

**Dakota Communications Center
Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes: 05/11/2016**

Members Present: Tom Lawell – Apple Valley; Heather Johnston – Burnsville; Dave Osberg – Eagan; David McKnight – Farmington; Melanie Mesko-Lee – Hastings; Joe Lynch – Inver Grove Heights; Justin Miller – Lakeville; Mark McNeill – Mendota Heights; Dwight Johnson – Rosemount; Steve King – South St. Paul; Matt Fulton – West St. Paul

Members Absent: Matt Smith – Dakota County

Alternates Present: BJ Battig – Dakota County

Others Present: Diane Lind, Jen Hildebrandt – DCC; Mike Meyer – Fire/EMS Ops Sub-Committee Chair; Shelley Calvert – Inver Grove Heights; Jerilyn Erickson – DCC Fiscal Agent

1. Call the Meeting to Order

Chair Miller (Lakeville) called the meeting to order at 3:00p.m.

2. Roll Call

Members in attendance are noted above.

3. Approve Agenda

Discussion:

Lind (DCC) referred to the consent agenda and informed members that there were no January or February, 2016 financial reports. The first report for the year was the March, 2016 report in the packet.

Action: No action.

Consent Agenda

4.

- a. **Approve minutes from the April 6th, 2016 executive committee meeting.**
- b. **Approve paid claims.**
 - **March 1st – 31st, 2016**
- c. **Receive financial reports & recommend approval.**
 - **2015 Year-End Financial Report**
 - **March, 2016 Unaudited Financial Report**
- d. **Receive report on contracts and agreements executed between March 30th and April 27th, 2016.**
- e. **Receive operations committee meeting minutes**
 - **April Fire/EMS Sub-Committee Meeting**
 - **April Law Enforcement Sub-Committee Meeting - Cancelled**

Discussion:

None

Action: Motion by Mesko-Lee (Hastings) to approve the consent agenda with the removal of the January and February, 2016 unaudited financial reports. Second by McKnight (Farmington). Motion passed unanimously.

Regular Agenda

Action Items

5. Emergency Fire Dispatching

Discussion:

Lind recapped events leading up to the meeting stating that the Fire/EMS group started discussing Emergency Fire Dispatching (EFD) back in 2013. Lind stated that in May, 2013 the Board of Directors approved implementation of EFD contingent on receipt of funding through grants that would cover implementation costs including initial training expenses. Lind reported that to date, there had been two unsuccessful attempts, sponsored by the Cities of Burnsville and Apple Valley, to obtain grant funding. Lind added that the City of Lakeville had a pending application, and the DCC had also attempted to apply for a grant in pursuit of EFD funding. Lind stated that based on past experience, it could be as late as December before response was received on whether or not either application would be successful.

Meyer (Fire/EMS Chair) distributed a document that reflected the key points the Fire/EMS group wanted to make the Executive Committee aware of as part of their consideration to fund EFD if the grant applications were unsuccessful.

Meyer (Fire/EMS Chair) reminded that the consortium currently used Emergency Medical Direction (EMD), which was the medical counterpart to EFD. Meyer stated that similar to EMD, EFD provided a set format that dispatchers, no matter their skill or experience level, would use to obtain the information necessary to send the appropriate level of response to events. Meyer added that also similar to EMD, there was rigid training that would teach dispatchers how to use the provided tools to obtain the information necessary, appropriately code events, and provide pre-arrival instructions. Meyer referred to the quality assurance piece and stated that it would allow DCC management the ability to review EFD administration by staff and ensure it was being used appropriately and as trained.

Johnson (Rosemount) asked if there was concern that the addition of EFD to the dispatch process would slow response. Meyer (Fire/EMS Chair) confirmed that with any new product there would be a learning curve, and that the Fire/EMS Sub-Committee acknowledged that would be the case. Meyer commented that once the comfort level increased, time should improve and process would be standardized.

McNeill (Mendota Heights) referred to the item on the handout that referred to undue risk and asked for clarification. Meyer (Fire/EMS Chair) clarified stating that dispatch was currently asking questions and making decisions based on experience with no real guide. Meyer stated that there wasn't a specific guide of questions to ask so dispatchers had to rely on experience or training received by their trainers. Meyer stated that while the group was confident in the DCC training process, there was a better option that provided a guide endorsed by the NFPA. Meyer gave an example stating that an oven fire was currently coded as a structure fire. Meyer stated that there was up to a 3 station response to structure fires when oven fires could, based on answers to specific questions, be 1 – 2 engine response.

Battig (Dakota County) asked if EFD was common practice. Lind (DCC) responded that it was not in the metro area, but was across the country. Lind stated that it seemed to be more popular in the south and southwest. Lind stated that in the metro area, only Washington County was using the protocol and they were currently using a manual card system. Lind added that because of all the small departments in Washington County, they were able to get the departments to agree to one set of dispatch protocol. Lind stated that one thing that could be reported in terms of risk management with EMD was that police response to medicals was cut by about 80% decreasing costs and risk on the roads. Lind stated that the only medicals that police really responded to was calls where the victim was not breathing, not conscious or in imminent child birth. Lind acknowledged that fire protocols would better aid in determining response levels and arriving at the same conclusion no matter the experience of the dispatcher.

Mesko-Lee (Hastings) asked if there had been any discussion related to following the Washington County practice and standardizing response protocols across the county. Lind

(DCC) responded that there had not been. Lind commented that the new CAD system being implemented may better accommodate some of the autonomy desired by member agencies.

Johnston (Burnsville) asked DCC staff to speak to the training aspect of implementation and how it might impact the workforce. Lind (DCC) responded that training would be more costly as there is an extensive protocol. However, it would be beneficial in the long run as all dispatch staff would be receiving the same standardized training.

Lynch (Inver Grove Heights) asked for clarification on how the costs were broken down in the budget. Lind (DCC) responded that they were split between capital and training. Lind stated that any hardware, software and books, etc. were into capital while the training costs were put into the operating budget.

Battig (Dakota County) referred to EMD and now EFD and asked if the group could expect ELD (Emergency Law Direction) in the future. Lind (DCC) acknowledged that there was a law enforcement companion piece but that reports were that it was not yet tried and tested life and was a number of years down the road. Battig (Dakota County) clarified that it could be in DCCs future. Lind (DCC) confirmed, depending on the desires of the Law Enforcement Sub-Committee.

Mesko-Lee (Hastings) acknowledged that the costs were included in the budget that would be presented but asked if the decision was to remove it from the budget, what the overall impact would be. Erickson (Fiscal Agent) responded that the capital component wouldn't change and the training costs would be much lower resulting in a small impact on member fees.

Johnston (Burnsville) referred to page 1 of the upcoming budget and asked if the numbers identified were the EFD impact. Erickson (Fiscal Agent) confirmed and added that it was also in the budget detail. Miller (Lakeville) reminded of the possible offsetting grant and asked if there was anything not grant-funded in the proposed budget. Meyer (Fire/EMS Chair) stated that the FEMA grant was regional and would be an 80/20 split. Erickson (Fiscal Agent) stated that 20% would be an approximately \$20,000 impact on member fees and would be negligible.

Miller (Lakeville) referred to past grant applications and asked if there had been any feedback on why the grants weren't given. Meyer (Fire/EMS Chair) responded that while there wasn't much information provided, the group was informed that they made it to the final round for consideration.

Osberg (Eagan) asked if any of the new CAD programming might mitigate the need for a full-scale EFD program. Meyer (Fire/EMS Chair) responded that the new CAD system allowed for development of guiding questions that could be asked. However, there were limitations. Meyer added that EFD was a credentialed system and TriTech was not. Meyer added that there was not the rigid training on what TriTech offered nor was there a quality assurance piece. Lind (DCC) agreed stating that credentialed systems were easier to represent in the event of a lawsuit. Lind added that responders had the ability to see the code and also the responses to the specific questions asked. Osberg (Eagan) asked if a fee was paid to TriTech for the addition of the fire questions. Meyer (Fire/EMS Chair) clarified that no fee was paid to TriTech as the capability was already within the program. Osberg (Eagan) commented that it felt significant that this wasn't NFPA standard. Lind (DCC) acknowledged stating that the last NFPA standard that related to dispatcher, #1221, did not call out EFD as a requirement but added points in the communication section of reviews if agencies used EFD. Lind added that agencies also were allowed additional processing time on the NFPA standard.

Fulton (West St. Paul) reiterated that it appeared as though the costs were approximately \$147,000 in capital for installation and then approximately \$40,000 in operating for training, both with grant potential. Lind (DCC) confirmed and added that there would be ongoing training costs after that.

Fulton (West St. Paul) asked if the product, being more heavily used in the south and southwest, had reflected positive results. Lind (DCC) confirmed but stated that the City of Chicago had installed it and then removed it as they believed because they had specific fire dispatchers, they could better train them to the needs of Chicago.

Lawell (Apple Valley) stated that it was his understanding that fires double in size within 60 seconds and voiced concern over the potential time delay associated with implementation of EFD. Meyer (Fire/EMS Chair) responded that if responders were getting the critical information needed to help ensure appropriate level of response, it was worth the few seconds added to the time. Lind (DCC) assured that there was the ability within the program to send response and continue to ask questions afterwards for absolute reports such as "I see the house burning". Similar to EMD, if someone isn't breathing, you don't waste time asking questions, you immediately start CPR.

Osberg (Eagan) commented that he did not have a problem with including the costs in the 2017 budget. However, he would like to hold off on determining if EFD should be implemented until CAD was up and running and until the results of the grant applications were received. Osberg stated that maybe the new CAD system would eliminate the need for EFD in which case, the funds wouldn't have to be spent. Fulton (West St. Paul) agreed. Johnston (Burnsville) asked what the implications of that decision might be. Johnston stated that the funds were in the 2017 budget so it wasn't imperative to authorize the acquisition at the current meeting. Lind (DCC) confirmed. Miller (Lakeville) agreed stating that while the discussion was necessary as far as budget impact, it was not yet necessary as far as implementation. Lind (DCC) agreed stating that between June and December, the consortium would have more experience and information on the grant applications. Lind stated that the discussion could be revisited in January, 2017 for consideration of implementation. Meyer (Lakeville) acknowledged and reminded members that the downside was that without implementation, all response was totally dependent on the questions asked by the dispatchers who did not currently have a guide for that. Meyer stated that EFD provided a lesson plan with training objectives that the DCC training process did not currently have.

Miller (Lakeville) recapped that the decision was to keep the funding for EFD in the 2017 proposed budget document but not discuss authorization of implementation until January, 2017 after CAD capabilities were better understood and Grant consideration was complete.

Action: No action. Discussion only.

6. 2017 LOGIS Medical Insurance Pool Participation

Discussion:

Hildebrandt (DCC) reported that the background in the packet provided all preliminary information leading up to the meeting, but there were just a few points that impacted consideration of the specific action requested.

Hildebrandt (DCC) informed members that DCC and LOGIS Pool broker, Gallagher Benefits, went out for bids for fully-funded and self-funded pool rates and also stand-alone rates for both the LOGIS Pool as a whole and the DCC, individually. Hildebrandt reported that based on the response, the LOGIS pool decided that it would be more costly to self-fund than fully-insure for 2017 based on the responses received, so the pool would be remaining fully-insured for 2017. Hildebrandt stated that the focus then turned to what rates the DCC would be getting as part of the pool opposed to stand-alone. Hildebrandt reported that stand-alone rates were based on 2015 claims experience which was approximately 160%. As a result, quotes from Medica, Blue

Cross Blue Shield and HealthPartners came in extremely high, ranging from 32.12% - 64.73%. Hildebrandt reported that preliminary DCC rates through the LOGIS Pool came in at 15% - 17%. Hildebrandt reported that based on that information, and with the support of the HR Task Force, staff was recommending the DCC continue participation in the LOGIS Pool for 2017 medical insurance.

Hildebrandt (DCC) informed members that the budget document they would be considering for recommendation reflected a 17% increase in the Hospitalization Insurance line item based on the preliminary numbers received and anticipating continued participation in the LOGIS Pool. Hildebrandt reported that updated unconfirmed information received the day prior to the meeting reflect the potential for significantly lower increases than the preliminary forecast and that it may be in the DCC's best interest to decrease the line item from the 17% increase to something more reasonable.

Mesko-Lee (Hastings) asked when the actual plan information would be coming out. Hildebrandt (DCC) responded that the firm rates through the pool could be available as early as May 19th. Hildebrandt speculated that firm plan offerings would likely not be finalized until mid to late June as LOGIS Pool participants had until June 15th to state their intent of Pool participation and any departures could impact rates.

Johnston (Burnsville) asked about union impact. Hildebrandt (DCC) reminded members that the union contracts were settled through 2017, but that insurance plan options were reviewed by a health insurance committee which included union stewards each year. Hildebrandt assured that when plans and rates were confirmed, those discussions would begin and that the HR Task Force would also be apprized. Johnston (Burnsville) stated that in the event there was any sort of decrease, staff should benefit from that also. Hildebrandt (DCC) agreed.

Action: Motion by Mesko-Lee (Hastings) to recommend continued participation in the LOGIS medical insurance pool for the 2017 calendar year. Second by Fulton (West St. Paul). Motion passed unanimously.

7. 2017 Operating and Capital Budget

Discussion:

Lind (DCC) reviewed a PowerPoint presentation addressing member fees, financial management, operations, personnel, fund balance & equipment.

Fulton (West St. Paul) referred to the \$2,000 identified for exercise equipment and asked how often the exercise equipment was used. Lind noted that it was likely a bit less with all the hours staff is having to work, but that there was a policy in place that allowed all employees up to 45 minutes twice a week in the fitness room. Lind stated that the equipment was used often and this was a very nice way to support staff wellness. Fulton (West St. Paul) referred to the claims experience of 160% in 2015. Lind (DCC) acknowledged reminding members that much of the expenses in 2015 were not something that the DCC wellness could have prevented. Hildebrandt (DCC) commented that staff had been accepted into the SHIP initiative and had hopes of changing DCC culture towards a healthier work environment.

Johnson (Rosemount) asked what the industry metric was on dispatchers being busy versus being available. Lind (DCC) responded that it was about 80%. Lind clarified that the standard was that staff should be busy about 80% of their time and if that was being exceeded, staffing discussions should ensue.

Miller (Lakeville) recapped that EFD and Health Insurance budget amount should be considered as part of a budget approval recommendation. Johnston (Burnsville) agreed and stated that it was her understanding that the funding for EFD would remain in the budget as presented and

implementation would be revisited in January, 2017. Johnston then asked if there was a staff recommendation on what the insurance increase should be changed to. Hildebrandt (DCC) responded that she would be comfortable with dropping the line item to a 10% increase. Hildebrandt stated that while the DCC could be looking at a decrease, there was potential for an increase that could come in up to 10% and she wasn't necessarily comfortable with dropping it lower than that. Erickson (Fiscal Agent) agreed with the reasoning given the unknowns. McKnight (Farmington) stated that he didn't want to underestimate.

Fulton (West St. Paul) complimented staff and fiscal agent on the presentation of the budget stating that it looked good.

Lynch (Inver Grove Heights) referred to Text-to-911 and asked for clarification on anticipated expenses. Lind (DCC) explained that the estimated \$60,000 was the preliminary quoted amount but the MESB felt that was very high. Lind stated that similar to EFD and Health Insurance, the budget timing required staff to include preliminary numbers. Lind stated that \$49,288 was identified in capital and covered maintenance, implementation training and hardware. Lind stated that \$6,600 was put in training for staff. Lind reiterated that as reported at previous meetings, this expense was expected to come in much lower than what the preliminary numbers reflected.

Action: Motion by Fulton (West St. Paul) to recommend approval of the 2017 operating and capital budget with modification to the hospitalization insurance line item from 17% increase to 10% increase. Second by Johnson (Rosemount). Motion passed unanimously.

Information Updates/Discussion Items

8. Capital Budget Funding Consideration

Discussion:

Fulton (West St. Paul) distributed a handout that reflected research West St. Paul had done on DCC Cost Increases per Agency, Market Value Strength and Cost per Capita. Fulton commented that the numbers demonstrated the shift in costs to communities fully developed, specifically Hastings, Mendota Heights, South St. Paul and West St. Paul, and experiencing different dynamics than other communities. Fulton added that the cost per capita and dynamics of the smaller geographic communities were putting more pressure on those communities to fund the member fees. Fulton clarified that he understood that members had to pay for their use so his concern was not so much with the operating budget as it was the capital budget. Fulton explained that whether there was one call or ten calls, the same equipment was still needed. Fulton stated that he was advocating for capital costs to be pulled from the member fee formula and spread via count levy.

Fulton (West St. Paul) then referred to GRH communities that all members were familiar with and stated that the communities of Burnsville, Hastings, South St. Paul and West St. Paul all had a number of GRH communities and statistics showed that call volume in these communities was higher than in other communities. Fulton stated that calls from GRH communities could be isolated and he felt they should be pulled out of the member agency fees and given back to the county to pay. Fulton acknowledged that it would take time to work through the formula and assured that he wasn't looking for anything to be done as part of the 2017 budget approval process. However, he wanted to get the conversation started as he felt it was time to review the funding formula.

Johnston (Burnsville) referred to investments made in capital that benefit the entire group and if members would get credit for that. Johnston also asked how that might be moderated.

Battig (Dakota County) commented that when this topic was first mentioned, he took the opportunity to discuss it with the county administrator. Battig reminded members that from the

county perspective, the county is funding 100% of the capital for the entire radio system which translates to an \$8 - \$10 million dollar investment every time there was a radio upgrade. Battig asked that as the discussion progresses, member remember that significant buy-in that allowed members access that, other than operational costs, was not passed on. Fulton (West St. Paul) acknowledged and stated that the intent of bringing the discussion forward was to recognize that communities like West St. Paul were picking up a big portion of increased costs based on use which were based on characteristics of the community that had lower tax capacity.

McNeil (Mendota Heights) asked what the GRH transfer would look like. Fulton (West St. Paul) responded that he wasn't sure what it would look like yet. Fulton reiterated that because there was the ability to isolate the calls, and due to the impact on public safety with the increased event volume, it should be evaluated.

Johnston (Burnsville) commented that she appreciated West St. Paul bringing the topic up. Johnston stated that there were two points that the group should ruminate.

1. If capital costs were shifted to the county, what did that mean from a governance standpoint? Would the weighted voting change?
2. Concerns about agencies paying for use in other communities.

Fulton (West St. Paul) acknowledged stating that Eagan costs had decreased the least over the course of the past seven years, but they also don't provide ambulance service. Fulton acknowledged that the current use-based structure made sense.

Lind (DCC) commented that when discussing the 2018 budget and user fees in general, this topic will need to be given much attention. Lind explained that with the current CAD system, if Apple Valley had a call and needed assistance from Burnsville and Lakeville, that would be 3 calls for service. In the new CAD system, that would be one call for service to Apple Valley. This could potentially reflect much higher costs per call because the costs are the same, but the number of associated calls may be different. Lind reiterated that the new CAD system brought everything together under one umbrella CAD event, which was different from current and much more reflective of what is happening in each community. Fulton (West St. Paul) acknowledged stating that allocation of usage could shift significantly as a result. Lind (DCC) confirmed that a shift was likely, but she was not yet certain how significant it would be.

Lawell (Apple Valley) reminded members that while you need the equipment whether you have 1 call or 10 calls, the size and amount of equipment is relative to call volume. Fulton (West St. Paul) acknowledged that there was a scale of operation.

Fulton (West St. Paul) reiterated that the review would take some work and asked that members be thinking about formula considerations as they year progressed.

Johnson (Rosemount) commented that when the discussion came back to the table, he would like the data behind the charts provided. Fulton (West St. Paul) agreed.

Miller (Lakeville) also suggested 2008 be the baseline.

Battig (Dakota County) agreed to share the conversation with the new county administrator so they were aware that the discussion was on the table. Battig added that maybe a work group would be in order.

Action: No action. Update only.

9. Executive Director Update

Discussion:

Aggregate Industries: Lind (DCC) informed members that Aggregate Industries had begun

mining the property to the south/southwest of the DCC but that reports were that they would not be mining the property directly between the DCC facility and highway 3. Lind reported that there was a constant hum, minimal vibration and some dust but to date, it was tolerable.

CAD Training: Lind (DCC) reported that this was the last week of CAD training. Lind stated that the past two weeks she spent in MDC training with officers and firefighters. Lind cautioned that the CAD system was based on geography and some of the first questions raised at MDC meetings were in reference to the ability to turn off AVL. Lind stated that feedback from dispatchers and responders alike was positive. Lind added that Minnetonka was still providing good reports since their go live. Lind reminded members that "go live" was set for 6am on June 1st and TriTech expected to have a team of about 30 people at the DCC and spread throughout the county to assist dispatchers and responders.

Lind (DCC) reported that one question on the MDC side was whether or not agencies would get photos when they ran driver's licenses. Lind cautioned that this got into DVS justification issues that decision would be left up to agency command staff to address.

Lind (DCC) thanked members of the Executive Committee for their support through the years and reminded that the DCC was a great organization that was very highly regarded not only in the metro area but also across the county. Lind stated that the DCC was one of the best organizations around.

Action: No action. Update only.

10. Executive Director Search Update

Discussion:

Miller (Lakeville) referred to the Executive Director Search draft document that was distributed to members for review. Miller stated that the draft did not address a number of modifications that he and staff had addressed, but that he wanted members to see the progress of the search to date. Lawell (Apple Valley) referred to the DCC picture on the last page and asked if the attribution should be to Wold Architects. Staff confirmed that there seemed to be a typo that would be relayed to the search firm. Miller (Lakeville) informed members that the document would be going out in the near future and that review of responses would be starting July 15th.

Action: No action. Update only.

OTHER BUSINESS

11. Executive Director Open House Reminder – May 19th, 10am to Noon @ Apple Valley Municipal Center.

Miller (Lakeville) thanked Executive Director Diane Lind on behalf of the Executive Committee for her years of service to the DCC and reminded members that there would be an open house after the Board of Directors meeting on Thursday, May 19th in the Apple Valley Municipal Center McIntosh Room.

Adjourn

Action: No action. Meeting adjourned at 4:26pm by Chair Miller.

Next Regular Meeting:

June 1st, 2016

3:00pm

Apple Valley Municipal Center
McIntosh Training Room