



## **AGENDA**

### **City Council Winter Retreat**

**Friday, January 22, 2016**

**Noon to 5:00 PM**

The Rock and Grille at Tiara Rado

2057 South Broadway

*To become the most livable community west of the Rockies by 2025*

**Noon – 12:30 p.m. – Goals for the Retreat**

**12:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. – Policy Discussions**

- **Chronic Homelessness**
- **Governance/ Funding Model for the Communication Center** [Attachment](#)
- **Valley Wide EMS/Fire District or Authority** [Attachment](#)
- **New Revenue including TABOR Discussion/Strategy**

**4:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. – Economic Development Budget:** Look at Funding Sources and Allocations for Economic Development

**4:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. – Council Comments**

**5:00 p.m. Adjourn**



# GRAND JUNCTION REGIONAL COMMUNICATION CENTER

Report to the Grand Junction City Council

The Grand Junction Regional Communication Center is a project of the Grand Junction City Council. The project is to build a new communication center for the Grand Junction region. The project is to build a new communication center for the Grand Junction region. The project is to build a new communication center for the Grand Junction region.

The project is to build a new communication center for the Grand Junction region. The project is to build a new communication center for the Grand Junction region. The project is to build a new communication center for the Grand Junction region.

The project is to build a new communication center for the Grand Junction region. The project is to build a new communication center for the Grand Junction region. The project is to build a new communication center for the Grand Junction region.

The project is to build a new communication center for the Grand Junction region. The project is to build a new communication center for the Grand Junction region. The project is to build a new communication center for the Grand Junction region.

## **Grand Junction Regional Communications Center**

### **Report to the Grand Junction City Council**

The Grand Junction Regional Communications Center (GJRCC) is considered one of the best communication centers in the state of Colorado. The Center has been recognized at both state and national levels for not only basic performance measures but also the quality of management and leadership that is demonstrated. Members of the GJRCC represent Mesa County on several state boards and committees and in many cases hold leadership positions within those organizations, including the State National Emergency Numbers Association (NENA), Association of Public Safety Communications Organizations (APCO) chapters, the State Telecommunicator Emergency Response Team (TERT), Public Utilities Commission (PUC), Colorado FirstNet, Public Safety Communications Sub-committee (PSCS), and Consolidated Communications Network of Colorado (CCNC).

In spite of the high performance we see today, there are concerns with how the current operation is governed and funded. These concerns are borne out of the recession which began in Mesa County in 2009 and continues to this day. In May of 2014, GJRCC staff produced the “State of the Center” report which details the current operating position of the Center and the challenges faced as a result of reduced staffing and increasing service demand. The report provides a historical overview of the Center going back 20 years in order to give perspective to the current situation. Additionally, the report clearly showed that between the requested and often expected level of service, combined with extensive technological improvements, we have created a situation that is not sustainable over time.

Recent efforts by the Communications Center Board to bring awareness to these concerns have included presentations to various elected bodies in Mesa County, including the Grand Junction City Council, the Mesa County Board of County Commissioners, Palisade Town Board, and the Fruita City Council. The Grand Junction City Council requested this report be developed in order to assist in identifying solutions to these issues.

#### **BACKGROUND**

The GJRCC originated in 1979 when the Grand Junction Police and Fire Departments agreed to consolidate public safety dispatching services with Fruita Police Department, Palisade Police Department and various other fire districts throughout Mesa County. In 1981, the Mesa County Sheriff’s Office joined this effort. In 1989, this regionalization effort was formalized with an Intergovernmental Agreement, allowing the new Emergency Telephone Authority Board to set the collection amount for 911 surcharges and oversee the expenditures of the Emergency Telephone Service Surcharge in Mesa County.

The GJRCC currently operates under an Intergovernmental Agreement signed in 1997. This agreement established a Board representing the 23 user agencies, defined voting rights, and

delineated the funding model for both the capital expenses (911 surcharge dollars) and operational expenses (cost-share dollars paid by user agencies on a per call basis). Additionally, this IGA charged the City of Grand Junction with the responsibility for all employment decisions concerning Communication Center employees, to include hiring, firing, discipline and promotion. The IGA established and adopted the GJRCC Policy and Procedure Manual for employees and required a user group consisting of specific user agency staff to assist in developing operational policies and procedures.

Between 2008 and the present there has been a significant increase in the number and complexity of systems and functions assigned to the Center. These include; full responsibility for dispatching Grand Junction Fire Department Ambulance Transports; 800 MHz Radio System; Countywide CAD/Records/Mobile (Aegis) Computer System; Everbridge Emergency Notification System; Fire Station Alerting; and emergence of specialized patrol teams such as the Street Crimes Units and Homeless Outreach Team. Additionally, over the past two years, the Center has seen double digit increases each year in calls for service, telephone calls and radio transactions. Each of these system changes and additions increases the work load and adds complexity for the telecommunicator.

## **CURRENT NEEDS AND OBJECTIVES**

While the GJRCC operates and functions according to national best practices and standards, inadequate funding and to some degree the current governance structure, prevents the center from addressing some of the following critical needs and objectives:

### Adequate Staffing

Today the Center has an authorized staff of 35 telecommunicators, 7 supervisors, 2 IT support staff, a project manager, and an operations manager. Insufficient funding has affected the GJRCC's ability to increase the actual staffing level to numbers that have already been authorized, or to increase staffing to implement specialized dispatching. Detailed staffing studies were conducted in 2008 and 2013, with the latest study recommending the need for 36 staffed telecommunicators and three overhires. The overhire positions are necessary to maintain the required level of staffing that is constantly disrupted by high turnover rates and an extensive year-long training program. The studies led to the approval of three additional positions, but with many user agencies struggling to pay the costs of the Center, the decision was made to delay funding those positions.

### Specialized Dispatching

Yearly increases in call volume and the additional number and complexity of systems and functions assigned to the Center make it necessary to look at ways to specialize dispatchers and implement tiered hiring. Due to current staffing limitations, new dispatchers are trained to become somewhat of a 'generalist' at all aspects of the job. Staff is required to regularly rotate

through various positions, to include call-taking, data channel, fire dispatching, police dispatching, and so forth. This is necessary in order to provide deployment relief to any and all positions at any given time. Although rotation lends itself to the efficient use of staffing resources, it comes at a cost. The current training period for dispatchers is a year, during which an average of 48% do not successfully complete the program (based on figures from the last four years). The “generalist” training also comes as a cost to the expertise of the dispatcher and to the safety of first responders. Both law enforcement and fire partners see the necessity for dispatchers to consistently work a specific channel (fire, enforcement etc.) in order to become experts in that discipline and increase the safety of line personnel.

### Tiered Hiring/Training

In order to begin the specialization of dispatchers, we should be using a tiered hiring process. Under such a system, prospective dispatchers are first hired to serve as call-takers, and upon gaining proficiency at that function become eligible to progress to other levels of dispatching. Tiered hiring allows for a shorter training period and a smoother transition to increased responsibility once the employee feels competent in their role. Some employees may ultimately feel comfortable remaining in the role for which they were hired, and others may wish to promote to progressively more responsible specialized dispatching positions. Either way, we would benefit from employees who are more proficient and have a higher degree of job satisfaction. Leadership of the GJRCC is of the opinion that, if staffing allowed, tiered hiring would be a much more effective method for hiring and retaining employees.

### Text to 911

Text to 911 is a relatively new feature in which a reporting party may utilize a smart phone device to send an emergency text in lieu of a telephone call to 911. This has great usefulness for the hearing-impaired community, who by and large no longer use the old TDD devices favored a few years ago. It can also be a potentially lifesaving feature for a caller who is unable to safely make a voice phone call, such as one who is trapped in a vehicle or hiding in a closet.

Of great concern, however, is the potential for citizens to begin favoring the texting method over making a voice call to 911. As one might imagine, the ability of a dispatcher to quickly obtain medical information or suspect descriptions via continual text messages is greatly diminished. Texting has become such a common form of routine communication however, that it may soon be difficult to convince citizens that a voice call is still far safer and preferable.

Much like cellular calls to 911 became the standard over landlines within a decade after their advent; our fear is that despite our best educational efforts texting may one day become the most frequent method for calling 911. Should that occur, the impact on staffing needs will be tremendous, leading to additional costs that must somehow be managed.

## Tactical (TAC) and other Specialty Channels

Ongoing budget constraints have not only prevented the increase in staffing to authorized levels, but has also led to service delivery cuts. Lack of funding has significantly reduced the ability to utilize tactical channels during major incidents, for both fire and police, to serve as a channel dedicated to a particular emergency or call. Tactical channels are generally used when the incident is expected to be protracted, or has a high volume of radio traffic that would otherwise overwhelm the primary channel. In a perfect world, the tactical channel should be monitored by a designated dispatcher, however in recent years staffing has not usually allowed for that. There have simply been an insufficient number of dispatchers available to staff such a channel, which greatly limits its utility. Out of necessity, tactical channels are still frequently utilized by both fire and police, however the lack of an available dispatcher puts first responders at greater risk.

It should be the goal of the GJRCC partners to provide sufficient staffing such that a dispatcher is always available to staff a tactical channel. When not needed for a tactical operation, that dispatcher would be available to staff a specialty channel, to be used for special events, downtown operations, or for tactical units such as Street Crimes and the Homeless Outreach Team.

## **CURRENT FUNDING SOURCES**

Each of the above concepts cost more to fund, and under the current governance/funding model most partner agencies would simply not be able to afford the increases necessary to acquire them. After service to our citizens and safety of our first responders, the primary goal of the GJRCC must be to implement a funding model that is *adequate, stable, and sustainable*. It must be *adequate* to cover the cost of all services, and provide for a fund balance that can quickly address unforeseen expenses. It must be *stable* so that the partners can anticipate their budget, with a reasonable expectation that the costs will not swing wildly from year to year. It must be *sustainable* so that the GJRCC is not continuously seeking new forms of funding or alternative methods of governance.

The Center has two current funding streams. The first are fees collected from user agencies annually based on their percentage of all calls for service. This funds the actual day to day operations of the Center; primarily staffing. The second source of revenue is from monthly 911 surcharges of \$1.30/month collected on landlines and cellular telephone lines registered in Mesa County. This fund is statutorily limited for use in support of 911 operations and is used exclusively for development and support of the infrastructure used by the Center. In years past the funds generated through the surcharge, combined with Homeland Security grant dollars, allowed the Communications Center to build out critical infrastructure and invest in quality computer and radio equipment. During the last few years, grant funds for this purpose have begun to dwindle as Homeland Security has changed their focus to other priorities. This

combined with flat or declining surcharge revenues has resulted in fewer financial resources to enhance infrastructure and plan for capital investment.

## **GOVERNANCE AND FUNDING**

The concept of consolidating Communications Centers has become more common in recent years. Historically it has been very common for individual municipalities and counties to operate their own communications centers. However, the fact that such centers are extremely expensive to build and operate, combined with current advancements in technology, it has become financially and operationally possible to cover large geographic areas with a single consolidated communications center. These facts along with shrinking government budgets are causing municipalities, counties and regions to consolidate, or at a minimum consider consolidation. GJRCC is already a consolidated regional center, and as a result has already experienced the financial benefit of consolidation. In spite of the early recognition in Mesa County of the benefits of consolidation, governance and funding remain areas that need reviewed and revised to meet the needs of the User Agencies in today's environment.

For this report, the Communications Center conducted a detailed study of 19 consolidated communication centers, to examine how they are governed and funded. Governance of the dispatch centers examined were placed into three separate categories: Independently Governed, City/County Governed; and Public/Private Governed. The types of funding sources for the consolidated centers that were examined vary and are dependent on the type of agreements in place between the consolidated center and the agencies. All centers receive 911 funds, but how the funds are distributed, how much they receive and how money can be spent are based on State statute. Also typical are fees charged to user agencies based on calls for service calculations, population or agency size. Other funding sources are from grants, state funds for dispatcher training and radio fees. This information is detailed in Appendix A with a spreadsheet and accompanying information. From this study, GJRCC has developed the following options for consideration:

### **Status Quo**

Maintaining the existing governance model of the GJRCC is a potential option provided there are changes to the current funding model. The concept and agreements put in place in 1997 have proven to work over the past 18 years and with some minor modifications may serve the county well into the future.

The primary limitations and challenges presented by the current governance model involve either funding, perceptions of fair representation on the Board, or a combination of both. Concerns expressed by the current user agencies include:

- Paying for the cost of City of Grand Junction personnel increases (raises and benefits) when some user agencies are unable to fund increases for their own staff.
- Due to the voting structure some smaller agencies feel they are forced to accept and pay for top of the line services they don't necessarily want and can't afford.
- User agencies sometimes feel they are secondary to the Grand Junction Police and Fire Departments when it comes to service and support. The belief is since the GJRCC staff is employed by the City of Grand Junction they show favoritism to those agencies.
- Although the impact of additional costs in the GJRCC affect all agencies proportionally, based upon usage, the smaller agencies are less able handle those increasing costs within their general fund budgets.

During the last two years there have been significant efforts on the part of the GJRCC staff to address the concerns of the smaller agencies and their perceived lack of influence/input. This is particularly true of the Fire Departments and Rural Fire Districts. Today the relationship between the GJRCC and those entities is better than it has been in many years. This was accomplished through outreach efforts on the part of staff, the re-implementation of the user group concept, and the creation of a technology committee which discusses technical issues with user representatives.

The main stumbling block for the current Board and governance in general seems to be funding. If avenues were developed to ensure sustainable funding for the day to day operation of the Center many of the concerns regarding governance would either go away or be minimized. Adequate funding would not wipe out all of the issues but would go a long way towards eliminating many of the concerns of the user agencies.

### **City Operation/Contract for Service Model**

A second method of governance that could potentially provide significant benefits is one in which the GJRCC becomes solely a City operation. Partner agencies would become "Users," or customers who pay for services on a contract basis. The cost of services would likely be allocated at a set rate, perhaps by size of agency or by expected call load. The rate could also be set based on a 'menu' of services from which the agency chooses to utilize. For example, a fire agency might elect to pay for paging and dispatching, but choose not to dispatch ambulances or utilize the services of a Tactical Channel.

This model provides a number of potential pros and cons:

#### Pros:

- Agencies would pay a stable and predictable rate, on a contract basis.
- Agencies would pay only for the services they need, and would not be expected to fund services or equipment that is of no use to them. For example, police agencies would not



be billed for additional paging equipment, and fire agencies would perhaps not be expected to pay for the use of a data channel.

- User agencies may feel as though they have more clout as ‘customers’ benefitting from the terms of a contract.
- The City would staff the Center based on need, without being dependent on the requirement of User Agencies to approve staffing decisions.
- Once established as a contract operation, the Center could offer its services to partners from outside the region. Currently the Center cannot take on new partners without ultimately incurring greater costs to all of the Partner Agencies.

#### Cons:

- The City of Grand Junction would undoubtedly sustain an increase in costs.
- User agencies may feel as though they have less representation than they did under a Board system.
- User agencies may view the Center as a monopoly, with whom they have little choice but to contract.

#### **Independently Governed (Stand Alone Authority)**

A governance form that has worked well in other public safety disciplines is the Authority Model. Governmental authorities are formed for a variety of reasons and purposes including:

- Financial considerations
- Improve or increase service levels
- Capture economies of scale
- Eliminate duplication and redundancy
- Reduce risk/liability

In Colorado, the authority model is used by fire departments consolidating into a larger fire authority as either a permanent governance structure, or as a temporary step before formation of a Title 32 special district. The Authority model can function as permanent or as a trial because it can be set up without voter approval. For our purposes, the Garfield County Emergency Communications Authority is a good example of how this governance model works for dispatch services. Language in their *Intergovernmental Agreement Establishing a Regional Communications Authority* states that the Authority is responsible for establishing and administering the operation of a countywide emergency communication and dispatch program. It further states that the Authority is a separate legal entity, and was established to implement that portion of the County sales tax to provide countywide emergency communication and dispatch services.

This model provides a number of potential pros and cons:

Pros:

- Authority would be a separate entity from any one agency.
- Communication center staff would be employed by the Authority, which could reduce the perception from some agencies that the center provides a different level of service or support to the City.
- Voter approval of a countywide tax could provide a sustainable revenue stream and reduce individual agency costs.
- Agencies would be equally represented through their vote on the Authority Board.
- Possible reduction in personnel costs by not falling under the City's market pay system.
- Once established as an Authority, the Center could offer its services to partners from outside the region on a contract basis.

Cons:

- Ownership of the center's facility and equipment would need to be defined.
- Possible increase in operational costs due to contracting for administrative services (legal, HR, finance), facility expenses, less clout as a smaller group, etc.
- User agencies may feel as though they have less representation/control than they do under the current Board system.

### **Public/Private Partnership**

There are very few examples of a public/private partnership handling Public Safety dispatching in the United States. The only example found involved two municipalities hiring a consulting firm to build, staff and then manage their entire 911 operation. The municipalities provide oversight through a two person board consisting of the City Managers of each city. Due to the private nature of this system there has not been any cost information available for us to use in developing a comparison.

### **Hybrid Model**

When looking at a new governance model the Communications Board has the opportunity to select one of the established models mentioned, or could create a hybrid of the best practices from the different models. Examples could be formation of an Authority for legal and financial purposes, but contract with the City for administrative services and employees. This could

eliminate the cost and expense of establishing a separate human resource structure, including compensation plans, benefit packages, personnel policies, etc.

Alternatively, the Board could participate in an even broader hybrid model. For years the fire agencies have been discussing cooperation up to and including formation of a fire authority. There has been further discussion of an EMS authority being formed. Similarly, a fire, EMS, and communication authority could be feasible.

## **Conclusion**

The Grand Junction Regional Communications Center continues to operate and function according to national best practices and standards. However, because of inadequate staffing and service cuts, the Center is not able to meet the important needs of user agencies such as staffing a tactical channel for a critical incident. Dispatchers are answering 911 calls because there are not enough call takers to handle those incoming calls. This means that a dispatcher could be providing CPR instructions to a 911 caller, while also managing officers that are conducting a building search for a burglar. Additionally, advances in technology for citizens demand that 911 centers keep up and be able to answer their 911 text for help, or perhaps view an uploaded video of an accident. Without additional funding for more staff and technical advancement of 911 systems, the GRJCC will not be able to provide necessary and expected services to the citizens and public safety agencies of Mesa County.

## APPENDIX A

### MODELS FOR CONSOLIDATED DISPATCH CENTERS

**Governance** – For the purpose of this document, the 19 consolidated dispatch centers examined are placed into three separate categories: Independently Governed, City/County Governed; and Public/Private Governed. One of the most common practices among these agencies is that there is a contract or agreement in place between the Communication Center and the agencies they serve. The content of the contracts varies but generally they contain the structure of the Communications Center, the governing body that has oversight for the operation and service that is provided by the Communications Center, and fees billed to the user agencies. The importance of a clear agreement between the Center and all user agencies that is regularly updated cannot be over-emphasized.

**Independently Governed** - Of the 19 models examined, 12 are independently governed, meaning that a local government entity does not have sole oversight over the operation. These entities have a governing board which is responsible for the entire operation. The name of these boards are different, but the responsibilities of the oversight board are similar. These Boards are responsible for approving the annual budget and have the authority to hire and fire the Communications Center Executive Director. Membership of the Boards vary, but usually consist of elected officials, city/county manager, police and fire chiefs, or a combination of these representatives. Voting authority varies between the governing bodies. Some of the groups allocate one vote per member and other groups have weighted votes that are dependent on the size of the agencies or the amount they pay.

Besides the governing board, there are other boards and committees that are used to oversee operational policies, protocol, procedures, and performance measurements. Some have technology committees that provide direction to the governing board regarding 911 phone systems, radio, CAD, etc. Some governance examples are:

- Emergency Communications Center of Southern Oregon’s governing body is the Chief Executive Officers Board that oversees the entire operation of the Center, including hiring of the Communication Center directors. There is also an Intergovernmental Council that in general acts as the budget committee and a User Group that handles the day to day policies and procedures.
- Dakota Communications Center’s governing body is the Board of Directors that provides policy leadership, handles the budget, deals with legal matters and hires the Communication Center director. They also have two other committees; the Executive Committee that carries out policy and operational

decisions, and makes budget recommendations to the Board of Directors, and a joint Operations Committee that acts as a User Group that serves as a resource to the Executive Committee to coordinate filed training, research topics of interest, and back up exercises.

**City/County Governed** - There are 6 consolidated dispatch centers that are governed by law enforcement agencies. Generally these agencies have a governing body that consists of representatives from the agencies the Communications Center serves. They also have other committees, such as User Groups, that provide support to the governing body and the Communications Center. The Communication Center Director is an employee of the law enforcement agency where the Communications Center is located. Some governance examples are:

- In 2013, Broward County Florida formed the Consolidated Regional 911 Communications Center of Florida. They have an executive board, an operation committee, and a funding committee.
- Valley Communications Consolidated Communication Center in Kent, Washington was formed in the mid-1970's. This center has an Administration board made up of the four (4) mayors from the municipalities that are the primary contributors to the overall funding of the operations. The governance board makes all fiscal and high level policy decisions. Managing day to day operations is the operations board which allows for input from the public safety agencies. Each agency they are contracted with has a position on this board. This agency is funded from an Enterprise Fund, primarily self-supporting through user fees based on calls for service.
- North East King County Regional Public Safety Communications Agency, in King County, Washington is governed and managed identically to Valley Communications, referenced above. It is a consolidated center managed by five (5) mayors on their Administration Board.

**Public/Private Governed** – One of the models examined is a consolidated communications center in Johns Creek, Georgia that called ChatComm. ChatComm created a public/private partnership between the consulting firm, iXP Corporation and the Chattahoochee River 911 Authority Board. iXP Corporation manages the operation

of the Center based on performance standards that are put in place by the Chattahoochee River 911 Authority Board.

Our GJRCC operates in a very similar fashion to the Communications Centers that were examined. Like the GJRCC, there is a Board that oversees the operation of the Communications Center and is responsible for policies, procedures, and approving the budget. The difference between the GJRCC Boards and the Independently Governed Boards is that the GJRCC does not have the overall authority to run the Center, the City of Grand Junction does. The Independently Governed Boards do have that authority also have the authority to hire and fire the Communications Center Director.

All of the Communications Centers that were examined have a formal contract or agreement in place between the Communications Center and the agencies they serve. These contracts provide direction regarding things like performance of the Communication Center, cost for dispatch services, and how radio systems and 911 systems are purchased and maintained. The GJRCC does not have a formal agreement in place. Instead, the GJRCC used an IGA that explains the responsibility of the GJRCC Board and how user agencies will be managed.

## **Funding Sources**

The types of funding sources for the consolidated centers that were examined vary and are dependent on the type of agreements in place between the consolidated center and the agencies. All centers receive 911 funds, but how the funds are distributed, how much they receive, and how money can be spent are based on State statute. Also typical are fees charged to user agencies based on calls for service calculations, population, or agency size. Other funding sources are from grants, state funds for dispatcher training, and radio fees. Some funding source examples include:

- Emergency Communications of Southern Oregon's total budget is funded by user fees, which are 70% funded by the law agencies and 30% funded by the fire agencies. Then, user fees are calculated based on a formula of population and the assessed valuation of each user's jurisdiction.
- Scott Emergency Communications Center is funded by user fees until 2015, at which time a county-wide property tax levy will be sufficient to fund the entire operation of the Center. It also collects 9-1-1 surcharge to pay for a debt service for the building, which includes the cost for capital and infrastructure.

- Calhoun County Consolidated Dispatch Authority in Michigan was initially funded by their agencies for the first five years and then 911 surcharge will be its only funding source. They also receive annual training dollars of approximately \$500 per employee from their State.
- Dakota Communications Center in Minnesota receives funding from their agencies based on a call for service percentage that is averaged over three years. They also receive \$600,000 of 911 surcharge money from the state, which is prorated based on population.
- Garfield County Communications Center in Rifle, Colorado is funded almost exclusively from 25% of the 1% county-wide sales tax. They do not charge user agencies a user fee. They do receive 9-1-1 surcharge dollars to help support infrastructure and IT support staff costs.
- Pitkin County Communications Center in Aspen, Colorado is funded by a user fee based on calls for service, on a 2 year average. In this center, 9-1-1 surcharge dollars help pay infrastructure costs.

### **Comparison with GJRCC**

Below are statements of comparison between the GJRCC and the 19 consolidated centers that were examined.

- Whether the Communications Centers are independently governed or governed by a local public safety agency, they all have a Board that provides operational and budgetary oversight for the Center. What differs was the final authority over the Center.
- The makeup of the oversight boards differs slightly. All of the communication centers use public safety representatives but some also use elected officials and/or citizens. Voting privileges varied between Centers, with some using a quorum vote and others using a weighted vote based on population or how much the agencies paid for service. The GJRCC uses only public safety representatives and a weighted voting system.

- All the Communications Center have a formal contract in place with the agencies they serve. GJRCC does not, but instead uses an IGA that provides guidance for the GJRCC Board.
- The GJRCC uses a call for service percentage averaged over five years to determine each agencies' annual fee. This is similar to many of the Communications Centers examined.
- Like GJRCC, all Communications Centers receive 911 surcharge revenue. For some Communications Centers this was their only source of revenue. Others use the 911 surcharge revenue just to pay for 911 Communications Center equipment, maintenance, and infrastructure as long as it was directly related to providing 911 service, similar to that of the GJRCC. A few Communications Center use 911 surcharge to fund positions.
- There were a couple Communication Centers that received funding from a tax. GJRCC does not have other reliable funding sources other than 911 surcharge and user agencies fees.



Agency/PSAP/Authority Name	Location/ Area Served	Governance Model			Funding Sources				Boards and Committees			Comments
		Independent	Local Agency	Public/Private	User Agencies	911 Surcharge	Tax/Levy	Other	Governing Board	Operation Board/Committee	Technical Board/Committee	
Emergency Communications of Sothern Oregon (ESCO)	Jackson County/Medford , OR	X			X	X			Chief Executive Officers Board Intergovernmental Council	User Group		provides 911, dispatch, technical support/maintenance services. Contract user pays annual fee. Unincorporated - ORS Chapter 90. Each member has one vote on the governing boards
Scott Emergency Communication Center	Scott County,(Davenport) IA.	X				X	X		SEEC Governing Body		Technical Advisory Committee	Jointly governed by City/County. Funded by tax (28E). Employees are of SECC but County provides administrative support
Calhoun County Consolidated Dispatch Authority	Calhoun County, MI	X			X	X			Governing Board of Directors		Technical Advisory Committee	managed by county - Governing Board of Directors - they also receive training funds from the state . The vote is passed by the majority present at the meeting when a quorum is present
Dakota Communications Center		X			X	X		Traffic Safety Council & radio fees	Board of Directors	Executive Committee	Joint Operations Committee	Board of Directors elected official from each jurisdiction - policy leadership, budget, hires Exec Director. Each member has one vote unless it is for the budget and then it's weighted. Executive Committee for policy decisions, administrative functions, budgets. Joint Operations Committee - (user groups)
Calhoun County 911 District	Calhoun County, AL	X				X	Complete Choice Package	radio fees	Board of Commissioners	X	X	Each Board member has one vote. They are funded solely on 911 surcharge. The Complete Choice package is a \$2.50 for residential and business lines. They also receive wireless funds from the Alabama Wireless Board. Radio fees are paid for the use and maintenance of the system.
Broward County Consolidated Regional E911 Communications	Broward County, FL.		X		X	X	would like to in the future		Executive Board	Operations Committee & Funding Committee	Office of Regional Communications and Technology	County Commission Governs - County Administrator oversees operation - weighted for larger cities/towns. Funding is based on 1/3 population, 1/3 calls for service, and 1/3 valorem taxes.
ChatComm	Johns Creek, GA			X		X						public/private between Chattahoochee River 911 Authority and iXP Corporation. iXP manages the operation based on a performance contract overseen by the authority. Financed strictly by 911 revenues
Roane County Emergency Communications District	Roane County	X							Board of Directors	Advisory Committee		Roane County District provides 911, dispatch services. Contract user pays annual fee. Annual increases will not exceed the Consumer Price Index.
Volusia County Sheriff's Office Communications Center	Daytona Beach FL		X									Consolidated center managed by the Sheriff's Office
Hamilton County Emergency Communications District	Hamilton County, TN	X				X						Emergency Communications District - 9 Board of Directors, contracts with public safety agencies
Washington County Consolidated Communications Agency	Washington County, OR	X										Board of Commissioners - IGA with agencies
Valley Communications Consolidated Communication Center	Kent, Washington	X			X					X		Consolidated center managed by the 4 Mayors who act as the governance board, contracts with public safety agencies
North East King County Regional Public Safety Communications Agency	King County, Washington	X			X					X		Consolidated center managed by 5 Mayors who act as governance board, contract with the public safety agencies
Salt Lake Valley Emergency Communication Center	Bluffdale, UT		X					X		X		Consolidated center managed by the police department
Garfield County Communications	Rifle, CO	X				X		County wide sales tax 1% (25% goes to Comm Ctr)			X	Stand alone authority
Pitkin County Communications Center	Aspen, CO		X		X	X				X		Managed by the Sheriff, contracts with public safety agencies
Adams County Communications Center	Commerce City, CO	X			x	x				X		Established as a non-profit in 1974, contracts with public safety agencies
Jefferson County 911 Dispatch	Jefferson, MO	X			X	X				X		Owned by the County, contracts with public safety agencies
Grand Junction Regional Communications Center	Grand Junction, CO		X		X	X				Law and Fire User Groups		

**Grand Junction City Council Retreat**  
**Cooperative Options for Fire/EMS**  
**January 22, 2016**

**1. Automatic Aid Agreement/Closest Unit Response**

Creation of automatic aid agreements to include closest unit response has been evaluated. No organizational structural changes are required to implement this option.

- a. Advances
  - i. Improves response times and service to community
  - ii. Ease of implementation (no organizational and/or tax or financial changes)
  - iii. Spreads service demand between response units
  - iv. Closer working relationship between agencies
- b. Considerations
  - i. Potential loss of ambulance revenue for individual agencies
  - ii. Concern that certain areas could be left uncovered
  - iii. Public perception/ need for education/awareness effort
  - iv. Not all departments have the technology equipment
  - v. Inadequate cellular coverage can reduce effectiveness

**2. Functional Partnership**

Link together different functions *i.e.*, fire prevention, fire investigation, ambulance billing, fleet, training, *etc.* No structural changes would be required to implement a functional partnership; however, implementation would be more effective if structural changes were made. Those changes could include but not be limited to, developing/revising operating guidelines, joint activities (meetings, training, *etc.*) and integration of supervision.

- a. Advances
  - i. Integrates areas of expertise from each entity for a higher level of service
  - ii. Opportunity to share operating costs and create purchasing power/efficiencies
  - iii. May tend to create “specialization of function”
- b. Considerations
  - i. Implementation challenges (training, processes)
  - ii. Potential increased operating costs
  - iii. May tend to create “specialization of function”

**3. Formation of Sub-District**

Creates special taxing district to pay for capital and/or operating for a fire station and/or specialized response *i.e.*, EMS only station. Generally the model works best for and to develop an increased service level such as EMS or more specialized EMS. The sub-district model exists in an area of the Grand Junction Rural District and was formed to construct and operate Fire Station 5.

- a. Advances
  - i. Ability to create perpetual funding via property tax
  - ii. Improves service to the area

- iii. Purchasing power/efficiencies and other economies of scale
- iv. Consolidates area under one entity
- b. Considerations
  - i. Requires an election
  - ii. Implementation challenges (training, processes, Persigo agreement, *etc.*)
  - iii. Potential increased operating costs
  - iv. Consolidates area under one entity

#### 4. **Contract For Service**

One entity provides service to another similar to the City's contract with the GJ Rural Fire Protection District. Entities retain control through their board or council and through the contract. Other examples are Denver providing service to Glendale, Sheridan, Englewood and Skyline Fire District.

#### 5. **Formation of a Fire Authority**

A fire authority is a formal legal "merger" of agencies under one Board.

- a. Advances
  - i. Creates framework for the future of fire and EMS in the valley
  - ii. Reduction in administrative costs/avoids duplication of administration, equipment *etc.*
  - iii. Equalization of service and administration
  - iv. Purchasing power/efficiencies and other economies of scale
  - v. Greater political power and influence
  - vi. Taxes stay the same or may be reduced
  - vii. Taxes may be increased with a vote
  - viii. May be a means to more popular support for *fees*
  - ix. For GJ – loss of City Department/change to general fund
- b. Considerations
  - i. Loss of individual department identities (options can lessen)
  - ii. Unequal taxation for service
  - iii. Taxes stay the same or may be reduced
  - iv. Taxes may be increased with a vote
  - v. May be a means to more popular support for fees
  - vi. Loss of individual department/history of, and autonomy of operations
  - vii. Implementation challenges (training, processes, Persigo agreement, *etc.*)
  - viii. Potential increased operating costs

#### 6. **Formation of New or Expanded Fire District** (also known as a Title 32 District)

Title 32 districts are governed by Colorado law. A district has a board but is also legally "supervised" by the District Court.

- a. Advances
  - i. Reduction in administrative costs

- ii. Equalization of service and administration
- iii. Purchasing power/efficiencies and other economies of scale
- iv. Greater political power and influence
- v. Eliminates redundancies (administration, equipment, *etc.*)
- vi. Ability to create funding (property tax)

b. Considerations

- i. Loss of individual department identities (options can lessen)
- ii. Requires an election and court review
- iii. Possible loss of City support for legal, finance, human resources, etc
- iv. Implementation challenges (training, processes, Persigo agreement, *etc.*)
- v. Potential increased operating costs