

**Dakota Communications Center
Board of Directors
Special Meeting Minutes: November 18th, 2021**

Members Present: John Bergman – Apple Valley; Mike Slavik – Dakota County; Mike Supina – Eagan; Jen Fox – Hastings; Rosemary Piekarski-Krech – Inver Grove Heights; Ultan Duggan – Mendota Heights; Jeff Weisensel – Rosemount; Lori Hansen – South St. Paul

Members Absent: Vince Workman – Burnsville; Katie Porter – Farmington; Michelle Volk – Lakeville; Dick Vitelli – West St. Paul

Alternates Present: Katie Bernhjelm – Farmington; Julie Eastman – West St. Paul

Others Present: Tom Folie, Cheryl Pritzlaff, Jen Hildebrandt – DCC; Logan Martin – Executive Committee Chair; Matt Smith – Dakota County; Helen Brosnahan – Dakota County Attorney’s Office

1. Call to Order

Recognizing a quorum Chair Weisensel (Rosemount) called the meeting to order at 8:00am.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Roll Call

X	Apple Valley	John Bergman		Clint Hooppaw
	Burnsville	Vince Workman		Dan Gustafson
X	Dakota County	Mike Slavik		MaryLiz Holberg
X	Eagan	Mike Supina		Gary Hansen
	Farmington	Katie Porter	x	Katie Bernhjelm
X	Hastings	Jen Fox		Mary Fasbender
x	Inver Grove Heights	Rosemary Piekarski-Krech		John Murphy
	Lakeville	Michelle Volk		John Bermel
X	Mendota Heights	Ultan Duggan		Stephanie Levine
X	Rosemount	Jeff Weisensel		Paul Essler
X	South St. Paul	Lori Hansen		Todd Podgorski
	West St. Paul	Dick Vitelli	x	Julie Eastman

Members and staff in attendance are noted above.

4. Approve Agenda

Discussion: No discussion.

Action: Motion by Duggan (Mendota Heights) to approve the agenda. Second by Eastman (West St. Paul). Motion passed unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA

5. Consent Agenda – Board of Directors Chair

- a. Approve Minutes from the August 19th, 2021 meeting
- b. Receive Adopted and Ratified Paid Claims
- c. Approve Unaudited Financial Report
- d. Receive Executed Contracts and Agreements
- e. Approve 2022 Depository Designation
- f. Approve 2022 Audit Engagement Agreement
- g. Approve DCC Post Employment Health Care Savings Plan Policy
- h. Approve Technical Support Furniture Modifications

Discussion: No discussion.

Action: Motion by Bergman (Apple Valley) to approve the consent agenda as presented. Second by Duggan (Mendota Heights).

Aye	Apple Valley
	Burnsville
Aye	Dakota County
Aye	Eagan
Aye	Farmington
Aye	Hastings
Aye	Inver Grove Heights
	Lakeville
Aye	Mendota Heights
Aye	Rosemount
Aye	South St. Paul
Aye	West St. Paul

Motion passed.

REGULAR AGENDA

Action Items

6. LELS 336 Dispatcher 2022-2023 Collective Bargaining Agreement

Discussion:

Folie (DCC) informed members that Legal Counsel Kevin Rupp, Executive Committee Chair Logan Martin, himself and Operations Director Cheryl Pritzlaff made up the negotiations committee representing the DCC at 2022-2023 contract negotiations. Folie

identified items tentatively agreed to in the dispatcher contract presented for consideration including:

- 2-year contract term
- 2.75% general wage increase as of 1/1/2022
- 3% general wage increase as of 1/1/2023
- Weekend differential pay increase to \$1.15/hour worked between the hours of 5:00pm on Friday and 6:00am on Monday.
- Communications Training Officer pay increase to \$4.00/hour.
- Longevity Pay of \$750/year for dispatchers with 11 or more years of continuous service
- Benefit Premium splits that are in line with the already-approved splits for non-union employees
- Overtime language change from pay to the nearest minutes to the nearest quarter hour

Folie noted that the dispatch negotiations team requested the addition of Juneteenth as a holiday, but that was denied until such time it is recognized by the State of Minnesota. Folie added that the dispatchers also requested increased uniform allowances and call-in pay, both of which were denied.

Folie acknowledged that there were some other topics that DCC and union stewards verbally agreed to work together on, outside of the contract. These included consideration of part-time positions and also having dispatcher representation in the interview process.

Duggan (Mendota Heights) questioned the overtime change to the nearest quarter hour. Folie (DCC) clarified that payroll system restrictions were the driving force for this change.

Action: Motion by Duggan (Mendota Heights) to approve the LELS 336 Dispatcher 2022-2023 Collective Bargaining Agreement. Second by Hansen (South St. Paul).

Aye	Apple Valley
	Burnsville
Aye	Dakota County
Aye	Eagan
Aye	Farmington
Aye	Hastings
Aye	Inver Grove Heights
	Lakeville
Aye	Mendota Heights
Aye	Rosemount
Aye	South St. Paul
Aye	West St. Paul

Motion passed.

7. LELS 368 Dispatch Supervisor 2022-2023 Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Discussion:

Folie (DCC) reported that the proposed Dispatch Supervisor contract was very similar to what was approved for the Dispatchers with a couple exceptions:

- PTO carry-over limit was increased to 600 hours
- Longevity pay is \$1,000/year for 11 or more years of service

Duggan (Mendota Heights) referred to the longevity pay and questioned if it was an annual payout. Folie (DCC) confirmed and clarified that for the supervisors, it was not based on continuous service. Folie commented that with all the staffing issues agencies were experiencing, longevity pay might make it a little more difficult for employees to leave the DCC.

Supina (Eagan) asked how many people were in the Dispatch Supervisors group. Folie (DCC) clarified there were 8 employees represented by the agreement.

Action: Motion by Duggan (Mendota Heights) to approve the LELS 368 Dispatch Supervisor 2022-2023 Collective Bargaining Agreement. Second by Eastman (West St. Paul).

Aye	Apple Valley
	Burnsville
Aye	Dakota County
Aye	Eagan
Aye	Farmington
Aye	Hastings
Aye	Inver Grove Heights
	Lakeville
Aye	Mendota Heights
Aye	Rosemount
Aye	South St. Paul
Aye	West St. Paul

Motion passed.

8. Non-Supervisory Administrative Staff Longevity Policy.

Discussion:

Folie (DCC) reiterated that the addition of longevity pay in the union contracts was an added step toward staff retention. Folie noted that the same should be considered for the three non-supervisory administrative and technical support staff. Folie noted that the recommendation mirrored what was approved for dispatchers, \$750/year for continuous service over 10 years.

Action: Motion by Duggan (Mendota Heights) to approve the Non-Supervisory Administrative Staff Longevity Policy as presented. Second by Slavik (Dakota County).

Aye	Apple Valley
	Burnsville
Aye	Dakota County
Aye	Eagan
Aye	Farmington
Aye	Hastings
Aye	Inver Grove Heights
	Lakeville
Aye	Mendota Heights
Aye	Rosemount
Aye	South St. Paul
Aye	West St. Paul

Motion passed.

9. Call Type Exception – Mental Health Aftercare

Discussion:

Folie (DCC) reminded members that the current funding formula was partially based on a percentage of the member's calls for service. Folie acknowledged there were certain call types that were considered exceptions, and were non-billable. Folie reported that the four call-types that were currently considered non-billable were Detail, Follow-up, Premise Check and Paper Service, and the current discussion was to add Mental Health After Care to that list of exceptions.

Folie informed members that at the February Law Enforcement Operations Sub-committee meeting, a member agency requested the addition of a call type for Mental Health After Care. Folie explained that this call type would allow members who were practicing follow-up visits to mental health calls to better track the time and effort put into those calls. Folie added that the addition of this call type was approved unanimously by the operations sub-committee and put into practice shortly thereafter. Folie stated that after approval of addition of the call type, sub-committee discussions quickly turned to whether or not this new call type should be billable. Folie acknowledged that after much discussion, the group agreed that the call type should not be billable, and requested staff to bring the recommendation to governance for consideration. Folie reported that the recommendation was brought to the April Executive Committee meeting, but was tabled as there just wasn't enough experience to evaluate potential impact.

Folie informed members that in November, with eight months of experience reflecting less than 1/3 of 1% of calls, the topic was again considered by the Executive Committee. Folie noted that at their November 3rd meeting, the Executive Committee

recommended that the Mental Health After Care call type be added to the call type exclusions list. Folie cautioned that current experience was not necessarily reflective of what members could expect because it was very possible that usage of this call type could change in coming months. Folie explained that the Board of Directors must use a weighted vote when acting on this budget-impacting decision.

Supina (Eagan) asked if members who had been using the call type since it was put in place were being billed for it. Folie (DCC) clarified that because of the 3-year rolling average in the current funding structure, members using this call type would be billed for it. Supina questioned if, because the call was a follow-up, the agency had been billed for the original call already. Folie (DCC) confirmed. Supina (Eagan) asked if staff felt once the call type became non-billable, usage would increase. Pritzlaff (DCC) referred to a table that was displayed during the conversation and acknowledged higher usage by some agencies than others. Pritzlaff clarified that some agencies, specifically Burnsville, already had mental health units and/or staffing in place, which helped to explain the varying usage. Folie (DCC) added that with the increasing number of mental health calls, it was anticipated that use of the call type would even out among agencies. Slavik (Dakota County) added that the communities that reflected higher usages already had social services embedded in their response efforts and it had been wildly successful. Slavik speculated the group would see usage fluctuation, but noted that there were some areas across the county that would continue to see higher usage than others. Slavik reported that the County Board was hiring 10 new staff members to accommodate expansion of the mental health crisis unit across the county. Slavik commented that one take away from COVID was learning how much society was lacking in mental health awareness. Slavik noted that the county was using ARP dollars toward this effort and hoped to be 100% responsible via county levy in the future. Bergman (Apple Valley) agreed with Slavik stating that Apple Valley had the program in place and was totally satisfied with the county's efforts. Weisensel (Rosemount) echoed Bergman's comments acknowledging the success of the effort so far.

Action: Motion by Slavik (Dakota County) to add Mental Health Aftercare to the list of call type exceptions to member fees. Second by Supina (Eagan).

Further Discussion: Slavik (Dakota County) asked if the non-billable would be retro-active for members who have already used the call type. Folie (DCC) confirmed.

Weisensel (Rosemount) requested staff review member weighted voting percentages.

10.84	Aye	Apple Valley
13.41		Burnsville
7.5	Aye	Dakota County
16.14	Aye	Eagan
3.45	Aye	Farmington

5.55	Aye	Hastings
8.85	Aye	Inver Grove Heights
12.72		Lakeville
2.97	Aye	Mendota Heights
4.60	Aye	Rosemount
7.19	Aye	South St. Paul
6.69	Aye	West St. Paul

Motion passed with a 73.78% vote.

10. 2022 Meeting Schedule

Discussion:

Supina (Eagan) referred to the September meeting date and asked if that was correct as it didn't follow the same structure as the others. Folie (DCC) confirmed citing past conflicts with the August meeting Date.

Action: Motion by Bergman (Apple Valley) to approve the 2022 Board of Directors meeting schedule as presented. Second by Duggan (Mendota Heights).

Aye	Apple Valley
	Burnsville
Aye	Dakota County
Aye	Eagan
Aye	Farmington
Aye	Hastings
Aye	Inver Grove Heights
	Lakeville
Aye	Mendota Heights
Aye	Rosemount
Aye	South St. Paul
Aye	West St. Paul

Motion passed.

11. Board of Directors Chair and Vice-chair Nominations

Discussion:

Folie (DCC) reminded members that at the first meeting of even-numbered years, the Board of Directors needed to elect a chair and vice-chair. Folie added that the terms are for two years with a term limit of two consecutive terms. Folie clarified that because the current chair and vice-chair filled vacated seats, the term limit did not apply.

Duggan (Mendota Heights) nominated Jeff Weisensel for DCC Board of Directors Chair for the 2022 – 2023 term. Chair Weisensel (Rosemount) called for other nominations, but received none.

Action: Motion by Duggan (Mendota Heights) to close nominations. Second by Bergman (Apple Valley).

Duggan (Mendota Heights) nominated Slavik for DCC Board of Directors Vice-chair for the 2022 – 2023 term. Chair Weisensel (Rosemount) called for other nominations, but received none.

Action: Motion by Duggan (Mendota Heights) to close nominations. Second by Hansen (South St. Paul).

Chair Weisensel (Rosemount) reminded that official vote would be taken at the February, 2022 meeting.

Information Updates/Discussion

12. Goals Update

Discussion:

Folie (DCC) provided an update on 2021 organizational goals identified the end of 2020 stating there were three main themes, each including multiple goals.

Improving Business Efficiencies

Folie referred to the Laserfiche effort saying it started with conversion of personnel files and would be continuing with streamlining work flows in 2022 and beyond.

Folie referred to governance meeting packet preparation efforts which were now starting earlier and ending with a staff meeting to review material in the packet.

Folie referred to JPA and bylaw modifications and acknowledged it was well underway and staff was ready for continuation of the effort based on satisfaction of the funding effort being discussed later in the meeting.

Finally, Folie referred to the open enrollment effort and exclaimed that the effort had been brought in-house and had been an overwhelming success, saving upwards of \$12,000.

Making DCC a Great Place to Work

Folie referred to the DCC facility and commented that it was a “cold environment” that he hoped to make more inviting to staff and guests. Folie noted that the first phase of this goal was to hang photos of DCC staff working with member agencies and Dakota County residents in the Training Room hallway. Folie commented that the effort would continue with DCC Dispatcher Gina Jermasek painting a Tree of Life in the main employee hallway.

Folie noted that the uniform policy had recently been relaxed a bit as requested by staff and the two director 360 personal growth evaluations had been completed.

Folie referred to an employee satisfaction survey that had been completed in July and would continue annually. Folie noted that while he was nervous that coming off of an emergency COVID schedule would negatively impact response, he was pleasantly

surprised by the feedback. Folie acknowledged that there were areas where staff needed to improve, but the overall response was positive. Folie reported that a mental health checkup program had been implemented in August and was nearing 100% completion.

Emergency Response Improvements

Folie (DCC) acknowledged that fire protocols had been a hot topic among member agencies for a number of months. Folie commented that he did not like putting monthly statistics out to the consortium that reflected fire stats that continuously missed the identified standards. Folie assured that staff had been meeting with fire chiefs to discuss the NFPA standard and identify how to proceed. Folie acknowledged contrary to original belief, the EFD protocols, while ensuring correct response, did not help to improve the statistics.

Folie noted that the current standard was a reach, not average. Folie assured that IAED was beginning a study of the topic with hopes that the NFPA would consider a change to the standard. Folie acknowledged there would likely be no change until 2023 or 2024. Folie referred to the data wall in the dispatch center and noted that the desire was to identify a software that would provide real-time stats for staff. Folie noted that would allow staff to make real-time adjustments to immediately improve statistics. Folie noted that there were three different real-time software packages being considered and that members could expect to hear more in coming months.

Folie (DCC) reported that another goal was to establish a long term backup plan for the DCC. Folie acknowledged that the current in-house backup plan was to shelter in the data room. Folie stated that what that was doable, it could not be sustained long-term as it was too loud and confined space. Folie noted that the off-site backup plan was to go to Ramsey County. However, that had not been tested. Folie noted that the original plan was to test it in 2020, but then COVID happened and staff has not yet been able to satisfy this goal.

Supina (Eagan) referred to response times and asked where the standard came from if most agencies were struggling to meet it. Folie (DCC) clarified that the NFPA set the standard based on parameters that included response and travel time. Anything left over was what the dispatch center(s) had to meet in order to be considered as having met the standard. Folie noted that at the conference he attended, PSAPs across the country were expressing significant concerns with the standard. Folie commented that it was reassuring to hear that most other PSAPs were also struggling and that the standard was being re-evaluated. Supina (Eagan) asked if the standard was the same for everyone, regardless of location, traffic and other factors. Folie (DCC) confirmed. Weisensel (Rosemount) noted that the standard was “ring to ding” no matter where you were.

Action: No action.

13. Logo and Website Update

Discussion:

Folie (DCC) reminded members that at the last meeting, the group authorized staff to proceed with logo and website updates. Folie noted that since that time the DCC had been awarded the Dakota911mn.gov domain and had been working with a contractor to identify a new logo and website improvements. Folie displayed the logo, and website screen shots for member viewing.

Bergman (Apple Valley) asked if staff had any say in the design of the logo. Folie (DCC) responded stating that both operations committees had declined participation. Folie added that after looking at many design options, a final concept was shared with the dispatch supervisory group, but that administration made the final decision. Bergman commented that he liked it and that the only suggestion might be to identify “dispatch” in the logo somewhere. Folie (DCC) explained the significance of the thin gold line in the middle of the logo stating it represented dispatch.

Supina (Eagan) referred to the website and commented that EMS in the logo got a bit lost because it was white, but other than that he thought it was good. Weisensel (Rosemount) agreed.

Folie (DCC) assured that the new website would allow responder access to needed forms and would allow staff to track “hits” to the website. Folie added that governance meeting dates, times and minutes would also be available to members.

Action: No action.

Director Bernhjelm left the meeting.

14. DCC Funding Update

Discussion:

Folie (DCC) introduced the DCC funding update noting that what was about to be presented by Dakota County representation had been provided at the Executive Committee November 3rd meeting.

Slavik (Dakota County) commented that he would detail the proposal from the County Board and would rely on County Administrator Matt Smith for support in answering any questions.

Slavik (Dakota County) acknowledged that Dakota County had been discussing DCC funding solutions since 2020 after having received a recommendation from the DCC Board of Directors that the County take over more of the DCC costs. Based on these comments, a recommendation had been made that DCC Staff work with DCC Fiscal Agent to break DCC expenses into two groups, Operational and Fixed. Slavik reminded

that Operational Costs were costs that were based on use, while Fixed Costs were based on dispatch center necessity regardless of usage.

Slavik speculated that it made sense, that fixed costs be covered by all tax payers in Dakota County, not by individual agencies. Slavik added that covering these costs at the county level made sense and would reduce member cities overall expenses. Recognizing that the County was not willing to take over DCC operations, but open to considering covering more of the costs, DCC governance submitted a proposal that the county take over 100% of DCC fixed costs over a period of 3 – 5 years. Slavik reminded members that when the consolidation happened, the County covered a large amount of facility expenses up front that should not go unrecognized. Slavik noted that after much discussion at the County level, there was a strong enough argument supporting the belief that fixed costs should be spread amongst all county tax payers, not individual populations. As a result, the county board responded to the DCC Board proposal stating that the County would be willing to cover up to 50% of fixed costs, phased-in over a period of three years starting on 1/1/2022. Slavik cautioned, however, that the County Board wanted to have some assurances before considering anything beyond that.

Assurances included:

1. Identify changes to the DCC Committee structure for reform/streamlining
2. Identify measures to provide the County greater influence over fixed cost spending
3. Check in on the progress of above assurances in 2024 to determine whether, and how fast the County would pick up the additional 50% of fixed cost spending

Slavik referred to Identifying changes to the DCC Committee Structure for Reform/Streamlining and reminded that there had been an effort to identify a streamlined governance structure that was tabled, pending financing discussions. Slavik suggested the County Board was looking for that effort to pick back up.

Slavik referred to Identifying measures to provide the County greater influence over fixed costs spending and suggested he was not overly concerned about this assurance as the DCC organization always did a good job representing budgetary needs, and the consortium had a good working relationship. Slavik clarified that discussing this might appease those commissioners who were a bit more concerned with the proposal.

Slavik referred to the 2024 progress report and noted that if the consortium could work out the aforementioned items, the County Board would consider conversations about taking over 100% of fixed costs starting in 2025. Slavik asked County Administrator Smith to provide additional comments.

Smith (Dakota County) noted that Slavik's comments were a very good rendering of discussions held at the County Board level. Smith noted that he tried to clarify among the Executive Committee that there were two things happening at the same time. First,

the County was committing to 50% of fixed costs over a three year period which would offset city contributions while, second, the DCC consortium worked on the structural reform. Smith reiterated that the County Board was interested in receiving some check-ins on the progress with potential consideration of covering the additional 50% of fixed costs starting after year 3.

Bergman (Apple Valley) commented that he visited about this item at length with his city administrator, police chief and fire chief. Bergman noted that Apple Valley considers this a great first step. Bergman added that everyone has been pushing for the structural reform for a number of years and with this proposal, that can finally get underway. Bergman referred to the breakdown of fixed v. operational costs and asked that the DCC provide that to all member agencies for reference. Bergman then referred to the message from the County and commented that it was crucial that the message be the same, and precise, no matter who it was coming from. Bergman reiterated that Apple Valley was comfortable with the progress and felt the assurances requested were attainable and would ultimately support the county taking over additional fixed costs in the future.

Duggan (Mendota Heights) asked if a vote on this topic would be weighted. Folie (DCC) commented that it depended on what the action was. Folie clarified that if the County were to take over more of the fixed costs, that would be a JPA amendment and would wind up going back to member governance. Folie noted that if there was a vote to support the County proposal, that would not be weighted.

Weisensel (Rosemount) reminded members that the discussion on the table was specifically in reference to the County covering more of the fixed costs. Duggan (Mendota Heights) noted that he would be interested in better understanding what a decision like this looked like for his city. Weisensel (Rosemount) clarified that all cities would see substantially decreased costs. Slavik (Dakota County) commented that fixed costs were roughly 20% of the overall budget, shared by the membership. The assumption was that by 2024, the County would be covering half of those costs with potential discussion for more going forward. Slavik added that the County had the tax base of the whole county, business and residential. Duggan (Mendota Heights) referred to growth in some of the member cities and asked how that would be impacted by this effort. Weisensel (Rosemount) reminded that operational costs would still be shared among members and the discussion on the table was specific to fixed costs that were inherent of a dispatch center regardless of member use.

Weisensel (Rosemount) acknowledged that while he was disappointed that the discussion on the table wasn't for 100% of fixed costs, partnering member Dakota County was expressing willingness to consider that in 2024. Weisensel commented that it was a step in the right direction and there would be much work needed in 2022 and 2023 to help ensure that happens. Slavik (Dakota County) agreed and noted that

he intended to stay on the DCC Board for another two years to help continue the effort. Weisensel (Rosemount) and Bergman (Apple Valley) agreed that representative changes mid-effort could be difficult.

Bergman (Apple Valley) referred to other recurring comments regarding the DCC becoming a division of the sheriff's department. Bergman noted that right now, that might be a "fine" idea. However, everyone needed to be aware how that opinion could change. Bergman questioned how member chiefs would respond to having policies dictated by the sheriff's department. Bergman questioned how that might work for the fire partners. Bergman commented that he firmly believed that the current structure and how it was being run by Folie and his administration was where it needed to stay.

Weisensel (Rosemount) asked that assuming the effort was proceeding, what the next steps were. Slavik (Dakota County) commented that it would be beneficial to the County Board to get affirmation that DCC governance was supporting progression of the effort.

Bergman (Apple Valley) asked for feedback from Martin and Smith on behalf of the Executive Committee. Smith (Dakota County) commented that he felt there was positive response from the Executive Committee. Martin (Rosemount) agreed, but noted that the Executive Committee would like further clarification on what the County felt was "progress" in support of moving forward with covering the additional 50% of fixed costs after 2024. Martin emphasized the belief that there was a great working relationship and there just needed to be some clarification.

Supina (Eagan) noted that he visited with his City Administrator about this topic and he was under the impression this was just an update so he was a little reluctant to take a vote at this time. Supina clarified that he wasn't saying there shouldn't be a vote at this time but that he would likely abstain to keep in line with his conversation with his city administrator. Martin (Rosemount) commented that while the Executive Committee may have been under the impression this was a good first step, it may not have been clear that action at this meeting would be the driving force behind a budget modification by the county. Martin commented that this seemed to be the final offer for right now. Supina (Eagan) acknowledged.

Weisensel (Rosemount) reiterated that the county would like the consortium to formalize the response a bit with a motion to support the County Board recommendation, including the assurances. Weisensel added that the DCC Board was looking for some clarification what the County Board felt would satisfy the request for assurances. Weisensel recapped stating that if the DCC Board motioned in support of the County Board recommendation, the County would start taking action and continue progression of the effort to start picking up more of the fixed costs.

Piekarski-Krech (Inver Grove Heights) reminded members that any funding change would have to be included in the JPA so it would come back to member governance units anyway. Piekarski-Krech noted that if the DCC Board did not take action, the DCC JPA could not begin modification and the County Board effort would be put that much further behind. Piekarski-Krech noted that with support of the effort today, it would allow for advancing conversations in February. Piekarski-Krech commented that she was in favor of taking a vote to signal DCC Board support for continuing Dakota County Board efforts.

Action: Motion by Duggan (Mendota Heights). Second by Bergman (Apple Valley).

Further Discussion:

Supina (Eagan) clarified that the motion on the table would be to support the County Board's proposal to phase-in over a 3-year period beginning in 2022 covering up to 50% of total fixed costs.

Duggan (Mendota Heights) inquired if it would be appropriate to request memo from the County Board clarifying what this effort looked like. Slavik (Dakota County) clarified that the fixed costs had already been identified by DCC staff and fiscal agent to the tune of \$250,000 for 2022. Slavik suggested that information come from Staff.

Duggan (Mendota Heights) suggested the next step in February would be to figure out what the assurances looked like.

Bergman (Apple Valley) reiterated this great first step and suggested the Executive Committee now work with the operations committee to work to ensure satisfaction of the assurances.

Supina (Eagan) questioned if the motion should only support the phase-in portion of the proposal. Bergman (Apple Valley) commented that there was time to get that clarified without stalling the progress further. Weisensel (Rosemount) agreed noting that there was no "commitment" identified in the assurances. Hansen (South St. Paul) also agreed noting that all the motion was doing was affirming support of the county's efforts toward a solution.

Smith (Dakota County) referred to the \$250,000 and noted that was based on the fixed costs list compiled by the fiscal agent originally. Weisensel (Rosemount) agreed reminding that it was presented via a ZOOM meeting the previous year. Smith (Dakota County) noted that he imagined the amendment to the JPA would have to be accomplished for February consideration and would specify fixed v. variable costs.

Action:

Aye	Apple Valley
-----	--------------

	Burnsville
Aye	Dakota County
Abstain	Eagan
	Farmington
Aye	Hastings
Aye	Inver Grove Heights
	Lakeville
Aye	Mendota Heights
Aye	Rosemount
Aye	South St. Paul
Aye	West St. Paul

Motion Passed.

15. Executive Director Report

Discussion:

Siren activation on 9/17 – Folie (DCC) noted that not activating outdoor weather sirens during the storm on September 17th resulted in some upset calls to the DCC, and likely member agencies. Folie explained that after speaking with the National Weather Service, it was determined that the rules governing activation of sirens were never met. Additionally, the two tornado touch downs were simultaneous and gone in one sweep of the radar. Folie reminded members that the dispatch center relied on protocols and first responders to activate outdoor weather sirens.

Director Hansen (South St. Paul) Left.

Matt Smith (Dakota County) left.

Compensation Study – Folie (DCC) noted that the compensation study was well underway and he hoped to have a final report at the February meeting.

E911 Funds – Folie (DCC) reported that the monthly DCC E911 funds from the State had doubled and there was nothing that led him to believe that would change in the near future.

Cloud based 911 system – Folie (DCC) noted that staff was currently considering moving CAD to a cloud-based system. Folie noted that there were pros and cons to the decision that would be revisited in the future as staff had more information.

Dispatcher Schedule for 2022 – Folie (DCC) noted that starting 1/1/2022 the DCC dispatch schedule was changing. Folie explained that it would allow dispatchers to have every other weekend off. Folie added that it would also allow for a double-up day that would allow for meetings, ride-alongs, trainings, etc. and not require overtime. Folie acknowledged that the schedule required a near-full staffing level, which was concerning.

Voluntary Employee's Beneficiary Association (VEBA) Accounts – Folie (DCC) reported that the FURTHER VEBA accounts had been sold and staff was working through evaluating what that looked like for DCC staff. Folie noted that it was happening so quickly and that legal counsel was currently working through the documents that needed to be acted on by November 30th.

BOD designations – Folie (DCC) reminded members that Board appointments may be due as of the first meeting of 2022.

Action: No action.

16. 2021 Executive Director Performance Evaluation

Discussion:

Weisensel (Rosemount) noted that he had requested the Executive Director stay for the discussion unless anyone wanted him to be excused. Hearing no requests, Weisensel gave the floor to Executive Committee Chair Logan Martin for the Executive Committee report.

Martin (Rosemount) noted that the 2021 review process was a very good one for Tom Folie. Martin noted that the review sub-committee was made up of himself, Vice-chair Melanie Mesko-Lee, Matt Smith and Chiefs Justin Elvestad and Bryan Schafer. Martin noted that the review document was provided to all executive committee members with guidance to reach out to their chiefs and elected officials for feedback. The feedback was then submitted to Dakota County Employee Relations for 3rd party compilation and return to the sub-committee for consideration and reporting. Martin noted that the Executive Committee received the report on November 3rd and recommended approval to the Board. Martin detailed that Folie's evaluation averaged upper 3s and lower 4s, which were all good to excellent scores. Martin added that some of the comments made were appreciation for the progress made on the organizational goals, positive feedback on the website and logo effort, great support pushing the funding discussion forward, appreciation for completion of the 360 evaluation, and overall continuation of operations during COVID. Martin added that Chief and Administrator support was a testament to Folie's leadership.

Martin reminded that in the past, there was a compensation recommendation. However, that is not necessary this year with the pending compensation study. Martin noted that there would be additional follow-up in February on that discussion.

Weisensel (Rosemount) noted that he wanted to publicly acknowledge Folie's leadership of the organization through a tremendously challenging year.

Action: Motion by Duggan (Mendota Heights) to receive and approve the 2021 executive director performance evaluation. Second by Bergman (Apple Valley).

Aye	Apple Valley
	Burnsville
Aye	Dakota County
Aye	Eagan
	Farmington
Aye	Hastings
Aye	Inver Grove Heights
	Lakeville
Aye	Mendota Heights
Aye	Rosemount
	South St. Paul
Aye	West St. Paul

Motion passed.

OTHER BUSINESS

Duggan (Mendota Heights) informed members that Burnsville Mayor, Elizabeth Kautz was currently in Glasgow representing Dakota County at a summit.

ADJOURN

Action: Motion by Slavik (Dakota County) to adjourn. Second by Duggan (Mendota Heights). Meeting was adjourned by chair declaration at 9:43am.

**Next Regular Meeting:
February 17th, 2022
8:00am
DCC Training Room**

Jeff Weisensel, Board of Directors Chair

02/17/2022

Tom Folie, Executive Director

02/17/2022