

Marion County 911 Service Board

Meeting Agenda

February 15, 2023 @ 6:00 PM

3014 E. Main St.

Knoxville, IA 50138

- I. Call to Order:
 - a. Chair Slycord calls the meeting to order.
- II. Approve Agenda for February 15, 2023, Regular Session:
 - a. Motion by: Terry Fisher
 - b. Second by: Jason Sandholdt
 - c. All in favor
- III. Approve meeting minutes from March 9, 2022:
 - a. Motion by: Kenny Thompson
 - b. Second by: Mark Clifton
 - c. All in favor
- IV. FY 2023-2024 Budget Public Hearing:
 - a. Discussion: No comments verbally or in office.
 - b. Motion by: Jason Sandholdt
 - c. Second by: Terry Fisher
 - d. All in favor
- V. FY 2023-2024 Budget Discussion:
 - a. Opening of budget discussion: All budget information sent out in a packet the week prior. Sheriff Jason Sandholdt asked for a recap of the budget. Same as last year, \$900,000 set aside, same as last year. Amount was not increased. Fund balance has remained relatively flat at \$1.3m. Funds are eligible to be spent at the board's discretion, they are just earmarked to appease the state 911 program manager. Expense wise everything has been brought forward from last year, wages computed at 5%. No capital expenditures are included. Expenditures from last year were just under \$200k. Raymie asked if expenditures of \$200k is normal year over year. Expenditures have been consistent year after year. Peak in calendar year '17 was grant related, grant money in and grant money out \$400-\$600K. Money was unable to be separated between grant and surcharge.
 - b. No moneys were budgeted for capital projects. Any spendings out of the budget when it comes to projects will just take a budget amendment.
 - c. Motion by: Raymie
 - d. Second by: Clifton

e. Roll Call:

City of Bussey: NA	Clay Township: Yes
City of Knoxville: Yes	EMA Commission: Yes
Marion Co. Sheriff: Yes	City of Melcher Dallas: Yes
Knoxville Township: Yes	Lake Prairie Township: Yes
City of Pleasantville: Yes	Indiana Township: Yes
Washington Township: NA	Pella Police Dept: Yes
City of Harvey: NA	Marion County: Yes
City of Pella: Yes	Pleasant Grove: Yes
Red Rock Township: NA	

VI. Zetron Shared Services Yr. 4 & 5:

- a. Recap: 2019 the Board moved to join the stated shared services network to save money. The motion obligated us to stay in the program for 3 years, we are currently in year 3. In the original contract there are 5 years, we need to opt in or opt out for years 4 and 5. PSAP annual reoccurring for years 4 and 5 \$8,698.99 per year. Included in this is equipment refreshing (911 call taking equipment). Prior to the state shared services, the Board paid for all call taking equipment at the cost of roughly \$250k, with a 5–7-year life expectancy. Paying roughly \$1600/month in vpn expenses between the two PSAPS.
- b. MCSO Discussion: Sheriff asked Jasper County if they felt like this was a good deal and they stated this was a good deal and there is no real wiggle room in it.
- c. PPD Discussion: PSAP per year \$5,296.98, 2-year total \$10,593.96
- d. Motion by: Sandholdt
- e. Second by: Hatch
- f. Roll Call:

City of Bussey: NA	Clay Township: Yes
City of Knoxville: Yes	EMA Commission: Yes
Marion Co. Sheriff: Yes	City of Melcher Dallas: Yes
Knoxville Township: Yes	Lake Prairie Township: Yes
City of Pleasantville: Yes	Indiana Township: Yes
Pella Police Dept: Yes	City of Harvey: NA
Marion County: Yes	City of Pella: Yes
Pleasant Grove: Yes	

VII. Elections

- a. Chair:
 - i. Mrstick nominates Mark Raymie. Nominations closed.

City of Bussey: NA	Clay Township: Yes
City of Knoxville: Yes	EMA Commission: Yes
Marion Co. Sheriff: Yes	City of Melcher Dallas: Yes
Knoxville Township: Yes	Lake Prairie Township: Yes
City of Pleasantville: Yes	Indiana Township: Yes
Pella Police Dept: Yes	City of Harvey: NA

Marion County: Abstain City of Pella: Yes
Pleasant Grove: Yes

b. Vice Chair:

i. Jason Sandholdt nominates Joe Mrstick, second by Raymie.

City of Bussey: NA	Clay Township: Yes
City of Knoxville: Yes	EMA Commission: Yes
Marion Co. Sheriff: Yes	City of Melcher Dallas: Yes
Knoxville Township: Yes	Lake Prairie Township: Yes
City of Pleasantville: Yes	Indiana Township: Yes
Pella Police Dept: Yes	City of Harvey: NA
Marion County: Yes	City of Pella: Yes
Pleasant Grove: Yes	

VIII. Fund balance discussion/action on project(s) Discussion:

a. Fund balance at the end of January was \$1.371m relatively stable. In Jeff's opinion only, the 40% they are keeping of your wireless surcharge is not meeting all the bills. If they were to send wireline and wireless surcharge directly to the State and keep 40% and send the remainder back to the county that will be a huge impact to E911 and limit what you would be able to do. Nothing in the que to be done this year but if year end comes and they are unable to pay the bills they will make a change of some sort. Sheriff asks how the \$ is distributed from the State and how counties are knocking the fund balances down so the State doesn't come after it? In the code of Iowa 34A there are very limited references made pertaining to eligible costs. In the states written 911 plan the following are non-recurring costs that are eligible: installation of HVAC fire suppression for facilities associated with the receipt and disposition of 911 calls, installation of redundant or backup communication equipment, hardware/software upgrades, equipment housing furniture, technician fees, consultants, communications towers, radios, customer premise equipment, radio consoles/consolettes, computer aided dispatch, mapping, logging recorders, emergency dispatch protocols, paging equipment, emergency communications PSAP related operational costs, a smaller section for recurring monthly costs, ng911 GIS, standalone ALLI database, service fees, maintenance fees, training, ALLI MSAG services, ESI Net, or POI (point of interconnection). Something to consider, if the state see's our fund balance relative to our expenses and this is reoccurring through other counties given our current environment, it's probably a red flag. The better question is what are other counties hanging onto? What is there cushion they keep in their budget. The fear would be if they see these numbers and we don't start using this money someone is going to notice and say this isn't a savings account. We should start earmarking these projects to show how we are going to spend the moneys. Are there things in rural fire depts and EMS locations that

are also needed with these funds? McSheehy states “maybe we should map out our projects 3-5 years that shows we have a plan.” EMA will create a survey sheet to send out to 911 board members for members to fill out what they are needing, cost, time frame, etc. Sheriff asked for this to be a standing agenda item for the foreseeable future. Update on the 911 testing radios, they are still in Clay Township being tested. They still need to go to Pella Fire, and we need to talk to Columbia Fire to see if they are interested in testing. Consensus about the test radios is that they have been working well throughout the departments. Clifton states pertaining to radio communication we need to decide sooner than later what we are going to do and how are we going to do it. The survey should state if the dept/area is able to cover any costs for what they are asking, or if all or a % needs to be covered by the board. The survey will contain: radio? what type of radio? how many radios? do you have the capacity to chip in \$ wise and what are you requesting from the funds? And over what period? Also need to factor in maintenance! As a board we just need to decide where we want that fund balance to be.

- b. 911 systems communication: Sandholdt, Andrew with IT and a team wanted to talk about some issues they have found. The issue is there is a lapse in addressing and them showing up on the 911 PSAP maps. Sheriff expressed that his concern is getting people to the right place at the right time. Andrew has an employee (Niccole) who does GIS for the County. Andrew states the following: Andrew was asked about 8-9 months ago to do an assessment of the mapping issues. Michelle and Andrew had a conversation that there were addresses that weren't mapping properly. In the assessment they identified that the address points that had been created in our systems since the change over to the state system in 2019, all new address since that point had not been entered into our system properly. Which means we have identified a couple hundred address that created over those 3 years that weren't getting into the system. The update process was looked at we tried to figure out why that wasn't happening, we found that the updating process should be being done through Geocomm. Were not exactly sure why that wasn't happening but it's not. We took it upon ourselves to fix that problem, we found that that was not good that we had this many addresses missing in our mapping system. Niccole the GIS person worked with GeoComm, Zetron and a few other vendors in the State to try to get these things fixed. It took her a lot of work and effort, several hundred hours of work. But we got it fixed and updated as of November. In the report we gave to Jason we stated we have identified the problems, we have fixed the problem up until now, but

this is specifically not in IT's job description. It is not in our job duties. It is specifically in Jeff and Emily's job. So, we said "it's fixed, but at this point we don't feel its appropriate for us to continue to maintain this data, it's a lot of extra responsibility so we said we gave you the report, this is what has been fixed and from there the Sheriff decided it should be brought to the board." The Sheriff thinks that on part of this he doesn't know that its more of an IT related issue or a communications issue. But I do believe that on the eligible expenses as we were reading through those that if the GIS is the major factor to do that, we should fund GIS on doing that. Getting people in the right place in the right seat on the bus type of deal. Making sure that its happening is the goal. How do we make sure it doesn't lapse? How do we make sure we are getting it taken care of? And move forward from there. Andrew states that this board also gets very specific GIS grant dollars from the State that are specifically for the GIS maintenance of the system. We should be receiving \$12,000 a year per PSAP, we are receiving \$12,000 a year, so we have 2 PSAP's we should be getting \$24,000 a year. Jeff states we are. Andrew asks where the other \$12,000. It all comes to the board. Andrew states they were unable to find it, he checked with the Auditor's office, and they were unable to find the second payment for the last several years. We've only ever seen \$12,000, maybe we are getting 24 but the fact is we should be getting \$24k specifically for GIS maintenance for our system. And that happened over the years, but when we switched from E911 to NG911 the systems have gotten much more database levels and so the NG911 requires to have the GIS points for all your address points in your system, it's a more technical database then what it had been in the past. GIS datapoints along with MSAG and our Zoning administrator typically creates those new address points for the county, so when new addresses come in it makes sense for them to be handled by the Zoning office because often they are also getting permits for building etc. So, Missy creates those then sends the address points over to GeoComm to be entered into the system. At some point in time there is a breakdown between when Missy sends the message over to GeoComm and GeoComm getting the address point into our system. Not exactly sure where that breakdown is, that vendor clearly needs more management, I can't say a lot of positive things about GeoComm. Maybe that's an opportunity in the future to maybe get rid of GeoComm, I think we could probably do a lot of that work ourselves, but the fact is we do have GeoComm right now and it doesn't appear that they are meeting all their obligations to us. Hatch says "when you said you reached out to GeoComm to work through some of those issues, did they have any response to why they were not getting updated?"

Andrew answered "no". Andrew said there SLAs are like 8 hours and it took us weeks to get them to do anything. Sandholdt then asks Pella how their process works in Pella city limits? Marcia states that Denny sends the information to Missy, then Missy sends the information to GeoComm. Missy CC's Jeff and Emily in new addresses or points going to GeoComm. There is no process document that shows the process of how a new address or point gets to where it needs to go. McSheehy states that they have not experienced any issues in Pella, and that this is a new conversation for them. Andrew states that they have had addresses missing in the Pella area. He can get a list of addresses that were fixed to Chief McSheehy, Marcia said she would be very interested to see the list. Raymie states that Andrew is correct when he said he works for the County. We pay him and his team to do county IT work. This is one of those times that Jeff and Emily with Andrews team get together to work through the process and remedy it. Jeff and Emily haven't had the chance to digest this either so it's not fair for them to answer this on the fly. Emily states that if we are paying for a service that isn't being done by GeoComm it needs to be address. Issues before having been from a complexity standpoint with "what do they do", they being GeoComm. McSheehy asks Andrew what he had to do to fix it, did you fix they system or just fix what wasn't working properly? It was unclear on GeoComm and IT's end on what was missing. Nicole had to do a comparison on the databases to see what was in the GeoComm system compared to the County's system. No updates have been completed since November 2022; another update will need completed if any new addresses have been placed on the map. Sheriff feels that if this is an IT related issue that needs done, then IT should be doing it. Who do we have that has the skill set that we are already paying or pay them a little extra to do the things that need to be done. Hatch asks if we ask Jeff and Emily to reach out to GeoComm. Sheriff then states if we have an E911 coordinator and an assistant then it should have been being done. Hatch states if you're paying for a product and assume that it's happening, then you don't know there is a problem until presented and you say why isn't this address in there? The Sheriff had been told that it has been brought to attention and nothing is being done. Hatch asks how we go forward from here? If we are paying GeoComm for a product, either we allow them to fix the problem or we go elsewhere. Raymie says we need to take multiple steps at this; the team that was working on this needs to meet with Jeff and Emily to go through these errors, what are the errors, then have some agreement as to why these errors have occurred. The next thing would be to bring GeoComm here then and address the issues. If it becomes an issue of technical

efficiency and we need to adjust as a board as to where this job is assigned then we are going to have better clarity as to how to do that. Maybe that's more IT focused for the County, but then we must talk about the money that goes with that, because as Andrew said he is paid by Marion County. We need to have an updated process document that we can track as a board as to how this works as well. Hatch mentions that something else to keep in mind from the Engineers office standpoint, with the new address system layer that we have now we have lost a lot of capabilities from the old one. We have troubles making maps. We no longer have the ability to make those very well because all the addresses are on there as one horizontal text, and we can no longer manipulate those. This could be a component of this issue as well, but Jeff feels this is an internal Marion County GIS issue. McSheehy asks Jeff who sets the layers and boundaries of when someone calls 911 it goes to this certain PSAP? Jeff states the 911 board is the authority. When we switched from legacy 911 to NextGen 911 we took the existing PSAP boundary map and pushed it to GeoComm to foster into the NextGen 911. McSheehy asked that as we explore this issue that we don't lose sight that this board still holds the authorization of this boundary map. The Sheriff would like to see the boundary map and agrees we should look at it, he thought this was a state decision. Sheriff asks does the money, surcharge wise go back to the jurisdiction covering an area on the map or does it go back to the County the jurisdiction is in? System, payment, and process are what we need to figure out. MrStick asks if there is anyway to cross reference Marion County Beacon with GeoComm. Andrew states those are two separate databases. Motion to have the key players reach out to GeoComm get some answers and bring it back to the board.

- c. Motion by: Sandholdt
- d. Second by: Clifton
- e. All in favor

IX. Address Marker Fee adjustment/adjustment Discussion:

- a. As written in the report, we are currently charging \$110 for a new address. Marker, labor, and lifetime of the sign. Our costs are averaging \$175. Jeff's ask of the board is to close the gap between the two. The \$110 takes care of the life of the sign forever, whether its regular change out or damaged. Raymie asked how much we spend a year in signs roughly? And the answer is roughly \$74k. That is not including personnel costs. Sign material, fuel, equipment only. We bring in roughly \$5250 a year. \$5250 is only new residents, the \$74k is the forever life part of the sign. The responders are the main ones utilizing the sign more then the resident. Bumping the cost from

\$110-\$175 doesn't even come close to the \$74k we spend. Leaving the rate as is, no motion needed.

- X. Adjournment:
 - a. Motion to adjourn by: McSheehy.
 - b. Second by: Clifton