

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES (EMS) FIRE TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

July 9, 2012

The EMS Fire Transport Committee, acting as the Request for Proposal (RFP) Evaluation Committee met in the Clerk's Large Conference Room, Fourth Floor, Pinellas County Courthouse, 315 Court Street, Clearwater, Florida, at 8:46 A.M. on this date with the following members present:

Senator (Retired) Jim Sebesta, Chairman
Craig A. Hare, Public Safety Services (RFP Evaluation Committee 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

Maureen A. Freaney, Assistant County Administrator
Don S. Crowell, Senior Assistant County Attorney
Chief Joe Accetta, Safety Harbor Fire Department
Chief James Angle, Palm Harbor Fire Rescue
Norman Atherton, Palm Harbor Fire Commission
Joseph Lauro, Pinellas County Purchasing Director
Kathy Freeman, Pinellas County Purchasing Department
Anne Lindberg, Tampa Bay Times
Barry Mogil
Will Newton, International Association of Fire Fighters
Jon Pearl, International Association of Fire Fighters
Mark Postma, Sunstar Paramedics
Lieutenant Scott Sanford, Palm Harbor Fire Rescue
Robert Stanley, International Association of EMTs and Paramedics
Greg Woodrum, Public Safety Services
Other Interested Individuals
Michael P. Schmidt, Deputy Clerk, Board Reporter

July 9, 2012

Agenda

1. 8:45 – 9:00 Welcome
Approval of Minutes
Introductions
2. 9:00 – 11:00 Presentation by TriData Division, System Planning Corporation
3. 11:00 – 12:00 Committee Evaluation and Scoring of TriData Division,
System Planning Corporation
4. 12:00 – 1:15 Break for Lunch
5. 1:30 – 3:30 Presentation by Fitch & Associates, LLC
6. 3:30 – 4:30 Committee Evaluation and Scoring of Fitch & Associates, LLC
7. 4:45 – 5:00 Brief meeting requested by Captain Jim Millican

Note: Evaluation and scoring times are estimates. The actual time necessary may be shorter or longer.

WELCOME

Chairman Sebesta called the meeting to order at 8:46 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.

Attorney Crowell explained that due to Sunshine Law requirements, the meeting is open to the public, but that the meeting is not a public hearing, and no public input will be taken.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Upon presentation of the minutes of the May 4, 2012 meeting, Chairman Sebesta directed that the minutes be approved, and no objections were noted.

Upon presentation of the minutes of the May 30, 2012 meeting, Ms. Freaney indicated that the figures used for the point values were incorrect; and, later in the meeting, Mr. Hare requested that the minutes reflect certain comments that he and Ms. Freaney made; whereupon, Chairman Sebesta directed that the minutes be edited, reviewed by Mr. Lauro, distributed to the members, and the edited minutes brought back for approval at the next meeting.

COMMENTS BY DIRECTOR OF PURCHASING PRIOR TO PRESENTATION

Mr. Lauro indicated that TriData Division, System Planning Corporation, would be providing an oral presentation for RFP No. 112-0213-P, an Operational Analysis of EMS and Fire Deployment and Response; that to ensure the RFP Evaluation Committee would be provided sufficient time to express concerns and ask questions of the presenter, the presentation would be limited to 1.5 hours; and that following a question and answer period, the committee members would take a ten-minute break and then proceed with the evaluation and scoring process.

PRESENTATION BY TriData DIVISION, SYSTEM PLANNING CORPORATION

TriData Senior Project Manager Harold C. Cohen provided a presentation outline as follows:

- Introduction
- The TriData Team
- Individual Introductions
- Methodology for Review
- Reviewing the Plans
- Using the Software
- Operationalizing the Results
- Past Projects
- Questions and Answers
- Wrap Up

Mr. Cohen provided a synopsis of his background and professional qualifications in the field of Emergency Medical Services, presented background information regarding TriData, and discussed the approach the firm would take if awarded the bid. He indicated that TriData has prepared over 200 studies for state, local, and federal governments; that 23 of those projects were located in Florida, including several metro-sized organizations; and that his understanding is that the county is seeking to maintain the level of service, equalize funding throughout the jurisdictions, contain costs, and create sustainability of the EMS delivery program. Mr. Cohen introduced Senior Consultant Gregg MacDonald, and related that CEO Phil Schaenman would be providing hands-on corporate oversight for the project; whereupon, he conducted a PowerPoint presentation titled *Operational Analysis of EMS and Fire Department and Response, Pinellas County, Florida*, a copy of which has been filed and made a part of the record, discussed the following matters, and responded to queries by the members:

- Documentation Review
- Review of Current Resources
- Stakeholder Input
- Review of Sanford-Millican/Integral Performance Solutions (IPS) Plans
- Analytical Software
- ARC GIS 10.0
- Maps of Jacksonville, Southern Lee County, and Orange County, Florida
- SPSS 15
- Travel Time Analysis
- Multiple Factor Charts
- Inter-Jurisdictional Comparisons
- From Models to a Plan
- 911 – The Atlas and The Axis
- EMS First Response
- EMS Transportation
- Can We Afford Not To?
- Considerations for Change
- TriData and Florida – Partnership
- Similar Multi-Jurisdictional Projects
- Why Choose TriData?

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

In response to queries by the members, Messrs. Cohen and MacDonald provided the following information:

Q Chief Lewis: In previous studies, have you addressed changing or expanding the scope of practice for both 911 and First Responders and, if so, what were your recommendations?

A Yes. *Mr. Cohen provided background information relating to the financial aspect of changing and expanding the scope of EMS, relating that the Department of Health and Human Services has recently made available several billion dollars in grant money to expand primary care; and that, for the very first time, four EMS systems qualified, including Reno, Nevada, for whom Tri Data is working. He discussed some recommendations he has made relating to keeping systems adaptable in order to expand the role of EMS; and indicated that the expanded role could include assisting with vaccinations, dispensing antibiotics, and providing other health care services; whereupon, Mr. Cohen stressed the need for financial remuneration for services provided by first responders and transport systems.*

Mr. MacDonald discussed possibilities for the expansion of EMS personnel skills and the impact it could have for the entire health care process, including changing legislation to allow EMS to play a role in the health care system. He related that although emergency providers tend to think “acute” rather than “chronic,” there are numerous ways EMS could fit into the healthcare system, including making safety assessments of patients; completing welfare checkups on patients transported to hospitals; and identifying, tracking, and providing follow-up care for “frequent flyers” to prevent further emergency calls.

Thereupon, Mr. Cohen discussed the social issues addressed in the RFP, indicating that fire transport needs to be reviewed from not only a patient’s point of view, but from the internal customer’s point of view, noting that the costs associated with a public pension system will be a long-term issue; that the opportunity for financial remuneration for fire service exists in that certain healthcare professionals may not continue to work for what Medicaid will pay; and that the option of using paramedics for preventive and follow-up care may be of value to the internal customers of EMS.

Q Mr. Ravins: In addition to the efficiencies gained from having done the St. Petersburg study, explain why your services might be more economical than another firm and how you are able to manage costs?

A *Mr. Cohen related that TriData is able to manage its costs better than competitors due to the firm having previously worked in Florida and its familiarity with the area and the local system; that local staff is available to address issues, which would keep the costs down; that much of the analysis can be completed at the company’s home office; and that the firm is experienced and utilizes effective methods and techniques to get the job done; whereupon, he pointed out that the TriData bid is sensitive not only to the upfront costs, but to the ongoing legacy costs.*

Q Mr. Ravins: Regarding your comment about the Public Utility Model and how it may have outlived its usefulness, explain what made it useful then and what has changed?

A *Mr. Cohen discussed the Public Utility Model, and related that the model provides EMS service similar to a telephone company or a gas and electric company; that although such a model should be efficient and save money, the dollars generated from a call for service are difficult to account for; that because EMS is an essential service, local governments require the EMS service provider to purchase bonds, which adds to the cost; and that the model has become expensive and does not save as much money as originally thought;*

whereupon, Mr. Cohen stated that over the last five years, the Public Utility Model has fallen from approximately eight percent of the delivery model to approximately two percent.

Q Captain Millican and Chairman Sebesta: Is there an upfront cost and a recurring cost to the county for software? Is it going to cost more? Once you provide a report to the county, is that data available to the county without extra costs?

A *Mr. Cohen indicated that it is typical off-the-shelf software that the county probably already has; that if it does, the only recurring cost would be if the county were to purchase a newly-released version of the software; that TriData has the licenses and, once a report is provided to the county, the data would be available without a consultant cost; and that TriData is providing a price to include all of the county's requirements.*

Q Ms. Triolo: Regarding the data systems being used in the current system, how do they compare to the model and the software being discussed?

A *Mr. Cohen noted the difficulty of obtaining usable data from many entities throughout the country, and related that in more progressive areas, modules are being tied directly into a computer-aided design (CAD) system; whereupon, he discussed modules that are able to do predictive values, and explained the value of a software program that is able to evaluate demand patterns.*

Q Chairman Sebesta: Are there any holes in the Pinellas County system that would prevent you from finishing your study at the cost quoted?

A *Noting that Pinellas County has a centralized source of data, Mr. Cohen indicated that while he does not see any issues regarding the price quoted for the project, he does not presently know if the data collection and availability are as good for the entire county as for the project completed in St. Petersburg. Mr. Cohen related that, historically, the only times TriData has asked for additional funds for a project were when the client had requested a change or expansion in the scope of work; that from the data obtained in past dealings with the county, he is confident that his firm will have what it needs to complete the study; and that should issues arise with obtaining data from any of the 24 municipalities or the 911 Center, he would inform the county and his firm would likely provide its analysis with the exclusion of that one area.*

Q Chairman Sebesta: Are any committee members uncomfortable about the possibility of not being able to retrieve the necessary data from the county system?

A *Mayor Foster indicated that he was not uncomfortable since he considered it a de minimis risk, and no other comments were noted.*

Q Mayor Foster: Can TriData be objective analyzing IPS in light of the study the firm has already done for St. Petersburg?

A *Mr. Cohen stated that his firm would be objective during its analysis; and that it would be looking at the project from an overall perspective of the county and its residents.*

Q Chief Lewis: Pinellas County contains 24 municipalities, 18 providers, and the ambulance provider. Will such a large and diverse mix of stakeholders hinder any objectivity on the part of TriData or the outcome of the proposal?

A *Mr. Cohen related that it would not hinder objectivity and provided examples of other cities containing multiple local governments and fire districts for which his firm has provided consulting services; whereupon, he related that although a large mix of players can be challenging, it is a challenge his firm will be able to meet.*

Q Chief Lewis: Has your firm dealt with an EMS system that, while being multi-jurisdictional, is under one authority, one medical director, and with one set of protocols?

A *Mr. Cohen related that while Pinellas County is unique, TriData has dealt with systems similar to the Pinellas County model; and that the closest model would be that of Orange County, Florida.*

Q Captain Millican: Has TriData ever been released from an RFP or missed a deadline?

A *Mr. Cohen related that his firm has never been terminated from a study that it had not completed; that while his firm has missed an occasional deadline, it is upfront about the matter and explains to the client why the deadline is being missed; and that the issue is usually related to a data issue.*

Q Captain Millican: Outside of St. Petersburg, does your firm have other dealings with Pinellas County or Paramedics Plus?

A *Mr. Cohen discussed the previous dealings TriData has had with Paramedics Plus, relating that he is impressed with the organization.*

July 9, 2012

Thereupon, following the question and answer period, Mr. Cohen provided a wrap-up, thanked the members for their time, and detailed the reasons why TriData should be chosen as the consultant to provide the Operational Analysis of EMS and Fire Deployment and Response, noting that the firm has a proven track record in multiple situations; that it can provide guidance now and in the future; that it has project staff members and consultants who can offer expert guidance; and that the firm provides economical service.

* * * *

At this time, 10:52 A.M., the meeting was recessed and reconvened at 11:06 A.M. with all members present.

* * * *

COMMITTEE EVALUATION AND SCORING OF TRIDATA DIVISION, SYSTEM PLANNING CORPORATION

Mr. Lauro recited the procedures for evaluation and consensus scoring of the oral presentation of TriData Division, System Planning Corporation, and indicated that the format would basically be the same as the evaluation and scoring of the firm's written presentation; whereupon, the committee members each utilized the *Evaluation Note Form For Oral Presentation for RFP No. 112-0213-P, Operational Analysis of EMS and Fire Deployment and Response* and provided the consensus scoring range and individuals scores for the proposal.

Thereupon, Mr. Lauro provided information regarding the first criterion as follows, and discussion ensued:

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 the affect on the community involved.

Mr. Hare indicated that although he considered TriData to be experienced and skilled, the first part of the presentation was generic; that the presenter did not seem to completely understand the current model in Pinellas County, as he had referred to the Medical Director and the 911 Dispatch Center in the plural; and that he was unsure if the firm has a thorough understanding of the requirements set forth; whereupon, Captain Millican related that the presenter had later

clarified and made it clear that he understood that there is one Medical Director and one 911 Dispatch Center.

Following discussion, Mr. Lauro reported that a consensus range of 70 to 90 had been selected by the committee members for the first criterion; whereupon, Ms. Freeman entered the consensus and individual scores into an interactive, electronic evaluation form.

Thereupon, Mr. Lauro provided information regarding the second criterion as follows, and discussion ensued:

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

Evaluates 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 work and county requirements.

Ms. Triolo expressed concern that the presenter did not clearly answer her questions regarding data; and that following his explanation, she was still confused, and Chairman Sebesta agreed; whereupon, she indicated that although the presenter did a good job in discussing the whole continuum of care, he seemed to contradict himself when discussing the data, future data elements, and what data would be needed to make the best decisions.

Mr. Hare, with input by Chief Lewis, clarified for the group that Pinellas County has one 911 Dispatch Center which handles all dispatch calls for the county; and that a consultant would be able to draw all of their data from that one single entity; and Ms. Triolo indicated that although she understood that the data would be obtained from the 911 Dispatch Center, she was unclear regarding what TriData would be using for a deployment analysis model and how the firm's model would be superior to the current county model. Mr. Hare indicated that the county and local individual agencies are in need of good deployment software; that TriData is not really offering deployment software; and that while the firm had been asked to demonstrate interactive software, it essentially referred to a map and spreadsheets; whereupon, he related that he is concerned that the software demonstrated by TriData is not superior to that of the county and would not move the county to where it needs to be, and Mr. Ravins provided input.

Chief Lewis related that the county uses ARC GIS software in the Planning Department; that the software is used across the entire nation by almost all consultants; that the firm will be able to extract data from the program; and that although he felt the consultant did not fully explain how his firm planned to execute its plan, the software is a commonly-used commercial software. Captain Millican agreed that while the presenter could have provided a more thorough

explanation, he considered the software to be more than just simple spreadsheets and does include mapping and charting; and Ms. Triolo related that the software must be able to perform to the committee's expectations, and discussion ensued as to whether the software would address peak demand, seasonal population, and similar issues.

In response to concerns and queries by Chairman Sebesta, Mr. Hare clarified that the consultant's price would only change if the scope of the project were to change, and discussion ensued with Mayor Foster, Captain Millican, and Chief Lewis providing input; whereupon, the members indicated that they were comfortable with the presenter's explanation that the firm would only revise its price if the scope of the project were to change.

Mr. Ravins expressed concerns that the presenter had indicated that the firm would be able to save on travel expenses by taking a long-distance approach versus a boots-on-the-ground approach, noting that the preferred approach would be to interact with the many municipalities and stakeholders at a closer range.

Mr. Hare indicated that, in his opinion, the presenter took a prescriptive approach during the presentation, was biased in his examples, and had already drawn conclusions; whereupon, Captain Millican stated that he disagreed; that the presenter had indicated that he would seek community involvement and input; and that he had provided examples of things he would need to research; and Mayor Foster indicated that, in his opinion, the presenter was not predisposed to any sort of a model.

Following discussion, Mr. Lauro reported that a consensus range of 70 to 90 had been selected by the committee members for the second criterion; whereupon, Ms. Freeman entered the consensus and individual scores into an interactive, electronic evaluation form.

Thereupon, Mr. Lauro provided information regarding the third criterion as follows, and discussion ensued:

3. Qualifications – Maximum Point Value: 300

This criterion pertains to the evaluation of the qualifications of the firm, including the project manager and staff to be assigned. Qualifications shall include, but not be limited to, experience with similar projects, including outcomes and implementation, management experience, firm experience, etc.

Mr. Hare indicated that Mr. Cohen brought in Mr. MacDonald as a co-presenter; that Mr. MacDonald was a former business partner of Mr. Cohen, an Emergency Room nurse, and not listed on the initial proposal as a team member; that he was not overly impressed that a low-level

July 9, 2012

individual was a co-presenter and had expected a more senior level individual; and that the firm may not want to utilize experts in order to contain costs; whereupon, Chief Lewis indicated that Mr. McDonald could be an additional expert on the consulting team; and that Mr. Cohen had not indicated that anyone was eliminated from the initial proposal regarding members of the team.

In response to queries by Chairman Sebesta regarding TriData's ability to complete the study for the quoted price, Chief Lewis indicated that the firm is well established, has completed a lot of studies, and there is no indication it has ever been fired from a job; and Mayor Foster related that Orange County, Florida, gave the firm an excellent review.

Following discussion, Mr. Lauro reported that a consensus range of 70 to 90 had been selected by the committee members for the third criterion; whereupon, Ms. Freeman entered the consensus and individual scores into an interactive, electronic evaluation form.

Thereupon, following a tally of the total scores for the above three criteria, Mr. Lauro reported that the final total average score for TriData was 798.57.

* * * *

At this time, 11:31 A.M., the meeting was recessed and reconvened at 1:31 P.M. with all members present.

* * * *

COMMENTS BY DIRECTOR OF PURCHASING PRIOR TO PRESENTATION

Mr. Lauro indicated that Fitch & Associates would be providing an oral presentation for RFP No. 112-0213-P, an Operational Analysis of EMS and Fire Deployment and Response; and that to ensure the committee would be provided sufficient time to express concerns and ask questions of the presenter, the presentation would be limited to 1.5 hours; whereupon, he explained that due to Sunshine Law requirements, the EMS Fire Transport Committee meeting is open to the public; but that the meeting is not a public hearing, and no public input will be taken.

PRESENTATION BY FITCH & ASSOCIATES

Joseph (Jay) Fitch, Fitch & Associates, presented background information regarding the firm he established 28 years ago, relating that the company has worked in nearly all sectors of emergency services; and that due to the unique requirements of the project, Fitch & Associates

has teamed with Optima Corporation North America to offer the Optima predict™ software; whereupon, he related that Optima has been providing analytics with detailed simulation software for nearly 15 years, with installations in emergency service environments in seven countries.

Mr. Fitch discussed the approach the firm would take if awarded the bid, relating that Fitch & Associates would accomplish its work in a collaborative and transparent process that would involve representatives from every district in the community; whereupon, he discussed the active simulations that would be demonstrated later in the meeting, and indicated that computer simulations not only provide an opportunity to review past data, but also allow a method to determine how the system would perform in the future; and that using the assumptions of the IPS and Sanford-Millican plans, the software simulation can be reviewed to see how they performed using the data from the previous year.

Mr. Fitch introduced Guillermo Fuentes, Senior Associate, Fitch & Associates, and Chris Callsen, CEO, Optima Corporation North America, and discussed the roles and responsibilities of team members who were not in attendance; whereupon, Messrs. Fitch, Fuentes, and Callsen conducted a PowerPoint presentation titled *Operational Analysis of EMS and Fire Deployment and Response*, a copy of which has been filed and made a part of the record, discussed the following matters, and responded to queries by the members:

- Value for Money – How do you measure fire and ambulance efficiency?
- Project Approach
- Methodology to Review Current Readiness
- IPS Plan Review
- Sanford/Millican Plan Review
- Optima predict™
- Decision Making in EMS and Fire
- Optimization
- Simulations
- Team's Reporting/Analysis Tools
- Optima predict™ – Customer Experience
- Similar Fire/EMS Experiences
- Apples to Apples Comparison – Urban to Rural Demand
- Realistic Schedules
- Payroll Efficiency

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

In response to queries by the members, Messrs. Fitch, Fuentes, and Callsen provided the following information:

Q Chairman Sebesta: Is the software intuitive? Is it learning from itself?

A *Mr. Callsen, with input by Mr. Fitch, indicated that the software is intuitive in the respect that it is constantly updated so that over time the bigger picture comes into focus based upon data that has been captured.*

Q Captain Millican: What price did Lee County pay for the software?

A *Mr. Fitch indicated that he did not consider it appropriate to answer the question; that it would put the vendor at a very significant disadvantage; that providing the software was not included as part of the scope for the project; and that if the RFP had been written requiring Fitch & Associates to provide the software to the county, the information would have been included; whereupon, he discussed variables that could affect the pricing mix.*

In response to follow-up queries by Mayor Foster and Mr. Hare, Mr. Fitch, with input by Mr. Callsen, indicated that a report will be provided upon completion of the project; that the software is not needed subsequent to the report; and that the committee will receive the data files for each of the simulations in a format that can be easily analyzed.

Q Captain Millican: What would be the purpose of accessing the software for 90 days if Fitch & Associates is going to provide all of the necessary information anyway?

A *Mr. Fitch, with input by Mr. Fuentes, indicated that although the software would be provided for 90 days in order for the committee to try it out, the software is not required for the committee to access and utilize the data that Fitch & Associates is going to provide at the end of the project; that if the county wants to keep adding subsequent years' data, it would need to pay an acquisition cost and acquire the software; and that there are other product suites that go with the program that the county may wish to purchase later. Mr. Fitch indicated that this is an unusual project for the firm; that in the typical business model for which they bid, they are asked to provide a planning tool to be used going forward, which would result in the client owning the software, having access to the software, and include training of staff to do simulation; whereupon, Messrs. Fuentes and Callsen discussed other product suites such as "Live" and "Marvelous" that help dispatchers make real-time decisions.*

Q Captain Millican: How many studies have you completed that recommended fire-based transport? Has your firm ever been released from or defaulted on an RFP?

A *Mr. Fitch related that his firm has never been asked to provide a recommendation one way or the other regarding fire-based transport; that the role of Fitch & Associates is not to determine who wins and who loses; and that a number of communities have expanded the role of the fire service in projects with which his firm has been involved; whereupon, he related that Fitch & Associates has never missed a deadline or defaulted on an RFP, but that deadlines have been shifted at the clients' request when sufficient data has not been available.*

Q Captain Millican: Have you been or are you associated with Paramedics Plus or Pinellas County?

A *Mr. Fitch related that his firm has not done business with Pinellas County before; and that its only business relationship with Paramedics Plus has been hosting conferences at their request, with no financial association.*

Q Chief Lewis: Did your firm do the Seattle system?

A *Mr. Callsen related that his firm did the Basic Life Support (BLS) transport piece of the Seattle system, which is contracted to AMR.*

Q Chief Lewis: Has your firm had any consulting jobs which are multi-jurisdictional, under one dispatch system, one Medical Director, one Authority, and one set of protocols and equipment?

A *Mr. Fitch related that Fitch & Associates had done a similar job in the Province of Manitoba, Canada, with the exception of the City of Winnipeg; and Mr. Fuentes indicated that Fitch & Associates has worked in multi-jurisdictional environments at other locations around the world, including Dubai and Hong Kong.*

Q Captain Millican: How does the optimization software merge one set of data for the 911 Dispatch Center and one set of data for the transport, and then combine those two sets of data from the initiation of a call to the end of the call?

A *Mr. Callsen indicated that Fitch & Associates would tie the data together and create a single data stream, with participation from the community.*

Q Captain Millican: Have you done a project like this before? Would Fitch & Associates only be looking at two systems, the IPS Plan and the Sanford-Millican Plan?

A *Mr. Fuentes, with input by Mr. Fitch, indicated that the firm had previously modeled a blend of volunteer and fulltime services and understands the impact of changing call volumes; and that with reasonable, unbiased people sitting around the table, it will become obvious how a system performs under the different approaches.*

Thereupon, following the question and answer period, Mr. Fitch provided a wrap-up, thanked the members for their time, and discussed the benefits of selecting Fitch & Associates as the consultant to provide the Operational Analysis of EMS and Fire Deployment and Response.

* * * *

At this time, 2:36 P.M., the meeting was recessed and reconvened
at 2:44 P.M. with all members present.

* * * *

COMMITTEE EVALUATION AND SCORING OF FITCH AND ASSOCIATES

Mr. Lauro indicated that the procedures for evaluation and consensus scoring of the oral presentation of Fitch & Associates would be the same as that of the previous presentation; whereupon, the committee members each utilized the *Evaluation Note Form For Oral Presentation for RFP No. 112-0123-P, Operational Analysis of EMS and Fire Deployment and Response*, and provided the consensus scoring range and individual scores for the proposal.

Thereupon, Mr. Lauro provided information regarding the first criterion as follows, and discussion ensued:

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 affect on the community involved.

Ms. Triolo related that from her perspective, Fitch & Associates had a full understanding of the project. Mr. Hare related that he liked the consultant's approach; that they tied back to everything the RFP requested; and that they focused on the scope. Captain Millican pointed out

that Commissioner Seel had brought forward the prospect of a hybrid plan at a committee meeting; that the scope of the RFP had requested information regarding a third model; and that the presenters had only discussed the IPS and Sanford-Millican plans; whereupon, Mayor Foster related that even though the presenters only discussed the IPS and Sanford-Millican plans, the possibility of a third plan did not seem to be off the table. Mr. Ravins discussed the simulation model, indicating that the software provides incredible flexibility for the fine-tuning of transport, and discussion ensued regarding whether a hybrid plan was sufficiently covered in the RFP.

Following discussion, Mr. Lauro reported that a consensus range of 70 to 90 had been selected by the committee members for the first criterion; whereupon, Ms. Freeman entered the consensus and individual scores into an interactive, electronic evaluation form.

Thereupon, Mr. Lauro provided information regarding the second criterion as follows, and discussion ensued:

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

Evaluates 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 work and county requirements.

Chief Lewis related that although the county would receive a 90-day trial period to try out the software offered by Fitch & Associates, the software is not provided free of charge and would be very expensive to purchase and to maintain a subscription; whereupon, Mr. Ravins discussed the superiority of the Fitch & Associates software, indicating that such sophisticated simulation software may be something the county would have an interest in at a future date; and that the 90-day trial period would provide time to see if the committee is comfortable with the results of all the simulations.

Chief Lewis related that while he was impressed with the presentation of Fitch & Associates and the simulation software, the end product is what is important; that he has lingering concerns regarding the price of the Fitch & Associates software; and that the committee is not comparing TriData and Fitch & Associates in an apples-to-apples fashion in software, but is grading them that way. Mr. Ravins noted that TriData did not communicate whether they would be able to do similar simulations and models, and Mr. Hare pointed out that the firms were asked to demonstrate the software.

Thereupon, following discussion regarding the benefits of the Fitch & Associates software, Chief Lewis reminded the members that they are not interviewing for a software consultant, but one who will review the current system and make recommendations; and Mr. Hare indicated that regardless of whether the county purchases the software, it will receive the output provided by the study; and Ms. Triolo agreed, indicating that the committee is tasked with making the best decisions with the best information; and that the simulation model has the most powerful tools for making decisions.

Ms. Triolo related that she liked the idea of the consultant getting buy-in from all involved parties, with not only executives, but frontline people involved in seeing the simulation model at work and determining if the right decisions are being made, and Mr. Ravins concurred. Mayor Foster discussed how Fitch & Associates indicated in its RFP response that the firm would identify any missing elements in the IPS and Sanford-Millican plans based upon best practices; and indicated that he thought the firm would review the deficiencies and strengths of the two and be able to simulate those out; and that he is convinced the committee would get a good result, and discussion ensued regarding the aspects of the presentation relating to community buy-in, stakeholders, transparency, and similar topics.

Chairman Sebesta related that the Fitch & Associates system is sophisticated and powerful; and that it would be incumbent upon the users to be prepared for its arrival.

Following discussion, Mr. Lauro reported that a consensus range of 70 to 90 had been selected by the committee members for the second criterion; whereupon, Ms. Freeman entered the consensus and individual scores into an interactive, electronic evaluation form.

Thereupon, Mr. Lauro provided information regarding the third criterion as follows, and discussion ensued:

3. Qualifications – Maximum Point Value: 300

This criterion pertains to the evaluation of the qualifications of the firm, including the project manager and staff of the firm to be assigned. Qualifications shall include, but not be limited to, experience with similar projects, including outcomes and implementation, management experience, firm experience, etc.

Captain Millican related that he considered Fitch & Associates qualified to complete the survey, but their fire-based transport experience to be minimal; whereupon, Mr. Hare related that he was impressed that the firm had a billing specialty and could sustain collections if the model changes; and that Mr. Fuentes would be an asset to the project due to his experience in running a large EMS system.

July 9, 2012

Following discussion, Mr. Lauro reported that a consensus range of 70 to 90 had been selected by the committee members for the third criterion; whereupon, Ms. Freeman entered the consensus and individual scores into an interactive, electronic evaluation form.

Thereupon, following a tally of the total scores for the above three criteria, Mr. Lauro indicated that the total average score for Fitch & Associates was 868.57; whereupon, he indicated that the evaluation process portion of the meeting was now over.

POST EVALUATION INSTRUCTIONS, DISCUSSION, AND STEPS FORWARD

Mr. Lauro reported that the total average score was 798.57 for TriData and 868.57 for Fitch & Associates; and that Ms. Freeman would distribute the scoring sheets for the members to sign; whereupon, he requested that the members turn in any notes made during the meeting, as the notes are considered part of the public record. He indicated that the item would be placed on the July 24, 2012 BCC agenda for approval of the ranking of firms; and that the final contract would appear on an August BCC agenda.

Captain Millican recommended that the results from today's meeting be sent to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) as soon as possible, since a tax increase is being considered; and requested that the bids from both consultants be sent, and no objections were noted; whereupon, Mr. Lauro indicated that he would provide all of the information to the Board.

In response to queries by Chairman Sebesta, Mr. Lauro indicated that the commissioners can accept the recommendation, reject the recommendation, or choose another company if they so desire; and that the Board would likely select a winner at the meeting, following which, a contract would be negotiated. Attorney Crowell discussed recent changes to Florida Statute 286.11 pertaining to the negotiation of a contract, and suggested that Mr. Lauro be allowed to negotiate the contract in order to simplify the negotiation process; whereupon, upon query by Chairman Sebesta, Mr. Lauro agreed to negotiate the contract, and no objections were noted.

In response to queries by Chairman Sebesta regarding the future role of the EMS Fire Transport Committee, Mr. Lauro indicated that while the committee would continue to exist, he was unsure of what input it would provide going forward; whereupon, Attorney Crowell related that the committee was created at the behest of Senator Jack Latvala; that Mr. Hare has completed his function of serving on the committee during the evaluation process, and Chairman Morroni or another commissioner would resume their place on the committee; that the committee members would provide input to the RFP scope of work report at the draft stage; that the members would be involved and provide input throughout the process, no matter which consultant is hired; that

July 9, 2012

the committee would decide on its future level of involvement; and that the committee is an advisory committee to the BCC and subject to the Sunshine Laws.

In response to queries by Chairman Sebesta, discussion ensued as to whether the committee is a creature of the Legislative Delegation and whether the Delegation had the power to create the committee or whether Senator Jack Latvala had directed the BCC to form the committee. Ms. Freaney recalled that the vote to create the committee occurred at a Legislative Delegation meeting; whereupon, Attorney Crowell agreed to review the direction of the Delegation and provide the information at a future date.

Captain Millican related that Senator Latvala had directed the committee to provide an accounting analysis of the Sanford-Millican and IPS plans; that the committee itself had subsequently decided that the plans should be operationalized prior to an accounting study; and that the committee remains responsible for providing an accounting study of the plans. Discussion ensued wherein Mr. Ravins clarified that the Delegation Committee spoke to the process and had included the word “operationalize” in their language; and that while the Delegation Committee had probably expected that both the operational and accounting analysis would be done by one firm, the EMS Fire Transport Committee had decided that two firms would be needed. Mr. Hare reported that a draft report would be coming back to the committee; and that the members would likely want an interim brief, and Captain Millican briefly discussed the timeline, noting that the committee is supposed to get a report while the study is being conducted and a final report from the consultant at the conclusion of the study; that the final report would be sent to the BCC for their decision on what action to take with the operational report; and that the accountant study would be the next step; whereupon, Mr. Hare suggested that the operational report might make it abundantly clear what action should be taken.

In response to query by Mr. Lauro, Attorney Crowell advised that someone should represent the committee at the July 24, 2012 BCC meeting.

BRIEF MEETING REQUESTED BY CAPTAIN MILLICAN

Attorney Crowell indicated that it was approximately 3:15 P.M.; that the meeting requested by Captain Millican had been separately noticed for 4:45 P.M.; and that the meeting could not be held until that time due to public notice requirements; whereupon, Ms. Freaney contacted Commissioner Seel via text message to determine her availability to attend the meeting, and reported that Commissioner Seel was at an offsite meeting and would likely be unavailable until after 4:45 P.M.

July 9, 2012

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Sebesta adjourned the meeting at 3:21 P.M.