

TORCH LAKE TOWNSHIP
ANTRIM COUNTY, MICHIGAN

~~APPROVED DRAFT~~ MINUTES OF SPECIAL BOARD MEETING WITH CORRECTIONS 5-0

MARCH 19, 2014

COMMUNITY SERVICE BUILDING

TORCH LAKE TOWNSHIP

Present: Martel, Schultz, Goossen, Amos and Windiate

Absent: None

Audience: 31

THE PURPOSE OF THE SPECIAL MEETING IS TO DISCUSS ITEM 2 ONLY. OTHER ISSUES WHICH WOULD NORMALLY COME BEFORE A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD WILL ONLY BE ACTED UPON IF THE FULL BOARD IS PRESENT AND THERE IS A NEED FOR URGENCY.

1. Meeting convened at 7:00 PM. There was no Citizen Commentary.
2. Mobile Medical Response (MMR) Proposal: Presentation by Matt Holtcamp and Steve Myers representing MMR, who had been asked to prepare a RFP for Elk Rapids, Milton and Torch Lake Townships. The presentation included an overview of the company, which was formed in 1994. It is a private organization, accredited by CAAS, ACE and others, servicing 13 counties exclusively as an Advanced Life Support (ALS) service. Their proposal for the 3 townships is \$ 650,000. ~~plus \$200,000 in projected run fees.~~ This proposal is a package plan for participation by all 3 townships or none. This would place two ALS ambulances, one in Elk Rapids and one in Torch Lake Township, with one Paramedic and one EMT on board. There would be a lease of the equipment we have, as well as payment toward rent and utilities. The contract would have an escape clause.
3. Citizen Commentary: The public had the opportunity to ask questions, which included the following:
 1. Thane Pressman of Elk Rapids said he believes there has been a misunderstanding of what was being proposed and why there is such a big difference in the costs. MMR's proposal of a subsidy of \$650,000 plus retention of the \$200,000 in run fees is different from the other proposals, which assumed the run fees would be returned to the townships. If looked at in that way, it puts them all in the same box. They're all \$850,000. Allied's proposal was less because it only included one ALS ambulance. In regard to response time, we need to make sure what we're comparing apples to apples.
 2. Becky Norris of Torch Lake Township commented on the nice presentation and asked whether the bid was affected at all by an interest in expanding into Antrim County. The response was absolutely.
 3. Jim from Elk Rapids asked about the customer retention percentages. If the customer is the patient, what choice do they have to call somebody else? You have customer retention by necessity.
 4. Ed Comai of Torch Lake Township asked about the two ambulances already in Torch Lake Township. What do we do with the second ambulance? When an ambulance needs service, who picks up the tab and supplies a back-up ambulance on site? The reply was MMR assumes all the cost of that ambulance and provides a replacement.
 5. Trisha Perlman from Elk Rapids asked about districting. She is concerned about the ambulance moving from Elk Rapids if the Torch Lake ambulance goes out. Can they state they want the ER ambulance to stay in ER?
 6. Christine Keenan of Elk Rapids asked of the 423 MMR employees, there have been some 70 OSHA-reportable incidents, 55 of them injuries. You have stated you have a huge work comp experience. Since injures alone are 10 % of your claims, how do you correlate that with your expenses? How does that add to your costs? The reply is that is correct, and to try to off-set cost, they try to have those employees on light duty work schedules.
4. Board Commentary:
 1. Board questions of MMR included questions about pay scales, which were not provided, along with benefit packages, health, education, etc. The reply, these can be emailed to the township.
 2. Also asked, if MMR sees the 3 townships as a beachhead to begin expanding on the west side of the state, and if so, would MMR rethink the resources based on the expanded footprint? The reply, no, they would be held to that by the contract. However, the expansion into the county creates more ambulances, which could provide help to the township
 3. Also, MMR was asked to explain how they work with the fire department as far as back-up. It's not that you get the bus on site, it's you get the people on site to get the patient entered. The reply is that they would want the fire department available to respond with them to a scene, to start rendering care.
 4. Also asked about pending litigation, which

MMR had responded there were none. The response was, in clarification, the proposal asked for three years, they responded to two. There have been law suits, which were more about HR issues, unhappy employees removed from work and not driven by malpractice. When asked if other customers (townships) were involved the answer was no, he did not believe so. The EMS director [Tom Persons](#) asked the counties currently covered by MMR, coverage is not exclusively by MMR. The replay was no, not in all. Also asked if they can re-chassis 4-wheel drive vehicles, which our ambulances are. We would require it. The reply is that it can be done, but they just have to figure out how. MMR was also asked how they came up with the sustainability model. Would Obama care affect them? They agreed, but had already budgeted for that.

5. The Board thanked MMR for their presentation, and with no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:35 PM.

These Minutes are respectfully submitted and are subject to approval at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

Kathy S. Windiate
Township Clerk