



**DRAFT MEETING MINUTES  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
AD HOC EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES COMMITTEE  
COUNTY OF MONO  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

MEETING LOCATION Lee Vining Community Center, 296 Mattly Avenue, Lee Vining, CA 93541

**\*These minutes are meant as a summary only. A copy of the audio file is available in the Clerk's office upon request\***

**October 15, 2015**

---

|               |          |
|---------------|----------|
| Flash Drive   | portable |
| Minute Orders | EMS15-08 |
|               |          |
|               |          |

1:04 PM Meeting Called to Order by Chairman Fesko.

*Present: Chairman Fesko, Bob Rooks, Mike Geary, Rick Mitchell, Dr. Rick Johnson, Fred Stump, Dave Robbins, Jack Copeland, Frank Frievalt, Leslie Chapman, Ralph Lockhart.*

*Absent: Rosemary Sachs, Lynda Salcido*

*Adjourn: 4:26 p.m.*

Pledge of Allegiance led by Chairman Fesko.

1. OPPORTUNITY FOR THE PUBLIC TO ADDRESS THE BOARD

*No one spoke.*

2. AGENDA ITEMS

A. Meeting Minutes

Departments: Clerk of the Board

**Note**

**These draft meeting minutes have not yet been approved by the Ad Hoc EMS Committee**

Approve minutes of the Regular Meeting held on September 17, 2015, as corrected.

**Mitchell moved, Geary seconded.**

**Vote; 9 yes; 0 no; Abstain: Lockhart**

**EMS15-08**

**Rick Mitchell:**

- Bottom of page 3, his comment should express disappointment over not having discussed increasing revenues for the program.

**Supervisor Fesko:**

- Fred Stump's name should read Supervisor Stump.

## B. EMS Models Workshop

(Bill VanLente) - Interactive workshop led by Bill Van Lente regarding potential EMS models for Mono County, including review and discussion of information received to date, discussion of details related to specific models, and future steps. Any additional information or attachments will be distributed at the meeting.

**Action:** Provide any desired direction to staff.

**Bill VanLente:**

- Handed out proposed agenda for rest of process. Asked committee to take 2 or 3 things that were most significant / learned from presentations.

**Rick Mitchell:**

- Feels if we'd had the quality presentations from the start, we may not have had to have spent so much time discussing up until now.

**Jack Copeland:**

- From ICEMA, got that medical care is only getting more expensive. Once you start the process, you can't go back. Felt cautioned.

**Dr. Rick Johnson:**

- There is no magic bullet. Agrees with Rick Mitchell.
- Dispatch should be able to send out appropriate response according to call. East Fork has resources we don't (hospice care facilities, skilled nursing facilities, etc).
- Liked the health care consortium available to East Fork. Thinks we can include MMSA because so much comes out of there. Including two clinics in North County, plus the hospital. Possibly incorporate Northern Inyo.

**Mike Geary:**

- Feels we could have the East Fork model as a goal for the future.

**Ralph Lockhart:**

- East Fork model, combo of fire/EMS was efficient use. More efficient, handle more calls, importance of volunteer fire depts. Was interesting.
- Thought paramedics' presentation was good, disappointed that they are unwilling to go backwards or budge. If we aren't willing to go backwards, then we need some ideas quantified and flushed out more. Overall well done.

**Leslie Chapman:**

- Enjoyed all presentations. Seems like paramedic services are moving toward an ER on wheels. Sounds like East Fork is successful with coalition partners; potential for our future

**Bob Rooks:**

- Keeps looking back at East Fork's model as something we could strive for. Should look at this model.

### Note

These draft meeting minutes have not yet been approved by the Ad Hoc EMS Committee

**Dave Robbins:**

- Should take dispatch away from Sheriff. Look at how East Fork creates their revenue stream.

**Frank Frievault:**

- Appreciated East Fork coming. We need to do some prework to get to that point. ... 70 to 80% of our options. Opportunities are out there, sees risks as political, history lessons. We get to decide what our fate will be. Risk taking.
- Symons had genuine interest in providing, but no real plan to provide. Lack of presentation.

**Supervisor Fesko:**

- Having all 3 here was great. We need to talk about dispatch, that's where it starts. Combo fire/EMS has its benefits, ISO ratings decrease. It's a goal we can work for.

**Supervisor Stump:**

- Sees multiple issues, potential legal conflicts, limited financial information.
- Stacey looked into this: The San Bernardino Board functions as the ICEMA board, a dual function board. Mono Co Board may not want to take that on. Everybody needs to be aware of that.

General discussion among members regarding the quality of each presentation, implied needs of the provider to operate, whether the model may/may not work in Mono Co, and financial sustainability of each program.

**Bill VanLente:**

- Look at game plan, walk through plan.
- Handout of EMS Definitions. Not his definitions, just synthesized what the committee said. Directed the committee to take a few minutes and read through.

**Stacey Simon:**

- At some point, there needs to be a legal feasibility review. To change providers at all, have to go to RFP. Small distinctions in the law as to whether an assessment or a tax would increase revenues.

Discussion on increasing revenues, reducing expenses.

**Ralph Lockhart:**

- 4 areas within current system – hard look at expenses, revenue enhancements, coverage areas, quality improvement.

**Supervisor Stump:**

- What the board should/should not have to do after the recommendations. Historically, board wants to take the easy way out. We've already done more than any other entity.

**Supervisor Fesko:**

- Follow up on Supervisor Stump's comments – not going to have a flushed out plan, A to Z. Never expected 4 or 5 plans to be completely flushed out. Probably need to decide what priorities are and work on detail for top choice, etc.

**Jack Copeland:**

- Definitions of quality are good, but need to make sure they are defining the same thing.

Went around table, reflecting on current definitions. Changes/ additions noted by Bill VanLente.

General concern regarding the definitions of what the different models actually mean. Current system with modifications could potentially mean a combination of any of the other three models. Concern that everyone should be on the same page with perceptions of each model.

**Note**

These draft meeting minutes have not yet been approved by the Ad Hoc EMS Committee

**Stacey Simon:**

- A new entity, a JPA, does not have the benefit of grandfathering. New entities become competitive bidders.
- Tri Valley area is not an EOA area, all other county areas are covered.
- Went through a review of current EOA, regions and overlays. County has an obligation to provide to areas whether or not it makes economic sense, rather than cities or towns serving only their area.
- Could adopt new EOA plan that shows a different configuration. The county could create a new EOA, and leave the big chunk grandfathered.

**Frank Frievalt:**

- What is the position of the BOS on keeping or not keeping the EOA?
- The current system operates in an auto aid way. Existing system includes things we need to fix.
- He will prepare an explanation and an overview of current EMS system, will deliver next meeting. We can't rate because we can't differentiate.
- Explain the current system, but then say, can we add/take away, and what are the likely consequences?

**Supervisor Stump:**

- Doesn't think the BOS has ever been asked, or even knows what an EOA really is.
- Felt the term "hybrid" just means flexibility.
- Feels the "existing model" means 4 units where they are.

**Supervisor Fesko:**

- Staff directs the Board in the direction it should go. This committee has to be ready to decide and direct the Board. Board would need to be educated as to what an EOA is in order to make the decision to keep or not to keep.
- To clarify, the way he sees the three options are: 1) current system with modifications, means keep the good and get rid of the bad, 2) county with fire means where EMS has some tie to fire depts. to get to the 7k system, and 3) total privatization means get rid of what we have and the entire county goes private.

**Jack Copeland:**

- Does not see how one model is going to suit every area of the County
- Does anyone come from NV to Walker? Yes, by mutual aid.
- Any great system is very complicated and very expensive.

**Bob Rooks:**

- Makes good sense to always make a mutual aid agreement with neighbors.
- What are options within current system?

**Rick Mitchell:**

- No current mutual aid agreement with Symons. He does it because he thinks he can bill. Symons has gone in to Benton, then turned around and gone back to Bishop to cover his legal obligation. Creates longer response times for our units.
- Rick limit to what's existing now
- Fire and paramedics already work together often. Vol fire are often out helping people, not just putting out fires, but EMS cannot currently go fight fires.
- Doesn't think e should focus on only one model and present one to the board

**Ralph Lockhart:**

- If you privatize the lower portion of county, you would have to break up the EOA. Is that option on the table?

**Dave Robbins:**

- Great system? We need to look at what we've got, see how we can modify it; we have to serve all areas.

General discussion on next meeting's agenda and discussion items.

**Note**

These draft meeting minutes have not yet been approved by the Ad Hoc EMS Committee

ADJOURN 4:26

ATTEST

---

TIMOTHY E. FESKO  
CHAIRMAN

---

HELEN NUNN  
SR. DEPUTY CLERK OF THE BOARD