

**Dakota Communications Center
Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes: 08.05.09**

Members Present: Craig Ebeling – Burnsville; Tom Hedges – Eagan; Peter Herlofsky – Farmington; Dave Osberg – Hastings; Joe Lynch – Inver Grove Heights; Steve Mielke – Lakeville; Dwight Johnson - Rosemount; Stephen King – South St. Paul; John Remkus – West St. Paul

Members Absent: Tom Lawell – Apple Valley; Brandt Richardson – Dakota County; Jim Danielson – Mendota Heights

Alternates Present: Charles Grawe – Apple Valley

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

Call the Meeting to Order

Chair Osberg called the meeting to order at 1:36p.m.

1. Announcements

None

2. Additions to the Agenda

None

Consent Agenda

3.

- a. **Approve minutes from the June 3rd, 2009 Executive Committee meeting.**
- b. **Approve May, 2009 and June, 2009 Paid Claims.**
- c. **Receive May, 2009 and June, 2009 Financial Reports.**
- d. **Receive Minutes from Operations Committees.**
 - o **Fire/EMS Minutes from June 9th and July 14th meeting.**
 - o **Law Enforcement Minutes from July 2nd meeting.**
 - o **Joint Operations Minutes from July 30th meeting.**

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

Regular Agenda

4. Cost Allocation Work Group.

Discussion:

Therkelsen (DCC) reviewed the events that led up to the Cost Allocation Work Group recommendation being brought before the Board of Directors for consideration at their August 20th meeting. Therkelsen stated that in May the Board of Directors adopted a revised amended cost allocation process that caused further discussion at the June Board of Directors meeting resulting in the Chair's assignment of a Cost Allocation Work Group chaired by Eagan City Administrator, Tom Hedges. Therkelsen continued saying that the work group held two meetings and came to a consensus on two recommendations.

Hedges (Eagan) summarized the issues presented by Eagan representation at the May Board of Directors meeting and then again at the July 8th Work Group meeting saying that the City of

Eagan voiced concern that the blended rate adopted at the Board of Director's special meeting in May wasn't in accordance with the JPA because it was not directly tied to the prior year's CAD/usage.

Hedges (Eagan) stated that the work group encountered two issues. The first was the legality question regarding Board actions at the May meeting. Hedges added that this issue slowed the process of the work group as it decided to direct the Executive Director to obtain an opinion on the Board of Directors actions at their May meeting. Executive Director Therkelsen contacted the City of Bloomington's legal advisor who provided an opinion that the Board of Directors acted within their power. Hedges continued that Eagan City Council also directed Eagan City Administration to obtain an opinion from their city attorney. Hedges stated that after receiving the two differing opinions, the work group decided they were getting out of their task scope and decided to leave the legality issue to the Board of Directors and focus on the second issue of funding formula alternatives.

Hedges (Eagan) informed members that representation from the City of Lakeville presented an alternative proposal at the July 20th meeting. Hedges stated after much discussion, the work group agreed that the proposal would be a good compromise and unanimously agreed to recommend the proposal to the Board of Directors at their August 20th meeting.

Mielke (Lakeville) informed members that in the first meeting of the Cost Allocation Work Group they considered two points. The first was that the blended rate made sense. The second was that the City of Eagan representation felt the approved use of the surplus was unfair as they paid in at one rate and were receiving their portion of the surplus back at a lower rate, which is now how they interpreted JPA direction. Mielke stated that City of Lakeville staff recommended continuing with the blended concept but then taking the \$1,700,000 in available fund balance and returning that back to members at the same rate they originally paid in at. Mielke then stated that he received notification from the City of Eagan Administrator, Tom Hedges, stated that he wasn't sure the City of Eagan truly understood what they had agreed to at the second Cost Allocation Work Group meeting.

Mielke (Lakeville) distributed a handout that provided a member specific comparison between the current approved cost allocation plan, the City of Eagan cost allocation and the City of Lakeville cost allocation plan. Mielke commented that the City of Lakeville proposal presented two new issues. The first was how to distribute the fund balance and the second was if the blended rate was still being perceived as fair. Mielke commented that that allocating based on how jurisdictions paid it would certainly be fair. Mielke then stated that in consideration of the concerns of the City of Eagan, the principle of a three year blended rate with a 1 year rebate was developed and presented. Mielke continued that in fairness to the City of Eagan and other members, that although specific fees were presented to support the City of Lakeville proposal, they combined the debt service and operating budget, which may have led to some confusion on the fiscal impact of the Lakeville proposal on Members.

Mielke (Lakeville) acknowledged the difficult position Eagan City Administrator Hedges was in when tasked with chairing the Cost Allocation Work Group. Hedges (Eagan) commented that in retrospect it may have made sense to convene a third meeting allowing Cost Allocation Work Group members an opportunity to review actual fees prior to making a recommendation. However, there was tremendous momentum in favor of the proposal from all members. Hedges stated that after running the numbers, from a financial standpoint, the recommended proposal wasn't much different than the original proposal from May. However, the principle is right and although he wasn't sure how this topic would play out in the future, he acknowledged that members cannot pick and choose according to what will benefit them each year.

Osberg (Hastings) thanked Hedges for his efforts chairing the Cost Allocation Work Group and asked members if the numbers presented to the Executive Committee should be brought back to the Cost Allocation Work Group prior to presenting to the Board of Directors. Herlofsky (Farmington) stated that he didn't feel that was necessary as more discussion may just add to the confusion. Ebeling (Burnsville) agreed and commented that the work group agreed to the principle unanimously.

Osberg (Hastings) commented that Hedges was in a tough situation as chair of the Cost Allocation Work Group and asked Hedges if he learned anything from the process that he would like to share with the group as this was probably the biggest governance issue the consortium has encountered so far. Hedges (Eagan) acknowledged that situations like this can be difficult but commended the Board of Directors Chair Kautz for appointing a work group made up of both elected and appointed members to deal with the issue and ensure that all members are heard. Hedges commented that it was difficult because he already endorsed the currently approved formula.

Action: Motion by Herlofsky (Farmington) to endorse the Cost Allocation Work Group recommendations. Second by Mielke (Lakeville). Motion passed unanimously.

Further Discussion: Hedges (Eagan) thanked members of the work group for their efforts. Hedges then stated that he would be unavailable for the August 20th Board of Directors meeting. Mielke (Lakeville) stated that he would be in attendance but that he thought the item should be presented by the Executive Director. Osberg (Hastings) agreed and offered assistance as he would also be in attendance. Osberg also commented that staff should be prepared to fulfill the procedural aspects of the recommendations. Therkelsen (DCC) stated that the recommendation would be presented and there would be a two-thirds weighted vote. Mielke (Lakeville) suggested legal counsel be in attendance in anticipation of the legality issue being brought up. He also suggested that the Executive Director seek the opinion of DCC legal counsel on whether the Board's action would amount to a budget amendment or a rescission of a previous action. Therkelsen (DCC) acknowledged.

5. Mass Telephone Notification System (MTNS) Policy.

Discussion:

Therkelsen (DCC) reminded members that at their April meeting the Board of Directors approved the recommendation to award the Mass Telephone Notification System contract to CodeRed and further directed the Executive Director to develop and authorize the agreement with the vendor. Therkelsen stated that the agreement has been executed and CodeRed is working on the implementation. The DCC is hoping to have the system active on or before Labor Day but it could be later in September. Therkelsen stated that at their April meeting the Board of Directors directed that DCC Staff develop a system administration policy that would be approved prior to the system activation date. Therkelsen then reviewed the policy with members.

Gudmundson (Dakota County) asked if residents will be able to register online. Therkelsen (DCC) confirmed. Ebeling (Burnsville) asked if the consumption of system minutes was measured in fractional amounts. Therkelsen (DCC) confirmed and stated that messages can be any length but 30 seconds is optimal. Hedges (Eagan) commented that the City of Eagan had wonderful success with their Mass Telephone Notification System but cautioned about the time of day that messages were sent out. Hedges asked if there would be a training session. Therkelsen (DCC) acknowledged the comments and confirmed that there would be a training period. Therkelsen stated that the policy was presented to members of the Joint Ops Committee at their July meeting and there were no concerns raised. Therkelsen clarified that there was a question if there was a buffer around the county, specifically in the Mississippi River area. Therkelsen stated that there was not a buffer but that if a neighboring

city wanted to participate in the notification, which would be an option at an incremental cost recovery plus the cost of the addition of those numbers to the database.

Lynch (Inver Grove Heights) questioned if a non-public safety organization were to use the secondary messaging and use up the balance of 200,000 minutes, the member agencies would be charged to make up the difference if the first organization wasn't charged enough. Therkelsen (DCC) responded that could happen. Therkelsen clarified that replenishment of minutes could be done in increments as little as 10% of the annual allocation. Lynch (Inver Grove Heights) suggested the consideration of charging those non-public safety entities a different rate for their secondary messaging. Therkelsen (DCC) confirmed that would certainly be the prerogative of the board and added that there is a need for gaining experience with the system and how rapidly minutes are used up. Therkelsen added that was one reason for starting with a very strict protocol for what sort of notifications are allowed. Lynch (Inver Grove Heights) then asked if it would make sense to recommend that non-public safety agencies not be allowed to use the system for a certain period of time to allow for some experience. Mielke (Lakeville) commented that he was fine with the draft as proposed and actually questioned the possibility of taking an entrepreneurial approach and allowing agencies in the Dakota County area to use the system for a fee. King (South St. Paul) asked if the private users such as Flint Hills or others would have to be pre-authorized to use the system. Therkelsen (DCC) confirmed that they would have to have a written agreement with the DCC specifying the terms and conditions on access of the system. Therkelsen also reminded members that any/all voice messages would be launched from the DCC.

Action: Motion by Mielke (Lakeville) to recommend approval of the Mass Telephone Notification System Policy as proposed. Second by King (South St. Paul). Motion passed unanimously.

6. 2010 Employee Wages.

Discussion:

Therkelsen (DCC) informed members that every year the Board of Directors approves a staff compensation policy for the upcoming calendar year. Therkelsen then recommended that for 2010 there be a 0% general adjustment increase for all employees and a 0% performance adjustment for all employees. Therkelsen reminded that this policy directly affects the 12 non-union employees. The 52 employees represented by LELS will bargain for 2010 wages beginning later this year.

Action: Motion by Herlofsky (Farmington) to recommend approval of the staff recommendation of a 0% general adjustment increase and a 0% performance adjustment for all employees in 2010. Second by Lynch (Inver Grove Heights). Motion passed unanimously.

7. Executive Director's Performance Appraisal.

Discussion:

Osberg (Hastings) suggested using the same performance appraisal format as was used in 2008 with the addition of a couple items. Osberg reminded members that Board members, Executive Committee members and Operations Committee Members were all requested to contribute to the Executive Directors performance evaluation through submission of comments. Osberg added that the Executive Director was requested to do a self-evaluation, which was reviewed with all comments by an ad-hoc group made up of the Board and Executive Committee chairs and vice-chairs. Osberg stated that Therkelsen had recommended pursuing comments from staff and the fiscal agent as part of the evaluation. Osberg informed members that only two Board of Directors responded on the 2008 evaluation and that he was going to strongly encourage more participation. General consensus was that The Executive Committee Chair continue with the process as detailed.

Action: No action taken. Consensus to continue with current format.

8. Director's Report.

Discussion:

MAAP Update – Therkelsen (DCC) informed members that the Joint Operations committee assigned three Law Enforcement representatives and three Fire/EMS representatives to participate on a work group to further evaluate the recommendations provided by the MAAP team.

Health Insurance Benefit Renewals – Therkelsen (DCC) informed members that staff members were working through the health insurance benefit renewals. Therkelsen clarified that during the 2009 renewal period, staff was directed to pursue bids for 2010. Therkelsen stated that the benefits consultant had received the bids and they would be presented at the September 2009 Executive Committee for further recommendation to the Board of Directors.

IES – Therkelsen (DCC) informed members that DCC staff and IES, the vendor for the 9-1-1 and administrative telephone system, were working on a support agreement as the warranties expire as of September 16th, 2009. Therkelsen stated that the support agreement would be presented to the Executive Committee at their September, 2009 meeting for further recommendation to the Board of Directors.

Board of Directors Meeting Schedule – Therkelsen (DCC) informed members that Board of Directors Chair, Elizabeth Kautz would be recommending the Board of Directors move their October meeting up to September in an effort to deal with Benefit Renewals and The IES support agreement in a timely manner.

Public Safety Software Selection – Therkelsen (DCC) updated members stating that Motorola would be doing demonstrations the week of August 3rd and New World would be doing demonstrations the week of August 10th. Therkelsen stated that both vendors would be responding to scripts and scenarios written by the users. Therkelsen added that the Law Enforcement Steering Team would be making their recommendation in September and that the LOGIS board directed that any LOGIS member not wanting to participate in the Law Enforcement Records Management System needed to submit their "opt out" notification to LOGIS by September 15th.

Media stories - Therkelsen (DCC) updated that there had been a couple of stories in the media recently that members should be aware of. The first story was about one week prior when a TV station ran a piece about the New Trier outdoor warning siren. Therkelsen stated that operations verified the signal was leaving the DCC correctly and that it was a local issue. Therkelsen stated that the New Trier Mayor was provided the name and contact information of the service company who handled most of the sirens in Dakota County. Therkelsen added that New Trier spent approximately \$2,000 to get the radio piece of the siren in an effort to no longer rely on the manual activation of the siren. Therkelsen continued that the siren was 60 years old, the motor had failed and the siren was full of bird nests. Remkus (West St. Paul) commented that the news organization should follow up on these stories when the full facts are known.

Therkelsen (DCC) informed members that the second media interest revolved around an Inver Grove Heights fire call. Therkelsen stated that staff was still reviewing the issue but he felt the person on camera had a distorted sense of time. Therkelsen acknowledged that the call was not a work of art as staff was given the incorrect address three times, which delayed processing but it was not nearly as long of a delay as what was reported on the news. Therkelsen continued that a second caller had since contacted the media saying they also experienced a delay, which documentation proved was not the case.

Action: Update only.

9. Miscellaneous

Discussion:

None.

Action:

10. Adjourn

Action: Motion by Hedges (Eagan) to adjourn. Second by Lynch (Inver Grove Heights). Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 2:53 pm.

Next Regular Meeting:

Wednesday, September 2nd, 2009

1:30 pm – 3:00 pm

Location: DCC

2860 160th Street W

Rosemount, MN 55068
