



REDCOM BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Agenda

February 9, 2023 – @ 2:00 PM

**Santa Rosa Fire Training Tower
2126 West College Ave.
Santa Rosa, CA**

Present:

Steve Akre - Chair
Bryan Cleaver – Secretary
Dave Crawl
Scott Westrope
Jason Boaz

Not Present:

Sundari Mase
Mark Heine – Vice Chair

Others Present:

Evonne Stevens – REDCOM Executive Director
Brenda Bacigalupi – REDCOM Administrative Assistant
Jasmine Mitchell - REDCOM Interim Operations Manager
Ken Reese – REDCOM Communication Manager
Tambra Curtis
Chad Costa

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

1. Call to Order Made by Steve Akre @ 1414
2. Approval of the Agenda Motion to approve made by Jason Boaz, Second Dave Crawl - Discussion – No Further comments – Approved unanimously.
3. Approval of January 18, 2023, REDCOM Board of Directors Meeting Minutes.

Motion to approve made by Bryan Cleaver, Second Dave Crawl - Discussion – No Further comments – Approved unanimously.

4. Public Comment Period

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

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

None

5. New Business

- a) Discussion and action item for a Letter for REDCOM Employees contingency plan – Steve Acre –

Steve Akre – I apologize for not getting the wording out to everybody prior to the meeting. I know that everyone knows that we are in an uncertain time right now, especially related to our REDCOM employees and what their future may or may not look like in terms of employing agencies, obviously very much related to the current RFP process. We know that the Dispatch contract has been held by the awardee of operating area one. With that coming up and yet to be determine, I felt that it was something that would be meaningful If I were a REDCOM employee, from the Board to really make a statement in policy. Sharing our appreciation and value of our REDCOM employees and doing what we can assure them that regardless of who might be the awardee, that they will still have a job at REDCOM. This is what I came up with and would like the Board to consider it.

“The REDCOM Board of Directors recognizes the tremendous service that our REDCOM employees provide to the citizens of Sonoma County and to REDCOM. The REDCOM Board is committed to ensuring that all REDCOM employees in good standing will continue to be employed with REDCOM regardless of any potential change in contract service providers.”

Jason Boaz – Is that something we can do?

Steve Akre – I think we can do everything in our powers.

Tambra Curtis – I do not think we can. I understand the intent and the purpose. I do not think you can make that guarantee at this point.

Jason Boaz – I would like to make that guarantee but I do agree, what if we were soften it a little bit. I support it.

Steve Akre - I appreciate that TAMBRA but I think what we are trying to do is make a statement and a commitment to our REDCOM employees that the Board appreciates them and is going to do everything in our power to ensure that they still have jobs regardless of who the next services provider may or may not be. You know the legal wording better than I do. I am not seeing in there where we are guaranteeing it, we are working to ensure. It is kind of making a statement that the incumbent workforce still has the opportunity to be employed and that the new agency will do everything they can to make that happen.

TAMBRA CURTIS – We do not know who the agencies will be so we cannot speak for them, and we cannot tie their hands. I certainly understand the point you want to make. I think it is probably better that it be an oral conversation that is had with employees to reassure them. You have to be careful what you put in writing. You can do that, but I would like to review it first. I think it is more effective if you have an in-person conversation.

Steve Akre – That was going to be the next step but, I wanted the Board to (as a group) and as the Board to make that same kind of commitment. I would ask the question. We do not have control over who will be the winning bidder for the RFP. We absolutely have the authority to approve the Dispatch contract.

TAMBRA CURTIS – I think it is a little more complex than that. It is a complex relationship. You cannot be making statement that if they do not end up being true it problematic.

BRYAN CLEAVER – For the record I will abstain from a vote on this particular item. However, in the interest of comment. I think Chair that your language is probably good. Although I believe I it is language that may have to go into either an RFP for dispatch services or a contract for dispatch services under the incumbent workforce portion of that. A blanket letter that says we will, we may or must maybe problematic. I do know that incumbent workforce language is common in RFPs and contracts.

JASON BOAZ – I am absolutely supportive of the Dispatchers and employees and of course keeping them on and bringing them along. On a side note, the wording “Employees in good standing” are there employees that are not in good standing, and if so, how is that going to work?

Evonne Stevens – There are no employees that are not in good standing. Everyone is in good standing. We do have trainees at the moment.

Steve Akre – Dave, generally speaking what are your thoughts?

Dave Crowl - I understand what Tamara saying but, I wholehearted agree that we be behind our employees and show them support in its turbulent time especially the unknowns going on. If there any way, we can word this to make the legal side happy while still showing our support of our employees that is what we should be doing.

Jason Boaz – I agree with that.

Scott Westrope - That is what I was thinking, just looking at even if we take out reference to “potential changing contract service providers” just being a general statement of employee support.

Tambra Curtis – Send it my way and I will take a quick look at it and turn it around quickly.

Steve Akre – Prefect.

Jason Boaz - Thank you for doing this. I appreciate what you are doing here. I just do not want to tie her hands up.

Evonne Stevens - I appreciate the gesture and the meaning behind it. Which is to support the team and let them know, that yes, it is a turbulent time. It is no secret that there is potential for changes in the future but that everybody is valued, and all of the time and you know dedication that they put into dispatching for us for all these that they are appreciated. That you will do your best to support and continue to support them.

Jason Boaz – I am totally supportive in following up with a verbal conversation. However you think is the best way to do that. Whether it is informal or members coming to a staff meeting or something. I definitely want to follow up with some in person verbal communication that is sincere to the employees not just a letter.

Evonne Stevens - I think that would be great. We could talk about Town Hall meeting, or something just face to face time with the dispatchers. Just to let them know.

Jason Boaz – I know they all cannot come to a REDCOM Board meeting. Even if it is some of us to take the time to go by the dispatch center or stop by a staff meeting if you have any staff meeting or something like that. I think it would be good for the employee to hear it from the Board Members in person.

Evonne Stevens - Maybe a couple times during the week where we have a good portion of people together like shift change would be a good time. I know that it is evening time and might be hard for you guys to make it but, like 7:00 PM twice during the week would be a great time to come in. We can get the management team to watch positions and let people have some time to talk with you.

Jason Boaz – Kind of informally.

Evonne Stevens - Kind of informally but, let them know you are there and that you support them. I think that will mean a lot to everyone as far as a REDCOM Board and the people that have been part of REDCOM after all these years. I think it would help to build a level of trust and security for everybody.

Steve Akre – That was the intention with this. Evonne and I had some conversation. We felt like having the Board making a statement formally added meaning to that. I will forward that language to your Tambra and if you could work on and get it back to me that would be great.

Tambra Curtis – Sounds good.

Steve Akre – Thank you. Actually let us do this. Can we consider that once Tambra gets back with me legal approved language. Can we consider approving that right now. Pending legal's input.

Scott Westrope- Putting a motion on the table to give the president of the Board authority to distribute a statement on behalf of the Board once it has been received by legal.

Motion to approve made by Scott Westrope, Second Jason Boaz - Discussion – No Further comments – Approved unanimously. Bryan Cleaver abstains.

Steve Akre - Thank you Tambra.

- b) Expansion Project Funding Special Assessment discussion and action to approve – Evonne Stevens

Evonne Stevens – REDCOM Board years previously approved the expansion project. We have discussed this at the last few Board meetings. We have definitely met our capacity in our current space. SO has made a clear overture that if we do not move on to taking that space up in a very rapid succession with an action plan, we will not have that space. It is 413 square feet that we would add to our center. The plan we are trying to adjust to is actually going to give us 50% more capacity to split channels, answer more 911 calls. I really think we definitely owe it to the citizens of the county and our First Responders to be able to split those channels. Especially when things are really busy. Just like when we had a situation like we had on the 4th. Where we can really spread the dispatchers out and when people come and that call to action when help is needed come on in to dispatch, we need a hand right now. We have staff that are ready to work but not enough consoles. That would really improve the quality and the availability to help our citizens when they are calling, in instead of putting them on hold. or waiting to get a dispatcher back on the phone because we are so overwhelmed. It is vitally important that we do this. We have already talked about doing this in 2020 money got in the way and money is still kind of an issue. Right now we have \$709,000 in unapplied funds budgeted for the 23 - 24 budget that has not been approved yet. The expansion is estimated to cost about \$825,000. To put into perspective would be about seventeen million to get a new center. This is a bargain. I am actually just looking for a plan of action and to make a special assessment to get some unapplied funds back into our unapplied funds because that is where we get our money for other unforeseen emergencies radio repairs, repeater repairs and things like that. If we put everything, we have right now into this expansion we are still going to need to raise about \$160,000 and that will be just really nothing in that unapplied fund. I proposed three assessments for us to look at today and possibly take action on voting for. If you look at the last two pages in your packet kind of, put them side-by-side you can see what the three assessments are in comparison with what the original proposed budget is for the 23 – 24. If you want to pull those out when you are ready, we can kind of look at them a little bit discuss each one.

Bryan Cleaver – Am I understanding correctly, we have already taken action to the approve the 700, but we still have a gap?

Evonne Stevens - We took action several years ago to approve moving forward with the expansion. Then it kind of got tabled and with previous the predecessors because of the budget. It is only getting more expensive. I think the price has almost doubled since we made that initial commitment. The time to move is pretty much now or almost yesterday according to the Sheriff's Department. I mean we still have a little uphill road to be able to get this

space and we really need it. If you look at the first line the original budget this is slightly different from what was sent out in your packet. As I was preparing these three budgets, we noticed that there was a broken cell that was not reflecting the \$75,000 from the unapplied funds to take out of the fund that was actually going into the member fees. This is \$75,000 less than that the initial budget that we put out and we reconciled that this week. If you look at that line that says that the total for all agencies is \$5,287,329.10 that is \$75,000 less than what we had put out because of that working cell. That is why it is a little bit different this is probably the best scenario to look at for the draft budget that we are looking at today. In comparison it did reduce the member costs a little bit. Looking at the first scenario if you are all there. That would be to put \$400,000 back into our unapplied funds spread out over four years we could take the \$116,000 out of that and then start to build back up to have a fund for other unforeseen emergencies like radios, repeater repairs and other things that could come up. That one is spread out in the same methodology that would do REDCOM budget. Sharing the fees as per call volume like we do normally for all the fee assessments. So you can see the price difference per agency with the \$400,000 being spread over four years. The next line talks about what that actually looks like per year. I do want to mention we are working on grants. We will continue to work on grants. If there is grant money that comes in during these years, we would look at refunding that money or changing that assessment to reflect that money coming in from another source and put that back into your budget and reduce those fees. We will be reassessing this every year to make sure that you were getting the money back if we came into the funding in some other way. We are going to definitely be concentrating our efforts on continuing to apply for any grants that look like they would help in that scenario. Scenario one looks fairly palatable it does break it down a little bit and spread it out especially for the smaller agencies looking at like Cazadero it is really only raising their cost \$109 per year. The second scenario would be \$450,000 spread over three years it would give us a little bit more cushion for the unforeseen emergencies but still spread it out a little bit for everyone. The range is \$164 like for Cazadero but for an agency like at Santa Rosa obviously that is a lot different looking at like \$38,000, that is something to consider. It does give us a little bit more money to work with. The third scenario would be doing all of this at once. That one to me seems the least palatable but it was actually intended just to show you the difference of how we get spread out and maybe make this doable. I think would be pretty difficult to come up with that large sum of money all at once for these agencies. If you have any questions or thoughts, please let me know.

Bryan Cleaver - Are you excepting with either of the scenarios that we will go with That these numbers would be realized in the members' 23 -24 budget?

Evonne Stevens – Yes, the original budget would be that first line and then if this was approved, we could change that scenario with the draft budget to include the special assessment.

Jason Boaz - So we are not approving the budget today?

Evonne Stevens - Yes, we have the budget to approve. We could reverse the order of this conversation. I have the budget here, but we could also include the special assessment, it just landed on the same board meeting. We have got the original budget here that does need to be approved minus the \$75,000 and that line is realized right there. If the special assessment gets approved, we could just include that in the budget as well.

Bryan Cleaver - It is pretty late in the budget planning cycle. Appreciate Chief Westrope is the largest contributor in the room. Looking at the three different scenarios what are the realities of including it in the 23 – 24 in your own budgets the increases?

Scott Westrope - Fortunately for us, we predicted, I think we budgeted for 1.4 to 1.45 it really is just a \$5000 increase at this. I met with Evonne already to mapped it out a little bit better. That is definitely more palatable if I have to come in with another \$13,000 or \$90,000 something that is going to be a problem. I am just speaking for Santa Rosa from that aspect of your point Bryan. The first scenario does seem to be more palatable considering where we are at in the fiscal year. I can make those minor adjustments, but a major adjust will be a tough one at this point.

Dave Crowl – I am kind of along for the ride here. The cost is needed to be done in my opinion. As far as CLSC we can absorb any of these scenarios. We are obviously not Santa Rosa.

Scott Westrope – Real quick Evonne, you have the \$700,000 now?

Evonne Stevens – Yes.

Scott Westrope - You need another \$100,000?

Evonne Stevens – Yes, it is \$116,000 I think it is.

Scott Westrope - If we were to approve \$100,000 now could you start the project now?

Evonne Stevens – Yes, we are ready to start the project. We are just hoping for a special assessment, so we are not putting all of our eggs into that basket and come up in a scenario, where we have a large repair to a repeater or radios go down and we have nothing to work with to try to get that done. Everything is so vital.

Scott Westrope - This would be a consider a onetime assessment?

Evonne Stevens – This would be spread out over four years, yes. If we get any grant money or anything else that comes in which we will be actively working towards. Then we would refund that and the same method as we spread out that fee to each agency. We will be reassessing every year to make sure that any money that does come in or if the cost goes down in some way as they start to realize what the actual costs are from the construction that that is also added to the possible refund of your money.

Scott Westrope – Over the course of the next four years. Let us look at Santa Rosa, over the course of four years, we are going to put in \$25,000, so actually you will end up with a bottom line of \$400,000, right?

Evonne Stevens – Right.

Scott Westrope - Right now your delta is 116 but you are going to raise four?

Evonne Stevens - What we are trying to do is put some money back into the unapplied funds. What we have right now in unapplied funds is \$709,000 and that is for things like an expansion project, radio repairs if something comes up.

Scott Westrope – You are using all of your savings' account?

Evonne Stevens – Yes, if we completely deplete that for everyone then we do not have anything.

Jason Boaz – What was the total cost for the expansion?

Evonne Stevens – \$825,000.

Dave Crowl – If we do the scenario one and that is over four years as opposed to the scenario three where we do the one time out. Why does that not equal out to the same amount of money. So like Santa Rosa is \$25,000 multiply that times four. It does not quite.

Steve Akre – Can I jump in Dave? The difference is like scenario one looked at four years \$400,000 just to be round numbers. Three years looked at \$150,000 each year. That would raise the savings by \$50,000 and then I think scenario three just kept with that \$450,000 level, so we would end up with a little bit more. The other thing that is part of this in my mind anyways. We looked last month at the expansion project and committing \$100,000 for the first steps in that to secure that project is you know \$825,000 is the current best estimate right now for construction costs. Scott you can speak to this much more detail than I can, but you know there is no contingency built in there. I feel like we are to build in something for a contingency as well in this process. I think that was part of my mindset of you know asking Evonne to look into some of these different scenarios to rebuild savings was also to be able to have the funding to cover any excesses and contingency.

Evonne Stevens - Absolutely, thank you for help to explain that.

Jason Boaz - Scenario one is \$400,000, scenarios two and three are \$450,000?

Evonne Stevens – Yes.

Jason Boaz - Which is? Is it better to have \$450 then why not have that?

Evonne Stevens - That was our original number, but I feel doing \$400,000 over 4 years does make it a little more sparse and take longer to have that contingency. It might be a little bit more palatable for the smaller agencies to be able to afford. I mean it is not ideal. I think that the better scenario of these would be the second scenario. Just because it does spread out over three years, we would have that money a little sooner. I think that would be a little bit better for us to have that, just as a kind of an insurance policy if other things do come up as well as if this you know does not run at the \$825,000 as they are saying it will now. With the smaller agencies and taking them into consideration with inflation and all the costs of some of these agencies that are running on a very tight budget. I wanted to include it as affordable an option as possible that would still get something in there now would be scenario one.

Jason Boaz - The question would be why not have a scenario where we have \$450,000 over 4 years?

Evonne Stevens - We could still change an option or make another option if that is something we want to do. I would just have to rework that.

Jason Boaz - If I am understanding you right. We are planning on using all of the entire amount of that unappropriated funds the first year it will be zero in that budget year?

Evonne Stevens – Yes if it gets completed within that year. I mean we are still looking at having to take permits and that \$100,000 is going to take a while for them to get everything set up and for us to be spending that money. I am assuming we are going to be paying that and some of it could come out of the 23-24 budget and some of that could come out of the next budget it really depends on their construction schedule and how that plays out.

Jason Boaz - \$ 450,000 fills in a little bit more of a buffer. What about a scenario where it is \$450,000 or four years?

Evonne Stevens - We could do that. I just would have to make another scenario. I did not plan for that.

Jason Boaz – My other question is, do we have a policy as to what our reserve should be or how much we should keep?

Evonne Stevens - We do.

Steve Akre – I do not believe we have anything in our unappropriated, but we have a percentage when you look at reserves on the budget here.

Evonne Stevens – It is 17%.

Steve Akre - Yes 17%. This is what we have now \$922 is our 17% fund balance requirement.

Jason Boaz – That is not included in this?

Steve Akre - No. I guess in an emergency the Board could take action to spend some of that.

Evonne Stevens – Yes.

Steve Akre – It is our adopted policy that we keep 17%. I think that is what we are trying to do.

Jason Boaz - \$825 none of that is coming out of that?

Steve Akre – No.

Scott Westrope - According to this for the current fiscal year there has to be \$922 and the \$778 you are talking about is part and parcel that is holding that other 17%, in reserve, correct?

Evonne Stevens – Correct.

Jason Boaz – I am comfortable with that. I understand what you are saying. I just want to throw it out there. I would be interested and seeing \$450,000 over 4 years. I do not want to come back and find out there were \$30,000 short.

Evonne Stevens - I could do that would take it will take a little time to put that together, but we could definitely do that.

Steve Akre – Evonne and I had this conversation as we were talking about how to present this. I think what we are looking for here is what I was envisioning is that we as the Board kind of decide on which one of these things we want to pursue but we revisit this every year in the budget process, and we see. If our performance to budget if we are building that savings account just through performance of our budget. Then we may not need to do the same assessment next year or we may find that we need to do more next year because things happened that were unexpected.

Jason Boaz - I know we need to approve the other budget to. I guess if that is what you are saying. I would be most supportive of scenario one which is spread over 4 years. I am also ok if we want to increase that number to

\$450,000, but I do not know if we are going to be able to do that today and approve the REDCOM Budget if you do not have those numbers.

Scott Westrope - I support scenario one also. I get that it is going to be harder. I get that it is not the exact expenditure that you need right now. It is going to take some planning and budgeting, but after what we heard yesterday at the Fire Chiefs Meeting about where we are at on the budget cycle with, particularly the smaller agencies. I think this is much more partible for the smaller agencies. It was very loud and clear that the smaller agencies are hurting right now, even though it is a couple hundred dollars, it can be a large percentage of their budget.

Jason Boaz – The other reason why I like that. It is not pushed out because it is less fluctuation. The budget proposal is secured. I would rather see it spread out.

Scott Westrope – It plans into what you said Steve. It would give us time to look at it each year and adjust.

Steve Akre – We have \$75,000 in the Tech Fund that some years we have spent that and other years we have not and if we do not have pressing needs for that, well that goes into the savings account.

Evonne Stevens – Right.

Jason Boaz - In that case I would be in support of scenario one. However, I think it is important when you do the member fees letter that we explained that there is a special assessment four years.

Evonne Stevens – Absolutely if that gets approved. We will make it clear that it will be reassessed every year and could definitely fluctuate based on grant, Tech fund, not spending or anything else that comes into play during that time,

Jason Boaz – What I am hearing from you Scott is the smaller agencies scenario one is probably the most partible.

Bryan Cleaver – While we need to sensitive to the member agencies and the increases that they experience. We also need to be responsible to the JPA and make sure we get that savings back. Is there any appetite for a scenario for which involves year ones increase according to scenario one, given that we are obviously already late on our budget process already. We have to minimize the 23 - 24 increases the members, but then recognize that in year two 24 - 25 we want to recuperate our full savings of \$450,000 and knowing that it is our goal. That number one gives the member agencies a whole another year of planning for that potential increase but we assume responsibility for looking to save on those technology funds and try to

minimize that \$450,000 burden over the course of the next year or 18 months. That way they probably will not have to fully one time. You know I think there is also some logic to doing it quickly and the logic is we are doing a one-time expansion project that does require capital investment and you are going to be hit with a minimal increase year one so we can make the project happen but we need to replenish the coffers year two. We are going to look for every place that we can within REDCOMs funds to rebuild that and know that whatever we do not achieve there will be a bottom line left and it will be a onetime cost to the member agencies just to get us through the expansion and back to savings. Things to consider and not married to the concept at all.

Jason Boaz - I would rather see something that I could consistently budget for. We do a two-year budget cycle, and I would like to know what year two is going to be. I do not like unknowns.

Evonne Stevens - Being in that meeting yesterday and hearing the pain that just that small increase would make for some of the smaller agencies. I do think having to come up with sounds like \$100,000 that first year it is doable but then \$350,000 for overall could make quite adjustment for some of the smaller agencies of year two. If we are not able to move that Tech fund into there or we are not successful with any grants. I am more than willing to work with numbers and put that out there. I am curious what the temperature of the room is for the smaller agencies that are not here to speak for themselves on how that would play out on their budget and what kind of affect that would have on their agencies to be able to come up with that money.

Steve Akre- I appreciate that thought. Where I am feeling is that I think especially the first year we need to stick with scenario one and present it that way. We can look at this in the next year's budget and see what our performance is, what our savings looks like. Then we will have a much better idea about what our true construction costs are at this time next year. Then we can adjust that assessment in next year's budget whether we need to go up or down. We can have that ability and when we have true cost instead of estimated cost. If true cost has risen above, then I think it does lend itself to a little bit more to tell agencies even the small ones, hey look these are our costs, and we need fund this. If it ends up being in year two that we need to go for \$150,000 through the member agencies instead of \$100,000. feel like we will have more of a justification for that more reasoning.

Evonne Stevens – Agree.

Scott Westrope – I like that.

Bryan Cleaver – I motion that we authorize the expansion project to move forward utilizing scenario one with the proposed budget scenario. That fills our gap to complete expansion year one and recuperates potentially \$400,000 over 4 years.

Scott Westrope – Should we but in a friendly amendment to be revisited in the last meeting of calendar year 2023 so we are a little bit ahead.

Steve Akre – I agree.

Bryan Cleaver – I amend my motion to approve that language.

Steve Akre - We have a motion on the floor. Do I hear a second? Scott? Thank you.

Jason Boaz- So I am clear we are committing to scenario one \$400,000 over 4 years and we are going to revisit on annual basis to see if it can be adjusted down or even up.

Steve Akre – It is part of the budget cycle.

Jason Boaz – Ok.

Scott Westrope – Late this year we will re-look at it again if it stays the same, we will stick with the plan. If it has to go up or come down.

Jason Boaz – I know there is a lot of unknowns. I just want to get it as close to possible to minimize or fluctuation because we do a two-year budget.

Motion to approve made by Bryan Cleaver, Second Scott Westrope - Discussion – No Further comments – Approved unanimously.

Steve Akre – Thank you Evonne very much appreciated.

Evonne Stevens – Thank you.

c) REDCOM Member Fees discussion and motion to approve – Evonne Stevens

Evonne Stevens - Probably the easy place to look at it is on the same piece of paper with the original Budget that has the \$75,000 Tech fund remove from the member fees because of that broken cell it had it added into the member fees, and it should of not it would be in the unapplied. That change the scenario a little bit. The other cost on what we had put out was \$5,362,329.10 the budget has changed a bit and the member fees went down accordingly to \$5,287,329.10 but this is broken down into agencies by call volume. If you look at the Budget, we sent out in the packed. You can see with it broken down in comparison with 21 - 22 as well as 22 – 23. We

went over this in the last meeting with Bobbi. Let me know if you have any questions on this actual Budget.

Steve Akre – Any questions for Evonne? Hearing none. Looking for a motion to approve the Budget and fees for the upcoming year.

Motion to approve made by Bryan Cleaver, Second Jason Boaz -
Discussion – No Further comments – Approved unanimously.

d) REDCOM AMR Contract Services Budget discussion and action to approve –
Evonne Stevens –

Evonne Stevens - We went over this at the last meeting. I sent a breakdown with our packet that was the third from the last page. It talks about the salaries and benefits are estimated labor cost increase of 4% for union. We are in the middle of a collective bargaining agreement so that is the best estimate we could come up with. We are assuming it is about a 4% increase. For our management staff they are getting a plan increase of 3% beginning 2023 for cost of living and merits. Then of course our regular step increases that is a 1.13% change overall in our budget by putting us at 2,271,396. For our Dispatch and management salaries the next line with the 3% increase. We have our tax adjustment which went up by 1.70% just by based on higher wages of taxation increases. Our benefits went up a little bit. Looking into that further with AMR, it appears to be due to the 401K going up a little bit and as people are gaining ten year and going up to higher steps their contributions are going up. We have a 5% match so is that 5% match goes up it just costs more for our overall benefits. Taxes went up 1.89% and for our depreciation budget. Last year we were at \$1000 and this year we had \$3333 of an increase . That was due to the management team getting new laptops. They were at the end of life, and they were all replaced so that depreciation went up as a onetime fee. It should go back to normal for probably another four or five years until we get the new laptops again. Insurance went up \$13,331 and that was an overall increase according to the inflation and I guess the effects of COVID and employee employment costs overall. For telecommunications we left that the same with the cell phone and the wireless phone lines at \$24,000. Occupancy stayed the same at \$1000. Training resources basically are total training budget including sending people to trainings, conventions, EMD/EFD, seminars and travel is at about \$68,000. Other operating expenses \$15,000. General Admin expenses which include our ACE accreditation, First Watch, Critical, Priority Dispatch and high-speed Internet, Chair Replacements and ProQA fees are at \$101,596 that sums everything up. We are at 18 full-time Dispatchers, 7 part-time dispatchers, 4 Dispatch supervisors, exempt Operations Manager, Technical services manager, a Software Systems Administrator and then our

full-time administrative amazing assistant Brenda as well as an Executive Director. Fire Season up staffing, which was helpful this year as we went back to the last two years and looked at what we actually spent on our Fire Season Dispatcher. This kind of fluctuation we had budgeted quite a bit for that, but it does not get as filled as much as we had budgeted for. We were able to put that back and lessen the members fees quite a bit. So that was nice. That sums up any changes on the contract services budget for us. Do you have any questions?

Steve Akre – Thank you.

Scott Westrope – I have a question. Where is the revenue reflected for when we get up staff dispatcher paid for by OES? Like during the flood you had extra dispatchers for two weeks. Usually it is down the road within a year of it. We catch it on a line item somewhere. I am just curious where that is captures to offsite to the expenditure.

Steve Akre – Is that miscellaneous revenues?

Evonne Stevens – I believe it is on the REDCOM Budget miscellaneous line. What line do you see that on Steve?

Steve Akre – It is the last line under revenues 46040 is the account number.

Evonne Stevens- Yes, that is the line.

Steve Akre – Any other questions?

Bryan Cleaver – You may have already addressed this. The Budget we just approved shows AMR Dispatch contract showed \$4,701,000. However we projected on the contract for 23 -24 for it to be \$4.2 million. How are we making up the \$129,000 gap.

Steve Akre and Scott Westrope – Fire Season Dispatch.

Bryan Cleaver – I did miss that. Thank you.

Steve Akre- Any other questions?

Motion to approve made by Jason Boaz, Second Dave Crowl - Discussion – No Further comments – Approved unanimously.

6. Old Business

a) Grants – No update

7. Next meeting will be – on March 9, 2023, at 14:00, in person.

Bryan Cleaver – I will not be able to attend in March. I will send a proxy.
Proxy are able to participate in discussions but unable to be a voting member.

Steve Akre – That is correct.

Dave Crowl – Does it have to be a Board approved proxy?

Bryan Cleaver – You just have to notify the Chair who it will be.

Scott Westrope – I am in the same boat.

Steve Akre – Dave you good?

Dave Crowl – Yes

Steve Akre – Jason you good?

Jason Boaz -Yes.

Steve Akre – We need to reach out to Mark Heine and Sundari Maze to make sure they attend to make sure we have a quorum.

Brenda Bacigalupi – I will reach out to make sure they will attend.

8. Adjournment- Motion to adjourn.

Jason Boaz - I would like to make a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Steve Akre – All in favor.

ALL I's, meeting adjourned at 1509.