



**Dispatch Operations Advisory Group
Regular Meeting**

Minutes

September 28, 2021 – 1:00 PM

Join by phone 1-323-886-6897 Conference ID number # 113 186 425 2

Email KT.McNulty@REDCOM-Fire.org to request web link

Present:

Spencer Andreis - Chair - Sonoma Valley Fire
Shepley Schroth-Cary – Vice Chair- Gold Ridge Fire
Ambrose Stevens - AMR Operations Manager
Travers Collins – Santa Rosa Fire Department
James Salvante - Coastal Valley EMS

Others Present:

KT McNulty- REDCOM Executive Director
Evonne Stevens -REDCOM Operations Manager
Ken Reese-REDCOM Comm. Manager
Marshall Tuberville
Andy Taylor
Abraham Stewart
Cody Bagley

Absent-

Brian York - CALFIRE

I. Call to Order Made by Spencer Andreis @ 13:00

II. Public Comment Period

In this time period, anyone may address the DOAG regarding any subject over which the DOAG has jurisdiction, but which is not on today's agenda. Individuals will be limited to a three-minute presentation. Members of the public will be given the opportunity to address the DOAG regarding items on the agenda at the time that the agenda item is taken up by the DOAG.

None

III. Approval of Minutes

- a) July 27th, 2021 Meeting Minutes - Spencer Andreis – Motion to approve minutes made by Traverse Collins and Second Ambrose Stevens – Discussion – No Further Comments – Approved unanimously.

IV. New Business

a) Discussion on Multi Incident Management Plans (MIMP) in SRA & LRA – KT McNulty – This is new to REDCOM. I would like to get the MIMP procedures into an SOP. We have had two incidents now. This is just mainly a discussion for SOP planning.

Spencer Andreis – Marshall if you wouldn't mind touching on the MIMP's so everybody understands. There are folks on the call that are not familiar with it.

Marshall Tuberville - It is designed for situations where there are multiple simultaneous occurrences of emergencies and standard deployment of resources that will rapidly deplete available resources. There has to be strategic dispatches, thinking about who goes where. It is like disaster planning but for smaller events. It is most often applied to lightning or Red Flag events. It is an alteration of some of the dispatch procedures like when we go into MCI levels. The simple version is like we did with the last lightning strikes. We can call it SOP 40 it is in policy already, to allow any agency to self-dispatch.

Spencer Andreis – I think some of the confusion was the incident naming convention. CALFIRE has 4 battalions in the west side 10, 11, 12, 13. If you get 3 or 4 lightning strikes and battalion 11 in the river. The first one is going to be 11-1, 11-2 so on, so forth. Then they follow up with GPS coordinates. It is something we can see that we can do a similar naming convention for anything in the LRA or as Marshall said multiple correlate that back to LRA side of things. Anybody have any other discussion points on it?

Shepley Schroth-Cary - I just ask that we use it in number of different ways maybe not completely. Storms is a good example and/or multiple fire events county wide. I have done it but never put a name to it. It makes a lot of sense to memorialize it in the policy.

Spencer Andreis – I agree. My thought is that we put CALFIRE'S policy that is specific to the Battalions and their naming convention into our policy, so it is common knowledge and everybody in the county understands it. We are going to cross the borders all the time and if you are assigned an incident 12.5 you know you are going Battalion 12 and it is incident 5 and then follow that up by lat/long or border location potentially. However, for us we are going to have to define it a little further it is not as easy because we have a large geographic area and maybe we could curtail off of their policy and mark it with in something in our regions and department zone sort of speak that it could be a workably document for us Sonoma County Fire Agency to utilize in unison.

Marshall Tuberville - Obviously there could be a policy for it as Spencer and Shepley are saying. I think in the more near term the lightning event we had a few weeks ago. CALFIRE is on the verge talking about an event and there should be some coordination with REDCOM just like any other event areas. I think that is more of a short-term that the REDCOM Duty Officer or Duty-Chief or operator coordinator has some ability that we are going away from

standard REDCOM procedure and all CALFIRE's guidance to whatever which may also apply to the LRA.

Spencer Andreis – To give you a little background, last year in the 2020 lightning we actually did that. I was the Duty Officer and of course the first strike was in my Battalion in the LRA. Immediately upon my arrival I initiated just that. The RDO or the Op Area Coordinator has that ability to do that immediately and just basically turn everything into a Fire Investigation which is a single engine response until first units' arrival, and should they need additional they will make that request.

Spencer Andreis - I think again every situation is going to be different. Like last year it was dry with no rain, and we had multiple fire starts where this most recent event was just half a dozen or so. I think that language can easily be added to the policy given that discretion and part of that planning processes more than likely we are going to be some sort of a red flag and the be there and whoever assigned RDO can quickly or even the REDCOM Supervisor can start initiating that practice right away once the lightening starts.

Spencer Andreis – Does anybody else have any comments, thoughts?

Just thinking outside the box. Do we take what CalFire has and integrate in a manner that works for our county and the LRA side of things? I don't know just a thought for everybody.

KT McNulty – I think that would be good. Are we saying that we are allowing our supervisors to make the decision if needed?

Spencer Andreis - I would like to give multiple options as we do in many of these policies where it could be the RDO or Operating Coordinator or Supervisor. That can make that immediate change to on the fly to Dispatches. What I can do is start taking the existing CALFIRE MIMP plan and make it a joint policy we can integrate it into our policies.

KT McNulty - I like that. The other thing is for extended periods like the floods and where we sent out a dispatcher and just handed the dispatcher all the incidents on the river. That worked out great and helped keep the burden of the main 911 center.

Spencer Andreis - I think that if we are talking lightning. That is easy for an isolated area. But if we are talking about county wide then it is tough to do so something like that.

James Salvante - Just one comment. I know that there was someone that said that there is nothing written down that talks about modifying the EMS dispatch to only be handling ambulances when there is a low fire system. I am happy to work with whomever to formalize that as official process, so nobody feels like they are acting alone.

Spencer Andreis - I guess we could put that in this policy or if there were another policy that would better suit that.

Marshall Tuberville - I think it is written somewhere. I am going to look at SOP 4. I believe it is somewhere where REDCOM can kind of whatever they need to do. There is some type of clause policy.

Spencer Andreis – I would say that needs to be in coordination with the EMS officer, REDCOM Duty Officer and the REDCOM supervisor to make that call, versus just being the REDCOM Duty Officer or REDCOM Supervisor. There needs to be a unified approach when we go to ambulance only dispatches.

James Salvante – Thank you!

Spencer Andreis – I will put that on my to do list. I am thinking this will be more of a winter project and hopefully get this back to the group in a draft form at our January meeting realistic normally we historically cancel November meeting which will be taking about next. Any other discussion on the MIMP plan? I appreciate everyone's input.

- b) Approval of the 2022 DOAG meeting Schedule - Spencer Andreis- Motion to approve made by Shepley Schroth-Cary and Second Spencer Andreis – Discussion – No Further Comments – Approved unanimously.

V. Work Group Reports/ Sub Committees

Work Groups developing dispatch implementation recommendations will present reports to the DOAG. The DOAG may take action on information contained in the reports.

- a) Dispatch Steering Committee (EMD or EFD topics) – None
- b) Radio – Spencer Andreis - I think a lot of that is going to fall under SOP 5. The one thing I would like to ask is for an update on Control 3 and maybe any background on Control 4 as I think we are still not out of the woods with that.

KT McNulty – Control 3 has been upgraded and two additional towers have been added. That project is complete. However, there is still an option to have Control 3 go to all the towers but that will cost about \$300,000 to make it county wide. I don't have an update on Control 4. Kenny do you have that.

Ken Reese – I don't not have an update on Control 4.

Spencer Andreis – It gave us some problems this weekend. It seems like there is a hit and miss intermittent on calls just to give you heads up. I am not sure what the actualization was this weekend.

KT McNulty- I know once we knew there was a problem, the radio techs were able to quickly deal with it. I didn't hear what the actual issue was.

Ken Reese - What typically ends up happening it is Sleepy and Sonoma are fighting against each other and they have to turn the power down on one and turn it up on another and for whatever reason the next time they go through and do some sort of maintenance then they have to reverse it. I have a note to ask them for an update on there.

Spencer Andreis – KT, I have a question on Control 3 coverage. It seems like it is a lot

better county wide. Has there been testing? I know out here I can actually hear it. I have not tried to transmit on it. It seems the coverage like at least county wide that if we had to utilize it in other areas of the county that we historical haven't.

KT McNulty – They have not tested past the normal boundaries as far as I know. They did create the coverage map for it. Which it does reach out a little bit further than it did before. I don't think that they tested the boundaries further than that.

Spence Andreis - Did the FCC sphere of influence change with the upgrade, Before there was a very small definitive really kind of just border ran around the city of Santa Rosa and Oakmont and I think if I remember correctly it might of touch Windsor. Did that expand out to where legally we can potentially use it or is that something that would have to happen with the upgrade if we opted to do that?

Ken Reese – That is a good question as well. I know that when we were talking about increasing that, there was I discussion about the licensing. The licensing would be whatever the power distance would be coming off of each mountain top about were the saturation area would end of being. I think that is a fair question to ask Russ. It may very well be considering changing or expanding what is on Control 3 verse what is on Control 4 or Control 2 on any given incident, as a standard.

Spencer Andreis – If I correctly remember Tac, Control 3, Tac 5, and Tac 9 were all kind of confined at the same level. It would be nice to plan to potentially go to the Board for funding to enhanced that or is it still to be determined?

KT McNulty – I am still looking for grant money to complete that. Ahead of the Control 3 project is still the Control 2 and 4 upgrade project and that is to replace all the equipment. The cost for Control 2 and 4 projects will be \$261,000.

Spencer Andreis - Any other thoughts or questions or discussion on Radio?

Ken Reese – It is not necessary a Radio thing. Just to let you know that the Tango Tango app is all up and functioning we are just in the process of moving some Radios so next week will start making contact with all the agencies and get the licensing out and get the people registered to be able to use that on their mobile devices. Make some other concessions for those agencies that want to expand on that use or more licensing that what we have they can certainly can self-pay and we can put them into our account. There are things coming up more on the horizon stuff that we have done on all the testing. Will have more information out next week.

Spencer Andreis - Thank you! Moving on to SOP's. Start with SOP5. Marshall has been working very diligently since our last meeting. Looks like the policy is pretty much done. A big thank you for updating that and I'll turn it over to Marshall.

c) SOP- Training

- o SOP 5 Radio Channel Line-Up and Use - Update work – Marshall Turbeville - not sure if you want to me share the policy. The only thing left I ran it by Russ from Sonoma County Communication the only person left would be Brian York at the lesser used CDF tactical frequency and Brian York is on vacation right now. Everything else should be pretty good. I will still continue to reread it and proof it for technical points. Some of the stuff region zones if you want to be consistent. Channel versus frequency just how we say that..

Spencer Andreis- Thank You and appreciate all your efforts on this. Any thoughts or questions on SOP 5. What I was hoping to do it can approve the policy and then if there are any subtle changes will just change them and update policy on the website. If the group is good with it.

Ken Reese - I can't really see that. I do see what tone it has for the different channels more so on the map. Do you have something because we keep asking Radio Shop for the CTSS frequencies for each of our channels of which mountain top is using which. They changed all the tones and the PL frequencies at one point in time and nobody seems to have any good document anymore. Not sure if you have one or not?

Marshall Tuberville - I can ask Russel. I had a lot of that stuff back in the Dennis Smiley day I just haven't kept up on it. Between the State and County tax.

Ken Reese - I see the transmit tone on REDCOM. I see the transmit and receive. Say if you have Victor 6 Jackson. What is the tone for that or what is the PL for Jackson for Victor 6? Is the Jackson PL tone the same for all channels regardless of what channel is using Jackson is it all 162 dot whatever?

Marshall Tuberville - For the voted system its mostly tone 5 (146.2). For Victor 6 it varies, for instance, Sonoma Race Way is different, it's not consistent, it's not the same for every mountain top.

Ken Reese - That holds true. We have people in this county that have portables and radios that are not tone selectable. Say for Motorola 1550 or 1250 or something like that. There may be some of the EMS agencies end up using. They want to program radios to be able to talk on those frequencies. They would have to program as Victor 6 Jackson. Victor 6 Track, Victor 6 Bodega whatever it happens to be because they cannot tone select them and not knowing what the actual PL tone is, then they are going to have difficulty programming it correctly. That is the only reason I ask.

Marshall Tuberville - That is all I have on SOP 5.

Spencer Andreis - Thank you Marshall I appreciate. Were the ambulance faster channels in there by chance?

Marshall Tuberville - No, and there are other frequency like REDCOM has been using the county wide frequency which is UHF those are not in there either.

Spencer Andreis - I am thinking James chime in please. I think maybe we put a section. Like for us we have 2 loads our ambulances get an additional load with all the faster channels. I wonder it might be a good idea.

James Salvante - I think that would be a great idea Spencer.

Ken Reese - We have a list of those (re: faster and hospital channels) and PL we can always provide those to get it in there and edit.

Spencer Andreis - I think we are already there the time has come. Would you mind maybe just adding addendum to the exciting policy for ambulance providers and we can just add all the common hospitals in the area and the closer, Kaiser Vallejo some of those, Marin General some of those that the providers that would be more prudent to be responding to and add it into the policy.

Ken Reese – Yes

Marshall Tuberville - The other thing to put on the ICS217 form. Because that is what the fire scope back radio protocol has. That way other agencies coming in would know that form too. That is the issue of trying to fit it into a policy verses a standardized form. Some of that stuff Telecom use to have it in a 217 form.

Spencer Andreis - Any other discussion on SOP 5? We are looking to making an approval on this. In addition to the faster channels and maybe a few edits that Marshall comes up with along the way. Looking for a motion.

Motion to approve made by James Salvante and Second Spencer Andreis – Discussion – No Further Comments – Approved unanimously.

Marshall Tuberville - Now that it has been approved. I was debating was the title of the policy should it change? In the original intent (it goes back to Bart Lewis days) everyone should have the same frequency load so you can jump into someone else's fire unit or ambulance and we are so far from that. So should we take out the word line up and just say REDCOM or County of Sonoma Radio System or it make it more general. It doesn't have to be in stone. Just debating it we should change the title. I am good as is approved.

Spencer Andreis - I will take a look at it and see if I can come up with something a little more general or broad. Again, thank you all your efforts on this. Really appreciate.

KT McNulty - Thank you Marshall.

Marshall Tuberville - I pasted some stuff in the chat 8.7 and 40.2. For the REDCOM modification Dispatches.

[9/28/2021 1:14 PM] Marshall Turbeville

8.7 After completing the Pre-Alert broadcast, REDCOM shall review the CAD unit recommendation for the incident. The Dispatcher may modify the unit selection based on additional information or circumstantial factors.

[9/28/2021 1:19 PM] Marshall Turbeville

40.2 During storm or disaster situations, the REDCOM Supervisor is provided the authority to modify the dispatch of non-emergency calls for any member agency, in order to provide for effective resource utilization throughout Sonoma County. Such decisions should be communicated to the duty officer of affected agencies immediately.

Spencer Andreis – Ok

Marshall Tuberville - 40.2 would work if you take out the word non-emergency. That would get full discretion.

Spence Andreis - Moving on to SOP 18

- o SOP 18 Requesting Additional Resources – Spencer Andreis – The big changes to this policy we worked on back in March was the later “All Call” version. Everything that is in green has been changed since then. There is couple of language items as well as request from the requestor for potentially initiating this as an option for your incident. Inclusive of making a Control Channel the channel to respond units on. This was a big change and obvious for those who don’t know this. This policy came fresh out of 2017 everybody that was around knows that are control channels were absolutely inedited. I believe post Glass we looked at having this option of utilizing a separate control channel for initiating that. The emphasis was that we didn’t have a later version now it is more of less than a strike team per region concept at first. Then you have the latitude of going the full big Red Button and that is pretty much anybody and everybody available that agencies that are willing to send go. Prior to this policy we did back in March it was just that. It was the big Red Button. As we have seen in the Kincade we had 60 plus resources responding to a staging area. Everybody can imagine the Control Channel operator not only running the incident but being overly inundated. We look at how we make this easier for dispatchers and we looked at exclusively putting a separate Control Channel so we could have the incident on Control 2 we are going to do the All Call and have everybody respond on Control 4. That was the mind set we were operating on until we have now this later version. That control channel operator should have the capacity to be able to handle any subsequent request if we do this later version first. This way you are not going to be inundated by so many resources maybe 10-15 maybe 20 at the most. Ultimately for accountability purposes, it is all going to be assigned to that incident. With that under 18.9.2.3. We have that clause in there. If the primary

control Channel is being severely impacted with radio traffic. The REDCOM supervisor has the discretion to create an event that is separate. Otherwise it is going to stay status quo meaning they would respond on the original control channel that is assigned to the incident. Any thoughts, questions, discussion on that?

Travers Collins - I know on the September 6th, fires there was a separate incident number cut to get resources to staging. I don't know if that was you Spencer behind the scenes. Rather than being all attached to Kincade it would be a whole separate like a preposition event number is that what you are thinking?

Spencer Andreis - These are going to be assigned to the incident. If I go for a 3 region All Call. They are going to be assigned to Control 4. They are going to status no differently than they would as an initial attack resource. That way they are assigned to that incident. Now if we are doing something inclusively as staging or preposition that is totally different. Is that what you are eluding to?

Travers Collins – One of the dispatchers that night created a separate Agency Assist. I don't think there was a strike team deployment. To get stuff to Dry Creek 101. Unattached to a specific incident to get stuff to the area.

Spencer Andreis - That is because you had multiple incidents. That absolutely would be appropriate and that is kind of one of those off the wall. It is different versus when we have one incident going. That is still obviously in place should the incident or incidents or where we are exercising the MIMP plan, and we need to get a staging area established. We are going to start deploying resources to multiple incidents within a certain area for lightening or something that would absolutely work. Ultimately this language would give that discretion to the dispatch center, supervisor, RDO to do either or base it around the scenario they are given.

Travers Collins – Got it, was just making the comment.

Ken Reese – They can always cross reference the incident numbers together so they both reference each other for tracking purposes.

Spencer Andreis - Yes, any other comments, thoughts on that portion? The other thing I discussed yesterday with KT, Kenny and Evonne. We are asking, rather than putting this on the dispatcher to figure out the closest 3 regions. If you feel in this scenario that the requestor would identify that and obvious a lot of it is going to be geographically driven. Where your incident is located North, South, East and West. What is going to be your closest region to support your incident. We are asking that whomever the requestor is identify the zones they would like to response as part of their request. Any questions, thoughts on that?

Marshall Tuberville – My comment is not specific to what you are saying Spencer. My thought of the intent of what this policy was even prior to 2017. It is basically there is a major disaster in this county everyone should go to the next level of being prepared or support their neighbors. Volunteer call backs, staff up additional staff be on standby to be deployed and what this has turn into. This is a deployment plan and

for stations that are staffed this is great they are out the door within seconds or minutes. We still do not have a system to call back like Timber cove, call back volunteers to say go pack your stuff. REDCOM has only one engine available and now you can stack 3 engines. Get in the system to go available. Don't just respond, everybody just go get in the game and be in the system and stand by and be ready to be assigned. That still needs to stay in here or somehow be included. This is a call back mechanism for agencies that don't have crew sense or other software or text messaging as an option. Places like Timber cove with no cell phone coverage. They have to come back to their station and standby for your assignment or cover your own zone. Under the supervision of the Op Area or REDCOM duty. I think that still needs to be in here as one of the uses of the one call.

Spencer Andreis - I agree and I think part of it we are still using that one singular page and if not, it will tone out of these 5 stations. We are still going to keep the All-Call page inclusively for this. It is also getting everybody else in the county ready; "Hey we have this expanding incident in this area start getting ready. Start heading to your stations. Your zone A potentially could be next and then B" We still have that ability for that incident to hit the Big Red Button. After you have exhausted the 6 regions that are predetermined to get anybody and everybody going to the incident. Are you looking for more so on verbiage? I know, I articulated that out in our Chiefs group and Ops groups in our last few meetings as we discuss this. That is not concrete in writing that is kind of intent at least from my thought on how I wrote it. If I need to be more specific by all means I can.

Marshall Tuberville – I am not a dispatcher but, in this protocol, you would not hit the all call you would hit individual agencies to response or whatever resource.

Spencer Andreis – You are still going to do the All Call then the voice over is going to be Region 7,8,9 Kenwood Station 1 Engine 6, Sonoma Station 2 and 3, Shell Vista etc. It is still going to be that singular tone. That way again it is keeping more or less that situational awareness for everybody else in the County to know that. This is going on you could be next we could go big Red Button and it is everybody all hands-on deck.

Marshall Tuberville – That is fine then.

KT McNulty – The other things we changed are some of the stations that we had in place due to equipment changes.

Spencer Andreis –The emphasis behind the stations here are the cross-staffing ability. I would say the majority of the identified station have type 3's, type 1's maybe types of water tenders. The idea is based on the incident type 1 or type 3 preferred depending on the type of incident. That was the methodology I used when we chose these stations along with getting by in with the input from the Chief Officer from the agencies. I did change Santa Rosa so like Region 3 was Santa Rosa Station 7 now it is 6. It is because they put their Type 3 in service. Adding Station 11 under region 7 now that they have a type 3 as well. Those are pretty much the 2 changes for the resources. We took County Station 9 out so that was there is some coverage out in the river if we would exhaust region 5. Any other thoughts, questions, or concerns on this policy?

Looking for a motion to amended SOP 18.

Motion to approve made by Traves Collins and Second James Salvante – Discussion – No Further Comments – Approved unanimously.

d) CAD /Back-Up - None

VI. Old Business

a) Discussion on returning to in person meetings. - KT McNulty - Leaving this on the agenda until we are allowed to return to in person meetings. There have been no changes since our last DOAG meeting. I am going to book mark the downstairs conference for our 2022 schedule.

Spencer Andreis – Sounds good

VII. Announcement Items from the Membership – Conduct a round table of members

Spencer Andreis - Opening it up for discussion.

KT McNulty - We have received a MOU from DEM to provide a data feed to watch duty. However, I am hesitant to grant that without the full support from our fire community. I have been getting various complaints from different agencies about the way that app is being run and the information that is regurgitated through the app to the public. I wanted to get your input on moving forward or not moving forward and taking it to the Board of Directors.

Spencer Andreis - Is there specific information like if we look at Tablet Command or apps we have on our phones where it gives call details RP information is that the feed.

KT McNulty - The data they would receive would be fire incidents, locations and it would be the same as Pulse Point. They would get information about medical calls but not the address or any specific just that there is a medical aid occurring in the area. The fire incident would be specific address there would be no call details on that either.

James Salvante – KT why are they after medical info? I thought this was for wildfire.

KT McNulty – They have asked for the same data as Pulse Point is receiving. They have not specifically said give us Medical so we can potentially just leave that off.

James Salvante – From an EMS agencies perspective. I feel really uncomfortable providing medical call information in general. With Pulse Point there is a reason for it. We have an arrangement Save Life Sonoma we are all engaged. I know nothing about the Watch Duty organizations.

KT McNulty - That is part of my concern. These are private citizens wanting to create something to replace Pulse Point.

Spencer Andreis – I know there was some concerns as of late with some of the fire incidents and some of the information as far as like fire progress being stopped. How are they getting that information if it is similar to Pulse Point?

Kt McNulty – They do not have a data feed at all right now. What they are doing is they have someone scanning the radio and regurgitated through the app what they are hearing on the radio. Not all these people are in the industry so they may not be understanding all the terminology that they are putting out to the public. The major issue last week is that someone said over the radio that the Sheriff's department would be handling the evacuations and then Watch Duty turned around and put out to the public that evacuations were in progress. Which was not accurate. The other thing that concerns me about the app that they are encouraging the public to go to the scene of the incident to take pictures.

Spencer Andreis – That goes against everything that we want of the public and it sounds to me the more we give into this group, the more we are enabling them and providing absolutely false information and potentially, if they are encouraging that is no way shape or form our intent. I would say there is no way should we be supporting it whatsoever.

James Salvante – They are tornado chasers to me. They are exuberant, and they put out a lot of information. They don't have any accountability. They always try to look at a site to see what was there and there is just nothing. At first, I thought there was something official this is great. I am getting a lot of updated information and then a little more research. You don't know who they are. Kind of pulling back from supporting them.

Spencer Andreis - I am with James. I would say I don't support signing any type of MOU. They absolutely have a platform as a public member now as a public with Pulse Point and the different apps for radios traffic so sounds like they have enough but beyond giving them anymore. I would not be in support either.

James Salvante - I am kind of surprised DEM has supported them on that basis. I got to figure that DEM would be pretty risk adverse when comes to putting information in their hands of people that are not accountable for what they do with it.

KT McNulty - I am not sure if DEM is fully aware of what is going on. I know that they were in support of the project before the app was even fully developed. I don't know if their opinion would change now.

James Salvante - Maybe it would be worth having a talk with them now. Do they know what they are really asking for?

KT McNulty – Yes, I can do that.

Spencer Andreis – Anyone else have any thoughts on that? I would say. Are you looking for a collective group consensus from us to take to the Board is that what I am kind of gathering?

KT McNulty – We can't take action on this item because it was not agenized. I was just looking for your opinions.

Spencer Andreis – I think unless anybody difference of opinion, you have it.

KT McNulty – Thank you. I appreciate it.

Spencer Andreis – Anybody have anything else? One thing I will bring up is that historically based on the next meeting being the week of Thanksgiving week we usually cancel since we have covered all the big ticket items with I the last few meetings. I am guessing we are going to have little to talk about in November. Unless anybody has any heartache, I would say let's cancel the next meeting. Unless something comes up that needs immediate attention. If the group concurs.

KT McNulty – One more item before we close out. It came up the other day for the Sebastopol fire to initiate move ups. We really don't have that in place for more of a handful of agencies. I wanted to start work on a County wide move up matrix.

Spencer Andreis – We do. There is a policy. I did it a couple of years ago. Maybe it didn't make it REDCOM. Let me dig it up and will talk offline.

KT McNulty – What we do have in place the dispatchers are successful in quickly initiating the move ups. If we had that tool for the rest of the county it would very helpful.

Spencer Andreis – I did something. I could of swore we got it in policy. Maybe we didn't. It was kind of the must covers and we kind of identified geographical area. It may not be this station but at least we a good coverage level to cover multiple districts. At least it is a starting point. Especially drawn down certain region or area. I will dig that up and then we can work on getting that in policy form.

KT McNulty – Thank you.

Shepley Schroth-Cary - I just wanted to add as part of that policy, the move up is not initiated by the incident commander. Some confirmation that the commander is aware of the move up is being initiated added to the policy. While appreciate that somebody is thinking and covering you. It can also be frustrating to some of these folks that things are happening without them knowing about it.

KT McNulty – Good point.

Spencer Andreis – We do have it in policy it is SOG 5. Fire drawdown guidelines. It is all there. It has all the stations at the time. It does need some updating.

If no one has anything else. Will adjourn the meeting and plan on canceling the November 23rd, 2021 meeting. Unless something comes up.

Next Meeting November 23, 2021 13:00 on Teams

VIII. Adjournment: Spencer Andreis adjourned meeting @ 14:03