

**Dakota Communications Center
Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes: 10/04/2017**

Members Present: Heather Johnston – Burnsville; Matt Smith – Dakota County; Dave Osberg – Eagan; David McKnight – Farmington; Melanie Mesko-Lee – Hastings; Justin Miller – Lakeville; Mark McNeill – Mendota Heights; Logan Martin – Rosemount; Steve King – South St. Paul;

Members Absent: Tom Lawell – Apple Valley; Joe Lynch – Inver Grove Heights; Ryan Schroeder – West St. Paul

Alternates Present: BJ Battig – Dakota County

Others Present: Tom Folie, Jen Hildebrandt – DCC; Jerilyn Erickson – DCC Fiscal Agent; Fire Chief Mike Meyer, Police Chief Brian Lindquist – Joint Ops Co-chairs; Jay Stassen – Civil Legal Counsel

1. Call the Meeting to Order

Observing a quorum, Chair Miller called the meeting to order at 3:01.

2. Roll Call

Members in attendance noted above.

3. Approve Agenda

Discussion: None

Action: None

Consent Agenda

4.

- a. **Approve minutes from the September 6th, 2017 Executive Committee meeting.**
- b. **Approve paid claims.**
 - **August 1st – 31st, 2017**
- c. **Receive Financial Reports**
 - **August, 2017 Unaudited Financial Report**
- d. **Operations committee meeting minutes**
 - **September 28th, 2017 Fire/EMS Ops Sub-Committee**
- e. **Ancillary Benefits**
- f. **2018 Non-Union Wage Increase**

Discussion:

None

Action: Motion by Osberg (Eagan) to approve the consent agenda. Second by McKnight (Farmington). Motion passed unanimously.

Regular Agenda

5. Dispatch Supervisor's 2018 – 2019 Union Contract

Discussion:

Folie (DCC) informed members that after mediation with the Dispatch Supervisor's group, the only variance from the dispatch negotiations was the modification to the supervisor's compensation structure to decrease the steps from 5 years to 2 years. Folie commented that DCC representation noted that there was some significant compression between the bottom of

the supervisor compensation structure and the top of the dispatcher compensation structure which made this a reasonable request.

Johnston (Burnsville) asked if the wage compression issue came up prior to mediation or during. Folie (DCC) clarified that it came up as part of mediation.

Action: Motion by Johnston (Burnsville) to recommend the Board of Directors approve the proposed 2018-2019 Dispatch Supervisor Union Contract as presented. Second by McKnight (Farmington). Motion passed unanimously.

6. Over Comp Policy Report

Discussion:

Folie (DCC) reminded members that he had been directed to review the history of the over comp policy and report back to the group. Folie noted that the official policy was adopted by the Board of Directors in 2011 stating that the Executive Director was authorized to hire up to 54 positions only when there was a known pending departure. Folie added that there was a provision in the policy that called for review of the policy in 2013. Folie commented that he could not find anything that confirmed the review of the policy had been done. Folie added that the policy had clearly been interpreted differently over the years since it was put in place. Folie offered four options on how to proceed:

1. Do nothing.
2. Alter to allow for increased staffing w/o staffing.
3. Authorize increase of FTEs to 54.
4. Provide incentive to those leaving.

Folie commented that in considering the four options, it seemed as though authorizing the Executive Director to increase the dispatch staffing level to 54 FTEs was the best option. Folie acknowledged that this could be done with the restriction that there be no budget impact for doing so. Folie reminded members the prior to consolidation, the five PSAPS had a total of 57 FTEs in dispatch. Folie noted that county-wide, population has grown by 20,000 residents. Folie added that Dakota County is the third largest county in the state in terms of population and it seems as though the dispatch staff ratio is off. Folie clarified that in comparison to the two larger counties, the DCC has about half the number of employees and half the budget. Folie assured that a better evaluation would be administered in the near future for further consideration.

Miller (Lakeville) asked if the current budget allowed for 52 or 54 dispatchers. Erickson (DCC Fiscal Agent) explained that the personnel costs were calculated based on 54 dispatchers. However, there was then a reduction put in decreasing that by two positions so the net impact was 52. Erickson explained that in the budget, the Executive Director is authorized to hire up to 54, so that is what the personnel gross budget is based on, which was roughly \$136,000 more than what the 52 FTE cost netted out to be. Erickson noted that the issue was the policy statement that only allowed Folie to hire the additional two positions when there were anticipated departures. Erickson acknowledged that if the DCC were to hire up to 54 dispatchers, there would be the potential risk of \$136,000 of that staffing level held through the year.

Folie (DCC) noted that the DCC was experiencing the same issues all the other PSAPs were experiencing with staffing. Erickson (DCC Fiscal Agent) added that in January, the DCC dispatch staffing level was at 54 but since that time there had been 8 resignations. Folie stated that the current staffing level was at 48, which was quite low.

Johnston (Burnsville) commented that it seemed from a practical standpoint that there would be turnover savings if the policy were stricken and the Executive Director were authorized to

hire up to 54. Erickson (DCC Fiscal Agent) acknowledged that could be done and in the event the funds weren't there, the fund balance could be used. Erickson noted, however, that she wasn't necessarily recommending that be done. Just acknowledging that it was an option of needed.

Mesko-Lee (Hastings) asked what the "right number" was for dispatch staffing. Folie (DCC) cautioned that was a difficult number to identify. Folie noted that there was a clear need for more staff because there was much overtime and statistics were not being met. Folie assured that changes were being made on the floor to address the call pick-up statistics but the bottom line was that there was a pretty clear need for more dispatchers. Folie noted that 54 would serve the DCC much better and that if allowed, the two extra positions (once trained) would be placed on the schedule somewhere between 10am and 10pm as that was where there was the greatest need.

Battig (Dakota County) asked if the issue would be resolved if the dispatch staffing level was at 52 all the time. Folie (DCC) responded that the call pick-up statistics were troubling. Erickson (DCC Fiscal Agent) added that overtime was at about \$500,000. Erickson noted that theoretically, full staffing should decrease the OT.

Osberg (Eagan) asked what the market was for dispatchers and when there was a vacancy, were there qualified candidates coming in? Folie (DCC) reiterated that all the PSAPs were in the same boat and were competing for the top candidates. Folie noted that qualified candidates were coming in, but that they often weeded themselves out of the position because it wasn't a good fit based on the nature of the position.

Johnston (Burnsville) referred back to the original policy and suggested the very last sentence be removed. Johnston noted that she was comfortable with staffing up to 54 as long as it was managed within the budgeted resources. Johnston noted that she was not a fan of tapping the fund balance to fund personnel. Erickson (DCC Fiscal Agent) acknowledged and agreed that it wasn't a long-term suggestion. Erickson clarified that for 2018, if the desire was to make the change, the fund balance could handle the impact. Erickson noted, however, that it might not even impact the budget given the varying staffing levels. Erickson stated that going forward, she would have to recalculate what the contributions would be.

Miller (Lakeville) noted that even if the authorization was given to hire up to 54, that likely wouldn't happen for 2017 so the chances of dipping into the fund balance would be pretty low. Miller then asked if there was even the need for an over comp policy. Folie (DCC) noted that given the direction, it didn't seem to make a lot of sense.

Erickson (DCC Fiscal Agent) referred to the 2019 budget and noted that it was projecting an increase to dispatch FTEs up to 57. Erickson asked if the group would want to come back and address the policy again. Folie (DCC) commented that it was his understanding this increased staffing level was in anticipation of additional needs associated with Text-to-911 and it was not currently believed that would be necessary.

Mesko-Lee (Hastings) noted that she felt the number of FTEs needed to be an intentional conversation. King (South St. Paul) agreed stating that he would like it to be part of the budget conversation.

Osberg (Eagan) noted that the 2018 budget reflected a net budget allowing for 52 dispatchers. Folie (DCC) confirmed. Osberg noted that the policy to allow the Executive Director to hire up to 54 dispatchers, within the approved personnel budget, could remain in place and then the discussion could be held for future budgets. Folie acknowledged stating that prior to that time,

he could have a staffing study done for review as part of the 2019 budget. Osberg agreed that he wasn't sure what the purpose of the policy was as each year, the group discussed staffing and allocated money for it.

Miller (Lakeville) recapped that he was hearing a desire to modify the policy to remove "FTEs in excess of 52 will be authorized only upon identification of an anticipated vacancy". Miller noted this would allow the Executive Director to hire up to 54 positions as long as there was room in the approved personnel budget to do so.

Action: Motion by Johnston (Burnsville) to strike the last sentence from the over comp policy. Second by Battig (Dakota County). Motion passed unanimously.

7. CJDN Agreement

Discussion:

Folie explained that the CJDN Agreement was the BCA Criminal Justice Data Network and it needed to be renewed every five years. Folie referred to the previous agreement in the packet and stated that the BCA wanted the renewed agreement by November 1st. Folie noted that this was also where the BCA officially requested the Management Control Agreement that would be discussed later in the meeting. Folie assured that this was a straight-forward agreement that had been reviewed by DCC legal counsel.

Action: Motion by McKnight (Farmington) to recommend approval and signing of the CJDN Agreement as presented. Second by King (South St. Paul). Motion passed unanimously.

8. FBI-CJIS Management Control Agreement

Discussion:

Folie (DCC) restated that the BCA had officially requested the MCA.

Miller (Lakeville) reminded members that at the September meeting it was agreed that each member would meet with their policy makers to discuss the presented options and solicit feedback.

Miller (Lakeville) reported that Lakeville discussions involved having the County sign the MCA with the DCC and then have the other members sign agreements with the County. Miller referred to discussions about the County taking overall control of the DCC and Lakeville was comfortable with pushing these discussions forward.

Osberg (Eagan) reported that he met with the Eagan Board representative and Fire and Law Chiefs and they were supportive of the County signing the MCA. Osberg added that Eagan was supportive of the County taking overall control of the dispatch center. – BCA has officially requested DCC MCA.

Johnston (Burnsville) reported that she spoke with Fire and Law Chiefs and also Council representation and they were open to the county taking overall control of the dispatch center. Johnston noted, however, that there was recommendation to consider the County taking over control of the dispatch center opposed to the sheriff's department. Johnston cited some concerns from the fire group. Miller (Lakeville) agreed with the concerns from fire and noted that there should also still be an advisory committee.

King (South St. Paul) reported that South St. Paul agreed that the MCA should be signed by the sheriff and that there would be support of continuing discussions about the County taking over control of dispatch. King cautioned that there were some concerns expressed by the fire group that special needs may not be addressed. King cautioned that this did, however, open the

group up to getting caught in battles between elected including any future sheriff and board representation.

Mesko-Lee (Hastings) reported that Hastings Chiefs expressed general support for the concept of the County taking over dispatch control. Mesko-Lee acknowledged there were some fire concerns similar to what others expressed.

McKnight (Farmington) noted that there was general support for the County signing the MCA and for further considering the County taking over total control of the dispatch center.

Martin (Rosemount) noted that Rosemount also supported both the County signing the MCA and further discussions on the County taking over control of the dispatch center.

McNeill (Mendota Heights) agreed on behalf of Mendota Heights that conversations about the County taking control of the dispatch center should be continued.

Smith (Dakota County) commented that he was hearing consensus that the Sheriff should be the holder of the MCA with the DCC and that other member agencies would sign agreements with the Sheriff on that point. Smith acknowledged that the Sheriff would be willing to do that as long as there was buy-in from everyone and to make sure the immediate compliance need was addressed. Smith then referred to the Sheriff taking total control of the dispatch operation and noted that it would have a much more significant impact. Smith noted that he had very limited discussions on both topics to date and that he didn't think there would be an issue with the elected officials about the Sheriff signing the MCA for data compliance. Smith noted, however, that if the discussions about the County taking control of the dispatch center were to continue, it was likely it would have to be over a period of years to allow for people "warming to the idea". Smith noted that a prerequisite would be to figure out a way that the fiscal impact would be minimal and explainable. Smith acknowledged that he wasn't yet sure what that said about cost allocations but as stated at the September meeting, it would likely be allocated on them members' tax base.

Battig (Dakota County) commented that he had visited with the Sheriff earlier in the day and noted that the Sheriff was planning on being at the October Chief's meeting to continue the discussion with his peers.

Johnston (Burnsville) suggested sensitivity to relations and that there may be a different view from the Commissioners that may be more palatable. Smith (Dakota County) agreed noting that the County Board may have a different view based on allocations.

Miller (Lakeville) referred back to the MCA agreement and asked if there was a general document available. Folie (DCC) confirmed there was a template that the FBI used and that Legal Counsel could endorse that would solve the immediate compliance need. Miller (Lakeville) recapped what he was hearing stating that Legal Counsel should start the process of having the Sheriff sign the CJIS MCA to ensure BCA compliance, assuming that each member organization will sign off on that, giving authority to the sheriff.

Miller (Lakeville) then referred to the larger discussion of the County taking over control of the dispatch center and asked how the group wanted to proceed. Miller noted that the Board of Directors was scheduled to meet on October 12th and asked if it was appropriate timing to discuss this at that time. Johnston (Burnsville) suggested giving Matt Smith more time to talk to the commissioners before talking to the board about it. Smith (Dakota County) acknowledged that at first blush, the discussion with Commissioner Holberg wasn't very encouraging until some of the different ideas were shared. Smith noted that he hadn't had time to discuss it

further. Smith noted that because the MCA topic had to be brought forward, it might be a good time to just share an overview of the discussions about the County taking over control of dispatcher so elected officials would know it is being discussed.

Johnston (Burnsville) suggested a workgroup of the Executive Committee come together to work on this. Develop some principles of what a County control might look like, discuss it at the next Executive Committee meeting and then give it to Matt Smith along with time to discussion at the County Board level. Smith (Dakota County) acknowledged stating that on the financial piece, that was something that the County needed to discuss taking on as it was more immediate due to levy sensitivity. Smith noted that he liked the idea of compiling a summary of issues that could be addressed by county operations so the case is clear.

Johnston (Burnsville), Osberg (Eagan) and Miller (Lakeville) agreed to meet prior to the next Executive Committee meeting to come up with something for the November 1st meeting.

Smith (Dakota County) noted that there was a committee report at County Board meetings where he could talk about this briefly. Battig (Dakota County) agreed to recap history of the consolidation and why this was being discussed now. Those reasons included the HIPPA initiative, 9/11 funding, previous PSAP needs for major improvements, the conversion to 800 MHz, the County ability to use UASI grant dollars towards technology infrastructure, etc.

King (South St. Paul) noted that it was fair to say that the County taking over control of the dispatch operations probably would have been a topic for discussion had it not been due to the MCA discussion.

Folie (DCC) noted that he had a Board of Directors meeting on October 12th and asked what the group desire was on what to bring to them. Miller (Lakeville) noted that the Executive Committee was comfortable with moving forward with the MCA. Also, discussion about governance and strategic planning was ongoing.

9. Executive Director Annual Review

Discussion:

Miller (Lakeville) reminded members that Tom Folie had been with the DCC for just over a year and it was time to do his performance evaluations for year-end, 2017. Miller noted that he would use a similar format as was used in the past and that he would work with Jen Hildebrandt to get that out to each members. Miller reminded that each members could meet with their Board representative and Chiefs as they saw fit and should return one evaluation back to either Jen Hildebrandt or himself. Miller noted this should be done in time for the December Board meeting for final action. Mesko-Lee (Hastings) reminded that when Folie was hired, there were a couple of directives he was given. Mesko-Lee asked if those would be woven into the evaluation. Miller (Lakeville) acknowledged that he would pull that together for the group and asked that members be watching for the material.

Action: No Action.

Information Updates/Discussion Items

10. Executive Director Update

Discussion:

Staffing – Folie (DCC) noted that staffing was down to 48 but that there were four strong candidates currently in the background investigation phase. Folie noted that administration was very happy with the candidate pool from this last hiring phase.

Fire Paging Quote – Folie (DCC) reported that Motorola had lost their sales person and was working to identify a replacement. Folie stated that if the DCC signs the fire paging quote before the end of the year, Motorola agreed to deduct \$45,000 from the contract price. Folie clarified that the contract still wouldn't be paid until 2018 and noted that members should see that contract discussion coming up.

Dispatch Floor Layout – Folie (DCC) reminded members that the dispatch workstation replacement was scheduled for 2018 and that along with that, there was an evaluation of the current floor layout, taking feedback from the member agency sit-alongs into account, in an effort to help improve operations. Folie stated that he had talked with a few vendors and received different layout options but that he would ultimately like to get a consultant involved to manage this process. Folie noted that County Facilities has agreed that the building fund could be used towards any costs associated with layout modifications. Folie noted that discussions would continue as 2018 approached.

Other:

Discussion: McKnight (Farmington) noted that he wanted to just take a moment to discuss domestic preparedness with the group as the Super Bowl need discussions were gaining momentum. Lindquist (Farmington) provided a report on the enormity of this event and the toll it would take on Dakota County public safety.

Adjourn

Action: The meeting adjourned by Chair acclamation at 4:02.

Next Regular Meeting:

November 1st, 2017

3:00pm

Dakota Communications Center
Training Room