

**Dakota Communications Center  
Executive Committee  
Meeting Minutes: 09.02.09**

**Members Present:** Tom Lawell – Apple Valley; Craig Ebeling – Burnsville; Tom Hedges – Eagan; Dave Osberg – Hastings; Steve Mielke – Lakeville; Jim Danielson – Mendota Heights; Dwight Johnson - Rosemount; Stephen King – South St. Paul; John Remkus – West St. Paul

**Members Absent:** Brandt Richardson – Dakota County; Peter Herlofsky – Farmington; Joe Lynch – Inver Grove Heights

**Alternates Present:** Don Gudmundson – Dakota County; Robin Roland - Farmington

**Others Present:** Kent Therkelsen, Jen Hildebrandt, Diane Lind – DCC; Sue Frick – Gallagher Benefit Services

**Call the Meeting to Order**

Chair Osberg called the meeting to order at 1:34 p.m.

**1. Announcements**

None

**2. Additions to the Agenda**

Flint Hills Agreement.

**Action:** Motion by Lawell (Apple Valley) to add the Flint Hills Agreement to the agenda. Second by Ebeling (Burnsville). Motion passed unanimously.

*Consent Agenda*

**3.**

- a. **Approve minutes from the August 5<sup>th</sup>, 2009 Executive Committee meeting.**
- b. **Approve July, 2009 Paid Claims.**
- c. **Receive July, 2009.**
- d. **Receive Minutes from Operations Committees.**
  - o **Fire/EMS Minutes from August 11<sup>th</sup> meeting.**
  - o **Law Enforcement Minutes from August 6<sup>th</sup> meeting.**

**Action:** Motion by Ebeling (Burnsville) to approve the consent agenda. Second by Roland (Farmington) Motion passed unanimously.

*Regular Agenda*

**4. DCC Telephone System Support Agreement**

**Discussion:**

Therkelsen (DCC) informed member that the warranty on the premise equipment was originally set to expire in March, 2009. However, due to service issues, IES agreed to extend the agreement to September 16<sup>th</sup>, 2009. Therkelsen stated that DCC staff requested that IES provide a support agreement proposal going forward from September 16<sup>th</sup>, 2009, which they did. Therkelsen stated the terms of the proposal were consistent with terms and dollar amount cost contained in the original RFP responses in terms of the post warranty coverage/support. Therkelsen stated that staff requested a 15.5 month agreement that would provide services

through the end of December, 2010. After that time, the agreement would be on a calendar year. Therkelsen stated the cost is estimated at \$96,000 and that funds are available in the 2009-2010 budgets. Therkelsen assured that the agreement had been through legal review and was currently at IES for their final signatures. Therkelsen commented that staff was looking for approval by the Board of Directors at their September 17<sup>th</sup> meeting. Osberg (Hastings) clarified that the agreement had been reviewed by legal. Therkelsen (DCC) confirmed and stated that both DCC and IES were ready to proceed. Lawell (Apple Valley) asked how frequently staff needed to call on IES over the past year. Therkelsen (DCC) responded that staff had a lot of contact with IES and PlantCML but that few issues were out of the ordinary or service impacting. Therkelsen stated the contact was in regards to a combination of tweaks on the system as well as the fact that it is still a new technical platform. Therkelsen reminded that the DCC system is one of a few IP based platforms in the State. Therkelsen commented that staff has been quite satisfied with the stability of the service.

**Action:** Motion by Danielson (Mendota Heights) to recommend approval of the DCC IES Software Support and Maintenance Agreement. Second by Gudmundson (Dakota County). Motion passed unanimously.

## **5. 2010 Employee Benefits**

### **Discussion:**

Therkelsen (DCC) updated members that the Board has the annual adoptions of employee benefits for the upcoming year on their next meeting agenda. Therkelsen stated that during the 2009 approval process the Executive Committee directed staff to rebid health insurance programs for 2010. Therkelsen added that with the assistance of Gallagher Benefits, an RFP was sent out and responses were received back from Blue Cross Blue Shield, Medica and HealthPartners. Therkelsen stated that details in the RFP were consistent with the current plan and that there were no substantive changes. Therkelsen stated the proposals were reviewed with Gallagher's assistance and it was recommended that staff retain the services of Blue Cross Blue Shield. Details were consistent with current plan. No substantive changes. Therkelsen stated that Blue Cross Blue Shield was not only the incumbent but also had the lowest cost proposal and would be the least disruptive.

Therkelsen (DCC) informed members that staff was intending on continuing with the three plans that were offered in 2009. The base plan was the high deductible health plan coupled with the H.R.A., the high deductible health plan coupled with the H.S.A, and the traditional co-pay plan.

Therkelsen (DCC) stated that staff saw cost increases based on claims ratio in 2008 which ranged from 12.8% to 22.8% depending on employee participation. Therkelsen stated that costs were estimated at \$518,000. Therkelsen acknowledged that the employer contribution appeared to be higher than what was budgeted but during the budgeting process, staff anticipated cost increases in the contingency budget. Therkelsen introduced Sue Frick with Gallagher Benefits and opened the floor to questions.

Osberg (Hastings) asked what the loss ratio was for the term in which the premium was quoted. Frick (Gallagher) responded that it was for the Calendar years 2007, 2008 and claims through March, 2009. Osberg (Hastings) requested the historical loss ration information. Frick (Gallagher) stated that for 2007 the ratio was 76%, for 2008 the loss ratio was 121% and for 2009 through March, the ratio was 79%. Osberg (Hastings) asked if members made a mistake by requesting an RFP opposed to a renewal. Frick (Gallagher) responded that the renewal may have allowed for a negotiation process, but with an RFP members cannot go back and negotiate. Roland (Farmington) asked how long it would be until another RFP request. Osberg (Hastings) responded that the DCC is only required to bid once every 5 years. Frick (Gallagher) stated that if claims came down and Blue Cross Blue Shield wasn't willing to negotiate, there

might be a suggestion to go out for bid sooner than 5 years. Ebeling (Burnsville) commented that the bids were what they were and questioned if the assumptions were worth revisiting stating that maybe the DCC shouldn't pay 100% of the employee increase this year. Roland (Farmington) asked how the union factored in. Therkelsen (DCC) responded that the current contract expired at the end of 2009. Therkelsen added that at the end of 2008 negotiations, there was not explicit language in the bargaining agreement on most of the health plan so staff met with LELS representation who agreed to move forward on a "me too" basis. Therkelsen stated that if there would be a substantial change in benefits, he was not sure if that would force staff back to the table or not. Ebeling (Burnsville) commented that staff would be going back to the negotiation table anyway. Lawell (Apple Valley) asked for clarification on the contingency comment. Therkelsen (DCC) clarified that the budget proposed did not have the inflationary increase included so it was put in the contingency. Osberg (Hastings) asked if anyone was willing to make a motion to recommend approval of the Blue Cross Blue Shield proposal.

**Action:** Motion by Roland (Farmington) to recommend approval of the proposed renewal with Blue Cross Blue Shield. Second by Osberg (Hastings). Motion passed by majority. Ebeling (Burnsville) opposed the motion.

**Further Discussion:** Ebeling (Burnsville) clarified that the motion included all of the assumptions of cost sharing. Roland and Osberg confirmed that was their intention.

## **6. Flint Hills CodeRed 911 Agreement**

Therkelsen (DCC) informed members that this agreement was a last minute addition to the agenda. Therkelsen stated that DCC would be implementing the CodeRed community notification system as of Tuesday, September 8<sup>th</sup>. Therkelsen stated that staff had received interest from Flint Hills for participating in the radius of their facility. Therkelsen stated that staff had been negotiating with Flint Hills on the agreement which used their agreement with the City of Eagan as a template.

Therkelsen (DCC) informed members that the agreement authorizes Flint Hills Resources to request public warning messages be sent within their specified radius. Therkelsen assured that would be different from their current agreement with the City of Eagan as today Flint Hills logs in, records their own message and sends it. Therkelsen clarified that the DCC agreement requires that Flint Hills Resources would contact the DCC and work with the supervisor to send the message. However, Flint Hills resource would be able to use the text/email feature for internal needs if their primary paging system were to fail. Therkelsen stated that the cost for the service would be a recurring monthly fee of \$1,500.00.

Therkelsen (DCC) stated that staff did not currently have the final agreement in hand as the last remaining issue was the DCC's language that Flint Hills Resource would comply with the Minnesota Data Practices Act specific to how the system operates. Therkelsen assured that Flint Hills Resources' attorney is very agreeable to confidentiality language and that both parties feel the document is acceptable. Therkelsen stated that Flint Hills Resources' attorney is not comfortable with the statutory reference. Therkelsen (DCC) assured the agreement would be in hand by the end of the week.

Therkelsen (DCC) stated that the intent of the recurring fees would be to place them in a dedicated account to replenish system minutes as needs arise. Therkelsen added that once the agreement is finalized, staff would work to look for additional candidates to partner with. Osberg (Hastings) asked if CodeRed offers anything in addition to what was offered through the Eagan system. Therkelsen (DCC) confirmed and stated that the CodeRed system offers the text and email features, which were not part of the Eagan system. Therkelsen added that the CodeRed system also allows for self registration for non landlines. Osberg (Hastings) asked if

the charges were too low. Roland (Farmington) responded that Flint Hills Resources wouldn't have the capability of sending their own voice messages so they would have less access. Therkelsen (DCC) confirmed and added that Flint Hills entered into the agreement with Eagan because they had no other local option and believes that maintaining the same pricing is reasonable to assure external revenue be secured to help support the system

Lawell (Apple Valley) gave an example of a one mile radius around the DCC. Therkelsen (DCC) stated that the calls would go to every landline phone plus any supplemental registrations. Gudmundson (Dakota County) asked if there would be additional costs built in. Therkelsen (DCC) responded that the DCC had a fixed flat rate from CodeRed that is guaranteed for as long as the system is renewed. Ebeling (Burnsville) asked if the Eagan system was ever deployed. Hedges (Eagan) responded that he didn't think it had ever been deployed for Flint Hills but that the City of Eagan had deployed for other events. King (South St. Paul) asked if the system was limited to emergencies or if it could be used for general business as it relates to access for the private paging system. Therkelsen (DCC) responded that the voice messaging aspects of the system would be used for critical needs for safety sensitive issues. Therkelsen added that the text and email notification incur no costs. Lawell (Apple Valley) spoke in favor of the agreement but asked if members were going to get some kind of report reflecting "x" number of addresses in a jurisdiction were signed up. Therkelsen (DCC) confirmed that at the October meeting, there could possibly be a demonstration.

**Action:** Motion by Ebeling (Burnsville) to recommend approval of the Flint Hills Resources CodeRed 911 Agreement. Second by Hedges (Eagan). Motion passed unanimously.

## **6. Inquiry Trends**

### **Discussion:**

Therkelsen (DCC) reviewed inquiry trends with members. Ebeling (Burnsville) asked to what extent members would want to know where their cities "ranked" on the Slide titled Distribution of Inquiries. Therkelsen (DCC) responded that staff would be willing to provide that information if requested but added that feedback from the previous review reflected that some agencies perceived that as an attack on the messenger, which wasn't intended. Therkelsen assured that the agencies have a good sense of where they are at. Therkelsen stated that the LE Ops committee had requested not specifically identifying the agency during the monthly issue reviews while Fire Ops committee has taken the opposite approach.

Therkelsen (DCC) informed members that the sense was that the trend lines would continue to go down through the combination of the DCC mastering the process and the agencies adjusting to new processes. Osberg (Hastings) asked if the trends would be reviewed with the operation committees. Therkelsen (DCC) confirmed.

**Action:** No action. Update only.

## **7. Director's Report**

### **Discussion:**

CodeRed System – Therkelsen (DCC) informed members that there had been some news coverage that has been generating some strong interest. Therkelsen stated that although the system was slated to go live on September 8<sup>th</sup>, staff was ready to go live now as the supervisors had all been trained. Therkelsen stated that public awareness would be crucial and that the self registration information was sent out to members of the Committee on a webpage link. Therkelsen requested members post the link on City sites.

Therkelsen (DCC) informed members that in the upcoming weeks, there would be a full test of the system and every phone in the database. The test will be used to promote the self registration. Therkelsen added that there would be a press release that members could expect to receive in the next couple of weeks.

Danielson (Mendota Heights) asked how long it would take to call that many phones. Therkelsen (DCC) responded that the system can deliver 60,000 calls per hour. Assuming no competing traffic, the message should take 2-3 hours to deliver.

**Action:** No action. Update only.

## **8. Miscellaneous**

**Discussion:**

**Action:**

## **9. Adjourn**

**Action:** Meeting adjourned by acclamation at 2:25pm.

### **Next Regular Meeting:**

Wednesday, October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2009

1:30 pm – 3:00 pm

Location: DCC

2860 160<sup>th</sup> Street W

Rosemount, MN 55068

---