
Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards
Commission Working Session Minutes
November 8, 2007
Southwest District Public Safety Building
Detroit, Michigan

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sheriff Gene Wriggelsworth, representing the Michigan Sheriffs' Association
Mr. John Buczek, representing the Fraternal Order of Police
Lt. Col. Timothy Yungfer, representing the Michigan State Police
Mr. David Morse, representing the Prosecuting Attorneys Association of Michigan
Mr. Bill Dennis, representing the Attorney General
Sheriff Robert Pickell, representing the Michigan Sheriffs' Association
Chief Doreen Olko, representing the Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police
Sheriff James Bosscher, representing the Michigan Sheriffs' Association
Chief Ella Bully-Cummings, representing the Detroit Police Department
Deputy Chief Deborah Robinson, representing the Detroit Police Department
Trooper Michael Moorman, representing the Michigan State Police Troopers Association
Mr. Raymond Beach, Executive Director
Mr. Tom Furtaw, Commission Counsel

COMMISSION MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Mr. Jim DeVries, representing the Police Officers Association of Michigan
Director Kurt Jones, representing the Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police
Professor Ron Bretz, representing the Criminal Defense Attorneys of Michigan
Chief Richard Mattice, representing the Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police

COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT:

Ms. Theresa Hart	Ms. Hermina Kramp
Mr. Gary Ruffini	Ms. Cheryl Hartwell
Mr. John Steele	Mr. Dale Rothenberger
Mr. Dave Lee	Mr. Darnell Blackburn
Mr. Wayne Carlson	Mr. Danny Rosa
Mr. Patrick Hutting	

GUESTS SIGNING IN:

There were no guests in attendance.

CALL TO ORDER:

The Commission Working Session was called to order by Sheriff Gene Wriggelsworth on November 8, 2007, at 10:00 a.m. at the Detroit Police Department's Southwest District Public Safety Building in Detroit, Michigan.

AGENDA ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

2008 MCOLES Justice Training Grant Application Reviews – Mr. Rothenberger explained that the grant applications would be read off in blocks of five. The individual staff members that reviewed the grants, would be giving a brief synopsis on each and would answer any questions the Commission members have. He recognized the work of Cheryl Hartwell on organizing the grant applications and of the staff reviewers that looked at each one line by line. The following grants were presented by staff for discussion:

ADJ-01 – Michigan Judicial Institute – Court Support Personnel – No comments.

CO-01 – Department of Corrections – Center Axis Relock: Mr. Blackburn asked for Commission guidance on the funding of this program. Staff had recommended it be partially funded. Comments were made that this training was for entry teams only and not officers routinely working on the inside. Therefore, the recommendation to staff was to not fund this program if cuts were necessary once the actual level of available funds is determined...

CO-02 – Department of Corrections – REID Interview and Interrogation: No comments.

CO-03 – Department of Corrections – Scientific Content Analysis: No comments.

CO-04 – Department of Corrections – Tactical Tracking Level I: No comments.

CO-05 – Department of Corrections – Tactical Tracking Level II: No comments.

CO-06 – Department of Corrections – The Bulletproof Mind: No comments.

CO-07 – Kirtland Community College – Corrections Training Consortium: Comments were made regarding the Corrections Training Fund that was recently created and whether it could support this type of training. Mr. Beach explained that the funds are currently tied up in litigation, but in the future they will be required to apply for the funding through that entity prior to submitting an MCOLES grant. A concern was raised regarding why staff would monitor the REID portion of the training. Ms. Kramp explained that this training has been conducted for quite some time and risk managers raised the issue that staff should audit the program to ensure the use of up to date techniques.

CO-08 – Northern Michigan University – Advanced Corrections In-service: No comments.

DEF-01 - Michigan Appellate Assigned Council – Technology & the Law: No comments.

DEF-02 – State Appellate Defender Office – Defender Books: A comment was made that in the future they could look at putting this information on a web page and access it in court through the use of a phone card. This would reduce the cost of copying CD's for individual attorney use.

DEF-03 – State Appellate Defender Office – Legal Technology Training: No comments.

DEF-04 – State Appellate Defender Office – National Skills Colleges: No comments.

DEF-05 – State Appellate Defender Office – State Skills Colleges and Conferences: If cuts are necessary, the number of sessions in this grant application could be reduced.

LE-01 – Clinton County Sheriff's Office – New Sheriffs/Undersheriffs School: Comments regarding the cost of travel and the use of LED funds were made. Ms. Hartwell explained that a newly appointed Sheriff takes the oath in January and may not have been a former licensed officer of that agency. This training takes place the previous December; therefore, the LED funds for the sheriff in some cases are not available until the following January. In the case where LED funds are available, and the sheriff qualifies, they are used for this purpose.

LE-02 – Delta College – Evidence Technician: No comments.

LE-03 – Delta College – Interview and Interrogation: No comments.

LE-04 – Delta College – Street Crimes: No comments.

LE-05 – Detroit Police Department – Enhanced Accident Scene Investigation: Ms. Hartwell explained that if the Commission could not fully fund this program, the review committee had recommended only one Leica station be purchased for training with the grant and a Special Use Request for the use of LED funds be submitted to pay for the other.

LE-06 – Eastern Michigan University – Computer Forensics: No comments.

LE-07 – Eastern Michigan University – School of Cyber Crime Investigation: No comments.

LE-08 – Eastern Michigan University – EMU School of Staff and Command: Mr. Beach, Mr. Rothenberger, and Ms. Hartwell met with the college this past year and were assured changes would be made in the administering of their grant if awarded.

LE-09 – Eastern Michigan University – Detroit School of Staff and Command: This grant application is less than LE-08 because development costs were not charged to this one.

LE-10 – Ferris State University – Central West Michigan Training Consortium: Mr. Morse asked that applicants check with their local prosecutors to provide legal update training to officers as a free service.

LE-11 – Flint Police Department – Regional Emergency Vehicle Operations – Sheriff Pickell noted that this was not submitted through the Flint Training Consortium and he and Mr. Beach will be meeting with the Police Chief on this issue.

LE-12 – Grand Rapids Community College – Calibre Press Street Survival: No comments.

LE-13 – Grand Valley State University – Police Precision Driving: No comments.

LE-14 – Holland Police Department – Advanced Tactical Training: No comments.

LE-15 – Ingham County Sheriff's Office – Firearms Proficiency Workshop: No comments.

LE-16 – Ingham County Sheriff's Office – Ingham Regional Emergency Vehicle Operations: No Comments.

LE-17 – Jackson Police Department – Emergency Vehicle Operations Consortium Training: Sheriff Wriggelsworth stated that Jackson has previously attended the Emergency Vehicle Operations Training provided by Ingham County.

LE-18 – Kalamazoo Valley Community College – Southwest Michigan Training Consortium: No comments.

LE-19 – Kellogg Community College – Tri-County Training Consortium: Mr. Morse stated that legal update training should be provided by the local prosecutor to reduce costs. In addition, the Commission suggested that if further cuts need to be made, some of the specialized areas could be reduced.

LE-20 – Kentwood Police Department – Accident Investigation: No comments.

LE-21 – Kirtland Community College – Northern Michigan Law Enforcement Training: The question of whether the State Police Labs would be able to provide some of the training in this grant due to recent cuts was discussed. In the past, a grant extension was required since they could not conduct the training. Lt. Col. Yungfer was unsure whether they would be able to commit to conduct the training due to resource limitations. However, he did suggest the college check into asking them to contract for off-duty hours. Mr. Beach suggested staff look into extending the current Northern Michigan Training Grant in lieu of awarding additional money.

LE-22 – Livonia Police Department – Supplemental In-service Project: Comments again were made regarding a local prosecutor providing the legal update portion and in-house officers attending instructor training to provide vendor-driven training to their own officers.

LE-23 – Michigan State Police, Computer Crimes Unit – Computer Crimes: A question was raised regarding a lot of grant de-obligations for this program. Mr. Rothenberger stated that there were several with their prior grant along with other State Police grants due to the Governor's Executive Order on spending and travel. It was suggested that because of the high number of de-obligations, the grant from 2007 be allowed to extend through 2008 which would free up available grant money for other awards.

LE-24 – Michigan State Police, Intelligence Section – Forensic Science Update Training: No comments.

LE-25 – Michigan State Police, Forensic Science – Forensic Science Training: No comments.

LE-26 – Michigan State Police, CJIC – Sex Offender Registration, Investigation, Legal Update: No comments.

LE-27 – Michigan State Police, CJIC – Understanding State & Federal Firearms Prohibitions: No comments.

LE-28 – Michigan State Police, Training – Firearms Instructor School: No comments.

LE-29 – Michigan State Police, Training – Firearms Proficiency Workshop: No comments.

LE-30 – Michigan State Police, Training – Law Enforcement In-service: No comments.

LE-31 – Michigan State Police, Training – Leadership Development: No comments.

LE-32 – Michigan State Police, Training – Quick Action Deployment: No comments.

LE-33 – Michigan State Police, Training – Precision Immobilization Technique (PIT): A question arose as to why this grant was suggested for denial. Mr. Beach explained that there were concerns over the use of force issues it presents. The committee felt that this technique was high risk and high liability training. Lt. Col. Yungfer stated that there should be an education process on what this type of training is and where it falls on the use of force continuum. This maneuver is a low speed tactic. Prior to the State Police committing to this training, they consulted the Attorney General's Office for direction. Chief Olko felt the Commission should take a harder look at this training as it is used as an effective tool in other states and officers are left with few alternatives. Sheriff Wriggelsworth explained that the Risk Management agencies would need to support this training as they represent numerous cities and counties. Trooper Moorman stated that MSP uses PIT and it is very controlled and specific and should be given consideration for funding.

LE-34 – Michigan State Police, Training – Supervisor Development: No comments.

LE-35 – Michigan State Police, Training – Web Based Training for Managers: No comments.

LE-36 – Michigan State University – Command Officer Development: No comments.

LE-37 – Michigan State University – Police Executive Development: No comments.

LE-38 – Michigan State University – Police Line Supervision School: No comments.

LE-39 – Michigan State University Police – Law Enforcement Forensic Training: No comments.

LE-40 – Monroe County Sheriff's Office – Regional Training Plan: No comments.

LE-41 – Northern Michigan University – Law Enforcement In-service: No comments.

LE-42 – Ottawa County Sheriff’s Office – REID Interview and Interrogation: A comment was made regarding an in-house instructor providing this type of training to their officers.

LE-43 – Schoolcraft College – Wayne County Training Consortium: No comments.

LE-44 – West Shore Community College – Advanced Evidence Collection: No comments.

PA-01 – Prosecuting Attorneys Coordinating Council – National Programs 2008: No comments.

PA-02 - Prosecuting Attorneys Coordinating Council – Staff Training 2008: No comments.

PA-03 - Prosecuting Attorneys Coordinating Council – Prosecutor Training 2008: No comments.

Mr. Rothenberger explained that prior to the December meeting; staff will look at the discussions from the meeting today, staff and practitioner committee recommendations, grantee priorities, de-obligation histories, and total grant award monies available to prepare a final recommendation to the Commission. At the meeting, the grants will be read five at a time and applicants will be allowed an opportunity to speak on behalf of their request. The Commission will consider this information, make suggestions and staff will balance the numbers during a brief recess. Before a vote is taken, Mr. Furtaw will explain the need for members to recuse themselves from voting on grants that will benefit their own constituents.

ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA:

There were no additions to the agenda.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

APPROVED BY _____ ON _____

WITNESSED BY _____ ON _____