

Marion County 911 Board Minutes
June 20th at 6:00 pm
3014 E. Main St., Knoxville, IA

1. Chair Marcia Slycord called the Marion County 911 Board meeting to order at 6:00pm.
2. Jeff Anderson took a verbal roll call and the following members and guests were in attendance:

City of Bussey	Absent
City of Harvey	Absent
City of Knoxville	Dan Losada
City of Melcher	Terry Fisher
City of Pella	Marcia Slycord (Chair)
City of Pleasantville	Absent
Clay Township	Jim Findley
Indiana Township	Steven Watson
Knoxville Township	Kenny Thompson (Vice Chair)
Lake Prairie Township	Doug VanGorkom (arrived 6:15)
Marion County	Jason Sandholdt
Pleasant Grove Township	Absent
Red Rock Township	Absent
Washington Township	Absent
<u>Guests</u>	
Marion County EMA/911	Jeff Anderson
Marion County Sheriff's Office	Martha Dykstra
Pella Community Ambulance	Greg Higginbotham
Pella Police Department	Robert Bokinsky

3. *Approve agenda for regular session of 06/20/18:* There was a motion by Losada and a second by Fisher to approve the agenda as presented. All members were in favor and the 06/20/18 regular session agenda was approved.
4. *Approve minutes of 05/16/18 meeting:* Slycord advised the second item is to approve the meeting of the May 16th meeting. Sandholdt apologized he couldn't make the last meeting and advised he had a question on #6 on the budget amendment and asked what it was for and how much. Anderson advised the original budget was \$154,150 and we upped it to \$210,150 and stated that they won't really be anywhere close to spending that much, but that the budget was amended due to a grant that was not originally in the budget for \$30,000 revenue income coming in and revenue going out. Sandholdt then asked what the grant was for. Anderson advised it was a \$30,000 GIS grant that paid \$30,000 of Kim's wages for last year for doing GIS maintenance. Sandholdt states it says for non-budgeted PSAP expenses. Anderson advised the Board approved some PSAP expenses that were not in the original budget. Slycord confirmed it was for the UPS. Sandholt stated his question on it is that the last two meetings they presented items that had normally been paid for through the 911 Board that were denied because they were not budgeted. He stated, "So we can do certain things that aren't budgeted, but not others, I'm confused." He advised it seems like lately they have not been able to get anything approved that would have normally been approved through this Board and he would like to know why. Anderson stated he is not the decision maker so he will need to

address the Board and the Board will have to respond to that. Slycord advised the UPS was prior to them designating funds for communications projects. She advised she doesn't know that the Board is necessarily being selective, but it is their decision to approve or not approve the expenses as they are brought forward. Sandholdt stated it's very frustrating and he's not trying to buy stuff for the sheriff's office, he's trying to buy stuff for the PSAP that a lot of the people here use, including Clay, Indiana, Knoxville Rural, Melcher and they can't get those items approved. He states it's either lack of a motion and Martha can't make a motion. Slycord advised she can't make a motion as Chair either. Sandholdt continued by saying it's come to the point he doesn't even know why they are continuing to come to the 911 meetings anymore. He stated he thought the purpose of this Board was to support or keep those PSAP's running and up and it seems like they are having trouble doing that. Slycord stated "we're having trouble supporting the PSAP's, is that what you are saying?" Sandholdt stated the requests to keep those PSAP's up and running. He stated he has always looked at the 911 Board as a pass through of the funding from the state to the PSAPs, whether it be Pella or Marion County and those purchases. If there was something that it was just going to benefit the deputies, he would understand if there was a lack of motion or no vote, but if it's something to benefit the different organizations or to run the PSAP, he's a little frustrated with that. He continued by saying he read in the meeting budget amendment side of it that there is a needed budget amendment for non-budgeted grant awards and non-budgeted PSAP expenses, but there is no mention of salaries or approval of salaries, that's a little frustrating. He asked if \$30,000 was the budget changed for the salaries. Slycord and Anderson both advised that was the GIS grant for two PSAP's in the county. Sandholdt asked what the salary change was or if there is a way he can get a break out of exactly what those budget amendments went for, or what the total dollar amounts of where you went from to the \$210,000. Anderson advised again that \$30,000 was the GIS grant and he would have to go through all of the bills to figure out what the PSAP expenses were. He asked the Board if that was for Racom. Dykstra advised that it was. Sandholdt advised he would like a copy of it and that's he's frustrated. Anderson advised \$30,000 of it was for the grant, that's \$15,000 per PSAP. Sandholdt stated so \$30,000 was on that and asked Anderson to go back to the slide where it showed where they went from \$154,150 to \$210,150, so that would put it at \$184,150 to the \$210,150 what is that amount for. Anderson advised it was done so they don't go over before the end of the budget year, with two months to go they were in danger of surpassing that, which would get them in trouble if they don't do an amendment. Sandholdt stated this is through the end of the budget year and stated part of it is salary, but we don't know what amount when to salary. Anderson stated he wasn't tracking him when he refers to the salary. Sandholdt stated that earlier in the meeting it was said that part of it was Kim's salary. Anderson stated \$30,000 of this difference would be that grant. Sandholdt confirmed to pay her salary and that it didn't go to the PSAP's. Anderson confirmed that. Sandholdt then asked again what the expense to go from \$184,150 to \$210,150 was for. Anderson stated they will not spend all of that, but if you do an amendment, you have to make sure that whatever you end up with at the end of this month for the year in spending does not exceed this number. Anderson advised he picked a high number so they would be in no danger of going over their amended budget. Sandholdt advised he was just confused on #6 in the meeting minutes and when it talked about budgeted grant awards and non-budgeted PSAP expenses. He didn't see anything in Marion County's PSAP that was non-budgeted, he doesn't know why the meeting minutes would say that. Anderson advised he will find it and provide it to all of them that there was at one of the meetings, late last year or early this year, they requested funds for three different

projects, one was the UPS, the Board authorized that, that was not in the budget, that is the PSAP expense that is referred to. Sandholdt asked how do you look forward to those expenses when sometimes we don't know exactly what those expenses are going to be. He continued by saying it's hard to know if we'll have this expense or that expense and if it's not budgeted then we are denied and you have to pay for it out of the Pella PD budget or the Marion County Sheriff's budget and that to him wasn't the way it's always been in the past. He stated in the past if you had a budget come up you had the expenses for the PSAP's, we would present them and we would say we need to do this and if it was just to outfit the Pella PD guys and that was it then the vote would be no we won't do it, but if the request was reasonable in regards to something Pella or Marion County needed, it usually passed, someone would make a motion or there would be discussion on it. He continued by saying he just wants to get clarified if he is really going to guess ahead and say I may have this expense I may not have and budget it for it for this upcoming year's budget for the fear if he doesn't say it that it's going to be voted down. Slycord asked the Board if that is what they are thinking or if that is what they want to do at budget time and have the Sheriff bring his next year's items forward. Sandholdt stated not just the Sheriff's office, Pella PD too. Slycord stated she understands that, but she doesn't recall Pella PD asking for any expenses to the Board. Fisher stated he thinks that any money that is spent out of a budget should be, and he understands there are emergencies that come up, but if you have any vision of anything coming up in a budget year it should be discussed and have it established in the budget, so they know what the end result is. Sandholdt advised he agreed. Fisher stated that was the premise of this whole thing, everything should come forth during the budget period. Fisher stated if you have an emergency and something breaks down you can't for see that, just like these licenses, we should have known when the end date of those licenses were and when they should be renewed, they should have been brought up and put in the budget so they could have done that. Sandholt advised he understands that, but somebody's salary should be too, you can make exceptions for salaries. Anderson advised the Board approved the GIS grant. Sandholt advised what he is saying is that those things can also be projected. Anderson advised he argues with that because when Homeland Security introduces a grant that we don't even apply for until after the start of the fiscal year we can't plan that, it is not captured in our budget. Sandholdt questioned as part of a salary. Anderson questioned what Sandholdt meant. Sandholdt stated to pay for a person's salary, you don't know what their salary is. Anderson advised he knows what their salary is but prior to this grant less than 30% of Kim's salary was paid for by 911. Anderson advised he switched her allocations, whether it was from EMA or 911, to capitalize on this grant, so essentially we got \$30,000 of benefit to pay her salary through this grant, that if they didn't apply for they weren't going to get the money. Losada confirmed that Kim's salary did not increase by \$30,000. Anderson confirmed that and advised he simply moved the cost centers around where the money comes from that she got paid for. Fisher advised this is actually that was new money in to the budget and new money out of the budget, after the budget. Sandholdt stated he's said his piece on it and he hopes that those that do dispatch, if it's something that somebody feels like it's only going to benefit the Sheriff's office or those employees he understands the no vote or a lack of motion or anything else, but if it's something we bring to the Board to increase or to make that better for the PSAP he would hope there would be support of that. Anderson advised he will find the minutes and he's not putting words in anyone's mouth, but he will go back to the executive committee meeting where the executive committee prioritized a strategic plan of projects they wanted to spend money on. Anderson advised if he remembers right when it came to those projects if they weren't in

that priority list to him that's why they got voted down, they were not identified in the strategic plan of targets of where the Board members wanted the money to go. Sandholdt advised he understands and his response to that is it's hard to bring something to the executive committee meeting when one of the two PSAP's in the county doesn't even have a seat on it. Sandholdt stated Marion County is not represented on the executive Board, so they can't bring those discussion or those things to that. Slycord and Anderson both advised Marion County is represented by Supervisor Raymie on the executive committee. Sandholdt advised that the PSAP is not, but stated point taken and he will talk to Supervisor Raymie and try to figure out better communication on those things, he advised that's very frustrating. Sandholdt stated he believed Supervisor Raymie expressed that at the last emergency management meeting on the same frustration. VanGorkom advised he never sees Raymie anymore and he's supposed to be here and that's he's only seen him once in the time he's been on the committee. Sandholdt advised he's in Kansas City, he understands what he's saying, but he thinks it's hard when you have a job that takes you out of the state. Sandholdt advised it's the setup, his frustration isn't with the Board, it's with the state and the way it's set up, because as one of the PSAP's, Martha and himself, or even Chief Losada, on dispatching or anyone else that uses their dispatch side of it there's not that day to day operation or the knowing what goes on. He continued by saying Kenny probably just trusts them to run it, but Martha and him, and now that Raymie isn't here today it actually gives them a voice. Sandholdt stated that it's kind of sad that it takes someone being gone and needing to be his proxy for the Marion County PSAP to even have a voice on the E911 Board and that's very frustrating for someone who runs a PSAP. He advised it's not the Boards fault, it's the way the state sets it up and it's very frustrating when they don't have a voice and things get voted down that never used to get voted down. Sandholdt stated he has even got to the point where he's thought maybe it's a personality conflict with him and a Board member, so he assigned Troy and Martha to start coming to meetings versus himself and they were still getting no votes, or no motions, or it got voted down or it died because of a lack of motion like on #7, it sat idle and died and \$30,000 came out of the Marion County taxpayers or Marion County Sheriff's office budget that normally would have been paid from this. Sandholdt stated we can look for grant money to pay for salaries for different people, but to pay for something that the county is now picking up the tab on and the taxpayers of Marion County are. Anderson stated he felt like that was a cheap shot at him for capitalizing on a grant. Sandholdt advised Anderson to take it however he wants, he stated it wasn't meant as a cheap shot, but if he feels like it was that way. Bokinsky advised on #7 as far as the minutes, first off there is a typo on the word idle and if his memory serves him right Martha had hardly any voice at the last meeting and it says that a Board member asked if it was a new system. Bokinsky believes it may have been him and would like Kim to go back over the minutes for accuracy because he believes what was being asked is if it was new telephone system and what he recalls Martha's answer he thought she said yes, but this says no, it's not. The misunderstanding may have been that he was asking about a new phone system and she answered in regards to the Eventide, so have Kim go back and if they need revised then they can be revised. Dykstra advised it's not that the license had expired, it was for an additional license. Slycord advised Dykstra that since she has a voice she could now clarify that and if the licenses hadn't expired then what are they for. Dykstra advised the county purchased a new phone system, the Sheriff's office got the same phone system the courthouse has, it's from analog to IP and their voice recorder had to be updated to reflect the increase in the IP addresses brought about by the phone system. Slycord asked for clarification on the recording from the last meeting on those couple of things,

therefore we will not approve the minutes this meeting. Anderson advised he would prefer to see a motion and a second to table them, so they stay alive. There was a motion by Losada and a second by Fisher to table the 05/16/18 meeting minutes. A roll call vote was done. All voted to table the minutes, except for VanGorkom with Lake Prairie who abstained from the vote due to arriving late to the meeting.

5. *Sign Program:* Slycord advised we are moving on to the sign program. There are five bullet points and she will let Anderson explain them, but advised the group if they had questions to ask them. Anderson advised going back to the presentation from the last meeting there is currently a \$40 fee when a new address comes in. Anderson advised that is supposed to cover our costs of installing the sign and creating the address point in the mapping and 911 system. Anderson asked Poffenbarger to confirm the fee was created in 2009. Poffenbarger advised that it was, but at that time, the \$40 was to cover only the cost of the sign, they didn't include labor and they didn't do address points at that time. Slycord asked if they made their own signs at that time. Poffenbarger advised they did, it was done on an old machine and it was phased out just prior to John retiring. Anderson advised his concern is that we are literally losing money every time we do a sign. The fee hasn't been updated since 2009 and the expenses are higher than that each time we do that. Anderson stated he wanted to identify that to them as the Board, if they are okay with that, it's acceptable to him, but he feels like it is our responsibility to make them aware there is an imbalance there in the fees we are charging and our cost. Chief Losada asked Anderson how he comes up with the truck labor expense. He stated he thinks that \$100 per sign seems a little high. Anderson advised when they are doing new addresses it's typically one over here, one over there, another over there, so what happens is that Missy creates it in the records system, it then comes to Anderson who creates a work order, who gives it to Randy. He advised the once Randy has it he has to drive out there and flag it for locates if that needs to be done, so there is one trip. Randy then comes back to the office, spends about 5 minutes of computer time to enter and request the locates, he waits the 48 hours for the locates, gets the all clear and drives back out to the location, drives the post and puts the sign up. Losada advised that makes more sense. Anderson advised it's somewhat subjective, because he could drive to Melcher Dallas and do three of them along the way if everything lines up, but typically it doesn't work out that way. Anderson advised he has three from last week that Missy generated and there is one north of Pella, one west of Pella and one closer to Pleasantville. Sandholdt asked if the cost of the sign has gone up. Anderson advised the cost of the sign has actually gone down as we are making them ourselves. Anderson advised we were paying roughly \$16 per sign and materials cost is less than \$5 now, so we are making them for about \$3-4 cheaper. Sandholdt asked if the decision back then was to not pay for the labor and it was just absorbed. Anderson confirmed that. Sandholdt asked what the rationale on the change is. Anderson advised he sees a Board that struggles with the increased cost of technology, PSAP expenses and radio systems and things that they want to do, meanwhile we live this every day and see the money being drawn from available funds to do those projects in to the sign program. Anderson advised if the Board is okay with that, he is okay with it, but it's significant drain on the funds of the this Board. Fisher stated it would cost \$140 to go install a sign in the southwest corner of Marion County so they have to at least build out to cover that cost. You just can't keep working and drawing money off of somebody else's shelf. If these people want an address, it's a cost to do that. Losada asks who typically pays this bill, is it the property owner or the power company. Anderson advised 95% of the time it's the property owner, there are very few of the utilities. Poffenbarger advised if you need an

address because you are putting utilities there it's still your responsibility to pay for the sign. Slycord asked if it's a utility box. Poffenbarger advised the power company has to pay for them and she advised Windstream decided they didn't want to address them when they had to pay for them. Anderson advised the 2nd part of that and wanting the Board to be aware is that in 2008 they were not addressing utility boxes, grain bins and storage buildings like we are now. His point now is that these things are not going to generate even \$1 of surcharge that comes back to the Board, so it's a further drain, so he felt like they need to be aware of that information. Losada advised he understands the need to increase the cost, but is hesitant to jump from \$40 to \$140, as it seems that is a significant jump at one time. If they do it he would rather see them do it as a step program, bring it up a little bit this year and then maybe next year split the difference. He advised going from \$40 to \$140, is almost triple the cost and often causes heartache within the public when they hear about that big of a change. He advised if we need to increase the cost, especially if they are thinking about \$140 range, he would be more likely to vote in favor of it if they did it in a step, split the difference and do it over two years, instead of one. He advised it's going to cost them a little bit of money, but he believes it's better for the public. Fisher stated he can agree with that, but as long as they can get it up to where it cost to put the sign in. Losada just advised he's hesitant to jump that far that fast. Sandholdt asked if there is an option of someone getting their E911 sign and installing it themselves. Anderson advised according to the current addressing ordinance, no. The Board tasked with providing, installing and maintaining them. VanGorkom stated the problem with that is that someone is not going to put it in a spot where first responders can see it. He advised he had a neighbor who moved their sign and put it in front of their mailboxes and it's no longer even in front of his house. Sandholdt stated he understands there has to be some type of requirements, but just because we put it somewhere doesn't mean it's going to stay there. He then advised he agrees with the Chief and he is not in favor of jumping to \$140, he thinks it's a very high number. Slycord asked how the maintenance work...her sign falls off or gets hit, are they assessing for the replacement. Anderson advised there is currently nothing in place from the Board the charges for that. Slycord asked the Board if that helps their decision, stating the Board is currently maintaining them for nothing. Anderson advised they were notified today from county roads of a sign on Dubuque that has been knocked down for the third time this year. Fisher asked why it was knocked down. Anderson advised he's not sure, but they are going to do a little investigating to find out, but frankly if they tell us someone else keeps knocking it down, there's not a lot we can do, but they are going to look at if it's placed properly or if there is anything we are doing to contribute to this. Fisher advised he thinks the 911 addressing should be handled the same way the communities handle it. He stated it's the homeowners responsibility to have the property or the house numbered and in the rural area it would be the responsibility of the property owner to have that 911 sign out there, report it if it's damaged, it's their sign for their relocation that all of the emergency responders need. It should be their responsibility to maintain it and when it needs replaced they would have to foot the bill to have it replaced. He continued by saying if someone runs over it and they know who it is then they can go after their insurance company to get it fixed. Findley stated he lives in Tracy and they have 911 addresses, but they're only 3 digits and so that's a whole other deal, but he still has to go through the county to get his, but if you're in Pella or Knoxville, you just have to have numbers on your house. Poffenbarger advised Hamilton pays Marion County because they want 911 signs, but Columbia, Tracy and the unincorporated towns are addressed and have signs just like anywhere else in Marion County. Poffenbarger advised she believes Hamilton is the only one that pays Marion

County for their signs. Anderson advised Harvey has paid for a few, but it's not near as wide spread as it is in Hamilton. Slycord asked what direction they want to point Anderson in. Thompson and Fisher both stated they need to be increased somehow. Fisher advised he's not going to agree to do it at a step. Losada advised he has no dog in the show being from the City of Knoxville, but he just knows how the public will react when you increase the cost by 300%. Anderson asked Poffenbarger what a building permit cost. She advised it is \$125 for a house and said she would have to agree to do it in increments. Fisher stated if a motion is made they could go ahead and change the sign fee, then they could work on the step grade increase, because this has been hammered to death. Thompson make a motion to increase the sign fee, with a second by Fisher. Anderson asked he is going to ask for more information in that motion. Slycord confirmed they are wanting to do the step. Thompson agreed with that. Slycord advised they will need the motion to be specifically increasing effective this date and how much. Poffenbarger advised July 1 is a good day. Fisher stated they will have to decide what duration they want, 3 steps, 4 steps, etc. Slycord advised she's afraid if they continue to come back to it, that they will just have a lengthy conversation, so if they can make that decision it would be better. Sandholdt stated if you wanted to do it on the step side it could be like \$10 a year or something, but he can't agree with more than \$80 total. VanGorkom advised he does not agree with that at all and stated they should put it at \$80 now. Sandholdt said he doesn't agree with it, but he's only one vote. VanGorkom asked him when they get to the final figure, whether it's 2, 3, or 4 years that he thinks \$140 is to recoup the cost is too much. Sandholdt stated he struggles with the cost of what it cost to do it. If they've been doing it for years at \$40 and now they are going to jump to \$140, they've been able to sustain it for all of those years and weren't going broke. It's not like they are going to be in debt next year if they don't do it. He just doesn't see the need for that much of an increase, it's his opinion and he's just one vote. He thinks there are other places to save. Losada asked how many signs a year they are talking about. Anderson advised they did around 90-100 and are on pace to match that or exceed it. Poffenbarger advised around 63 of those were new homes. Losada stated he is not making a motion, but if it said something to the effect of on July 1st the fee goes up to \$60 and then every year thereafter increases by \$10 until it reaches \$140, would that be along the lines of what you are asking? Anderson confirmed yes. Losada advised he is not going to make the motion as the City of Knoxville is not involved. Sandholdt advised if you raise it from the \$40 to \$140 it's about a \$10,000 a year difference in a \$200,000 a year budget. Slycord asked if \$10 a year is reasonable and acceptable, or \$15. Fisher asked Anderson if that is acceptable. Anderson stated he will do whatever the Board wants to do. Fisher advised they don't want to get upside down or too far out of their budget. Anderson advised there are several thoughts, one the Board is now being tasked with trying to fix something that hasn't been in front of the Board since 2009, so it's our own fault we haven't kept up. Anderson advised he will point out that every year gasoline and other overhead expenses continue to go up, sign costs go up and we haven't kept track with that. If you intention is to cover your cost you have to figure out how to get there and sooner than later. Anderson pointed out that 10 years ago, this Board wasn't concerned about buying a radio system, a lot of things have changed that are driving this. He advised it's partially his fault for letting them get this far in the conversation, but he will step back to this presentation from last month where he showed how many signs they have and get back to the big picture. He advised it's a tremendous liability on the Board when they have 14,000 signs they are responsible for and they have no means of when they got knocked down or stolen, we just fix it and maintain it. He will also point out that 10 years ago the Board was under no obligation to replace

these like they are now. The Board now has a federal mandate that says these signs are in the right of way and you must maintain them in accordance with the MUTCD, that was the game changer when that took effect in 2012 that changed things. Fisher advised going on a premise of raising it \$40 and adding \$10 a year they could look at it in 4 or 5 years, see how they are doing and re-evaluate at that time. Losada asked if that was a motion. Fisher made a motion that they raise it \$40 and then \$10 a year and revisit the cost in 5 years. Losada advised he would 2nd that. Anderson confirmed on July 1, 2018 the cost goes to \$80 and then will have a \$10 increase annually for a 5-year period and then it will be re-evaluated in July 2023. Fisher confirmed. All members in attendance were in favor of the motion, except for Marion County. The motion carried. Slycord advised the next agenda item is a sign installation standard. Anderson advised he does not expect the Board to adopt a standard tonight, but his goal is to get a small committee together that could make a recommendation after talking to first responders, getting their input and then coming back to the Board. VanGorkom asked if the current standard is no good. Anderson advised they do not currently have a standard, so we fall prey to someone wanting it in the flowerbed that's clear behind the right-of-way in their front yard. VanGorkom advised in the development he lives in the posts are put right next to the curb, which shows him on that diagram that it's in a driveway, but if we were to adopt this standard it would be put back in the right-of-way. What will that do with places that have sidewalks? He advised he's not sure they can use one blueprint to take care of every situation in the county. Anderson advised he's right. He stated this diagram is more of a gravel road or county pavement and their neighborhood has more of a feel of being in town, with sidewalks. VanGorkom advised there are several of those, Knoxville Estates, where are their signs? Poffenbarger advised they are with their mailbox. VanGorkom stated theirs are out by the mailbox too, but going down a gravel road you may or may not want it by the mailbox. He advised there are a lot of variations that come about with sign placement. Sandholdt stated there is merit to what they are trying to do, they've all been there when it's stuck on a telephone pole or somewhere we can't see it. He agreed with VanGorkom that it's hard, as some right-of-ways are a lot smaller than other right-of-ways and you're driving and you've passed it and you don't see it because it's clear back down the right-of-way where it would have been better down by the mailbox. VanGorkom asked Sandholdt does it make sense to just say where the mailbox is that's where the sign has to be. Anderson advised you may end up with mailboxes on the other side of the road. Slycord advised this is why Anderson would like a committee for this. Poffenbarger advised there are 40 and 120 foot right-of-ways. Sandholdt stated that's a big difference when you are looking for that sign. Anderson stated the speed limit on the road plays a big part in how hard they are to see and how easy they are to get knocked down. Sandholdt asked if there is a way to address the ones that are a problem without readdressing the ones that aren't. Anderson stated he wanted to be clear that if they adopt a standard he has no intention to pull every sign out of the ground that doesn't comply with that and fix them. It would be as they need repaired or new ones. Sandholdt stated there is one by Bussey on a telephone pole, they went on a call and couldn't find it and he advised them they needed to move their 911 sign to where it is visible. Sandholdt asked if they have the authority to do that. Poffenbarger advised if we don't have a standard then we don't. Anderson advised that is where he is trying to get to. Poffenbarger stated we have a right to tell them to move it if we have a standard that's in place. Sandholdt stated he doesn't know if it will cause more problems by having a standard then what you would have by not. Anderson advised it will reduce his problems. VanGorkom stated that Poffenbarger is trying to say if we don't have a standard we can't make them move them. Poffenbarger stated it's hard to tell them to

move it if we don't have a standard. VanGorkom stated we can tell them, but whether or not they pay any attention. Poffenbarger advised maybe from a safety standpoint they may have more of a right. VanGorkom stated there's no teeth in it. Sandholdt stated it's in how you ask them, if you say "I'm the Sheriff and I want you to move your damn sign" they may not do it, but if you say, "Hey listen in an emergency we really want to get here as fast as we can get here, would you do me a favor and move it out" and that was how he asked them. Sandholdt stated if you adopted this right now that difference between 40 versus 120 even though you have a standard is it going to cause problems, depending on if you're 40 foot off the road or the right-of-way, you can see it, but when it's 140 you're struggling at times depending on that lane. Anderson stated he totally agrees. VanGorkom stated then maybe it's from the side of the road that you have a standard. Slycord and a few others stated that is why they need a committee. Anderson stated he doesn't think you're going to have one picture or one diagram that fits everything, we have too many nuances. Slycord asked if there was anyone who wanted to be on the committee or if the Board want Anderson and Slycord to be on the committee and bring items back. Other advised to do that. Slycord stated next on the agenda is signs for cities and others. Anderson advised we have received an official request from Warren County to produce some signs for them. As talked about at the last meeting it was not Anderson's intention to end up in a discussion to readdress the entire county, but as Board members pointed out, if we start down the road of replacing our signs now that we are responsible for them and we get half way through and figure out we need to readdress all of that money is essentially wasted, so that's how we came back to readdressing. Losada confirmed they are discussing signs for other cities. Anderson confirmed they are, but that plays a part in the entire big picture. He advised it was hard to put as a bullet point on an agenda, because it's part of it, but his point is whatever they decide to do with a sign replacement schedule is going to drive the amount of free time we have for our sign technician. Anderson concern is they have to have enough sign productivity where we keep our sign technician busy so that when he's still around on years where we have a higher sign volume that need replace. Anderson advised what he is getting at is if the Board chose to do a 15-year sign replacement on the address markers and you readdress the entire county next year through 2020, those signs wouldn't be due until 2034-2035. It would be a lot of work over the next two years, but then not much as far as address markers, or volume, over the next 15 years. On the street names signs he would recommend a 12-year replacement because they are the ones that take more abuse, very few of those are in the shade so they will fade quicker. Most of them have been replaced between 2010 and this year, so there are very few of those that need done. If you chose that 12-year they wouldn't need done again until 2020-2032. He advised he is getting at that there is gaps in staff time, Randy's time, with whatever the Board chooses for him to make signs for others, so that we can keep him busy. There is time in there for him to make signs for our cities, if they choose to purchase them from us, so that we can keep him busy. Anderson advised his fear is that if we get to a year where we are only going to do 200 signs we are going to have trouble keeping him or anybody with any kind of quality, because they aren't getting any work. Sandholdt asked if that is a bad thing. He stated he thinks we are going about this the wrong way and the way Anderson explained it we are trying to justify keeping a person because our signs are lasting. To him that is totally backward, whether it's county government, state government or federal government that you justify trying to keep a person when there's not enough work to keep them. Sandholdt stated that totally does not make sense to him. Anderson stated he understands that and he agrees with that, but the Board is required to establish a replacement schedule. Sandholdt asked if the schedule can't be as they wear

out or as they are needed. You have to say that you're going to replace this signs that really still good two years from now. Anderson stated here are your management methods available to you, based on expected sign life, based on blanket replacement or you use control signs. Due to the expenses involved in using control signs or using the electronic retro-reflectometer and having to check every sign every year, he doesn't want to put words into the Boards mouth, but he felt like doing a blanket replacement based on the warranty on the sign paper was the best way to move forward. Sandholdt advised he's not for a blanket replacement. Sandholdt stated Anderson just showed they've gradually been replaced over the years from 2010 to 2018, so blanket to him means a sign that was just put out in 2017 would be replaced. Anderson and Slycord stated not necessarily. Sandholdt asked them to explain and show him what he is missing on that blanket. Anderson advised we currently don't have a management method and the Board is required to come up with a management method and adopt that. Sandholdt asked if we know when the signs were installed. Anderson advised some of them. Sandholdt stated the ones we know when they were installed, he would hope there is an idea of that, then they would know the 12-15 year replacement side of that and you could replace those signs at that time, but you're not going to replace all of those signs in one year. Anderson stated this is where things get complicated and where we ended up in the conversation about totally readdressing the county. We have 14,000 plus address markers. If this Board decides that we need to readdress the entire county because of the issues we are having then to him it makes sense, if you make that decision now, you are going to replace all 14,000 of those signs over the next two years when you readdress. The period for replacement on all 14,000 signs starts over at the same time, so you have to schedule this out. Anderson asks if he makes sense. VanGorkom confirmed they need to replace 14,000 signs in two years. Anderson advised he's not saying they have to, he is saying if the Board chooses to readdress the county that's what is going to happen. That is the net result, all 14,000 will get replaced over a two year period. Your replacement schedule starts a new. VanGorkom asked if that means you're talking a 12 year life then we are doing all of them then 12 years down the road we would be replacing all of them again, regardless if they are good or bad. Anderson advised that is what the Board needs to decide, what is going to be their adopted schedule for replacement. VanGorkom asked if they have to put a year on it, it can't just be as needed. Anderson advised no, because that is essentially taking the other method of buying the very expensive meter and checking every sign. VanGorkom confirmed all of this is now coming down from the government. Anderson advised it actually took effect in 2012. Sandholdt asked if in the last six years if we have been audited on this, who is the enforcement powers on this saying this has to be done. Anderson advised the Iowa DOT adopts the manual on uniform traffic control devices. Sandholdt stated not that he wants to be out of compliance, but he assumes that Marion County is ahead of a lot of other counties that he has seen. Sandholdt advised he is adamantly against readdressing. Anderson advised it was not his intention to get back to having that discussion, but when the Board at the last meeting looked at all of this data, if they choose a 15 year life for these signs and we get half way through and decide to readdress everything done in the last 7 years is for nothing. Anderson advised the second part of this since the last meeting is that Missy has had two requests for addresses come in, one on Idaho Drive, which is a new buyer and they wish to subdivide it and want three more addresses. Anderson advised we only have two. Anderson advised the other example is the DeMoss subdivision on 118th just northwest of Knoxville. They have three new lots, with the fourth lot having the existing house. Poffenbargers understanding is that at least two homes are going in. Poffenbarger advised if three homes went in right away then there

would be a need to fix at least 5 to 6 other addresses in order just to make it work. Sandholdt asked if the far north lot was selling. Poffenbarger advised she believes lot one is going to be sold for a house, which is up against Black's, it's the north lot. Sandholdt confirmed Lisbon or 118th. Poffenbarger advised 118th goes around the corner, it's west of the VA. Anderson advised it would be Everly's shop. Sandholdt asked which lot Dr. DeMoss's house is. Poffenbarger advised it's lot four. He asked what his house number is on the east side of the road. Anderson confirmed it's 1350. Poffenbarger stated what he has found out is that 1344 has already been assigned to one of the storage units, so it's out of the equation. She advised that is part of the problem that over the years addresses have been assigned that weren't tracked as well as they should have been, so we have 1346 and 1348 left. DeMoss is 1350, 1352, 1354, 1356 and 1358 have all been used. Sandholdt asked how much it jumps to the north. Poffenbarger stated there is nothing when you go around the corner to the northwest, she advised it was a mess because there was odd and even addresses, but there are no open addresses. We would have to readdress five homes one way or the other. Sandholdt stated so we could changed theirs versus 33,000 people. He then stated the example given on Idaho, he'd just call it Doug VanGorkom Court. Anderson advised you can't do that though. Sandholdt asked why you can't have something come off of Idaho. Poffenbarger advised the current home would have to be readdressed. Sandholdt stated how they are developing that he assumes when you get to the third one down on the bottom right there's going to be a lane that comes in on off of that or how is he going to get back to Idaho Driver. Poffenbarger stated no and that she hasn't seen the actual division, so she can't tell them that she knows the division, but she thought all of them were going to have road access. Sandholdt asked if it would be a cul-de-sac off of Idaho. Poffenbarger advised she didn't believe so. Sandholdt asked if they could be required to be a cul-de-sac. Poffenbarger advised it's under Pella's jurisdiction, so she doesn't know what they will require. VanGorkom stated the sad thing about this whole thing is whether it's county or state-wide there are more and more people moving out to the suburbs, so this is going to be an issue. To say he's totally in favor or re-addressing, no he's not saying that, but this is going to be an issue that they're going to have to deal with. VanGorkom continued by saying it's going to continue to increase, like that other one that you were talking about west of Knoxville. You're going to readdress, well if Joe Blow down the road decides to sell of his section then you're going to go back to that same group of people and say now you're going to readdress again. Sandholdt stated he understands that, but all the addresses, he shouldn't say 33,000 because we only have 14,134 911 addresses that would have to be changed on that, he's adamantly against changing them. VanGorkom asked for what reason. Sandholdt stated he doesn't see the reason. He said you can easily on this one call it whatever Court, or however it is, and those 5 or 6 homes that are at that whatever you name it road, but in order to change 14,000 peoples mailing addresses, to change their banking information and do everything that has to go along with that, he stated there is no way he's for that. VanGorkom asked is if somebody, and this is probably in the city limits, but regardless, if Weiler's putting that new subdivision by Bos Landon, calling it Bos Ridge, how is that going to be done. Poffenbarger advised it's city. Sandholdt stated just to stay that's out in the county you would have to come up with a new address and name, or however it is, for that development going in there, and however it's going to be divided and zoned out to whatever it is, and call it a different name. You couldn't call it T15. VanGorkom stated he understands that, but thinks the problem is that we are talking about Marion County, and starting at the north side of the county, all of the east/west roads are named, so we start out with a, b, c, d or whatever they are, what he always found to be crazy was

that it kind of took a turn because in his area there are no names. The roads are 187th place, 186th place, etc. Poffenbarger advised there wasn't a lot of consistency in subdivisions. She advised there are subdivisions north of Knoxville that have three digit addresses. VanGorkom stated what he is saying and he doesn't disagree that it's going to be a lot to do and everyone is going to have to change, but there has got to be some type of a method. Sandholdt asked Dakota versus Dubuque, there are still extra c's or d's and if you ran out of c or d words you would have an issue, he thinks you could come up with enough different words, it doesn't have to be that we skip d and go to f and not have an e. VanGorkom stated if we turn it the other direction and go north/south those are numbered starting west going bigger going east. Sandholdt asked on what increment. Poffenbarger advised the numbers are from Jasper County and go to Lucas County and the letters from Warren County to Mahaska County. VanGorkom stated Mahaska switched them around. Poffenbarger stated we aren't running in to issues if we can create a new road, like Sandholdt is talking about, it's when they all have county road access that we're getting in to an issue. If they are splitting and putting in a new road it won't be an issue because we can give them a new name. Anderson stated that's correct, if they're subdivision plan calls for a public road, that's not an issue for us. Sandholdt states then they're going to have to come up with a new solution to put a cul-de-sac. Poffenbarger stated the one west of Knoxville, there is no way to put a road in all of those lots. Sandholdt stated that's why he was asking what's the farthest north and farthest south number and it goes from 1350 to 1354 and there is no way to put those, if you divide that out with that distance, just like you do with any other road, from his to his neighbors it doesn't go from his out at 1033 to his neighbors at 1035 that are a mile apart. When John McCoy asked him on his house John told him he has to choose from 1027 to 1035, was the number he could pick from. He went with 1033, meaning between him and his neighbor there are still plenty of places and numbers that are open. Poffenbarger stated the problem is that they didn't use a consistent method back then and that's where the issue came from. Anderson advised when 911 data was switched to GIS driven, we took in excess to 300 exceptions to the NENA standards, Poffenbarger's example in the DeMoss subdivision where we have an odd and an even on the same side of the road that is an exception to the standard. Poffenbarger advised sometimes what happens is there is an east/west road that takes a north/south turn. Sandholdt confirmed 2116 is the house below and 2138 is the high, he asks why they jump. Poffenbarger advised in order to fix this one you could change the existing house. Sandholdt states easily and you aren't affecting 14,000 other addresses. Sandholdt states 16 is down below and 38 is above, so if you went by 2's for the even side of it, you have 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, so you have 10 different residences that could fit between 2138 and 2116, so there is no issue. Sandholdt stated he was sorry, but he's frustrated that we just keep coming back to these conversations and he doesn't understand why this can't be accomplished. Anderson stated he's not saying it can't, but asked how many times are we going to do this, because he's willing to go in conversation with this, we apply that as a fix and then someone else subdivides, so we rearrange the addresses in this area. Sandholdt states there are zoning requirements so they can't put so many on top of each other, they aren't going to build five more houses on top of it down at 2116. Anderson stated not right here. Fisher states he can't see the county putting a limit on what they can build out in the rural area for taxable valuation. Poffenbarger advised they do have a limit and they have a lot with minimum size, so there is going to be a number at some point in a major subdivision and they'll have to put a road in. Fisher stated they can subdivide to the those dimensions. Sandholdt states if it fits, but if it doesn't meet those standards, they can't do it. Fisher states he understands that. Anderson advised his

point is when the next request for a subdivision comes in then you're potentially changing the addresses again. Sanholdt stated then we'd talk about it again. Anderson states meanwhile we would be creating more exceptions to the NENA addressing standards by doing that. Fisher stated he might be looking at this wrong, but the counties around us have had this same conversation and they have gone from four number to five numbers. If it were fixable they would not have gone to five numbers. He stated we are trying to re-invent the wheel and trying to do something that everybody else has failed to get done. He doesn't want to sit on this Board and spend a lot of money to redo the four numbers that have to be done and then in five or six years we throw all that money away and go to five numbers. Sandholdt stated we'd already be doing that now, you'd be spending/wasting that money on something's that not needed. He stated if you change it to five numbers you're going to be wasting that money right now on something that's not needed. Fisher asked how it's wasted. Sandholdt stated because it's not needed. Fishers states Sandholdt saying it's not needed, but the people here told us it needs passed, they have a hard time getting the situation fixed when somebody wants to build. Sandholdt states there's a prime example that was just given in tonight's meeting. He states did I fix it in two minutes. Fisher states he doesn't know if it's fixed or not. Sandholdt states that's the example that was just given, did you understand the 16 to the 32, the way he just described it with 10 houses coming between there. He asks is that fixed. Fisher states it could possibly be. Sandholdt replies with thank you. Fisher states at that location. Sandholdt states ok, so that's an example that was given of a problem, that's his frustration on it. He states the Board can vote however they want, he just hopes that when all the public, the 16,000 people, realize the expense they were there, he's going to be a no vote saying there was no way he thought this was needed at the time. Sandholdt continued by saying he hopes the Board can justify to the public in saying yep we did it because these examples of whatever it is and if that's way you want to vote on it and that's the way you want to do it, fine, he doesn't see the need. When you talk about the other surrounding counties, he thinks a lot of them did it when the whole rural route and addressing started, didn't a lot of them go to five to begin with. Anderson advised some of them did. Sandholdt was thinking a lot of them started out that way, so they were already ahead of the game when it went from rural route addresses to everything else that was there. He stated so far in however many years we've discussed this and this is where we talk about the what if's or what happens, we've discussed this for how many years, three. Tell him in those three years the number of times it's been an issue they couldn't come up with a solution of whatever it was, so far we have this example and he thinks that solution he gave where the ten homes in between there would work. The other example he doesn't have the numbers to look at that, but as not as big of a problem as it's being made to be. He continues by stating could he be wrong five years from now or ten years, or two years, he doesn't know, maybe there is a place that he is completely wrong and somebody could say that, but in the three years we've discussed this he hasn't seen enough need and a problem to deal with 14,000 addresses and to change 14,000 addresses at post offices and banking accounts and everything else that goes along with it. He advised that's the last thing he will say on it and if people want to vote differently, they can vote differently. Losada advised the Mayor has directed him that countywide going to five digits is something he will not support and the City of Knoxville will vote against it. He stated he has the same feelings as the Sheriff and it causes too many problems for too many people to justify it at this time. Findley asked if the signs out there or how many will need replaced in the next five years. Anderson advised we are currently only replacing them if they are completely illegible or reported as being illegible until this is all figured out. Anderson stated he can't answer that with

certainty because we don't know. Anderson advised he's just looking for direction. Sandholdt made a motion that the addressing stay the same as it is right now, with four digits, and we work towards solutions with those issues until we cannot come up with a solution, we keep it the way it is. Losada seconded the motion. Roll call was done with City of Knoxville, Marion County and Clay Township voting for the motion and City of Melcher, City of Pella, Knoxville Township, Lake Prairie Township and Indiana Township all voting against the motion. *In the meeting it was stated there were four yes and four no votes meaning the motion and second were null and void, but this was incorrect. There were five against and three for it meaning the motion did not pass.* Poffenbarger asks if they need direction from the Board on the DeMoss subdivision stating they would change six addresses one way or another, do we hope they don't sell all three lots at once, what's the direction they want to go with this. Anderson advised he should have pointed this out earlier, but he and Poffenbarger are lucky right now as none of these folks have officially requested these addresses because once they officially request them we have seven days per the county ordinance to produce a viable address. Losada stated numbering off all of these three lots is the only thing that makes sense. Sandholdt agreed. Poffenbarger advised if you go towards the track you have 1316, 1331, 1335, 1340, 1342 and 1344, why we have to odd numbers on the north side of the road she is unsure. Poffenbarger advised going the other direction we have 1350, 1352, 1354, 1356 and 1358 and asked do we go to the north and make those people that are already screwed up fix theirs? Losada stated this would be a great opportunity to correct the ones that are out of compliance to compliance, if the odd ones are on the even side of the road. Anderson advised they'll have to look and see if it was done out of necessity or done as a mistake and he can't answer that right now. Losada advised it makes sense if we are addressing this issue in that area at this time we need to correct the mistake if we can. Sandholdt stated he agrees with the Chief and he's guessing that part of it is the north side of the road is normally odd. Poffenbarger believes it may have been a mistake, but agreed it looks like they switched sides. Sandholdt stated the road comes around when they did it they probably just went with what they normally did on the east/west thinking it had to be odd versus north/south where it's even and odd on the different side. Poffenbarger stated the two that are odd are on the north side, it's not a necessity though and she's not sure why. Sandholdt asked if the road name changed, Poffenbarger advised it does not. Sandholdt believes they were in the mindset of when they were putting them in they were on the north side of the road so they had to be odd numbers and they should have been even numbers. He asked if there is enough even numbers if you went on the east side of the road. Poffenbarger advised 1316 won't have to, it would be 1331, 1335, 1340, 1342 and 1344. Sandholdt asked if there are enough numbers if you add those in there in between it, so like the Chief said you'd have to switch a few to stay they were supposed to be on the east side of the road. Poffenbarger advised we'd be switching five if we went this way and six if we went the other way. Poffenbarger asked the BOS will probably ask this question at the meeting when they approve the subdivisions. One of the things on the checklist for subdivision approval is addresses. Findley asked if they are a subdivision if they get their own road name. Poffenbarger advised this is a minor subdivision verses a major, in a major subdivision they're creating roads and cul-de-sacs and they have their own road names. A minor subdivision they all have direct road access to a public road, so this is a minor. Slycord asked if there is anything else. Slycord then advised the next topic is work behind the right-of-way. Anderson advised he would like permission from the Board to consult with the county attorney and the county engineer, as they currently have policies and processes in place for when work is done behind the right-of-way. Anderson thinks it would make sense for

us to become familiar with what those policies and processes are and if it works for us adopt something consistent to what they are doing. Losada advised that should go with sign installation standard, those two have to go hand and hand. He stated we aren't going to set a standard the county attorney won't support. He would roll that in to sign installation standards and part of that discussion would be consulting with the attorney's office to make sure what is legal and what we can and can't do. Anderson one item that remains that he would like direction on is the request for Warren County to make signs for them. It was asked how many signs Anderson was talking about. Anderson advised eight and he wanted to give it a try to see if it works for both counties. Sandholdt asked what the cost was. Anderson advised his recommendation was to take the schedule they came up with, which would be cost plus 5%. Bokinsky asked if cost includes labor. Anderson advised yes, it would be material and labor plus 5%, so he would need to establish what our labor cost for each of these different sizes is and that is going to change every year, so it will need to be a living document. He believes an additional 5% is warranted because they have made the investment in everything to be in this position and he feels it's only fair they pay something towards that investments as far as a buy in. Losada asks what the cost would be for similar signs would be if they bought them from the state. Anderson advised a 10x30 inch sign vendor costs are \$22.15, out materials costs is \$9.72, so what he is saying is \$9.72 plus labor, plus 5%. It would probably get you fairly close to that \$22.15. Anderson advised they are using a different vendor and they are currently paying more than \$22.15. Sandholdt asked if we really want to get in to business. Losada stated he doesn't think we do. Anderson advised he is fine with that, but what about for our own cities, because we've had the request. Sandholdt stated that for our own cities is a different thing. Losada asked if they are asking for street signs. Anderson confirmed street names signs. Sandholdt stated if Attica needs signs and we have the equipment to him that's a lot different then Warren County, if we're doing it for a different county, or Tracy, he thinks we should try to help out those smaller towns along those lines. Slycord asked if Anderson wants a motion and second. Anderson confirmed yes with the specifics of what are we doing, maybe you want cost plus 7%. Poffenbarger stated they were charged the regular \$40 for resident signs. Anderson advised as a rule, we have not made any street name signs for any of our cities that he is aware of. Sandholdt makes a motion that our cost plus 5% is what we would charge for the cities to make their signs, but not make them for other counties. Sandholdt stated if that is reasonable, maybe it should be higher than that, for smaller towns its hard enough for budgets so he thinks 5% is a reasonable amount. Losada stated especially if this puts us in the same ballpark of what a vendor would be, it will save them some, but not so much that they are going to want to create street names for every 20 feet down the street. Poffenbarger stated we may have possibly done street names when we did Hamilton, but she can't remember. Losada seconds the motion. Findley asked what's the reasons for not going the other direction, do we have the time. Losada stated that's the \$64 question. If we start doing it is it going to become a full-time job and that's his hesitation. Sandholdt states the hourly cost for a sign person, the expense that goes along with it and everything else, do we end up paying more to do something for another county, that the county we make the sign for x amount of dollars and then they charge \$40 or \$60. He thinks we keep it. VanGorkom wants to be clear so we provide them for communities within our county, we build that sign for 5% over cost, but we do not install it. It was advised that was correct. Losada advised his concern is that if we did it for other counties pricing becomes competitive and it becomes a full-time position. We don't want to compete and go in to the sign making business. Anderson advised to be clear his agreement with Warren County was going to be anything they want done is based on our

work load to not exceed the 25 hours a week budgeted for. Losada states his concern is that if people hear we do it for them, other counties will come to us. Poffenbager wanted clarified that for Hamilton we put the signs up for them, so will it be the same fee. Anderson advised we are talking street name signs, so there is no exception to the rule. Roll call was done for the motion and all were in favor.

6. *RFP Work Session:* Slycord advised next on the agenda is an RFP work session. She advised at the last couple of meetings they have discussed bringing forward an RFP for a consultant to analyze what they need for radio communications in Marion County. She, Anderson and Chief Bokinsky worked on a proposal and they have a rough draft to review. Bokinsky stated this is not in its final form and it's not complete, but it gives them enough where they can get some decisions made and finish this off and have it makes sense. He advised they can go through the document and it will make sense to do that. He advised he has highlighted with a different colored font some of the decisions they really need to make countywide. One that he thinks they can do this last is the proposal due date, we have to no idea what that's going to be until we publish the request for proposal. He advised it says the Marion County 911 Service Board invites the submission for proposals for the now existing public safety radio communications systems and the creation of an implementation plan. He advised the first decision will be 700/800 mhz or P25 communications interoperability among all Marion County public safety agencies. Bokinsky stated he was glad the Sheriff was at the meeting because this is a pretty important point that everyone needs to weigh in on and he doesn't want to speak as an authority on the Sheriff's PSAP or their system, so the Sheriff will have to speak up on that. He advised the Sheriff's Office has moved in a direction and the Pella PSAP has moved in a direction and will operate off of a 700/800 mhz digital platform as far as their communications. It will be in line with the P25 standard, it's going to be in line with the state system and the SARA network. Bokinsky advised the State of Iowa has determined this is the platform for interoperability, so as we do this with a consultant they are going to look at what's the landscape in Marion County and how do we make this happen. If we decide this is where we want to go, this is what we put in to the RFP, but understand that means the consultant is going to tell us this is what it's going to be and how are you going to get there, so it will turn in to Melcher, how are you going to get on the 700/800 mhz system and same thing with Indiana, Clay, etc. He advised if that's what you want to do fine, but this is one of the issues that he is hoping to address with the consultant, what is your pathway of getting there. The State has pretty much established, and every state does this, but they aren't all the same, every state declares this will be our interoperability frequency or network, we are operating off of this platform, Iowa we're looking at this 700/800 mhz system, so you would think everybody should be on that same system, but it's not going to be cheap. How do you get there, what is your timeline going to be, what's it's going to cost you, where are you going to get the money. He advised you can pare it back, some counties are doing that, and say there is no way this is going to happen, we want to step back from that, but that is something that has to be decided. What are we asking these guys to do for us. Bokinsky advised the Sheriff's Office is already committed. They are already on the 700/800 mhz system and Pella is moving towards it for the Police Department and as we go the rest of the city goes, the Fire Department and we'll bring Pella Community Ambulance along as well. Bokinsky stated he doesn't know how the rest of them see this. This might be something you want to chew on for a while and think about. What the consultant will do is they will tell you what you need to do. It may just be portable radios and tying in to the system. They'll tell you what it takes to do that. There's going to be other issues that

come up that the consultant will help you decide those things. He advised the group everywhere they see blue ink is a decision point. They are looking for a long-range plan to enhance, replace and simultaneously modernize certain existing communication systems and with that we need components of the system as well. As we move toward an interoperable P25 system on the 700/800 mhz platform the final consultant report will describe a communication system or systems among law enforcement, fire, public works, if we want to include, them and emergency medical services throughout Marion County. Emergency responder communications is a vital component of our public safety effort and therefore must be an efficient reliable and expandable. He advised this is basically a purpose statement from us saying, this is big deal to us. If you've ever been the person who is fighting a fire, yelling for someone to support you in an area, or someone's getting shot at and nobody is on the other side of the radio, you'll figure out real quick just how important this is. The goal of the Board is to develop a phased and there is no decision point to that paragraph. Bokinsky advised they are looking for identification of weaknesses within the existing systems that could be old, outdated infrastructure, so they are looking for a complete analysis. He advised they have a sixty foot tower behind their station, that they got from the hospital when they updated and that is their communications link to the 160 foot water tower in town. He doesn't believe this is the way to go for them, so they will probably update that and they may abandon that tower for that purpose, but for right now their page goes from there to the north water tower, so it may continue to be that way. Bokinsky advised they may need to clean up some of the infrastructure on that tower as they already know the cable is really old. He advised the Board they may face those same challenges in their communities. The report shall also describe additional infrastructure and supplemental components necessary to achieve described performance goals for base, mobile and portable radio communications. He advised what they are talking about there is the State system is a mobile radio system, mobile radio being in your vehicle. He advised it may work very well for your portable radio, and it's going to be an enhancement over what you've been using, is it performing at the level you want it to. That's going to be a decision where you have to decide what level of reliability do you want it to perform at, and if it's already there you're golden, if it's not what does it take to get it there, do you need a repeater or a tower. He continued by saying then you have to decide that's too expensive, it's not really worth it, or do you go to a vehicle repeater, there's a lot of work around and the consultant can help you get to where you want to be and how do you get there. The selected consultant will contract with the Marion County 911 Service Board. He advised he believes that is appropriate in this circumstance since we are the ones who voted for that and we are the ones who are going to pay the bill. Bokinsky advised this is a letter of introduction, almost like an executive summary, this is what we are looking for, then you get in to the actual RFP. He stated if there is anyone that wants a copy to let him know. He will email it and before anything goes out they will have the opportunity to review the complete RFP. He wants to make sure it does what everyone wants it to do. Bokinsky advised the key in the introduction is the request for them to review the existing public safety radio systems, to include infrastructure within the county, to conduct a performance analysis of the existing systems, asking where are you right now with your connectivity and reliability of your system, to develop recommendations for the design, modification and enhancement of existing systems to meet identified performance objectives. The goal of this project is to have reliable radio coverage throughout Marion County and joining areas where Marion County Emergency Response agencies provide coverage or provide mutual aid. He advised this is important. Pella Community Ambulance and Pella Rural Fire cover a good portion of Mahaska

County. Pella Fire has the fire district and Pella Community Ambulance as well, it's almost 1/8 of Mahaska Country that they go in to, so whatever system we have does it reach to those outer limits and we need it to pair up with what Mahaska County is doing. He advised this is outside of his paygrade, he knows they need connectivity and interoperability, they'll tell us how it works. If we perform in those areas, we need to know that. Not only that, but Pella Community Ambulance runs down to Bussey under a 28E contract and they intrude in to Mahaska County almost an equal area of real estate that Pella Rural Fire has and they share on the north side. That is a good chunk of Mahaska County so we have to make sure we can reach those area. Sandholdt advised along with that you have Columbia, Melcher and Pleasantville. Pleasantville goes over in to Warren County and Runnells, Columbia goes down in to Lucas County. Sandholdt asks Bokinsky to look at his Appendix A. Bokinsky advised he does not have it yet and Sandholdt has touched right on what he wants to get to when they get to Appendix A. He advised he doesn't know what that looks like so everybody is going to have to help there. Sanholdt advised they would have to give how far in to a county they go, asking Fisher how far they go or if they go in to Warren County. Fisher advised just for mutual aid, but we would need communication when they go there. They go in to Warren County about a mile. Sandholt asked if they go in to Lucas County. Fisher stated not often, but occasionally. Bokinsky asked who covers norther Lucas. Fisher advised Chariton and Williamson, who have a fire department first responder, but they don't have a transport team. Bokinsky asked if we have fire district or response district maps that already exist. It was advised we do. Bokinsky advised you can see the chunk, down in the lower right, the Bussey district, which is Bussey Fire and Pella Community Ambulance. He advised he may have written it in, but just talking about mutual aid considerations we have to be able to pair, talking with Greg earlier he also has tiering issues with Sully and New Sharon, so that will extend it even more. Bokinsky advised that's the beauty of interoperability, those things are supposed to be taken care of, but as a primary communication center we have to make sure when you are the primary responder in to those areas, like Pleasantville, Bussey and Pella, we have to make sure our communications can go to that. He continued by asking about Jasper, which shows Runnells, Prairie City and Monroe. VanGorkom advised they go to Highway 14. Bokinsky asked if Jasper County receives 911 money from Marion County since we are getting 911 calls from this area. Anderson believes they are receiving those funds and recently was informed we are required to have a legal exemption from the State, which we do not have. Anderson advised we are the only Board in Iowa that has a service area that is different from geographic county boundary. He advised Blake stated you don't want to be here and he doesn't want to give the Board a waiver, so Anderson advised it needs fixed. He advised the reason those surcharge dollars were diverted to Jasper years ago apparently has no merit and was based on a whim of the then 911 program director. Blake can find no documentation and no waiver. Per code Barb should have issued us a waiver at that time, Anderson advised her rational was that it was part of the Neal Smith Refuge tax district and she exercised some wiggle room and allowed that to be applied and that is why we ended up with what we got. Anderson advised Blake wants us to get it fixed, get those surcharge dollars coming back to Marion County and have a written plan that says the service area of this Board is the geographic boundary of the county. No waiver would be necessary, which is why going back to Bokinsky's email on the typo, it's null and void anyway because we don't have a waiver. Bokinsky advised we'll probably copy that and it will be our Appendix A. If there is anything outside of this, he was under the impression that Knoxville Fire/EMS responded to Warren County. Higginbotham advised it would only be under mutual aid. Anderson advised there are a

few minor corrections that need to be made. Sandholdt asked if Columbia goes further down. Anderson advised there is one section that is Indiana Township that needs split north and south along G76. Knoxville Fire provides EMS here and Columbia Fire provides EMS in the south. Dykstra asked if Knoxville City is shown to provide EMS service for the City of Harvey. Anderson advised yes. Anderson stated to Chief's point, with a minor correction or two, this gets us very close to a map that is very useable in what they are asking for. Bokinsky advised we want an accurate map and the important thing for this Appendix will be the tentacles that reach outside the county. It is a county system that we extend beyond the county as primary responders. He advised they all need to take a look at this and tell him if he has the right agencies, if he's missing somebody or somebody has been merged and work off the same system. He advised what they are looking for as far as differences is radio and paging. Sandholdt advised it looks like has all of them that he can think of off the top of his head. Bokinsky asked if MCSO does Corp communications or if they do their own. Sandholdt advised they do Corp communications as well. Bokinsky asked if they have a dedicated channel. Sandholdt advised they use theirs, but the problem they are going to run in to with that is their district goes clear in to Des Moines. So the Des Moines River, before it's never been that great, they lose radio communications once they go that way, like the Hartford boat ramp and the Corp ground. He advised we would have to get the map from them that shows their area. Bokinsky confirmed Hartford is outside of Marion County. Sandholdt confirmed it is in Warren County, it skips to the levy's up in Des Moines, which are actually the Corps responsibility. He advised he doesn't know if those needed added on, that's more the fundamental side of it. Bokinsky stated he thinks it could go on the Appendix A. He advised through ISICs it should be a seamless transition, asking if they were 700/800 right now. Sandholdt advised they are moving right along with them and pushing forward with the equipment side of it, they've already bought all the mobiles and handhelds. Bokinsky stated the next section may not be needed or, the consultant can step in and figure it out themselves, but currently the Pella PSAP maintains radio communications on the following channels. He advised he's more concerned about their primary dispatch and call taking responsibilities. He advised they handle these, but he also included and he'll probably break it out, who do we monitor but still have the capability of communicating with. Pella PD repeater, fire/ems which is county wide, the paging system which is also the fire channel, Pella Fire, Pella Fire Ground, LEA, some of these are legacy systems that are going to go away, but they are active right now. It goes right down to VLaw and Micron. Bokinsky advised they use the Zetron Max Solution console, one tower sight for the system, where it sits, how far and showed what their connectivity is. He advised he did not put Marion County Sherriff's Office in there, but they have a Zetron console and wireless access. Sandholdt advised they would want to put in there that they still use the corp tower for all of their fire and different things until someone is to decide if they want to stay P25 digital or want to switch, along with the tower at the office. He advised they would also need to put in the public safety side of things they still utilize. Bokinsky advised they have the state tower, the legacy tower hits the corp tower. Sandholdt advised the corp, MCSO, county conservation and Pleasantville PD have all made the transition to the 700 state tower, all others are being kept up and running for those that want to stay on that. Sooner or later there will be a push for people to move, but they want that to be their decision when they do it so we are keeping the other stuff up and running. Bokinsky this is a verbal description of jurisdictions and it's not all together in order, the section he is showing describes the Pella situation with the response districts. He advised they will probably need something similar to this and he included it as just a representation. He advised he

started to put something as an example of Mahaska County for mutual aid as we do go in to that county and sometimes are the first responders if there is an accident on Hwy 163. They are looking at other outlying agencies, unless they don't need that data and they can put that on the consultant as well to figure out. He stopped with the scope of work and this is where we tell them what we want them to, the nuts and bolts. He advised to get a lay of the land to evaluate all of the systems currently out there. It will be easy to look at the PSAP's and see what they have, but then they will start looking at the other areas, for example Melcher and what they have. This will be for every community. Sandholdt advised the only problem with that is, depending when this goes out, the state system won't be up and operating until August, so that consultant won't know that full capability in those areas until after August, or first part of September, to know those Lucas County towers, the Warran County site, all those different areas, so how will they do a fair analysis without it being a system that is developed. Bokinsky stated he's going to introduce a timeline for it and that will be considered. He advised just looking at other model RFP's from around the state, how long did it take for them to get through each phase, in having spoken with Chris Maiers, the statewide interoperability coordinator, Tom Lampe representing DPS, they are the driving force behind all of this and they are winding down on this. One of the key sites is Albia. Bokinsky advised we should be within the scope of that. VanGorkom confronted Sandholdt stating that things are dragging and in a previous meeting Sandholdt said they could do this, but set a July 1 date and the state tower would be up and running. Van Gorkom stated they are dragging their feet and now he is saying September. Sandholdt advised they need to understand it's a \$60 million system and there are issues all over the state. They have parts of it up and running, but until it's all connected that system isn't fully functional and connected. He advised if they did a comparison right now, he doesn't know how it would turn out...whether it's SARA, Racom, independent or the state system. Bokinsky stated the average RFP timeline would be an average of 30 weeks before they would even begin work. Sandholdt followed up with if we spend an average of \$30,000 on the consultant would we have enough time to go with the state system or whatever is up and running, could that \$30,000 be used to buy equipment versus paying for a consultant. VanGorkom stated none of them know anything about radio communications which is why they need someone who knows something about it and can direct every department in what they need for communications. He thinks it's essential and doesn't want to throw money at something that isn't going to work and doesn't want someone who doesn't know what they are talking about, he wants a consultant and someone that knows what they are doing. Sandholdt advised his frustration is you have a lot of Sheriff's office that have hired consultants and they come back with these reports stating these are your options, not telling you what to choose. Bokinsky advised the value of a consultant is the consultant can give the information as to what it's going to cost to do what we need to do, they are an expert in their field and this will assist with agencies talking with their councils to get what they need. Bokinsky advised they have done propagation testing with both the state system and Racom and neither was the golden standard. He advised he just wants communication for his officers. Bokinsky advised with a consultant you identify the problems and they will solve them for you. Sandholdt advised he'll be curious to see what the price is and where's the best bang for the buck. Bokinsky advised he would like each of them to think about; signal out and signal back to the PSAP via mobile, portable outside and portable inside. They need to decide how much connectivity is good, what is acceptable. He recommends getting pricing on this at a few different levels. Sandholdt would like an in-building via a mobile repeater added to this. Bokinsky asked them to think about the uniqueness of their agencies and what will be

the best fit, then discussed how to pick who we are going to use and if there should be some type of review. He likes the idea of having a panel of four assessors from the 911 Board who evaluate the RFP's and make determination and how to score them. There was additional conversation amongst the group on how to go through the process. It was decided Bokinsky would be point of contact, but it was requested that the group be included in the emails to the vendors, however they not email the vendors on their own.

7. *Outside legal counsel:* Anderson advised that Chief Van Gorkom made the request to bring this agenda item back before the Board. He asked staff for a recommendation of the entities that were contacted and received information from. Staff recommendation is Brown Winnick Law Firm. They have experience with telecommunication projects and are a bigger law firm, but are willing to send a junior member at a lower billing rate if that is all we need. Van Gorkom confirmed this is someone we would put on board after we have this put together after we have the RFP so it's done correctly, is that what this will be used for. Anderson advised he would agree with that, but not necessarily after, it would be better to get them now and up to speed and familiar with the Board now so when that RFP is done we already have the relationship. Sandholdt asked if they had talked to the Marion County Attorney to see if they would be willing to do it for free. Anderson advised he had and was told we should have someone in contract law that was familiar with RFP's and telecommunications. He also thought there could be a conflict of interest with depending on how it is financed with the county as his first interest is protecting Marion County. Sandholdt states it's the Marion County Joint 911 Service Board, he assumed he would assist and not want this Board going down the wrong path. Anderson advised this Board is it's own municipality and he has no obligation to represent it. Anderson advised he asked to be kept in the loop, but when it came to giving specific advise we need to go to someone that specializes in it. Van Gorkom made a motion that we use Brown Winnick Law Firm for legal counsel. Sandoldt asked if there is a certain dollar amount we are willing to pay up to or is it a just an open checkbook. Anderson advised we were quoted at \$375 an hour for the full blown attorney and a lesser rate for partners, etc. Sandholdt asked but how many hours. Van Gorkom stated there is no way to know that. Sandholdt stated he understands that, but he's very conservative with the budget and doesn't know if it's needed or if we have to have a legal counsel to do this. Anderson advised it's up to us not to abuse that and make sure we are very focused on what we ask them to do. Bokinsky stated he wasn't sure if it's what the Sheriff is referring to, but Mahaska County got in to a big ordeal with everyone threatening to bring lawyers, but he doesn't see us getting in to a position where that will happen. Sandholdt stated he just wants whomever is making the decision to be very conscientious about the legal fees. Bokinsky advised maybe it's just made so that only the executive board or the chair have access. Sandholdt advised if only \$3,000 is budgeted it's not as big as a deal if it's \$15,000. Losada seconded Van Gorkom's motion to retain Brown Winnick. All were in favor.

8. *State 911 Shared Services Network:* Anderson advised House File 2254 was signed by the Governor and that allows HSEMD to implement a consolidation plan or merging of the 911 networks, there are currently two...one for cellular and one for landline. What putting everything on a common network would do for this Board is that we would no longer have to pay the monthly fees for having the landline trunks in the PSAP's. Dykstra stated she took it that you don't have to opt in that it's just going to go away. Anderson advised that is correct. He advised it doesn't change the dissemination of the how the surcharge money are being handled now. The State will take on the cost for

merging and managing the network. Once the networks are merged in to one they intend to offer some services to us that they are terming shared services, one of those services is Call Processing Equipment (CPE). Anderson advised currently our host sits at the MCSO and the Board pays roughly \$1,000 a month for a leased circuit through Winstream that connects the host equipment at the MCSO with the remote equipment at Pella PD. Those two computers are tied together with a landline circuit that we maintain. Anderson advised if its decided to opt in for CPE there would be two hosts and everyone would remote in to that. The current CPE was purchased in 2014 through NG911 at a cost of about \$250,000. Warranty and service has been paid on it for 5 years and that will be expiring next year. Anderson asked Slycord, Bokinsky and Dykstra if there was anything they wanted to add. Dykstra advised it would be good for MCSO to get out of the host business as it seems with the current vendor they are not having good luck. She advised they have been with NG911 for almost 19 of the 20 years she has been here and back then they were great, but lately they have been horrible. She advised she's on the phone at least weekly trying to figure something out. She would like their staff to see the Zetron system in action. Back in 2014 the current system was thrown on them and they were not involved in the decision. Had they been shown any other system they would have picked something different. Monroe County currently has Zetron and Dykstra would like to send some of her staff down to see it. Sandholdt advised he thinks going the state CPE direction is the way to go. Anderson advised the Solacom product has not kept up with the times compared to the new stuff. The recommendation from Anderson, Slycord and Dykstra is too move forward with a notice of intent to the state that we are interested in joining their network. Van Gorkom made a motion with a second by Fisher to do the notice of intent for the CPE. All were in favor. Anderson advised another service being offered is mapping, they are using Zetron. He advised their mapping is integrated with their call taking and they interact together. He advised we currently are with GeoComm and pay roughly \$15,000 a year for mapping solution. Van Gorkom asked what the cost is. Anderson advised \$0, but Dykstra believed there was a cost share on this. Anderson advised he did speak wrong and it depends on the number of call taking positions...it would be roughly \$4,200 per year versus \$15,000. Van Gorkom made a motion if we go with the system that we go with the Zetron mapping. There was a second by Thompson. All were in favor. Anderson advised the next shared service available is the Recorder. It records all of the radio and telephone traffic. Van Gorkom asked why we can't do a blanket vote on all of this. Anderson advised he doesn't believe they will want all of them, as they just paid to upgrade the recorders two years ago. Dykstra asked how it affects them as she believes the state was going to do something for the people that already had the CAD, so she wondered if they would do the same for the Recorder. It was believe they were not doing anything at this point. Sandholdt stated it should be researched to know if what we have right now is good enough and if we can upgrade letter. Dykstra stated you take the chance of others being able to access your recordings and Sandholdt stated the ease of being able to pull calls would be gone and his recommendation is that they hold off until we know how it plays out. Slycord advised she feels it needs more investigation also. Anderson advised we have two new recorders that are under warranty and service that have been paid for so it buys us time to see how it works out. There was no motion on this topic. Anderson advised the next section is the Zetron Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD), both centers are currently using different CAD systems then this, so it would be a significant hurdle for them. Losada asked if either of them are wanting to change. Sandholdt would like to know if we would lost out on a really good piece of equipment, is this the only time this will be offered at this match. Anderson advised this contract that the State of Iowa is

signing with Zetron is a four year contract so these prices are locked in for that amount of time. Neither dispatch center wants to change at this time, so there was no motion. Anderson advised the last piece is the Emergency Medical Dispatch (EMD) which neither PSAP currently has. The state is making this available for roughly \$6,000 a year. Losada asked if this is something that is wanted in the county. It was advised that yes, it is wanted and needed. Van Gorkom made a motion and Fisher seconded for both PSAP's to get EMD through the shared services. All were in favor.

9. *GIS Grant FY 2019:* Anderson advised last year the GIS Grant available was \$15,000 for PSAP, so we were eligible for \$30,000. He advised this year it is \$12,000 per PSAP and they've changed their requirements a bit. He advised you actually have to do things that are measurable this year. They have put in some incentives and mandatory uploads to verify accuracy rates and instead of receiving one check if you do well in the first six months you get a check for \$6,000 per PSAP and a same in the second half. Anderson advised we are going to spend money regardless, so it's a question if we want to pay a contractor such as GeoComm to maintain our data in accordance with the standard or do you want Kim to take off where she is going to leave off this year. Anderson's suggest is that we apply for the \$12,000 per PSAP and continue to use Kim and Brian and have uploaded twice a year to reach the incentives. Losada asked if the incentives were above the \$12,000 and Anderson advised they are not, it's to get up to the \$12,000. Losada asked what the current accuracy is and Anderson advised it's about 96%. Losada made a motion to apply for the grant. Sandholdt asked what the due date on it is. Anderson advised they have not set a date. They've changed the whole application process and he has to go through a Google process. He advised what hindered us this year is that it wasn't available until after the fiscal year. Dykstra asked if we are changing from GeoComm to Zetron if GeoComm would still be onboard. Anderson advised yes, because this Board has contracted with GeoComm to take a 2nd look at Kim's work. Dykstra asked how much we would pay GeoComm if Kim didn't do it. Anderson advised he can't answer that because we've always had a grant to pay for the guidance. Sandholdt asked if that \$24,000 is going to Kim's salary and what is happening for that \$24,000. Anderson advised he could show them what this year's looked like. He advised for this year's project Kim will have worked 1,025 hours at her hourly rate that includes benefits.....RECORDING STOPPED AT THIS POINT, but per notes there is a second by Van Gorkom and all were in favor of the motion.
10. *Establish next meeting date:* The next meeting was set for Thursday, August 23rd at 6pm at 3014 E. Main St.
11. *Adjourn meeting:* There was a motion by Losada and a 2nd by VanGorkom to adjourn the meeting. All were in favor and the meeting adjourned.

Respectively submitted

Kim Pettyjohn