

**Dakota Communications Center
Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes: 06.03.09**

Members Present: Tom Lawell – Apple Valley; Craig Ebeling – Burnsville; Brandt Richardson – Dakota County; Tom Hedges – Eagan; Peter Herlofsky – Farmington; Dave Osberg – Hastings; Steve Mielke – Lakeville; Dwight Johnson - Rosemount; Stephen King – South St. Paul; John Remkus – West St. Paul

Members Absent: Joe Lynch – Inver Grove Heights; Jim Danielson – Mendota Heights

Alternates Present:

Others Present: Kent Therkelsen, Jen Hildebrandt, Diane Lind – DCC

Call the Meeting to Order

Chair Osberg called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.

1. Announcements

None

2. Additions to the Agenda

None

Consent Agenda

3.

- a. **Approve minutes from the April 29th, 2009 Executive Committee meeting.**
- b. **Approve April, 2009 Paid Claims.**
- c. **Receive April, 2009 Financial Reports.**
- d. **Receive Minutes from Operations Committees.**
 - o **Fire/EMS Minutes from the May 12th meeting.**
 - o **Law Enforcement Minutes from the May 7th meeting.**
 - o **Joint Operations Minutes from the May 28th meeting.**

Action: Motion by Herlofsky (Farmington) to approve the consent agenda. Second by Johnson (Rosemount). Motion passed unanimously.

Regular Agenda

4. Proposed 2010 and Preliminary 2011 DCC Operating and Capital Budgets.

Discussion:

Therkelsen (DCC) reviewed the DCC 2010-11 Operating and Capital Budgets with members. Osberg (Hastings) reminded member that the budget had been previously reviewed at the May meeting which was held on April 29th. Osberg added at the April 29th meeting members agreed the budget looked good but they wanted to wait on recommending approval until the June meeting to allow additional time to review it.

Therkelsen stated that in May, the Board of Directors received and approved the recommended funding formula. Lawell (Apple Valley) commented that he heard the funding formula vote was not unanimous and asked for a recap of the meeting. Therkelsen (DCC) confirmed that the

vote was not unanimous and that there was a lengthy discussion among Board members. Therkelsen stated that his sense was that members were quite comfortable with using CAD Assigned events as the single factor for actual activity indicators. Therkelsen clarified that the real discussion was based more around the use of the three year rolling average for determining the fees. Therkelsen acknowledged the rolling average impacts each city quite differently for 2010. Therkelsen informed members that there were 8 members present at the meeting and 6 of them voted in favor and 2 voted opposed. Therkelsen continued stating the 6 in favor represented 70% of the weighted membership present and only 66.67% was needed to get the 2/3 majority. Osberg (Hastings) clarified that the concern was not changing the formula but more the recommendation of how to change it. Therkelsen (DCC) confirmed and stated that it was more a discussion of how quickly to get to the resolution of some cities feeling they are carrying a heavier weight proportionately and wanting to get down to the pure equity faster.

Hedges (Eagan) stated that he has a council member who has an issue with the blended vs non-blended funding formula and intends to bring the topic up at an upcoming Eagan City Council budget work session. Hedges clarified that at this time the issue is not the position of the Eagan Council but is the position of one representative of the Eagan Council.

Johnson (Rosemount) commented that over time it might be more unfair to the lesser growing cities than the faster growing cities and that it is possibly a built-in equity issue. Therkelsen (DC) reminded that the basis of the three year recommendation was that the prevailing sense of the finance directors and probably in many cases, the administrators, is that a smoother line is easier to budget for.

Osberg (Hastings) questioned if the qualifier that the funding formula will be revisited again in one year would help ease the concerns of the Eagan Councilmember. Hedges (Eagan) responded that is a hard question to answer and reiterated that the issue was voiced by one Councilmember, not the whole council. Hedges added that Councilmember Hansen did a really nice job representing the DCC Board action back to the Eagan Council.

Lawell (Apple Valley) commented that in looking at the numbers, Eagan has the biggest savings. Lawell then questioned what the savings would have been without the rolling average. Therkelsen (DCC) responded that it would have been close to \$300,000. Ebeling (Burnsville) commented that Burnsville is in a similar situation and acknowledged that position could be taken but that the three year rolling average was arrived at in the spirit of compromise. Ebeling then reiterated that there was a significant reduction in 2010 proposed from what was originally projected and that needs to be stressed to member agencies.

Osberg (Hastings) , citing the direction Eagan's DCC Board Member was given to vote on the funding formula discussion, commented that this issue lends an interesting discussion about how the Board member from each city choose to, or are directed to vote.

Therkelsen (DCC) commented that there will be information regarding the Board's May 21st action the budget presentation.

Therkelsen (DCC) informed members that as a result of Executive Committee direction at the April 29th budget presentation, staff developed a more detailed 10-year CIP, available in handout. Therkelsen added that staff provided an additional handout illustrating the 2010 member fees for the general fund, the debt service and total amount for each member comparing to 2009 figures. Therkelsen closed stated Fiscal Agent representative Dennis Feller was available for additional question.

Herlofsky (Farmington) complimented the DCC stating that not many organizations can come together in one year and have the success the DCC has had.

Therkelsen (DCC) directed attention to the Member Fees document that was available in handout. Therkelsen informed members the handout included the comparison to 2009 fees as recommended at the April 29th meeting. Therkelsen informed members that in 2009 members were assessed 6.9 million dollars for operating expenses. Therkelsen stated that for 2010 that assessment drops to 6.2 million dollars due partly to a small reduction in the operating budget but mostly to a transfer from the fund balance. Therkelsen (DCC) reiterated that the 2010 recommended budget is nearly 900,000 dollars less than what was provided as information in the preliminary 2010 budget one year ago.

Lawell (Apple Valley) commented that on the 10-year CIP is nice to see but he questioned how it applies to the next year or two. Therkelsen (DCC) responded that for 2010 and 2011 there isn't a large capital expenditures need other than the anticipated CAD replacement in 2011 which staff things will be about \$700,000. Lawell (Apple Valley) commented that in looking at 2011 and 2012 there is nothing and then in 2013 there is a huge change reflected. Therkelsen (DCC) commented that from an operations side the items were simply placed on the replacement schedule at their anticipated end of useful life and if some can be moved forward or back a year, that would be considered. Lawell (Apple Valley) then asked if it would be better to issue debt more frequently and in smaller amounts. Feller (Fiscal Agent) responded that that schedule presented is what was provided by staff and is strictly based on what is perceived as needs from an organization standpoint. Feller directed attention to the bottom of the page where staff attempted to keep the debt service as equal as possible. Feller acknowledged the debt service reflected fairly flat with the exception of 2013. Feller continued stating that the drop in debt service payment in 2013 will provide the consortium with choices on whether to reduce fees or levy for future capital needs. Feller stated the document addresses capital needs without any significant increase going forward for the next decade. Therkelsen (DCC) added that at the April 29th meeting the discussion was about how all comparisons were to the 2009 estimated budget and now they are all to the 2009 adopted budget.

Action: Motion by Ebeling (Burnsville) to recommend approval of the proposed 2010 and preliminary 2011 operating and capital budgets. Second by Osberg (Hastings). Motion passed unanimously.

Further Discussion:

Mielke (Lakeville) commented that there had been a discussion at the managers meeting regarding the 2011 CIP CAD replacement through LOGIS. Mielke then suggested getting the topic on an upcoming agenda.

Ebeling (Burnsville) reiterated that comparing budget to budget, the 2010 budget looked reasonable.

5. Benefit Summary and Compensation Policy.

Discussion:

Therkelsen (DCC) informed members when the DCC started operations the Board of Directors adopted benefits and compensation policies for employees. Therkelsen continued stating shortly thereafter the non-supervisory dispatch staff organized through LELS and the BMS issued a status quo order. Therkelsen stated that at the end of 2008 a contract was finalized through arbitration and now staff is attempting to bring current policies in line with the reality of the collective bargaining unit, eliminating startup references in the document and clarifying processes. Therkelsen then requested member consider recommendation of approval to the Board.

Ebeling (Burnsville) directed attention to the holiday time and commented that he thought that would be a topic that would be addressed in the contract. Therkelsen (DCC) assured that the policies are for all employees, including the 12 non-dispatch staff. Therkelsen also clarified that staff has a standard disclaimer at the beginning of each policy stating the bargaining agreement prevails for those employees it covers in case of discrepancies between the agreement and the policies.

Osberg (Hastings) asked if there are any substantive changes in either of the documents. Therkelsen (DC) responded that he believes all recommended modifications are simply Clarification and do not represent substantive benefit or compensation changes.

Remkus (West St. Paul) requested a copy of the document after it has been modified. Therkelsen (DCC) confirmed.

Therkelsen (DCC) informed members that the next negotiation process would be starting in the near future. Therkelsen also reminded members that the current budget envisions a wage freeze for all employees.

Action:

Motion by Mielke (Lakeville) to recommend approval of the proposed modifications to the Benefits and Compensation policies. Second by Lawell (Apple Valley). Motion passed unanimously.

6. Receive Report and MAAP Review.

Discussion:

Therkelsen (DCC) informed members that staff asked the Association of Public Safety Communications Officers (APCO) to come in at the one year anniversary and evaluate DCC operations, through the Member Assistance Advisory Program (MAAP). Therkelsen stated that staff recently received the MAAP report. Therkelsen (DCC) then requested Operations Director Lind highlight some key areas of the report.

Lind (DCC) stated that staff is planning a much more detailed review of the report with the operations committees in July.

Lind (DCC) informed members that in February, a team of 3 APCO representatives from Green Bay, WI, Austin, Texas and Livermore, CA visited the DCC and spent three days interviewing staff, member agency personnel and Executive Committee and Board representatives and reviewing DCC policies and procedures, in an effort to analyze DCC operations and possibly recommend some operational modifications that would better serve internal and external service provided. Lind (DCC) stated that the result of the visit was a very complimentary report. Lind stated that the APCO representation stated they expected to come to the DCC and find the operation in a state of disarray but what they found was a very professional staff with an organization that was ahead of the curve. Lind commented that the report came in a 6 inch binder that was presented in a format where they discussed current procedures, provided feedback including any recommendations as well as a standard or some other documentation supporting the recommendations.

Lind (DCC) informed members that the review team had some suggestions/recommendations on customer service, operations and governance that she would briefly detail.

Governance – Lind (DCC) stated the report reflected some recommendations that simply would not work for the DCC organization and how it is set up. Lind commented that none of the review team worked in a governance model like the DCC and speculated that had the team had an opportunity to meet with the Executive Director, that would have been further clarified. Lind

stated that the Executive Director was out of town during the review.

Customer Service & Operations – Lind (DCC) – informed members that the team focused on the performance standards and quality assurance and how staff can make them work. Lind added that the team reported that staff needed to stick firmly to the two stage process, trust that it is the correct communication platform for the DCC and not have call takers take over radio to speak directly to responders as that results in staff focusing on both radio and phone ~~listening to 1/2 of each conversation~~ and possibly missing key information.

Lind (DCC) added that the team discussed Project RETAINS for staffing and provided numerous resources to assist staff in getting through some of the current issues being experienced at the DCC.

Lind (DCC) commented that the overall process was very good. Lind added that the binder also included additional resources including contact information for other experts in the field.

Osberg (Hastings) asked if there is a routine for how often a review like this is performed. Lind (DCC) responded that the frequency is up to the member agency.

Mielke (Lakeville) commented that the Executive Committee and Board of Directors may need to come together to jointly discuss the governance issues. Mielke added that he agreed with streamlining the governance process and clarifying who is responsible for what functions. Therkelsen (DCC) stated that the team didn't fully understand where the distinctions are between the Executive Committee and the Board. Mielke (Lakeville) added that in discussion with Lakeville chiefs, they feel like regular operational issues require multiple steps just to make operations changes and they would like more control.

Richardson (Dakota County) asked for clarification on the secondary backup PSAP. Therkelsen (DCC) stated that he believes that offsite backup is a goal of every PSAP regardless of size or location. Therkelsen continued stating that the DCC currently has some back up capabilities but has not designated a specific spot. Therkelsen clarified that some technology can literally walk out the door with staff and be set up elsewhere. Richardson (Dakota County) asked if there is a primary backup location. Therkelsen (DCC) responded that there is on-site and off-site pre-established centers that can take over for a period of time but that the secondary backup in discussion is more of a long term backup option. Therkelsen (DCC) added that a secondary backup location at a new fire station in the county is being considered and that a Member city has an architectural study underway. Richardson (Dakota County) commented that at some point, staff will be going through the process of investigating what is available. Therkelsen (DCC) confirmed.

Action: No action. Update only.

7. Director's Report

Discussion:

2008 Financial Report – Therkelsen (DCC) informed member that the 2008 financial report was recently completed and is on the June Board agenda.

LOGIS CAD Evaluation – Therkelsen (DCC) reported that the review group has reduced the number of providers they are still interested in from 5 to 3 and vendor demos would be over the next couple of weeks. Therkelsen (DCC) assured members that there are 22 positions on the software selection task force and the DCC occupies 10 of those positions. Therkelsen stated that the group plans to bring a recommendation before the LOGIS Board of Directors in October, 2009.

Lawell (Apple Valley) stated that the issue of the Police Records Management System (RMS) is on the agenda at the June 26th Dakota County administrators meeting and a representative from LOGIS has been invited. Osberg (Hastings) asked if Therkelsen would also be available to attend the meeting. Therkelsen (DCC) confirmed. Lawell (Apple Valley) stated that CJIIN has indicated they may have the capability of getting the RMS system but not the mobile or CAD. Lawell continued stating that the DCC doesn't seem to care which system as long as members understand the DCC can only host one interface. Herlofsky (Farmington) stated that the report he heard was that Motorola wouldn't support the system but then when the RFP was issued, Motorola submitted a proposal. Lawell (Apple Valley) responded that Motorola has a new product.

Mielke (Lakeville) commented that for CAD and Mobiles, the DCC will be in the driver seat as there isn't a CJIIN option for those areas. Mielke continued stating that for the RMS portion, CJIIN may be an option. Mielke acknowledged that agencies may be looking for the most cost effective option but the consortium needs to ensure the product works and isn't just the least expensive. Mielke stated that fire has worked with ImageTrend to develop an RMS package that appears to be working. The question is if CJIIN can do a similar thing and come up with a product that is more effective than what LOGIS currently has. Ebeling (Burnsville) assed that he thought that part of the reason for looking for a new CAD, Mobile RMS system was to get rid of the interfaces but CJIIN disengaged that idea. Osberg (Hastings) reiterated that the meeting date is June 26th from 8:00 – 10:00 am at Apple Valley City Hall.

Lease – Therkelsen (DCC) informed members that Aggregate Industries has a permit to do gravel mining to the west of the DCC and across Hwy 3. Therkelsen stated this means we could see mining in the property adjacent to the DCC by the end of 2009. Therkelsen clarified that Dakota County is investigating potentially purchasing a buffer strip of land going out 150 – 200 feet. Therkelsen assured that PSC Alliance feels the operation will not heavily impact the DCC as Gravel mining doesn't produce a lot of heavy duty vibration. PSC Alliance did, however, recommend staff pay attention to the vibration and dust and if a problem results, the DCC may need to look at legal remedies.

Action:

8. Miscellaneous

Discussion:

Osberg (Hastings) asked members if there is any concern about the July 1st meeting. Consensus was to keep the meeting date and time.

Action:

9. Adjourn

Action: Motion by Ebeling (Burnsville) to adjourn. Second by King (South St. Paul). Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 2:29 pm.

Next Regular Meeting:

Wednesday, July 1st, 2009

1:30 pm – 3:00 pm

Location: DCC

2860 160th Street W

Rosemount, MN 55068
