



REDCOM BOARD OF DIRECTORS

October 12, 2023 – @ 2:00PM
Santa Rosa Fire Training Tower
2126 West College Ave.
Santa Rosa, CA

Present:

Steve Akre – Sonoma Valley - Chair
Mark Heine – Sonoma County Fire – Vice Chair
Scott Westrope – SFFD
Jason Boaz – Healdsburg
Dave Crawl – Coast Life Support
Bryan Cleaver – CVEMSA – Secretary (Showed up then left after about 10 minutes before the meeting)

Others Present:

Evonne Stevens – REDCOM Executive Director
Brenda Bacigalupi – REDCOM Administrative Assistant
Ken Reese – REDCOM Communication Manager
Will Buck – REDCOM
Bob Stratton – REDCOM
Greg Fontana – REDCOM
Darrell Kopriva – REDCOM
Holly Fischer – REDCOM
Meagan Horeczko – REDCOM
Forest Neal – Grant – REDCOM
Monica Vanoni - REDCOM
KT McNulty – AMR Regional Director
Ambrose Stevens – AMR Operations Manager
Tambra Cutris – County Counsel
Jack Thomas – SRS
Matt Gloeckner – SRFD
Sam Hoel – L1401
Stephan Dalporto – L1401
Sean Lacey – Sonoma Valley
Ron Busch – Sonoma County Fire
Travers Collins – Deputy Fire Chief SR
Spencer Andreis – Sonoma Valley
Mike Stornetta – Sonoma County Fire
Jeff Veliquette – Rancho Adobe
Ron Lunardi – Occidental Fire
Paul Lowenthal – SRFD
Mike McCallum – SRFD

Dave Bray – Goldridge Fire
Darren DeCaril – Goldridge Fire
Chad Costa – Petaluma Fire Department
Terry Adair – Sheriffs Department
Krista Butts – SRFD
Mellisa Estrella-Lee - ACTTC
Mayra Marquez – ACTTC- Client Accounting
Dr. Karen Smith – Sonoma County Health Officer (Left at 1430 pm)
Steve Busher – Bells Ambulance
Matt Dahl - SRFD

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 1402
2. Approval of the Agenda Motion to approve made by Scott Westrope, Second Jason Boaz – Discussion – No Further comments – Approved unanimously.
3. Approval of the July 13, 2023, REDCOM Board of Directors Meeting Minutes. Motion to approve made by Mark Heine, Second Scott Westrope – 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.

KT McNulty – A portion of this Board has been meeting privately to plan a new direction for REDCOM to the benefit their own agencies, excluding fellow Board Members, REDCOM Staff and the public. The Board Members not involved in this inappropriate conduct owe it to REDCOM and the public to look into this behavior and corrected it. Collaboration is the vein of REDCOM's existence. Plotting behind closed doors goes against everything that we stand for. Thank you!

Jeff Veliquette - I just want to take this opportunity and thank you to the Board for allowing me to talk a little bit about the condition of the infrastructure of our radio system and specifically the Control 2 – 4 issues that we have been having which has really left communications day to day and emergency communications and unreliable condition. Yesterday at the Fire Chiefs meeting we took an action declared basically an emergency of our Control 2 – 4 infrastructure and ability to communicate on those channels. Not only in the southern part of the county but what appears now to have kind of leaked over into Sonoma Valley, West out into Gold Ridge and North into the Mark West Spring Larkfield area on Control 2 as well as 4. I am fully aware that there is partial funding through UASI

to replace and repair some components that may help resolve that. What I am looking for is supportive of REDCOM Board to take a similar action with what the Fire Chiefs did yesterday and really consider this to be an emergency resolve issues as quickly as possible and look at all opportunities of funding and reached out through the county and whatever opportunities we have to expedite the repairs and get our radio system back in useful condition for the safety of the firefighters and the community. Thank you.

Steve Akre – Thank you. Anyone else under public comment? Ok, hearing none. Closing Public Comment.

5. New Business

- a) Discussion and possible action item regarding redirecting 22 - 23 FY true up funds to be able to complete the Control 2 - 4 Project in conjunction with USAI Grant Funds – Evonne Stevens – I kind of goes to your public comment about 2 and 4 and I spoke with Ken and Nick. We went over all of the radio complaints that were documented through the REDCOM page and through emails that went to Ken and Nick. I feel pretty strongly that the majority of the problems that we are facing right now the biggest most dangerous problems are on Control 4. Looking into this with Tandra and with Terry yesterday we decided to that it would be appropriate to take the money that we have set aside from the budget from last year that we were over and use that true up money to expedite and order on the Control 4 parts to resolve that now. It does take three months to get the parts. We are ready to make that order. I have three quotes for the different cards. We have got the quote we want to go with, and I have a letter from Terry saying that is the equipment that we need. It will keep it consistent with the with the radio shops needs to have consistent tools, extra parts available and we are using what the Sheriff's Department is right now. I would be prepared to do that with the Board action and if we can get an action from the Board to approve spending that money today to get that going.

Steve Akre – Thank you for your very hard work yesterday to get these options to the Board. I do appreciate that hard work. Would you mind explaining a little bit more about what we are attending to do with the USAI funding.

Evonne Stevens - The original intent with the USAI funding was to put that together with the tune up money and make the order at the same time for the Control parts and have them be done together. Unfortunately with the shape that 4 is in we are going to have to wait to do Control 2 part of the project until we get the USAI grant funds. That should not be too long. In talking with Sherry yesterday, she thinks it could possibly go as early as December. Once that happens then we are ready with the quotes, again to order those parts and get that work started. I feel really strongly that in the meantime, we should be looking at getting those parts here as quickly as possible, so we can resolve this and get you guys back on your respective channels for your agency and your districts. I do have quotes here from Terry. He really did hard work from TCOM. He is here today. In finding the prices, finding the right

vendors for these parts, and getting us the letter that we need to express the need for those particular parts to use that vendor. With us using our own REDCOM money and are true up from our budget from last year we can avoid having to do like an RFP for the purchase because those quotes should be enough along with your letters saying this is what we need to do especially with the letter from the Board saying it is an emergency to do it now. I am open to any questions.

Steve Akre – Any questions from the Board?

Mark Heine – Evonne, there is not funding in place right now? I do not want to take away from prioritization. I support that, I just want to make sure that we are clear that 2 and 4 are both really bad right now. 2 might not have been documented as much, but there were two calls this morning where the field crews could not hear Control 2 and could not communicate on Control 2.

Evonne Stevens - We probably could take that money, however the problem with doing that is we cannot have any money put aside with that UASI grant money in use to pay it back we could essentially lose the \$220,000 that we have in the grant money for that. If 2 is holding strong enough to get us to December then we could take that \$220,000 use it for that, otherwise you know we could probably look at taking out of unapplied funds but that is a big loss financially. The 2 problem is newer to me. I have seen some documentation. I went through everything, and I saw something from Mr. Leonardi the few months ago from Occidental and he had communicated with Kenny. Kenny said to him; they just did some work on it yesterday. Let me know how it goes and then there was nothing back from him saying it is still bad or anything like that. Hearing more about the problem and finding out from Chief Busch yesterday that there are ongoing problems was kind of a surprise to me. We have been deeply involved with the Control 4 issues. It is really bad to the point where all of Rancho Adobe actually have been on Control 2 since I think August 23rd. It is pretty much a state of emergency. I know for 4 but, I am not doubting that Control 2 is not getting bad to. I am just hoping that we do not lose the grant money and we can responsible make this happen and get it all done and probably the difference in the projects is 2 months.

Mark Heine – Understood thank you.

Steve Akre- Any other questions?

Jason Boaz - I have a couple questions. I missed the Chiefs Meeting yesterday. Because we had our groundbreaking for the new station so I may not be fully up to speed. My question is one, I am assuming from what you are saying that we know the cost and what needs to be done to correct both of them.

Evonne Stevens – Yes

Jason Boaz – We are proposing to do is to split it up into two phases 2. Do Control 4 first and then Control 2 when the UASI money funding.

Evonne Stevens – Correct.

Jason Boaz – Then my second question is, do we have enough funds now currently to cover the first part of that control 4.

Evonne Stevens - Yes, with the board action today.

Jason Boaz – I am just curious is there more of a cost to break it up into two phases?

Evonne Stevens – The UASI is very particular about what they are going to fund. When we get that money, we need to make sure that we are following their process and if we have to go out to RFP and get those particular parts that we need we need to make sure we do not spend it ahead of time. They are like you cannot use that money that way and then we lose it. We want to make sure that we are checking in real time and doing it exactly as they need to do it.

Jason Boaz - Are we then talking about two separate board actions? One to write a letter. Did you need to the letter somewhere with the Fire Chief did create an emergency. Then a second action to reallocate the funds the way you are talking.

Evonne Stevens – I do not believe I need an action. I think I just need a permission or Board action to take the true up funds which I have \$280,000 that I can put towards the purchase the Control 4 equipment and it will also take us to the labor to get those installed and the rest of that money can go towards the rest that is needed Control 2 project. When we get the UASI money, and it should cover everything.

Jason Boaz – You are just looking for direction?

Steve Akre – I know what was requested yesterday at the Chefs Association was for this Board was to consider taking immediate action to correct the problems.

Jason Boaz - Then we have a plan to correct Control 2 and Control 4.

Evonne Stevens – Yes.

Jason Boaz - Funding for both? Is there public comment on this one?

Steve Akre – There will be, just getting the Boards questions first. Open it up to any public comment on this item.

Darrin DeCarli – I appreciate you taking the time yesterday at the meeting to get things going on Control 4. It is not just Rancho Adobe. I am speaking for Sonoma Valley but for the South County agencies it has been absolutely horrific. I appreciate

you pushing that through. Speaking on the Control 2 side of it. I have been out of Commission for about a month and a half or so. I apologize for not giving you a lot of that information. Control 2 is not as bad as 4. It is getting there, as Chief Heine alluded to, we had some calls on the post today were everything was scratch you could not hear anything, and this is a Fire safety issue. If there is a way from this Board here to potentially go to the County of Sonoma and go, we have got a serious issue here and to try and get these things in conjunction at the same time. I think it would benefit all of us. This is very frustrating out there, as it is, I am sure for the folks up at REDCOM. Where you are hearing every other word or nothing but static it definitely worry's itself especially along the coast. If there is one time funding through the County and then we look at reimbursing UASI that is another possibility. Something along those lines and get this going. December that is still a ways out there. If we can get this going in conjunction that would be awesome.

KT McNulty – Can we lease a channel from CalFire temporarily?

Evonne Stevens – That is something we could look into.

Ken Reese – Most of CalFire frequencies most of them are not simulcast and there repeated but their tone selected. I would not know what that would entail. That has been the big benefit of 2 and 4 is having the ability to have the responders talking not talking back through a particular line path but back into the simulcast or hearing the traffic but, probably something to look at.

Matt Gloeckner - I do support what Evonne present to the Board and as quickly as possible to get the steps she needs to get done. I know the hard work you have done to get to this point let's just move on with it. I do have a question during the COVID melt down. Was the Board aware of any issues that came up and that were noted during that melt down that Control 2 and Control 4 were at risk of having the same kind of issues. I do remember the Board discussing the fact those Control stations and modules were at risk.

Steve Akre – I will speak for me, and I do not want to speak for my fellow Board Members. I was not aware of that of the severity or the likely hood of that severe consequence to either Control 4 or Control 2 when we made those decisions. I think this Board has been and through KT Leadership first and the Evonne's we really tried to address some really old infrastructure. I totally understand from my time operationally and now being responsible for our responders throughout our system. Taking these safety considerations and concerns very very seriously. We have tried, I believe as a body to really address the infrastructure. I think with the work we are going to approve today we are taking another big step in that. It does not solve it immediately, but it gets us on that road. We cannot control the time it takes to get our parts and equipment from New Zealand that is part of the process. I believe you got this Boards full support and as well as staff to do whatever we can in the intern to ensure that there are alternatives. Matt, you talked about yesterday about Control 3 maybe there is off peak times to use Control 3 in certain areas. Our partners in Rohnert Park were very gracious in offering Com Center if needed. I know that this is

something that we are taking very seriously. I think we are on the right path to get it done as soon as we can. Thank you for your comments.

Jeff Veliquette - I appreciate it one more time since we are on the specifically on this issue now. We have been doing a lot of work with troubleshooting and through Evonne's Leadership, Sheriff's Department, the Radio Shop, infield testing, out of shop testing and their continuous work on it. We are talking infrastructure that is outdated way past years of service it has become un-repairable, and the parts are not available. We are at that make-or-break area where we need to take that action. I appreciate Evonne work you have done and certainly in the last 24 hours. It has been great to spin up the information how to prepare for the Board. Rancho Adobe really appreciates that.

Steve Akre – Any other public comment on this item?

Ken Reese – Just one question as far as the interim plan for that. Terry is there anything that our team can be doing more diligently, better, or effectively or do anything to help you guys out other than “Hey, they said.” “This is that.” One of the main key things is we get a lot of phone calls that says “Control 2” sounds like crap. When, where and what kind of equipment were you on. Were you on portable, were you on mobile, were driving, were you stationary it all makes a difference. I think the thing that all people in this room need to remember is when you are reporting those things try to get that down to your folks and pass that information along. As far as our staff we have to make sure that, if it is coming into our supervisors that the supervisor are conveying that to our tech team so we our making sure that there is proper documentation about what was going on. Beside from that, is there anything that we can do to train the system pretty daily. The problem is when that training process happens the minute, we key up the radio it stops that from happening. Then you get repeaters and stuff that will fall out redundancy or out of sync. Is there anything that we can watch for to know if that has occurred or not occurred and be able to report that to you.

Terry Adair - Not really, other than location, time, any were there any other circumstances that brought that up.

Ken Reese – Ok. A lot of it is report, call someone, they train the system. We go back and say “ Hey, they just sync the system how is it now?” and everybody has a million things on their plate. Now that we are a little bit more hyper focus on that maybe that will help to narrow some things down.

Steve Arke – Thank you, Ken. Now will bring it back to the Board for any additional comments or questions.

Mark Heine – I was wonder if there is any value in the REDCOM Board declaring a similar state of emergency. My thought process is after the County Chiefs Association taking that action yesterday. If the REDCOM Board does the same thing it might be helpful for a time if we need to go to the Board of Supervisors. Then that is much more of a funding opportunity to perhaps help alleviate some of the existing purchasing guidelines and to help us financially. I do not know. I suspect there is a value in the REDCOM Board taking a similar position.

Steve Akre – I agree, I think that we could probably add that into the motion that we are taking this action in an emergency situation. One of the other things that Evonne worked on very diligently yesterday to get this item before us was explore the opportunity of what it means with the UASI program and that \$200,000 we have been awarded; can we accelerate that process can we do a sole source purchase; can we do a number of those things and unfortunately there is very little we can do with that in the UASI program has pretty strict guidelines. I do not think it will hurt, but from the information that Evonne shared it is not likely it will help with that one. I think ultimately it comes down to and this is tough one is the Board prepared to spend the additional reserve funds and say goodbye to the potential of that \$200,000 from the UASI grant. After many conversations with Evonne and back and forth UASI that seems to be our only two options.

Scott Westrope – Do we know which agency original owned Control 2 and 4?

Terry Adair and Ken Reese and Darrell Kopriva – We are going back years. Control 2 was blue, and Control 4 was orange and REDCOM was green.

Scott Westrope – In other words they were owed by the County of Sonoma.

Terey Adire – Yes.

Scott Westrope – For a matter of conversation, KT might have to help me out. When Control 3 went down Santa Rosa Split the cost. It was 50/50 cost to repair the structure of Control 3. Which I think was \$50,000ish.

KT McNulty – Each, yes.

Scott Westrope - It would seem prudent that the County of Sonoma responsible for half the replacement cost. Based on history. I just leave that out for discussion. Mark to your point, it maybe going to the Board saying that this is historically done infrastructural replacement. If it could help.

Jason Boaz – To Chiefs Heines point. Just so you know where I stand. I would be supportive in writing or signing a letter for the REDCOM Board if we think it would be of any help. I am open to that. Whatever the Board decides. Secondly, the only thing that I ask is somehow find a way to communicate to all the stakeholders here either from the REDCOM Board or thorough the Chiefs Association the steps that are being taken in real time, so we know that progress is being made so everybody does not leave this room and just wait for something to happen. Trying to be proactive about communicating things that are happening and when it is happening. If that is something we can do.

Evonne Stevens – Yes. Terry, hopefully you can help me with that. Keep me updated so I can share that information.

Terry Adire – Yes.

Evonne Stevens – Thank you.

Jason Boaz – If that is it, I will make a motion that we redirect FY 22-23 true up funds to be able to complete Control 2 and Control 4 project injunction with UASI grant funds and in an expedite manner and so desired by the Board follow that up with a letter declaring Radio Communication System Emergency from the REDCOM Board. Motion to approve made by Jason Boaz, Second Scott Westrope – Discussion – No Further comments – Approved unanimously.

Brenda Bacigalupi – Excuse me, we have our Health Officer here.

Karen Smith – Sorry I was late. I got two wrong addresses. Then I ran into Bryan thankfully.

Brenda Bacigalupi – Tambra, does she have the opportunity to vote, she is an interim.

Karen Smith – According to our County Council can, but entirely up to you.

Tambra Curtis - It is not entirely clear. Give me a second. I know it is initially it is not entirely clear. I have looked into the issue. Let me give it some further thought.

KT McNulty - Does it not have to be an agenized for the seat?

Tambra Curtis – Yes, like I agree with that analysis.

KT McNulty – You can certainly be here and participate.

Karen Smith – I will let them know we do not have a seat. Thank you.

Karen Smith got up and walked out at 1426.

Steve Arke – We still have a quorum. We will get that agenized at the next meeting. Will move on to the next item.

- b) Discussion and possible action regarding potential notice of non-renewal and/or early termination of dispatch services contract with American Medical Response (“AMR.”)
– Steve Akre – I will introduce this one. We have had a very long and I would say very productive contractual arrangement with AMR going back 20 years. We have become a center of excellence we have been on the ground floor of adopting Fire Protocols and the Wildfire Protocols we are the first in the nation to do that. We have had some really exceptional leadership and hiring and development of our REDCOM staff and it is noted in in many parts of our service. Most recently we just turned from an ISO grading evaluation when it came to points for dispatch. When we mentioned that REDCOM was our dispatching agency. The reaction was “WOW” they are one of the very best in the nation. We have been fortunate for having this relationship for 20 years. We are at of time now for a couple of big reasons. I feel like it is really important to discuss and have a conversation about the future of REDCOM. I will go back in history a little bit, and this is just historical this is not anything more than that. When REDCOM, in talking with some of the folks that originally designed REDCOM and created it. We started a contract agreement with AMR. That was not the intention

of those forefathers of REDCOM to have it be permanently within a contracting agency. The review was to get it back to a Fire agency if at all possible. Right now, we are faced with two things that I think really warrant this discussion. (1) We are now in January we are going to have a new provider of ground ambulance service in the EOA1. That is a big change for all of us, for this county and all of us that are connected within the EMS world and Fire world, it is a big change. Look at things reasonably and structurally. AMR has been very successful having both for many years. The ground ambulance contract as well as the dispatching contract. It seems to make sense to me as a starting point in looking at this. Having a competitor that lost the ground ambulance bid and having control of dispatch. This is not a judgment of values of AMR, but it does not seem to make a whole lot of sense setting up the system for its best opportunities for success. (2) I believe is very incredibly likely almost a slam dunk at this point is the sales tax measure. The county Chiefs have set aside a significant amount of funding to be able to finally realize the kind of vision and dream that many of us have had in the Fire service here to bring REDCOM to the level of any ECC. That is something that as we move towards that. We have taken some incremental steps over the years with fire season dispatchers and other efforts. When we are able to get to that point of being an ECC I think all of us in the in the fire service can look at that and say that that needs to be run by a Fire Agency, plain and simple. Those are the two big things, that I think make this the right time. This is never a comfortable conversation to have, but we have to conduct business as the REDCOM Board and looking out for all of our providers here both in the Fire and EMS world. We know that those overlap and intertwine in a big way. There is a couple of things that as a starting point for this discussion. I want to remind and just point out again, that is one, our first and foremost mission is continuity of operations, service to our communities, our citizens that call 911 that need service and our service to our First Responders that are out there on the other end of those radios. As we just discussed in our previous item. Very, very importantly, in being able to accomplish that. We only do that through our REDCOM employees and their service. This Board has taken a number of steps to demonstrate our commitment to our REDCOM employees through a very uncertain time in everybody's world as we went through the RFP process and as we continue to move towards that new EOA1 provider. With that I will open it up for the Board first for any discussion any thoughts and then we will go to public comment.

Scott Westrope – I will jump in here try to break the ice.

Steve Akre – Thanks, I appreciate that.

Scott Westrop - You know as we explore this, I agree. I just want to double down on the fact that as we potentially explore this. The two big things are continuing of operations and that we are focused on the best interest of the community and the organizations represented that are serviced by REDCOM. We need to make a conscientious decision that is based on the region and the service to the community of the region and also focused on the workforce that has been very steadfast and strong throughout the big emergencies and on the day-to-day. I think there needs to be some planning associated with this. Jumping into a decision right now without

doing a little bit of research and maybe taking 30 days to look at what is the best options and maybe come back to a special meeting or something like that would be something that I would be in supportive of. Just to make sure that we are making an equitable decision that is for the best interest of everybody involved.

Steve Akre – Thank you.

Mark Heine – My only comment is, I think as a Board, we need to have our options open to us to be able to capitalize on any future opportunities for REDCOM. I think for me it was frustrating that we could not continue down the path with conversations and collaboration with Marin. Legislation change kind of in the moment of that. That ended up precluding us from moving forward on that. I just want to make sure that REDCOM as a Board is always positioning capitalize on opportunities that neighbors have something. Whatever those are no or whatever those may be in the future. I think we are a little limited because of legislation that passed agreements, but that could change too. It does warrants us to be cautious moving forward. I think the other background pieces sort of prompted this in my mind was the contract was coming up next June for renewal. It was going to be pressing time for the REDCOM Board to have to make a decision one way or another anyway. I may have this wrong; Tandra can clear this up. I think there is a 6-month notification piece of either party is not going to renew. That was going to be a deadline where we are working back from December anyway. That is it.

Steve Akre – Thank you Mark.

Dave Crowl - I have to agree with my colleague over here. You just said that the REDCOM is one of the best in the nation. It is our people that is best in the nation. They need leadership and management to continue to be the best in the nation. I am hesitant to make any actions at this time. I do not think I have enough information. What does our forecast look at what can REDCOM do in the future? What is the ECC management look like there. I think we need more discussion about this and a special look of what alternatives to having that management change. That is my opinion.

Steve Akre - Thank you.

Jason Boaz – Let me see if I can articulate where I am with this. I kind of agree with everybody here and I am kind of on the fence. To me everything you said makes sense for all the right reasons moving forward. I personally think AMR and REDCOM have done a fantastic job. This does feel a little bit rough to me. I understand the logic and the urgency of it. I would be ok with waiting a little bit. With that being said, I do not know how we are going to get that information and disseminate it and use it to better inform our decision. I do not know how that would work. My main concern really is just more clarity on the status of the employees and how that looks transition from AMR employees to who we do not know. What that process would look like and what potential unforeseen consequences that would be. For example: If it was a

public agency and the employees are in another PERS agency or their ramification with that. I do not know. I am kind of on the fence. I feel like maybe it would be ok to call a special meeting. I would like to kind of know exactly what other information we want to clarify and just bring it back some more answers because we can postpone it 30 days but if we come back and it does not answer any further questions from us, we just have another discussion. I do not know if that gets us anywhere. I am not giving you a real solid opinion here one way or the other. That is kind of where I am at, I am really interested to hear what the public comment is on this before I move forward.

Scott Westrope - One thing that I would offer Jason, is just as an idea for the Board is a subcommittee or an ADHOC but together whether it is from this body or from the DOAG committee. A collaborative group looking at the questions we need answered. I do not know necessarily what that is defined as right now, but a group this collaborative of Regional Representation, Private, Public, all the labor groups that are involved. Get everybody in the room and answer those questions and look at what the opportunities are. Moving forward with the timelines are moving forward and maybe it is not 30 days I just kind of threw that out there. That is a lot of work to get done with 30 days. A group that is specially trained, especially incumbent personnel who have the subject matter expertise to come back to us with that information because it is not necessarily the information that we hold. But it is just information that we need to make an educated decision. This is an idea.

Jason Boaz - That makes sense. Now 30 days is kind of an arbitrary number. It is also short enough to put pressure on the group to actually get some work done in a period of time. I think we could move quickly and on that. I think it is important that we find what it is that we are trying to clarify.

Steve Akre - I think so and I think what we are looking for here from this Board is policy direction right. If we give staff and the work group direction on what it is that this Board needs to be able to make a better decision and have that information. Then that would seem to be what the right role and responsibility of the Board.

Jason Boaz - I just feel like this is a big jumping off point. It is a big change is a big move and I do not feel like I am quite clear enough on what we are jumping off into yet. It all makes sense. I think it is moving in the right direction for all the right reasons. I would be willing to volunteer to be on an ADHOC if it pleases the Board.

Dave Crowl – I would also.

Mark Heine – I think we should hear from everybody in the room. Before we make a discussion.

Steve Akre – Lets open it up for public comment.

Steve Busher - First of all, is there something broken. I mean usually change leads to is precipitated because there is something broken. I would like to know what is broken. I mean I think REDCOM does a great job. I think they work their tail off. I think they have worked the Fire services and changed their whole perspective and trained people to deal with the Fire services over the years and I thought everybody was happy. I really do not understand what is broken.

Chad Costa – Steve, I am not hearing anything is broken. What I am hearing is that the same, it may just be a patch change if you will. I get that there is more that affects the employees, but I did not hear anything is broken.

Steve Busher – We are talking about a sit change. Changing the employees, change things. I do not want to see REDCOM. People have put a lot of effort into REDCOM and the employees especially. I do not want to see them loss on this.

Chad Costa – I think that would be the intent of the Board is for that not to happen. In a perfect world if you are looking at this as Fire dispatch perspective. You have the same people, maybe their patch changes, maybe some of the structural changes. You still provide the same excellent service. It is just not an AMR patch versus a Petaluma Fire patch. That is what I see.

Steve Busher – That is not my point. I do not care what the patch is. I just want to see the employees protected and I want to see all the effort that has gone into REDCOM over the last 30 years. I have set on every committee to bring us here and I do not want to see that lost.

Chad Costa – I 100% agree.

Evonne Stevens – To speak to something you said Jason. We do have several employees that do collect PERS and that would be a big change if we ended up with an agency that was using PERS as part of our benefits for them to be able to continue the employment. I know that has been a concern that has been raised by several employees to me if something like this was to happen.

Jason Boaz – That is a good example of the kind of unforeseen unattended consequences. I just want to make sure we are seeing everything.

Steve Akre - That would be something that our subgroup that we would appoint would you know look into. I think again, I know I am being repetitive, but it is worth being repetitive in this and Steve to your point, this Board has solidly and publicly and in writing given our commitment to the REDCOM employees and maintaining your employment and keeping you whole in this process. We do not want to lose any of you no matter what happens with this. That is our overriding thing and I think we were all very clear on that. That we provide the excellent service because of our employees that are staffing REDCOM every day. The commitment of the Fire service to REDCOM is tremendous. I mean we have Chief officers volunteering every single

week without pay to be the REDCOM duty officer. Those things are not going to go away and with the commitment is very strong and what we are looking at is growing even more and expanding what services we are able to provide. I know change is uncertainty is hard. It is also opportunities to get better and that is something that is worthwhile.

Jason Boaz – I have been on the REDCOM Board for six years now and I feel like we have always been very supportive of the employee at REDCOM, and I want to continue to do so, and believe me I am not one to one create extra subgroups or have more meetings just to delay a decision. I truly feeling this case it might be good to provide a little bit of priority and just looking at it from different directions. There is no doubt in my mind that we are doing the right thing, but I just want to make sure that we identify any potential pitfalls before we do that, if that makes sense. We are still in public comment.

Steve Akre – Yes, we are.

Sam Hoel – I work at 1401. I represent seven Fire Department and a private ambulance company. We are all in the EOA, all in Sonoma County and we are listening to REDCOM every day. We are all very aware that we have a great dispatch center a lot of the discussions we make on the streets, safety decisions all depend on having such a good dispatch center. I think the baseline thing for all of us to come to this is that there has to be communication and transparency between all the stakeholders that participate in the system. I am not actually 100% clearer as to what is before the Board right now. Whether it is an action item or discussion item. The agenda says it is both. I also heard some comments about an ADHOC committee. My comments are not necessarily targeted at any one of those options. I would certainly come out in favor of any that gives us more discussion and more input from stakeholders that have a really big and really important stake in the system. I first heard about this item earlier this week just seeing it on the REDCOM agenda. Nothing came to my president's inbox about this. It definitely caught my attention because like I said I have 300 members that are listening to REDCOM all day, every day. We went to a meeting of our overall Eboard and brought it up to my affiliate leaders hoping to find more information that has been more communication on those levels. I did not hear back that there was any communication at all. We were all kind of sitting around the table going, I am really not sure what this is, but it sounds big, potential termination of a contract that you know as Chief Akre said, one of the best dispatch systems in the country. I feel like an important moment for us to have been included in that discussion that did not happen. I have since then had some great conversations. Steve and I talked last night and that was a great conversation to have. I think that those conversations are kind of going to be a lifeblood of what we move forward with. It is important that labor and that the people not only us at 1401 but also the people at REDCOM are included in these decisions. I am not going to speak to them, but I have been communicating with a lot of people in the last few days and there has been general lack of information. What direction we are considering taking. Whether it is going to be collaborative or whether there is going to

be a single agency. Which agency is going to be, and you know like I said I am not really sure what is under consideration before the Board right now. I have not really heard any specifics about what it is going to be. I could say from our perspective. We very much support a public option. We think it is very important that we move forward together like we have on the EOA. We also need to do it collaboratively. The seeds in the disfunction sewn when you do not have collaboration with all parties early on. That does not mean bringing a completed plan to stakeholders and after the sign off that means from day one being involved. One of the things that me and Steve talked about last night was the original contractor and was there at the beginning in 2002 and lived with it for the next two decades. We should be making decisions as if these decisions will be the ones, we are living with for the next 20 years as opposed to an internal or six-month basis. I know there is a June 2024 deadline that could change things again. It is a very powerful force, especially in the Fire service. I want to make sure that at the beginning of all this that all stakeholders not only labor employee's groups but all the different management groups of all the people that pay for REDCOM services not respond dispatch by REDCOM. All those people to start with. If there is that information gap that I have seen over the last week. I think we are all on the same team we can work towards the same goals. The biggest and most important thing to me speaking from a labor perspective is that we all have the true legitimate voice in the room from the very start of the plan and how that looks going forward. I appreciate it.

Steve Dalporto – I will be a little more frank in my opinions. Steve Dalporto the director of the Santa Rosa Association. What happened here was nonsense and I feel like the Board seeing that now and realizing what they were trying to pull is not going to happen. I believe the new ambulance provider is nervous that AMR will expose any deficiencies and that is why they are doing this move now to try and create some sort of emergency to remove AMR before it happens. These are words have been spoken by the Chair saying that that is a concern and that this was going to be an action item at this thing to remove AMR here and put in some Sonoma Valley into that position. I appreciate Sam comments and luckily for you guys you could work with him he is a lot more political than I am. This was very inappropriate the way it went down. That it was going to come to this Board agendas three days before no discussion. I find that insulting in fact that that 1401 was not brought into this. That the REDCOM Employee Association was not brought into this. The city of Santa Rosa where the dispatch center sits was not brought into this. My Chief was not brought into this who the majority of the calls are running our city. I do not want to say too much but what was about to take place here it was inappropriate, and it was conducted by two members of this Board, and I think this needs to be a bigger discussion as to what is going on behind the scenes to bring these things forward moving here on out. Moving forward it does need to be a collaboration that needs to be unions, management, city leaders together to create a plan moving forward. That is all.

Steve Busher – That took guts.

Steve Dalporto – It is easy for me.

Steve Busher - There is the component that if we are going to have a new provider in Santa Rosa. I mean Chief Heine needs to be involved with how the dispatch center is going to work. That needs to be part of this collaboration as well and a very important part. That is the key to how we are going to avoid fines, how they are going to make response times. There is much to be done here.

Monica Vannoni - As far as the REDCOM employees. I have talked a few different people. Our concerns are that it does not really matter to us who runs it. We run the way we run because it works. Our concerns are if AMR leaves then our union leaves. If AMR leaves then what are the benefits look like. We get pretty good benefits through AMR not that they are perfect, but these are our concerns. Union, benefits, retirement has been mentioned because we do have some that have already retired from PERS. That is going to put a limit on them on how many hours they can put in per year. Those different points that make us nervous as far as making a full different change.

Matt Gloeckner - I just want to say that comments are making today are made as a Labor Leader for Santa Rosa Fire Department, Fire Management Labor Unit. Secondly, as a Labor Leader in the past VP for local 1401. I would just like to apologize to the employees at REDCOM for finding out that this was up 72 hours prior to this meeting. To me as a Labor Leader and a manager of my organizations this is not how I would see this was coming. It is not fair to the employees have to stress out and freak for 72 hours about what is going to happen who is going to move forward what and how this is going to plan. To me this is totally inappropriate. The only thing I can do is express my support for the employees at REDCOM and both local 4911 and other miscellaneous and employees at the dispatch center for the work that they have done. The Fire Management Labor Unit and Santa Rosa Fire will be here to stand by your side as well as 1401as well as they stepped up. Twenty years ago, our agency and Sonoma County with direct spear heading with Santa Rosa Fire created REDCOM JPA in the original dispatch center. Since that time AMR has operated its contract with the dispatch service for 20 years. Think about that. There were not even smartphones. Now we are talking about putting a Board action item to make a change with 72 hours' notice. AMR has worked tirelessly on requested by services and professional manner for 2 decades. This employee group has worked hard throughout every emergency that we could ask them to do and now we are going to talk about an action item to again exercise 120 exit clause. We are doing so in the middle of trying to pass Fire Service Tax Measure arguably the most important thing effecting Fire services in Sonoma County since the creation of REDCOM 20 years ago. This is also being done in the middle of the EOA1 provider moving in and stepping in to provide you ambulance services, again once in two-decade change. That was significant hardware and software issues already effecting REDCOM as we speak. We are doing this change to what end. Decision is not and would not be safe as citizens Santa Rosa just arguably drop the dime right now and make this move forward. Two months ago, my daughter nearly escaped being

involved in a multi car collision on 101 with four people nearly died. Two patients were flown out, two Code 2 ground transport. In that process my daughter had to provide care to the patients in the car prior to Fires arrival. The dispatchers and system worked incredibly. The dispatcher was there for her, thank you to Evonne and her team for providing her excellent service. Thank you to Chief Boaz and his team first provided incredible service.

This story exemplifies the fact that there is no immediate need to change dispatch providers at this moment. The system is working as we want it to and expect it to and it worked for my daughter that day. Santa Rosa Fire Management does not disagree with the fact that that times are changing, and it is time for us to make a change moving forward. Dispatcher contract is up for renewal in nine months and the Board should look at other alternatives and private provider have the contract and likely should move forward with some type of member on contract. In the interim set, Santa Rosa Fire Management Labor Unit expects conversational terminated contract with AMR to seize. The Labor Unit expects the Board to do what is right, what is fair and what is transparent. SFRD managers believe that the right path is to have the Board set of special meetings. Where all interested parties including labor and give those members of the system to determine time and what they want in the system before they input the process of moving forward. Special meeting should be done sooner than later. Obviously, you know we are worried about the exit clause. In that time the committee should be able to build a proposal. If AMR decides to exercise its exit clause and also give us time to prepare for the end of the contract to nine months. This is a fair process it is also transparent process and values each members input and unique needs. Yesterday at County Chiefs there was a lot of talk about collaboration and communication. The road that the Board is heading down if you take a vote today is not collaboration and the purposely skirts adequate open time of communication. If the Board truly fills what they talked about yesterday at the County Fire Chiefs is true, do not take vote, take no vote, and push it to a committee where we can work to create a collaborative solution and move forward from there. That is what the community expects and what my community deserves.

Steve Akre- Any other public comment?

KT McNulty – I would like to add one more thing. AMR has no intention of leaving Sonoma County. We have identified enough revenue to remain with our current staffing and we have no intention of pulling out of the dispatch. Thank you.

Will Buck - I just want to say, just like Monica said. Whoever is in charge of the contract our patches currently do not say AMR they say REDCOM which is what all these REDCOM employees are for. It is for providing excellent dispatch services. Just like Chief Akre said, some of the best in the nation and regardless of who does hold the contract. We are still going to continue to do that for all of our contracted agencies. As supervisors unionized force, we just look for the transparency as well. Thank you.

Bob Stratton - To further what Will said. I would like to say that we need to be included in those conversations as well as actable employees' supervisors and above with REDCOM so important for us to be involved in whatever decisions, actions or future brings. I am one of those CalPERS retirees who would lose my CalPERS retirement if I worked over 1010 hours for the year or another CalPERS agency. That being said, I go from 3% at 50 to whatever the current format is and lose my retirement. If I continue to work like that. It would specifically affect me. I had a five-year plan to be at REDCOM and it is now has been 6 1/2 years and I am still kicking.

KT McNulty – Thanks Bob.

Bob Stratton - With no plans to leave at this point. If it was just me that was affected by it, I would say hey you know what is best for the community which is what I have always lived with from my four years of Fire Service as well as my commitment here. If it was me, it would affect it would be a different story, but it does affect others that are in REDCOM as well some of the union employees. Keep aware of everybody that is involved in this not just select groups.

Steve Akre – No other public comment bringing it back to the Board.

Mark Heine – Here is the deal. I think as a Board of Directors are job is to ensure that the REDCOM folks and our Executive Directors are property support. Another piece of our job is to make sure that we are properly serving all of our Constituent Agencies in our State Agencies that are part of the REDCOM JPA. Clearly, I hear loud clear the public comment. I do not think it is wise to move forward with a definitive action today without us making sure that we are taking clear collaborative steps to get everybody's input. The only clavate that being is whatever you want to do President Akre as far as setting up committee or a group of committees or ADHOC however you want to preside with that. There is a certain timeline here that we have cognizant as a Board as well, coming up by the end of the calendar year. If the Board was to choose to make change in the future, it does have a deadline to operate under. With that being said, I hear loud and clear. There is nothing easy about these kind of agenda items. They are very emotional for all the right reason for everybody, and I totally respect that. I think it is important that we make sure that we back up a step and super collaborative reach out to the critical stakeholders. I would also part of the agenda item today; I think for the Board it opens this dialog and have the courageous conversations that we need to have. We can listen the critical feedback provided to us that I know is in the spirit of trying to make REDCOM successful. I do appreciate that.

Steve Akre – Thank you Mark.

Scott Westrope – What I would offer is, I brought up the idea of this subcommittee earlier in and hearing the group and hearing Jason your concerns. I am wondering if we frame it into more of a swat analysis and maybe there is a new core or something

like that. An analysis maybe we do not have specific questions, but we have swat analysis of REDCOM going into the end of the calendar year when we do have to make a decision. That would be a very collaborative group. You know the Fire Departments by region, private providers, all the unions involved, the underrepresented supervisor, allied agencies there needs to be some fiduciary look at the organization things like. I do not if we bring Tandra in that conversation or we bring in, but you know sort of the top to bottom approach about of an analysis of the system so we can make an educated decision prior to the end of the calendar year.

KT McNulty – Can I correct something really quick? I that ok?

Steve Akre – Yes.

KT McNulty – The January deadline is to allow the contract to expire by notice but there is still a 180-day clause to cancel the contract. January by the artificial timeline.

Jason Boaz – I am not comfortable moving forward with an action today. Given by the public comments and stakeholders. I think it might be a little bit of missed step here. These are the people that make up the system that we are trying to work forward here. I do not know how we do it more collaborative. I am willing to step in, however it needs to be done. I am cognizant of the time frame. I do not how exactly what that is, but we have the time to step back and do this right. This is too important to not get it right. We need to get the right people in the room and figure this out.

Steve Akre – Any other comments.

Steve Akre – I will comment briefly and then we will look for maybe a motion to take the next steps. For a lot of reasons this this item was not intended to catch people off guard. This was having an agenda item and the first thing is a discussion right. It is very important to hear from all of you. We really could not really do that until we agenize an item and get some policy direction from this Board and that was clearly the intention. I do not believe that was received that way, but that was the intention to have this conversation and until we hear from our stakeholders in this forum in this discussion it is hard for us to then take any action, right. We have clearly heard; I think all of us on the Board have heard the comments and I am confident that will get a motion and something in place to be collaborative and inclusive in a process to look at what our opportunities are and what that plan might look like once we look at opportunities.

Jason Boaz – Here is a suggestion. How about we frame that in the form of kind of a work group where we can do some of the stuff that Chief Westrope recommend. Set a meeting date and time and invite the stakeholders. We can come up with an agenda and a framework for it. Form it more as a work group or do you want something more formalized.

Steve Akre – I was kind of wondering about, we already have a standing subcommittee the DOAG and looking at operations and all that is their purview, and it is fairly well represent. I think we could direct them to add some representation to it. I also know it is really important to have the right representation there. It is also important to have a group that is used to working together at its core and actually we are talking about 30 days to come back with something that they would need to be able to be effective in that timeline.

Jason Boaz – You are proposing the DOAG group and ask them to put together special meeting. I do not know what representation the Labor as in the DOAG group. There are numerous Labor Groups.

Steve Akre – That is part of what I said turning it to the DOAG with additional representation for those groups clearly are REDCOM work force, supervisors, Union as well as our IFF representation to be able to have them be a part of this process.

Jason Boaz – Run it as a special meeting not a public meeting?

Steve Akre - Yes.

Mark Heine – I think important is Labor piece for sure and make sure AMR union representation. No matter what direction the REDCOM Board ends up going or not going not. We cannot create a situation where everybody is losing, certainly if anybody's pension is being effect, benefits being effect. We cannot do that.

Steve Akre – Absolutely.

Jason Boaz – I definitely think that we have intellectual Fire power on the DOAG to come up with a good format and dig through the right questions.

Steve Busher – Not to mention the employees at REDCOM have made a huge effort to work with Fire and to change they did things and to learn new things and they have done a great job. I have not heard any complaints. Are there complaints out there? I think that REDCOM need to be looked.

at as sperate entity. I think AMR did a great job. Sonoma County Fire has won the bid. AMR is still a separate entity in my option. They have been trained by all of the Fire side of this and I think that needs to be takin into consideration.

Scott Westrope – I will take a crack at a motion. I will make a motion that the REDCOM Board of Directors directs the DOAG committee to develop a collaborative subcommittee or working group to include, the DOAG Committee, Fire representation by region, private ambulance providers, all unions represented within those employee group, the unrepresented supervisors of REDCOM, the allied agencies to perform swat analysis and report back to the REDCOM Board of Directors at a special meeting 45 days to hear the progress on the swat analysis by the DOAG special working group.

Steve Akre – Our DOAG Chair is present. Spencer is that a realistic time frame for you to establish the work group at least have one meeting hopefully more before 45 days.

Spencer Andreis – Yes, they will be long meetings.

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

Steve Akre – Moving on to REDCOM Uniforms.

- c) REDCOM Uniforms – Evonne Stevens – First of all lets back track just for a moment. I just wanted to say all the wonderful things that have been said today about the REDCOM group and our Dispatchers and Supervisors with the work you guys have done and do every day. It means the world to me, and I am really proud to work side by side with all of you. Night shift and Day shift any time of the day. I really appreciate everything you do, and you guys mean the world to me. I want to be a part of whatever happens in the future to make sure you guys are taken care of. You guys have my word, and you mean everything to me. Thank you for what you do I am really proud.

Our current CBA with our union says, “We do not have to wear uniforms all the time in the center.” This is actual a big moral boost for a lot of people. They are tired of wearing uniforms in there, the pants do not fit and are uncomfortable for the woman. What we decided is to put together a policy that we want to keep uniforms available. There are some people that like to wear the uniform. The come in they do not have to figure out what to wear. I also what to have uniforms available when people are representing REDCOM and special meetings. I want to keep the uniforms available but not make them a daily chore for people that do not want to wear them. I just wanted to let the Board know that was our attention so when you come in a see us in nice business casual wear that is what we are doing. That is it.

- d) Approval of next year’s meeting schedule- Steve Akre -

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

6. Old Business

- a) ZTRON Radio console update - Evonne Stevens/Ken Reese Ken Reese - As you probably know we have aging infrastructure. Some of that aging infrastructure was a radio consoles which are 22 - 23 years old now. Those are being replaced. We have a couple that are installed, and the staff have been trained on it. It is a slow go because we have got some challenges with some audio levels and things like that.

Terry is working due diligently with the Vendor and they are pushing out updates every day. I probably suspect it to be done probably by January, they should have them all done. The strive is to get all the all of those things done. We just do not want to have problematic work consoles that we continue to install. That is where we are at with that. We will keep reporting on that.

- b) **Expansion Project update – Evonne Stevens** - I have been meeting with Scot Stanley and his workgroups and the public safety infrastructure pretty frequently. We continue to encounter little bits of red tape and right now there is a letter out there that needs to be signed by about eight people just to a little bit further along with the permit process to be able to get the permits done. I just continue to move with him, and he has been wonderful at continuing to bring people and trying to get them to sign that letter and moving it on to the next desk and keeping me in the loop on what is happening. I think our expansion completion date is still October/November. That is going into November where it was October. We are still working closely with them. We did put money into an account for them to do the permit process and architecture it was about \$210,000 and they have not taken the money yet. They know it is there, they acknowledged it and that is part of this signature process. We are just continuing to move forward with that and keep communication going and I feel like the more we talk and the more I e-mail them and call them more things seem to move along. I am going to keep bothering them and be squeaky go until we actually get some action happening next door.

Steve Akre – Thank you.

- c) **ACE Project update – Evonne Stevens** – The end of August IAED finally got their website up and running. We were able to upload all of our application. Which includes 20 points for our EMD recertification and 20 points for our EFD recertification. There are many sub points on there. We got out initial feedback from ACE department. They said our applications looked good; our scores looked good. Now they have to go good and dig into each policy and all the recordings and start listening to merging tapes. As they progress through, they have been giving us little things to correct, need to update this policy here there to say this, because there are standards continually change. We are about four weeks in now to that back and forth on those corrections. I suspect within the next two to three weeks we should be completed recertified with both EMD and EFD with ACE. Thanks to the hard work of these guys and your awesome call taking.

Steve Akre – Thanks Evonne.

7. Next meeting will be – January 11, 2024, at 14:00 in person only.
8. Adjournment- Motion to adjourn - Motion to adjourn, all in favor - Approved unanimously @ 1521.