

San Joaquin County Emergency Medical Services Agency



Memorandum

TO: All Interested Parties


FROM: Leon Brown, MBA, EMS Analyst

DATE: May 22, 2025

SUBJECT: Ripon Consolidated Fire District Exclusive Operating Area Ambulance Contract

Compliance Report

This EMS Agency Report on the Exclusive Operating Area Zone E and the contract compliance for the Emergency Ambulance Provider Ripon Consolidated Fire District (RCFD) for the months of March and April 2025, provides an in-depth review of RCFD's performance. The County's contract with RCFD establishes accountability for meeting specific standards and provides the EMS Agency with complete access to data and information on RCFD's operational, clinical, and administrative performance. Performance data in the table below are the result of combining two months to ensure that a minimum of 100 responses are measured for statistical relevance.



RCFD's combined two-month percentile with 189 responses for March and April 2025 was 97.89%. As shown in the graph above. The complete compliance report may be viewed or downloaded from the EMS Agency's website: www.sigov.org/department/ems

| Fines and Penalties Report | | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|--|--|--|--|
| Type of Penalty | Mar 2025 | Apr 2025 | | | | |
| Late response minutes | \$170 | \$20 | | | | |
| Failure to provide data | N/A | N/A | | | | |
| Preventable mechanical failure | N/A | N/A | | | | |
| Failure to meet staffing and clinical standards | N/A | N/A | | | | |
| Failure to Respond | N/A | N/A | | | | |
| Failure to submit documentation at hospital | N/A | N/A | | | | |
| Other minor breach | N/A | N/A | | | | |
| Totals | \$170 | \$20 | | | | |

Response Time Analysis By Population

| | Mar 2025 | | | | Apr 2025 | |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| Population Density & Response Time Standard | Number of Responses | Non-Compliant Responses | Percent Compliant | Number of Responses | Non-Compliant Responses | Percent Compliant |
| Urban 8:00 | 82 | 3 | 96.34% | 83 | 1 | 98.80% |
| Suburban 20:00 | 9 | 0 | 100.00% | 5 | 0 | 100.00% |
| Rural 20:00 | 4 | 0 | 100.00% | 6 | 0 | 100.00% |
| Total | 95 | 3 | 96.84% | 94 | 1 | 98.94% |

Detailed Response Time Analysis

Mar 2025

| | IVIAI 2020 | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| Population Density | Responses | Response Time Interval Maximum | Response Time Interval Mean | Std Deviation | Response Time Interval 90th Percentile | |
| SJ ZONE E URBAN | 82 | 17:34 | 06:16 | 03:09 | 11:11 | |
| SJ ZONE E SUBURBAN | 9 | 12:56 | 09:03 | 01:55 | 11:30 | |
| SJ ZONE E RURAL | 4 | 12:58 | 11:31 | 01:09 | 12:35 | |
| Total Responses | 95 | | | | | |

Detailed Response Time Analysis

Apr 2025

| Population Density | Responses | Response Time Interval Maximum | Response Time Interval Mean | Std Deviation | Response Time Interval 90th Percentile |
|--------------------|-----------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|--|
| SJ ZONE E URBAN | 83 | 16:44 | 06:43 | 03:21 | 11:53 |
| SJ ZONE E SUBURBAN | 5 | 10:49 | 07:51 | 02:58 | 10:16 |
| SJ ZONE E RURAL | 6 | 13:56 | 11:17 | 02:47 | 13:44 |
| Total Responses | 94 | | | | |

Comparison of Compliance with and without Exemptions

| | | Mar 2025 | | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Population Density | Total Responses | Number of Late Calls Prior to Exemptions | Compliance Prior to Exemptions | Total Responses Adjusted | Number of Late Calls After Exemptions Approved | Compliance After Exemptions |
| SJ ZONE E URBAN | 82 | 19 | 76.83% | 82 | 3 | 96.34% |
| SJ ZONE E SUBURBAN | 9 | 0 | 100.00% | 9 | 0 | 100.00% |
| SJ ZONE E RURAL | 4 | 0 | 100.00% | 4 | 0 | 100.00% |
| All Zones Combined | 95 | 19 | 80.00% | 95 | 3 | 96.84% |
| | * Minimum of 100 responses required for calculation. True compliance shown in rolling compliance zone tables. | | | | one tables. | |

Comparison of Compliance with and without Exemptions

| | | Apr 2025 | | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| Population Density | Total Responses | Number of Late Calls Prior to Exemptions | Compliance Prior to Exemptions | Total Responses Adjusted | Number of Late Calls After Exemptions Approved | Compliance After Exemptions |
| SJ ZONE E URBAN | 83 | 27 | 67.47% | 83 | 1 | 98.80% |
| SJ ZONE E SUBURBAN | 5 | 0 | 100.00% | 5 | 0 | 100.00% |
| SJ ZONE E RURAL | 6 | 0 | 100.00% | 6 | 0 | 100.00% |
| All Zones Combined | 94 | 27 | 71.28% | 94 | 1 | 98.94% |
| | * Minimum of 100 responses required for calculation. True compliance shown in rolling compliance zone tables. | | | | one tables. | |

| Zone Assist | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------|----|--|--|--|
| Panulation Dancity | Mar 2025 | | | | |
| Population Density | Ambulance Service Provider | # | | | |
| SJ ZONE E URBAN | AMR San Joaquin | 1 | | | |
| | Manteca | 22 | | | |
| SJ ZONE E | Escalon | 2 | | | |
| SUBURBAN | Manteca | 1 | | | |
| SJ ZONE E RURAL | Escalon | 3 | | | |

| Zone Assist | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----|--|
| Denulation Denaity | Apr 2025 | | |
| Population Density | Ambulance Service Provider | # | |
| SJ ZONE E URBAN | Escalon | 1 | |
| | Manteca | 15 | |
| SJ ZONE E SUBURBAN | Escalon | 1 | |
| SJ ZONE E RURAL | Escalon | 2 | |
| | Manteca | 1 | |

| Exemption Request Reports | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|--|
| | Mar | 2025 | Apr 2025 | | |
| Types of Exemptions | Exemptions Approved | Exemptions Denied | Exemptions Approved | Exemptions Denied | |
| Any other circumstance deemed acceptable to the AGENCY | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | |
| Delays due to road blockages such as at train crossings or major road work | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | |
| During extreme system overload | 8 | 0 | 10 | 0 | |
| Incorrect or inaccurate dispatch information received from a calling party or PSAP | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | |
| Reduction from code 3 to code 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Unavoidable delay caused by traffic congestion in which there is no alternate route of travel | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| Zone Assist | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |

| Out of County Mutual Ald | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------|----------------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Date | Location | Ambulance Service Provider | Dispatch Determinant | | | | |
| Failure to Provide Data | | | | | | | |
| Event Type | | Mar 2025 | Apr 2025 | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | | | |
| Mechanical Report | | | | | | | |
| Event Type | | Date | Preventable | | | | |
| N/A | | | | | | | |
| Community Service Report | | | | | | | |
| Event Type | | | | | | | |
| See Appendix A. | | | | | | | |