

INDEX OF MINUTES

SANTA FE REGIONAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

June 27, 2013

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>ACTION</u>	<u>PAGE(s)</u>
CALL TO ORDER	Convened	1
ROLL CALL	Quorum	1
APPROVAL OF AGENDA	Approved	1
APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 7, 2013	Approved	2
<b>EXECUTIVE SESSION (If determined necessary)</b>		
a. Limited Personnel Issues		
b. Threatened or Pending Litigation	None	2
<b>OLD BUSINESS</b>		
a. Report on RECC equipment maintenance cost sharing and possible approval of Amended Capital Purchases Agreement (Ken Martinez)	Motion passed	2-12
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>		
a. Request approval of Amendment to the 2013 RECC Open Meetings Resolution	Approved	12-13
b. Request approval to extend professional services agreement for medical direction with Dr. Alfredo Vigil, M.D., FAAFP	Approved	13-14
c. Request approval to enter into a Professional Services Agreement for legal representation with Basham & Basham, P.C.	Approved	14
d. Request approval to continue stenography services with Stenography Services, Inc.	Approved	14-15
<b>INFORMATIONAL ITEMS</b>		
a. Medical Director Report		15
b. Financial Update and Director's Report		15-16
<b>MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC</b>	None	16
<b>MATTERS FROM THE BOARD</b>		17-18
<b>NEXT MEETING DATE</b>		18
(The next meeting was scheduled for September 12, 2013 at 9:00 a.m.)		
<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>		18



**MINUTES OF THE**  
**SANTA FE REGIONAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER**  
**BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING**

Santa Fe, New Mexico  
June 27, 2013

The Meeting of the Santa Fe Regional Emergency Communications Center Board of Directors was called to order by Chief Sperling, Chair at 9:05 a.m. on this date at the Public Safety Complex, 35 Camino Justicia, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum for conducting official business as follows:

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Chief David Sperling, Chair  
Chief Fred Radosevich, Vice Chair  
Eric Johnson  
Chief Erik Litzenberg  
Katherine Miller  
Chief Raymond J. Rael  
Sheriff Robert A. Garcia  
Brian Snyder

**MEMBER (S) ABSENT:**

None

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Nancy Calhoun, RECC  
Ken Martinez, RECC Director  
Pablo Sedillo, Public Safety Director

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Mark A. Basham, Basham & Basham P.C.  
Dr. Alfredo Vigil  
Jo Ann G. Valdez, Stenographer

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**Sheriff Garcia made a motion to approve the agenda. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.**

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 7, 2013**

**Chief Rael made a motion to approve the Minutes of the March 7, 2013 meeting as submitted. Sheriff Garcia seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.**

### **EXECUTIVE SESSION (If determined necessary)**

- a. Limited Personnel Issues**
- b. Threatened or Pending Litigation**

It was determined that there was no need for an Executive Session.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

- a. Report on RECC equipment maintenance cost sharing and possible approval of Amended Capital Purchases Agreement (Ken Martinez)**

At the January 6, 2011 Board Meeting, the Board approved the agreement for provision of RECC Capital funding contributions by the City, the County and the Town of Edgewood. As a result of this agreement, funding was obtained to purchase equipment and software to upgrade the RECC CAD, records management and mapping systems. Because this equipment and software is used by and for all RECC client agencies, sharing of the annual maintenance costs as well as the purchase costs may be appropriate.

Staff requested discussion and Board approval of the Amendment to the Capital Funding Agreement allowing sharing of the annual maintenance costs for equipment purchased pursuant to the RECC JPA and the Capital Funding Agreement.

*[Stenographer's note: The following agenda item was typed verbatim at the request of the RECC Director and Legal Counsel.]*

Mr. Martinez said this particular item has been an ongoing agenda item at all RECC Board meetings since about January 2011. He said at that time we had done a Capital Purchases and Funding Agreement to try to abide by what the intent of the Joint Powers Agreement was; and at that time we looked at the wording within the Joint Powers Agreement with Legal; and it was brought up at one of the Board meetings that it wasn't specific as to whether or not maintenance was included with the purchase of our equipment. He said the argument was made on one end that, naturally, maintenance of the agreement goes with the purchase of the agreement, but because it is split by percentages under the JPA, it kind of became a discussion point and an issue; and since that time there have been many attempts at getting the City and the County to come together and meet on this, along with other items, larger items. And, unfortunately it never really has been agreed upon and it's never been addressed in its entirety.

Mr. Martinez said for the purposes of the RECC, he requests funding each year for capital purchases according to the percentages stated in the JPA, which states that the Town of Edgewood would contribute a total of 20% for all capital purchases, not to exceed \$100,000 (i.e., the maximum the Town of Edgewood will contribute on an annual basis for capital expenditures is \$20,000). So, the City and County then, taken at a split of 50/50 basis, whatever remains. He said each year before the beginning of the year, prior to the budget cycle, he brings to the Board, his requests for capital funding for the upcoming year; and he does his best to estimate the needs that they are going to have, and he includes all of their services and equipment and maintenance. He said he has been asked to do, several times, by the Board, to break those down; and shortly after the March Board meeting, he sent by email all Board Members, this breakdown; spreadsheets and a cover letter explaining how he requests; what he requested; and what those funds go to. He said as you know, all of our equipment serves all agencies and all governing bodies; so when we split those costs, it goes according to that percentage. He noted that he included all of this in the Board Members' packet and he will go to whatever detail is necessary to explain, if there are questions.

Mr. Martinez said what he is asking for the operations of the Center is for - not only the purchases of equipment - but also the maintenance costs ongoing for that equipment to be included in the request he takes to the governing bodies each year. He said there has been a lot of discussion between all governing agencies about this. He said as you all are aware, funding for the operation is different from capital purchase funding; dispatch service funding; it all goes here but is used in different methods. He said he will stand for any questions based on the packet material; or historically, on any of the funding issues that we have, but he would like for the Board's consideration of possibly approving the amended Capital Funding Agreement between the City and the County and the Town of Edgewood.

Chief Radosevich said maybe I'm new and I don't quite understand, but my understanding of capital purchases is a one-time deal, you go out and buy a brand new car that's a capital purchase, but the maintenance then is not part of that purchase, just some ongoing cost, so I don't understand why you would want to roll up maintenance agreements into a capital purchase because capital to me means you buy something once, that's it. Just like if I buy a radio, and after the warranty runs out, if I have to get service done on it, I have a line item for service and equipment. He said he just does not see how you can mix those and then call them capital purchase/maintenance.

Mr. Martinez said under the original Joint Powers Agreement, what was stated under the *Contribution for Funding* was that all cost for operating the RECC were to be shared. He said when we went to the First Capital Funding Agreement, that was the intent, but because there were questions about that very issue, we know how much we are going to spend each year on ongoing upkeep of the equipment (it takes PTS and uploads and maintenance) of the different systems in the Center. Because we know that amount, and I'm not talking about repairs for things that break, or what not, but ongoing

maintenance of it and that's why we thought we could put it together in one agreement to get that money contributed by those percentages for those purposes. He said that is what the intent was, and if it is not according to what is normally done, he understands that, but he was trying to get the cost of the equipment and the upkeep of our dispatch, which is critical equipment for the purposes that we provide.

Chief Radosevich said he understands that, he does, but again, he thinks they need to change the Joint Powers Agreement because operating costs are not capital outlay. He said capital outlay is a one-time purchase for something, and he does not understand-and again I could be wrong but I have been doing this a long time- where when I do my budget, if I want to buy 14 new cars, I put in a capital outlay request, not under maintenance operations of vehicles.

Mr. Martinez said OK, Chair and Chief Radosevich if it would be appropriate to separate the two or to specify that this funding request is for purchase of new equipment, and this amount requested is for the maintenance of that set of equipment.

Chief Radosevich asked Mr. Martinez if he had a budget for maintenance of equipment, isn't this built in the budget every year.

Mr. Martinez said yes, it is under the County budget. Again, according to the original Joint Powers Agreement, all the operating costs of the RECC were to be shared by all client agencies. He said because of an amendment done in 2007, the employees of the RECC were transferred over to become part of Santa Fe County; and assets were transferred over, and all operational costs currently are being paid solely by the County, but the capital purchases portion of that was not included, and that remained to be contributed by the governing bodies, as parties to the JPA. He said he is trying to bring it all together, trying to make it work on both ends, so that the funding requirements for the Center and its equipment are taken care of; and it hasn't been easy but that's what he is trying to do.

Chief Rael said there is still the basic issue of the disagreement of the two governing bodies as to what is operating costs and who covers what. He said he understands what Mr. Martinez is trying to do but this subject has come up over and over, and until the governing bodies have determined what their obligations are, he is afraid, in his position, that this Board does not have the authority to commit to approving this. He suggested that this issue go back to the governing bodies.

Mr. Martinez said, as requested by the Board, he has split the maintenance costs presently, and prior to the Agreement. These are included in the spreadsheets that were distributed in the Board Members' packets for today's meeting. The spreadsheets also include the breakdown of the existing maintenance costs and the new maintenance costs.

Chief Rael said he understood that the request was to have this breakdown to take

back to the governing bodies and allow them to make that decision because the Board does not have the authority to commit at this point; and he does not think the County does either, until that problem is basically worked out, we're actually hashing over the same issue. He said he appreciates the information but it's going to depend on the governing bodies.

Ms. Miller said Chair, and for the new members that might not actually know the history of this, a little bit, particularly Edgewood. As the Director said, this was a Center that had shared-operating costs based on call volume, and capital costs based on a 50/50 split; and then when Edgewood came in, they had a rate on the operating costs, as well as on the capital costs. As Ken said, in 2007, that changed and some things were not taken into consideration and that was that the County ended up picking up the costs for the City side, but not for Edgewood on operating; so Edgewood contributes to operating and the County contributes to operating; and the agreement for capital stayed in place at the split that it was. So, Edgewood and the County pay operating costs on what is needed to maintain and continue with any new equipment upgrades and those licenses, but the City does not, and that is a point of contention with the County Commission; and probably a point of contention with City Council – that while you agreed to do it, so take it on; and then it has been a point of contention with Edgewood – that it's an unfair situation for Edgewood. She said until the governing bodies, and she agrees with the Police Chief, that until they decide to do something different with that, this will just keep going round and round.

Ms. Miller said the County put forward a budget of over \$2 million to expand the facility and did not ask any of the other members to do that. She said the Center is too small and needs expansion and she put forth to the County Commissioners that getting into an argument over that is not worth it – and the safety and security of the employees, and the ability to run the Center based on needed space, the County should just do that. So, the County has put over \$2 million in the budget to expand this facility and didn't ask for anyone to put into that. She said she would hope that this will be taken back to the governing bodies when they are considering the maintenance costs for the equipment of the RECC. She said the County has stepped up to the plate, way beyond its obligation, and we could sit there and say no, and argue about trying to get more money for that. She said we have some capital funds, as with every governing body, operating a government entity, the operating money is the hardest to come up with. She said because we have the money to expand that, we're going to do it, and not ask any of the other partners of the facility to contribute. So, she hopes this will help the governing bodies on this issue of paying the license fees to maintain the equipment. She said there is a good faith effort on the County's part to continue to make this work as a collective entity.

Chief Rael said an additional point of clarification, it is my understanding that a lot of the disagreement comes from the fact that the City agreed to allow the County to take over all of the public safety tax money; and that's really the base, that's really where the disagreement comes in – is that you took that in exchange for committing to provide

the operating funds; and again I go back, that's not a decision we can make here, but I do appreciate the information and I'm sure the City Manager will pursue some kind of response from our governing body.

Mr. Martinez said so, Chair and fellow Board Members, if I may, just to get this off as a continuing agenda item, what we can do from this point is to proceed with the original Agreement that was approved; and all maintenance for all equipment will be budgeted annually through the County, but I will still continue to ask for contribution for any *new* equipment purchases.

Chair Sperling said before we go there; is there any other discussion on this existing item.

Chief Radosevich said thanks for giving him a little history and again, I think I was involved with the arrangement with Sandoval County; and trust me anytime you get, three or four, we had five governmental entities trying to agree on how to do things. He said in speaking with his administrator and the Mayor, he thinks the Town of Edgewood does not have a problem in paying their fair share but again, I don't know, going back to the history, is if it is being funded by some type of tax; and the residents and people in Edgewood are already paying the same tax also, why would they be paying an additional amount of \$70,000 or \$75,000, which again personally, I don't have a problem with because again, we need that service but he thinks again, it's a small amount, that they figured Edgewood only has a very small budget, and he does not know what their total call volume is versus the City, the County or Edgewood's call volume, but he would guarantee that it cannot be more than a couple percent. He said he thinks that this would be something that their Council would say "why are we paying a hundred grand when really maybe our costs, if you break it down by call volume, may be less than that but I don't know".

In response, Mr. Martinez said he has those numbers-and he breaks it down annually according to the calls.

Chief Radosevich said City Council and Mayor of the Town of Edgewood would want to know this. He said he does not want to get into a situation of paying maintenance costs out of capital outlay because he does not think that that is the purpose of the capital outlay thing.

Chief Sperling said he has a couple of small points to make and one being, when we talk about maintenance, I tend to agree, you know, when you think about purchasing a car, for instance, you know you're going to have to do regular maintenance on that car. He said this is more service-related than maintenance-related; and I know that, as a Board, we all share the desire to have the most up-to-date services possible for the public and for our members; and I look at the Dialogic, for instance, the original Dialogic system service agreement was \$2600. While the system had severe limitations and we all agreed



that it was not something that would suit our purposes in any kind of regional emergency, so we upgraded the system and the cost went from \$2600 a year to \$33,000 a year, and I'm afraid personally that if the service agreements and the costs associated with those agreements don't get shared, that there's going to be a block on the road for continuing to provide the most up to date and current services for our firefighters, our officers and our public. So, I really do hope that common sense will prevail to some degree and I understand the issues involved, certainly, I have been doing this a while myself but the costs have really escalated in regard to the service agreement, hugely, and there are lots of other things that we could be doing as a service to provide better service for our folks out in the field, but the costs are there and they're real. So, I kind of echo what Manager Miller said, that I think that the County has stepped up significantly in improving the quality of services provided but he really wonders when we are going to hit the wall, and he thinks as a group, we will regret that we let that situation develop. So, he didn't know if a recommendation from this body would be in order, or if we should just let it sit; and I say a recommendation, because the former City Manager had, for many meetings in a row, not promised us, but implied that he would come back with additional information and get together with the governing body and give us more insight to their feelings about this issue but that has not happened; and he does not expect you to be aware of that necessarily, but he knows we have heard it for quite some time; and so short of just putting this out to pasture forever, it would be nice to actually try to get some traction on this issue and get it resolved one way or another-either nothing happens or we make some kind of amendment, and just putting out to pasture, which I think, in my opinion is not something, we as a Board should allow to happen. That's my feeling about the issue.

Mr. Johnson said I'm trying to remember from the past, was it recommended that you do a presentation to the City Council to try and help them understand it a little more.

Mr. Martinez said right, the previous City Manager Romero suggested that he was going to take the issue to them and anything that I could present regarding information, I would be more than willing to do that for either of the governing bodies, with regard to the history, or whatever information is required so that they can understand what the request was for, and what the equipment is because again, it's shared equipment. We do the same job for each agency and each department so, it all goes to the same hand and I'm willing to speak or present whatever information.

Mr. Johnson said I'm sure a presentation to the Public Safety Committee would be in order as well, to help the process along.

Mr. Snyder said he could commit to making a similar commitment of previous City Manager Romero to take this to the Public Safety Committee and the Finance Committee to help their understanding. He said he understands some of the complexities, and has heard about this for a number of years, even though I have never participated in it, so it's been discussed. But that being said, it does not mean it can't be discussed again, and as things evolve, we can take it to the committees that make sense taking it to: Public

Safety, I think is first and foremost, and then our Finance Committee (a Subcommittee of Council) can definitely give us at least, guidance and we can see what the perception is. He said he could commit to doing this at some of the upcoming meetings.

Chief Rael said he is a little reluctant to make a recommendation at this point because it is the governing bodies that need to work this out. I have no problems with bringing it before the Public Safety Committee requesting their direction and providing the information but I don't feel that we, as a Board, can recommend to either governing body how to spend their money, or how to address the problem. As I said, I have no problem discussing it, but I'm reluctant to approve any recommendation at this point.

Chief Sperling asked if there were any questions.

Sheriff Garcia said, if I may Mr. Chair, Director, what I'm looking at here is the maintenance and service agreements total, and I'm looking at a total of \$264,000, correct?

Mr. Martinez said yes.

Sheriff Garcia said then you have a breakdown by City and County and Edgewood.

Mr. Martinez said correct.

Sheriff Garcia said he can't see why there would be such a major issue with either entity for that total amount right here, especially when the County has been dishing out all operating costs, at this point, and still here, I see the County with a higher figure than the City. But I do feel, as a Board, we recommend that it be taken to the governing bodies to look at this issue and address it. So, I do support a recommendation.

Chief Sperling said thank you Sheriff. He asked if there is any more discussion.

Mr. Snyder said as somebody that is new to this issue, and I have plowed through these numbers, now and in previous sessions, I'm still not totally sure that I understand all the complexities of it. I think it's one thing to recommend that it be taken to the committees, but I think it's a whole other thing for us to recommend approval, some sort of suggestion from these numbers; and I would say we've already come up with a recommendation like Chief Rael said, he will make sure that it is seen by these committees, and it's quite appropriate, but I agree with Chief Rael, that I don't think I would be comfortable making a recommendation, from what I feel, is limited knowledge of the issue itself and the numbers. I would suggest that the committees and the presentations would help clarify my questions; and the governing bodies' questions as well.

Chief Sperling asked if there were any other comments. I mean, a recommendation, from my perspective, could be that we're seeking guidance and direction from the governing bodies and we would like to resolve this issue one way or the other, so it doesn't just stay there, and move it forward; and allow you to give a presentation and allow us to give input one way or the other and just try to move this along; and that could be the genesis of our, or the substance of our recommendation. If there's not, I mean I hate to take a recommendation forward requesting a yay or nay without consensus of the Board, I think that would be a mistake, personally.

Chief Redosovich said, Mr. Chair, again, not knowing about the history, and I think, the City Manager and I were just talking about maybe we don't all have all of the history, is there a bigger issue than \$150,000. So, why don't we try to get them to resolve, if they resolve the bigger issue, which I know in the political world, that's probably never going to be happen. But I mean, to me, and I just don't see that, I mean, I'd be glad, you could come down to present before the Council and whatever, and I think we'll support whatever we need to do to pay our share, but I think we want to be careful on what we want to open up, because if the Council finds out that the residents and people are already paying a tax to do this, and I'm still paying another \$100,000, I have a feeling that they're going to say "Whoa, whoa, wait a minute", so it's kind of like the question, be careful what you ask for because you may not get the answer you want. So, I don't know that we, and you guys know the politics here more than I do in Santa Fe County, but if they're arguing over \$150,000 then that tells me that there's something else behind that, and by our board recommending something to all of the governing bodies is not going to solve that problem.

Ms. Miller said Chair, Members, I'll talk about the elephant in the room since it's here and we're all talking around it. We're talking about 3.5 million dollars and we're talking about a tax that municipalities and counties can put in place: a quarter cent, EMS, fire or dispatch, a communications tax authorized by the Legislature several years ago, and municipalities as well as counties can put it in place. The County tax goes across to some municipalities and in Santa Fe, more than probably anywhere in the entire state, because I was Secretary of DFA, and I can tell you, the *only* municipality and county that have this argument and have this Achilles, is that the City of Santa Fe believes that their tax goes through its municipal boundaries-that tax should be shared. And, it has come up between the two governing bodies for the last 12 years or 10 years, and depending on whose in office, it goes back and forth whether the County has said OK or not OK. So, at a time when the County went forward to put the tax in place to pay for its portion at that time of the RECC, and for its Fire Department, that's what they put it in place for; and I think it can also be used for behavioral health and they didn't put it in place for that. The City came forward and said we will fight you on putting that tax in place if you don't cough up some of the money to something that is a City's cost. So, the County, for whatever reason; and I do not know why in the minds of the individuals that were there at the time, agreed and changed the JPA to say we'll pay the City's share. Edgewood was not involved in that, Edgewood, I think was just paying it's flat rate at the time and it

wasn't even brought into the conversation but the City and County changed the JPA to say that the County would take the operating costs. My personal issue with that if they wanted to agree to something like that is that they should have said, well we'll take the first million, or something like that, so that everybody, whether they were in the Town of Edgewood, the County of Santa Fe or the City, got a benefit from that, no matter where the tax came from; and then the call volume method, you know sharing the operating costs by the call volume still would have been shared. And, I think the City probably would have been happy because they would have had a reduction in their costs; the County would have been, I think worked collaboratively, I believe with all of the entities, but it didn't come up then and it's not the way the JPA is written. I now have a completely different board than what is in place at the time that this happened, and they're not happy about it but the City also says "hey, you agreed to it". So, it's about a 3.5 million dollar issue, you're right, it's not a \$165,000 question, it's a 3.5 million dollar question of which probably 2.5 (2.2) would fall back to the City if it went back to the way that it was. I don't see that the City would have any desire, or the City of Santa Fe to do that. So they're not going to jump up and down and go "Oh yea, let's set the path to do that", completely understandable but unfortunately, and I think, Chief Sperling hit the nail on the head though, do we want to see this fall apart because nobody wants to bring a suggestion forward. I have suggested something along that line to my governing body of why don't we look at covering a base amount, and then sharing the operating costs above that. I think the problem though, a part of why it hasn't come up is, we had a lot of issues to deal with on annexation, and a lot of costs that is going to be incurred by both sides. It was like let's kick that can somewhere down the road a little bit so, that's where it is and I don't know, it's probably at a level where Brian and I need to go "OK, do we want to actually bring the governing bodies back together and have a discussion again." Frankly, that's not what I'm looking forward to, but I think something needs to happen before the whole structure falls apart, or before, because what happens when equipment purchases come up, the County goes we don't want to take on more operating costs. So, I think the idea behind this Agreement was to say "OK, well at least for keeping our equipment up to date, why would we have a problem recommending paying for the new equipments maintenance, each individual body and its percentage, to at least try to separate that from what had previously been agreed to". So, I think even just being that blunt with the City Council, County Commission and Edgewood's City Council would be helpful because I think from an operating standpoint, for everyone in this room, it's really hard to try and support Ken; and what Ken wants to run a good center for the safety of our community, to get stuck on this what I would say bad agreement from 7 years ago and bad on the County, and I'm not saying, I don't blame the City, I really don't, if I were the City Manager or City Councilor, I would be like "we are not changing that agreement". But that said, you know, do we do it at the cost of having the best equipment, having public safety, and is it really the County's responsibility to take on all of that for everybody on a tax that hasn't grown; it's gotten smaller since then so, it's hurting the citizens if we can't come together and find a way to share the costs. So, I can agree with Chief Sperling that maybe we should at least put a dialog out there and start presenting some things to how do we go forward because it will take 2 years to change the thing; and I don't think it's

going to happen, even if we started at today's budget, and only those costs above that, budget were split. You know, I don't know, I can't say what the County Commission would agree to; I can't say what City Council would agree to; I can't say what Edgewood would agree to, but something that shows we're trying to tackle this issue, so that we're not avoiding buying equipment because we don't want additional maintenance costs. So, I would be for recommending at least going to the committees of the different governing bodies and presenting what we want to try to do to move forward on sharing the maintenance costs.

Sheriff Garcia said he would consider that a good recommendation. He said there is nothing wrong with it-we're talking pennies compared to 3.5 million, so I'm with the County Manager, let's move it forward.

Chief Rael said he is not clear what the actual motion is.

Sheriff Garcia said there doesn't have to be a motion – just that we move forward and address both governing bodies to support this. He said this is minute compared to what the whole picture is and we shouldn't be breaking down for something so small.

Mr. Martinez said he could put something together so he can approach the Public Safety Committee, the City Council and put that through the RECC for their review and approval; and they can help him facilitate those meetings and speak to who he needs to speak to and put the information in front of them. He said he could do this if that is OK.

Mr. Johnson said there are new members on each governing body that are probably not educated on how the Center works or operates, so it can't hurt to put the information out there.

Chief Radosevich said he agreed and thinks we need to recommend that they need to address this but he had one question. He said in looking at the breakdown, we've got our \$20,000 share for maintenance of equipment, that's not capital purchase.

Mr. Martinez said no, the purchases that he outlined are for any equipment that needs to be purchased. He said what we were asking for previously, we just purchased, we did a pilot project for AVL and GPS equipment, and that would have included any equipment that we purchased and it could be something as small as a stove, and he put it in each year's budget request. He said we bought the AVL and GPS modems with some of that money for the pilot project and we've got two.

Chief Radosevich said but I'm looking at your breakdown, and correct me if I'm wrong, on the second page, but the \$161,000 is what you're saying is the maintenance costs.

Mr. Martinez said yes, and that would be on the agreed upon contributions

according to the percentages.

Chief Radosovech said OK.

Mr. Martinez said but again, as we go forward, I can break these down however we see fit but I was just breaking them down according to what the request was by the Board at that time, but as we move forward, I can put this information into any format that's required. I have it listed by every cost; by line item for everything that we purchase and everything that we maintain. So, having the information isn't the issue, it's how would be the best way to present it, so I'm open to any type of suggestion or request from any Board Member as to how best to present to their governing body. Again, I just threw these together on spreadsheets to show what our costs were, what the services were; what the equipment was; but Chief I can get any of that information and break it down any way that you see fit. When I request it by percentages, I put in the percentages according to the JPA so again; I take \$20,000 off the top for Edgewood and split the rest between the two other bodies.

Chief Sperling asked if there were any other questions.

**Chief Rael made a motion requesting that the RECC Director (Ken Martinez) prepare that information for presentation to the various committees (not making a recommendation that the Board's approve or disapprove because again that's the Governing Bodies decision). Sheriff Garcia seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.**

Mr. Martinez will put together this information for the Board's review and approval prior to making presentations to the various committees.

#### **ACTION ITEMS**

**a. Request approval of Amendment to the 2013 RECC Open Meetings Resolution**

During the 2013 Legislative Session, House Bill 21 was passed amending the Open Meetings noticing requirements for public bodies.

Staff requested the Board's approval of the Amendment to the RECC Open Meetings Resolution as required to maintain compliance with the law.

Mr. Martinez said the notice shall be given at least 72 hours in advance of any regular meeting of a quorum of the members of the RECC Board of Directors and a draft agenda will be posted *at lease seventy-two (72) hours prior to the meeting. A final agenda shall be published at least thirty-six (36) hours in advance of any Board meeting held for the purpose of discussing public business or taking any formal action within the authority of the RECC Board of Directors.*

**Sheriff Garcia moved to approve the Amendment to the 2013 RECC Open Meetings Resolution. Chief Rael seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.**

**b. Request approval to extend professional services agreement for medical direction with Dr. Alfredo Vigil, M.D., FAAFP**

For Fiscal Year 2014, funding was requested in the budget for the RECC to enter into a Professional Services Agreement for medical direction.

According to Section 4, Effective Date and Term, of the current Agreement which was entered into by and between the Santa Fe RECC and Dr. Alfredo Vigil, M.D., FAAFP on July 1, 2011, the Agreement may be extended for three (3) additional years contingent upon funding.

Staff requested approval to extend the current Professional Services Agreement for medical director services between the RECC and Dr. Alfredo Vigil, M.D., FAAFP for Fiscal Year 2014 beginning July 1, 2013 and ending June 30, 2014.

Ms. Miller asked how much was funded on the contract last year.

Mr. Martinez said approximately \$20,000.

Ms. Miller asked how much of the funding is left.

Ms. Calhoun said about \$5,000-\$6,000.

Ms. Miller asked if this was a 1 year agreement or a 4 year agreement because it shows like it is a new agreement, as opposed to an extension. She explained that there is a limit of \$50,000 for contracts and if it goes over \$50,000, there has to be a new RFP.

Mr. Martinez said the RECC originally did a contract for \$20,000 per year and it is extended year after year.

Mr. Basham said they can change the language in the agreement to reflect that this is an amendment. He said although the contract is for one year, it can be extended for an additional three years, for a total of 4 years - before the RECC has to go out with a Request for Proposal again.

Mr. Martinez mentioned that they did not receive a lot of responses when they originally did the Letter of Interest for medical direction services.

Mr. Basham suggested that a Letter of Interest be done every year. He

recommended that the Board approve this now in the interim, and a Letter of Interest will be done in the near future to bring back to the Board. Mr. Martinez will get with Mr. Basham and get this taken care of.

**Chief Rael moved to approve the request to extend the current Professional Services Agreement for medical director services between the RECC and Dr. Alfredo Vigil, M.D., FAAFP for Fiscal Year 2014 beginning July 1, 2013 and ending June 30, 2014 (with the understanding that a new Letter of Interest will be done). Sheriff Garcia seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.**

**c. Request approval to enter into a Professional Services Agreement for legal representation with Basham & Basham, P.C.**

For the 2014 Fiscal Year, a total of \$25,000 was requested in the budget for the RECC to enter into a Professional Services Agreement for legal services

In April of this year, the RECC distributed solicitation for Letters of Interest to four different Santa Fe area attorneys requiring response by sealed bid on or before May 10, 2013. The only response received complete and before the deadline was from Basham & Basham, P.C.

Staff requested the Board's approval to enter into a Professional Services Agreement for legal services for the RECC for the Fiscal Year 2014 with Basham & Basham, P.C.

**Ms. Miller moved to approve the request to enter into a Professional Services Agreement for legal services for the RECC for Fiscal Year 2014 with Basham & Basham, P.C. Sheriff Garcia seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.**

**d. Request approval to continue stenography services with Stenography Services, Inc.**

For Fiscal Year 2014, funding was requested in the RECC budget for the RECC to enter into a Professional Services Agreement for stenography services for the RECC Board meetings.

Jo Ann Valdez is currently the stenographer for the RECC.

Mr. Martinez noted that the contract is for \$2,000.

Staff requested approval to enter into a Professional Services Agreement for stenography services for the RECC Board meetings for Fiscal Year 2014 with Stenography Services, Inc. (Jo Ann Valdez).



**Sheriff Garcia moved to approve the request to enter into a Professional Services Agreement for stenography services for the RECC Board meetings for Fiscal Year 2014 with Stenography Services, Inc. Chief Rael seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.**

## **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

### **a. Medical Director Report (Dr. Alfredo Vigil)**

[The Medical Director's written report was distributed in the Board Members' packets. The QI Summary Report for the period: 04/01/2013 – 06/03/2013 was attached.]

Dr. Vigil said the QI Summary Report shows that the dispatchers continue to provide excellent service to the community; and continue to maintain the levels of compliance ratings that are required to keep the accreditation.

Mr. Martinez said the RECC plans to seek accreditation in the future on the protocols for both the fire and police side as well.

Dr. Vigil mentioned that Randy Vallejo's training program is in full swing and they are very proud of the "robust" training program. He noted that all requirements are being met.

He said as expected, there has been some turnover but screening and processing of applicants is underway. Realizing that turnover will always occur, it is important that advertising and recruitment be happening at all times.

### **b. Financial Update and Director's Report (Ken Martinez)**

[Copies of the Year-to-Date Budget Status Report as of 06/17/13 were distributed in the Members' packets.]

Mr. Martinez said in getting closer to the end of the fiscal year, he does not see any shortfalls or issues with the budget.

Mr. Martinez reported that the RECC presently has 10 vacancies.

Mr. Martinez noted that the second RECC academy is in session now and there are currently six trainees going through the training process.

He reported that the RECC staff has attended the following trainings:

- Four staff members attended the State Law Enforcement Public Safety and Tele-communicator Academy.
- Three staff members attended the DPS Accredited Instructor Development Class.
- The RECC was asked to attend the 18<sup>th</sup> Annual Advocacy and Action

- Conference that is put together by the Violence Against Women group
- The RECC is planning to have active team leader training.

Mr. Martinez gave a brief update on the GRT status noting that GRT collections for the County are coming in 2% -6% better than budgeted.

Mr. Martinez said they are still working on the full implementation of the CAD and AVL GPS.

He noted that all of the Motorola radios will be out of service soon, as well as the Center consoles. The radios will not be supported anymore. He will be meeting with the City and the County IT departments to look at a solution and possibly upgrade the radios. Mr. Martinez said equipment costs could cost up to \$1.3 million for the future for the Center alone. He mentioned that they will be putting together a focus group to see what is needed in terms of equipment.

Ms. Miller asked if E911 funds could be used for this.

Mr. Martinez said no. He said the problem is that the 911 service is only half of the services that the RECC provides.

Chief Sperling asked if there are any grants available for this.

Mr. Martinez said he will check.

Mr. Snyder said the City has grant writers and possibly they may have some ideas on grant funding, etc. He asked if there is a "phase-in" approach so that they won't have to spend the \$1.3 million all at one time.

Mr. Martinez said yes, they could look at a phase-in approach.

Mr. Snyder said he would like to be involved. He mentioned that the City is in the process of hiring a new IT Director and they are conducting a thorough evaluation on all ITT for the City; and how they handle the maintenance contracts, etc.

## **MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC**

There were no matters from the public.

## **MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

Chief Rael thanked Ken Martinez for being responsive when they have any issues or complaints. He congratulated Mr. Martinez and his staff on the numbers of the QI Summary Report.

Mr. Johnson said he has talked to several people on a number of calls that he responded to, and they have made positive comments about the great direction they received from the dispatchers.

Chief Radosevich agreed.

Chief Sperling said the dispatchers did a great job with the Tres Lagunas fire. He acknowledged the initial dispatcher (Vanessa Marquez) for the outstanding job she did in getting the resources out to the fire so quickly.

**NEXT MEETING DATE**

The next meeting was scheduled for September 12, 2013 at 9:00 a.m. at the Santa Fe County Public Safety Complex.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Board, and the Board having completed its agenda, Sheriff Garcia moved to adjourn the meeting. Chief Radosevich seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 10:40 a.m.

Approved by:

  
Chief David Sperling, Chair

Respectively submitted by:

*Jo Ann G. Valdez*, Stenographer

Witnessed by: *Nancy L. Calhoun*



COUNTY OF SANTA FE ) REGIONAL EMERGENCY MIN  
STATE OF NEW MEXICO ) ss PAGES: 19

I Hereby Certify That This Instrument Was Filed for  
Record On The 13TH Day Of February, 2014 at 12:45:06 PM  
And Was Duly Recorded as Instrument # 1729956  
Of The Records Of Santa Fe County

Witness My Hand And Seal Of Office  
  
Geraldine Salazar  
Deputy \_\_\_\_\_ County Clerk, Santa Fe, NM

SFC CLERK RECORDED 02/13/2014