



## 911 ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA

**\*Note Revised Date\***

Thursday, February 14, 2013 at 3:00 pm  
Conference Room D/E of the Human Services Building  
5303 S. Cedar Street, Lansing, MI 48911

Call to Order

Approval of the January 17, 2013 Minutes (Attachment 1)

Additions to the Agenda

Limited Public Comment

1. Operations Sub-Committee – David Hall
  - a. Report from Rich McNulty (Attachment 2)
2. Ingham County Deputy Controllers Report – John Neilsen
3. 911 Directors Report – Lance Langdon
  - a. Report on Ingham County 911 Central Dispatch Operations
  - b. Capital Region Airport Authority Update
  - c. Policy & Procedures
4. Other

Limited Public Comment

Adjournment



## 911 ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

January 17, 2013

**Members/Designees Present:** Kyle Bowman, Fred Cowper, David Hall, Greg Harless, Ed Hude, Kerry Minshall, Jeff Murphy, Gerald Rodabaugh, Kelly Roudebush, Randall Talifarro.

**Members Absent:** Edward Hay, Juli Liebler, John Stressman, Teresa Szymanski.

**Others Present:** Bryce Alford, Bruce Gaukel, Tom Krug, Lance Langdon, Kathy Murray-Rice, & John Neilsen.

**Call to Order:** The 911 Advisory Committee was called to order by John Neilsen, Ingham County Deputy Controller, at 3:10 p.m. in Conference Room D& E, Second Floor of the Human Services Building, 5303 South Cedar Street, Lansing.

**Approval of Previous Minutes:** Moved by David Hall, supported by Kerry Minshall, to approve the December 20, 2012 minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

**Introductions:** Those present at the meeting introduced themselves, as some alternates were in attendance.

**Additions to the Agenda:** None.

**Limited Public Comment:** None.

### 1. Annual Organizational Meeting Elections – John Neilsen, Ingham County Deputy Controller

#### a. Election of Chairperson for 2013-14 Term

John Neilsen asked the committee members if there were any nominees for Chairperson. Greg Harless moved to nominate Kerry Minshall as Chairperson, supported by Randall Talifarro. Motion carried unanimously.

#### b. Election of Vice-Chairperson for the 2013-14 Term

John Neilsen asked the committee members if there were any nominees for Vice-Chairperson. Greg Harless moved to nominate David Hall as Vice-Chairperson, supported by Randall Talifarro. Motion carried unanimously.

### 2. Ingham County Deputy Controllers Report – John Neilsen, Ingham County Deputy Controller

#### a. Operations Sub-Committee Update

John Neilsen updated the committee on the Operations Sub-Committee activities. The sub-committee has met twice; they also elected David Hall as their Chairperson. David Hall stated that they have reviewed three cases and will be providing a summary of their findings at the next 911 Advisory Committee meeting, once that summary has been reviewed by the sub-committee. He described the dialogue as productive and thanked everyone who participated. Randall Talifarro requested clarification on which calls will be reviewed

by the sub-committee and how a request for review should be made. He suggested the sub-committee determine a process for this at one of their future meetings.

b. Review of the Ingham County 911 Advisory Committee Updated Bylaws

John Neilsen reviewed the updated Ingham County 911 Advisory Committee bylaws. One change was made to the bylaws, based on discussion at the December meeting: under Section B, Item 5, "even numbered years" was changed to "odd numbered years". Moved by Gerald Rodabaugh, supported by Dave Hall to adopt the Ingham County 911 Advisory Board bylaws. Motion carried unanimously.

c. Clinton County 911 Service Plan

John Neilsen informed the committee that Clinton County's Board of Commissioners will be taking final action on their 911 Service Plan on January 29th. We have previously submitted all the required "notice of intent" documentation to continue to provide service in areas of Clinton County just beyond the borders of Ingham County. John does not anticipate any changes to the Clinton County 911 Service Plan that will affect Ingham County operations. John may attend the meeting if Clinton County staff feels his presence is needed.

3. **911 Director's Report** – Lance Langdon, Ingham County 911 Director

a. Report on Ingham County 911 Central Dispatch Operations

Lance Langdon reviewed a summary of operations at the 911 Center. Three new dispatchers have been hired and started training; three on-call background investigators have also been hired to perform background checks on additional dispatch candidates.

4. **Roster of 911 Advisory Members and Staff**

Kerry Minshall reminded the committee that a roster of the 911 Advisory Committee members and staff was included in the agenda packet. Steph Strickling has requested that any corrections and/or updates be forwarded to her.

5. **Other**

None.

**Limited Public Comment:** Tom Krug requested clarification on how many dispatcher positions were still open at the 911 Center. Lance Langdon stated that there are still nine open positions, with 14 applicants pending background investigations. Lance explained that the job posting had been removed from the Ingham County website until the background investigators could get caught up on the current pool of applicants.

The next meeting was rescheduled for Thursday, February 14 at 3 pm. The meeting location will remain the same.

Meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Steph Strickling

**ADVISORY REPORT TO THE INGHAM COUNTY 9-1-1 ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
REGARDING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ADVISORY  
OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE**

**JANUARY 31, 2013**

---

**REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING INGHAM COUNTY 9-1-1  
INCIDENTS REFERRED BY THE INGHAM COUNTY 9-1-1 ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

---

**THE TASK REFERRED TO THIS COMMITTEE:**

The Ingham County 9-1-1 Advisory Committee created and referred to the Operations Subcommittee the charge of reviewing: 1. One issue which arose at the City of Lansing 9-1-1 prior the opening of the Ingham County 9-1-1 Central Dispatch Center ("Ingham 9-1-1"); and, 2. Two issues which arose after the opening of Ingham 9-1-1. The Subcommittee undertook a thorough and objective review of the 9-1-1 calls, the responses by the dispatchers, and other background information utilizing our collective public safety expertise.

**THE SUBCOMMITTEE AND MEETINGS:**

The Subcommittee consisted of Chief David Hall (Meridian Township Police Department), Fire Marshal Gerald Rodabaugh (East Lansing Fire Department), Captain Marc Tyler (Lansing Fire Department), Chief Deputy Greg Harless (Ingham County Sheriff's Office) and Chief Kerry Minshall (Mason Fire Department). County law enforcement representatives, legal counsel, and representatives of the Controllers' Office and Ingham 9-1-1 were in attendance at the meetings to answer any questions of the Subcommittee and to act as an information resource to assist the Subcommittee.

At the January 16<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Subcommittee appointed Chief Hall to act as chairperson of the Subcommittee. The Subcommittee agreed the primary scope of its review were any issues at Ingham 9-1-1 arising from the three 9-1-1 incidents. This would include review of the performance of 9-1-1 staff, as well as any operational or technological issues implicated by the incidents. The Subcommittee also agreed to provide Ingham County 9-1-1 Advisory Committee with any recommendations which it deemed appropriate from its review of the incidents.

The Subcommittee met on January 11, January 16 and January 25, 2013 to review these matters.

## THE INCIDENTS REVIEWED:

The focus of the Subcommittee was to review the three incidents. Specifically:

1. A June 2, 2012, 9-1-1 call to the City of Lansing 9-1-1 (this call and dispatch actually occurred prior to Ingham County opening Ingham 9-1-1) reporting a home fire, and the resulting dispatch to 609 Pine Street, Lansing.
2. An October 13, 2012, 9-1-1 call to Ingham 9-1-1 reporting a possible medical emergency at, and resulting dispatch to 3320 Beaujardin, Lansing.
3. An August 7, 2012, 9-1-1 call to Ingham 9-1-1 reporting a possible medical emergency and resulting dispatch to 1238 Parkview Avenue, Lansing.

In reviewing the incidents, the Subcommittee first reviewed the stories reported in the news media regarding the incidents. The Subcommittee then carefully and repeatedly reviewed the actual complete 9-1-1 calls and follow up calls, the dispatches, and conversations between 9-1-1 staff and responders and/or third parties. The Subcommittee extensively discussed the calls, reviewed Ingham 9-1-1 technology utilized by call takers and dispatchers and, where appropriate, the Subcommittee requested further information or clarification from various County resource personnel.

## BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INCIDENTS, THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### I. 609 PINE STREET CALL AND DISPATCH.

#### A. BRIEF SUMMARY –

On June 2, 2012, City of Lansing 9-1-1 received an initial 9-1-1 call at 9:38:49 p.m. via cellular telephone from a Good Samaritan who was driving and reported a fire at a home at 609 Pine Street. The caller did not specifically designate North or South Pine Street in the call. Based upon the possible cross streets identified by the Computer Aided Dispatch (“CAD”) system, the call taker inquired of the caller whether Lapeer and Saginaw streets crossed or were nearby. The caller responded “yep”.

At 9:39:21 p.m. City of Lansing 9-1-1 dispatched numerous responders to 609 North Pine. Minutes later, another Good Samaritan called to report the same

fire. However, this caller identified the cross streets as St. Joe and Pine (i.e. South Pine). The dispatcher corrected the dispatch at 9:41:48 p.m. and first responders arrived at the scene at 9:44:00 p.m. Approximately five (5) minutes elapsed from the initial 9-1-1 call.

## **B. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This call was taken by the City of Lansing 9-1-1 and not, as reported in the media, by Ingham 9-1-1. However, based upon our collective review, the Subcommittee concluded that:

1. Under the circumstances and nature of the calls (i.e. cellular telephone), there is no indication of any improper performance by the City of Lansing staff in how the calls were handled or dispatched; and,
2. Based upon the nature of the calls (i.e. cellular telephone) and the available technology and procedures, the Subcommittee has no recommendations regarding additional policies, procedures or technology to be utilized by Ingham 9-1-1.

## **II. 3320 BEAUJARDIN CALL AND DISPATCH.**

### **A. BRIEF SUMMARY**

On October 13, 2012, a male caller phoned via cellular telephone Ingham 9-1-1 at 2:24:55 p.m. reporting that he could not move, had breathing difficulties, and had a history of diabetes. The caller clearly stated he was at 3320 Beaujardin apartment 1033. Responders at 2:29:05 p.m. were dispatched by Ingham 9-1-1 to 3320 Beaujardin Apt. 1033 and the first unit arrived on the scene at 2:34:39 p.m. Upon going to the identified apartment, the responders determined it was a false alarm after contacting the residents of apartment 1033. Upon notice from the responders that they could not locate the caller, Ingham 9-1-1 staff first attempted to call the individual but the calls went to voice mail. The responders left the scene at 2:46:43 p.m.

The Ingham 9-1-1 call taker was informed by the dispatcher that responders could not locate the caller. Apparently convinced she believed the call was not a false alarm, the call taker took it upon herself to locate the telephone number for the management company of the apartments and called them. The management company confirmed there was nobody in apartment 1033 matching the name provided to the call taker. However, on further review of tenant records, the management company apprised the call taker there was an individual with a

matching name in apartment 1023 (which was on a different floor of the apartment building). The call taker updated the call, and at 2:56.24 p.m., the dispatcher re-dispatched responders to apartment 1023. Responders arrived on the scene at 3:00.53 p.m. The response time from the initial call was approximately twenty-six (26) minutes.

## **B. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based upon our collective review, the Subcommittee concluded that:

1. Under the circumstances and the nature of the call (i.e. cellular telephone), there is no indication of any improper performance by Ingham 9-1-1 staff in how the call was handled. In fact, the Subcommittee would commend the call taker for her efforts and initiative under the circumstances; and,
2. Based upon the nature of the calls (i.e. cellular telephone) and the available technology and procedures, the Subcommittee has no recommendations regarding additional policies, procedures or technology. There is no technology of which the Subcommittee or County resources are aware which would allow a call taker or dispatcher to distinguish cellular telephone locations of apartments in the same building, particularly one apartment directly under another. The Subcommittee does recommend that, given the excellent performance of the call taker, Ingham 9-1-1 Administration continue to include in Ingham 9-1-1 staff training alternative methods and resources which staff can utilize to locate callers such as were used by the call taker in this instance.

## **III. 1238 PARKVIEW CALL AND DISPATCH.**

### **A. BRIEF SUMMARY**

On August 7, 2012, at 7:17:15 a.m. a female caller telephoned (from a cellular telephone) Ingham 9-1-1 reporting she was having breathing difficulties. Because of her breathing difficulties, the caller had substantial trouble responding to the inquiries of the Ingham 9-1-1 call taker. However, upon repeated review of the 9-1-1 call, the caller initially reported her address as 123 Parkview on at least two occasions. However, on further inquiry by the call taker, the caller appeared to respond 1238 Parkview Street and identified a cross street as Holmes Street. The call taker input the dispatch as 1238 Parkview Avenue (which is transected by Holmes Road, but not Holmes Street) and the dispatcher

dispatched responders to that address at 7:19:18 a.m. The second call transmission was performed at 7:21:32 a.m. Commendably, less than a minute later at 7:22:16 a.m., Lansing Fire Department (“LFD”) Engine 49 advised Ingham 9-1-1 of a possible wrong address. Ingham 9-1-1 staff telephoned the caller and confirmed the correct address as 1238 Parkview Street at 7:23:05 a.m. and dispatched at 7:23:23 a.m. Medics arrived on the scene at 7:28:10 a.m. The response time from the initial call was approximately eleven (11) minutes.

## **B. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based upon our collective review, the Subcommittee concluded that:

1. Ingham 9-1-1 staff error in this matter has been administratively addressed by Ingham 9-1-1 internally;
2. The Subcommittee commends the personnel of LFD Engine 49 for the quick recognition and report to Ingham 9-1-1 of a possible wrong address; and,
3. It does not appear to the Subcommittee that any staff error in this instance was the result of deficiencies in the technology available to Ingham 9-1-1 staff. However, although not relevant to this instance, Ingham 9-1-1 Administration and the Subcommittee recognize certain technological enhancements could be implemented in the future to assist staff in the split second decisions made by staff. Ingham 9-1-1 Administration has addressed with the CAD system manufacturer two possible future changes in the software: resizing the window on a call takers computer screens to reveal (without the need for staff to expand the window) the full address range for identified streets; and, seeking from the CAD system manufacturer a verification/warning screen when an identified address input by staff does not fall within the identified address range identified for the input street. While the Subcommittee does not conclude the technology currently available to staff at Ingham 9-1-1 was the cause of the dispatch to Parkview Avenue, the Subcommittee fully supports the changes already requested by Ingham 9-1-1 Administration. The Subcommittee has no additional recommendations regarding changes in technology, policies, training or procedures.



**ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATION OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE IMPLICATED BY THE  
SUBCOMMITTEE'S REVIEW OF THE THREE INCIDENTS**

All three instances underscore, in the view of the Subcommittee, the limitations in the ability of existent technology to allow dispatchers to track with 100% accuracy the location of persons or emergency situations when the calls to 9-1-1 are made by means of cellular telephones, voice over internet protocol ("VOIP") or even in some instances, by landline. The Subcommittee recommends that the Ingham County 9-1-1 Advisory Committee consider recommending to the County Board of Commissioners that the Board of Commissioners authorize some type of public education program (for example, public service announcements or other advertisements) advising the public of the importance when calling 9-1-1 to first providing 9-1-1 staff with a clear and precise location of the caller or emergency.