

ESA April Board Meeting

MINUTES

APRIL 2, 2008

2:00 PM

PIKES PEAK REGIONAL BUILDING
DEPARTMENT

FACILITATOR	Jim Reid
NOTE TAKER	Laurie Schneider
ATTENDEES	Commander Jim Reid, Jeff Wanderscheid, Dr. Jack Sharon, Dr. Marilyn Gifford, Councilwoman Margaret Radford, Commissioner Sallie Clark, Rob Helton, Chief Bryan Jack, Rosemary Bakes-Martin, Dan Molner, Jane Fredman, Bob West, Laurie Schneider

Agenda topics

CHANGES TO AGENDA/POSTPONEMENTS

DISCUSSION	Remove item 6C (Off-site Date for Contract Selection Committee to Meet).
-------------------	--

PRESENTATIONS TO BOARDMEMBERS AND STAFF

DISCUSSION	
<p>Commissioner Reid thanked Lisa Martinez for her outstanding support to the ESA Board. Thank you for all of your hard work in all that you have done.</p> <p>Commander Reid thanked Margaret Radford and Sallie Clark for their efforts and perseverance in the reorganization of the ESA Board. The ESA Board was reorganized with the task awarding a new contract. This responsibility was not to be taken lightly as it was 10 years since the last contract was established. Both El Paso County and the City of Colorado Springs have experienced a large amount of growth, with more growth to come. The County Board of Commissioners and the City Council saw fit to expand the ESA Board to meet the community needs by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • expanding representation of the customers served, • establishing committees with diverse backgrounds to look at performance requirements and to determine if the public is properly served, and • offering different perspectives for the type of service required and how it should be delivered in the years to come. <p>A group of volunteers and appointees gave of their time, in addition to their full-time jobs to serve the citizens of this community. I thank each member of the Board. I also thank Ted Sayer from AMR for dealing with the change.</p> <p>The reorganization of the ESA Board was a result of County Board of Commissioners and City Council actions, and especially the efforts of Sallie Clark and Margaret Radford. I thank them for their diligence to ensure that the work was complete and the Board stayed on task for the first year – not an easy task given the different personalities involved.</p>	

APPROVAL OF MARCH 5, 2008 BOARD MINUTES

DISCUSSION	No comments or corrections.	
MOTION		PERSON RESPONSIBLE
Motion to Approve the March 5, 2008 Minutes		
Second to the Motion		Bryan Jack
Approved		Unanimous

JANUARY/FEBRUARY COMPLIANCE REPORT

DISCUSSION	
<p>Bob West, ESA Compliance Officer presented the January and February 2008 Compliance Report. This report has been reviewed and approved by the contractor. Ted Sayer from AMR confirmed their review and approval. The potential penalty is \$11,200, the majority of which comes from contractor level 0 and maximum exception situations. The recommended penalty based on a review of the data is \$9,600.</p>	

Calls and transports were: January 3,021 priority 1 calls that resulted in 2060 transports and for February there were 3,088 priority 1 calls that resulted in 2,078 transports.

The occurrence of alpha calls has been tracked to determine if there has been any impact on the contractor as a result of Colorado Springs Fire Department (CSFD) decision. At the last meeting it was announced this would no longer be done, is this trend data of value to the Board? This data is simple tracking of priority 1 and priority 2 calls over the last 18 months.

Commissioner Clark would like to see a quarterly or semi-annual snapshot of this data to see what is happening.

Commander Reid asked AMR if they have noticed any major trends as a result of CSFD's decision. Ted Sayer from AMR responded that the trend line negates the significant increase in ALS calls between January 2007 and January 2008, which was an increase of 14-15%. Commander Reid requests that the data be displayed to address AMR's concerns.

Commissioner Clark is interested in looking at previous year call volumes and where the trends are changing. Bob stated that the data is easily extracted and can be presented in any format that the Board would like.

Maximum Exception Report

In January there were 42 calls that exceeded the maximum time standards, 37 were within Colorado Springs and 5 in the suburban areas. In February there were 38 calls that exceed the time standards, 34 were within Colorado Springs and 4 in the suburban areas.

Mutual Aid Report

In January 2008 there were 32 mutual aid calls, 29 were released to Black Forest and 3 to Fountain Fire Department. None of these calls exceeded the maximum time standards.

In February 2008 there were 27 mutual aid calls, 26 were released to Black Forest and 1 to Fountain Fire Department. One call exceeded maximum time standards and the appropriate \$120 penalty was applied.

Contractor Level Zero

In January there were 2 occurrences, both of which exceeded the 2 minute mark, so the full \$2,000 penalty is recommended.

In February there were potentially 5 occurrences, 4 of which exceeded the 2 minute mark. One instance was a request for a 3 hour SWAT standby. Based on the contract, it is reasonable to exempt this one.

Requests for Exemption

All of the requests for January 2008 were with in confines of the contract and should be granted. It should be noted that the first entry is for a mass casualty event, the Galena Court Fire

In February, the contractor requested 15 priority 1 calls; most are due to severe weather.

In the Major Condition and Complaint Report there are no major changes.

For the first two months, Detox transports are 297.

The contractor is in full compliance with the contract in the rest of the report. The penalty recommendation is \$9,600

Dr. Sharon asked how many calls were delayed at level 0? This information will be included in the next report.

Commissioner Clark thanked Bob for putting together and easily understandable and useful report and thank you to AMR for providing the data.

MOTION	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
Motion to Approve the Compliance Penalty	Commissioner Clark
Second to the Motion	
Approved	Unanimous

COMMITTEE REPORTS - GRANTS

DISCUSSION
Two grants were approved at the March meeting, one to Falcon Fire Department for AED equipment and one for Calhan Fire Department for capnography equipment. These agencies were presented with their awards

COMMITTEE REPORTS - COMPLIANCE

DISCUSSION

The compliance committee met earlier this meeting and reports that there are no major complaints. The number of complaints has been decreasing.

COMMITTEE REPORTS – MEDICAL CONTROL

DISCUSSION

Dr. Sharon reported that the Medical Control Committee met prior to this Board meeting. A review of the RSI process with Dr. Ross, Dr. Gifford and their staff, there were 6 cases in first quarter. All cases meet the El Paso County protocol for RSI. One question arose on a case outside of the CSFD jurisdiction. If the AMR and RSI medic have clear indication that procedure is appropriate and they are in agreement, then they will proceed. If it is a gray area case, then medics will contact the receiving hospital for an order. If they are unable to establish contact, they will not proceed without authorization.

Councilwoman Radford asked if the 6 cases is more or less than in the past. Dr. Sharon indicated this is a decrease.

RFP BRIEFING

DISCUSSION

Curt DeCapite, City Contracting Office and Gina Abbott, County Procurement and Contracts, thanked the Board for their acknowledgement of work both City and County Procurement staff have done on this project. Gina and Curt have worked hard to ensure that the process is equitable, impartial and consistent. The process has been proven, but the complexity does make it unique in how and what we are doing. May 9th is the submittal deadline to City Contracting. No one will know how many responses are received or who they are from until the first evaluation meeting with the committee. The evaluation committee will establish the evaluation criteria, their weights, and the confidentiality of the group. Integrity forms must be signed by all committee members, and the members may not have any discussions about the RFP responses outside of the committee meetings. Each evaluator will review the proposals and evaluate each proposal based on the criteria established on the evaluation form. No decisions will be made at this first meeting. A follow up meeting will be held to go through the evaluations and rank the proposals to determine the competitive range. If there is a tie for a position, there may be interviews, these are not to negotiate with the companies, but to go through their proposal to clarify items in their response; similar to what you might do with a prospective candidate in a job interview. After the interviews, if there is not a clear successful bidder, then negotiations will begin with the selected vendors by the evaluation committee. These negotiations will allow the committee to narrow down the criteria and get the final product that you want. Once a vendor is selected, the Board will be briefed on the process and the committee's final recommendation for their approval. The selected vendor is then presented to the County Board of Commissioners and City Council.

Do we need to extend the existing contract? Curt's suggestion is that whether or not there is a new contactor is selected, it would be best to request a 6 month extension since this is a lengthy process to complete the vendor selection and to ensure a smooth transition, if necessary.

Commander Reid asked how long does it take to make the extension effective? Curt responded that this a logistic issue for the Board. The ESA attorney would present to the Board for their consideration to extend the contract, based on the language that has been used for the previous extensions.

Commissioner Clark added that we would need to put on the agenda for the next meeting, and then get it on both City Council and Board of County Commissioner agenda meetings. This extension would only extend the end date of the contract, not change any of the contract terms. Ted Sayer from AMR indicated that they would have no issue extending the current contract.

A Guide to Understanding the RFP process has been handed out to the Board to explain this process.

Councilwoman Radford requested that Curt please email the Board with the steps and the committees involved in the process for this contract.

Gina Abbott added that the process that was presented today is what has been done is following government procurement standards and process that both the County and City use to ensure open and fair competition. So far they are very happy with the process and have not encountered any problems.

TREASURER'S REPORT

DISCUSSION

Treasurer Helton presented the March 2008 financial report. It shows that the County has billed for the second quarter compliance administrator. Also, the first billing from the consultant has come in and is in the process of being paid. We have spent a lot of money in March, but it does cover part of the second quarter.

Commissioner Clark requested that copies of the financial report be included in the Board packet.

Treasurer Helton reported that the fund balance is well funded, that grant expenditures are covered and that the grant

fund is in good shape, even with the consultant payment. 74.5% of the budget is available for the rest of the year. This means that we have spent 25% for far this year, so we are right on track.

Commissioner Clark requested confirmation on the consultant payment, which has been submitted for payment, so it does appear on the March statement.

Treasurer Helton reported that we have \$133,521.72 available, with only one consultant payment; there is more to be paid and also the costs of the administration.

Commissioner Clark noted that there is also \$5,000 budgeted for citizen accessibility.

Dr. Sharon requested that the financial reports be emailed out to the Board.

Treasurer Helton noted that a reconciliation was done with Administrator in accordance with the audit report. All expenditures were as expected.

MOTION	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
Motion to Approve the March Financial Statements	Commissioner Clark
Second to the Motion	
Approved	Unanimous

INTRODUCTIONS

DISCUSSION
Commander Reid introduced Laurie Schneider who will be acting as the ESA Administrator. She is currently a City employee who works with the Homeland Security Grants for the South Central Region. Her background is on the financial side, with prior experience as an Accountant for the University of California and the California Court system.

STAFF COMMENTS

DISCUSSION
Vice-Chair Jeff Wanderscheid inquired about the System Status Plan powerpoint that Ted Sayer presented at the last meeting. Ted will send the presentation to Laurie for distribution to the Board.

OTHER BUSINESS

DISCUSSION
Ted Sayer from AMR noted that several meetings ago they discussed the problems they were having with the Ford vehicles, AMR has since ordered 20 new Chevys and we having more problems than with the Fords, while the Fords are getting better. You will see two new Ford vehicles this year to support operations this year. The Chevrolets are vans with the DuraMax, AMR is experiencing sensor problems in motor compartment, and have had motor and engine control failures.

MOTION	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
Motion to Adjourn	Commissioner Clark
Second to the Motion	Dr. Jack Sharon
Approved	Unanimous

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 2:50 PM
