

April 24, 2017

Darke County Commissioners
520 S. Broadway
Greenville, OH 45331

Questions Regarding County Dispatch Services and MARCS Radios:

1. **At a recent commission meeting a resolution was unanimously approved to provide dispatch services to all county agencies at no cost. The City of Greenville would like a written agreement with the county commissioners outlining the details of the terms, costs, grievance procedures, and other administrative details. Would the commission be willing to entertain such a written agreement?**

Answer: "No. We got with the CCA (County Commissioner Association) and our lawyer and discussed; and, were advised we have no agreements with any other entities in the county as per dispatching charging on that. So, we were advised it doesn't seem to be necessary when we've got a several year history of doing all that. And, it didn't cost anybody any money; and we would do the same thing for you, the same general application."

2. **If, yes to above, who will negotiate the agreement on behalf of the commission? (N/A)**

3. **Would the commission be willing to agree to 5, 10, or 20 agreement, with 20 years being preferable to the city? (N/A)**

- a. "The City of Greenville has a very, very large call volume, so what assurance can you give us for the long term, other than the fact that you've done it a very long time for everyone else, that the city would not be facing charges **any time** in the future? And, if the City of Greenville were to incur costs with the entire county at that point, would it be at the same cost based upon the same rate, would we look at it per capita or...?"

Answer: "That's how we talked about this morning. We looked at it if... 'Cause you've got a genuine concern. I understand that. But if we do have an issue, everybody's gonna pay, not just you guys. It would be everybody, and we know that. We know that going in that... everybody'd have to pay. 'Cause it's been an issue. I can bring up, Curt, I've been here 17 years now and it started before I got here... but with the MARCS system coming on like it is, everything needs to be upgraded... but if we had to, it would be everybody, it wouldn't be just you guys, especially after our lawyer advised us to that."

4. The Sherriff, through his Chief Deputy, has presented a spreadsheet outlining additional labor costs for Dispatch due to the decision to eliminate the City of Greenville PSAP and increase the county's PSAP with 4 stations. The county general fund will increase approximately \$200,000 for the additional labor. Also, the county will incur the cost to upgrade its consoles & purchase additional dispatch consoles (probably somewhere between \$250,000 & \$300,000)... In the event the city decides on county dispatch, do the commissioners currently have a sustainable funding source for these additional charges? (I'm just guessing at an estimated \$9,500 engineering expense for remodeling dispatch & looking at a construction cost of usually around 10%, maybe not in this situation...)

Answer: "In that particular case, it has been under discussion before this even came about in our jet room down there."

- a. "Going back to the previous question about not charging, or will you charge in the future, with all of these costs in mind, is there a highly sustainable funding source that is going to continue to fund dispatch, not only for the City of Greenville, but all county agencies, for the long haul? And, can you explain what that funding source is?"

Answer: "I know you've already talked to the auditors, so you've got the information. And what it is, we've been approached, a couple years ago, that there was a need from Tri-County Mental Health Board for a facility to house the drug epidemic of people we have in this county, a place to take them for treatment and what have you. So, we've been negotiating and discussing... well, we've negotiated already but... they will be taken to the County Home. And we've already got it worked out with Mike Besecker, at DD, and Gracie out there at Job & Family Services. They know that they got... proper places to put the only (20) residents we have out there. And right now, (20) residents costs us over \$500,000 a year just to house them. So, once the sale is done on that and the people's got their own facility, money that has been going there can be diverted to different entities than that. And the County Home has been there since before my time. So, that's where the funding is going to be coming from."

- b. "And so that is a 99.9 % done deal? (Yes, sir.) So you're selling the County Home?"
Answer: "Yes, we are selling it."

5. Because the agreement is not feasible, a concern that the city has in moving forward with dispatch is, what procedure will the city follow to insure the best quality dispatch service when there are procedural and/or administrative issues (i.e. a conflict resolution)?

Answer: "I guess, help me out, what would be some issues, off the top of your head, you'd need to resolve?"

Reply: "You had a call that wasn't dispatched properly and... in our professional opinion, you had a call that wasn't dispatched properly... let's just say we're not receiving the level of customer service that we had anticipated with this move, and because there is no agreement, there's really nothing in black & white that says anybody is committing to do anything."

Answer: "Here, I'll field some of that question. I mean we're all adults here and we've all been in law enforcement, we've got city folks that have got a lot of years of experience, we've got deputies with a lot of years' experience...why would a dispatch dispatch something incorrectly when a person's life is on the line, when a person's security is on the line? I mean, at that point we're providing a service to take care of the public and all the needs that the public has... why would we, or why would dispatch, I shouldn't say "we" because I'm not involved in it. But why would dispatch want to create an issue where it puts a person's life in danger either health wise, a fire issue, something?... And that's my perspective when taking all this in. Why would you

bring that in to jeopardy where you'd have an issue that could even come up? Plus, we have thirty plus years' experience in dispatching for (31) other agencies within the county; and as far as I know, there hasn't been a major issue come up from when I was, you know, researching some of this. From my point of perspective, why do you even have an issue?"

Reply: "Well, if I might explain, I think the reason is in dealing with our own dispatch center, I can't speak for the county, you know, we all like to think we have well-trained dispatchers; however, we are all human and unfortunately, it is a human nature to make mistakes and I'm not sitting here saying, or standing before you saying, that anybody at a dispatch center is going to intentionally mess up and do something that would put someone else's life in jeopardy; however, we know that in whatever department we are managing, whether it's a dispatch, or a whether it's a sheriff's deputy people mess up, people make mistakes. It may not be intentional, but mistakes happen and mistakes have happened. I think to, sit here and think that mistakes won't happen, we're kidding ourselves. So, all I'm asking for is a process... and can we identify, and not necessarily today, but what would that process be. Is it simply a matter of we have an issue, we take it to the sheriff and we basically accept whatever the sheriff's opinion is & how he decides to deal with the situation, is that our only recourse at that point or is there something else that we might implement, such as a conflict resolution?"

Answer: "Let me think that through."

Reply: "Yeah, I'm just asking the question."

Answer: "I think the best course on that one is to think about it because I think it's going to be a longer decision than what we can make in this room today because you have a city council of so many members and yourself and the mayor and all this that plus your law enforcement and our law enforcement. We gotta get, you know, heads together and see how that process would work beneficially for everybody."

Reply: "Just understand that as we are...currently we have our own dispatch center, so we, and our management team like to think we can manage our own dispatch team, we manage it well... and basically, we have that control. When we...we are not contracting for your service, basically we are sending everything out to the county, what recourse do we have? We lost that control, that management control."

Answer: "Okay, food for thought."

6. If, let's say, the sale of this property wouldn't go through & there's no other funding source available, would you foresee any kind of a property tax levy being placed county wide to offset the funding of dispatch, labor and equipment? And has that been talked about?

Answer: "Yeah, you've been aware of that; so has Chief Butts, on our communication team. So, yeah, there is discussion that has been going on. It's a matter of getting the final numbers put together. Now that ODNR has given us all them radios, it's going to lower that price tag to get that done. So, we're in the process of getting that... we've got a communication... is that next Wednesday? (*This Wednesday.*) This Wednesday."

Reply: "I guess the question is, do you really...your recent an announcement, just today, of the County Home, if that comes to fruition, do you still see the tax levy being implemented?"

Answer: "Yes. Yes, it is substantial that we have sustained future. It's going to be for emergency communication. Did I say that right, Chief? (Yes.) Emergency communication and that'll be for whatever the millage we finally determine to put out to the public to vote on that will be a sustainable amount so that every so many, every year, we go and place so many radios, to go about what have you so that it will be sustainable."

Reply: "And that's something we talked about on the MARCS radio side, my question is about dispatch."

Answer: "Well, I'm talking about just the MARCS radio end of it."

Reply: "I'm talking about if things didn't come to fruition; and again, that long term model for dispatching all the City of Greenville calls, the adding of the (4) dispatchers, we're not taking wages from the 9-1-1 fund that could be used to off-set some of those wages. This is a \$200,000, and will only continue to go up, labor increase to the county's general fund. Again, would you write that levy in such a way that that levy provided a sustainable funding source for dispatch?"

Answer: (You can handle it Mark... If you've got a comment, go ahead.) "First of all, it's important to distinguish between... your talking, two different things: MARCS radios and dispatch. So, I want to make sure everybody in the room understands that we kind of melted those together just a minute ago. I think, a couple of things... you're asking about funding source for 9-1-1 dispatch, right?"

Reply: "No, 9-1-1, answering the phone calls, PSAPS, we know is funded through the tax money received from cell phones. (Right). And you stated in prior meetings that you do not anticipate in the future taking wages from that fund, or a portion of the wages from that fund. (Correct). Okay, so now we're left with a \$200,000 increase whether they're there to answer 9-1-1 phones or they're there for the City of Greenville dispatch, it's still a \$200,000 increase. (Right). And that increase is going to come from the sheriff's budget i.e. the commissioner's general fund."

Answer: "I see. It will come to the 9-1-1 budget through an appropriation from the commissioners, but it will be out of the general fund at this point. Yeah."

Reply: "Sorry, I don't know how the circle of accounting finance works. Either way, it's a \$200,000 increase on the county's budget. The question is, if that sale that you just mentioned doesn't go through, is there another source for that extra incurred labor?"

Answer: "Some of the \$200,000 is going to get watered down just on savings of equipment and making SPEAKS, because you have the \$200,000 in labor, which was shared with you by the folks out at the deputy's office, but the equipment cost savings by buying more..."

Reply: "The equipment, you're right. There is a savings when you add the (2) numbers but they come from different funds. (Correct.) One comes from the 9-1-1 tax dollars. The other, labor, only comes from the general fund. So, the general fund will still see a \$200,000 increase."

Answer: "It's still part of a similar pool."

Reply: "You'll have to explain it. Because I don't..."

Answer: "In account financing, instead of putting into a line item it'll go to the other line item."

Reply: "I understand you're able to buy the equipment from the 9-1-1 fund, but labor you do not. Labor will come from the general fund."

Answer: "But the money we're putting towards the OPOA & PSAP, we no longer have to put toward the OPOA & PSAP, so..."

Reply: "You take money from the general fund to off-set PSAP costs?"

Answer: "For the [REDACTED], that is a capital improvement. Right now we don't because we can use the wireless fund. But when the wireless fund is underfunded, in the past, we have. We've been putting general fund money..."

Reply: "The wireless 9-1-1 fund or tax is not a guarantee. So you don't know what the level is going to be."

Reply: Address to Chief Whittaker: "The spreadsheet you sent me increased you labor charges by the \$200,000, Correct?"

Answer: "Yes."

Reply: "Where, in your opinion, will that \$200,000 come from?"

Answer: "In my opinion, it will likely be appropriated from the general fund. Yes."

Reply: "So, that is a \$200,000 increase to your fund if the sale of the county property does not go through what other sources of long-term sustainable funding do you have?"

Answer: "Rest assured it's going through."

Reply: "So, to our tax payers, the City of Greenville tax payers, this is the concern: that the City of Greenville is currently paying for a service at its current taxing rate, so we don't want to get into a situation where we take that service that we are currently financing, and doing well with it; & move it out to the county; but then have to turn around and start paying for something. Maybe, it's a charge to the City of Greenville, but the City of Greenville would then write a check to the county; or maybe it's a tax levy that goes on everybody's property tax, but what they're currently paying is already getting that service, so why should the City of Greenville support an income tax, or I'm sorry, a in property tax to fund something they already have?"

Answer: "I think you're back to getting muddled between dispatch and MARCS because..."

Reply: "I totally understand there. I am asking about dispatch. What is your long term funding solution to this \$200,000? We're only talking \$200,000. Nothing about MARCS radios, if that doesn't go through."

Answer: "As I said a while ago, Curt, the \$500,000 we've been putting in every year to the County Home, to run that, will go away. So, if we keep going forward the way it is today, we'd be spending \$500,000. So with that closing, the \$500,000 was to be for eternity, so it's already in the general fund that we can absorb that."

Reply: "And I don't disagree with you; and it's a great funding source. I'm only saying if something were to go haywire, what's plan "B"? That's all I'm asking."

- 7. In the event the current funding source for Dispatch is no longer available, what options will the commission have for funding solutions maintain county-wide dispatch services at no charge and maintain the same level of service?**

(Answered above.)

Questions regarding MARCS Radios:

- 1. The county made a recent announcement that it will be receiving numerous radios from the ODNR. When the radios are distributed to the various agencies who will own the radio?**

Answer: "County. ODNR."

- 2. What agency or group will be responsible to administer the MARCS radio program (if a radio needs fixed)?**

Answer: "Sheriff's dept."

Reply: "Or the County Communications Committee?"

Answer: "No, the County Communications Committee is an advisory."

Reply: "Okay, so that's the answer, the county sheriff will be?"

Answer: "He's in charge of all of them. Well, that's the way the memorandum of understanding is. It goes through their department to manage it."

Reply: "So, EMA didn't...didn't..."

Answer: "She just happened to be at the right place, at the right time."

Reply: "So, she wrote the grant...I didn't know if it was going to be her agency or her department that would be administering radios or if it's the sheriff's department."

- 3. Will the county be entering into Memorandums of Understanding's (MOU) with county agencies stating county and local financial responsibilities related to maintenance, subscription, and replacement costs? What will be the term of this MOU? Does the county anticipate these costs indefinitely?**

Answer: "I think we just answered that for ya. The county will be taking that."

Reply: "They're going to manage it. What I'm asking is, will there be agreements stating "I am giving you (x) radios, the county's responsible (and I'm just saying this hypothetically) the county's responsible for subscription fees; the county will replace this radio when it comes to the end of its useful life. If the radio breaks, we take it to the county sheriff and he fixes the radio." Will there be a written agreement with all agencies, not just the City of Greenville, stating those parameters?"

Answer: (I can't answer that, can you? If you can, go ahead.) "If we are talking about the ODNR radios, it would be the sheriff's office, the sheriff's recommendation that what we do is we distribute those radios, that we do have an MOU, an account for the inventory of the radios and what individual agencies they go to. And, during that MOU, we could address some of those costs which would be installation costs, programming costs, tuning costs...we're talking ODNR radios right now."

Reply: "Right now, that's all we're talking about."

Answer: "I would like to recommend to the commissioners and the sheriff that we engage in some sort of an MOU that spells that out so that everybody knows."

Reply: "So, the cost that Chief just mentioned on the front end is going to be coming up really soon, or as soon as we decide to implement. We have programming costs; we have installation costs; we have some tuning costs. As you distribute these radios, who is...is the county commission committed to paying those upfront costs?"

Answer: "We talked and I can't honestly remember what we talked. When we got 'em we started to talk about that. What was that? I can't remember. I really can't. We discussed that it was likely that the county commissioners would probably have to cover those expenses because the agencies with themselves, some of them, many of them would struggle to do it. Plus, we have huge [redacted]."

Reply: "So, I have a paper and was looking at the Chief's numbers, have you put any costs to what that might be on the front end?"

Answer: "We're waiting on quotes from Motorola."

Reply: "I think I've come up with about \$85-100k based on \$200 per radio to install; \$50 to program, which is what we're paying for the fire radios; and tuning costs, I don't know. Again, just curious if, or inquiring with the commission that you'll put that in the MOU when we sign it, that the commission will...again, the subscription fees are perpetual; they don't end just the first year. (They usually keep going.) Yeah. So, is the commission willing to agree to that?"

Answer: "We'll get that kind of stuff worked... we'll take it on record, what you're asking and address."

Reply: "Because I'm assuming that, well it's not safe to assume...I know these same questions will come up. Chief was quick to identify that this was only for the ODNR radios we have on hand. We still have a whole 'nother situation with the communications committee which is coming up on Wednesday. We know that these are, what, 7-8 year old radios; that they're getting close to their end of useful life. It bought us some time. I think Chief was quoted as to 5 years; one might debate that back and forth. We don't know how long a radio is going to last, but the issue is that definitely within the next (10) years, we're gonna be buying those same radios again."

Answer: "Like what I said, that's what the levy's going to be about, that we would address how much and figure out how many radios we need to plan on every year to replace; whether we need to replace them the first year, second year, whatever...but that would be figured in on that. So there would be a funding mechanism set up there just to take care of that cost."

Reply: "This is a follow-up question; you won't see this on your paper. We've had a couple of meetings with Chief Deputy in talking about the MARCS radios, so... and just trying to nail him down... you know, what is our implementation date? You know, when we talked the first time, they kept badgering me for a date and so I threw out January 1, 2018, we're going live. Okay, so that means that this funding source, this levy that you've talked about should be in place, hopefully, this November to at least be voted on. Is that your anticipating goal to get it on the ballot for November?"

Answer: "Yes."

Reply: "It is your goal? Okay."

Answer: "Yes."

Reply: "What is plan "B" if that levy does not pass for an ongoing? Again, the reason that this is important to the City of Greenville and dispatch is that we are currently on a VHF system. You're aware of that. Our VHF system works well for us. We have no reason, at this point, to... it is not as the Chief terms "mission critical" for the City of Greenville to change to MARCS by January 1, 2018. We're confident our VHF system will maintain. With the radios that you are giving us, we can carry (2) radios and still be inter-agency operable. Okay? So, that question about the levy, and if it fails, and what direction the City of Greenville needs to go, you know...and Chief has made the comment, he made it just the other day that if the levy doesn't pass we are still going on.... Now I won't hold him to the January 1, 2018, but it's gonna happen whether the levy passes or not, we're going live."

Answer: "The sheriff's had the discussion with the Information Board. Whether the levy happens or not, the sheriff's department is going to MARCS for all of it."

Reply: "So, the question is, what all this discussion boils down to if the levy doesn't pass, what's plan "B"?"

Answer: "We'll be on MARCS."

Reply: "Do what?"

Answer: "We'll be on MARCS."

Reply: "Who is gonna pay for it?"

Answer: "We're taking care of ourselves you all take of yourself. The people, the voters have got to understand that you're gonna be on VHF. (Okay). So the dispatching, whatever your issues, that'll be yours to go with or anybody else."

Reply: "And that's right. It's not just the City of Greenville..."

Answer: "It's anybody. Its county wide."

Reply: "So all agencies receiving and knowing that we're going MARCS, if this levy doesn't pass... whether you're a small town, or you're an EMS department made up of many townships, you will be responsible for your own MARCS radios at that point."

Answer: "Or, you do your own dispatching for your own, VHF, UHF, because we won't be."

Reply: "Okay, that definitely gives us some direction. We appreciate that answer."

- 4. The county fire departments were successful in obtaining a state grant from the Fire Marshall's office to purchase MARCS radios. Will the county pay for those subscription costs after the initial year?**

Answer: "The information given to me the other day was that the State Fire Marshall's grant

would continue the subscription fee. That should be an ongoing.”

Reply: “It’s guaranteed for (1) year. You can re-apply, but there is no... I mean, I understand, yeah sure, as long as the grant will cover that cost... great. But, what happens if that money dries up, which we know grants change all the time. Will the county assume those radios? Because, I mean, it’s been a part of the communications committee dialog, from the very beginning, that we would fund all agencies. Why would the Fire Departments be a step-child at this point and not move forward with that same funding program? Now, I know that there were some discrepancies in the communication committee that Fire Departments were over asking for some radios, but we did set a minimum. We agreed in the communications committee to a minimum. Why would that minimum, at the very least, not be funded through any kind of...it could be a levy; well, it would be a levy, or it’s on our own anyway. So, why would those radios not be funded through the levy?”

Answer: (Go ahead.) “Okay, the MARCS radios that the purchase the State Fire Marshall’s bring, all the Fire Chiefs are aware this and these conversations have happened... that if they go out an obtain the grant, they would ultimately be responsible for the ongoing expenses of those radios. Those radios are *their* radios. We still have the formula and the list of radios for each EMS, each fire agency, and each law enforcement agency that was provided by their individual chiefs to the communications committee. But we looked at those numbers and said if the county was able to obtain a funding source with the goal of providing public safety, emergency communications radios, portable radios, mobile radios, etc. to all county public safety agencies at the numbers that each of the chiefs provided to us through a formula the committee came up with; and, if the county could buy those through this funding source and purchase them, we would also be maintaining those and be providing the user fees to those radios. When the Fire Marshall’s grant came up, the firefighters, our impression was, most of the chiefs were using those grants, **not** to go towards the number that they had submitted to the county, because they still want the county to provide those radios. In that scenario, that was the additional radios the fire departments wanted, they felt, to get them enough radios to individual volunteers or firefighters. They wanted more radios. And we made it clear to them, that that’s going to be their responsibility. And, they’re going to have to maintain it thereafter. And, you’re correct, there is no guarantee, however, [REDACTED] has given indications if you apply for a MARCS radios, we would like you...you could apply for future grant funding with the idea that they would try to continue that funding and it wouldn’t fall on the county. So, those were additional radios bin and above what the county would provide for them.”

Reply: “So, my follow-up question to what you just said, for clarification is, if, when that levy passes, we’ll be positive, *when* that levy passes and you make your initial purchase of mobile and portable radios for the county, that initial purchase will include the numbers that we came up with, the communications committee came up with, the formula numbers, that initial purchase will include those radios for the fire departments?”

Answer: “What we said we would do is, we would assess the fire departments once their MARCS radios had come in, that we would look at what those numbers were. What the county would not do, is they weren’t going buy...weren’t going to provide a county fire department that had (15) volunteers with (20) radios to have (5) of them sitting on the shelf, being paid and not used. (Right). The MARCS radio had brought in the interesting scenario, if you will, they have done very good on the MARCS grant and they’ve purchased enough radios where now, technically have (15) members, but MARCS covered (5) of those radios; now they only need (10). We’re not going to provide above and beyond what their membership was or what the formula was.”

Reply: “But you would only provide them that (10)?”

Answer: “Yes. We’re not going to provide them more radios than they need.”

Reply: “But the thing is...so, and I understand what you’re saying. The issue is long term. What happens...That’s great for this cycle and it saves you on levy money, but what happens (10) years down the road, when now I have an agency that needs (23) radios, (15) of which were bought through the MARCS grant, on that next cycle, are you going to purchase those (15) when it comes to the end of useful life?”

Answer: “If the county commissioners are successful in obtaining this levy and we have this recurring revenue source, yeah, absolutely. If the fire departments staff increased such that they required more radios, that was discussed. Now, if we want to get into the nitty-gritty, what does that look like? If all of a sudden we have a fire department that expanded by 100 times, now that might have to be re-evaluated. (Right, I understand.) But the objective was that, you know, if a police department added another police officer, they had two and say Ansonia wanted to have a third one, the county is obtaining money through county tax payers, including those in Ansonia. In theory, under this scenario, they would buy that additional radio for the member of their staff *reasonably* expanded.”

Reply: “Again, to summarize my question and the point to this long dissertation is that there is no reason why, whether it’s Greenville City Fire Department or Arcanum Fire Department that any fire department should be left as step-child to fend for themselves: 1) for subscription costs if the grant were to fail or not come in, not be awarded; 2) replacement costs if every other agency in the county is getting those radios replaced by the levy at the end of their useful life. There is no reason why *any* municipality have to suffer that to keep their department in the MARCS program. That’s what I’m asking... that we have language.... do you agree with that statement? I guess, first of all, that I made that no county agency should be left out when the radios come to the end of their useful life?”

Answer: “Yeah, I believe based on the formula and reasonable radios for the 838 mapping.”

Reply: “So, we’re looking at this Fire Marshall’s grant as, basically, off-setting so we don’t have to incur those costs on the front end with this levy; however, as you plan for this levy and advise on long term millages, hopefully, the replacement of **all** the radios through that formula are accounted for, that you don’t subtract out the MARCS grant, or no, I’m sorry, you don’t subtract out the radios received from the Fire Marshall’s grant when you look at your long term replacement costs.”

Answer: “As long as they’re not exceeding their... (Exactly.) Staffing necessary.”

Reply: “But you know, if that formula said they needed (10) portables and (20), I’m sorry, (20) portables and (10) mobiles, that’s what we should figure for in the long term replacement costs.”

Answer: “That’s what I would suggest.”

Reply: “Good, we’re on the same page.”

- 5. Like dispatch funding, do the county commissioners have a sustainable funding source to fund the long-term costs required to maintain the MARCS radios and subscription costs? Does the county commission anticipate placing a property tax levy on the ballot to fund such a program?**

(Already been answered) – “If the levy doesn’t pass, everyone is on their own & most likely we are going live somewhere around the middle of 2018 and is that a safe assumption?”

Added comment: “Yes. What might be my recommendation to the county commissioners, sheriff and everybody else? It is important. This is extremely important. This is not some arbitrary decision to switch to MARCS. I mean, our current county, not the city, the current county VHF system, its equipment, the repeaters and the microwaves are at the end of life right now, past end of life. As a matter of fact, if one of that pieces of equipment fails today, it’ll be off line and there’s no replacement for it. So, naturally, I’m pushing folks and the powers that

be. We need to be moving to MARCS because that is really our only option at this point. And, I'd like to see it done, assuming no failure, between now and some sort of projected date that we need to come up with, which should be in 2018. Every day that we go, we are taking a chance of a potential failure, which Preble County is incurred themselves already."

Reply: "So in wrapping this up, so that we are all on the same page, the implementation of these ODNR radios...no municipality is going to need to go out and make this large dollar purchase for radios when we decide to go live. Every agency will be covered with radios. So, that gives us some time, obviously, to *pass* the levy. We don't *have* to pass it in November. November will be our first opportunity; and then, if it were to fail, we have, subsequently, the goal would just be that we need to have, hopefully, a levy in place by the time the radios are given to us from ODNR come to the end of their useful life. Is that a good summary?"

Answer: "Yes. And I'd like to stress to the people in the public, it's not broken, why do we need to fix it? Lives count. If we go down, we're all in a world of hurts; and the sooner we can get this system up and running, the better we can all breathe and be comfortable that we are all safe and sound."

Thank you for your time and answers. I will forward this information on to city council.

Curt Garrison
Director of Safety and Service
City of Greenville