

**SNOCOM – SNOPAC Joint Task Force**  
**Meeting Summary for February 1, 2017/9:00-11:00 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	x	Bryan Stanifer	✓	Ralph Krusey	✓
Staff Support Team					
Kurt Mills	✓	Karen Reed	✓		
Terry Peterson	✓	Brenda Froland	✓		

**Welcome / Review of Today's Agenda.**

**Standing Items:**

- a. **Approval of Meeting Summary from Jan 17.** The meeting summary was unanimously approved with one correction. *Brenda will update the meeting summary and send to the Directors to upload to their websites.*
- b. **Communications Updates / Roundtable.** Last week Terry, Kurt, and Karen provided an update to the SCPA and received very few questions. On February 9<sup>th</sup>, SNOPAC will host a WebEx for member agencies and stakeholders to discuss governance. It was noted that while SNOCOM's member agencies are all represented on the Board and are updated regularly on consolidation discussions, not all SNOPAC agencies are. This will be an opportunity to ask questions and give feedback to the JTF. The Edmonds and Lynnwood City Councils would like updates in March. Kurt will *update the executive summary Power Point* and along with Terry, brief Snohomish County's Law & Justice Council on February 13. Karen will be out of the office from February 2-16.
- c. **Schedule Updates.** At the end of this meeting, the JTF *will decide* whether or not to meet next Tuesday, February 7.

**Scenario Cost Modelling – pricing of other options; draft of presentation to Joint Boards.** Kurt and Terry are *finalizing spreadsheets* for the remaining options, but gave the JTF a status update.

Notes from discussion:

- From an operational standpoint, the Directors will make recommendations to the JTF on 2/21:

- which option has the greatest benefit for service delivery
- which option(s) could be removed from consideration
- A cost per call has been built into the spreadsheets
- Takeaways / impacts will be the bulk of the presentation on 3/9; the Directors plan to provide an executive summary along with each option's corresponding spreadsheet.
- Both SNOCOM and SNOPAC have a 16-hour fire position; Brad did not think they would both be necessary in a consolidated agency, but *he will bring up at the 2/15 Fire Ops meeting* and get additional feedback from agencies. Any resulting assumptions will need to be addressed in the executive summary for Option 4: consolidated agency.
- Kurt and Terry identified a duplication in funding capital reserves that could have an impact on modelling a consolidated agency. They asked the JTF for input as they don't want to double count or under count. SNOCOM budgets \$228K every year for the capital reserve fund. The SNOPAC Board allocates year-end E911 carry-over into the capital reserve fund which is typically sufficient to fund capital. There was discussion about whether \$228K should be factored into the budget for a consolidated agency. While there are several options for funding capital reserves, it was agreed that the philosophy needs to be normalized for cost modelling; a future Board could always adjust that philosophy. The Executive Summary for the consolidated option should explain any assumption and link to top-step budgeting if appropriate.

**Assessments – formula implications, costs shifts, options, next steps.** While analysis of assessments wasn't a deliverable, there has been enough interest that it has been added to the JTF's scope of work.

Notes from discussion:

- Kurt and Terry determined that the correct allocation in Option 4 for the call-taking cost center is 75% police and 25% fire, because adding FD1's CFS would have a significant impact on numbers.
- The Admin/Tech cost center is divided by number of consoles: 65% police and 35% fire.
- Karen would like to provide the Boards with details on assessments in the April timeframe; March discussion would be more conceptual
- Terry Peterson is *working on pie charts*.
- There was discussion about why assessed value (AV) is a factor in the assessment formula, and whether its weight in the formula (%) should be lowered and/or eliminated. The Directors will *attempt to find out* why it was originally factored in. Karen suggested the JTF could come forward with two options on the assessment formula, provide rationale for each, make a recommendation about the inclusion of AV, and have the Boards take action. It was acknowledged that AV provides a smoothing

benefit in the assessment formula. The other option, which is simpler, is to only use CFS and population.

- For the next JTF meeting, the Directors will try to provide some historical context for AV; after review, the JTF *can draft some rationale* for their recommendation.
- Karen introduced three options for dealing with possibly significant increases / decreases in individual assessments. The option of adding a smoothing factor for a couple of years to mitigate large fluctuations was the preferred method for the JTF.

**Transition Plan and timing – brainstorming discussion and next steps.** The JTF did some high-level brainstorming about the transition process and considerations:

- Facilities: renovation, moving people, connecting systems, parking, seismic reinforcement, keeping SNOCOM as a warm back-up
- Equipment: the Directors thought this would mostly be incidentals (bigger hard drives, recorder upgrade, etc.)
- Operating Systems & Polices: already 80-90% consistent between SNOCOM and SNOPAC; liability is a consideration so timely implementation would be key; people could begin working on this right away to get ahead of it
- Staff: different unions, labor negotiation costs, etc.

There was discussion about hiring a consultant, for perhaps no more than \$5,000, to work on a transition plan and estimate costs. The *Directors will talk with some individuals and bring back a recommendation* at the next JTF meeting.

Jon Nehring offered that while SERS remains engaged in the consolidation discussions, the priority of the SERS Board must be the new radio system. If timing becomes a problem, they will have to focus on the new radio system.

**Path forward on consolidation discussion – draft timeline.** Transition costs and assessment formula are the two biggest outstanding items for the March 9 Joint Board meeting discussion. Karen wasn't certain if the "Path Forward" timeline should be distributed at the March or April Joint Board meeting. The April 20 date *needs to be firmed up*.

- a. What is most likely start date for a consolidated agency?** Karen reviewed the pros and cons of two potential start dates: June 2018 and January 2019. She noted that starting in the middle of a calendar would add complexities (budget, ILA, etc.) The JTF could make their final recommendation to the Boards as early as September of this year. Karen offered that drafting the bulk of the ILA is relatively easy as there are numerous templates available, though there would be many small decisions to make that are specific to this project.

### **Governance – next steps.**

- a. Input from Boards, other stakeholders – next steps.** Discussion at all levels (Boards, city councils, fire users, member agencies, etc.) is taking place. It is important to have all stakeholder input in hand so the JTF can compile and discuss on 2/21.
- b. Re-cap: list of items requiring unanimous consent of member’s legislative bodies.**  
Karen reviewed the list.
- c. Possible action: recommended cost control language.** Karen noted that this has been a big concern for some Board members, though the historical and consolidated models are not concerning.
- d. Possible action: recommended supermajority vote language.** There was discussion about whether or not a weighted vote was necessary with a representative governance structure. The decision can wait until after governance structure is finalized, but the JTF was in agreement that it would be simpler to remove weighted voting from ILA.

**Joint Board Meeting Agenda for March.** Karen reviewed the Agenda. The JTF agreed that 8:30 – 11:30 am was more realistic.

**Next Joint Task Force Meeting Target Date / Agenda.** The JTF decided to meet on Tuesday, February 7 and discuss assessment formula, capital reserves philosophy, and 16-hour fire dispatch position.

**Closing Comments / Adjourn.** The JTF adjourned at 11:25 a.m.