

**Dakota Communications Center
Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes: 02/06/2019**

Members Present: Tom Lawell – Apple Valley; Matt Smith – Dakota County; David McKnight – Farmington; Mark McNeill – Mendota Heights; Logan Martin – Rosemount; Joel Hanson – South St. Paul; Ryan Schroeder – West St. Paul

Members Absent: Melanie Mesko-Lee – Burnsville; Dave Osberg – Eagan; Joe Lynch – Inver Grove Heights; Justin Miller – Lakeville

Alternates Present: BJ Battig – Dakota County; Julie Flaten - Hastings

Others Present: Tom Folie, Cheryl Pritzlaff, Jen Hildebrandt – DCC; Lakeville Fire Chief Mike Meyer – Fire/EMS Operation Committee; Rosemount Police Chief Mitch Scott; Dakota County HR Director, Andy Benish.

1. Call the Meeting to Order

Recognizing a quorum, Chair McNeill called the meeting to order at 3:00pm.

2. Roll Call

Members in attendance are noted above.
Chair McNeill called for introductions.

3. Approve Agenda

Discussion:

No Discussion

Action: Motion by McKnight (Farmington) to approve the agenda. Second by Lawell (Apple Valley). Motion passed unanimously.

Consent Agenda

4.

- a. **Approve minutes from the December 5th, 2018 Executive Committee meeting.**
- b. **Approve paid claims.**
 - **November 1st – 30th, 2018**
 - **December 1st – 31st, 2018**
- c. **Receive Financial Reports**
 - **Unaudited November 2018 Report**
- d. **Dakota County Facilities Management Space Lease Amendment**
- e. **Official Newspaper Designation**

Discussion:

No Discussion

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

REGULAR AGENDA

Action Items

5. Memorandum of Understanding Between Dakota Communications Center and Dakota County for HR services.

Discussion:

Folie (DCC) re-introduced Dakota County HR Director, Andy Benish. Folie (DCC) reminded members that at the October 2018 meeting, there had been some confusion on an agenda item titled Non-Union Personnel Compensation Study that quickly evolved into discussion on a MOU between the DCC and Dakota County. Direction at that time was to return to this meeting with a recommended MOU for consideration. Folie commented that the belief is that there were some HR services that the County could provide that may help streamline DCC processes. Folie explained that the proposed MOU revolved around three main areas, Compensation Analysis, NeoGov and being a single resource for ad hoc HR questions. Folie referred to the MOU in the packet and turned the discussion over to Andy Benish.

Benish (Dakota County HR) noted that the MOU provided in the packet had a couple blank spaces that had since been updated. Benish distributed a revised copy for members to look at and commented that the two updates were on the fees and some additional rewording.

Benish noted that in a less formal capacity, County staff had been working with DCC staff on these efforts already. Benish added this was just formalizing what was already happening.

Benish explained the basis for the \$94 hourly fee and noted that it would only be charged if a request or need resulted in studies/efforts that required excessive Dakota County staff time. Benish suggested Compensation and Classification efforts may be one of those efforts.

Compensation & Classification - Benish acknowledged that County staff had previously assisted in development of a compensation structure, and recently, a compensation study which would be addressed in an upcoming agenda item.

NeoGov – Benish commented that NeoGov was an onboarding and retention program that was widely used, possibly by many of the member agencies. Benish noted that the County could assist DCC by granting DCC HR access to the NeoGov system as an administrator. Benish stated that the County was already doing this for other partners. Benish stated that like experiences with these other partners, he did not anticipate there being any cost for this unless DCC needs resulted in added costs to the County. If that occurred, Benish noted that those costs would be passed on to the DCC.

HR Consulting – Benish noted that it was common practice to respond to inquiries and provide HR feedback to other Counties/Cities as a professional courtesy. Benish noted this would continue to be one without the need for an MOU. Benish reiterated that fees would only be charged in the event a request for assistance resulted in studies/efforts that required excessive Dakota County staff time.

Folie (DCC) assured members that signing the MOU did not obligate the DCC to use the County for these services. It was merely an understanding of what services the County was agreeing to provide the DCC if the need were to present itself. Folie added that the one Compensation and Classification effort that could result in incurred costs was only required to be done every 3 – 5 years.

Schroeder (West St. Paul) asked if there was an anticipated need for a budget adjustment. Folie (DCC) clarified that there was not.

Action: Motion by Lawell (Apple Valley) to recommend approval of the MOU as presented at the meeting. Second by Martin (Rosemount). Motion passed unanimously.

Action Items

6. Non-Union Personnel Compensation Study

Discussion:

Folie (DCC) reminded members that at the October 2018 meeting, there was a proposal for an adjustment to the compensation structures for the four non-union positions. At that time, the proposal was not recommended, and direction was provided to show the background work. Folie noted that considering that discussion, and with the pending MOU discussion, the County agreed to administer the study. Folie stated that the results of the study were received on February 1st and forwarded to the group on February 4th. Folie clarified that the study only included the Technical Support, HR Coordinator/Executive Assistant and Operations Director positions. Folie stated that the result of the County study was a proposal to not change the current wage ranges. Folie noted this was good news from a 2019 budget standpoint.

Schroeder (West St. Paul) referred to a comment on the memo that stated, "the data that was available, and used in the past, reflected that the wage ranges for the identified positions were within an acceptable range". Schroeder questioned if there was any commentary beyond that. Schroeder clarified stating that in looking at the Dispatch ranges, those positions seemed to be at the top end of their comparables. Benish (Dakota County) responded that the ranges were appropriately positioned in the market, not too high and not too low. Benish clarified, however, that only the ranges were reviewed and there was no commentary about the actual salaries or recommended increases beyond what was outlined in DCC policy and contracts.

Schroeder then asked if Benish was comfortable that the comparables identified were appropriate, or if they were just what was available. Benish noted that while there was some difficulty in identifying comparables for a couple of the positions, County staff was confident the comparables used were appropriate. Schroeder commented that in looking at it, he was inclined to ponder on the larger question of, "what is our compensation philosophy?"

Folie (DCC) noted that in the formative stages of the DCC, all benefits and personnel policies were implemented based on the desire to be among the best. Folie commented that DCC compensation had potentially "lost ground" in its starting range compared to metro PSAPS.

Martin (Rosemount) asked about the Executive Director compensation and stated he thought that was to be part of the study also. Benish (Dakota County HR) assured that the Executive Director position had been analyzed earlier than the other non-union positions due to the Director's ongoing evaluation discussion. At that time, results were shared, and a recommendation was made. Folie (DCC) reminded members that the recommendation was to provide a 2% lump sum as of the anniversary date wage. Folie added that he also received a 3% general increase as of January 1st. Folie clarified this was part of the recommendation, and due to the me-too directive that all non-union employees receive at least the same general increase percentage as the union personnel. Folie noted, however, that in visiting with the previous and current chairs, it was agreed this practice should be addressed as giving percentages on top of percentages was not sustainable.

McNeill recapped that the 2019 structure was set but long-term, it needed to be re-evaluated. McNeill suggested a study start mid-year so it can be ready for the Executive Directors evaluation in October. Folie (DCC) and Benish (Dakota County HR) acknowledged.

Action: Motion by Martin (Rosemount) to approve the Non-Union Personnel Compensation Study. Second by McKnight (Farmington). Motion passed unanimously.

7. Emergency Fire Dispatch

Discussion:

Folie (DCC) noted that this added service had been allowed for in the 2019 budget and now that updated costs had been received, he was requesting authorization to proceed. Folie noted

that the final quote was better than previous estimates. Folie reported that the capital costs would be just under \$154,000, the operating costs would be just under \$30,000, and the annual maintenance costs would be \$22,000. Folie repeated that the item was adequately funded in the 2019 budget and there were no staff concerns associated with proceeding. Folie also reiterated that the provider of the proposed EFD service was also the current provider of DCC EMD, which would be good consistency for staff.

Scott (LE Ops Chair) noted that the EMD information for medicals "muddied" what officers saw on their mobiles and tended to cause some frustrations on the law enforcement side. Scott asked if this would now also be happening with EFD on fires. Meyer (Fire/EMS Ops Chair) commented that he didn't think it would be as in-depth as EMD. Pritzlaff (DCC) commented that there would likely be more information. Folie (DCC) agreed but commented that the amount of information displayed was something that could be controlled and ultimately minimized. Folie noted that the EMS group wanted all that information in there for EMD calls as medics used this prior to arrival. Folie speculated that it would not be as much information as seen for medical calls.

McKnight (Farmington) referred to EMD and asked if that also had annual fees. Folie (DCC) confirmed stating that it was approximately \$15,000 currently, and was anticipated to go up significantly as the plan we are on is no longer available.

Lawell (Apple Valley) asked how EFD implementation might impact response times. Meyer (Fire/EMS Ops Chair) responded stating that there would be a period that things would slow down a bit because of the learning curve. Meyer assured that it was anticipated to be short-lived. Meyer reminded that member jurisdictions are fully aware that this will happen and feel that, through use of EFD, accuracy of information and better resource identification capabilities would far outweigh the concerns about temporary slower times. Pritzlaff (DCC) assured that there was a series of questions that had to be asked with or without the use of EFD including location, nature of call, your name, etc. Pritzlaff also assured that the higher priority calls pushed faster than lower priority calls.

Action: Motion by McKnight (Farmington) to recommend approval. Second by Martin (Rosemount). Motion passed unanimously.

Information Updates/Discussion Items

8. Governance Discussion

Discussion:

McNeill (Mendota Heights) reminded members that it had been one year since the overall governance discussion was presented to the Board of Directors. McNeill questioned if 12 months and 2 – 3 new primary Board representatives later, the group desire was to continue to pursue Dakota County taking over the dispatch center. McNeill clarified stating that assuming the County Board funding philosophy hadn't changed, maybe there was another way to address the concerns of the group.

Lawell (Apple Valley) commented that he believed the last directive was to develop a possible governance transition plan. McNeill (Mendota Heights) asked if there were any ideas on how to facilitate this effort.

Smith (Dakota County) speculated that if proposed as is, asking the County to take more responsibility for the DCC and associated costs, the response would be no. Smith noted that if the desire could be represented that there was a desire to have the county assist more in management, and consider a revised cost-share method that didn't necessarily mean the county taking over full costs of the operation, maybe that would open a door for further discussion. Smith noted that maybe there could be a discussion that laid out varying options versus going immediately to a governance transition plan.

Smith commented that the DCC was the one place where all represented agencies came together to discuss management of public safety data. Smith noted that there were a variety of other groups discussing public safety topics that were not part of this consideration, but that would have to potentially be considered by the County Board down the road. Smith noted that the DCLEA was discussing CJIIN becoming its own independent JPA. Smith questioned what that looked like and how it would be sustained and work with all members considering some were supported by CJIIN and others by LOGIS. Smith added that there was also another discussion revolving around management of incoming video data, and how that would be stored, disseminated to members & the County Attorney, and redacted. Smith recapped that there was a whole mess of issues that the County was trying to take into consideration and deal with and the DCC didn't feel "broken". Smith noted that governance may need to be streamlined, and funding be reconsidered, but a proposal may be more palatable if it included options.

Lawell (Apple Valley) acknowledged that as a non-CJIIN city, this was the first he had heard about CJIIN considering becoming a stand-alone organization. Lawell asked if there was a timeline for that. Smith noted that DCLEA chiefs had been talking about it for a couple of years and CJIIN staff had been advocating for it. Smith expressed concerns about what it looked like and if it would be sustainable so there was no set time yet.

McKnight (Farmington) noted that he hated putting Manager Smith in the middle of this. McKnight commented that he could have misunderstood but it was never his understanding that the agencies expected the county to take over full responsibility for DCC costs. McKnight expressed that if this overall transition wasn't looking like it was going to happen, there was a pressing need to get back to the streamlining of the DCC governance structure and funding discussions that started four years prior. McKnight expressed concern, however, that the group may be spinning its wheels today with no representation from Burnsville, Eagan or Lakeville, the three largest cities in the County.

McNeill (Mendota Heights) asked if the group could convene a sub-committee to start a funding discussion without knowing what the governance was going to look like. Martin (Rosemount) agreed that an updated proposal would need to be put to paper addressing all options. Martin acknowledged that the group has an idea of where it feels the direction needs to go. That could be put to paper, and then other off-shoots that may be impacted and what that might look like. Prepare a presentation and make a pitch. Smith (Dakota County) noted that the Board was aware of the current DCC Executive Committee desire, and the ongoing CJIIN discussions. Smith noted that he could inform the County Board that something was being developed and would be forthcoming from this group. However, if the only recommendation was to proceed with overall county takeover of the DCC operation and funding, he would need more time before reporting back.

McNeill (Mendota Heights) acknowledged that all members had met with their Board representatives and discussed how this might proceed. McNeill suggested that rather than bringing a proposal before the Board in February, look at getting the sub-committee together to prepare a proposal. Smith (Dakota County) suggested that staff was prepared to do an OPA presentation at the February meeting, and Director Holberg could give an overview of the current County stance. Folie (DCC) commented that the Board of Directors would be expecting an update in February with the approach of the one year mark. Folie acknowledged that it may not need to be a full OPA report, but at least an update was necessary. McNeill (Mendota Heights) suggested that the update may be that the Committee is convening sub-committees to formulate a proposal that will be brought to them in May for endorsement and presented to the Board of Commissioners after that. McNeill (Mendota Heights) added that the group could sit down and flush out some components of reducing the current five committee DCC structure.

Smith (Dakota County) agreed that it would be useful to look at status quo and consider simplifying the current structure. Smith acknowledged that could change financing but reminded there was a model for that structure two years prior that was proposed and endorsed. Lawell (Apple Valley) suggested this be the update to the Board. Folie (DCC) acknowledged.

Smith (Dakota County) noted that he would be happy to participate on the sub-committee with whoever else was interested between this meeting and March. Hanson (South St. Paul) asked if only members of this group could do that considering the broader issues related to CJIIN, etc. Hanson suggested adding participation from the Chiefs group. Chiefs Meyer and Scott agreed to identify two representatives from each of their disciplines to participate. Chief Scott represented that if the County didn't want to take over, at a minimum, the agency billing formula would need to be revisited.

Matt Smith, Deputy County Manager Jean Erickson, Sheriff Leslie, Logan Martin, David McKnight, Joel Hanson, Tom Folie, and possibly Melanie Mesko-Lee, Dave Osberg and Justin Miller, along with two Fire/EMS Chiefs and two Law Chiefs will participate on this sub-committee. Dakota Communications will administer a poll to get the best attendance possible.

Battig (Dakota County) commented that the process just outlined was what was used in development of the DCC. Battig recapped developing principals that all members could stand behind and then working back through the policy workgroup to develop what it would look like in the end. Lawell (Apple Valley) offered use of the Regent Room since the DCC facility would be unavailable through February and March.

Action:

No action. Discussion only.

9. Executive Director Report

Discussion:

Folie (DCC) provided a DCC update to members.

Representation – Folie circulated a list of Executive Committee primaries & alternates and requested it be reviewed and updated as needed to ensure accuracy.

Staffing – Folie noted that staffing continued to be an issue, like other PSAPs across the country. Folie noted that a webinar recently attended by himself, Pritzlaff and Hildebrandt provided guidance that proved the DCC was on the right path as most of the suggestions were already being administered at the DCC. Folie noted that administration was scheduled to interview 34 candidates the following week.

RapidSOS – Folie informed the group that staff was very excited about an advancement in cell phone location services offered through RapidSOS. Folie presented how RapidSOS could benefit staff calls. The RapidSOS service does not work on all incoming wireless calls but has proven beneficial so far.

Workstation Remodel Project – Folie reminded that the project was scheduled to start February 19th and run for one month. Acknowledging that the project would be invasive, Folie reminded that meetings through the month of March will be held at alternate locations. Folie noted that the March Executive Committee meeting would also be held in the Apple Valley Regent Room.

Goals – Folie reviewed a series of organizational goals he had set for the 2019 calendar year and noted that if anyone had additional thoughts on goals, they could be shared now or sent to him via email. Smith (Dakota County) suggested consideration of a retention plan and potential county assistance. Folie acknowledged that the beginnings of that was in place with NeoGov.

Folie added that Jen Hildebrandt had also implemented a detailed exit interview via Survey Monkey that would help better-identify reasons employees chose to leave.

Depository Agent – Folie informed members that Fiscal Agent, City of Lakeville and informed him that they were changing depository agent to USBank. Folie noted that the information came too late for the agenda, but he wanted the group to know it would be on the February Board of Directors consent agenda. Going forward, this will be an annual consent agenda item.

Action: No action. Update only.

OTHER BUSINESS

None

Adjourn

Action: Motion by Smith (Dakota County) to adjourn. Second by Martin (Rosemount). Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 4:12pm.

Next Regular Meeting:

March 6th, 2019
3:00pm
Apple Valley City Hall
Regent Room