

DRAFT

EMS Code Task Force Meeting Minutes August 27, 2008

The Idaho Code Task Force held a meeting on this date in the Basement Conference Room of the Len B Jordan Building, 650 West State Street, Boise, Idaho. Facilitator Bob Werth called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

Task Force Member Attendees:

Bob Werth, Facilitator
Dia Gainor, EMS Bureau
Gary Rohwer, ISFCA via teleconf
Joe Young, IAC
Keith Bird, AIC
Murry Sturkie, EMSPC
Roger Christensen, IAC
Ron Anderson, IFCA
Ron Frazell, ISFCA
Sam Scheu, ISFCA, via teleconf
Ted Ryan, IHA
Teresa Baker, IAC
Tom Dale, AIC
Troy Hagen, IAC
Wayne Denny, EMS Bureau

Other Attendees:

Jane Smith, Division of Health, Administrator
Kerry Ellen Elliott, IAC
Diana Hone, EMS Bureau
Scott Tucker, Canyon County

Review and Approval of August 1st Minutes

Teresa Baker moved to approve draft minutes as submitted. Joe Young seconded. Minutes stand as approved.

Report on presentation

Teresa reported on presentation she made to the prosecutors association. There were about 40 in attendance from all over the state. They were surprised the task force is as far along as it is. Teresa asked them to read the draft legislation and give feedback but she had not received any yet. Bob noted that Dan Chadwick was also in attendance and made a few comments that were very helpful. Bob did not hear any negative comments either. He sensed the prosecutors felt they should take a look at the legislation because there seemed to be some really good stuff in it.

Review of draft legislation v2.7

Gary reported concerns raised to him about the amount of grace period for existing ambulance districts and the agencies to morph into the new system. Some feel we are not providing

DRAFT

47 adequate time for planning. Also the annexation side needs to be streamlined a little bit with
48 logical jurisdictional boundaries so fire districts don't have to have two operational sets of
49 protocols because they cover areas in two different Emergency Medical Services System
50 (EMSS) districts where the medical directors could be requiring different things.

51
52 Sam requested clarification:

53 Section 12, Line 86 – Shouldn't there be more than 20 people, shouldn't it be 20% of tax payers?
54 Shouldn't there be a little more consensus? ANSWER: Teresa said it was 20 people in
55 the existing law.

56 Section 8, Line 54 - clarified that it was anything up to .02%, is not all or nothing

57 Section 42, Line 383 – After some discussion and clarification on this section it was decided to
58 change “by” in the section heading to “between”.

59 Section 56, Line 492 - change “Robert’s Rules of Order” to “procedural rules adopted by the
60 board” just like in Section 31.

61 Section 31-1439, Line 671 - After discussing some questions Sam had about this section, Murry
62 asked why we are only addressing fire districts. ANSWER: Because fire districts have a
63 separate code so it needs to be addressed specifically there for clarity.

64 Section 21 - However, this brought up the concern as to whether cities are addressed in this way
65 as well somewhere in the legislation. It was agreed that this was the intent of the EMSS
66 legislation. To clarify, ADD “by all agencies” in Section 21, Line 191 and copy the
67 language of Section 31-1438, replacing “fire district” with “EMS agency” to create
68 another section in the EMSS legislation near Section 21. (*Already there, see section 40.*)

69 Section 21 – Extrication: Ron Anderson brought up the question of billing for extrication. There
70 is a current debate (nationally) as to whether extrication is part of EMS or a separate
71 function. Who will determine how it will be billed and if it must be deposited in the
72 EMSS district fund? It was agreed that the local EMSS district will need to determine and
73 define this in their fee schedule. ADD something about “and definition of fees” to Line
74 190.

75
76 Section 14 – Trigger Point: Roger brought up the trigger point discussion again as it keeps
77 coming up in the feedback from around the state. Should the transition to the alternate
78 form of governance be triggered by a single entity or by two out of the three entities
79 (county commissioners, cities, fire districts)? The feeling he and others have received is
80 that it should be a higher threshold to pull that trigger, not just one group but two. After
81 discussing this again it was agreed to change this section to read that the majority in two
82 (2) out of the three (3) entities must petition for the implementation of the alternate form
83 of governance.

84
85 New Section for Reversal from the alternate form of governance back to the county
86 commissioners was again discussed. This had been discussed at the August 1st meeting
87 as well and all felt reversal should be even more stringent than the original trigger to
88 avoid the chaos of going back and forth. It was again decided to create a new section near
89 Section 15 called “RESTORATION OF ORIGINAL COMPOSITION.” Restoration to
90 the original composition with the county commissioners as the three board members
91 would require a unanimous decision by a majority of stakeholders in all three entities. To
92 reach this majority within each entity would require a public hearing by the EMSS

DRAFT

93 District Board, not just the three EMSS district board members agreeing to revert. The
94 petitions to revert must be in writing showing signatures that equal a majority of the
95 cities, fire districts and county commissioners. If the majority of the stakeholders within
96 an entity want to revert, the representative on the board cannot vote otherwise.
97

98 **Executive Summary and other materials**

99 The Task Force created the attached Executive Summary, line by line with Troy projecting it on
100 the screen and everyone contributing and editing.
101

102 Task Force members requested the “EMS Code Draft Legislation Highlights” (created in April)
103 handout be updated and cross references to the draft legislation added.
104

105 Task Force members requested the Executive Summary, the updated Highlights with cross
106 references, the updated draft legislation v 2.8 and the paper copy of the slide presentation be
107 prepared and ready for distribution for the upcoming September presentations.
108

109 **Preliminary New Bureau Law**

110 Dia distributed copies of what the Bureau has submitted on a preliminary basis for changes to
111 Idaho Code. It was a little tricky to write because it has to stand-alone and work regardless of
112 what happens to the EMSS District legislation. If early on the EMSS district legislation looks
113 promising, some wording could be changed in this Bureau submittal as well. It is not a
114 comprehensive overhaul of the EMS act in its entirety. Perhaps the two biggest differences are
115 all on page 5 beginning at the very top with the endorsement concept and then the violation and
116 penalty stuff with suspension and revocation. This is the very first draft. It has not been blessed
117 yet administratively or legally. Changes could be made at any time but she wanted to share it
118 with the task force.
119

120 **Next Meeting**

121 Next meeting: Thursday, October 9th
122

123 It was determined to have someone else, other than the Bureau, organize the next meeting and
124 invite lobbyists and other organizations outside of the task force groups to get them familiar with
125 the legislation, answer their questions and hopefully get their support and help in approaching
126 legislators. Troy agreed to provide an administrative assistant to secure a meeting location and
127 notify those invited.
128