

LEELANAU COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
Leelanau County Communications Task Force - Wednesday, July 13, 2016
Approved 7-22-16 – Meeting Recorded

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Task Force Chairman Carolyn Rentenbach at 9:10 a.m. Today's session was held in the Commissioner Meeting Room of the Leelanau County Government Center, 8527 E. Government Center Dr., in Suttons Bay.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the United States of America was led by Task Force Chairman Rentenbach.

Roll Call:

Members Present:	Matt Ansorge	Present
	Pat Burguard	Absent
	John Dodson	Present
	Chet Janik	Present
	Greg Julian	Present
	Melinda Lautner	Present
	Gary McGhee	Present
	Steve Morgan	Present
	Ron Plamondon	Present
	Carolyn Rentenbach	Present
	Doug Scripps	<i>Arrived at 9:21 a.m.</i>
	Ty Wessell	Present

Guests present.

Approval of Agenda – Additions/Deletions:

Task Force Chairman Rentenbach called for any additions to the agenda.

MOTION BY MORGAN TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED. SECONDED BY JANIK.

Discussion – Julian asked if the Task Force would be making a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners today. Ansorge said they have the numbers, so if the Task Force (comes to a decision) as a group, we could make a recommendation. We do want to present to the Board in August, if possible. Janik suggested adding Potential Recommendation between the topics Timeline/Deadline and Next Meeting.

MOTION AMENDED BY MORGAN TO APPROVE THE AGENDA WITH THE ADDITION OF ADDING POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATION. SECOND AMENDED BY JANIK.

Discussion – none.

AYES – 10 (Morgan, Plamondon, Rentenbach, Wessell, Ansorge, Burguard, Dodson, Janik, Julian, Lautner, McGhee)

No – 0 Absent – 2 (Burguard, Scripps)

MOTION CARRIED.

Approval of Minutes – June 30, 2016, Meeting:

MOTION BY DODSON TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 30, 2016, MEETING. SECONDED BY WESSELL & MORGAN.

Discussion – Janik complimented the Clerk for the attention to detail in the minutes.

Ayes – 10 (Dodson, Janik, Julian, Lautner, McGhee, Morgan, Plamondon, Rentenbach, Wessell, Ansorge)

No – 0 Absent – 2 (Burguard, Scripps)

MOTION CARRIED.

Discussion Items –

Potential Equipment Review and Associated Costs:

• **Review of Current Budget – Tower Fund, 911 Annual Budget, Grants.**

Ansorge referenced the attachment from the last meeting (see Attachment #1). The cost for the New World CAD (Computer Aided Dispatch) should be \$232,000.00, not \$23,200.00; a zero was missing from the estimate. He has made the adjustments to that in the financial projections. Everything else seems to be as it was brought before the Task Force last time. Ansorge noted the information was provided to him just before the last Task Force session; he has made changes to the financial projections.

Discussion followed on the increase; consensus the new total would be approximately \$3.4 million. Janik asked Morgan and Plamondon if anything was missing from a law enforcement or technology perspective? Morgan said no. Plamondon responded what New World laid out was very good; however, they did go back and talk to Grand Traverse County. What we were looking at for \$232,000.00 was in using our existing “virtual server,” which was obtained through a Federal grant. Plamondon noted Leelanau County’s equipment is very adequate; the Grand Traverse County equipment may not be. They came back with a different proposal with their recommendation, which was for Leelanau County to become a “satellite” for Grand Traverse County, without an in-house server. Their server is basically backed up and is not redundant. Plamondon said his recommendation was for Leelanau County to be redundant, so that physically we both had servers so that if one went down, the other server took over. That is not what New World quoted. It is still early enough to convince (Grand Traverse County) to go with a redundant system; additional costs could be required. Maybe we could say we can give Grand Traverse (some) of the money to become redundant. The quote did not include adding hardware to Grand Traverse County. He doesn’t know if anyone wants to consider adding money for that, which could be an approximate \$50,000.00. In his opinion, you would have enough funds for two separate, identical servers for each county, to make us redundant. Grand Traverse County was concerned about spending more money to enhance their disc capacity; that is his only concern. Plamondon said he doesn’t want Leelanau County’s system to be a

satellite to Grand Traverse County – we would then be relying on them for an internet connection, and if their connection were to go down, we would not have CAD. Lautner concurred; we should convince them to become redundant. Discussion. Plamondon said we are early enough in the game – if we were to add another \$50,000.00 to that estimate, he would be very comfortable in saying we could do a redundant system with Grand Traverse County; that is also why he had said early on the cost may be more expensive. Lautner asked and Ansoerge responded the County received a Federal grant – a PSIC (Public Safety Interoperable Communications) grant years ago to fund the virtual consolidation. Plamondon added Leelanau County received a \$26,000.00 CAD server and put in a wireless connection to Grand Traverse County – that was our virtual consolidation. They installed their software on our system and we installed our software on their system, so that we could send people back and forth. If for some reason we had to close down, we could send Dispatchers there to run our (911), but we are still two different systems – that is what he liked about this solution. It would put us on the same system so there are no training issues, their dispatchers could use our agency and know how to do it. Julian asked if someone spends \$50,000.00, they would be able to do that system, correct? Plamondon affirmed, adding that would be the most it would take to purchase two servers. Julian remarked, so it would be ideal for Grand Traverse County to pay at least half of the \$50,000.00 amount. He knows they carry radios in their trucks just to speak with Cedar Fire and Rescue, because (Cedar is) not up to speed. Plamondon noted they Grand Traverse County hosts the LEIN (Law Enforcement Information Network) for Leelanau County. We collaborate a lot with Grand Traverse County – the Courts system, their document imaging system; we benefit from them more than they benefit from us.

Scripps arrived at 9:20 a.m.

Dodson asked Plamondon, so this is a hardware issue? Plamondon responded the \$232,000.00 estimate is for both software and hardware. Dodson asked we could still send our people there or they could come here? Plamondon affirmed. Dodson asked and Plamondon explained what he is proposing (adding on for approximately \$50,000.00) are redundant servers, which would continually update each other. Discussion. Plamondon said with an additional \$50,000.00, we could purchase two identical servers that could be mirrored, so that if one went down, we could still run our Dispatch and Grand Traverse County could still run their Dispatch, as long as a wire is connected and the tower is still operating. Dodson asked why would the second server have to be housed in Grand Traverse County and not a separate building? Ansoerge said if we took Grand Traverse County out of the mix, the quote would be affected. If we were stand-alone with New World, the quote would be higher. Plamondon affirmed. Ansoerge said if we took Grand Traverse County out of the mix and wanted to have a redundant system with two servers, we would have a higher cost to install. Plamondon said we do not want to do that because we are still relying on the internet to access that server. Lautner asked does the second server have to be housed in Grand Traverse County? Plamondon affirmed, adding it could be housed in the cloud; again, if

he was them, he would not want to be relying on an internet connection for the CAD system. In a perfect world, it would be best to have a server in Grand Traverse County where they are hardwired to it, and a server in our County where we are hardwired to it, and the two with an internet connection are mirroring each other. So that if either server went down and you have an internet connection, you can still function – the best of both worlds. He added a third (server) in the cloud would be even better, but would be way more expensive.

Julian said the price of \$232,000.00 is for enhanced interoperability with Grand Traverse County. Plamondon affirmed, saying it is the cost to get the same software that they use. Julian said, so you are saying if we jump away from them, that number will change and probably offset the \$50,000.00 to tie them together. Plamondon affirmed. Julian said it makes sense to (continue our collaboration) with Grand Traverse County in this. Plamondon said it could be cheaper to use solely Grand Traverse County's system, but he does not want or (recommend) that.

Janik remarked, if the \$50,000.00 were added, the figure of \$3.4 million would be an accurate number? Ansoorge affirmed. Janik asked are you comfortable with the annual maintenance costs? Ansoorge affirmed. Janik noted, so we are looking at \$3.5 million for that first year.

Task Force Chairman Rentenbach said the Tower Fund money is for maintenance; could the annual costs be taken out of the Tower Fund? Ansoorge responded a lot of it can be; we can make it so it goes directly toward this project. Lautner said right now, some of it is going towards 911? Ansoorge affirmed saying some of the Tower Fund money offsets the cost for 911 operations. He reports to the State that the County pulls from the Tower Fund in order to cover some of our costs.

Chief Staff Accountant Jennifer Zywicki was present, to provide budget figures for the three funds that affect Emergency Management – Fund #232, Dispatch 911 Services Fund; Fund #468, Communications Capital Projects Fund, and Fund #518, Communications Tower Fund (on file with the County Clerk's Office). The information revenue and expense reports are for 2010 through December 31, 2016. The sheets reflect actual costs, not what the budgets were amended to.

Zywicki said Fund #518 is income from the tower sites. Collectively from 2010 to 2015, it runs higher than \$200,000.00. The other revenue from the Tower Fund is the nonrefundable analysis fees – the only income for this fund. Zywicki continued to provide a detailed explanation of the revenues and expenses on the three funds.

Zywicki noted the largest expense in that fund is the agreements with, in general, the property owners of the tower sites. Janik remarked, there currently is a fund balance of \$290,000.00 (in Fund #518)? Zywicki affirmed.

Zywicki said the money in Fund #518 will not actually be used to build the tower; the amount needed is transferred to Fund #468. She continued to detail what types of things Fund #468 pays for.

Zywicki provided a history of transfers to the three funds. Janik asked Zywicki, is it fair to say we could add the fund balances from those two funds (#518 and #468) and have a balance of \$347,000.00? Zywicki affirmed, clarifying we wouldn't be able to capitalize within Fund #468, because there are not enough funds. Janik said in general terms, the two fund amounts could be added together. Zywicki affirmed the two amounts could be added together. To date, you will have more income, but you will also have more expenses with the end of the year contractual, on any needed repairs. Zywicki noted if something goes down, these funds cover the expense. Janik asked and Ansonge responded the only major expenses going out this year are the leases; those are ongoing. Janik asked no major upgrades? Ansonge said not with the towers at this time. The major expenses are the ongoing lease payments to the property owners; the additions to the State system through the BDAs (Bidirectional Antennae) will be addressed in the radio equipment.

Zywicki said Fund #232 is more complicated, as it has many revenue sources. In 2010-11, there was a fund balance. She provided an explanation of the history of that fund's uses. It has been a history pulling this fund balance. At the Board's discretion, they have pulled the Tower Fund money to balance this budget. If we did not pull from the Tower Fund, funds would be pulled from the General Fund. If you eliminate the Tower Fund revenue to Dispatch, the General Fund would be used to balance Fund #232, as well as fund balance. Lautner said in 2017, what are we looking at? Zywicki said if you didn't pull the \$120,000.00, it would be that number plus salary increases, etc. Zywicki said she did do actuals, and there were will be a slight increase to the 2016 budget because of unbudgeted salaries and fringes.

Plamondon asked Zywicki, what about the current fund balance in (Fund #232)? Zywicki responded it is \$161,000.00. This fund is (depleted more) in the second half of the year due to holidays, buyouts and other expenses.

Janik asked are these all the sources of income at this point? Zywicki affirmed, income for 911 comes from the General Fund transfer in, the E-Wireless 911 Fund, and the Communications Tower Fund. Lautner asked Zywicki, did we get a grant for 911 in 2011? Discussion followed. Zywicki said she would have to look that up; her guess is that money came in from the General Fund. For a while we had Fund #235 (EMD Grants Fund), that was designated for EMD grants.

Janik said if we look out at the next four to six years, could the fund balance support the annual maintenance costs? If you add the fund balances together, it is approximately \$340,000.00. Zywicki asked, are you stating you would still transfer out to 911? She said how she would look at this from the perspective of fund accounting,

in the beginning adjusted balance of Fund #518, when we look at the transfer we are usually in arrears. Of the \$311,000.00 at the end of the year, that is where the \$120,000.00 comes from. So if you are stating that your (projected) maintenance will be \$70,000.00, then it would be \$190,000.00, or \$311,000.00 less the \$190,000.00. You would then carry that through to your next year, when leases come in and your expenses are current. She cautioned that is an estimate.

Plamondon said the other income we were talking about was the per device surcharge. Ansonge noted that would come up to about \$95,000.00.

Janik remarked the fund has been fairly stable for the last few years. Zywicki affirmed. Janik asked Lautner, there was a millage at one time, and it expired in 2010. Lautner affirmed. Janik commented that was how the 911 operations were funded. Zywicki said the 911 millage was approved by voters in 2008 and then went on the 2009 and 2010 tax bills. Janik asked and Plamondon responded prior to that we didn't have one. Zywicki said she can research the time length for that millage. There could have been four years that the millage operated. Ansonge said there was an approved millage in 2006. Janik said the current configuration has been in existence for 10 years in terms of operations. Ansonge and Zywicki affirmed. Zywicki said for the last five years the General Fund and the other funding sources have been funding 911 operations.

Potential Funding Options:

Millage, General Fund, 911 Surcharge, Tower Fund. Task Force Chairman Rentenbach said as far as potential funding options, can we have a hybrid? Janik said he had distributed a sheet earlier (see attachment #2) on potential millage options and how much money they would generate. Currently, the County allocates 3.5212 mills annually – even though this is the lowest rate among the 83 counties in Michigan, our property tax values are high. One mill equates to \$2.569 million annually. Janik reviewed the document with Task Force members on potential millage requests and what funds would be generated. He noted in past years funding has been very stable because the Headlee Amendment did not have an impact.

Janik said this would be the annual income derived. The second sheet of the handout lists Bureau of Elections guidelines of when a proposal would need to be approved for inclusion on the November General Election ballot; it has to be approved by the Board of Commissioners by 4:00 p.m. Tuesday, August 16. The Board would have to pass a resolution by that date; it is a pretty tight deadline. Discussion followed.

Janik continued – the General Fund could be used. Funding for the communication upgrade could be a combination of all of these. Lautner said once we have the equipment purchased and are ready to move forward, the funding for maintenance costs could be taken out of the Tower Fund. Maybe something set up along the line, similar to the Motor Pool. Zywicki asked Lautner, similar to a cost allocation; who would you spread it to? Lautner said that is her next point. The fire departments

currently are budgeting for two-way radios at \$600.00 per radio. Dodson dissented, saying that is not correct; he doesn't think fire departments are budgeting for any radios. He clarified that he had said departments are quite a bit behind. Lautner said so they may need to now. If we were to pick a number, for each fire department and how many radios they would want, there is also a possibility not everyone may need a radio right up front, and use the two-way until the two-way dies and then replace with the 800 (MHz). We may be able to cut down on that initial cost right at the start, and then if fire departments pay a certain portion towards the radios in ongoing, that's kind of your fire department "buy-in."

McGhee said neither the townships or fire departments are going to be able to fund this. The whole idea (initially) was that the County would purchase these (radios). When we first started, this was supposed to be a County-wide purchase for the Dispatch center, and an initial purchase for fire departments, along with extras. That was the initial discussion. McGhee stated again, that his townships, Suttons Bay and Bingham in particular, are not in a position to fund a capital outlay to support this system. Lautner said, she is saying they may have to... McGhee interjected, but they are not going to. Discussion ensued.

Wessell said it doesn't really matter whether the County or townships (obtains funding); the people are doing it. If the County does it, there is consistency and everyone has the same (equipment). The burden is shared across the whole County rather than individual townships. If the purpose is to save money for the taxpayer, one way or another, the taxpayer will pay for it. Lautner agreed, saying we are responsible for 911 – that is what we generally budget for. Fire department to fire department...we do have a situation where we provide upgrades. Up until now, fire departments have been purchasing their own radios. We did the whole grant thing awhile back where the County purchased them and then fire departments were buying their own radios. We can continue that where the replacement of the radios or some portion of them, (\$600.00 to \$800.00), fire departments could put towards the radios as ongoing. Julian said either way, the funds come from the taxpayers – whether it is a millage to the County, the fire department or the ambulance service. Because this is a necessary communication between one another, that is why it makes sense to him that we do this as a joint venture so that we all benefit from an economy of scale, and make this happen together, at a more expedient timing. The need is now; not two years from now. Lautner remarked that is why we need to figure out what formula we are going to use now. She stated she doesn't want to seek a millage to pay for this system.

Janik asked County Treasurer John A. Gallagher, with regard to the General Fund budget when looking at a purchase price of \$3.5 million spread over those years, can the County absorb that kind of funding? Gallagher responded the County would have a difficult time over five years; we would have to have some sort of outside source. Gallagher asked and Zywicki concurred, you do not have the money in the General Fund coffers. She said in conferring with Gallagher, maybe it's not so much going out

for a separate millage; perhaps the Board could change their tax rate for maybe one year. That way you are generating more revenue in your General Fund to help pay for this. Janik said the reality is there has to be a new source of revenue. Zywicki stated you pull in \$8.6 million of a \$12 million budget for your General Fund.

Lautner said, there are grants available, correct? Ansonge responded not as abundant as they used to be and the likelihood of having one awarded to us is less than it was a few years ago. Task Force Chairman Rentenbach asked and Ansonge affirmed the maximum amount the County could go for with a 911 surcharge without a vote is 42-cents (per device). He is a little hesitant on the surcharge because it isn't a reliable figure and will fluctuate immensely. He added not all devices will be (tied to) Leelanau County that phone 911 in Leelanau County. Plamondon noted it is a place to get some funds, and is similar to a grant (in that respect).

McGhee said if we are successful with a millage we would need to emphasize the money that had been coming out of the General Fund would stay in the General Fund and not being spent here. He contended that is why the County's 911 millage failed because of the story in the paper of the \$1 million fund balance that had turned up. If we did ask for a millage this high... Plamondon said the projected \$3.5 million cost is just to cover the purchase of equipment, and get us the technology, not to operate the 911 Center. He wasn't assuming the millage would cover \$100,000.00 of the operating budget for 911. Janik concurred, we are strictly using the funds for purchasing equipment; we could get a bond request for just equipment. Plamondon said even maintenance could be considered as equipment. Janik said if we ask for a specific amount for equipment only, he thinks people can relate to that. We are not discussing operational. Lautner concurred.

Lautner asked Zywicki, if we were to make this purchase, what other funding options are out there for us, such as borrowing money, based on our credit? Janik said with bonding, you are borrowing \$3.5 million and guaranteeing the taxpayers will pay it back and interest rates are lower. With a millage request, you get a certain amount every year for "x" years. With a bond election, you get the full amount requested for the equipment purchase up front and pay it back over time. With a millage, you get, for example, approximately \$700,000.00 a year. McGhee asked would there be a reduction in cost, because you wouldn't be paying interest on the equipment. Janik responded most of the time, yes, because banks like that.

Lautner said if it were done that way, can you calculate this out? Janik said if you go with the \$3.5 million request, divide it out how many years you want to go out for, that is \$700,000.00 a year; can we absorb that? Discussion ensued. Janik remarked if he were a taxpayer, people can relate more to a bond than a millage, as bond funds only go toward equipment.

Lautner said that also buys a little time to discuss the potential in going to Lansing and establishing a household fee. Plamondon said you could perhaps establish a household fee to fund operations. Discussion followed. Janik said Ansorge and Morgan are saying we need this equipment right now; we could have a major breakdown at any point. Morgan and Ansorge affirmed.

Julian said there are several reasons they haven't purchased any radios in Cedar; they need everything from "A to Z." These radios have been discussed for a long time. The (department's) purchase cannot be accomplished in this year's budget; next year's budget will include that purchase. Their guys have radios that are inefficient and do not work. The need is now; they will be pursuing that purchase whether the County does or not. However, it is just more efficient and equitable if it comes from the County. Lautner said she just wants to see a certain portion of the funding for the radios coming from departments, exactly like what Julian is saying. Dodson dissented, saying Cedar isn't planning on purchasing 800 (MHz) radios; you are buying VHF radios next year, a \$500.00-\$600.00 radio, versus a \$3,500.00 radio. If Cedar does this, it would then require the purchase of a "patch." The radio you are suggesting is not the one we are talking about. That is the technology you would be buying next year. Lautner said this way, you take that very same formula, and ask your departments to pay \$600.00 toward that radio. That way, your fire department owns that radio. Some departments will need more radios than others. Plamondon told Lautner, you are also relying on every single township being able to come up with either a millage or some funding mechanism to do it. Lautner countered, departments are spending \$500.00 to \$600.00 for a radio now. McGhee told Lautner, his department has nine radios; do you think with a project cost estimate of \$3.5 million, will \$5,400.00 in radios make that big of a difference? Lautner affirmed – it will be that buy-in we are looking for. Multiple comments ensued.

Lautner said as it is now, if the County buys all the radios, and if a department comes up short on radios, I think they need to keep... Julian interjected, that wouldn't make sense; we are (proposing) a general pool, where we have parts and radios – that is how the system is run; it is run as a group, joint effort. Based on the information from everyone it seems to make more sense. Lautner said it makes sense to go Countywide on the radios, but it also makes sense that as the radios are disbursed, that the departments are charged (about) \$600.00 a radio. McGhee dissented, saying we are buying in to this; taxpayers fund the fire departments and they fund the County – either way they are paying for it; why should they pay twice?

Janik said Leland Fire Chief Rick Royston had noted at a previous session that he had worked for Ingham County, and stated that Ingham took the leadership on purchasing radios for all of the townships and then those townships worked with the county so that everyone was on the same page. Would that work here? Ansorge affirmed, saying he is prepared to be in charge of the radio cache. If we did a Countywide system, the 911 EMD (Emergency Management Department) would be in charge of that inventory and

the radios would be County equipment. Janik said there are a score of representatives from fire departments; you are all saying you do not have the money in your budgets – you would have to go to your taxpayers. Lautner said when you purchased radios, you didn't go with an 800 system? McGhee responded his department just did two years ago – they purchased all new radios, because of a State requirement for narrow-band radios. So they have all new radios and pagers in their trucks. Lautner asked McGhee, if that radio breaks today, what are you going to do? Tampa said, replace them as needed. Lautner said you are going to replace those radios – that is all she is saying. If you continue having the departments paying \$500.00 towards (each) radio, for however many radios they need. Elmwood Township Fire Chief Keith Tampa countered, if he pays \$500.00 toward the radio, is the radio now township property? Lautner responded, no, it's a lease of that radio.

Task Force Chairman suggested discussion on a potential 911-surcharge. Wessell said the buy-in is the support from the townships for the fire departments themselves. We have the buy in; now we are here, trying to find out how to fund it. He remembers comments made by County resident Eric Lind, who stated he was appalled. Wessell said we have got the buy-in, with the fire departments. Let's figure out how to do it, and make sure everyone is on board and everyone has consistent equipment. Let's talk about bonding over five years; how much of a bond proposal would that be? What percentage are we talking about?

Task Force Chairman Rentenbach said in going back to the agenda, a 911 surcharge would generate... Ansonge responded roughly \$95,000.00 a year. He directed Task Force members to the handouts (see attachments). The first (surcharge) collection would be in November, 2017. The County would receive less than \$16,000.00. The County wouldn't receive any substantial revenue from a surcharge until 2018. Janik asked and Ansonge responded the surcharge isn't reliable due to how they pull the revenue from that device. If the device is not housed in Leelanau County, we do not receive that money. There are some gray areas, whether the surcharge from a device (registered to a) Traverse City address goes to Leelanau or to Grand Traverse County. There are a lot of Traverse City addresses outside of the annexed portion in Elmwood Township that may or not be attributed to Leelanau County. Rentenbach remarked, so the 911 surcharge is unreliable. Ansonge affirmed; it would be good to supplement whatever we decide. It might be a good "insurance policy." Plamondon noted (a surcharge) could offset some operating expenses. Ansonge added, or maintenance. Janik said if you look at \$95,000.00 versus (a millage-generated) \$770,000.00. Ansonge agreed (a per-device surcharge) could cover maintenance costs. Rentenbach asked, could we also use the Tower Fund for some of that?

Janik said in returning to Wessell's question, with regard to the \$3.4 million and using a figure of .25ths mill that would generate \$642,000.00 a year. Discussion followed on millage rates configurations over a five-year period.

Janik noted we are talking about a .25ths mill; the Senior Services millage is .27ths mill. That would equate to an average cost of \$25.00 to the taxpayer. Lautner asked and Janik explained the bonding process; discussion ensued. Janik said it is a very inexpensive way to finance the project. Discussion followed on ways to fund the project. Gallagher said the County could engage a bonding agent and get those numbers.

Plamondon asked could you increase the County's General Fund millage, by Board action, rather than a millage request? He said a bond could still be purchased based on... Janik said there would be some interest costs with that. McGhee asked what kind of interest would Motorola be charging? Mike Muskovin of Motorola said less than 2.9 percent at this time. Discussion followed on bonding interest rates.

Janik said legally, the County has set its millage rates for the summer. Gallagher added there is an option of putting an additional on the winter tax bill. Discussion ensued on how much more the County could go for without a vote. Scripps asked how can the Board by itself raise the millage rate? Janik said voters approved a millage in 1969; which has been rolled back to its current rate. Lautner stated she is not in favor of raising the millage rate. Janik noted they will look into that.

Task Force Chairman Rentenbach asked everyone to state his or her opinion on the best way to request funding for a communication upgrade.

- Wessell said he likes the sound of bonding, and .25ths mill sounds responsible, over five years.
- Scripps said he likes the .25ths mill; whether it is by millage or bond, that is up to the Board. He wants to strongly endorse that the County bears the burden. Expecting each township to do it may happen, but for this amount of money, we want a system that works and is available to everyone.
- Lautner said she would like to finance this project up front, spend two years in Lansing getting the per-household fee so it is paid equitably across every household. Search for any grant options, ask the Tribe to consider contracting with us to fund the system they would definitely benefit from; and add a \$500.00 allowances on the radios to guarantee equality across all departments.
- Julian said a .25ths millage is the way to go. The people he has spoken with over the years, there is support for these types of issues in our communities. The taxpayers are willing to fund these additional costs. We need to approach them to make this happen sooner rather than later. In terms of a bond or millage, he would defer to Janik's advice on how to make this happen.

- Dodson said a .25ths mill to finance the program is what should happen; and then be continued to also support the system. The County needs to endorse that 911 is not the responsibility of the fire departments, police, road commission or public safety guys, it is the primary responsibility of everyone.
- Tampa – no comment.
- McGhee said he agrees the .25ths mill as a bond issue may be smarter if it is less expensive; he would agree fire departments are already being funded by the taxpayers. If you make the fire department buy in, taxpayers are paying twice. The County needs to (finance) this.
- Janik said the concept of a bond proposal from a taxpayer perspective guarantees every penny goes towards equipment for those with concerns on tax money going towards personnel. Janik said he thinks the County wants to continue funding the day-to-day operations of the 911 personnel costs. If he were an outside person looking at this, and would know the money would go towards equipment, that could make a difference in how I might vote for the proposal – this is a unique equipment purchase. Janik said he and Gallagher can check out the legal options of the bonding and whether or not the Board could raise the millage. More comments followed.
- Morgan stated he is in totally in favor of a .25ths mill as Janik stated, for equipment. As a taxpayer, he would love to see the taxpayers be able to decide this. He works with this problem every day and there are so many instances where there are issues with the communications; Leelanau County is so far behind.
- Ansortge said he likes the idea of a bond; he is not well versed enough to see if it would sustain them moving forward. However, he would be open to exploring that option. If he were to choose one of the options, it would be the .15ths-mill and the .42-cent surcharge. That would sustain us through the project and allow us rebuild in 10 years.
- Plamondon said the .25ths mill is reasonable as a bond, and he also likes the idea of a per-household (fee) supporting operations, not the equipment. The usage of 911 is based on per household, not so much the value of land for the purpose of operations, not equipment.
- Task Force Chairman Rentenbach said it sounds like there is a pretty general consensus of the Task Force for a bond. That would be a primary topic.

Janik suggested setting a meeting date to research this. We know what a surcharge would generate. Ansortge said he is also comfortable with the cost estimates. Janik said

they could take that number and convert that to a bond rate and come back to the next meeting with very specific responses. Rentenbach asked, are you still looking for a Board action? Janik responded if the Task Force could meet again sometime in the next two weeks, he and Treasurer Gallagher should be able to return with enough information for the Task Force to make a formal recommendation.

McGhee asked Treasurer Gallagher, is there a way to estimate how much money would be saved by paying up front, rather than going for a bond with the interest? Gallagher affirmed. Muskovin noted there is no penalty, so you take advantage of the lease purchase program, and replace the aging equipment and support and during that two year period, you went to bond, and then pay off (the purchase) without penalty.

Next Meeting Date:

Discussion ensued on the next meeting date. **Consensus to hold the next session of the Communication Task Force on Friday, July 22, at 8:30 a.m.**, prior to the Budget Work Session of the full Board of Commissioners, and then bump that meeting to 10:00 a.m. or immediately following the Communication Task Force meeting, whichever is later.

Julian asked will the agenda be more specific? Janik said the Task Force will look at what can the County legally do without a vote, and get some information on a per-household fee. Task Force Chairman Rentenbach noted it can still be a hybrid approach.

Public Comment:

None.

Task Force Member Comments:

Lautner asked how long does the process take to bid the radios? Discussion followed on Board process and typical bid procedures.

Motion to Adjourn:

MOTION BY JULIAN TO ADJOURN. SECONDED BY MCGHEE.

Ayes – 11 (Julian, Lautner, McGhee, Morgan, Plamondon, Rentenbach, Scripps, Wessell, Anson, Dodson, Janik)

No – 0 Absent – 1 (Burguard)

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 10:35 a.m.

Laurel S. Evans
Special Deputy County Clerk

INITIAL PURCHASE			ANNUAL COSTS	
Dispatch Radios	\$750,000.00			\$40,000.00
Consoles, Recorder, Computer Equipment				Preventative Maintenance, Replacement parts
Field Radio Equipment	\$2,200,000.00			\$34,000.00
Mobiles, Portables, Pagers, Base Stations				Comprehensive radio coverage for radio replacements
Remote Viper	\$80,000.00			\$16,000.00
NexGen911, Remote site off GTCO				Software/Hardware subscription & on-site maintenance
Smart911	\$7,000.00	per year		\$7,000.00
NexGen911 subscriber information				
RAVE Alert	\$5,000	1st year		\$3,000.00
Coincides with Smart911 database				\$2,000 activation fee, \$3,000 annually afterward
New World CAD	\$232,000.00			\$8,000.00
Enhance Interoperability with GTCO				1st year maintenance included in purchase
Priority Dispatch - EFD	\$44,000.00			\$3,600.00
Fire Dispatch Protocol, improve ISO rating for Depts				Annual Maintenance, Licensing
Priority Dispatch - EMD	N/A			\$3,600.00
Medical Dispatch Protocol				Annual Maintenance, Licensing
	TOTAL:			TOTAL:
	\$3,318,000.00			\$107,200.00



Leelanau County 9-1-1 Dispatch Capital Improvement Planning

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Tower Revenue	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00
9-1-1 Surcharge @ \$0.42	\$ -	\$ 15,892.71	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25
9-1-1 Millage @ 0.125 mills	\$ -	\$ 321,174.32	\$ 321,174.32	\$ 321,174.32	\$ 321,174.32	\$ 321,174.32
Total Annual Revenue	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 587,067.02	\$ 666,530.56	\$ 666,530.56	\$ 666,530.56	\$ 666,530.56
Capital Equipment Purchase	\$368,000	\$ -	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63
Maintenance Expenditures	\$ -	\$ 107,200.00	\$ 112,560.00	\$ 118,188.00	\$ 124,097.40	\$ 130,302.27
Total Annual Expenditures	\$ 368,000.00	\$ 107,200.00	\$ 657,122.63	\$ 662,750.63	\$ 668,660.03	\$ 674,864.90
Annual Fund Adjustment	\$ (118,000.00)	\$ 479,867.02	\$ 9,407.93	\$ 3,779.93	\$ (2,129.47)	\$ (8,334.34)
Annual Fund Balance	\$ (118,000.00)	\$ 361,867.02	\$ 371,274.96	\$ 375,054.89	\$ 372,925.43	\$ 364,591.09
	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027
Tower Revenue	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00
9-1-1 Surcharge	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25
9-1-1 Millage	\$ 321,174.32	\$ 321,174.32	\$ 321,174.32	\$ 321,174.32	\$ 321,174.32	\$ 321,174.32
Total Annual Revenue	\$ 666,530.56	\$ 666,530.56	\$ 666,530.56	\$ 666,530.56	\$ 666,530.56	\$ 666,530.56
Capital Equipment Purchase	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$ -
Maintenance Expenditures	\$ 136,817.38	\$ 143,658.25	\$ 150,841.17	\$ 158,383.22	\$ 166,302.38	\$ 174,617.50
Total Annual Expenditures	\$ 681,380.01	\$ 688,220.88	\$ 150,841.17	\$ 158,383.22	\$ 166,302.38	\$ 174,617.50
Annual Fund Adjustment	\$ (14,849.45)	\$ (21,690.32)	\$ 515,689.40	\$ 508,147.34	\$ 500,228.18	\$ 491,913.06
Annual Fund Balance	\$ 349,741.64	\$ 328,051.32	\$ 843,740.72	\$ 1,351,888.05	\$ 1,852,116.23	\$ 2,344,029.29

9-1-1 Surcharge, if passed as a resolution by the County board before 7/1/17, will first be collected 11/1/17. Any amount exceeding \$0.42 must be passed by public vote.

Capital Equipment Purchase assumes Dispatch Radios and Field Radio Equipment are funded through Motorola lease-purchase with no interest and no payments for the first two years (offer expires 9/20/16).

Annual Maintenance Expenditure assumes an annual increase of 5%.



Leelanau County 9-1-1 Dispatch Capital Improvement Planning

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Tower Revenue	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00
9-1-1 Surcharge @ \$0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9-1-1 Millage @ 0.15 mills	\$ -	\$ 385,409.18	\$ 385,409.18	\$ 385,409.18	\$ 385,409.18	\$ 385,409.18
Total Annual Revenue	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 635,409.18	\$ 635,409.18	\$ 635,409.18	\$ 635,409.18	\$ 635,409.18
Capital Equipment Purchase	\$368,000	\$ -	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63
Maintenance Expenditures	\$ -	\$ 107,200.00	\$ 112,560.00	\$ 118,188.00	\$ 124,097.40	\$ 130,302.27
Total Annual Expenditures	\$ 368,000.00	\$ 107,200.00	\$ 657,122.63	\$ 662,750.63	\$ 668,660.03	\$ 674,864.90
Annual Fund Adjustment	\$ (118,000.00)	\$ 528,209.18	\$ (21,713.45)	\$ (27,341.45)	\$ (33,250.85)	\$ (39,455.72)
Annual Fund Balance	\$ (118,000.00)	\$ 410,209.18	\$ 388,495.73	\$ 361,154.28	\$ 327,903.43	\$ 288,447.71
	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027
Tower Revenue	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00
9-1-1 Surcharge	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9-1-1 Millage	\$ 385,409.18	\$ 385,409.18	\$ 385,409.18	\$ 385,409.18	\$ 385,409.18	\$ 385,409.18
Total Annual Revenue	\$ 635,409.18	\$ 635,409.18	\$ 635,409.18	\$ 635,409.18	\$ 635,409.18	\$ 635,409.18
Capital Equipment Purchase	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$ -
Maintenance Expenditures	\$ 136,817.38	\$ 143,658.25	\$ 150,841.17	\$ 158,383.22	\$ 166,302.38	\$ 174,617.50
Total Annual Expenditures	\$ 681,380.01	\$ 688,220.88	\$ 150,841.17	\$ 158,383.22	\$ 166,302.38	\$ 174,617.50
Annual Fund Adjustment	\$ (45,970.83)	\$ (52,811.70)	\$ 484,568.01	\$ 477,025.95	\$ 469,106.79	\$ 460,791.67
Annual Fund Balance	\$ 242,476.88	\$ 189,665.18	\$ 674,233.19	\$ 1,151,259.15	\$ 1,620,365.94	\$ 2,081,157.62

9-1-1 Surcharge, if passed as a resolution by the County board before 7/1/17, will first be collected 11/1/17. Any amount exceeding \$0.42 must be passed by public vote.

Capital Equipment Purchase assumes Dispatch Radios and Field Radio Equipment are funded through Motorola lease-purchase with no interest and no payments for the first two years (offer expires 9/20/16).

Annual Maintenance Expenditure assumes an annual increase of 5%.



Leelanau County 9-1-1 Dispatch Capital Improvement Planning

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Tower Revenue	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00
9-1-1 Surcharge @ \$0.42	\$ -	\$ 15,892.71	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25
9-1-1 Millage @ 0.15 mills	\$ -	\$ 385,409.18	\$ 385,409.18	\$ 385,409.18	\$ 385,409.18	\$ 385,409.18
Total Annual Revenue	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 651,301.89	\$ 730,765.42	\$ 730,765.42	\$ 730,765.42	\$ 730,765.42
Capital Equipment Purchase	\$368,000	\$ -	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63
Maintenance Expenditures	\$ -	\$ 107,200.00	\$ 112,560.00	\$ 118,188.00	\$ 124,097.40	\$ 130,302.27
Total Annual Expenditures	\$ 368,000.00	\$ 107,200.00	\$ 657,122.63	\$ 662,750.63	\$ 668,660.03	\$ 674,864.90
Annual Fund Adjustment	\$ (118,000.00)	\$ 544,101.89	\$ 73,642.80	\$ 68,014.80	\$ 62,105.40	\$ 55,900.53
Annual Fund Balance	\$ (118,000.00)	\$ 426,101.89	\$ 499,744.68	\$ 567,759.48	\$ 629,864.88	\$ 685,765.40
	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027
Tower Revenue	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00
9-1-1 Surcharge	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25
9-1-1 Millage	\$ 385,409.18	\$ 385,409.18	\$ 385,409.18	\$ 385,409.18	\$ 385,409.18	\$ 385,409.18
Total Annual Revenue	\$ 730,765.42	\$ 730,765.42	\$ 730,765.42	\$ 730,765.42	\$ 730,765.42	\$ 730,765.42
Capital Equipment Purchase	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$ -
Maintenance Expenditures	\$ 136,817.38	\$ 143,658.25	\$ 150,841.17	\$ 158,383.22	\$ 166,302.38	\$ 174,617.50
Total Annual Expenditures	\$ 681,380.01	\$ 688,220.88	\$ 150,841.17	\$ 158,383.22	\$ 166,302.38	\$ 174,617.50
Annual Fund Adjustment	\$ 49,385.41	\$ 42,544.54	\$ 579,924.26	\$ 572,382.20	\$ 564,463.04	\$ 556,147.92
Annual Fund Balance	\$ 735,150.82	\$ 777,695.36	\$ 1,357,619.62	\$ 1,930,001.82	\$ 2,494,464.86	\$ 3,050,612.78

9-1-1 Surcharge, if passed as a resolution by the County board before 7/1/17, will first be collected 11/1/17. Any amount exceeding \$0.42 must be passed by public vote.

Capital Equipment Purchase assumes Dispatch Radios and Field Radio Equipment are funded through Motorola lease-purchase with no interest and no payments for the first two years (offer expires 9/20/16).

Annual Maintenance Expenditure assumes an annual increase of 5%.



Leelanau County 9-1-1 Dispatch Capital Improvement Planning

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Tower Revenue	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00
9-1-1 Surcharge @ \$0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9-1-1 Millage @ 0.175 mills	\$ -	\$ 449,644.04	\$ 449,644.04	\$ 449,644.04	\$ 449,644.04	\$ 449,644.04
Total Annual Revenue	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 699,644.04	\$ 699,644.04	\$ 699,644.04	\$ 699,644.04	\$ 699,644.04
Capital Equipment Purchase	\$368,000	\$ -	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63
Maintenance Expenditures	\$ -	\$ 107,200.00	\$ 112,560.00	\$ 118,188.00	\$ 124,097.40	\$ 130,302.27
Total Annual Expenditures	\$ 368,000.00	\$ 107,200.00	\$ 657,122.63	\$ 662,750.63	\$ 668,660.03	\$ 674,864.90
Annual Fund Adjustment	\$ (118,000.00)	\$ 592,444.04	\$ 42,521.41	\$ 36,893.41	\$ 30,984.01	\$ 24,779.14
Annual Fund Balance	\$ (118,000.00)	\$ 474,444.04	\$ 516,965.46	\$ 553,858.87	\$ 584,842.89	\$ 609,622.03
	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027
Tower Revenue	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00
9-1-1 Surcharge	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9-1-1 Millage	\$ 449,644.04	\$ 449,644.04	\$ 449,644.04	\$ 449,644.04	\$ 449,644.04	\$ 449,644.04
Total Annual Revenue	\$ 699,644.04	\$ 699,644.04	\$ 699,644.04	\$ 699,644.04	\$ 699,644.04	\$ 699,644.04
Capital Equipment Purchase	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$ -
Maintenance Expenditures	\$ 136,817.38	\$ 143,658.25	\$ 150,841.17	\$ 158,383.22	\$ 166,302.38	\$ 174,617.50
Total Annual Expenditures	\$ 681,380.01	\$ 688,220.88	\$ 150,841.17	\$ 158,383.22	\$ 166,302.38	\$ 174,617.50
Annual Fund Adjustment	\$ 18,264.03	\$ 11,423.16	\$ 548,802.88	\$ 541,260.82	\$ 533,341.66	\$ 525,026.54
Annual Fund Balance	\$ 627,886.06	\$ 639,309.22	\$ 1,188,112.10	\$ 1,729,372.92	\$ 2,262,714.57	\$ 2,787,741.11

9-1-1 Surcharge, if passed as a resolution by the County board before 7/1/17, will first be collected 11/1/17. Any amount exceeding \$0.42 must be passed by public vote.

Capital Equipment Purchase assumes Dispatch Radios and Field Radio Equipment are funded through Motorola lease-purchase with no interest and no payments for the first two years (offer expires 9/20/16).

Annual Maintenance Expenditure assumes an annual increase of 5%.



Leelanau County 9-1-1 Dispatch Capital Improvement Planning

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Tower Revenue	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00
9-1-1 Surcharge @ \$0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9-1-1 Millage @ 0.2 mills	\$ -	\$ 513,878.90	\$ 513,878.90	\$ 513,878.90	\$ 513,878.90	\$ 513,878.90
Total Annual Revenue	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 763,878.90	\$ 763,878.90	\$ 763,878.90	\$ 763,878.90	\$ 763,878.90
Capital Equipment Purchase	\$368,000	\$ -	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63
Maintenance Expenditures	\$ -	\$ 107,200.00	\$ 112,560.00	\$ 118,188.00	\$ 124,097.40	\$ 130,302.27
Total Annual Expenditures	\$ 368,000.00	\$ 107,200.00	\$ 657,122.63	\$ 662,750.63	\$ 668,660.03	\$ 674,864.90
Annual Fund Adjustment	\$ (118,000.00)	\$ 656,678.90	\$ 106,756.28	\$ 101,128.28	\$ 95,218.88	\$ 89,014.01
Annual Fund Balance	\$ (118,000.00)	\$ 538,678.90	\$ 645,435.18	\$ 746,563.46	\$ 841,782.34	\$ 930,796.34
	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027
Tower Revenue	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00
9-1-1 Surcharge	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9-1-1 Millage	\$ 513,878.90	\$ 513,878.90	\$ 513,878.90	\$ 513,878.90	\$ 513,878.90	\$ 513,878.90
Total Annual Revenue	\$ 763,878.90	\$ 763,878.90	\$ 763,878.90	\$ 763,878.90	\$ 763,878.90	\$ 763,878.90
Capital Equipment Purchase	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$ -
Maintenance Expenditures	\$ 136,817.38	\$ 143,658.25	\$ 150,841.17	\$ 158,383.22	\$ 166,302.38	\$ 174,617.50
Total Annual Expenditures	\$ 681,380.01	\$ 688,220.88	\$ 150,841.17	\$ 158,383.22	\$ 166,302.38	\$ 174,617.50
Annual Fund Adjustment	\$ 82,498.89	\$ 75,658.02	\$ 613,037.74	\$ 605,495.68	\$ 597,576.52	\$ 589,261.40
Annual Fund Balance	\$ 1,013,295.24	\$ 1,088,953.26	\$ 1,701,991.00	\$ 2,307,486.68	\$ 2,905,063.20	\$ 3,494,324.60

9-1-1 Surcharge, if passed as a resolution by the County board before 7/1/17, will first be collected 11/1/17. Any amount exceeding \$0.42 must be passed by public vote.

Capital Equipment Purchase assumes Dispatch Radios and Field Radio Equipment are funded through Motorola lease-purchase with no interest and no payments for the first two years (offer expires 9/20/16).

Annual Maintenance Expenditure assumes an annual increase of 5%.



Leelanau County 9-1-1 Dispatch Capital Improvement Planning

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Tower Revenue	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00
9-1-1 Surcharge @ \$0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9-1-1 Millage @ 0.25 mills	\$ -	\$ 642,348.63	\$ 642,348.63	\$ 642,348.63	\$ 642,348.63	\$ 642,348.63
Total Annual Revenue	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 892,348.63	\$ 892,348.63	\$ 892,348.63	\$ 892,348.63	\$ 892,348.63
Capital Equipment Purchase	\$368,000	\$ -	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63
Maintenance Expenditures	\$ -	\$ 107,200.00	\$ 112,560.00	\$ 118,188.00	\$ 124,097.40	\$ 130,302.27
Total Annual Expenditures	\$ 368,000.00	\$ 107,200.00	\$ 657,122.63	\$ 662,750.63	\$ 668,660.03	\$ 674,864.90
Annual Fund Adjustment	\$ (118,000.00)	\$ 785,148.63	\$ 235,226.00	\$ 229,598.00	\$ 223,688.60	\$ 217,483.73
Annual Fund Balance	\$ (118,000.00)	\$ 667,148.63	\$ 902,374.63	\$ 1,131,972.64	\$ 1,355,661.24	\$ 1,573,144.97
	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027
Tower Revenue	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00
9-1-1 Surcharge	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9-1-1 Millage	\$ 642,348.63	\$ 642,348.63	\$ 642,348.63	\$ 642,348.63	\$ 642,348.63	\$ 642,348.63
Total Annual Revenue	\$ 892,348.63	\$ 892,348.63	\$ 892,348.63	\$ 892,348.63	\$ 892,348.63	\$ 892,348.63
Capital Equipment Purchase	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$ -
Maintenance Expenditures	\$ 136,817.38	\$ 143,658.25	\$ 150,841.17	\$ 158,383.22	\$ 166,302.38	\$ 174,617.50
Total Annual Expenditures	\$ 681,380.01	\$ 688,220.88	\$ 150,841.17	\$ 158,383.22	\$ 166,302.38	\$ 174,617.50
Annual Fund Adjustment	\$ 210,968.62	\$ 204,127.75	\$ 741,507.46	\$ 733,965.41	\$ 726,046.25	\$ 717,731.13
Annual Fund Balance	\$ 1,784,113.59	\$ 1,988,241.35	\$ 2,729,748.81	\$ 3,463,714.22	\$ 4,189,760.46	\$ 4,907,491.59

9-1-1 Surcharge, if passed as a resolution by the County board before 7/1/17, will first be collected 11/1/17. Any amount exceeding \$0.42 must be passed by public vote.

Capital Equipment Purchase assumes Dispatch Radios and Field Radio Equipment are funded through Motorola lease-purchase with no interest and no payments for the first two years (offer expires 9/20/16).

Annual Maintenance Expenditure assumes an annual increase of 5%.



Leelanau County 9-1-1 Dispatch Capital Improvement Planning

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Tower Revenue	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00
9-1-1 Surcharge @ \$0.42	\$ -	\$ 15,892.71	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25
9-1-1 Millage @ 0.25 mills	\$ -	\$ 642,348.63	\$ 642,348.63	\$ 642,348.63	\$ 642,348.63	\$ 642,348.63
Total Annual Revenue	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 908,241.34	\$ 987,704.88	\$ 987,704.88	\$ 987,704.88	\$ 987,704.88
Capital Equipment Purchase	\$368,000	\$ -	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63
Maintenance Expenditures	\$ -	\$ 107,200.00	\$ 112,560.00	\$ 118,188.00	\$ 124,097.40	\$ 130,302.27
Total Annual Expenditures	\$ 368,000.00	\$ 107,200.00	\$ 657,122.63	\$ 662,750.63	\$ 668,660.03	\$ 674,864.90
Annual Fund Adjustment	\$ (118,000.00)	\$ 801,041.34	\$ 330,582.25	\$ 324,954.25	\$ 319,044.85	\$ 312,839.98
Annual Fund Balance	\$ (118,000.00)	\$ 683,041.34	\$ 1,013,623.59	\$ 1,338,577.84	\$ 1,657,622.69	\$ 1,970,462.66
	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027
Tower Revenue	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00	\$ 250,000.00
9-1-1 Surcharge	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25	\$ 95,356.25
9-1-1 Millage	\$ 642,348.63	\$ 642,348.63	\$ 642,348.63	\$ 642,348.63	\$ 642,348.63	\$ 642,348.63
Total Annual Revenue	\$ 987,704.88	\$ 987,704.88	\$ 987,704.88	\$ 987,704.88	\$ 987,704.88	\$ 987,704.88
Capital Equipment Purchase	\$544,562.63	\$544,562.63	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$ -
Maintenance Expenditures	\$ 136,817.38	\$ 143,658.25	\$ 150,841.17	\$ 158,383.22	\$ 166,302.38	\$ 174,617.50
Total Annual Expenditures	\$ 681,380.01	\$ 688,220.88	\$ 150,841.17	\$ 158,383.22	\$ 166,302.38	\$ 174,617.50
Annual Fund Adjustment	\$ 306,324.87	\$ 299,484.00	\$ 836,863.71	\$ 829,321.65	\$ 821,402.49	\$ 813,087.37
Annual Fund Balance	\$ 2,276,787.53	\$ 2,576,271.53	\$ 3,413,135.24	\$ 4,242,456.89	\$ 5,063,859.38	\$ 5,876,946.75

9-1-1 Surcharge, if passed as a resolution by the County board before 7/1/17, will first be collected 11/1/17. Any amount exceeding \$0.42 must be passed by public vote.

Capital Equipment Purchase assumes Dispatch Radios and Field Radio Equipment are funded through Motorola lease-purchase with no interest and no payments for the first two years (offer expires 9/20/16).

Annual Maintenance Expenditure assumes an annual increase of 5%.

To: Communications Task Force Members
From: Chet Janik
Date: July 13, 2016
Re: Leelanau County Tax Rate

In anticipation of the discussion on the County's tax rate and a potential millage, I thought the following information would be beneficial:

The current County tax allotment is 3.5212 mills annually

1.0 mill in Leelanau County equates to \$2,569,394.52 annually

0.5 mill in Leelanau County equates to \$1,284,67.26 annually

0.25 mill in Leelanau County equates to \$642,348.63 annually

0.1 mill in Leelanau County equates to \$256,934.42 annually

0.01 mill in Leelanau County equates to \$25,693.44 annually

**By 4:00 p.m.,
Oct. 28, 2016** Write-in candidates file Declaration of Intent forms for the November general election. (168.737a)

November 8, 2016 STATE GENERAL ELECTION

Filing Deadlines: New Parties and State Ballot Proposals

**By 5:00 p.m.,
June 1, 2016** Petitions to place a legislative initiative proposal on the November general election ballot filed with the Secretary of State (252,523 valid signatures required). (168.471)

**By 5:00 p.m.,
July 11, 2016** Petitions to place a proposed constitutional amendment on the November general election ballot filed with the Secretary of State (315,654 valid signatures required). (168.471)

**By 4:00 p.m.,
July 21, 2016** New political parties file petitions to qualify for November general election ballot (31,566 valid signatures required). (168.685)

Filing Deadlines: County and Local Proposals

By Apr 26, 2016 Petitions to place county and local questions on the August primary ballot filed with county and local clerks.

**By 4:00 p.m.,
May 10, 2016** Ballot wording of county and local proposals to be presented at the August primary certified to county and local clerks; local clerks receiving ballot wording forward to county clerk within two days. (168.646a)

By Aug. 2, 2016 Petitions to place county and local questions on the November general election ballot filed with county and local clerks.

**By 4:00 p.m.,
Aug. 16, 2016** Ballot wording of county and local proposals to be presented at the November general election certified to county and local clerks; local clerks receiving ballot wording forward to county clerk within two days. (168.646a)