

**SNOCOM – SNOPAC Joint Task Force**  
**Meeting Summary for November 21, 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	✓	Brad Reading	✓	Roy Waugh	✓
Steve Guptill	✓	Bryan Stanifer	X	Jon Wiswell	X
Staff Support Team					
Kurt Mills	✓	Karen Reed	✓		
Terry Peterson	✓	Brenda Froland	✓		

**Welcome / Review of Today's Agenda.** Karen reviewed the Agenda with the group. We will make a decision about whether or not to move forward with the Joint Board Meeting in December, debrief the November Board meetings, discuss assessment principles, possibly assessment formula, and choice of entity.

**Standing Items:**

- a. **Approval of Meeting Summary from Nov 1.** 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.** KING 5 has not followed up on their interest in an interview. Kurt met with the Manager and Administrator (MAG), but there were no unexpected questions. There have been no emails via the web links.
- c. **Process Issues.**
  1. **Communications Update.** The Facilities RFP is expected to be posted by the end of the year. The scope of work will likely be 2-3 months. Karen noted that the JTF will not be able to make a recommendation until the consultant's study has been evaluated, likely not before April of next year.
  2. **Schedule Updates.** There is not quite enough information to warrant a Joint Boards meeting in December. The JTF decided the time that had been set aside for that, December 14<sup>th</sup> at 0830 could be used for an extra JTF meeting in December. A tentative date for a January Joint Boards meeting was proposed: January 19<sup>th</sup>. *Brenda will update calendar invites and work with the Directors on a new date for the SNOCOM/SNOPAC Boards to meet in January.*
  3. **Project schedule review.** Karen reviewed the Approved JTF Work Plan with the group.

**Debrief from SNOCOM and SNOPAC Board meetings.** Karen reported that there were good questions at both Board meetings. Both Boards approved the Cost Scenarios Proposed to be Developed and received informational material on continuity of operations.

**Future Options Modelling: assumptions revisions and baseline scenario components.** Karen noted that on October 18<sup>th</sup>, Kurt and Terry walked the JTF through costing assumptions and today they have a spreadsheet to review with the group. Karen asked if there were enough data points built in to be able to plug in the SNOPAC or SNOCOM fee model and determine any agency's assessments in a given year. Terry offered that there is with one caveat, assessed values. The group agreed that the intent is not to use the model for this purpose at this phase of the project, but the model be built out enough to function at this level.

Terry reviewed the spreadsheet which focuses only on Option 1, status quo. Once the modelling process is vetted by the JTF, the model will be used to cost Options 1 through 4.

The source for the population forecast is the County's Growth Target document, available online. The takeaway from the analysis is that every year population is expected to grow by 1.02% in SNOCOM's service area and by 1.28% in SNOPAC's, but the growth is distributed unevenly between member agencies. The individual agency population growth estimate was used to estimate call volume through 2026.

The next step was to quantify each agency's average CFS change over the past five years and determine the ratio of police and fire CFS per capita by each agency as there is quite a variance between agencies. When averaging each agency's historical usage, a standard deviation was applied. The result is a chart that shows the target CFS change with an upper and lower limit based on the agency's standard deviation. The CFS data will not drive staffing changes in the analysis because of the already agreed to principal of not reducing service levels. Kurt and Terry agree there might be some areas for potential dispatch position consolidation but recognize there is no formula or standard to drive this. This should be a future consideration/discussion between member agencies.

Not being considered in the analysis:

- Possible annexations
- Change (increase or decrease) in dispatch positions
- Future technologies

The amount of time dispatchers spend answering incoming 911 calls was not included in the draft analysis. Kurt and Terry reported they are working on including this in the next version as to more accurately reflect any recommended staffing changes.

While the spreadsheet contains very detailed information, the report that will be provided to stakeholders will be an Executive Summary. An overarching goal is to make certain that comparisons between the models/options are apples to apples.

Other notes from discussion:

- Fire CFS is more consistently driven by population than police CFS; police CFS can wildly fluctuate based on agency driven initiatives (policing policy changes)
- Calls into the non-emergency number and abandoned calls are included in call volume
- Because of the recession several years ago, it could be beneficial to factor in 2016 statistics
- Kurt and Terry are working to determine how to evaluate known, future big ticket items—capital projects, facilities
- Call volume estimates and Erlang-C are being used to model how many call takers were/will be needed in the years 2015, 2020, and 2025.
- In addition to growth in total 911 revenue, common assumptions:
  - 3% increase in salary per year
  - 5% increase in benefits per year
  - 4% increase in M&O per year (M&O = everything except for salary/benefits)
- Need to consider the impact to SNOCOM's costs if they went above 50 FTE's and had to apply FMLA requirements. Taxes and worker's comp should be considered, at least to understand potential impacts

One key assumption to develop the apples-to-apples comparison is to increase staffing so that NFPA standards can be met by both agencies, specifically toward meeting the goal of answering 90% of calls in 10 seconds or less on the busiest hour of each day. This would require an estimated 8 additional staff at SNOCOM in 2017, and 4 additional SNOPAC staff. Without any staffing changes, SNOCOM service levels in this area are lower than SNOPAC's service levels. It was noted by Kurt and Terry these staffing estimates will be impacted once the model is updated to consider the amount of time dispatch staff answer phone calls.

The JTF affirmed that modelling is headed in the right direction, but some additional time to refine would be valuable. *Kurt and Terry will add call taker assumptions, expected large expenditures, and begin working on a summary presentation for the Joint Boards.*

**Discussion: Assessment principles, and a deeper dive on approaches.** Karen reviewed the updated assessment principles document.

- The item "Who Pays" was passed over as the JTF could not reach a consensus.
- For Cost Allocation between Police and Fire, the SNOPAC approach was chosen, though percentages will be addressed/refined later
- For Cost Allocation between Individual Agencies, the SNOCOM approach was chosen.

- It was agreed that with regard to charges for special services, shared dispatch positions would need to be factored in.
- CFS should be defined with precision.
- There was further discussion about the pros and cons of having the membership of a consolidated agency limited to direct service providers.

**Discussion: Choice of Joint Entity.** Not covered.

**Next Joint Task Force Meeting Agenda.** Continue discussion on future options modelling, assessment principles and formula, joint entity choices, and survivability.

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