

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES (EMS) FIRE TRANSPORT COMMITTEE
May 30, 2012
(AMENDED)

The EMS Fire Transport Committee at the St. Petersburg College EpiCenter, Room 1-455, 13805 58th Street North, Largo, Florida, at 9:30 A.M. on this date with the following members present:

Senator (Retired) Jim Sebesta, Chairman
Craig A. Hare, Public Safety Services
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
Mayor Bill Foster, City of St. Petersburg

Also Present

Maureen A. Freaney, Assistant County Administrator
Don S. Crowell, Senior Assistant County Attorney
Chief Joe Accetta, Safety Harbor Fire Department
Chief Tom Jamison, East Lake Fire Department
Joseph Lauro, Pinellas County Purchasing Director
Chief Robert Polk, Pinellas Suncoast Fire and Rescue
Mark Postma, Sunstar Paramedics
Lieutenant Scott Sanford, Palm Harbor Fire Department
Greg Woodrum, Public Safety Services
Other Interested Individuals
Arlene L. Smitke, Deputy Clerk, Board Reporter
(Minutes by Tammy L. Burgess, Deputy Clerk)

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Overview from Joe Lauro, Purchasing Director
3. Develop Script for Oral Presentations
4. Discuss and Determine Evaluation Criteria
5. Discussion of Vendor Presentation Date

WELCOME

Chairman Sebesta called the meeting to order at 9:30 A.M. and, at his request, those in attendance introduced themselves. A sign-in sheet has been filed and made a part of the record.

MISCELLANEOUS DISCUSSION

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

Chairman Sebesta referenced a note regarding financial disclosure received from Supervisor of Elections Deborah Clark, and questioned whether the determination made at the first Committee meeting that the Committee members were not subject to financial disclosure still stands; whereupon, Attorney Crowell confirmed that the Committee members are not subject to financial disclosure; and requested that anyone receiving a document specifically referring to the Committee provide it to him for review.

COMMITTEE CONCERNS

Mr. Millican expressed concern regarding the County's failure to disclose the connections between Paramedics Plus and Fitch & Associates, as well as the participation of County staff on the Committee. He indicated that Senator Jack Latvala called a Special Delegation meeting as a result of head-to-head arguments throughout the County about fire transport versus EMS transport, as neither side believed the other's numbers used in the presentations were correct; and that this Committee was established as a result of that Special Delegation meeting called by Senator Latvala; whereupon, he stated that he feels that at the end of the last meeting during the ranking of the firms, it was made clear that any progress this Committee has made has been lost; that the Committee is no longer unbiased; and that County staff should not serve on the Committee.

* * * *

Mr. Hare and Ms. Freaney entered the meeting at 9:33 and 9:34 A.M., respectively.

* * * *

In response to query by Chairman Sebesta, Mr. Millican stated that he would feel more comfortable if the representative from the County was not related to the EMS group or part of the County Administrator's Office; and at the request of Chairman Sebesta, reiterated his concerns for the benefit of Mr. Hare and Ms. Freaney, indicating that the Committee was formed to scrub the numbers presented in the fire transport and EMS transport presentations; whereupon, he pointed out that County staff had claimed that the Sunstar numbers in the fire transport presentations were incorrect, but that Ms. Freaney had confirmed that the numbers were accurate during the County Commission meeting in which the Paramedics Plus contract was extended.

May 30, 2012

Mr. Ravins expressed concern regarding the timing of Mr. Millican's concerns about County staff's participation on the Committee, pointing out that the Committee voted unanimously to appoint Mr. Hare to the Committee to replace the Councilmember who had a conflict; and that the ranking process has been completed. Mr. Millican stated that he has thought a lot about the situation since the last meeting, but has been unable to share his concerns with the Committee members until today's meeting due to Sunshine Law restrictions; and discussion ensued wherein Mr. Lauro stated that Mr. Millican's concerns should have been raised prior to the evaluation process, noting the importance of having the same evaluators for the oral presentations for the sake of consistency.

Mr. Hare gave his perspective on Mr. Millican's comments, stating that, preceding issues aside, the County, through the Legislative Delegation, agreed that it wants an objective study; that obtaining an objective study is the purpose of these efforts; that the scope was written very objectively; and that some of the past history referenced by Mr. Millican does not apply. Mr. Hare maintained that he did disclose on the record that the County does not have any business dealings with Fitch; that Fitch has made numerous bids, but the firm was never utilized; and that he did disclose what he knew as a County employee of the ambulance contractor's relationship with Fitch, which was very limited and consisted of conferences where they were a vendor and Fitch the consultant, such as Alameda County.

Thereupon, following brief discussion, Chairman Sebesta stated that no changes would be made to the Committee membership, and no objections were noted.

OVERVIEW

Mr. Lauro announced that June 22, 2012 had been chosen as the date for the oral presentations by Tri-Data and Fitch, with Tri-Data giving its presentation at 11:00 A.M. and Fitch at 2:30 P.M., and discussion ensued regarding scheduling conflicts and rescheduling the oral presentations. In response to query by Chairman Sebesta, Attorney Crowell advised that the Committee may contact Mayor Foster telephonically to verify his availability, noting that it is part of a noticed meeting and would be considered administrative scheduling; whereupon, attempts were made to contact Mayor Foster and the vendors.

DEVELOP SCRIPT FOR ORAL PRESENTATIONS

Referring to the draft letter in the member packets, a copy of which has been filed and made a part of the record, Mr. Lauro noted that the first paragraph provides the date, time, and location

of the oral presentations, which will be filled in after the information is determined; and recommended that the members focus on the script for the oral presentations. In response to queries by Mr. Lewis and Chairman Sebesta, Mr. Lauro indicated that the members will be able to ask questions at the end of the presentation and can direct them to specific individuals, if necessary; whereupon, during discussion, the members agreed on the following script for the oral presentation and set a total time limit of not-to-exceed two hours:

1. Team and general introduction by Firm Principle or person in charge of this project (2 minutes).
2. Short (2 minutes maximum) synopsis by each key team member personally of their individual experience and expertise specifically relevant to this project (10 minutes).
3. Explain the methodology for reviewing and evaluating the current level of Pinellas County's fire protection and EMS performance and readiness (10 minutes).
4. Explain the methodology for reviewing both plans (IPS and Millican/Sanford) and how you would interface nationally recognized Fire and EMS deployment standards and best practices to fit into this methodology (15 minutes maximum).
5. Demonstrate how your firm will utilize the software proposed, and explain how the County would be able to utilize the software, and any associated costs (15 minutes).
6. Explain how your firm will convert the resultant deployment models into a detailed operational plan (10 minutes).
7. Discuss similar projects and multi-jurisdictional EMS systems. What was the outcome and status of the implementation?
8. Questions and answers (20 minutes).
9. Wrap-up by the Principle or person in charge of the project (5 minutes).

Attorney Crowell pointed out that both the EMS Authority and the Fire Authority adopt local standards; and advised that the firms need to either work within the construct of the local standards or explain that what they are doing will require a change to the adopted standards.

DISCUSS AND DETERMINE EVALUATION CRITERIA

Referring to the Oral Presentation Evaluation Criteria forms provided in the members' backup packets, copies of which have been filed and made a part of the record, Mr. Lauro noted that the criteria in the oral presentation needs to be addressed in the evaluation criteria to ensure that the Committee evaluates what is presented; whereupon, the Committee discussed the criteria enumerated on the forms and identified the agreed upon evaluation criteria for the oral presentations:

1. Understanding of Project – Maximum point value: 300

Evaluate the firm's understanding of the overall project, including the scope of work, which may include, but is not limited to, studies performed that affect the project, key design elements, and effect on the community involved.

2. Approach to the Project and Methods Used, Including Software, to Plan, Design, Execute, and Implement the Project – Maximum point value: 400

Evaluate the overall approach to the project, including software, proposed by the firm and the appropriateness of the methods proposed to plan, design, execute, and implement the project in relation to the scope of the County requirements.

3. Qualifications – Maximum point value: 300

Evaluation of the qualifications of the firm, including the project manager and staff of the firm to be assigned. Qualifications shall include, but are not limited to, experience with similar projects, including project outcome and implementation, management experience, firm experience, etc.

Mr. Lauro enumerated the next steps following the oral presentation process, indicating that a ranking of the firms will go before the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) for consideration and authorization for staff to negotiate a final contract; and that the final contract will go before the BCC after it has been negotiated, which is anticipated to be in place by the second meeting in August or the first meeting in September; whereupon, in response to query by Chairman Sebesta regarding the process in the event of a tie, Mr. Lauro explained that the odds of a tie are very slim, but that in the event a tie should occur, the item will go back to the BCC for discussion and drawing of lots.

DISCUSSION OF VENDOR PRESENTATION DATE

Mr. Woodrum provided Mayor Foster's times of availability and, following discussion, the Committee agreed to hold the oral presentations on July 9, 2012; whereupon, Mr. Lauro indicated that he will schedule Tri-Data for 9:00 A.M. and Fitch for 1:00 P.M., noting that he has confirmed the time with Fitch and has left a message for Tri-Data regarding the amended date and time for the oral presentations.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:44 A.M.