

8.32.050 (c)

First I have seen this, but we are aware of private ambulance providers handing out flyers that advertise their own number rather than 911 and attempted to limit this during legislation several years ago. Since it states “medical emergency,” which is ambiguous should there be a clause that allows the county to approve this type of advertisement OR am I missing the point of this clause.

>>This subsection existed in code already. As a group, we expanded the language to cast a wider net to prohibit this type of activity I think the ambiguity of “medical emergency” serves this subsection as an arbitrary definition runs the risk of being overly limiting to what one considers an emergency.

8.32.060 (k)

While I understand proprietary concerns, one of the alliances main tenants is transparency as well as fiscal responsibility. Is there a carveout for EMS alliance to review financials as needed to support this mission while continuing to keep it confidential OR will the county EMS staff provide the information as needed/warranted to inform the alliance?

>>Emergency ambulance rates are dictated by the County and defined by rule. Other transportation fees refer to non-emergency, IFT, and wheelchair transportation. Since these services are an open market services and include smaller agencies as well as larger providers, it wouldn't be within Alliances purview to review these rates. I wonder if this would be better suited for Alliance documents, etc. rather than regulating/legislating their disclosure to this group.

8.32.190

Where is this variance kept? Have we ever not granted one? Is this necessary or should it just read, “unless licensee cannot maintain a medical director on their own...”

>>This is an excellent question. Looking through our digital documents, I have not come across one, however, this predates digital storage and may exist in paper form in our office. I have not heard of a request being denied. I think there will be continued conversation about the structure of medical direction.

8.32.210

Just want to point out that this slightly differs from EMS Alliance bylaws. I believe one should be a reflection of the other and align with what the BOCC approved.

>>I believe what is currently written and proposed additions in code are an accurate reflection of the Alliance bylaws.

8.32.410

Either adding a .415 or wordsmithing to include a section that carves out system enhancement funds and the policy for utilizing them.

>>I agree that there should be wording that incorporates “system enhancement” and policy structure. As discussed in the past Alliance meeting, .410 structures how the WCEMS office is funded to account for staff, programs, etc. “System enhancement” would likely be added as a new subsection to admin. rules. For this update, our current timeline does not permit the scale of work needed to create the structure and policy for system enhancement distribution. As currently written, there is nothing in code or rule that prohibits it.