

---

---

**MEMORANDUM – OFFICE OF THE TOWN ADMINISTRATOR**

---

---

**TO:** Karel, Crawford, Chair CC Dispatch Subcommittee  
**FROM:** Carter Terenzini, Town Administrator *Carter*  
**RE:** CC Dispatch Service Financing  
**DATE:** October 2, 2013  
**CC:** D. Owen, E. Sires, D. Richardi, M. Santuccio,



This memo is to transmit an illustration of what a fee for service model might look like if used to pay for the dispatch services provided by Carroll County. These discussions were triggered by a request by Conway, Moultonborough and Wolfeboro that the County consider implementing such a model as a matter of equity to them as they maintain their own primary dispatch services. Without going into great detail, such a model is in use in four of the ten counties in the state. In fact, discussions similar to those we have been having are becoming more frequent in other counties as well.

The first step in our process was to gain an understanding of which jurisdictions the County dispatches for (Exhibit A). The second step was to try to establish the call volumes for each. Due to the software tracking system that is currently used by the County, it is not easily decipherable as to how many calls now assigned to a given community may be for local jurisdictions as opposed to the Carroll County Sheriff's Office (CCSO) itself.

As part of an initial attempt to agree on some "rules of thumb" as to what the percentage of calls allocated to each jurisdiction might actually be for them, as opposed to the jurisdictions, the Dispatch Supervisor has carried out a hand count of Wolfeboro and Moultonborough. In those cases the CCSO calls were roughly 1.5% and 1% respectively of the total calls for those towns. Given the non-material nature of that percentage, it was suggested by Dave Owen, Wolfeboro's Town Manager, that the simplest thing to do for this illustration was to assume that all calls assigned to a jurisdiction are in fact for that local jurisdiction.

During that same discussion it was brought up that there are a number of calls within the Town of Ossipee that should be more definitively assigned a new code (00) for jail related transports. That was subsequently estimated by the CCSO at 8% to 10% of Ossipee's call volumes. The higher figure was used for the purposes of this estimate. The resulting call volumes are presented on Exhibit B. While the CCSO and three town data does not provide a specific head to head call comparison by year, a general annual comparison is as follows:

County	59,780
Conway	60,678
Moultonborough	25,051
Wolfeboro	42,504

With call volumes in hand we next turned our attention to what formulas we might use in creating an illustration of the financial impact of a fee for service approach on a town by town basis. We chose to use the Grafton and Merrimack county models. It is important to bear in mind that any fee assessed under a fee for service approach is revenue to the County. That revenue, like income from timber sales or Medicare, offsets the county tax that needs to be raised (Exhibit C). Thus a shift to a fee for service approach is not all new cost to a participating community.

On Exhibit D you can see both the reduction in tax and the increase in fees for service under the Grafton County model. Under that approach all costs are apportioned amongst all user jurisdictions. There are six jurisdictions which benefit from this model with savings ranging from approximately \$1,200 to \$121,000. Thirteen jurisdictions see their costs increase on a range of approximately \$700 to \$98,000.

On Exhibit E you can see both the reduction in tax and the increase in fees for service under the Merrimack County model. Under that approach only a portion of the costs are apportioned amongst user jurisdictions. Based upon the assumption we have made as to call volumes, and an assumption we have made as to the costs to maintain the dispatch center upon the baseline CCSO needs, the range of savings and costs varies quite a bit. The six which benefit from this model realize savings ranging from approximately \$600 to \$60,000. The thirteen jurisdictions which see their costs increase would see a range of approximately \$350 to \$48,750.

It is important to note that each set of numbers is impacted by any refinement in the assignment of call volumes, our ability to create true head to head comparisons, and agreed changes to the distribution models. You will find attached to this electronic memo the actual "what if" spreadsheet that I have created to prepare the attached exhibits. You will be able to see the results of various changes on that.

It is also important to note that as local taxing jurisdictions ourselves we three towns fully understand the need to not "shock" any other jurisdictions with a large budgetary increase. I therefore will point out again that we have indicated we are most understanding of the need to transition to a new system over a period of 3 to five years.

As to the numbers used for the basis of this illustration, prior to finalizing this memo it was circulated to the CCSO for comment in an effort to ensure that the "facts", based upon the stated assumptions, had not been misrepresented. Sherriff Richardi responded that "I cannot say that I agree with any of the numbers as the word assumed is used in coming up with some of your facts. Also I still have issues on how each department counts numbers. I believe I would be correct that not any one department counts calls the same way, shape, or form. That being said I really can't agree that any of your facts are true and correct."

K. Crawford Re: County Dispatch  
October 2, 2013  
Page 3

While I understand and agree that what each department identifies as a “Call for Service” may vary, I would believe that the call count reported by the Sherriff’s office would be an accurate reflection of the “traffic” dispatchers are handling. Given the use of the higher estimate of the so-called “00” calls in Ossipee and our adoption of the suggestion of Dave Owen to count all calls logged to a jurisdiction as a call on behalf of the jurisdiction, I believe the numbers used herein are in a light most favorable to the county based. Further, while new software or a considerable amount of labor and “hand count” by the CCSO might produce better numbers in the future, I am comfortable that the illustrations herein provide a reasonable basis for our current discussions.

Finally, I want to thank Lt. Michael Santuccio and the Dispatch Supervisor for their efforts to help us understand and sort through the various dispatch numbers. I look forward to an opportunity to present on October 7 and address the many questions people may have.

# Exhibit A – Entities Dispatched by County

September 20, 2013

Jurisdiction	Law Enforcement		Fire/EMS	
	<u>Primary</u>	<u>Secondary</u>	<u>Primary</u>	<u>Secondary</u>
Albany	x			x
Bartlett	x		x	
Brookfield	x		x	
Chatham	x			x
Conway		x		x
Eaton	x		x	
Effingham	x		x	
Freedom	x		x	
Hale's Loc.	x			x
Hart's Loc.	x		x	
Jackson	x		x	
Madison	x		x	
Moultonborough		x		x
Ossipee	x		x	
Sandwich	x			x
Tamworth	x		x	
Tuftonboro	x		x	
Wakefield	x		x	
Wolfeboro		x		x
CC Sherriff	x			
Others	Mutual aid assistance to neighboring towns/counties and states as needed			

**Exhibit B**  
**September 20, 2013**

	<b>Total Calls</b>	<b>Average Per/Year</b>	<b>Primary Dispatch</b>	<b>Local Dispatch</b>	<b>Note</b>
CCSO	48667	16222	X		1
CCSO (00)	3206	1069	X		2
Albany	3501	1167	X		
Bartlett	10188	3396	X		
Brookfield	1152	384	X		
Chatham	246	82	X		
Conway	660	220	N	60678	3
Eaton	673	224	X		
Effingham	5792	1931	X		
Freedom	6230	2077	X		
Hale's Loc.	1053	351	X		
Hart's Loc.	320	107	X		
Jackson	4206	1402	X		
Madison	11585	3862	X		
Moultonborough	1142	381	N	25051	4
Ossipee	28855	9618	X		5
Sandwich	748	249	X		
Tamworth	9739	3246	X		
Tuftonboro	13531	4510	X		
Wakefield	20022	6674	X		
Wolfeboro	2846	949	N	42504	4
Others	4979	1660	X		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>59780</b>		<b>128233</b>	

- Note: 1 CCSO #s provided for 2009 - 2011  
2 New code to be created for jail transports and other CCSO functions  
3 Assumes Walk-Ins @ 15% (2012 #s)  
4 Excludes Walk Ins of 4,546 (M'boro) and 5,213 (W'boro) (2012#s)  
5 Total Calls are 32061 but... 10% Are Assumed to be CCSO Code 00

**Exhibit C**  
**September 20, 2013**

	<b>2010</b> <b>%</b> <b>Proportion</b> <b>to County</b> <b>Tax</b>	<b>2011</b> <b>%</b> <b>Proportion</b> <b>to County</b> <b>Tax</b>	<b>2012</b> <b>%</b> <b>Proportion</b> <b>to County</b> <b>Tax</b>
Albany	0.8404%	0.8527%	0.8364%
Bartlett	7.8003%	7.7719%	7.5179%
Brookfield	0.8277%	0.7989%	0.8159%
Chatham	0.4276%	0.4292%	0.4194%
Conway	11.4196%	11.3434%	11.4105%
Eaton	0.8336%	0.8178%	0.8375%
Effingham	1.4075%	1.3989%	1.4226%
Freedom	3.9080%	4.0584%	3.8484%
Hale's Location	0.5623%	0.5463%	0.5846%
Hart's Location	0.1302%	0.1296%	0.1312%
Jackson	2.9074%	3.0154%	2.6140%
Madison	3.5628%	3.5346%	3.5784%
Moultonborough	22.6038%	22.6341%	23.1079%
Ossipee	5.7522%	5.1680%	5.5441%
Sandwich	3.5009%	3.7669%	3.4587%
Tamworth	2.6766%	2.7963%	2.4158%
Tuftonboro	7.9455%	7.9647%	8.0493%
Wakefield	7.3212%	6.9023%	7.2028%
Wolfeboro	15.5723%	16.0705%	16.2046%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>100.0000%</b>	<b>100.0000%</b>	<b>100.0000%</b>

\*Rounded for display. Actual apportionment based on detailed figures.

# Exhibit D

## Impact - For Illustration Purposes Only

### Grafton County Model

September 20, 2013

Total Budget of CCSO Dispatch	\$801,000	Assumed	
Call Split		Service Fee	<b>\$547,078.52</b>
County	32% \$253,921		
Local	68% \$547,079		
Assumed Service Fee at CCSO/Local Split			

	FY 2012 % of CC Tax	% Local Calls Exhibit B	County Tax Reduction	Service Fee AppORTioned	Net Change
Albany	0.8364%	2.8582182%	(\$4,575.76)	\$15,636.70	\$11,060.93
Bartlett	7.5179%	8.3174884%	(\$41,128.82)	\$45,503.19	\$4,374.38
Brookfield	0.8159%	0.9404934%	(\$4,463.61)	\$5,145.24	\$681.62
Chatham	0.4194%	0.2008345%	(\$2,294.45)	\$1,098.72	(\$1,195.72)
Conway	11.4105%	0.5388243%	(\$62,424.39)	\$2,947.79	(\$59,476.60)
Eaton	0.8375%	0.5494375%	(\$4,581.78)	\$3,005.85	(\$1,575.93)
Effingham	1.4226%	4.7285917%	(\$7,782.74)	\$25,869.11	\$18,086.37
Freedom	3.8484%	5.0861752%	(\$21,053.77)	\$27,825.37	\$6,771.60
Hale's Location	0.5846%	0.8596697%	(\$3,198.22)	\$4,703.07	\$1,504.85
Hart's Location	0.1312%	0.2612482%	(\$717.77)	\$1,429.23	\$711.47
Jackson	2.6140%	3.4337805%	(\$14,300.63)	\$18,785.48	\$4,484.84
Madison	3.5784%	9.4579999%	(\$19,576.66)	\$51,742.69	\$32,166.03
Moultonborough	23.1079%	0.9323294%	(\$126,418.36)	\$5,100.57	(\$121,317.78)
Ossipee	5.5441%	23.5571550%	(\$30,330.58)	\$128,876.13	\$98,545.55
Sandwich	3.4587%	0.6106676%	(\$18,921.80)	\$3,340.83	(\$15,580.97)
Tamworth	2.4158%	7.9509245%	(\$13,216.32)	\$43,497.80	\$30,281.48
Tuftonboro	8.0493%	11.0467153%	(\$44,035.99)	\$60,434.21	\$16,398.22
Wakefield	7.2028%	16.3459709%	(\$39,404.97)	\$89,425.30	\$50,020.32
Wolfeboro	16.2046%	2.3234758%	(\$88,651.89)	\$12,711.24	(\$75,940.65)
		100.0000000%	(\$547,078.52)	\$547,078.52	\$0.00

# Exhibit E

Impact - For Illustration Purposes Only

Merrimack County Model

September 20, 2013

Total Budget of CCSO Dispatch	\$801,000			<b>Assumed</b>	
				<b>Service Fee</b>	<b>\$270,518.75</b>
\$s of Budget Above CCSO Needs	\$270,519				
	% of Total	34%			
	<b>FY 2012</b>	<b>% Local Calls</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>Net Change</b>
	<b>% of CC</b>	<b>Exhibit B</b>	<b>Tax</b>	<b>Fee</b>	
	<b>Tax</b>		<b>Reduction</b>	<b>Apportioned</b>	
Albany	0.8364%	2.8582182%	(\$2,262.62)	\$7,732.02	\$5,469.40
Bartlett	7.5179%	8.3174884%	(\$20,337.33)	\$22,500.37	\$2,163.04
Brookfield	0.8159%	0.9404934%	(\$2,207.16)	\$2,544.21	\$337.05
Chatham	0.4194%	0.2008345%	(\$1,134.56)	\$543.30	(\$591.26)
Conway	11.4105%	0.5388243%	(\$30,867.54)	\$1,457.62	(\$29,409.92)
Eaton	0.8375%	0.5494375%	(\$2,265.59)	\$1,486.33	(\$779.26)
Effingham	1.4226%	4.7285917%	(\$3,848.40)	\$12,791.73	\$8,943.33
Freedom	3.8484%	5.0861752%	(\$10,410.64)	\$13,759.06	\$3,348.41
Hale's Location	0.5846%	0.8596697%	(\$1,581.45)	\$2,325.57	\$744.12
Hart's Location	0.1312%	0.2612482%	(\$354.92)	\$706.73	\$351.80
Jackson	2.6140%	3.4337805%	(\$7,071.36)	\$9,289.02	\$2,217.66
Madison	3.5784%	9.4579999%	(\$9,680.24)	\$25,585.66	\$15,905.42
Moultonborough	23.1079%	0.9323294%	(\$62,511.20)	\$2,522.13	(\$59,989.08)
Ossipee	5.5441%	23.5571550%	(\$14,997.83)	\$63,726.52	\$48,728.69
Sandwich	3.4587%	0.6106676%	(\$9,356.43)	\$1,651.97	(\$7,704.46)
Tamworth	2.4158%	7.9509245%	(\$6,535.19)	\$21,508.74	\$14,973.55
Tuftonboro	8.0493%	11.0467153%	(\$21,774.87)	\$29,883.44	\$8,108.57
Wakefield	7.2028%	16.3459709%	(\$19,484.92)	\$44,218.92	\$24,733.99
Wolfeboro	16.2046%	2.3234758%	(\$43,836.48)	\$6,285.44	(\$37,551.04)
		100.0000000%	(\$270,518.75)	\$270,518.75	\$0.00



# Exhibit F

## Theoretical Staff Budget CCSO Needs - For Illustration Purposes Only September 20, 2013

Description	Quantity	\$ Per Unit	Hrs/Wk/Yr	Extension
Full Time Dispatchers	4	\$19.40	40	\$161,408.00
Part-Time Hours	1850	\$17.50	32	\$32,375.00
Overtime @7.5% FT				\$12,105.60
FICA @ 6.2%				\$13,218.05
Medicare @ 1.45%				\$2,985.3847
Workers Compensation @ 7%				\$14,412.20
NHRS @ 10.77%				\$18,687.41
Unemployment				-
Health Insurance (Net of Employee Contributions) (Asumed 2F/1Two/1One)				\$58,137.60
			Estimated Base Items	\$313,329.25
			Current Staff/Fringe Items	\$583,848.00
			<b>Net CCSO Only Under Current</b>	<b>\$270,518.75</b>
Annual Base Hours		8736		
Annual FTE Hours @ 14% Lost Time		10158		
Annual FTE Hours @ Staffing		10170		
<b>Assumed Slippage</b>	160	Vacation		
	80	Holiday		
As a % of Hours	24	Sick		
13.85%	24	Training		
	<b>288</b>	<b>Total</b>		