



**Dispatch Operations Advisory Group
Regular Meeting**

Agenda

September 27, 2022 – 1:00 PM

In person at Santa Rosa Fire Department
Training Tower
2126 West

College Ave Santa Rosa, CA 95403 or
Hybrid

Join by phone 1-323-886-6897 Conference ID number # 905 616 744#
Email Evonne.Stevens@gmr.net to request web link

I. Call to Order

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.

III. Approval of Minutes

- a) July 26, 2022, Meeting Minutes - Spencer Andreis

IV. New Business –

- a) Summer Swift Water Event Type – Ron Bush discussion – Action motion to approve
- b) Agency 360 Training Program - Update - Evonne Stevens

VI. 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)
EIDS Tool During EMD – Evonne Stevens – Pending Medical Director Approval - Discussion
- b) EMD and EFD for Cloverdale – Evonne Stevens – Discussion
- c) Radio – Ken Reese
 - 1. New Repeater Sites
 - 2. Update Station Alerting Issues
- d) SOP- Training
- e) CAD /Back –up – Ken Reese
 - 1. Tablet Command
 - 2. Response Plan changes with the Sonoma County Fire Districts
 - 3. Genesis Pulse

f) Tiered Response-

1. Report out and Discussion on any updates from the Tiered Response Task Force meetings - Shepley Schroth-Cary and James Salvante

VII. Announcement Items from the Membership

Conduct a roundtable of members

Next Meeting November 22, 2022, at 13:00 hybrid on teams and in person

Adjournment:



**Dispatch Operations Advisory Group
Regular Meeting**

Minutes

July 26, 2022 - 1:00 PM

Join by phone 1-323-886-6897 Conference ID number # 657 865 179#

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
Nica Vasquez – CALFIRE
James Salvante – Coastal Valley EMS

Others Present:

KT McNulty - AMR Executive Director
Brenda Bacigalupi – REDCOM Administrative Assistant
Evonne Stevens - REDCOM Operations Manager
Ken Reese - REDCOM Comm. Manager
Andy Taylor
Chad Costa
Cody Bagley
Doug Williams
Sundari Mase
Steve Suter
Abraham Stewart

I. Call to Order - Made by Spencer Andreis at 1301

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) January 25, 2022, Meeting Minutes - Spencer Andreis
Motion to approve minutes made by James Salvante and

Second Ambrose Stevens – Discussion – No Further Comments – Approved unanimously.

IV. **New Business**

a) Presentation of the FY Q4 REDCOM Director's report. – KT McNulty –

Operational - REDCOM continues to maintain their Ace Accreditation for EMD. We did experience a small dip in EFD. Evonne did a really great job at developing some center wide trainings and then working on some individual trainings for certain folks. We are now showing some improvement now that the trainings have been completed.

Staffing – Upper Management: Technical Services and Operations Manager are all filled. Recruitment for Executive Directors still in process

Supervisor - All 4 positions filled. We have a new supervisor out of San Francisco that we are very excited about her name is Jasmine.

Full Time Dispatchers – Seventeen out of our eighteen full-time positions are filled.

Part Time Dispatchers – All positions are filled.

Operations Updated - Spencer and Evonne did a great job doing some pre fire season trainings. They did an active status review, SOP 28, SRA/MTZ review, Sop 18, and additional resources. We also for the first time since we went live with IROC. We had a full course training for our IROC users, and we have a couple of new users as well. We are very happy about that.

We continue to do quarterly wireless emergency alert training .

Technology Update -

Genesis Pulse - We have been talking about it now for two years. We are finally on the verge. Kenny, do you want to provide any update on that?

Ken Reese - Yes, we currently have the data feed going from the CAD system to Genesis Pulse. We are now just tightening up the information that they are receiving and cross checking against resources that we have in the system. We are installing additional monitors now. We have to work with the county on web access from the CAD systems that should not be an issue. They lost a team member over at that ISD department, so we are a little bit behind from that standpoint. I would venture to say sometime next week or week after we should start being able to see what you can see on the screen there. Then start coming up with some dates for training and start some discuss internally with management to see exactly how we are going to use it and what we are going to use it for. That is where we are at.

KT McNulty – The program as you can see the image over here on the left that is real time WAZE data. Not only are we going to have real time traffic in REDCOM for the first

time. We will be able to see accidents as they are report by WAZE users. WAZE is saying that they are getting reports 10 mins ahead of CHP report. We are hoping to get head start on these accidents. It also has advanced location services and medical history of cell phone users if it is available. It really brings in a new system status element that we have been lacking. We are pretty happy about it.

The REDCOM Communication van is fully outfitted and ready for use. Kenny and Nick and radio Rick did an excellent job getting it all together. We are still looking for funding for a wrap on the vehicle because it is still awful looking. It does run well.

Call Trends - Nothing too crazy to report out except we have seen an uptick in overall call volume this year over the last two years. That may be in part, due to the pandemic. I know a lot of people were not calling 911 when they truly did need the 911 service.

Average Call Duration – Nothing of note there.

Contractual Performance - We continue to excel in our call answer times. Well above the 90% standard. As well as our call dispatching times. We continue to be on point with that. These next couple of graphics just represents the data that we just showed you above.

Exemption Reasons – I would like to have an open dialogue conversation about how we are reporting this out currently. Right now in the Director's report just saying the counts. I was wondering if there was a different way, we want to look at this that would be more meaningful. I would like to open that up for discussion. That is the end of my report.

James Salvante - KT, can I ask you a question just a few slides back. You do not have to go back. It was about the medical information. How is that coming into the Genesis Pulse system?

KT McNulty – When a user sets up their new phone. They will be able to put their medical information into their phone as well as their emergency contact information. That information will now be broadcast into the REDCOM Dispatchers. Where this might help us a lot when we get a 911 call for someone that cannot identify themselves and we have their phone data. We will be able to identify who they are.

James Salvante – That is fantastic. I have seen the option on the phone. That makes sense now. Thank you.

KT McNulty – I would like to do public outreach campaign to let the community know that it is optional now and available and why it is so important to us.

James Salvante – That might be a good thing to bring up with Save Life Sonoma. Maybe that could a part of the messaging too.

Spencer Andreis - KT, how is summertime staffing looking? I know in early June we did are normal summer enhancing staffing the center. Is it filling in on regular basis and is it being effective?

KT McNulty - Unfortunately not, because we are down that fulltime dispatch position. The fire season shifts are often not getting picked up.

Ken Reese - I was just wanting to just touch bases back on Geniuses Pulse. I just wanted to mention. All that data you are talking about on the medical stuff. That will be flowing in throughout the Rapid SOS which we technically have access to now. We had to do individual look ups. Now it will be real time. I did a review of one hundred plus 911 callers not one of them had medical information. Rapid SOS provided me with community outreach information. Which I recently received. I will get together with you all and share that.

KT McNulty – That would be great. The other thing that Geniuses Pulse has that I did not mention. If a user has a medical alarm subscription and the phone number, they dial 911 and it matches the alarm companies phone number. Then we can get that data as well.

Chad Costa - I would like to ask a quick question. I am curious if this has anything to do with CAD recommend since it has live traffic data?

KT McNulty - We will not be using it for the primary CAD recommend. We would still just do that out of CAD. What it does give us that we are lacking right now is if the unit clears or becomes available and it is closest to the incident it will alert us to that.

Chad Costa – Thank you.

Ken Reese - Looking for closest resources there is a mechanism in there that will allow you to just simply click on it and it says recommendations and what do we want to look for. It gives us the closest one by traffic routing as real time and it matches the same criteria that resources assigned. There is set up and work, that we would probably have to done in that. We will be doing that during our discovery.

KT McNulty – Going back to REDCOM call exemptions. I just wanted to see if there is any desire to present this data in a different manner that would be more meaningful to this group?

Spencer Andreis - Seems to me it is self-explanatory it kind of breaks it down in subcategory. Exemption reason. I do not know if there is anything else for the group or any other thoughts on making it cleaner. It seems straightforward to me.

James Salvant - I agree. I think that it tells a story unless there is an event type that or something that needs to be added or something that maybe benefited to looking at it in a different format for potential improvement. These seem to be outside of your control no matter what.

KT McNulty – Sounds good. That is the end of my report.

Spencer Andreis – Any further questions for KT? Hearing none.

- b) Discussion on SOG 3, Event Type Criteria. Action to approve proposed new event type Park Rescue – Spencer Andreis

Spencer Andreis - This was asked of me by Sonoma County Fire District to add a new event type which is Park Rescues. It would be specific to the different parks, County, and State Parks we have throughout the county. A lot of times REDCOM staff on the line can kind of decipher. Sometimes it will come in as a rescue, sometimes it will come in as a medical aid. There is a fine line of what truly is it. It will forward the agencies the ability to create a recommend within the park systems their own ESZ or deployment models for parks. That was asked and I want to purpose it to the group and see if there are any concerns. I know KT was concerned about Annadel, because of the multiple jurisdictions involved. Which I think there is work arounds. I will open it up for discussion.

KT McNulty – My other concern is caller location within the Spring Lake and Annadel, Callers often do not know where they are at. They sometimes know what trail they left off of or what street they left off of. A lot of times we are relying on a cell phone ping to locate a caller who may or may not be near a patient. I think it would be difficult if all the agencies did not move over to this event type. I think that what they are looking for can be addressed with ESZ modifications. That no matter where that incident does land in CAD that the agency is getting what they want. Whether it is a rescue or medical event type.

Spencer Andreis – It would require us to redraw and make sub ESZ within our deployment areas versus it being in park. We would have to create a new ESZ for every park in that jurisdiction.

Ken Reese - Which needs to be done anyway. County Parks has been asking for us to create individual park ESZ for five years or more. You know and it is just a project that we are slowly chipping away on as people make modifications. I will give you an example: Sonoma County Fire District has two massive ESZ one encompasses foothills, and one encompasses Shiloh Ridge. The question is are you going to have a park rescue event type five miles outside the park in that one ESZ or are you going to take and create a new ESZ anyway so when you do a park rescue you are getting the recommendations for the park itself and not for some vineyard in the back part of the district somewhere so that is the exemption, I think that we really need to look at. The question is does an event type solve your problem or does changing the ESZ solve the problem. It most likely to be the ESZ boundary to be able to flex a standard rescue response verse a different event type.

Shepley Schroth-Cary – Would the event type drive the calls in the query of the caller RP would they identify them even in an isolated area. That should be where we drive the call type. Then remind me, doesn't Annadel have an interior response? For response to Annadel interior versus somebody reporting that they are at the horse trailer parking area with a medical emergency, and you can drive that call type. Maybe Annadel does have the ESZ already?

Ken Reese – Annadel has its own ESZ, but they are spilt. One side of it is really Sonoma County Fire District and a sliver of it is Kenwood. Kenwood is cut off so it just park and Sonoma County is cut off, so it is just a park. You have Taylor Mountain which is now part of Sonoma County Fire District there is a sliver of it that really falls in

Rancho's District and the ESZ encompasses massive other area. If I were to put in park rescue at the tip of Taylor Mountain and it is in Rancho's district, it could be driven that way. It is just isolated in that particular area which makes it a little bit more difficult. Ideally if you did have an event type change you would want the event type and the ESZ to change but it does not need to if you only change ESZ boundary.

Shepley Schroth-Cary – I suspect just using the event type would be easier than building a bunch of ESZ's. That is on your end.

Ken Reese - It is going to be done anyway. It needs to be done at some point in time just because of County Parks is trying to get notified. They have stuff in their districts, and you know it is difficult when we do not have ESZ that just encompass that particular area. If we put County Parks in the notification for calls that do not involve the parks. Then they are getting notified for medical aid five to eight miles outside the park. It is a long-term project that we have been talking about for some time and having this new event type discussion kind of helps to bolster the need to get it done. One way or the other it probably needs to be done.

Chad Costa - For the purpose of this agenda item, does it need a new event type, or do we just need to do a better job of using the existing EMD code? Identifying access and when you have its inaccessible patient and then having the corresponding agencies build out what they want in that event type.

Ken Reese - I think the park rescue idea is so they can change their responses. They can dispatch like ATVs and things like that on initial attack to go into a particular rescue. You tie that to the event type that works and even if you do not change the ESZ that could potentially work. To be able to finite the response specifically to within an actual park boundary. Then you could then take a rescue event type and make whatever you want to go to that rescue event type in that ESZ to be specific to what you have. You either are controlling it by event type or controlling it by an existing event type with a new response plan on a new with ESZ. Putting them around the parks and making it a new ESZ numbers and making those modifications it is not as daunting as that sounds. The GSI guys already got park boundaries. They just snapped new ESZ boundaries around the parks and patch it to the REDCOM ESZ. Given each one of them number and little behold there it is. The question is do you want a have a new event type or add to what we are already doing, or do we just want to reline it?

Shepley Schroth-Cary – I guess that is the question for this conversation is. Do we need to reinvent something, or do we need to utilize the tools at hand? Just because it is in a park does not mean we cannot have a large property where we need all those resources as well. I get that it is a focus at a park, but if you have a large piece of property, you have somebody injured in the back half of 1000 acre property. Then it should be the injury and the and inaccessible nature of the call that drives the resource order. I guess that is all I am proposing, is that we stick to the tools that we have.

Ken Reese - I think that would work great if we dispatched recommendations tied to response plans tied to EFD codes for rescues or medical codes for rescue. We do not do that. We take a generic event type of rescue. I think that is part of the idea of probably having the park rescue is because we do not dispatch off of a particular EMD

Code with an event type tied specifically to that type of a rescue. If we were doing EMD to the determinant and dispatching or EFD to the determinate and dispatching, then yes that works fine.

Chad Costa – From multiple departments of doing ESZ for many years. Please do not create another event type just to satisfy. We have plenty of event types of Swiftwater rescue there are like five rescue event types. The ESZ change is the answer to this problem, and it is super easy. Like Kenny said it is not hard. GIS already has the data it is just a matter of somebody doing the work from the agency to redraw or utilize that GIS to create an ESZ. I have some serious concerns about continuing to create more sub event types that just become more confusing. If they had a ESZ all they would say is, make it a rescue and then it would do all the notifications that they want to do inside the park That is my two cents.

Shepley Schroth-Cary – I agree with that. I just do not want to see us where that the location alone is driving the response because it may not warrant the response unless there is additional information. That they are trapped or down in the ravine. You could be on a roadway with a sprained ankle in Annadel, and because you have created this generic call type or ESZ that immediately gets a helicopter and whatever the deployment is. You are putting a lot of resources on the road for something we have the information. You are at a roadway but because it falls within this boundary you get an over-the-top response.

Chad Costa - In my mind, in Foothill if there is a medical aid it should be coded as a medical aid. If the person falls down a cliff, then it can be upgraded to a rescue either by the responding units or the dispatcher. So medically in the ESZ for Foothill may just be an engine ambulance, but a rescue would be helicopter or whatever else you want to send. I just think the rescue event type is good enough. They just need to have an ESZ if it falls within the boundaries of Foothill, it gets park notification and maybe the Battalion Chief or whatever they want.

Spencer Andreis – If we went that route and have to be a subset of the rescue because a rescue there is a lot of blanket rescues that may trigger at medium or a heavy rescue as well. That we do not need it a park. We need potentially ATV, a short haul helicopter. If we do an ESZ. I guess the solution and so is that something that we can get GIS Kenny to get built for all the agencies. We can circle back with all the affected agencies, and they can do what they want with the ESZ.

Ken Reese - The County Park boundaries is what I am working on. County Park boundaries are that process is already underway and all he has to do is snap them to make them REDCOM ESZ. Then we just determined with the numbers are going to be for any one particular agency. Take existing rescue plans and copy to those to the new ESZ. Then modified plan to what they want for that particular ESZ in the park. You want a helicopter you get a helicopter. If you want a UTV you get your UTV, whatever it is going to be.

Chad Costa - It is the same concept in Petaluma. If it is a trailer park that has a structure fire ESZ does not get a ladder truck. If it is a residential area, it gets a ladder truck. So modifying your ESZ is the simplest way to modify your different types of

response plans. Just adding more event types, I think it is going to make things even more confusing for the dispatchers and those responding.

Spencer Andreis - It sounds like we can work towards getting that done and it will make everybody happy. Then everybody can take their new ESZ within their parks and do what they want with them. Any further discussion on that? Hearing none.

- c.) Discussion on SOG 5, Fire Draw Down. Action to approve proposed amendments.
Spencer Andreis – Looking for a motion

Motion to amendment made by Shepley Schroth-Cary and
Second Ambrose Stevens – Discussion – No Further Comments – Approved
unanimously.

- d.) Discussion on SOP 6, Resource Identifications. Action to approve proposed
amendments. - Spencer Andreis – Looking for a motion

Motion to amendment made by Shepley Schroth-Cary and
Second James Salvante – Discussion – No Further Comments – Approved
unanimously.

- e.) Discussion on SOP 19, Fire Resource Move-Ups. Discussion on what roles are
appropriate to initiate move ups. Action to approve agreed upon new language.
- Spencer Andreis – Looking for a motion

Motion to amendment made by Shepley Schroth-Cary and
Second Spencer Andreis – Discussion – No Further Comments – Approved
unanimously.

VI. 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.

- Dispatch Steering Committee (EMD or EFD topics) – KT McNulty – I have no updates for the work groups.
- Radio – Spencer Andreis – Very minimal changes to the State and Federal loads that I know of. I think those got disseminated out a couple months ago. Nothing drastic on our end unless anybody has anything that I might be missing.

KT McNulty - We do have that topic that Brian York brought up at the last meeting regarding technical CALFIRE tac channels in Sonoma County.

Spencer Andreis - They have not asked yet and unfortunately the ECC BC not on this.

KT McNulty – Yes, she is.

Spencer Andreis - I will turn it over to Nica.

Nica Vasquez - I apologize I have made it to a couple of meetings, but this is the first one that I am actually speaking on. I will have to get with Chief York to get caught up on the ins and outs of that TAC Channels and what he had requested.

Spencer Andreis – The background is the West is currently primary six, secondary ten apparently there is some sort of overload with Mendocino's. Mendocino has asked that; I believe that they want to use six the primary and they wanted us to switch to Tac five and ten. Just a little history for us, when we implemented REDCOM twenty years ago, we purposely did not put us Sonoma County TAC six, ten to purposely so to avoid any confusion with our field units. Now his is that there is that potential with us shifting. One recommendation I asked Brian was when we had these discussions about six months ago. If we have to make this switch to put CDF Tac ten as a primary and then I think CDF five as the secondary. That is the short sweet of it .

Nica Vasquez - I will be sure to follow up with Chief York and I will send out an e-mail with confirmation.

Spencer Andreis - I think we were shooting for potentially next fire season. If that was the case that will give everybody the opportunity to re clone. Let me know when we can work through that.

Nica Vasquez - You got it.

KT McNulty – There will be a little bit of training on our end as far as the duplicate names and the TAC Channels. We need to be really clear in the CAD notes that it is Sonoma County Tac five. Right now we just writing Tac five.

Spencer Andreis - The other thought was, I do not know if that is something that we could look at. I do not believe there is a Sonoma Tac four. We could potentially look at that as well. I do not know if that is not available within the State systems for primary use over here. That would be another opportunity to alleviate any concerns with switching to the wrong TAC.

KT McNulty - Is there anything preventing us from calling it something differently locally and putting it into the loads?

Spencer Andreis - We would have to just re number it. We own the license that frequencies. We will just have to remember it. Which would cause everybody to have to go in and re clone all their mobiles and portables. It is quite the workload. A lot of the agencies have to pay contractors to come out. There is a cost associated with it as well.

KT McNulty - We will have to do that regardless right?

Spencer Andreis – Not necessarily, not if we use existing and we do not rename anything.

KT McNulty – Do we have Tac 10 in our load currently?

Spencer Andreis – We have CDF Tac ten not Sonoma County Tac ten. There are those and Sonoma County Tac four, six or ten.

KT McNulty – What about Cal Fire Tac five?

Spencer Andreis – Cal Fire has Tac one through like thirty-five.

KT McNulty – Do we have those loaded?

Spence Andreis – Yes. They have them with in their state loads. Any further questions or discussion?

- **SOP- Training**

Spencer Andreis - Anything on training KT that we are missing. I know you covered some of it.

KT McNulty - Nothing that I am aware of. Evonne is there anything I did not cover?

Evonne Stevens - Just our ongoing fire training for cameras that we continue to work on. We have two new hires that just cleared backgrounds.

KT McNulty – We hired one above the vacancy because we have one dispatcher that is going leave fulltime status for school.

Spencer Andreis – With these two new hires. Will that put us to where we could potentially have the fire season staffing back?

Evonne Stevens - Probably for next season. They are going to have to get trained. We well get one person back in a more of a full-time status when Jasmine clears training. We have a full-time employee training her so that kind of takes her out of the mix on the daily shift.

Spencer Andreis - Any questions on SOP Training? Hearing none.

CAD /Back –up

Ken Reese - We can talk a little bit about what is going on with tablet command world. We have pretty much got everything all sewn up from the tablet command standpoint as it is related to the interfacing with CAD. It has internal GPS, tracking form the iPad has transport capabilities. One of the things that we are probably going to start maybe looking at some point in the very new future. Is some sort of a messaging component that would allow it to message back and forth between the CAD systems. Currently the Tablet command does not have that interface. The only way you can really message is by using something IMessage or some sort of a messaging iPad cellular itself. When we get Genius Pulse, we are going to look at some ways to communicate with the iPads in the field via that network connection. It cannot be done via the CAD itself. That is what is going on in the CAD world. The other thing that is going on in the CAD world is we are going to start looking at some options to upgrading into cloud-based versions of this CAD system and what those costs are going to look like. Which really would in the long run end up being a less expensive to the consortium. Which would mean less cost of REDCOM in put into keeping that CAD system running. We are not due for any kind of CAD upgrade or replacement except for another couple of years. We do have to start looking at that those options now Last thing is with backup, we are going to be getting together with Nica here sometime in next couple weeks and making the trip over the ECC. Running back through our backup procedures of how we can tone out agencies from their radio system and the options for CAD backup. God forbid if we would go down. That is all I have.

KT McNulty – Thank you.

Spencer Andreis – Any questions for Kenny? Hearing none

One quick item I will throw out to the group. Then well open it up for announcements. Is in person versus virtual. What is everybody's preference. I know that everybody indicated with meetings. I know today was problematic for someone of you to make this. I want to through out to the group what your preference are. We can switch back to in person or hybrid option as well.

KT McNulty – We already have rooms reserved for the Board and the DOAG at the training center already.

The Board had landed on the conclusion that they are aiming for a hybrid meeting for their next meeting.

James Salvante – Can we do a hybrid option for the meeting that are in person? It is still possible that somebody might have an exposure and not want to risk coming in and being present and still be able to participate in the group.

Spencer Andreis – Yes by all means. If TC as infrastructure there. I am not sure if you have an owl available, yes by all means it looks like we can easily accommodate. The other thing is, as everybody knows on this Board and this group. If we do not have anything pressing to discuss or anything pressing to talk about. As you have seen the last couple of meetings I have cancelled.

Well tentatively schedule the September meeting in person or be hybrids for those that may or may not be able to attend in person so get those opportunity. We will go with that model moving forward if everybody concurs.

KT McNulty – That sounds good. Then maybe ahead of time to communicate with Brenda whether you will be attending in person or virtual, I do not want to go over there and set it up and sit there in a room all by myself if no one's going to be there in person.

Spencer Andreis – Thank you for that. I will open it up for announcements from round table.

VII. Announcement Items from the Membership

KT McNulty – In regard to the AI cameras. Their initial grant funding is running out and they are looking to see whether the fire community feels that the tool is valuable enough to keep in Sonoma County and continue to fund it going forward. What I have asked Altura to do is build me out a cost on camera use. I do not believe we need AI on all the cameras especially not where we have a population of folks that have cell service. They will build us out camera by camera on how much it is going to cost and who would like to maintain that. I will say that we have in the last year and a half had some wins with the AI beating the 911 callers. We have not had any wins that was so great that it caused us to just get well ahead of the fire. I also think that we have not really had a great opportunity yet to use the nighttime detections. We have only been sampling that since May. I think that there may be some more wins that will see this season at nighttime. I just want to open that up for this discussion and then also have you all start dialogue with your own agencies about whether you feel that tool is valuable to you or not.

Spencer Andreis - Any inclination on cost?

KT McNulty – No I do not. The only funding I have heard about was the initial grant funding, but those funds were used also to develop the program not to keep it going. I am really not sure at all what it is going to be going forward.

Spencer Andreis – I could see PG&E wanting to fund that. I am not sure if there is anybody that has any connections in there, but I can see them jumping all over that.

KT McNulty – PG&E has teamed up with Altura already in different areas to look at electrical line anomalies. It is not too much of a stretch to think that they would want to start looking at the fire detections as well.

Spencer Andreis – Anyone else have anything for the call to order?

James Salvante - Just to keep everybody who is not engaged in this process already. We have a couple of groups looking at the implementation of Tiered response model making that possible. We do not have the presentation right now that would of course come under the purview of the Dispatch Steering

Committee as a Medical Dispatch policy that would be reviewed. There is going to be a lot of operational stuff that will be involved in that as well and certainly KT can speak to you in more than I can. We are engaged, Shepley is involved now. We are meeting almost weekly with two separate Tiered Response work group subcommittee of the EMCC more or less and then a Data group that is looking through EMD Data that is reporting back to the other group. Pretty heavy meeting schedule. Just to keep the DOAG fully aware that it is moving forward. I would invite comments from either KT or Shepley.

KT McNulty – I would add to that today we seem to have reached a bit of a group consensus on doing more of an auto dispatch for BLS tandem responses. It sounds like there are some consensuses in moving that forward. What that would look like on the dispatch floor the way it sits as proposed today, the REDCOM dispatcher would do the initial dispatch send all the resources out the door code 3 for ALS and Fire. Then once the call taker gets to point where they have a determinate code, Omega Alpha, or Bravo they need to place their caller on hold, communicate back to the REDCOM dispatcher to start BLS. Then the REDCOM dispatcher would have to go back into the call and start BLS and then dispatch them. Then they would switch over to the control channels. It is a little bit herky jerky in my opinion, but it is progress. I am happy about that.

James Salvante - Shepley, you have any thoughts from your inaugural experience with that group?

Shepley Schroth-Cary – I thought there was some progress. That was good to see. I think really what we are doing is we are educating people on the EMD process and with the data hopefully making people feel comfortable with the idea of maybe someday getting into the tiered response. This is a good first step, with the tandem concept. I was going to maybe propose, because it will have large impacts on the operations side of things. Would it be appropriate to have it as a standing report on the on the agenda?

James Salvante – I think it should be. We might get to the point where we want to call a subgroup to look at a Dispatch steering Committee specific to that. I am hearing this real disconnect. Developing a set of standards that say yes, we could do this it would be safe to send a BLS unit, without even considering, what does that mean for the reality of the dispatch centers operation and the non-medical work that the center has to do. We stated that we were going to be very mindful of that of those needs and consider those but, really this is the group that that needs help inform that process. If we want to meet separately, I am game for that. If we are going to operationalize anything we need to have a lot more discussion here about it.

Shepley Schroth-Cary – That is what I noticed, was kind of missing from the conversation. Are the impacts of the dispatchers and impact the resources. While conceptionally there is some movement. There is going to be a lot of work to make it function. I think that is where we need to be engaged.

James Salvante - I do appreciate the backup that you gave Shepley on one of the really valuable things we are doing that we have not done before we have not been QI on how well the processes itself works. I know there is extensive QI on how dispatchers follow the EMD protocols that they are compliant with what their supposed to do. But does the system itself produce the results that we believe it does. There are national studies of huge systems that are doing very well with this. I think you made a good point. We have to have our community trust the process before they are going to be willing to let the algorithm make the choice to send something different than everybody code three all the time.

KT McNulty – Thanks James

Spencer Andreis – Thanks James. Anything Shepley?

Shepley Schroth-Cary – That is really my takeaway from my first meeting, as that it is the right movement in the right direction. It really is a matter of building comfort with EMD process on what that might look like in the future. Ultimately how do we implement in the way that it does not cause an impacted to all the stakeholders. I think that is the takeaway from today anyhow.

Spencer Andreis - A big thank you to you for representing on that group. TC you got anything.

Travers Collins – We have been working with Ken in putting our type-3s on dispatch for all in city wildland responses, moving away from type-1 response. Going to type-3 response in the city within our MTZ. Which kind of looking through that some technical stuff there that Ken is obviously very savvy at going through the process of that.

Spencer Andreis – Remind me where and what is are identifiers where they are living now. That is one thing you and I need to talk about on the SOP 18. If you want to change that all.

Travers Collins – We will be changing that. Right now Spence, you are right we need to touch base on that like probably next week. Right now engine Twenty-Seven is housed at Eleven. Twenty-Six is engine Six and Twenty -Five is at station Ten.

Spencer Andreis - Which ones it two-wheel drive ? Twenty-Five?

Travers Collins – Yes, Twenty -Five.

Spencer Andreis – Good to know. Congratulations that is great.

Travers Collins - We have a couple more type-5s coming. Just like everything else just delay.

Spencer Andreis – Sure. Ambrose?

Ambrose Stevens - The only thing I think is worth putting on everybody's radar is we recently got notified by one of our folks who supplies a lot of our radio

equipment that our current portable radios we are using are beginning discontinued. We are internally looking through some options to see what the next portables for SLS are going to look like. Kind of working side by side with radio Rick on that project. It is still very early on in the early phases that. Trying to see what options we have out there to what we might moving towards.

Spencer Andreis - I do not think there is a vendor out there that is not discontinuing portable radios right now.

Ambrose Stevens – We have been reaching out to some of our neighbors to see what they are having success with. It is kind of all over the map. We will get great reports about one from one county. Then we talk to the next county they say the radios are not working really well for them. Still early on but still differently dealing with all the same supply chain issues that every other industry work with is dealing with.

Spencer Andreis – Good Luck.

Ken Reese – Ambrose/KT, is AMR still using is still using ES chat and other operations as to primary communications application?

Ambrose Stevens - We do use it a lot of other operations. It has a lot of success when here is no sort of challenges with the cell phone infrastructure. I know that from the operations I have spoken to use it primarily a lot of them were engaged like exclusively interfacility transport work or in areas that are very urban. Where they do not have to go into the sticks it all. I know a lot of folks who are using it and more diverse areas kind of use it in conjunction with a really solid radio program so there is no gaps. Simple answer yes. It is used by a lot of other operations, and it is very successful. I know the primary challenges when the world melts down and we do not have the same cell phone access that we typically, it does create some challenges.

Ken Reese - Thank you, I was just curious.

Spencer Andreis - Anybody else in the gallery wishing to speak or have any good to the order.

KT McNulty - We did schedule at Tablet Command demo at potentially look at that platform as a system for us.

Spencer Andreis – That is great.

Ken Reese – Has that been scheduled yet?

KT McNulty – Not yet.

Ken Reese – If they do not reach out. I am sure the Chad and Spencer the power users and they have it all configured for this county They could in effect do something if Tablet Command does not come through.

Spencer Andreis – Yes, anytime just let us know.

Kt McNulty – Thank you.

Next Meeting September 27, 2022, at 1300 on Teams

Adjournment:

Motion to approve minutes made by Travers Collins and
Second Shepley Schroth-Cary – Discussion – No Further Comments –
Approved unanimously @ 1409