

**SNOCOM – SNOPAC Joint Task Force**  
**Meeting Summary for December 14, 2016/ 8:30-10:45 am**  
 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	✓	Bryan Stanifer	✓	Jon Wiswell	✓
Ralph Krusey	✓				
Staff Support Team					
Kurt Mills	✓	Karen Reed	✓		
Terry Peterson	✓	Brenda Froland	✓		

**Welcome / Review of Today’s Agenda.** Karen reviewed the agenda.

**Standing Items:**

- a. **Approval of Meeting Summary from Dec 6.** 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 was a meeting last week with Sheriff Trenary regarding governance in a consolidated agency. He definitely wants the office of Sheriff to have a seat at the table. He and Chief Templeman also noted that it is very important to them to have certainty that there will be a good balance of operational and elected staff on the board, not to leave that to the chance of appointments. We will spend a good chunk of time on governance today. There have been no emails via the web links.
- c. **Schedule Updates.** The JTF will meet next Tuesday, December 20<sup>th</sup> at FD1. The SNOCOM/SNOPAC Joint Board meeting will be at FD1 on January 4, 2017. SNOCOM Board will meet afterwards.

**Review/Edit/Approve: High-Level Summary of where we are on the major issues.** Karen reviewed the updated document which provides a status on the issues that were identified by both Boards at the very beginning of the consolidation discussions.

Notes from discussion:

- Brad asked if existing redundancy can be considered “good” if neither Center is earthquake resistant? Bob noted that SNOCOM’s situation is actually pretty good. New wording was suggested to reflect that SNOCOM’s current redundancy is good, but SNOPAC’s is less than optimal.

- Wiz emphasized that regardless of consolidation, redundancy / survivability needs to be addressed at both PSAPs.
- Terry offered that as he and Kurt work on capital expenditures, they are including the option of building up DEM as a feasible backup.
- There was significant discussion under the Cost category and what should be included in the high-level status document. Mayor Colinas wants the transition costs noted. Kurt noted that he and Terry have been examining potential economies of scale and they appear to be significant. Karen suggested additional wording to reflect both points.
- Roy noted that the primary goal all stakeholders identified at the beginning of the consolidation discussions was to address service delivery.

Karen will *update the document* and bring back for the December 20<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Review/Approve: Addition to Choice of Joint Entity memo.** Karen reviewed a few minor changes to the memo. The memo was unanimously approved and will go to the Boards for review/approval at the January 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Review/Edit/Approve: Assessment principles and briefing for January to Joint Boards; introduction to definition of calls for service issues.** Karen noted that the JTF has looked at this document twice. There are redline updates.

Terry offered that additional work is being done on the definition of calls for service; SNOCOM has a meeting on January 20<sup>th</sup> to further review as they have determined there are a number of call types that do not generate work for the PSAP. One challenge is that agencies do business differently. Bryan stated that consistency will be important. Agreed that the definition of CFS will not be finalized by this group, but in PSAP workgroups.

Karen will *work offline* with Kurt and Terry on clarifying remaining cost allocation issues relating to dispatch.

Next steps: Karen asked the JTF *to review this document and be ready to discuss/approve* next Tuesday.

**Cost Modelling – Summary of Baseline Option.** Terry reviewed the Executive Summary and an additional new document on Cost Modelling that summarizes the Baseline Option. Bob offered that the SNOCOM Board will be discussing the NENA call answer standard and their position on it. SNOCOM has not adopted the NENA standard, they have adopted a different standard.

Other notes from discussion:

- Have to be careful to not attribute costs to consolidation that would occur anyway.
- Reminder that a function of the cost analysis is to compare apples to apples.

- On the spreadsheets, the 2016 Optimal column reflects optimum staffing levels (an 8 FTE increase for SNOCOM, in order to be able to meet the NENA standards, and a 2 FTE decrease for SNOBAC).
- While SNOBAC reduced staffing by two in the 2016 Optimal column, the total budget still increased; this is because optimally there is no Call Taker category as everyone is cross-trained, increasing the average pay per employee.

Terry summarized that with the baseline option complete, the Directors *can begin plugging in numbers* for the other three options. Documents covered today will be presented at the Joint Board meeting on Jan 4.

**Governance Board Options: Working towards proposed options and a Joint Board Presentation in January.** Karen reviewed the discussion document starting with Part 2 – Additional Governance Recommendations.

Notes from discussion:

- Bob wants to discuss #4 with the SNOCOM Board. If members are only direct service providers, that would include all SNOCOM agencies, but the difference is that agencies only participate in a fire or police caucus (for purposes of board member selection) if they are a direct service provider. Under this approach, not all agencies served by SNOBAC would be members or participate in caucuses.
- There was a wealth of discussion about the mix of electeds and operational staff on a consolidation Board. One option presented was to include TAC representatives (operational) and have electeds designate the rest of the Board members. Some expressed a preference for all positions being designated by an elected official.
- Karen asked the JTF how they were going to deal with the Sheriff's request on Jan 4<sup>th</sup>. It was suggested that the Sheriff be invited to the next JTF meeting on 12/20. There was consensus that if Snohomish County and the Sheriff's Office could work it out internally, that would be a better route of resolution.
- A caucus system generally favors small agencies.
- Roy suggested ordering governance issues in the order they would need to be addressed to move forward. Karen will put the agreed upon issues at the beginning of the document.
- Karen reviewed the document, Discussion: 5 ways to build caucuses. She noted that this conceptual and the goal for today is to narrow it down.
- The decision to move forward with a 15-member Board was unanimously approved. This eliminated option E from the list.
- Karen recommended using a bottom up methodology when sizing caucuses as it results in a more balanced population size between caucuses.
- It was noted that small fire districts don't always have the personnel available to actively engage on a PSAP Board.

- Karen handed out spreadsheets and asked the JTF to review and be ready to discuss next Tuesday. Option B is new.

Next steps: identify 2-3 ways to structure a 15-member Board and present at Joint Board meeting on Jan 4. In addition, identify principles to show why these options are being forwarded.

**Review/Edit/Approve: Proposed Agenda for January 4 Joint Boards Meeting.** Karen noted the group needs to consider how much the Joint Boards can be expected to act on in January—some items are solely for information. The JTF will need to finalize the agenda next week.

**Next Joint Task Force Meeting Agenda – Tuesday, December 20.** Review and finalize all Joint Board materials.

**Closing Comments / Adjourn.** The JTF adjourned at 10:45 a.m.