

SNOCOM – SNOPAC Joint Task Force
Meeting Summary for November 1, 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	✓
Al Compaan	✓	Brad Reading	✓	Roy Waugh	✓
Steve Guptill	x	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. Hope to leave today with a couple of items ready for the Board meetings in November: one action item (Scenarios for Evaluation) and one informational item (Information on Continuity of Operations). Also today, we will map out policy options around rate structures, and look at the choice of corporate forms that a joint entity could take.

Standing Items:

- a. **Approval of Meeting Summary from Oct 18.** 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.** Although no date has been set, King 5 is interested in learning more about consolidation discussions. As this is a general inquiry, the Directors will provide an overview of the project.
- c. **Process Issues.**
 1. **Schedule Updates.** Karen will attend both Board meetings in November. Terry Peterson is not available for the next JTF meeting scheduled for November 15th. *Brenda will send out a meeting invite for November 21st to check availability. Kurt and Terry will let Karen know if 11/21 works.*
 2. **Communications update.** There have been no emails via the web links.

Debrief from SNOPAC Board meeting. Karen reported that there was good discussion. The SNOPAC Board made a minor change to #7 of the Proposed Framework Principles for Governance, allowing for requirements found in local codes or charters. The change was unanimously supported by the JTF. SNOCOM will have a chance to review the change at their November Board meeting.

Future Options Modelling: Karen noted that the desired outcome today was to agree on a briefing memo to go to the Boards in November, seeking approval to pursue modelling of four

options instead of two. The four remaining options correlate to the original list of eight (in the September Joint Board briefing on call transfers) as follows:

- Option 1 originally #1
- Option 2 a mix of #4 and #5
- Option 3 originally #4
- Option 4 originally #8

In the briefing memo, *Karen will include information* about the four options that were chosen and why they will not be pursued. The JTF discussed the importance/necessity of comparing apples to apples when the scenarios are priced out. The Directors are working with Bill Cushman, a public sector finance consultant, to confirm the approach being developed. *Karen will update the briefing memo and send a redline copy to the JTF via email.* Pending an opportunity to review the redline version, the JTF unanimously approved forwarding the document to the Boards for review/approval.

Discussion: Redundancy/Survivability. Karen referred to the updated document, noted that Kurt and Terry have reviewed it, and the goal today is to agree on forwarding it to the Boards for their November meetings. Due to the nature of the information in the document, it will not be shared on the websites but will be made available to the Boards in Executive Session. Other notes from discussion:

- Karen will add a footnote about public disclosure with two RCW's
- We may want to post a summary document on the website
- The row for "Staff" will be divided into Staff: Capacity, and Staff: Interoperability.
- Both SNOCOM and SNO PAC are understaffed, in terms of their ability to meet service level standards, SNOCOM by 8 FTE's and SNO PAC by 2-3 FTE's
- Clarification on meeting NENA standard: "busy hour" is the busiest hour every day; during a windstorm or other large event, nobody is meeting the standard
- At the next JTF meeting, *the Directors will provide a spreadsheet* that shows how the NENA standard is evaluated
- Expand the conclusion of the briefing document
- Change Exhibit B to Exhibit 2
- It is important the Boards realize the complexity of the issue
- Add information noting the current option that is in place in terms of survivability, which is essentially a variation of a hot back-up.

Karen summarized that this document looks at where the PSAPs are now; outlines different options for addressing the issues going forward; and what our neighbors have done. *Karen will update the document and send a redline copy to the JTF via email.* Pending an opportunity to review the redline version, the JTF unanimously approved forwarding the document to the Boards as an informational item.

Next steps: Finalize the facilities RFP and start pricing out the four options, as well as evaluating feasibility of pursuing the various back-up options.

Current assessment formulas: side-by-side comparison, initial policy recommendations. Karen offered that there are many ways to recover costs in a consolidated agency. It is important to start with the Statement of Values & Principles already approved by both Boards and from them, build out a set of principles about assessments and cost recovery. The group reviewed and commented on a set of sample assessment principles, and reached consensus as follows:

1. Components of assessment formulas should be readily determinable by generally accepted data.
2. Assessments should *generally* reflect the actual cost to the agency of providing service, but there is a larger value to all participants to be gained from the unified service delivery model which should also be recognized in the assessment formula to some extent which may result in a less precise cost allocation.
3. There should be no price differential in assessments between subscribers and principals.
4. Assessment formulas should be based on multiple year average CFS to avoid cost spikes for individual users – probably 2 years. Annexation impacts need to be addressed as lease annually in fee calculations.
5. Those buying special services not utilized by all, or requesting a higher level of service should pay the actual cost (direct and indirect) of these special/higher level of services. And, assessment formulas should not unduly discourage agencies from choosing to provide a higher level of police response, but should reasonably reflect the cost to the dispatch agency of supporting such higher response levels. If you use the services of the dispatch agency, you should pay something for that service—need to address ancillary users in some way (e.g., jail, prosecutor).
6. We should design an assessment formula before running numbers, so people make a decision based on equity, rather than their personal bottom line.
7. Latecomers should be assessed an entrance fee that holds existing partners neutral financially and should be asked to make some reasonable contribution towards sunk infrastructure costs.

Held for further discussion: Proposal that fees should be imposed only on agencies receiving dispatch services directly (e.g., those providing fire and/or police service) rather than billing their customers because the agencies are responsible for the service they provide and dispatch is a key element in their ability to provide high quality service (e.g., matching risk and responsibility). So, client agencies of police and fire service providers would be billed by those providers.

Other notes from discussion:

- Definition of CFS varies slightly between PSAPs
- Only government agencies can be a member of the consolidated agency

Next steps: Dig further into the table.

Choice of Joint Entity: Introduction of Issues. Karen asked the JTF to *review offline* and be ready to discuss at the next meeting. She noted that there are benefits to the non-profit choice and other agencies are moving in this direction. The choice here is about maximizing your flexibility and minimizing your risk as an individual member agency. Noted that changing SNOPAC from a shared Board to a non-profit would be a relatively easy project for Brad Cattle.

Next Joint Task Force Meeting Agenda. Continue discussion on service levels, debriefs from the November Board meetings, joint entity choices, and survivability.

Closing Comments / Adjourn. Items for the Joint Board meeting in December could include levels of service, cost scenarios, assessment formula (principles at a minimum).

The JTF adjourned at 11:15am.