

STATE 911 COMMITTEE
Emerging Technology Subcommittee
September 6, 2013
Michigan State Police Headquarters
Meeting Minutes

I. Roll Call

The meeting was called to order and roll call was taken.

Voting Members Present:

Ms. April Heinze (Chair)
Ms. Pat Anderson
Ms. Marsha Bianconi
Ms. Patricia Coates
Mr. Bob Currier
Mr. Todd Jones
Mr. John Hunt
Ms. Sarah Taylor

Representing:

NENA
AT&T
Conference of Western Wayne
CLEMIS
Intrado
Advanced Wireless Telecom
TCS
Washtenaw County Office of the Sheriff

Non-Voting Members Present:

Ms. Harriet Miller-Brown
Ms. Stacie Hansel

Representing:

Michigan State Police
Michigan State Police

Voting Members Absent:

Mr. Mike Muskovin
Mr. Carl Rodabaugh
Ms. Lisa Beth Harvey

Representing:

Motorola
Midland County Central Dispatch
Livingston County Central Dispatch

II. Approval of Meeting Minutes – October 17, 2012, and August 8, 2013

A **MOTION** was made by Mr. Hunt, with support by Mr. Currier, to approve the minutes of both the October 17, 2012, and August 8, 2013, meetings. A vote was taken and the **MOTION** carried.

III. Presentation by Peninsula Fiber Network

Mr. David McCartney, General Manager of Peninsula Fiber Network and Mr. Mark Grady with INdigital Telecom gave a presentation of the U.P. project with Peninsula Fiber Network. Copies of the presentation were given to the subcommittee. Discussion followed.

Mr. Hunt asked if county plans had to be amended. Ms. Miller-Brown stated the statute has three requirements for making changes: 1) change of equipment, 2) change of funding, and 3) change of public safety agencies. Anything else can be changed under the category of administrative findings, such as a change in service provider or creating or dissolving PSAPs. However, there are no enforcement provisions in the statute if plans are not amended. Regarding the U.P. project, Ms. Miller-Brown's office has never received notice about changing service providers.

Mr. McCartney stated in 2001 the counties met with Mr. Doug VanEssen to amend plans through administrative findings. Ms. Miller-Brown asked Mr. Hal Martin if the chair of the subcommittee or AT&T should file a formal action to ask the U.P. counties for a copy of their plan or because they have filed administrative findings, recognizing PFN as their service provider, without opening their plans. Mr. McCartney stated that has already been completed and he could provide Ms. Miller-Brown with a copy of all 15 counties' resolutions and letters of authorization. Ms. Miller-Brown asked if the subcommittee wanted her to take the issue of non-compliance to the full State 911 Committee. What the counties' resolutions say and what the statute says are different. Even though the plans were amended, the statute has the three requirements. Ms. Heinze stated the subcommittee could look further into the issue, but in the end, there are no enforcement provisions to do anything, and couldn't see why it would matter at this point. The only time there would be enforcement is if a complaint is filed with the Michigan Public Service Commission. The legislation is currently being amended and will address these issues.

Mr. Hal Martin stated Section 602 provides for two things. First, it shall develop a voluntary, informal dispute resolution process that can be utilized by any party in resolving any dispute involving 911 services in the state. Secondly, except for a dispute between a commercial radio service and a local exchange provider, a dispute between one or more service suppliers, counties, public agencies, public service agencies, or any combination of those entities regarding their respective rights and duties under this Act, shall be heard as a contested case before the Public Service Commission. It is his understanding this language is the closest thing to an enforcement provision under this Act. As the service provider is being changed, it would fall to AT&T to bring that dispute.

After much debate, Ms. Heinze ended the discussion and again thanked those who presented and the representatives from the U.P. for coming to the meeting. She asked they not take the discussions personally and commended the group for what they are doing in the U.P. What the subcommittee is essentially trying to do is fix it so everyone can continue to move forward.

Mr. Tim McKee stated the plans are county plans and are accountable, not to the state, but to the people in their communities. A few counties in the U.P. recently went through a compliance review and are meeting requirements. He stated if there are county plans missing from the State 911 Office, let him know and he will make sure to send copies. Mr. Currier stated this project needs support. If it means working with the Legislative Action Subcommittee to make changes to the existing statute so this project can be replicated in the framework expected in Michigan, that is where the ETS should focus.

Mr. Hal Martin stated it is his belief that the purpose of creating the ETS was to have one central place knowing what was going on in the 911 community. The counties should notify the subcommittee when they change service providers, and add new technologies just for shared interest in a central repository of knowledge in the 911 community. Ms. Heinze stated new directors may not always know that and it needs to be communicated. There is nothing in writing stating what the ETS does. It was suggested each subcommittee chair begin their committee report to the State 911 Committee with what each does to support the 911 community. Ms. Miller-Brown will start a list of information to post on the Web site as well.

IV. Public Comment

The subcommittee suggested the next meeting be a single topic, discussing how the ETS will help the PSAPs prepare for text to 911. Ms. Miller-Brown will work with Ms. Heinze to prepare material to send to the ETS for everyone to have homework ready before coming to the next meeting.

After all discussions, a **MOTION** was made by Mr. Currier, with support from Ms. Coates, the Emerging Technology Subcommittee support the efforts and activities of the U.P. 911 Authority and the combined 15 counties of the Upper Peninsula with their project. With no discussion, the **MOTION** carried.

V. Next Meeting

October 2, 2013
10 a.m.
MSP Headquarters

VI. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3 p.m.