

Kenton County Addressing Authority

Proposed Strategy to Assess the Needs and Set Direction

1. **Problem:** Kenton County is deficient in assigned responsibilities and procedures designed to:
 - a. Locate mis-numbered and non-standard addresses and parity (even/odd) issues;
 - b. Assess and clarify confusing street and road names;
 - c. Designate an official Kenton County address database and an agency responsible for maintaining it;
 - d. Interact with all local governments to coordinate anything/everything dealing with addresses; and
 - e. Resolve existing problems and prevent their re-occurrence.

2. **Goal:** Prepare Kenton County—administratively and procedurally—for future Next Generation 9-1-1 Dispatch system technology.

3. **Objective 1**
 - a. Establish a taskforce to oversee an assessment of these issues and propose direction. The taskforce should consist of the following members (or designee) at a minimum.
 - I. County Administrator or designee;
 - II. County Emergency Services Director;
 - III. County Emergency Communications Director;
 - IV. County Emergency Communications Board representative;
 - V. County PVA or designee;
 - VI. Kenton County Mayors' Group representative;
 - VII. US Postal Service representative;
 - VIII. Northern Kentucky Water District representative;
 - IX. Sanitation District 1 representative;
 - X. Cincinnati Bell representative; and
 - XI. Northern Kentucky Emergency Planning Committee representative.

 - b. Seek professional support from PDS personnel to pursue the leg work of the task force.

 - c. Charge the task force and staff to:
 - i. review the County's addressing issues;
 - ii. identify problems requiring resolution;
 - iii. answer the question of whether an addressing authority would resolve existing problems and prevent their re-occurrence;
 1. if so, recommend a structure and parameters for the program, and present an implementation strategy; and
 2. if not, propose an alternative to the creation of an addressing authority along with an implementation strategy;

 - d. Determine what if any costs recommendation III-1 or III-2 would prompt.

 - e. Set a timeline for completion of the task force's work.

4. Objective 2: NEXT UP

- a. Consider the task force's recommendation and reasoning.
- b. Pursue questions with the group if necessary.
- c. Seek assistance from the County Attorney regarding:
 - i. the proper legislative action to move the recommendation forward;
 - ii. procedures, policies, and assignments that might require action; and
 - iii. other legislative action as needed.
- d. Get buy in to the recommendation from the Kenton County Mayors' Group.
- e. Bring other group(s) into the process as necessary.

5. Objective 3

- a. Put the ordinance before the Fiscal Court.
- b. Give direction to appropriate staff to move forward.
- c. Provide timeframe for periodic reports.

Approved

Kenton County Addressing Taskforce

Judge/Executive Kris Knochelmann asked the following individuals to serve on the task force.

- Joe Shriver, Kenton County Administrator
- Steve Hensley, Director, Homeland Security and Emergency Management
- Dan Mathew, Director, Office of Emergency Communications
- Brent Cummins, Office of Emergency Communications
- Mayor Dave Jansing, Emergency Communications Board
- Gabrielle Summe, Kenton County Clerk
- Mayor Paul Meier, Kenton County Mayors' Group
- Mike Alter, Manager, Address Management Systems, US Postal Service
- Vince DiGirolamo, Database Administrator, Northern Kentucky Water District
- Jerry Biedenbender, GIS Manager, Sanitation District 1
- Mike Wills, Director of Transport & Voice Operations, Cincinnati Bell
- Tamika Green, Senior Director, Network Planning & Engineering, Cincinnati Bell
- Eric Brunner, Cincinnati Bell
- Kathy Stephens, Northern Kentucky Emergency Planning Committee
- Mike Hoffman, Customer Relations Representative, Duke Energy

CHARGE: Help prepare Kenton County—administratively and procedurally—for the onset of Next Generation 9-1-1 dispatch system technology.

Task force members met five times to pursue the charge and discuss the four tasks included in Judge Knochelmann's charge. From the beginning, all expressed agreement with the **Problem** identified in the strategy adopted by Kenton County Fiscal Court. Further, they agreed the identified **Goal** needed to be accomplished.

TASKS: (1) Review the County's current addressing issues, identify all address and road name problems that could prompt difficulties for Next Gen 9-1-1 technology, and compile a comprehensive list of these issues by jurisdiction so the appropriate elected officials may consider remedies if they wish.

Task force members used their initial meetings to discuss the scope of the problem, the reasons behind it, and the ramifications of attempting to correct every one of them. They heard a presentation on the many possibilities that will open when Kenton County transitions to Next Gen 9-1-1 technology. And, they considered how communities across the US are resolving similar problems.

In the end, they agreed with PDS staff that attempting to correct all past numbering and naming mistakes—while well-intended—could waste valuable time, create a negative perception of the new technology, spawn public pushback, and lessen the possibilities for success. And, they came to consensus that focusing

on the prevention of future problems was a more important goal to pursue. And finally, they concluded that education and engagement—particularly with Kenton County’s local governments—was important.

(2) Consider as best possible the events and entities that played a role in creating these problems. Answer the questions of whether and how a countywide addressing authority would prevent the re-occurrence of these problems going forward.

Through their many discussions, task force members realized quickly that the absence of uniform procedures and best practices documents produced the current problem. The fact that Kenton County includes so many jurisdictions only increased the odds that these problems would be created.

Task force members asked early in their deliberations how other communities are handling similar problems. PDS staff provided them with information from several communities, most notably Travis County, Texas—location of Austin. They learned that a vast majority of communities across the country are creating addressing authorities to take on these and other related problems. Members found the information compelling and useful and agreed that following a similar course of action was wise and timely.

(3) If it can, recommend a structure and operational parameters for an addressing authority program and present an implementation strategy along with a recommended timeline for startup.

By their final meeting last month, task force members agreed as follows.

1. To accomplish the February 2019 Fiscal Court charge, the County needs to establish and provide direction to a county-wide addressing authority. PDS is the logical location for these responsibilities to be housed since it handles the bulk of addressing being pursued today.
2. To codify the direction, governance, and operating procedures for a Kenton County Addressing Authority, the Fiscal Court and/or Judge Knochelmann need to appoint a small committee to work with the County Attorney to produce a draft ordinance as soon as is practicable.
3. To maximize opportunities for success, members of the task force recommend that some of its members and PDS staff present to individual legislative bodies where requested, the Kenton County Mayors’ Group, and other organizations with an interest in accurate addresses going forward. They suggest that three talking points be used to present a cohesive message to the community.
 - a. **Safety** – The most important factor is safety, both for citizens and responders. Getting to the right location as quickly and safely as possible benefits everyone, saves lives, minimizes danger, and protects

property.

- b. **Single Authority** – A single authority responsible for all addressing eliminates confusion about who is responsible for assigning addresses and where to find the official addressing database. Provision of services should be dependent upon a verified address, and a procedure for documenting unknown addresses should be implemented.
- c. **Standardized data** – Predictability and standardization of addresses leads to finding information faster and correlating information more thoroughly and accurately.

Further, they recommend that the draft ordinance be distributed during these presentations with a request for review and feedback.

- 4. To complete this phase of the process, members of the task force recommend that the small committee and County Attorney amend the draft ordinance as necessary before presenting it to Kenton County Fiscal Court for review, discussion, and action.

(4) Consider and report on what if any costs the recommendation will prompt.

Absent a proposed framework and operating procedures, task force members and PDS staff were unable to project what if any costs might be prompted. They recommend revisiting this question once a draft ordinance is complete and submitted to the Fiscal Court.

Preliminary report and recommendations by March 1, 2020.

The task force recommends that June 1 be set as the goal for presenting a draft ordinance to the Fiscal Court. Meetings of the small committee should be set accordingly.