

**SNOCOM – SNOPAC Joint Task Force**  
**Meeting Summary for October 18, 2016/ 9:00-11:15am**  
 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	x
Al Compaan	x	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 Kurt and Terry have made good progress in mapping out a way to develop the cost modelling of options. Today's priorities include the Continuity of Operations/Redundancy Discussion Guide and the Pro Forma Financial Model Assumptions. Discussion about choosing a joint entity will be postponed until the November meeting.

**Standing Items:**

- a. **Approval of Meeting Summary from Oct 3.** The meeting summary was unanimously approved. *Brenda will update the meeting summary and send to the Directors to upload to their websites.*
- b. **Communications Roundtable.** On October 12<sup>th</sup>, Terry and Kurt provided an update for the Everett City Council. Council members appreciated the information; most of their questions were related to the recent outage and New World. The next scheduled update is at the MEG meeting in mid-November. The JTF discussed whether to move forward with the Joint Board meeting scheduled for November 2<sup>nd</sup>, but with not enough materials ready for recommendation, the group decided to postpone the meeting and forward documentation to the individual Boards for their November meetings.
- c. **Process Issues.**
  1. **Schedule Updates.** Karen will be attending the SNOPAC Board meeting on Thursday. The Joint Boards meeting scheduled for November 2<sup>nd</sup> is cancelled. *Brenda will send a meeting cancellation notice.*
  2. **Communications update.** There have been no emails via the web links.

**Debrief from SNOCOM Board meeting.** Karen reported that there was a long discussion about governance at the SNOCOM Board. With a couple adjustments to the wording, the governance principles were approved by the SNOCOM Board, as was the services recommendation. The document with changes highlighted will go to the SNOPAC Board on Thursday. Karen noted it was very helpful for her to be able to hear the concerns of the board members first hand.

**Review of DRAFT Organizational Chart for Consolidated Agency:** Terry and Kurt circulated an initial draft. It is not a recommendation, but an example of what a consolidated agency *could* look like today if there were no layoffs. SERS is also included in the diagram, as it is structured today.

**Discussion: Redundancy/Survivability.** Karen referred the group to the 9-2-16 draft document and summarized that there are a variety of ways agencies have addressed this important issue. One of the main factors to be considered when looking at the multiple options is cost. Some comments/clarifications from discussion:

- We are not fully redundant today. SNOCOM is in pretty good shape as SNOPAC could accommodate all of SNOCOM’s operations. By contrast, because of SNOPAC’s size, SNOCOM cannot accommodate all of SNOPAC: call takers would go to SNOCOM and dispatch would move to DEM. Neither SNOCOM nor DEM has sufficient positions to accommodate SNOPAC operations, though with additional equipment, DEM could be a viable back-up for SNOPAC.
- SNOCOM’s building is at the bottom of a hill in a flood zone and not seismically reinforced; SNOPAC’s building is partially reinforced. Kurt offered that seismic reinforcing adds approximately 10-15% to the cost of a facility.
- When choosing a backup location, distance and infrastructure are important factors to consider: how hard will it be for staff to get there?
- The comm vans have some capacity to offer dispatch but would be a worst-case scenario.
- Having “the last building standing” is viable option for numerous reasons, though a backup facility will still be necessary for planned outages such as emergency repairs
- The group acknowledged that in the case of a catastrophic earthquake, the federal government recommends people not expect assistance for 72 hours.
- Terry referred to the list of systems for which redundancy needs to be considered so the group could discuss where we are today and where we need to be. It was agreed to add a column for how much control we have over these systems—ability to fix them if they go down, or prevent them from going down in the first place:

System	Resiliency Level	Importance	Our level of control over this
LAND MOBILE VOICE RADIO	Medium	High	High (after upgrade)
VIPER 911	High	High	Medium
BACK-UP WORK STATIONS	Medium	High	High
PHYSICAL FACILITIES	Deficient	High	High
CAD/MOBILE/RMS/CORRECTIONS	High	High	High
PSAP CENTER STAFF	High	High	High
PSAP ADMIN & TECH STAFF:	High	High	High
WIRELESS DATA:	Medium	Medium	Medium

- There was a question about the accuracy of DEM’s assumption that SNOCOM is located on a site that has a high risk for liquefaction. *Kurt and Terry will confirm.*
- There was a question about our vulnerability with the fiber ring. Jon W. offered that there is more risk if on a spur (one input route, rather than two). DEM and SNOCOM are both on spurs.
- There are only a couple of places in the country that have a full-size backup facility; the biggest limitation is that the back-up needs to be utilized and tested on a regular basis. Roy offered that nobody can afford to do a regional-scale back-up facility unless it is regionally funded.
- Roy suggested that we don’t want to end up with a recommendation that offers less redundancy than we have today.

Next steps: *Kurt and Terry will build up the matrix* for discussion at the next JTF meeting.

**Building the Options for Consideration by the Boards: Four Proposed Scenarios, Rationale, and Initial Planning Assumptions.** Kurt and Terry have narrowed the number of options for reducing call transfers from eight to four of the more feasible options.

Option 1 Status Quo – agencies remain stand-alone.

- 1.a SNOCOM stand alone
- 1.b SNOPAC stand alone

Option 2 – Eliminate the demarcation line (agencies remain stand-alone; 911 call lines in jointly served area are re-routed. Dispatching remains as is.)

- 2.a SNOCOM—jointly served area (JSA) calls routed to SNOCOM
- 2.a SNOPAC – JSA calls route to SNOCOM
- 2.b SNOCOM – JSA calls route to SNOPAC
- 2.b. SNOPAC – JSA calls route to SNOPAC

Option 3: “Aggressive Cross PSAP Processing” (ACPP) (agencies remain stand-alone and fully process all CAD entries that they receive—rather than just initial CAD entry on priority calls. Dispatching remains as is.)

- 3.a SNOCOM –stand alone
- 3.b SNOPAC – stand alone

Option 4: Full consolidation

- 4.a Fully consolidated agency and facility
- 4.b Fully consolidated agency and two facilities.

Discussion points included:

- Options 2 and 3 assume no change in **dispatch** functions
- Roy noted that he does not consider any option that increases the risk to responder safety as viable. Do options 2 or 3 increase risk to responder safety, since call takers and

dispatchers may be in different facilities and have limited if any ability to directly communicate? *Kurt and Terry will do some analysis on this.*

- Operational challenges mentioned include staffing levels and E911 funding
- Brad confirmed that it was problematic for FD1 when they were dispatched out of one PSAP and most of their law enforcement counterparts were dispatched out of SNOCOM.

Karen queried the group for an informal approval to support Kurt and Terry moving forward with the four options. There was unanimous support.

Terry then reviewed eight assumptions he and Kurt are proposing for modeling the various scenarios. Some comments/clarifications from discussion:

- While annexations will not be factored in, the assessment formula will be able to account for them
- Assumption 6 assumes the NENA standards will be used for modelling staffing requirements. There was a question about the NFPA standard; the Directors did discuss this, but the standard fluctuates and is created by fire agencies rather than PSAP's.
- All calls for service, including officer-initiated incidents, are being counted
- The models will arrive at costs for all members in total rather than individual agencies. While individual cost is of interest to the JTF and important for agencies, this phase of the work will look at a higher-level equitability.

The JTF concurred that it would be beneficial to use a 5 year sample of historical usage trends, unless the data seems anomalous because of Great Recession impacts, in which case we should use a shorter timeframe.

**Current assessment formulas: side-by-side comparison, next steps** Karen handed out a draft discussion document, Assessments / User Fees: Building a Policy Basis and *asked the JTF to review before the next meeting.*

**Next Joint Task Force Meeting Agenda.** Continue discussion on redundancy/survivability, assessment formula comparisons, and options for a joint entity.

**Closing Comments / Adjourn.** The JTF adjourned at 11:10am.