

MINUTES

KALAMAZOO COUNTY CONSOLIDATED DISPATCH AUTHORITY

REGULAR MEETING

MAY 14, 2015

ITEM 1 - Call to Order

The Regular Meeting of the Kalamazoo County Consolidated Dispatch Authority was called to order by Chairperson Beam, at 3:35 pm in the Board of Commissioner's Room, second floor, County Administration Building, 201 West Kalamazoo Avenue, Kalamazoo, Michigan, on May 14, 2015.

ITEM 2 - Roll Call

Introductions were made.

Members Present: Ron Reid, Jim Pearson, Jim Ritsema, Thom Canny, Bill Fales, Jan VanDerKley, Bob Beam, Claudette Reid, Mark Barnes, George Cochran, Jeff Heppler

Others Present: Mike Seals, Nick Pollich MSP Paw Paw (for Dale Hinz); Tim Scott, Jeff Troyer, Karianne Thomas, Don Martin, Mark Myers, Julia Jankowiak

ITEM 3 - Approval of Minutes

Mr. Barnes motioned for approval of the April 9 minutes. The motion carried by a voice vote.

ITEM 4 - Citizens' Time

No citizens shared at this time.

ITEM 5- For Consideration

1. Update on Memorandum of Understanding with search firm - Thom Canny

Mr. Pearson stated that Strategic Government Resource (SGR) had been approved.

Mr. Canny stated that all were comfortable with wording of the letter of understanding from SGR.

Page 3 of the letter addresses billing. The Authority would be billed in 3 equal installments. If approved today we would have a little bit of time before having to pay first installment.

It was recommended we authorize Chairman Beam to sign the letter of understanding today.

A motion to approve Chairman Beam to sign the letter of understanding with SGR today was made by Mr. Barnes and it was duly seconded.

Ms. VanDerKley noticed the letter of understanding estimated the search will require approximately 120 days; the full contract stated 160 days under Tab 7. Mr. Cochran and Mr. Pearson stated 120 days had been discussed with SGR.

Mr. Canny stated we are to go with the letter of understanding and that the contract may indicate the longest timeframe.

Mr. Reid questioned how soon the County would be able to start helping with financial. Mr. Canny said by June 2. Mr. Canny suggested the Authority should notice the County Board on Tuesday, May 19 with the budget. The County would then be able to start payments after their June 2 meeting.

Mr. Cochran explained the County would write and issue checks on Authority's behalf until such time as monies are coming into the Authority and appropriate accounts have been established.

Mr. Canny stated an agreement would be drawn up between the Authority and the County.

Chairman Beam's understanding is that the county would see the SGR signed letter of understanding as a commitment and would act accordingly.

Ms. VanDerKley stated if per chance the county took a different position the 5 PSAPS would need to take responsibility for the contract if the County Board didn't approve to provide temporary funding on June 2.

Mr. Seals stated he thought the County Board would approve \$27,000 on Tuesday. The whole budget would then be reviewed and be able to be approved at their June 2 meeting.

Approval of the motion to sign the letter of understanding upon funds being available from the county was sought.

Mr. Cochran stated that as of July 1 money is starting to generate. The money will be there. The County Board should have no problem knowing that the money will be there.

Mr. Barnes stated that the commission meeting is on Tuesday, less than a week away and we should wait to sign until after meeting and confirmation of the funds being available.

Ms. VanDerKley supports Mr. Barnes's amendment to wait until after Board meeting with the approval from them for funds.

The Amended Motion in support of the SGR contract being signed after Tuesday's county board meeting upon their approval to financially support authority with at least \$10,000 was made.

There being no further discussion, the motion carried by a voice vote.

Mr. Canny will let SGR know we should be signing the contract on Wednesday, May 20.

The process according to Mr. Canny will be for a Memo being sent to commissioners on the recommendation that the board support the full cost of the contract with SGR. A formal agreement on repayment will follow.

Committee of Whole meeting takes place first and where the commissioners will discuss. The vote for approval would be made at the 7:00PM meeting.

2. Technical Committee Report - Karianne Thomas

The Technical Committee met Monday regarding a timeline. They have developed a timeline consisting of 4 benchmark dates: 60 day mark; 120 day mark; and 180 day mark. She briefly outlined the suggested benchmarks to be established at each point.

Ms. Reid questioned at what point we should expect to have a plan from the Director.

Ms. Thomas stated that at the 180 day mark the Director should have a plan together; with certain benchmarks being established at 60 days and 120 days.

Chairman Beam asked that there be a definitive statement in the 180 day benchmark for a final plan.

Mr. Pearson asked what start date the Technical Committee anticipated. Ms. Thomas stated they didn't actually use a definitive date; they used the 60, 120 and 180 day benchmark timetable.

Chairman Beam stated Mr. Hopewell had suggested we should look to contract with another PSAP to contract services. Chairman Beam suggests we hire a Director who could then implement a plan with all the parts outlined and lay out a proposal if we might solicit with other resources who might do what we want done.

Mr. Pearson asked if counties of our size have multiple dispatch. Mr. Pearson thinks outsourcing to another county may hinder all of the PSAPs getting and staying on board. If the Director sees this as an option then we could take another look at it.

Mr. Cochran believes eventually it may be regional or statewide dispatch; but if we are united now at that time we would have one unit to change as opposed to 5.

Ms. VanDerKley suggests we broaden the language for the Director. We don't want to limit them to just a consolidation as opposed to outsourcing.

Mr. Ritsema stated that the Interlocal agreement it was designed to come together as a consolidated dispatch. Due diligence is important as to outsourcing, but may not be ultimate goal at this time.

Mr. Reid indicated we just want the information from the Director on all aspects of our possibilities.

Chairman Beam indicated we want, as a body, the opportunity to create a benchmark. We may

not necessarily want to go down one road without looking at all possibilities.

Chairman Beam requested Ms. Thomas distribute the Technical Committee benchmarks to the members.

Mr. Ritsema asked if there are items that the Technical Committee can compile for the Director so that they have information needed to start such as what each of the PSAPs have now as to equipment, etc.

Ms. Thomas indicated that the Technical Committee does have or will have information for the Director.

3. Finance Committee Update – George Cochran

Mr. Cochran presented a proposed budget from this day forward through the end of the year.

The committee used a September 1 start date for the Director and an administrative assistant.

25% of monies owed would be paid back to county in each quarter of 2016; the goal would be that it would be able to be paid back sooner.

Mr. Pearson requested the Committee explain the discussion they had regarding locating the Director at a site other than one of the PSAPs.

The Committee explained this would prevent the perception of the Director working for one of the PSAPs more directly than with the others.

Mr. Fales suggested a radio is needed for the Director. It was suggested this could come under contingencies.

Ms. VanDerKley recommended approval of the budget. Mr. Ritsema seconded. The motion carried by a voice vote.

Mr. Seals stated that this is a more realistic budget for the County Board. It will be easy to present to the Board for their approval.

Mr. Ritsema asked how much revenue is expected to be received from the state. Mr. Cochran stated \$1.2 million per year

4. Legal Services Update - Jim Ritsema

Mr. Ritsema is willing to put an RFP out for legal services. Those firms being utilized by PSAPs will ideally not be utilized.

Chairman Beam believes it is the labor side of dispatch that is of concern. The employment contract is of vital importance.

Mr. Reid stated general counsel is as important.

Mr. Pearson suggested contacting other Southwest Michigan agencies to inquire as to what firms they use for 911 employment contracts.

5. Board of Commissioners funding/loan update - Jeff Heppler

Nothing further. Discussion was covered in the earlier Finance Committee update.

6. IRS ID Progress Update - Thom Canny

This is being worked on.

7. Final Items

Chairman Beam presented the idea of an accounting/purchasing/administrative agreement. He would like to execute an agreement while we are operating under a county advance. He would like this done with the county. Is there a need for a formal agreement? Does the process of the purchasing need to be spelled out?

Mr. Ritsema thought we could let the Director decide on that. We could operate on an interim process through the end of the year.

Mr. Canny indicated that if a Director is on board October 1, they are going to need paycheck, etc. The County did this with Transportation Authority. Things were done through the county process and then reimbursed. It can be done at the start. He doesn't want to create the presumption that the County is the one in "control" any other entity may do this as well.

The county would be the Authority's agent. A Memorandum of Understanding like the Transit Authority has used could be created.

Mr. Canny stated it is a couple of step process.

ITEM 6- New Business

Mr. Barnes commented that the Kalamazoo County Fire Chief's Association contract with Roe-Comm for their opinion of 800 vs. VHF service. New technology is coming forth. They are working to get themselves in order for a smooth transition with this consolidation. They are going to work with the Technical Committee.

Mr. Reid questioned if Roe-Comm is the place to use.

Mr. Barnes stated they are local and know the systems in place.

Chairman Beam stated the Director may be able to look into this further. The budget money will be decided upon on how to spend the monies coming in, not the fire chiefs or other entities.

Ms. Thomas stated the fire chiefs being proactive and wanting to work with the Authority is a good thing. All avenues will be looked into.

A discussion on the Technical Committee status, whether they are to have the authority to decide

what direction to go or the Director is to have that authority ensued.

Mr. Troyer from Calhoun County stated their Technical Committee brings the information to the Director and they typically work out the best option together. If there is a disagreement on a direction both parties' opinions would be brought to the Board, reviewed and a solution determined.

ITEM 7 - Any Other Items

1. Next Meeting Date June 11th, 2015 3:30 pm. County Building room 207A

ITEM 8 - Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:14 p.m.

There being no discussion, the motion carried by a voice vote.