

POLICE SERVICES STEERING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Wednesday, September 15, 2010

3:00pm – 4:30pm

705 North Zeeb Road

Members:

Jerry Clayton (present)	Sheriff
Roland Sizemore (present)	BOC Chair
Jeff Irwin (present)	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 (present)	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 Vaillencourt (present)	Manchester Village

County Staff Present: Verna McDaniel (County Administrator) William Reynolds (Deputy County Administrator) SiRui Huang (Budget Office)

Sheriff Leadership Commander Dieter Heren, Lt. Brian Filipiak, Exec. Assist. Kathy Wyatt

Others Present: Kristin Judge (BOC), Shawn Keough (Village of Dexter), Mary Morgan (Ann Arbor Chronicle)

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 pm by Sheriff Clayton, at the Washtenaw County Western Service Center Building, 705 North Zeeb Road, MSU Conference Room.

2. Approval of Minutes

The July 7, 2010, PSSC meeting minutes were approved by Committee.

3. Citizen Participation (none)

4. Committee Check-In

PSSC Financial Sub-Committee

5. Discussion PS Cost Issues

Sheriff: moving back to PSU –really not just deputy cost but all the costs that go into deployment.

Sheriff: Have two documents with three scenarios--hope PSSC members will take documents back, to review in detail, send any questions so can be answered by next meeting. Pat Kelly: is any the current scenario? (Answer – yes: #1). Mike Moran: the Financial Sub-Committee is comfortable with scenarios, didn't take position on scenarios, some questions around Plante Moran methodology and figures. Mark Ouimet all the scenario differences are small and within the margin of error. The numbers that these scenarios are based on are accurate—

there is a margin of error in all these assumptions. Roland Sizemore –top number \$180,000. McFarlane has questions about some of indirect costs—push cost beyond what he expected. McFarlane said he is very happy with the Sheriff. McFarlane thinks some of the indirect costs shouldn't be included. Example: if he spends time in utility dept. --doesn't put on utility bills. McFarlane: Sheriff is of whole county –feels admin part is suspect. Pat Vaillencourt—agrees—have sheriff no matter what, wonders if info and tech pro-rated? SiRui: Sheriff's salary is in OH—is not included. Salary support services are: as are a portion of business offices. Pat Day: would be nice to have a little glossary to say what each category means. SiRui: car insurance is separate. MM: info & tech systems are just for Contract Patrol. Sheriff: CAP costs are out. Sheriff: we tried to think about if you had your own police agency what you would have to pay for. Scenario three does not have Sheriff's salary (different option) If had own agency would have to pay own tech. Sheriff: we tried to anticipate questions. Pat Kelly wants to understand the numbers. Mike Moran: These numbers relate only to patrol deputies. (Mike M: little bit of fleet needs resolving) Sheriff: Will re-send documents around fleet (in word format).

Shawn Keough: seems similar to a year ago—has some questions and suggestions—thinks is ok to go back to PSU –understanding that PSU represents more than the officer—not just 74 deputies, also command officers (87 FTE) (2 Lt. 11 Sgts.) thinks should make clear –thinks should do same for fringes. How does this work for Central Dispatch? Sheriff: 17 dispatchers—Central Dispatch indirect --only a part of SO budget for Dispatch. Based on study by Plante Moran—67% attributed to contract calls. Mike Moran: committee went over all numbers –but didn't vet 67%. SiRui: is 67% of all dispatch calls then 74% of that. Mark Ouimet : some of PSSC Financial Sub-Committee members could help make presentation. Shawn Keough: thinks need more description (“individual line items in the summary explanation that was passed out need more description regarding what was included in each.”). Pat V. and Pat K. want to see formulas. Pat V: won't BOC want more detail? Kristin J: we have a detailed formula sheet that the Financial Sub-Committee went through. Pat K: concerned how we got there. Mike M: maybe should have a note –that this was average based on all contracting deputies. Mark O: gets back to margin of error. Roland wants to make all sure questions are answered before to go to BOC. Sheriff: Financial Sub-Committee has tried to work through the questions—send us questions and we will add more info—even next meeting might not get right. Pat K: is more about presentation. McFarlane: these numbers aren't necessarily the price. Sheriff: we focused on costs. Mike M: debate would be on scenarios—maybe a recommendation. Sheriff: some policy decisions for BOC.

Sheriff: send questions to Kathy—will get to Greg and SiRui. Call Kathy with questions as well. Sheriff: 74 does not include any staff supported out of General Fund. Roland: if lose more deputies what does that do to cost? Sheriff: most are fixed costs—may result in increase in price (support costs would lag dramatically—not change much). Roland: may need to look at cost if lose Ypsi deputies. Roland: also how does it affect the cost if we gain deputies? Pat V: if openings helps budget somewhat. Pat V: contract—what if nobody contracted and county had to provide a certain level of service—some commissioner's feel can't subsidize. Pat V: maybe contracting entities subsidize the county because they are helping the county provide LE. Sheriff: Some argue county-wide is counties commitment. Pat K: thinks that is this is a fair price—what we are paying today. Pat K: thinks jurisdictions can't reproduce LE receiving on their own for this cost. Mark O: critically important we don't confuse price vs. cost. Sheriff: respectively disagrees with McFarlane –thinks these numbers are really close to real cost. Sheriff: if look at jurisdictions that have own agency—believes we are least expensive—the more jurisdictions we bring in-the more can spread the cost. Sheriff: doesn't think cost will ever go down—want to stabilize price by cost containment. Pat V: small municipalities' price is spread over fewer residents. Mark O: maybe county should determine % of cost to commit to LE. Sheriff: is a choice to pay extra dollars for own agency—other areas shouldn't be penalized. County does have obligation to LE. Also is an economic development issue. Shawn agrees with points Sheriff made.

Shawn expressed concern about possible consolidation of substations—(“asked Sheriff Clayton if he could confirm the rumor of whether or not the Sheriff’s office was evaluating the possible consolidation of substations, specifically the Dexter substation with the Scio substation?”) Sheriff: should look at all options—no plan. Shawn: what is cost of substations? Sheriff: if have fewer substations—then less fleet, less technology—Shawn: analysis ok if look at cost reduction such as fringes--should look at other areas of cost reduction. Sheriff: brainstorming every option—best service, cost efficient. PS—Sheriff not even preliminary discussions around substation. Shawn: thrilled with the service they get from SO. Sheriff: sensitive to issue raised re; substations. Pat V: losing an hour of service because drive back and forth. Sheriff: sensitive to issue but have to look at cost containment which benefits contract price. Sheriff: understands importance of visibility. Mike M: closed Ann Arbor Township station—turned out to be a positive thing—very workable –as part of combination. Shawn: is free building. Sheriff appreciates Shawn bringing up issue—don’t worry—nothing on horizon. Sheriff: also looking at revenue generation.

Sheriff: Couple of policy issues need to pin down, if BOC agrees on PSU cost and price. Sheriff: need criteria for cost increases— Financial Sub-Committee going to recommend to BOC policy that increases should be in alignment with actual cost increases—some indicators so that contracting entities will understand any cost increases. Pat K: cost and price will probably not be equal. Mark O: could tie bar it. McFarlane: how will we know –if fixed amount for more than two years (BOC terms) Bill McFarlane: key is the LE benefit the county receives from, value to county from the contracting agencies. Pat K: the methodology would be policy. Sheriff: one of townships talks about rise in PS costs—gap has been closed—Sheriff: would like longer term contracts—even if rolling contracts. Sheriff: also hard on staff not to have stability. Pat V: look at the benefit the county gets from the deputies (if crisis the 74 deputies are there) as well as county responsibility. Pat K: every LE boot on the ground helps every other. Sheriff: contract price for new customers—is support closed or open to new contracts—possible two tier—do they come in under the same cost (or 0% of cost) –need to decide. For existing contract entities do more deputies come in at the same price. Sheriff: need to look at longer contracts.

The failure of the county and jurisdictions to account for operational issues resulted in the \$83,000 –was too much of a burden on the county. Sheriff: if we fail to address the policy questions –we will end up back in trouble. Pat Kelly: should the PSSC make recommendation? Sheriff: yes, plus recommendation and scenarios. Pat V: are increase in costs, but also lowers by distributing costs. Ken Schwartz: two tier system—no incentive to contract. Sheriff: county’s budget not getting any bigger—need county to stay motivated to support PS. KS: need substantial fairness, not perfect. Mike M: if we have a formula that drives up the price—if we have to pay we should have someone sit at the table. Ken S: are we talking about collective bargaining --Mike M: yes. Pat K and Pat V: more openness and knowledge the better. Ken S: probably should try to quantify value of contracts to LE. Mark O: in theory the more boots on the ground impacts county crime. Sheriff: working on new metrics to quantify value of our services--working on costs of crime. Ken S: if can start quantifying—if value added equals county subsidy would make more sense to BOC. Sheriff: what is the county’s minimal level of service, what is the county’s commitment? Roland: back-up studies would be beneficial—check and see what everyone else is doing?

6. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:22 pm.

Next Meeting

October 6, 2010

4:00pm – 5:30pm

Washtenaw County Western Service Center

705 North Zeeb Road

Lower Level MSU Conference Room

Approved by Committee: October 6, 2010