# NOTICE OF OPEN MEETING <br> AGENDA <br> SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING <br> City of Moberly <br> City Council Room - Moberly City Hall <br> 1366 Highway 24 East <br> August 18, 2020 <br> 6:00 PM 

Posted:
Roll Call
Approval of Agenda
Recognition of Visitors
Anything Else to Come Before the Council

1. Consideration of a Motion to adjourn to a Work Session

Adjournment

We invite you to attend virtually by viewing it live on the City of Moberly You Tube Live Channel, Facebook page. A link to the City's Channel can be found on our website's main page at www.cityofmoberly.com. The public is invited to attend the Council meeting. Representatives of the news media may obtain copies of this notice by contacting the City Clerk. If a special accommodation is needed as addressed by the Americans with Disabilities Act, please contact the City Clerk twenty-four (24) hours in advance of the meeting.

## City of Moberly

## Dispatch Costs Based on 2020-2021 Budget

|  | 2020-2021 Salary | FICA | LAGERS | Health | Life | Dental | Liability/WC | L/T Disability | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\boldsymbol{1}$ Position | $27,456.00$ | $2,100.38$ | $3,514.37$ | $7,800.00$ | 43.68 | 828.00 | $2,402.40$ | 107.08 | $44,251.91$ |
| 4 Positions | $109,824.00$ | $8,401.52$ | $14,057.48$ | $31,200.00$ | 174.72 | $3,312.00$ | $9,609.60$ | 428.32 | $177,007.64$ |
| 6 Positions | $164,736.00$ | $12,602.28$ | $21,086.22$ | $46,800.00$ | 262.08 | $4,968.00$ | $14,414.40$ | 642.48 | $265,511.46$ |

# 9-1-I Fees \& Call Flow Analysis Consulting Services Proposal 

## City of Moberly, Missouri July 30, 2020



Public Safety Technology Consultants www.scgconsultingservices.net

## Company Overview \& Qualifications

SCG Consulting Services, LLC (SCGCS) was established in 1992 by Stacen C. Gross, ENP. Mr. Gross has served as Principle Consultant and Project Manager provided consulting and technical expertise to numerous units of local government on issues surrounding 9-I-I, public safety technology, communications, communications center consolidation, cooperative agreements between units of government and issues pertaining to funding and $9-1-I$ fees. Mr. Gross has a strong and broad technical knowledge of public safety systems and technology. Stacen currently serves as the APCO Commercial Advisor for both the lowa and Nebraska APCO Chapters.

Mr. Gross will be responsible for all aspects of the contractual relationship with the City of Moberly including contract management, negotiations and overall project management. Some of Mr. Gross's qualifications include:

- Presenting technical concepts to varied audiences in both commercial and government markets and conducting technology seminars/speaking engagements at IT industry events
- Specific expertise with 9-I-I and NG9-I-I telephony solutions, VoIP solutions, etc...
- Personally consulted with over 400 units of local government
- Identification of the client's technology goals and the development of technical solutions to meet those goals
- Exceptionally skilled at facilitating problem-solving meetings with clients and representatives from all industries
- Defining, communicating, and fulfilling contractual obligations, goals, and breaking complex issues into manageable parts


## Proposed Services

SCGCS understands that the Randolph County residents approved a ballot measure under Section 190.455 RSMo. which allows for governing bodies to impose a monthly fee on subscribers of any communications service that has been enabled to contact 911 . It is further understood that the revenues from the new $9-1-I$ fee are less than expected.

SCGCS proposes to provide technical consulting services to conduct a financial audit related to the remittance of the newly imposed $9-1-1$ fee by contacting all telecommunications services providers. SCGCS will also re-evaluate the initial revenue projections based on known revenues from other similar sized jurisdictions that are collecting the same 9-I-I fee. After the telecommunications service providers have been contacted and provided with the pertinent information regarding the proper collection and remittance rules per Section 190.455 RSMo., SCGCS will then monitor the remitted revenues for at least the next 90 days to see if any changes occur in the receipts from the Missouri Department of Revenue.

While the revenue receipts are being monitored, SCGCS will conduct on-site interviews with local staff and officials to evaluate the 9-I-I emergency call flow and handling between the City of Moberly Police Department, the primary Emergency Communications Center (ECC) for Randolph County and the Randolph County Ambulance District, a secondary ECC that receives transferred medical emergency calls from the Moberly Police Department ECC. Call volumes, transfers and processing times will be evaluated along with the type and level of training at both ECC's will also be documented. Last, the level of technology at both ECC's will be evaluated and documented. The anticipated outcome will be statistical data along with sound, solid advice and recommendations for improvement to the $9-1-\mathrm{I}$ call process and dispatch function that will increase overall operational efficiency.

## Project Schedule

SCGCS will begin work immediately upon contract signing. The project term and duration is anticipated to be 90-I20 days.

## Deliverables

SCGCS will provide the following deliverables as a part of this contract.

- Telecommunications Service Provider Contact Report
- 9-I-I Fee Remittance Report with Revenue Projections
- Emergency Communications Center Call Flow Analysis \& Recommendations Report
- Zoom meetings and conference calls as necessary
- A minimum of one (I) on-site meeting as mutually agreed upon


## City of Moberly Responsibilities

The City staff will be expected to provide support and coordination in order to assure the successful completion of all tasks as follows:

- Provide access to pertinent offices and records
- Providing local project contact(s)
- Providing copies of any prior completed reports and documentation
- Providing meeting facilities for local project meetings
- Cooperation from agencies and departments, as needed
- Timely response to follow up data requests and confirmation requests
- Timely review of documents and reports


## Project Costs

The following costs reflect services proposed within the scope described herein.

| Service Description \& Fees |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 9-I-I Fee Remittance Research \& Analysis | $\$ 1,500$ |
| 9-I-I Call Flow Review, Analysis \& Recommendations | $\$ 8,500$ |
| Total Cost |  |$\$ 10,000$

## Project Experience \& References

Following are a list of projects and references for SCGCS.

- Jersey County, IL (Completed 2016) Project Cost: \$50,000

Assist the Jersey County Emergency Telephone System Board JETSB) by providing consulting services and project management required to re-direct the wireless Phase $9-I-I$ calls from the Illinois State Police for adjacent Calhoun and Greene County's to the Jersey County PSAP which will enable the JETSB to capture additional wireless $9-I-I$ revenues as well as provide Phase I and Phase II wireless services to the residents or Calhoun and Greene Counties which currently do not have E-9II service.
Contact: William Hedger - (6I8) 498-557I whedger@jerseycounty-il.us

- South Sioux City, NE (Completed 2016) Project Cost: \$825,000

Project planning, specifications development and procurement management services for the following:

■ NG9-I-I Compliant Telephone System Replacement

- Radio Console System Upgrade
- NG9-I-I Compliant Voice Logging Recorder Upgrade
- CAD/RMS Upgrade

Contact: Greg Koinzon - (402) 494-7572 gkoinzan@southsiouxcity.org

- Three Affiliated Tribes, ND (Completed 2017) Project Cost: \$1,200,000

Project planning, specifications development for procurement of the following:
■ NG9-I-I Telephony Equipment

- Radio Communications Control Consoles

■ Modular Dispatch Furniture
■ Computer Aided Dispatch System Upgrades

- IP Compatible Voice Logging Recorder

The project also involved the construction of a completely new facility with coordination with project architects and engineers on PSAP layout, design, HVAC and technology elements.
Contact: Monica Trevino-Trousdale - (70I) 627-36I7 mtrevino@mhanation.com

- Hamilton \& Merrick Counties, NE (Completed 2018) Project Cost \$350,000

Retained to provide support services to facilitate the consolidation of dispatch operations between Hamilton and Merrick Counties with Hamilton Co expanding their dispatch operation with an additional operator position and new updated CAD/RMS.
Contact: Deb Wehmeier, 9|I Director - (402) 694-6936 9|lsupervisor@hamilton.net

## - Boone \& Nance Counties, NE (Completed 2019) Project Cost \$550,000

Retained to provide support services to facilitate the consolidation of dispatch operations between Boone and Nance Counties with Boone Co planning to expand their dispatch operation with new radio console equipment, and new CAD/RMS.
Contacts: Sheriff Denny Johnson, Boone Co - (402) 395-2। 44 bcsheriff@boone-county.org
Sheriff Ben Bakewell, Nance Co - (308) 436-2452 nancesheriff@nance.nacone.org

## - Fayette County, IA (Completed 2019)

Retained to evaluate the $9-I-I$ and communications traffic and associated workload at the two emergency communications centers serving the county to determine if one of the centers could handle and manage the aggregated call volume and workload of both centers and what the resulting impact on staffing and technology would be.
Contact: Brenda VandeVoorde - (563) 422-6I28 bvandevoorde@fayettecountyso.us

- Antelope County, NE (Ongoing)

Retained consultant to Sheriff's Department providing on-going advise and technical expertise regarding technology and NG9-I-I deployment.
Contact: Sheriff Robert Moore - (402) 887-5560 sheriff@antelopecounty.org

- Burt County, NE (Ongoing)

Retained consultant to Sheriff's Department providing on-going advise and technical expertise regarding technology and NG9-I-I deployment.
Contact: Sheriff Eric Nick - (402) 374-2900 sheriff@burtcounty.org

## $\square$ Clay County, IA (Ongoing)

Retained consultant to County Joint 911 Service Board providing on-going advise and technical expertise regarding technology and legislation affecting the Board and PSAP(s).
Contact: Eric Tigges - (7I2) 264-3987 etigges@co.clay.ia.us

- Poweshiek County, IA (Ongoing)

Retained consultant to County Joint 911 Service Board providing on-going advise and technical expertise regarding technology and legislation affecting the Board and PSAP(s).
Contact: Dawn Disney - (64I) 623-5679 ddisney@poweshiekcosheriff.com
■ Winneshiek County, IA (Ongoing)
Retained consultant to County Joint 91I Service Board providing on-going advise and technical expertise regarding technology and legislation affecting the Board and PSAP(s).
Contact: Sheriff Dan Marx - (563) 382-3667 dmarx@co.winneshiek.ia.us

- Columbus/Platte County, NE (Completed 2019) Project Cost $\$ 1,830,000$

Retained to provide support for efforts by the City and County to consolidate 91I and communications services at a new joint communications center. Contact: Tim Hofbauer (402) 564-I206 tim.hofbauer@plattene.us

## - Maryville/Nodaway County, MO (Current Project)

Dispatch and emergency communications consolidation feasibility study following by project management services to implement a new joint communications center within the new Maryville Public Safety Center. Contact: Keith Wood - (660) 562-3209 director@maryvilledps.com

## A SHORT HISTORY OF 911 IN RANDOLPH COUNTY/ MOBERLY

1967 President's Commission on Law Enforcement recommends the establishment of a nationwide single number for reporting emergencies. AT\&T and the FCC meet to discuss the introduction of a nationwide emergency number.

1968 Alabama Telephone Company becomes the first telephone service to implement 911.
1972 Columbia, Missouri implements a 911 system.
1980 Moberly contracts with Southwestern Bell Telephone for an emergency 911 number for Moberly.

1986 Boone County implements a 911 system.
1994 Moberly authorizes imposition of a 911 emergency telephone service tax (Sec. 190.305 RSMo.) not to exceed $11 \%$ of the tariffed local service rate. Tax collection to commence July 1, 1994.

2002 Randolph County and Moberly agree that Moberly will provide Enhanced 911 for all of Randolph County in exchange for the County paying the city $\$ 60,000.00$ per year.

2005 Moberly enters into agreement with Southwestern Bell to provide Enhanced 911 service for all of Randolph County. At a minimum Moberly must provide E911 to all law enforcement agencies, ambulance districts and fire districts located in the county. Required to provide 24/7 answering of 911 calls.

2019 Randolph County ballot measure to authorize fee on all cell phones for additional 911 funding passes (Sec. 190.450 RSMo.).

2020911 Service Board and Department of Revenue reduce Moberly's 911 emergency telephone service tax to $\$ 1.00$ per device resulting in no net gain for 911 funding.

PRESENT All 911 calls in Randolph County are routed through the Moberly PSAP to be forwarded to the appropriate responding agency. Moberly is liable for all costs associated with the call center. Randolph County Ambulance District has never contributed any funding to the call center.

|  | TOTAL | MTD | YTD | PERCENT |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACCOUNT NUMBER | ACCOUNT TITLE | BUDCET | BALANCE | BALANCE | EXPENDED | UNEXPENDED |

EMERGENCY TELEPHONE FUND FUND

| 400.000.4113 | MOBERLY LANDLINE FEES | 90,000.00 | 15,548.78 | 15,548.78 | 17.28 | 74,451.22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 400.000.4116 | randolph CTY Landline fees | . 00 | 3,073.13 | 3,073.13 | . 00 | 3,073.13 |
| 400.000.4117 | RAND CTY WIRELESS DEVICE FEES | 241,800.00 | 3,547.44 | 3,547.44 | 1.47 | 238,252.56 |
|  | TAXES TOTAL | 331,800.00 | 22,169.35 | 22,169.35 | 6.68 | 309,630.65 |
| 400.000.4600 | TRANSFER FROM CENERAL FUND | 250,000.00 | 20,833.33 | 20,833.33 | 8.33 | 229,166.67 |
|  | TRANSFERS IN TOTAL | 250,000.00 | 20,833.33 | 20,833.33 | 8.33 | 229,166.67 |
| 400.000.4901 | INTEREST INCOME | 250.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 250.00 |
|  | MISC REVENUES TOTAL | 250.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 250.00 |
|  | total revenue | 582,050.00 | 43,002.68 | 43,002.68 | 7.39 | 539,047.32 |
| 400.000.5100 | SALARIES | 218,310.40 | 12,388.12 | 12,388.12 | 5.67 | 205,922.28 |
| 400.000.5101 | FICA | 16,815.48 | 973.26 | 973.26 | 5.79 | 15,842.22 |
| 400.000.5102 | LAGERS | 27,275.64 | 858.19 | 858.19 | 3.15 | 26,417.45 |
| 400.000.5103 | HEALTH INSURANCE | 72,474.12 | 4,798.93 | 4,798.93 | 6.62 | 67,675.19 |
| 400.000.5104 | LIABILITY \& WORKMEN'S COMP INS | 18,396.70 | 18,348.41 | 18,348.41 | 99.74 | 48.29 |
| 400.000.5105 | LONG TERY DISABILITY | 851.42 | 38.68 | 38.68 | 4.54 | 812.74 |
| 400.000.5106 | OVERTIME SALARIES | 1,500.00 | 82.32 | 82.32 | 5.49 | 1,417.68 |
| 400.000.5107 | CLOTHING ALLOWANCE | 3,150.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 3,150.00 |
| 400.000.5108 | HOUSINC ALLOWANCE | 16,800.00 | 300.00 | 300.00 | 1.79 | 16,500.00 |
|  | PERSONNEL SERVICES TOTAL | 375,573.76 | 37,787.91 | 37,787.91 | 10.06 | 337,785.85 |
| 400.000.5200 | CENERAL SUPPLIES | 1,050.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 1,050.00 |
| 400.000.5204 | LAUNDRY, CLEANING, \& Janitor S | 50.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 50.00 |
| 400.000.5206 | UNIFORMS | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
| 400.000.5209 | ELECTRICITY \& CAS | 4,500.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 4,500.00 |
| 400.000.5211 | TELEPHONE | 72,000.00 | 7,936.37 | 7,936.37 | 11.02 | 64,063.63 |
| 400.000.5217 | SAFETY \& MEDICAL SUPPLIES | 235.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 235.00 |
|  | SUPPLIES TOTAL | 77,835.00 | 7,936.37 | 7,936.37 | 10.20 | 69,898.63 |
| 400.000.5300 | BuILDINC MAINTENANCE | 2,250.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 2,250.00 |
| 400.000.5306 | OFFICE EQuipMent Maintenance | 300.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 300.00 |
| 400.000.5307 | RADIO MAINTENANCE | 2,750.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 2,750.00 |
| 400.000.5311 | GENERAL EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE | 1,500.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 1,500.00 |
|  | REPAIRS \& MAINTENANCE TOTAL | 6,800.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 6,800.00 |
| 400.000.5402 | TRAining recistration | 2,500.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 2,500.00 |

BUDGET REPORT
Page

| ACCOUNT NUMBER | ACCOUNT TITLE | PCT OF FISCAL YTD 8.3\% |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TOTAL BUDCET | MTD BALANCE | YTD BALANCE | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PERCENT } \\ \text { EXPENDED } \end{array}$ | UNEXPENDED |
| 400.000.5403 | DATA PROCESSING | 13,400.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 13,400.00 |
| 400.000.5406 | CONTRACTED SERVICES | 500.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 500.00 |
| 400.000.5411 | ADMINISTRATIVE FEES | 26,995.67 | 2,286.21 | 2,286.21 | 8.47 | 24,709.46 |
| 400.000.5421 | 9-1-1 COUNTY EXPENSES | 30,437.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 30,437.00 |
| 400.000.5502 | CONTRACTUAL SERVICES TOTAL | 73,832.67 | 2,286.21 | 2,286.21 | 3.10 | 71,546.46 |
|  | CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 32,867.50 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 32,867.50 |
|  | CAPITAL OUTLAY TOTAL | 32,867.50 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 32,867.50 |
| 400.000.5600 | TRANSFER TO CENERAL FUND | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  | TRANSFERS TO TOTAL | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  | TOTAL EXPENSES | 566,908.93 | 48,010.49 | 48,010.49 | 8.47 | 518,898.44 |
|  | EMERCENCY TELEPHONE FUND TOTA | 15,141.07 | 5,007.81- | 5,007.81- | 33.07- | 20,148.88 |


|  |  | TOTAL | MTD | YTD | PERCENT |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ACCOUNT NUMBER | ACCOUNT TITLE | BUDGET | BALANCE | BALANCE | EXPENDED | UNEXPENDED |

EMERCENCY TELEPHONE FUND FUND

| 400.000.4113 | MOBERLY LANDLINE FEES | 115,000.00 | 530.91 | 87,269.20 | 75.89 | 27,730.80 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 400.000.4116 | Randolph CTy landine fees | 70,000.00 | 3,199.00 | 99,366.02 | 141.95 | 29,366.02- |
| 400.000.4117 | RAND CTY WIRELESS DEVICE FEES | 275,000.00 | 14,721.85 | 42,909.91 | 15.60 | 232,090.09 |
|  | TAXES TOTAL | 460,000.00 | 18,451.76 | 229,545.13 | 49.90 | 230,454.87 |
| 400.000.4600 | TRANSFER FROM GENERAL FUND | 250,000.00 | 50,000.00 | 250,000.00 | 100.00 | . 00 |
|  | TRANSFERS IN TOTAL | 250,000.00 | 50,000.00 | 250,000.00 | 100.00 | . 00 |
| 400.000.4901 | INTEREST INCOME | 5,600.00 | . 00 | 965.58 | 17.24 | 4,634.42 |
|  | MISC REVENUES TOTAL | 5,600.00 | . 00 | 965.58 | 17.24 | 4,634.42 |
|  | total revenue | 715,600.00 | 68,451.76 | 480,510.71 | 67.15 | 235,089.29 |
| 400.000.5100 | Salaries | 249,784.81 | 16,979.64 | 218,055.29 | 87.30 | 31,729.52 |
| 400.000.5101 | FICA | 20,507.27 | 1,285.07 | 16,076.28 | 78.39 | 4,430.99 |
| 400.000.5102 | LAGERS | 30,834.42 | 1,288.98 | 19,623.60 | 63.64 | 11,210.82 |
| 400.000.5103 | HEALTH INSURANCE | 69,651.35 | 5,577.86 | 67,031.75 | 96.24 | 2,619.60 |
| 400.000.5104 | LIABILITY \& WORKMEN'S COMP INS | 20,376.95 | . 00 | 19,222.45 | 94.33 | 1,154.50 |
| 400.000.5105 | LONC TERY DISABILITY | 1,038.72 | 45.13 | 580.00 | 55.84 | 458.72 |
| 400.000.5106 | OVERTIME SALARIES | 1,500.00 | 96.43 | 2,201.69 | 146.78 | 701.69- |
| 400.000.5107 | CLOTHINC ALLOWANCE | 3,150.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 3,150.00 |
| 400.000.5108 | HOUSING ALLOWANCE | 16,800.00 | 600.00 | 2,433.79 | 14.49 | 14,366.21 |
|  | PERSONNEL SERVICES TOTAL | 413,643.52 | 25,873.11 | 345,224.85 | 83.46 | 68,418.67 |
| 400.000.5200 | CENERAL SUPPLIES | 1,050.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 1,050.00 |
| 400.000.5204 | LAUNDRY, CLEANING, \& JANITOR S | 50.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 50.00 |
| 400.000.5206 | UNIFORMS | . 00 | . 00 | 72.00 | . 00 | 72.00- |
| 400.000.5209 | ELECTRICITY \& CAS | 4,500.00 | . 00 | 303.82 | 6.75 | 4,196.18 |
| 400.000.5211 | TELEPHONE | 72,000.00 | 7,865.36 | 87,467.72 | 121.48 | 15,467.72- |
| 400.000.5217 | SAFETY \& MEDICAL SUPPLIES | 235.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 235.00 |
|  | SUPPLIES TOTAL | 77,835.00 | 7,865.36 | 87,843,54 | 112.86 | 10,008.54- |
| 400.000.5300 | Buildinc maintenance | 2,250.00 | . 00 | 4,314.45 | 191.75 | 2,064.45- |
| 400.000.5306 | OFFICE EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE | 300.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 300.00 |
| 400.000.5307 | RADIO MAINTENANCE | 2,750.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 2,750.00 |
| 400.000.5311 | CENERAL EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE | 1,500.00 | . 00 | 26,488.00 | 1,765.87 | 24,988.00- |
|  | REPAIRS \& MAINTENANCE TOTAL | 6,800.00 | . 00 | 30,802.45 | 452.98 | 24,002.45- |
| 400.000.5402 | TRAINING RECISTRATION | 2,500.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 2,500.00 |


| ACCOUNT NUMBER | ACCOUNT TITLE | PCT OF FISCAL YTD 100.0\% |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TOTAL BUDCET | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MTD } \\ & \text { BALLANE } \end{aligned}$ | YTD BALANCE | $\begin{gathered} \text { PERCENT } \\ \text { EXPENDED } \end{gathered}$ | UNEXPENDED |
| 400.000.5403 | data Processinc | 37,400.00 | . 00 | 1,667.00 | 4.46 | 35,733.00 |
| 400.000.5406 | CONTRACTED SERVICES | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
| 400.000.5411 | adMinistrative fees | 32,596.37 | 1,686.92 | 32,306.01 | 99.11 | 290.36 |
| 400.000.5415 | OTHER PROFESSIONAL SERVICES | 500.00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 500.00 |
| 400.000.5421 | 9-1-1 COUNTY EXPENSES | 30,437.86 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | 30,437.86 |
|  | CONTRACTUAL SERVICES TOTAL | 103,434.23 | 1,686.92 | 33,973.01 | 32.85 | 69,461.22 |
| 400.000.5502 | CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN | 100,000,00 | . 00 | 180,582.50 | 180.58 | 80,582.50- |
|  | CAPITAL OUTLAY TOTAL | 100,000.00 | . 00 | 180,582.50 | 180.58 | 80,582.50- |
| 400.000.5600 | TRANSFER TO CENERAL FUND | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  | TRANSFERS TO TOTAL | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 | . 00 |
|  | TOTAL EXPENSES | 701,712.75 | 35,425.39 | 678,426.35 | 96.68 | 23,286.40 |
|  | EMERCENCY TELEPHONE FUND TOTA | 13,887.25 | 33,026.37 | 197,915.64-1 | 1,425.16- | 211,802.89 |


| MONTH/YEAR | MPD | MFD | RCAD | RCSO | HUN | CLARK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jan-19 | 72 | 52 | 180 | 19 | 1 | 0 |
| Feb-19 | 60 | 49 | 166 | 22 | 0 | 0 |
| Mar-19 | 99 | 55 | 145 | 26 | 2 | 0 |
| Apr-19 | 103 | 48 | 132 | 17 | 0 | 0 |
| May-19 | 83 | 30 | 139 | 48 | 2 | 0 |
| Jun-19 | 87 | 48 | 140 | 29 | 0 | 0 |
| Jul-19 | 93 | 56 | 175 | 25 | 0 | 0 |
| Aug-19 | 75 | 59 | 169 | 34 | 1 | 0 |
| Sep-19 | 95 | 49 | 182 | 22 | 0 | 0 |
| Oct-19 | 74 | 49 | 148 | 32 | 0 | 0 |
| Nov-19 | 79 | 46 | 135 | 31 | 0 | 0 |
| Dec-19 | 73 | 32 | 139 | 34 | 1 | 0 |



| MONTH/YEAR | MPD | MFD | RCAD | RCSO | HUN | CLARK |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jan-20 | 78 | 67 | 196 | 18 | 3 | 0 |
| Feb-20 | 62 | 45 | 176 | 22 | 3 | 0 |
| Mar-20 | 82 | 15 | 171 | 20 | 1 | 0 |
| Apr-20 | 66 | 11 | 140 | 20 | 2 | 0 |
| May-20 | 64 | 10 | 74 | 18 | 0 | 0 |



RCAD is calls transferred to RCAD for dispatch * $\begin{gathered}15 \\ \text { there will be call overlap }{ }^{* *} \text { may is thru 05-21-2020 }\end{gathered}$

# Crioberly! 

## Police Department

Troy Link
Interim Chief of Police
264th Session FBI Academy

300 N Clark Street
Moberly, MO 65270
Phone: 660-263-0346
Fax: 660-263-8540

Date: 08/17/2020
Attention: Recipients of 911 Calls by Agency Statistics
Reference: Letter of Clarification
Earlier this year I was asked to provide information on the number of 911 calls handled by the different agencies. It should be noted that these numbers are a reflection of 911 calls that were actual calls to service, not the total 911 calls received in the time frame. The distinction is due to the fact we receive several 911 calls that are accidental dials, children playing with deactivated cell phones, and public using the 911 system for calls that do not constitute an actual emergency (power outage and general information questions). There is no actual report from our 911 system that can generate a report that reflects these numbers; this is due to the fact that 911 calls are assigned to each agency by the human dispatcher answering the call by speaking to the caller and determining the nature of the emergency and the location where services are required. In order to generate numbers that best reflected this request, I used 2 different methods to come up with the information.

The first method I used was to determine the law and city fire 911 calls for service. This was done by using Spillman Flex our RMS (report management system). When 911 calls come into dispatch and a call is generated into our RMS for service, it shows the call origin as E911. By doing individual searches for each agency and call origin as E911 I was able to best determine the number of calls for service originating from 911 calls for Moberly Police Department, Randolph County Sheriff Office, Huntsville Police Department, Clark Police Department and Moberly Fire Department. Due to Moberly Joint Communications being responsible for dispatching these calls through a system that I have knowledge of and access to I was able to pull these reports and generate the information to a degree that I felt reasonably reflects the calls to service by agency.

The second method I used was to determine the 911 calls to RCAD (Randolph County Ambulance District). Due to the way our dispatching system is set up, once a call is determined to be medical, it is transferred by the dispatcher to RCAD for further action. During this transaction, because we are not dispatching any RCAD units for the call there is no further action taken as far as entry of calls for medical service into our RMS. Because of this there was no way for me to check our RMS for 911 calls handled by RCAD. The best and most reasonable way to determine the number of 911 medical calls sent by dispatch to RCAD was to use the 911 system software to do a search of 'calls for speed dial entry for ! ${ }^{*} 20$ ' which is the speed dial number we use when sending 911 calls to RCAD for service once they are determined to be of medical nature.

I attempted to make it clear that 2 different methods were used to generate the information provided in the reports I created, and even noted at the bottom "RCAD is
calls transferred for RCAD dispatch * there will be overlap on some calls'. I tried my best to explain to Chief Link how I came to the numbers provided so he would be able to answer any questions about the reports. I realize now that I should have written this letter of explanation and attached it to the reports to further clarify. I did my best to verbally caution that there was a larger amount of error in the RCAD numbers compared to the other numbers due to the fact that the $!^{*} 20$ number is also used by dispatch when we contact RCAD to request an ambulance for officers on a call, or to relay information to RCAD about a call which Moberly Fire responded to for medical assist or request for their services for a fire call. It also does not take into account that one RCAD event may have more than one 911 call; however it would still be calls that would have to be serviced by the Moberly Joint Communications Dispatcher to determine the nature of the call and then transferred to RCAD for further processing.

After the information was first received by the recipients I was contacted by Mike Mattox to go over the information in the reports and how it was generated. I showed him the 2 different methods used, and explained to him as I have in this letter that there was going to be a bigger margin of error for the RCAD numbers than the others due to the method used to gather the information. At the time of the meeting I strongly suggested to Mr. Mattox since he was in close contact with RCAD to speak to them about generating reports for service using whatever RMS system they use to keep track of runs to see what their numbers showed. This way he could compare them to the numbers I was able to best determine for RCAD, to find a better reflection of the calls for service from 911 that RCAD responds to. I assume for audit purposes RCAD is capable of determining the 911 calls for service through their RMS as I was able to for ours, considering that ! 20 goes to their phone line reserved for 911 emergency. I did not ever receive follow up on if he was able to receive these numbers from the RMS used by RCAD.

Hopefully this letter helps to clarify any confusion caused by the reports I provided earlier in the year. If anyone has any further questions, I would be more than happy to answer them to the best of my ability. I do apologize for any confusion created by the numbers provided, again it was difficult to fully determine RCAD's numbers due to the separation of our agency as would be expected.

Bobbie Smith 294


| Month Year | MPD | MFD | RCSO | HUN | CLARK | $\text { HPD }+ \text { Clark calls }$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jan-19 | 849 | 100 | 215 | 104 | 0 | atomaticallyaddecl |
| Feb-19 | 793 | 93 | 194 | 63 | 7 |  |
| Mar-19 | 944 | 97 | 233 | 60 | 11 | as RCSO if no HPD |
| Apr-19 | 975 | 82 | 225 | 39 | 9 | officer auailable |
| May-19 | 1002 | 75 | 249 | 21 | 1 | or Clark ofticer auailab |
| Jun-19 | 1066 | 100 | 281 | 0 | 7 | to Respond. |
| Jul-19 | 1022 | 113 | 267 | 1 | 6 | 10Respond |
| Aug-19 | 978 | 101 | 287 | 1 | 1 |  |
| Sep-19 | 963 | 96 | 230 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Oct-19 | 954 | 90 | 229 | 4 | 8 |  |
| Nov-19 | 884 | 83 | 239 | 20 | 6 |  |
| Dec-19 | 878 | 59 | 255 | 15 | 0 |  |




This includes 911, Non-Emergency, Officer Initrated Calls (traffic stop, field contact, building check)

## Joint City/County/RCAD Meeting

911 Discussion

- 1980 - City Establishes 911 Number
- 1994 - City of Moberly implements 911 using a tariff of roughly $11 \%$ on all city landlines
- 2002 - Countywide 911 is implemented through City 911 Center using a tariff on all county landlines
- 2005 - City agrees to provide 911 for all of Randolph County
- 2019- City and County enter into a new three year agreement for 911 and dispatching for city and county services using a mix of 911 landline fees in city, 911 landline fees in county and a new 911 mobile phone tax.


## 10 year review of 911 Fees

| City of Moberly 9-1-1 Fees Received |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vendor | 2009-2010 | 2010.2011 | $2011 \cdot 2012$ | 2012.2013 | 2013.2014 | 20142015 | 2015.2016 | 2016-2017 | 2017.2018 | 2010-2019 | 2019-2020 | total | Comments |
| exa mc |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21842 | 34233 | 148.78 | 709.54 |  |
| Access ponit |  |  |  |  |  | 34.80 | 24.38 | 28741 | 45989 | 29134 |  | 1.096 .69 |  |
| ACN come |  |  |  | 37.63 | 6375 | 70.25 | 62.29 | S1.48 | 6459 | 39.15 | 30.31 | $413 / 5$ |  |
| ARBMNO |  |  |  |  | 18.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16.55 |  |
| ARESPPING |  |  |  |  |  |  | 447.95 | 375.48 | 50064 | 37547 | 125.28 | 1.824.82 | Last porment 10 20, 9 |
| ALTEL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 48 | 26.86 | 31.85 |  |
| AMERICAN BGOADPAND |  |  |  |  | 16.63 | 1658 |  |  |  |  |  | 33.19 |  |
| AnPr Buginess. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25728 | 1es, 01 | 421.29 |  |
| ATBT |  |  |  | 265 | 7.35 | 4.98 | 6.26 | 18.47 | 1521 | 31.26 | 107.4 | 192.58 | Uuvaly 1.2 poymerta per Trocal warlod |
| ATLANTAX SYSTEMS |  |  |  |  |  | 44.92 |  | 128.16 |  |  |  | 189.98 |  |
| avalaramc |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16.25 | 118.47 | 134.72 | Last paymer 122019 |
| BRCH TELECOM |  |  |  | 39810 | 2,18324 | 3.000 .13 | 3,08026 | 3.30340 | 3,08035 | 1.379 .08 |  | 18,488.86 |  |
| BROADMEW NETWORKS. INC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22.28 | 22.28 |  |
| BULSEVE TEECOM |  |  |  | 55622 | 25258 | 431.22 | 48290 | 4S475 | 41840 | 429.53 | 301.88 | 3.321.54 |  |
| ceucopartnersmp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.4 | 82.83 | 34.37 |  |
| CHAPRTON VALLEY |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.52 |  |  |  |  | 252 |  |
| CHARTER |  |  |  | 6,29128 | 22.825 .54 | 29 s50.63 | 33, 298.18 | 33,14127 | 32,9440 | 27,123,38 | geeat | 196,795.92 | Morilily peyments dropped to about hat starting 12/2019 |
| COMPLIANCE SOLUTIONS |  |  |  | 6211 | t99,15 | 74.99 | 10170 | $79 \times 0$ |  | 48.00 | 2427 | 65002 |  |
| FASTEK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 125.15 | 128.15 | 25030 | Lax eamen 720010 |
| FUSION TELECOM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,100.25 | 1,00565 | 2.11380 |  |
| grante telecom |  |  |  | 6.22037 | 8.294 .71 | 9247.19 | 10,200.19 | 10,00306 | 12.806 .54 | 14.582.21 |  | 72.201 .26 | Ota toutinses 102019 |
| great cell |  |  |  | 28.50 |  |  | 1369 |  |  |  |  | 42.13 |  |
| INTERFACE SEC SYSTEVS |  |  |  | 15.81 | 126.54 | 174.58 | 20183 | 127.18 | 18970 | 13576 | 7263 | 1.031.59 |  |
| Level 3 communications |  |  |  |  |  | 8734 | 15860 | 2192.85 | 62.27 | 163 | $381 / 2$ | 3.02127 |  |
| MATRIX TELECOM |  |  |  | 83.52 | 174.18 | 137.02 | 119.84 | 128.88 | 48.72 |  | 2320 | 7153 |  |
| MCIMETRO ACCESS |  |  |  |  | 588.52 | ${ }^{8} 863$ | 54175 | 89603 | 698.99 | 455.89 | 19.41 | 3,89022 | Lostraymen 192019 |
| MCLEOD USA |  | 115.20 |  | 223 | 224 |  |  |  |  |  | 2965 | 43583 |  |
| MEITEL |  |  |  | 404.11 | 738.81 | $3 \times 047$ | 44523 | 24975 | 214.89 | 220.36 | 50115 | 3,104.27 |  |
| nexvortex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.05 | 188 | 1.50 | 0.90 | 525 | Lax Reymani 2raczo |
| Ooma |  |  |  | 0.68 |  |  |  |  |  | 12207 | 20.60 | 14355 |  |
| PaEtec COMMUNICATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.73 | 1.73 |  |
| PHONECOM |  |  |  | 2968 | 59.22 | 4455 | 1930 |  | 1.74 | 2139 | 537 | 172.20 | Last payment 102019 |
| PREFEPED LONG DISTANCE |  |  |  | 3330 | 454.38 | 76101 | 54580 | 384.20 | 457.60 | 313.43 | 21494 | 3,13458 |  |
| randocph County | 90,00000 | 83,242.15 | 76.274 .74 | 62.500,00 | 88,750.00 | 75,00000 | 7, 0 , 6850 | 2046200 | 67654,00 | 20,00000 | 81,36550 | 884,306.39 | Lastayment 12/2019 |
| Repuruic wireless |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2938 |  |  | 2938 |  |

## 10 year review of 911 Fees Continued

| City of Moberly 9-1-1 Fees Received |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vendor | 2009-2010 | 290.2019 | 2011.2012 | 2012.2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014.2015 | 20152018 | $2016-2017$ | 2017-2018 | 2010-2019 | 2019-2020 | TOTAL | Commants |
| RNGCENTRAL |  |  |  |  |  | 23128 | 139.90 | 4528 |  | 109.28 | 195.09 | 721.53 |  |
| SOCKET |  |  |  | 10.93324 | 1735287 | 17,461.83 | 1780098 | 16.32952 | 15,981.16 | 16,157, 37 | 18329.49 | 129566.49 |  |
| SOUTHWESTERN PELL | 117,991.05 | 12, 685.44 | 122,24,36 | 102,045.72 | 100,475,96 | $722 \times 3.51$ | 111.088 .08 | 70,2208 | 60,08439 | 52.190.99 | 33011.54 | 9889890.01 | Luat esment $12 \times 20$ |
| tank america |  |  |  |  | 6.82 | 8.40 |  |  |  |  |  | 15.22 |  |
| taxconvex |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17.84 | 107.04 | 2894 | 33.94 | 29.05 | 216.81 |  |
| teecom evolutions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 29.62 | 29.62 |  |
| TEESEPERE NETWORXS |  |  |  |  |  | 874.65 | 789.36 |  |  |  |  | 1.464.01 |  |
| TNCI |  |  |  |  |  | 4300 | 194.50 | 1639 |  |  |  | 254.69 |  |
| UNTED NETWORK SERV |  |  |  |  | 23.32 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 23.32 |  |
| Vopstreet |  |  |  |  |  | 0.87 | 4.80 |  |  |  |  | 5.67 |  |
| VONAGE |  |  |  | 184.28 | 261.09 | 20886 | 780.4 | 1,76862 | 1.502 .48 | 1,066.50 | 518.88 | 6.461:6\% |  |
| Vonage tax account |  |  |  | 10068 | 145.90 | 5928 | 19205 |  |  |  |  | 539.12 |  |
| VORTEX |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.15 |  | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.45 |  |
| WEST PP COME |  |  |  |  |  | 218 | 058 | 1231 | 44.04 | 47.25 | 6358 | 187.79 |  |
| WHOLESME CARRER |  |  |  | 101.25 | 105.75 | 171.69 | 4860 |  |  | 157,18 | \$565. | \$20.03 |  |
| wnpatrean |  |  |  | 2.15 |  | 4.20 | 1239 | 17.20 | 0.53 | 641.45 | 588.28 | 1.252 .18 | Lost parmert 1228019 |
| Xo communications |  |  |  | 83588 | 404.02 | 458.03 | 257.28 | 27258 |  |  |  | 2.437.78 | Last porment 12017 |
| UMDENTPED | 22,13131 | 15,08388 | 20.740 54 | 2864689 |  |  |  | 1,181.14 |  | 1.881 .55 | 49.50 | 80.086.07 |  |
| totals | 230,12237 | 223, 00651 | 279,25973 | 220,285 63 | 233.000 .05 | 214,20, 7 | 260.14879 | 23272597 | 198.170.97 | 200,872.38 | 14atras.e9 | 23,37,579.20 |  |


| 911 Fees by Month |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Randolph County |  | Moberly Landline Fees | Randolph County |
|  |  |  | Wireless Device Fees |
| Apr-19 | 7,500.00 | 21,709.13 |  |
| May-19 | 7,500.00 | 2,017.63 |  |
| Jun-19 | 7,500.00 | 2,569.17 |  |
| Jul-19 | 7,500.00 | 21,643.71 |  |
| Aug-19 | 7,500.00 | 2,105.70 |  |
| Sep-19 | - | 2,066.10 |  |
| Oct-19 | 15,000.00 | 18,827.14 |  |
| Nov-19 | 43,865.50 | 1,913.31 |  |
| Dec-19 | 7,500.00 | 1,274.07 |  |
| Jan-20 | - | 17,988.69 |  |
| Feb-20 | - | 236.90 |  |
| Mar-20 | 8,322.90 | 581.40 | 3,768.75 |
| Apr-20 | 3,273.61 | 4,321.36 | 6,053.98 |
| May-20 | 3,205.01 | 844.70 | 18,365.33 |
| Jun-20 |  |  |  |
| 911 Fees Cumulative |  |  |  |
| Randolph County |  |  | Randolph County |
|  |  | Moberly Landline Fees | Wireless Device Fees |
| Apr-19 | 7,500.00 | 21,709.13 |  |
| May-19 | 15,000.00 | 23,726.76 |  |
| Jun-19 | 22,500.00 | 26,295.93 |  |
| Jul-19 | 30,000.00 | 47,939.64 |  |
| Aug-19 | $37,500.00$ | 50,045.34 |  |
| Sep-19 | 37,500.00 | 52,111.44 |  |
| Oct-19 | 52,500.00 | 70,938.58 |  |
| Nov-19 | 96,365.50 | 72,851.89 |  |
| Dec-19 | 103,865.50 | 74,125.96 |  |
| Jan-20 | 103,865.50 | 92,114.65 |  |
| Feb-20 | 103,865.50 | 92,351.55 |  |
| Mar-20 | 112,188.40 | 92,932.95 | 3,768.75 |
|  | 115,462.01 | 97,254.31 | 9,822.73 |
| $24-20$ | 118,667.02 | 98,099.01 | 28,188.06 |

## April 2019 to May 202 Fees for 911

911 Fees by Month
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## 2019-2020 Budget



| 409-911 Emergencr Telphone funi |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| devinues |  |
| taxes |  |
| $400 \cdot 00 \times 1113$ | Weomy Ladra fees |
| 200.00.415 | Rardowh Canty Landinv Fues |
| Exacosi17 | Mcolo Downa foer |
| taxes Total |  |
| TRMSFRR |  |
| 4500000480 | Trander fon Gemend furd |
| TReshrras Tornl |  |
| MSCEL LNEOUS |  |
| 400050950 | Itrosal hoome |
| MSCELINEOUS TOTAL |  |
| тotal reverues |  |
| Expesses |  |
| personnel |  |
| 4004005100 | Southes |
| 200.0005109 | FCA |
| 200.00. 102 | LMERS |
| 850.0025103 | thath lisersm |
| 4000025104 | Litielwc harance |
| 450000.5105 | Lorg Temp Dastiny |
| 4000035106 | Owuthe Sustree |
| 4500005107 | Oatricg Nomace |
| Pessonime Total |  |
|  |  |
| supples |  |
| 40.0805850 | Gomeal Scppes |
| 40058055296 |  |
| ${ }^{401050065208}$ | Examity Cam |
| ${ }^{400500052711}$ | Tenerome |
| sumpes total |  |
|  |  |
| STMALEENWCE |  |
| 25acou. 350 |  |
| ${ }^{40} 50.0055356$ |  |
| ${ }_{4} 40.0030 .5311$ |  |
| mentenuice total |  |
| COMTRACTUM SEREES |  |
| 4008085658 | Trunkg Ropatraion |
| 40.0 cossion | Oina Prowesm |
| 402500.34031 | Cortacae Sencos |
| 400.0055411 | Atmienutime Feen |
| ConTructual services toral |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { CONTTACTUAL SE } \\ & \text { C CPTTAL OULLAY } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 20.000 5502 |  |
| cintal dimar total |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| TOTN EXPENSES |  |



## Randolph County 911 Budget Issue

## Funding Shortfall Analysis

| FY2020-2021 Annaul Budget |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| REVENUES | AMOUNT |  | COMMENTS |
| Moberly Landline Fees |  | \$96,000.00 | 12 month estimate from 8-19 to 8-20 |
| Randolph County Landline Fees |  | \$96,000.00 | 12 month estimate from 8-19 to 8-20 |
| Mobile Device Fees |  | \$93,000.00 | 12 month estimate from 8-19 to 8-20 |
| Total Revenues |  | \$285,000.00 |  |
| MINIMUM ESTIMATED COST TO RUN 911 |  |  |  |
| EXPENSES | AMOUNT |  | COMMENTS |
| PERSONNEL |  | \$265,000 | 6 dispatchers |
| SUPPLIES |  | \$72,000 | Mostly ATT lines |
| MAINTENANCE |  | \$6,800.00 | radio maintenance |
| CONTRACUAL SERVICES |  | \$73,000.00 | Includes County Expenses |
| CAPITAL OUTLAY |  | \$32,000.00 | Hardware Upgrades |
| MISCELLANEOUS |  | \$2,500.00 | training |
| Total Expenses |  | \$451,300.00 |  |

- County provide half of the shortfall
- County provide half of the shortfall

Or

- City reduce services to Ambulance District and Sheriff's Dept. and return to a transfer calls only 911 center
Or


## Potential Solutions

- Status Quo and potential shortfall and reduction in quality of services Or
- Hire Consultant to review Current and potential new agency with new model and organization to handle 911 in county
Or
- City return to 911 only for City of Moberly

Or

- ?????

