

**POLICE SERVICES STEERING COMMITTEE**  
**Special Meeting**  
**Wednesday November 19, 2008**  
 4:30pm – 6:00pm  
 200 North Main, Ann Arbor

**Members Present:**

Jeff Irwin	County Commissioner, Chair of Board
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
Brenda Stumbo	Ypsilanti Township
Patricia Vaillencourt	Village of Manchester

**Members Absent:** Paul Bunten, Dan Minzey, Kenneth Unterbrink

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

**Sheriff Leadership Present:** Lt. Dieter Heren

**Others Present:** Barbara Bergman (BOC), Jerry Clayton (Sheriff Elect), Leah Gunn (BOC), Courtney Nicholls (Village of Dexter), Jessica Ping (BOC), Mike Radzik, Rolland Sizemore (BOC)

**1. Call to Order**

The special meeting of the *Police Services Steering Committee* was called to order by Facilitator O’Hare, 4:35 pm, at the Washtenaw County Building, 200 North Main, lower level conference room.

**2. Police Services Contract 2010 Discussion**

**Matrix of Timelines (Township millages, etc.)**

Patton reported that townships, cities and villages all submit a L-4029 form to Equalization. Patton indicated that this information from Equalization had been compiled into a spreadsheet identifying what the millage rate is for each jurisdiction, along with when it will expire and how much the millage generates. He noted that Superior was absent from this spreadsheet, providing their information today as:  
 ✓ Law Fund Millage / 2.25 Mills / Generating 1,382,000 / Expiration December 2010

Patton stated that there are other millages that jurisdictions have passed that include other entities such as Parks, indicating that this additional information is available if *PSSC* members would like to see it. Patton clarified that this spreadsheet represents only special millages, based on information submitted from the jurisdictions via the L-4029 form.

### **Updated Budget information based on discussion/requests**

Watson provided further budget information to further clarify information and assumptions presented at the November 5, 2008, *PSSC* meeting.

Watson stated that the two big issues raised at the prior meeting were around 1) fleet costs and longevity and 2) the length of Sheriff Deputy tenure.

#### **Longevity**

Watson said that based on position control as of today, and based on deputy start-date carrying this out through 2010, the average length of tenure is eleven years of service. She stated that based on this, the 6% longevity figure is reasonable. She indicated that more detailed information, by employee, is available.

#### **Fleet Costs**

Watson indicated that she reviewed the budget assumptions and the Plante Moran methodology that was used for the 2008 calculations. She indicated that Plante Moran had taken the total Sheriff fleet budget projected for the fiscal year, and determine that 69% of this was dedicated for deputies. She stated that using this model, it drops the deputy fleet cost figure slightly to \$12,515 (prior projection was \$13,672). She stated that if we were to stay with the Plante Moran model exactly, the bottom line price per Deputy would be \$126, 945 – a 6.12% increase from the 2009 contract price.

Watson stated that in 2010, per negotiations, Deputies will receive a 2% increase, plus the top pay grade is to receive an additional 1% increase. She indicated that it can be confirmed with Human Resources whether the 1% is added prior to the general 2% increase and therefore compounding, indicating that for budget assumptions a flat 3% has been used for those at the top pay grade.

Watson stated that she could do further comparisons using micro assumptions by employee if this data is needed.

### **Process for developing recommendations for contract**

O'Hare presented a draft process for coming to an agreement regarding a Police Services contract, noting that this draft process is for discussion purposes to get the committee started, and that it had been based on the idea of a three year contract. She stated that outlined in this draft process, there are four main tasks for the *PSSC* to work on:

1. Agreement on cost projections and assumptions
2. Services provided = what is of value to the communities and within the capacity of the Sheriff's Office
3. Price growth for each year is acceptable to townships for a three year contract (2010/2011/2012)
4. Overall cost to County budget given agreed upon price growth is acceptable to BOC (how does this offset the rest of the County's budget and the whole picture?)

O'Hare stated that this draft process for a Police Services Contract has included a timeline for coming to resolution by March 2009.

Moran asked for clarification regarding item 4 with regard to price growth being acceptable to the BOC, asking if the *PSSC* will be weighing the entire Commissioner's budget and reviewing all the line items. He stated the need for some understanding of the County budget and what may be in tolerable range, but that beyond that inquired what is the expectation for the *PSSC*?

Irwin stated that it would be valuable for the BOC to know that the PSSC has a good understanding of costs, and that all are seeing “eye to eye” on what the financial impact is. He stressed that any *PSSC* recommendation will need to be “salable” to the BOC.

Bergman stated that the County General Fund budget covers many services, and that what is spent on Police Services can't be spent on other services which may also be important to jurisdiction's constituents.

Kelly noted that there is good Commissioner representation on the *PSSC* to help keep balance in mind as the contract process continues.

Vaillencourt inquired regarding what is covered in the \$12,000 fleet cost. She stated that it takes a lot of time and detail to fully understand Deputy costs and assumptions.

O'Hare stated that this proposed process for the Police Services Contract is assuming that the *PSSC* will take the time to delve behind costs and arrive at a point where *PSSC* members can say “yes I understand what that cost is, I may not like it, but I do understand it.”

Lovejoy Roe stated that the main reason the *PSSC* is holding this special meeting is that members had brought forward the idea of having a short term contract to assist jurisdictions that need to go out for a millage to move forward to get this on the February ballot.

O'Hare said that two ideas had been brought forward at the November 5 *PSSC* meeting, one which would really expedite action by the beginning of December 2008 or another which would provide for a potential millage in May 2009, with action by March 2009.

**Commissioner Ping presented a proposed resolution for bringing to the BOC at tonight's meeting:**  
*“A Resolution Authorizing The County Administrator, Upon Review Of Corporation Counsel, To Propose An Amendment To The Existing Police Services Contracts To The Local Contracting Entities Which Would Extend The Contract For Two Additional Years Through December 31, 2011, At A Price Increase Of 2% Per Year For 2010 And 2011.”*

O'Hare asked *PSSC* members for questions, discussion or comments about this proposed resolution.

Kelly said that extending the contract is a good idea; that it would give *PSSC* members time to dig deep and do the work that needs to be done. She stated that it should not take two additional years to do this, indicating that if there is a two year extension the pressure to resolve will go away. She stated she would support an extension, but not for two years.

Sizmore agreed with Kelly, stating that he would be willing to go one year at 2%.

Ping stated that she is open to either a one or two year extension, indicating that if the *PSSC* agrees on one year, she can make a friendly amendment for just 2010.

McFarlane stated that extending the contract one year actually gives the new Sheriff two years to work with the budget and come up with some internal cost savings. He stressed the opportunity of using General Fund Deputies to backfill for longer extended periods of leave, including vacation and illness, which could be helpful to lowering costs.

McFarlane noted the “broader understanding for everyone” that Commissioner Irwin’s participation on the *PSSC* has provided, indicating that he brings a good understanding of both sides of the issues. He stated that he would like to develop a “good contract that we all can live with, but that we probably don’t like.” McFarlane agreed with Kelly and Sizemore, supporting a one year extension at 2%.

Moran stated that they have heard from some of the other Township Supervisors that they really do expect the Township officials on the *PSSC* to look very carefully into costs and determine whether they are real or not, and what they are based on – noting that this will not get done quickly. He stated that two things are needed: 1) a quick fix to give time and comfort to move forward and 2) the time to do the work well. He stated that he would be comfortable with one year at 2% because this gives the *PSSC* the time they need to do this work, and it provides a reasonable short time increase for Washtenaw County.

Lovejoy Roe stressed that if the *PSSC* decides to go with a one year extension, they must be diligent and move forward to meet a March 2009 deadline.

Lovejoy Roe suggested also a further *PSSC* discussion around a different model of service delivery, designing a model that meets basic criteria for response times, services needed, etc. She stated that the Police Services model is now very jurisdictional, suggesting the *PSSC* explore what it would look like if we are truly a regional police department for Washtenaw County, and what deployment would look like for this.

Bergman stated that the idea of backfilling with General Fund deputies is important, noting that she would like to see this included in anything presented to the BOC.

Ping stressed the need to stay focused on the proposed BOC resolution and pricing, stressing that the intent of this is an approach to the pricing not the methodology, and that it will then allow the *PSSC* to focus on methodology in detail with the new Sheriff. She stated that the resolution had been proposed for two years to be in alignment with the County budget cycle.

Vaillencourt stated that her initial instinct would be to try and lock in two years at 2% for her jurisdiction, stating however that the efforts put forth by the *PSSC* to break down walls, negotiate and better understand the other side demonstrate how far the group has come working together, and that she would therefore support the one year extension in the interest of not undermining the *PSSC* and how far the *PSSC* has come, and in fairness to both the County and jurisdictions in respect to the big picture and uncertain economic future.

Ouimet stated the reality that both the County and jurisdictions are now under the same economic pressures, and that it is important to represent both our jurisdiction and constituents and also “the good of the whole,” indicating that it is critical to be a good partner. He noted that while the policing issue is important, there are also other issues with similar importance. He said that if we can extend the contract for a year at 2% and then get to a methodology that will continue to provide enough time up front to allow jurisdictions time to do what they need to do to react appropriately, then we are probably better off.

Irwin stated the importance of the impact on the total County budget, noting that a 2% extension would cost the County about \$200K for the next year, indicating that this would impact other County jobs/services. He stated that the best resolution may result in a contract that has both sides walking away feeling “equally wronged.” He stated that if he were to pick a number that he felt was fair, it would be more than 2%, but that he would be willing to support a short term extension at 2%. He stressed that he would like to see all the approved *PSSC* Policies (four) “enshrined” in the contract.

Schwartz indicated that the approved *PSSC* Policies could be incorporated as an Appendix or Exhibit to the contract.

Sheriff Elect Clayton stated he is not currently a *PSSC* member, and is attending this special meeting to listen only; indicating he did not feel it appropriate to comment.

Stumbo stated that including the approved *PSSC* Policies would be changing the contract; that the contract should be extended as is instead of starting to alter. She noted that the policies are already being implemented.

O'Hare stated that if the approved *PSSC* Policies are added as an Appendix or Exhibit, they may not interfere with the contract extension, indicating that this would need to be reviewed by Corporation Counsel.

Gunn stated that if the four approved *PSSC* Policies are going to be incorporated into the Resolution for Contract Extension, the BOC will need to see copies of these four policies:

- ✓ [Policy 0801 - Contract Deputy Deployment Policy](#)
- ✓ [Policy 0802 - In-Service Training on Common Staffing Day](#)
- ✓ [Policy 0803 - Court Time and Shift Coverage](#)
- ✓ [Policy 0804 - Adding Deputies to Existing Contract](#)

Ping stated that she would be willing to make a friendly amendment to include the four approved *PSSC* policies.

Radzik inquired if including the *PSSC* Policies as part of the contract extension would lock in the current scheduling and methodology for the "in-service training on common staffing day" (Policy 0802). *PSSC* review of this policy indicated that the policy is written generally enough that it would not lock in the training days or methodology.

Gunn stated that it is very difficult as a Commissioner not to know what is being voted on, indicating that the *PSSC* Policies should not be part of the resolution presented tonight, that it would be good to leave the new Sheriff flexibility.

O'Hare summarized *PSSC* thought that it is "not so much that that we might not want to include the *PSSC* Policies in the contract as an attachment, but that it would not go with the resolution for this evening."

Kelly inquired if there is a reason this contract extension resolution needs to be passed this evening. Guenzel noted that there are only two BOC meetings remaining in 2008, and that the resolution will need to pass both Ways and Means and the Board. It was noted that it could go to the new BOC in January.

Vaillencourt stated that the contract extension resolution has a statement making allowance for future amendments.

**Moran moved that a recommendation be made from the *PSSC* to the Washtenaw County Board of Commissioners that the Police Services Contract be extended for one additional year at a 2% increase. Vaillencourt seconded.**

**Irwin moved that the recommendation be amended to include an additional “Be It Further Resolved” clause that the “Four PSSC Policies as adopted are included as addendums to the contract”. Kelly seconded.**

Moran stated that, while he does not object to the four *PSSC* Policies included as an addendum, he does not want this to put the contract in a position where BOC members will not vote for it just because they don't fully understand interpretation of the *PSSC* Policies operationally.

O'Hare reminded the *PSSC* that jurisdictions represented on the *PSSC* have only one vote, if a jurisdiction has multiple members, it may only vote once.

**Vote on motion with amendment from *PSSC* member Irwin, as seconded by Kelly:**

“That a recommendation be made from the *PSSC* to the Washtenaw County Board of Commissioners that the Police Services Contract be extended for one additional year at a 2% increase, with the amendment to include an additional ‘Be It Further Resolved’ clause that the Four *PSSC* Policies as adopted are included as addendums to the contract.”

**The amended motion was denied with one in favor (Irwin) and nine opposed.**

**Vote on original motion from *PSSC* member Moran, as seconded by Vaillencourt:**

“That a recommendation be made from the *PSSC* to the Washtenaw County Board of Commissioners that the Police Services Contract be extended for one additional year at a 2% increase.”

**The motion carried with eight in favor and two opposed (Irwin and Lovejoy Roe).**

**3. Conflict for December 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting**

Kelly moved that the December 3, 2008, Police Services Steering Committee meeting be canceled; Schwartz seconded; all in favor.

**4. Committee Check-In**

None.

**5. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by Facilitator O'Hare at 5:55 pm.

**Next Meeting**

January 2009 – Date TBD

4:30pm – 6:00pm

200 North Main, lower level conference room

Approved by Committee: 7 January 2009