COUNTY 1826

WASHTENAW COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

WORKING SESSION

May 5, 2005

The meeting was called to order by Chair Solowczuk at 6:30 p.m. in the Board Room, Administration Building, 220 North Main Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Comms. Bergman, Brackenbury, Irwin, Ouimet, Peterson, Prater, Sizemore, Smith,

Solowczuk.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Comms. Gunn, Kern.

OTHERS PRESENT: Bob Guenzel, County Administrator; Frank Cambria, Deputy County Administrator;

Curtis Hedger, Corporation Counsel; Catherine McClary, Kirsten Osborn, Treasurer; Sheriff Dan Minzey, Under Sheriff Herb Mahoney, Harry Valentine, Jeff Fulton, Sheriff's Office. Dale Vanderford, Andy Brush, Doug Perlin, Ken Schrader, ITS; Diane Heidt, Mary O'Hare, Scott Patton, Human Resources; Pete Ballios, Finance; Kerry Sheldon, Administration; Gordon Burger, Bob Hubbard, Jennifer Watson, Budget; Greg Dill, Facilities; Mary Udoji, Library; James D. Higginbottom, Deputy

Clerk; various citizens; and members of the press.

Roll Call

Citizen Participation

Michael Moran, Supervisor of Ann Arbor Township, said that incremental costs are the only reasonable way to charge for incremental services. He said they are still facing other costs that would need to be paid despite the road patrol. He said that the townships should not be forced to pay for services other than the road patrol.

Commissioner Follow-Up to Citizen Participation

None.

Discussion Items

Continuation of Public Safety & Justice Discussion

Bob Guenzel presented a series of memorandums to the board regarding the Police Service Units.

- Public Safety & Justice Recommendation (4/6/05)
- Public Safety & Justice Funding Alternatives & Recommendation (4/21/05)
- Response to Public Safety & Justice Proposal Questions (4/21/05)
- Cost per Capita Contribution by Jurisdiction Revised
- Explanation of Washtenaw County 2006 Projected Costs per PSU
- Plante & Moran Memorandum on PSU Cost Analysis
- · Plante & Moran Slides
- Plante & Moran Inmate Costs

Bob Guenzel stated that deputy costs are not the same as a PSU. He stated that the county wanted to be as transparent as possible with the figures. He stated that the Ypsilanti Township Auditor and reviewed the formula for PSU's and agreed with it as did the Sheriff's Office over the past few years. He also noted that administration and the Board of Commissioners are in no way questioning the quality of the Sheriff's Deputies or the need of the community, but rather said they must determine who should pay for the services.

Adam Rujan of Plante & Moran presented information on their PSU Cost Analysis. He said that the numbers provided are valid, however the method used to determine the figures is different from other counties. He stated that the costs for services using the methods of Oakland or Macomb Counties would be to within 5-7% of Washtenaw County's method. He then addressed costs per inmate and the additional factors that lead to additional costs. He said that Washtenaw County's costs are comparable to most of southeast Michigan.

Comm. Brackenbury asked if overtime costs were considered in the millage subsidy. Bob said it would increase by 1/8 should it be included.

Comm. Irwin stated that Ingham County may not be a good comparison since the location of the state capital may affect the statistics. He asked what was meant by the term published rate. Mr. Rujan stated that it referred to the rate the county makes public as well as the rate charged to house inmates from other counties. He added that aside from Ingham County, all costs given were actual costs.

Comm. Ouimet thanked Bob Guenzel for attending the town hall style meeting in Chelsea. He also thanked the staff for putting all of the time into the meeting. He asked if there is a figure of the total cost spent on the jail at this point. Gordon Burger responded that the information would be provided. Comm. Ouimet said that he hoped all parties could agree on numbers, so decisions could then be made.

Comm. Brackenbury asked if there is any value to comparing costs between Sheriff's Deputies and local police costs. Bob Guenzel said that there are a few comparisons that could be made. Gordon Burger said that a comparison was made to the Ann Arbor Police Department about four years ago and costs were quite comparable. Comm. Brackenbury then asked about the Michigan State Police and how they determine which call they respond to. Bob Guenzel said that Central Dispatch coordinates all of the calls.

Comm. Smith asked about the incremental charges and if all services were mandated. Mr. Rujan responded that it would be determined by the services requested. Comm. Smith then asked what becomes of the crimes that a township is not willing to pay for. Mr. Rujan stated that they are still investigated. Comm. Smith said that it would be necessary to cut and additional 80% to cutting PSU's and merely cutting PSU's would not be enough to meet the required costs.

Comm. Sizemore asked if a program could be established which allowed townships to choose the services they desired. Bob Guenzel said that it could be done, but it would probably be more expensive and the county would absorb toe costs. Bob said that the larger townships would have to pay significantly get higher costs. Comm. Sizemore asked if the option could be offered only to the smaller townships.

Comm. Peterson asked for the input of the Sheriff. He hoped they would be more interdepartmental involvement, but hoped that it would not be necessary to create new police departments. The Sheriff stated that he did not believe he had been included in the discussion and felt excluded. He stated that he believed that the methods implemented by other counties were better and counties like Oakland and Macomb were on the right track.

Comm. Bergman stated that the Sheriff has had plenty of opportunities to speak and said they should look in to other local police agencies that may offer services.

Comm. Smith asked if there were any checks and balances in the Sheriff's Office to ensure that the Sheriff stays within budget.

Comm. Irwin asked how costs are determined for Sheriff's Deputies at special events, such as sporting events. Gordon Burger responded that costs are recouped on an across the board rate per deputy.

Comm. Brackenbury asked again about the jail costs in the other counties being discussed. Bob Guenzel, Adam Rujan, and Sheriff Dan Minzey said that they were unaware of how much it costs.

Comm. Sizemore asked why the PSU system is not used for special events. Gordon Burger stated that it is the standard which has been used and special event services is based on voluntary overtime. The Sheriff said that they would be charged at an overtime and incremental rate. All costs are recouped. Under Sheriff Herb Mahoney stated that previously all costs were calculated, however it became so time consuming that rates were set for supervisors and deputies and the event coordinators were charged accordingly. He said that special events and court security are charged at an incremental cost while police services are set at a full cost recovery. Bob Guenzel stated that the effort to calculate it would not make financial sense.

Comm. Solowczuk asked if contracting for special events is included in the budget. Sheriff Minzey said it is included.

Comm. Prater asked if the special events are charged an hourly rate. Under Sheriff Mahoney stated that they are charges about \$50-55 per hour per deputy/supervisor. He said that total does not include any additional costs. Comm. Prater asked if the Sheriff liked the Oakland County model and asked if there could be any comparison. He also stated that he is willing to look at all options. His goal is to pay for the jail improvements, operations and continue to service the townships. It was a question of how it would be paid for.

Bob Guenzel stated that the proposal came from the Criminal Justice Collaborative Council as well as meetings with the Sheriff. He stated that the funding mechanism were his own proposal, however despite requests, the Sheriff's Office offered no proposals. He added that the proposals he offered were intended to generate discussion.

Comm. Ouimet said that as we precede not everyone will agree, though despite what happens, he hopes everyone will know all of the facts. He also asked what could be done to lower the costs in the Sheriff's Office to keep it within budget.

Comm. Prater noted two expenses, fleet costs and dispatch costs, and said that compared to other neighboring communities, they are more expensive and need to be balanced. Gordon Burger said the cost of the entire fleet is included in the PSU's.

Comm. Irwin noted that the fleet and dispatch costs included different technologies, such as computer systems, that other communities have, but do not include in the fleet and dispatch expenses. Under Sheriff Herb Mahoney added that the other counties also calculate those expenses based on an incremental system.

Comm. Brackenbury thanked the staff as well as all of the Sheriff's Deputies for offering great questions and concerns.

Comm. Irwin commented on the fleet and dispatch costs and said that we should perhaps evaluate the Oakland County method.

Comm. Peterson asked for a more detailed timetable of the decision making process following the meeting. Comm. Solowczuk stated that the next Board Working Session would have the Sheriff; however the details of the agenda would soon be prepared. Comm. Peterson asked what the layout would be. Bob Guenzel stated that additional dates had been set for public forums and added that the month of May would be focused on input from the townships, judiciary and sheriff's office. Comm. Peterson asked what would be decided on in June. Bob Guenzel responded that they would first decide what should be built and then how it would be funded. Comm. Peterson said that he hoped to address the needs of the jail prior to discussing the costs.

Comm. Bergman stated that the Criminal Justice Collaborative Council discussed the jail needs and all had agreed on what was needed. She also added that she did not like the fact that deputies who volunteered for special events should get overtime pay.

Commissioner Items

None.

County Administrator Report

None.

Items for Current/Future Discussion

Pending

Facilities Management Policies - May 19th

Status of Annual Activities/Goals

No report.

Citizen Participation

Cheryl Farmer, Mayor of the City of Ypsilanti, thanked the county for all of their work. She said that other jurisdictions had considered partnering with the City to use Ypsilanti City's police services, but discovered that the cost would be significantly higher than the Washtenaw County Sheriff's Office. She added that the county should focus on mandated services and let other jurisdictions pay for additional services.

Carlos Acevedo, a former commissioner, recommended three actions for the Board of Commissioners and administration to take. First he wanted to see a breakdown of the staff. Second, he wanted to see the standards of the staff. Finally, he added that the Sheriff should not be responsible for the funds. He believed that it should be given to the townships, so accountability would be narrowed.

Michael Moran, Ann Arbor Township Supervisor, said he did not realize all of the costs involved in the police services. He said that more information is needed before a decision can be made. He said that it is not a question of who pays, but rather what they must pay for.

Pat Kelly, Dexter Township Supervisor, said that the number of hours other deputies work in other counties is important to figure out if their fees compare to Washtenaw County. She also asked for the mandated costs before a method could be considered.

Commissioners Follow-up to Citizen Participation

Comm. Prater said that he appreciated the comments from former Comm. Acevedo, but reminded him that they all were involved in the initial decision.

Comm. Peterson asked about the units of government that may be used to subsidize. He also asked for information regarding crime in Washtenaw County, should there be no involvement of the Sheriff's Office.

Comm. Irwin said that the county is under policed and the community does not wish to pay for more. He also acknowledged the burden that existed for everyone.

Adjournment

Comm. Bergman seconded by Comm. Prater moved that the meeting be adjourned until May 19, 2005, at 6:30 p.m. in the Board Room, Washtenaw County Administration Building. Motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 9:24 p.m.	
	Stephen Solowczuk, Chair
Lawrence Kestenbaum, Clerk/Register By: James D. Higginbottom, Deputy Clerk	

APPROVED: 5/18/05