STATE 9-1-1 COMMITTEE

Certification Subcommittee
Michigan State Police Headquarters
1920 Conference Room
March 16, 2011

Meeting Minutes

A. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 10 a.m. by Chair James Fyvie. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present.

MEMBERS	REPRESENTING
Mr. James Fyvie, Chair	Clinton County Central Dispatch
Ms. Yvette Collins	A T & T
Mr. Rich Feole	Mason-Oceana 9-1-1
Sheriff Dale Gribler (via conference call)	Van Buren County Sheriff Department
Ms. Margaret Hatfield	Hillsdale County Central Dispatch
Mr. Gary Johnson (via conference call)	Marquette County Central Dispatch
Mr. Steve Leese	Eaton County Central Dispatch
Mr. Victor Martin (via conference call)	Lapeer County Central Dispatch
Mr. Melvin Maier	Oakland County Sheriff Office
Mr. David Piasecki	A T & T

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

Ms. Harriet Miller-Brown	Michigan State Police
Ms. Mary Jo Hovey	Michigan State Police

ABSENT

Mr. Chris Luty	Michigan State Police Troopers Association
Mr. James Loeper (w/notice)	Gogebic 9-1-1

B. APPROVAL OF JANUARY 24, 2011, MEETING MINUTES

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Steve Leese to accept and approve the minutes of the January 24, 2011, Certification Subcommittee meeting. The motion was supported by Ms. Yvette Collins.

One correction was noted to the minutes under “Approval of September 13, 2010, Meeting Minutes.” The minutes note “Ms.” Leese and should read “Mr.” The motion was amended appropriately.

The **MOTION** carried.

C. OLD BUSINESS

1. County Compliance Review Updates

   Ms. Mary Jo Hovey provided an update on the open reviews.

a. Benzie County

This review is waiting on dispatcher training paperwork from the acting center director regarding receipts for training expenses. Once the training receipts are looked at for completeness by Ms. Gina Saucedo and the report is updated, it will be ready for review by the team members.

b. Chippewa County

The Chippewa County on-site visit is scheduled for March 22. The review team consists of Mr. Rich Feole, Mr. Gary Johnson, Ms. Margie Hatfield, Mr. Jim Loeper, and Ms. Mary Jo Hovey.

c. Eaton County

The needed materials have been received from Mr. Leese and Ms. Hovey will be reviewing them to forward on to the team members. A date for the on-site review will be coordinated between Eaton County and the review team members based on availability of all involved. Operations and budget will be looked at. Millage money will not be reviewed. This will be similar to the Barry County review where the state surcharge and dispatcher training monies will be reviewed. Mr. Leese noted that the state surcharge monies are used for personnel costs.

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. New County for Review

Baraga County was randomly selected as the next county for review. The review team will include Mr. Gary Johnson, Mr. Steve Leese, Mr. Jim Loeper, and Ms. Mary Jo Hovey. One additional team member will be sought. The review will be held in the early fall.

Because Baraga County is dispatched by the Michigan State Police, Negaunee Regional Dispatch Center (NRDC), both the county and NRDC may be visited. Ms. Harriet Miller-Brown reported that the back-up or default calls go to the Sheriff Department in Baraga as 10-digit calls and that Baraga County has a contract with NRDC for dispatching services. Funding is completely through their state 9-1-1 surcharge. They do not have a technical or local surcharge, nor are general funds used. They have saved some of their money and have a contract with AT&T for 9-1-1 service, as well as the contract with NRDC for dispatching. This review will be similar to that in Kent County where both sites are visited.

2. Membership

Mr. Chris Luty resigned from the subcommittee on March 15. Chair Fyvie asked that members give thought to who from the State 9-1-1 Committee (SNC) would be good to include on this subcommittee. As per the bylaws, the chair of the subcommittee makes a recommendation to the chair of the SNC for approval of appointments to the subcommittee. Send any recommendations to Chair Fyvie, Sheriff Dale Gribler, and Ms. Miller-Brown.

E. COMPLIANCE REVIEW PROCESS (CHECKLIST)

There have been many discussions on this topic. Chair Fyvie is proposing the subcommittee look at what the objective of the compliance review is and what the SNC is statutorily required to do through Public Act 32 (as amended). Members will then take a look at the current Best Practice list to decide what should remain and what should be removed from the checklist, and look at a current ISO review to see how the checklist can be incorporated into a similar format.

The goal is to share the checklist ahead of time with the county being reviewed to answer as many questions as possible. Then when the on-site review is held, it will only be a matter of verifying if, in fact, things are being done as described on the checklist. When the compliance report is written up by Ms. Hovey, the narrative portion would be very minimal. This procedure may allow for more consistency and also provide a needed periodic review of the process.

There are copyright issues with using any of the ISO materials directly. Notation will need to be made on the SNC's final document if information is taken directly from it.

Ms. Miller-Brown noted that historically the development of the current compliance review process came from dispatch center directors. Questions often were raised by directors regarding the use of funds, as they were challenging how the funds were being directed through their administration. The process was not to point out problems within 9-1-1 centers, but to protect funds for proper use as there were best practices being questioned.

Mr. David Piasecki raised the issue if possibly the counties needing to be reviewed are the 100 percent surcharge counties. The group then discussed the different types of reviews (random, for cause, and by request) and the history behind them. All counties receive surcharge of some form as the State 9-1-1 surcharge is received by general fund and millage funded counties.

Chair Fyvie led a review of the various portions of the Act outlining those sections that pertain to compliance reviews. Highlighted areas included:

- Sec. 406 (1) "…rules promulgated under section 413," with a question as to how those rules are defined by the commission.
- Sec. 408 (4)(a) "…Money received by a county under this subdivision shall only be used for 9-1-1 services as allowed under this act. Money expended under this subdivision for a purpose considered unnecessary or unreasonable by the committee or the auditor general shall be repaid to the fund."
- Sec. 712 "…other recommendations for emergency telephone services" which would be best practices.
- Sec. 714(1)(d) "Provide recommendations to public safety answering points and secondary public safety answering points on statewide technical and operational standards for PSAPs and secondary PSAPs."

The group then reviewed the current "Checklist for Compliance Reviews – Recommended Best Practice" that was last updated and approved by the SNC on October 6, 2008. The list was broken down into different segments containing questions, many with yes or no options to check and identify types of programs used. Ms. Hovey will arrange the information into a document similar to the ISO example. When a draft is completed, it will be e-mailed out to the subcommittee members for editing and discussion at the next meeting.

F. PUBLIC COMMENT - None

G. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be Wednesday, May 11, 2011, 10:00 a.m., at the MSP headquarters in Lansing, 1920 Conference Room.

H. ADJOURN

A **MOTION** was made by Chair James Fyvie to adjourn the meeting. Supported by Mr. Steve Leese, the **MOTION** carried.