

SNOCOM – SNOPAC Joint Task Force
Meeting Summary for April 4, 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	✓	Bryan Stanifer	✓	Jon Wiswell	✓
Staff Support Team					
Kurt Mills		Karen Reed	✓		
Terry Peterson	✓	Brenda Froland	✓		

Welcome / Review of Today’s Agenda. Karen welcomed the group and noted the primary goal for the day is to prepare for the Joint Board meeting on 4/20. There is one more JTF meeting before that - on 4/18.

Standing Items:

- a. **Communications Updates / Roundtable.** Karen, Kurt, and Terry continue to provide numerous stakeholder briefings around the county. Following the presentations, there are relevant, thoughtful questions. There is some interest in what might happen with SERS and specifically, the \$75 million estimated cost to update the radio system. The JTF discussed the timing and importance of having additional conversations about SERS. Karen offered that if consolidation occurs, the ILA would be structured so that a governance discussion would not be necessary to envelope SERS into the organization. A few individuals at the first finance review on 3/21 asked for a deeper dive; later today there will be a review with Fire District 1, City of Everett, and City of Marysville representatives.

- b. **Schedule Updates.** The second finance review is next Tuesday the 11th at 1:00pm. Terry already sent out a calendar invite.

Approval of Meeting Summaries from 3/7 and 3/21. The meeting summary from 3/7 was unanimously approved. Karen asked the group to review the meeting summary from 3/21 and let her know if there are any concerns about wording. In the meantime, as the summary is an excellent and helpful record of the meeting, it will be posted as a Draft. *Brenda will forward both documents to the PSAP IT managers for uploading to the websites.*

Scenario Cost Modelling and Assessment – feedback so far and next steps.

- a. **4/11 – meeting #2 with finance staff.** Already discussed.

- b. “smoothing” options/issues.** Karen reviewed the content of the document in the packet. Additional notes from discussion:
- Regarding who qualifies, there was agreement to use an option that considers the % of increase.
 - With fire agencies paying a larger percentage of assessments than before, it may adjust the allocation of Board seats to 6 for fire and 9 for law enforcement.
 - Using E911 funds is not an option because they are designated for the call-taking function only.
 - There was a question about the legality of the third option for funding sources. Karen noted that money between local governments does not qualify as a gift of public funds.
 - Table 1 (Fire District 1 numbers reflect unincorporated area only)
 - Individually, the boards need to discuss how to deal with existing reserves (in the event of consolidation) before considering them as a source of funding for smoothing rebates.
- c. Run model of status quo, no normalization?** This request was made by a Woodway representative. As it is not clear if this report will answer the questions Woodway has, Terry will follow up. Terry can run a 10-year status quo with no normalization fairly quickly. Karen suggested that the tradeoff between cost and service delivery for SNOCOM should be noted if and when the report is distributed.

Governance.

- a. Non-service provider cities issues and options.** Karen reviewed the document in the packet. After some discussion, there was consensus that option 2 was preferable: fire and police contract cities sign the ILA and participate in a caucus, but cannot serve on the Board. Karen noted that NORCOM holds an annual meeting for contract cities that has been well received.
- b. April Joint Board meeting approach/goals.** Karen suggested the small cities options be presented at the Joint Board meeting on 4/20 as adjustments to the governance approach. The JTF can recommend option 2 and determine if there is support from the board members. Likewise, smoothing options will be presented; if it appears to be a significant issue, the JTF will offer to work on a more detailed proposal.

Karen said the goal for 4/20 is that both Boards would have a spokesperson that summarizes their process and the Boards decision about governance structure.

During the presentations, JTF members will want to note:

- Why an option was chosen
- Why another option wasn't chosen
- The points of agreement and disagreement

c. Input from Boards so far. Karen asked Steve and Bob if the Boards are ready to do this on 4/20. Steve said that SNOPAC will be ready. Police representatives have chosen option 3. Fire representatives will make their final determination this Wednesday, but it appears option 3 will be fire's choice. Karen asked that SNOPAC be ready to include why these options were chosen. Bob noted that SNOCOM has not had significant discussions about governance as they were waiting on costs to be finalized. Karen offered that since costs have been finalized, SNOCOM will need to be ready to present their decision on 4/20. The SNOCOM Board meets on 4/13. Bob and Terry *will update the agenda* to include consolidation governance.

d. Input from other agencies and other discussions.

Paths to Consolidation – Attorney review. Five thousand dollars has been set aside for this. Pacifica Law is on board; an engagement letter has been drafted but *needs to be approved* by both PSAP boards. Karen has worked with the attorneys before and they have a wealth of experience with mergers/consolidations. On 4/20, Pacifica *will present* a matrix/path of the legal steps that would be necessary for consolidation; Karen is *preparing a draft* for Pacifica to work from. The JTF agreed that it would be better to draft a brand new ILA rather than fold one agency into the other. Karen noted the steps are not to be underestimated and suggested January 2019 is a more realistic date for consolidation (although work can begin much earlier).

Fact sheet review. JTF members reviewed the fact sheet and unanimously approved the document to be posted on the websites. The working document will be updated after future Joint Board meetings. *Brenda will forward to the PSAP IT managers to upload to their websites.* The document will also be included in 4/20 materials.

April Joint Board Meeting 4/20 Proposed Agenda. Karen reviewed the DRAFT Agenda and suggested the smoothing discussion happen after Cost Scenarios and Assessments. Under governance, the next steps will likely include a Joint Board meeting in May.

Next Joint Task Force Meeting 4/18. A final opportunity to prepare for the 4/20 Joint Board meeting.

Closing Comments / Adjourn. If any additional stakeholders ask for a briefing, please let Karen and the PSAP Directors know. The JTF adjourned at 10:35 a.m.