

**Dakota Communications Center
Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes: 02/03/2016**

Members Present: Tom Lawell – Apple Valley; Heather Johnston – Burnsville; Dave Osberg – Eagan; Melanie Mesko-Lee – Hastings; Justin Miller – Lakeville; Mark McNeill – Mendota Heights; Dwight Johnson – Rosemount

Members Absent: Brandt Richardson – Dakota County; David McKnight – Farmington; Joe Lynch – Inver Grove Heights; Steve King – South St. Paul; Matt Fulton – West St. Paul

Alternates Present: BJ Battig – Dakota County; Brian Lindquist - Farmington

Others Present: Diane Lind, Jen Hildebrandt - DCC

1. Call the Meeting to Order

Chair Miller (Lakeville) called the meeting to order at 3:05p.m.

2. Roll Call

Members in attendance are noted above.

3. Approve Agenda

Discussion:

No modifications to the presented agenda.

Action: No approval.

Consent Agenda

4.

- a. **Approve Minutes from the January 6th, 2016 Executive Committee Meeting.**
- b. **Approve Paid Claims.**
 - **December 1st – 31st, 2015**
- c. **Receive Financial Reports and Recommend Approval**
 - **None – pending audit**
- d. **Receive contracts and agreements executed between December 30th, 2015 and January 27th, 2016.**
- e. **Operations Sub-committee Meeting Minutes**
 - **January 28th, 2016 Joint Operations Committee Meeting**
- f. **2016 Legal Newspaper**

Discussion:

McNeill (Mendota Heights) pointed out a typo in the January 6th, 2016 meeting minutes.

Action: Motion by McNeill (Mendota Heights) to approve the consent agenda. Second by Mesko-Lee (Hastings). Motion passed unanimously.

Regular Agenda

Action Items

NONE

Information Updates/Discussion Items

5. Strategic Planning Update

Discussion:

Lind (DCC) informed members that staff was directed to meet with DCC Legal Counsel to discuss possible changes to the governance model. Lind stated that she had met with Jay Stassen on January 12th and that he had commented that he thought it was a good idea to streamline the governance structure. Lind stated that Stassen had worked to outline changes to the governance model and would be providing two options. The first was to keep the Board of Directors in place with two meetings a year. The second option was a total hybrid consisting of the Board of Directors, Executive Committee, Law Enforcement and Fire Operations. Lind stated that Stassen commented that modification of the governance structure at this time showed organizational maturity and that he did not think it would be a major issue. Lind commented that the bigger undertaking would be discussion on what the committee and the representation would look like. Lind stated that she hoped to have the outline the next day.

Miller (Lakeville) commented that the Executive Committee should spend some time to discuss this a bit further. Miller stated that it had been brought up at the management meeting a couple weeks back and that he, Steve King and BJ Battig should be prepared with feedback from the Executive Committee to guide the workgroup review of the outline. Miller reiterated that there were concerns about the representation split and the potential level of authority each of the groups would hold.

Battig (Dakota County) commented that it could be easy if the Board of Directors were to be left in place with decreased meeting frequency. Battig stated that discussion would then go back to the structure of the Executive Committee, Law Enforcement and Fire hybrid committee. Battig commented that the County Administrator had concerns about the structure of the committee, meeting frequency and what the end goal was. Battig clarified that the Richardson was wondering if the end goal was to streamline policy decisions without them going through all the current committee levels. Battig then stated that Richardson asked if the chairs of the Fire and Law Enforcement Committees shouldn't just be given a seat on the Executive Committee. Battig added that there was also a suggestion that the Sheriff should participate on the Committee. Battig stated that there were concerns about representation rotating through elected officials, administrators and operations representation.

Lind (DCC) reminded members that the makeup of the committee and rotation was still in flux and could be adjusted however desired. Lind stated that legal counsel concern was directed towards elected official participation at the budget level, given the impact to member agencies. Lind clarified that legal counsel questioned if it was a good idea to have operations representatives voting on the consortium budget. Lind added that legal counsel questioned how conflicting interests might impact DCC operations. Lind agreed stating that there were some members of operations that thought the DCC was progressing well while others felt the DCC was costing way too much money.

Johnston (Burnsville) asked operations representation for feedback on the overall opinion of the operations committee group. Lindquist (LE Ops Chair) commented that he had not been party to anything that the Chiefs have brought forward that the Executive Committee didn't rubber stamp. Lindquist added that when the Chiefs got together, the discussion often turned to budget because the group wanted to, or felt, they had the right to oversee that. Lindquist stated that he didn't want to vote on the budget and Farmington had no issue with the identified cost per CAD call. Lindquist clarified that Farmington, however, hadn't known anything different while some other agencies had PSAPs in their agencies where they could direct change as desired.

Lindquist affirmed that he thought the group would like to have some participation in different pieces impacting the budget that included upcoming expenses that related to new services requiring technology and policy considerations. Lindquist stated that he didn't think operations

would take issue with a decision to just add some operations representation onto the executive committee. Lindquist reminded members that each chief had the ear of their Administrator/Manager at their home agencies.

Osberg (Eagan) referred back to the fundamental pieces that got the group to the development of the workgroup. Osberg stated that there was a perceived feeling that the chiefs were unable to influence change, and that the Executive Committee and Board roles were predominantly "rubber stamping" recommendations, including budget approval. Osberg commented that the thought was that having a "super committee" was the way to go. Osberg stated that maybe after going through the process, nothing would change at the governance level. However, the chiefs still needed the ability to participate in conversation that may influence change. Osberg then stated that it had also been suggested that governance consider having the sheriff take over the organization altogether.

Lawell (Apple Valley) commented that he didn't hear a lot from Apple Valley operations, but noted that because Apple Valley previously had a dispatch center, changes were immediate. Lawell questioned the need for the multiple layers of governance as responsiveness to operational concerns was a problem.

Lindquist (LE Ops Chair) commented that not having a dispatch center previously, he felt that operational issues were being heard and addressed. However, it was not as quick as some, probably those with previous dispatch centers, felt it should be. Lindquist reminded that approaching another CAD mobile suite, there was a push to standardize things across the board and it was time to give up the thought that you were going to run the PSAP again. Lindquist referred to the suggestion of the Sheriff running the PSAP and there were pros and cons. Lindquist acknowledged that the topic had been discussed, usually during budget season, and it was a conversation that could be held. However, it would still be one voice for multiple agencies. Lindquist stated that his concern was more focused on the number of meetings and the continual rehashing of the same topics over and over.

Lawell (Apple Valley) commented that he wasn't sure fire representatives would support the sheriff taking over the PSAP. Johnston (Burnsville) agreed.

Lind (DCC) commented that one significant concern was that the DCC was conceptualized, implemented and is being operated by staff as a consolidation while many of the chiefs and member agencies were expecting services of a co-location, resulting in some of the issues. Lind explained that the two models were entirely different as consolidation was standardized services/operations while co-location was individualized services/operations existing at the same location. Lind stated that consolidation would not work without standardization.

Mesko-Lee (Hastings) commented that she was not sure what the right model was, but there was clearly the need for flexibility for allowing pilot programs and also reasonable timelines for those conversations. Mesko-Lee added that she couldn't help but shake the feeling that the issue was personalities more than governance. Mesko-Lee stated that things were not going back to the way they were when agencies had their own dispatch centers and agencies needed to get behind that. Mesko-Lee then commented that there was a need to work on common operating procedures and move forward from there.

Johnston (Burnsville) acknowledged Mesko-Lee's comments and stated that there seemed to be a better way to have those conversations as she didn't feel comfortable not having Law Enforcement and Fire as active participants. Johnston clarified, however, that she had some concerns about the makeup of a hybrid committee that allowed operations a majority or even ½ voting authority on the budget. Johnston stated at the end of the day, the elected officials were responsible for the budget. Johnston agreed that the policy issues were still a significant

concern.

Battig (Dakota County) commented that he was hearing that operationally, the DCC was being expected to act more like a co-located center vs. a consolidated center. Battig added that he was only getting bits and pieces through minutes, etc. Battig reminded members that as an entity, decisions were based on best solutions for the overall consortium. Battig acknowledged, however, that the member impact of the base assumptions had never really been evaluated, nor had the impact on DCC operations.

Lawell (Apple Valley) commented that in the beginning, discussions revolved around no agency having degradation of the level of service, which was how everyone wound up with EMD, because Burnsville had it. Lawell acknowledged that some agencies felt that guiding principal had been compromised along the way, and that needed attention. Lawell suggested efforts be made towards streamlining of operations and continue the Board of Directors role in budget approval.

Johnson (Rosemount) commented that he thought everyone was in agreement on the importance of inclusion of the chiefs. Johnson stated that he also tried to see what that "looked like" for staff. Johnson reminded members that it seemed as though DCC staff was continuously pulled in different directions. Johnson referred to meeting frequency for staff that included quarterly board meetings, monthly executive committee meetings, bi-monthly joint operations committee meetings, bi-monthly fire/ems meetings and bi-monthly law enforcement meetings, all with different agendas and lines of thought. Johnson commented that must put enormous burden on DCC staff and commented that he was in favor of consolidating efforts by putting representation in one room to work through issues and then provide staff with direction on how to carry it out. Johnson stated that he was still in favor of a hybrid governance group in some capacity.

Lind (DCC) acknowledged Johnson's concerns about the impact on DCC staff and stated that she had made a number of contacts with people in the PSAP consolidation world and there was one overwhelming theme which was how consolidating agencies tended to remember the bad and not the good. Lind stated that additionally, as agencies experience chief turnover from within, there was still the "history" there. Lind added that as chiefs turned over from outside, topics that had been discussed numerous times repeatedly were again brought to the table. Lind commented that reports from consolidation specialists were that there needed to be a full generational officer turnover before consolidation was really institutionalized. Lind acknowledged that while the DCC Consortium was 8+ years old, it was still experiencing growing pains. Lind noted that the DCC saw the same issue internally with dispatchers who worked for the previous PSAPs.

McNeill (Mendota Heights) commented that he agreed that having the number of governance levels was inefficient. McNeill added that he wasn't opposed to considering the sheriff's office model as it had been successful in Scott County.

Osberg (Eagan) commented that governance didn't have a lot of discretion for a variety of reasons and suggested penetrating the founding policies and procedures. Mesko-Lee (Hastings) reminded members that discussions about advancing pilot projects, and discussions on policies and procedures had been addressed at a previous meeting. Mesko-Lee stated that there couldn't be foundational changes until policies were reviewed. Johnston (Burnsville) agreed and suggested the Executive Committee start walking through the policies with the chairs and vice chairs of the two operations committees. Lindquist (Farmington) asked if the group was thinking a workshop was in order. Johnston (Burnsville) responded that she thought it would be worthwhile. Johnston suggested staff present the policies, possibly in a workshop environment.

Osberg (Eagan) suggested consideration of an annual meeting of the Executive Committee, Law Enforcement and Fire chiefs opposed to a workshop.

Miller (Lakeville) recapped the conversation:

1. There was still a need for streamlining of the governance structure.
2. There is the need for stronger Fire/EMS and Law Enforcement input and participation on a hybrid committee but maybe not ½ of the committee.
3. Continued elected official responsibility for review and approval.
4. Identify a way to start a policy-level review that would include executive committee, fire/ems and law enforcement participants.

Miller (Lakeville) asked if there were any concerns about the Board's only participation being on the budget. Johnston (Burnsville) suggested the Board be scheduled to meet twice. The first meeting would be presentation and the second to vote. Lawell (Apple Valley) added that it would be the executive committee member's responsibility to maintain communications with the board member through the year and keep them updated so the budget meeting wasn't the only time elected officials received DCC information.

Lind (DCC) commented that it was her belief that the daily procedures were pretty solid. However, there was a need to look at equipment needs that allowed for interfacing with in-field equipment such as bodycams, etc. Additionally, there was a need to determine how implementation of policies and additional services impacted staffing and ultimately, the budget.

Lawell (Apple Valley) referred to the review of the current governance structure by DCC legal counsel and suggested it also be reviewed by agency attorneys. Miller (Lakeville) acknowledged and suggested not all attorneys, but possibly a secondary attorney. Lawell (Apple Valley) commented that if the elected officials were not going to be voting on the budget, this could become a concern for member agency legal counsels.

Action: No action. Update only.

6. Executive Director Update

Discussion:

Technology

Audio Logger – Lind (DCC) reported that staff was still working with the non-CJIIIN agencies to obtain email addresses to send audio logger recordings to for criminal prosecutions. Lind commented that this was a very big deal because it solidifies the County Attorney's Office opinion that it was OK to transmit recordings with private data in them via the internet, which has otherwise been considered non-secure. Lind stated that this ability will save much time and money for both DCC and member agency staff.

Lind reported that the DCC had not completed final acceptance of the new logger yet as there were some minor issues still being addressed. Lind speculated that the final acceptance would happen in the next couple of weeks.

CAD – Lind (DCC) reported that the TriTech/LOGIS designated go-live date for the DCC consortium was June 14th, but the consortium requested that date be moved up into May. Lind explained that training for the DCC, Law Enforcement and Fire personnel was beginning April 11th and would run through the 2nd week in May. Lind stated that member agencies and DCC expressed the desire to go-live prior to Memorial Day, opposed to waiting a month. Lind commented that DCC training would be taking place at the DCC which would save time and a considerable amount of money in travel expenses for staff.

Lind (DCC) reported that Minnetonka was still scheduled to go live in March and that the DCC

Consortium would be closely watching. Mesko-Lee (Hastings) commented that Hastings had a number of other events that needed to happen that were dependent on go-live and asked when the Consortium might know if the date would be moved to May. Lind (DCC) speculated that it could be early the week of February 8th and agreed to notify member agencies as soon as confirmation had been received.

Lawell (Apple Valley) commented that TriTech seemed to be buying out other companies in the same business and asked if that was a good thing for the consortium, or if there was concern that another larger agency might attempt to buy out TriTech. Lind (DCC) commented that it appeared as though TriTech was the dominant agency buying the others out and that it seemed to be beneficial to the consortium as each time TriTech bought out another competitor, the positives with that product became part of the TriTech product that the consortium was engaged in.

Personnel:

Staffing – Lind (DCC) reported that the DCC dispatch staffing level was still significantly low and while it looked bad, it was still better than other agencies across the metro. Lind added that the average retention rate for DCC dispatchers was at approximately 10.5 years. Lind reported that through the MESB, metro area PSAPs were starting a metro-wide effort to consider group recruiting and training. Lind stated that the desire was that this effort might speed up training. Lind commented that the group was encountering obstacles in getting the Sheriff's Association to undertake the effort, so it was decided that they would make this a project of their own. Miller (Lakeville) asked if the PSAP group anticipated support from the Sheriff's Association being an obstacle. Lind (DCC) commented that it had been as they didn't want another set of training to be responsible for. Lind clarified that the obstacle was not necessarily with the metro area Sheriff's Assn as with out-state agencies where their dispatchers were also their jailers and records staff. Lind reiterated that the DCC was looking forward to being part of this PSAP group effort through the MESB.

Battig (Dakota County) asked if there was such a thing as a part-time dispatcher. Lind (DCC) confirmed but stated it was more common in smaller agencies. Lind stated that there was so much to know, learn and understand in large organizations that skillsets for part-time positions proved difficult to maintain.

Lawell (Apple Valley) asked if there were schools where people could take dispatching prep courses. Lind (DCC) responded that there had been pilot attempts such as Century College in 2015 and Hennepin County years back. Lind commented that there had been varying degrees of success.

Finance:

Budget – Lind (DCC) reported that the first round of staff budget work had been done and the document had been sent to fiscal agent, City of Lakeville, for inclusion of the personnel and other finance pieces. Lind stated that staff expected to have the budget back by February 15th for continuance and finalization. Lind asked for volunteers to participate on the yearly budget workgroup, tasked with reviewing the budget line by line, and weed out any possible questions prior to formal presentation to the Executive Committee. Melanie Mesko-Lee, Dwight Johnson and Tom Lawell agreed to participate on the workgroup. Lind added that the CIP being presented would reflect 10 years opposed to the 5 year CIP presented in previous years.

Mesko-Lee and Miller both thanked Lind for following up on their request from the January meeting to present Executive Director topic in the background so members had an opportunity to prep for the discussion.

Action: No action. Update only.

OTHER BUSINESS

None

Adjourn

Action: Motion by Johnston (Burnsville) to adjourn. Second by Johnson(Rosemount). Motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 4:00pm.

Next Regular Meeting:

March 2nd, 2016

3:00pm

DCC Training Room