

INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT
FOR THE OPERATION OF THE
GRANT COUNTY E911 COMMUNICATIONS CENTER

This agreement is entered into by and between all the agencies and entities which have signed this agreement.

Recitals:

1. The legislature of the State of Washington has provided through the interlocal cooperation act, as codified in RCW 39.34, the needed statutory authority and opportunity for Grant County and the cities, towns, fire districts, hospital districts, and miscellaneous service districts to enter into a contract and agreement to cooperatively establish, maintain, and operate a central communications center.
2. It is the desire and intent of all parties to this agreement to enhance both police and fire protection operations as well as emergency medical service operations and other various service operations in Grant County, all in a manner that will offer optimum opportunities for public support and confidence, effectiveness of operations, efficiencies and economies of operation, cooperation between jurisdictions, avoidance of unnecessary duplications of expenditures and efforts for attracting financial assistance from state, federal, and private resources, for implementation while yet assuring and enhancing the continuance and effectiveness of local policy and administrative control of police, fire, hospital, emergency medical service, and other operations.

Now, therefore, in consideration of the mutual covenants, terms, and conditions agreed to by each of the agencies, entities, and municipalities who are parties to this agreement, the parties agree as follows:

1. ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTER: The Grant County E911 Communications Center is hereby established for the purpose of providing consolidated answering of enhanced 911 telephone calls made from within the borders of Grant County and as outlined in Grant County's E911 Plan submitted to the State of Washington in April of 1994 along with the amendments subsequently made to the plan after submission to the State of Washington. This consolidated center is established within Grant County for the purpose of rendering enhanced 911 call answering and 911 call transfers and associated dispatch functions as appropriate.
2. PURPOSE: In consideration of the agreements of the parties hereto the Grant County E911 Communications Center shall provide police, fire, and EMS support communications to the signatories of this agreement. The Grant County E911 Communications Center shall provide the services by radio and/or telephone. Nothing within this agreement shall relieve the members from their responsibilities to provide their own equipment for receiving communications from Grant County and their own equipment for communications between their own personnel, except where otherwise agreed to.

The director of the Grant County E911 Communications Center or his/her designee shall act as the secretary of the Board of Directors.

The Board of Directors shall adopt and, when necessary, amend by-laws which shall more specifically set forth the definitional, operational, and procedural parameters and functions of the Grant County E911 Communications Center.

The Board of Directors shall be authorized and empowered by virtue of this agreement to perform all functions and duties described in the "By-laws for Grant County E911 Communications Center" adopted _____, 1994. In addition the Board of Directors is authorized and empowered to perform all other functions as may be deemed necessary to carry out its explicit duties and responsibilities as set forth in the by-laws including the allocation to participating agencies their financial responsibility for such portion of each year's operational cost.

5. ADVISORY COMMITTEES: The Grant County E911 Communications Center Board of Directors shall establish three (3) standing advisory committees, one for police/law enforcement, one for fire, and one for emergency medical services (EMS). These committees will be technical in nature and advise the Board of Directors on issues pertaining to the delivery of communication services to its constituent group/agencies.

The Board may establish other technical committees as needed or deemed necessary by the Board of Directors. These committees may be temporary in nature or scope of assignment or become a standing committee at the discretion of the Board of Directors.

- A. Police Technical Advisory Committee: The Police Technical Advisory Committee shall be comprised of five (5) members as follows:

The Grant County Sheriff, the Police Chiefs of Moses Lake, Ephrata, Soap Lake, Quincy, and Coulee City. The Police Chiefs may appoint a designee to act on their behalf on the Technical Advisory Committee.

- B. Fire Technical Advisory Committee: The Fire Technical Advisory Committee shall be comprised of five (5) members as follows:

The Fire Chiefs of Moses Lake and Ephrata, and three (3) representatives of three (3) different fire protection districts from within Grant County.

The Fire Chiefs of Moses Lake and Ephrata may appoint a designee to act on their behalf on the technical advisory committee.

- C. Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Technical Advisory Committee: The Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Technical Advisory Committee shall be comprised of five (5) members as follows:

participating member, the party shall be entitled to a proportionate share of the assets of the Grant County E911 Communications Center in the same manner as any other active participating agency.

7. CONSULTATION: The Board of Directors shall advise and consult with the police/law enforcement and fire/emergency medical services technical committees as such may be deemed necessary by the Board of Directors as to the scope and contact of the services to be undertaken by the Grant County E911 Communications Center.
8. PARTICIPATION IN THE GRANT COUNTY E911: An agency's right to receive services and to participate in any capacity in the functions of the Grant County E911 Communications Center shall be suspended when the party fails to transmit to the Board of Directors its assigned payment.

Each party to the agreement to the party shall be billed quarterly for its assigned payments. If a party fails to transmit to the Board of Directors its assigned payments within 90 days of the date of the billing to such agency is made by the Grant County E911 Communications Center, then the director shall immediately send to the non-paying agency a notice of proposed termination of services and participation, which notice shall give the non-paying party to this agreement 30 days in which to pay all past due arrearages. If such past due arrearages are not paid in full then the Board of Directors shall have authority to terminate all services to such party and all participation of such agency in the Grant County E911 Communications Center.

9. FILING: As provided by RCW 39.34.040, this agreement shall be filed prior to its entry and force with the participating agencies, the Grant County Auditor, the Secretary of State, and any other entity or agency as is required by law.
10. SEVERABILITY: If any section or provision of this agreement is determined to be invalid, such action shall not affect the validity of any other section or provision.
11. EXECUTION OF AGREEMENT: This agreement shall be executed on behalf of each party by its authorized representative pursuant to an appropriate resolution or ordinance from the respective local governmental unit entity or agency as the case may be. Each party to this agreement shall be bound to the agreement as of the date it is signed by that party.
12. AMENDMENT: It is specifically agreed by and between the parties to this agreement that this interlocal governmental agreement may be amended by the parties to the agreement.
13. WASHINGTON STATE PATROL LAW ENFORCEMENT DATA COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM REQUEST: The Advisory Council on Criminal Justice Services in the Washington State Patrol has requested that all participating communications centers, such as the Grant County E911 Communications Center, which are or may be terminal users of the Washington State Patrol Law Enforcement Data Communications System have



Address reply to:

Suite 210
 6 Chelsea Place
 Clifton Park, NY 12065
 Bus. (518) 383-7880
 (800) 237-4911
 Fax (518) 383-1280

August 24, 1994

Commissioner Helen Fancher
 Grant County
 P.O. Box 37
 Ephrata, Washington 98823

Dear Helen:

Pursuant to your request I have developed an estimate of the costs and staffing which would be necessary for Grant County to operate a full service dispatch center for all municipalities within the county.

Full service is defined as a communications center capable of receiving both emergency and administrative calls and providing dispatch and alerting services. Calls would either be transfer via telephone transfers to the appropriate agency or could be dispatched directly via radio. I would caution there needs to be a great deal of discussion about mechanism used to make these transfers as it impacts both personnel and equipment costs.

Departments would have to review and evaluate their own operations to make a determination on the need to have "windows" staffed for walk up traffic. It is assumed if a department chooses to have staffed a window operation, they would probably want administrative calls handled by the same person.

If there is one question I have about the entire operation, it is the radio systems and the need to have them integrated into the county communications center. RCC has not been charged with studying existing radio systems, therefore the indepth knowledge needed to make definitive judgements is not available. Our estimates are our best guess based upon our limited knowledge of the systems in use today.

Should you have any questions please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul E. Lent", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Paul E. Lent
 Senior Consultant - Group Leader Public Safety Systems Group

- Each full time position will require 5.2 persons to cover 24 hours per day 365 days per year.
- On some shifts dispatchers will be call takers also. Single stage dispatching.

Staffing Predictions

63,000 calls x 3 mins each for call taking and dispatch = 189,000 minutes.

189,000 ÷ 60 mins p/hour = 3,150 hours

3150 hrs ÷ 365 days p/year = 8.6 hrs of work p/day

8.6 hrs of work p/day x 60 minutes p/hr = 516 minutes p/day

By Shift workload prediction:

8-4 shift - 45% workload = 232.2 minutes of work ÷ 8 hrs = 29 minutes p/hr of work

4-12 shift - 40% workload = 206.4 minutes of work ÷ 8 hrs = 25.75 minutes p/hr of work

12-8 shift - 15% workload = 77.4 minutes of work ÷ 8 hrs = 9.6 p/hr minutes p/hr of work

Busy hour factor:

8-4 29 minutes x 4 busy hour factor = 116 minutes in the busy hour
116 minutes ÷ 38 available minutes p/hr = 3 staff persons

4-12 25.75 minutes x 4 busy hour factor = 103 minutes in the busy hour
103 minutes ÷ 38 available minutes p/hr = 2.7 staff persons

12-8 77.4 minutes x 4 busy hour factor = 309.6 minutes in the busy hour
309.6 minutes ÷ 38 available minutes p/hr = 8.15 staff person

Staffing Matrix:

Staff/Position	8-4 Shift	4-12 Shift	12-8 Shift
Dispatcher 1	x	x	x
Dispatcher 2	x	x	x
Call/Disp 1	x	x	
Calltaker 1	x		

Grant County, WA
Full Consolidated Communications Center
Impact Statement

Budget Reconciliation

Operating budget:

Items	1st Yr	2nd Yr
Supervisor	\$52,000	\$53,820
Fulltime Staff	\$275,000	\$296,010
Part-time Staff	\$32,500	\$33,638
Consoles/Equip	\$75,000	\$0
Misc Equip Costs	\$25,000	\$17,500
Operating Expenses	\$30,000	\$40,000
TOTALS	\$489,500	\$440,968

Participants Costs:

First year assumption, County will pick up \$225,000 of first year cost leaving \$264,500 to be amortized among participants.

Second year assumption, County will pick up \$225,000 of second year costs leaving \$215,968 to be amortized among participants.

Participant	% of use	First Year costs	Second year costs
Sheriff	57%	\$150,765	\$123,102
Moses Lake	21%	\$55,545	\$45,354
Ephrata	11%	\$29,095	\$23,756
Others	11%	\$29,095	\$23,756
TOTALS	100%	\$264,500	\$215,968

As is apparent there are some second costs which are reduced. Salaries were estimated to increase an average of 3.5% in the second year.

It is emphasized these costs are estimates based upon the best information available to RCC. More indepth study could alter the costs depending the additional information which is developed.

These costs should used as an estimate only.

DRAFT

Grant County E 9-1-1
Participant List
Exhibit "A"

	Coulee City
	Quincy Valley
	District 8
	District 10
Hospital District	?

GRANT COUNTY E 9-1-1
Consolidated Public Safety Communications Agreement

DRAFT

Exhibit C

Services to Participant Agencies

Agency	9-1-1 Call Taking	9-1-1 Call Transfer	Direct Dispatching	Alerting
Grant Co SO	X		X	
Moses Lk PD	X	X		
Ephrata PD	X	X		
Moses Lk FD	X		X	
Ephrata FD	X		X	
All other fire and EMS	X		X	X

Grant County, WA.
PSAP Configuration Options

needed to service Moses Lake would only answer the 9-1-1 call and then transfer it to Moses Lake Police Department for action. Calls originating within the City of Moses Lake for fire and ambulance service would be dispatch directly from the County.

The City of Ephrata does not generate enough call volume to warrant additional staff at the County PSAP, however as was outlined in my previous memo there is some workload impact to receiving and dispatching these calls. Moses Lake's call volume added to the Ephrata's does warrant an additional position, which would require five additional personnel to staff one position full time 24 hours per day.

All other 9-1-1 services would occur as they do now under basic 9-1-1, with the exception of calls for Fire District 5. They would be dispatched directly by the County.

Summary Option 2

- Single PSAP at County, calls for Moses Lake would be transferred to the a secondary PSAP at Moses Lake PD.
- Ephrata's 9-1-1 calls would be answered and dispatched by the County (including Fire District 13).
- The cost for a secondary at Moses Lake would be approximately \$30,000-45,000 in equipment for ANI/ALI.
- Configuration would meet the requirements of the State for a consolidated 9-1-1 system.

Option 3 - This option would call for a single primary PSAP at the County, with secondary answering points at Moses Lake Police and Ephrata Police. All 9-1-1 calls in the County would be answered at the county communication center, with those calls which need dispatch to Moses Lake Police, Fire and Ambulance, as well as those for Ephrata Police, Fire, Fire District 13 and Ephrata Ambulance would be transferred to those cities respectively.

This configuration would add transfer time to the call and potentially cause callers to reiterate their story a second time upon call transfer. The dispatchers at the County would confirm the nature of the call and the ALI information before making the call transfer. Upon answering at the secondary, the caller would be asked to again to state the nature of the call and give the needed details. There is some potential for caller confusion and frustration with this system.

The added 9-1-1 cost would approximately \$75,000 - \$85,000 to the system. The impact to the county workload not does require any significant changes, but may require an added position during peak working hours 8 a.m. - 12 mid. This staffing may be for only certain days of the week or weekend. Temporary or part time personnel might be used to cover added position.

Grant County, WA.
PSAP Configuration Options

a terminal at the appropriate dispatch center. On the screen will be all the pertinent data required to initiate a dispatch. As new information is developed during the call-taking sequence the screen is refreshed with the new data. Typically screens are refreshed either manually or a given time interval, such as ten seconds.

An audible alarm would sound notifying the dispatch center a 9-1-1 call was inbound for dispatch. There may be a visual alarm also. The call-taker would be electronically notified by the system when the call was acknowledged by the receiving secondary PSAP.

The CAD would build a geo-file historical call information and be available to do other reports and to perform other routine functions.

There is the possibility the County CAD might be able to interface into the records management system of Moses Lake. The two vendors at the appropriate time would have to meet and discuss the technical parameters.

There may be other system configurations which might be developed to meet the needs of the participants. We have available to us a full cadre of technical routes which can be employed to meet those needs. What is needed at this juncture is an agreement in concept to a way the system might be configured.

Financing

Financing a system such as Grant County's 9-1-1 system is much more a diplomatic mission as opposed to a technical issue. There are as many ways to finance the system as there ways to technically configure it. I have developed a few models which might be employed to stimulate discussion among the potential participants.

I have made an assumption the County acknowledges it would be in the emergency communications regardless of the implementation of enhanced 9-1-1. This means the County would have to have some form of a communications division to service the needs of fire districts and ambulance providers, in addition to meeting the needs of the Sheriff's Department.

To that end, I have assumed \$225,000 of the now \$425,000 budget for the communications division is a direct County expense and will not enter into the calculations of formulas. With that assumption I believe the costs attributable to fire districts is covered. Therefore, there will no direct charge backs to the fire districts.

Another assumption is there will be a single PSAP at the County Communications Center. Therefore the all 9-1-1 calls, with exception of those from the 633 exchange would be answered at the County Communications Center. Based on this assumption there would

Grant County, WA.
PSAP Configuration Options

Formula 2 -

This formula is based on the County being the primary PSAP with dispatching being accomplished at Ephrata and Moses Lake. Whereas dispatching is being done locally the impact to County would not be as great with call-taking/dispatching together. Due to the reduced role the County communications center would play in scenario there would not be a need to add another position or 5 FTE's. There probably would only be the need to use a third position occasionally, which part-time help could staff. Part time help would be less costly because no benefits would be attached to the cost of personnel.

The Sheriff's Department would receive full service (dispatch & call-taking). The Cities of Ephrata and Moses Lake time used of the County communications center would be reduce over Formula 1, as actual dispatching would take place at their respective centers.

Again, using the call volumes used in 4/18/94 report the following might be a distribution of costs:

The added cost for part time personnel would be estimated at about \$21,000 or 2080 hours at \$9.95 per hour.

\$425,000	total dispatch costs
-225,000	direct county costs
\$200,000	balance spread among participants
+ 21,000	cost for part time help to be amortized
\$221,000	total cost to be amortized

$\$221,000 \div 8,760 \text{ hours} = \$25.22 \text{ p/hr cost to County}$

Sheriff's Department	57% of hour or \$14.37 p/hr
Moses Lake	21% of hour or \$ 5.30 p/hr
Ephrata	11% of hour or \$ 2.77 p/hr
Other Cities	11% of hour or \$ 2.77 p/hr*

* divided on a call volume basis by other participants such as Quincy, Soap Lake, Coulee City, etc..

Cost projections Sheriff's Dept.	= \$125,812
Moses Lake	\$ 46,428
Ephrata	\$ 24,265
Others	\$ 24,265
TOTAL	<u>\$221,000</u>

As with all of these formulas, they are based on one year fixed costs and projection of activity. Each year the costs and activity levels would be reviewed for revision.

I would anticipate the County could invoice the participants on a quarterly basis, thus reducing budget impact to the affected