November 8, 2018

Judge Peter C. Deddeh
Presiding Judge
San Diego Superior Court
1100 Union Street, 10th Floor
San Diego, CA 92101


Dear Judge Deddeh:

Pursuant to California Penal Code Section 933.05(a),(b) and (c), the City of San Diego provides the attached response from the Mayor and City Council to the applicable findings and recommendations included in the above referenced Grand Jury Report.

If you require additional information or have any questions, please contact Erin Demorest, Director of Legislative Affairs, at 619-533-3920.

Sincerely,

Myrtle Cole

   2. City Council Resolution R-312011
Pursuant to California Penal Code section 933(c), the City of San Diego provides the following responses to the findings and recommendations pertaining to the City of San Diego that are included in the above-referenced Grand Jury Report:

**REPORT CLARIFICATIONS**

Three factual corrections are listed below to provide clarification:

**Grand Jury Report Statement 1:** RAP, a pilot program funded by grants, ended in December 2016 when its four paramedics, who were employees of and on loan from American Medical Response (AMR), were called back to AMR.

**Clarification:**

RAP personnel were not funded by grants. RAP was a partnership, founded by Rural/Metro Ambulance and the City of San Diego. Both organizations supported the program with personnel and financial support. When American Medical Response (AMR) purchased Rural/Metro, they initially expressed intent to maintain the program but withdrew support during compliance negotiations. There was no contractual obligation with Rural/Metro or AMR to provide the resources needed for RAP.

RAP was implemented as a formal program in 2011 and was not considered a pilot program at the time of staff removal. In 2008, San Diego Fire-Rescue’s Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Division utilized two Firefighter-Paramedics to trial the concept as a pilot. With positive results, SDFD then implemented the program formally in 2011 in partnership with Rural/Metro, creating permanent positions for the program. In 2014, the State of California EMS Authority gave RAP permission to test additional medical and operational concepts, which because of high visibility, often caused the impression that RAP itself was a pilot program.

**Grand Jury Report Statement 2:** The RAP pilot project was funded by a $15 million Beacon Community grant from the Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology in 2010, an additional $1 million from the Alliance Healthcare Foundation in 2011, and a $2.5 million California Community Paramedicine Pilot Project grant in 2014. These funds supported RAP operations and allowed the development of a computer software tool called Street Sense, an innovative health information exchange.

**Clarification:**

RAP personnel were not funded by grants.

The Beacon Grant: The Beacon Grant was a regional award. San Diego Fire-Rescue (SDFD) participated in the Beacon project by providing a near real-time data feed to the health information exchange. The University of California San Diego was the recipient of
the $15 million and used a small portion of the money to build an electronic interface to the SDFD EMS database. SDFD EMS did not receive additional money from the Beacon project.

The Alliance Healthcare Foundation: SDFD collaborated with “211” and Father Joe’s Villages to apply for a grant for a proposed “Community Information Exchange” (CIE). The proposal was successful and received more than $2 million in funding. The newly-formed CIE obtained formal organization status and paid a small portion of the money to build an electronic interface to SDFD EMS. No additional funding was received from the CIE.

California Community Paramedicine Pilot: The City received approximately $5,000 to pay for State curriculum training, and approximately $16,500 to pay for data costs associated with the tested concepts.

**Grand Jury Report Statement 3:** *At the end of the pilot project period in December 2016, a decision had to be made concerning the continuation of RAP. AMR requested that it be disbanded and the paramedics reassigned to AMR’s conventional response crews. The City Council considered including the program in the 2017/2018 budget, but was not able to find funds.*

**Clarification:**

There were no discussions about ceasing RAP in December of 2016, and the State pilot project was not expiring at the time. The FY 2019 Proposed Budget does not include additional resources for RAP. Currently, RAP is staffed with 1.00 Program Manager position but no paramedics are assigned to the program due to staffing shortages with the City’s ambulance provider, AMR. Fire-Rescue is in ongoing discussions with AMR regarding future staffing opportunities for RAP. Additionally, Fire-Rescue’s long-term solution is to include a RAP component in the future RFP for the 911 EMS delivery system.

**FINDINGS 01 THROUGH 03**

**Finding 01:** *This small group of frequent 9-1-1 callers creates a serious logistical and financial strain on emergency medical services.*

**Response:** The Mayor and City Council partially disagree with the Grand Jury’s finding.

Frequent 911 callers, who represent approximately one percent of the population (1,400+ individuals), typically generate 15% to 20% of the EMS call volume. Like other major EMS systems in the United States, the San Diego EMS system can manage this level of frequent use because system management is designed around call volume. However, an
ever-increasing call volume in the general 911 system is a resource concern for EMS leadership.

**Finding 02:** RAP, a program designed to identify over users and reduce their 9-1-1 calls and ER visits, resulted in substantial financial savings and reduced strain on other emergency responders during the time it was in operation.

**Response:** The Mayor and City Council agree with the Grand Jury’s finding.

**Finding 03:** Paramedics in a program such as RAP require an exemption from current law, allowing them flexibility in deciding appropriate treatment options for clients in the program.

**Response:** The Mayor and City Council partially disagree with the Grand Jury’s finding.

Most RAP functions, like coordination of services and navigation through the healthcare system, do not require an exemption from the California EMS Authority.

However, certain specialized services provided by RAP paramedics do require a State exemption to operate in roles beyond the normal paramedic “scope of practice”. This exemption enhances the program because it allows RAP paramedics to, for example, transport patients to non-hospital locations or to provide medications or treatment that 911 paramedics cannot. Legislative efforts to implement this as a permanent scope of practice are in progress.

**RECOMMENDATION 18-41**

**Recommendation 18-41:** San Diego Mayor and City Council consider exploring ways to replicate the success and benefits of the now-defunct Resource Access Program, with the goal of reducing over-use of emergency medical services and thus improving the efficiency of the 9-1-1 system.

**Response:** The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be in the future.

SDFD will include an updated version of the RAP program in the upcoming Request for Proposal (RFP) for the City’s next 911 ambulance provider. The requirements will provide for dedicated staff and opportunities to scale the operation over the life of the contract. This RFP is anticipated to be released in the last quarter of calendar year 2018.
RESOLUTION NUMBER R-312011

DATE OF FINAL PASSAGE OCT 22, 2018


WHEREAS, on June 6, 2018, the 2017-2018 San Diego County Grand Jury (Grand Jury) filed a final report titled "The Resource Access Program: A Successful Program Disbanded" (Report) that requested a response from the Mayor and City Council (Council); and

WHEREAS, the Report discusses the Resource Access Program which was active in the City of San Diego (City) from 2010 to late 2016; and

WHEREAS, under California Penal Code section 933(c), within 90 days after the filing of the report, each public agency which the Grand Jury reviewed, and about which it issued the Report, must comment to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of the agency; and

WHEREAS, the comments required from the Mayor and Council are due to be submitted to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on November 30, 2018, as the City requested and received an extension of time to respond; and

WHEREAS, the response to the Report requires that the Mayor and Council respond to Findings 01 through 03 and to Recommendation 18-41; and

WHEREAS, the Office of the Independent Budget Analyst has proposed a Council response to the Report, which is joined by the Mayor, as set forth in IBA Report No. 18-29, dated September 11, 2018, for the Council’s consideration; and
WHEREAS, the response proposed by the Office of the Independent Budget Analyst also includes clarification to three statements included in the Grand Jury’s report which clarify the background information on the Resource Access Program and provide context for the Grand Jury’s recommendations; and

WHEREAS, the response proposed by the Office of the Independent Budget Analyst was submitted to the Public Safety & Livable Neighborhoods Committee on September 19, 2018 and recommended unanimously to the full Council for approval; NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of San Diego, that the Council approves and adopts as its own the response to the 2017-2018 San Diego County Grand Jury Report titled “City of San Diego Corporate Partnership Development Program,” as set forth in IBA Report No. 18-31, dated September 12, 2018.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Council President is authorized and directed, on behalf of the San Diego City Council, to execute and deliver the above-described response to the Presiding Judge of the San Diego County Superior Court no later than November 30, 2018.

APPROVED: MARA W. ELLIOTT, City Attorney

By

[Signature]
Catherine C. Morrison
Deputy City Attorney

CCM:jdf
10/03/18
Or.Dept: IBA
Doc. No.: 1848935
I certify that the foregoing Resolution was passed by the Council of the City of San Diego, at this meeting of __________ OCT 16 2018 __________.

ELIZABETH S. MALAND
City Clerk

Approved: __________ 10/22/18 ________
(date)

By __________
Deputy City Clerk

KEVIN L. FAULCONER, Mayor

Vetoed: __________ (date) __________

KEVIN L. FAULCONER, Mayor
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Passed by the Council of The City of San Diego on OCT 16 2018, by the following vote:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councilmembers</th>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Nays</th>
<th>Not Present</th>
<th>Recused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Bry</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorie Zapf</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Ward</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtle Cole</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Kersey</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Cate</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Sherman</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Alvarez</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgette Gomez</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date of final passage OCT 22 2018

(Please note: When a resolution is approved by the Mayor, the date of final passage is the date the approved resolution was returned to the Office of the City Clerk.)

KEVIN L. FAULCONER
Mayor of The City of San Diego, California.

ELIZABETH S. MALAND
City Clerk of The City of San Diego, California.

By ______________________________, Deputy

Office of the City Clerk, San Diego, California

Resolution Number R-312011