

---

**Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards**  
**Commission Workshop Minutes**  
**October 27, 2009**  
**Crowne Plaza Hotel, Auburn Hills, Michigan**

---

---

**MCOLCS MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mr. John Buczek, representing the Fraternal Order of Police  
Sheriff James Bosscher, representing the Michigan Sheriffs' Association  
Mr. Marty Bandemer, representing the Detroit Police Officers Association  
Professor Ron Bretz, representing the Criminal Defense Attorneys of Michigan  
Mr. Jim DeVries, representing the Police Officers Association of Michigan  
Chief Richard Mattice, representing the Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police  
Chief Doreen Olko, representing the Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police  
Mr. David Morse, representing the Prosecuting Attorneys Association of Michigan  
Trooper Michael Moorman, representing the Michigan State Police Troopers Association  
Sheriff Robert Pickell, representing the Michigan Sheriffs' Association  
Mr. Fred Timpner, representing the Michigan Association of Police  
Mr. Richard Weiler, representing Police Officers Labor Council  
Commander James White, representing Chief Warren Evans, Detroit Police Department  
Captain Jack Shepherd, representing Colonel Peter C. Munoz, Michigan State Police  
Mr. John Szczubelek, Commission Counsel

**COMMISSION MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

Mr. Tom Cameron, representing Attorney General Mike Cox  
Director Kurt Jones, representing the Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police  
Sheriff Gene Wriggelsworth, representing the Michigan Sheriffs' Association

**COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT:**

Ms. Cheryl Hartwell	Mr. David King
Ms. Hermina Kramp	Mr. Wayne Carlson
Mr. Gary Ruffini	

**GUESTS (signing in):**

There were no guests signing in.

**CALL TO ORDER:**

The Commission Workshop was called to order by Chairman John Buczek at 2:10 p.m., at the Crowne Plaza Hotel in Auburn Hills, Michigan.

## **INTRODUCTIONS:**

Chairman Buczek asked all present to introduce themselves.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

There was no public comment.

## **ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA:**

There were no additions to the agenda.

## **NEW BUSINESS:**

2010 Michigan Justice Training Fund Grant Application Review – Mrs. Hartwell provided the Commission with the grant review activities to date. She explained that once the grants were reviewed for the requirements of meeting the submission deadline and having content in all sections, the grant applications were divided up and assigned to a number of staff members. She stated that the staff review process was changed this year so that the staff members that work in the Curriculum Development Section were assigned to review and analyze the curriculum content of the grants; and the financial staff members in the Executive Section were assigned to review and analyze the budget information and funding priorities in the grants.

After the individual reviews of each grant application were complete, all reviewers met as a group to discuss each grant and the related recommendations to reach a consensus on the recommendation of each grant that was made to the Commission. After the initial discussions and proposed recommendations based upon the guidelines and prioritized training list, the amount of recommended funding still exceeded the estimated funding level of \$2.3 million.

The review group then discussed additional recommendations for funding reductions to the grant applications based upon Commission recommendations during the September meeting. One of the reductions that the review group recommended was the removal of all REID Interview and Interrogation training programs. This recommendation was a result of a number of complaints that MCOLES staff had received that REID & Associates had not been entering individual student training completion results into the MCOLES Information and Tracking Network. In addition, there have also been a number of law enforcement agencies who have submitted Special Use Requests to

## **NEW BUSINESS Continued:**

host these programs with law enforcement agencies utilizing their Law Enforcement Distribution (LED) funds to attend the training; so these programs would continue to be available to law enforcement agencies without the support of grant funding. Similar programs provided by other training vendors were also removed from the funding recommendations based upon their availability to law enforcement through the use of LED funding. The review group also took the same position on the Calibre Press Street Survival programs as they are also available through the use of an agency's LED funds. Staff also recommended the same course of action for all Accident Investigation series programs as they too are widely available to law enforcement agencies through the utilization of their LED funding.

Mrs. Hartwell stated that there are a number of grants on the spreadsheet designated as being incomplete grant applications and therefore, not eligible for funding. She explained that during the initial application review, staff looks at each section to see that there is narrative present, however does not read each of the sections in great detail to ensure that all questions asked were in fact answered. During the review process staff found that the grants listed as being incomplete were from grantees that submitted multiple grant applications and prioritized the applications from most important to least important. However, the grantees did not prioritize within each of the grant applications the most important expenditures to the least important expenditures as required in Section five (5). While many of these grant applications would provide critical training in some areas, staff held to the guideline requirements of only complete applications being considered for funding. Mrs. Hartwell stated that while the review staff held with the guideline requirements, it is the Commission's responsibility to make the decision of whether or not any of these grants receive funding.

The review staff also took an in-depth look at some of the items in the proposed budgets that are nice to do things when there is enough funding available, but may not necessarily be critical to the actual presentation of the training. Budget items that are being recommended for removal are things such as the printing and mailing of promotional brochures (both color & black & white), telephone charges, postage for mailings, certificates and certificate holders, etc. Staff also looked at a returning grantee's de-obligation history to see what percentage of a grant award was unspent after the completion of the grant and returned to the fund for future award.

Mrs. Hartwell stated that under the new process for review, the staff intended to identify grants that involved additional questions or issues to be discussed by the Commission during this workshop, however, there were no grants with issues that the review committee determined would require additional Commission guidance. Therefore, she explained that she and Mr. Carlson were ready to address any questions that individual

## **NEW BUSINESS Continued:**

Commissioners may have with respect to specific grants. She also asked for the Commission's guidance in making additional reductions in an effort to have the recommended funding level more closely match the estimated available revenue.

Mr. Buczek stated that the sheet outlining the recommended funding level for each grant that was provided by staff is still two million dollars more than the estimated revenue. He further stated that one of the areas that he had asked staff to look at was the leadership and supervision grants versus the consortium grants for law enforcement. Mr. Buczek stated that his position was that most of the supervision training grants be cut and the Commission should direct the majority of the funding for law enforcement to line level officers through training provided by the consortiums. He also explained that any training program that a Commissioner desires to restore from the recommended cuts will have to be done at the expense of a grant that is recommended for funding.

The Commission then individually reviewed the 2010 Competitive Grant Applications and their recommended funding levels.

Adjudication and Corrections Grants: The adjudication grant recommendation is to cut the live training sessions and supervision training. The two corrections grants are being recommended for zero funding as the target audience is supervision employees and not the line level employees who perform these functions.

Criminal Defense Grants: In these four grants recommended adjustments are the elimination of equipment, reduction of training sessions, removal of out-of-state training and related travel costs, and the elimination of non-essentials like postage, mailers and labels, name badges and holders, etc. In addition, a minor adjustment for mileage was recommended in one grant. Commissioner Bretz stated that he has already spoken with the Criminal Defense grant writers about the recommended funding reductions. Needless to say they are disappointed, but they understand that funding is limited.

Law Enforcement Grants: There are recommended cuts to a number of grants that contain the REID Interview and Interrogation type programs, Calibre Press training programs and Accident Investigation series training. Additional recommendations for reduction in various grants were the elimination of equipment, cutting mailing, postage, telephone, and supplies not critical to the delivery of the respective training program. Adjustments were made to instructor rates consistent with the guidelines. Those grant applications that did not complete the prioritization within the grant application as required in Section 5 have been recommended for zero funding. Funding requests were also cut based upon other available funding sources such as LED or federal funding.

## **NEW BUSINESS Continued:**

Commander White expressed concern over the recommendation to not fund the Eastern Michigan University grant that would provide Staff and Command training for the Detroit Police Department. This is training that is critical to the Department in light of all the recent changes that the department has undergone. He asked that this grant be reinstated for funding at the reduced level and the Commission concurred with his request. After further discussion with respect to the Staff and Command grants that have been submitted, the Commission decided to fund the Eastern Michigan Grant for the Detroit Police Department, opening the availability of the training to other agencies for seats that the department would not be able to fill and to fund the Staff and Command grant from Michigan State University.

Mrs. Hartwell stated that she had also received a letter from the Ingham County Sheriff's Office requesting one of their grant applications be withdrawn due to staffing reductions at their department that diminished their ability to deliver the training.

Prosecution Grants: Staff recommended the reduction of hotel costs and out-of-state travel costs in one grant and a percentage reduction in another grant that provides a distribution type of funding to county prosecutor offices. The percentage reduction is recommended based upon available funding and an effort to maintain parity between prosecution and criminal defense grants as outlined in Public Act 302.

Mr. Morse asked that the recommendations for funding be modified to reduce the National Training 2010 grant from \$60,000 to \$20,000 and take \$20,000 of the reduction and add it back into the Prosecutor Training 2010 grant that is a distribution to county prosecutor offices.

The Commission discussed a possible across the board cut of 16% for each grant and what impact that would have on individual grants. After further discussion, the Commission reached a consensus on the areas of training they wished to support. In order to fund more grants, the Commission determined that lower priority items, as identified by grant applicants, should be cut.

Mr. Buczek stated that the Commission is scheduled for a tour of the Crest Center at Oakland Community College. He suggested that the Commissioners take the tour and allow the staff to work through the consortium grants during the next hour and identify further cuts that could be made to more closely mirror the estimated available funding. The additional recommended changes could be presented to the Commission when they return from the tour or summarized during the meeting tomorrow. Mr. Buczek stated that the reductions need to cover the adding back of the Eastern Michigan University Staff and Command for the Detroit Police Department, the Staff and Command submitted by Michigan State University, and the Advanced Firearms Training grant submitted by the

**NEW BUSINESS Continued:**

Department of Natural Resources. These additions were agreed upon by the Commission before departing for their tour.

Mr. Buczek stated that the final recommendations for additional cuts could be presented to the Commission either when they returned from the tour or a summary could be provided during the regular business meeting tomorrow morning.

**NEXT MEETING:**

Date: Wednesday, October 28, 2009 – 10:00 a.m.

Location: Crowne Plaza Hotel, Auburn Hills  
Hosted by Chief Doreen Olko of the Auburn Hills Police Department

**ADJOURNMENT:**

A **MOTION** was made by Sheriff Bosscher and supported by Mr. DeVries to adjourn the workshop.

A **VOTE** was taken. The **MOTION** carried.

The workshop was adjourned at 4:07 pm.

APPROVED BY \_\_\_\_\_ ON \_\_\_\_\_

WITNESSED BY \_\_\_\_\_ ON \_\_\_\_\_