

SNOCOM – SNOPAC Joint Task Force
Meeting Summary for February 7, 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	X	Brad Reading	✓	Roy Waugh	✓
Steve Guptill	✓	Bryan Stanifer	✓	Ralph Krusey	✓
Staff Support Team					
Kurt Mills	✓	Karen Reed	X		
Terry Peterson	✓	Brenda Froland	✓		

Welcome / Review of Today's Agenda. Roy welcomed everyone and began the meeting.

Standing Items:

- a. **Communications Updates / Roundtable.** No updates.
- b. **Schedule Updates.** No updates.

Scenario Cost Modelling – pricing of other options; draft of presentation to Joint Boards.

Terry handed out the pro forma budgets for all options and reviewed each one. Notes from discussion:

- The 2017 Optimal MODIFIED column reflects normalizing process, but comparisons are being based off actuals.
- To avoid skewing the numbers too much, the common assumptions at the top of each page were not applied until 2018.
- While transition costs will be listed elsewhere, the spreadsheets could *contain a footnote* that transition costs are not accounted for.
- Option 3: the changes in E911 revenue were inadvertently left off and *will be added* to reflect a reduction of \$66K for SNOCOM and an increase of \$197K for SNOPAC.
- The main difference between options 4A and 4B is a \$220K cost to maintain the SNOCOM facility as a warm backup.
- Regarding the two 16-hour fire dispatch positions, Kurt and Terry eliminated both of them and added one 24-hour fire dispatch position; this was the most conservative approach. If fire agencies decide one 16-hour fire dispatch position makes more sense, it will be a quick fix. Kurt reminded the JTF that a change in dispatch positions, fire or police, affects all cost centers in the consolidated agency model.
- Terry noted that while a consolidated agency would require 14 fewer FTE's, the cost savings is only \$314K. This is because actuals are being compared:
 - SNOPAC's call-taker function is going away as cross-training is assumed, and

- SNOCOM does not budget top step

Kurt and Terry emphasized that this is consistent with their methodology throughout the process of erring on the conservative side of cost savings. Possible savings are being captured by listing assumptions.

- Kurt and Terry are working on a Power Point presentation that will accompany the spreadsheets at the 3/9 Joint Board meeting; this executive summary will highlight the pros and cons of each option and a comparison of the options.
 - Kurt and Terry asked if the two bottom rows (cost per call / cost per capita) were relevant. The JTF agreed that agencies were asking for this, but the information should be clarified as a metric only.
- a. Reserves: current approach of both agencies, proposed approach and rationale.** Kurt summarized the current approaches of SNOCOM and SNOPAC with regard to budgeting for reserves. SNOCOM has a line item in their budget of \$228K. SNOPAC budgets top-step labor costs and the Board allocates carry-over into capital and tech reserves. Top-step budgeting is common among large entities and for modelling purposes, the JTF was agreeable to using this philosophy.

Assessments – the backstory – what do we know about why the current formulas are the way they are? Proceed with a revised approach excluding consideration of A.V.? In the process of cost modelling, Kurt and Terry have realized that assessed value is an important metric. Steve offered that AV was originally factored in to account for an agency's ability to pay, as CFS can fluctuate significantly from year to year. Roy noted that its weight (% of the formula) still needs to be determined.

Joint Board Meeting Agenda for March. No adjustments were suggested.

Next Joint Task Force Meeting Target Date / Agenda. The next meeting is schedule for 2/21. The agenda below was reviewed. Kurt and Terry have identified a City of Everett employee who has the knowledge to ballpark transition costs, and the Matrix estimate is available for a comparison. A list of costs should be available at the JTF meeting on 2/21. Bob recommended a written resource used by local agencies for estimating transition-type costs. While Kurt and Terry are close to having individual agency assessment figures, the JTF confirmed the priority of having an assessment formula vetted by the Boards before individual assessments were calculated.

Proposed agenda for JTF 2/21:

- Approve meeting summaries from 2/1 and 2/7
- Communications Update – where are the Boards on governance

- Governance – what proposal(s) or options should go forward to the Joint Boards in March
- Finalize all items for March Joint Board meeting:
 - Cost Scenarios Presentation:
 - Confirming fire dispatch positions assumption
 - Reserves issue
 - Other? Statement about facilities, transition costs...?
 - Assessments: 2 options, recommendation/rationale, next steps
 - Governance: what materials? Should focus just be on Board structure or should we briefly also address unanimous consent and cost control?
 - Project schedule/next steps (what materials?)

Closing Comments / Adjourn. The JTF adjourned at 9:45 a.m.