

**SNOCOM – SNOPAC Joint Task Force**  
**Meeting Summary for July 19, 2016/ 9:00-11:30am**  
 Location: Fire District 1 Headquarters

Note: *Follow-up action items are noted in italics. Decisions are underlined.*

**Meeting Attendance:**

Joint Task Force Members					
Bob Colinas	✓	Jon Nehring	✓	Rick Smith	✓
Al Compaan	✓	Brad Reading	✓	Roy Waugh (via phone)	✓
Steve Guptill	✓	Bryan Stanifer	✓	Jon Wiswell	✓
Staff Support Team					
Kurt Mills	✓	Karen Reed	✓		
Terry Peterson	✓	Brenda Froland	✓		

**Welcome / Review of Today's Agenda.** Bob Colinas called the meeting to order. Karen reviewed the Agenda with the group and noted that numbers 5 and 6 on the Agenda were not ready to be covered.

**Standing Items:**

- a. **Approval of Meeting Summary from June 24.** The meeting summary was unanimously approved as submitted.
- b. **Communications Roundtable.** Nothing to note.
- c. **Process Issues.**
  1. **Schedule Updates.** The August 30<sup>th</sup> meeting has been changed to September 6<sup>th</sup> and meeting invitations have been sent. At their Board meeting tomorrow, the SNOCOM Board will discuss an August 18<sup>th</sup> Joint Board Meeting at FD1.
  2. **Communications if plan approved by Boards.** If the Communications Plan is adopted, all adopted documents and meeting summaries will be posted to both the SNOCOM and SNOPAC websites.

**Preparations for this week's Board meetings.** Karen will be at both meetings. After an introduction by the PSAP Directors, Karen will review the documents with the Board and be available to answer any questions. *After the Board meetings, Karen will send an email to the JTF and let everyone know how it went.*

**Review / Input: Call Transfers Information Gathered:** Karen stated that the purpose today was to review the information gathered by Terry and Kurt and determine what information or recommendations should be forwarded to the Boards. Terry walked the JTF through the packet. Some clarifications, questions and comments that came from the discussion:

- Aid calls transferred from SNOPAC to SNOCOM are not dispatchable for FD1 without further assessment.

- The two agencies are collaborating to select a replacement for the EMD system. Site visits are planned this summer or fall to help evaluate options.
- Currently, there is no way of knowing if an incoming call is a transfer, but it may be feasible to send transfers to a different queue.
- Analysis shows little difference in dispatch times between transferred calls (CFS pre-entered) versus calls directly received. This benefit should be shared with the public.
- A communication plan is being developed with New World (NW).
- Transfers getting dropped by agency systems (as opposed to cell towers) and calls that are transferred back and forth are very rare. However, the longer a cell call lasts, the greater the risk it of it being dropped by a cell tower.
- SNOPAC receives about 100 abandoned calls a day, and while 99.9% are not emergencies, the agency calls back all these callers.
- “USS (unsecured scene)” is not a type code. *Staff will make this change in the document.*
- Data on the number of calls transferred is from the phone system and NW. The two databases cannot be linked, so it was necessary to make some assumptions.
- Percentage of calls transferred includes all transferred calls in the jointly served area.
- Why does SNOCOM transfer so many more calls than SNOPAC? Fundamentally, this is because the 911 call lines are programmed to route to Fire, rather than Police, and there are a lot more Police calls.
- The “Mason/Dixon” line splitting the call routing was instituted over ten years ago when the technology we had was much more limited.
- *The 20,000 total call transfers in January-May 2016 figure needs to be confirmed.*
- Data analyzing the priority of calls transferred was based on the ending priority of calls.
- To show the benefit of NW, we could add information comparing transferred call response time from pre-NW to the data developed in this document. Essentially, calls took about 45 seconds longer to process before NW. *The Directors will add a bar to the table for pre-NWS data.*
- For several hours on the 4<sup>th</sup> of July, the PSAP’s did not transfer calls as both Centers were assumed to be overwhelmed. Instead, each PSAP handled and dispatched all calls they received. The results are being analyzed, but it was noted that it is not a broad reaching solution as big events like Oso and MPHS happen without warning.
- The working relationship between the two agencies is very strong now. We cannot assume this will always be the case. A good working relationship is not a substitute for good policy.
- A transferred call percentage as high as the 21% we are seeing is not seen anywhere else in the U.S. and is unacceptable. Regardless of whether we consolidate, we need to do something to correct this.
- The E911 office has an ongoing effort to improve routing.
- It was not possible to get good numbers on transfers before the Viper system was installed.

- Regarding the Options Table – ways to address call transfers—
  - Being dispatched by two agencies was problematic for FD1 in the past. If NW has resolved the delays resulting from transfers, FD1’s concerns about who answers the calls (911 routing) has been eliminated.
  - Continuing to work the problem is basically the *status quo* option.
  - Consolidating call taking but not dispatch is not ideal because of the need to staff up in both agencies for dispatch, and due to the impacts on 911 dollars – per state law these dollars can only go to call taking, not dispatch.

Individual takeaways from today’s discussion included:

- I am better informed now.
- 40,000 transfers per year unacceptable. We can fix this and we should.
- We have to improve our business model. There are too many transfers. We need to let go of stuff that happened 10-15 years ago. Technology has changed to allow different and better solutions. We need to focus on solutions.
- Appreciate the work to pull this together. Good report.
- Good report. Highlights why we’re at the table. We can solve this and should.
- Great to have facts and data. Nice to see improvements from NW. There are still too many call transfers. But this is just part of the consolidation puzzle.
- We’ve mitigated a lot of the transfer problems with NW. But still too many transfers.
- Good report.
- We need just one PSAP. We should not underestimate the value of the current collaboration between the two agencies—but this is dependent on the people and can change if they change.

**Next steps:** *The Call Transfer Briefing will be updated by the Directors for review at the JTF Meeting on August 9<sup>th</sup>, and presented at the Joint Board Meeting on August 18<sup>th</sup>. It was noted that an accompanying PowerPoint would be helpful for the presentation.*

The JTF discussed whether it was appropriate to include the options and if any of the less viable options should be removed from the list. As the Scope of Work document includes options being presented to the Boards, *the options will be included. However, recommendations will be reserved until all of the pieces are reviewed by the Task Force.*

**Review / Input: Comparative Governance Matrixes:** Karen reviewed the matrices she prepared comparing governance of SNOCOM, SNOPAC, SERS, NORCOM, CRESA, SouthSound911, TCOMM and Pierce Transit. Her criteria for choosing which agencies to compare: they serve a large number of agencies and have a broadly-shared governance structure. She offered some observations on best practices for multi-agency operations agreements, based on her experience:

- Type of Entity: a non-profit corporation structure, under RCW 24.06 (24.03 is similar) provides a lot of flexibility to structure according to local needs while providing liability

protection not available under a joint board or partnership structure. Debt financing for facilities can be accomplished under this structure.

- Allow for agencies to purchase services and not be owners/members.
- A two-prong supermajority vote structure based on (1) assessments, and (2) number of participating agencies addresses concerns where some member agencies are very large, and others are very small.
- Technical advisory committees should not have power to direct executive directors – they should be advisory to avoid conflict between the TACs and the governing boards.
- Advance notice of withdrawal of around 1 year is fairly common.
- If there may be “latecomers” joining, it is helpful to identify in the interlocal agreement the policy goals to be met in developing entry conditions.
- It’s easier to have a term of agreement that is perpetual unless terminated agreement—folks sometimes forget to do the periodic renewals.
- Allowing ILAs to be amended in most (but not all) regards by less than unanimous consent is a preferred approach.

Items to change / double check in the matrices:

- *Do population numbers account for shared service areas?* Numbers should be reflected in both.
- *Function: under SNOCOM, ‘records retention’ should be changed to ‘police records’*

Karen noted that whether or not there is consolidation, the JTF scope of work calls for it to make a recommendation on consolidation, which will include a recommended governance structure. She will develop some “straw proposals” for how a governance board could be composed, based on JTF input. JTF members offered the following ideas/reactions:

- Matrices have good ideas from which to cherry-pick, such as the double pronged super majority vote.
- There needs to be some shared representation to avoid a 50-member Board.
- Criteria for having a seat at the table needs to be defined.
- Criteria for a board seat could include budget/assessments and population, and should account for how these may change over time.
- Like having TAC’s appoint representatives for their disciplines.
- Elected officials should decide who is going to be on the Board.

**Next Meeting Agenda.** Items for the next meeting will include debriefing the two Board meetings, an updated Call Transfers Briefing, and items 5 and 6 from today’s Agenda: review and input on Services Offered and a Template for Information on Baseline Alternative.

**Closing Comments / Adjourn.** Meeting adjourned at 11:34.