

**C.C.E. Central Dispatch Authority
Board of Directors
1694 US Highway 131 – Petoskey, Michigan
MEETING LOCATION**

**1694 131 US Hwy
Petoskey, MI**

MINUTES

March 15, 2017

BOD MEMBERS PRESENT

Michael Cain, Chairman
John Wallace, Vice Chair
Tom Richards, Secretary
Charlie MacInnis
Chris Christensen
Marcia Rocheleau
Pat Ball
Lyon Stephens
Rob Straebel
Mike Newman
Jonathan Scheel
Bill Dohm

REPRESENTING

Charlevoix County Cities and Villages
Cheboygan County Board of Commissioners
Emmet County Cities and Villages
Emmet County Board of Commissioners
Charlevoix County Board of Commissioners
Cheboygan County Townships
Emmet County Townships
Charlevoix County Townships
Alternate Emmet County Cities and Villages
Alternate Cheboygan County Board of Commissioners
Alternate Emmet Count Board of Commissioners
Alternate Emmet County Townships

BOD MEMBERS ABSENT

Winifred Riddle

REPRESENTING

Cheboygan Cities and Villages

911 COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Kevin Shepard
Jeff Lawson
Marty Krupa
Kari Kortz
Robert Engel

Charlevoix County Administrator
Cheboygan County Administrator
Emmet County Administrator
Fiscal Officer
Civil Counsel

OTHERS PRESENT

Bob Bradley
Greg Clark
Michelle Katt
Chief Matt Breed
Derick Carroll
Al Welsheimer
Megan Anderson
Jason Lee
Mark Kooyers
Cherie Browe
Becki King

REPRESENTING

CCE Central Dispatch
CCE Central Dispatch
CCE Central Dispatch
TAC - Petoskey Department of Public Safety
TAC- MSP
TAC -Resort Bear Creek Fire Department
Emergency Management
Emergency Management
Tele-Rad
Charlevoix County
Charlevoix County

Meeting called to order by Chairman Michael Cain at 3:00 PM.

ROLL CALL – See Above

PUBLIC COMMENT

CORRESPONDENCE – NONE

Mr. Wallace asked to have a Motion to reconsider the Fiscal Officer subject. Mr. Cain asked Mr. Engel for proper clarification on how to handle the request from Mr. Wallace. Mr. Bradley passed out a document that addresses the proper way to handle bringing this subject back to Board for discussion. Mr. Cain suggested that this be placed on the Agenda as Item #8, if there were no objections. No objections were raised.

APPROVAL of MINUTES – February 15, 2017

*Motion by Mr. Ball with Support from Mr. Stephens to approve the February 15, 2017 Meeting Minutes.
Motion passed with Unanimous Voice Vote. Absent; Ms. Riddle.*

AGENDA ITEM #6

Krause Rd Tower Bids

Mr. Cain explained that at last month's meeting there was discussion on correcting the wind load issues at our Krause Rd tower, bids were requested and turned in this past Friday at 4:00 PM. Mr. Cain explained that on the recommendation from our radio consultant Tele-Rad, that they believe that removing the unused equipment from the tower will most likely correct the wind loading issue. If it is found that there are still microwave issues after this happens that we can then look at reducing the size of the microwave dish on the Krause Rd tower. Mr. Cain concurred with the recommendation from Tele-Rad, that the first step should be to remove the old equipment and this was the best direction to go at this point. Mr. Cain felt this topic should come in front of the entire Board and not just the Executive Committee. Mr. Bradley discussed the finding of one of the bid companies and they estimated that we would be removing approximately one (1) ton of wind loading weight off of the tower.

Mr. Bradley discussed the bid summary handout that shows the bids received from the three vendors.

Mr. Cain asked if we have a low bid price in the summary and if we had any references for the company and what was the recommendation of the Director.

Mr. Bradley responded that his recommendation is to go with the low bid from All-Cell to remove the old equipment from the tower at a cost of \$6800.00. This company is on a State of Michigan approved tower vendor list.

Motion by Mr. Richards with Support from Mr. Wallace to approve the bid from All Cell Communications in the amount not to exceed \$6800.00 for removal of excess antennas and coaxial lines from the Krause Rd tower and further authorize the Director to sign a contract to the same effect.

Motion approved by Unanimous Voice Vote. Absent; Ms. Riddle.

Discussion: Mr. MacInnis asked if the bidders had an opportunity to bid on just the removal of the excess equipment. Mr. Cain explained that their bids were similarly broken out. Mr. Christensen asked about the original discussion about welding plates to the legs that would put the tower load at 104%, he also asked what the loading will be after the removal of the excess equipment. Mr. Christensen asked if we should address the loading of the tower after the removal of the equipment.

Mr. Richards stated that doing a wind load study would add to the cost of the bids. Mr. Cain felt that we should address this issue at a later date. Mr. Christensen suggested that we look at the loading on each of our towers. Mr. Stephens asked how long the work would take. Mr. Bradley stated that All Cell thought they could have the removal of the unused equipment from the tower by the end of next week. Mr. Bradley discussed how wind loading effects tower sites. Mr. Stephens asked that after this work is complete would we still be looking at

investing \$70,000.00 in tower infrastructure upgrades. Mr. Bradley explained that from prior discussions, we do not think that further tower infrastructure upgrades will be needed.

Mr. Christensen asked if this tower has been inspected before. Mr. Bradley explained that we had an appraisal completed in 2012 when it was purchased by CCE. Mr. Cain asked if any other equipment has been added to the tower since the purchase, Mr. Bradley stated that we added an antenna for Straits Area Regional Ride. CCE added two microwave dishes prior to the purchase of the tower. Mr. Christensen asked if an appraisal is the same thing as a structural analysis. Mr. Bradley stated that it was an appraisal of the tower value and property.

Mr. Kooyers asked if he could clarify a couple of the questions for the board, he stated that the Mackinaw City Tower site was built and approved at the most recent specification. Stutsmanville tower was well under the specs and when we added the equipment for Central Michigan University last year and a structural analysis was completed on the Stutsmanville tower at that time. The Krause Rd tower had a structural analysis last year by Mission One which provided a complete loading and antenna specifications report. Mr. Kooyers also recommended after the removal of the equipment that CCE should have a new structural analysis to get a new loading benchmark on the Krause Rd. tower.

Mr. Cain asked if we had an approximate ideas of what the percentage of equipment that is currently on the tower, what percent would we be removing? Mr. Kooyers offered up a guesstimate of the equipment would be approximately 30% of the weight after the tower. Mr. Christensen asked if in tower leases is it normal to have the leasing entity remove their gear at the end of a lease. Mr. Kooyers explained that it is normal to have the leasee remove any of their equipment at the end of the lease agreement, though with this tower since it was purchased from the ISD that may not have carried forward through the purchase of the tower.

Motion carried by Unanimous Voice Vote: Absent; Ms. Riddle.

Motion by Mr. Richards with Support from Mr. Ball to create a policy document to provide for the routine maintenance of our towers and to create and maintain an assessment of these Towers.

Discussion; Mr. Cain discussed his concerns with adding another priority project to the current list he also felt that we should have another goal setting session of the Board. Mr. Christensen agreed with Mr. Richards on the need for such a document and feels that it is important to accomplish with a completion timeline attached to the project.

Mr. Richards stated he is willing to add a timeline to his motion. Mr. MacInnis added that a timeline would be beneficial.

Motion carried with Voice Vote – Yay - Wallace, Richards, MacInnis, Christensen, Rocheleau, Ball, Stephens. Nay- Cain. Absent; Ms. Riddle.

Mr. Cain expressed his concern about adding yet another project list to be completed by October. Mr. Richards asked if this could be accomplished before the next budget cycle so that this project can be included as a budget item. Mr. Cain asked the Director if an October time line is a realistic commitment on his part to accomplish the tower document, Mr. Bradley stated that he felt it was realistic.

AGENDA ITEM #7

Radio Steering Committee

Mr. Cain discussed the Radio Steering Committee on March 20th in this room. The meeting is open for anyone from the board to attend. Ms. Kortz asked if we have been given any engineering cost for infrastructure numbers from Motorola. Mr. Bradley stated that we are still waiting on the information from Motorola.

Mr. Cain asked if there were any other questions.

Mr. Lawson provided an update to the board on the timeline of the Radio Steering Committee, he discussed the review is to include a summary report and financial figures to the steering committee for the April or May meeting. The dates are relevant based on if there is going to be a recommendation from the steering committee to the 911 Authority and the three (3) County Boards of Commissioners if there may need to be a vote

Mr. Lawson asked if the BOD would like to see the DRAFT documents to review ahead of final review and approval by the Steering Committee. He stated that the June deadline impacts the requirements of putting the project out for a vote if needed.

Mr. Cain asked if the BOD members would like to see the draft documents to begin reviewing. Several Board members stated that he would like to see the draft documents ahead of time.

Mr. Stephens asked if the Radio Steering Committee is being aggressive in their gathering information for the reports for the boards. Mr. Stephens discussed his concerns on the costs of radios going up over time. Mr. Cain stated that he felt that the Steering Committee is moving as quickly as they can for the project and that ultimately the decisions will be with the Authority and the three Counties.

Chief Welsheimer he felt that the numbers seems to be a hold up in getting this information gathered, he would like to see the numbers given to the Steering Committee members. Mr. Bradley mentioned that the numbers that we are currently working on presently provide a solid number of radios that have been requested, at the present time we are waiting on final cost analysis from Motorola and the MPSCS. Mr. Bradley stated that he could make phone calls to the Director of the Michigan Public Safety Communications System. Chief Welsheimer discussed the needs of the some agencies for purchasing radios at this time. Mr. Cain stated that from the discussion at the last Radio Steering Committee meeting that the time frame was approximately one year to one and a half years before implementation.

AGENDA ITEM #8

Fiscal Officer

Discussion was held on the subject of the Fiscal Officer. Mr. Wallace stated that he would like to discuss the withdrawal of the motion on the fiscal officer position from the February meeting. Discussions was held on the proper course of action for handling this matter. Mr. Cain discussed a meeting that he called with the three County Administrators, and a representative from each of the Counties and himself as the Board chair. The meeting was held to further discuss the Fiscal Officer position and the timing of the proposed transition. The consensus at the meeting was that the best course of action was to follow the original motion to begin a transition to make the change of the Fiscal Officer over a period of the timeline stated in the motion. Mr. Cain further discussed the meeting content on concerns that were given to the transition with a recommendation coming from the parties involved to determine if a mid-fiscal year change is feasible.

Mr. Richards asked about the timing change and if Cheboygan County actually requested a change of the fiscal officer change. Mr. Cain felt that the change was approved in an earlier Board Motion, he further discussed the timing. Mr. Cain discussed the rotation of the position over the past eight years under Cheboygan County and previous to that the fiscal officer role was under Charlevoix County for approximately 13 years. Mr. Ball asked Mr. Wallace if he was okay with the information as it is being discussed, Mr. Wallace stated he was good with the information. Mr. Engle stated that if no action occurs the tabled motion would die for lack of support or action. Mr. Cain stated that he did discuss with the Authority's chief auditor and that he felt that a transition to take place at the end of the fiscal year would probably be more feasible and create a better transition.

Motion by Ms. Rocheleau to bring the Motion back to the table. No Support offered for the Motion as stated. Motion dies for lack of support.

Motion by Mr. Richards with Support from Ms. Rocheleau to retain the current fiscal officer and not make any change.

Mr. Engle stated that it is a new motion, but he felt if it was to change the Motion that was made in January, he felt it would not be proper to bring this motion back at this time due to the ongoing discussions of this matter. Mr. Richards asked when it would be appropriate to bring forward this motion, Mr. Engel explained the process of bringing a motion back on this subject. Mr. Richards expressed his concerns that the Board could not make changes from one meeting to the next, Mr. Cain stated that he felt the board has had adequate time to discuss this subject. Mr. Christensen discussed that the Charlevoix County board felt that it was important from their standpoint to be more involved with the information and guidance of the Authority.

AGENDA ITEM #9

Action Plan Update

Mr. Bradley discussed the Action Plan Update that he provided to the Board. He felt that good progress has been made on the Action Plan with the updated information as provided. Mr. Cain discussed the assistance and resources provided by the three County administrators who have offered their help to the staff in following up with items in the Action Plan. Mr. Cain felt that a Motion to allow Mr. Bradley the ability to work with the three County Administrators would be beneficial. He is concerned about overloading their time with 911 items but felt that this would be the best course of action.

Mr. Christensen asked about the cost of developing an employee handbook, Mr. Bradley stated that he addressed this with Ms. Abbott (previous Civil Counsel) and her recommendation was to work with Mr. Dinon (Labor Attorney) to develop an employee handbook. Mr. Cain expressed his concerns about the timing of projects. Mr. Cain further discussed the cost of developing an employee handbook and that the figures do not seem to be out of line for costs that he has seen. Mr. Cain felt that it would be worthwhile for the three County Administrators to work with the Director to accomplish this project.

Motion by Mr. Cain with Support from Mr. MacInnis to allow the Director (and staff as needed) to work with the three County Administrators to begin to work on the Action Plan items and bring information back information to the board.

Discussion; Ms. Rocheleau asked if the County Administrators would be doing the work or if the staff would be working on these document projects or assisting the items with the Director. The administrators would be guiding and assisting.

Motion carried with Unanimous Voice Vote. Absent; Ms. Riddle.

AGENDA ITEM #10

Meeting Remote Access.

Mr. Bradley mentioned at the request of a Board member if it would be appropriate to allow for remote access of the meetings, he reached out to our Civil Council for an opinion. Civil Council suggested that the Board would have to pass a rule/policy to allow attendance remotely. Discussion was held on the process of having access to remote meeting access.

Mr. Ball felt that remote meeting access was not needed, since each board member should have an alternate member to attend in their place. Mr. Christensen felt that the information was relevant for discussion and that there should be a rule/policy to either allow or not allow remote access to attend the Board meeting. Mr. Richards stated that he brought up the question due to the fact that he and others may not be able to attend due to other commitments and felt it was important to be able to attend for the purpose of hearing and participating in the meeting discussions. Mr. MacInnis added that if more than one Board member were attending remotely it may get confusing. Mr. Richards said his intent was to allow for remote access via conference phone call. Mr. Wallace asked the Civil Counsel how any Board would know if the person on the phone was actually a voting member. Mr. Engle suggested that the board members would usually be able to recognize their Board members voice.

Mr. Engle stated that he would ask if he and Mr. Bradley could draft a rule/policy that would allow for remote access via a conference call into a meeting. Mr. Cain had questions about the procedural process of the number of people that can conference call into a meeting.

Motion by Mr. Richards with Support from Mr. MacInnis for the Executive Director and Legal Counsel to draft a definition document explaining the process and bring it back to the Board.

Motion carried with Voice Vote – Yay - Cain, Wallace, Richards, MacInnis, Christensen, Rocheleau, Ball, Stephens. Nay – Mr. Ball. Absent; Ms. Riddle

Agenda Item #10.1

Authority Board Counsel Representation

Mr. Engle addressed the Board with his concerns about a possible conflict in his role as the Counsel Representative, in particular his representation as Counsel of CCE Central Dispatch and his Counsel Representation of Emmet County for the matter of discussions on the CALM agreement. Mr. Engle that he felt that he would need to have consent from both clients, CCE Central Dispatch Board of Directors and the County of Emmet Board of Commissioners. Mr. Christensen asked the question if the Authority's Board of Directors needed legal Counsel for representation for discussions being held at the County level. Mr. Engle was not sure at this point and discussed the need to make sure that during the process of discussions on the CALM agreement he felt it would not be appropriate to try and represent both sides.

Mr. Cain discussed that the current CALM agreement as it stands is under discussion, the future direction of how the current agreement is written may need to be updated to be effective. Mr. Cain further stated that he felt that the agreement may need some updated revisions, but that there have been discussions on a complete re-write of the agreement, which may change the makeup of the current board. He felt that it was important that in the future the Board should have Legal Counsel for representation for certain matters. He further stressed that everyone needs to work together for the best interest of everyone involved. Mr. Cain stated that the current CALM agreement and the amendments to the agreement will be discussed. Mr. Cain has reached out to Mr. Dinon (CCE's Labor Counsel) and Mr. Dinon felt that he would be comfortable in representing CCE, though he does also represent at the County level and would have to have discussions with the respective Counties. Mr. Cain felt that it may be important for the CCE Board of Directors to have their own Legal Counsel to fulfill the Authority Boards obligations and to get the answers as to what standing the Authority has. Mr. Stephens mentioned that he is getting questions from Township officials asking about redoing the CALM agreement that would be re-written with only County representation and would not have Township or City/Village representation.

Discussion was held on the formation of the CALM agreement and prior amendments brought to the three Counties. These are amendments that were brought forth years ago regarding the makeup of the 911 Board and the Authority operated under this agreement and its amendments. Mr. Christensen discussed that he has not seen the amendments that were passed years ago. Mr. Shepard stated that they have a couple of the amendments that have been passed, but they may not have been approved by the Charlevoix County Board.

Mr. Cain felt that the legal and board information that is held here at Central Dispatch should be the same information as the information that is held at each of the County's.

Mr. Christensen felt that it was more important to have Emmet County legal counsel. Mr. MacInnis felt it was important to have Mr. Engle represent both Emmet County and CCE Central Dispatch, he felt it may be up to the other Counties if they are comfortable with the Mr. Engle having dual representation. Mr. Cain discussed that there are 4 legal government entities in discussion, Charlevoix County, Cheboygan County, Emmet County and CCE Central Dispatch Authority, and there is a need to determine who should have legal representation. Mr. Cain felt that Mr. Engle has asked a fair question about the Board's desire to make sure that Authority has concerns about his role representing both Emmet County and the Dispatch Authority.

Mr. Ball discussed that there has not been a conflict in the past with the Legal Counsel and he felt that the three County Dispatch Authority has been working well and does not it changing in the future. Mr. Cain felt that our three County Central Dispatch Authority remains important and has been a model throughout the State for a long time, he believes the question is to go through the CALM and review the legal agreements that are in place. Mr. Dohm asked what the current objectives are and was it to just review the current CALM agreement and to make needed adjustments. Mr. Ball further discussed the process that the Authority has always brought recommendations to the three County Boards of Commissioners. Mr. Dohm felt that there may be a need for separate representation down the road if the discussions require separate input from the Authority Board.

Mr. Christensen addressed Mr. Cain's discussion on the agreement, and that the CALM agreement while in place, it may not be being followed as the agreement specifies. The Charlevoix County Civil Counsel felt that the CALM agreement should be overhauled. Mr. Cain stated that there are a couple of items that may need to be updated as it pertains to the funding formula of the Authority and the current member representation of the Authority Board. Mr. Christensen discussed the original formation of the Authority and the board members as was determined by the MTA membership, the local municipalities and the Counties each appointing their representatives.

Mr. Cain discussed the timelines that the original elections took place in 1992 and the CALM agreement was executed two years later in 1994, at that time all three Counties approved the CALM agreement knowing at the funding process at that time. Mr. Cain stated that he felt the original discussion held a couple of meetings back were to review the CALM agreement to update with some minor housekeeping issues, now he feels like there are discussions on a possible major overhaul of the CALM agreement. He again reflected that there may be a need to have legal representation for the Authority to give the Board recommendations on the Authority's standings. Mr. Richards felt that the current discussion was whether there is a conflict of interest in legal representation between our current legal counsel and the County legal representation. Mr. MacInnis stated that the funding is coming from the three Counties and at the same time he felt it was important that the Board has representation from the Townships, Cities and Villages. Mr. MacInnis asked if the 800 Radio project comes to fruition, who will provide the funding for the project, Mr. Cain answered that the funding source has not been determined at this point. Mr. MacInnis did not immediately see a conflict for Mr. Engle role at this time. Mr. Straebel agreed with Mr. Cain that the Authority needs its own legal representation as these discussions move forward. Mr. Shepard stated that at this time there has been no discussion about the future makeup of the Authority Board or getting rid of this Board. Mr. Cain and Mr. Stephens both stated that they have heard different lists of possible Board member make up for the Authority Board. Mr. Cain further discussed that he felt it was important to continue discussions, but since this was an added agenda item and that the he felt it was in the best interest of everyone to take time and read the agreement to have a full understanding. Mr. Engle wanted to cover three points from a legal aspect, what if any conflicts may exist of the dual legal representations. He also stated that he would not be available for the April 19th Authority meeting due to a conflict. Mr. Engle further discussed conversations he had with Legal Counsel Brian Graham that there may be a legal conflict due to the dual role of Emmet County representative and Authority Board representative, if the Board decided that there was not a conflict he could possibly represent both sides. Mr. Richards discussed the role of Mr. Engle and that it was important for Mr. Engle to represent the

Authority, he felt it would be appropriate for the Authority Board to approve his representation of the 911 Board and then Emmet County may determine to obtain outside legal counsel if they feel it is appropriate.

Mr. Engle wants to make sure that there is fair legal representation for all parties. Mr. Cain asked Mr. Engle how would represent the Authority Board and Emmet County and how he would be able to keep both sides in the loop on the meeting discussions being held. Mr. Engle stated that he would keep both boards informed of the meeting discussions.

Mr. Dohm asked how much information is needed before the next meeting and he would like to see what Emmet County's decision will be. Mr. Stephens asked Mr. Engle if he just needed a decision on whether he should represent the both Emmet County and the 911 Authority Board for the purpose of the CALM agreement discussions. Mr. Shepard stated that the only timeframe that may be necessary to keep track of would be for dates on any possible need to vote for a surcharge increase.

Mr. MacInnis felt that it would be good for the 911 Authority to take whatever action is needed at today's meeting. Mr. Cain again expressed his thoughts that the 911 Authority should have legal counsel representation. He felt that it was important that if needed we can make changes in the future that will preserve the options for the Board for future discussions. Mr. Lawson addressed the Board that meetings have been preliminary at this point, he felt it was important to let the attorney's continue their fact finding and to bring back recommendation with the information that they find. Mr. Cain agreed with Mr. Lawson that there are ongoing discussions on how the future look of the 911 Authority Board is made up, and currently the 911 Authority Board does not have a seat at the table to be a part of the ongoing discussions. Basically decisions may be made without input from the current Authority Board which represents the communities within the three Counties.

Motion from Mr. Richards with Support from Mr. Wallace to give consent to Mr. Engle to represent both Emmet County and the 911 Authority Board with the ability to withdraw or make future changes as needed.

Discussion; Mr. Scheel agreed with Mr. MacInnis and that the Emmet County board will most likely not vote on the subject tomorrow night (Thursday). Mr. Scheel felt that it would be difficult for Mr. Engle to represent both sides on the CALM agreement, he felt it was important to allow the Authority Board to have retain its own representation. Mr. Straebel asked Mr. Bradley to send out the pertinent documents to the Board Members. ***Question has been called by Mr. Ball. Motion carried with Unanimous Voice Vote. Absent; Ms. Riddle.***

DIRECTORS REPORT

Mr. Bradley stated that several items were in the Board packet for the Board. He also mentioned that we have the Quarterly Financial Report available to us this afternoon and will be handed out for the Boards review for the next meeting. Mr. Cain discussed the timeliness of dispersing the documents to the Board. Mr. Cain reiterated that it is important that documents should be sent out as far in advance as possible.

ROUND TABLE

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn the meeting at 5:47PM by Mr. MacInnis with Support from Mr. Wallace. Motion Carried by Unanimous Voice Vote.

NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED April 19, 2017 AT 3:00PM AT CCE CENTRAL DISPATCH.

Respectfully submitted by Greg Clark