

**SNOCOM – SNOPAC Joint Task Force**  
**Meeting Summary for December 6, 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	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.** Jon Wiswell introduced Ralph Krusey, the new Executive Director for SERS. *Brenda will add Mr. Krusey to the calendar invites for the Joint Task Force.*

**Standing Items:**

- a. **Approval of Meeting Summary from Nov 21.** The meeting summary was unanimously approved. *Brenda will update the meeting summary and send to the Directors to upload to their websites.*
- b. **Communications Updates / Roundtable.** There have been no emails via the web links.
- c. **Process Issues:**
  1. **Communications Update.**
  2. **Schedule Updates / Project schedule review.** The next JTF meeting is on 12/14 at FD1 HQ at 8:30am. There are three additional JTF meetings scheduled before the Joint Board meeting on January 4<sup>th</sup>: December 14<sup>th</sup>, December 20<sup>th</sup>, and January 3<sup>rd</sup>. It may not be necessary to meet three times, but for now, they are on the calendar.
  3. **January Joint Board meeting:** The SNOCOM/SNOPAC Joint Boards meeting will be on January 4, 2017 at Fire District 1 HQ.

**Discussion: High-Level Summary of where we are on the major issues.** Karen referenced the new draft document which provides a status on the issues that were identified by both Boards at the very beginning of the consolidation discussions. Task Force members noted that it was a helpful summary and historical representation of the process up to this point. A final version will be shared with the Boards on 1/4/17. One change was to remove a sentence under "Cost" that referred to dispatchers and service levels. Karen encouraged the group to review in more depth before the next meeting as there is still time to make changes.

**Discussion: Assessment principles and briefing for January to Joint Boards; introduction to definition of calls for service issues.** Karen reviewed the updated document with the group. Would like to have a Draft ready for the Joint Board meeting in January. From discussion:

- Charging when an annexation has occurred – needs further review; some comments:
  - Assessments should follow the revenue stream (tax)
  - Involved agencies should address PSAP assessments during the annexation process; PSAP does not become party to discussion and moves forward as usual
- Special services– specify that this is referencing non-member agencies
- Latecomer charges rationale – infrastructure catch-up; fair; policy goal
- New Item 10—reliable revenue generation. Was agreed on. *Karen will add the rationale.*
- Cost allocation formula
  - The Dispatch Cost Center should be divided into two cost centers: Fire Dispatch and Police Dispatch. Cost allocation data should be refreshed every two to three years and be based on actual data. New known costs can be factored into cost allocation immediately.
  - If fire agencies requested a dedicated tech at SNOPAC, all costs related to that position would be covered by fire agencies.
  - The topic of how to recover costs from the jails, prosecutor’s office, etc. will need to be addressed. Their portion should come off the top (before cost centers). Right now they pay a share of the annual maintenance related to New World; at it stands, there is no cost recovery for licensing, connectivity, support, etc.
  - Should there be a cost center for records management?
- Kurt reviewed the CFS definition document.
  - Consensus was that officer instituted calls that result in a CFS should be counted as CFS.
  - Additional discussion will be needed about WARRANTS and Mutual Aid responses.
  - Rather than sharing this detailed document on CFS with the Boards, a line item will be added to the High-Level Summary.

Karen asked group members to continue their review of the document for discussion at the next JTF meeting.

**Discussion: Choice of Joint Entity.** The JTF unanimously approved the recommendation that a consolidated agency would be a non-profit corporation.

**Cost Modelling – Summary of Baseline Option.** Terry reviewed the Ten Year Status Quo Executive Summary draft with the group. They are still working on costs related to capital and M&O. With feedback from the JTF, the conclusions section will be expanded to include explanations when helpful, a parallel structure, visuals, and comps for a couple of variables (ex:

budget) to provide context. There was discussion about the importance of noting the likely adjustment to E911 Revenues in the future under the status quo option.

**Governance Board Options: Working towards proposed options and a Joint Board Presentation in January.** Karen reviewed “Setting the Governance Table”. Goals for the Joint Board meeting on January 4 include getting feedback on policy directions and perhaps 3 governance options to compare. The Boards could take a month to digest the issue and reconvene as early as February to make a decision. From discussion:

- The Sheriff should be queried about SCSO agreements with contract cities that could possibly conflict with JTF recommendations on governance
- *Karen will merge FD7 and FD3 on the spreadsheet*
- Only direct service providers would have a seat at the table
- Seats would follow 66% police – 33% fire; with percentages re-evaluated every five years. This tracks fairly steadily total assessment payments in both SNOCOM and SNOBAC over the last few years.
- One example suggested: 15 seats (5 police caucuses; each choose 2 = 10 seats; 5 fire caucuses; each choose 1 = 5 seats)
- A hurdle regarding governance will be the culture shift, particularly for SNOCOM Board members
- Fire representatives did not anticipate any problems having city and county fire providers on the same caucuses
- A weighted vote means the weight of the caucus. More details on this will need to be established.
- Karen advised bringing more than one governance option to the Boards
- The detailed charts do not need to go to the Boards, but rather a simplified chart with options for perhaps 13, 15, and 17 member Boards (66% / 33% split used in each option). A couple of ways to facilitate adjusting the number of Board seats: adding TAC representatives and/or limiting the Board to one seat per jurisdiction/city

**Next Joint Task Force Meeting Agenda – Wednesday, December 14.** Finalize High-Level Summary document, continue discussion on assessment principles, CFS definition, Executive Summary of Baseline Option, and Governance Board options.

Karen anticipates the following items will go to the Boards on January 4:

- High-Level Summary
- Assessment Principles
- Fee Formula
- Choice of Joint Entity
- First look at costs (Baseline Scenario at a minimum)
- Three governance options with rationale for each

Items remaining after January:

- Costing the three other options (Facilities RFP needed)
- Choice of Governance Model

**Closing Comments / Adjourn.** The JTF adjourned at 11:00 am