

High Performance Partnerships
Final Report:
Executive Summary



July 30, 2004

Submitted by:

Craig Rapp Consulting, Inc.
Pepin Hugunin & Associates

High Performance Partnerships *Dakota County*

Steering Committee

Co-Chairs

Mayor Mary Hamann-Roland, Apple Valley
Dave Osberg, City Administrator, Hastings

Members

Mayor Bill Droste, Rosemount
Mayor Pat Geagan, Eagan
Mayor Elizabeth Kautz, Burnsville
Mayor Molly Park, Sunfish Lake
Commissioner Nancy Schouweiler, Chair, Dakota County Board
Councilmember Wendy Wulff, Lakeville

Craig Ebeling, City Manager, Burnsville
Tom Hansen, Deputy City Manager, Burnsville
Tom Hedges, City Administrator, Eagan
Steve King, City Administrator, South St. Paul
Tom Lawell, City Administrator, Apple Valley
Brandt Richardson, County Administrator, Dakota County
Jim Willis, City Administrator, Inver Grove Heights

Project Staff

Jack Ditmore, Director, Operations, Management, and Budget Division,
Dakota County
Sabrina Lau, Management Analyst, Office of Planning, Evaluation, and
Development, Dakota County

Project Consultants

Craig Rapp, Craig Rapp Consulting Inc.
Marc Hugunin, Pepin Hugunin & Associates



Executive Summary

The High Performance Partnerships (HiPP) project team identified 20 opportunities with the potential to enhance service delivery or reduce costs, or both:

Projects Evaluated

- **9-1-1 dispatching:** Consolidated PSAP
- **Building inspections and code enforcement**
- **Communications:** Enhance/expand joint communication efforts, including CATV
- **E-Government**
- **EMS:** New model for deployment of EMS resources
- **Energy:** Joint development and purchasing
- **Firefighting:** New model for deployment of firefighting resources
- **Health care:** Joint purchasing of employee health care
- **Information technology:** Combined operations, training, purchasing
- **Juvenile services:** One-stop shop
- **Law enforcement support/service center**
- **Leisure activities:** Coordinated delivery and scheduling
- **Police services:** New model for deployment of police resources
- **Prosecution services:** Joint non-felony prosecutions
- **Road system:** Coordinated planning
- **Service centers:** Co-location of multiple jurisdictions
- **Specialized public works equipment:** Sharing by multiple jurisdictions
- **Specialized public safety equipment:** Sharing by multiple jurisdictions
- **Street and road maintenance**
- **Transit services:** Coordinated planning and delivery

Evaluation Criteria

Each project was evaluated with a letter grade from A through F, on ten weighted criteria:

A. What is the magnitude of the potential success? (50%)

- **Quality of service:** How substantial is the anticipated improvement? (17.5% by weight)
- **Cost savings:** How significant are the expected cost savings? (17.5%)
- Is there any other way to deliver the service? (5%)
- **Transferability:** How many communities can benefit? (5%)
- **Qualitative advantages:** Are future "spin-off" benefits anticipated? (5%)



Executive Summary (continued)

B. What is the likelihood of achieving success? (50%)

- **Short-term manageability:** How complex, how costly is the initial effort? (17.5%)
- **Long-term manageability:** How complex is the ongoing management? (5%)
- **Political feasibility and support:** What are **citizens'** preferences? Is the opportunity consistent with citizens' values? (12.5%)
- **Political feasibility and support:** Is the opportunity consistent with the values of **elected officials, government employees and civic leaders?** (12.5%)
- **Measurement:** Can the outcomes be accurately measured? (2.5%)

The evaluation models and criteria are described in detail on pages 12-18 of this report. The "scorecard" is shown on page 18.

Projects Recommended at This Time for Implementation

1. **Joint non-felony prosecution services** (total score of 3.05 on a 4.00 point scale)
Rated "A" for long- and short-term manageability, public support, measurability
2. **Law enforcement support/service center** (3.05)
"A" for cost savings, transferability, spin-offs, officials support, measurability
3. **IT operations, training and purchasing** (3.00)
"A" for spin-offs, public support
4. **Joint purchasing employee health care** (2.85)
"A" for transferability, short- and long-term manageability, public support
5. **Sharing specialized public safety equipment** (2.82)
"A" for cost savings
6. **Centralized PSAP/9-1-1 dispatching** (2.80)
"A" for cost savings, transferability, spin-offs, measurability

The six projects that are recommended at this time for implementation are described in detail on pages 23-37 of this Final Report. The other projects considered are described on pages 38-52. A table showing the letter grades for all 20 projects on all 10 criteria, each, as well as the numerical score of all 20 projects, is shown on page 21.

Three additional projects earned numerical scores close to those of the six recommended projects. They are joint communications including CATV (2.72), joint purchasing of energy (2.70) and E-government (2.65). Other projects exhibited substantial strengths but also significant difficulties.



Executive Summary (continued)

Project Description

Project Charge: The HiPP project was designed to evaluate a very broad range of potential partnerships, and to identify three to five such opportunities that offered the best opportunity for success. As such, this project was not charged nor expected to provide a definitive or final analysis -- such as a fiscal or cost/benefit analysis, detailed feasibility study or an implementation plan -- of any of the opportunities. A more definitive analysis of the recommended options is anticipated as a next step for the recommended options.

Project Scope: The focus was primarily (though not exclusively) on those services for which the responsibility and accountability clearly rests with parties to this process -- i.e., on public-public partnerships, and on those among and between Dakota County and the cities and townships located within the county. Potential partnerships with such jurisdictions as school districts were not strictly ruled out, however, and the process also considered opportunities for privatization.

Methods: The project used a variety of methods to collect information, conduct evaluations and reach conclusions:

- Literature review of "best practices" in local government collaboration
- Survey of 300 citizens, local government employees and elected officials
- Facilitated workshops with municipal and county elected officials and senior administrators
- Public input meeting with an 80+ member citizen panel
- Additional public feedback from 60+ panelists in moderated focus group discussions

From all of the above sources, a list of 20 candidate opportunities for local government collaboration was developed, as well as the criteria for their evaluation.

- A scorecard was developed, against which the 20 candidates were rated and ranked

The methods of the HiPP process are described in greater detail on pages 7-11 of this Final Report.

Next Steps: For each of the six opportunities for local government collaboration that are recommended at this time for implementation, a further description of next steps, special challenges, possible features of the implementation, etc., are described on pages 18-37.