

**STATE 911 COMMITTEE**  
**Dispatcher Training Subcommittee**  
February 24, 2015  
Meeting Minutes

**A. Call to Order / Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order at 10:03 a.m. and roll call was taken.

Voting Members Present:

Mr. Jeff Troyer (Chair)  
Ms. Christine Collom  
Mr. Andrew Goldberger  
Sheriff Dale Gribler  
Mr. Vic Martin  
Mr. Tim McKee  
Ms. Terry Strother-Dixon  
Chief Paul Trinka  
Mr. Brian McEachern  
Ms. Cherie Bartram  
Ms. Kelly Page

Representing:

Calhoun Co. Consolidated Dispatch Authority  
Clinton County Central Dispatch  
Retired  
Van Buren County Sheriff's Office  
Lapeer County Central Dispatch  
Chippewa County 911  
Detroit Police Department  
Adrian Fire Department  
Negaunee Regional Communications Center  
SERESA  
Troy Police/Fire Department

Non-Voting Members Present:

Ms. Theresa Hart  
Ms. Stacie Hansel

Representing:

Michigan State Police  
Michigan State Police

Voting Members Absent:

Mr. Dave Ackley  
Ms. Karen Chadwick  
Mr. Stephen Todd

Representing:

Genesee County Central Dispatch  
Grand Rapids Police Department  
Retired

**B. Approval of Meeting Minutes – February 13, 2015**

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Martin, with support by Mr. McKee, to approve the minutes of February 13, 2015, as presented. With no discussion, the **MOTION** carried.

**C. Old Business**

None.

**D. New Business**

1. Review of Dispatcher Training Fund Application Denial Appeals

a. Warren Police Department

During the initial review of the applications, Warren Police Department was denied due to the validity of the signature page. Questions were raised regarding the Chief Financial Officer's signature by a Sergeant.

Corporal Charles Younkin attended as the representative for Warren Police Department. Mr. Troyer stated if questions arise, the subcommittee members will make a call to get questions answered during the course of reviewing the applications. He apologized to Corporal Younkin that no one reached out to get clarification.

Corporal Younkin apologized for the errors and thanked Ms. Hart for all the help in filling out the paperwork as this was his first time completing the application. He entered Sergeant Nichols' name as the Chief Financial Officer as he is that person for the Police Department. As Corporal Younkin is reading the instructions further, he would say Sergeant Muller is the CFO for the PSAP funds and Sergeant Nichols would be the CFO for the department. Corporal Younkin brought a letter from the Police Commissioner explaining that further. He also brought a new signature page with Sergeant Muller's signature as the CFO, as well as the original signature page with Sergeant Nichols.

Mr. Troyer stated that was the question, because it is rare to see a sergeant as a CFO. Usually it is someone from the finance office or someone from the city.

When asked who signs the checks, Corporal Younkin stated everything is done through Sergeant Muller, with Sergeant Nichols overseeing. Mr. Troyer read the letter to the group, which stated, "...Sergeant Matthew Nichols is the CFO for the Warren Police Department as a whole. Sergeant Gary Muller is the CFO who handles the day-to-day financials for Warren Police Dispatch. Sergeant Muller also handles all the necessary financials for the State 911 Dispatch Fund..."

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. McEachern, with support by Ms. Bartram, to approve the appeal for Warren Police Department, and approve them for 22 FTEs for 2015 training funds. With no further discussion, a roll call vote was taken:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
Mr. Jeff Troyer	X		
Ms. Christine Collom	X		
Mr. Andrew Goldberger	X		
Sheriff Dale Gribler	X		
Mr. Vic Martin	X		
Mr. Tim McKee	X		
Ms. Terry Strother-Dixon	X		
Chief Paul Trinka	X		
Mr. Brian McEachern	X		
Ms. Cherie Bartram	X		
Ms. Kelly Page	X		
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

With a unanimous vote, the **MOTION** carried.

b. Grosse Pointe Park Department of Public Safety

The first signature page appeared to have the same signature for the CFO and PSAP Administrator. A notice was sent to Grosse Pointe Park after the page was received stating three separate signatures were needed. When a new signature page was received, all three names appeared to be signed by the same person. Both signature pages were included in the application packet for review. Grosse Pointe Park DPS was denied due to the validity of the signature page.

As a representation of Grosse Pointe Park DPS was not available to attend, they submitted a letter of appeal.

Grosse Pointe Park DPS has 2014 money, and in looking at their documentation, it appears no training has been done since 2012. Ms. Strother-Dixon stated in the appeal letter it says Chief Hiller told the Sergeant to white-out his name and enter his own name. The letter also stated they had no intention to cheat the system.

A **MOTION** was made by Chief Trinka, with support by Sheriff Gribler, to deny the appeal from Grosse Pointe Park Department of Public Safety. With no further discussion, a roll call vote was taken:

Name	Yes	No	Abstain
Mr. Jeff Troyer	X		
Ms. Christine Collom	X		
Mr. Andrew Goldberger	X		
Sheriff Dale Gribler	X		
Mr. Vic Martin	X		
Mr. Tim McKee	X		
Ms. Terry Strother-Dixon	X		
Chief Paul Trinkka	X		
Mr. Brian McEachern	X		
Ms. Cherie Bartram	X		
Ms. Kelly Page	X		
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

With a unanimous vote, the **MOTION** carried.

c. South Downriver Communications Center

During the initial review of the applications, South Downriver Communications Center (SDCC) was denied due to spend down.

Chief Steve Voss attended as the representative for SDCC. For background, Chief Voss stated in 2012 Riverview and Trenton combined to form SDCC. There are currently 20 dispatchers, and they are dealing with much turnover.

Chief Voss stated the individual who oversees the training and funds thought all the training funds were spent. Two courses were attended in December; however, the registration fees were not paid until January so SDCC did not include them on their spreadsheet. They have now put controls in place to not review financials in the middle of January, but review them in November to make sure they know before the December deadline if funds need to be paid back.

Chief Voss stated the funds are vital to their dispatcher training and does not know how training can occur without the funding.

When asked about the courses taken in December, Chief Voss stated the registrations were \$169 each. Mr. Troyer advised that even though the course registrations weren't paid until January, the dispatcher wages were paid at the time the course was taken. Since that was December, the wages alone would have taken care of the \$145.06 not spent down.

In addition, Mr. Troyer stated on the 510 spreadsheet, the MSP Basic LEIN Ops School course only has \$13.40 entered. The subcommittee asked Chief Voss if he was aware he can charge wages when employees take a course in which case he replied that he was unaware of this. The subcommittee felt SDCC did spend down, it just was not documented correctly.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. McKee, with support by Mr. Martin, to approve South Downriver Communications Center's appeal with an approval of 9 FTEs. Discussion followed.

Ms. Collom suggested SDCC seek assistance as in looking at the 510 spreadsheet, mileage, meals, and wages do not seem to be included. Chief Trinkka asked if SDCC should submit an amended form. Mr. Troyer suggested a revised 510 form be submitted, either by the end of the current week or beginning of the following week, showing an accurate spend down.

Chief Trinka brought up the fact that another appeal was just denied based on a form that was not filled out properly and asked if that could be an issue. Other members felt the two could not be compared as they are different topics.

The **MOTION** was amended by Mr. McKee, with support by Mr. Martin, to include criteria that South Downriver Communications Center submit a revised 510 form to the State 911 Office by 4 p.m. on Friday, February 27.

The motion will be voted on pending receipt of the revised form. If SDCC fails to submit the form by the deadline, the issue is null and void. With no further discussion, a roll call vote was taken:

Name	Yes	No	Abstain
Mr. Jeff Troyer	X		
Ms. Christine Collom	X		
Mr. Andrew Goldberger	X		
Sheriff Dale Gribler	X		
Mr. Vic Martin	X		
Mr. Tim McKee	X		
Ms. Terry Strother-Dixon	X		
Chief Paul Trink	X		
Mr. Brian McEachern	X		
Ms. Cherie Bartram	X		
Ms. Kelly Page	X		
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

With a unanimous vote, the **MOTION** carried.

2. Adjust FTE Count for Ingham County Central Dispatch

Ingham County did not appeal, this was an error found in the FTE count after the original review of the applications. The DTS approved Ingham County for 56 FTEs and it should have been 57.

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Martin, with support by Ms. Page, to adjust the FTE count for Ingham County to 57 FTEs. With no further discussion, the **MOTION** carried.

3. Rave Wireless Appeal to Denial of Smart911 Dispatcher and Administrator Training

For background, Mr. Troyer stated the review committee denied the request for training based solely on their stance of software-based training in the past. Many vendors have applied for CAD software training, telephone software training, and Pro QA software. Software-based training has always been denied at the review team level. If a PSAP uses training funds for a single software program, they are not using the funds in the way they were meant to be used, which is to meet the minimum training standards for Emergency Telecommunicators.

Ms. Page asked if there has ever been approval for a Microsoft course. Mr. Troyer stated Pro QA had been approved prior to the training standards being in place; however, after the standards were in effect, when they applied for renewal, it was denied. Ms. Collom asked if Rave was applying for Module I endorsement also. Ms. Hart felt that was an error on the application as Rave's training course is one hour.

Mr. Adam Eisenman and Mr. Scott McGrath conferenced in to represent Rave Wireless. Mr. Eisenman stated with the appropriation and rollout of Smart911 Basic, which is available to every PSAP, they wanted to have a standardized approach to training the dispatchers as well as directors. Mr. Troyer explained the reason the course was denied at the review team level was based on the fact Rave's course is a software-based system and the subcommittee does not have software-based system specific training approved. He explained multiple

requests have been submitted and they have all been denied. Mr. Troyer stated the reason behind the training funds is to assist PSAPs in bringing their staff up to the minimum standards. When reviewing requests, the review team determines if the particular request pertains to PSAPs across the state of Michigan.

Mr. McGrath stated the curriculum is not a “push a button, how to use the software,” but how to interpret supplemental data that is presented to the dispatcher when a Smart911-enabled call comes in. More, “What do I do with the information being displayed, how does it interact with our standard procedure” and so forth. Mr. McGrath stated it is not focused on the nuts and bolts of what buttons to push, but what is the information you are getting with the inbound call and how does it pertain to dispatch activity. With the Basic program rolled out to every PSAP in the state, Rave sees this as information that will be in the hands of every PSAP.

Ms. Page stated it is the subcommittee’s goal to have training for the dispatchers and call takers equally relevant across the board. She asked if her PSAP does not sign up for Smart911, what good would the training do her employees. Mr. McGrath stated there has been approval statewide of the product and it is available to every PSAP.

Mr. Troyer stated Mr. McGrath mentioned the course is geared more toward what to do with supplemental data coming in from Smart911. He asked if it was specific on what to do with the data how it comes in from Smart911 or is it information his staff could use with supplemental data they get on their CPE system. Mr. McGrath stated the things they are covering are the pieces that are delivered through the Smart911 software; supplemental data format. What makes the question hard to answer is Smart911 does have the ability to support connectivity to other data providers not just specific to their system. That could potentially be specific to pieces turned on in the state or in individual implementation. In general, Rave is focusing on the specific supplemental data types that are going to come in through a Smart911-enabled call through CAD.

Mr. Troyer asked if the state has funded the project, why is Rave looking for training fund approval. Mr. Eisenman stated it was suggested by the State 911 Office since it is being made available to all PSAPs. Mr. Troyer asked if it is Rave’s intent to charge for the training. Mr. Eisenman stated the training is part of the appropriation and licensing, so there is no charge.

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Strother-Dixon, with support by Ms. Page, to deny the appeal of Rave Mobile Safety’s training application for Smart911 training. Discussion followed. Mr. McKee stated the subcommittee is saying the centers can still complete the training; they just cannot use training funds to cover the costs. Mr. Troyer stated the course is still allowed using one hour in-house training. With no further discussion, a roll call vote was taken:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
Mr. Jeff Troyer	X		
Ms. Christine Collom	X		
Mr. Andrew Goldberger	X		
Sheriff Dale Gribler		X	
Mr. Vic Martin	X		
Mr. Tim McKee	X		
Ms. Terry Strother-Dixon	X		
Chief Paul Trink	X		
Mr. Brian McEachern	X		
Ms. Cherie Bartram	X		
Ms. Kelly Page	X		
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

With a vote of 10:1, the **MOTION** carried.

Mr. Troyer explained an appeal to the full SNC is available. If they so choose, they must submit paperwork to Ms. Hart.

**E. Public Comment**

Mr. Troyer stated he contacted Ms. Jeri Tapper to place the subcommittee meeting on the agenda of the NENA conference. Ms. Collom stated it will give those attending the conference an opportunity to attend the meeting and ask questions. She is hearing questions about what happens if telecommunicators become undesignated.

**F. Next Meeting**

May 19, NENA Conference; Crowne Plaza, Lansing

**G. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 11:08 a.m.