

**NORCOM
9-1-1 USER BOARD MEETING
MINUTES**

May 16, 2007

PRESENT: Scott Russell, Shawn Baird, Vince Herman, Gordon Jensen, Vasily Hansen, Kevin Hendricks, Dan Johnson, Pete McCallum, Brent Earhart, Rick Lewis, Jay Hannon, Paul Iverson, Greg Dyke, Rod Yoder, Carol Ruef, Dan Mullen. Staff: Gina Audritsh
Guests: Shawn Mangun and Brad Johnson

The User Board Meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. p.m. by Scott Russell.

I Minutes

A motion was made by Dan Mullen to approve the minutes as presented. Motion seconded by Paula Smith. No discussion. Motion carried with all in favor.

II Bills

A motion was made by Brent Earhart to approve the bills as presented for April and May 2007. Motion seconded by Paula Smith. Motion carried with all in favor and no opposed.

III New Business

No new business on the agenda and no new business from the floor.

IV Old Business

User Fee Calculation / Distribution Discussion: The business scheduled for this board meeting was the continuance of the discussion about user fee formulas and calculations.

Scott Russell provided an electronic version of the documents that have been sent out prior to the meeting and they are available overhead while discussion can occur during the meeting. Gina proceeded to explain each of the concepts that were introduced at the previous month meeting, this month including numbers that were associated with the various calculations either based on calls for service, population or assessed value.

During the presentation of each concept and identifying other supporting documentation, there was encouragement to proceed with discussion on the concepts as presented.

Rod Yoder: Rod is not in support of the Base Fee Concept primarily because it does not seem equitable or fair to the smaller agencies versus the larger agencies if they are expected to pay the same base fee. Rod feels that everything should be based on use; use meaning the calls for service.

Scott Russell: Scott presented a flow chart that identifies the Base Fee correlation with the overhead for the agency. The Base Fee would translate to share the costs among all agencies for the following: rent, phones, administration, supplies, equipment/maintenance, etc. Then to identify the other costs that are associated with each position as: frequencies identified with specific duties [police/fire and EMS], support for other positions, call taking, record entry, unencumbered time and the potential for 911 call answering. The piece that is not clear is how much should the base fee be calculated at and is it based on a percentage of the overall budget or use.

Discussion about the shared responsibility at each position continued. Brenda Weaver was asked to share the data that she found when reviewing random calls for service and how much time it took to process calls for the same incident or for multiple incidents and how many personnel are responsible for sharing the responsibilities for the calls that are being received and handled. There was a spreadsheet that identified an average length of time spent on the telephone for a variety of calls that was reviewed by random for the calendar year 2006. A specific call that was reviewed was in St. Paul's fire district and the total amount of time that was spent on the telephone within a 30-minute time frame for this particular motor vehicle accident was 26 minutes and 16 seconds. Handled by three dispatcher personnel. This was telephone only skill.

Rod Yoder: The Base Fee will be difficult to explain to councils due to the many aspects that are involved in how to determine where the number came from and what it associated with.

Scott Russell: The Base Fee should be to cover the overhead for the Agency and all users should share in the overhead equally as it is a requirement to keep the center operational and no matter what the size of the agency; there is a need to have equipment, maintenance, support staff and personnel to handle the potential calls for service and the active calls for service.

Paul Iverson: Adding a Base Fee into user fees increases the user fee so high above what they [Monitor FD] pay now. The ability to pay would become an issue for the smaller agencies and you cannot out price the ability to pay. There is no way for these districts to receive additional revenue within their districts.

Scott Russell: The Base Fee accounts for some benefit to add additional agencies into the center.

Rod Yoder: If an agency had 83 calls a year, they could do their own dispatching rather than pay a high Base Fee – strongly feel that the smaller agencies would be penalized with the Base Fee Concept because the impact to their budgets is greater than the impact to a larger agency.

Kevin Hendricks: Provided the history on the Santiam Canyon Dispatch Center and their user fee calculation and split. At one time Stayton PD had threatened to pull out of the

dispatch center if the Fire Districts were not willing to pay higher user fees and shorten the gap between the user fee percents. At the time, the Fire Districts wanted to keep the peace, so they agreed to go to a 50/50% split. Kevin continued with the discussion that in the years that he has been in the fire service he has never seen users of a dispatch center agree that the user fees were fair and equitable between police and fire. Kevin said, "I told people to leave this alone." Kevin advised his fireboard at the meeting last Tuesday that they would need to put a value on their local dispatch service and that they would need to look at other options if they were going to be fair to the community. Kevin advised he is not prepared or willing to go beyond a 80/20% split.

Gina continued on with the explanation of the Functional Group Concept referring to the spreadsheets and documentation on the screen. No comments or questions were raised or developed from the board on this concept.

The Three Position concept was presented – Carol Ruef clarifying that the 3-Position Concept provides for a 66 / 33 % split.

Gina asked Brenda to explain how the operation within the center works and how the staff work together to support each position. Brenda explained how everyone is there to support each other and to work to provide the best possible outcome to the users in the field through speed and quality. Brenda explained what it takes internally to make it easier for the field operations to be a success. Brenda advised the dispatchers all work hand-in-hand while one person may be making a phone call to the tow company, the other is talking to life flight and the other is talking on the phone with neighboring jurisdictions related to the call. They all maintain their own dispatch channels throughout the phone calls and the support for each other.

Gina presented a final spreadsheet that identifies the calls for service based on actual CAD's over the 11 years that the CAD system has been in operation. The spreadsheet also indemnifies the totals for each discipline [police and fire/EMS] and how the percent of use is split. This is based on calls for service only. Gina expressed that she would not recommend that the sole user fee calculation be based on calls for service as it is too easy to manipulate the numbers no matter what discipline you are representing. Gina also expressed that it will cause a greater impact on the NORCOM staff time if they have to spend more time determining what should be a number and what should not be documented. All the information must be documented in some fashion or another. There was support from the board and recognition that calls for service can be managed by user agencies.

Rod Yoder: Thanked Gina, Brenda and their staff for the information that has been provided, it is just difficult to identify a specific formula or concept that will work.

Shawn Baird: The call volume for the split would not be a huge impact if used as a total. If there were manipulations on one discipline or another, the changes would not be so

significant when looking at the totals from a whole. Shawn did agree that if the calls for service were used within the discipline split and there were call volume controls in place, it could have a substantial impact on the user fee calculation by calls for service.

Scott Russell: Shared that he believes that population was used for the law enforcement agencies rather than calls for service partially based on the potential to control the call volume. Scott also explained that the population is a valid point of reference for the potential of crime that can occur within the jurisdictional boundaries.

Brend Earhart: Clarified that all Federal Statistics are based on population. Brent expressed his opinion that he feels the Base Fee is fair because every agency must have someone at the dispatch center to answer phones/dispatch/etc. Brent explained how we come up with the Base Fee is up for debate – possibly have each discipline divide up their own fee structure.

Paul Iverson: Expressed a concern that when referencing population it does not take into account the population that is served on the I-5 calls; making reference to Aurora Fire District.

Rod Yoder: Expressed that the Base Fee could encourage smaller fire districts to merge together to only have to pay 1 Base Fee rather than each are responsible for their own Base Fee. Smaller agencies should be paying a smaller fee than the larger agencies.

Shawn Baird: The key is what is the split between the disciplines and once that is determined then the balance between the two disciplines.

A Motion was made by Rod Yoder to take the 911 Tax Revenue off the top of the required revenue and then agree to set a percentage split between the two disciplines, Police and Fire/EMS. Once the split is identified; each functional group [police and fire/ems] determines what their cost share formula will be for each common user within their own disciplines. Motion Seconded by Paul Iverson.

Discussion:

Shawn Baird: Within that model there could still be the pursuit of a base fee concept within the disciplines or individual disciplines.

Rod Yoder: “The reason behind my motion was to move us forward and to come up with a percent for the split.”

Scott Russell: Opposed to the motion, as we have not given all the concepts a review. Scott advised it has taken the board a long time to get to this point and to get us out of the situation we are in with the discussing percent splits should not be rushed; we need to

take the time to evaluate all the options.

Brent Earhart: Believes it would be fair to wait and hear from all agencies that are not represented today at the meeting prior to voting.

Paul Iverson: "I was here when an agreement was joined at 40/60 split and I'm with Kevin – Monitor Fire District feels like we pay more than our fair share. Now I have to pay the same base fee as a larger agency. It is not fair to have the same base fee high for small agencies as it is for large agencies." "I am tired of people not here, they all have the same opportunity to come to a meeting and discuss this, pick a percent and lets move forward." "We either agree to support the center or agree to dissolve the center and move forward. I am tired of fighting."

Vince Herman: "Agree"

Scott Russell: "We have talked about increasing the user fee for years and I feel it is short sided to try and close the deal today with only 4 months of reviewing the options."

Rod Yoder: I am not trying to close the deal and I am not closed to the % split; why I made the motion was to get us moving in a direction forward.

Brent Earhart: Clarified that we have had three meetings to discuss the user fee change. Brent expressed the desire to have agencies go back and talk to their councils and their boards.

Scott Russell: Concerned about people speaking today and their viewpoints that it is more than agreeing to the split. Fire will out vote the police.

Paul Iverson: Continued discussing the base fee and how it affects the small districts and how it is a lot to ask a small district to pay. "The Base Fee Concept is not a good concept. I don't like the Base Fee, the Functional Group is the best for the smaller districts."

Rod Yoder: Believes that every agency in the room and at NORCOM wants to keep each agency here, we just need to move forward for a "fair split" and quickly. This seems the best way to approach the budget.

Shawn Baird: "Everyone at the table has talked to other centers and no one has come up with a good solution, we just need to bit the bullet and do it."

Scott Russell: Expressed he would like to leave the motion open and wait until the next meeting to continue the discussion.

Kevin Hendricks: Called for Question and asked for a Roll Call vote.

Gina proceeded with the Roll Call vote:

Mt. Angel Fire District – Yes vote
Hubbard Fire District –Yes vote
Mt. Angel Police Department- No vote
Woodburn Fire District – Yes vote
Monitor Fire District – Yes vote
Woodburn Police Department – No vote
Woodburn Ambulance – Yes vote
Silverton Fire District – Yes vote
Aurora Fire District- Yes vote
St. Paul Fire District – Yes vote
City of St. Paul - Yes vote

Kevin Hendricks advised that all users not present are considered an automatic NO vote.

City of Donald – No vote
City of Hubbard – No vote
Drakes Crossing Fire District – No vote
City of Scotts Mills – No vote
City of Aurora – No vote
City of Gervais – No vote
City of Silverton – No vote
Marion County SO – No vote

9 Yes votes to 10 No votes – Motion fails.

User Board Meeting adjourned at 2:36 p.m.

Next User Board Meeting
NORCOM / WPD Facility
June 20, 2007
2:00 p.m. [1400 hours]
Budget Public Hearing