

STATE 911 COMMITTEE
Dispatcher Training Subcommittee
February 26, 2013
Meeting Minutes

A. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Jeff Troyer.

B. Roll Call

Voting Members Present:

Mr. Jeff Troyer (Chair)
Ms. Karen Chadwick
Mr. Vic Martin
Ms. Terry Strother-Dixon
Mr. Stephen Todd
Mr. Brian McEachern
Ms. Cherie Bartram
Ms. Kelly Page

Representing:

Calhoun County Consolidated Dispatch
Grand Rapids Police Department
Lapeer County Central Dispatch
Detroit Police Department
City of Flint 9-1-1
Negaunee Regional Communication Center
SERESA
Troy Police/Fire Department

Non-Voting Members Present:

Ms. Theresa Hart Michigan State Police
Ms. Stacie Hansel Michigan State Police

Absent:

Mr. David Ackley Genesee County Central Dispatch
Ms. Christine Collom Clinton County Central Dispatch
Mr. Andy Goldberger Retired
Sheriff Dale Gribler Van Buren County Sheriff's Office
Mr. Tim McKee Chippewa County 9-1-1
Chief Paul Trinka Adrian Fire Department

C. Meeting Minutes Approval

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Vic Martin to approve the meeting minutes of February 13, 2013. Supported by Ms. Terry Strother-Dixon, the **MOTION** carried.

D. Dispatcher Training Fund Application Denial Appeals

1. St. Joseph County Central Dispatch

Mr. Jon Uribe attended, representing St. Joseph County. Introductions of the subcommittee members were made.

At Mr. Uribe's request, Mr. Troyer explained the process from application to appeal. Mr. Uribe began by stating St. Joseph was denied training funds due to non-spend down of 2010 training funds. Based on his conversation with Mr. Dave Ackley, the issue was a lodging reservation purchased in 2012 was not considered an acceptable posting. Mr. Troyer stated during the discussion with Mr. Ackley, Mr. Uribe was on speaker phone before the subcommittee who heard the explanation as a request for a check was submitted in December 2012, but was not actually cut until January 2013. Mr. Troyer stated on that conference call the subcommittee was going to initially deny the application, but it was recommended Mr. Uribe appeal with supporting documentation for reconsideration.

Mr. Uribe stated St. Joseph County is requesting the opportunity to appeal based on the belief that St. Joseph County's accounting principles meet the generally accepted accounting principles and the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) when the debt of \$1,348.96 was incurred. St. Joseph County only has a voucher system to secure purchases. Mr. Uribe usually receives an invoice with confirmation on the date of the event; however, in this instance, he only has the confirmation number.

In going through the packet of information supplied to the subcommittee, Mr. Uribe began with exhibit one, which speaks to the supporting documentation requested for the disputed entry. Documents in this exhibit include a cover letter and DTS-510 Mr. Uribe submitted on February 13, a copy of an e-mail discussion between himself and Mr. Dan DeWolf regarding hotel options with the confirmation number for the chosen hotel, a copy of the payment voucher submitted, stamped and processed in December 2012 for the lodging. Mr. Uribe contends, according to the UCC and generally accepted accounting principles, this is a valid debt incurred in 2012.

Mr. Stephen Todd stated the subcommittee is not necessarily concerned when Mr. Uribe made the expenditures. The training funds of 2010, used by 2012, are intended for employees to attend training in 2012. The subcommittee is not disputing the expense using 2010 money, but the training itself is in 2013.

Mr. Troyer stated St. Joseph County has 2011 money and asked Mr. Uribe if they expect to spend down those funds. Mr. Uribe stated, due to the new training standards, he has already started scheduling employees for upcoming training opportunities. Mr. Uribe explained when he first started at St. Joseph County, he lost four employees. Due to that reason, he had to amend his operating budget to the overtime budget. He did not have the staff to send others to training. This is the reason his entries show a lapse in training, but picked back up in the fall.

The point Mr. Uribe is making is the training guidelines make reference to generally accepted accounting principles, and he believes St. Joseph County meets those principles. Mr. Troyer stated the subcommittee is not questioning the accounting principles. The question is the validity of the expense, which Mr. Troyer stated Mr. Uribe has supplied plenty of supporting documentation.

Mr. Troyer asked the subcommittee for questions. Mr. Martin asked how often St. Joseph County cuts checks per month. Corporate checks are done within 30 days; however in this particular incident, the check was cut the following week. Mr. Martin asked when Mr. Uribe registered for the training, which Mr. Uribe answered registration was done the same day. Ms. Chadwick had concerns there was no receipt from the Hampton Inn. Mr. Uribe stated he has the voucher documentation with the vendor name and amount, which is stamped and received on December 27, 2012. Ms. Chadwick asked if there was any receipt from the Hampton Inn itself to show the rooms were actually used and paid for. Mr. Uribe stated he would have to look in the travel vouchers. Ms. Strother-Dixon stated even though the check voucher was created in 2012, it was not paid until 2013 when the check would have been cashed. Mr. Uribe stated a check is no different than paying by credit card; the payment comes out of the budget the day of the transaction. Mr. Troyer agreed that the expense is incurred when the check is cut, not when it is cashed.

Mr. Uribe was asked to step out for subcommittee discussions. Mr. Todd stated St. Joseph is a singular incident right now, but it could cause complications in future training fund applications. He restates his belief that the year's training money is for training within that calendar year. Mr. Martin stated he has a similar situation, but he knows which dates checks are cut and when he has to have his information into accounting to get those checks issued. Ms. Strother-Dixon stated the supporting documentation includes many receipts, but the one that matters is the check that was cut in January, which is outside the scope of the guidelines.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Stephen Todd to deny St. Joseph County's appeal based upon the Dispatcher Training Fund Guideline, section two, number six, expenditure period. Discussion followed. Mr. Todd asked if the subcommittee could ask for advice from counsel, for future reference, because he believes the guidelines stipulate classes must occur, not the expense, within the calendar year. Mr. Troyer stated this issue has occurred in the past and it has always been based on the expenditure in the time period, which is the way both the guidelines and statute read. Item six reads, "Funds distributed under the program shall be expended by the PSAP..." He states that in this particular incident, the funds were expended in January 2013. According to general accounting principles, funds are expended when a check is cut, not when a voucher is submitted. Mr. Todd asked what is to keep someone from using funds for training and cancelling at a later date, and how anyone would know whether the trainees were present or not. Mr. Troyer stated, as

a reminder for next year, all training funds must have a receipt. After no further discussion, Mr. Vic Martin supported the **MOTION** and a roll call vote was taken.

	Support	Oppose	Abstain
Mr. Jeff Troyer	X		
Ms. Karen Chadwick	X		
Mr. Vic Martin	X		
Ms. Terry Strother-Dixon	X		
Mr. Stephen Todd	X		
Mr. Brian McEachern	X		
Ms. Cherie Bartram	X		
Ms. Kelly Page	X		

The **MOTION** carried.

Mr. Uribe was brought back for the decision. Mr. Troyer stated the subcommittee approves and denies applications based on the training fund guidelines. The guidelines are very specific that the funds must be expended within two calendar years of the year of distribution, which was December 31, 2012. Mr. Troyer stated the intent was understood as to the submission of the check voucher, but the issue is that expenditures occur when a check is cut and the documentation shows the check was cut on January 4, 2013. Mr. Troyer stated the denial is based upon section two, item six of the guidelines, which states, "The funds distributed under this program shall be expended by the PSAP for approved training within two calendar years following the year of distribution." The State 911 Committee (SNC) meeting is March 12, 2013, and Mr. Uribe reserves the right to a second appeal to the full SNC committee. Mr. Uribe will receive written notice of the DTS response, and should he choose to appeal, the deadline to submit notice to Ms. Theresa Hart will be 4 p.m. on March 5, 2013.

2. Ingham County Central Dispatch

Mr. Lance Langdon and Mr. Bruce Gaukel attended, representing Ingham County Central Dispatch. Introductions of the subcommittee members were made.

Mr. Langdon stated between their consolidation and staffing issues, they did not realize there was a different date for the application deadline as opposed to returning funds. Ingham County did return their unspent funds, but had the wrong date listed, which was not intentional but an effort to return everything by what they thought the deadline to be. Mr. Gaukel stated in the previous year they returned funding in January along with their application forms and he thought it was the same process as they had last year. They had the county cut a check for 2010 funds in record time and thought they were on track. Mr. Gaukel stated they take the responsibility for not following the guidelines, but under the circumstance and the experience they had the previous year, Ingham County is looking for the subcommittee to reconsider their decision.

Ingham County has hired seven dispatchers, promoted to fill a supervisor vacancy, have three more starting soon, and five vacancies to fill. They do have 2011 and 2012 funds, but realize with the new training standards and what is needed to accomplish in the next few years, the need for funding is greater than ever before. Mr. Gaukel stated they regret having to return money for two years, which is directly tied to the consolidation and loss of employees as a result. Mr. Troyer asked Ms. Hart what the application deadline was for this year, which was February 8.

Mr. Langdon stated they have tried to be compliant with the consolidation, working with the State 911 Office, as far as returning funds from East Lansing, etc. during the consolidation process. Mr. Troyer stated there was significant discussion between Ms. Harriet Miller-Brown and himself. Last summer, they reached out to both Mr. Langdon and Mr. Gaukel to inform them of a consolidation policy where they could reapply for the second distribution of last year to get additional funding and no revised application was received. Mr. Langdon stated that paperwork was filed and the second distribution was received.

When asked if an appeal was filed last year, Mr. Gaukel stated it was not as they returned money and received their funding. Mr. Troyer stated there was an exception made last year due to an issue with the mailing of the application packet, so returned money was accepted after the deadline, to which Mr. Gaukel stated that is where his mindset was for returning money this year. Mr. Troyer stated the December 31 deadline has been set since the training fund was created, which is the reason Ms. Strother-Dixon asked how long Mr. Langdon and Mr. Gaukel had been PSAP Administrators. Mr. Gaukel stated that with the exception of last year, they have never had to return funds.

In the supporting documentation supplied by Ingham County, they stated they did not receive the e-mail notification, any application documents, or, when asked, did they receive the postcard. The address where the postcard was mailed was then verified. Ms. Page stated the subcommittee understands and can relate to the staffing issues, etc., but there were over a hundred other PSAPs who were able to go through the process. Ms. Page stated she took exception to their letter essentially blaming Ms. Hart for not mentioning the deadline, and that as directors, they have the responsibility to pay attention to detail. Mr. Gaukel apologized to Ms. Hart and stated he was in no way blaming her or the 911 office, but rather trying to describe his mind set at the shock he felt when the denial letter arrived.

Mr. Troyer stated that by December 31, 2013, Ingham County will have to expend \$44,000.00; otherwise they will be in the same situation they are in now with having to return funds in order to qualify for 2014 funds. Mr. Gaukel stated there will be no question of them spending down their money this year as they have already outlined training for this year. Mr. Troyer informed Mr. Gaukel they have another \$52,000 from 2012 to spend also. Mr. Gaukel stated while it seems like a large sum of money, they have a very large staff to adhere to the new training standards. Ingham County has never had issues with spending down their money until the consolidation took place.

Mr. Troyer stated, based on the guidelines, Ingham County could have kept their 2010 funds. Mr. Langdon stated they thought they were making the deadline, so they returned the funds to qualify for 2013 funds.

Mr. Langdon and Mr. Gaukel were asked to step out for subcommittee discussions. Mr. Martin asked if when they received their funds last year, even though money was returned after the deadline, it stated in the letter specifically this was an exception to the rule due to issues with the mailing going out.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Karen Chadwick to deny Ingham County 911 Central Dispatch's appeal based upon the Dispatcher Training Fund Guideline, section two, number six, expenditure period, which states if a PSAP is unable to spend down their training money within a two year period, they may return the excess money by December 31 of that year. After no further discussion, Mr. Stephen Todd supported the **MOTION** and a roll call vote was taken.

	Support	Oppose	Abstain
Mr. Jeff Troyer	X		
Ms. Karen Chadwick	X		
Mr. Vic Martin	X		
Ms. Terry Strother-Dixon	X		
Mr. Stephen Todd	X		
Mr. Brian McEachern	X		
Ms. Cherie Bartram	X		
Ms. Kelly Page	X		

The **MOTION** carried.

Ms. Miller-Brown came into the meeting and Mr. Troyer explained the situation regarding returning funds to Ingham County. Ms. Miller-Brown stated there is no way to return funds, as funds coming

out have to follow statutory distribution. She stated it is part of the 6% which the SNC certifies twice a year, authorizing the distribution.

Mr. Troyer stated both himself and Ms. Miller-Brown reached out to Ingham County asking if they would like to reapply under the consolidation policy for the second distribution. When Mr. Langdon stated earlier they did receive that distribution, Mr. Troyer stated that was for the original approval. They did not submit a revised application under the consolidation policy for a new FTE count.

Mr. Martin asked Ms. Miller-Brown if she remembers anything in the letters last year stating money could be returned after the deadline, but as an exception. Mr. Troyer stated he did not think so, but the statement was in the minutes from last year. Mr. Troyer informed Ms. Miller-Brown that the other issue was Ingham County has almost \$44,000 from 2011 they need to expend in the next 10 months in order to qualify for 2014 funds. Ms. Miller-Brown stated Ingham County can appeal to the SNC.

Mr. Langdon and Mr. Gaukel were brought back for the decision. Mr. Troyer stated the subcommittee has to approve and deny applications not based on intent but by the training fund guidelines. He informed Mr. Langdon and Mr. Gaukel that the subcommittee has voted to deny the appeal based on section two, number six, which defines the expenditure period, as well as if those funds are not expended, the deadline in which they must be returned. Mr. Troyer stated the deadline has not changed since 2001. There is a second and final appeal process to the full SNC. The SNC meeting is March 12, 2013, and Mr. Langdon and Mr. Gaukel reserve the right to a second appeal at that time. They will receive written notice of the DTS response, and should they choose to appeal, the deadline to submit notice to Ms. Theresa Hart will be 4 p.m. on March 5, 2013.

E. Old Business

1. Training Standards Tracking Database

Ms. Hart e-mailed the contact in DTMB to let him know the database is empty, but during the testing, information was entered. He has not responded yet, but Ms. Gina Saucedo is coming this week to review the database with Ms. Hart. Mr. Troyer stated the course listing was auto-populated to be a drop down box, and all employees off the worksheets of those who were testing, were entered. Ms. Page asked if telecommunicators would be assigned an identifier similar to MCOLES, which Mr. Troyer said yes.

Mr. Troyer asked about access and Ms. Hart stated she is waiting to send the application out because she does not want the PSAPs to have access to the portal until the issues are worked out. Mr. Troyer stated most PSAPs would have access through the MiCJIN portal or an LG net connection, without having to use a token.

2. Audit of Dispatcher Training Courses

a. EMD Courses to be Notified of Change in Hours

Ms. Hart supplied the subcommittee with a training course list to identify which programs will have a change of hours from eight to one. Mr. Troyer summarized the issue brought up at the last meeting regarding the change of course hours in recertification and CDE quizzes.

Mr. Troyer stated he is only familiar with the EMD Priority Dispatch side, but is unaware what the APCO and PowerPhone recertification processes are. Mr. Troyer called Mr. Lloyd Fayling to ask about APCO's recertification protocols. Mr. Fayling stated an hour is good for APCO as well. Ms. Bartram stated she was told PowerPhone's recertification takes between seven to eight hours. The subcommittee will stand by their decision to change the number of hours to one.

The courses to change are:

- Continuing Dispatch Education (CDEs) PDIS200811A
- Emergency Medical Dispatch Recertification – PWH 200903A

- Recertification for EMD, EFD, EPD – PDIS 200704

b. MCOLES Audit Process

As stated during the last meeting, subcommittee members reserve the right to audit approved courses at random. Ms. Hart supplied the subcommittee an e-mail she sent to Mr. Patrick Hutting at MCOLES to ask about their online course audit process. Currently, MCOLES does not have a process in place.

The next thing to begin work on is an evaluation form to compare the content providers are requesting approval for versus what is being taught.

c. Draft Letters to PSAPs and Training Providers

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Brian McEachern to approve the training provider letter and the PSAP administrator letter. Supported by Ms. Kelly Page, the **MOTION** carried.

Mr. Troyer stated a process will need to be created to let the State 911 Office know when a subcommittee member will be auditing a course. The provider, if they so choose, can then contact the State 911 Office for validation.

3. Draft Dispatcher Training Program Manual

Mr. Troyer stated that much of the content in the manual derived from the training workgroup. From the last meeting, the subcommittee was to reevaluate and bring concerns to this meeting before submitting to the SNC for approval. Ms. Hart checked with Mr. Hal Martin for his interpretation of the training standards as it pertains to the grandfathering clause. The grandfathering did not say an employee had to be continuously employed for the previous 12 months, it only stated employed by a primary PSAP 12 months prior to. Mr. Martin's response was that his interpretation is an employee who is continuously employed by that PSAP for a minimum of 12 months prior to the effective date of the rules. A question was raised by the wording of, "...employed by that PSAP..." Mr. Troyer stated he is not in favor of considering "that" for the manual. The subcommittee can write what they want in the manual, but it cannot contradict what the standards say. Mr. Todd clarified that the word continuous be included, but "that PSAP" should be "a primary PSAP."

Mr. Troyer stated people will look to this manual for clarification and the biggest question is if that means an employee literally has to work 12 months prior to, at a PSAP. Example – an employee works 15 years, takes one week off, and begins work at a new PSAP. Does that disqualify them from the grandfathering?

Leave of absence is also included in the manual. How is the leave of absence considered, not just if the employee leaves employment, but what happens if they go on 16 weeks of FMLA?, The issue of grandfathering needs to be the focus – how it should be worded and should some type of break of employment be allowed, and if allowed, what is the time frame.

After Ms. Miller-Brown joined the meeting, Mr. Troyer summarized the message sent to Mr. Hal Martin for his interpretation and asked for her opinion of the words "that PSAP." She stated in her previous discussions with Mr. Martin, they were looking at continuous employment at a Michigan PSAP for a period of 12 months.

On page 5, letter F, add the words continuously and Michigan to now read, "...who are continuously employed by a Michigan primary PSAP..." Mr. Troyer stated he would like clarification on what is meant by continuous. Thirty calendar days was recognized by the subcommittee. The first sentence of Letter F should start, "As referenced in R484.803..." Add as the next sentence, "Continuous employment shall be recognized as no break of employment greater than 30 calendar days."

Regarding Ms. Chadwick's comment on page 5, she asked how the State 911 Office knows when there is a break in employment. It was believed there is a status field in the database, which

Ms. Hart will check into. Mr. Troyer stated it would be up to the PSAP to update the database with the status change.

On page 4, Letter C2, Ms. Miller-Brown suggested needing some wording regarding documentation of internal training. She stated what is important is maintaining the integrity of the program. It was suggested to add an annual accounting of internal training, but will need to be discussed how to accomplish and gather the information. The last sentence of the paragraph should be added referencing an annual accounting of internal training will be provided to the State 911 Office.

On page one, the first paragraph, "...State of Michigan maintain a minimum training standard..." Mr. Todd recommends the word requirement instead of standard, and throughout the document. Mr. Martin stated it should be standard, as it is a standard the SNC is setting. Before the manual is presented to the SNC for approval, the subcommittee members would like to see the manual with the adjustments. Ms. Hart will edit the manual to include the changes and e-mail to the subcommittee. A conference call will be scheduled for discussion.

F. New Business

None

G. Public Comment

None

H. Next Meeting

Tuesday, March 5, 2 p.m.
Conference Call

I. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12:40 p.m.