



METCOM 9-1-1

BOARD MEETING MINUTES

April 7, 2016
Aumsville Fire District

Governing Meeting called to order at: 1335 hours.

Members in Attendance:

Jason Alexander
Shawn Baird
Sherry Bensema
Jack Carriger
Jordan Donat
Greg Dyke
Jim Ferraris
Damian Flowers
Jeff Fossholm
Alan Hume
Terrill Isak
Paul Iverson
Jack Krill
Lance Lighty

Brad McKenzie
Bill Miles
Jon Remy
Rick Schmitz
Scott Shepherd
Gary Swanson
Don Taylor

Proxy:

Dan Mullen
Mike Erwert
Leland Ohrt
Jim Trierweiler
David Dryden
Peter Spirup
Rich Sebens

METCOM Staff:

Gina Audritsh
Louise Funk
Brad Johnson

METCOM regular Governing Board meeting called to order at 1:35 PM with a quorum met by members present and represented by proxy. Gina read the votes presented by proxy.

Meeting Minutes:

The regular Governing Board Meeting Minutes for February 9, 2016 were presented for approval.

- Motion to approve meeting minutes: Scott Shepherd
- Motion second: Alan Hume
- Motion carried no opposition.

Monthly Financial Review:

The monthly financials for the months of January and February 2016 were presented for review within the board packet.

- Motion to approve the financials: Gary Swanson
- Motion second: Jon Remy
- Motion carried no opposition.

Budget Committee:

Discussion surrounding the Budget Committee included the following:

- Term commitment – Discussion if the members currently serving on the budget committee should continue to reside on the committee for a set term in order to retain some of the history of discussion and decisions made by the committee members. Terms should be set using a “staggering” system so new committee members are serving alongside of previously serving members. Bill Miles inquired if METCOM was not currently governed by budget law, as budget law outlines the rotating 3 year split terms for budget committee members. Gina advised, Yes METCOM is governed by budget law; however part of the discussion includes the

budget committee members meeting not just at budget time but periodically throughout the year so establish history of agency goal setting sessions. Questions included:

Q: What are the current terms? Who's terms are expiring now?

A: All current budget committee members are new with this current budget cycle. All current budget committee members are "scheduled" to expire in three years.

Q: Is the current plan to have someone new brought onto the budget committee half way through the current 3 year cycle to moving into the rotating 3 year split terms.

A: Yes. Currently the plan is to have a short term for some of the current committee members to support establishing the 3 year split term commitments. This may occur through "natural turnover" of current committee members.

Q: How many people are currently on the budget committee?

A: 7 committee members (all starting at the same time).

Q: Are we committing a redundancy? Currently the bi-laws state: The Executive Director shall present the proposed budget to the Joint Operating Board for their review and recommendation. So are we establishing a second committee that is doing the same thing that the bi-laws state should be occurring at the Joint Operating Board level, or does the Budget Committee have "special powers" pertaining to the budget that the Joint Operating Committee does not have?

Further discussion was tabled until later in the board meeting to be addressed under the topic of the Joint Operating Committee.

- Motion to table further discussion: Gary Swanson
- Motion second: Rick Schmitz
- Motion carried no opposition.

Budget Committee Presentation for Approval:

This is not a budget hearing. The budget hearing meeting will be held in June that will incorporate the full budget including user fees. This is a discussion and approval for user fee formulas prepared by the law enforcement and fire disciplines so that the budget hearing process can move forward.

- Gina read notes on absentee ballots:
 - St. Paul Fire – I cannot commit to the budget term without knowing the individuals and their thoughts better. I feel certain folks are not remembering we must live within our means. We can't put projects, large increases in operating to the small agencies. Those folks need to remember that though we run <250 calls a year, we do not have large tax revenues to provide to dispatch. We work on budgets that don't collect many resources. For this reason I can't support it fully.
 - Hubbard Police – I noted that the conversations at the budget meetings were lively at times. It appears to me that a focus towards the future of METCOM was facilitated. I am very much in support of commitment terms for budget committee positions, as well as where the budget committee has taken the 2016-17 budget.
 - Mill City Fire – Abstain
- Terrill Isaak brought forward discussion on the need for the fire side to establish written guidelines outlining how the budget process works, formulas, functions, how these items work and are established, etc. in a binder that will be housed at METCOM for future reference. There was a lot of conversation regarding how the fire user fee formulas were established, how it works and how it is applied. For the

ease of upcoming years, there is a need to have this information clearly established and provided in writing for reference in the future. There needs to be a group to put this information in writing and get it to all fire users for comment. The same is true for the law enforcement side.

- Jon Remy noted that the 190 Agreement references the user fee formulas, who needs to approve them and by what majority; page 16 of the ORS190.
 - Sherry Bensema voiced concerns about the user fee formula and requests the need for further conversation.
 - Allan Hume inquired if there is currently an overall proposed budget from METCOM indicating an overall breakdown of fees to fire side and law enforcement side. Terrill Isaak confirmed this is correct. Allan confirmed that the budget breakdown was not the current topic of discussion; the overall budget numbers are acceptable it is the further breakdown of user fees and the formulas that is still being discussed. Gina confirmed that is correct. The overall proposed budget amount references a 3% increase across the board to users (with a 59/41% split).
- Motion to approve the proposed 59% (Police)/41% (Fire)split - fire/EMS \$659,375 Law \$949,010.07: Jack Carriger
 - Motion second: Jeff Fossholm
 - Motion carried no opposition.

Agency Goals and Updates

The most recent update to the METCOM goals and associated tasks were included in the board packets.

Joint Labor Management: Continues to meet on a regular basis.

Technical Committee: The committee is in suspension at this time due to the hiring of the consultant to evaluate the current system, looking at each site, and talking with our neighbors. The consultant will be speaking with and/or spending some time with each agency individually or in small groups to evaluate current systems and needs. A specific radio or radio system project has not been identified. Phase one of the project is the consultant evaluation. Once possible solutions are identified those will be presented in an oral and written report to you from the consultant. At that point the board will have the opportunity to make or not make a decision regarding a radio system/radio system project. Cascade Networks was hired as the consultant. The scope (Personal Service Agreement) has been finalized. The board approved no more than \$25,000; the consultant will be \$24,000, 50% to be paid up front the remaining 50% at the conclusion of the report provided to the board. The estimated time frame is September 2016.

METCOM & WVCC Work Group: Next joint meeting is scheduled for May 2, 2016. No updates since that last meeting.

Staff Updates: For the first time since we became METCOM, METCOM is fully staffed as of March 1, 2016. 3 persons are still in various stages of training. Hopefully by September they will be fully trained.

SHSP Grant

Gina participated at the state level reviewing the grants. There were 124 grants to review state wide. Gina's goal for participating at this level is to glean information on the process as well as the grants that were being awarded to help our grant writing in the future. METCOM applied for grants that were associated with Marion County and some in correspondence with Polk County. There are three, that if approved, we would benefit at METCOM. These grants should be

awarded sometime in June or July. The first was submitted by OEM regarding a communications plan. Marion County does not currently have an official communications plan that has not been adopted by a county commissioner. Polk County submitted a grant to align all the microwave tower links. This would create some additional interoperability to our VTAC channels. The 3rd is regarding creating a backup system between WVCC and METCOM entailing installing equipment at both centers to start a backup process for each other.

Phone and System Upgrades: METCOM has been working on the phone system upgrade. There are 9 positions set up in the EOC room at Woodburn Police Department for staff training on the new system. Training is scheduled to start next week. This is part of the 3 year upgrade plan funded through OEM. We will go live at 0300 hours on April 20, 2016. Next update on the CAD system is planned for April 27th on the test side. Anticipated roll out to the live side will be May 24th, 2016 at 0500 hours. There is a potential through the testing phase that we may not move to the production side. Anticipated down time will be communicated to all users via email.

Proclamation: April 10 -16th is Public Safety Telecommunicators Week. Gina advised if you feel inclined to appreciate the staff please feel free to let them know that they are appreciated during this week. The Admin staff has a few fun things planned for staff during the week.

ORS190 Agreement: Copies of the current ORS190 Agreement were passed out. Chief Isaak stated there has been some discussion surrounding the 190 Agreement and ensuring it is being followed. Discussion regarding the 190 Agreement followed:

- Section 4 – Powers (#17, 18 & 19) Chief Isaak stated “Basically this organization has given Gina the right to do whatever she wants; make purchases of contracts for services necessary to fully implement the purpose of the agreement, entering into the agreement with and receiving and distributing funds from any federal, state, or local agency and nineteen (19) is receiving all funds allocated to METCOM by participating.” Chief Isaak suggested they be reviewed, think about it and have some discussions. This is not to say it is not appropriate, however if we are to follow purchasing policy does this violate state law or purchasing policies law? Does the current 190 violate contract laws with the dollar threshold required to go out for bid? Gina suggested that when reviewing the 190, to also review the resolutions adopted by the board along with the public contracting laws and regulations that is what should be referenced. Gary Swanson stated “I heard you say that Gina has the power to enter into contract. The 190 does not say that. It uses the term “METCOM” has the power. So, is Gina METCOM or is the governing body METCOM, or is it the Executive Committee? It is a simple thing to correct however it sets up a very important point. This happens in several different places in this document. Chief Isaak concurred.
- Section 6 – Joint Operating Board and Service Boards (page 12) - Reopened discussion regarding the Joint Operating Board. This was originally brought up at the September 29, 2015 board meeting. At that time it was determined that it would be discussed at the fire defense board and both the north and south county fire chief meetings. Gina has not received any further direction. Further discussion stated that this should be reviewed by the chiefs and not at fire defense as all attendees are not users of METCOM. Additional conversation included:
 - Direction and clarification was needed regarding the current committee groups, who they report to, hierarchy of said groups, where the QA committees fall, budget committee, the need to further develop the structure, currently METCOM does not have a Joint Operating Board, etc.
 - Is METCOM operating according to the 190 if these committees and groups are not in place or structured correctly?
 - Alan Hume provided a hand written organizational chart on the white board for a visual reference. This is how Chief Hume understands and interprets the ORS 190 Agreement.

- Chief Hume referenced that the 190 talked about three things: the governing board, the joint operating board, and the individual police and fire services QA committees. The governing board would be at the top of the organizational chart (all users), within that there is a chair and two vice chairs (representation from the both the fire/EMS and police side). Next is the executive director (receives direction from the governing board and runs the day to day business), next box down is the joint operating board. This is also listed anyone who is a participant or a user is on the joint operating board which also has a chair and two vice chairs; identical to the governing board. Down from that are the individual police and fire/EMS service/QA committees. This also references that METCOM will be responsible for managing their own QA committee. The issue that Chief Hume referenced is that how he is reading the organizational chart, there are redundancies in several of the levels; possibly blurring the lines with who is in charge of what. He stated it appears that METCOM has not been using the Joint Operating Board at all and that is what he believes Chief Carriger was making reference too. The Joint Operating Board, according to the 190, is established to give advice and clarification (not direction or specifying a particular action) to the governing board and Gina. Chief Hume expressed that he felt having everyone at both levels it too confusing. Maybe having a committee of 5 or 7 at the Joint Operating Board level would make more sense. Shawn Baird pointed out that the Joint Operating Board includes the contract agencies such as Santiam Hospital and Woodburn Ambulance so it really is not the same as the governing board; so it is not the exact same membership. The Joint Operating Board was intended to give those agencies an opportunity to have a voice in policy and procedures that they would not without the Joint Operating Board. Chief Hume also would like to have clarification if they are a "board" or a "committee" and are they "service boards" or "QA Committees?" He believes they should be referenced as service boards and not QA committees.
- Gina addressed some of the areas brought forward by Chief Hume. Gina also provided her interpretation of the organizational chart in conjunction with the 190 Agreement. She stated she felt there was a disconnect in how "we" are interpreting the 190 Agreement and how we are operating under the organizational chart that was adopted. One or the other needs to be changed, or both. The way things are working now, in the organizational chart it shows the QA Committee as modified by a resolution and the joint operating board is show because it was still up for discussion from September. Chief Isaak asked if we had an organizational chart currently that was adopted. Gina confirmed yes. The current organizational chart that was adopted by the board is with the copy of the 190 Agreement as well as on the CD that was provided to each agency. Chief Fossholm referenced the Organizational chart in his binder and asked if this was the chart Gina was referencing; Gina affirmed. Chief Carriger stated that the organizational chart and the 190 Agreement need to be in alignment. He believes that there should still be a police and fire/EMS service group(s), but does not think they should have anything to do with QA. The QA should be where it is right now and doing what it is doing; they should be two separate things. Gina clarified that what the group was wanting are the following committees/board.
 - Police Advisory
 - Fire/EMS Advisory
 - Police QA
 - Fire/EMS QA
 - Joint Operating Board
 - Governing Board

This was confirmed correct. Gina stated that there needs to be a definition for each of the groups. Chief Carriger asked out of all the groups listed above is the

Joint Operating Board needed? Can the two advisory groups perform the same function(s) as the Joint Operating Board? If working with a contractor that would go to the governing board. Gina asked if the group would want the advisory boards to report back to the full governing board or if they would have the authority to take care of items that they were tasked with. Chief Carriger stated that he felt they should be able to take care of things that were within their discipline. Chief Jon Remy asked what if there is a question or a situation that is important that there is a police perspective and then a fire/EMS perspective (i.e. a radio system) and we need police and fire to be on the same page. In situations where we need to have "frank" discussions in a group that is small enough to facilitate good discussions; in the model you are discussing it appears that police and fire could still have two different perspectives until we get to the governing board. That is my concern. Chief Carriger acknowledged that he is correct. Chief Remy stated in those situations it would be important (referencing the radio project) that we get both police and fire together, possibly in a small group of 5-7 with representation from both disciplines. Gina asked in those situations, would you want those groups to be able to move items forward or would you want them to bring them forward to the governing board for discussion? Chief Swanson stated there appears to be a great deal of confusion surrounding section 6 (the Joint Operating Board). The section defines the Joint Operating Board as a combined group of the police and fire service committees. It does not address those services committees specifically. The structure of the Joint Operating Committee has to change; structurally and verbally. Chief Isaak suggested to for a group to work on reviewing and cleaning up the whole ORS190 Agreement. Gina reminded the group that revisions to the ORS190 Agreement may need to go out to each agency for the review and approval of each agencies board of directors. Gina also reminded the board that there is a paper trail as to why sections of the 190 are not being followed (adopted resolutions and board meeting minutes) and those sections were modified at the direction of the Board.

The ORS190 Review Committee:

- Alan Hume – Committee Chair
- Gary Swanson
- Rick Schmitz

Gina will send all pertinent documents to the committee individuals. They are also available on the METCOM 911 website user portal.

Executive Director Review: Chief Isaak addressed the board regarding the recent annual review he conducted for METCOM Executive Director Gina Audritsh. Chief Isaak felt uncomfortable with the process of performing Gina's review. He indicated he felt the process was an individual process and did not feel that was fair to the Director to have one individual perform the evaluation. Chief Isaak stated he was not familiar with how the process occurred in the past. Gina advised in the past the evaluation has been performed by the executive board. Chief Swanson suggested that the committee tasked with evaluating the ORS190 Agreement so maybe the same committee should come up with a process for future annual reviews for the Executive Director.

Budget Committee Service Terms (revisited): The Budget Committee Service terms and "staggering" of such terms will be reviewed and addressed by the ORS190 Agreement Review Committee.

WVCC/METCOM Future: Chief Iverson voiced the importance for the board to evaluate "where we will be in a year." WVCC is facing the same issues that METCOM is. The board needs to start looking at options for the future; where we are going to go and what opportunities may emerge

with others. Chief Ferraris echoed Chief Iverson's concerns and would like to see METCOM pursue possible options. We have to look at the future and ways to defuse costs. We cannot continue to operate in the future with how funding is currently set. Chief Fossholm asked if WVCC owned and maintained all the radio equipment for the user agencies. Chief Ferraris advised yes and no. Some is owned by individual agencies and some equipment is owned by the city of Salem. The city has a radio shop to service the equipment that is owned by the city. Chief Fossholm voiced concern with putting a lot of money into a system and turn around to merge with another agency later; it gets convoluted as to what direction we should be going. Chief Ferraris stated that it is not all that much different than what we have going on right now inside our agencies. Chief Carriger stated agrees with Chief Iverson, although he does not see this occurring within the next 3 years. However, there does need to be some partial upgrades to our current system. We will most likely never be on an 800 system like the City of Salem so we will need to continue to support and use our system even if there is some type of merger. If the board is smart about the steps we take and look at the things we do to ensure they can carry on in the event of any type of consolidation. Gina shared documents to the board about the future and similar PSAP situations. Gina shared that both PSAP's have similar issues with funding and service concerns. Gina shared that METCOM cannot sustain a dispatch center with the need to improve radio service and the maintenance of staffing levels with a cap of 3%. Chief Swanson thinks the vision for the future needs to start with the METCOM Director and the Executive Board. These four (4) persons would then share their vision and information with the rest of the board for future considerations. We need to have a vision or we will continue to sit here and repeat history. Chief Isaak advised that the ORS 190 Agreement Review Committee also needs to address when the agreement references private radio systems if we have contracts with those agencies/individuals (i.e. towers, base stations, etc.) if METCOM is working or spending monies on that equipment without a contract this would be a violation of the 190 Agreement. We need to make sure we have correct contracts, documents and verbiage in place. Chief Taylor asked for confirmation if Marion County received a grant for approximately \$250,000 to study consolidation of PSAPS? This was confirmed by board members. Chief Taylor stated his understanding was that gained about zero traction or support from this board group. He stated his confusion about being back to where the board was a year to two years ago. Chief Iverson stated he sat on that committee and admitted he may have had some self-biases at that time, thinking about how to preserve METCOM. METCOM is all near and dear to all the agencies and giving up that control to a dispatch center that we do not have the personal connections with is hard to do. But now as I sit here and we are all fighting the same battles, how do I put more people on the ground, how do I provide a better service to my customers; it really comes down to we have humans that do this job. We do have issues such as a delay of call transfers between centers; when I start evaluating and setting aside my personal biases I have to ask are we really doing the best we can for everyone out there. For me, I think we have a good center, but I think we need to explore the option of possible future consolidation or merger. Chief Taylor questioned if the study covered all of that. Chief Iverson stated the study covered phase one; talking about what the opportunities could include. It did not go further into a consolidation process other than full consolidation, CAD to CAD interface, or stay as we are. It talked about positives and negatives. The study showed there were no large cost savings. For Chief Iverson, his cost savings in a possible consolidation/merger is the "cost savings" associated with a reduction or elimination of call transfer delays. With the WVCC/METCOM joint committee we have addressed some items that we are now doing more efficiently and have minimized the delays. Chief Carriger stated some of the things he had hoped to maintain and keep when bringing the two centers together (SCCC and NORCOM) were lost. I was hoping to keep some of the dispatchers that really knew our area and our agencies, but that did not happen. These things have not developed as much as he would have like to see develop since the METCOM formation. So, the things that kept him very focused on maintaining our own center and keeping things similar to how they were are not that way anymore. "The things I valued are already gone so I cannot consider them as factors in judgement of future consolidation," Chief Carriger said. Chief Remy feels the same way. I tried to maintain SCCC when it was falling apart because he had a dispatch center that was working for him. He has had some very

negative experiences with dispatch centers in the past. What they had in Stayton was a treasure. Because we did not do a very good job as a PSAP council in some critical areas of our responsibility we found ourselves in a difficult spot. The partnership with NORCOM appeared to be the best path for maintaining areas of our center that were important to us as users. NORCOM was generous in sharing Gina and other resources with us, that frankly a lot of south county users did not appreciate. I feel we are in the same position we were before. When we reached out to WVCC in the past we had the impression that they were not interested in a model that felt fare to us. I think it is time to revisit that, but I think we owe it to our communities to get rid of the delays. Chief Swanson stated he feels there is a big difference between collaboration and commitment. We can do a lot. I think we owe it to ourselves to work on collaboration for the benefit of this entity and when we have collaborated as much as we can and we still need to do more, than we need to take a serious look at the next step. However, for now I think it is important to understand the difference between collaboration and consolidation to get something done. Chief Iverson thanked everyone for having the openness to have this conversation.

Upcoming Board Meeting Dates:

The following dates have been identified for the 2015-2016 Fiscal Year Board meetings.

- **Wednesday, June 15, 2016 @ 1:30 p.m. – METCOM**

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.