**STATE 911 COMMITTEE**
**Legislative Action Subcommittee**
May 3, 2018
Meeting Minutes

**A. Call to Order/Introductions/Roll Call**
The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Shawn Sible.

Roll Call was taken.

| Voting Members Present: | Representing: |
|---|---|
| Mr. Shawn Sible (Chair) | Michigan State Police |
| Ms. Patricia Coates | Courts & Law Enforcement Management Information Systems |
| Ms. Lisa Hall | Midland County Central Dispatch |
| Ms. Jordyn Sellek | Conference of Western Wayne |
| Mr. Jeff Troyer | Appointee, Speaker of the House of Representatives |
| Ms. Cherie Bartram | South East Regional Emergency Services Authority |
| Ms. April Heinze | Appointee, Speaker of the Senate |
| Mr. Tim Smith | Ottawa County 911 |
| Ms. Jennifer Greenburg | Telecommunications Association of Michigan |
| Mr. James Loeper | Gogebic 911 |
| Mr. Greg Clark | Charlevoix, Cheboygan, and Emmet Central Dispatch (CCE) |

| Non-Voting Members Present: | Representing: |
|---|---|
| Ms. Harriet Miller-Brown | Michigan State Police |
| Ms. Kristine Bond | Michigan State Police |
| Mr. Joel King | Office of the Attorney General |

| Voting Members Absent: | Representing: |
|---|---|
| Mr. Dale Berry | Huron Valley Ambulance |

**B. Meeting Minutes Approval – November 6, 2017**
A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Jordyn Sellek, with support by Ms. Cherie Bartram, to approve the meeting minutes of November 6, 2017, as presented. With no discussion, the **MOTION** carried.

**C. Old Business**
1. Senate Bill 400 (now 2018 PA 51)
Public Act 51 of 2018 has created a lot of work for the State 911 Office. Hundreds of emails and letters have been sent to providers and retailers. The Michigan Public Service Commission has opened Case No. U-20146 regarding cost recovery for Next Generation 911. U-20146 includes deadlines for filings. The Emerging Technology Subcommittee is meeting next week to prepare recommendations for the State 911 Committee for the response filing.

**D. New Business**
1. Senate Bill 930
Senate Bill 930 was introduced by Senator Casperson on April 11, 2018. Ms. Harriet Miller-Brown gave the subcommittee a brief history on the issue of road signs that began in 2004 and continued through 2014. The SNC had voted in 2004 to not allow 911 funds for road signage. There had been several requests and discussions in the ensuing years and the SNC remained consistent in its denial of the expense. During a compliance review several years ago, an Upper Peninsula county was discovered as having improperly used State 911 funds for road signs, and the State 911 Committee issued a letter requiring payment back from the county's general fund. In August of

2017, Senator Casperson met and discussed this issue with Ms. Harriet Miller-Brown and Sgt. Tim Fitzgerald. The restrictions of the 911 Funds for the issues concerning the responsibility of signage were explained.

F/Lt. Amy Dehner, who was present, and the subcommittee discussed and agreed that the bill should continue to be monitored and brought back to the attention of the subcommittee if further action is necessary.

2. Senate Supplemental Appropriation Senate Bill 601 with Rave Mobile Safety School Alerting System Funds

Senate Bill 601 is a Supplemental Appropriation to the Michigan State Police's current budget and it included in Section 103.(3) a one-time appropriation of a School Emergency Notification System an initiative that Rave Mobile Safety has introduced in support of its Panic Button for K-12 schools. The model has issues and if attention is drawn to the bill, it will be necessary to have information and suggestions if revisions are considered. The legislative timeline involved did not permit for a referral to the State 911 Committee. Therefore, the Legislative Action Subcommittee discussed developing a letter of issues to send to the legislature as expeditiously as possible. The issues discussed included:

The bill currently has specific payment dates without a requirement for the vendor to be accountable and provide proof of work being satisfactorily completed for the school, which violates purchasing policy. There is concern that the bill provides a program that would be a statewide pilot project and does not give the schools the option of electing an alternative service or opting out of the program. It also does not break down how the funds would be distributed to the schools who elect to participate in the program. Schools will likely face cost concerns since it is a one-time appropriation, and it does not cover the entire cost such as licensing, renewals, and other incidentals.

Members offered county specific cost information to run countywide Panic Button programs which included schools, hospitals, and all government buildings. The reoccurring annual costs are high. Members also discussed how the Panic Button interfaces with public safety answering points (PSAPs) and the concerns.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Jordyn Sellek, with support by Ms. Patricia Coates, to approve the following bullet points regarding the legislation and provide it to the State 911 Committee, and Legislative Action Subcommittee (LAS). With no further discussion, the **MOTION** carried.

- The current payment language is vague, and could lead to the vendor receiving payment even if no schools were to implement this product:
    - Vendor payments should be similar to those established for Rave Mobile Safety and its Smart911 product in which payment is tracked and tied to participation in the program.
    - If the program is funded as a "pilot" project, what are the metrics for success, factors for improvement, or continuation?
    - Who reports on the above metrics, and who is responsible for the project management/administration?
    - How long is the pilot program good for? Annual project, biennial project?
- The language seems to indicate that this funding can only be used for system implementation and maintenance:
    - Can it be used for ongoing licensing costs?
    - What about long term funding?

- Are all schools required to sign up for the same product or will multiple vendor solutions be funded?
- What is the definition of the "state's current supplemental 911 database"? (It is not in the proposed legislation).
    - If the bill is referring to an existing project involving Smart911, it should be noted that this is not the State's database, nor do all of Michigan's PSAPs participate in the Smart911 system.
    - Does this require all PSAPs to participate in Smart911 if a school in their service area implements this "panic button" solution, and who is responsible for that long term funding?
- Is there a procurement process involved? There are several vendors/companies that provide school alerting systems through smartphone apps, and there are opportunities to prevent a "one size fits all' approach to implementing an alerting system for schools.

Ms. Harriet Miller-Brown will distribute the information to LAS members.

3. Added to the Agenda - House Bill 5579 regarding Rave Mobile Safety School Alerting System
   The House Bill 5579 is assigned legislatively to the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) and not the Michigan State Police. Therefore, the Michigan State Police is not permitted to offer direct communication to legislators. However, it is possible to express concerns to the MDE lobbyists. The House Bill 5579 contains the same language for the school panic button as stated in Senate Bill 601. The same bullets above in SB601 apply to House Bill 5579.

4. Legislative Action Subcommittee Membership
   The Legislative Action Subcommittee membership has openings. Three applicants, whose names were shared, have been received. Mr. Shawn Sible asked the subcommittee to review the draft of the proposed formal process for membership. The other subcommittees of the State 911 Committee have adopted formal processes, and both Mr. Jeff Troyer and Ms. April Heinze shared examples of the processes utilized by the Dispatcher Training Subcommittee and the Emerging Technology Subcommittee.

   A discussion was held about the requirements of the membership, who would be responsible to make the decision on new applicants, along with whether to include a cap for the membership. There was concern raised by Ms. Jennifer Greenburg that the formal process was limiting possible applicants who were willing to volunteer for the subcommittee and potentially creating a bias against less qualified or knowledgeable applicants. Ms. Jordyn Sellek shared that she herself attended meetings with her predecessor and worked to gain her current positions and had no expectation to immediately sit on the committee or subcommittee. Mr. Sible asked the subcommittee to review and submit responses, and the guidelines would be on the agenda for the next meeting.

**E. Public Comment**
None

**F. Next Meeting**
The subcommittee will resume a quarterly meeting schedule with the dates to be announced in the near future.

**G. Adjourn**
A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Jordyn Sellek, with support by Ms. Patricia Coates to adjourn the meeting. With no discussion, the **MOTION** carried. The meeting adjourned at 2:26 p.m.