

POLICE SERVICES STEERING COMMITTEE
Wednesday November 5, 2008
 4:30pm – 6:00pm
 200 North Main, Ann Arbor

Members Present:

Paul Buntin	Chief of Police Saline
Ruth Ann Jamnick	Ypsilanti Township
Pat Kelly	Dexter Township
Karen Lovejoy Roe	County Commissioner
Herb Mahony, Designee	County Under Sheriff
William McFarlane	Superior Township
Michael Moran	Ann Arbor Township
Mark Ouimet	County Commissioner
Kenneth Schwartz	County Commissioner
Kenneth Unterbrink	Lima Township
Patricia Vailliencourt	Village of Manchester

Members Absent: Jeff Irwin, Dan Minzey, Brenda Stumbo

Staff Present: Mary O’Hare (Facilitator), David Behen, Scott Patton, Jennifer Watson, Linda Wicks (Recording Secretary)

Sheriff Leadership Present: Lt. Jim Anuszkiewicz

Others Present: Barbara Bergman (BOC), Kristin Judge (BOC Elect), Courtney Nicholls (Village of Dexter), Mike Radzik

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Facilitator O’Hare, 4:30 pm, at the Washtenaw County Building, 200 North Main, lower level conference room.

2. Approval of Minutes

Jamnick moved for approval of the October 1, 2008, Police Services Steering Committee meeting minutes; Buntin seconded; all in favor.

3. Citizen Participation

None.

4. Revision to PSSC Policy 08-01 – Contract Deputy Deployment Policy

O’Hare clarified that the only change to this previously adopted policy is the amendment in italics at the end, stating “*Overtime worked by a recruit deputy in a jurisdiction due to: shift extensions, late runs, training, etc., will be paid by the County. Overtime hours associated with any court appearance by a Recruit Deputy will be billed to the contracting jurisdiction where the court case originated from.*”

McFarlane moved for approval of the revised **PSSC Policy 08-01 – Contract Deputy Deployment**; Jamnick seconded; all in favor.

Bergman requested that data be provided regarding the impacts of this amendment including estimates for what the overtime costs might be for the County.

5. Draft Language for PSSC Policy Concerning Adding Deputies (PSSC 08-04)

Mahony stated that at the October 1 *PSSC* meeting information was brought forward indicating that Scio Township submitted a letter of intent to add two deputies to their contract, stating that there is nothing currently in the contract to address this issue. He noted that *PSSC* members had discussed the addition of new deputies to contracts at their October 1 meeting, indicating that he has subsequently put together a draft policy to capture the essence of this discussion.

McFarlane inquired if this would need to be included in shift bids, so that General Fund Deputies are aware that they may be reassigned to meet this policy. Mahony responded that this would be a Union/Labor consideration, noting that the Sheriff's Office does have the authority to assign personnel to different work areas. Mahony stated that proactively those bidding would be made aware of this policy.

Mahony clarified that a General Fund deputy temporarily reassigned to fill a new position would, per Union/Labor Contracts, continue their shift bid and station assignment, but would be reassigned to cover the contracting jurisdiction. He noted that the Sheriff's Office is revisiting the stations for deployment, indicating that a deputy may voluntarily agree to deploy from a different station.

Mahony stated that the draft policy language limits temporary assignment of General Fund Deputies to maintaining at least six fully trained General Fund Deputies for County-wide law enforcement services, indicating that the *PSSC* and Sheriff Elect may want to discuss this minimum number.

Mahony stressed that the purpose of *PSSC* Policy 08-04 is confined to adding deputies to an existing Police Services contract, indicating that it does not address how to deal with new policing requests.

Patton stated that Exhibit B of the Police Services contract reflects that a minimal base level of County-wide Deputies could be satisfied with as few as three to five deputies.

Moran suggested that *PSSC* 08-04 be in accord with the contract as it exists, allowing a fluctuation down as low as three fully trained General Fund Deputies for County-wide law enforcement services, with a general policy to try to maintain six.

Vaillencourt cautioned not to be so flexible that filling the needs of jurisdictions adding deputies is at the expense of those that have been contracting for the correct level of service. Kelly stated that five could be a good number. Patton said that additional deputies could be added to contracts one or two at a time; that a larger number could be added incrementally.

Bergman stated her concern about jurisdictions contracting for new deputies after the contract deadline, inquiring if it is fair to all involved if they receive the same pricing at this later date. She indicated that she would like to know the price impacts for adding more deputies mid-contract, stating concerns about how this would impact the original County budget – “can we afford more deputies after we plan for X number in our budget?” She indicated that this is an issue she would like looked at more thoroughly, that while overhead may be less, there is a new body involved.

Patton reminded *PSSC* members that the Police Services contracts contain a six-month out clause.

Mahony stated that procedurally there would not be any incremental support increases based on a jurisdiction contracting for additional deputies, stating that if an additional deputy was going to cause

support increases (vehicle, supervision, equipment), this would require a total budget adjustment with positions approved by the BOC.

Bergman stressed her concern that she would need to know where the County's portion of the costs will come from in the budget.

PSSC members requested the following revisions to *PSSC* Policy 08-04:

- ✓ Change in the last line under “*Personnel to Fill Increase While New Deputies are Trained*” to reflect **five** (rather than “six”) fully trained deputies
- ✓ Change in the second line under “*Policy General*” to reflect “shall notify the County **Administrator** and Sheriff’s Office...”
- ✓ Change in the fourth line under “*Policy General*” to reflect “the degree to which the request can be **accomplished** (rather than “made”) while maintaining County-wide law enforcement services”
- ✓ Rename Policy to reflect “Adding Deputies to **Existing** Contract”

O’Hare stated that Policy 08-04 is written in a general enough manner that it includes language about looking at impacts before approving. O’Hare inquired if the Sheriff Elect Clayton had seen this policy draft, further inquiring if this should occur before the *PSSC* votes on this as recommended policy. *PSSC* members determined the need to proceed as a committee in making their recommendations.

Moran moved for adoption of *PSSC* Policy 08-04 – Adding Deputies to Existing Contract – as drafted with the above four revisions; McFarlane seconded; all in favor.

6. Police Services Contract Discussion Beginning 2010

O’Hare stated that the issue of discussions around the next Police Services contract has been brought to the *PSSC*, indicating that informal notes from the October 29 **Police Services Contract Forum** have been distributed as a reference.

Jennifer Watson, WC Budget Manager, provided two documents for review/discussion:

- ✓ WC Police Services Incremental **Cost** Model Deputy Direct/Indirect Costs
- ✓ WC Police Services 2010 & 2011 Contract **Price** Scenarios

Per Deputy Cost (Summary Version)

Watson provided an explanation of the *WC Police Services Incremental Cost Model Deputy Direct/Indirect Costs* (document on file). This Cost Model demonstrates that if we were to set the 2010 contract price based in alignment with the increment cost model used for 2008 the rate would be \$128,103 – a 7.09% increase over the 2009 contract rate

O’Hare stressed the need to be clear between “cost” and “price” in today’s discussions.

Lovejoy Roe inquired about the fringe increase and how this breaks down. Watson clarified that this is not an increase in the benefit level, indicating that the fringe rate costs go up annually. She further indicated that this fringe cost assumes the reality of retirement employer contributions going up based on the actuarially determined required contribution. She stated that the assumption is that there will be a 7% increase over 2009 budgeted fringes for deputies. Lovejoy Roe stated that she would like to see what the fringe projections are in more specific terms.

Watson stated that the assumptions were made at a macro level and that variables could make these assumptions high or low.

Kelly inquired where the 80 deputy count came from. Watson replied that there were 81 Deputies for the 2008 Fiscal Year, but that the Willow Run Schools contract is being terminated, and therefore a 80 deputy count was used for 2010 projections.

Vaillencourt inquired what "Fleet" included, with Watson replying that this covers lease, gas, estimated maintenance, and outfitting. Watson indicated that this fleet rate for Deputies was an average of the per vehicle rate established in the 2009 budget plus a 3% increase. Mahony inquired regarding how many vehicles this is assuming, stating this should reflect the fleet used for Contract Policing (about 56), and should not reflect all the vehicles that are at the Sheriff's Office divided by 80. Watson indicated that she would verify the fleet cost information. Vaillencourt asked how this fleet cost reflects a car shared by multiple shifts. O'Hare noted that this fleet cost was an escalation from the Plante Moran formula, indicating that this formula can be researched further.

Radzik inquired about the 6% longevity assumption and how many years of service this reflects. Watson indicated that 6% reflects 12-15 years of service (8% after 15 years and 10% after 20 years of service). Radzik stated that the 12-15 years of service assumption seemed high, with Watson replying that this assumption was based on the average length of longevity in the 2009 salary projections with a year added for 2010.

Vaillencourt requested that the costing document be expanded to include additional information behind the numbers, providing further explanation and clarification.

Patton reminded *PSSC* members that discussions are regarding 2010, with the last year for real data coming from 2007.

O'Hare stated that this Cost document is more "reference" and that what had been discussed at the Police Services Contract Forum was a focus on the pricing.

WC Police Services 2010 & 2011 Contract Price Scenarios

Watson provided an explanation of the *WC Police Services 2010/2011 Contract Price Scenarios* (document on file). Three Price Scenarios were given for:

1. Scenario of 0% keeping the rate as it is now
2. Scenario of 4% increase
3. Scenario of 10% increase

Lovejoy Roe inquired what the actual overtime costs to the County have been for long term vacancies.

Mahony stated that the County is not in the same operational situation going into 2009 as it was in 2008. He indicated there have been about 33 new hires in the last year. Radzik indicated this new hire rate should impact the average longevity percentage.

Watson will verify that the 500K County Overtime Pool is growing at the same percentage as salaries for projections.

Schwartz requested an electronic version of the budget figures presented.

O'Hare stated that it is the task of the *PSSC* to bring a recommendation to the BOC about the next Police Services contract.

Mahony stated that the POAM contract is thru 2012 with a wage reopener for one year.

Ouimet stated the need to make sure that the funding source matches the expense for the contracting units, so that they have the opportunity to make an informed decision.

Patton indicated that a document will be provided to *PSSC* members indicating when Public Safety Millages are set to expire. Schwartz noted that some jurisdictions are funding Police Services from their General Fund.

PSSC members discussed contract term length options, noting:

- ✓ “Would it be something that you can take to the bank?”
- ✓ Two year, and then maybe a longer contract – timing for a longer contract now is not good
- ✓ Neither side wants to go out on a long term contract now
- ✓ No point in doing just one year unless you just leave as is now
- ✓ Original thought for those interested in a one year contract was that it were be akin to an extension, rather than an extensive development
- ✓ If *PSSC* is really going to dig into numbers, go longer than two years
- ✓ Authorize an “up to” amount for millage to accommodate assumptions

O’Hare asked *PSSC* members if they want to hold additional meetings during the next months and try to push through a recommendation for a short term contract; or if they would prefer to take more time, get additional detail and perhaps look at a longer term contract. She noted a third option to recommend an extension of the current contract, and then continue investigation/exploration during 2009.

Mahony stated that current Sheriff leadership have worked hard to involve other levels of the Sheriff’s office in the Local Units Police Services process, to ensure that this knowledge is not just with current leadership. He noted that all this documentation and work is there, and will be available under the new Sheriff come 2009. He noted that everybody is currently facing very difficult economic times, and all forms of government are looking at what they do and reprioritizing. He stated that with the new Sheriff starting January 1, and a 2009 contract intact, it is important to engage and re-evaluate -- What are the core services going to be and what value does this bring to your community? He advocated that good business practices be followed noting that this is a really good time to look at what we are doing, why we are doing it, and can we continue to do it? -- Taking a long hard look at not just what is the cost for contracting, but what is in that cost, and why is it there, and should it still be there?

Jamnack agreed with the need to further evaluate Policing best practices, and that to wrap up a recommendation by year end would be a monumental task, noting that there are three main timeframes to consider: County two-year budget, the length of the local community millages, and the length of the contracts. She stressed that whatever agreements are made, they need to be stuck to.

O’Hare summarized that the *PSSC* will not try to get Police Services recommendations ready by year end; that the discussion is too important to rush. She stated that the *PSSC* may still want to take advantage of Mahony’s expertise and knowledge before January when the new Sheriff Leadership takes office, and may wish to hold additional meetings during 2008. She suggested that the *PSSC* come up with some solutions for dealing with the short term pressure issues that jurisdictions may be facing early next year, but with the idea that the next contract the *PSSC* is discussing is something that they will look thoroughly at.

Kelly moved for a special *PSSC* meeting on November 12, 4:30pm-6:00pm, 200 North Main, Ann Arbor; Vaillencourt seconded; all in favor.

7. 2009 Committee Membership

Deferred to December *PSSC* meeting.

8. Committee Check-In

None.

9. Adjournment

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

Next Meeting – Special *PSSC* Meeting

Wednesday, November 12, 2008

4:30pm – 6:00pm

200 North Main, lower level conference room

Approved by Committee: 7 January 2009