

POLICE SERVICES STEERING COMMITTEE

Wednesday, April 1, 2009

4:00pm – 5:30pm

705 North Zeeb Road

Members Present:

Jerry Clayton	County Sheriff
Jeff Irwin	County Commissioner
Pat Kelly	Dexter Township
Karen Lovejoy Roe	Ypsilanti Township
William McFarlane	Superior Township
Mark Ouimet	County Commissioner
Kenneth Schwartz	County Commissioner
Rolland Sizemore	County Commissioner, Chair of Board

Members Absent: Paul Bunten, Michael Moran, Brenda Stumbo, Kenneth Unterbrink, Patricia Vaillencourt

County Staff Present: Scott Patton, Jennifer Watson

Sheriff Leadership Present: Director Greg Dill, Commander Dieter Heren

Others Present: Kristin Judge (BOC), Courtney Nichells (Dexter), Wes Prater (BOC)

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

McFarlane moved for approval of the March 4, 2009, *PSSC* meeting minutes; Kelly seconded; all in favor. The March 4, 2009, *PSSC* meeting were approved..

3. Citizen Participation

None.

4. Committee Check-In

None.

5. PSSC Financial Sub-Committee Update

Sheriff Clayton distributed a report from the PSSC Financial Sub-Committee. The Report summarized the March 20, 2009 and March 27, 2009 meetings of the Sub-Committee. Sheriff Clayton stated that the thought process of the Sub-Committee was to give the full PSSC a progress report, without rehashing everything. Sheriff Clayton offered to lead the discussion of the Summary Report, with the caveat that anyone could jump in with questions at anytime.

a. First Meeting, 3-20-09 Summary: The Sub-Committee decided that it needed to: agree on terminology, agree on assumptions (behind fleet costs, etc.), identify what should be included and how costs should be allocated (the SO needs cleaner numbers to deliver to the Budget Office, so the Budget Office can allocate properly), and agree on contract direct and indirect costs (and how they are handled). The goal of the Sub-Committee: to arrive at agreement that is fair for all concerned. Specific issues would be decided on in the next meeting.

b. Second Meeting, 3-27-09 Summary: Questions were raised if fleet costs as identified were a fair representation (we quote a higher price than Oakland County). The Sub-committee is working through the process. E911 PSAP funds

–the Sub-Committee raised concerns about the impact of the loss of those dollars if we go regional (WCSO no longer gets funds)—what kind of financial hole that would leave. The Sub-Committee agreed this issue needs more examination. Discussions are on-going about should or should not be included in “Total Police Services Expenditure” and in “Total Contract Price per Deputy”. The position of the Sub-committee was that unfunded liabilities and retiree health costs shouldn’t be included in the actuarial cost passed on to the contracting entities (a portion is now). The Sub-Committee will be looking at the actuarial reports—getting better information as to what is included. The Sub-Committee will be looking at how Oakland County handles police services contract issues—keeping in mind it has a different commitment, and different assumptions about public safety. The Sub-Committee wants a better understanding of how CLEMIS operates, generates calls for service and cases, how things are counted.

6. Discussion of PSSC Financial Sub-Committee Summary Report

Ken Schwartz asked if the sub-committee had set a timeline. The Sheriff responded they originally thought four meetings, but it will probably take longer.

Central Dispatch Discussion:

Bill McFarlane asked how Central Dispatch authority would work. The Sheriff said part of the cost plan is that PSAP money would go to the Authority. McFarlane asked how the costs or cost gap caused by the Authority would be allocated—passed on to the Townships, County, or both? Scott Patton said they have looked at the capital side, but not given sufficient attention to financing side. Pat Kelly said the Authority should hopefully do a better job providing service. Jeff Irwin thought the costs should be slightly less. Some confusion was expressed as to how costs of the Dispatch Authority would relate to PS contracts. Karen Lovejoy Rowe said we must look at revenue, and allocate costs based on usage to be fair. Wes Prater questioned validity of the Ford School study, raised the issue of all the costs involved initially and ongoing. Prater said the issue needs to be simplified and really looked at—if not a cost savings, he would not support the Authority. Questions were raised about staffing: levels, retention, and who pays the salaries. Lovejoy Roe and Greg Dill believe the staffing levels stay the same. Commander Heren said the turnover is during training, but once in place Dispatchers stay. The Sheriff said the County would continue to pay employees (only 3 very limited ways that would change). Patton said there is a lot of information that needs to be straightened out. Patton, Prater and Mark Quimet are going to be working on. Kelly said public safety should be the driving force. The Sheriff said the assumptions about public safety improvement should be questioned. Ouimet said that we need to get the financial nailed down, then look at public safety (hopefully improved service), then look at whether the value is worth it. Kelly agreed that all facts need to be on the table before a decision is made. Kristen Judge and Irwin both suggested that we should approach PS costs by excluding the issue of the Authority, going with what we have now, and plugging in the numbers as an option when we have a correct picture. Dill agreed additional clarity is needed on the Central Dispatch Authority, including a business plan (Patton and Jennifer Watson are working on).

Terminology, Police Services Cost Allocation Discussion:

Sub-Committee is using Incremental Cost Model. Irwin suggested it is important overhead be put in the right place, and raised what should be included or not (example: Detectives). The Sheriff said the total Police Expenditures go to the true cost per Deputy, also there does need to be recognition of the County’s contribution. Irwin suggested the Sub-Committee should look at County-wide services and price them out in the incremental cost model process—then do the Deputy formula. Judge questioned what would be the responsibility of jurisdictions like Pittsfield that use some of the county-wide SO resources. Kelly also questioned how that should be allocated out, and how to avoid having contracting entities end up paying twice. Kelly also raised the issue of the Townships that don’t pay at all (or adequately). Lovejoy Roe suggested we look at data. Sheriff questioned what could be done about it. Kelly said we need to know, to clarify who is getting a break. Dill said we need to look at all costs, what they really are, then make adjustments and decisions. The Sub-Committee is going to provide different ways to express costs and give different options as to Police Services costs. Sizemore agreed we need all the real costs, all the pieces. The Sheriff said that the Sub-Committee shouldn’t get bogged down by philosophical issues. Ken Schwartz agreed the Sub-Committee should focus on the math, and leave out philosophical questions that have no clear answer. Kelly said the Sub-committee should have what the numbers are and what they represent all written down. Kelly commiserated that the issue is a monster, but felt progress had been made. Roland Sizemore said the PSSC wants to see all the pieces involved in what a Deputy costs. Kelly agreed numbers are the first priority.

7. **Expression of Appreciation for Presence and Engagement of the Sheriff with the Process**

Voiced by Pat Kelly (applause from the PSSC and those in attendance)

.

8. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by Facilitator Dill at 5:10 pm.

Next Meeting

May 6, 2009

4:00pm – 5:30pm

Washtenaw County Western Service Center

705 North Zeeb Road

Lower Level MSU Conference Room

Approved by Committee: May 6, 2009