



Sonoma County EMS Workgroup

March 19, 2018 – 9:30-11:00 AM
Sonoma County Water Agency Redwood Conference Rooms
404 Aviation Blvd, Santa Rosa CA 95403

DRAFT Goal: To create a safe, effective system that delivers high-quality Emergency Medical Services to the communities of Sonoma County as supported by qualified, committed and accountable EMS caregivers.

Alternate Suggestion: To create a safe, effective system that delivers high-quality field care medicine that is responsive to the community needs of Sonoma County as supported by qualified, committed and accountable EMS caregivers.

Goal for this meeting: To reach understanding of topics interested to be addressed in project to improve the EMS System.

Draft - Minute notes

Chris Thomas opened the meeting with welcome and initiated a round of self-introductions from the participants.

Chris advised the Notes from March 5, 2018 meeting are up on website, and asked for any corrections to be sent via email to Chris Thomas and Theresa Lombardi. Steve Herzberg (EMCC Dist. 5/ BBFPD) advised he could not open the file as it was an .odt file; Chris said in future staff will send out to all in a Word Document format, along with this week's minutes.

Chris provided an update on progress on current franchise extension. Tim Aboudara (Santa Rosa Firefighter's Local 1401) presented a list of questions that will be incorporated into the minutes. (See the end of this document.)

Chris shared that Supervisor Lynda Hopkins' office will participate in a conference call with the California EMS Authority (EMSA) regarding the extension of the EOA contract. Call participants will be EMSA, DHS leadership and staff on March 26, 2018 at 1PM.

Kurt Henke, (AP Triton, Sonoma County Fire Chiefs consultant, Cal Chiefs) is questioning the reliability of communications between EMSA and LEMSA, and advises the stakeholders group make sure all communication is in writing. Kurt stated there is already activity elsewhere in the state where communication with EMSA has changed if not in writing.

Steve Herzberg stated Sup. Hopkins wrote to Barbie Robinson, DHS Director, on January 23, 2018, requesting copies of communication with EMSA requesting an extension of the current EOA contract. Steve stated there has been no response to the request. Mike Williams (The Abaris Group, DHS/CVEMSA Consultant) offered that he informally had conversation with EMSA Director Dr. Howard Baker, and Deputy Director Dan Smiley, about an extension of the EOA and contract saying that a formal request will be made at a later date. Chris pointed out that Supervisor Hopkins

or her delegate are scheduled to speak to EMSA. At the present time, no formal request of the Board of Supervisors has been made to participate in this conference call or to ask EMSA for specific action. Chris noted thus we don't have the answer to a potential extension yet and moved to the next question on Tim Aboudara's list.

Tim asked staff to provide detail on all discussions with EMSA regarding an EOA extension. James Salvante (CVEMSA EMS Coordinator) advised the conference call was set up with EMSA by Barbie Robinson's assistant Linda Lowe. A number of Stakeholders advised they would want to be part of that meeting. Chris took the input and said he'd check in with leadership scheduled to be on the conference call and advise if stakeholder's representatives can participate. To date, Chris, James, Bryan Cleaver (CVEMSA Administrator), Jeff Berk (Deputy County Counsel), Barbie Robinson, and Rod Stroud (DHS Assistant Director) participated in discussions in person, via conference calls and on emails regarding the extension and process for requesting an extension. Tim Aboudara stated stakeholders are "...not feeling the love..." on the extension request with this open process. Tim stated the stakeholders can go to a public records request process to county counsel to obtain the requested information, but would prefer to receive the information from the staff.

In response to questions regarding progress and meetings that have occurred, Chris Thomas described the quick project staff discussion after the March 5th meeting and the tasks undertaken which included:

- 1) Engaging with EMSA about extension on EOA and franchise contract. County Counsel was brought into the process so there could be careful consideration regarding the request. Counsel needs to understand the need to obtain an EOA contract extension and how to frame the question.
- 2) Chris' outreach to AMR to assess willingness to participate in an extension of the contract. Awaiting response from the company. Initial concerns expressed regarding retention of exclusivity during the extension period and the ability to make financial changes were expressed.

The group discussed the rationale for the extension; October fires brought issues into focus needing additional time to address prior to an RFP. Chris talked about the support available from legislators to facilitate extension including the potential for introduction of legislation to allow for extension. James mentioned the need to define the instrument used to request an extension; potentially a contract amendment to current agreement approved by EMSA as an EOA agreement. Kurt Henke related an example of an EOA reaching term end in Santa Clara; LEMSA wanted to provide an extension, including exclusivity for the provider. EMSA supported the contract extension, but not an exclusive status for the provider. Kurt advised the group that there is no statutory limit on EOA term length; characterizing the limitation as an underground regulation.

The request was made and it was agreed to pass these questions to Barbie and Bryan about prior to March 4 and any formal communications with the state (see Tim's questions, 2.d.)

Tim asked, if not protected by any specific privilege, for the stakeholder group to be made aware of any planned meetings or calls going forward on the subject of the EOA extension. Chris asked if any staff present had awareness of any other meeting aside from the 3/22 pre-meeting with Supervisor Hopkins before the 3/26 conference call with EMSA, or EMS project admin group meeting on Friday 3/23/10AM which will include the subject as part of the discussion. Staff present had no additions to that list. There was discussion regarding the need for Bryan to attend these stakeholder meetings in the future and the group was reminded that the time for these meetings was selected to best accommodate all stakeholders and that some schedule conflicts were likely to exist. EMS staff confirmed that Bryan had pre-existing conflicts for this date.

Tim introduced a draft letter to EMSA director, Dr. Howard Backer from Sonoma EMS Stakeholder group in support of the extension. Tim stressed the importance of considering what is best for our

area. Explaining we need more time to consider the system because we have been impacted by fires, recovery, and personally, (as well as business-wise) due to the fires, We have learned certain things from the fires that we need to do differently.

Steve Herzberg asked whom from the stakeholders group is going to participate in conference call. Chris asked the group if any of those present would like to participate. Steve Herzberg stated he was asked by Supervisor Hopkins to participate. Chris again provided the date and time; 3/26 at 1PM. Chris took the input and suggested that one ask would be for any interested stakeholders to be able to listen to the discussion, with 2 reps identified to speak if they have questions. Chris will check in to see if appropriate at this call for stakeholders to participate. The call was slated to be admin staff and the Supervisor's office along with EMSA, so the state participants will need to be asked with respect to any change in participants. Pending agreement to add stakeholders, per a suggestion made by Tim, a message will be sent to stakeholders inviting them to participate.

Chris asked the group to review Draft Stakeholder Identified Topics and Interests, and asked for any additions. Chris explained that the list was compiled from the previous two meeting's minutes, as well as the flip chart pages produced in the last meeting. Chris advised the list was emailed out after the previous meeting and is currently posted on the google docs website. Chris pointed out the whiteboards in the room have some broad topics listed. Chris asked that participants add things they feel missing or clarify any previously missing topics. Chris also said participants may add detail to the shared google docs posting but added a request to not delete any existing text.

The following is a link to the document:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1jpl0JwWQRYRvwATDrDA3cH-sgt4Jspwc00URh6VmYtg/edit?usp=sharing>

Chris felt two topics rose to the top of the list based on some of the passions expressed in participants' responses:

Dispatch issues and accountability of LEMSA acting in its role.

Accountability of LEMSA: Chris mentioned the topic of evaluation of current LEMSA had been brought to his attention as missing from the topics list. While understood that to be incorporated under the topic of Accountability and Supervision, he noted that he may have misunderstood the conversations and notes from the last meeting so that is why this conversation for clarification and addition is on the agenda.

The request was made to add to the topics for discussion in the ordinance revision effort something that provides for evaluation of the LEMSA. Further, Steve Hertzberg indicated that there had been requests made to evaluate the current LEMSA for more than the last year. He felt that it was important to evaluate the current LEMSA before the ordinance revision work was completed in order to see if anything raised in that evaluation might be pertinent to the ordinance revision effort. Steve Hertzberg and Chris pointed out the Board of Supervisors can designate a number of different types of entities as LEMSA.

Chris asked for thoughts on LEMSA evaluation; how specifically to develop a process to evaluate the LEMSA. Tim Aboudara suggested a group of neutral people from stakeholders that work with the LEMSA and would take a survey about what's working and what's not. Steve Akre (Chief, SVFRA) advised the group should consider "raising up the altitude; take a higher level view". Steve pointed out the LEMSA used to be a three-county LEMSA and now has two counties with one county "on the fence". Is a multi-county LEMSA structure the best to carry out the job for Sonoma County?

Tim stated that public employees are subject to evaluation. Stakeholders want a chance for input from stakeholders on what the LEMSA does for us, what they do well, and what needs improvement. Steve Herzberg stated HR should be contacted; the employees have some rights.

In addition, there was a suggestion that a consultant be used and that it could be something like a 360 survey evaluation. Chris asked Mike Williams if Abaris Group has performed LEMSA evaluations and Mike confirmed that they have. Bob Norrbom (Battalion Chief SVFRA) advised that he recalled a survey or some process perhaps ten years ago, relating it to the Napa departure from the LEMSA association. Bob thought it should be revisited. Ultimately the report should go to EMCC perhaps BOS with recommendations and process.

Other issues raised relating to the LEMSA were compliance, stakeholder perception, and general understanding by the stakeholder of what the functions of the LEMSA are and what is getting done. James Salvante advised as a LEMSA staff member LEMSA compliance with regulation and law was a high priority to examine and share with the system. We also need to share the rules by which we function and know if are regulating in compliance the law. Review of all LEMSA functions was appropriate if informed by an understanding of the structure.

Steve Hertzberg noted that we also needed to understand the role of LAFCO in any EMS service area designation.

Chris advised the group we are working with counsel to answer some of the questions raised about LEMSA structure and authorities as well as questions on jurisdictional boundaries related to the EOA, and the legal framework of how/why changes can be made and by whom.

At about 10:55 AM, Chris pointed out the meeting was near the end and talked about assignments for the next meeting to be held in the same location on April 2, 2018

Given the time, Chris suggested the dispatch topic, the second of those that seemed to generate a significant amount of passion for some stakeholders should be discussed at the next meeting meeting.

Attendees were asked to review the draft minutes when sent and to add anything felt to be missing. Attendees were asked to consider the topics list on the google docs site and to think about what works, what doesn't, and to make comments on the list in Google docs. Attendees were reminded to not delete any items previously added.

Chris was asked about extension length; how long of an extension did we ask for? Chris replied he asked AMR for contract extension scenarios of 6 months, 1 year, and 2 years. What is the process of each scenario? We are awaiting a response.

There were no other questions or announcements before adjournment.

Project Website:

<https://www.coastalvalleysems.org/about-us/committees/sonoma-county-ems-systems-workgroup.html>

Staff Note:

The questions below were provided at the beginning of the meeting in written form by Tim Aboudara. Tim requested the document be incorporated into the meeting minutes. The responses to the questions are being generated as these draft minutes are being written and will be added to this document when they are completed.

Questions Regarding Sonoma County EOA Extension 2018

1. Prior to March 5, 2018 did anyone from the County of Sonoma and/or CVESMA formally, or informally, request an extension of the current EOA Contract from California EMSA? If yes,
 - a. Who made that request and under what authority?
 - b. Who else was the request discussed with before, or after, it was made?
 - c. What date and time was that request made?
 - d. Of whom was the request made?
 - e. How was the request made (email, letter, phone, text message, etc.)? f.
Was that request responded to?
 - i. How was the request responded to (email, letter, phone, text message, etc.)?
 - ii. What was the response to the request?
 - iii. Was any supporting documentation or authority cited in responding to the request?
 - iv. Who was notified of the response?
Who is currently in possession of the documents related to the request and the response?

2. After March 5, 2018 has there been any discussion or planning by anyone at the County of Sonoma and/or CVEMSA to formally request an extension of the current EOA Contract from the California EMSA?
 - a. Who has been involved in those discussions?
 - b. What steps have been discussed, planned, or executed?
 - c. Has any communication occurred between personnel from the County of Sonoma, CVEMSA or anyone working under the authority or direction of the County of Sonoma and/or CVEMSA and California EMSA? If yes,
 - i. Who was involved in that communication and under what authority?
 - ii. What is the content and extent of that communication?
 - iii. What date(s) and time(s) did such communication occur (email, letter, phone, text message, etc.)?
 - d. Has any documentation been provided to, or received from, California EMSA by anyone from the County of Sonoma and/or CVEMSA regarding an extension to the EOA Contract?
 - i. Who provided, or received, such documentation?
 - ii. What documentation was provided or received?
 - iii. How was that documentation provided (email, letter, phone, text message, etc)?
 - iv. Who provided (before), or was provided (after), such documentation?
 - e. Are there any planned meetings, conference calls or the like scheduled with California EMSA or amongst County of Sonoma and/or CVEMSA personnel regarding the extension of the EOA Contract?
 - i. When?

- ii. What is the purpose of such?
- iii. Who is scheduled to participate?

Presented for consideration and response 03/19/2018 at EMS Stakeholder Meeting