

**EMS System Oversight Committee Meeting
August 13, 2009
EOC Conference Room**

Members/Liaisons Present: Faye Barefoot, Kathy Dutton, Duane Holder Jimmy Garris, Kyle Willis, Chuck Owens, Juan March, MD, Jack Cote, David Lusk , Jack White

Staff Present: Noel Lee, Helen Bryant, Janis Gallagher, Melonie Bryan, Mike Taylor

Absent: Ted Delbridge MD, Scott Elliott

Open: Chairman David Lusk called the meeting to order.

Approval of Agenda: David Lusk requested to add Election of Officers and Kyle Willis requested to add the Farmville EMS Request for Grant Funding. Jimmy Garris made the motion to approve the agenda with the additions. Kathy Dutton seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous. Motion passed.

Election of Officers: The meeting was turned over to Janis Gallagher. Nominations from the floor: Kathy Dutton nominated David Lusk for Chair. Faye Barefoot seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous.

Motion: Dr. March made the motion to close nominations. Jack Cote seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous.

Jack White nominated Faye Barefoot for Vice-Chair. Kathy Dutton seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous.

Motion: Jack White made the motion to close nominations. Kathy Dutton seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous.

The meeting was turned back over to David Lusk.

EMS Squads Comments to the EMS-OC:

Jeff White of Johnston Ambulance Service requested to speak. Jeff distributed a letter to the committee from all four Non-Emergency EMS Providers who are franchised in Pitt County. They have a concern that East Care is operating a non-emergency ambulance transportation service and whether or not they are franchised to provide this level of service within Pitt County.

August 13th 2009

Pitt County EMS Oversight Committee Members:

The Non-Emergency EMS Providers of Pitt County held our regularly scheduled meeting on Monday the 10th of August. During this meeting a concern was raised in regards to East Care operating a non-emergency ambulance transportation service and whether or not they are franchised to provide this level of service within Pitt County.

In accordance with the franchise regulations adopted by the Pitt County Commissioners and referenced in the "Ordinance Establishing a Franchise for Non-Emergency Ambulance Providers" (Part VIII. Minimum Standards for Non-Emergency Ambulance Franchisees) any agency wishing to operate a non-emergency ambulance transportation service within Pitt County must be evaluated by Pitt County Emergency Management for compliance with the requirements of this ordinance, be presented and approved by the Oversight Committee, and the Oversight Committee must then give their recommendation to the Pitt County Board of Commissioners for their approval.

In accordance to the "Ordinance Establishing a Franchise for Non-Emergency Ambulance Providers" (Part X. State Permits and County Franchise Requirements) "No person either as owner, agent, or otherwise, shall furnish, operate, conduct, maintain, advertise, or otherwise be engaged in or profess to be in engaged in the transportation of patients within Pitt County, unless the person holds a valid permit for each ambulance used in such business or service issued by the NCOEMS, and has been granted a franchise for the operation of such service by Pitt County, pursuant to this Ordinance".

It is our understanding that East Care has not applied for a franchise to operate as a Non-Emergency Ambulance Provider within Pitt County, has not been approved by the Oversight Committee or the Pitt County Board of Commissioners to operate said service within Pitt County, and does not meet the exemption requirement spelled out within the Ordinance. We contend that East Care is operating a non-emergency ambulance transportation service within Pitt County and has been operating this service during the last few months without a franchise and therefore is in direct violation of Part X Section A of the "Ordinance Establishing a Franchise for Non-Emergency Ambulance Operators" and should be required to follow the guidelines specifically spelled out within this ordinance. We also would like to respectfully request this committee direct the notification to East Care of there violation of the Ordinance and they not be allowed to provide Non-Emergency Ambulance Transportation within the county limits of Pitt County (specifically where the pick-up and drop off locations are within Pitt County) until they are a approved provider within the Pitt County EMS System and have met all the requirements specifically spelled out within this Ordinance.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted by;
Jeffrey White
Chief
Johnston Ambulance Service, Inc.

Gary Whitehurst
Chief
Care First Medical Transports, Inc.
Kevin Davidson

Chief
Med One Interfacility Transports, Inc.

Terry Campbell
Chief
Atlas Medical Transports, Inc.

The Non-emergency EMS Providers are requesting that this committee inform East Care that they are in violation and cannot operate in Pitt County until they are franchised.

Jimmy Garris suggested legal department review this issue.

Kathy Dutton reported that East Care would welcome the opportunity to meet with the key players and a representative of Pitt County Emergency Management and NC Office of Emergency Medical Services to discuss the way East Care operates and if there are changes that need to be made.

Would like to set up a meeting in the next 2-3 weeks. Jeff suggested that the meeting be coordinated through Pitt County Emergency Management.

Items for Report: Noel reported that Duane Holder was appointed to a 3 year term.

Noel distributed the first and second quarter 2009 EMS Report for Pitt County squads and for the City of Greenville. Chuck Owens compiled the report for the City of Greenville. Chuck reported that the number of dispatches reported by E911 does not match the city's numbers. The City is divided into six EMS territories. All calls occur in city or out of city. Engine responses to EMS calls are not captured when county squads come into the city as mutual aid. Chuck reported that if the county could extrapolate emergency calls out of dispatches the utilization rate would increase.

Gene Powell of Eastern Pines EMS reported that there are discrepancies in E911 data and Pitt County needs to make sure the data is correct before changes are made in districts.

GFR January 1, 2009 - March 31, 2009 EMS Report 1st Quarter of 2009													
								Fractile					
GFR	Dispatches	Completed	No Transport	Canceled	Other	Hours	Utilization Rate	10	12	14	16	18	20
Station 1	979					781.00	36.16%	79%	89%	95%	97%	98%	99%
Station 2	921					748.75	34.66%	86%	92%	96%	98%	98%	99%
Station 3	792					677.00	31.34%	73%	84%	91%	95%	97%	96%
Station 5	586					522.50	24.19%	71%	85%	93%	95%	97%	98%
EMS 10 - 210 hours	84					72.75	34.64%	96%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	3362					2802.00	31.66%						
GFR April 1, 2009 - June 30, 2009 EMS Report 2nd Quarter of 2009													
								Fractile					
GFR	Dispatches	Completed	No Transport	Canceled	Other	Hours	Utilization Rate	10	12	14	16	18	20
Station 1	919					823.00	37.27%	74%	87%	92%	95%	98%	98%
Station 2	755					694.00	31.43%	81%	90%	93%	96%	98%	98%
Station 3	751					711.00	32.20%	71%	85%	91%	95%	97%	99%
Station 5	551					543.50	24.62%	72%	86%	91%	96%	98%	99%
EMS 10 - 920 hours	264					248.50	27.31%	87%	94%	97%	98%	99%	98%
Total	3240					3020.00	30.97%						
Dispatches - 911 data of all dispatches													
Completed - Transported patient to hospital													
No Transport - Patient contact, treated but did not transport to hospital													
Canceled - Unit canceled by 911, no patient contact													
Other - Stand by, etc.													
Hours - Unit dispatch by 911 until unit completed call - operational hours													
Utilizations Rate - Total of hours of reporting period divided by operational hours													
Fractile - Percentage of response time from 911 received call until unit arrival 10 minutes or less, 12 minutes or less, etc.													

GFR January 1, 2009 - March 31, 2009 EMS Report 1st Quarter of 2009 (90 Days = 2160 Hrs.)

GFR	911 Dispatches	COG Dispatches	COG Transported	COG Non-Transport	COG Cancelled	COG Other	911 Hours	COG Hours	911 Utilization Rate	COG Utilization Rate	Emergency		Other	
											Fractile 90%	Fractile 95%	Fractile 90%	Fractile 95%
Station 1	979	790	569	72	49	121	781.00		36.16%		9	11	11	13
Station 2	921	1090	924	76	19	98	748.75		34.66%		9	12	12	13
Station 3	792	480	345	76	20	70	677.00		31.34%		10	12	14	18
Station 4		71	57	7	2	9					12	15	16	16
Station 5	586	417	316	59	13	49	522.50		24.19%		10	12	15	18
Station 6		276	185	32	20	47					12	14	14	15
Out of City		73	43	6	16	9								
Total	3278	3197	2439	328	139	403	2729.25				10	13	14	16
EMS1		930	709	59	35	133	772.92		35.78%		10	12	13	14
EMS2		873	726	38	28	86	676.58		31.32%		10	12	11	14
EMS3		742	528	58	52	114	675.97		31.29%		11	14	15	15
EMS4		11	9	0	0	2	15.35		0.71%		12	15	12	12
EMS5		543	423	44	23	61	496.57		22.99%		11	14	15	19
EMS6		16	16	1	0	0	15.08		0.70%		8	9	N/A	N/A
EMS10 - 210 Hours	84	62	57	3	1	3	72.75	56.38	34.64%	26.85%	7	8	8	8
Total	3362	3177	2468	203	139	399	2802.00	2708.85	31.66%	30.26%	10	12	12	14
Definitions														

911 Dispatches - 911 data of all dispatches

COG Dispatches - COG data of all dispatches

COG Transported - # of transported patients to PCMH per COG data

COG Non-Transport - Patient contact, but not transported to PCMH per COG data

COG Canceled - Unit canceled by 911, no patient contact per COG

data

COG Other - Stand by, assist fire unit, no patient found, etc. per COG data

911 Hours - Unit dispatch by 911 until unit completed call - operational hours

COG Hours - Unit dispatch by 911 until unit completed call - operational hours per COG data

911 Utilizations Rate - Total unit operational hours divided by the total hours of the reporting period

COG Utilizations Rate - Total unit operational hours divided by the total hours of the reporting period per COG data

Fractile - Maximum number of minutes to respond at the specified fractile level, measured from "911 Receive Time" to "Unit On Scene," separated by response type

GFR April 1, 2009 - June 30, 2009 EMS Report 2nd Quarter of 2009 (91 Days = 2184 Hrs.)

GFR	911 Dispatches	COG Dispatches	COG Transported	COG Non-Transport	COG Cancelled	COG Other	911 Hours	COG Hours	911 Utilization Rate	COG Utilization Rate	Emergency		Other	
											Fractile 90%	Fractile 95%	Fractile 90%	Fractile 95%
Station 1	919	838	615	65	32	148	823.00		36.03%		10	12	13	15
Station 2	755	901	767	48	22	78	694.00		31.78%		10	12	12	14
Station 3	751	476	364	67	15	55	711.00		32.55%		11	13	15	16
Station 4		98	79	6	1	12					13	15	16	16
Station 5	551	404	306	52	19	44	543.50		24.89%		10	12	14	15
Station 6		248	174	32	15	36					13	15	18	18
Out of City		101	71	7	18	9								
Total	2976	3066	2376	277	122	382	2771.50				11	13	15	16
EMS1		869	670	50	20	135		812.52		37.20%	12	14	13	17
EMS2		708	574	24	33	80		593.36		27.17%	11	13	14	17
EMS3		706	518	61	41	97		654.63		29.97%	11	14	13	15
EMS4		0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
EMS5		528	424	44	21	49		509.65		23.34%	12	15	15	17
EMS6		1	0	0	0	1		2.83		0.13%	NA	NA	11	11
EMS10 - 920 Hours	264	239	208	9	5	17	248.50	207.15	27.01%	22.52%	9	10	13	16
Total	3240	3051	2394	188	120	379	3020.00	2780.14	31.28%	28.76%	11	13	13	16

Definitions

911 Dispatches - 911 data of all dispatches

COG Dispatches - COG data of all dispatches

COG Transported - # of transported patients to PCMH per COG data

COG Non-Transport - Patient contact, but not transported to PCMH per COG data

COG Canceled - Unit canceled by 911, no patient contact per COG data

COG Other - Stand by, assist fire unit, no patient found, etc. per COG data

911 Hours - Unit dispatch by 911 until unit completed call - operational hours

COG Hours - Unit dispatch by 911 until unit completed call - operational hours per COG data

911 Utilizations Rate - Total unit operational hours divided by the total hours of the reporting period

COG Utilizations Rate - Total unit operational hours divided by the total hours of the reporting period per COG data

Fractile - Maximum number of minutes to respond at the specified fractile level, measured from "911 Receive Time" to "Unit On Scene," separated by response type

January 1, 2009 - March 31, 2009 Pitt County EMS Report 1st Quarter of 2009

Squad	Dispatches	Completed	No Transport	Canceled	Other	Hours	Utilization Rate	Fractile					
								10	12	14	16	18	20
Ayden	433	316	55	59	3	427.75	19.80%	70%	80%	87%	91%	94%	97%
Bell Arthur	285	170	31	84	0	207.00	9.58%	54%	69%	83%	90%	95%	96%
Bethel	230	158	25	47	0	213.50	9.88%	44%	66%	84%	90%	94%	97%
Eastern Pines	378	242	84	50	2	329.00	15.23%	47%	66%	79%	85%	92%	96%
Falkland	189	144	24	19	2	198.75	9.20%	34%	57%	78%	86%	92%	95%
Farmville	403	275	58	65	5	337.50	15.63%	85%	93%	98%	98%	99%	99%
Fountain	80	51	15	13	1	72.50	3.36%	44%	72%	84%	93%	95%	95%
Grifton	248	157	40	49	2	231.75	10.73%	80%	84%	90%	94%	95%	96%
Pactolus	193	135	27	31	0	201.50	9.33%	25%	45%	63%	78%	86%	92%
Winterville	407	235	59	111	2	347.00	16.06%	65%	77%	88%	93%	96%	98%
Total	2846	1883	418	528	17	2566.25	11.88%	55%	71%	83%	90%	94%	96%
QRV	82	74	0	8	0	35.75	3.97%	81%	86%	95%	96%	96%	99%

Dispatches - 911 data of all dispatches

Completed - Transported patient to hospital

No Transport - Patient contact, treated but did not transport to hospital

Canceled - Unit canceled by 911, no patient contact

Other - Stand by, etc.

Hours - Unit dispatch by 911 until unit completed call - operational hours

Utilizations Rate - Total of hours of reporting period divided by operational hours

Fractile - Percentage of response time from 911 received call until unit arrival 10 minutes or less, 12 minutes or less, etc.

April 1, 2009 - June 30, 2009 Pitt Co9unty EMS Report 2nd Quarter of 2009

Squad	Dispatches	Completed	No Transport	Canceled	Other	Hours	Utilization Rate	Fractile					
								10	12	14	16	18	20
Ayden	431	296	59	74	2	438.25	19.85%	68%	80%	86%	91%	95%	97%
Bell Arthur	280	157	34	88	1	193.00	8.74%	49%	64%	85%	91%	97%	99%
Bethel	268	170	44	53	1	264.50	11.98%	39%	67%	82%	89%	92%	95%
Eastern Pines	384	236	47	101	0	334.50	15.15%	45%	61%	75%	84%	90%	94%
Falkland	216	148	36	31	1	200.50	9.08%	36%	63%	83%	93%	95%	97%
Farmville	390	271	61	53	5	323.50	14.65%	86%	93%	96%	98%	99%	99%
Fountain	75	51	12	12	0	79.50	3.60%	60%	67%	86%	90%	95%	97%
Grifton	247	163	44	38	2	236.00	10.69%	77%	86%	88%	94%	98%	98%
Pactolus	209	148	24	37	0	229.75	10.41%	29%	55%	69%	85%	92%	95%
Winterville	442	265	56	102	19	380.50	17.23%	75%	86%	92%	95%	96%	97%
Total	2942	1905	417	589	31	2680.00	12.14%	56%	72%	84%	91%	95%	97%
QRV	91	75	0	16	0	44.00	4.78%	74%	85%	94%	97%	97%	99%

Dispatches - 911 data of all dispatches

Completed - Transported patient to hospital

No Transport - Patient contact, treated but did not transport to hospital

Canceled - Unit canceled by 911, no patient contact

Other - Stand by, etc.

Hours - Unit dispatch by 911 until unit completed call - operational hours

Utilizations Rate - Total of hours of reporting period divided by operational hours

Fractile - Percentage of response time from 911 received call until unit arrival 10 minutes or less, 12 minutes or less, etc.

Fitch Recommendations: David Lusk reported that the recommendations were sent out to everyone for review. Please respond back to Noel with the status of the recommendations assigned to you by the next meeting.

Approval of Minutes: June 11, 2009 Minutes, and Data Reports – Corrections to the minutes. Chuck Owens asked for “that” to be removed and a comma added to the sentence, “There is no dispute, there is a legitimate need for a system that is free of alcohol and drug impairment. “ Dr. March clarified that he had not seen the draft document “Fitness for Duty” prior to it being sent out to the committee. Jimmy Garris made the motion to approve the minutes with the corrections and the Data Reports. Faye Barefoot seconded the motion. Motion Passed. Dr. March abstained from the vote as he was absent at the last meeting.

Items for Discussion:

Monthly vs Bi-monthly Meetings: David Lusk reported that we need to determine if we want to go to bi-monthly meetings beginning in September and there would not be a meeting the month of December.

Motion: Duane Holder made the motion to meet bi-monthly beginning with the September meeting. Kathy Dutton seconded the motion. Motion passed. The next meeting will be September 10th.

EMS Response Districts: Noel reported that the county commissioners directed Emergency Management to meet with the squads and survey them regarding EMS Response Districts. A compilation of the data was distributed. Noel reported that Emergency Management will be moving the response districts to parcel base this fiscal year. This will make it easier for 911 to dispatch. The EMS Oversight Committee has to determine the criteria to be used when evaluating the EMS district lines.

David Lusk asked if EMS redistricting is addressed in the Fitch Recommendations. Emergency Management, Rescue Association, and E911 were charged with this recommendation and can use this data in making their recommendation. Kyle Willis reported that the EMS chiefs need to be involved in the decisions that are made.

Jack Cote responded that he is skeptical that we will see performance improvement by changing district lines.

Dr. March reported that one can try to improve the first contact time by using first responders. Ayden and Grifton expressed an interest for a first responder unit in the survey. This would be an area of significant improvement in improving first contact time.

EMS Response District Survey from EMS Squads										
Questions	Ayden	Bell Arthur	Bethel	Eastern Pines	Falkland	Farmville	Fountain	Grifton	Pactolus	Winterville
Do you feel your EMS Response District needs to be adjusted?	No	Yes		No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		No
If yes, Larger or Smaller		Needs to be balanced between R12 and R52			Need to be adjusted between R12 and R52		Larger	Larger		
Do you feel any of the other County EMS Response Districts need to be adjusted	No	Yes		No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		No
If yes, Larger or Smaller		Minor Adjustments			Minor Adjustments	Total County including GFR	Smaller			
If EMS Response Districts are adjusted, what criteria should be used for the adjustment	Square Miles Population	Response Times		Population	Number of Dispatches and Response times	Square Miles. Population, Number of Calls, Number of Dispatches, and UR	Square Miles. Population, Number of Calls, Number of Dispatches, UR, and Response Times	Square Miles 75. Population 6,000, Number of Calls 1000, Number of Dispatches 1200, and UR 65%,		Square Miles. Population, Number of Calls, Number of Dispatches, UR, and closest unit using AVL
If EMS Response Districts are adjusted, what one criteria should be used for adjustment	Square Miles	Response times		Population	Response times	Number of Dispatches	Response Times	UR		Response Times

Questions	Ayden	Bell Arthur	Bethel	Eastern Pines	Falkland	Farmville	Fountain	Grifton	Pactolus	Winterville
Comment	Gardnerville area would be greatly served by having at least a first responder unit until a transport unit could arrive from Ayden or closest unit.	Should considered district lines between R12 and R52		Interoperable Communications and GPS	Should considered district lines between R12 and R52 also R21	Should included all Chief of Affected Districts that may be changed	County needs to do what is best for the citizens of the county	1st Responder in Clay Root operated by R43 and look at lines between R43 and R42		Apply EMS Tax to entire County
Person completing Survey	Shane Hall	Jesses Harris		Gene Powell	Mecie and Steve Nichols	Kyle Willis	Nancy and George Bell	Ervin Harper		Rick Britt

Items for Decision:

Farmville EMS Request for Grant Funds: In a letter dated May 13, 2009 to the EMS Oversight Committee, Farmville EMS requested a grant in the amount of \$27,000 to pay off the outstanding loan balance for a 2005 Farmville EMS unit.

Motion: Kyle Willis made the motion to recommend to the county commissioners to grant Farmville EMS funds in the amount of \$27,000. Faye Barefoot seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous.

Discussion: Kathy Dutton asked if there is a capital plan so that we will know who is applying for grants. Melonie Bryan reported that there is no adopted plan but the county knows who is applying for grants and who will be looking for matching funds. This is a little different in that they have already purchased the truck and this is a debt. Noel reported that this committee requested that squads submit capital outlay plans for this fiscal year, and only two squads have responded. We have the data on the vehicles so we know which vehicles will need to be replaced.

Jack Cote clarified that this request is not a grant it is a debt payment.

Helen Reel reported that Farmville EMS has been making the payments for the loan through money from fund raisers.

Melonie requested that it be expressed to squads that the county needs to be aware of the debt before it is incurred. Squads need to apply for grants. If the county purchased trucks with tax money then the county holds title to the vehicles.

Rick Britt reported that Grant packages were received August 1 and are due October 1. Grants are awarded December 15.

Motion: Dr. March made the motion to create a subcommittee to develop a capital replacement plan for ems vehicles.

Amendment: Kyle Willis made the amendment to include Charles Mayo on the subcommittee. Kyle Willis seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous.

Recommendations for committee: Charles Mayo, Kyle Willis, Chair; Jack Cote, Helen Reel, Milton Reel. (No motion was made to appoint members.)

Questions/Comments from Members: Kyle Willis reported that there was an incident this weekend involving an ambulance, and a paramedic intern and some other issues. Kyle asked if the county attorney get with the agency it occurred with and follow up with legal issues and do we need to allow our ems squads to do paramedic intercepts from non-Pitt county squads. The captain asked what legal rights he had to get on that truck and what position would he be in if something happened on that truck and he did not have his supplies. These were the concerns he had today.

Noel reported that this was a request for mutual aid and we need to keep in mind who is the customer. Pitt County does not need to be a catchall for all squads coming into Pitt County, therefore criteria needs to be set when an outside county requests mutual aid or intercept. Noel reported that Pitt County Emergency Management is in the process of scheduling a meeting with Greene County to address the issue. Janis reported that she will participate in the meeting if invited but does not feel it is appropriate for her to contact another agency and provide them unsolicited advice. Legal will advise Pitt County on the county's liability. Dr. March reported that there are some significant system issues that need to be addressed by getting key players together so that incidents of this nature do not occur again.

Meeting adjourned at 7:15. The next meeting is September 10, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,

Helen Bryant