



REDWOOD EMPIRE DISPATCH COMMUNICATIONS AUTHORITY

KT McNulty, Executive Director ■ REDCOM Fire/EMS 9-1-1 Center ■ 2796 Ventura Avenue ■ Santa Rosa, CA 95403
Office: (707) 565-8880 ■ Fax: (707) 568-6693 ■ Cell: (707) 230-3951 ■ E-Mail: KTMcNulty@REDCOM-Fire.org

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Steve Akre

Chief
Sonoma Valley Fire & Rescue
Chair

Mark Heine

Chief
Sonoma County Fire District
Vice Chair

David Crowl

Administrator
Coast Life Support District

Bryan Cleaver

Regional EMS Administrator
Coastal Valleys EMS Agency
Secretary

Jason Boaz

Chief
Healdsburg Fire Department

Scott Westrope

Chief
Santa Rosa Fire Department

Sundari Mase

Public Health Officer
Sonoma County Public Health

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

KT McNulty

COUNSEL

Tambra Curtis

Deputy County Counsel
County of Sonoma

DISPATCH OPERATIONS ADVISORY GROUP

Spencer Andreis

Division Chief
Sonoma Valley Fire & Rescue
Chairperson

Shepley Schroth-Cary

Chief
Gold Ridge Fire Protection District

James Salvante

EMS Coordinator
Coastal Valley EMS Agency

Ambrose Stevens

Operations Manager
Sonoma Life Support

Brian York

Battalion Chief / ECC Chief
Cal Fire

Traverse Collins

Deputy Chief
Santa Rosa Fire Department

Table of Contents

March 10th, 2022 REDCOM Board of Directors Meeting Agenda	2
February 10th, 2022 REDCOM Board of Directors Meeting Minutes.....	4
AMR Contract Services Budget for FY 22-23	29
AMR Contract Services Budget Details for FY 22-23.....	31
REDCOM Budget – Member fees for FY 22-23	33
REDCOM Budget – Allocations for FY 22-23.....	34



REDCOM BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Agenda

March 10, 2022 – @ 2:00PM

Join by phone 1-323-886-6897 conference ID: 179 967 135#
or Email KT.McNulty@REDCOM-Fire.org to request web link

Notice: Copies of additional materials provided to the Board of Directors for information on agenda items are available at the REDCOM fire & EMS 9-1-1 Center.

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the Agenda
3. Approval of the February 10, 2022, REDCOM Board of Directors Meeting Minutes.

4. Public Comment Period

In this time-period, anyone from the public may address the REDCOM Board of Directors regarding any subject over which the Board has jurisdiction, but which is not on today's agenda. Individuals will be limited to a three-minute presentation.

No action will be taken by the Board as a result of any items presented at this time.

5. New Business

- a) REDCOM Financial Audit Request for Proposals – Discussion on initiating Requests for Proposal for REDCOM's FY 21-22 Financial Audit.
- b) REDCOM Executive Director annual performance review – Discussion and direction on upcoming performance review process.

6. Old Business

- a) REDCOM Budget sub-committee recommendations - Discussion and possible adoption of the REDCOM subcommittee's recommendations.
 - a. REDCOM JPA Section 16, annexed agencies' base fee recommendation.

["JPA section 16 - Consolidations, Divisions and Annexations of Parties. Consolidations of Parties with other Parties or with non-member agencies, divisions of Parties into two or more entities, and](#)

annexations of portions of Parties shall have no adverse effect on the cost assessments of uninvolved Parties. In the event that involved Parties cannot come to agreement with regards to adjustments to cost assessments between themselves, the Board of Directors shall resolve the matter after considering and hearing from the affected Parties.”

- b. Member agency base fee assessment intervals recommendation
 - c. Base fee tier adjustment recommendation
 - b) AMR Contract Services Budget - Discussion and possible approval of the Draft FY 22-23 AMR Contract Services Budget – KT McNulty
 - c) REDCOM Budget - Discussion and possible approval of the Draft FY 22-23 REDCOM Budget
7. Next meeting will be – July 14, 2022, at 14:00, held virtually.
8. Adjournment- Motion to adjourn.



REDCOM BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Agenda

February 10, 2022 – @ 1:00PM

Minutes

Join by phone 1-323-886-6897 conference ID: 464 735 788#
or Email KT.McNulty@REDCOM-Fire.org to request web link

Notice: Copies of additional materials provided to the Board of Directors for information on agenda items are available at the REDCOM fire & EMS 9-1-1 Center.

Director's Present:

Steve Akre - Chair
Mark Heine - Vice Chair
Bryan Cleaver - Secretary
Dave Crowl
Scott Westrope
Sundari Mase

Others Present:

KT McNulty
Brenda Bacigalupi

Abraham Stewart
Bobbi Lovold
Ken Reese
Ambrose Stevens
Evonne Stevens
Tambra Curtis
Nica Vasquez
Rick Maudlin

Not Present:

Jason Boaz

1. Call to Order - Made by Steve Akre @ 14:02
2. Approval of the Agenda - Motion to approve made by Dave Crowl, Second Mark Heine - Discussion – No Further comments – Approved unanimously

3. Approval of the October 14th, 2021, REDCOM Board of Directors Meeting Minutes. - Motion to approve made by Scott Westrope, Second Dave Crowl - Discussion – No Further comments – Approved unanimously

4. Public Comment Period

In this time-period, anyone from the public may address the REDCOM Board of Directors regarding any subject over which the Board has jurisdiction, but which is not on today's agenda. Individuals will be limited to a three-minute presentation.

No action will be taken by the Board as a result of any items presented at this time.

None

5. New Business

- a) REDCOM Executive Director's Report - Presentation of the FY Q2 Director's Report – KT McNulty - KT McNulty – Ace Status – For Medical we continue exceed ACE standards. For Fire we have been experiencing a drop below standards. What we have found out is that we have a new quality assurance manager assigned to the Fire side. Their standard has changed, and our dispatchers are having to adjust to this new person's standards. Which they are correct standards, we should be following them. It is just new to us. It is a behavioral and habit change that we are having to over come right now.

I pulled together some 2021 data sets. This way you can have a small sample of what has been going on in the EMD and EFD world. The 1st report I am showing you is our Hands Only CPR report. This report shows non-Barrier cases. Which means we were easily able to position a patient to a supine position to start CPR. Then the barrier cases in which there was some sort of issue, whether they were in a bathtub, a vehicle or we were unable to get them off the bed, whatever was going on. We had a harder time to get them into position. Sometimes we don't have any control of that, they are locked behind a bathroom door, and we are not able to get them in position until responders get on scene. The green line represents the American Heart Association standards. You can see from non-Barrier cases the REDCOM Dispatchers for unconscious, breathing uncertain and the not breathing at all, we are excelling with the AHA Standards. The not breathing at all is so much quicker because that is something in Case Entry where the caller spontaneously offers that the patient is not breathing. The unconscious and the breathing uncertain we are having to gather the caller statements, we are

saying “Telling me exactly what happen” followed by their story which sometimes takes way too long and then we have to ask, “Are they breathing” “Are they awake”. In the not breathing at all cases we don’t have to ask those two questions, so we are able to go right into positioning. The blue is the questioning. The orange is the positioning, and the instructions we are giving. The grey is the time for hands on chest. We are excelling in that area. Now that we are providing data to the academy as far as hands on chest and other areas. We can compare ourselves to other ACE centers nationwide. We are above those standards or instep with other dispatcher centers nationwide. We are doing very well.

As far as our EMD this is how many calls we have taken for each Protocol for 2021. We took 34,412 EMD calls. Most of those calls were from falls and sick and that is no surprise. It has always been those two Protocols. For Fire we took 8,627 calls. Most of them were Fire alarms and Public Assist.

In our staffing we remain fully staffed. In our Upper Management positions all filled. Supervisor Positions are filled. Full time and Part time positions are filled. Since I made this chart, there has been a change to the Regional Director. it has gone back to Dean Anderson. I will report to him now and he will also be handling my performance review with the Board of Directors. That will go on March’s agenda.

Strategic Planning – I will speak about the Grant proposals as an agenda item later.

Technology – Academy Analytics, I just spoke about with the data that we are feeding the academy. It provides us with this dashboard of information and all these different items that we can look at in real time and compare ourselves nationwide to other dispatcher centers. This also helps the academy develop protocols. Determine different areas as a whole nation, what we need to work on and focus on. It will break down shift, dispatcher, protocol. All kinds of very interesting information that right now we were not unable to measure except for manually.

We had our kick of meeting with Genesis Pulse software. That is the software that incorporates Waze Traffic information, AVL Data, 911 caller location services and Medical Alarm information, incidents reported through the Waze App and system status information. On the left-hand side of this image there is the real time traffic collision information coming in through the Waze app. They are finding that those collisions are being reported 4-6 minutes ahead of the 911 calls. Our dispatchers will have to change what their current practice and monitor this program and see if there is any kind of injury reported

extractions, roll overs that kind of item so we can get a jump start on those 911 calls. A lot of it is going to be fender benders that we have nothing to do with. But if there is any indication that this is going to be a 911 call, we can get a jump start on it. We are working with Genesis Pulse and Pulse Point to try to incorporate the Pulse Point AED location. That way the dispatchers can see on the map the location of the caller, incident, responders, and the AED. This way we can be giving real time instructions. If there is an AED next door, "Please send someone to get it now and return to the patient". I haven't heard an update on where we are on that. I am very happy to be exploring this.

Google Sheets is now being used for each agency's responses plan. I hope that most people have had an opportunity go in and look at it and provide any feed back on it. Each agency can modify their own response plans and also view any other agency's responses plans.

Call Trends – The last 2 years from what I can tell, everything continues to be consistent outside of Fire Disasters. For 2021 the colors on the chart are Dark Blue and Brown. There is nothing major going on. It continues to be consistent for All Calls and 911 Calls. This data surge and dip is from the Kincade fire and loss of data at the state level. Looking forward to that dropping off the trends.

Call Duration – The upper bank is our 911 calls. Average calls are in the center. The bottom one is the business line calls. No anomalies there.

Answer Time Performance – We are well above our 90% standard.

Dispatch Times – Continues to be well below the 70 second standard. This 55 second is incorrect average. It is actually 54 seconds for rolling 12 months.

Exception Reports – I have been reporting it out in this format. It really doesn't give you a good picture of what exactly the trends are. Going forward I am going to do a 12-month rolling average of these numbers. This way you get a better idea of consistency. The numbers as they are presented are consistent with the prior months. No major anomalies there.

Steve Akre – Thank you very much KT. Opening up to the Board for any questions for KT

Bryan Cleaver - I found the Cardiac Arrest report in the beginning of the presentation to be fascinating. We do have CARES. Would there be a value in analyzing those cases against actual patient outcomes. It is the one data set that we have real patient outcomes.

KT McNulty - I think that would be absolutely appropriate. I think it is the missing link in the whole story. I would be in favor of providing that data.

Bryan Cleaver – I would not know how to do that. Weather it is you that provides the data or Cares provides the data to you. I think it would be interesting. You have a really high success rate. I think it would be important for us to evaluate the outcomes of those success rates to demonstrate how important the dispatch pre-arrival instructions really are ultimate patient outcome. I think we would all appreciate seeing that data.

KT McNulty - I wouldn't say we have a high success rate. I would say we are very successful getting hands on chest quickly. What we would want to evaluate is the success rate. I would be happy to provide any of those ECHO cases where we are putting hands on chest, and you can cross reference across your CARES data.

Bryan Cleaver – My sneaking suspicion is that you are getting hands on chest early is what is resulting in actual improved outcomes. I think the CARES data would be good to support your report by demonstrating the patient outcomes are improved when dispatchers get hands on chest early.

KT McNulty – I agree.

Steve Akre - I agree Bryan. That is valuable Metrix. Any other questions for KT?

- b) AMR Contract Services Budget - Presentation and discussion of the Draft FY 22-23 AMR Contract Services Budget – KT McNulty - KT McNulty - I am happy to report this year on the AMR side and the REDCOM side there are very small increase in fees. A lot of decreases in the areas that cost us a lot of money. As far as salaries there was a 2.5 increase and that was in part due to union wages which were .3% and the cost-of-living for Admin was also .3%.

Benefits actually went down from \$11.70 a month to \$10.98 a month. There was a \$9,000 savings there.

Insurance went down a significant amount for Workers Compensation. We have not had any active Workers Compensation cases in a while. There was a significate decrease of \$37,000 in that area.

Telecommunications has gone down almost \$4,000. That was due to some line clean up on the back side.

General Admin expenses have gone down \$5,500 that was mostly for First Watch fees unused triggers.

The total increase on the AMR side house is \$14,511.

For the proposed budget. We are looking to continue to our 18 Full Time, 6 Part Time Dispatchers which cost the same 3 Full Time salary on average. We are funding 4 Dispatch Supervisors, 1 Operation Manger, 1 Technical Services Manager, 1 Software Administrator, 1 Administrative Assistant, Executive Director and Fire Season up staffing. In regard to the Fire Season up staffing we elected to leave those costs at the original proposed rate, which was a mix of half straight time and half overtime. That was \$193,000. Because we have not experienced any major incidents last year, we are still not sure if \$193,000 is going to be an accurate number going forward. We just wanted to leave those funds in there in the event we have a major incident again.

For AMR depreciation there was very little equipment depreciating. That was around \$1,000. I have already spoke to you about the Insurance cost going down and the telecommunication lines.

Occupancy funds continue to be a \$1,000.

No major changes as far as external Training resources. Our EMD and EFD National Q cost. Those are the evaluators for our 911 calls. Those did increase a little bit. We budgeted \$68,420 for that area.

General Administrative expenses - No major changes there. It is still \$93,000.

Other operating expense remains \$15,000. That is all for the AMR side of the house.

Steve Akre – Thank you KT. Anybody have any questions about the AMR Contract Services Budget? None.

- c) REDCOM Budget - Presentation and discussion of the Draft FY 22-23 REDCOM - KT McNulty and Bobbi Lovold – KT McNulty – We have included \$5,000 for the van. I still do not have a service contract agreement with the county. I am not sure how much exactly that is going to cost. We have allotted \$5,000 for any kind of gasoline, oil, and routine items. That is just for chassis stuff. That is not including any of the box items, communications, lights, sirens any of that. Bobbi, can you talk about the Air Cards please.

Bobbi Lovold – The Air Cards are for the Consortium for the MDCs activities. Looks like a lot of the agencies are switching to Tablets this year. The cost went down quite a bit. I just put in the Air Cards for the people who were not on the list for the tablets. That is approximant cost for the year.

KT McNulty – That is a significant decrease in that area.

Insurance - I don't have the final cost on what it will be for this upcoming cycle. They advised to build in 3% annually going forward. That is what we did.

Annual Audit Cost - We budget \$18,000. We will need to go out to RFP this spring that will be in the March Agenda to discuss.

Accounting Services also had a 5% increase built in.

Sonoma County Public Safety Consortium 4.4% increase in that area.

Legal Counsel we brought back down to \$7,500 based on actuals and a little bit of a buffer.

Travel and training we built in \$3,500 as part of leadership growth.

Consulting Services have gone down based on ZEN actuals. What we actually paid last year.

AMR Contract we have already discussed.

Fire Season Dispatchers has its own line to be billed out to Fire agencies.

Data Communications lines remains the same.

Radio Services this is just the cost to maintain them. This is not the cost if something breaks. If something breaks, then we will have to pull it out of the Technology Funds. We budgeted \$20,000.

County General Services remains a \$1,000.

Equipment and Tool remains \$500.

Shared replacement funds for the consortium. Went from \$57,000 to \$62,000.

Software we removed Live MUM and we need to discuss adding Pulse Point for another year. We did add it last year. But we want to confirm that we want to fund it for another year.

Bryan Cleaver – Can you share the cost of Pulse Point?

KT McNulty - The cost is \$13,000 annually. They have agreed to not increase those fees for the next cycle. \$13,000 for the regular and then \$5,000 additional for the Verified Responder Pro Services.

Bryan Cleaver - Thank you! What was the reason behind such a significant decrease in Air cards? Do we have that information?

KT McNulty – A lot of the Fire agencies have switched from MDCs to Tablet Command. So they will not have to pay for those Air cards any longer.

Technology fund place holder. We left at the same \$75,000. However, we moved it into its own budget line item. So that we won't need to do a budget adjustment should we need to tap into those funds.

There are no advances or advances clearing. Any questions on the REDCOM Budget? None.

- a) Discussion and direction on continuation of funding Pulse Point. - Steve Akre – What we are looking at here for the Pulse Point item is the desire of the Board to provide staff direction on whether or not to continue funding Pulse Point \$13,000 and the Verified Responders Pro additional \$5,000. Opening up to the Board for any thoughts and discussion that we may have as far as continuing or discontinuing paying for those services.

KT McNulty – I will add some context. For the Verified First Responder Pro. We did draft a Memorandum of Understanding between REDCOM and any of the member agencies that wanted to participate in that to relieve REDCOM of any liability should a responder show up on scene and be inappropriate. They will be responding into a private citizen's home where there is a cardiac arrest happening. Once that MOU went out, I heard crickets from the member agencies except Graton. Graton right now is the only member participating in that. The Sheriff's Department did reach out to me that they were very interested in participating in the program and that they would be signing MOU. However, that has been over 8 months since I have heard from them. I would say that there is not an overall member interest in the Responder Pro.

Bryan Cleaver- KT, I do know that we need data to support this, but do you feel that your numbers in terms of hands-on chest compared to the American Heart Standard. Has in some way been contributed by this or are we not

impacting that overall number, or the other options is. Do we need to further look at that?

KT McNulty – They are unrelated. Since we have gone live with the trial period for the Responder Pro. I have had only one verified responder hit their button, that they are responding to a CPR event. I think that the idea of the program is a good one and it is very important. However, I think there is just a lot of concern about off duty folks responding outside of the jurisdiction into a private home. There is a lot behind that. I think most agencies are not interested in taking on that responsibility.

Ken Reese - I know just like the normal Pulse Point. If you wanted to be alerted to nearby CPR that was needed. You had to have that selected location serve on. It is still that way on that app?

KT McNulty – I am not sure off the top of my head. However, one of the biggest things is I sent out over 25 invitations to folks that were interested and maybe 10 people accepted the invitations. There really isn't a lot of Verified Responders out there hitting their buttons. The project just kind of had a failure to launch overall.

Ken Reese - I know that when we first started looking at the nearby CPR even outside the Responder Pro, it is all predicated on the ECHO sub type in the CAD. Because we do EMD backwards, half the time the responders are halfway there or even there before we even add the sub typed into the call because it is a Manual process. That update doesn't happen in a timely enough fashion for that to be accurate. If we were actually doing EMD correctly then the sub type /event type would happen from the onset and people would be notified CPR needed faster.

Steve Akre – Any other comments or questions from Board Members or staff?

KT McNulty – One more thing on the basic Pulse Point product. Our community has come to rely on that product for information on what is going on around them, aside from the CPR piece of it. I think it is still a valuable verified information resource for our communities. That does benefit every community in Sonoma County with the exception of Cloverdale.

Steve Akre – Thank you. I think I will weigh in a little bit. Bryan thank you for your questions. I do appreciate them. Kenny for the additional information. I am very much in favor of continuing with the basic Pulse Point. As far as the

Verified Responder Pro. I see the fact that it is not being used. But I also see that \$5,000 is an incredibly small amount of money. I would wonder or purpose that we maybe continue for another year and maybe try and advertise that service again to our member agencies. See what happens and in 6 months from now and after another attempt and seeing if people are using it. If they are still not, then maybe we put anybody that is using it on notice that we are not going to continue paying for it. All it takes is one Verified Responder to respond somewhere and have a save and that how many times over that \$5,000 is worth spending that money.

KT McNulty – Absolutely! The other thing that is happening right now with Pulse Point is that they put out a Grant for a marketing campaign. I have applied for that marketing campaign. What I have applied for is a Sonoma County/Sonoma Strong campaign to produce banners. I am going to ask for one banner for each fire agency so we can get one for each community that we serve.

Steve Akre- Excellent. Thank you, KT.

KT McNulty – If we do have a push to continue with the Responder Pro. Maybe we can bring it to the Chiefs and do a further push with the program. I do think it is a good program.

Steve Akre - Any other Board comments or ideas or direction?

Mark Heine - I would support to keep both programs.

Dave Crowl – Agree with the discussion.

Steve Akre - KT, I think generally you have direction to do that. In the coming year budget. We will make the final discussion when we finalize the budget.

KT McNulty – Thank you.

Steve Akre – Welcome. Thank you!

- b) Discussion and direction on agency consolidation effects and the cost to uninvolved parties. KT McNulty – Starting off with the JPA agreement regarding consolidation effects on involved parties. This is something that we have not looked at before in discussion. This cycle we realized that this is

something that is affecting uninvolved parties. Please read the following Item 16 from the JPA agreement. Reads as follows:

Consolidations, Divisions and Annexation of Parties.
Consolidations of Parties with other Parties or with non-member agencies, divisions of Parties into two or more entities, and annexations of portions of Parties shall have no adverse effect on the cost assessments of uninvolved Parties. In the event that involved Parties cannot come to agreement with regards to adjustments to cost assessments between themselves, the Board of Directors shall resolve the matter after considering and hearing from the affected Parties.

KT McNulty – We have prepared the budget as we have been historically before any of these consolidations started occurring. That is what I sent out in this current packet. What we are finding, is the biggest cost that is driving up the uninvolved parties is the lack of base fees from the individual agencies before they were consolidated. We are moving multiple agencies into one agency, and we are losing all those base fees that were going towards funding REDCOM.

This budget in front of you. The cost to each agency is the merged budget. This is with the consolidation and the single base fee per consolidation. As an example: Santa Rosa has not consolidated and their contributions for 22-23 is one million sixty-eight thousand. If we look at the unmerged version of this budget. They would only be paying one million sixty thousand. It is costing them a little over eight grand a year from loss of base fees essentially. What I am bring to you today is for discussion on how we would like to proceed going forward with this item.

Bryan Cleaver - This would be the consolidation potentially. For example, AMR into GMR, Reach, CalStar becoming a single organization also the consolidation Fire Agencies within the membership.

KT McNulty - If you look directly at CalStar and Reach. They are at the lowest Base fee. They should be combined. That three thousand you should retain that base fee and we should retain AMR 's base fee. As it were since those are now absorbed into AMR. We are only realizing this two hundred thirteen-thousand-dollar amount in base fees.

Mark Heine – Let's use Sonoma County Fire District and Bodega Bay as example. That consolidation will come into effect on the first of the next

fiscal year. Walk me through that same scenario again. I think I understand what we are saying.

KT McNulty – For Sonoma County Fire District. Your Base Fee with the merge is \$36,000 and Bodega Bay stand alone is \$4,800. We would lose Bodega Bay's base fee of \$4,800.

Mark Heine – Clearly what needs to happen is a foundational strategy for the Board. We can not do consolidation and end of adding cost to other Jurisdictions. It seems to me, using Bodega Bay as an example, we need to absorb the base fee and absorb whatever the total member contribution is. The easier way is to say we end up absorbing their member contribution because that is inclusive of the base fee.

Steve Akre – The next Budget KT if you will go to the merged one. This is something that Bobbi, KT and I, had meetings on in preparation for this. We discussed not only the JPA agreement language. Which we are bound by also the principle and equity and fairness. Showing the Sonoma County Fire District and right below it is Sonoma Valley Fire District. Both of us have merged agencies. Those base fees were never added to our own base fees.

In this Budget r(draft) that Bobbi worked up. The solution was to add in manually what the base fees were from those former districts. For my case, Glen Ellen and Valley of the Moon both should be counted. They should not have gone away. What the tab is just a special notation saying and explaining how we got to the base fee contribution. It is not in an alignment with the table below of which agency and which has a range from 1 -8 and that Base Fee associated with that. Does that make sense?

Mark Heine - I do completely support that. It seems to be the most logical thing. We cannot have that base fee, let's say that Bodega Bay spread across everyone else's. Particularly Districts that are still having those fees paid for by the county. We can not have those fees spreading to cities that are not having those fees already covered as well. We just need to add those base fees in. Does the language in the JPA support what we are potentially doing? Or do we need to go back and amendment to the JPA?

KT McNulty – It is inline with what we are proposing. As long as there is not a single member agency that disagrees with the discussion.

Mark Heine – Ok

Bryan Cleaver – I really appreciate the flexibility by my colleagues who are specifically impacted by this discussion. I think it is wonderful that we are offering this option up. My question to the group is; As a long-term strategy is that a right approach or does there need to be a reassessment and/or reevaluation for the long hall. Not having to do that immediately is much appreciated by those of you that are consolidating. I am thinking long term is this something that we need to put on our radar in terms of how we work towards a fair and equitable division of this cost.

Mark Heine – I appreciate that, Bryan. Right now, I feel like it is wrong currently and we have to right the wrong. My agency is picking up another agency. We need to pick up the totality of their REDCOM fees cost. Nothing is changing as far as the deployment operation, CAD usage and the other stuff we look at. The landscape of the County Fire Service is changing or least for first responders. I do think we would have to come back and just ask the question. Maybe we might not have to make changes but at some point, we have to ask REDCOM do we need to make any adjustments on how we look at things.

Steve Akre - Thank you Bryan and Mark.

Dave Cowl – How was the base fee computed in the very beginning? How did we come up with the base fee?

KT McNulty – That is my next item.

c) Discussion and direction on base fee assessments and adjustments. **KT**

McNulty – There was an established base fee really early on in the REDCOM history. The last time those base fees were assessed was in 2014 that I can find. Depending on your call volume, you were placed into a bracket. I can produce and send that out if you would like. I just don't have it with me right now.

Whatever bracket you landed into was your base fee contribution. With that said, the call volumes have not been assessed to the base fee bracket since 2014. How do we want to handle agencies that have jumped brackets and have not been assessed at their actual current base fee contribution amounts?

Mark Heine – That is one side of it. The other side is and maybe this is a good point to what Bryan's speaking point was a minute ago. As an agency annexes other agencies. It's call volume is going to go up. Call volume for annexation doesn't appear on the map anymore. It is not overall there is more CAD usage or more dispatch time or more radio traffic more any of those measurable outputs. We just changed the landscape on how that looks. I think first and foremost, I would propose the need to look at this is in Phases. Phase 1, We have to fix , this being spread out, it should not be spread out it should be assessed to the annexing body. Then Phase 2, We need to come back and look at that base fee and if it is tied to incident volume. The incident volume isn't really changing. It is just going under a different umbrella. (don't know if you need that direction today)

Dave Crowl – I agree with that. I think right now it is very prudent to just say that you need to absorb the base fee from who you are merging with in my option. I think the longer term. We need to look at that base fee all over again. How much has changed in the pass 8 years with all the agencies. With their run volumes potentially their increased/decreased volumes. We can maybe take a look at that as well.

Mark Heine – There has not been a lot of microscopic focus by fire districts, because they are not paying it right now. That is going to start soon. Whether it is next year or the year after that. It does behoove us over the next fiscal year to try to sort all this out and we are going to make any changes and probably it is best if we do that in the next year or so.

Steve Akre – KT, did we end up having a conversation with Bobbi to do a draft budget in contributions for Base Fees, based on what a reconciled range would be.

Bobbi Lovold – I was going to wait. However, the one you are looking at now does have adjusted Base Fees. When we talked about it on the phone it seemed like that was going to possibly come up. This one does have the new brackets. It was mostly the smaller agencies going from bracket 8 to bracket 7. That was the majority of the changes. If you scroll down to where the calculation is. I actually added in what the brackets were. This way you can kind of see what the call volume is. A lot of people pretty much jumped into this bracket 7. They had like 600 calls or whatever, so they bumped up into that next level. That was the majority of the changes. I wasn't the accountant when this was put in service. There is a really big difference between 1,2,3. Maybe that would be my

suggestion. When we look at it. Is to even out the huge difference between one and three.

Bryan Cleaver – Are we suggesting that through mergers, what has historically been. I will use Russian River as an example. A moderate to lower call volume , now being affiliated with Sonoma County Fire could land themselves in a higher bracket and have a higher charge?

KT McNulty – No there are two separate issues. One is the merger of base fees and losing the multiple agencies base fees. Then 2 is that agencies whether they are merging or standing alone. Their base fee bracket has not been assessed since 2014. Healdsburg Fire is a good example. They are not merging with anyone, but their bracket jumped significantly since 2014. I believe they went from a 4 to a 3.

Bryan Cleaver – Just based on volume?

KT McNulty – Yes.

Steve Akre - I feel like that we have several different decisions to make. I would suggest maybe we try to address the agencies on their current call volume be assessed against the base fees. I don't see a reason why we should wait eight years to reclassify an agency. I think that it is a pretty easy one. We say whether it is one year or every three years or whatever the Board decides. That seems to be a straightforward one. We could make a pretty quick decision and provide direction to KT and Bobbi on how we address that on an ongoing basis. Then I think the bigger questions are. How we deal with consolidating or merging agencies. To date we have not applied those base fees for merged agencies. Those agencies have just disappeared off of the maps and the base fees off of the budget. I think that one requires a little bit more thought. As I mentioned, I am perfectly comfortable as an agency that absorbs somebody else of paying that. I also want to be cautious about going forward, if we were to adopt that position of now Sonoma Valley and Sonoma County Fire pay and AMR and Reach, Cal Star paying more in base fees right now and then we decide to do something different. We would be like, on a kind of a rollercoaster with fees for agencies. That I think is more concerning to agencies, whether they pay a little bit more incrementally. I think those swings are going to notice and have more heartache about then if it is just a slight increment. Open that up to anybody else's comments Bobbi or KT or of Board Members?

Bryan Cleaver - Steve I actually agree with the concept. I guess where I'm going with this is that we are all accustomed to budget cycles and budget deadlines. They cannot happen necessarily annually. Perhaps it is a system by which we re-evaluate every year or every two or every three years to assess the call volumes of a particular agency against the scales. That we have adopted. I know we cannot obviously take an action item by any means on this today. We were not prepared for this. If I'm hearing you correctly Steve, there needs to be a mechanism by which we do re-evaluate and assign brackets and maybe even evaluate the brackets given that the growth is inevitable. Do I understand you correctly?

Steve Akre - I think quite honestly that every year we need to pay attention to those brackets and what the agencies call volume is and assign them appropriately. I just don't see a reason why not to. I agree that we need to look longer term on what that mechanism is and certainly to look at the Base Call allocations. As KT and Bobbi pointed out there is a tremendous difference between a range two and a range three. I certainly don't have the history and the knowledge to say, "Why was that originally?" you know that disparate. "Why was it designed that way?". I think that is something that we could look at going forward.

Bryan Cleaver - I apologize for being the historian on this group. Every time I am relied upon to be the historian, I'm reminded of how old I truly am. In the original development of REDCOM. There were four dispatched seats and AMR was asked to pay for the fourth dispatch seat. Given that, they ran system status management, and they had a complex deployment process that everyone felt AMR should pay 25% right off the top of the operating costs of REDCOM. That was later evaluated and determined that we may have entered into a place of a Medicare Violation. Which we were using Medicare dollars from patients within the EOA that were unfairly and equitably being distributed outside of that EOA. When that happened, we found ourselves in a rather significant budget deficit. The solution that we came up with was the bracket system and the tiered system. It really came down to cost of readiness. If we have a provider that only runs one or two calls a year, but we have the status of and manage them and track them. There was a cost associated with that. That is where the bracket system came up. The idea of cost of readiness, cost of service whether you use REDCOM services or not. You had to pay something for them to status you, acknowledge, recognize and be able to utilize you when appropriate. Maybe that system is still valid today, maybe it is not. I don't know. I think we have had enough change shift within our systems. I think that this Board needs to take into serious consideration.

Whether or not that it is still valid. Whether the brackets and assignments that we came up with are still applicable.

Steve Akre – Thank you Bryan.

Mark Heine - I agree with all that. This maybe a good sub committee to sit down with KT and look at some of this stuff. I think Bryans history on this is hypercritical. I Myself included we don't have that. I think that will be helpful. I do think from a timeline standpoint we want to get this addressed at least before middle or end of next fiscal year. The reason I say that. Is right now we are looking at financial analysis of potential consolidation, REDCOM fees are not entertained in the financial analysis because they are covered. It just never even comes up. Just about every consolidation has some type of funding gap with it. We have been able to rely on the County to help fill those gaps, but I don't think they are in that position anymore. We will have to start individual agencies that are still exploring consolidation. We have some big ones coming up right. CSA 40 and Goldridge, North Bay Fire that is going to be a really big one. REDCOM fees will become hypercritical in some of that financial analysis. We have to figure out what we want to do at the ranges. Whether that is still a good tool and within the ranges. One, two and three needs to be resorted because those don't match the other ones. It is not just a methodology there to the end user, it is not familiar. I think it has to be addressed and there should be a sort of a timeline we should be cognizant of.

Steve Akre – Thank You Mark.

Dave Crawl - I'm just along for the ride at this point and just trying to dig through the numbers. I appreciate the history lesson. I will do some investigation on my side.

Steve Akre – Thank you Dave. Other support? Mark, you had a really good idea about a subcommittee to work on this. I think we do have and opportunity here while we are in this budget cycle. To at least make a decision for the short term. I would defiantly be in favor of a subcommittee. I would ask if anybody that is interested in serving on the committee that would be willing to get together with KT and Bobbi. At least a couple of times and provide some direction and some corresponding draft budgets before we need to adopt the budget. Which I believe is at the next meeting, right KT.

KT McNulty – That is correct.

Mark Heine - I think we do have a couple of consolidations that are going to come to fruition pretty quick. The Bodega Bay piece and the North County piece for Sotyome and Fitch Mountain. We are going to see some changes in agencies as we adopt this next fiscal year budget. I do think with regards to the base fees, we could take action on that right away. I certainly feel a responsibility because I don't think that is right for other agencies to be picking up those fees

Steve Akre - Do I have any volunteers to get on a subcommittee with KT and Bobbi?

Bryan Cleaver - Steve, you have me as a volunteer given the history. It does sort of lie with me at this point. I would also ask in my volunteering could we have Tambra get in contact with prior council that advised us on our methodology in the past.

Tambra Curtis – I would be happy to do that. Linda is retiring, but maybe we can catch her before she retires.

Steve Akre - Brian that is a great suggestion. Thank you Tambra. I was going to ask Tambra for guidance in terms of the existing JPA language and how we might best go about changing or how we may go about changing if that is what the board decides to do in terms of a change in methodology and how we do that legally and effectively.

Tambra Curtis - I'm happy to do so.

Steve Akre - Thank you Bryan for volunteering. I really value your historical knowledge and experience with this. I think that is going to be a really valuable piece of this. I would like to serve on it as well as I've been working with KT and Bobbi on the budget the last couple of years. I open it up if there is one more Board member that was inclined to serve. I don't think it is necessary, but if someone was inclined and interested I would certainly welcome that.

Dave Crawl - I'm interested, if there is room.

Steve Akre - Absolutely.

Dave Crawl - Great.

Steve Akre - As a Board, thank you for the discussion. I guess I am going back to what Mark said about that responsibility. I think both you and I have shared that same sentiment. Do we want to provide direction to staff for this year's budget? That they can be ready to present the Board a budget option for a decision next month.

Mark Heine - That would certainly be my motion.

Steve Akre – Ok.

Mark Heine – I am not sure where this is laying right now. If the County in particular is going to pay Fire District REDCOM fees in next fiscal year. They are going to need this data pretty quick.

Steve Akre - I am in agreement with that as well. Dave, Bryan, or Scott any disagreement or other options that you would like to present for a direction to staff on this issue.

Bryan Cleaver – I am in agreement as well. I am actually grateful that we can look at the short-term solution. While also starting to analyze the longer-term solution. I appreciate it.

Steve Akre - Thank you Bryan. KT, I think this does give you adequate and clear enough direction for this year's budget? Then we will look through the subcommittee at some of the other things and with Tandra on the base allocations and whatnot.

KT McNulty – Absolutely.

Steve Akre - Thank you.

KT McNulty - We didn't talk about the cost per call in the unmerged scenario it is going to go down by \$0.89 or 1.9%. In the merge scenario it will be the same. That is good news for this year.

Steve Akre - Consistency is good.

- d.) Discussion and direction on balance of Fire District fees not covered by Transient Occupancy Taxes. \$8,533.45 for FY 20-21 and \$113,479.85 for FY 21-22. Steve Akre - I think we brought this up at a previous Board meeting. If I recall correctly, I think that the sentiment of the Board, maybe not quite direction at that point. Sentiment was since these fees are born by

the Fire Districts that they should be paid by the Fire Districts and not use REDCOM reserves. We have both private entities as well as city paying into the reserve funds. These cost ought to be pushed back out to Fire Districts on a proportional level. With that kind of reconnection. I will open it up to the rest of the Board or KT if there is any difference of opinion or support of that.

KT McNulty - I just had a point of clarification. Which I think I brought up to you Steve. Is the TOT agreement that I have with the county says that they would be covered through 23-24 fiscal year. I wasn't sure whether they had severed that contract and are ceasing at the end of this cycle or if they are going to continue to pay through 23 -24.

Steve Akre - That is a great clarifying question, and I was going to bring that up. I guess this is as good a time as any to bring that up. I do not know the answer to that. I appreciate that you shared the agreement with me. I am certainly not a lawyer, but the way that I read that agreement, the only way that that agreement can be amended is by an agreement of this Board as well as the County. It cannot be unilaterally changed as far as I read it. As far as I know the County has not approached this Board at all with a request to stop that funding. That was an agreement between this Board and the County. As such, I believe that the County is obligated to pay our districts fees through 23-24 unless or until there is a request to negotiate an agreement from this Board to allow them out of that agreement.

KT McNulty - The reason why I ask, is that I was considering the opportunity or option to allow the districts to spread out these costs. If the funds are covered through 23-24 that would probably be the easiest time for them to repay these costs. Before they start assuming the entire fee for REDCOM annually.

Steve Akre - I agree.

Mark Heine – Steve, I agree with that. I think that is should be spread amongst the Member Districts. I think that this is the most equitable approach. I suspect quite frankly on the MOU it has probably just has been forgotten that the document exists on the County side. With all the discussions that has been focused around REDCOM fees as they attached to a proposed sales tax measure. I think everybody sort of lost track of what the history was and that that document exists. I think we have to reach out to County Administrator's office and just have that conversation

proactively. Just as a reminder, but I think we should spread these things out now.

Steve Akre - Thank you, Mark.

KT McNulty – Tambra, are you familiar with the document or would you like to review it?

Tambra Curtis – I would like to review it. I just want to add. Make sure you reach out before budget planning season which is pretty much now.

KT McNulty - Thank you.

Steve Akre – Any other Board Member comments? Hearing none. KT, you have direction for how to handle those 2 fiscal years shortages.

KT McNulty - Thank you.

Steve Akre -Thank you.

- d) Grant consulting cost update – Update and discussion on Glen Price Groups work and fees of \$4,668.13 – KT McNulty – The grants consulting group. Glen Price did produce 3 proposals for me for the recent SHGAP grants opportunity through the County. Since I wrote this agenda, I did get back that we were not awarded any of the grants. I wrote this agenda with optimism, I'm sad to report today that we did not gain anything from it. I just wanted to let you know that we did spend \$4,600 in consulting with Glenn Price Group for those three different proposals.

Steve Akre - Thank you. I would say well worth the opportunity. I wanted to say thank you to all your efforts to pursue grant funding. You mentioned one earlier in the meeting as well as these ones. Keep up the good work. I know that grant writing is a labor of love, and it does take a lot of extra effort to put in for every single one of those. Thank you.

KT McNulty - Thank you.

Steve Akre - Any other Board member comments on that topic? Hearing none.

e) Time sensitive spend authority – Discussion and Direction on authorizing the REDCOM Executive Director in conjunction with the REDCOM Chair a spending authority for a set amount of dollars for time sensitive needs (not associated with technology funds). - KT McNulty – This came about because of the Glen Price Group. The opportunities for grants come up so suddenly, that there is sometimes not time to wait for the next REDCOM Board of Director’s meeting or try to convene the Board to spend the money. I felt comfortable talking to Steve about spending that money because we had already discussed it as a Board and that was the direction, we wanted to go in. What I am looking for is permission to spend whatever you guys’ feel is appropriate to kind of set a boundary for me to spend money without having to convene the Board. It would only be for urgent time sensitive items such as grants.

Steve Akre – KT, do we have a purchasing and procurement policy that is existing?

KT McNulty - No

Steve Akre – Ok. I am absolutely in favor of this. I think that maybe a purchasing policy or procurement policy might not be a bad thing for us to have as an agency. Did you have a dollar amount that you were thinking?

KT McNulty - \$10,000 or less.

Steve Akre - I would absolutely be in support of that. I will open it up to the rest of the board for thoughts.

Bryan Cleaver – I feel that we have done this already. It may not be integrated necessarily in our bylaws. I feel like it may have been previous action item. As I recall there were discussions of \$40,000 to \$50,000 range particularly given that it would be with the Director and Chair. I am not suggesting that we go that way. I would like to see that we maybe research some of the prior Board actions. I do recall this having come up many times in the past and perhaps it does need to be incorporated either in contract or bylaws. I am in support for this coming with additional information to a future meeting with potential action item.

Steve Akre - Thank you Brian. KT, if I am remembering correctly, you did reach out to former Executive Director Abbott about this right?

KT McNulty – Yes, the only thing we do have is the authority to spend with in the Technology Funds. That is typically if something broke or something needs to be replaced.

Steve Akre - Thank you. Any other comments from Board Members. Hearing none. We can move this one forward KT. I am not tied to the \$10,000 either. I think many of us in our experiences as Executive Directors, have spending authority that is greater than that. I would ask you to really come back to the Board with something, maybe it is a purchasing procurement policy that spells out really what you think you might need. I would encourage you not to shoot below on that.

KT McNulty – Thank you.

Steve Akre – Welcome.

6. Old Business – Steve Akre – Old Business we have none.

Steve Akre - Before we get to our next meeting. I would like to open it up to see if there any round table. Either further agenda items, Items of interest or Good of the Order type of information to share from any of the Board Members first. Hearing none.

I have one thing to share kind of related to KT reminded me with the connectivity with WAZE. We Sonoma Valley Fire have contracted with WAZE alerts. We now have a transponder in our first out ambulances and engines. That connect into the WAZE system and provide alerts to anybody that has the WAZE app open in their vehicles that an emergency vehicle is approaching. It is not a two-way communication. The WAZE users cannot access that function, input or comment. They are not asked to. It is just a one-way information flow. We are pretty excited about being able to enter into that level of technology and be able to alert our communities when emergency vehicles are approaching. We did have a vehicle accident. Thankfully just very minor injuries with the with one of our responding ambulances going through an intersection and hit a civilian vehicle. We are excited to be able to go into this arena and hopeful that it does good things for our community.

KT McNulty - Does it tell private vehicles when they are approaching an emergency vehicle.

Steve Akre – Yes, I think it is when an emergency vehicle is within 1/4 mile of you. It gives you an alert. Dave did you have something you wanted to share.

David Crowl – We just took delivery of our new ambulance about 3 months ago. We decided to grant old the ambulance down to Timber Cove. Where we are still overseeing the upkeep of the ambulance. We got a training program for them down there. They are using it as a medical utility for a shelter in place, in a really bad situation, like what happened last year. They did not have an ambulance to respond in a timely manner and they took a patient in the back of a pickup truck to a helicopter zone. Now they are going to have an ambulance available to transport patients safely. We are looking to do that at both ends of our district. Right now we are just starting with Timber Cove. That is a great access to the improvement for our district.

Steve Akre - Good for you. Great partnership Dave. Mark, Scott, or Bryan?
Anything for Good of the Order.

Mark Heine – Nothing from me.

Bryan Cleaver - Nothing from me.

Scott Westrop - Nothing from me.

KT McNulty - I just have one more thing. I reached out to Santa Rosa Fire to get the DOAG and The Board Meetings scheduled in classrooms in the event that we should ever be allowed to return in person.

Steve Akre- Thank you! If no more items for the Good to the Order.

7. Next meeting will be – March 10, 2022, at 14:00, held virtually.
8. Adjournment- Motion to adjourn.- Motion adjourn made by Bryan Cleaver and Second, Mark Heine all in favor - Discussion – No Further comments – Approved unanimously @ 15:25.

FY 22-23 Preliminary Propose

COST OF PROVIDING SERVICES				
	AMR 21-22	AMR 22-23	% Change	\$ Change
	approved	draft		
Salaries - Dispatchers	\$ 2,196,569	\$ 2,245,942	2.25%	\$ 49,373
Salaries - Management & Admin	\$ 957,805	\$ 971,231	1.40%	\$ 13,426
Taxes	\$ 252,349.91	\$ 257,373.80	1.99%	\$ 5,024
Benefits	\$ 388,152	\$ 379,080	-2.34%	\$ (9,072)
Total Salaries, Benefits & Taxes	\$ 3,794,876	\$ 3,853,626	1.55%	\$ 58,751
Depreciation	\$0	\$1,000	#DIV/0!	\$ 1,000
Insurance	\$83,750	\$46,669	-44.28%	\$ (37,081)
Telecommunications	\$28,732	\$24,773	-13.78%	\$ (3,959)
Occupancy	\$1,000	\$1,000	0.00%	\$ -
External Training Resources	\$67,120	\$68,420	1.94%	\$ 1,300
Other Operating Expenses	\$15,000	\$15,000	0.00%	\$ -
General & Admin Expenses	\$98,596	\$93,096	-5.58%	\$ (5,500)
Total Operating Costs	\$ 4,089,073	\$ 4,103,584	0.35%	\$ 14,511

ed AMR Dispatch Services Contract Budget

Notes

18 FT, 5 PT, 3 Trainees, Fire Season Dispatcher mix of stright time and Overtime. - Increase for wage step increases and CBA wage increase (3% FY 22/23) -

9 Full Time Exempts - Increased 3% cost of living/ merit increase

Went from \$1098/month per FT Employee (includes 401K) to \$1170/month

Office furniture, AMR computers, etc. -

Liability and Workers Compensation - Decrease in workers compensation fees

Cell phones and Wireline Phones

General Cleaning supplies,coffee, etc.

EMD Training, Conventions, Etc., EMD QA/QI, EFD QA/QI, Seminars, Training, Travel.

Uniforms & Equipment

ACE Accreditation, First Watch, Criticall, Priority Dispatch, Copier, high speed internet, chair replacement. Increase in Pro-qa fees. Decrease in FirstWatch Fees.

REDCOM/AMR Contract Services Line Budget Details FY 22-23

- Salaries and Benefits – These are labor costs for all personnel, Exempt and Non-Exempt. Beginning on January 01, 2022, there was an additional 3% Union Collective Bargaining Agreement wage increase. For Exempt employees, there is a planned increase of 3% beginning in July 2022 for cost of living and merit. There are also the regular wage step increases. This budget includes the Fire Season shift line that was approved in the FY 21-22 budget. This was calculated as 12 hours a day, 7 days a week for 26 weeks with a 50/50 mix of overtime and straight time.

The FY 22-23 proposed budget, allows for the following Full Time Equivalent (FTEs):

- 18 Full Time Dispatcher/Call-takers (18)
 - 6 Part Time Dispatcher/Call-takers (0.5 FTE x 6 = 3 FTE)
 - 4 Dispatch supervisors
 - 1 Exempt Operations Manager
 - 1 Exempt Technical Services Manager
 - 1 Exempt Software System Administrator
 - 1 Full Time Administrative Assistant
 - 1 Executive Director
 - Fire Season Upstaffing
- Depreciation – These are depreciation and scheduled equipment replacement costs for AMR owned office equipment such as laptop computers, desktop computers and furniture. All current AMR equipment has been expensed or fully depreciated, therefore the monthly depreciation for FY 22-23 will be approximately \$1,000.
 - Insurance - This is the cost of the Liability Insurance and worker's compensation in the amount of \$46,669 for FY 22-23. This is down 44.28% from last FY. This is mainly due to no work-related injuries in the last reported time frame.
 - Telecommunications – This is the amount spent throughout the year on: Local, cellular, data networking and internet services lines and connections. There have been no changes for FY 22-23, the budgeted amount remains \$28,732.
 - Occupancy – This is the amount spent throughout the year on cleaning and sanitation supplies as well as tax on AMR owned office equipment. The Budgeted amount for FY 22-23 is \$1,000.
 - External Training Resources – Includes the costs of dispatch and call-taking initial and continuing training, Quality Assurance training, certification maintenance and the cost to attend conventions and seminars. The budgeted amount includes \$21,710 for EMD National Q and \$21,710 for EFD National Q. Each National Q cost is evaluated based on call volume. A total of \$10,000 is budgeted for employee continuing education and employee certifications. For Conventions and seminars \$15,000 is budgeted. For FY 22-23 a total of \$68,420 is budgeted.

REDCOM/AMR Contract Services Line Budget Details FY 22-23

- General and Administrative Expenses – In order to maintain Accredited Center of Excellence (ACE), these costs include Fire and Medical Dispatch Accreditation fees which are \$2,250 each, ProQA software (medical and Fire call-taking protocols) \$15,100 each, and Quality Assurance software. Other G&A expenses include, \$1,295 for recruitment testing software, \$3,600 for copier/scanner lease costs, and an additional \$10,000 in chair replacements. Budgeted amount for FY 22-23 is \$93,096.
- Other Operating Expenses – This has historically been budgeted each year to capture additional, unforeseen operational expenses and is based on historical costs. For FY 21-22, this was budgeted at \$15,000. For FY 22-23 that amount will remain the same at \$15,000.

Preliminary Budget FY 2022-23																				
Calendar Year	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	5-yr Average	% of Total Calls	2022-23 Contribution	Range	Base Fee Contribution	#####	Fire Season Dispatcher	2022-23 Member Contribution	Price Per Call by Agency	2022-23 Tablet Charge	2022-23 MDC Charge	2022-23 Aircards Charge	2022-23 Device Charges	Total Charges	
Cities and Districts																				
Bodega Bay FPD	630	550	730	646	601	631	0.60%	24,867.71	7	4,876.17	1.03%	1,995.02	31,738.91	50.27	3,054.38			3,054.38	34,793.29	
Cazadero CSD	104	107	110	101	143	113	0.11%	4,450.51	8	3,657.42	0.18%	357.04	8,464.97	74.91					8,464.97	
City of Healdsburg	1,776	1,632	1,783	1,665	1,793	1,730	1.65%	68,128.24	5	18,284.78	2.82%	5,468.82	91,878.63	53.12	2,290.79			2,290.79	94,169.42	
City of Petaluma	6,642	6,979	7,365	6,791	7,397	7,035	6.72%	277,065.86	3	36,589.56	11.46%	22,227.74	336,865.16	47.74	4,581.57			4,581.57	340,446.72	
City of Santa Rosa	26,773	27,485	28,048	26,884	27,492	27,136	25.92%	1,068,768.11	1	213,323.56	44.20%	85,742.42	1,367,834.10	50.41	9,277.43			9,277.43	1,377,111.53	
City of Sebastopol	1,056	1,080	1,195	1,070	1,119	1,104	1.05%	43,481.08	6	12,189.85	1.80%	3,468.29	59,189.22	53.59					59,189.22	
Coast Life Support	3,550	3,454	3,188	4,153	4,327	3,734	3.57%	147,079.48	4	24,379.70	6.08%	11,799.52	183,268.71	49.07	7,590.00	8,083.20	15,673.20	198,931.91		
CSA 40	755	869	873	760	914	834	0.80%	32,855.00	7	4,876.17	0.00%	37,731.17	37,731.17	45.23					37,731.17	
Dry Creek Rancheria	1,168	1,266	1,437	759	425	1,011	0.97%	39,818.27	6	12,189.85	1.65%	3,194.44	55,202.56	54.60					55,202.56	
Graton FPD	158	139	179	149	166	158	0.15%	6,230.71	8	3,657.42	0.26%	499.86	10,387.99	65.96	2,290.79			2,290.79	12,678.78	
Kenwood FPD	714	590	771	641	745	692	0.66%	27,262.32	7	4,876.17	1.13%	2,187.13	34,325.63	49.59	3,817.98			3,817.98	38,143.60	
Monte Rio FPD	284	250	295	249	283	272	0.26%	10,720.61	8	3,657.42	0.44%	860.07	15,238.09	55.98					15,238.09	
North Bay Fire -Gold Ridge FPD	492	483	624	564	763	585	0.56%	23,048.12	7	4,876.17	0.95%	1,849.05	29,773.34	50.88	2,290.79			2,290.79	32,064.13	
North Sonoma Coast FPD	1,175	1,108	1,244	2,368	2,273	1,634	1.56%	64,339.40	5	18,284.78	2.66%	5,161.66	87,785.83	53.74	18,342.62			18,342.62	106,128.45	
Northern Sonoma County (Geyserville)	325	274	321	297	340	311	0.30%	12,284.50	8	3,657.42	0.51%	963.93	16,905.84	54.29					16,905.84	
Occidental CSD	575	516	636	593	621	588	0.56%	23,168.28	7	4,876.17	0.96%	1,858.53	29,900.97	50.83	2,290.79			2,290.79	32,191.76	
Rancho Adobe FPD	321	302	361	297	379	332	0.32%	13,075.83	8	3,657.42	0.54%	1,049.01	17,782.26	53.56	2,290.79			2,290.79	20,073.05	
Scheil-Vista FPD	2,456	2,346	2,567	2,225	2,619	2,443	2.33%	96,201.89	5	18,284.78	3.98%	7,717.84	122,204.51	50.03	4,597.90			4,597.90	126,802.41	
Sheriff Helicopter	684	633	709	626	664	663	0.63%	26,120.16	7	4,876.17	1.08%	3,091.83	33,091.83	49.90	9,163.14			9,163.14	42,254.97	
Sonoma County Fire District	122	106	139	108	99	115	0.11%	4,521.40	8	3,657.42	0.00%	8,178.82	8,178.82	71.24					8,178.82	
Sonoma Valley Fire	10,662	9,470	9,793	9,100	9,671	9,619	9.19%	378,832.55	3	36,589.56	15.67%	39,393.62	445,815.73	46.35	6,888.69			6,888.69	452,704.41	
Timber Cove FPD	1,642	1,790	1,968	674	653	1,389	1.33%	54,721.57	6	12,189.85	2.26%	4,390.06	71,301.49	51.32	3,054.38			3,054.38	74,355.87	
Total Cities/Districts	61,881	61,590	64,637	59,876	63,719	62,341	59.54%	2,455,287		457,125.20	100.00%	193,978.00	3,106,390.03		74,232.02	7,590.00	8,083.20	89,905.22	3,196,295.25	
Private Providers						61,391.60														
Bells	3,663	3,731	3,766	3,549	4,139	3,770	3.60%	148,465.83	4	24,379.70		172,845.54	172,845.54	45.85		1,515.60	1,515.60	1,515.60	174,361.14	
Cal Star - Merged into REACH	11	15	28	15	27	20	0.02%	787.70	8	3,657.42		4,445.12	4,445.12	222.26					4,445.12	
Life West	357	350	290	373	563	381	0.36%	14,989.94	8	3,657.42		18,647.36	18,647.36	48.99					18,647.36	
REACH	97	114	121	132	114	116	0.11%	4,552.91	8	3,657.42		8,210.33	8,210.33	71.02					8,210.33	
SLS	36,834	37,521	40,268	36,779	38,995	38,079	36.37%	1,499,758.57	1	213,323.56		1,713,082.13	1,713,082.13	44.99	17,250.00	17,176.80	34,426.80	1,747,508.93		
Total Private Providers	40,982	40,982	41,731	44,443	40,852	42,365	40.46%	1,668,554.96		248,675.51		1,917,230.47	1,917,230.47		17,250.00	18,692.40	35,942.40	1,953,172.87		
Total All Agencies	102,843	102,552	106,368	104,319	104,571	104,706	100.00%	4,123,841.78		705,800.72		5,023,620.50	5,023,620.50		74,232.02	24,840.00	26,775.60	125,847.62	5,149,468.12	

Comparison to prior year													
2022-23 Member Contribution	2021-22 Member Contribution	21/22 & 22/23 \$ Inc/Dcr	21/22 & 22/23 % Inc/Dcr	2022-23 % of Total Calls	2021-22 % of Total Calls	2022-23 Increase %	2022-23 Device Charges	2021-22 Device Charges	21/22 & 22/23 \$ Inc/Dcr	21/22 & 22/23 % Inc/Dcr			
31,738.91	31,609.47	129.44	0.41%	0.60%	0.62%	-0.02%	3,054.38	1,195.20	1,859.18	156%			
8,464.97	8,218.09	246.88	3.00%	0.11%	0.10%	0.01%	-	-	-	-			
91,878.63	85,786.76	6,091.87	7.10%	1.65%	1.63%	0.02%	2,290.79	1,195.20	1,095.59	92%			
335,865.16	336,956.01	(1,090.85)	-0.32%	6.72%	6.63%	0.09%	4,581.57	11,952.00	(7,370.43)	-62%			
1,367,834.10	1,361,953.14	5,880.96	0.43%	25.92%	26.04%	-0.12%	9,277.43	43,902.00	(34,624.57)	-79%			
59,159.22	52,216.26	6,942.96	13.30%	1.05%	1.04%	0.01%	-	-	-	-			
183,258.71	182,973.61	285.10	0.16%	3.57%	3.50%	0.07%	15,673.20	15,673.20	-	0%			
37,731.17	38,261.57	(530.40)	-1.39%	0.80%	0.80%	0.00%	-	-	-	-			
55,202.56	63,401.27	(8,198.71)	-12.93%	0.97%	1.13%	-0.16%	-	-	-	-			
10,387.99	10,026.93	361.06	3.60%	0.15%	0.14%	0.01%	2,290.79	-	2,290.79	-			
34,325.63	32,703.60	1,622.03	4.96%	0.66%	0.64%	0.02%	3,817.98	-	3,817.98	-			
15,238.09	14,976.97	261.12	1.74%	0.26%	0.25%	0.01%	-	-	-	-			
29,773.34	25,238.83	4,534.51	17.97%	0.56%	0.48%	0.08%	2,290.79	-	2,290.79	-			
87,785.83	65,301.66	22,484.17	34.43%	1.56%	1.33%	0.23%	18,342.62	-	18,342.62	-			
16,905.84	16,097.57	808.27	5.02%	0.30%	0.28%	0.02%	-	-	-	-			
29,900.97	29,398.42	502.55	1.71%	0.56%	0.54%	0.02%	2,290.79	-	2,290.79	-			
17,782.26	17,129.93	652.33	3.81%	0.32%	0.30%	0.02%	2,290.79	-	2,290.79	-			
122,204.51	121,347.72	856.79	0.71%	2.33%	2.28%	0.05%	4,597.90	8,046.00	(3,448.10)	-43%			
33,091.83	32,456.54	635.29	1.96%	0.63%	0.64%	-0.01%	9,163.14	-	9,163.14	-			
8,178.82	8,361.69	(182.87)	-2.19%	0.11%	0.11%	0.00%	-	-	-	-			
445,815.73	451,903.11	(6,087.38)	-1.35%	9.19%	9.16%	0.03%	6,888.69	16,868.40	(9,979.71)	-59.16%			
71,301.49	77,907.28	(6,605.79)	-8.49%	1.33%	1.74%	-0.41%	3,054.38	-	3,054.38	-			
12,566.28	12,656.37	(90.09)	-0.71%	0.20%	0.20%	0.00%	-	-	-	-			
Total Cities/Districts	3,106,390.03	3,076,884.80	29,505.23				89,905.22	98,832.00	(8,926.78)				
172,845.54	171,278.63	1,566.91	0.91%	3.60%	3.50%	0.10%	1,515.60	1,515.60	-	0.0%			
4,445.12	4,272.86	172.26	4.04%	0.02%	0.02%	0.00%	-	-	-	-			
18,647.36	15,376.47	3,268.89	21.26%	0.36%	0.28%	0.08%	-	-	-	-			
8,210.33	8,116.35	93.98	1.16%	0.11%	0.11%	0.00%	-	-	-	-			
1,713,082.13	1,757,837.78	(44,755.65)	-2.55%	36.37%	36.80%	-0.43%	34,426.80	34,426.80	-	0.0%			
Total Private Providers	1,917,230.47	1,956,883.89	(39,653.42)				335,942	335,942	\$0				
Total All Agencies	5,023,620.50	5,033,768.69	(10,148.19)				1,235,848	1,324,774	(88,927)				

Base Call Budget Allocation	2% CPI	
Range	2021-22	2022-23
25,000+	\$ 209,141	\$ 213,324
15000-24999	\$ 179,264	\$ 182,849
4001-14999	\$ 35,853	\$ 36,570
2501-4000	\$ 23,902	\$ 24,380
1500-2500	\$ 17,826	\$ 18,285
1000-1499	\$ 11,951	\$ 12,180
501-999	\$ 4,781	\$ 4,876
1-500	\$ 3,586	\$ 3,657

"Call" Budget	Base "Call" Budget	Total "Call" Budget
\$4,123,842	\$705,801	\$4,829,643
Price per call	\$6.74	\$46.13
Increase Per Call from 21/22 (\$47.02)	-\$0.89	-1.9%

**REDCOM Budget
78401-66060100**

	Actual	Approved Budget	Preliminary Budget	Change Budgeted	% Change	
	FY 20-21	FY 21-22	FY 22-23	FY 21-22/ FY 22-23	FY 21-22/ FY 22-23	Notes on significant changes
Revenues						
42610 Graton Rancheria Contribution	200,000	-	-	-	N/A	
42627 Cities & Districts	2,380,042	3,092,263	3,106,390	14,127	0.5%	
44002 Interest on Pooled Cash	14,398	-	-	-	N/A	
45310 Private Ambulance Providers	2,232,219	1,941,505	1,917,230	(24,275)	-1.3%	
45507 MDC Air cards - Members	64,684	61,634	101,008	39,373	63.9%	
46040 Miscellaneous Revenue	6,916	-	3,818	3,818	N/A	
Total Revenues	\$ 4,898,259	5,095,403	5,128,446	33,043	0.6%	
Expenditures						
51061 Maintenance (Van)	-	-	5,000	5,000	N/A	
51025 Telecommunication Wireless Svc (Aircards)	67,025	71,168	26,776	(44,393)	-62.4%	Moving from MDC's to tablets
51041 Insurance	17,346	17,500	18,025	525	3.0%	Based on 20/21 Actuals plus recommended annual inc
51206 Annual Audit	11,420	18,000	18,000	-	0.0%	
51207 Fiscal Accounting Services	23,695	32,530	34,157	1,627	5.0%	
51209 SCPSC Operations	405,139	482,593	503,726	21,133	4.4%	
51211 Legal Counsel	4,830	15,000	7,500	(7,500)	-50.0%	
51225 Travel and Training	-	3,500	3,500	-	0.0%	
51226 Consulting Services	25,983	35,000	26,000	(9,000)	-25.7%	Based on 20/21 Actuals - Zen
51235 AMR Dispatch Contract	3,840,661	4,089,073	4,103,584	14,511	0.4%	
51235 Fire Season Dispatcher	-	193,978	193,978	-	0.0%	
51901 Telecommunication Data Lines	6,359	8,000	8,000	-	0.0%	
51902 Radio Services	27,121	17,813	20,000	2,187	12.3%	
51916 County Services	424	1,000	1,000	-	0.0%	
52111 General office expenses for JPA	1,617	500	500	-	0.0%	
52141 Equipment & Tools	144,777	-	-	-	N/A	
52142 SCPSC Shared Replacement Fund	52,570	57,748	62,651	4,903	8.5%	
52143 Software	-	52,000	96,050	44,050	84.7%	Pulse and Livemum Annual Maintenance
53103 Interest on LT Debt	5,455	-	-	-	N/A	Loan was paid off in 20-21
53402 Depreciation	134,127	225,000	225,000	-	0.0%	Based on current depreciation schedule
52142 Technology Fund Placeholder	-	-	75,000	75,000	N/A	Moved to budget so appropriations can be made avail:
59002 Advances	-	-	-	-	N/A	
59003 Advances clearing	-	-	-	-	N/A	
Total Expenditures	\$ 4,768,548	5,320,403	5,428,446	108,043	2.0%	
* Expenses funded by member contributions	\$ 4,628,966	5,095,403	5,128,446	33,043	0.6%	

Fund Balance Summary	FY 20-21	FY 21-22	FY 22-23
Beginning Fund Balance Available for Budgeting	\$ 1,223,105	1,669,318	1,578,446
Plus Revenues	\$ 4,898,259	\$ 5,095,403	5,128,446
Less Expenditures	\$ (4,768,548)	\$ (5,320,403)	(5,428,446)
Adjustments	\$ 316,502	134,127	216,314
Ending Fund Balance Available for Budgeting	\$ 1,669,318	1,578,446	1,494,760
17% Fund Balance requirement	\$ 810,653	\$ 904,469	\$ 922,836
Technology Improvement Restricted Funds	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000	\$ -
Excess Fund Balance over minimum balance	\$ 783,665	\$ 598,977	\$ 571,924

Moved into budget

REDCOM MDC Budget 78402-66060200	FY 20-21	FY 21-22	FY 22-23	FY 21-22/ FY 22-23	FY 21-22/ FY 22-23
44002 Interest on Pooled cash	4,274	-	-	-	N/A
47101 MDC/CAD Central Dispatch Contribution	-	7,277	5,954	(1,323)	-18.2%
45301 REDCOM MDC Replacement Fund Agency Specific	97,278	73,140	-	(73,140)	-100.0%
Total Revenues	101,552	80,417	5,954	(74,463)	
52141 REDCOM MDC/CAD Replacement Fund Central Site	11,183	7,277	5,954	(1,323)	-18.2%
52142 REDCOM MDC Replacement Fund Agency Specific	264,744	73,140	-	(73,140)	-100.0%
Total Expenditures	275,927	80,417	5,954	(74,463)	