



REDCOM BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Minutes

October 14, 2021 – @ 2:00PM

Join by phone 1-323-886-6897 ID: 293 599 088#

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

Jason Boaz

Scott Westrope

Sundari Mase

Others Present:

KT McNulty

Brenda Bacigalupi

Doug Williams

Brian Henricksen

Ken Reese

Ambrose Stevens

Evonne Stevens

Tambra Curtis

1. Call to Order – Made by Steve Akre @ 14:01
2. Approval of the Agenda - Motion to approve made by Mark Heine, Second Scott Westrope – Discussion - No further comments - Approved unanimously.
3. Approval of the July 8, 2021, REDCOM Board of Directors Meeting Minutes. Motion to approve made by Scott Westrope, Second Jason Boaz – 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.

None

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

5. New Business

- a) Watch Duty Application Memorandum of Understanding. Request for REDCOM to provide CAD Data feed with Watch Duty. Discussion and approval. - KT McNulty – Watch Duty is an application that has volunteers monitoring emergency radios channels. Then relaying what they are hearing on the scanners to the public via the application. The information that they are relaying to the public is unverified information and to date has led to some miscommunication which harmed a few incident operations. The company that is responsible for the app is called Sherwood Forestry Service and they are seeking a direct CAD Data connection with REDCOM. They have only asked for Fire information. They would like incident type and location to be pushed out to them. Like what we are doing with Pulse Point now. I have brought this topic up at the round table at the DOAG meeting and they are not in support of moving forward with this MOU. I am also not in support of it. My main concern is that this application encourages the public to go to a public emergency and take pictures of the incident and post it for other users to see. I am also doing a lot of work with the county PIO's to try and train the public on what is verified good sources of information and I don't feel like this application falls into a verified trust worthy information site. I will turn it over for discussion.

Steve Akre – Thank you KT. I will open it up to the Board Members for any questions or discussion then we can take this out to the public for any comments.

Mark Heine – I am not sitting in support of this right now. I have shared concerns as KT has already outlined. It has caused issues in the field on different incidents on how effectively they are managed and or communicated out to the public. It doesn't mean that it cannot become a valuable tool for resources in the future, but right now it is more on the concern side then it is for me on the support side. I am not in support of moving forward with this MOU.

Steve Akre – Thank you Mark. Scott, I see your hand up.

Scott Westrop – I will echo Marks comments. When I read this item. I had some significant concerns about it, and I don't stand in position of support at this time. I do understand the intent and support the intent to educate the community and create community awareness. I believe there is a better avenue or there are ways we can make this beneficial to all parties involved. I just wanted to echo Marks comments make sure that it is on record. We need a lot more work and a lot more direction and oversight with this before we move in the positive direction.

Steve Akre – Thank you Scott. Jason, I see your hand up.

Jason Boaz – I am following in the same category. Clarification, this is for a direct CAD feed and if they do not get that they will still continue to operate in the fashion that they are right?

KT McNulty – That is correct.

Jason Boaz – It is just limiting their ability to get direct information directly from REDCOM. It doesn't alleviate any of the problems with miss communication or people showing up on incidents, things like that right? It just doesn't formalize the agreement.

KT McNulty – That is correct. I do believe that if they did have a direct CAD data it would be giving them a jump start to be switching over to channels and monitoring and scanning and responding to the incidents to take photos which is one of my concerns.

Jason Boaz – That makes sense. I am not in support of it.

Steve Akre – Thank you Jason. Anyone else like have any thoughts?

Bryan Cleaver – I do agree with you. I think that it is unfortunate that basically refusing to sign the agreement doesn't solve sort of the problem that we are already experiencing. I am also in support of not signing the MOU.

Steve Akre – Thank you Bryan.

Dave Crowl - I agree with everything that has been said. There is a thin line transparency and sharing the information and out right anarchy and this is not controlling the information that we are sending out anyways. I agree with what has been said.

Steve Akre – Thank you Dave. I think we have heard very clearly from the Board, and I would definitely stand and support of my fellow Board Members with also not supporting moving forward with this MOU at this time. Maybe we could revisit it in the future. If there is an opportunity to address some of the concerns that have been brought up and what is currently happening. If we had the opportunity to address some of those, then maybe this is something we could revisit.

Sundari Mase – I just wanted to voice my agreement with everybody on this matter.

Jason Boaz – I know the public really likes this app. Are we having any discussion? I know it is clear from the REDCOM standpoint that is not the way to go. Just from a Fire Service are we working with Watch Duty at all to try and correct some of the errors and problems that it is causing so it doesn't lead to more errors and confusion in the future?

KT McNulty – DEM is working with them. I don't know if DEM has all of the concerns that have been coming in. I am also going to speak at the Sonoma Fire Safe. They want to do a presentation on Pulse Point, so we can kind of get into a little further in that group as to what is this verified information versus what Watch Duty giving you. The public doesn't understand that it is not an official source of information. They believe that something official is coming in. That is one opportunity, and I am working with PIOs on this very topic more coming on that.

Steve Akre – Thank you KT.

Mark Heine – In addition to what Jason was just saying, speaking to in the group and who KT is working with. With the County Fire Chiefs hat on. I had this conversation with Ben Nichols and Shawna Johnson they are reaching out to the company to the folks that are sort of startups of this and creating a conversation with them about its future as well.

Steve Akre – Thank you for reminding us about the Cal Fire LNU Leadership taking that roll. I think it is really important, no slight to our partners at DEM. But I do think it is really important for us as a Fire Service to have a very

prominent voice and participation in those conversations with the Watch Duty folks.

I wanted to acknowledge that this is in the back of everybody's mind. I want to state for the record. That our counter parts and the DOAG have looked at this and it is really important to acknowledge their recommendation and I know that was the bases for a lot of us also. Taking a position of not supporting at this time. I do appreciate the DOAG and their ongoing efforts with this and a lot of other very important initiatives.

KT at this point I don't know if we need to do anything, because we are not going to have motion from anybody to support moving forward with this. I don't know if we need to take any official action at this time. Unless Tambra thinks that we need to do something official.

Tambra Curtis – No, I think you are fine.

Steve Akre – Thank you.

- b) Approval of the 2022 REDCOM Board of Directors meeting Schedule - Motion to approve made by Jason Boaz, Second Dave Crowl – Discussion - No further comments - Approved unanimously.
- c) Director's Report for Q1 FY21/22

KT McNulty – **Operational Report** – Ace REDCOM continues to maintain Accredited Center of Excellence (ACE) for our Medical Dispatch. However, we did see an atypical drop in our EFD for August and September. This is the first time in we haven't been compliant. We have already implemented a plan to improve the areas that are system wide concerns and are working with the staff on individual issues. The other thing that happened in August that we got a new Quality Assurance person assigned to us for EFD and their style is much different than our pervious Quality Assurance folks. They are grading a lot differently and our dispatchers are going to have to adapt to that. We are going to have to update some policies to reflect those standards as well. Overall I think we are already doing better in October and hoping not to see this dip continue in our compliance.

Staffing update - We are once again fully staffed. All 3 Upper Management positions are full. All 4 supervisor positions are full. We just hired Greg Fontana from Santa Rosa PD. He comes with a lot of background in CAD work, and he has been working with us for years. We are excited to have him.

All 18 full time positions are full, and all part time positions are full as well and we are continuing to up staff for fire season.

Strategic Planning – The REDCOM expansion project is still in the works. The design phase is complete. We are still waiting on funding.

Communication Van – Formally OES5262 is now identified as 2141. We just replaced the house batteries and inverter. The radio work is almost complete. Antennas are currently being installed. Once that work is complete it will be a functional vehicle. Remaining tasks include light bar installation and exterior body work.

Technology Update – Tango Tango the application that lets you listen and talk on the radio on your cell phone or smart phone is up and running. Kenny is going to put out a training video soon to our subscribers on how to use the application. If there are any other agencies that wish to use the app, they may sign up directly for a subscription and that will allow them to have use of the channels we have programmed into Tango Tango.

Control 3 - The upgraded Control 3 is fully functional and running on Jackson, Barham, and Sonoma Mountain. Maintenance is now solely handled through Sheriff's Telecommunications Department.

Genesis Pulse – The product that is a system status product as well as a live cell phone location system. It has been in the works for over a year now because it requires a real time data inquiry from the CAD. Our current system doesn't support that. They are having to work on a work around for that.

Zen – Is the product that we use to push data out to multiple platforms. The product is costing REDCOM approximately \$30,000 annually in usage and maintenance fees. The interface between CAD and Zen needs to be re-written to solve an issue with CAD. We are working on that currently. We are trying to find another way to feed data at a more cost-effective rate.

911 call volume and total all call volume – Nothing significant about the data. However, I did report at the last Director Report that there was an upward trend in April, May and June that has plateaued off and we are actually dipping down a little bit. We are still showing the normal fire season uptick. It is easier to see on the chart. Where we kind of plateau on our call volume and now we are just dipping it down a little bit.

Average Call Duration – Nothing note worthily on our call time duration. Consistent with the prior years.

Contractual Performance - The interface between CAD and Zen needs to be re-written to solve an issue with CAD.

Call Processing - For the last 12 months on average calls were dispatched in 55 seconds from 911 answer time to dispatch time. We continue to do well.

Steve Akre – Can I ask a question? Who sets the 70 seconds standard?

KT McNulty – It was an NFPA standard. That REDCOM adopted. However, that time doesn't include a pre alert. Which we do, we are doing more work than the standard and still beating that standard.

Steve Akre – That is something we could revisit if we wanted to change that Matrix?

Kt McNulty – I think so, yes.

Steve Akre – Thank you.

KT McNulty – **Exceptions Reports** – Those continue to be fairly standard no anomalies in those reports. That is all for the Directors Report.

Steve Akre – Thank you very much KT. Anybody on the Board have any questions or comments on the Directors Report? Hearing none. Anybody from the public or guest in attendance have any comments or questions?

Ken Reese – Just one comment. On the NFPA portion. The NFPA re-adopted a new time which now they moved to 90 seconds. Then are 70 second rule was the NPFA standard at the time which was written into our contract. That has since been moved out to accommodate for actual processing time of 90 seconds.

KT McNulty - is that with apre-alert?

Ken Reese - It is from time of received of call. We are doing receipt of call now 70 seconds and they have since moved that to 90 in a NFPA.

Steve Akre – Thank you, I appreciate that update.

6. Old Business

- a) Oak Ridge Antenna Relocation originally approved to come out of Technology funds in FY20/21. Discussion and approval of budget adjustment for funds to come out of FY 21/22. – KT McNulty – There has been an update since this package went out. It was originally about \$30,000 to relocate that antenna. It is now \$20,000 less than we thought. Now it is only \$10,729 because they didn't need to use Henry 1 to do a lift and we didn't need to pull out permits because the equipment was already in place. I am asking to take the \$10,729 out of the Technology fund.

Steve Akre – That is good news. KT just because I don't have the budget in front of me let me know how much of the Technology Fund we are already committed to this year.

KT McNulty – We have not committed any of it.

Steve Akre – Thank you. Opening up to the Board for any questions or comments or simply a motion to approve taking the \$10,729.99 out of the Technology Fund for the Oakridge Antenna move.

Motion to approve made by Mark Heine second Scott Westrope – Discussion - No further comments – Roll Call - Approved unanimously.

- b) Falck's past due fees update and discussion. - KT McNulty – As you recall there are 3-4 invoices from Falck. It turns out only one of those invoices was for a time period that we continued to provide services to Falck. In conversation with our Chair and our council we opted to go with only trying to pursue those fees. They were responsive and we have received a check now for \$12,935.

Steve Akre – That is good news as well. They are now what I considered current in terms of them paying their fees the time that they were in the county providing service.

KT McNulty – That is correct.

Steve Akre – The other invoices that they were invoiced for that they have not paid was the period of time that they vacated without giving REDCOM notice.

KT McNulty – That is correct.

Steve Akre – Ok. I will now bring to the Board for any discussion or comments. Guest or members of the public any comments on that. Hearing none will consider this item closed. Thank you KT and Tandra for your work on that.

- c) Fire and Ambulance Districts' dispatch fees not covered by TOT funds - Fire and Ambulance Districts' dispatch fees not covered by Sonoma County's Transient Occupancy Tax funds for FY 20/21 in the amount of \$8,533.45 and for 21/22 in the amount of \$113,479.85 Dispatch fees exceeded the available \$900,000 per fiscal year. Revisit discussion and potential direction to address funding gap. - KT McNulty – I just put this back on the agenda. We did spend

a lot of time talking about how we were going to address this in the future when the TOT funds will no longer be available to us. We really didn't address what we're going to do in this current billing cycle and the previous billing cycle for 20/21 there was a short fall of about \$8,500 and then for the current fiscal year 21/22 there is a \$113,000 short fall. We really didn't address how we want to assess this to the agencies or how we would like to do that. See attached break down.

Steve Akre – Thank you. If I remember correctly, the last time we discussed this we were going to try to look to a one-time County Fire Service Project funds to see if we could come up with at least somewhat of an offset these access fees. I will say that as busy as we have been with the other more pressing items with the County. I don't know if we have had a good discussion on this. Mark, I will ask you in your roll with both the Fire Districts and Chiefs and in this discussion has this topic been approached by Terry Wright and the County?

Mark Heine – I think we did Steve when were first had this come to our attention. We have not done a good job of following up on it. I am certainly happy to reach out to the County side of the table with the County Chief's hat on and the REDCOM Director's hat on. Just approach the conversation. I think we should have REDCOM Board have a backup plan B. I think with all the existing funding agreements with agencies that are currently in negotiation at the midnight hour here. I doubt seriously if we will see any of the County funds to fill this need. Related to this, I would like to share for our record as REDCOM Board Director's, the county has put special districts on notice if the sales tax measure makes it on the ballot and passes the sales tax will become responsible for paying ongoing REDCOM fee for special Districts. If it does not pass, those are then 100% borne by the agencies. That has a potentially devastating impact on some of the Fire Districts budgets, that have not been budgeted for this purpose.

Steve Akre - Thank you for that update, Mark. I do agree. I think with all of that I think it is going to be tough to trying to get the county to cover these fees. I think it would feel good if we do follow up on that through. I would also very much support a plan B. I will open it up to the Board for any other thoughts, concern, or ideas.

Steve Akre – I will present something just as an idea. First brainstorming idea for a plan B is I would maybe submit this for the 20/21 overage. We would maybe just cover that out of the REDCOM reserves. Then I would further suggest or throw out as an idea that maybe the 21/22 overage. If we are not successful with the county, then that gets passed on to the member agencies.

Jason Boaz – Are we talking all member agencies or just the member agencies that are currently having their dispatch fees paid?

Steve Akre – Just the member agencies having their dispatch fees paid. According to the chart that KT has on the screen. As I am thinking about this more, I am going to

amend that. I am going to go back and say both 20/21 and 21/22 fees need to go just to the districts that are presented there. I am feeling an equity issue even though it is a small amount the \$8,500 from 20/21. The REDCOM reserves are there for all the agencies not just the special Districts. Any thoughts or ideas?

Mark Heine - I agree with that. That is a good plan.

Steve Akre - Can we just decide between now and the January 13th meeting that we will make efforts to try pin down the County on whether their one-time funds to cover this and if not for the January meeting let's bring this back as an agenda item to pursue these fees with each of the capacity coverage fees on to each of the Special District Member agencies. As presented in these charts.

Bryan Cleaver – Steve do we need to communicate early and by early, I mean now that we have a Plan A and describe what our Plan A is in terms of approaching County, but then also essentially giving them a heads up on Plan B.

Steve Akre – Yes, I think that is a great idea. KT if you could work with me and Mark on maybe just a general email basically presenting these charts and to the specific Special Districts Member Agencies that are listed and let them know we are trying to pursue County Funding but if not, the Board will consider passing these coverage fees on to the each of the Special District members at the January 13th, 2022, meeting.

KT McNulty - Yes

Steve Akre – Thank you.

- d) Sonoma County Grand Jury Final Report findings – Discussion regarding REDCOM's next steps KT McNulty – We did elect to go with the ADHOC committee to handle this. We have met and discussed steps. Meeting with SCSO and DEM. Going through the minutes I feel like we kind of missed the spirit of what we all decided. I think we need to convene again and actually sit down with SO and DEM to find out what their thoughts are.

Steve Akre – Any comments or questions from the Board?

Mark Heine – I think KT is right. I think this kind of fell off the radar screen a little bit. I have reach out a couple of times SCSO side and didn't hear anything back. I really didn't pursue it. If memory serves me right. I think what we decided was we didn't have a lot of mandatory response requirements to report for REDCOM in particular. We wanted to make sure we were active collaborate partner with agencies that did and see how they were going to be responding to some of those mandated responses.

KT McNulty – REDCOM was not required to respond at all. We do want to be a part of steering the other conversations, because it is specifically saying DEM and SCSO come up with a plan to help REDCOM's radio infrastructure. We do want to steer whatever that conversation is.

Steve Akre – Absolutely. It sounds like KT you'll reach to DEM and SCSO. Hopefully be available to have some discussion before our next meeting in January.

KT McNulty – Yes, I will say DEM has reached out to me last week with a great opportunity to invite us to participate in and we did make that deadline on Friday at 5pm we got it submitted. For the Control 2-4 project.

Steve Akre – Great, Thank you. I will entertain any last-minute thoughts, comments from the Board Members. Staff and Public? Hearing none.

7. Next meeting will be – January 13th, 2022, at 14:00, held virtually.
8. Adjournment- Motion to adjourn - Motion to approve made by Mark Heine Second Dave Crowl – Discussion - No further comments - Approved unanimously at 14:43.