

SNOCOM – SNOPAC Joint Task Force
Meeting Summary for September 20, 2016/ 9:00-11:00pm
 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	
Steve Guptill	✓	Bryan Stanifer	✓	Jon Wiswell	✓
Staff Support Team					
Kurt Mills	✓	Karen Reed	✓		
Terry Peterson	✓	Brenda Froland	✓		

Welcome / Review of Today's Agenda. Karen reviewed the Agenda with the group and noted the primary goal is finalizing the Governance Principles document which can then be forwarded to the SNOCOM and SNOPAC Boards for their regular meetings in October.

Standing Items:

- a. **Approval of Meeting Summary from Sept 6.** The meeting summary was unanimously approved with recommended changes. *Karen will update the meeting summary and send to the Directors to upload to their websites.*
- b. **Communications Roundtable.**
- c. **Process Issues.**
 1. **Schedule Updates.** Several JTF members will be visiting Burbank on October 4th to see an emergency medical dispatch software in use. The JTF rescheduled the next meeting for Monday, October 3rd, and Brad Reading booked the meeting room. *Brenda will update the meeting invite.*
 2. **Communications updated.** Karen asked if the Directors had forwarded the Informational Briefing materials to their agencies. Kurt noted that SNOPAC will be doing this today. Karen asked JTF members to let the group know if anyone asks for an in-person briefing. The one standing request is from MEG for a city manager's meeting. Bryan Stanifer noted that most of the county police chiefs were at the Joint Board Meeting. *Brad Reading will be on point to see if county fire chiefs would like a presentation.*

Debrief on Joint Board Meeting. JTF members noted there was good turnout, support to move forward, and shared their takeaways:

Kurt: Operations people were disturbed by the call transfer presentation; electeds were looking for a solution.

Jon N: Call transfer issue is concerning; not seeing awareness among all elected officials.

Bob: South county mayors are aware, but would not give up SNOCOM or seats on Board to solve call transfer issue only. They are open-minded, but the other issues (redundancy, cost, governance) are critical to their support.

Bryan: At the last SNOCOM Board meeting, governance was referred to as a “deal breaker” and Board members wanted to weigh in on that topic. At the meeting, Bryan, Al, and Brad collectively suggested the Board wait until the JTF has time to review the topic and make recommendations, but there was not much support for that suggestion.

Karen responded that there is a method to the order, and jumping ahead is problematic. This group is spending a lot of time and money and needs to stay on the rails.

Al offered that the SNOCOM Board has tasked some of its members to represent them on the JTF and drawing a line in the sand at this point is inappropriate.

Steve G. asked what the deal breakers are. Bob said he does not know. Karen asked Bob if the SNOCOM Board would be agreeable to discussing principles/policy before seats/positions. She added that materials on governance would go to the Boards in October, but at this stage it will be about principles.

Terry: Governance is a hot button issue and the Board wants to be involved. He suggested Karen attend the next SNOCOM Board meeting to walk them through it.

Steve and Rick: The SNOPAC Board is happy with the work the JTF is doing and their objectivity is appreciated. The SNOPAC Board knows the JTF is available for questions/comments. It is beneficial that the same information coming out of the JTF is going to both Boards.

Steve: Should we be looking at governance only right now and put all other work on hold? Bob offered that the whole package is important to the SNOCOM Board.

Rick: Reminded the group that this is not an all-or-nothing discussion. Everyone is going to have to compromise to some degree for this to be healthy and successful. This is about 750,000 people and we must stay in it and be resolved.

Employee Survey – results summary. The survey is being forwarded to SNOCOM administrative staff; *Karen will incorporate their responses into the document.* She reported that a common theme from employees was that even though they have personal concerns, several recognize this is an opportunity to improve public safety. Bob asked if costs for consolidation end up being too high, do agencies go back on the letter that guaranteed no layoffs? Rick offered that while he sees this as an internal leadership decision, he feels it is important to honor the letter or trust and credibility is lost.

Steve noted that both PSAP’s currently have an open position for an IT Manager. He asked about the possibility of combining these positions for now and hiring a second if there is no consolidation; he highlighted that this may be just one of the timely opportunities to consider. Brad added that with the FD3 and FD7 merger, there was a one-year agreement to blend

management; Steve added that it was initiated as a suggestion of the staff, followed quickly by the support of both Boards. Terry offered that SNOCOM experiences a 12% turnover every year; attrition will factor in fairly quickly. Terry acknowledged that SNOCOM is hurting without an IT Manager and needs to move forward with filling the position. Bob suggested the Directors propose a blended management to their Boards, get guidance, and see if an ILA or contract for service would be the right path. Bob asked Karen if a short term agreement could accomplish this sharing of staff; she said yes. Kurt stated that if there is no political will for consolidation, the Centers are just struggling until the JTF completes its work. Terry suggested that it may make sense to combine IT staff even if there is no consolidation. Kurt agreed that with common phone and CAD systems, there are strong reasons to combine IT. Terry noted that if SERS comes on board, providing their IT may not make sense as the systems are vastly different.

- a. Next Steps: *Karen will rework the survey results and bring back to the group.* It could potentially go the Boards in October.

Scope of Services – developing preferred option(s) for consolidated agency. Karen summarized that she is hearing there will be no elimination of service offerings under consolidation and that would be the assumption in modelling consolidation costs.

- a. Next steps: *Karen will write up a short statement confirming this for submittal to the Boards in October.*

Update: Building the budget templates for the two scenarios. *Kurt and Terry are working on this.*

Redundancy/Survivability discussion. For the sake of time, Karen said that the JTF would come back to this topic at a later meeting.

Governance Discussion: Board structure options – initial review: Karen said that the goal for today is to identify sentences to support the principles in the draft document. The group reviewed each proposed governance principle and confirmed the rationale for each. Adjustments were made to the principle regarding supermajority vote, and a new principle was added endorsing the continued use of technical advisory committees.

- a. Next Steps: *Karen will revise the document per discussion today and circulate for review; the group agreed the document should be submitted to the Boards for approval in October.*

The group talked about several other governance items. Consensus points coming out of the discussion included:

- Board terms should be for two years, since elections happen every two years.

- Replace vacancies by caucus action, (caucuses appointed by jurisdiction legislative bodies as normal), as soon as practicable. We may decide to create rules for the caucus process, to at least confirm they have been inclusive of all members.
- Date for election of Board members: May or June after latest OFM numbers published (end of April)
- RFA seats: need additional discussion.
- Who is qualified to serve on the Boards: after discussion, consensus was that (1) any elected official, (2) CEO/agency administrator or their deputy, or (2) Chief or a deputy or assistant Chief would be qualified to hold a Board seat.

Karen referred the group to pages 12 and 13 in the governance packet. Bob suggested an exception should be built in for contract cities. Rick offered that contract cities buy into SCSO services and therefore turn their representation over to the Sheriff's Office (Option 2B). Representation follows payment. Further clarification was that with a Regional Fire Authority, cities are taken out of the equation. Karen referred to the option on page 21; Rick voiced his support for this option.

- Allocation of Board seats between police and fire: The group looked at comparative data on calls for service, population and cost allocation. As presented, the numbers are not "apples to apples" in terms of the CFS data. The group discussed how CFS should be calculated in the case of traffic stops—one suggestion was to count each traffic stop as ½ of a CFS. No decisions made here. There was preliminary consensus that using cost allocation would be the most appropriate way to allocate seats between police and fire—the figures are very stable over time and nearly identical between the two agencies, and would result in an allocation along the lines of 60-65% of seats to police, 35-40% the seats to fire agencies.

Next Joint Task Force Meeting Agenda. The agenda will include a last review of the proposed governance principles before they are forwarded to the Board, as well as a review of call transfer options—pros and cons.

Closing Comments / Adjourn. Kurt offered that nothing has been done yet with the Facility RFP. Karen said that the JTF will discuss redundancy options in October so that it can hopefully be shared at the Joint Board meeting in November. The JTF then adjourned.