

INDEX OF MINUTES

SANTA FE REGIONAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS CENTER

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

September 12, 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 JUNE 27, 2013	Approved	2
EXECUTIVE SESSION (If determined necessary)		
a. Limited Personnel Issues		
b. Threatened or Pending Litigation		
	None	2
ACTION ITEMS		
a. Request approval and Direction on Soliciting Participants for the Re-Establishment of the RECC CAD Working Group		
	Approved	2-3
b. Request approval to Reclassify four (4) ECS Trainee Positions to ECS Call Taker positions		
	Approved	3-7
c. Presentation, Discussion and Direction regarding RECC Structure and Funding Information		
	Motion passed	7-14
INFORMATIONAL ITEMS		
a. Request for Feedback from the Board regarding Quarterly Reports and Presentations		14-15
b. Medical Director Report		16
c. Financial Update and Director's Report		16-18
MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC	None	18
MATTERS FROM THE BOARD		18
NEXT MEETING DATE		18
(The next meeting was scheduled for November 21, 2013 at 9:00 a.m.)		
ADJOURNMENT	Adjourned at 11:45 a.m.	18-19

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

Santa Fe, New Mexico
September 12, 2013

The Meeting of the Santa Fe Regional Emergency Communications Center Board of Directors was called to order by Chief Sperling, Chair at 9:15 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
Chief Raymond J. Rael
Brian Snyder

MEMBER (S) ABSENT:

Sheriff Robert A. Garcia, excused
Katherine Miller, excused

STAFF PRESENT:

Nancy Calhoun, RECC
Ken Martinez, RECC Director
Vanessa Marquez, RECC Manager
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

Chief Litzenberg made a motion to approve the agenda. Chief Rael seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: June 27, 2013

Mr. Martinez noted that he replaced the Minutes that were in the Board Members' packets with an updated version to include the verbatim comments on the agenda item for the *RECC equipment maintenance cost sharing and possible approval of Amended Capital Purchases Agreement*. This is what the Board would be approving today.

Chief Rael made a motion to approve the (verbatim) Minutes of the June 27, 2013 meeting as submitted. Chief Litzenberg 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.

ACTION ITEMS

- a. Request approval and Direction on Soliciting Participants for the Re-Establishment of the RECC CAD Working Group**

At the time of the initial consolidation of the RECC, in order to ease the operational transition of the two original departments into one, a group was established to represent all stakeholders and other parties pertinent to the implementation, planning and operation of the RECC Computer Aided Dispatch system. Considering that the RECC is now in the process of implementing several upgrades to the CAD, and with the technological changes that the RECC will face with the upcoming NM911 requirements. The RECC Director recommends that this group be re-established to meet regularly to address CAD issues and any other equipment and technology needs the Center may have.

Mr. Martinez requested the Board's approval and assistance in delegating or allowing the solicitation of client agency employees to be members of, and participate, in the meetings of the RECC CAD Working Group.

Chief Rael asked Mr. Martinez if that isn't the purpose of the Board.

Mr. Martinez said yes, it is. He said he would like to bring a group together that would decide if there are changes that need to be made, more at an operational level; and to have a better line of communication between the RECC and the agencies.

Chief Rael said he is always a little leery of having more meetings and more committees. He was not sure this was a good idea.

Mr. Snyder said he could see the value of it. He asked Mr. Martinez if this is a request for funding, or is this only an opportunity for the agencies to get together.

Mr. Martinez said no, this is not a request for funding. This would only be an avenue for them to discuss issues and come together as a group. He said he is trying to be better responsive to field staff. He said this could help resolve complaints or issues on a timelier manner.

Mr. Snyder asked why the original group went away.

Mr. Martinez said he thinks the meetings were scheduled with such regularity that it got boring for the members and the members dropped out. There was also a lack of content for the meetings. He said having the ability of having a group like this could be beneficial for all the agencies. He also would like to have more contact, operationally, with the agencies when they have issues. It could also serve as an advisory group to the Board.

Chief Radosevich agreed with Chief Rael that people can tend to spend a lot of time in meetings and nothing really gets accomplished, but he did not see a problem in bringing it back on a trial basis.

Mr. Martinez said they could try it out because he believes it will benefit everyone.

Chair Sperling asked if it would be more appropriate to call it the "RECC Technologies Working Group", rather than focusing only the CAD because they are looking at expanding technologies beyond the CAD. He said his second comment is that the Board has talked in the past about looking at a new CAD because the current CAD technology is outdated. He suggested that this group look at starting the process of what other models of CAD are out there, and bring the information to the Board.

Chief Litzenberg moved to approve the request to re-establish the RECC CAD Working Group (it will now be called the RECC Technologies Working Group). Chief Radosevich seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

b. Request approval to Reclassify four (4) ECS Trainee Positions to ECS Call Taker positions

Mr. Martinez said it is common for 911 Communication Centers to have employees specifically dedicated to the call taking function. Currently, Santa Fe RECC utilizes all operator staff to answer incoming lines. This requires those radio operators to also take phone calls. This can cause delays in answering the telephone and contribute to delays in answering field staff over the air. It is his belief that having staff dedicated to

telephones only would allow radio operators to focus on field unit communications while allowing call takers to handle the majority of the incoming telephone traffic.

This will also assist the RECC in retaining employees who are hired and successfully sign off the Call Taker portion of the training program, but are unable to progress or cannot sign off on the radio program. Normally, employees in this situation are terminated even if they can adequately perform the call taking function. This reclassification will also help maintain adequate staffing levels, and decrease the workload of the radio operators by allowing the call takers to handle the majority of the incoming calls without having to man a client agency radio.

Mr. Martinez requested approval to reclassify and fill four ECS Trainee positions to ECS Call Taker positions.

He said he has not been able to get new FTE positions for the RECC and he would like to reclassify the four ECS Trainee positions to Call Taker positions in the meantime. He explained that he presently has two operators who are in this position where they cannot advance to the radios and one of them is a superb Call Taker.

Chief Litzenberg said he wonders if Mr. Martinez is creating positions around certain people that the RECC does not want to lose. He questioned if this plan was sustainable.

Mr. Martinez said he has had a desire to do this for a long time but he did not want to lose the FTE positions in the process. He said he is not creating positions around certain people.

Mr. Snyder asked Mr. Martinez how many trainees they have now.

Mr. Martinez said six trainee positions. He noted that the RECC has 10 vacancies presently.

Chief Rael asked how this will affect the Radio Operator position long-term, and will it create a problem if the RECC is fully staffed.

Mr. Martinez said the only way it would affect staffing is that it would not allow him to do staffing configurations. He said it might limit him to the amount of possibilities he'll have (in terms of schedules), but he will still be able to remain the same level of staffing.

Mr. Johnson noted that they have had trouble getting through when calling 911. He asked Mr. Martinez if this will help alleviate that problem.

Mr. Martinez said yes, and he is also looking at other options to transfer the calls

so that it won't ring and ring.

Chief Radosevich said he thinks these are the Director's decisions because he is the one that deals with this day to day. His only concern is that this will affect the minimal staffing levels if the staffing levels are based on radio operator positions that are no longer classified as radio operators.

Mr. Martinez said his minimal staffing levels are based on having six radio operators at all time. As mentioned earlier, it will affect his ability to offer different shift configurations.

Chief Radosevich explained that the State budgets at a certain vacancy rate when they do their budget. He said there is not a dispatch center in the state of New Mexico that does not have staffing problems, and maybe they need to take a look at that, and how we do things. He thinks the call taker positions is a good idea but he doesn't want the RECC to come back to the Board, and ask for more radio operators in the future because those call takers can't run the radio; and the RECC still has openings. He said sometimes we need to change and re-evaluate what we do. He challenged the RECC to look at whether or not they are duplicating the same things and doing a lot of things that they don't necessarily have to do; and this is why people are leaving.

Mr. Martinez said he will keep these points in mind. He said it takes time to get these employees trained but they have talked to the Law Enforcement Academy about cutting back on the amount of time it takes to certify the dispatchers. Also, when he has an adequate amount of operators, he can give them an easier schedule that is not so hard for the operators. He said he will not ask for positions in the future because he does not believe he will need them.

Chief Rael said as he understands this, one of the reasons that the Director wants to do this to keep an individual that is working as a call taker now, without having to let them go. He asked Mr. Martinez if this is correct.

Mr. Martinez said no.

Chief Rael asked him if there was some other way to extend this employee's employment to give him more opportunity to qualify without necessarily having to change the position classification to call takers.

Mr. Martinez said if this doesn't happen, this individual will be terminated anyway. He said he is not building this around this particular individual because the call taker position does not depend on him and he wants the call-taker position even if he did not have somebody who could fill it right now. He noted that the call takers can be trained in two months.

Mr. Snyder said he will ask the same type of question, maybe in a different way. He asked if there is an opportunity - rather than changing the name of the position to call taker- to change the function of the trainee and to keep them in that function.

Mr. Martinez said he would have to come up with a justification as to why the trainee is not going to train on another station or to move up to the next station. They also would not get a raise after a year.

Chair Sperling said they could also extend the probationary period if someone does not meet the needs of their probationary period and then come up with an action plan to proceed to the next classification.

Mr. Martinez said he can extend the probationary period for 90 days.

Mr. Snyder said when you have invested the time with somebody that wants to be here, why not figure out a way to extend the probationary period; and do an action plan to build their skills set so that they can become a call taker and work their way up, especially because the RECC currently has 10 vacancies. He said he is not sure what the Board's role is as to personnel matters and what the RECC Director is responsible for - to bring to the Board.

Mr. Basham said the Board does not get involved with personnel matters but they could give the RECC Director some direction.

Mr. Martinez noted that any changes that are made to the organizational structure of the RECC need to be brought before the Board.

Mr. Snyder said there is a reason why the RECC has these vacancies, and any opportunity to help those that are willing to be here after investing a year in them, he thinks it would make sense to extend their probationary period and do whatever is necessary to set up an action plan to help them through this process.

Mr. Martinez said with this structure, he knows within three months if they are going to stay.

Mr. Johnson said asked if the steps that they have to go through is an accreditation standard, and how are these changes going to affect the RECC's accreditation status.

Mr. Martinez said no, accreditation only deals with those who are EMD certified. He said this would not affect the RECC's accreditation status. He said it was easier, in his mind, organizationally to have this position. If somebody does not want to deal with radios, they could just be a call taker; however the call taker position will be required to be EMD certified because they will be taking medical calls. He said both trainees and call takers will be required to go through the Academy training.

Ms. Calhoun explained that there are some people who just want to be call takers, and they could stay for a long time. She said when she started with the RECC she could not move on to become a dispatcher.

Mr. Basham asked if these employees would be eligible for raises, if they are reclassified.

Mr. Martinez said that is the issue because once they are here a year, under the current contract, they are eligible for a \$2.00 per hour raise, and the reason they are eligible is because they have progressed to the radios.

Chief Radosevich said he thinks the call taker thing is a good idea because he knows that a lot of centers around the state have gone to this; however, he questions the union part/side of it. He said if the Board approves the call taker positions but the County says no, what happens then.

Mr. Martinez said he has already received HR's approval to do this.

Chief Radosevich asked if the County has the option to change it.

Mr. Basham said yes.

Chief Radosevich said in what he has read so far in what's going on, we're the policy makers for the Board, so where does the County come into place.

Mr. Basham said he thinks the Board discussed this at length at the prior meeting – when the City and County made an agreement to form the first Amended JPA where they made all of the RECC employees, County employees.

Chief Radosevich asked if this is what the JPA states, or is that what the County interprets it to say.

Mr. Basham said as Mr. Martinez noted before, he has received approval from HR to do this.

Chief Radosevich said the fact that the RECC has its own legal staff tells him that the RECC is a separate entity.

Chair Sperling asked if there were any other comments.

Chief Radosevich moved to approve the request from the RECC Director to reclassify the 4 ECS Trainee positions to ECS Call Taker positions. Chief Sperling seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously after a roll call vote was taken.

c. Presentation, Discussion and Direction regarding RECC Structure and Funding Information

At the June 27, 2013 RECC Board Meeting it was requested that the Director prepare information regarding the RECC structure and funding to be brought back for review by the Board.

Mr. Martinez requested that the Board discuss and provide him direction regarding the information that is presented and any possible next steps in addressing the governing bodies.

[A PowerPoint presentation was made regarding the RECC Structure and Funding Information. Copies of the presentation were distributed in the Board Members' packets.]

Mr. Martinez presented the information from Exhibit VI-c. Please see *Exhibit "VI-c"* for the specifics of this presentation.

In summary:

- The City and County of Santa Fe entered into the Original RECC Joint Powers Agreement in November of 2001 for the purpose of defining the terms and conditions of operating, administering, and maintaining a joint enhanced 911 Regional Communications Center.
- The City of Santa Fe performed the duties of fiscal agent, handling the financial transactions and personnel functions. Funding was a joint contribution based on call volume. All costs were shared as per the percentages outlined in the JPA.
- In October of 2006, the Board of County Commissioners and the governing body of the City of Santa Fe executed a Joint Resolution in which the County agreed to be solely responsible for the costs of the day to day operations of the RECC, in the event the County's proposed Countywide Emergency Communications and Emergency Medical Gross Receipts Tax was approved by the voters. The Agreement went further to say that the County would become the fiscal agent for the RECC, and the employees of the RECC would be taken on as County employees.
- Missing from this Amendment was the wording that maintained the separate legal entity status of the RECC.
- As related to funding, all operational costs of the RECC would, pursuant to the First Amended JPA, now be covered by the County, but capital purchases would still be shared pursuant to the Agreement. The County and City would

equally provide funds for capital expenditures.

- In May of 2008, the Town of Edgewood approached the RECC with a request to provide communications services for their newly developed Police Department. Terms were negotiated and as a result, the JPA was amended a second time to include Edgewood as a client agency and to provide a seat for its Police Chief on the RECC Board of Directors.
- Changes to the funding portion of the JPA included that the Town of Edgewood would contribute 20% of total capital expenditures/needs not to exceed \$100,000.00. The City and County would then equally split the remainder (i.e., maximum contribution by Edgewood is \$20,000).
- Budgetary restrictions in fiscal years 2009 and 2010 prevented the adequate appropriation funding from the City, County and Town of Edgewood for capital purchases requested by the RECC. As a result, implementation of an efficient funding mechanism and process became necessary for the RECC to obtain funding for necessary equipment and other capital expenditures.
- At the October, 2010 RECC Board of Directors' meeting, Board approval was requested to draft a Capital Purchases Agreement to create an effective way to secure funding for the RECC needs.
- At the January, 2011 Board meeting the Board approved the RECC Capital Funding Agreement which provided an official means by which to request funding of capital purchases.
- At the June 2011 Board meeting, Board approval of the Amendment to the Capital Funding Agreement was requested. This allowed sharing of annual support costs for equipment purchased pursuant to the RECC JPA and the Capital Funding Agreement. This was tabled in June pending a report on RECC equipment support costs. It was tabled again at the August Board meeting pending a study of what equipment and annual support would cost for all entities to provide this equipment and communications services on their own. This item has been tabled at every Board meeting since then, pending discussion and agreement between the City and the County's respective governing bodies.

Mr. Martinez reviewed the duties of the RECC, the challenges and proposed solutions. He believes that the funding and budget approval process could be simplified and streamlined through the use of a combination of procedures taken from both the existing JPA and the approved Capital Funding Agreement, and also with a couple process and approval changes implemented and performed by the Governing Bodies and the RECC Board of Directors.

Duties of Santa Fe RECC (as stipulated in JPA)

- The Board of Directors shall provide oversight and direction for the operations of the RECC and shall regularly advise the governing bodies of the City, the Town, and County concerning the operations of the RECC.
- The Board of Directors shall periodically review revenue and expenses of the RECC and shall propose to the County an annual operating budget for operation of the RECC which shall be submitted for approval to the County prior to March 1st of each year.
- The Board of Directors shall ensure that the proposed annual operating budget of the RECC is adhered to and that the finances of the RECC are properly managed.
- The Board of Directors shall review and approve any proposed capital expenditures for the RECC on an annual basis, which shall be submitted to the City, the Town and the County prior to March 1 of each year as a supplement to the proposed annual operating budget. Capital expenditures are assets over \$5,000 each item including delivery, install, and other related costs of equipment, machinery, or vehicles with a life of longer than one year.

Challenges

- After the Second Amended JPA was executed, the budget funding process became a bit more convoluted. Although the annual budget and supplemental capital purchase requests were still prepared and presented to the RECC Board but because the operational funding was now the responsibility of the County, presentation to the County and the City was no longer required. Instead, the budget request became part of the County's process, through which, although approval of the RECC Board was already obtained, budget items could be changed, deleted or disapproved at the finance level.
- With regard to capital purchases, the JPA stipulated that requests are to be prepared and presented to the RECC Board for approval prior to March 1. Specifically, the JPA states that "Capital expenditures are assets over \$5,000 each item including delivery, installation, and other related costs of equipment, machinery, or vehicles with a life of longer than one year. Historically, this was interpreted to mean that annual support of both software and equipment was to be included in these numbers as other related costs. However, over the last couple of years, this has been brought into question.
- Although all equipment and software is utilized in performing the functions of the Center across all agencies, this further muddied the waters as to what amounts would be contributed by which agencies and for what equipment.

The added question as to whether ongoing costs of annual support for all RECC equipment would be shared or not has also contributed to confusion and difficulty in preparing budgets and requesting funding approval; and in deciding what equipment would be used by the Center and which agency will be using it. This severely limits the ability of the Center to move forward with projects that will benefit the public as a whole and ease operations within the Center.

Proposed Solutions

1. Historically, approval by the RECC Board of Directors of the proposed RECC operating budget and capital requests served as the leverage necessary to take the budget to the City and County bodies for approval. Although it may not be appropriate any longer to take the operating budget to the City, it does make sense that the review and approval of the budget by the RECC Board of Directors is sufficient to forward the budget to the County Commission for final approval. The Capital Purchase request, upon review and approval by the RECC Board of Directors, can then be presented for approval to the City's, the County's and the Town of Edgewood's governing bodies. Once that approval is obtained, direction can then be given to the respective Finance Departments to arrange transfer of the funding to the fiscal agent for disbursement into the RECC account, or other processes can be agreed upon by the finance departments to arrange post purchase reimbursements.
2. Requested is that the RECC Board of Directors can, as stipulated in the JPA, re-establish itself in practice as the governing body of the RECC, overseeing the operation of the Center and advising, on its own or through the Director, the Governing Bodies of the City, County and the Town of Edgewood.
3. Also requested is that the governing bodies, by agreement and consensus, establish and allow for the stipulations of the JPA regarding the funding and operation of the Santa Fe RECC, including the duties and responsibilities of the Board, be recognized in full, enabling the Center and its staff to more closely focus on, and adequately provide to both its client agencies and the public, the regional emergency communications services as was originally intended upon its creation.

Mr. Martinez said this information will eventually be presented to the City, County and the Town of Edgewood's governing bodies (to include the Public Safety Committee) and any other pertinent committees regarding the RECC funding process.

Chair Sperling asked Mr. Basham if he had anything to add.

Mr. Basham said no.

The Board Members had the following comments:

Chief Radosevich said he discussed this with the Town and the Town's Attorneys are looking into this because they are questioning why they are even paying, because the County tax is collected within the town of Edgewood. He said he realizes there is the JPA, but he thinks this is something that nobody really thought through because they are already paying for that service, whether they have their own police department or fire department. Plus, they are paying another tax to Santa Fe County Fire for fire and EMS protection within the Town, which he assumes would cover the dispatch portion also.

Chief Radosevich said he agreed with the Director that if this Board is responsible for all this stuff, then he thinks it is up to the Board, and Legal Counsel, to pursue it with the County and inform them that they do not have the control that they say they do, according to what the JPA says. The Board can direct Legal Counsel to sit with the County and tell them that this is what the JPA says, and if the County says no, then take legal action against them. If not, then we just keep on plugging away and do what we are doing.

Mr. Martinez said he is not specifically saying that we need to go and fight for a separate and legal entity status and independence. He said this has caused an issue for him and this is why he brought these issues up. He is asking the Board to make decisions governing requests and take those budgetary requests to the County. This Board, as the governing body of this Center, has the authority to do that per the JPA. He is asking that the Board recommend this to the County.

Chair Sperling said this could be more than the Director's interpretation of how the JPA reads, and that's the root of the issue; and the fact that there is disagreement on how this is interpreted.

Chief Rael said a lot of this is subject to interpretation. The County is interpreting it the way they want to; the City Council interprets it the way they want to, and the RECC Director has his own interpretation and we're all stuck in the middle. He said the reality of it is, as you read this, it states that we will present the County a recommendation for funding. He said we can't tell the County what process it utilizes to make that final decision, or the County Commission, for the funding. We can't dictate to either governing body. He said all of us have to come to some consensus of what the reality is and see how we approach it from that end.

Mr. Snyder asked if Mr. Martinez is anticipating taking this to any entity.

Mr. Martinez said the purpose of this presentation was to present information to the Board and to put together a request to take to the Public Safety Committee. He explained that this stemmed from the Capital Purchases Agreement and whether or not all agencies will support paying for maintenance costs, or if these costs will be left to the

County.

Mr. Snyder said he did not get that from this, he gets more of a history here, which is great. He said it comes down to what Chief Sperling said - that there has been a disagreement on how the JPA has been interpreted. If there was a next step going to City Council, as an example, or the County Commission, I think what the Director has been talking about, which is not in here, is what Katherine Miller brought up last time, is the elephant in the room of what is the current situation, and how is it currently set up and what the challenges are with that, and what you propose to recommend to fix that challenge. He said to him that does not have anything to do with what he read in this presentation, this is just a background, but the challenges are capital – funding for capital and who is going to pay for it and who's not going to.

Mr. Martinez said and the maintenance.

Mr. Snyder said and along that- maintenance that goes along with the capital. So, that's the reality of the situation and if you're looking for, and pursuing participation of the existing agreement is one way, and the County's is a different way, and you're stuck in the middle of that. What I hear you wanting to get out of this is some kind of resolution to how to move forward and it may be that the City and County have the same interpretation but by the time it is said and done and it goes through the City Council and County Commission process, the reality is, and that's what you're trying to get, is to initiate that conversation so that the Council and Commission is aware of what the challenges are, and what you're faced with, and what the results of those challenges mean-do they affect call time, what challenges they create in your operations.

Mr. Martinez said when he tried to summarize what's on this page because the challenges are directly related to capital funding.

Mr. Snyder asked him what the challenges are. He said I hear your challenges are capital and then follow up on the maintenance around the capital and who's paying for it, who's money, that's what it comes down to right?

Mr. Martinez said right now, to be honest, as long as the money that I am requesting for whatever equipment that I buy is provided, I don't have an issue, I just need the equipment, so if the County is forced to pay for all the surrounding cost, like support and updates, and all that, it's getting paid for because I put that into my County budget. If the City and Town help me to buy the AVL and GPS, it's getting paid for. It's just that the difficulty for me is when I'm including in those budgets, is to get that money. The difficulty for me is coming to the Board every time and saying will you share these costs or not share these costs, how am I going to break them up, or I'm not going to break them up.

Mr. Snyder said I guess, I look at it in a little different way is that I don't see you

having a problem with the Board, you have a problem with the governing documents of the Board, which is the JPA and the way the cost structures are broken down.

Chief Radosevich said the issue is, even with this Board, is do we pay for the maintenance costs of those systems. He said in his opinion, the maintenance fees should be built into the regular General Fund budget and that cost just keeps on going. He said he supports whatever the Director wants to buy 100% as long as the Board approves it, but after that warranty or maintenance agreement runs out on that initial purchase, that funding should be built into the general operating budget of the RECC.

Chief Sperling said maybe if we were to focus on the specific language in the Amended JPA - requesting participation in maintenance costs - to what does related costs mean, is it specific to maintenance costs and can we come to agreement as to what that means between the City and County.

Mr. Basham said the one thing that the JPA does say is that the terms of capital purchases is to be reviewed annually by the City, County and the Town, so the Board can make a request that the policy makers solve this issue. He said he could get direction to draft a letter to the City and County attorneys that the Board is requesting that they sit down and review these terms.

Chief Rael moved to direct the RECC attorney (Mark Basham) to pursue a meeting with the three governing bodies to resolve these issues. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

a. Request for Feedback from the Board regarding Quarterly Reports and Presentations

Mr. Martinez noted that he has received feedback from Board Members regarding the content of reports and other information presented at the quarterly RECC Board meetings. The issue has been raised that more response-specific reporting may be appropriate at the meetings.

Mr. Martinez requested that the Board discuss this and provide direction regarding what information they would prefer to be presented at the meetings.

Chief Litzenberg said it is more useful to have a comparison or correlation between what the dispatch center is dispatching their units to, and what the units are actually finding. He said this is useful to him on how well the dispatch center is performing. He thinks that the statistics that are now provided to the Board really help the Director to know how his staff is performing.

Mr. Martinez offered to work on getting that information to put together a report.

Chief Radosevich said one thing he would like to see information on is the call volume for the Center - to get an idea of what is happening in the Center and the issues (radios, GPS) that are coming up and affecting all of us. Also, what types of calls are they, are they for law enforcement, etc. He said it would be nice to know the staffing levels of the RECC and the problems he is having, and that type of stuff, so that the Board knows what is going on.

Mr. Martinez said he gathers that information monthly and he has a running tally of how many law enforcement calls they have taken; how many medical calls they have taken and what the percentages are, etc. He offered to do a report and include it in the Board Members' packets in the future.

Chief Radosevich said another thing he has, he noticed on the EMS side medical report you do a random sample of how they are handling calls. He asked Mr. Martinez if he did this on the law enforcement side. He thinks quality control on the law enforcement side is just as important as it is on the EMS side -are we getting our people out there quick; are we asking the right types of questions; are we dispatching the right people.

Mr. Martinez said the random evaluation and testing is done with regard to the EMD certification and accreditation. He noted that he wants to go to a police dispatch and fire dispatch protocol in the future; however in the meantime, they can run random evaluation on the law enforcement side and provide reports on that.

Chief Rael said he would like to see more frequent updates in terms of the RECC projects, like the CAD, to see if they are meeting their obligations, does he need to make any adjustments, etc. Also, are we using the equipment that we purchase?

Mr. Martinez said in the past, the RECC provided an IT report and they can start doing this again.

Chief Radosevich would like to have information and updates on the GPS in the vehicles, are we using it, etc.

Chief Sperling suggested that a written report from the Working Group that was approved today be provided in the monthly packets. As well as some feedback in regards to the reclassification and whether this is effective for the RECC; what kind of difference is it making-how quickly units are dispatched because dispatchers no longer have to take calls due to the call takers.

Mr. Snyder said it would be helpful to establish some measures or matrix on the success of the RECC - to have a baseline on how we are successful.

b. 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: 07/01/2013 – 07/30/2013 was attached.]

Dr. Vigil said he would like to make a comment on the issue of the vacancies. He said the pressures on the dispatch position are increasing and this is clearly somewhat responsible for the level of vacancies. These pressures include: the recession – the economic down turn several years ago created havoc on budgets, which is continuing to be felt. However, the economy is beginning to improve and as the economy improves, potential candidates have more job choices and salaries are becoming more competitive, with perhaps less pressure. There is also heavy competition from other public safety agencies in the area. Another pressure is the recent meltdown with behavioral health agencies in the state and the impact of the new Affordable Care Act that is going to be implemented here in the next few weeks.

Dr. Vigil thanked the Board for reclassifying the call-taker positions because he thinks it is an important step forward to work on the issue of reclassification. He explained that the vacancies result in scheduling pressures on the remaining dispatchers; and anything the RECC can do to make the system more flexible and work with the resources that are available would be beneficial.

c. Financial Update and Director’s Report (Ken Martinez)

[Copies of the Year-to-Date Budget Status Report as of 09/05/13 were distributed in the Board Members’ packets.]

Mr. Martinez reported that the RECC presently has 10 vacancies from the original list of 23 applicants. After orientation and testing was done, the RECC hired four individuals.

Mr. Martinez said the RECC presently has five trainees who are going through the training process and two have completed the Law Enforcement Academy.

Mr. Martinez reported that the RECC staff has attended the following trainings:

- Staff members are obtaining accreditation through the State Law Enforcement Academy so they can become certified instructors at the State Law Enforcement Academy.
- Two supervisors attended first line supervision and management courses that was hosted by Bernalillo Sheriff’s Office.

Mr. Martinez said at the last Board meeting, he was down two supervisor positions but these have been filled. He noted that the RECC filled the Center Manager position. He introduced Vanessa Marquez. Ms. Marquez has been with the RECC for 16 years.

Mr. Martinez gave a brief update on the GRT status noting that the County Finance Director reported at the last meeting that both the Fire and EMS GRT collections that help fund the RECC materialized better than budgeted by 14%, and are 7% better than the prior year for the same month.

Mr. Martinez gave a status update on the equipment of the RECC as follows:

- The RECC upgraded the auto-log recorder and can now send audio bits through e-mail, if necessary. They are working on doing this with the District Attorney's office and the courts. This will increase and improve efficiency in that regard.
- The NavaLine server has been successfully installed but they still need to do some program security configurations and Jason is working with City and County records department on implementing those systems.
- The RECC is in the process of updating the AQUA and Pro-QA software.
- The RECC needs to upgrade the AS-400 operating system on the CAD, which is a huge undertaking with 14-16 hours of down time. This will need to be coordinated with all of the client agencies and vendors because the RECC will be down for a while. All agencies will be notified in advance.
- The RECC was using the City's License to implement the mapping server software for the AVL and GPS but the RECC has now purchased their own version of this and will relinquish the license back to the City.
- The RECC is looking at installing cameras outside the RECC Center, and a security swipe type system to increase security. These were budgeted items and will be purchased.
- The GEO Blade licenses for AVL and GPS are being updated.

Mr. Martinez said currently the Police Department has 75-80 GPS units installed and 78 are active. GPS modems have been installed for the Edgewood Police Department in four of the five units and the Sheriff's Office has 20-25 units installed, in which two are active so he needs to get with them to see what is going on. They still need to work no implementation for the Santa Fe Fire Department.

Mr. Martinez said the RPM software, which is texting to the volunteer Fire Districts, has been installed and is working well.

He said the reporting software has been installed on the new server.

Mr. Martinez noted that they presently have 1,100 citizens who are registered for the emergency notification system.

Mr. Martinez mentioned that the RECC received laptops for training from the Sheriff's office.

Chief Litzenberg requested that Mr. Martinez send out an organizational chart. Mr. Martinez agreed.

Chief Sperling asked what the timeframe was for the CAD upgrade.

Mr. Martinez said sometime before the end of this calendar year but it won't be done at peak hours so that it won't affect operations. He has a meeting on October 5th to discuss this further.

MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no matters from the public.

MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Johnson said the Pojoaque and Tesuque Police Departments are not part of the RECC but they take a lot of the initial calls and he would like to talk to the Director about doing some cross training for their dispatchers. This could help run things better.

Mr. Martinez said they could provide the primary questions that the dispatchers ask and a copy of the curriculum of the academy.

NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting was scheduled for November 21, 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, Chief Radosevich moved to adjourn the meeting. Chief Rael

seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Approved by:

David Sperling
Chief David Sperling, Chair

Respectively submitted by:

Jo Ann G. Valdez, Stenographer

Witnessed by: *Nancy Calhoun*

SFC CLERK RECORDED 02/13/2014



COUNTY OF SANTA FE) REGIONAL EMERGENCY MIN
STATE OF NEW MEXICO) ss PAGES: 20

I Hereby Certify That This Instrument Was Filed for
Record On The 13TH Day Of February, 2014 at 12:45:07 PM
And Was Duly Recorded as Instrument # 1729957
Of The Records Of Santa Fe County

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