

**STATE 911 COMMITTEE
Certification Subcommittee**

August 14, 2014
MSP Headquarters
Meeting Minutes

A. Roll Call

The meeting was called to order by Chair Rich Feole at 10:08 a.m. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present.

Mr. Feole said the agenda needed to be amended to include the review of the amended SNC-301 form and selection of the next random county or counties. A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Hasil, with support by Mr. Loeper, to approve the agenda as amended. With no further additions, the **MOTION** carried.

Voting Members Present:

Mr. Rich Feole, Chair
Mr. Greg Clark
Ms. Yvette Collins
Mr. James Loeper
Mr. Barry Nelson
Mr. Ron Bonneau
Mr. Robert Stewart
Mr. Ray Hasil

Representing:

Calhoun County Consolidated Dispatch Authority
Charlevoix-Cheboygan-Emmet Counties (CCE)
AT&T
SNC/Gogebic County
Saginaw County 911 Communications Center Authority
Kent County Dispatch Authority
Frontier Communications
Mason Oceana 911

Voting Members Absent:

Mr. Gary Johnson
Mr. Philip Bates
Sheriff Dale Gribler
Mr. Mel Maier
Mr. Vic Martin
Mr. Tim Smith

Representing:

Marquette County Central Dispatch
INdigital Telecom
SNC/Van Buren County Sheriff's Office
Oakland County Sheriff's Department
Lapeer County Central Dispatch
Ottawa County 911

Non-Voting Members Present:

Ms. Harriet Miller-Brown
Ms. Amanda Kennedy
Ms. Theresa Hart

Representing:

Michigan State Police
Michigan State Police
Michigan State Police

B. Meeting Minutes Approval

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Loeper, with support by Ms. Collins, to accept and approve the meeting minutes of June 25, 2014, as written. With no further discussion, the **MOTION** carried.

C. Old Business

Update on Bay County

Ms. Kennedy shared the completed Bay County report via e-mail to committee members. Members of the Bay County review team were Mr. Clark, Ms. Collins, Mr. Martin, Ms. Kennedy and observers Mr. Bates and Mr. Stewart. Mr. Nelson was originally on the review team, but was ill and could not attend. Mr. Clark stated the report looked good and agreed with Mr. Loeper that the county appeared to be doing a good job.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Loeper, with support from Mr. Nelson, to accept the Bay County review as written and present it at the next (October) SNC meeting. With no additional discussion, the **MOTION** carried.

Updates on Marquette and Dickinson Counties

Ms. Kennedy reported the site visits were successful for both counties. Marquette County's site review took place on Tuesday, July 29, 2014, and the review team included Mr. Loeper, Mr. Clark, Mr. Nelson, and Ms. Kennedy. Mr. Johnson's flawless submission of paperwork was very complete and will serve as an example for counties who are in need of additional assistance with preparing their materials for future reviews.

Overall, Mr. Clark thought Marquette was in good shape. He expressed that it was a very busy day as Negaunee Regional Communications Center was having an annual site inspection, adding to the busyness of the center. Mr. Nelson was impressed with the interoperability happening in the Upper Peninsula. Mr. Loeper said he would have his paperwork ready by the end of the week.

Dickinson County's site review was held on Wednesday, July 30, 2014, and the review team included Mr. Loeper, Mr. Clark, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Johnson, and Ms. Kennedy. Mr. Schlitt was unable to call together a group of representatives from the field to interview during the site visit. In order to complete that section of the review, Ms. Kennedy provided Mr. Schlitt with a list of questions, which he has disseminated among the local representatives. Ms. Kennedy is awaiting the responses from the field representatives to add to the report.

Ms. Hart made contact with Mr. Schlitt about missing training documents and it was determined that the original request from Ms. Hart was never turned over to him by his department. Ms. Hart spoke with Mr. Schlitt and discussed the documentation needed.

The Marquette County report will be ready for the October SNC, but the Dickinson County review may be delayed and reviewed at the December meeting.

Best Practices Document for Compliance Reviews

Mr. Feole received a few submissions from the group, but questioned if others needed more time to complete their sections. Mr. Nelson will be out of state for another week and will try to get the paperwork sent out by the following week. Mr. Clark said his sections will be ready next week, as he is working with representatives in the U.P. on a cut over. Mr. Feole commented that Mr. Bates would not have anything due to the cut over in the U.P. Ms. Collins felt her contributions were lacking, and wasn't clear on what she should add. Mr. Feole offered to assist her and Ms. Kennedy also recommended the fcc.org Web site for additional research.

Ms. Kennedy asked for suggestions for reformatting the current document. Once the content is complete, Mr. Smith will reformat in order to separate the document in a way as to address PSAPs based on their specific governance structure.

Mr. Bonneau wanted to clarify that as a committee, the final document would be going through a formal approval process. Mr. Feole assured him that is the plan. Additionally, Mr. Bonneau wanted to know if it was necessary to cite sources. Mr. Feole said the majority of the information subcommittee members provide is taken from their knowledge and personal experience from being in the field of 911. Mr. Bonneau said philosophically he has a problem with the committee providing an "authoritative best practice" document without citing sources. Mr. Clark commented he thought what Mr. Bonneau is trying to ask is, do we have evidence based processes to back up our recommendations? Ms. Miller-Brown said just because it isn't in a manual somewhere, doesn't mean that the certification subcommittee doesn't possess expertise in 911. Ms. Kennedy asked Mr. Bonneau if he had concerns with a specific area of the document causing readers to question the validity. Mr. Bonneau said he agreed with Ms. Miller-Brown's example if we are suggesting ways for PSAPs to improve their operation; however, if we are saying they are in violation by not following the best practice document, which is another story.

Mr. Feole said, it isn't possible to create one document that fits all PSAPs. The document will serve as a guideline for what's been suggested by the members of this committee, who collectively have several years of experience in 911. Mr. Bonneau cited NFPA and said he could get behind supporting those standards, but for areas that do not currently have cited best practices; the groups knowledge will be helpful if presented in the correct manner. Mr. Feole said maybe at the end of the document we could list different sources, not specific cited sources, but a list of helpful links that people can refer to for more information. Ms. Collins agreed and likes the idea of adding that resource information. Ms. Miller-Brown said a list of Michigan specific sources would be good to include. Ms. Kennedy is in favor of adding sources and asked for suggestions to add to the document. Mr. Feole reiterated for the committee to please have members share their sources, which gives the document credibility that extends beyond the certification subcommittee. Mr. Feole set a deadline of August 28 or 29 for the assignments that have yet to be submitted and the source reference information.

D. New Business

SNC-301

Mr. Feole asked the committee to take a look at the revised SNC-301 form. In reviewing the counties information submitted on this year's SNC-301 form, Ms. Kennedy explained that much of the information was not being reported accurately. The State 911 Office staff looked at the form for ways to make it clearer and as simple as possible for counties to complete. The new form is designed with more elaborate line-by-line instructions and includes a sheet with examples. At this point, staff is looking for input from committee members.

Ms. Miller-Brown wants to add an explanation of a "county 911 coordinator" for section one. A county coordinator is not a requirement in the statute; however, the State 911 Office asks that each county have one. This individual is designated to provide and verify the information submitted by the county, and is the one central person who can act and report on behalf of that county or the Wayne County Service District.

Mr. Hasil asked if any of the items have changed from the 2014-2015 form. Ms. Kennedy said overall it was language that changed to make it clearer, and a total line was added to make filling out the form more logical to the person completing it.

Selection of Next County for review

Mr. Hasil randomly selected Sanilac County. Mr. Feole suggested pulling a second county as Sanilac County is fairly small. Ms. Hart made the second draw and randomly selected Roscommon County. Mr. Feole said he would be getting in contact with committee members who would like to be a part of the next two reviews.

E. Next Meeting

Ms. Kennedy will send out a doodle poll to determine the next meeting date, targeting for September 22, 2014.

F. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m.