

Waterloo, Iowa June 1, 2023

The Oversight Board for the Consolidated Communications Center (CCC), in the State of Iowa, met in regular adjourned meeting at the Courthouse in Waterloo, County Seat of said County, and electronically via Zoom, at nine o'clock (9:00) a.m., pursuant to law, to the rules of said Board, and to adjournment. The meeting was called to order and on roll call there were present: Cedar Falls Mayor Rob Green, Dunkerton Mayor Michael Schares, Evansdale Mayor Deanne Kobliska, Gilbertville Mayor Mark Thome, Hudson Mayor George Wessel, La Porte City Mayor Jasmine Gaston, Waterloo Mayor Quentin Hart, Black Hawk County Supervisors Dan Trelka, Chris Schwartz, and Linda Laylin.

Supervisor Tom Little arrived later.

Absent: Black Hawk County Supervisor Tavis Hall.

Also present: Consolidated Communications Center Director Judy Flores, County Sheriff Tony Thompson, Black Hawk County Finance Director Michelle Weidner, Assistant County Attorney Mike Treinen, Auditor's Office Real Estate/Tax Manager Tim Jamison, Waterloo Fire Chief William Beck, La Porte City Police Chief Chris Brecher, Cedar Falls Public Safety Director Craig Berte, Jason Morris of Racom, Human Resources Director Amanda Fesenmeyer, County Auditor Grant Veeder.

Unless otherwise noted, all actions were approved unanimously.

Moved by Trelka, seconded by Schwartz that the AGENDA be received and placed on file with the County Auditor as approved. Motion carried.

Jamison said that the county would be sending refund checks to cities for unspent funds in an aggregate amount of \$80,000. They are usually sent in October after the end of a fiscal year but were held up because of cash flow difficulties after the department was put under a fiduciary fund.

Trelka said since the City of Cedar Falls is investigating switching to the Iowa Statewide Interoperability Communications System that others should consider it as an option as well. The vendor for that system is Motorola, which will be doing coverage tests here on June 14. He said the Board of Supervisors isn't receptive to a countywide Emergency Management Agency (EMA) levy under the county budget, but it wishes to consider all options in seeking a compromise, because the ongoing costs of CCC are unsustainable.

Hart asked if all the supervisors opposed a countywide EMA levy. Laylin said she needed more information but didn't see how they would be ready to do it in FY25. Schwartz said he is open to all possibilities, but it would have to start happening sooner rather than later. Hart asked if the remaining cities would need to pay more or less if Cedar Falls dropped out of the agreement. Trelka said there may be less cost for personnel, but it wouldn't offset the costs of the system. Green said that Cedar Falls is exploring other options but is in a holding pattern at the moment, and he noted that someone else will replace him as mayor in 2024. He was disappointed that the county isn't enthusiastic about an EMA levy, as it would solve the funding problem for cities. Laylin said it creates a problem for the county. Trelka said mayors should know that the county has recently decided to invest \$800,000 in the Sheriff's Office for Information Technology, with ongoing costs of \$200,000 a year, and this is the backbone of a service that benefits all the cities, which are not sharing in the costs.

Wessel asked why the county opposes the EMA levy. Trelka said he would support it if the cities guaranteed that they would reduce their levies a commensurate amount, which he thought unlikely, and he stopped supporting the EMA levy when the Emergency Management Commission voted to enact it without seeking the support of the supervisors. Schwartz said he had concerns due to recently enacted laws limiting growth in county budgets, since an increase for EMA could affect the funding for other county services. Laylin said she has always been willing to consider the option, but it was presented to the supervisors as an accomplished fact without information on how best to begin the process, and that in checking with other counties that use the levy the county found that it often was part of a plan implemented over a number of years. She supported hiring a consultant to evaluate options.

Laylin asked if the EMA levy was the only option favored by the mayors. Green said that decisions at the city level must be made by the city councils. Laylin said it is the role of the Oversight Board. Green and other mayors said they felt they were placed in a subservient role at Oversight Board meetings, where supervisors sit at their desks and mayors sit in the audience. Laylin and Schwartz said that the meeting setup could be changed. Gaston suggested monthly Oversight meetings, which met with general agreement.

Trelka said he had suggested to other supervisors that dispatch be made a separate department under the Board of Supervisors with a separate semi-autonomous board, but he wanted mayors to have skin in the game to help control costs. Flores said she and her staff were willing to work with the Oversight Board to control costs.

Schwartz asked Weidner to determine the impact of adding an EMA levy to the county budget, considering the recently enacted county budget growth limitations. Weidner said that the new law requires considerable interpretation, but she could make estimates.

Trelka asked if tax increment financing (TIF) districts could be used to support CCC. Weidner said they could for capital items paid for through debt service but not for operating expenses. She noted that the county paid over \$9 million for the erection of seven radio towers used by all CCC parties. She thought if an EMA levy were initiated that there should be buy-in from all users, and that perhaps a consultant could determine an equitable way of sharing. Hart said that when the county paid for the radio towers, it was using countywide taxes that were largely assessed to city dwellers. He said when cities increase their tax base it benefits the counties as well.

Laylin said she wanted to confirm that all parties planned to pay the FY24 funding allocations based on valuations. Brecher said that the E911 Board was willing to contribute \$200,000 from its reserves to help out. Jamison said since the first FY24 payments are due July 15 any change should be made as soon as possible. He said that the budgets that the cities have submitted indicate that they plan to pay the agreed-upon allocations.

Wessel said the current 28E agreement between the parties, approved in 2020, does not include the allocation plan based on valuation, that it is based on population and calls for service. He asked Treinen if the allocations based on valuation were valid. Treinen said that the parties agreed to a new allocation method (moving from 90% based on calls for service and 10% based on population to 80% CFS and 20% population) after the 2020 agreement, and paid accordingly, and based on this, in his opinion, a new allocation agreement is enforceable if agreed to by the parties. Wessel recommended amending the 28E agreement to change, at this time, only the paragraph relating to expense allocation, even though as a CPA he opposes in principle allocating by valuation. Treinen said that if allocation by valuation is not approved, the 80-20 formula would still be in effect. Laylin said the matter would need to be voted on in a meeting with proper notice.

On motion and vote the meeting adjourned at 10:25 am.

Linda Laylin, Chair, Board of Supervisors

Grant Veeder, County Auditor