



REDCOM BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Agenda

March 14, 2024 @ 2:00pm

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

Join by Teams Meeting 1-323-886-6897 Conference # 112 557 712 9

**Director Dr. Luoto will have his location at 26 Loma Ave La Selva Beach, CA 95076
He will be attending remotely.**

Public is Welcome at this location.

**Since we have one Board Member remote for this meeting. He will be meeting the
guidelines that are required per the Brown Act.**

Present:

**Steve Akre – Sonoma Vally – Chair
Mark Heine – Sonoma County Fire – Vice Chair
Scott Westrope - SRFD
Jason Boaz – Healdsburg
Dave Crawl – Coast Life Support
Dr. Mark Luoto – County EMS Medical Director (Remote TEAMS)**

Others Present:

**Evonne Stevens – REDCOM Executive Director
Brenda Bacigalupi – REDCOM Administration Assistant
Kellie Crumbliss – REDCOM
Ron Busch – SCFD Robert Johnson – SCFD
Monica Vanoni – REDCOM
Nick Barber – REDCOM
Jasmine Mitchell – REDCOM Operation Manager
Peter Goyhenetche – SLS
KT McNulty – SLS
Jeff Valiquette – Rancho Adobe
Mayra Marquez – ATTC
Mellisa Estrella-Lee – ATTC**

Darrin DeCarli - GFD
Holly Ficher – REDCOM
Tambra Curtis – Legal Counsel
Matt Gloeckner – SRFD
Jason Jenkins – SRFD
Meagan Horeczko – REDCOM
Chris Mattis – SRFD
Darrell Kopriva – REDCOM
James Salvante – CVEMSA
Jack Thomas – SRS
Greg Fontana – REDCOM
Forest Neel- Grant - REDCOM
Krista Butts – SRFD
Sam Hoel – Local 1401
Zach Brown – Local 1401
Matt Tognozzi – Local 1401
Stephen Dalporto – Local 1401
Jimmy Pierson – MEDIC Ambulance

Remote in on TEAMS:

Margie Moulin – AP Triton
Dan Peterson – AP Triton
Tim Maybee – AP Triton
Casey Vanier – Regional Rep for Local 4911
Ken Reese – REDCOM Communication Manager off at 1448

Not Present:

Bryan Cleaver – CVEMSA

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 @ 2:03pm
2. Approval of the Agenda - Motion to approve Agenda made by Mark Heine, Second Dave Crowl – Discussion – No further comments – Approved unanimously.
3. Approval of the February 8, 2024, REDCOM Board of Directors Meeting Minutes. Motion to approve Minutes 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.

None

5. New Business

Long Term Recorder enhancement requirements – Evonne Stevens

Evonne Stevens - This is a budgetary item. We are just bringing it up to let you guys know that we noticed when we were looking for some recordings that were requested from us about 2 weeks ago. That our long-term recorder for Control 3 and Control 2 were not recording radio traffic. With that being said there is some upgrades that need to happen for us to get that reporting equipment. I will let Nick take over with some details on that.

Nick Barber – That actually included REDCOM as well. The reason for it is all the new equipment is IP based network based and older equipment that is 30 years old was analog so when they started to remove the old MOUDCOM equipment there was one piece that was interface between our long-term recorder and the old MOUDCOM equipment and the new ZETRON equipment. When they remove the wiring, it took that out. They were not able to replace it, so we started the process to get the SIP upgrade IP based from our vendor which is a pretty heavy price. It is a onetime charge, and it will cover all our channels that go IP based.

Evonne Stevens - It was just under \$12,000 and so I went ahead and used as some of our money for the \$75,000 technology fund to put that order in immediately to get the recording back on track. They did put a band aid in place basically using a scanner. We are still recording right now to get that in place. We do have the purchase order and ordering that equipment to be able to continue to record and provide any records and review any calls that happen or any radio traffic for those channels.

Steve Akre – Thank you Evonne. Any questions from the Board?

6. Old Business

a) AP Triton Update of the Study – Jason Boaz – Dan Peterson

Jason Boaz – I do not have an updated myself, but Dan Peterson from AP Triton does.

Margie Moulin – Looks like Dan is having a bit of difficulty with his audio. I am going to go ahead and just start off and give you a brief overview of what we have done and then I will let him take over. My name is Margie Moulin, I have been in the industry for 32 years. I appreciate you letting me be a part of this. When we were there your center is fully staffed which is an amazing feat in this day and time. A recent study showed that 82% of the 911 centers across the nation are critically staffed and are having a difficult time actually hiring people so with those struggles you are doing quite well to be fully staffed right now. Not only that you are staffed with experienced personnel you know a lot of people with a lot of years in the business and experience outside of dispatch in public safety so that is a benefit for your center as well. Your staff has great pride in the work that they do. They are meeting and exceeding all of your performance measures that are set for them. We do have a few recommendations for improvement that will be in the report and the anticipate presenting that full report in April that is my update I will hand it over to Dan for the next piece.

Dan Petersen - I will give a brief status of the RFP. We should have a draft RFP ready for legal review next week, but it really depends on the action taken on agenda item 6B. Which is the next on your agenda. If that is approved in the discussion that we have on the next agenda. We will need to schedule a Board meeting to accept the RFP and approve the publication after legal has review. I can move on to 6B.

Steve Akre - Based on legal counsel advice. Our legal counsel has recommended that both Chief Westrope and I recuse ourselves from this item. We could potentially be bitters for the RFP and this item could materially change or affect any.

Scott Westrope - And for me, I am disclosing recusing myself and not participating in item 6(b) under old business only to the extent those items cover potential issuance of an RFP for dispatch services. This is based on the city's status as potential bidder being a REMOTE interest under section 1091(b)(13) of the California Government Code. I will also note that, even those I am doing my best to understand the scope of what I am recusing on

these items today is not clear from the way that these agenda items are drafted. Two items really aggregate commingled questions governance of JPA government and structure with discussion about a potential RFP.

Steve Akre - I will turn it over to our Vice Chair Chief Heine for this item.

Steve Akre and Scott Westrope removed themselves at 2:08pm for the discussion.

Matt Gloeckner – Brenda, I have a question prior to moving on to 6B.

Brenda Bacigalupi – Go ahead.

Matt Gloeckner – I would like to make a statement then. Are we saying by those two recusing themselves that anyone else that is in this room is no longer able to bid on the contract moving forward.

Brenda Bacigalupi - Tambra

Tambra Cutris – No, it is only because they are on the Board, and they are voting. They do not have a voting right.

Matt Gloeckner - Anyone else on the Board are no longer able to bid on the RFP if they do not recuse themselves from this conversation.

Tambra Curtis - That would be something that would have to be address best practice is if you plan on bidding on the contract RFP recuse yourself.

Matt Gloeckner - If you are advising both Chief Officers to recuse themselves.

Tambra Curtis – It is not black and white it is just the best practice.

Matt Gloeckner - Proceed

b) AP Triton Memo – Discussion and Possible Action – Dan Peterson

Dan Petersen – In your packed on page 10 of the PDF where you see the AP Triton memo dated March 8th. We wanted to bring a conversation to the Board to decide if they want to accept this potential change or not. In our review really just identified a bit of a finding and then we have an observation and a recommendation that we thought was important to bring forward today to make

this work. Our finding this been at the existing scope of the agreement puts a lot of responsibility on the contractor for performance but gives very limited opportunity for the actual REDCOM Board to oversee the service that is provided by the center. The contractor selects an employee the Executive Director with consultation and concurrence of the Board, but the REDCOM Board can really only make a request to make any adjustments and whoever serves in the role of Executive Director. There is a section in the in the agreement as well that talks about a conflict that can happen between the contractor and REDCOM and if the Director believes there is a conflict and then they are required to notify both the contractor and REDCOM for direction. What we found was that the staff were phenomenal to work with and the current contractor did not interfere with anything that we did. What we found is that the none of the staff were really able to fully represent REDCOMs interest because they were all subject to employment supervision and direction by the contractor. The contractor gets to determine staffing levels and the staffing model for the center totally at their discretion as long as the performance standards are met. The contractor compensates the employees in accordance with its existing agreements and is only required to make its best efforts to notify REDCOM Board of any changes in employee compensation or other expenses that result in a 1% increase of the approved contract as a whole. Some of our observations from this is that we believe that the Executive Director should work at the pleasure of the REDCOM Board of Directors, and the direction of the staff and the performance of the center should be the responsibility of the Executive Director who works for the Board not the contractor. REDCOM Board of Directors should determine the pay for the employees of the center following the appropriate process for labor negotiations, retirement and health benefits would need to be consistent with the contractor's requirement and health benefit costs since they would be the employers. All equipment in the center should also be owned and maintained by REDCOM. The contractor should not be responsible for any portion of the center's materials, services equipment, or capital inventory. Today there is a number of things that are owned by the contractor not by REDCOM Board. The contract for dispatch services we believe should be limited to employment of staff and support of this specific administrative functions. This would allow then the REDCOM Board through the shared governance model to direct the center as we believe it should be designed to do. Our recommendation is to establish the scope of work for services that includes, administrative support services for the center and employment of staff including retirement and health benefits. REDCOM staff would be employees of the contractor. However, they would be selected and directed by REDCOM through the Board of Directors selection of the Executive Director. Then we have identified administrative and support services which would include payroll, provide employment and payroll

to staff including retirement and health benefits human relations support the Executive Director with HR issues such as recruitment, hiring, promotions, workers compensation, employment law, reviewing disciplines, Labor Relations, and negotiations at the Directors request. Information Services supporting the Executive Director with those needs but not to include CAD and related products that is done through a separate agreement. The RFP for the service would include this scope of work and request bidders to identify the cost to provide these specific services for REDCOM. The successful bidder would have no responsibility for the actual performance of the center. In closing we see this as a recommendation that would clarify REDCOM a regional provider of dispatch services with the shared governance and direct oversight that can potentially benefit all agencies involved. The change also reduces the complexity and risk for any agencies considering bidding to provide the service. We believe it is entirely possible that more agencies might even be interested in submitting a proposal based on this reduced scope of responsibility. We are presenting this for consideration for the Board to discuss and decide if this is a direction they would like to go. I will leave that to the Board with any questions or any discussion might be at.

Mark Heine – Questions from the Board members for staff or for the consultants.

James Salvante – Under this model Dan, how do you see the Executive Director position working? Right now, we have a contractor, and we have a Board. With the Executive Director position would that an employee of the Board?

Dan Petersen – They would be an employee of the contractor but only for employment purposes. They would be selected and directed exclusively by the Board of Directors as an at will employee through an employment agreement with the Board of Directors.

Mark Heine - How can they have an employee agreement with the Board of Directors and be employed by the contractor?

Dan Petersen - We believe that the whole proposal here is that they take direction from the Board of Directors, but their payroll is covered by the administrative support services.

Mark Heine - How is that a change in the model that we have now?

Dan Petersen - Today the contractor selects an and overseas the Executive Director not the Board of Directors.

Mark Heine – Any other questions from the Board.

Dan Petersen - The intent here is to make this entity as close as possible to being directed and run by the center without creating all the administrative overhead that would be required to be a fully independent entity.

Mark Heine - I guess my initial comment is I am not sure we are solving anything through that equation right. With the Executive Director is employed by the JPA and the Board is the employee entity. Then we have the administrative control responsibilities that any manager or supervisor would have seems to me that this recommendation for petulance on both sides of the fence type approach. I am just concerned about that. I am not advocating one way or the other. I just not sure that that takes us any farther along. I am just that sliver of it.

James Salvante - I do not know enough about employment law sort of confidently ask the right questions. It does seem kind of odd. How is this any different from what is going on right now.

Mark Heine – Any other questions for staff.

Dan Petersen - We are you having a hard time hearing the questions?

Mark Heine – Dan, the comments from the Board members before we take public comment. We have a lot of folks in the room you made may not be able to see. Concerns expressed by the Board is, we are not seeing the forward step here by what is being recommended. If the Executive Director is taking direction formally from the Board but employed by the contractor entity, how does that solve some of the issues you highlighted page one of your findings.

Dan Peterson - I think if the Board wanted to employ the Executive Director themselves, I think that is a completely doable right. Then you would have to establish that system for the Board. The idea here would be that the only thing that contractors doing is pass through providing the payroll services. You can spell out in an agreement that they take direction from the Board of Directors. It is a nuance to allow there not to be any new payroll systems developed by REDCOM. One of our other proposals is at some point it probably would be healthy for REDCOM to become a fully independent entity just the time of making that happen would be challenging. Whereas all you are doing here is

saying this agency is going to provide the payroll services, but REDCOM would enter into the agreement for direction and determine the level of pay. Much like a finance department might do inside of a city. Where the finance department may manage the payroll and may manage all of the payments to the employees, but the finance director does not direct the employees in a city. Think of it in a term that REDCOM Board is providing the oversight of the employees, and the finance department of the contractor would then be providing the payroll.

Jason Boaz - Really the only change is that the Executive Director is ultimately hired by the Board of Directors and receives direction from and reports to the Board of Directors rather than the contractor.

Dan Petersen - Correct and you take away in the agreement all of the performance requirements for the contractor and let the REDCOM Board of Directors through their selection of an Executive Director to determine the performance so it becomes the shared governance model then would ensure the quality performance of the center.

Jason Boaz - The Board would negotiate the employment agreement with the Executive Director.

Dan Petersen - Correct and approve the pay levels for all the employees and then the contractor would process that payroll.

Jason Boaz - The Board would also be negotiating with the labor groups for all of the employees rather than the contractor doing.

Dan Petersen – The Executive Director would be responsible for it and would reach to the contractor for assistance in HR functions, but the Executive Director and the Board would have the authority to enter into those agreements for the level of pay.

Jason Boaz – For all employees.

Dan Petersen – For all employees.

Mark Heine - I feel like we are highly complicating an existing process. I guess my question would be. I can see a separation of powers being important from the standpoint that the Executive Director could be employed by the JPA authority and managed and supervised directly by the REDCOM Board of Directors as a direct report. I would rather have in my mind keep that clean if

that is the model we are going to use. The converse that is, I cannot think of a situation at least in my ten years on the REDCOM board where we have given an Executive Director any type of direction that was not adhered to by our contractor. I do think that you know moving forward there is perhaps a better model that the Executive Director is employed directly by this entity for that separation of duties or separation of power thing but as Dan said that would require some extra steps to be taken.

Jason Boaz - I kind of agree with you in spirit. I do not think the apparatuses in place. I guess discussion is that an end goal. I do not see any harm in doing this. I am really interested to hear what the employees and public would like. I think we are all on the same team and ultimately, we have the same goal here.

Dave Crowl – Just a quick question. Just to way out there. What is the benefit? What are we solving? What problem are we solving by making this change or we just have a solution for looking for a problem to solution. You know what I mean. I just would like to say here is the benefits we are going to achieve from this. This is how we are going to make REDCOM even better than it already is by making this change. That is what I would like.

Mark Heine - I like the recommendation the way it is laid out with regards to what the specific administrative services are that would be going out in an RFP right. That makes a lot of sense. We need to clearly define that so that the lanes and expectations are crystal clear for anybody that is going to be potentially bidding on providing the service. I think that is really helpful. I think the sticky point probably always would have been a sticky point is what you want to do with the REDCOM Directors position and who that employee entity is and maybe a better way to ask that is who the managerial body is for that person who is going to have a final say if there ever was a conflict between a future contract provider and the direction we are giving the REDCOM Executive Director. Maybe at this point unless there are other questions amongst the four of us some staff for the consultants we can pause and take public comment. Let us open it up for public comment.

Sam Hoel – I have got a question on the second paragraph on the second page says the REDCOM Board of Directors shall determine the pay the employees of the center following appropriate process for labor negotiations with the representative workforce. As a 1401 labor rep, I am very concerned about the effect that this is going to have on our MMBA guaranteed rights and representation. The MMBA specifically is a scope that covers employer/employee relationships and all the rights that our workforce benefits from under the MMBA. Are employer/employee relationship rights. To have the

employees be forced to negotiate with the REDCOM Board of Directors which is not their employee. First of all, potentially exposes them to losing those MMBA rights during the process of negotiating their pay and then secondly potentially puts them into a position where they have to run a gauntlet of negotiations with the overall Board. Then return to the employer and negotiate with the employer that is going to be forced to bear those costs. That is a very concerning structure for being this recommendation. I would urge that if we are going to pursue the recommendation that we do a full analysis of exactly the effect that this has on the MMBA upon the labor unions negotiating rights and then the legality of negotiating pay with the non-employer entity in California. Thank you.

KT McNulty – I just wanted to point out a couple inaccuracies in the memo. The statement that the Board does not have control over staffing is inaccurate. Every position that is ever been staffed in REDCOM has been run by the Board for approval. Secondly, the Board does not have oversight of the Executive Director. The Board has always been involved in recruitment, interviewing and the final selection of the Executive Director on top of that the Board is responsible for employee review annually of the Executive Director and so they do have oversight over the Director's performance.

Mark Heine – Appreciate that.

Darrell Kopriva – Long with the first union rep that stood up. Representing 4911 REDCOM employees. As a Chief shop steward, I agree having that negotiate with the Board is not the right way to do it. You can deal with the contractor that is who we are employed with. I do agree in part with the Executive Director should be employed by the REDCOM Board and shall serve at the will of the REDCOM Board and not the contractor. That is the power of policy scope performance and everything else that is that position. I have seen a couple conflicts prior of having that person be part of the contractor. I do kind of agree as that as a union representative that person should be the Board's say in person not the contractor. As far as negotiations part of this write up, we should be negotiating with the contractor as their employee not to the REDCOM Board.

Matt Gloeckner - I am Santa Rosa Fire management labor Rep, I represent 9 Chief Officers in city of Santa Rosa. I am speaking here on their behalf not as an employee of Santa Rosa. My job just kind of works both ways though. A couple of issues, 1) AP Triton when we met with them in a stakeholder interview. I felt that they were unprepared. They told us directly they had not read any documentation prior to meeting with us. Which personally, I think is

unprofessional. They came with no questions and asked us “What do you want to talk about.” When we asked them about making recommendations, they advise us during the stakeholder meeting that they were not there to make recommendations because it was not part of their scope. I would agree that the scope of the RFP does not allow them to make recommendations which I think is a mistake in drafting of the scope of the RFP. Why, I believe that is that during our feasibility study for the city Santa Rosa determining whether or not we want to stay in the system and what our placement system is and whether or not we want to bid on it. We have determined that there are significant structural issues in the foundation of JPA documents specifically related to liability and those agencies that participate REDCOM wholly and completely whether or not your independent ambulance company or a fire agency. 2) We found purchasing issues regarding lack of purchasing documentation in the JPA agreement which is dictated by California regulation and law. Which technically makes the RFP process illegal and null and void. I would recommend that the Board stop the process with this RFP right now and work on changing and fixing the foundations of this agreement. I do not want to blow this process up, but I believe that we can make a better product by working more collaboratively on the front end to fix the foundation of the JPA. In looking at the last agreement that we have signed with the member agencies. Ten of those agencies longer exist. We are operating in the blind. I think we should focus refocus the contractor and the new agreement on fixing JPA agreement, fixing liability, fixing purchasing and then work collaboratively with all the agencies that are represented in this room and go outside of our way and make sure everyone has input and looking at what kind of structure we want to have in the system moving forward. The founding agencies and members that put this thing together spent years working on it and we have an opportunity right now to not only in fix some of the issues that they could not get correct but also expand our system to make it world class. We have that opportunity right now I think that we should take that opportunity in our research we have done many other systems Dan did talk about one and that JPA run organization is one model it is not the only model. There are several other models out there and I think that the Board and the Member Agencies should have a right to hear from the subcontractor prior to delivering or submitting an RFP. What other models are out there? What exists and I think the employee groups have a right to hear that information. Alot of agencies put a lot of time and money into the system. I think they have a right to that information. I would also agree that because the passing of Measure H is indicated now that we have an opportunity that either add staffing or change staffing in REDCOM and what does that look like. Prior to working on RFP and delivering that RFP and selecting bidders. The staffing model in that center should be identified if you are talking about making it a command center. The

Member Agencies should have the opportunity to have input on what that looks like. What do they want? Do they want a Chief Officer or whatever else in there. That should be part of the RFP process and should be part of the bid. Why ask someone to bid on that right now and then in six months make a change. That is extremely detrimental process moving forward. Last but not least. I would say that Dan is right there are several recommendations about when we get to the RFP process and get to the bidding process. That having a subcontractor if that is the model that we determine to move forward with. Identifying things like IT cost, payroll cost, HR cost specifically unfunded pension liability cost and how that subcontracting agency is going to handle that with the JPA is significant and those costs should be outlined in there because there are ways that agencies can deal with unfunded liabilities with public pension. That is a big cost for the JPA, and they should want to know that information how they are going to handle it, Thank you.

Mark Heine – Thank you Matt.

Matt Tognozzi - I would say, given the fact that there is questions about the legality of everything that is occurred in hiring a contractor to perform an RFP. This whole process should be stopped right now and delayed until you as a Board are able to determine what legal issues are there. The reality is that at the end of this whole process you could pick a contractor to go take over services at REDCOM and then lawsuits could just start flying back and forth or the REDCOM Board themselves could be sued. It seems ridiculous that there may be questions about the legality of this process, and you moved on to it. You as a board were able to determine exactly what you are allowed to do and what you have done up to this point, what legal liability you have in it.

Mark Heine – Any other public comment.

Kellie Crumbliss – I do not understand lot of this it is over my head. When I read the AP Triton memo to me it said the ultimate goals is to take the politics out of this whole process. So different entities are not fighting with us in the middle. That is the why I took it. It seems very complicated it seems a lot more work for the Board. I kind of like the idea us being a political. Does that make sense.

Mark Heine – Yes it does, Thank you. Any other comments. Hearing none. Let us go back to the Board.

Jason Boaz - I thought a lot of this stuff that was brought up would be addressed in the RFP maybe I am wrong and need to read it again. I do tend

to agree as a Board member, I do not feel like we should be negotiating with labor unions or negotiating with their employer. I will leave it at that. All the other legal issues I would have to defer to somebody else.

Mark Heine – Anyone else. Hearing none. I would provide these comments from my perspective. I do not think that the memo from the contractors is in alignment with where the current process is in place for REDCOM Board of Directors, and our current contractor perpetuate either side of that moving forward as opposed to kind of taking a fresh look at it. I was kind of hoping that is what this would be after a lengthy series of meetings with stakeholders and supposedly a lengthy in-depth analysis of the center and its operations and staffing and its interactions with the Board a two-page memo is incredibly disappointing from my perspective. I do not think it went to the debt that needed to go. I think it just raises issues not solving issues. I certainly am not ready to move forward on any of these recommendations today. I have heard enough from the public comment that I think I would like to meet with our Legal Counsel to make sure that anything that was put out in the original RFP for our contractor to look at and any potential recommendations moving forward that are already in front of us have met any legal standards that need to take place that is number one. I think the Board needs to take another look at the process that was used for coming to where we are today. I guess to keep this movement I do disagree with the immediate analogy that there are legal problems. I do not know that to be factual maybe there are, maybe there are not. I think we need to do our due diligence in that. I do not agree that everything should necessarily be put on hold indefinitely while everything is revisited from scratch because your original direction of the Board was not to review 30 new models but was to look at what is currently in place and are there any additions, changes, deletions, that need to be made if we are going to move forward in some different model. I would recommend that as a next step that we find an immediate date for a special meeting not wait till a monthly next scheduled meeting. Then in the interim at least one or more of us needs to be recused Akre and Westrope from this process continuing and for any discussions related to this. I certainly would like our Board member to be able to hear from the council about any new concerns she has or does not have based on what she has heard today. I would like to take a look again at what it is we are really trying to look at. I am not sure for me, just speaking for me I am not sure if this captured what I thought we were looking at.

Jason Boaz – I agree with a Special Meeting is in order. What concerns me is the discussion about the foundation documents and how that is coming up now and how that plays into the process and if that is in fact legal concern. would like more advice on that.

Mark Heine – We have to always have to do our due diligence on that. Can I frame in the form of a motion.

I would move that we do not make any immediate decisions relative to the recommendations that are in front of us in item 6B. We then table this to a special meeting within the next two weeks.

Dave Crawl – I will second that.

Mark Heine – Let me add in one piece in the Antrim, I am happy to do this, or you can, or anybody can. To meet with our legal counsel and at least check that piece of it and any concerns that we followed up on that. In the next meeting we focus on really what it is we are trying to get to the bottom of.

Jason Boaz – With this memo in particular or the entire process?

Mark Heine - No the work that has already been done by a consultant. Whether we can refocus that work or need to refocus that work and then if so, can we refocus that work or do we need to stop and go a different route. That is the motion.

Jason Boaz – I will not be available until after the 26th.

Mark Heine – We can ask Evonne to put something out.

Brenda Bacigalupi – I will put out a poll and schedule.

Jason Boaz – I would like to know from legal do we have all the questions that we need to discuss prior to the next meeting and should we clarify those a little bit more.

Tambra Curtis – We need to have a discussion, but I do think that we need a special meeting soon is a good next step.

Mark Heine – I think we could flush out all of that at the Special Meeting with a singular topic.

Dave Crawl – I will still second even though you add on.

Mark Heine - Just to do due diligence on the motion that is on the floor. Does anybody have any comment on the motion that is on the floor? Mark Luoto, I

am sorry I did not go to you for discussion and other comments. Did you want to add anything before we moved to a vote.

Dr. Mark Luoto - You know I am the most inexperienced person here, but I would say that given their study that showed that we are a very successful Dispatch center, fully staffed and unlike 80% of the other Dispatch centers. I would agree with KT that we tend to as a Board a lot of oversight, but I am not sure we should spend a lot of energy trying to change a model that has been successful.

Mark Heine - Thank you.

Motion to approve made by Mark Heine, Second Dave Crowl – Discussion – No further comments – Approved unanimously.

Take just a tactical pause to bring back in the Board Members Steve Akre and Scott Westrope at 2:47 pm

Steve Akre – Moving on to Old Business Item 6c Control 4 Update.

- c) **Control 4 Update** – Evonne Stevens - After a long-awaited process. We have finally received our Control 4 equipment that was purchased with the UASI Grant money, and it arrived last week to the Sheriff's TCOMM. We had a meeting with the stakeholders on Control 4 as well as the TCOMM radio team and they are in the process right now of taking inventory of those packages that arrive and programming the Control 4 equipment for its installation that should be coming up shortly. We are hoping to have that installation starting within the next week or so. There is a map being drawn up where the boundaries are going to be during this Control 4 installation phase. It looks like there is potentially going to be some splitting between the Lakeville District due to some radio problems that they encountered yesterday I got an e-mail from Darren. We are looking into changing our map a little bit from initial process. Essentially, we are going to take Control 4 down for the entire duration of the state and equipment. We are going to expand the footprint of Control 3 to include Rohnert Park and Cotati and Rancho Adobe District and then some of the agencies will be moved on to Control 9 where it is working properly, and they are able to continue to use Control 9. Then the remainder of the agencies and Districts will be moved over to Control 2 while they do that process. This process will probably be a little slower than the process for Control 2. They put that equipment together in a really quick fashion right before we had those storms it was about a week and a half of true installation time. They thought it might take three to four weeks so because they did that so quickly although it

is working properly there is a lot of loose ends and things that need to be tighten up and organized better. When they go into Control 4 mode, they are also going to take that opportunity to clean up the work that was done on Control 2 and make sure everything is safe and is not subject to rain or anything like that there is no loose ends out there. We foresee this project probably being completed within about a month. We are looking at another week out potentially we are going to look as far as we can into the future for weather indications if there is any type of storm that is coming if we may have to delay that process because we know 2 gets very impacted during the storm so we do not want to take Control 4 down and then end up with some type of weather event. We will be checking as soon as Terry lets us know that we will have the go ahead for that project. We will be check in with the weather as far as we can and as much as we can depend on you know whether a meteorologist to potentially avoid any conflict with that. With that being said, we are really excited that the equipment is here. We are lucky that we got that grant money it seems like it is just in the nick of time. We appreciate everybody's patience with this process because you know it has been lengthy and it has been stressed on the dispatchers and the agencies. We are grateful for Petaluma Fire for loaning us Control 4. They have been fantastic, and you know helping out and just everything seems to come together with the teamwork and the collaboration. That is my report on Control 4. Does anybody have any questions, feel free to let me know.

Steve Aakre- Thank you and the team for doing that is good work. I know we have reported back out that Control 2 working so much better then previously. I am confident we will get there with Control 4 too, so thank you.

Meagan Horeczko - I just wanted to say as the dispatcher doing the Control Channels. If we could just put it out to the Chiefs to make sure that your crews really pay attention in this time if we are shutting down the Channel. I know they get accustomed to being like this is my Channel. If you could just really get that memo out to them and just like "Hey, make sure you are listening to the Channel that you are assigned on REDCOM." That really plays a big deal for us especially if big instances accrue and we need to move things around and the Channels are already going to be skewed down now that we are taking 4 off and we are going to have to kind of patch things together so if you could just iterate that to the crews just pause before you flip over just to make sure that you are on the right Channel that really help so us out, thank you.

Steve Akre – Evonne, can you please forward me a copy of the map.

Evonne Stevens – Once I update yes, I will.

Steve Akre - Back to you Evonne for follow up on 6d.

- d) Follow up from Jan 18th meeting for Tango Tango, report back from Spencer DOAG Chair. – Evonne Stevens – Nick did you have more communication with Kenny about Tango Tango.

Nick Barber – No.

Evonne Stevens - I think, we talked about this at our last meeting. Kenny had met with Spencer and discussed the potential possibilities for Tango Tango as a backup radio system. The cost was \$16,000, but the potential for that to be a backup radio the incidents or another way to communicate seems worth the risk and from examination and conversations between Spencer and Ken. They believe that it is worth that purchase and that we should continue now that this product is not free anymore to pay that subscription fee and to keep Tango Tango available. Probably would be good at least from my perspective to let everybody know about Tango Tango now the licensing is unlimited, so all of your agencies are able to put everybody into that Tango Tango license and attach it to your phone. You will be able to listen to all the radio channels that are you know pulled up on the Tango Tango as well as transmit through Wi-Fi and use that it as a backup radio versus having to grab the portal or something like that. I have used it a couple of times myself and you know there was some upgrades that needed to happen, but it seems like the last time we used it worked really well. I think that it is a good thing, and we should spread the word to our agencies that it is available and maybe do some testing and practicing on it as a potential backup.

Steve Akre - Is that number included in the draft budget.

Evonne Stevens – We are intending to take it out of the technology fund.

Steve Akre – Ok, is there any questions or comments about Tango Tango. Hearing none. Moving on the 6e.

- e) ACE Update – Jasmine Mitchell – I am really pleased to announce that REDCOM has achieved reaccreditation for ACE in both Medical and Fire disciplines. We are obviously really happy to be reaccredited. Although thankfully we did have a piece of minded going into the process that we knew all of our performance standards and data were in line with the ACE standards. Having that said. We are still really excited to receive our

certificates and get to hang them up on the wall with all the ones that we have received in the past.

Steve Arke – Congratulations, nice work. You know anytime you lead that process it is a big one. So big undertaking. Thank you and everyone else for getting through that process successfully and obviously a very strong reflection of the entire staff and the service that we have.

Jasmine Mitchell – Absolutely, we have our dispatch to thank for being recredited.

Steve Akre – Absolutely, thank you everyone. Expansion update, Evonne.

- f) **Expansion update** – Evonne Stevens - We got a little bit of traction in the last week or two from Scot Stanley our project manager with the public safety infrastructure. They are moving forward with a I guess it is called a DLR now they have changed the initial design group a little bit. There some paperwork changes and some different changes there but we have got all the signatures we need. They are in the process of doing the final plans for the expansion. We got an original set of plans kind of a blueprint of what it would look like but now they are really looking into what that design is going to look like and really looking at costs and how this is going to play out over the next few months. We are in the works of scheduling a meeting with Sheriff's Department obviously TCOMM and the expansion design group to talk about steps moving forward. We do have another agency the Public Community Outreach that is next door. When we get to the construction phase. We are going to have to actually move them into a different space while we put up a wall and separate that space and get that expansion started. We intend to start it on that side of the wall, so it has the least impact on dispatch. We kind of went through this in 2014. When we had our move from that old center into our center. We are going to have to be flexible with times and you know there is going to be some noise issues from here and there. We are looking really good at moving forward. I believe this process is going to happen within the next year. I know we have talked about this for a long time, but I am really hopeful that if we are going to move forward with this and it is a big impact on one of our next items which is our REDCOM budget. We still got seven \$788,000 left in the expansion cost that was projected that could change a little bit when they do the finalization. That has all been accounted for in this next budget item that is coming up. It is expensive but it is a really great thing for REDCOM. I mean it gives us the potential to have five fully working additional CAD stations right now we have 10 so that is 50% more to potentially have people come in during big storms, big fire events, civil unrest anything that happens we have got the

potential to get up to five more dispatchers behind the console and working the radios and phones. We are incredibly excited about that potential, and it also gives us potential just everyday working of conditions as you know the community grows and our population grows that we can move forward with our agency and not being crammed into small little space we have and the 10 consoles we currently are working with. Very excited about that. If you guys have any questions about the expansion, please let know.

Steve Akre – Any questions or comments. Thank you for the continued efforts on that. I know there is a lot of moving parts with that. Next, we will move on to our item 6g.

- g) REDCOM Budget FY 24- 25 Update Discussion and possible action - Evonne Stevens - Initially last Monday we sent out the REDCOM budget and the AMR budget to everyone in the board Packed. Since then, we have had to make a few changes, so we have given the updated REDCOM budget. The AMR budget stayed the same but the preliminary budget for fiscal year 24-25 has been updated due for two reasons. One we needed to separate the cost from Sonoma County Fire District and Sonoma County EMS division. Those costs have been separated out and they are basically like a contracted entity, so the cost from those are in the separate lines. You can see that those are highlighted on this preliminary budget with a blue line and were we highlighted those changes. Then the other change on the same page was in the previous version there was a problem with one of the cells. When the accounts were working on this it was a big broke cell. It changed the Member agency fees I think about \$485,000. That has been corrected and once that cell was repaired it brought that total cost down from the old budget that we had given you guys which was about \$5,347,436 to its current total for all agencies which is \$4,850,745 that is a pretty big difference. We are glad that we were able to catch that broken cell. I do not know if the ladies from the county want to talk about any of the calculations that they put into the new version of what they did for Sonoma County Fire they probably understand that a little more than I do.

Mayra Marquez – I think you handled it very well. If there are any direct questions, we can answer them.

Evonne Stevens – We have reduced the member fees a little bit and it is also a really good thing because it puts some money back into our unapplied funds which was nice because it is the lowest, I have seen the unapplied funds in a while. That is really truly because with the RFP and the ZETRON cost that were kind of a surprise to us this year in tune of about \$126,000. Then the expansion cost that we put in as well. Then the next round of expansion costs

it took our unapplied funds a pretty big hit as well as the two radios. We did have that \$212,000 from the UASI grant but the additional cost for the Control 4 radio as well as all of the costs for Control 2 and the installation cost for both of those radios came out of our unapplied funds at REDCOM. That took our unapplied funds down to a really low level, but I feel that all of the things that happened were necessary. We clearly needed Control 2 and Control 4 to be repaired. I think that enhancement of having the additional 50% of capacity as a REDCOM dispatch center is going to be immensely important to us going forward. If you guys have any questions about this particular budget feel free to ask. I think between the three of us we might be able to answer any questions.

Steve Akre – Any questions from the Board. Hearing none. I have one question. I noticed the fire season dispatcher the budgeted amount was almost half of what it was previously. Can you share that.

Evonne Stevens - Actually it went down last year too from the previous year. We have the capacity to have that fire season dispatcher be there from 9-9 but it is not actually getting staffed to that level. I went based on what the actual staffing was last year, and I added a little bit to it for fluctuation. It is not regularly getting staffed it seemed like we were just taking money and putting it as a pass through and it ends up in our unapplied funds at the member agencies could be saving.

Steve Akre - Thank you. Opening up to anybody from the public or member agencies if there are any questions in regards to the proposed budget.

Matt Gloeckner - I have a bunch. Do you want to go one by one?

Evonne Stevens - Sure

Matt Gloeckner - Line item for the REDCOM Budget in revenues for \$4042 for Air Cards and the expenditure line down below for Air cards \$36,492 is their agencies still using Air cards and if so, why the difference between the intake and the expenditure.

Evonne Stevens - I am going to let Nick speak on the Air cards. He took care of our Air card inventory with Mayra.

Nick Barber - Part of it is the building cycle. It is the 19th to the 18th of the month. I submitted the last 10 for Sonoma County Fire District the other day. So, we will get one more bill for those 10. Then there is no more. The last time

I talk to their IT guy. He was not given any direction on canceling the Air cards, but I let them know to budget zero. Whether or not Zach submitted tickets to cancel those, that I do not know.

Matt Gloeckner - I was just wondering is it a budgetary issue where the money drags over to whomever is using Air cards by the end of July. Is that why there is an expenditure for \$36,000.

Nick Barber – I do not know. It should not be that high. There are only 8 Air cards left. That is a couple for us, a couple for SLS and a couple for Bells.

Matt Gloeckner – Ok

Mayra Marquez - That \$36,000 is a direct bill from Public Safety based on the budget from the original Air cards that would be true of during the year once the Air cards are canceled and no longer charge from public safety.

Matt Gloeckner – Thank you, I had another question on the REDCOM budget. The actual AMR draft dispatcher budget of 4.5 million versus in the REDCOM budget of 4,477 is that normal to have a slight difference and the true up before its finally.

Mayra Marquez - The AMR budget of 4.5 million is the both 4.4 plus the Fire dispatch line. We separate it out so that the Fire dispatch does not get allocated to all members only to certain District members. AMR itself does not get any of that cost in their collections.

Matt Gloeckner – The Dispatcher does more than just dispatch vegetation fires, right?

Mayra Marquez - You would have to ask a dispatcher.

Evonne Stevens - That is true. I was not part of this when this started but when we had the fire dispatcher position. The agreement was that the Fire Districts were going to pay for that position only. It was not going to be included in the EMS agencies so that has not changed.

Matt Gloeckner - Couple more. On the REDCOM budget General budget it says County Services in the amount of \$1000. What does that County Services cover in that.

Mayra Marquez – Accounting and Legal. That line item is directly any ISD charges that are not part of any other contract cost. They are small, rare items from ISD for certain charges.

Mellisa Estrella-Lee - This also includes a lot of the General accounting like process vouchers and including printing checks and things like that.

Matt Gloeckner – It is not part of the fiscal finance plan.

Mellisa Estrella-Lee - No it is not part of the fiscal accounting services. It is part of using. We have a separate division within the counties. That one does direct accounting and the system of being able to use the county system is those charges.

Matt Gloeckner – Couple of questions on the AMR Dispatch service contract. Looking at a couple lines regarding the depreciation. Of AMR owned assets.

Evonne Stevens – You want to wait Matt until we get to that.

Matt Gloeckner – No problem.

Evonne Stevens – Does anyone else have any questions regarding REDCOM budget.

Steve Akre - Would entertain consideration of the motion to approve the REDCOM budget. We are at that spot.

Motion to approve REDCOM Budget FY 24-25 made by Mark Heine, Second Jason Boaz – Discussion – No further comments – Approved unanimously.

- h) AMR Budget Update FY 24-25 Discussion and possible action – Evonne Stevens - This has been laid out as 24-25 draft budget. A couple of main items I would just discuss and put out there to start with. With our CBA I think the dispatchers Kelly, Darrell and the rest of the team did a really did a good job of negotiating an excellent contract. It shows the value and the appreciation for the dispatchers and give them some pretty good wages this time. It is a nice bump of about 13.32%. In that 13.32% change in that dispatch salaries that includes a nighttime differential that has been asked for many years. It is pretty exciting for our dispatch team they are went from no differential to a differential of \$2.50 additional to their salary for every hour worked between 1900 and 7:00 AM in the morning. That that was a good and substantial amount of

money, but it is far worth it. Working dispatch myself for many years on night shift, I know it takes a lot out of you and I think that compensation is well deserved. The other little addition was we have 7 CTOs at REDCOM. They make \$1.50 an hour to be CTO that is our communication training officers. They get that money all the time whether they are training or not because they are always there as our leaders on the floor helping with all different types of things. They are just kind of our star performers on the floor. We are really happy that they got a little bump, so they were getting \$1.00 an hour for those things that they do and now that went up to \$1.50. That is included in the 13.32% change in our dispatch salary along with their raises that they got. Those will continue each year. They got a really good the contract and they negotiated some good wages. That is about a \$300,000 change in the salaries but very well deserved. The next line would be the management and admin salaries along with their general 3% that we normally go up each year which is kind of the general rule for management. They also added some additional money so they could kind of maintain that cushion between what the supervisors make and along with what the dispatchers are making. Our line supervisors got a bump in their salaries to kind of coincide with the raise in salaries that our dispatchers make for their additional duties that they do on the floor. Taxes would clearly go up anytime you make more money you have more taxes we all know that. Benefits went up slightly to salary and benefits and taxes altogether you have a total number there. The line you were talking about Matt that depreciation is a good question. I posed that question to our accountant at AMR exactly what that meant so we went over some of the assets that we purchased an AMR over the years. That includes laptops and chairs. The 24-hour chairs are pretty expensive some of them cost up to \$3000 on the initial purchase and they do depreciate as the time goes on because they are being used 24/7. There is a budget item for depreciation, and they basically are taking some money away from the value of those items each year in depreciation.

Matt Gloeckner – They are charging the JPA for the whole cost up front then adding the depreciation more like a replacement program.

Evonne Stevens - Essentially that is how it was explained to me. It is the depreciation of the value of their assets, and they consider those their assets.

KT McNulty - The assets are on automatic refresh cycle. They budget out the depreciation.

Matt Gloeckner – You guys buy them and budget them out over 7 or 8 years or however long it takes to replace them.

Evonne Stevens - Thank you KT.

Evonne Stevens - The insurance pretty much stayed the same as last year. There was no change in cost for our insurance. We are doing really well with workman's compensation. We have not had any new claims, knock on wood for several years. I think that helps in keeping those costs down instead of rising. Our telecommunications, that is our cell phones that myself, Kenny and Jasmine have. The cell phones that we use right now that we have been recording on and listening to these meetings on those are all our backup cell phones if we have to evacuate. We have 1 that just sits at the supervisor desk. We also have I think 6 more that are charged up and ready to go if we need to take those phones out of there. They are all programmed with pretty much all of our peace apps and hospitals and other agencies that we need to contact when we are in transition as we move to putting up an emergency center. Occupancy these are general cleaning supplies basically coffee cups, forks, spoons, paper towels all the things that we use in the kitchen. Then we have our external training resources and that pretty much stayed the same that is about \$68,000. That includes the trainings for all of our certifications, PR, conventions (Hexagon, Navigator, Learning Conventions, EMD, EFD and seminars. Operating expenses stayed the same. Uniforms, equipment that is kind of just general funds. Then our general admin and expenses went down a little bit and that is mostly because of being fully staffed we decreased critical because we did not have a need have a need for critical for the immediate future and that was about \$2500 for that subscription so we took that off for now. We also got a decrease in our First Watch fees and a couple other things. Actually, it went down instead of up. We are looking at a looked at a savings of about \$6800.

Steve Akre – Thank you for all of that explanation. Bring it back to the Board for any questions, comments about the proposed AMR budget. Hearing none. Anybody else from the public have any further questions or comments.

Matt Gloeckner – There was some discussion at some point about lease service payments.

Evonne Stevens - There are no lease payments. I mistakenly thought the occupancy tax was occupancy in the building. I cleared that up with AMR it is just the general fund for coffee, wipes, paper towels, Kleenex, and everything we keep in the kitchen.

Matt Gloeckner – The County of Somona is granting use of that space.

Evonne Stevens – That is correct.

KT McNulty - \$1.00 a year.

Evonne Stevens – I do not know if I have ever seen that invoice.

Matt Gloeckner – There was some discussion in an earlier item regarding who owns the licenses and some of the pieces for software specific brought specifically brought up by Dan Petersen. Is the time that the Board would want to discuss and that is an idea of moving licenses over to JPA Board level. So, the JPA owns the licenses for the critical software. What I am getting at is that if the Boards direction is to move quickly and expeditiously for change. We are obviously not going to do that if we are looking at adopting an AMR draft budget for dispatch services. I mean to be frank, AMR obviously performing stellarly in the center right now and 120 days for the exit clause is passed July 1st. We are anticipating AMR after July 1st. If we are anticipating that, should we start the process and work towards maybe isolating some of the things that we know that we know could be issues for potential bidders or cruxes in the road. Just to clean up pieces of the JPA in the event of a divorce or change in service provider some point after July 1st.

Evonne Stevens – Is that a question for me or for the Board?

Matt Gloeckner – It is a general question for you and the Board. I am just asking the question because Dan brought it up.

Mark Heine – It is not agenized.

Steve Akre – It is not agenized. If that is something that is recommendation for us to work through. We will have to agenized that for a future meeting. Bring back to the Board for any additional discussion or a motion to approve.

Motion to approve AMR Budget FY 24-25 made by Dave Crawl, Second Mark Heine – Discussion – No further comments – Approved unanimously.

Steve Akre - That concludes old business, our next regularly scheduled meeting is July 11th, 2024, 2:00 PM. I am quite certain that we will be having additional meetings prior to July 11th.

Mark Heine – Chair, in your absentee during your recusal. We directed staff to send a special meeting to follow up on the item 6b within the next 2 weeks.

Steve Akre – Ok, prefect.

Brenda Bacigalupi – I will take care of that request.

Steve Akre – With that, I look for a motion to adjourn.

Next meeting will be –July 11, 2024, at 2:00 pm, In person only.

7. Adjournment- Motion to adjourn.

Motion to approve Adjourn made by Mark Heine, Second Dave Crowl

Discussion – No further comments – Approved unanimously. @ 3:18pm