

# SNOCOM & SNOPAC JOINT BOARD of DIRECTORS MEETING

## March 9, 2017 - Fire District 1

<b>SNOCOM Board Members &amp; Management in Attendance</b>	Mike Catlett	Brier Police	Greg Wilson	Mountlake Terrace PD
	Al Compaan	Edmonds Police	Jennifer Gregerson	Mukilteo
	Tom Mesaros	Edmonds	Chris Alexander	Mukilteo Fire
	Don Anderson	Edmonds Police	Cheol Kang	Mukilteo Police
	Jim Lawless	Edmonds Police	Kent Saltonstall	Town of Woodway
	Ian Cotton	Lynnwood	David Chan	Fire District 1
	George Hurst	Lynnwood	Brad Reading	Fire District 1
	Bryan Stanifer	Lynnwood Police	Robert Eastman	Fire District 1
	Pam Pruitt	Mill Creek	Terry Peterson	SNOCOM
	Greg Elwin	Mill Creek Police	Marlin Herolaga	SNOCOM
	Jerry Smith	Mountlake Terrace	Karen McKay	SNOCOM
	Seاون Richards	Mountlake Terrace	Andie Burton	SNOCOM
	Scott Hugill	Mountlake Terrace		
<b>SNOPAC Board Members &amp; Management in Attendance</b>	Steve Guptill	Monroe Fire	Jonathan Ventura	Arlington Police
	James Lever	Everett Police	John Dyer	Lake Stevens Police
	Ty Trenary	SCSO	John Flood	Snohomish Police
	Susy Johnson	SCSO	Roy Waugh	Fire District 7
	Eric Hick	Everett Fire	Murray Gordon	Citizen-at-Large
	Susan Neely	Snohomish County	Kurt Mills	SNOPAC
	Rick Smith	Marysville Police	Angie Baird	SNOPAC
	Dan Templeman	Everett Police	Steve Lawlor	SNOPAC
<b>Others in Attendance</b>	Heather Chadwick, FD7	Brian Haseleu, Snohomish Co	Scott James, Edmonds	
	Rikki King, Everett Herald	Pete Caw, Mountlake Terr PD	Sonja Springer, Lynnwood	
	Caitlin Tompkins, Everett Herald	Rebecca Polizzotto, Mill Creek	Nicola Smith, Lynnwood	
	Bill Anderson, Woodway	Peggy Lauerman, Mill Creek	Corbitt Loch, Lynnwood	
	Keith Strotz, FD19	Dave Earling, Edmonds	Art Ceniza, Lynnwood	
	Jim Haverfield, FD17	Gregg Sieloff, Lynnwood FD/FD1	Richard Schrock, FD1	
	Dennis Fenstermaker, FD24	Paul Taylor, FD22	Carla Nichols, Woodway	
	Darryl Neuhoff, Marysville FD	John Cermak, NCRFA	Jon Nehring, Marysville	
	Jordan Wallace, Attorney	Ralph Krusey, SERS	Karen Reed, JTF Facilitator	
	Brenda Froland, SNOPAC	Sharon Brendle, SNOCOM		

AGENDA ITEMS	REPORTS & COMMENTS	ACTION OR FOLLOW-UP
<b>Call to Order</b>	The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by SNOPAC Chair, Steve Guptill. Chair Guptill asked everyone in attendance to state their name and agency for the record, as well as sign in on the sheet being passed around.	
<b>Welcome and Introductions</b>	Roy Waugh, Joint Task Force (JTF) Committee Chair and Fire District 7 Commissioner, welcomed everyone to the meeting. He thanked the members of the JTF for their diligence and objective approach in tackling the subject of PSAP consolidation. He recalled the priorities and directives of the two boards: service delivery, cost, redundancy and governance. He included in his comments his praise for the two	

AGENDA ITEMS	REPORTS & COMMENTS	ACTION OR FOLLOW-UP
	<p>PSAP Directors, Kurt Mills and Terry Peterson, along with their respective staff, for the time and effort they have put into the collection and preparation of the information presented. He also thanked the facilitator, Karen Reed, for keeping the JTF on track.</p> <p>Commissioner Waugh went on to explain that since the JTF hopes everyone becomes comfortable with the cost scenario data that will be presented today, they will be shifting the focus of their March 21<sup>st</sup> meeting. Instead of the usual agenda, the directors will be leading a discussion regarding the financial modeling used in the scenarios. He encouraged all those interested, including financial directors, to come and ask questions. He also stated that he felt the JTF is well on their way in documenting a clear picture of what could be possible in Snohomish County if all parties are interested in moving forward with consolidation. He concluded by saying that it was his hope that both boards decide to continue the process and finish up the work they had set out to do last July.</p>	
<p><b>Presentation of All Cost Scenarios</b></p>	<p>JTF Facilitator, Karen Reed, said that it was good to be part of a process where the parties are ahead of a massive crisis. She thanked the group for taking the time to build the data in order to make their decision about a public safety service. She also thanked the directors, Kurt Mills and Terry Peterson, for the work they've been doing on the project. She also thanked SERS members: Marysville Mayor Nehring and Ralph Krusey for attending all of the JTF meetings as ex-officio members. She commented that the perspective they shared has been very helpful.</p> <p>Ms. Reed listed their goals today: to understand the data presented, to identify what questions there are, and to hear and understand how the directors came up with the data, and why they made their particular choices. She also asked that if the meeting attendees had questions that weren't answered to email them to either Director Mills or Director Peterson. Any questions they receive will help them prepare for their meeting on March 21<sup>st</sup>. She also stressed the importance of that meeting so that all parties involved understand the cost data that is being presented.</p> <p>A copy of the 40 slide PowerPoint was provided to both boards. Ms. Reed went over the first few slides and explained the steps up to this point as well as the important factors identified by both boards: service level, cost, resiliency / redundancy, and governance.</p> <p>She shared the key decisions and information, to date, that had come out of the Joint Board Meetings, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No lay-offs from consolidation</li> <li>• All current services would remain</li> <li>• All staff would be cross-trained to handle all types of calls</li> <li>• Governance principles were approved</li> <li>• Employees were surveyed</li> </ul>	

AGENDA ITEMS	REPORTS & COMMENTS	ACTION OR FOLLOW-UP								
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board Members were briefed on the subject of call transfers</li> <li>• Other governance options were reviewed</li> <li>• Current resiliency and redundancy status was evaluated and options reviewed</li> <li>• Scenarios, other than status quo or consolidation, were requested</li> <li>• High level assessment principles were approved, with more discussion planned for today</li> </ul> <p>She also explained that today’s briefing would provide two parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 year estimated costs for all 6 of the scenarios evaluated</li> <li>• A review of the proposed assessment formula and the policy basis previously adopted, including 2017 amounts for each agency</li> </ul> <p>SNOPAC Director, Kurt Mills, spoke about the current situation within the county, provided a map of the service areas served by both PSAPs, and pointed out the arbitrary demarcation line that was established about 10 years ago to split the two service areas. He also highlighted the Jointly Served Area or JSA as it is referred to.</p> <p>Regarding transfers, he listed the following stats:</p> <table style="margin-left: 40px; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="padding-right: 20px;">45-50,000</td> <td>Combined transfers each year</td> </tr> <tr> <td>33,000</td> <td>SNOCOM to SNOPAC transfers (1 out of 5 911 calls)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10,000</td> <td>SNOPAC to SNOCOM transfers</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11 days/year</td> <td>That 911 callers spend waiting being transferred between agencies</td> </tr> </table> <p>Director Mills explained that these transfers account for a loss in productivity for dispatch staff and serve as a driver for the consolidation discussions. He added that in addition to the transfers cited, there are additional transfers around the border areas. For SNOPAC, only 40% of the transfers they make to SNOCOM are within the JSA, the rest are border areas (within Mukilteo or Mill Creek). For SNOCOM’s transfers to SNOPAC, 75% of those are within the JSA, with the rest in the border areas.</p> <p>Director Mills also stated that the transfer issue will not be resolved by Next Gen 911. The majority of the transfers are with JSA calls, and no technology exists that can differentiate if a 911 caller needs police or fire. Next Gen 911 may impact calls made within the border, and he anticipates within 1 to 5 years a lot of phones will be able to share their location with 911 to route the call to the appropriate call center.</p>	45-50,000	Combined transfers each year	33,000	SNOCOM to SNOPAC transfers (1 out of 5 911 calls)	10,000	SNOPAC to SNOCOM transfers	11 days/year	That 911 callers spend waiting being transferred between agencies	
45-50,000	Combined transfers each year									
33,000	SNOCOM to SNOPAC transfers (1 out of 5 911 calls)									
10,000	SNOPAC to SNOCOM transfers									
11 days/year	That 911 callers spend waiting being transferred between agencies									

AGENDA ITEMS	REPORTS & COMMENTS	ACTION OR FOLLOW-UP
	<p>Director Mills, in response to a question, confirmed that their in-house transfers are not included in these statistics.</p> <p>SNOCOM Director, Terry Peterson, spoke about the different options that have been analyzed, including 3 that don't involve consolidation. He explained that in order to compare the costs between the two agencies, they needed to equalize service levels and normalize the way each of the dispatch centers are staffed. For options 1-3, they used data from each of their 2016 operating budgets as their basis for comparison.</p> <p>For Option 4 (the consolidated option), they used 2017 operating budget data. Director Peterson also stated that each of the options have been examined and discussed by the JTF, and conservative estimates have been used. The directors provided additional packets that accompanied the PowerPoint presentation. These are separated by option and contain executive summaries, including financial information, as well as pros and cons of each option. Also attached is a 10 year forecast for each option. Director Peterson also mentioned that each of the findings were tested back to the Matrix Report that had been requested by the Snohomish County E-911 Board. In addition, data relating to staffing levels is supported by industry recognized standards (APCO Retains, Erlang-C).</p> <p>Director Peterson went over the operation assumptions for Options 1-3. He mentioned that 85% of the budget for both PSAPs is attributed to staffing. The biggest changes in the first 3 options are related to staffing increases.</p> <p><b>Option 1 is the status quo.</b> It follows changes to normalize staffing levels, but makes no changes to operational practices. Ms. Reed explained that Option 1 was only created in order to compare it to Options 2A, 2B, 3A, and 3B. Director Peterson stated that the significant advantage of Option 1 is that neither board would have to change their governance structure. He read through the significant disadvantages of the options that were included in the packet. One of these is a staffing shortage at SNOCOM. To equalize the staffing levels, SNOCOM would need to increase staffing by 8 full time employees (FTE). A couple of incidents were mentioned where a huge number of calls were received in a short period of time. Due to the decreased staff, this resulted in some lengthy hold times for calls coming in.</p> <p><b>Options 2A and 2B.</b> These options are similar and result in all of the calls being handled within the Joint Service Area to move to either SNOPAC (Option A) or to SNOCOM (Option B). This would basically be a re-routing of incoming calls. Primary impacts would be felt in E911 funding and the number of FTEs that would be processing the calls. For revenue, Option A would result in a \$666,000 increase for SNOPAC, and a \$534,000 decrease to SNOCOM. Even though there's a re-routing of calls resulting in a 22% decrease in call volume for SNOCOM, the staffing model shows they would still need to add 7 FTEs. Also, about 81% of the transfers SNOCOM does, and about 31% of the SNOPAC transfers would be resolved under this model.</p>	

AGENDA ITEMS	REPORTS & COMMENTS	ACTION OR FOLLOW-UP
	<p>Director Peterson read through the advantages and disadvantages of this model. These are included in the meeting packet. The director clarified a question about call taking and dispatching the call. This option would affect call taking. Those agencies currently being dispatched by SNOCOM or SNOPAC would still be dispatched by their current PSAP.</p> <p>A question was raised about officer safety being impacted and the Sheriff asked to respond. He explained that because he fit into both categories, both as a subject matter expert, those working in the field, and elected officials, he has a unique perspective on this issue. He went on to explain that the issue seems to lie in the separation of communication centers when the information is coming in. Sharing of work between agencies happens frequently in Snohomish County. He gave a recent example of an incident that he came upon in Mill Creek where there was a delay in information sharing because two different PSAPs were involved in the call that created an officer safety concern. With this option, the call taker and dispatcher wouldn't be at the same agency. This scenario would eliminate potential behind the scenes handling, as well as the face to face, or across the room, communication that is often so critical when dealing with a major incident.</p> <p>Director Peterson explained that Option 2B is mostly a reverse of option 2A. He added that there were a few changes: revenue would increase at SNOCOM by about \$300,000. It would decrease revenue for SNOPAC by a \$175,000. The call volume would increase at SNOCOM by 15%, so the model indicates that they would need to add 9 FTEs to be able to process the same load at equal levels of service.</p> <p>There was also some comments made about the advantages of a redundant system that is currently in place. Ms. Reed stated that the directors would be addressing that concept later in the presentation.</p> <p><b>Option 3, Aggressive Call Processing.</b> This option maximizes the use of New World, where if a call taker answers the 911 call, they would enter the call. No re-routing calls, and no transfers of calls. This would reduce the call volume at both dispatch centers, 5% for SNOCOM; 6% for SNOPAC. 911 Revenues would shift slightly, with a decrease to SNOCOM in the amount of \$66,000, and an increase to SNOPAC by \$200,000. SNOCOM would still need to add 7 FTEs in order to have the equalized level of service. In this option border transfers would also be eliminated. Governance structures for both PSAPs would remain the same. Director Peterson clarified a question on whether this option matches current practice. He explained that the PSAPs follow this on high priority calls, along with most fire calls, but transfers are still being completed. In these cases, the call taker gets most of the information entered in order to get the first unit dispatched before completing the transfer. The director explained that in order for this model to work, SNOCOM has to be staffed at the same level as SNOPAC to provide an equal level of service.</p> <p>To summarize for Options 2A, 2B and 3: in addition to staffing concerns, there is still a negative impact on operations and service</p>	

AGENDA ITEMS	REPORTS & COMMENTS	ACTION OR FOLLOW-UP
	<p>level with these 3 options. Transfers will still exist to a varying degree. With every one of those 3 options, SNOCOM will need to add staff in order to equalize the level of service with SNOPAC. Since funding will not be able to keep up with staffing increases, there would be some funding concerns. Redundancy and governance would also go unchanged.</p> <p><b>Option 4, the consolidated model.</b> Director Mills explained that there are two scenarios: 4A - a single dispatch center, with SNOCOM being de-commissioned, or 4B - a single dispatch center, with SNOCOM's facility being kept as a warm back-up. The JTF thinks 4A isn't viable, and that 4B should be the one considered since resiliency is so important.</p> <p>Director Mills then went over the specifics that were included in the packet. These included salary ranges, benefit packages, and work schedules. He spent some time explaining the top step budgeting philosophy SNOPAC uses that was also used in costing out this model. In this case, SNOCOM budgets at individual steps for their staff, which results in a much tighter budget, along with the need to budget for capital replacements. He added that SNOPAC's budget results in a more stable year-to-year increases. Ms. Reed clarified that even though SNOPAC budgets at top step, staff isn't necessarily paid at that level. This type of budgeting results in more funds available for capital expenditures or unexpected costs throughout the year.</p> <p>Option 4B still takes in consideration the same staffing models previously used, and shows that 15 positions (four supervisors and 11 dispatchers) could be eliminated through attrition. This option also eliminates transfers completely, with the net result is a savings of \$1.1 to \$1.3 million dollars in annual savings.</p> <p>Director Peterson added that supervisory levels are still improved with this option, with 2 supervisors on duty 24 hours a day. This would also not require any up-staffing that was previously required for SNOCOM, and more closely matches the recommendations that were listed in the Matrix Study. In that report, they claimed that 16 FTEs could be eliminated by consolidation. He added that he believes that the agency can get to the right number of dispatchers within one year, and to the right number of supervisors within 2 years. Since both dispatch centers have open positions today, it's realistic to estimate that there will still be open positions when the decision is made whether or not to consolidate. Along with the 10% attrition rate annually, the director estimates that within one year, downsizing could occur to get within the recommended level.</p> <p>Director Mills answered a question on whether the 10% attrition rate was based on a national study. He replied that 9 years ago, APCO conducted a study that said the number is actually closer to a 14-15% rate.</p> <p>Director Peterson clarified that the increase in staffing that was required by SNOCOM to reach a comparable level to SNOPAC, is not required under this option.</p>	

AGENDA ITEMS	REPORTS & COMMENTS	ACTION OR FOLLOW-UP
	<p>Responding to a question about size limitations at SNOCOM in the event that it would need to back up the call takers and dispatchers at SNOPAC, Director Mills stated that Snohomish County is actually in a much better situation than most of the counties in the state. In the event that they need to leave their current facility, they would send the dispatch staff to the DEM building and the call takers to SNOCOM. He anticipates that if such an event exists following consolidation a similar split off would likely occur.</p> <p>There was additional discussion on the specific scenarios that would need to occur in order for SNOPAC to have to leave their facility. Director Peterson brought up the subject of what a future facility might look like. They will address that matter later in their presentation.</p> <p>Director Mills spoke about housing the consolidated agency in SNOPAC's current facility. He explained that this is possible but would require some renovations of the existing facility. It is also possible to bring in SERS if they decide to move in as well, but the facility wouldn't be able to accommodate some large equipment storage needs that SERS has. Parking is the only problem at SNOPAC, and the current parking space wouldn't be adequate. They are doing some analysis to see what could be done. He then spoke about costs associated with moving into a single facility, and added that with the savings from consolidation, he felt that these initial costs could be paid for in the short term.</p> <p>In addressing the original objectives that the committee was tasked with, option 4B has the following advantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% elimination of the transfers</li> <li>• The operational safety issue is eliminated</li> <li>• Resiliency is unchanged, with a warm backup in place</li> <li>• A county-wide governance model can be developed which opens the door for SERS to join.</li> </ul> <p>Director Peterson spoke about the 10 year pro forma in Option 4B. It includes a labor line and the number of staff is built upon assumptions based on county growth. Based upon the 10 year growth figures, they would be adding 2 FTEs as call-takers. Taken these figures into consideration, they determined that the SNOPAC facility has the space available to house all the staff for the next 10 years.</p> <p>Answering a question about projected cost savings, the figures compare the normalized costs of a consolidated center (most conservative numbers) versus what is actually being paid for today. There is a 10 year pro forma for both Option 1, as the status quo, and Option 4B as the consolidated option with SNOCOM being the warm backup.</p>	
<p><b>Assessment Formula Components, Impacts and Options</b></p>	<p>Ms. Reed reminded the joint board group that they approved a set of principles presented by the JTF in January that related to cost recovery. These are provided in the packets again today. This also included a high level matrix showing how the different components of an assessment formula would be pulled together.</p>	

AGENDA ITEMS	REPORTS & COMMENTS	ACTION OR FOLLOW-UP
	<p>Director Peterson went on to explain that they consolidated the feedback that was provided and put together a hybrid approach to the existing formulas between the two centers. SNOCOM bases its assessment formula on calls for service, population and assessed value.</p> <p>This hybrid approach was explained as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a total budget for the agency</li> <li>• Applied 911 revenues received from the E-911 office</li> <li>• Developed 4 cost centers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Shared dispatch console approach (cost is shared amongst all the police or fire agencies) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 54% Calls for service</li> <li>▪ 23% Assessed valuation</li> <li>▪ 23% Population</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Directly purchased console (in the case of Everett and Marysville PD) amount would be directly carried by that agency.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<b>Break</b>	The joint board adjourned for a brief break at 10:05 a.m.	
<b>Reconvene</b>	The joint board reconvened at 10:20 a.m.	
<b>Assessment Formula Components continued</b>	<p>Ms. Reed explained that in terms of the basic policy approach, the JTF has presented their reasons why the group is recommending their formula. She asked if everyone understood the formula that is being recommended, and if anyone would like to see more on how that formula would impact their agency.</p> <p>A handout of estimated assessment comparisons was also provided. These assessment amounts show, in 2017 dollars, what the agencies are paying now, and what they would be paying with a consolidated PSAP. More information will be provided at the meeting on March 21<sup>st</sup> at Station 11.</p> <p>Ms. Reed gave an example that when Eastside agencies consolidated to become NORCOM, there were cases where some of the agencies saw a huge jump in their assessments. For that reason, the City of Bellevue was able to offer sliding scale subsidies on a limited basis so that the rate impacts were mitigated over time.</p> <p>Director Mills went over the handout that listed the estimated assessment by individual jurisdiction. For SNOCOM fire agencies, the assessment increases, but for police agencies, there's a decrease. He explained that when costs are assigned, the current SNOCOM formula doesn't assign cost by discipline but rather by a group assessment. He went on to say that while all of the SNOCOM cities see an overall reduction in their assessment, it's being more accurately assigned to the various disciplines. Director Peterson explained that by Interlocal Agreement, and after 911 revenues are applied, 33% of the costs are assessed to fire and 66% are assessed to police. This new formula</p>	



AGENDA ITEMS	REPORTS & COMMENTS	ACTION OR FOLLOW-UP
	<p>shifts the costs more to the people doing the work. In essence, fire has more of an impact on the dispatch center on a daily basis when it comes to staffing and work load.</p> <p>Director Mills spoke about their formula by explaining that 10-12 years ago SNOPAC went through a similar process that tried to direct more specific costs to functions. This resulted in a similar adjustment.</p> <p>Director Peterson reminded the joint board that these figures do not include the one-time transition costs, nor how these costs will be funded.</p>	
<b>Governance</b>	<p>Ms. Reed stated that the JTF isn't asking for any decisions on the governance matter, but wanted to bring everyone up to date on discussions with the fire and police chiefs with regard to the 6 governance options that were shared at the last joint board meeting.</p> <p>Chair Guptill said that following their discussion at the last Joint Fire Tac/Ops meeting, the unanimous agreement was that Option 1 on page 12 was in the best interest of fire agencies. He added that this hadn't been discussed yet by the Fire Commissioners' group, and the Fire Chiefs haven't weighed in either on the subject.</p> <p>Chief Compaan stated that Police TAC polled those cities with law enforcement agencies, along with the county, and the consensus resulted in Option 3 on page 11, as the first choice, with Option 1 as the second choice. He added that this is only representative of Police TAC, and doesn't necessarily represent how the governing boards may decide.</p> <p>More discussion on governance is expected at the April Joint Board meeting. Ms. Reed spoke about governance issues that would still require either supermajority or unanimous consent by legislative bodies. She referred to a list of such issues on page 9 of today's packet. Also included in the packet are references to the way decisions are made on budgets by the current agencies. She recommends that any decision on what constitutes a supermajority be made only after a decision is reached on governance structure.</p> <p>A lengthy discussion followed this on elected officials and operatives. The consensus was that a balanced approach should continue.</p>	
<b>Project Schedule</b>	<p>Ms. Reed said that if there is a good discussion with the governance issue in April, the JTF is prepared to visit member agencies over the summer. The remaining issues of the Interlocal Agreement would then be tackled and legal counsel would need to be engaged, with the hope that a draft ILA would be made available in the Fall. If everything falls into place, a consolidated agency could be up and running in the middle of 2018.</p> <p>In April, the JTF would like to be able to map out the ways that consolidation can occur. Ms. Reed has asked for up to \$5,000 to hire independent counsel, possibly from Foster Pepper, to draft an ILA.</p> <p>Councilmember Mesaros of Edmonds moved that the JTF continues operating and refining the information that is before them, that another</p>	

AGENDA ITEMS	REPORTS & COMMENTS	ACTION OR FOLLOW-UP
	<p>Joint Board meeting be held in late April, and that recommendations from our respective agencies be made, for or against, regarding the governance structure of a proposed organization. The motion was seconded by Lynnwood Councilmember Cotton, and passed unanimously.</p> <p>Sheriff Trenary made an identical motion, and this was seconded by Member-at-Large Murray Gordon. The motion was passed unanimously.</p>	<p><b>JTF approved to continue moving forward</b></p>
<p><b>Additional Comments</b></p>	<p>Sheriff Trenary expressed his appreciation to Ms. Reed, Director Mills and Director Peterson for the amount of work that has gone into the information presented today. He added that he fully supports having outside counsel getting involved in helping to answer important questions.</p>	
<p><b>Adjourn</b></p>	<p>The meeting was adjourned at 11:05 a.m. The next meeting will held on April 20<sup>th</sup> at Fire District 1.</p>	