

**Kent County Dispatch Authority  
Administrative Policy Board**

**Meeting Minutes  
November 24, 2008**

**Meeting Location:** City of Wyoming– City Hall

**Members Present:**

Kevin Belk	City of Grand Rapids
Art Tanis	Kent County Board of Commissioners
Larry Stelma	Kent County Sheriff's Department
Curtis Holt	City of Wyoming;
Chuck Deschaine	City of Walker
Senez Rodriguez	KCEMS
Greg Sundstrom	City of Grand Rapids
Jim Valentine	City of Lowell
Michael Young	City of Rockford
Chris McIntire	Michigan State Police #61
Dave Peterson	Plainfield Township
Peter MacGregor	Cannon Township

**Members Absent/Excused:**

**Members Absent**

Randy Gelderloos City of Grandville

**Guests:**

Ralph Gould, GRPD; Dave VanHouten, GRPD; Matt Groesser, KCSD; Kevin Walk, LIFE EMS; Michelle Young, KCSD; Laura Knapp, GFRD; Mark Herald, EGRDPS; Brad Schutte, WPD; David Kiddle, GRPD; Catherine Garcia-Lindstrom, Walker PD; Carl Wood, Walker PD-Dispatch; Tom Valdez, MSP; Harvey Becker, MSP

**911 Insight:**

Bill Doolittle

**Staff Present:**

Jennifer DeHaan, Kent County Administrator's Office

**Media:**

None

**Call to Order :**

9:02

**Action Items:**

**11-24-2008 -01**

Approval of the Agenda

To approve the November 24, 2008 meeting agenda

Motion by: Peterson

Support by: Tanis

Unanimous



- 2) **Legislative Update:** Art Tanis stated that HB 6070 has been passed by the House. The legislation, as passed, would extend the sunset of the legislation for a period of six years and would establish a millage vote requirement for any surcharge rate above 42 cents. The counties that currently have a surcharge or in which the surcharge was approved by the MPSC in 2007 and would be allowed to continue collecting without a millage vote. It was noted that the County has received payment from 31 providers totaling \$692,000. This amount is less than the \$900,000 quarterly estimate that was expected. This could be due to providers not submitting payment and from the fact that there was no reliable or valid information to identify the number of land line or wireless communication devices that would be subject to the surcharge. A discussion ensued regarding the potentially large number of subscribers that may have not remitted payment and that may need a reminder. Authority members indicated an interest in knowing who had remitted payment and requested a list of those that had remitted payment. It was stated that the information had not been provided as a result of the enabling legislation which exempted provider information from the Freedom of Information Act. There was concern as to whether or not releasing this information, even the names of the providers that remitted payment, could be a violation. To assess if this information could be released, County counsel will be asked to opine if this information can be made available.
- 3) **Executive Committee Update:**
- a) **RFP for Legal Services:** Holt stated that the Executive Committee had met and reviewed the proposals that were received for legal services and is recommending that the Dispatch Authority enter into a contract with Varnum, Riddering, Schmidt, & Howelett. Varnum was selected as the recommended firm based upon their qualifications and ability to address multiple needs. A **MOTION** was made by Greg Sundstrom and supported by Tanis for the Authority to enter into a one-year renewable contract with Varnum and to authorize the Board Chair to sign all appropriate documents. A discussion ensued. Michael Young stated that he was concerned that because of Varnum's array of services and agencies served that there could be a conflict of interest. Holt stated that this was a specific issue that had come up during the review and that the Executive Committee had asked that he and Jen DeHaan meet with Varnum to discuss if this would be an issue. Holt stated that the outcome of that meeting was that Varnum would more than likely be working on day-to-day functions such as intergovernmental agreements rather than issues that might result in litigation where a conflict might be realized. Tanis stated that Kent County receives services from many firms and any of the larger ones would also likely have a conflict as the agencies that they serve are many. MacGregor stated that using a firm that does not have ties a specific agency may prevent a headache in the future. Holt indicated that if the Authority desired they could republish the RFP and seek a larger number of responses. It was noted that the RFP had been published in the GR Press, posted on the Accesskent.com website, and been e-mailed to the legal firms that are registered with the Kent County Purchasing division. Greg Sundstrom stated that Varnum represents almost all of the entities present on cable and that acquiring services from a firm without any potential conflict of interest would be comparing two firms with completely different qualifications. Varnum had developed a team of qualified staff that will be able to assist with the necessary requirements and that most qualified agencies would have the potential to have some type of conflict. Kevin Belk stated that if the Authority chose to go with a firm that had less experience it could potentially compromise the success of the Authority. Dave Peterson stated that there are two perspectives on this issue, the first being the need to seek out the best law firm and the second is that that the firm with the most experience and would represent the Authority the best might have a conflict in the future. Dechaine stated that the selected firm with the most

experience should provide the most knowledge and experience to avoid a conflict and if a conflict arises to be able to then make a decision regarding the next steps. Stelma stated that the County does business with both of the firms and that the executive committee is recommending the one with the most experience and that the Authority is cognizant that in the future there may be a conflict and if one arises they would work to address that issue. The **MOTION** passed.

- b) **2009 Budget Process:** Holt stated that the Executive Committee would be meeting on Monday, December 1, 2008 to develop a recommended budget for 2009. The budget process had been delayed as a result of the need to wait to determine the amount of the revenue that could be expected and budgeted in 2009. The Board would consider the recommended budget at its next meeting on December 22, 2008.
- 4) **Distribution of the State 911 Surcharge:** Holt stated that members had received in their meeting packet information related to the distribution of the 911 Surcharge. To assist in coordinating the available resources for 911 it was suggested that the KCDA adopt a **MOTION** to recommend that the Kent County Board of Commissioners amend the Kent County 911 Plan to distribute the revenue from the State 911 surcharge to the Kent County Dispatch Authority. The **MOTION** was made by Greg Sundstrom and supported by Art Tanis. Sundstrom state his support for this **MOTION** and that Grand Rapids has historically provided this service and received the associated revenues. Holt stated that his perspective that the funding should follow the agency that provides the service until such time as the routing of these calls is changed. Stelma stated that the Dispatch Authority will have to make some policy decisions on how the surcharge revenues will be distributed, but at this time, the State had indicated that the surcharge would be revenue neutral and that the Authority may not have any additional funding beyond that which would be distributed to those agencies providing the existing services. The **MOTION** passed.
- 5) **Update from 911 Insight:** Bill Doolittle stated that he was coming to the end of the year and that he would not be onsite for the December meeting. Bill indicated that the Technical Advisory Committee was continuing to work on the RFP for the Computer Aided dispatch System. Bill stated that the CAD RFP process was challenging. Bill stated that he would provide the Authority with information for the 2009 budget to make any necessary revisions to the timeline and budget process. Curtis stated that the Executive Committee would be meeting following the conclusion of this meeting to talk with Bill about the CAD RFP process. It was also noted that the TAC has the first draft of the PSAP requirements and that they are going to bring this to the Authority for consideration. Bill stated that designating the appropriate PSAPs would be completed in the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter of 2009.
- 6) **Update from TAC:** Michelle Young stated that the Technical Advisory Committee was continuing to meet to review the CAD RFP and that it would not be in its final format for a few weeks. There were still some additional things that needed to be included and reviewed. The TAC would be meeting immediately following the Administrative Policy Board meeting today to continue the review and discussion. Greg Sundstrom indicated that he is hearing a strong sense of consensus from the dispatchers and asked if there are other outstanding issues that have been identified or anticipated? Michelle Young stated that the TAC had reached consensus on the issues and that they were receiving a good amount of outside input and have a lot of people looking at the document. Chief Garcia-Lindstrom stated that there are a lot of dispatch centers that do not operate the same but that the collaboration demonstrated has been impressive and that where there were differences they have

walked through and developed agreeable solutions. Ralph Gould stated that the consensus has been good between police, fire, and medication and from individuals. He stated that in the GR dispatch center the dispatchers have been reviewing the document. Belk asked if there would be a vendor that could respond to the RFP or if it would be too detailed or too technical? Michelle Young stated that there were vendors that had reviewed the draft document and that none had indicated a problem. Garcia-Lindstrom stated that any vendor that responds 100% should be avoided and that there will be areas that they cannot miss. Mark Herald stated that he had been very comfortable with the process and the document and that the system is working well to achieve the desired result.

7) **Miscellaneous:** None

**Adjournment 9:42 AM**