

The following transcript is provided for your convenience, but does not represent the official record of this meeting. The transcript is provided by the firm that provides closed captioning services to the City. Because this service is created in real-time as the meeting progresses, it may contain errors and gaps, but is nevertheless very helpful in determining the gist of what occurred during this meeting.

>> Pete Constant: Good afternoon and welcome to the Public Safety, Finance and Strategic Support committee meeting for Thursday, October 20th. First thing we'd like to do today is get a motion for a sunshine waiver. The packet came out about one day -- 24 hours late but still met the Brown Act requirements. Motion?

>> Councilmember Nguyen: Mr. Chair I make that motion.

>> Pete Constant: We have a second? Nobody opposed, that's great. Review of the work plan. We have a few things here before we get to the motion. On our agenda we have a deferral request for two items, Team San José quarterly report and the report on the domestic violence prevention program. We also have a request for a deferral of item D-9 which is the report on title 16 amendments and a request to -- I'm sorry, D-8 and a request to drop D-9 which is the report on the medical marijuana regulatory program. And additionally we have the request for items D-3 and 4, the CAFR and CADR referred directly to city council due to timing issues. So if we could get a motion for all of those en masse.

>> Councilmember Nguyen: I make the motion.

>> Pete Constant: Thank you, do we have a second?

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Second.

>> Pete Constant: Any discussion? All in favor? Any opposed so that motion carries. Two deferrals to council one drop and one drop. We have a motion and second to accept the consent calendar, all in favor, any opposed that passes unanimously. As well. We'll now move on to the committee reports. The first item we have is item D-1 which is a review of relevant 2012 legislative guiding principles I see we have Betsy.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Betsy Shotwell, Director of Intergovernmental Relations. This is our annual review of alleviate guiding principles for the next year 2012, the second year of the state legislature and Congress. It's an opportunity to review the priorities the council have set at the policy level. It's sort of the I call it

the 30,000 foot document. This is the foundation for our advocacy in Sacramento, Washington and of course collaborating with our regional partners as well. This is helping in a fairly recent policy that you adopted last year where we can use these as a foundation for taking what I call the expedited process, review what the council has adopted and with the approval and review of the mayor's office, City Attorney and we can review pretty quickly and get it on the floor rather quickly, rather than the two or three week process that we would take normally. Also helps us a lot where perhaps the council on July is on furlough and we have some issue brewing in Sacramento our lobbyist can act quickly and expeditiously. And we report back to the council on this action. And we have a few adds in the area of this committee's purview with respect to protection of local control. I think that's clear next year that we will -- the advocacy will be intense against legislation that preempts local control and also for maintaining levels of funding for programs that we are so dependent on particularly from the federal government. Those specific issues and priorities will be coming to the rules and the council in addition to this document. That will be specific to CDBG and home and Safetilu and reauthorization of the federal air. I don't have anything more specific to say. I'm certainly happy to answer any questions. I would like to add that what we do visit our delegation we do drop off, this document is not the document, it comes out into sort of a cliff notes version of the first two pages. I have had staff though inquire with our delegation for copies and have me walk through these documents with them. So usually at the beginning of the year in January. And in February. So with that be happy to answer any questions.

>> Pete Constant: Thank you. Do we have any questions regarding the legislative guiding principles?

>> Councilmember Nguyen: Motion to accept the report.

>> Pete Constant: I have a motion and second. Anyone from the public? Doesn't look like it. All in favor, opposed, thank you.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Thank you very much.

>> Pete Constant: So our next three items are all Sharon's first we have the semi annual recommendation follow up report on all outstanding audit recommendations and then the monthly report of activities and then the airport public safety level of service. We can kind of steam roll all through them.

>> Sharon Erickson: I'll just roll through them as quickly as I can. So the first one is the semi annual recommendation follow-up report. There were a total of 175 open audit recommendations, as of June of 2011. This included 158 recommendations that were outstanding from our last status report, in December of 2010. And 17 new recommendations from audits issued within the last six months. Since our last report, staff implemented 16 recommendations, a total of 100 recommendations are partly implemented, 59 recommendations are not implemented. I did want to point out that a total of 37 recommendations are included in this report, which still have potential budget impacts totaling in the \$60 million range or more. These recommendations will be considered as part of the upcoming budget process. If I could take a minute to walk through a few of the more significant issues that I'm seeing in this report, on page 23, our audit of employee medical benefits. HR has implemented recommendations improving the reconciliation with benefit providers. These are the health benefit providers. They're in process on a number of recommendations to reduce cost. We believe those recommendations could realize ten to \$11 million, were they to be implemented. They're currently under consideration all of them with different bargaining units. On page 43 we have the audit of civilianization opportunities in the police department. The department has made significant progress in addressing our recommendation on civilianization. The POA and the city did reach an agreement to civilianize their contract out 20 positions and in fact the budget this year through budget action, 15 positions and the contract police artist were civilianized and or contracted out saving at least \$1.2 million. We believe there is an additional 2 to \$4 million embedded in the remaining recommendations and we'll be following up on those. On page 59 of the report, we report on the status of the audit of the licensing and permitting of card room owners and employees. We did want to point out in that report we paid six recommendations to improve the City's process for licensing and permitting employees. The title 16 revisions which were on your agenda today, but have been deferred, would address one of these recommendations. And some other issues. But I did want to point out that that revision alone would not fix the process issues that we have in the remaining -- the rest of those six recommendations. On page 70 of the report of course our audit of pension sustainability, there were six recommendations in that report. Those

recommendations are of course all under consideration, as we are all painfully away. I did want to point out recommendation number 6 of that report which appears on page 72 of your report. It is a long report. That recommendation was to prepare an annual report. There was a recommendation to the retirement department to prepare an annual report to plan members on the status of the plans. We haven't made a lot of progress on that recommendation, and I am bringing it up because I am still hopeful. I think it's critically important that at a time like this the plan is reporting directly to its members. On page 73 of our report, we talk about the audit of City's take home vehicles. I wanted to point out that significant progress has been made in this area. Our recommendation included, we identified 93 vehicles, 58 of those vehicles were eliminated in the Police and Fire department's budgets this year. There were a few more vehicles that we believe could be addressed, the total there the cost is only about \$150,000 but these days we are painfully aware of how much \$150,000 will buy us. On page 79 of the report, we report on the status of police department staffing audit. There was one recommending on that audit that it has been implemented. The redeployment of day detectives, takes care of that recommendation. I did want to point out, recommendation number 1 of that report regards reporting on the number of employees. So this was at each shift change to report on changes in staffing by unit and function. That report is partly implemented. There are many other recommendations that are in process or not implemented. I did want to point out that in terms of the status of recommendation number 3 which was to reduce the -- potentially the number of districts, and the other recommendation, I'm forgetting the number of it, was number 9 -- was regarding staffing ratios. I did want to point out on page 80 of our report, as we calculated the department staffing ratio for example of sergeants to officers has improved in my view. Other people may disagree. From 1.45 to 1.47. We did see more movement in terms of patrol from 1.1 to 5.5, moving to 1 to 6.2 in terms of the ratio. But we do think there's potentially some more movement in that area that could be made. Just a couple more. I did point out on page 84 of the report, our report on key drivers of employee compensation. That report included seven recommendations. It includes reducing or eliminating sick leave payout, reconsidering some of the premium pays. Those are significant dollars involved and they're significant issues that are under discussion now with our bargaining units. My office will continue to follow up on all open audit recommendations. We will continue to focus on recommendations that have budget impacts. I can assure you that if any department is interested in implementing one of those recommendations, and it needs any assistance or information from my office, we are jumping right on it. We do, however, understand, and let me close by saying that we understand the pressures that city staff is under in these

-- as we face these reductions in staffing in the organization. People have moved around, the people who were there when we did the audit have frequently moved to other locations. And I just want to express again my appreciation to them for being so responsive to my office when we call to get updates. We'll continue to work with them to address these issues. I'm happy to answer any questions.

>> Pete Constant: Any questions from the committee? Vice Mayor?

>> Councilmember Nguyen: Thank you. Just one general question, Sharon. For the -- in regards to the recommendations that have not been implemented, that are recommended by your office, is there consistent or constant conversation between you and the various departments that you're making these recommendations for implementation?

>> Sharon Erickson: That to --

>> Councilmember Nguyen: Why it hasn't happened or when it's going to happen or how it's going to happen?

>> Sharon Erickson: We're doing it at least every six months and on occasion especially if we're approached by the department we can be in constant communication. For example the recent audit you heard about on supplemental military pay, we are talking to the departments involved in that on a constant basis as we work through those issues. So it really varies from one to the other. My staff would prefer that we only followed up on recommendations like once a year, maybe once a decade. But there is some value in following up every six months. We have to rattle everybody's cages. Nobody likes it very much. But it does give us the opportunity to sit down with departments and get an update on the status and remind people that this is on their to-do list.

>> Councilmember Nguyen: The reason why I ask this question, like you pointed out earlier, some departments are short staffed and sometimes it might take a while to implement this according to our schedule. So if there's consistent dialogue that's going on between your office and the department it makes us feel a little more comfortable on that, that they're working on it. Thank you.

>> Pete Constant: Pierluigi.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Thank you, Chair Constant. Anything from the city management on any of these outstanding things that you see as hurdles or concur or disagree, level of effort, et cetera?

>> Alex Gurza: No, we do agree with all of the recommendations. There are quite a bit of work on some of the parts, and some -- a lot of them are in progress, and to the extent that the City Auditor has any particular ones where we from the City Manager's office could assist in getting responses or status we'd be happy to do that.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: And I appreciate that answer but are there specific ones that you want to speak to personally that you feel we're making great strides but you know we've reached certain problems of implementing them?

>> Alex Gurza: Well I think that we have in a lot of the recommendations made great strides some of them that Sharon indicated are subject to meet-and-confer we are very successful in starting to reduce cost in the area of health care and other items of the recommendations but there is a lot more work to do and we're going to continue that effort.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Just at this time is there any department heads that have anything that have an outstanding item with the auditor that wanted to comment at this time on any of those? I see this -- that's fine. Okay, thanks.

>> Pete Constant: Kansen, anything? Any member of the public, I don't think any have joined us. Motion?

>> Councilmember Nguyen: Motion.

>> Pete Constant: We have a motion and second. All in favor, any opposed, thank you. So we'll move into number 5, D-5.

>> Sharon Erickson: The next report up is just our monthly status report. I'll remind you under our charter I need to provide this report to the council on a monthly basis. The next item up details our work in process. I just want to let you know the next audit up will be the audit of form 700 filers. It should be out in November, for your November meeting. Following that the city's open purchase order for office supplies will be up next on your agenda, followed by police department secondary accomplishment which is coming along. With that I'm happy to take any questions.

>> Pete Constant: Any questions for Sharon? We have a motion and a second. All in favor, any opposed, that carries, so we'll move now into item number 6, audit of airport Public Safety level of service.

>> Sharon Erickson: I'm being joined by the appropriate staff. Thank you very much. We were asked to do this audit and have included some of the details of the duties of the respective parties who are involved in Airport public safety, because of the potential that the city may be -- is considering outsourcing some of these functions. Let me start by saying that in May of 2010, the council approved the airport competitiveness strategic plan which set a competitive cost per enplaned passenger or CPE target of about \$12 in fiscal year 2011-12. In response to that target in part the city has reduced airport staffing by 49%. And the city has been considering whether to reduce and/or outsource airport law enforcement and aircraft rescue and firefighting services that are currently provided by the San José police department, and the San José fire department respectively. Public safety at the airport currently is a joint responsibility of airport operations, SJPD, SJ fire department, the TSA, transportation security administration and the federal aviation administration, the FAA. These entities and agencies each have personnel permanently stationed at the airport. In addition, both the San José police department and the San José fire department provide responses from off-field as needed. What we found in doing this review was, while each agency has its own specific duties and responsibilities, each must frequently coordinate with one another in order to respond to issues, and identify other issues, as they arise at the airport. Details of their respective duties was what we considered to be part of the scope of this work, so the detail

of some of that is outlined in the body. Again, the purpose of our report was to benchmark the current level of service by which I mean who's doing what? And how much of it are they doing? With the idea that we could be potentially outsourcing this effort. Our report actually identify -- includes five recommendations to clarify any potential agreement, if outsourcing were to occur. And to better monitor public safety levels of service at the airport. What we've found is, the measures don't -- these performance measures don't appear to be consistently reviewed and shared among the different airport Public Safety partners. So we are recommending regardless whether the city proceeds with an outsourcing effort that it is imperative that this city rigorously monitor those public safety metrics and response levels given the changes in personnel and responsibilities between all the city staff who are assigned at the airport. Exhibit 1 shows a summary of the selected indicators that we believe should be tracked. What it shows in exhibit 1, it is right there on the page little Roman numeral double I, it does show a comparison of those figures from fiscal year 09-10 to fiscal year 10-11 and then a month to month comparison of an average month in 10-11 to July of 2011. In area of law enforcement services, in an effort to reduce cost, San José PD's airport division reduced sworn staff from 47 in fiscal year 2010 to 41 in fiscal year 2011. This reduced the police department cost per enplaned passenger from \$2.81, which was at the high end of comparable airports. As you can see from the graphics on page 35 of our report, it reduced that cost to \$2.70 per enplaned passenger. I did want to point out that during that time period or in the year subsequent to that San José police department maintained priority 1 response times at the airport but did see delays in priority 2 response times during that year. So the department as we looked at the data was prioritizing priority 1. Priority 2 was what suffered when you reduced the staffing. Then in June of 2011, the airport division, the San José PD's airport division, staffing was further reduced to 23 sworn staff. Which the data for the first month of 2012, of fiscal year 2012 indicates a dramatic decrease in officer initiated calls, and the near elimination of police responses to airport during gate alarms, compared to the average month in the previous year. Now, it should be noted that airport operations took over some of those responsibilities from San José PD during this time period. Although it's too early to draw further conclusions this did reduce San José police department's airport division cost from -- to \$1.29 per enplaned passenger. So that cost went down from \$2.81 per enplaned passenger to \$1.29 per enplaned passenger. I did want to point out, as you can see on exhibit 1 as well the average response time for priority 2 calls did further declined, in the July to July comparison, to 11 minutes and 30 seconds for a priority 2 call. Then in terms of the outsourcing proposals, we looked at the initial outsourcing proposal. We understand that

there have been some modifications and clarifications and negotiations since then. But in terms of the initial outsourcing proposal from Santa Clara County sheriffs that would have provided similar numbers and similar staffing numbers and services, that cost would have reduced -- that would have reduced the cost per enplaned passenger down to \$1.03 per passenger or even 26 cents lower than the department's July 2011 cost. To address service level concerns from this reduced staffing level, the City Manager is considering an increase in police department staffing in the current fiscal year that would increase the current cost per enplaned passenger and the comparable outsourcing cost as well. Given the advantage of utilizing San José police officers at the airport, it's our understanding that the City Manager is considering whether to defer the outsourcing proposal until at least 2013. In terms of aircraft rescue and firefighting service, so this is a service provided by the San José fire department, fire department has also reduced staff at the airport. It's reduced from 17 staff members in 2009-10 to 13 staff members in 2010-11 and 11-12. This was due to a reduction in the Airport's FAA required staffing. It also reduced the cost per enplaned passenger for the firefighting service from 99 cents per enplaned passenger which was actually in the mid range of comparable airports. That graphic is actually on page 51 of your report. It reduced the cost from 99 cents to 83 cents. It's currently 85 cents per enplaned passenger. I did want to point out that overall response times at the airport for -- from station 20, the firefighting station, was an average of six minutes and 40 seconds, which in spite of the reduced staffing was actually an improvement. Which does go to show that when there aren't typically a lot of calls, a lot of small numbers comes in, calls can fluctuate but the department was able even with the reduced staffing to hit their staffing -- to hit their response times. The initial outsourcing proposal for the aircraft rescue and firefighting services would have further reduced the cost so it had come from 99 cents per passenger down to 85 cents, 83 cents and then to 85 cents, it would have further reduced the cost to 44 cents per enplaned passengers or 41 cents less than the San José fire department's July 2011 cost. We want to note though that under the proposal, the initial backup EMS response at the airport would have to be provided by off-field responses, resources from San José fire. Potentially delaying EMS response times at the airport. With the acceptance of the SAFR grant the fire SAFR grant in June 2011, the outsourcing proposal for firefighting has already been delayed until at least 2013. I want to thank all of the staff at the airport, the fire and police departments who were involved out there for their assistance, when all of us are traveling. Also for their time, information and cooperation during the audit process. I'd also like to thank Roy Cervantes from our office and Bill Olson who isn't here but was our Stanford fellow, who was grateful for the fire department and

police department for the ride-alongs and the tours that they provided in the airport. With that I'll turn it over to Kim Aguirre from the airport.

>> Good afternoon, Mr. Chair and members of the committee, Kim Aguirre, the COO at the airport. And the airport agrees with the importance of developing and monitoring metrics as indicated in the auditor's report. More importantly we support the concept of widely sharing the information collected among all of the partners who jointly share the responsibilities of Public Safety at the airport. The airport acceptance the recommendations in the report and would like to thank the City Auditor and her staff for their review and the PD and fire departments for their support during this process.

>> Pete Constant: Thank you. Do we have any questions from the committee? I would just like to say looking at the chart on second page there, page I-I, I think paying just over \$2 a trip is a pretty good deal to be safe at the airport. And I'm amazed that we can provide it at that price. And I'm just even more convinced that we need to maintain our own Police and Fire department at the airport. I know that's not the discussion we're having today but it's an observation I make from this. It's less than the surcharge we pay for the TSA on each of our tickets when we fly. And remember this is enplaned passenger, not did deplaned passenger. It's less than a buck and three cents or something every time you get off the plane. It's cheaper than the Starbucks I get when I'm waiting for my plane. In the grand scheme of things I think that's the way we should be looking at that, something as critical as our resident safety in the air. Any other comments from my colleagues? There's no one from the public I don't believe that wants to speak so a motion?

>> Councilmember Nguyen: Motion to approve.

>> Pete Constant: I have a motion and second. All in favor, we passed that unanimously thank you. And Sharon I think that's it for you, right? All right, or at least right now. Plenty more waiting at the office when you get back. We'll move now to our standing agenda item of the monthly report on public safety communications initiative. And I think we're going to get a brief update and I also have a brief update from SVRIA that I'll give after -- Michelle are you going to present?

>> I'll start and then the chief can take over from there. I just want to let you know that since you met last month, the BayRICS authority has actually had three meetings. And we've been quite busy as well the negotiations team, that's been working on behalf of the BayRICS authority to reach an agreement with Motorola which as you all might remember, received about a -- just over a year ago, maybe 14 months ago, a stimulus grant from the Department of Commerce to build a Public Safety broadband system in our area. In the ten-county Bay Area. We still don't have a contract with Motorola, we're working on that. The BayRICS authority's negotiations team of which I am a member, actually met this morning for the first time, with their contract counsel. And I have to say it was a very productive meeting and I'm quite pleased with the team of attorneys that have been brought on board to advise the authority on this critical work. As you know, it's San José believes that reliable high speed broadband is essential for our public safety providers, and despite our concerns about the origins of this broadband project, we have continued to invest significant staff time and resources into ensuring the development of a project that needs the needs of our first responders. As I reminded some of my colleagues on the authority earlier this week, if San José were not hopeful that we could make this work, we would have walked away back in December of 2010. Instead our council put in place some guiding principles around public safety broadband and those are what guides -- guide me as I serve as your representative and as Chris serves as the alternate. I mention that because, as -- over the last month we've had three meetings in which significant policy decisions were made around the contract with Motorola and the business model, for the bay web project. There were three key areas that San José had policy disagreements with the board. And in which I was in the position of voting no. Sometimes alone and sometimes joined with other cities and counties. So I just mention that. And there are some areas of significant progress. One, Motorola has agreed to pay site remediation costs at the public safety towers and facilities that our cities and counties provide to the project. And that is up to \$24 million that they will pay for the 193 sites. The other is that they have agreed to not have a commitment, a minimum commitment for the number of subscribers to the system. So the board of the BayRICS authority voted to go with a business model that meant that we don't have to commit a single public safety user to the system. Motorola will have to rely on market forces and market the system and have a system that works for jurisdictions to opt-in. There are some hurdles that we still have and that's what we're working with our attorneys on around performance and coverage standards, system design, an back-haul. And back-haul is sort of the backbone of this superhighway and we're

still working to try and lock down what might be the back-haul provider. Whether we partner with BART or another fiber network and that still needs to be done. With all of that, there is a very tight time line for the project. And Motorola is insisting that the contract has to be signed by November 18th. And that all the sites, all 193, have to be locked down by November 15th. So three days earlier. The JPA under its -- the JPA agreement that was approved by our city council and all of the jurisdictions, actually cannot legally sign a contract by November 18th. Because they have to have a 90-day review process of their systems funding plan, which is their budget. That systems funding plan was approved by the board Tuesday morning to go into circulation. I will be bringing it to the council for comment and consideration to come back to the authority. I will note that I did vote no. There are significant holes in that funding plan from my perspective and in working with the administration we decided that it wasn't ready to be circulated yet. However, the majority of the board voted yes, so San José will need to provide its comments. I think those are the main highlights. I can provide a more detailed report by info memo, if the committee would like. Those are the issues we are struggling with. Those are the issues we have been dealing with over the past month.

>> Pete Constant: It is lonely being the only no vote.

>> Sometimes it is.

>> Pete Constant: Chris, do you have more to add?

>> Mr. Chair, members of the committee, Chris Moore, chief of police. You are right, it is tough to be the lone voice in the wilderness, but at the same time when you know you're right and you're out there, you have to do your best. I'm going to follow on with just a few comments on the national level with respect to the proposed national Public Safety broadband network of which Bay Area piece would be just one covering the bear or the nine Bay Area counties. I want to particularly thank Michelle for her work on this because if you recall a year ago we had to uncover quite a bit of information that was difficult to get to, to bring sunshine to this project that was so troubled in the beginning. It is worth pursuing because it is part of the bigger national piece. On the national front there are two bills one coming out of the senate that I've reported on before S-911 peaced out of the committee

on a 24-0 vote bipartisan. To provide not only the public safety, the 700 megahertz D block, which is a swap of spectrum that is really necessary for public safety to have an effective network in broadband nationwide. And also, provide funding to the tune of anywhere between 7 and \$10 billion along with the governance process that we've come to find is so important, witness what's going on in the Bay Area, witness what governance is to make sure we get it built and it's sustainable. Right now we believe, we know that the future of S-911, as well as HR 607 which is the house companion, very similar legislation is being tied up with the discussions with the supercommittee, a select committee on deficit reduction. And we anticipate that those, the presentations will be put forth so I think the deadline for the supercommittee is I believe November 23rd and the full -- both houses of Congress have to vote it up or down by December 23rd. I think at that point we will know whether we have a national public safety broadband network, of which this is a part. So I'm not as concerned with what happens here although you know either way we should pursue it as Michelle has mentioned and follow it through to its logical conclusion. But at the same time I think we're going to probably have a national network paid for. So we won't have to worry about this and we should thank everybody here in the Bay Area that's pushed so hard on behalf of the country. I'll say for the people that I help lead of all the national public safety organizations to bring this to reality, this is something that's long overdue. It's an opportunity that we'll never see again with respect to spectrum and money particularly at this tough time in the budget for the federal government when we're looking at slashing, this is the one area where I think they're actually going to come through with significant federal dollars. And if Betsy is still here, and I don't see her here, but Betsy Shotwell and our partners at Patton Boggs have been very helpful in this regard, as well. I'm going to leave it there, unless any of the committee members have questions.

>> Good morning, Mr. Chair, I'm Chris Godley, director of emergency services. Relative to the significant events going on with the BayRICS and the boon negotiations in Motorola, I can report very -- relatively minor items regarding SVRIA that the emergency communications projection is phase 3 is starting. We have approved an agreement with a vendor for maintenance of the operations center for nine months for the option for 12 more, we got a pretty good deal on that. On the CAD project we have received proposals from several vendors. Interviews will be scheduled this month. The contract will be awarded in early 2012 with work beginning in the first quarter of 2012. That project will continue for about 18 to 24 months. And in terms of narrow banding the existing radio sets

we're essential down in San José police department has almost entirely completed their portion of it so we're well on our way there. I would also mention that we were able to obtain through the UASI approval authority \$94,000 to reimburse the city for costs going forward associated with Patton Boggs weighing in on behalf of the entire Bay Area in terms of obtaining the necessary waiver from the FCC for operation of the 700 megahertz.

>> Pete Constant: Any questions for Chris? That Chris? I'll just tag on from the SVRIA board of directors we have I'm sure you're all aware two different groups working on the same project, the board of directors and the working group. Chris is involved on the working group. Pierluigi and I are involved on the board of directors. We've continued to make progress in trying to really figure out from a board perspective the roles and responsibilities between the working group and the board. And there's been some frustration on the board, in a number of areas, but one is, the board is in charge of the budget, and budget allocations and budget approval. But the working group does the RFPs and signs contracts and obligates the board to pay money, which is kind of an interesting issue that we need to work through to make sure that we're always on the same page. We, on our side on the board we've created a finance committee so that we have more -- a more of a hands-on approach to the financial situation. We have moved financial accounting from the City of Mountain View over to the county of Santa Clara. We've been meeting with the finance staff and auditors at the county to make sure that transition work moves smoothly and we are almost done with a full audit of all the finances since the JPA started. We're making progress there. I just took over as chair of that organization with this first meeting this month. What else? We finally have established general and asset liability insurance coverage on all of the assets through the special district's risk management authority. So that is good. We got a Website that hopefully is going to be up and running very soon so that there will be more access to information from the public. I think -- oh, we also moved into a new office which is in Santa Clara at the same building as the Santa Clara chamber of commerce. So we're starting to get a little more grounded and a little more centered. We also have transitioned, or in the process, the final steps of transition of the executive director, being moved from the City of San José temporary contract employee to an employee of the JPA. That will be completed, all the contracts have been signed, that will be completed mid-November. So that's moving forward. I do know that we just recently had a real live situation test of our baymax system which is the regional interoperability channel that allows public safety personnel to talk to each others on different frequencies while using the radios from their individual agencies. It's

been working pretty well and I understand it was used extensively in the manhunt following the shootings in Cupertino. And Chief, I wanted to see if you had any comments on how that worked, any perspective, because I know we had involvement in assisting there. If you could enlighten us any.

>> We did. Thank you, councilmember. If you recall those difficult events that occurred in the Cupertino quarry and the search that went on for the killer in that case, a number of agencies, although this was a sheriff's office jurisdiction case, the city Sunnyvale was heavily involved because the search ultimately ended up in their city. But we did provide resources to help with the search along with many other jurisdictions in the county. The challenge there is in what we're trying to address is the ability to talk to one another in real time, with not having to have two or three radios and figuring out who is talking to who. The baymax system was created several years ago as sort of a short-term step until we could create SVRIA and be able to build, stand up a true 700 megahertz narrow-band system. We're not there yet because we don't have the money for it. But it's nice to be able to flip to the channel and have everybody be able to talk to each other. And during those searches in particular, it was critical so that you know if you're searching one yard, that the person next to you, if you have got a canine search going on, you don't want to step into that yard. So communication was key. It plays into a number of other cases where we have interagency events, and we have had a number of them recently. We had the officer-involved shooting of a deputy that occurred here in San José on a Saturday just moments before we had the double homicide down the street here in San José. So I mean, with a lot of resource being tied up, it's nice to be able to talk to one another on the same frequencies.

>> Pete Constant: Great, I know there's been a great strain on you and your department's resources begin the last four to six weeks of activity and hopefully next month at our meeting we'll have the opportunity to agendaize and talk a little bit more about how those issues strain the department and the impact they've had on your budget in relation to how many people you had to call up on overtime and all the logistical issues now that we have such a slim staffing ratio, so we'll look forward to that. And Chief, if you could just make a note, any time that we have an opportunity to either use interoperability in our mutual aid responses, either coming in or going out, or a time when communications system frustrated the response of the police, and also, Willie if we have anything from the

fire department, if you can just make a note to make sure that we're apprised of that at this committee to make sure we're getting the same message out throughout our interoperability efforts.

>> We'll make sure we do that, thank you, sir.

>> Pete Constant: Any questions from the committee? Pierluigi?

>> Councilmember Oliverio: I just didn't know if you want an update on the four-hour study session we're going to have for the SVRIA in January.

>> Pete Constant: Yes, it's actually February 1st, we will be having for the first time a joint meeting of the SVRIA board of directors and the working committee. It will be from 8:30 in the morning until 12:30 in the afternoon. And I think it's something that's overdue so that we can start to work a little more cohesively and at least understand what each other are doing. I think they know what we're doing, I just don't think we know. Not because they don't tell us, just because we don't have the ability to understand what they're doing, is all, as a body, but we're working on that. Any questions, anyone else? Still no members of the public for this thrilling meeting?

>> Councilmember Nguyen: Motion to accept the report.

>> Pete Constant: We have a motion to accept the report and a second. Any opposed, that carries we are done in 47 minutes.