

**POLICE SERVICES STEERING COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday May 7, 2008**

4:30pm – 6:00pm

200 North Main, Ann Arbor

**Members Present:**

Paul Buntin	Chief of Police Saline
Jeff Irwin	County Commissioner, Chair of Board
Herb Mahony, Designee	County Under Sheriff
William McFarlane	Superior Township
Michael Moran	Ann Arbor Township
Mark Ouimet	County Commissioner
Kenneth Unterbrink	Lima Township

**Members Absent:** Ruth Ann Jamnick, Pat Kelly, Karen Lovejoy Roe, Dan Minzey, Kenneth Schwartz, Brenda Stumbo, Patricia Vaillencourt

**Staff Present:** Mary O’Hare (Facilitator), Scott Patton, Linda Wicks (Recording Secretary)

**Sheriff Leadership Present:** Lt. Jim Anuszkiewicz, Lt. Dieter Heren

**Others Present:** Mike Radzik

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Facilitator O’Hare, 4:40 pm, at the Washtenaw County Building, 200 North Main, lower level conference room.

**2. Approval of Minutes**

McFarlane moved for approval of the April 2, 2008, Police Services Steering Committee meeting minutes; Irwin seconded; all in favor.

**3. Citizen Participation**

None.

**4. Committee Check-In**

O’Hare shared news that Commissioner Lovejoy Roe’s father had passed away over the weekend; indicating that the showing and service is taking place this afternoon, with some *PSSC* members absent from this meeting to attend.

Moran raised the **issue regarding the contract’s ratio for Sergeants to Deputies**; noting that the contract indicated a pay rate of 1/6 of a Sergeant cost per Deputy (one Sergeant for every six Deputies). He noted that this figure was somehow adjusted at some point to a ratio of one Sergeant for every 7.5 Deputies. He stated that in the Ann Arbor/Superior Township Collaboration they have 13 Deputies, but only one Sergeant, when they should have two. He stated that if Ann Arbor/Superior Townships were really getting what they were promised, they would have two Sergeants; inquiring about this situation – whether it is temporary and will be resolved, or if there is a “rebate” for having fewer Sergeants.

O'Hare suggested that this issue be added to the agenda, inquiring if research may need to be done prior to discussion. Patton suggested that this issue might be a good test of the Dispute Resolution Process, putting it into writing.

McFarlane indicated the need to know what the future is for this issue; asking if the Sergeant/Deputy ratio is going to go on "forever" or if it may be date specific when Ann Arbor/Superior Townships may get their second Sergeant – suggesting that there may be other solutions, and that the *PSSC* may be the best forum to have this discussion.

McFarlane raised a **second issue of overtime** – noting that jurisdictions had been reimbursed for not having sufficient Deputies at straight time, when on a couple of the same dates they were asked to pay 2.5 time. He indicated that he had shared these costing concerns with Lt. Anuszkiewicz, who is looking into the issue.

O'Hare summarized the question for *PSSC* members as being "What is the deployment policy?" as opposed as to what is the amount paid/charged, which may require further investigation/review. She stated the question for *PSSC* discussion as being "Is there a change as to how the (Sergeant/Deputy) ratio is done? – If it was originally put out as 1 to 6, has it changed now and is that a permanent policy change?"

Mahony stated that the funding and the charges for supervision that were built into the per Deputy cost were not done by the Sheriff's Office. He stated that the Sheriff's Office currently has all their positions filled, except one, which should be filled next week; noting, however, that many are still in training and that until these people are ready, they are short positions everywhere. Irwin inquired if this "short staffing" is why the staffing model is the way it is currently, or if the correct staffing model should be something other than 6:1.

Moran shared his memory that the ratio was always calculated at 6 to 1; but that when the General Fund Patrol came in, it went to 7.5 to 1 – asking who changed this model, and should the jurisdictions be the ones bearing the outcome of this. Moran stated that their current reality of 13 Deputies to one Sergeant is too high a ratio. Irwin stated the importance of determining the right staffing model and ratio prior to discussions for the next contract.

Mahony stated that the initial new methodology formula for Police Services Contracting provided for one Sergeant for every six Deputies, and one Lieutenant for every 13 Deputies. He noted that that this ratio was dropped from the formula conversation for the next version of the contract, with the next contract version based on dollar amounts. Mahony stated that they are staffed at one Sergeant to 7.5 Deputies, if all approved positions are filled.

Mahony indicated that he can provide an idea of what the future may look like. He stated that they "never assign a number of Sergeants strictly based on a number of Deputies working in a contract area; there has always been a very close ratio of somewhere around 1:6, and it has been as high as 1:10, but you have to remember that Supervisory responsibilities happen on all three shifts." He noted that currently being down three staff, Lieutenants and Commanders, along with himself, have picked up some of the day-to-day work load to keep going.

Moran stated his concern that if this (Sergeant/Deputy ratio) is an issue that will not be resolved quickly, he would need to protest at this point; indicating that he would rather not go through this if we know what is coming and it is acceptable, or there is some other resolution. He indicated that "if the answer is that when the available Sergeant positions are filled, one is going to come to Ann Arbor/Superior" then they

would know what is happening, and could make further determination from there. Moran noted that he did feel the supervision is better now than before, aside from the fact that they are short Sergeants; indicating that they would like to see more of what they are getting. McFarlane concurred that “it is not a problem with what they have, it is what they don’t have.”

McFarlane asked about the Sergeant/Deputy ratio in Ypsilanti Township; with the response from Mahony of 38 to 5.

Radzik shared his observation that to solve some specific problems, more administrative tasks have been placed on the Sergeants, with direct supervision on the street suffering the most.

Mahony stated that the plan is to fill all the Deputy positions first; and then begin promotion and filling of the two open Sergeant positions – indicating that the General Fund positions will be the last to be filled.

O’Hare stated that the Sergeant/Deputy ratio is an issue noted; asking if the *PSSC* wants to monitor it as hiring happens, or there are specific next steps that Ann Arbor/Superior Township would like to see at this time. McFarlane indicated he would like a date-specific time for when this issue would be resolved. Mahony stated he would send some projected dates out to *PSSC* members subsequent to today’s meeting. Moran stated that they are mostly interested in getting sufficient amount of supervision, rather than refunds.

Moran raised the issue of access to *CLEMIS* reports. Mahony indicated that there are issues with civilians having access to *CLEMIS*, and that he did not believe local jurisdictions would ever have access to the *CLEMIS* reports; but that statistical reports can be developed from *CLEMIS* for the jurisdictions. He stated the need to provide accurate information, rather than just access to information, noting that for individuals to access *CLEMIS* they would need to be trained to run SQL queries and that it could be easy to misinterpret the data (you may think you are getting one answer, but are actually getting another answer). He stated the need to determine what it is that the local jurisdictions want to see, and what we need to do to create those reports – suggesting that maybe a website can be made available for these “prefab” reports. Mahony noted that the idea of jurisdictions running their own reports is a great idea, but that in practicality the execution is not good – if you don’t ask the right question in the right way, you don’t get the right answer. Radzik stated that he finds the Local Unit Reporting website very useful, observing that the accuracy of it is driven to some degree still by what Deputies are putting on the logs, suggesting that some of this could be fixed with technological changes. Mahony noted that what he is hearing from other jurisdictions is that the Local Unit Reporting website is very nice, but that they don’t have the time to learn it – that they would like access to a canned report that they can run off and share monthly. Irwin suggested that a standard report be created, running the appropriate queries, that would allow these jurisdictions to simply push a button to spit out the same report monthly – while still allowing others the ability to run customized queries as desired. Patton will contact WC Application Specialist Jim Burkey, to follow-up and have the Local Unit Reporting Group come together again (subsequent to the Local Unit Workshop/s, where additional reporting issues may arise).

## **5. Regional Dispatch Update**

Patton shared an update from the U/M Ford School students’ presentation regarding regional dispatch services in Washtenaw County – regarding how Washtenaw County and Ann Arbor Police dispatch could be consolidated (report emailed to *PSSC* members 4/25/08). Patton indicated the report finding was that there could be a cost savings over a ten-year period, with additional costs in year one, and savings in years two through ten. He indicated that a group has been formed, including Under Sheriff Mahony, Jeff Fulton, Greg Bazick (Ann Arbor), Greg Hollingsworth (Ann Arbor), and Jerry Zapolnik (HVA), to delve through the details of this report. Patton noted that it was pretty clear to him that the major issue has less

to do with running the numbers and coming up with the models and more to do with staff engagement and employee buy-in and uncertainty. Mahony concurred with this assessment, noting that the employee piece will be the biggest obstacle to face; noting that if “we are all pointed in the same direction, and talk the same language, it will help deflate (this issue)”. He stated one issue that he had just been made aware of is that this U/M report for regional dispatch includes the County and Ann Arbor taking all the other PSAP’s 911 surcharge monies. He stressed that he had not been part of any discussions to bring this as a move to the PSAP committee; noting that the student’s had simply operated from this assumption to complete their report and that it does not necessarily mean there is a way to back the assumption out. Bunten noted that the costs savings were built on using all PSAP monies for the cost figures; inquiring what the impact/s would be if the non-County/Ann Arbor PSAP monies were backed out, stating that those savings are not going to be there.

Patton asked Mahony how much PSAP monies are received; with Mahony’s response of approximately \$750,000/year. Patton noted that the U/M report model can take out the non-County/Ann Arbor PSAP monies. Mahony agreed that there are a lot of variables in the model allowing you to explore costs, based on any number of policy decisions, including staffing. Mahony stated the reality is that you need to find out where your revenue will come from, what are the political and legislative realities; and if those change, and you operate under different assumptions, how does this effect your long-term costs. He stressed that the U/M students had built into the model the use of all PSAP 911 monies, but that you can change any one of the assumptions in the model for review. Irwin noted that the U/M report had also included a 17% staff increase; another assumption that moves the model in the other direction.

Bunten stressed that many agencies are not planning to participate in a regional dispatch, and they rely on the PSAP monies for 911.

Moran stated that he had attended the U/M presentation, and was disappointed that the Centralized Dispatch did not include Fire as well as Police. Patton noted that Fire was not included in the model, but it was included in the general theme and operating principles. Moran stated that he would prefer to see a true combination, with economies involved.

**6. Final Review of Recommended Policies:**  
**In-Service Training on Common Staffing Day and Court Time/Shift Coverage**

Mahony provided draft copies of policies for “In-Service Training on Common Staffing Day” and “Court Time and Shift Coverage,” providing an example of staffing for In-Service Training staffing on Wednesdays. He stressed the “Discussion” component of the proposed policy; outlining the need for common staffing days, and why these are used, noting that this provides for 45-50% more staff on duty to allow for training and coverage.

He stressed that staff is not reassigned to cover for benefit time off, stating the concept for the “In-Service Training on Common Staffing Day” is to pool all their resources and staff at what they normally would for that day (not minimum staffing). He noted that over the calendar year all staff will end up going to training and most likely will end up covering to help contain costs. Mahony noted that if the days adjoining the Wednesday training day have two different staffing levels, they will use the higher level to determine the Wednesday training-day staffing minimum.

Mahony stressed that alternate methods are also being used to help keep training costs down; noting that Web-based Taser training saved close to \$100,000 agency-wide.

Radzik requested that the In-Service Wednesday staffing be tracked for a year to determine if it is equitable.

Mahony indicated that he would send a final copy of the approved Recruit/Trainee Policy out to *PSSC* members. O'Hare stated that copies of the two policies discussed today will also be sent to *PSSC* members prior to the June 4, 2008, *PSSC* meeting, at which time they can be adopted. PD Staff will explore the development of a *PSSC* Website to archive *PSSC* materials.

## **7. Planning for Local Unit Workshop/s**

O'Hare noted that Local Jurisdictions have not had any contact or updates since the Local Unit Workshops in June 2007. She asked *PSSC* members for input regarding possible 2008 Local Unit Workshops, including:

- Topics/Key Messages
- Presenters
- Location/s
- Publicity/Invitations

McFarlane volunteered Superior Township to host a Local Unit Workshop.

### **Workshop topics discussed included (cover all four topics in one workshop):**

- Policies that have been developed
- Monthly data reporting (especially standard items of interest)
- Something to help Local Units understand backfill / benefits of collaboration vs. operating on own
  - Management of overtime / Impacts that come from not backfilling – decisions Local Units need to make
- General Fund deputies (Provide summary report for Q1)  
Are areas under-policed? Where are the General Fund Deputies ending up?

### **Further ideas brainstormed regarding the Workshop/s included:**

- May be more realistic to hold the Workshop in Fall (Summer may have low turnout)
- Police Services may be an issue in elections; people may feel unconnected and want information – better to offer Workshop in July; possibly offer again in the Fall
- Offer one Workshop date/time/location this Summer
- Regarding next Contracts – rather than engaging in conversations regarding the next contract at this Summer workshop, note that contract discussions will begin in November, and that everything talked about at the Workshop will feed into this (gather data)
- Best presented by Under Sheriff Mahony; with *PSSC* members present to respond to inquiries
- Length should be about two hours; well-planned and organized

O'Hare indicated that County staff will come to the June *PSSC* meeting with a tentative Workshop agenda and draft materials for *PSSC* review.

Mahony reported that York Township approved their Millage at Tuesday's election.

## **8. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by Facilitator O'Hare at 5:50 pm.

### **Next Meeting:**

Wednesday, June 4, 2008

4:30pm – 6:00pm

200 North Main, lower level conference room

Approved by Committee: 4 June 2008