

**POLICE SERVICES STEERING COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday, July 8, 2009**

4:00pm – 5:30pm

705 North Zeeb Road

**Members Present:**

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

**Members Absent:** None

**County Staff Present:** Jennifer Watson, SiRui Huang

**Sheriff Leadership Present:** Director Greg Dill, Commander Dieter Heren, Lt. Jim Anuskiewicz, Lt. Troy Bevier  
Lt. Brian Filipiak, Exec. Assist. Kathy Wyatt

**Others Present:** Kristin Judge (BOC), Courtney Nichells (Dexter), Wes Prater (BOC), Mike Radzik (Ypsilanti Township)

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Facilitator Dill, 4:08 pm, at the Washtenaw County Western Service Center Building, 705 North Zeeb Road, MSU Conference Room.

**2. Approval of Minutes**

The May 6, 2009, *PSSC* meeting minutes were approved by Committee.

**3. Citizen Participation**

None.

**4. Committee Check-In**

None.

**5. PSSC Financial Sub-Committee Presentation**

- a. The Sheriff’s Office provided an Executive Summary and Police Services Methodology Documents.
- b. Sheriff’s Comments:

The Sheriff suggested that the meeting be brief, that everyone take the documents home, review, and bring back questions to the next meeting.

The Sheriff thanked the Sub-Committee members, and commended their efforts and cooperation. In particular he thanked Director Dill, Jennifer, and SiRui for their hard work.

The Sheriff noted that the Financial Sub-Committee had focused on its charge. It had drilled down into methodology and answered as many questions as possible as to the actual costs. He noted that there were some unanswered questions because of incomplete data or questions that related to policy decisions. (Contract approval through 2011 diminishes some of the urgency.)

The Sheriff believes that the Sheriff's office should move toward service levels—because that would be the best way to be fiscally responsible and meet people's needs.

c. Executive Summary

Wes Prater asked if questions around fleet had been clarified. JW said she had and there was no double depreciation—she stated she would forward documentation.

d. Review of documents Relating to Police Services Methodology

Document # 1, pages 1-2, Police Services Cost Analysis, 2009-2011

Document #2, pages 3-5, Police Services Cost Analysis Assumptions  
The Assumptions support the numbers presented in pages 1-2.

Document # 3, page 6, Police Services per Contract Analysis  
Is a spread sheet –compares estimated cost with price. The price is in alignment with the 4% increase.  
Looks at Direct and Indirect.

Document #4, pages 7-9, Police Services per Contract Analysis Formulas  
Updated Plante-Moran methodology with the most current data available.

## **6. Discussion of Sub-Committee Presentation**

MM noted that the Sub-Committee tried to determine costs using the Plante-Moran assumptions. MM has some on-going concerns about their calculations, but feels that the Sub-committee did the best that they could, though some numbers are still outstanding. There are also a number of fleet issues unresolved because the basis for a lot of what Plante-Moran did is not easy to determine. For example, there appears to be no attribution of admin costs for fleet, and it is not clear where things like the DB trailer go (MM). The Sub-Committee tried to collect and synthesize data on fleet and central dispatch to share with the full committee (GD). The SO is continuing to analyze operations, which may change things—therefore it may not be worth the effort to try to dig any deeper at this time (MM).

Commissioner Sizemore had to leave but, thanked the Sub-Committee members for all their work.

Brenda S. raised some questions about mandated vs. overhead. MM and GD noted that involved policy decisions, which the group stayed away from. Pat Kelly expressed appreciation for formulas. Mark O. said that there were unanswered questions, but as more data comes in, they may be answered. He noted that the difference between cost and price presented in the documents was much closer. Brenda S. and Pat K asked about what the difference between cost and price was. The Sheriff noted that agreement on definitions was one of the first things the Sub-Committee did. The County's contribution is the difference between cost and price (how to allocate overhead and county-wide is a policy decision -JW).

Recommendations: How should the PSSC and Financial Sub-Committee function. The Sheriff noted that there had been some suggestion that the PSSC or the Sub-Committee were no longer needed. The Sheriff said that he believed both were a good group of people to talk about issues—suggested that the PSSC meet quarterly or as needed—and the

Financial Sub-Committee be convened as needed to tackle questions that arise. The Sheriff feels that as the SO looks at alternative ways to deliver services, that it doesn't want to do so in a vacuum. Ken S. said that changes in services would affect 2012 and beyond, but we would use these numbers through 2011. The SO will be looking at more efficient ways to deliver quality service (Sheriff). Pat Kelly agreed group gets the stakeholders around the table, should not meet when unnecessary, but when there are issues, reporting from SO. The Sheriff said it is important to make sure that the roles/responsibilities are clear—it is not the PSSC's role to tell the SO how to run the Office, it is the SO's responsibility to develop strategies. The Sheriff emphasized that the PSSC's input is extremely important in developing those strategies, and is very valuable in terms of communication. Pat Kelly agreed with the importance of the PSSC's value re: communication. Pat V. agreed with the value of two way communication –allows the PSSC member's constituents to feel that they have representation/input/good communication with the SO—result is better understanding. Participation allows the PSSC members to be better informed and in a better position to communicate with taxpayers about important issues. Karen L. suggested quarterly meetings a possibility. Bill McFarlane said the PSSC allows communication so that SO can take back concerns (example: about MSP reduction)s—communicate with County about Township concerns. The Sheriff said he understands and respects the need to communicate about concerns. KJ stated her faith in the Sheriff –supports his leadership of the PSSC—the Sheriff should decide where the PSSC should go. GD/KS noted that the Sub-Committee membership make change over time.

Director Dill personally thanked the Office of Budget—expressing that it was a great partnership and spirit of collaboration. The Sheriff also thanked the Budget Office, the Commissioners, and everyone else who was involved with the work of the Sub-Committee. Ken Schwartz also expressed appreciation for the Sub-Committee's work.

## **7. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by Facilitator Dill at 4:55 pm.

### **Next Meeting**

August 5, 2009

4:00pm – 5:30pm

Washtenaw County Western Service Center

705 North Zeeb Road

Lower Level MSU Conference Room

Approved by Committee: September 2, 2009