

## POLICE SERVICES STEERING COMMITTEE

Wednesday June 4, 2008

4:30pm – 6:00pm

200 North Main, Ann Arbor

### Members Present:

Jeff Irwin	County Commissioner, Chair of Board
Pat Kelly	Dexter Township
William McFarlane	Superior Township
Michael Moran	Ann Arbor Township
Mark Ouimet	County Commissioner
Kenneth Schwartz	County Commissioner
Patricia Vaillencourt	Village of Manchester

**Members Absent:** Paul Bunten, Ruth Ann Jamnick, Karen Lovejoy Roe, Herb Mahony, Dan Minzey, Brenda Stumbo, Kenneth Unterbrink

**Staff Present:** Mary O'Hare (Facilitator), Linda Wicks (Recording Secretary)

**Sheriff Leadership Present:** Lt. Jim Anuszkiewicz

**Others Present:** Mike Radzik

### 1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Facilitator O'Hare, 5:05 pm, at the Washtenaw County Building, 200 North Main, lower level conference room.

### 2. Approval of Minutes

Kelly moved for approval of the May 7, 2008, Police Services Steering Committee meeting minutes; Ouimet seconded; all in favor.

Vaillencourt requested a procedural clarification regarding whether those absent from the meeting should abstain from the approval process. It was noted that under [Roberts Rules of Order](#), members absent from a prior meeting may still participate in the motion or vote for their approval.

### 3. Citizen Participation

None.

### 4. Committee Check-In

O'Hare announced that a new *PSSC* Website has been created, by request from *PSSC* members at the May 2008 meeting. This Website may be found on eWashtenaw at:

<http://www.ewashtenaw.org/government/departments/pssc/index.html>

O'Hare noted that *PSSC* approved policies will be posted on this Website also.

Schwartz inquired about Court Overtime issues, asking about coordination efforts with the Prosecuting Attorney's office to more efficiently schedule court appearances with case management.

Moran stated that he is a Local Government representative on the CJCC, indicating that this issue has been raised briefly there, and that the CJCC would be the group to deal with this issue. He stated that "getting the Judges onboard" is at least, if not more, important than the Prosecuting Attorney's office efforts, stressing that it is the Judge that controls the docket.

O'Hare noted that the issue of communication had been raised with the Prosecuting Attorney's Office, dealing with when court cases are dismissed and how that message is supposed to go out "broadly" to all the people involved. She noted that what is not covered in their procedure is what happens if the Deputy gets there the day of, and the case is dismissed after a 15 minute conversation. O'Hare summarized that the Prosecuting Attorney's Office procedure really covers only up to the day of the court case.

Schwartz noted an opportunity for the Township attorneys, which prosecute a lot of the misdemeanor traffic cases, to call the Deputy with an update. Kelly requested that this issue be added as information to the Local Units Workshop in July, noting an opportunity for the jurisdictions to work with their attorneys for further communication.

Irwin stated that he had brought this issue up at the CJCC yearly workplan planning meeting, on behalf of the *PSSC*, indicating that it is now on the CJCC workplan.

Anuszkiewicz stressed the need to recognize the extent to which this communication is already occurring, on behalf of the County and Township attorneys, stating that they are trying to make every effort, to the best of their ability, to communicate prior to the court date.

O'Hare summarized that the court case adjournment communication issue will be added to the Local Unit Workshop agenda as a "point of interest" for the jurisdictions to know what is currently going on and offer suggestions.

##### **5. Adoption of Recommended Policies**

Copies of the three *PSSC* policies were distributed. O'Hare noted that Policy *PSSC*-08-01 "Contract Deputy Deployment" had been approved by the *PSSC* at their March 4, 2008, special meeting. She requested that *PSSC* members review the remaining two policies, and provide any comments for discussion prior to approval.

##### **PSSC-08-02 – Court Time and Shift Coverage**

O'Hare noted a small clarification change to be made to the policy General Statement for *PSSC*-08-02 regarding "Court Time and Shift Coverage", to make clear that the paying jurisdiction is the "jurisdiction in which the court case generated".

McFarlane inquired if the court time would automatically be backfilled, noting that there may be times when they are staffed adequately and may not need the backfill, even though it would not be charged to their township. He noted that as long as reciprocal time spent crossing jurisdictions is close, not all time spent in court may need to be backfilled, saving money overall. He indicated that he has asked for an up-to-date report of time spent crossing into other jurisdictions.

Moran stated that it could complicate the issue and policy if some jurisdictions do one thing, and others differently; and, while agreeing that the relationships with the closest jurisdictions may even out, as a policy it may be easier for the Sheriff's Office to implement if all do the same.

Irwin noted that this court time policy could help with the problems associated with jurisdictions that may be "underpolicing" themselves; noting that if they underpolice, and draw over deputies from another jurisdiction, and then end up in court, they now need to pay the backfill for that court time.

Radzik inquired about the practical application of the policy, asking how you can force a Deputy to come in for an overtime shift when you don't know how long it will run.

O'Hare asked if this policy states anywhere whose decision it is to backfill, or if it is automatic. Radzik noted that the decision element is not addressed in the policy, only what happens if backfill occurs.

Kelly stated that she may be satisfied to let the Sheriff's Department make the determination if backfill is necessary. O'Hare inquired if the backfill determination would fall under the normal policies and protocol that have been worked out with each of the jurisdictions. Radzik noted that this court time backfill determination could tap right into the minimum staffing requirements.

Anuszkiewicz stated that there seem to be a lot of questions still generating from this policy document, recommending that he take it back for further development, along with *PSSC* questions/comments; bringing it back to the *PSSC* for approval at their July meeting. O'Hare noted that any needed communications can take place prior to the July *PSSC* meeting, via the L-*PSSC* listserve.

Radzik noted that the simplest way to look at it may be to assess how it affects minimum staffing in any particular area, stating the need to tie the policy to this.

Schwartz stressed the need for clarity around which jurisdiction is being talked about at each point; getting rid of any ambiguity and perhaps assigning "names" to the jurisdictions (i.e., Jurisdiction A = the jurisdiction in which the incident occurred).

### **PSSC-08-03 – In-Service Training on Common Staffing Day**

Radzik reiterated his request to have the In-Service Wednesday staffing be tracked for a year to determine if it is equitable.

O'Hare inquired if the *PSSC* policies need to have a review date/schedule set. Radzik noted that they would necessarily be reviewed as part of the contract process. *PSSC* members agreed that *PSSC* policies would be reviewed during the contract process.

Moran moved for approval of Policy *PSSC-08-03* "In Service Training on Common Staffing Day"; Schwartz seconded; all in favor.

## **6. Local Unit Workshop Agenda Review**

O'Hare distributed a draft agenda and Powerpoint for a July *Police Services Local Unit Workshop*. She noted that the agenda had been developed from *PSSC* input at their May meeting resulting in one workshop, to take place in July, two hours in length.

- **Intro/Welcome** with an update of the work done by the *PSSC*, including **Workplan** and **Website** – *Presented by PSSC member*
- **PSSC Polices** adopted, and how they play out in practicality – *Presented by Mahony*
- **Reports** that are available –ask for feedback from jurisdictions regarding standard items that can be put into a generic report, easily accessible (this standard report does not take away additional access to report data for those that want this) – *Presented by Mahony*
- **Experiences of Jurisdictions** – Backfill issues and Individual vs. collaborative contracts
- Update on **General Fund Patrols** – *Presented by Mahony*
- **Additional Questions or Comments** – *Facilitated by O'Hare*

Irwin stated his concern that the agenda may be a little too ambitious; suggesting that one of the items be eliminated. He suggested the opportunity to turn the *Update on General Fund Patrols* into a document to be distributed rather than an agenda item.

Anuszkiewicz indicated that it could be feasible to have a report of how General Fund Deputies were deployed for the first quarter, noting that IT will need to be contacted to have this developed and run. O'Hare asked *PSSC* members how important they felt this report would be to the local jurisdictions, with members responding that this would be of great importance to the local jurisdictions, and that it had been identified as one of the *PSSC* Key Indicators to monitor. Anuszkiewicz clarified the report requested as "where the General Fund Deputies are spending their time, in terms of jurisdictions". Kelly noted that this data would be significantly impacted because of the shortage of General Fund Deputies; noting it is not known how useful this first quarter data will be.

Moran suggested that it might be better to run this Local Units Workshop as a three hour program, with *PSSC* members agreeing. O'Hare stated she would update the meeting time and agenda to run three hours.

O'Hare inquired if it would be useful for Mahony to share his Powerpoint presentation regarding the "Final Report on 2008 Police Services Personnel Deployment" – and how the Sheriff's Department went through this decision process. Anuskiewicz stated that this information has already been given to the jurisdictions. *PSSC* members determined not to allocate the time to present this report at the July Workshop.

Irwin stated the need to streamline the "Experiences of Jurisdictions" agenda item, suggesting that case studies be presented for this, allowing the jurisdictions to talk about what they do, and what has worked for them.

McFarlane suggested that Mahony provide comparison numbers before and after collaborations. Kelly indicated that it would be interesting to see the data from York Township; to see how they are doing on their own, and how many calls don't get answered.

Irwin stated that this agenda item should feature two case studies, one case study focusing on the numbers, and why collaboration is better on a cost basis, and one focusing on how you negotiate the collaboration and how you work it out.

O'Hare suggested that it would be good for a Local Unit *PSSC* member to provide the Workshop "welcome," with Moran or Kelly selected for this.

O'Hare indicated three possible dates for the Local Unit Workshop. Vaillencourt moved that the Police Services Local Unit Workshop be held on **Thursday, July 31<sup>st</sup>**, with Irwin seconding, and all in favor. The Workshop time was set for 9am to 12pm. Locations to be researched include Scio Township or the MSU Extension classroom at Zeeb Road.

## **7. July PSSC Meeting**

O'Hare noted that the *PSSC* meeting is scheduled for the third Wednesday in July (July 16), having been moved earlier in the year in anticipation of the BOC moving to that date. She noted that the BOC meeting date has not been changed from July 2, asking which date *PSSC* members would prefer to meet on. Irwin moved that the *PSSC* meeting remain on July 16, with Kelly seconding and all in favor. O'Hare noted that the July 16 date corresponds with the Ann Arbor Art Fairs, suggesting that the meeting be relocated to the LLRC. *PSSC* members agreed to relocate this July meeting to the LLRC, and this updated location will be posted officially.

## **8. Dispute Process**

Radzik indicated that he has an issue with the first overtime bill regarding recruits/overtime, inquiring about the appropriate process for this dispute. He noted that he has been told to pay this bill, and then to file a dispute letter with County Administration to begin the formal dispute process; inquiring if the issue should not be coming to the *PSSC* first for discussion and possible resolution. He asked for clarification regarding the formal dispute process, noting that issues may be being dealt with in two different ways, indicating the need to be consistent with the dispute process.

O'Hare clarified that the original contracts signed indicated that if there was a dispute from a bill received that it needed to be paid and then disputed after. She noted that the *PSSC* was then noted as one of the first forums that it might come to before it became a mediated issue. She restated the issue as whether this had been handled differently the first time (earlier this year); with the dispute coming direct to the *PSSC* before it was ever formally disputed, asking if this is the new way it will be handled, or should it go back to the process of paying it, disputing it, and then bringing it to the *PSSC* – concurring that there were two different ways that it was being dealt with.

Radzik noted that once you start the formal dispute process it has to run the course, stating that he just wants to know what the appropriate process is so that they are not filing a dispute if they don't have to, but if they do have to, they are doing it timely.

Kelly inquired if there is a formal protocol to come to the *PSSC*, stating that if there isn't there should be.

O'Hare noted that the *PSSC* review process was included in the July 2007 minutes, but that it may not have ever been attached to the contract in any way. She stated the issue as: "is this a forum in which we can take apart the issue to see whether or not there is a policy that addresses this. If there is not a policy that addresses this, is there one that needs to be created? Is it an extension of a policy, or is it an interpretation of a policy? Is it under the auspices of the Sheriff's role for deployment?"

Vaillencourt stated that part of the *PSSC* reasoning for wanting to be the first line of resolution is the benefits of ironing out, defining and clarifying issues before the next contract discussions.

O'Hare stated that the *PSSC* can't come to any resolution at this meeting regarding the specific issue that Radzik has, noting that neither Under Sheriff Mahony or Administration is present; but that what she is sensing from the *PSSC* is that they would like to deal with these issues the same as they have others, which is to bring them to the *PSSC* first, then going the more formal route if applicable. O'Hare restated the need to pay first before bringing to the *PSSC* for discussion.

Kelly stressed the need to mention this process at the Local Units meeting, with O'Hare noting that this can fit under Agenda Item #1 regarding the work that the *PSSC* has been doing.

#### **9. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by Facilitator O'Hare at 6:05 pm.

#### **Next Meeting:**

Wednesday, July 16, 2008

4:30pm – 6:00pm

Library Learning Resource Center, 4135 Washtenaw Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI 48108

Approved by Committee: 6 August 2008