencies and could be integrated.**”

Page 3, Deliverables, Sanford/Millican Plan Review, Item No. 6 – Mr. Hare indicated that the wording would be modified as discussed under Item No. 17 in the Operational Study.

Page 3, Presentation and Reports – Mr. Hare indicated that the wording would mirror the language in the Operational Study.

Page 5, Timeline – Mr. Hare indicated that the timeline matches that in the Operational Study; whereupon, referring to Page 11 of the Request for Proposal, Commissioner Seel stated that the verbiage for the April 24, 2012 line entry should be specific as to which Board it is referring; and that the word “Board” should be replaced with “Board of County Commissioners,” and no objections were noted.

During discussion Ms. Freaney indicated that the due date for contractors to submit their proposals would be adjusted based on the date the Request for Proposal (RFP) is advertised and published; whereupon, Mr. Lauro related that although the RFP is complex, most firms dealing in such work already have boilerplate language established; and that 30 days is an ample amount of time for the contractors to respond to the RFP; and that the members retain the ability to add days if necessary.

Later in the meeting, Captain Millican related that, in his opinion, 30 days may not be sufficient time for the contractors to submit a bid because of the large amount of information they would need to review; whereupon, Mr. Ravins suggested that the timeframe be changed to 45 days, and following brief discussion, no objections were noted.

NEXT STEPS

Discussion ensued regarding next steps. Attorney Crowell related that because of Sunshine Law considerations, the members would need to notice another meeting if they wanted to engage in additional discussion or make further changes to the document; and that although the members could not engage in email conversations with each other regarding the specifics of the document, they would be able to forward their comments to their respective staffs and would be permitted to email the Chairman and simply request an additional committee meeting if so desired; whereupon, Attorney Crowell related that the members could simply allow Mr. Hare to revise the document with the changes agreed to during the meeting and, in response to queries by Chairman Sebesta, the members indicated that Mr. Hare and Ms. Freaney should proceed and revise the document accordingly.

Ms. Freaney indicated that once the bids are in, she would begin to get a sense of the members' schedules in order to allow sufficient time to review the bids individually and as a committee.

February 20, 2012

MISCELLANEOUS DISCUSSION

REQUEST FOR BUDGETS

Ms. Freaney informed the members that within the next two weeks, her office would be putting out requests for budgets for Fiscal Year 2012-13, and indicated that the members could request Fiscal Year 2010-11 data from the fire departments, including personnel and other costs. She related that the data would be provided to the accountants in an audit-ready form; that it would help them to fully calculate the costs of a fire based transport model; and that by obtaining the information early, it could be obtained in a non-rushed, logical fashion; whereupon, Chairman Sebesta and Mr. Ravins expressed support for the idea, and no objections were noted.

ORAL PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Lauro presented information pertaining to allowing candidates to provide oral presentations to the Committee, and indicated that while the members always retain the option of requesting an oral presentation, they may wish to place the option in the RFP; whereupon, Chairman Sebesta and Chief Lewis indicated their support, and no objections were noted.

NEXT MEETING DATE

To be determined.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:14 A.M.