

MINUTES

KALAMAZOO COUNTY CONSOLIDATED DISPATCH AUTHORITY

REGULAR MEETING

JUNE 11, 2015

ITEM 1 - Call to Order

The Regular Meeting of the Kalamazoo County Consolidated Dispatch Authority was called to order by Chairperson Beam, at 3:30 pm in the Board of Commissioner's Room, second floor, County Administration Building, 201 West Kalamazoo Avenue, Kalamazoo, Michigan, on June 11, 2015.

ITEM 2 - Roll Call

Introductions were made.

Members Present: Bob Beam, Mark Barnes, Thom Canny, Bobby Hopewell, Jim Pearson, Paul Matyas, Scott Merlo, Dale Hinz, George Cochran, Richard Ford, Jim Ritsema, Jeff Heppler, Bill Fales

Others Present: Mike Seals, Don Martin, Ed Switalski, Julia Jankowiak, Larry Shaffer, Richard White, Tim Scott, John Faul, Dena Smith, Mark Meijer

ITEM 3 - Approval of Minutes

Mr. Cochran motioned for approval of the May 14 minutes. The motion carried by a voice vote.

ITEM 4 - Citizens' Time

No citizens shared at this time.

ITEM 5- For Consideration

1. Search Committee Update – Mr. Pearson.

The City of Portage HR Department has provided a proposed job description for review.

As things come together emails of documents will go out so that by the July 9 meeting the Board can sign off on it and it can go to SGR.

Chairman Beam presented 2 questions:

1. Compensation;

2. The speed of how quickly we want to turn this around and get it out there. Would it be better to simply say here it is and get it out there once PSAPS review and it is revised accordingly? We should try to get it out there before July 9 meeting. Would like interview process going before end of summer, as most who would accept this would need month time to notice employer.

Mr. Cochran agreed to having discussion today, PSAPS look at, send it back and get it out.

Mr. Canny said from a procedural stand point that would work. If all agree on base document within one week; SGR can go ahead. However, if one PSAP disagrees with something any changes would need to be approved by all.

Mr. Shaffer – Chairman signed contract with SGR 1 ½ weeks ago; sent over to county administrator; it has been taken and adjusted accordingly. All to review description and let Chairman Beam know if agree with or changes needed.

Mr. Shaffer passed out Job description. Salary – Chairman Beam thought \$90,000 is a number that should be utilized. Talked with the Calhoun County Director and he receives \$87,000 with a \$3000-5000 contingent compensation along with benefits.

Mr. Fales thought Calhoun County is 2/3 size of Kalamazoo County; so compensation may be larger for county of our size.

Mr. Heppler pointed out the Calhoun County director has been in the position for a number of years so has moved up in pay accordingly.

Chairman Beam pointed out SGR suggested \$110-120,000.

Mr. Cochran thought SGR is coming at this by way of their knowledge of the industry.

Mr. Shaffer stated we are pushing with SGR that we need someone to really get this off the ground not for someone to continued an established consolidated dispatch.

Mr. Seals stated whenever the county brings in new people we want a salary that will warrant them sticking around; not wanting them to leave quickly.

Mr. Ritsema inquired if the search committee would be willing to continue with this, the job description so that we can get it out there. He is suggesting they continue and meet with the consultant to get this worked out.

Chairman Beam doesn't think this director should be paid more than our principal chiefs.

Mr. Hopewell thinks you should base survey on job; what is typical range. We've got so many varied "chiefs", some elected others not.

Mr. Pearson agrees with Mr. Hopewell and Mr. Cochran. It is of great importance that this person be versed in many areas, including technology.

Chairman Beam feels we would be better off putting a range on this so that if someone is too qualified and wanting too much salary doesn't waste their or our time.

Mr. Barnes asked if we shouldn't we have the compensation in place to start.

Mr. Cochran stated that is all built into the contract.

Mr. Ford felt compensation should be based on qualifications and experience. We don't want to rule anyone out that may possibly want to move from a higher paying area for an area such as this.

Mr. Cochran suggested we put a cap on the salary.

Mr. Canny felt the Board is getting a little far ahead of ourselves from his experience. We should go back to SGR and ask them what they feel the value is. Let's see the range they offer once we find out what other counties in Michigan pay.

Mr. Pearson – the take home is the Authority is willing to go up based on experience and qualifications. Another reason we may want to up it is someone out there may be experienced at starting up a consolidated dispatch and it is their expertise.

Mr. Switalski suggested looking at other counties may be a little different because they are in an established system and our director will be starting with "nothing".

Chairman Beam suggested the Board open it up to the PSAPS to review and go from there getting it approved. There may be a need to have a special meeting if not agreeable with all.

Mr. Pearson is to ask SGR for a process that they would like us to fall into; get a plan with dates from them as to how it will go the rest of the summer.

2. Technical Committee Report - Dale Hinz

Technical Committee met on June 3. They had a presentation by Roe Comm about new technology.

Updated benchmarks to include 60 day

Chairman Beam – The early part of timeline for the Executive Director was to hire an executive assistant and a deputy director. Chairman Beam is pausing at the deputy director. He is unsure if this is a step to take at such an early stage.

Mr. Hinz stated the verbiage is to look at staff needs. This is not a directive that there be a deputy director right away.

Discussion ensued. We should let the Executive Director lead.

3. Finance Committee Update – George Cochran

Finance Committee has not heard anything back from the County.

Mr. Heppler & Mr. Seals stated the full budget has not gone to the county. Mr. Heppler is looking at the July 7 county board meeting. The County approved the funding for the search committee.

It had been motioned for and carried at May meeting that the entire budget request was to be presented to the County Board.

Mr. Heppler stated the full budget will be presented next Tuesday and they will get it on the July 7 meeting agenda.

Mr. Canny said the Board of Commissioners may be surprised by the \$173,000 amount. Some had expressed they wouldn't approve more than \$100,000. Now with more information it may be presented to the Committee of the Whole. Mr. Cochran will be there to explain if needed.

Mr. Seals understanding after last meeting was that Authority needed the \$27,000 now. He didn't think the Authority was sure on total budget.

Mr. Cochran explained the budget went until 12/31/2015. It won't be the full \$173,000 needed from the County as the funds will start coming in November. The committee had presented it as a budget for the year in explanation to the County as well as for the Authority.

4. Legal Services Update - Jim Ritsema

Working on RFP and getting it out to the firms. He would like a general timeline from the Authority. It was agreed by the end of the summer.

It will be sent to all of the firms identified and will ask for any conflicts and how they will deal with conflicts.

5. Executive Update – Bob Beam

Nothing more to add.

6. Interim Funding Discussion – Jeff Heppler

See above under Finance Committee. Reiterated the budget will be presented to Committee of Whole on Tuesday, June 16, going to July 7 Board Meeting.

7. Final Items.

ITEM 6- New Business

ITEM 7 - Any Other Items

1. Next Meeting Date July 9, 2015 3:30 pm. County Building room 207A
2. Citizen Time –

Mr. Barnes – going back to May 14 minutes re: Technical Committee – can the Technical Committee come with their position to the board and not just be advisory to the Executive Director?

Mr. Cochran – there are members of the Board on the Tech Committee and it should remain that way.

Chairman Beam pointed out Calhoun County's process and all agreed that is the way to proceed. The Technical Committee goes to Director and they work something out. If they are in disagreement, they both present to the Board.

ITEM 8 - Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:26 p.m.

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