



## REDCOM BOARD OF DIRECTORS

**December 11, 2023 @ 2:00pm  
In Person/Virtual**

### **Special Meeting Minute**

**Santa Rosa Training Tower  
2126 West College Ave.  
Santa Rosa, Ca**

**Join by phone Teams 1-323-886-6897 Conference ID: 314 792 761#**

**Director Dr. Luoto will have his Location at 26 Loma Avenue La Silva Beach, Ca  
95076**

**Director Dave Crawl will have his location at 1701 West 22<sup>nd</sup> Street Loveland, CO  
80538**

**Public are Welcome at both locations**

**Since we are having a few Board Members remote for this meeting. They will be  
meeting the guidelines that are required per the Brown Act.**

**Present:**

**Steve Akre – Sonoma Valley – Chair**

**Mark Heine – Sonoma County Fire – Vice Chair**

**Scott Westrope – SRFD**

**Jason Boaz – Healdsburg**

**Dave Crawl – Coast Life Support (Remote TEAMS)**

**Dr. Mark Luoto – County EMS Medical Director (Remote TEAMS)**

**Not in Attendance:**

**Bryan Cleaver – CVEMSA**

Others Present:

Evonne Stevens - REDCOM Executive Director  
Brenda Bacigalupi – REDCOM Administration Assistant  
Ken Reese – REDCOM Communication Manager  
Darrell Kopriva – REDCOM  
Chad Costa – Petaluma  
Darrin DeCarli – Goldridge Fire  
Ron Busch – Sonoma County Fire  
Travers Collins – SRFD  
Robert Johnson – SCFD  
James Salvante – CVEMSA  
Jeff Schach – Petaluma  
KT McNulty – AMR Regional Director  
Peter Goyhenetche – SLS  
Jack Thomas – SRS  
Matt Gloeckner – SRS  
Mike McCallum – SRFD  
Tambra Curtis – Legal Counsel  
Ben Nicholls – CalFire  
Matt Tognozzi – 1401  
Sam Hoel 1401  
Stephan Dalporto – 1401  
Gabriel Kaplan – DHS  
Dan Reese – Bells  
Melissa Estrella -Lee – ACTTC  
Mayra Marquez – ACTTC  
Jessica Mullan – CSR  
Jeff Veliquette – Rancho Adobe

Remote TEAMS:

Kurt Henke – AP Triton - Principal/Managing Partner  
Kurt Latipow – AP Triton - Vice President Operations  
Monica Vanoni – REDCOM  
Dan Petersen - AP Triton - Project Manager

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 @ 1403 – With that we do have some virtual attendees. We have Director Dr. Mark Luoto and Director David Crowl online with us as well as AP Triton the submitter for item 6a. I just wanted that for the record that we have those attendees with us online.
  
- 2. Approval of the Agenda Motion to approve agenda made by Jason Boaz, Second Mark Heine – Discussion – No further comments – Approved unanimously. Roll call was made since we have remote Board Members. Motion passed.
  
- 3. Approval of the November 15, 2023, REDCOM Board of Directors Meeting Minutes Motion to approve agenda made by Scott Westrope Second Mark Heine – Discussion – No further comments – Approved unanimously. Roll call was made since we have remote Board Members. Motion passed.
  
- 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 to approve transition of call volume dispatch service fee calculation from current EOA1 provider to new EOA1 provider. – KT McNulty - As you know the dispatch service fees are calculated based on a five-year rolling average. With the transition of the EOA1 to a new provider there is going to be unprecedented tip in call volume between the two agencies. Essentially if we leave it as is with just calculating off the five-year rolling call volume AMR will be paying for Somona County Fire dispatch fees. What I would like to do is do a calculation based on actual EOA1 based on actual call volume for the last five-years just EOA call volume minus IFTs and do a true up of sorts to switch out what is actually going to be going forward. We would still be paying for our dispatch fees but just based on what we would be using.

Evonne Stevens - To clarify AMR will be paying for the five-year rolling average for the IFTs.

KT McNulty – IFTs, yes.

Steve Akre – The request is for that to go forward January 16th.

KT McNulty – Yes. Going forward definitely yes.

Steve Akre – Specially for this fiscal year because that is going to result a change in our budget.

KT McNulty – It should not result in a change in the budget because Sonoma County Fire would be .....

Steve Akre – Calculation relates to the budget it will. Bottom line the budget might not change because the call volume might not change but how we portion those fees are going to change for mid-year change to the budget.

KT McNulty – That is correct. It would not affect the REDCOM budget. It would affect Sonoma County Fire Districts budget.

Steve Akre – I will start with a question then I will open it up to the rest of the Board Members. Was this addressed at all in the contract in the RFP for EOA1 service.

KT McNulty – No.

Steve Akre - I will open it up to the Board Members for any questions.

Mark Heine - It seems logical from my perspective. Is this a topic that I can legally weigh in on?

James Salvante - I definitely agree with what Mark says we cannot weigh in on this. The consensus is that it follows the rationale. (indiscernible)

Steve Akre – It does, and I would agree with that.

Jason Boaz – Would we come back later on that.

Steve Akre – We have to decided now how we are going to do this is new.

Scott Westrope - I am just a little bit uncomfortable with the action based on the fact that we do not know exactly what this means and what it looks like. I do understand at the end of the day the budget will still be the same but without any staff report or any or any sort of metric to measure this off of. I just have some concerns with jumping head long into something when we do not have all the information.

KT McNulty – The other thing is we just lost Bobbi as our accountant. We have lost a little bit of that knowledge of how things have been handled in the past. The path forward might be exploratory of course but a little bit difficult to iron out.

Steve Akre - I will open it up, Dr. Luoto or Director Crowl any comments or questions on this.

Dave Crowl - It makes sense to me as the previous Director said. It would be nice to have some more information. Is this just going to be a tradeoff with the new provider picking up those extra fees or not. We do not have the history of that. That is my only concern. It makes sense to me. Thank you.

Dr. Luoto – It makes sense to me.

Steve Akre – Thank you Directors. I will bring it back to Board present. I am hearing consensus that this seems logical, and it is something we are open to. I am also hearing we may not be armed with enough information and direction to actually make a decision today. I am hearing maybe what we could do is to ask staff to develop some of the data and come back to us at our next meeting with some options.

Scott Westrope - Is there any particular timeline that associated with or is it this is something that is just turnkey the day that the Board votes on it.

Steve Akre – I am almost tempted to ask the question could we make the transition be tracking calls and then after three months look back into kind of the true up at that point. I do not think anybody wants either provider to be damaged in this financially.

KT McNulty – Right.

Steve Akre – This is something new for us.

KT McNulty – Absolutely.

Steve Akre - How we do this in a measured way that is fair at the end of the day that is fair for everybody. I think would be what I would hope to accomplish.

KT McNulty – AMR is on a quarterly billing cycle with REDCOM. I do not know what Sonoma County is on.

Mellisa Estrella -Lee - ACTTC taking over for Bobby. I would feel better being able to present you with better estimated numbers and doing either a gradual with the true up of how we take the numbers that we presented them two budgets and what we are currently invoicing all the agencies on based on the five-year average. I cannot say at this time of changing from the five-year average to actuals would not affect any other agencies invoicing of how the percentages change. I would be hesitant to move the effect on other agency's billing too.

Steve Akre – Thank you for that, that was very helpful. If you can maybe provide direction to staff to come back to us. I honestly think that the January 11th meeting is probably a little bit quick to expect that over the holidays and whatnot. Especially if I am hearing that doing a true up on a quarterly basis would be ok once we get into January, we will start a new quarter. When is our next meeting after January?

Brenda Bacigalupi – February

Steve Akre - I think it would seem to make sense maybe to have a staff report at the February meeting for us to discuss further and figure out that path forward.

Jason Boaz – I think the February meeting is a good idea for staff report to come out with the agenda beforehand.

Steve Akre - Absolutely

Ken Reese – Steve if it is helpful all. I am the one that pulls all the billing data, so I do all the queries. I have all those five to seven years statistics numbers at my fingertips. I can get that information over to you guys and you can break it all down.

KT McNulty – That would be great.

Ken Reese – Then you can make a determination of what system call versus what is transfer and work with KT to kind of make sure that we are not missing any nuances.

Evonne Stevens – Also we will be presenting the next year budget in February so it would be go to know how the allocation will play out moving forward.

Steve Akre - The census on that. Do we need a motion? Director Crowl or Director Luoto any further comments or census on that approach.

Dr. Mark Luoto – Nothing further form me.

Dave Crowl - Nothing further from me.

Steve Akre – Staff you have enough direction from us to proceed Mellissa?

Mellisa Estrella -Lee – Yes

Steve Akre – Great, thank you great next item is old business.

6. Old Business

- a.) Receive, discuss, and consider approval of the RFQ response. Action Item. – Steve Akre – For background, most of you are all very familiar faces over the last couple of REDCOM Board meetings. Just a quick review, we brought this up in October and task our working group to create a representative working group which they did. That working group had consensus on recommendation and directions going forward. They were presented to us last month and the board took action of adopting those recommendations as a result we put out a request for quotations which is included in your Board packet. With that, we have received one proposal, one consultant group and one we did not hear back from and in another e-mail in there and they declined to respond to RFQ. With that we have one RFQ response from AP Triton. They have a team online today that I am going to turn over to them. Kurt Henke maybe I can start with you and just give us a very brief summary of your proposal and what those next steps are.

Kurt Henke – Hi my name is Kert Henke, I am the principal of managing partner of AP Triton and it is an honor and privilege to join all of you this afternoon. I joined by Kurt Latipow who is our Vice President of Operations and our Project Manager for this project is Dan Peterson. I am going to have Dan take us through the proposal. You have read Dan’s resume he has extensive experience sitting as chair both on Salt Lake Valley Communications center as well as in Southern Oregon. Dan

comes from a very complex background with JPAs and multiple City Managers and Mayors just in Unified Fire Authority alone in Utah. I am going to ask Dan to take us through the proposal briefly. We would be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Dan Peterson – Good afternoon, like Kurt mentioned. I think the Kurt's asked me to manage this project predominantly because of my background in Oregon and Utah working successfully with complicated systems. Like he mentioned Unified Fire Authority I worked directly for 17 Majors and 700 member originations servicing 15 municipals. In Salt Lake I served as the Regional Center Chair for a Communications Center that managed 450 thousand Emergency 911 calls a year. While I was chair, we hired a new Executive Director, revised the operations level by-laws, implemented new regional CAD processes and product, implemented a drop order response with the Fire Agencies and address the weakness that have been identified from a State of Utah buy in. I also do not have any history with agency's servicing Sonoma County. I am confident that I can help guide this process to a fair and impartial outcome. Our understanding is that REDCOM wants us to develop an administer an RFP for Dispatch Services and you want us to make sure the successful bidder not only meets the current Operational requirements but also adapted to the future, and you desire this project to be completed to allow a successful bidder to start work July 2024. Our team with have Denise Pangelinan she will force in on the 911 center review with 30 years' experience in 911 Communications, Director of Emergency Communications for San Ramon Valley 911 and currently is serving on the California State 911 advisory committee. Tim Maybee has 30 years' experience in the Fire Service and EMS and a strong background in administrative of operational levels in California metropolitan department. Mellisa Swank has 10 years' experience in Project Operations. In her attention to detail, fact checking, and optimal performance will help us ensure that this is an exceptional product in the end. Currently in 2018 Scott Clough partner up with AP Triton they both have backgrounds in large, complicated agencies that help the communities do the best for the residence. They are available to us on the primary team but the are not going to be directly engaged in the work itself. Our process starts with data collections. We will have a series of data pieces that we need to be collected. We will generate stake holder input on site through the Board of Directors from the agencies receiving service from the center, the center managers and labor. We will do a dispatch system



analysis cover the lines of authority, the policy documents, dispatch system components and performance and do a staffing assessment. We will design the RFP, identify, and recommend the minimum requirements from bidders, requirements for a submission for bib. The evaluation criteria, the process for submitting for proposals. Comprehensive guidelines for key areas and concern. Make sure that the integration plans are there for existing agencies and any other requirements that may be identified from our analysis deem necessary by REDCOM. Then we will help administer the process. We will help assemble a panel of independent evaluators collaborations with REDCOM. We will verify that panel do not have a relationship with any of the bidders. We will assist in the end with negotiating the final contract including the development of drafting the language. The bottom line is our goals for this based on our understanding of the project. We will facilitate the process, desire outcomes. We will give you a collaborative process to ensure the outcome is durable and sustainable and we will provide a fair enough biased recommendation for the Board to consider. We will do this in a most efficient manner possible to make the timelines. Any questions that you might have.

Steve Akre- Questions from the Board?

Dr. Luoto – I have over the years been very impressed with our incumbent workforce at REDCOM. I know it is fairly boilerplate to pretty much adopt the incumbent workforce, but I think in this situation that is important to me. I have been with Costal Valley for 30 years and have recently visited REDCOM and I think they have an excellent crew there including Evonne obviously. I just wanted to make sure that the incumbent workforce will get a lot of respect and consideration as you move forward.

Dan Peterson – Well Doctor, I think that is the key part of evaluating. I think that is going to be a part. I also think that it is a legislative issue that we will be dealing with. I think the employees are generally going to be considered very strongly. I have reviewed the performance of the center and honestly you are meeting the targets really well. I think you are accurately assessment in the team itself. You are in to the 96% -97% of answering calls within 10 seconds. If centers are not meeting those targets effectively there is generally some deeper problems and some issues. I think you are accurate assuming that the people there are doing a good job.

Steve Arke – Thank you Dan. A little bit more information real quick Kurt if I can piggyback on Dr. Luoto, I know this is one of your first meetings and welcome and thank you for serving with us. The board has previously taken action and reinforce the importance of our incumbent workforce and providing service to not only our community members but our first responders that are out there. We have placed it very high priority on keeping the incumbent workforce in place because they truly are what makes REDCOM successful.

Kurt Henke - I was just going to add to that. Just like ambulance contracts in California. When one vender takes over from another vender, it is normal for the incumbent workforce to be given a priority to transfer over. They are your experience people they have the knowledge and stuff and so that will be a key part of our report that goes there. I do appreciate Dr. Luoto concern, it is a concern of ours across the state any of that to look out for the incumbent workforce.

Steve Akre - Any other questions comments from the board. What we have before us is the consideration of the of the response and direction to potentially enter into a contract with AP Triton to provide these services. The one piece that I would like to touch on and turn over to the Evonne is you know it is not an insignificant amount of money to run this process. I had asked Evonne in preparation for this to share just a little bit of the financial piece for us before we entertain the next steps, Evonne.

Evonne Stevens – Per our discussion, looks like this RFP contract would run REDCOM from anywhere between \$60,000 to \$100,000. With speaking with Mayra and Melissa looking at our available fund balance minus money we spent on radio equipment and the \$200,000 we put on the expansion this year. Our current available fund balance is still at a \$674,000 and we also still have our 17% reserve balance. I think for this fiscal year we could afford to have this RFP contract completed potentially in our next budget we might have to increase some fees just based on a couple of other things that we were going to talk about today. One of those being the last CBA with our employees that occurred was pretty costly. I was looking at overall because it was retroactive to last September all the way through to the July number and it is about \$315,000 overall and raises and differentials and things like that. The other unexpected hitting our budget is the radio equipment being down and having to upstaff especially strengthening the night shift from midnight to seven. Although we have opened the shifts up our

workforce has not been picking up as many shifts as they could without having to use mandation or callback. That potentially if we have to use callback just for the night shift that is about \$28,000 a month and if we are filling all the shifts, it is about \$50,000 a month extra just to fill though shifts. All of it is overtime or mandation or double time. I think this year we could absolutely afford it with that available fund balance, but next year we would have to make some adjustments, especially with the expansion project coming up. We still have the expansion project on the docket for public infrastructures next Board meeting on January 23<sup>rd</sup> that is where they will awarding the \$201,000 contract to Ross, Drulis and Cusenbery and once that occurs I think we will have this sort of this slow march forward to the next steps in that project so potentially spending the rest of the money would be in the next year's budget not this budget.. We did have \$150,000 sort of fee assessment that we put into the budget after our budget was approved last year to try to get some of that back into our reserve funds. With that \$150,000 you could maybe squeak by with the expansion, but it is tight so potentially we might potentially need another assessment at that point.

Steve Akre – Thank you, any questions for Evonne. Dave or Dr. Luoto any questions on the financial piece.

Dr. Mark Luoto – No thank you.

Dave Crowl – No thank you.

Steve Akre – Bring it back to the Board for further discussion.

Jason Boaz – Would the budget need to come back as a separate action item.

Steve Akre – No, any public comment on this item.

Matt Gloeckner – Just general looking at the cost and the timing of this. I am not sure the extensive discussion on the Board level about starting what you call a swat analysis or generally using the consultant to start that process of phase one. Can we look at it in more of a phase approach at looking at what the outcome of phase one is in. Then building sections as we move along. We have an opportunity here to change or modify our center really for the next two decades. I think that a slow deliberate process, take all of the input in not necessarily timeline it might be better, that we also look at what our finances are for this piece. The second component is. We are looking at it from a July 1

standpoint again that is really tough on the consultant and tough on the bidders tough on this group while we are dealing with several other large projects in the county. We could as you move along move through this piece allow perspective bidders that time to build and promote and get the contract renewable so be it. We can always terminate within the 120 days. (120 days is 120 days) There is an option that we eventually get it right Just making sure instead of moving so quickly let us do it in phases first.

Steve Akre - Thank you. Any other public comment. Bring it back to the Board.

Mark Heine – We want to do our due diligence on this. We want to be cautious. We want to be careful on all aspects and looked at properly and equities built-in throughout this process as well. With regards to the potential for a more slower phased approach that is not what the RFP with word on the street. I am a little concerned about straying from that. I think with listening to our consultants that sounds like they have a good grasp on complexities involved here with this. They know what our timeline is. If the board is to award this contract to them. They know the time frames that they have to perform under.

Scott Westrope- Is there an estimate on the RFP would be complete on the street.

Steve Akre – I will turn that to Kurt or Dan.

Kurt Henke – Everything depends, and you can see it on our proposal and data collection You will notice that we address the issue the faster we can get the data collected the faster we can do the evaluation of the system. Which is going to inform your RFP development, at this point I believe there is the layout. The timeline is to get it completed by the due date that the Board has asked for but at the end of the day if we cannot get data for some reason if there is a delay in data there is a mechanism built in there for delays. I think that you guys have that and that is with every project. Data collection is the most important thing and the faster you can go on data collection that is really when our clock starts so as soon as the contract is approved then we are going to send that data request out. We will have our first sit down on project management with the teams are from your side of the aisle you already know who ours. We will put them together and you have a comprehensive list of data that we are going to need and then of course we will move right into stakeholder interviews a lot of that will be happening simultaneously. The data collection

is the most important and that is going to be the point. That is really the issue that I see that would hold anything up. If we could not get the data. I assume since you folks are REDCOM, and you are the center that we are not going to have any issues with that. A lot of the data is already publicly available as well.

Steve Akre – Thank you Kurt. Does that answer your question?

Scott Westrope – My only concern is that the development of the RFP takes 6 months then the potential bidders only have 30 days to submit. I was trying to see if we could delineate with sort of chunks of time were parts of the process. From a purchasing perspective is there a standard length of time and an RFP response that needs to be applied here.

Kurt Henke – That is dependent on what your Board regulations require your purchasing policies. That would be something that you would want to go to your legal counsel with. Do they want it to sit on the street for two weeks. Do they want to give it a month. What is the reasonable time and fair amount of time to put it out there but more importantly what is the legal amount of time that is required by your legal counsel under your policies and guidelines for purchasing. I could not answer that. I do not know what your policies are.

Steve Akre - I guess I kind of look at this as. We are intentionally here within this proposal is an evaluation and study of our current operations and what is possible right? That is kind of taking our time to really be thoughtful about this and thorough about this. Kurt, to your question. We do not have any delineated timelines that we have to deal with. I would expect every month that we are going to need to be as a Board and we are going to need to get status updates from AP Triton and the consultants if we move forward with this contract. Then have us whether it is the January meeting or another special meeting to then make that decision on how long we want an RFP to be on the streets. I think that is up to us to decide. I do not know if I am comfortable necessarily saying that right now obviously the more time for bidders the better. Let us also be very honest here everyone. That if you are even thinking about this you ought to be working on it right now right as an organization. If an organization is even considering this, the wheels ought to be starting to move to some degree.

Mark Heine – Steve., AP Triton's proposal is broken down to 3 phrases itself. Phase one being their system review and analysis

once that is well underway if not completed, we will have a really good idea working closely with them to be able to turn the phase two timeline which is the RFP development. When that is taking place, we will kind of get an idea of the calendar when it can be released. I mean work from there with regards to how much time we wanted to float on the street to make sure we get this good at number of qualified bidders possible.

Steve Akre - Thank you, overriding for everybody is we want to get this right. We want the process to be fair and equitable give whoever might be interested in responding to an RFP enough time to be able to do that successfully.

James Salvante - I would think with their previous experience in the county. Working for the Fire District and for Fire Chiefs they probably have a good understanding of what makes the county tick and that should help them quicker than someone else might. Thank you.

Dave Crowl - We had a board meeting a couple weeks ago where we discussed this. I told my Board about what is kind of shaking at REDCOM right now. They wanted to have a statement about this process is that it has kind of turned into an emergency of our own making. It does not need to be an emergency. It gives us an opportunity by hurrying them to evaluate our system to make it better and also pump the brakes a little bit and gives everyone some time to think about this and the right path to make REDCOM even better than it has ever been. That is just a statement from the coast here. Thank you.

Steve Akre - Thank you Dave.

Dan Petersen - Chair if I might add. When we first do our project initiation and development of the work plan like you mentioned right that beginning stage. We are going to sit down and make sure that you are clear on the things that we need for information. We will identify the plan, build out Gantt chart that will give you a little more detail. We do not include a Gantt chart to start with because we need to sit down and talk after this process is done. Sometimes we do not know how long it takes to award a contract or not. You will be able to get a viewpoint of where we think we can be successful and what pace we can go. It will include how long you want to make that if you declare and decide you want two weeks or a month of open. We will make sure and hit that target.

Steve Akre - Thank you, Dan I appreciate that.

Scott Westrope – Ready for a motion?

Steve Akre – Yes.

Jason Boaz – If there is no more discussion. After reading the RFQ and listening to the presentation. I am comfortable with moving forward AP Triton. I will make a motion that we move to approve the RFQ response from AP Triton to develop a full RFP process for dispatch services.

Steve Akre – Can I ask it in that motion that you authorize me and our legal counsel to enter into a contract with AP Triton because I think that is the next action step that we have taken.

Jason Boaz - So amended.

Scott Westrop - One friendly amendment. Is that the timeline is to be determined by the Board in consultation with AP Triton.

Jason Boaz – Of course, do you want me to restate it.

Steve Arke – No, I think we are good. Unless any of the Board members need it restate.

Jason Boaz – Accept that amendment.

Steve Akre - We have a motion and a second any further discuss.

Motion to approve AP Triton to do the RFP. Motion to approve made by Jason Boaz, Second Dave Crowl – Discussion – No further comments – Approved unanimously. Roll call was made since we have remote Board Members. Motion passed.

Steve Akre - Move to next item under Old Business item 6B.

AP Triton removed themselves form the meeting.

Steve Akre – Thank you.

b.)Control 2-4 Radio Update – Evonne Stevens – Most of you are aware we are having multiple issues with our Control Channels 2-4. The equipment is way pass its expective life. We have gone to the point

that we had to use Control 9 in place of Control 4 in several areas due to do the lack of reception. The inability to transfer and receive during several emergency events. With that being said, we have ordered some equipment to repair one of the Channels from Dailey Wells. I received a call from Mike at Dailey Wells last Friday that the equipment for one of the Channel arrived in Houston and was inventoried and is being sent today to Sonoma County TCOMM and that should be arriving Thursday or Friday. With that being said are initial plan was to go ahead and fix Control 4 because it had been an ongoing problem especially for the Rancho Adobe area. In consideration of Control 4 being a work around for a period of time and it seems to be working for the areas that are using Control 4. We have started think about possibility of continuing to use Control 9 for a while and starting with Control 2. Control 2 does not have a current work around. I know there was talk about using Victor 6 that would potentially have us have another dispatcher to work another channel and that is not ideal. Secondly, another concern that comes to mind is with January historical being a wet month and Control 2 is typically the channel that gets impacted the most with the floods and swift water rescues. I will prefer to see Control 2 in the best working order more rapidly if that makes any sense. I do plan on having a meeting later this week and include representatives from the voices from the Chiefs and Control 4 and Control 2 and see if we can get a consensus as to which Channel we want to work on 1<sup>st</sup>. When I say first the second phase of this project and the second round of equipment is waiting to be sent here by Daily Wells. They got it pre-ordered and ready to go. We are awarded a grant that for \$212,000 which is just \$6000 shy of the cost of the equipment for the second Channel. I believe that is on the Board of Supervisors agenda to be approved in January either 7<sup>th</sup> or 9<sup>th</sup>. I would have to double check that date. When that occurs because we have a PO with Daily Wells it appears that we do not have to do it could be a sole source, so we do not have to do any type of RFP for that equipment. They are just going to send it we will get them that PO number pretty much immediately. We have been working behind the scenes to make that very streamlined and ready to go. With the time it will take to prepare either 2 or 4 by the time that is done dialed in and tested that other equipment should be arriving within a week or so maybe before maybe after. Then we would move right on to that second Channel. I just want to assure the Chiefs that are going to be concerned on either channel that just because your channel is not maybe getting with the repair first, it does not mean that second repair is not going to happen, and you are also going to be brought up to speed. That is where we are. Steve Akre if you want to talk about your discussion with Heidi and where we are with TCOMM and prioritizing this project.



Steve Akre - Thank you and your team. I have been credibly impressed with how quickly we have been able to move on this once this was brought up to the Board level. We took some action steps, and the timelines continue to be compressed more and more which is good for all of us and our responders. A big thank you first of all to Petaluma for having the foresight to get Control 9 and have that be a good alternate for us I think that has really saved us in a lot of ways right now, so thank you for that foresight and those effort. I did reach out to the Sheriff's Administrative Chief looking at this the only real opportunity we have now from the time that the that the equipment arrives later this week to being implemented is that installation time right. I had a really good discussion with the Sheriff's Administrative Chief who oversees TCOMM and put in the request. I did share with her the action steps that we have taken both as the REDCOM Board as well as the County Chiefs Association and asked at any and all consideration that they could make to prioritize this as an emergency situation and that they could devote TCOMM personnel there the most that they could do we would be incredibly grateful and she recognized the critical issue of Fire and EMS personnel not being able to talk to one another. They are having a meeting later this week. TCOMM just got a new manager in so I think that that could be helpful in this situation going forward. but bringing them up to speed hopefully they will have that same level of priority for this. We are continuing to try to work and get this done just as quickly as we can and t for both channels get it resolved.

Evonne Stevens - Just to add to that and working with Terry it is a big priority for him and he really wants to see this happen and he is one of their most senior techs for TCOMM and he really wants to rock and roll this and get it going.

Mark Heine – There is a value nonetheless even though it seems like there is support, maybe there is a value in the minutes for this meeting reflecting that we consider Channels 2 and 4 to still be in a state of emergency as far as communications.

Steve Akre – Yes, absolutely. Can you make that motion.

Mark Heine - I will make the motion that the Board of Directors for REDCOM continues to fine Control 2-4 in the state of emergency, due to its bad transmission and received capabilities, Second Jason Boaz - Discussion – No further comments – Approved unanimously. Roll call was made since we have remote Board Members. Motion passed.

Jeff Veliquette - I would just like to share a couple things on that. Number one, I appreciate the movement on all of this and two comments, one would be for the other group as well later this week. Control 9 is a

workaround certainly and does not meet the full intent of a workable radio channel has significant areas where portable radios are just ineffective. It is really a mobile radio workaround channel Then the second thing that I would like to just maybe ask on is since we have declared a state of emergency at both the Fire Chief and the REDCOM Board level is there any discussion on bringing that forward to the Board of Supervisors for funding or repair funding for the infrastructure on either one of those channels thank you.

Steve Akre – Thank you Chief. Any other comments.

KT McNulty - The funding is secured right.

Steve Akre – Yes, the funding is secured.

Darin DeCarli – I would like to echo to your comments Chief Akre. Thank you, Chief Costa, and Chief Schach, on getting Channel 9 available. It has really expanded the area. I did some testing with REDCOM we were able to take it all the way out Two Rock and Bloomfield area, highway 37 and Lakeville where we had nothing before. Our Control 4. Being a user on both Control 2 and 4. My personal preference Control 4 while not optimal versus Control 9 while not optimal and Control 2 is to detriment to everybody on the West County and North County. If there is a way to make it a priority my recommendation and my request is Control 2 to be done first and then Control 4.

KT McNulty – How far out is the second set equipment?

Evonne Stevens – The second set is January 7th is the date of the meeting and then we can have that GIO per Sherry in a day or two and then it will be another 4 weeks to arrive here. There is also a five-to-six-week time frame of this equipment to getting installed and then tested.

KT McNulty - I was wondering if there is any opportunity to install them simultaneously.

Evonne Stevens – It is not possible to do them simultaneously. I had that meeting and Terry said it is not possible.

Brenda Bacigalupi - Motion again nothing changed Motion passed.

Steve Akre - Our next regularly scheduled meeting will be in person on January 11<sup>th</sup>, 2024. I do want to take just a minute and thank everyone. I know we have had a lot of meetings here lately and appreciate everyone's attendance and participation. It is obviously reflective of what a what a big process we are in right now and big decisions that we have

moving forward. I would also just ask all Board members as well as our engaged public and participants stakeholders We will likely have to have some additional special meetings in this process to do it right. I just ask in advance for your consideration and flexibility as we as we do our best to navigate this for the best outcome. With that I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

6. Next meeting will be – January 11, 2024, at 14:00 In Person
7. Adjournment- Motion to adjourn made by Mark Heine, Second Jason Boaz all in favor @ 1452.