

**Dakota Communications Center
Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes: 05/06/2015**

Members Present: Tom Lawell – Apple Valley; Heather Johnston – Burnsville; Dave Osberg – Eagan; David McKnight – Farmington; Melanie Mesko-Lee – Hastings; Justin Miller – Lakeville; Dwight Johnson – Rosemount; Steve King – South St. Paul

Members Absent: Brandt Richardson – Dakota County; Joe Lynch – Inver Grove Heights; Mark McNeill – Mendota Heights; Matt Fulton – West St. Paul

Alternates Present: BJ Battig – Dakota County

Others Present: Diane Lind, Cheryl Pritzlaff, Jen Hildebrandt – DCC; Brian Lindquist, BJ Jungmann – Joint Operations Committee Co-Chairs; Jo

1. Call the Meeting to Order

Chair King (South St. Paul) called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Members in attendance are noted above.

3. Approve Agenda

Discussion:

Lind (DCC) informed members that the first line on item 4b of the consent agenda was missing the total amount for approval. Lind stated that it was \$620,835.24 as supported by the attached register.

King (South St. Paul) added the consideration of recommending a wage adjustment for the Executive Director to the agenda as item 10.

Action: Motion by Johnson (Rosemount) to approve the agenda with noted modifications. Second by Johnston (Burnsville). Motion passed unanimously.

Consent Agenda

4.

- a. **Approve Minutes from the April 1st, 2015 Executive Committee Meeting.**
- b. **Approve Paid Claims.**
 - **March 1st – 31st, 2015**
- c. **Receive Financial Reports and Recommend Approval**
 - **March, 2015 Unaudited Report**
- d. **Receive contracts and agreements executed between March 25th and April 29th, 2015**
- e. **Statutory Tort Limit**
- f. **Operations Committee Meeting Minutes**
 - **February, April Fire/EMS Meeting**
 - **February, April Law Enforcement Meeting**

Discussion:

None

Action: Motion by Mesko-Lee (Hastings) to approve the consent agenda. Second by McKnight (Farmington). Motion passed unanimously.

Regular Agenda

Action Items

5. Participation in the 2016 LOGIS Medical Insurance Pool

Discussion:

Lind (DCC) introduced Yvonne Johnson, Gallagher Benefits Services stating that Yvonne was our broker representative who guided the DCC through all medical and ancillary benefit decisions. Lind reminded members that when 2015 benefits discussions were taking place in August and October of 2014, there had been discussion about whether or not the DCC should remain in the LOGIS Medical Insurance Pool. At that time, it was noted that the date for notifying the LOGIS Pool of a members departure from the pool for 2015 medical benefits had already passed. Lind added that members requested a review of whether or not the DCC should remain in the pool for 2016 benefits prior to the June, 2015 deadline. Lind then stated that Johnson would be presenting information that helped staff arrive at the the decision to recommend remaining in the LOGIS Medical Insurance Pool for 2016.

Johnson (Gallagher) informed members that Gallagher and DCC staff met earlier in the year to review claims experience from the prior year. Johnson stated that while previous claims to premium ratios were very good, the 2014 data was reflecting a claims loss ratio of 119.86%. Johnson added that considering the pooling charges and credits and other additional fees, the loss ratio was 138.86%. Johnson stated that usually when you have a year with high loss ratios, it doesn't make sense to look at other options as you won't receive long term rate caps or guarantees.

Johnson then informed members that the LOGIS pool was also in the process of evaluating the possibility of self-funding and along with that, banding within the pool and if that happened, it would open up other opportunities for the DCC. Johnson added that the current discussion was about allowing a 2.5% or 5.0% variance meaning depending on experience, of the pool received a 10% increase, the individual agencies would be banded up or down in those increments based on agency-level experience.

Finally, Johnson stated that under the Healthcare Reform, the previous small employer status of under 50 employees was increasing effective 1/1/2017 to agencies with under 100 employees. Johnson explained that the DCC would fall into that category and as such, be put into the small group market which had many moving parts to be cautious of. Johnson stated that the small group market worked differently as it wasn't experience rated, but demographics rated. Johnson stated that agencies could see some decreases or significant increases based on the demographics. Johnson commented that administratively, this was not desirable as there was no single or family rate as every individual, employee, spouse and dependent was rated based on age. Johnson added that the plans were typically not the same as what the DCC currently had.

Johnson recapped that given the 2015 claims loss ratio, the current evaluation of self funding with consideration of banding within the pool, and the future small employer designation, Gallagher did not feel it was a good year to leave the LOGIS insurance pool.

Johnson informed members that there a few other points there were important to understand. The first was that the LOGIS pool was under a five year rate cap agreement with Blue Cross Blue Shield, and that agreement was ending in 2016 so the pool would be going out for bid in 2017. Johnson stated that when that happened, the pool would be obtaining bids on both fully insured and also self-insured options. Johnson stated that this was also done in 2012 when the DCC joined the pool and the fully insured rates came back very favorable so the pool decided not to self-fund for that contract. Johnson reminded members that by joining the LOGIS pool, the DCC received a 16% rate decrease. The second point was that there would be educational meetings explaining self-insuring and associated costs/rates. Johnson stated that groups

would, at that time, indicate whether or not they wanted to continue on the self-insured basis and if so, they would then be included as part of the RFP. Johnson clarified that there would be an RFP for each, the self insured group and the fully insured group. Johnson assured groups that the review of options would include what was available to the small groups.

Johnson (Gallagher) acknowledged that there had been some discussion about possibly joining another pool, or cooperative, specifically the Southeast Cooperative. Johnson commented that was probably more expensive care costs because it was a predominantly Mayo Clinic district with higher claims. Johnson explained that by contract, the Service Cooperatives required a non-complete so Blue Cross Blue Shield could not quote both pools. Johnson stated that if the decision were to move to another co-op, it would require departure from the current plans prior to receipt of a quote, and then movement back into plans under the co-op. Johnson acknowledged that there was another pool that was currently working with HealthPartners, but that would prove to be difficult as they didn't receive rates until late August which was very late for DCC process.

Johnston (Burnsville) referred to the background where it talks about the inability to obtain high cost claims information. Johnson (Gallagher) responded stating that due to HIPPA, the agency would not be able to obtain catastrophic claims information because that information isn't released to agencies with under 100 lives. Johnson clarified that general information could be obtained categorically and for the agency as a whole.

Battig (Dakota County) referred to the claims loss ratio and stated that unless 2015 were to be a really good claims year, the market for DCC would not be very favorable. Johnson (Gallagher) responded stating that the LOGIS pool was highly sought after by the carriers and if the DCC stayed in the pool, the expectation would be very aggressive quotes in response to the RFP when it went out. Johnson stated that even if the DCC were banded within a self-funded pool, the outcome should be favorable.

Action: Motion by Lawell (Apple Valley) to remain in the LOGIS pool. Second by Johnston (Burnsville). Motion passed unanimously.

6. 2016 Operating and Capital Budget

Discussion:

Lind (DCC) introduced newly appointed Lakeville Finance Director, Jerilyn Erickson. Lind stated that Erickson had only been at the City of Lakeville for a week and a half but that she intended to sit down with Erickson to better acquaint her with DCC finances in the very near future.

Lind (DCC) thanked DCC staff, Pritzlaff and Hildebrandt for their efforts on the 2016 budget. Lind also thanked City of Lakeville finance representatives, Dave Lang and Pat Vinje for their efforts and contributions as well as volunteer Dennis Feller for providing one final review prior to presentation to the budget workgroup. Finally, Lind thanked Executive Committee members David McKnight, Dwight Johnson and Matt Fulton for their participation on the budget workgroup. Lind then reviewed the budget with members using a Powerpoint presentation.

Osberg (Eagan) referred to the Fund Balance and asked if there had ever been an unanticipated event that would cause the fund balance to be drawn from. Lind responded that there had not. Johnston (Burnsville) asked if part of that was due to the regularity of cash flow. Lind (DCC) responded that the fund balance was designated primarily to be used in the event of something catastrophic. Lind confirmed that cash flow was consistent. Osberg (Eagan) recognized that the fund balance was currently sitting at approximately \$1,000,000 and questioned if that should be looked at going forward. Lind (DCC) reminded that the policy directed maintaining a fund balance of 8 – 14%. Battig (Dakota County) reminded members that up until recently, the

equipment was basically new and as it aged, there was greater risk for issues that could require use of the fund balance. Battig commented that on the Dakota County Radio Services side, these experiences were starting to occur. Johnson (Rosemount) commented that in looking at the 1.9% overall budget increase, he was originally concerned that the increase was too low. However, knowing that the consortium had a healthy fund balance reassured his concerns.

Johnston (Burnsville) referred to debt issued and asked if it had been done under the Dakota County rating. Battig (Dakota County) confirmed but reminded that each jurisdiction had to pass a resolution assuming their portion of the debt.

Osberg (Eagan) acknowledged the feedback and stated that being a relatively seasoned organization, the ability to manage the budget gets better each year and unanticipated expenses should become more of a misnomer if there weren't cash flow problems. Osberg added that this wasn't something for action at the current meeting, just a suggestion that review of the fund balance policy be considered going forward.

King (South St. Paul) referred to the personnel costs and asked if the budgeted number included anticipated wage increases for the Operations and Executive Directors. Lind (DCC) responded that it did not.

Lind (DCC) addressed some of the questions raised in the workgroup with members.

1. Assumptions on Wage and Salaries – assumptions were made on the wages and salaried based on the current step increase in place. Lind stated that the two overcomp positions were also accounted for.
2. 2017 Spike in Overtime – this is an estimate only. It is known that some of the seasoned staff will be leaving in the 2016 – 2017 timeframe. The belief is that amount will come down before the 2017 budget process but it is being monitored.
3. LOGIS Payments – Clarification that the DCC currently had a CIP with LOGIS that continued through the end of 2019.
4. Fiber – Staff request for additional money in capital for fiber expenses is due to two projects that were already under way. The first was with the State for increased fiber into the building for complete redundancy. The second was additional fiber for the new CAD system as there would be more data coming in that would increase the data load. Answer is no cannot because of our JPA format.
5. Liability Insurance under Dakota County Umbrella – As the DCC is its own entity formed under a JPA, it could not go under the Dakota County liability insurance umbrella.
6. Building Maintenance – A full detail of building maintenance expenses was provided. Each year a full review of the details is done by DCC and Dakota County staff where information is discussed line by line. This cost covers wanted to see the full detail on that. It is very extensive, go through line item by line item with the County and also a meeting coming up here.
7. Member Fees – A question was raised about member fees and why they are higher for some cities. It was explained that this was a discussion administrators/managers should have with their chiefs as it is usage-based.
8. Capital Improvements covered by Property Taxes through the County – No discussion.
9. 10 year CIP. As requested in 2014, the 5 year CIP normally presented as part of the budget process was expanded to 10 years. After 2020, forecasts became vague as known technology changes that could be substantial, but identification of associated costs would be very difficult. There will be the need for paging equipment and radio infrastructure replacement in 2014, but staff didn't know what that looked like yet. There were a few replacements needed in 2018 causing that spike and the first one was workstations. However, current workstations were holding up very well and that replacement would be pushed back if able.

There will be some future CAD interface needs that would allow for CAD to CAD exchange with DCC partners. Already available with Allina, as they had TriTech, this discussion would be necessary for partners to the Northeast such as HealthEast. Finally, there will be additional needs related to communication like text messaging, photo and videos and it would all need to be saved and stored somewhere.

10. Workforce Management – Workforce dynamics are changing and people are working to live, not living to work. Adequate staffing to meet the current standards will need to be visited, as will added training on text and video communications.
11. Containment of Member Fees – 2017 will likely still see a 2% increase if everything were to stay the same. Staff will continue to try to contain costs while maintaining the high standards.

Lind (DCC) informed members that if approval were recommended, the budget would be brought to the Board of Directors for consideration at the May 21st meeting. Lind added that once approved, the member fee costs would be sent out to members for use in their internal budgeting processes.

Osberg (Eagan) referred to maintaining the standards and stated that they were set a number of years ago. Osberg then asked if there was a unit of measure that could be used that identified cost of dispatch time? Osberg then commented that if consideration of lowering standards ever needed to be considered, it would be good to have this ability. Osberg clarified that he was not suggesting standards be lowered, but acknowledging that costs continued to go up and it would be important to review all factors that contributed to that, including identified standards. Lind (DCC) confirmed that there was a mathematical formula that could be run against the dispatch availability time as far as call answering time impacts. Lind added that the number of zones could be revisited as well as the standards. Lind stated that if it ever came down to it, the decision could go as far as to decrease to 2 zones and dispatch similar to neighboring agencies where it was strictly voice dispatching for priority 1 calls. Lind explained that beyond that, officers were on their own for everything else, including traffic stops. Lind commented that she did not feel that was safe, nor the direction the DCC should go. However, it was an option. Osberg (Eagan) agreed and stated that there should be a regular evaluation of all factors. King (South St. Paul) commented that the Board of Directors had mentioned doing a strategic plan and this topic would be a good part of that. Johnston (Burnsville) agreed stating that would be an appropriate time to do it.

Action: Motion by Johnston (Burnsville) to approve the proposed 2016 operating and capital budget as presented. Second by McKnight (Farmington). Motion passed unanimously.

7. Disposal of DCC Assets

Discussion:

Lind (DCC) informed members that with the recent console replacement, the DCC had a large amount of equipment that needed to be dealt with. Lind stated that while there may be a secondary market for some of it, there were 23 computers that needed to be disposed of. Lind stated that Dakota County Radio Services was assisting with identifying interested parties in the secondary market and DCC IT staff was looking for approval to dispose of the other equipment. Johnston (Burnsville) clarified that the disposal process included the necessary clearing of data from the hard drives. Lind (DCC) confirmed.

Action: Motion by Johnston (Burnsville) to recommend approval of disposal of assets as requested, including the clearing of any data prior to disposal. Second by Miller (Lakeville). Motion passed unanimously.

8. Executive Director Performance Review Process

Discussion:

King (South St. Paul) commented that the last executive director performance review identified a number of areas where direction was very vague and needed improvement for the future. King recapped the most recent process stating that the process started in October with disbursement of an evaluation form and collection of responses from member agencies. King stated that in November, the responses were compiled and presented to the group for final approval, and Lind worked on her goals and objectives. Once approved, the compilation was presented to the Board of Directors for consideration at their first meeting of the year, which was February. King stated that while the Board generally agreed with the findings of the Executive Committee, they did not offer any wage adjustment and instead, sent that back to the Executive Committee to formulate a recommendation and also streamline the evaluation process. King stated that at the March Executive Committee meeting, direction was to formulate a meeting of a combination of DCC staff, Executive Committee and HR Task Force representatives to work on the Board of Directions direction. King reminded members that the workgroup included Diane Lind and Jen Hildebrandt from the DCC, Steve King, Dave Osberg, Justin Miller and Matt Fulton from the Executive Committee, and Jill Hansen, Brenda Wendtlandt and Ray Kennedy from the HR Task Force. King reported that the workgroup convened the day before, and while not all representatives could attend, there was a good discussion that provided the information needed to formulate a recommendation for both a streamlined process and also a wage increase from the most recent evaluation. King stated that he would identify the process first and then excuse Director Lind at the end of the meeting to address the recommended wage increase.

Timing

King (South St. Paul) stated that he found the October – December timeline worked very well. King recapped that evaluation information would be distributed for the October meeting and members would have the month of October to provide one compiled response from their agency. The Chair would then compile the evaluation responses for the November meeting and meet with the Executive Director after compiling the final product. The Executive Director would then compile their response and all material would be combined for consideration at a special December Board of Directors meeting.

Recommendation: Adopt the October – December timeline ending with a special meeting by the Board of Directors in December to approve.

Range

King (South St. Paul) referred to the 2015 compensation structure that was approved in 2014, specifically the Executive Director section. King stated that this range was not something that was adjusted yearly, but reviewed every 3 – 5 years. King stated that there was no historical information that identified what the original comparables were. King added that the 2015 compensation structure used member Administrator/Manager ranges and while it was approved, the belief of the workgroup was to add the chiefs positions into that comparison. King reiterated that would mean that the comparables used going forward for the executive director position would be PSAP Directors, Member Agency Full Time Chiefs and City/County Managers/Administrators.

Johnston (Burnsville) commented that she wasn't certain using the Administrators/Managers was appropriate stating that position had a much broader responsibility. King (South St. Paul) acknowledged and stated that the workgroup tended to agree and that the Chiefs positions were added to the comparable to temper the range. King added that the executive director does report directly to the governing body which was one argument in favor of including the administrators/managers. Osberg (Eagan) also agreed that the administrator/manager position was the least comparable of the three positions. However, because of the nature of the position, there was a need for a variety of positions in the comparables. Battig (Dakota County) reminded members that many of the other PSAP comparables were buried in the law enforcement departments and ultimately reported to the sheriff. Battig commented that having dealt with a number of the other PSAP directors, the responsibilities of the DCC director position

are quite different. King (South St. Paul) informed members that Kennedy had reported that other than a couple agencies, like Ramsey County and Red River Valley, other comparables were across the country. King reminded that although the comparables are obtained, it was still the Board's prerogative to determine the DCC director position range based on recommendation from the Executive Committee. King stated that the comparable information obtained was only intended to be used as a guide. King also reminded that pay equity was a large factor in the structure and Kennedy's assistance was invaluable. King clarified that this was merely a topic of discussion and clarification and that there was no request for direction. King added that the range would not need to be revisited for 3 – 5 years or at such a time it appeared to be out of line with it's comparables.

Recommendation: Identify PSAP Directors and Member Agency Administrators/Managers and Full-Time Police/Fire Chiefs as comparables for Executive Director position.

Process Administration

King (DCC) informed members that responsibility for the executive director evaluation process had never been specifically identified. King added that previous evaluations were handled in a number of different ways. King then stated that now that the center had moved to more of a operational status, it seemed appropriate for the Executive Committee to administer the process and present a recommendation on both the performance evaluation and also a wage increase. Lawell (Apple Valley) referred to the timing and asked when any wage adjustment would take place. King (South St. Paul) clarified that any wage adjustment would take place effective the anniversary date, which in Lind's case was January.

Recommendation: Executive Committee administer the process and make recommendation on both the evaluation approval and the wage adjustment.

Compensation for Non-Union Personnel

King (DCC) reported that historically, any general adjustment that the union personnel received, the non-union personal also got. King stated that the executive director position was no exception. King then suggested consideration of adoption of a "me too" clause for non-union general increases based on union action. King added that general increases for non-union personnel would not take place until after union wage adjustment discussions and action concluded. Lawell (Apple Valley) asked how that had been handled in the past and if wage increases were addressed in conjunction with benefits approvals. King (South St. Paul) clarified that non-union wage increases were historically presented to the Board of Directors for action. King added that wage increases did not go hand-in-hand with benefits in the past because wages were acted on later in the year while benefits were acted on in August to allow time for open enrollment. Lawell (Apple Valley) clarified that if it is a non-contract year with the unions, the Board acted at their last meeting of the year. King (South St. Paul) confirmed.

Recommendation: Board of Directors act on non-union general increases at their last meeting of the year, but not before union discussions are finalized if during a contract year. Board of Directors consider a "me too" clause identifying the same general increase for non-union personnel as what union staff receives.

360 Evaluation

King (South St. Paul) reminded members that there had been prior discussions about administering a 360 evaluation of the executive director as part of the performance review. King reported that the workgroup felt that a 360 evaluation was a professional development tool and should not be done as part of the performance review. A 360 evaluation, however, should be done independent of the evaluation. Lawell (Apple Valley) asked what time of year that might be done. King (South St. Paul) responded that it should be done mid-year. Johnston (Burnsville) Agreed that it shouldn't be tied to the performance evaluation, but that it should be done.

Recommendation: Approval of implementation of a 360 evaluation to be done mid-year for the executive director, separate from the performance evaluation.

Other items

King (South St. Paul) stated that Jill Hansen, member of the HR Task Force agreed to take the current evaluation form and, with the help of the HR Task Force, modify it for relevance to the executive director role, including goals and position description. This will be finalized in time for the upcoming performance evaluation.

King (South St. Paul) noted that previous director, Kent Therkelsen, operated under a contract and current director, Diane Lind was not. King asked members if there was a need for yearly contract with the executive director position. Osberg (Eagan) added that it appeared as though that should be an option for consideration. Mesko-Lee (Hastings) asked what the identified comparables did. Lind (DCC) responded that she was not aware of any director position currently operating under contract. Battig (Dakota County) commented that even the Sheriff operated as an employee of Dakota County in the pay scale identified for the sheriff's department. King (South St. Paul) suggested pulling Therkelsen's personnel records to look at what that contract looked like before moving forward. Osberg (Eagan) agreed. Battig (Dakota County) also referred to Mesko-Lee's question and agreed that the comparable agencies should be asked if they operate under contract.

King (South St. Paul) stated that the final topic for discussion under this item was that the closest direction received from the Board of Directors to working through the grading system was "Diane should take us to the next level". King questions what that looked like. Osberg (Eagan) referred to the strategic plan and asked if the Board was in agreement that needed to be done. King (South St. Paul) confirmed. Osberg (Eagan) then stated it would be part of that discussion. Lind (DCC) agreed and asked if the desire was to go to the next level, what were they thinking and how they suggested she get the DCC there.

King (South St. Paul) stated that he would summarize the points addressed along with the outcome of item #10 on the agenda and present it to the Board of Directors on May 21st. King asked if there were any additional issues or concerns about the points discussed. There were none.

Action: None.

Information Updates/Discussion Items

9. Executive Director Update

Discussion:

Technology – Lind (DCC) reported that the new consoles had been installed and the transition went fairly seamlessly. Lind complimented Motorola personnel on how easy they were to work with during the process.

TriTech – Lind (DCC) reported that the TriTech process continued with the go live date of March, 2016. Lind stated that the Law Enforcement group would be meeting the third week of May to start discussing what they want their MDC screens to look like and the Fire group would be meeting a little further down the line. Lind informed members that reports from Ramsey were that the transition to TriTech went fairly smoothly with minimal issues.

Telephones – Lind (DCC) reported that the cutover to the new phone system was scheduled for July 29th with training the 2nd and 3rd weeks in July. Lind stated that the DCC consortium would be the third in the metro area to cutover and reports were that cutover was going fairly seamlessly.

Audio/Data Logger- Lind (DCC) stated that the RFP for the audio/data logger was being finalized and should be back to the DCC for final review in the next couple of weeks. Lind

stated that after review, it would go to the County Attorney for follow up review. Lind stated that the hope was to have responses back by the second week in July and purchase of a system would follow shortly thereafter.

Staffing – Lind (DCC) informed members that three great candidates would be starting over the next month and all three had previous experience. Lind stated that the hope was that would bring the DCC to full staffing, but she had just received a letter of resignation earlier in the week.

Legislative – Lind (DCC) reported that the bills that the group were watching were in conference. Lind explained that the House passed it but it didn't have the same language as the Senate bill had so it was currently in language review. Lind reminded members that while the DCC wouldn't see any direct benefit, the increased fees on phone lines would allow the State money for infrastructure support that would ultimately impact users fees.

Action: No action.

Chair King excused Executive Director Lind for the next action item.

10. Executive Director Wage Adjustment Recommendation

Discussion:

King (South St. Paul) clarified that with the current structure, candidates moved through the ranges towards the midpoint in the system. When the mid-point was reached, there were a couple of different options. The first would be a single year adjustment, the second would be a range adjustment. King stated that neither was right nor wrong. King stated that in speaking with Ray Kennedy at the workgroup meeting the prior day, it was clarified that people usually spent 8 to 10 years to get to the mid-point. However, if the employee came with experience and skills, progression to the mid-point could go much faster. King stated that Lind had been in the position since 2011, but was also the acting director for much of 2010, the operations director from 2007 to 2010 and a supervisor and dispatcher for many years prior to that. King stated that the directors current pay was \$116,000 and the discussion at hand was what, if anything, should the Executive Committee recommend the Board of Directors consider for a performance/merit adjustment that would be retroactive to the anniversary date of January 20th, 2015. King reminded members that this increase was movement within the identified range. King also stated that in workgroup discussions, consideration of a 4% increase was recommended. King clarified that was what the Operations Director received and would also bring the director position up to just under mid-range. Hildebrandt (DCC) reminded members that historically, the performance/merit increase was based on the 3rd quartile amount in the wage range. Battig (Dakota County) acknowledged stating that the thought behind that was to help those closer to the bottom of the range move faster than those at the top of the range. Hildebrandt (DCC) stated that if the direction was to consider a wage increase of 4% to the current wage, that would be different than how it was handled in the past. Johnston (Burnsville) commented that it seemed to be much more manageable. Hildebrandt (DCC) agreed that this topic had been cause for confusion since inception.

Action: Motion by Osberg (Eagan) to recommend a performance/merit increase of 4% based on current earnings and retro-active to the anniversary date of 1/20/2015. Second by Miller (Mendota Heights). Motion passed unanimously.

Adjourn

Action: Motion by Mcknight (Farmington) to adjourn. Second by Johnson (Rosemount). Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 4:41pm.

Next Regular Meeting:

June 3rd, 2015

3:00pm

DCC Training Room