



MEETING MINUTES

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF MONO

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

MEETING LOCATION Mammoth Lakes Suite Z, 237 Old Mammoth Rd, Suite Z, Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

Special Meeting

February 15, 2017

9:20 AM Meeting Called to Order by Chairman Corless.

Supervisors present: Corless, Gardner, Johnston, Peters, and Stump.
Supervisors absent: None

Break: 10:45 a.m.
Reconvene: 10:55 a.m.
Lunch: 1:10 p.m.
Reconvene: 1:40 p.m.
Adjourn: 3:07 p.m.

The Mono County Board of Supervisors stream all of their meetings live on the internet and archives them afterward. To listen to any meetings from June 2, 2015 forward, please go to the following link:
<http://www.monocounty.ca.gov/meetings>

Pledge of Allegiance led by Chairman Corless.

1 OPPORTUNITY FOR THE PUBLIC TO ADDRESS THE BOARD

No one spoke.

2. AGENDA ITEMS

A. EMS Workshop

Departments: Mono County Emergency Medical Services

(Lynda Salcido, Bob Rooks) - Presentation by Emergency Medical Services Management regarding future planning for services in Mono County. Please access the EMS Ad Hoc Committee webpage for links contained within the final EMS report. <http://www.monocounty.ca.gov/ems/page/ad-hoc-emergency-medical-services-committee>

Action: None.

Supervisor Corless:

- Gave overview of how this item would go; guidelines, recommended action.
- Perimeters set for this work are to provide high quality, fiscally sustainable, county-wide program.
- Doesn't feel we will get through all of the agenda today. Feels another special meeting is going to be required.
- Special Meeting March 8th at 10:00 a.m. – Bridgeport location (teleconference to Mammoth BOS Chambers).

Lynda Salcido:

- Gave introductions.

Bob Rooks:

Emergency Medical Services Workshop Power Point:

- How we got here
- Financial Crisis
- Board of Supervisors creates EMS Ad-Hoc Committee
- Goals of Committee
 - Committee presented findings on March 9, 2016 but nothing was adopted.
 - Interim EMS Chief approved but his time is running out
- Current System
 - 2017/17 Budget
 - Possibility of mid-year adjustment
- Statistics on where calls are run – 70% of call volume is in the Town of Mammoth Lakes
- Station Readiness Costs – 2015/16
- Committee Recommendations Adopted
 - Modifications to enhance revenues
 - Modifications to reduce costs
 - Modifications to enhance deployment
 - Modifications to enhance management capacity
- Ad Hoc Model Recommendations
- Barriers to Change
- Options
- Key Considerations

Penny Galvin (power point):

EMS Billing

- History
- Coding and Billing Process
- Collection Procedures
- Total Calls
- Total Billed and Collected
- Payer Mix
- Questions and Comments
 - Board asked various questions

Stacey Simon:

- Anything we charge has to be related to services provided.
- Need to put together some numbers, then have a public hearing and get a resolution approved.
- Isn't sure that locals shouldn't be allowed a discount.

DISCUSSION:

Supervisor Corless:

- Asked for detail of each option in depth.
- Reminded everyone what the Ad Hoc recommendation was; she understood Ad Hoc recommended to Board that we work with current system.

- Need to decide which direction to go and maybe rely on consultants.
- We have agreed we want to expand service to underserved parts of county.
- Asked about scope of work on RFP. What are risks to county? What are experiences of other counties?
- Should we get some numbers from SYMONS for Fred's district?
- Would like pros and cons/risks and benefits of all options, including numbers.

Supervisor Peters:

- If there are options that majority of Board would NOT like to use, it might be easier to focus.
- Gave suggestions on how to bring in money for program.
- Walker is greatly motivated to keep their medic station and response times.
- Suggested board members do research/homework prior to the next scheduled special meeting.

Supervisor Johnston:

- Doesn't feel that there was any consensus on the recommended options by Ad Hoc Committee.
- Not thinking about doing a tax.
- In studies done, we're \$250,000 over what it costs other stations to run. Why the difference in personnel costs?
- If what we need is \$500,000 because we're choosing the Status Quo Option, how do we get there?
- Really just trying to determine *what* the options are.
- Why would anyone do an RFP unless they are expecting some subsidy?
- Feels we need to take whatever time it takes to figure this out.
- What about partial closure of two stations?
- Is response time related to time of day of call?
- Feels overtime is an issue that needs to be addressed.

Supervisor Gardner:

- Feels we're jumping into a solution without trying to solve the problem.
- Raising taxes may not be a good idea as no one will get anything more. Need to figure out who is getting the service.
- Seems that there are a lot more non-residents getting services than residents – not sure if that's true, would like to see the data.
- Need to define "fiscally sustainable".
- Conversation needs to be about response times.
- Asked about making a decision to recruit the chief now (no, because it's not agendaized). Need to agendaize that item for a meeting soon.

Supervisor Stump:

- Pointed out that percentages of contribution from county general fund out of various areas of county is around 83%, areas of county not being reached by medics are helping support the program.
- Doesn't want anyone to lose service, isn't looking to pull Medic 1.
- He's not rigid when it comes to service in District #2, he's not asking for full medic station.
- Brought up the possibility of Town contributions, they don't contribute now.
- Maybe look at revenue increases in areas of town where the stations are: increased TOT?

Chief Frank Frievalt:

- 3 options forwarded by Ad Hoc Committee – not one weighted more heavily than another but put in this order: remain status quo with modifications, integration of EMS with Fire Districts, Privatization of EMS.
- Mono has only system of our type in California; found something similar in Colorado. Board needs to tell them what they need to know in order to proceed.
- Feels we have to put out an RFP to see what the interest is.

Lynda Salcido:

- Feels we need to consider the four new options, the "more" – not what the Ad Hoc

Committee originally recommended.

Bob Rooks:

- Status Quo Option: need a minimum of \$500,000 to make a difference and there's no money in this option. Is it cost effective? Is it fiscally sustainable? Where is more money going to come from? Increase in taxes – TOT or specifically earmarked.
 - Asked Frievalt about our cost per station vs. others?
 - Residents vs. visitors on calls and collections.
 - His goal was to find a minimum of \$500,000.
- Contract for Services: can only estimate cost: need to do RFP and have folks bid on that and say what they'd charge. There is interest: REMSA, SEMSA, SYMONS and AMR.
 - Need to question what is allowable on response time?
- Close 1 Full Time Station: potential to save \$1 million, just a rough number. Will cause greater call load on Medic 7 (Bridgeport).
 - East Fork Fire Protection has a very robust program – maybe they'd be willing to pick up calls in Northern area of Mono County.
 - Cost savings comes from laying off six employees.
 - Dispatch needs to be part of the overall discussion.
- Alternate Staffing Model: Maybe two stations open 24 hours and two dark at night.
 - This isn't a brown out, it's rather meeting some of the requirements in Ad Hoc Committee report.
 - Problems: If at night and there are high number calls, you take a chance you can't cover your calls.
 - The cost savings then comes from employees working less, not from operational budget.
 - Goes back to response times.
- May have until end of March, or into April until he's done working for county. Cautions to not set time limits on this. It's too important.

Stacey Simon:

- Gave additional information regarding RFP process.
- Inyo just completed RFP process.

Leslie Chapman:

- This is a cyclical thing; always coming up in relation to the economy.
- This program is not mandated so it always comes under a microscope.
- Looks like economy is on the mend again.
- Do we value this program? Is it important to county and citizens? If it is, we need to commit to it and determine what the county needs to do to keep it going.
- Always comes back to YES, it is important.

B. Afternoon Session

THE AFTERNOON SESSION WILL RECONVENE NO EARLIER THAN 1:00 P.M.

C. Mono County Cemeteries

Departments: Public Works

(Peter Chapman) - Presentation by Peter Chapman regarding the Mono County Cemeteries.

Action: None.

Peter Chapman:

Power Point

- Presentation Outline:
 - Information on the current status of the cemeteries and the draft ordinance.
 - Identify challenges and solutions

MEETING MINUTES

February 15, 2017

Page 5 of 6

- Discuss plot fees
- Prioritize next steps
- Currently not accepting reservations (since 2007)
- GPR mapping has been done (unmarked graves located)
- Maps for Bridgeport and Mono Lake are mostly consolidated
- Draft Ordinance is 90% complete
- Details of draft ordinance
- Mapping and Plotting Requirements
- Discussion re: Mt. Morrison, Mono Lake, and Bridgeport Cemeteries
- Monument and Headstone Policy
- Fees and Establishment of Maintenance Fund
- Record Keeping Requirements
- Interment and Disinterment Procedure
- Purpose of Cemeteries: To honor loved ones, provide a history of the area, for the health of the community
- Plot Confirmation and Burial Process and Challenges
- GIS Database
- Survey
- Policy
- Layout, installing markers and building the GIS database will take time
- Plot Fee Analysis
- Revenue and Expenditure
- Comparison Study: Small County Cemetery Operations
- Plot Fee Comparison Study
- Small Counties
- Nearby Cemeteries
- Averages
- Proposed Fees (Informal)
- What is correct order of operations?
- Questions & Comments?

Further Discussion:

- Feels that Ordinance is 90% done.
- He doesn't feel the Ordinance is a big hurdle; more concerned about the fee structure?
- Bring the fee structure back to RPACs or no?

Paul Burdeno (leader of volunteer group at Mt Morrison Cemetery):

- In first two working groups that worked on Ordinance, goal was to minimize height and width.
- He would just be happy with some action.

Leslie Chapman:

- Cemeteries can be treated by a business.
- Feels like the messenger is getting killed here; she appreciates Peter's work on this. He has spent a lot of time on it.
- She will get with Public Works and work on maintenance schedule.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Supervisor Gardner:

- Shouldn't cost taxpayer anything but the cost of doing business.

Supervisor Peters:

- Has Bridgeport RPAC been approached to do something similar to what Antelope Valley has done?
- Asked additional fee questions?
- This is his first run at this – feels people should be able to reserve a plot.
- Needs to be brought back to Bridgeport RPAC.

Supervisor Stump:

- Feels we need to act on either A or B.
- We're in the cemetery business, feels we should have this addressed by now.
- Feels we should encourage option B and move on with it. This has gone on way too long.
- He doesn't want to go back to RPACS.

Supervisor Johnston:

- Supports Option B.

Supervisor Corless:

- Suggests we direct staff to do begin maintenance.
- Asked what realistic timeframe for finalizing ordinance.
- Shoot for first meeting in April?

Christy Milovich:

- Explained Ordinance timing.

ADJOURN at 3:07 p.m.

ATTEST

**STACY CORLESS
CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD**

**SHANNON KENDALL
CLERK OF THE BOARD**