#### POLICE SERVICES STEERING COMMITTEE MINUTES

### Wednesday, November 3, 2010

3:00pm – 4:30pm 705 North Zeeb Road

#### **Members:**

Jerry Clayton (present)	Sheriff
Roland Sizemore (absent)	BOC Chair
Jeff Irwin (absent)	County Commissioner
Pat Kelly (present)	Dexter Township
Michael Moran (present)	Ann Arbor Township
William McFarlane (present)	Superior Township
Mark Ouimet (present)	County Commissioner
Kenneth Schwartz (absent)	County Commissioner
Brenda Stumbo (absent)	Ypsilanti Township
Paul Bunten (absent)	Chief of Police Saline
Kenneth Unterbrink (present)	Lima Township
Karen Lovejoy-Roe (absent)	Ypsilanti Township
Patricia Vailliencourt (present)	Manchester Village

County Staff Verna McDaniel (County Administrator) SiRui Huang (Budget Office), Kelly Belknap

(Budget Office)

**Sheriff Leadership** Commander Dieter Heren, Director Greg Dill, Director Derrick Jackson, Exec. Assist. Kathy

Wyatt

Others Present: Kristin Judge (BOC), Courtney Nicholls (Village of Dexter), Mary Morgan (Ann Arbor

Chronicle), Jim Leonard (Ann Arbor Observer), Mike Radzik (Ypsilanti Township)

#### 1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 pm by Greg Dill, at the Washtenaw County Western Service Center Building, 705 North Zeeb Road, MSU Conference Room.

## 2. Approval of Minutes

The October 13, 2010, PSSC meeting minutes were approved by Committee.

### 3. <u>Citizen Participation</u> (none)

### 4. Committee Check-In

**PSSC Financial Sub-Committee** 

Sheriff: have discussed a timeline and schedule. Plan to vote today. (Quorum is present.) Differences range 166,000 to 179,000 (Indirect and OH impact the differences.)

Going to walk through presentation for tomorrow.

### 5. Recommendations to BOC

Speaking to BOC but also beyond. Thought is to talk about the cost model. County decided in 2000 to go to contracting model PS (based on Northwest Study). Also want to talk about increase in costs. Original price very

low because did not take into account the operational issues (that this group wrestled with—county trying to close the gap).

We are going to talk later about a policy recommendation that will deal with rises in price. Identify policy issues for BOC to consider. Want to make sure the mistakes of the past won't be made again—want ability to foresee cost/price increases. Want to develop plan to address adding/decreasing deputies.

Cost of a deputy is not the real cost—so we decided to go back to a PSU. Fleet charges are always an outlier. If have own agency, costs would also be borne. Looking at what is fair. Technology –if had your own agency would have to have.

2012 cost slide--recommendation from this group. Need to talk about as a group. Do we want to recommend one or forward all three. Sheriff: understood group wants to make a recommendation.

Mike Moran: recognize costs appropriate to providing a police unit. Recommends we recommend Scenario 3 (they are not that different). Thinks providing all three would be confusing. Greg: we plan to give all the documents. McFarlane: we should make a recommendation and why. Mike Moran –only put in the packet the one scenario with a footnote. Sheriff: from the point of full disclosure—we want to make sure that the BOC doesn't feel we were not providing all the information.

Mark Ouimet—nothing in line items particularly susceptible to rising, other than the normal. Sheriff: the biggest one is wages and fringes.

Mike Moran important to say is based on 74 PSUs. Pat V. agrees with Mike that we say we looked at all and the cost difference is minimal—more important is the number of the deputies contracted for. Sheriff: power in the presentation is what is presented verbally. Pat V. agrees is somewhat confusing. KJ: what if is highlighted. Sheriff: whatever the recommended scenario is put on this slide. KJ: point out difference clearly. Kelly: BOC needs to understand the level of thought and work put into this process. Greg: over a year and ½. Process of vetting and making sure everyone at the table is comfortable. Kelly: for what year would this apply? Sheriff: for 2012. Pat V.: where did the 4% come from? Sheriff: policy decision for BOC –has to be able to defend. Commissioners were present. Local officials were present.

Sheriff: Going to speak to committee outcomes. Increased boots on the ground is a value to county. Sheriff: doesn't care what uniform wearing –value to County. Must be recognition of value of contracting deputies to the county. Mark Ouimet: who is making the presentation? McFarlane: Thinks Sheriff, then opportunity for other members to speak to boots on the ground, help throughout county, etc. Verna: would show support if reps from the Townships sit at the tables for joint presentations. KJ: coming from the group. Sheriff: thinks is great idea—is from the group. Sheriff: Greg and maybe SiRui may be able to answer questions. Sheriff: was a collaboration—county staff put in a lot of work. Pat V. would like to know how many boots in each location—also how many 5 years ago. Sheriff thinks we have that. Pat V: thinks would show slope we are on and we need to work together to stem.

Policy issues that need to be addressed:

- Length of future contracts: love to see a 3-4 year contracts (Pat Kelly likes) Sheriff: especially is we can build in process and metrics for adding/decreasing. Would help with planning.
- Process for adding PSUs—BOC needs to decide if open and process
- Overall commitment to PS –possible %

Kristin J: if add or decrease PSUs the over-all cost will be spread differently. Have we worked on that? Greg: thinks should be next steps for financial subcommittee. Pat V: hopes group could agree on formula. Greg hopefully number of deputies going up and would have a favorable impact on the scenario. Sheriff: any additions or deletions, key points from group captured? Some points best to come from members. Kristin: where does it say SO responsibility to answer 911 calls—Brownstown (very very vague)—not clear what the mandate is. Courtney: will citizens understand the difference between cost and price. Sheriff: we must make sure to talk about/stress early on the current price—this is not the committee's recommendation that this become the new price. Sheriff: the charge was to identify as close as possible what the true cost is. Pat V: lots of conversations about the legal but also the moral obligation to provide public safety in the county. Pat V: there is a point where the smaller jurisdictions can't do it—70% of their general fund budgets. Mark Ouimet: if contracting stops it will raise costs to county. Sheriff:

can speak to partnership with the city of AA—we back them up—we are able to do that by using contracting deputies—our initiatives allow us to redirect our resources—which benefits other areas and the county as a whole. Pat Kelly: we need to quantify this—powerful to show AA other areas benefit from. Pat V: wants to change thought process—to value that we bring—not subsidy. Greg: if live within boundary of AA, travel throughout the county—need to have a base level of safety—McFarlane: emphasizes decrease in State troopers—SO picking up that response (now barely one state trooper a shift). Everyone needs to collaborate more—is a benefit to having LE outside the immediate jurisdiction. McFarlane: everyone has reduced numbers. McFarlane: doesn't think should make additional costs too expensive to add deputies. Pat Kelly: are start-up costs with adding new deputies (training)—though shouldn't cost more. Pat V and Pat K; should make it easier to add more deputies. Sheriff: crime doesn't know boundaries. Some jurisdictions with no LE. Staff overburdened.

Sheriff: believes arguments compelling enough to get a reasonable level of support from the BOC. Greg: we will make the modifications to one slide, likes the idea of having the Committee members sit together. Sheriff: Mike moved adopt scenario 3 as the scenario recommendation to BOC with others as footnote or backup information. McFarlane and Pat K second. Pat V; are we going to recommend a fair price? Doesn't want to have Commissioners think this should be price. Kristin agrees. Thinks Pat V's point of not pricing out important. Greg: thinks there is an interim step. Mark Ouimet: important to talk about benefits—which drive pricing—so topic isn't solely about money. Sheriff: does anyone think the price will be less in 2012. About \$160,000 with OT, PSU cost. Mike M; \$140,886 --20% with backfill and OT. –thinks would be where we are now. Sheriff: does not think county will backtrack the price is not likely. SO looking at potential cuts for 2012. Hope we could keep price static and identify metrics & process for future increases. Mike M: important for BOC to understand if they are only doing 20% they are not really even contributing 20% because of the cost of OT and backfill. Sheriff: some people think the county support for PS is higher than it actually is. There is really not that high level of financial support. The charge of the Financial Sub-Committee and the PSSC was to come up with the real numbers—thinks is fair to say not really giving 20% today.

McFarlane: we haven't answered Pat V's question—should we recommend a price? Critical that we point out the value we bring and the incremental impact if priced so high that deputies are lost. That is the next discussion. Pat V: her trustees think the County is trying to balance the budget on the backs of the contracting jurisdictions—want to get under control. Thinks identifying costs not enough. Pat V: make it very clear there is more to this. MM: what is the Working Session presentation billed as? MM; recommendation is as to cost—which leads to question of what the price is. Give people opportunity to discuss issues around the price. Kristin: Pat's V's board might have thought this was for 2011. Mark Ouimet—value –impact on price. Sheriff: we are working with an economist as to true value of SO—i.e. property values, insurance cost, --SO insurance policy in sense—quantitative data. Mark O: if we can identify a figure (such as 20% value to County then tie bar. Sheriff: can't demonstrate yet— Mark O: set the ground work for this piece which is coming. Pat Kelly: make a long list of benefits. Sheriff: could do right now—if going to be there—create list—compare with others and speak to it-more powerful coming from the members of the committee/local entities. Mark Ouimet—at some point we need to come up with a number. MM: anecdotal -- shooting in AA—where the SO had 26 officers there -more than AAPD. McFarlane: what is the procedure which is going to take place—how does it fit into the contracting costs. McFarlane: context has to be emphasized by local jurisdictions and Sheriff. Make sure that cost is not the price—price is yet to be determined. Large numbers in the past were based on inaccurate math. Just like the NW study. KJ: going to be a resolution which will be presented to the BOC. (No resolutions tomorrow.). Tomorrow night very clear—all we have done is cost. Sheriff will make adjustments to slides. Kristin: will talk to this 11-4. Greg: value of having Commissioners as part of the discussion. Kristin can be dialogue form table—ongoing. (Working Session to be held at 220 N. Main, BOC meeting room. 6:30 pm—will be taped.)

Sheriff wants to do a "contracting 101" Towns Halls—would like to take away the confusion—would like this to be a PSSC initiative. Go throughout the County. Pat V: thinks that is a great idea. This would be a part of the healing process. Brainchild of Derrick Jackson. Will debut at Dexter Forum next week to a limited extent. Greg: thanks Sheriff Clayton for his leadership, the Admin, the local units of government, etc. for all their hard work over the last 18 months.

Future discussion on policy issues—Commander Heren—several situations where there are not clear cut policies as to how to handle—would like to bring to group –and decide what's fair—bring resolution to those issues.

# 6. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 5:32 pm.

## **Next Meeting**

December 1, 2010 (Note: subsequently changed to December 15, 2010) 4:00pm – 5:30pm
Washtenaw County Western Service Center
705 North Zeeb Road
Lower Level MSU Conference Room

Approved by Committee: <u>December 15, 2010</u>