

**Proposed Framework Principles for Governance Initial Points of JTF Consensus
Relating to Board Composition and Voting**

Incorporating edits as approved by both SNOCOM and SNOPAC Boards

Initial version of document unanimously endorsed by the Joint Task Force on October 3, 2016 and referred to SNOCOM and SNOPAC Boards for consideration and approval in October. Reviewed at October 2016 SNOCOM and SNOPAC Board Meetings, and again in November 2016 by SNOCOM Board.

Purpose of this document

The purpose of this document is to set forth a recommended set of policy guidelines that will help guide the approach to defining governance of a consolidated dispatch agency.

Adopting this set of policy guidelines narrows the range of options – but there are still dozens of potential governance outcomes consistent with these guidelines.

These policy guidelines are consistent with, and build upon, the previously adopted Statement of Values and Principles (see Table 1).

Table 1: Excerpts from adopted Statement of Values and Principles relating to governance
Providing high quality service to citizens and first responders.
Being an effective and efficient steward of public funds.
Participatory Governance. All participating agencies should have a meaningful voice in the operating decisions of the Agency
Promoting interagency collaboration, communication and strong working relationships.
We strive to operate nimbly, with the ability to make decisions and respond quickly when necessary.
We seek to develop unified public safety communications policies countywide.
We seek to understand and address the unique needs of Police and Fire agencies. We strive to address these needs, as well as the disparate needs of small and large

agencies. We strive to address these needs equitably in all operating and financial decisions.

Proposed Framework Principles for Governance

A. General points:

Board members need to:

- Be active and engaged
- Be able to make a decision for their agency, then and there, at the table
- Have a solid understanding of the operation of the agency
- Collectively, include a mix of operational and elected perspectives

B. More specifically:

1. The Board should include a total of between **12-19 members**.

Rationale: The board likely needs to be somewhat larger than either the current SNOCOM or SNOBAC Boards to accommodate the interests of both agencies. The board should not exceed the recommended size in order to ensure functional dialogue. All 50+ agencies cannot serve if the board is to be functional: agencies will need to share representation.

2. The Board should include representation from **Cities, the County, and Fire and Police agencies and/or representatives**.

Rationale: This will ensure that the various types of member agencies are represented. A balance will bring more perspectives to the table and create a more effective board. It reflects current practice of SNOCOM and SNOBAC.

3. The Board composition –allocation of seats -- should consider **workload of the consolidated agency as between Fire and Police agencies**.

Rationale: This reflects current practice of both SNOCOM and SNOBAC, in which workload imposed on the agency translates to cost allocation. It ensures representation of agencies reflects the services delivered to those agencies and their financial commitments.

4. **Small, medium and large agencies** should be represented.

Rationale: Agencies of different sizes have different needs and perspectives. Ensuring all are represented is one step in ensuring that one or two large agencies don't control all decisions.

5. Geographical location of agencies is not very important in allocating Board seats.

Rationale: The size and type of agencies is more important. Avoiding geographic based allocations of seats will also help build countywide cohesion.

6. There should be a mix of Operational and Electeds Representatives on the Board

Rationale: This brings an important mix of skills, expertise and perspectives to the Board—including but not limited to stewardship of public funds and user agency perspectives-- as well as a means of ensuring continuity over time of Board members.

7. Except in jurisdictions where local code or charter dictates that the executive has appointment authority, Legislative authorities (councils, commissioners) should make the appointments (although this will typically be *appointments to a caucus to select Board representatives* since there will be substantially more members than board seats).

Rationale: This reflects current practice of SNOCOM and maintains the important role of elected officials in selecting leadership of the agency. It also allows local jurisdictions to follow their own local codes/rules in deciding how to decide who represents them at the caucus to appoint Board members.

8. Those appointed by legislative authorities to a caucus for purposes of appointing Board members should have the freedom to decide who to represent them on the Board. Their choices should ensure the general requirements of a Board Member (Part A) are met, and could therefore include: any elected official, the chief executive officer/administrator of an agency (or his/her deputy), a Police or Fire Chief or their deputy/assistant chief.

Rationale: This builds upon current practice and gives the appointed representatives the freedom to select the person they believe will best represent their interests on the Board.

9. There should not be a general public representative on the board.

Rationale: It will be sufficiently challenging to allocate seats without further diluting representation of members.

10. The allocation approach needs to be dynamic—able to address changes in the members' population, workload, etc. over time.

Rationale: If the ILA incorporates flexibility to adjust over time as population grows and shifts between members, this can avoid the need to amend the interlocal agreement and thus provide important stability for the agency.

11. There should be a single designated alternate for each Board member, who should be encouraged to attend Board meetings regularly in order to remain well informed of agency activities.

Rationale: This will ensure a continuity in the oversight of the agency and ensure full representation of all Board members and caucuses.

12. Supermajority votes approval should be required for major issues, including, but not necessarily limited to:

- a. Adding a new member
- b. Terminating a member
- c. Amending the ILA
- d. Amendments to bylaws
- e. Approving the budget if it exceeds a specified % increase over last year
- f. Capital expenditures exceeding a specified amount
- g. Dissolution or merger/consolidation of the agency
- h. Whenever any Board member requests

Rationale: This reflects a model that is already in use in the County. It requires consensus between small and large agencies on major action items. (Note: the specific definition of "supermajority vote" is not yet identified/recommended).

13. A single agency should not be able to stop the consolidated agency from moving forward on important actions for which there is otherwise strong consensus.

Rationale: The work of the public safety dispatch function is critical and should be able to proceed where there is consensus. (Note: this principle is not intended to override situations in which unanimous consent is required by law.)

14. Regardless of Board structure, Technical Advisory Committees, one for police and one for fire, should continue to meet and provide input and advice to agency leadership.

Rationale: It is important that operational expertise informs service delivery.