

MECC/HCSO Dispatch Consolidation

(Decision briefing)

Status quo situation

- MECC at 86.5 FTE and ~\$6.8M (GF)
- MECC technology upgrades needed
 - Federal grant money (\$4.2M) for CAD
- MECC brick and mortar is adequate
- MECC protocols and service completion is acceptable to MPD, MFD, and HCMC
- MECC operating at highest efficiency in the County

Hennepin County offer

- Resolution offered no-cost (with some exceptions) dispatch service;
- Exceptions have to do with some technology transition costs
- Offer was for HC Sheriff's Office protocols
- HC has apparently OK'd the City plan to delay an answer past Nov 30 and has been willing to talk about protocol changes.

City Resolution

- Offered a “maybe; we need to study this” answer in time for Nov 30, 2004 deadline.
- Resolution recognized complexities and suggested careful study and treatment of several items including:
 - Technology, personnel retention, costs to taxpayers; governance arrangements, and maintenance of safety through operational procedures.

Actions since Resolution

- Steering Team set March 21 as deadline and launched study group with focus on business or service requirements and costs
- HCSO/Mpls study group with consultant assistance met in January and February and listed concerns/options with focus on:
 - service requirements, costs, timelines, technology transition planning, and risks

Actions since Resolution

(continued)

- Labor Union reps (both HC and City) just beginning to meet after feasibility was agreed to in early February by steering and study group
 - List of issues and resolution recommendations not in hand at the time of writing this
- Study report prepared and provided

Options

- **Reject initial HC Resolution offer (Option 1)**
 - All HCSO and City workgroup members agree that HCSO procedures are not acceptable to MPD and MFD without changes.
 - HCSO has informally agreed to this, but has been open to adjusting its initial offer to accommodate the changes needed to provide adequate service levels (they have qualified that by saying they could do that; “with adequate resources and staffing”).

Options

- Propose an agreement different than initial HC offer (fold in requirements and work together for mutual acceptance); Options 2 & 3;
 - At least 2 timelines
 - At least 2 costing approaches
- Work toward merger versus transfer
 - This is Option #4 in the report

Timeline/Cost Options

■ Timing:

- ASAP (January 2006); respective Centers would remain in place and staffed until a joint Center were to be constructed (~2008).
- Consolidate only after joint Center is finished

■ Costs:

- All except transition costs by HC/HCSO.
- Share selected costs (e.g. for upgraded technology and/or service)

Risks/concerns

- Service levels must be maintained
- Cost savings are not fully forecasted
- Governance to assure the above not in place
- Technology of HCSO may lack what Mpls needs and/or the costs will be significant
- Personnel cannot all be retained in long-run
- Risks go down as planning increases, but cost-savings deferred if delays are necessary

Next steps

- Evaluate risks; balance them with savings
- Council decision needed on option(s) to pursue with HC Board
- Request HC Board action by March 21 deadline to facilitate capital planning schedule and deadline for \$4.2M CAD grant