

POLICE SERVICES STEERING COMMITTEE
Wednesday September 6, 2006
 4:30pm – 6:00pm
 110 North Fourth Avenue

Members Present:

| | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Jeff Irwin | County Commissioner |
| Pat Kelly | Dexter Township |
| William McFarlane | Superior Township |
| Herb Mahony, Designee | County Under Sheriff |
| Michael Moran | Ann Arbor Township |
| Mark Ouimet | County Commissioner |
| Wes Prater | County Commissioner, Chair of Board |
| Steve Solowczuk | County Commissioner |
| Brenda Stumbo | Ypsilanti Township |
| Patricia Vaillencourt | Village of Manchester |

Members Absent: Paul Bunton, Ruth Ann Jammick, Daniel Minzey, Kenneth Unterbrink

Staff Present: Mary O’Hare (Facilitator), Robert Guenzel, Tony VanDerworp, Linda Wicks (Recording Secretary)

Presenter: Conan Smith, Michigan Suburbs Alliance and WC County Commissioner

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Facilitator O’Hare, 4:35pm, at the Washtenaw County Annex Building, 110 N. Fourth Ave, first floor large conference room.

2. Approval of Minutes

Prater moved for approval of the August 2, 2006, Police Services Steering Committee meeting minutes; Solowczuk seconded; all in favor.

3. Citizen Participation

None.

4. POAM/COAM Leadership

O’Hare indicated that POAM/COAM leadership have been sent the *PSSC* meeting calendar and have been invited to attend (non-member participation). No POAM/COAM leadership were in attendance.

5. Committee Member Check-In

- Moran shared that the most recent **Michigan Township Association** (MTA) journal, *Michigan Township News*, contains an article about Police Services in Townships. It was noted that the MTA distributes this magazine to its township members. O’Hare indicated that she would forward a copy of the article out to *PSSC* members.
- McFarlane indicated that Superior Township has a committee currently investigating all options for police services for the future; inquiring of neighboring communities if they are interested in looking at a regional police services model. Four of the seven communities that have been contacted to-date have indicated an interest in investigating this option. McFarlane noted that this committee will assist in

providing the information necessary to make an informed decision; whether Superior Township stays with the Washtenaw County Sheriff services or forms a regional service. O'Hare inquired if Superior is doing any research regarding regional policing, with McFarlane responding that currently they are exploring the interest in neighboring communities and gathering citizen input. If appropriate, Superior Township could then do further research, perhaps hiring a firm/consultant to do a feasibility study. McFarlane noted, however, that they have collected some information to-date, and would be willing to make this information available to *PSSC* members.

- Stumbo reported that Ypsilanti Township has a Police Services committee similar to that of Superior Township, currently doing data-gathering and exploring information and financial projections.
- McFarlane inquired if Sheriff Minzey would be attending *PSSC* meetings. O'Hare noted that, while Minzey is the Board appointed representative, Mahony has been assigned as "designee".
- Guenzel noted that the County was in court the week prior, defending two motions; one brought by the three townships not signing contracts (amended with three new causes of action), and the other by the Sheriff. He noted that Judge Costello asked the parties to agree to a stipulated order, so that an evidentiary hearing could take place regarding the Sheriff's motion. This evidentiary hearing is scheduled for October 10th and 11th in Washtenaw County. Guenzel noted that these are two separate cases, being heard by the same judge. Guenzel reported that on October 15th there are motions to dismiss the two remaining township counts from the original ten; leaving the new motions and the County's counter-claim.
- Moran inquired about the status of Union negotiations and any update regarding one-year bids and two-car issues. Guenzel responded that there was no update at this time, that negotiations are still in the very preliminary state. Mahony indicated that the first negotiation session had taken place, with a subcommittee meeting scheduled for September 25th to work on proposed language for some issues.
- Stumbo noted that Ypsilanti Township in the past has offered a stipend payment for officers to live in their jurisdiction as an incentive.

6. Regional Services Discussion

O'Hare noted that *PSSC* "future topics" included exploring regional police services, looking at ideas locally and across the board; and exploring what structures should be encouraged and supported – what works well for local jurisdictions and what can optimize resources and quality of service. She indicated that one of these options would include the idea of more regional contracts, or having a regional hub of sorts for contracting with the Sheriff's Department or another entity. She framed today's Regional Police Services discussion to include:

- Overview of existing regional efforts
- How do we start the discussion of regional police services?
- What kinds of concerns or barriers might occur?
- What would *PSSC* members be interested in exploring further?

O'Hare indicated that Conan Smith would be present to offer a "*Creating Collaborative Communities: Police Service Collaboration*" presentation on behalf of the Michigan Suburbs Alliance; and that Tony VanDerworp (Washtenaw County Director of Planning and Environment) would provide information about some of the work that he has been doing with the Washtenaw Metro Alliance which would feed into this discussion.

Washtenaw Metro Alliance Fire Services Collaboration Discussion Update

Vanderworp provided a brief talk about what the Washtenaw Metro Alliance is doing regarding sub-regional work for fire services, with the Washtenaw County Planning staff assisting in this effort. He noted that they have had several meetings with the Fire Chiefs, and will soon be making some recommendations for the future. He noted that they had looked toward the year 2030; population and daytime employment, trends and calls for service; and what the systems look like currently (on call staff, volunteer staff, full-time staff), equipment and its condition. He noted that they are currently in serious discussions regarding furthering mutual aid agreements, either to become automatic mutual aid, centralized dispatch or further functional consolidation, with first consideration given to assurance that they are able to provide service at the level that is wanted. VanDerworp indicated that this group found that there was not a lot of economy of scale in terms of fire services; that regardless of the community size it comes to about .65 FTE fire-fighters per thousand. He noted that additional cooperative services would result in about the same number of staffing FTEs, but would allow for faster response and handling of more calls for service, and a more efficient dispatch – that you may get better service, but that it may not cost any less money. VanDerworp indicated he would make this Washtenaw Metro Alliance report available to *PSSC* members, anticipating that this report would be available late 2006.

O'Hare suggested *PSSC* members explore what could be the non-cost benefits of regional police services, such as Central Dispatch.

- Moran expressed some concerns about a private entity running the central dispatch and also providing the service (HVA currently is central dispatch for some, offering a cost per run fee).
- McFarlane and Guenzel noted that the County had gone through a Central Dispatch planning process prior with the City of Ann Arbor, ultimately with Ann Arbor opting out.
- Guenzel noted that the County had recently asked the City of Ann Arbor for a proposal to share police dispatch, indicating that he would provide this information to the Washtenaw Metro Alliance, the 800MHz Committee and the *PSSC*.
- Mahony noted that there are nine public safety answering points currently within Washtenaw County (Chelsea, Washtenaw County, Ann Arbor, Pittsfield, Saline, Ypsilanti, Milan, EMU, U/M). He noted that if combined you may have the same staffing needs; but could save on facilities and equipment.
- VanDerworp indicated that the 800 MHz system could provide communication as a main benefit; cost containment may be a secondary concern. He indicated that the 800 MHz project would be on the agenda for the next Washtenaw Metro Alliance meeting.
- Kelley shared her concern that it is not about the cost; that it is about the service; stressing that every time a call is transferred you lose time, and time is life.

Creating Collaborative Communities: Police Service Collaboration

Smith shared that he would be presenting on behalf of the Michigan Suburbs Alliance, filling in for Rachel Gartell, prior project director for the “Creating Collaborative Communities” effort. He noted that the Suburbs Alliance is a coalition of 26 cities in Southeast Michigan. He indicated that about one year prior the Michigan Suburbs Alliance began work with a number of local universities to start looking at how local units of government collaborate, contracting with the “Citizens Research Council” (CRC). The CRC then conducted a State-wide survey of 83 Counties and hundreds of townships and cities, asking “what services are you providing and how are you providing these services?” An output from this survey was a database that catalogs all this service information, now available on the CRC website: www.crcmich.org.

Smith noted that a two-day conference was offered in 2005 by Wayne State University and the Michigan Suburbs Alliance, the first of its kind in the Country, bringing together state-of-the-art research on intergovernmental collaboration and pairing the researchers up with hard-case practitioners, bringing together the leaders and the folks who have to make collaboration work on a day-to-day basis. This resulted

in a set of best practices which were captured and disseminated via a set of manuals focusing on police and fire service collaboration. The “*Creating Collaborative Communities: Police Service Collaboration How-To Manual*” was distributed to *PSSC* members.

Smith noted that this two-day conference included a series of workshops exploring case studies from communities that put together collaborative efforts, political, administrative and communication barriers and legal and financial challenges; along with what tools are available.

Smith walked *PSSC* members through the “*Police Service Collaboration How-To Manual*,” highlighting the main points for consideration.

– ***Continuum of Collaboration (page 10)***

Start with things that are simple and don’t pose political barriers (e.g., mutual aid agreement) – build trust and once relationship is established move toward more complex collaboration (e.g. full consolidation)

– ***Plan for Implementation (page 13)***

There are a number of issues that any community must address and understand before the collaboration process can begin: Inventory of assets/facilities; Develop a phased transition plan; Craft agency policies, procedures and protocols; Design an oversight board

– ***Types of Allocation Models (Page 21)***

Six model options: Annual Subscription Fee, Run Charge, Subscription Fee + Run Charge, Percentage Share Based on Usage, State Equalized Value Share, Weighted Formula

- Prater inquired how Road Patrol could be cost allocated, with possible options including time needed to patrol a jurisdiction and/or road miles covered; with these allocation methods working better with similarly constructed jurisdictions. It was noted that the most complex scenario is when you are faced with multiple jurisdictions that are very different, creating wealth/equity and service delivery issues.
- Irwin noted that the Subscription Fee + Run Charge model is most similar to Washtenaw County’s situation; suggesting it might be good to compare examples of this method.
- Mahony noted that the weighted formula, while hardest to develop, can eliminate inequities.
- Guenzel noted that none of the allocation models really deal with the issue of affordability. (SEV models may take into account somewhat)
- Smith indicated that he would provide references for different communities currently using the different types of allocation models; also encouraging *PSSC* members to explore the SEMCOG Website Community Services database: www.semco.org.

– ***Barriers to Collaboration (page 31)***

Guenzel noted the challenge created dealing with two constitutional authorities; e.g., Sheriff authority in deploying staff/assignments and County Administration fiscal responsibility; noting that this requires a close working and trusting relationship to work well.

– ***Elements for Success (page 33)***

This section explores what is needed to build up a really functional collaboration amongst any number of units of government. Administration and pre-planning are key to making the collaboration functional. Smith

stressed the need to make sure the agreement is written; rather than simply “known” as some jurisdictions do currently. O’Hare inquired regarding what the driving forces have been in starting collaborations that have been successful, with Smith noting that finances are the major driver in most cases, with the rarer instances of visionary leaders starting the collaborative discussions looking for a better way. He noted that almost never is it the service delivery or the consumer that is the impetus of the collaborative conversation. Smith noted that the CJCC is a good example of collaboration.

– **Public Engagement (page 36)**

VanDerworp noted that it is more difficult to do collaboration once a jurisdiction has its own departments established. Smith noted that communication and a comprehensive public engagement process is key in such instances.

Smith noted the list of resources available, included in the “Creating Collaborative Communities” manual; indicating that he could provide speakers that have gone through the process of collaboration. He noted that the “failure experiences” could be the most informative to gather information from. He recommended finding a successful model that can be used as an example, and then focusing on failure examples for further information.

VanDerworp noted that it costs money to “do a collaboration right,” saving money in the long run. He indicated that it is important that you have the resources and information needed to work through the different scenarios; and it can be important to have a neutral party in terms of credibility. Smith indicated that the Michigan Suburbs Alliance has sources of revenue for collaborative “initiation” needs through grants, and will forward a listing of these resources for **PSSC** members.

Smith was asked to provide a speaker for the October 4, 2006, **PSSC** meeting; addressing a collaboration experience. **PSSC** members were asked to forward to O’Hare specifics that they would be interested in seeing in a “weighted allocation model,” to be shared with Smith for further information to be presented at the October **PSSC** meeting. Benchmark data including information from Oakland and Macomb Counties was also requested for the October 4, 2006, **PSSC** meeting.

7. Other

None.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Facilitator O’Hare at 6:00 pm.

Next Meeting:

Wednesday, October 4, 2006

4:30pm – 6:00pm

110 N. Fourth Avenue, Large Conference Room

Approved by Committee: 4 October 2006