

**POLICE SERVICES STEERING COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday October 4, 2006**

4:30pm – 6:00pm

110 North Fourth Avenue

**Members Present:**

Paul Bunten	Chief of Police, Saline
Jeff Irwin	County Commissioner
Ruth Ann Jamnick	Ypsilanti Township
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:** Daniel Minzey, Kenneth Unterbrink

**Staff Present:** Mary O’Hare (Facilitator), Robert Guenzel, Rolland Sizemore, Jr., Tony VanDerworp, Linda Wicks (Recording Secretary)

**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 September 6, 2006, Police Services Steering Committee meeting minutes; Solowczuk seconded; all in favor.

**3. Citizen Participation**

None.

**4. Committee Member Check-In**

– Vaillencourt indicated that she had received inquiries from citizens regarding recent articles in the *Jackson Citizen Patriot* and the *Toledo Blade*, noting projected Sheriff’s contract rates of \$67,000/year and \$85,000/year respectively. Vaillencourt indicated her citizens are wanting to know what the difference is in costs between Counties. Further discussion was deferred to the agenda item for “Pricing of Police Contracts in Other Counties”.

– McFarlane shared an update on Superior’s “Blue Ribbon Committee,” looking into future law enforcement needs and options. He indicated that there is a group

interested in investigating a regional approach, with committee members now going back to their respective boards and councils to see if there is interest in paying for a feasibility study. He suggested that it may be an opportunity for the County to also participate in this study and its cost. Guenzel said that he thought a regional study could be worthwhile; that every dollar it saves can be put back into the delivery of police services – indicating that he would certainly listen to a proposal and talk with Commissioners regarding it.

*PSSC* members continued further discussion regarding Regional Policing and feasibility studies:

- Vaillencourt suggested the idea of some type of joint training/information sharing; where local units can look at options and explore what makes sense as regions. Irwin noted that this may be an opportunity for *PSSC* involvement.
- VanDerworp noted that methodology developed by the Superior Township “Blue Ribbon Committee” could be transferable to another regional effort; looking additionally at what the local conditions and costs are. He suggested the idea of a study for the more suburban areas and one for the more rural areas.
- Mahoney stated that a basic way to form regional policing is to decide what your coverage should/will be and then talk about options for the service provider. He noted that this ties into current work he is doing on staffing analysis for regions. Manony stressed the idea of breaking the County down into “like” regions (geography, population) and then developing scenarios for both needed and recommended staffing – and from this point to look at options to operationalize. He stressed that you cannot build a model and then have some of the members back-out, that this “changes the sum of the whole” impacting the model itself.
- Solowczuk inquired regarding including outlying areas in the study; what should be included in the study and what would this cost?
- Kelly inquired how this would fit with the individual jurisdiction efforts; noting that the *PSSC* should be involved with this in broad terms.
- Moran noted that the eastern, more urban, jurisdictions may have needs that are somewhat different from the other less-urban townships, but that it might not be a bad idea to expand the study to include the eastern entities.
- Prater suggested exploring the costs needs on a per capita basis, noting that cost is a main issue involved in the Police Services contracts, and that a per capita could provide a base line to start from. Jamnick suggested that level of service needs to be looked at in addition to a per capita basis, further noting that there is already a regional police department in the County today.

- McFarlane indicated that additionally there are operational issues of concern to have the levels of service desired.
  - Moran noted that, in looking at the Jackson and Toledo contract costs, the difference must be that these counties give more underlying support to the costs. He agreed that along with the cost issue there are operational issues, many of which are “legacy” issues. He indicated that he owes it to his township to explore what options they have.
  - Vaillencourt stressed that in order for her jurisdiction to be in the position to have alternatives, there is only about eight months to explore this information; indicating the need to get in motion quickly if looking at a regional opportunity.
  - McFarlane expressed the need to examine the Deputy costs for the different counties; exploring the differences and why.
  - Stumbo stated the need to discuss operational issues at the contract negotiation tables this year. O’Hare indicated that Labor Relations Manager Heidt had attended the May *PSSC* meeting to provide information on the police contracts, and has been connected with *PSSC* members to make sure these operational issues are addressed as contract negotiations take place.
  - Irwin noted a difference of scale in collaboration effort opportunities – that folks on the east side have a real opportunity to explore what it might look like if they start their own department, but that the smaller jurisdictions would find it much more difficult to actually start their own department. He noted this difference might impact where conversation takes place – that this *PSSC* might be a more appropriate place for looking at smaller jurisdictions; such as getting four townships and a village to work together. Vaillencourt noted that Manchester Village had done this to an extent with Bridgewater Township, but that the renewal had been defeated.
- Mahony provided a brief update on contract negotiations, indicating that Heidt had put together a comprehensive list of issues for discussion. Main areas of concern included: location bid, vacation bid, comp bid and shift bid (scheduling issues); the amount of assigned deputies to different jurisdictions; and two-deputy cars after dark. He indicated that there have been two meetings of pre-negotiations to-date and that significant progress has been made in the area of scheduling. Mahony noted that all the representatives from management and from the union met and have agreed to allow Mahony and two POAM representatives to sit down and look at how it would operationalize should the contract change to a year-long area bid. He shared his hope to have an agreement on this issue by early November, noting that they would then look at the issue of two-deputy cars. Mahony noted that compensation time is an additional issue to be discussed.

- Sizemore suggested that a committee should be established that has the ability to explore best practices, and has the “muscle” to get answers and get things done.
- Ouimet suggested that it would be beneficial for all government units to explore options and look at what it costs to provide services locally or regionally, knowing which offers the most for their constituents – coupled with a “Plan B” as backup to protect their citizens’ interest.
- O’Hare asked *PSSC* members if there are other contract issues that might impact a regional model or collaboration. She indicated that any issues may be forwarded to either herself or directly to Herb Mahony or Diane Heidt for consideration.
  - Kelly inquired about rules regarding how many double shifts may be taken on during a period of time, indicating this might be a contract consideration.
  - Kelly suggested the use of Part-Time Deputies for overtime.
- O’Hare inquired what the next steps are for this *PSSC* committee; confirming that this committee has expressed that feasibility study involvement is something they should be involved with, at least in coordination efforts. She inquired of *PSSC* members what their interest is, as a committee, in being part of whatever studies take place – should the *PSSC* participate at the level of getting the information and coordination; or should a subcommittee be formed that would help to participate in some of the studies? Solowczuk indicated the need to respond to McFarlane’s suggestion that Washtenaw County participate in Superior Township’s “Blue Ribbon Committee”, both as a participant and financially, suggesting it might be more appropriate for the jurisdictions to do their own research; without County input.

Mahony stressed the need to determine what gets included in an incremental cost or total cost recovery – that the numbers are correct, it is what is used for the formula that differs.

**5. Discussion on Pricing of Police Contracts in Other Counties and**

**6. Continued Discussion on Regional Services (combined conversation)**

O’Hare noted that the following information items have been distributed for review /discussion at this meeting:

- WC Incremental Cost Model Deputy, Sergeant & Lieutenant Direct/Indirect Costs (2008 costs)
- Oakland County Direct Costs
- Livingston County Direct Costs – (18 month contract, 48 hour weeks)  
1% Administration “CAP” does not cover support costs

O’Hare noted that a prior handout distributed to *PSSC* members indicted an average overtime hour rate for Deputies – about 150 hours per year. She noted that the Jackson County \$67,000/year Deputy amount covers only the basic salary and fringes, the

administrative costs associated with putting the deputy on the road is covered by the County as a policy decision.

Kelly inquired regarding how many deputies Jackson County contracts out; noting that Washtenaw County covered these administrative costs initially also. She indicated that Jackson County may change this policy as numbers increase. O'Hare indicated that further information can be requested regarding deputy numbers.

O'Hare indicated that Monroe County also does contract policing; with a model that takes the total costs and splits it 2/3 & 1/3 – with 1/3 of the cost absorbed by the County.

Kelly indicated that she would be interested in seeing demographics from the Counties contracting for police services.

O'Hare provided 2006 rate information regarding Macomb County, indicating that updated 2008 cost information would be forthcoming, with their cost for a deputy \$120,550 (\$95,000 for overall deputy salary cost, with an indirect allocation of \$16,000 per deputy and a fleet charge).

O'Hare noted that in Livingston County there is a fleet charge, but that the local jurisdictions are actually purchasing the vehicle – with the County paying the cost up front and charging back.

O'Hare noted that this initial Oakland/Macomb County cost comparison analysis was done by Plante and Moran more as a look at methodology. She noted that there are some basic cost differences between the Counties; with base deputy salaries starting at different levels; and that there is then also the policy/price decisions made by the Counties.

Kelly suggested that good information to review might be the percentage of population in these Counties that are covered by their own police services, along with information on any areas that may have started a local police service over the past few years. Mahony noted that you also need to know the policy for these Counties and what base services are provided under the contracts – determining what the responsibility of the sheriff's office is in these jurisdictions. Economic conditions of these Counties were also indicated as an important factor to consider.

O'Hare inquired if there were other Counties that *PSSC* members would like to see information regarding, with members suggesting Kalamazoo and Ingham as ones more similar to Washtenaw County.

Mahony stressed the process of determining the minimum staffing requirements, then exploring policy decisions regarding incremental costs vs. total cost recovery – with the base of what is needed to provide police services grounded in sound mathematic formulas. This type of information, he noted, can be developed, and then communities can look at their options by simply plugging in different variables to meet local or regional policy decisions. He stressed that the science behind determining the number of

people needed to police a community is pretty straight-forward, that what is not straight-forward is how it is paid for. Prater noted that people pay what they can afford; ending up determining the level of service at a bottom-line.

Vaillencourt suggested the need to look at how general fund dollars get used to provide services County-wide– that each area has different needs, e.g., police services, social service programs, housing for homeless, etc., and that tax dollars should be used to provide for the needs in that particular area – that there is a right to have some of these needs met.

O’Hare inquired where *PSSC* members want to go from here; what are the next steps and what would this group like to look at regarding regional police services. She noted that there is an opportunity for this committee to coordinate committees and share information; insuring a consistent look at issues.

McFarlane clarified that they have invited the eastside townships to discuss collaboration and regional efforts through their “Blue Ribbon Committee”: Superior, Northfield, Salem, Ann Arbor, Ypsilanti, Augusta, York, City of Ypsilanti, (Pittsfield declined). Guenzel inquired if this committee would be looking for short-term or long-term answers, a determination for now or for where they want to be in 20 years. He noted that perhaps it might not be best for this committee if the County was to partner with it for these studies.

Moran indicated that there are some services (e.g., detective bureau, marine policing) that serve the county as a whole, and that if an area of the County is regionalized, these more specific capabilities might not be replicated; that they may want to rely on a reduced County force for these services.

VanDerworp noted that efficiencies in services could be realized through regionalization, and that it is a good idea to explore this opportunity. He noted that the County can provide information and data for jurisdictions’ consultants, but it may not be appropriate and/or feasible to participate in studies for all jurisdictions.

Mahoney noted that there are the skills/abilities within County staff to do work in-house rather than to have consultants provide this information for jurisdictions; cautioning that consultants may not always understand all the issues/specifics involved – that anyone can give you answers that you want to hear, but that you need a true picture of what that jurisdiction/region looks like and what their needs are.

VanDerworp stressed that consultants can offer information in a format that is not originated from the County that can be of value for jurisdictions’ residents and trustees. He further noted that while there may be the expertise and skills within the County to provide this information for jurisdictions, the reality is that to be done in a timely manner this would need to be made a priority, impacting other staff outcomes and initiatives. He stressed that the County can lend expertise, and can provide information on socio-economic data, along with other information needed by consultants, but that this is an

opportunity for jurisdictions to take a look at their unique operational items, base line costs, types of calls for service, and geographics utilizing independent consultants – providing a more credible and quicker look than using County resources might.

Kelly suggested it might make most sense to have the County at the table in the discussions to select a consultant, and then have the consultant/s do the actual work for the study. Jamnick also noted that it might be beneficial to have County staff assist with the RFPs for consultant proposals; but that it might be a challenge to have the County actually participate in the study. Moran further concurred that it would be appropriate for the County to assist with the development of the RFPs for consultants, along with providing assistance in reviewing the proposals – but that the County should not then take part as a participant in the studies; leaving this to the selected consultant/s.

McFarlane noted that the Superior “Blue Ribbon Committee” would be meeting next on October 19, with the townships/cities reporting back regarding board/council authorization to proceed with the regional study, providing funding. He requested that VanDerworp and Mahony attend this meeting to share thoughts for consideration as the RFP for the consultant is created, suggesting this might be the conduit through which the County would be involved.

O’Hare requested that McFarlane bring a follow-up to this Superior “Blue Ribbon Committee” meeting to the November 1, 2006, *PSSC* meeting. She further inquired if there was a time at which a communication update should be sent out to the jurisdictions that are not part of the *PSSC*. *PSSC* members noted that information from their meetings is available at the CEO meetings and via the minutes; with O’Hare noting that perhaps a year-end communication update might be appropriate.

**7. Other**

None.

**8. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by Facilitator O’Hare at 6:10 pm.

**Next Meeting:**

Wednesday, November 1, 2006

4:30pm – 6:00pm

110 N. Fourth Avenue, Large Conference Room

Approved by Committee: 1 November 2006