

*2010 State 9-1-1 Committee*

**Annual Report to the Michigan  
Legislature**



July 30, 2010

333 S. Grand Avenue  
Lansing, Michigan 48909  
(517) 241-0133  
[www.michigan.gov/snc](http://www.michigan.gov/snc)

**State 9-1-1 Committee  
2010 Annual Report to the Michigan Legislature  
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Page Numbers</b>
Report of the Chair/Status of 9-1-1 in Michigan	4
Reporting Requirements of the Emergency 9-1-1 Service Enabling Act	5
A. The extent of emergency 9-1-1 service implementation in this state.	5
B. The actual 9-1-1 service costs incurred by PSAPs and counties.	5
C. The state 9-1-1 charge required under section 401a and a recommendation of any changes in the state 9-1-1 charge amount or in the distribution percentages under section 408.	6
D. A description of any commercial applications developed as a result of implementing this act.	6
E. The charge allowed under sections 401a, 401b, 401c, 401d, and 401e and a detailed record of expenditures by each county relating to this act.	6
State 9-1-1 Plan Objectives for 2009-2010	7-8
State 9-1-1 Committee Overview	9-10
Department of State Police Report	11-12
Department of Treasury Report	13
County Certification Report	14
Dispatcher Training Report	15
Appendix 1 Overview of Emergency 9-1-1 Fund	16
Appendix 2 County Information	17-20
Appendix 3 Distribution of Emergency 9-1-1 Funds to Counties	21
Appendix 4 Next Generation 9-1-1 Feasibility Study	22-25

---

Appendix 5 Allowable 9-1-1 Fund Expenditures List	26-27
Appendix 6 Michigan PSAP Payment report	28
Appendix 7 Approved Dispatcher Training Courses	29-38
Appendix 8 Michigan 9-1-1 County Surcharges	39-41
Appendix 9 Committee Membership Listing	42
Appendix 10 Subcommittee Membership Listing	43-44
Appendix 11 State 9-1-1 Plan	45-67
Appendix 12 Range of 9-1-1 User Fees	68-69
Appendix 13 Glossary	70-75

---



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM  
GOVERNOR

State of Michigan  
STATE 9-1-1 COMMITTEE  
Lansing

DALE GRIBLER  
CHAIR

July 30, 2010

Dear Michigan Legislators:

Once again, I am pleased to provide you with the introduction to the State 9-1-1 Committee's (SNC) Annual Report to the Legislature. Public Act 32 of 1986, as amended, requires the SNC to provide the Michigan Legislature annual data on our state's 9-1-1 system. For 2010, there are some changes to the report that I think you'll find useful. That information includes: An Overview of 9-1-1 in Michigan and an update on the four objectives of the State 9-1-1 Plan.

While many of the county 9-1-1 surcharges approved in 2008 under the Michigan Public Service Commission's (MPSC) Docket U-15489 remain intact, a number of them have changed. PA 379 of 2008 permits the counties to modify their local 9-1-1 surcharges through county commission resolution (up \$0.42 a month) or up to \$3.00 by voter approval (or a combination of the two). A current list of the local 9-1-1 surcharges can be found in Appendix 8 of this report.

In December of 2009, the Kimball Corp. issued its report and recommendation on an IP-based Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG-911) system for Michigan at the SNC's quarterly meeting. The well attended public presentation of the report was given at the State Capitol with several members of the Legislature in attendance. The public was invited to pose questions to Kimball about the report and its recommendations. In April 2010, the questions and the answers from Kimball were posted to the SNC's web site. Our next step will be to develop a project plan based on the report and collaborative engagement of all the parties involved. The report's Executive Summary can be found in Appendix 4.

Last September, Michigan became one of 30 states and territories to receive notice of an award of a federal ENHANCE 911 Grant from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). The grant project, which is supported by the SNC, is for a 9-1-1 geographical information system (GIS) database that will create a statewide interface for 9-1-1 location data between PSAPs. The federal award of \$1,699,999 will be part of a \$3.4 million project. The matching state funds are still pending passage of House Bill 5622, which will allow the distribution of \$1.7 million for matching funds from the former state wireless 9-1-1 fund.

This past year saw steady progress in two pieces of 9-1-1 rule making through work between the SNC and the MPSC staff. In June of 2010, the MPSC staff issued a final collaborative draft recommendation to the Commission for minimum training standards for 9-1-1 operators in Michigan. A formal rule making docket has not yet been opened. MPSC staff also opened an informal public comment process for multi-line telephone systems (MLTS) standards based on SNC recommendations. A final collaborative draft is currently being finished and is expected to be readied for the Commission's consideration soon.

There has also been dialog this year among members of the 9-1-1 community about improved efficiencies in the 9-1-1 system. While the members of the SNC fully support the exploration of ways to make our state's 9-1-1 program more efficient, in June of 2010 the SNC issued a letter in opposition to the forced consolidation proposed in HB 5927. The SNC welcomes the legislature's engagement with its members and resources to assist the legislature in exploring improvements in the state's 9-1-1 system.

In closing, as the chair of the SNC, the committee designated by statute to guide 9-1-1 in Michigan, I hope you have the opportunity to give this report some of your valuable time to see the progress and services of the 9-1-1 system in Michigan. We sincerely seek your continued support in our work by being engaged in dialog with the member organizations of the SNC and by supporting policies that will keep Michigan's 9-1-1 system reliable and moving forward. The SNC is looking ahead to the issues that will help us build a flexible, technology-neutral "Next Generation" 9-1-1 system which will serve all citizens' calls for help through 9-1-1, regardless of the technology they use.

Sincerely,

Dale R. Gribler, Chair  
State 9-1-1 Committee

State 9-1-1 Committee  
2010 Annual Report to the Michigan Legislature  
**REPORTING REQUIREMENTS OF THE  
EMERGENCY 9-1-1 SERVICE ENABLING ACT**

**MCL 484.1412 Report on 9-1-1 system and charge**

**Section 412 states: (1) The committee shall make a report annually on the 9-1-1 system in this state and the state and county 9-1-1 charge required under sections 401, 401a, 401b, 401c, 401d, and 401e and distributed under section 408 not later than August 1 of each year. The report shall include at a minimum all of the following:**

- (a) The extent of emergency 9-1-1 service implementation in this state.**
- (b) The actual 9-1-1 service costs incurred by PSAPs and counties.**
- (c) The state 9-1-1 charge required under section 401a and a recommendation of any changes in the state 9-1-1 charge amount or in the distribution percentages under section 408.**
- (d) A description of any commercial applications developed as a result of implementing this act.**
- (e) The charge allowed under sections 401a, 401b, 401c, 401d, and 401e and a detailed record of expenditures by each county relating to this act.**

\*\*\*\*\*

**A. The extent of emergency 9-1-1 service implementation in this state.**

All of Michigan's 83 counties are both Phase I and Phase II compliant. In regards to Phase II service, there are counties that may have wireless providers still in the process of Phase II deployments due to market/coverage expansion. At this time, all counties are delivering Enhanced 9-1-1 on both wireless and landline communications. (Mackinac Island currently provides Phase II (enhanced) 9-1-1 for wireless callers and is in the process of implementing landline 9-1-1).

**B. The actual 9-1-1 service costs incurred by PSAPs and counties.**

Each county was asked to report actual Phase II implementation costs and any other allowable 9-1-1 fund expenditures for calendar year 2009. A detailed list of responses can be found in Appendix 2. Overall, Treasury reported distributing \$22,419,220.00 in State distributed funding during calendar year 2009. Counties reported receiving \$64,355,588.81 in local surcharge funding during 2009. Counties also reported \$45,420,711.88 in allowable 9-1-1 surcharge expenditures.

While not all landline providers participate in the technical surcharge pooling process, based on the annual accounting of the landline providers and the "true up" performed by McCartney and Associates, the estimated total figure for technical costs in 2009 was \$7,637,048. However, information was not provided to the State 9-1-1 Committee by Charlevoix, Cheboygan, Emmet, Hillsdale, Kalamazoo, Manistee, Mason, Montmorency, Wayne – East, Detroit, and Down River.

**C. The state 9-1-1 charge required under section 401a and a recommendation of any changes in the state 9-1-1 charge amount or in the distribution percentages under section 408.**

No changes were recommended during 2009.

**D. A description of any commercial applications developed as a result of implementing this act.**

No providers reported any commercial applications in 2009.

**E. The charge allowed under sections 401a, 401b, 401c, 401d, and 401e and a detailed record of expenditures by each county relating to this act.**

County reports indicate the total annual cost of 9-1-1 operations in Michigan to be \$198,555,029.18. Of this, approximately \$86,774,808.81 came from 9-1-1 surcharge funding. Of the Michigan PSAPs capable of counting their call volumes, an average of 50% of all calls to 9-1-1 came from wireless phones. Due to the inability of numerous counties that are unable to report VoIP 9-1-1 call volume, that figure is unavailable for this report. A detailed record of expenditures is set forth in Appendix 2.

**State 9-1-1 Committee**  
**2010 Annual Report to the Michigan Legislature**  
**STATE 9-1-1 PLAN OBJECTIVES**  
**2009-2010**

On June 23, 2009, the SNC adopted a comprehensive State 9-1-1 Plan to lay out a future path for Michigan's 9-1-1 system. That Plan is found in this report as Appendix 11. Those objectives and the annual update for this report is as follows:

**Objective 1:** Create a system for notice, data collection, reporting, and review of the funding systems established in Secs. 401 and 408 of P.A. 32 of 1986, as amended.

Completion Date: August 1, 2010

Measurement(s): Revised format for the Annual 9-1-1 Report to the Legislature complete with data in regard to state and local funding revenues for 9-1-1 as well as reporting for the technical aspects of 9-1-1.

Update June 21, 2010:

This objective has been met in part and will continue to be developed. A comprehensive database for providers has been created and steps are being taken to streamline that data for cross referencing and tracking.

The first full year of state and local collection reporting is now complete. Analysis on the data is being compiled to create a "snapshot" of the funding levels and distribution. Additionally, the creation of more comprehensive information included reporting of additional allowable expenses by county not directly to PSAP budget (i.e. coordinator of efficiencies at county level and network enhancements).

Expanded information sought from communications providers to make the database on providers more useful for tracking revenue and giving notices as required under statute.

Continuing to improve communication with Michigan Department of Treasury for the collection of state revenue and distributions, includes entering into agreements necessary to obtain revenue information, providing advance notice to MPSC and Treasury for input on notices to providers, and assisting with review of county-reported data to Treasury and MPSC for federal and state purposes (i.e. NET 9-1-1 Act, calculation of prepaid, and training standards).

Recommendation:

None at this time. The State 9-1-1 Office will continue to collect data and provide to the SNC and its appropriate subcommittees for consideration as to future actions that may need to be taken.

**Objective 2:** Recommend, in consultation with PSAPs, the implementation of set operational standards and model policies for PSAP operations, 9-1-1 fund use, service provider 9-1-1 delivery functions, and best practices for 9-1-1 governing authorities.

Completion Date: June 30, 2010

Measurement(s): Issuance of administrative rules by the MPSC as recommended by the Committee.

Update June 21, 2010:

Standards for PSAPs and service provider functions have not yet been done. This completion date will need to be re-established. Considerations made to re-establishing a completion date should include a program/migration plan for NG-9-1-1. (A draft plan will not be completed until at least December 31, 2010.)

Input from the PSAP community on operational standards will need to be provided and advance agreement on the standards by the membership of the SNC needs to be reached prior to this objective advancing further.

The ENHANCE 9-1-1 Grant GIS project (upon initiation with the matching funds legislation HB 5622) will also serve as a platform for location information.

Recommendation:

A completion date of this objective re-evaluated and re-established pending stakeholder meetings and a report on the outcome made to the SNC Executive Committee prior to the December 2010 SNC meeting.

**Objective 3:** Establish a written plan for migration from the current 9-1-1 legacy system to a Next Generation IP-based 9-1-1 system that identifies a timeline for implementation, system benefits, potential areas of challenge, and potential funding methods.

Completion Date: July 31, 2010

Measurement(s): Issuance of a network migration plan and recommendation in the State 9-1-1 Committee's Annual 9-1-1 Report to the Legislature.

Update June 1, 2010:

The Kimball report was issued to the SNC in December 2009 with the opportunity for stakeholders to provide questions in regards to the report and recommendations.

April 2010: Kimball issued a final report and a contract extension has been granted to Kimball to help engage and coordinate stakeholder issues to develop a project/migration plan. (As noted in Objective 2, a draft plan will not be completed until at least December 31, 2010.)

Recommendation:

A completion date of this objective re-evaluated and re-established pending stakeholder meetings and a report on the outcome made to the SNC Executive Committee prior to the December 2010 SNC meeting.

**Objective 4:** Develop a program for the implementation of the Committee's Recommended Minimum Standards for Dispatcher Training as adopted by the Committee on December 14, 2007.

Completion Date: December 31, 2009

Measurement(s): Issuance of administrative rules for dispatcher training by the MPSC as recommended by the Committee.

Update June 1, 2010: While the December 2009 date was not met, the informal collaborative process has ended and a set of rules for training standards has been sent to interested parties on June 18, 2010, by the MPSC for formal comments (posting as an official docket is pending).

Recommendation:

None at this time. The State 9-1-1 Office will continue to keep the SNC and its Dispatcher Training Subcommittee updated on the progress of the rule making status of the training standards through the MPSC.

**State 9-1-1 Committee**  
**2010 Report to the Michigan Legislature**  
**AN OVERVIEW OF 9-1-1 IN MICHIGAN**

Each year the State 9-1-1 Committee issues a report on the current state of 9-1-1. This year we are also providing a “snapshot” of the 9-1-1 operations in Michigan.

In Michigan 9-1-1 calls are answered at dispatch centers known as public safety answering points (PSAP).

What do PSAPs do?

A PSAP is a 24x7 public safety facility that answers 9-1-1 calls for a designated jurisdiction. It processes calls and initiates emergency and non-emergency responses for police, fire, and emergency medical services (EMS). PSAPs may also perform other important public safety services such as LEIN entry, poison control transfers, and the activation of community alerts.

What does the State 9-1-1 Committee (SNC) and the State 9-1-1 Office do?

The State 9-1-1 Committee was established in accordance with P. A. 32 of 1986. Its 21 member organizations representing local public safety, private industry, and state services work together to promote the successful development, implementation, and operation of 9-1-1 systems across the State of Michigan.

In accordance with P.A. 244 of 2003, the Michigan State Police provides staff assistance to the committee as necessary to carry out the committee's responsibilities. That assistance comes from the State 9-1-1 Office. The Office provides a number of services to the SNC and the 9-1-1 community, including: the coordination and oversight of the State 9-1-1 Training funds; the SNC web site and the information provided through it (i.e. contact numbers, current PSAP info, fund distribution info, meeting postings, current issues, etc); maintenance of a centralized system of data collection and reporting; the gathering of data and distribution of the Annual SNC Report to the Legislature; compliance reviews and facilitation of best practice standards; statutory notices on state and local surcharges to communications providers, counties, and PSAPs; funds and assistance with the Office of the Auditor General's annual audit of the state 9-1-1 revenues.

Some informational reports and lists on 9-1-1 available at the State 9-1-1 Committee's web site include:

- Annual Report to the Legislature
- Distribution of state 9-1-1 funds to the counties
- Training fund distribution to PSAPs
- List of counties which compliance reviews have been performed
- List of all Michigan Primary PSAPs
- Allowable and Disallowable Expenditures of 9-1-1 funds

The Committee's web site address is: [www.michigan.gov/snc](http://www.michigan.gov/snc)

**Some current issues facing 9-1-1:**

- 1) Changing Technology/Moving Michigan to an IP-based 9-1-1 system – In order to accommodate new communications utilizing 9-1-1, the current hardwire 9-1-1 system must be replaced with an IP-based (digital) Next Generation (NG-911) system. The LR Kimball Corp. was contracted to perform an extensive feasibility study on an IP-based 9-1-1 for Michigan. That report was issued in December of 2009, with additional responses to stakeholder questions issued April of 2010.

As a result of the report, the 9-1-1 community is aware that this migration will not only require technical changes, but policy, statute, and operational changes as well. The contract with Kimball has been extended for two years to assist the SNC in the development of a project plan for NG-9-1-1 in Michigan.

- 2) Training Standards – The SNC has worked through channels with the MPSC staff on putting rule making in place to require basic training for telecommunicators as well as continuing education for established telecommunicators. A set of standards has been reached and was sent to the MPSC in June 2010 for their formal action. At the time of this report, a formal rule making docket has not yet been opened.
- 3) Multi-line Telephone System (MLTS) – The MPSC staff, with a core collaborative group of other interested parties and the State 9-1-1 Office continue to work with SNC recommendations on MLTS standards to require specific location information on 9-1-1 calls made from MLTS devices. While there has been multiple draft revisions developed through the collaborative process, at the time of this report, a final draft for the MPSC’s formal consideration has not yet been issued.
- 4) Operational Standards – With approaching Next Generation 9-1-1, 9-1-1 calls will be able to be answered, moved, and processed among the various PSAPs regardless of location a system of operational technical standards that meets the broad spectrum of operations, yet allows for local 9-1-1 operations to effectively serve the communities as needed by the various PSAPs’ jurisdictions will need to be developed.

**Some background on Michigan 9-1-1 and its PSAPs:**

\* All 83 counties in the state have enhanced 9-1-1 (Mackinac Island is still using basic 9-1-1 and in the process of addressing buildings for enhanced 9-1-1 and Bois Blanc opted out of the Mackinac County Plan and its calls are answered at various points in the public safety system in Northern Michigan.)

\* The technical costs in 2009 for the network as reflected in the data reported by the counties.

\* Michigan PSAPs reported answering 6,888,925 calls on 9-1-1 lines in 2009.

\* There are 174 PSAPs in Michigan; they are operated at various levels.

- 1) Cities/Municipalities: 103
- 2) County: 67
- 3) Multi-county: 4
- 3) State: 4

\* Under Michigan Statute, 9-1-1 is established at the county level by implementing a county 9-1-1 plan. Each county determines locally how its 9-1-1 operations are funded.

\* The reported 2009 total annual operating budgets of the PSAPs and capital outlay expenses by counties as reported to the State 9-1-1 Committee for the 2010 Annual Report to the Legislature was: \$198,555,029.

\* The reported 2009 funding resources (\$202,782,699) for PSAPs approximately included:

- 1) Local General Fund: \$73,309,747 (36%)
- 2) Millage Funds: \$32,677,783 (16%)
- 3) Local Surcharge: \$64,355,588.81 (32%)
- 4) State Surcharge: \$22,419,220 (11%) (From Treasury figures)
- 5) Other funding sources: \$10,020,361\* (approx 5%)

*Notes:* Some PSAPs are under the operating budget of a larger public safety entity and not all those operating costs are reflected in the budget figure as they are absorbed into the larger entity’s operating budget.

- As noted on Appendix 2 on the 2010 Annual Report to the Legislature, while this figure contains additional revenues such as fees, rental, and training funds, the figures also indicate non-revenue funding such as loans and contracts with other counties with revenue already reported.

**State 9-1-1 Committee  
2010 Annual Report to the Michigan Legislature  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE REPORT**

3 Cent Fund

For the first two years of the wireless act, Michigan's 9-1-1 wireless surcharge (2000/2001) was \$.55 per month. During that time, \$.03 was set aside for use by the Michigan State Police (MSP) "to fund priority issues of 9-1-1 coverage."

MSP retained Schumaker and Company of Ann Arbor, Michigan, to assist in the preparation of an objective needs assessment, an overall financial disbursement strategy, and a proposal submission form which was widely distributed to the 9-1-1 community. Evaluation of the proposals was done with the assistance of a working committee comprised of representatives from the PSAP community. Each recipient is required to submit a quarterly status report, with a final report once their project is up and running. On-site audits of completed projects are conducted by the 9-1-1 State Administrator to assure funding has been used in the appropriate form.

In 2004, the following projects received funding from the 3 Cent Fund; their present status is as follows:

MSP Negaunee Regional Dispatch Center – UP wireless 9-1-1 implementation in 8 counties	\$213,096.67	Project and on-site review completed 2004
Delta County Central Dispatch – Upgrade 24 year old 9-1-1 hardware system to become Phase II wireless compliant by installing LifeLine 100 system	\$110,338	Project and on-site review completed 2006
Lake County 911 Central Dispatch – Putting Lake County on MAP by furthering mapping project in which Lake County would take data already collected and integrate it into 9-1-1 system	\$57,175	Project and on-site review completed 2007
Alger E9-1-1 – GIS mapping	\$20,750	Project and on-site review completed 2005
Houghton County Central Dispatch – Basemap creation for Phase II implementation	\$59,769	Project and on-site review completed 2009
MSP2 (CTI Equipment) – ANI/ALI E911 CTI equipment for 2 of 7 MSP dispatch centers (Detroit and Gaylord), specifically for 10 of 35 consoles	\$345,600	Gaylord project and on-site review completed 2008  Detroit project in progress
Wexford County Central Dispatch – Computer-aided dispatch/mapping project	\$283,545	Project and on-site review completed 2006
Grand Traverse County Central Dispatch – Replacement of 9-1-1 and radio equipment, allowing mapping and compliancy to Phase II wireless	\$703,969	Project and on-site review completed 2006
Macomb County Sheriff's Department – Upgrade emergency telephone services to Lifeline 100 with existing keyphones	\$73,547.25	Project and on-site review completed 2005
Total	\$1,867,789.92	

### Upper Peninsula Dispatching

The Michigan State Police 8<sup>th</sup> District Regional Dispatch Center (NARD), located in Negaunee, provides full dispatching services for the following counties:

Keweenaw	Houghton
Ontonagon	Schoolcraft
Gogebic	Baraga

From January 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009, NARD answered 11,192 landline 9-1-1 calls and 9,877 wireless 9-1-1 calls.

### MSP Detroit Metro-Area Wireless 9-1-1 Services

At times wireless 9-1-1 calls cannot be processed directly to local PSAPs for reasons that include trunk loading and network outages. The MSP 2<sup>nd</sup> District Regional Dispatch Center (SDRD) in Detroit, serves as one of the default routing points for these calls in the Detroit Metro area. From January 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009, SDRD answered 60,402 wireless 9-1-1 calls.

### MSP Rockford Wireless 9-1-1 Services

The Kent County 9-1-1 Plan has designated two wireless PSAPs for wireless 9-1-1 call answering. Grand Rapids Police Department answers the calls for that city, and the MSP 6<sup>th</sup> District Regional Dispatch Center (RARD) in Rockford, answers the calls for the remainder of county. From January 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009, RARD answered 127,932 wireless 9-1-1 calls.

### Administrative Services Bureau

The Administrative Services Bureau (ASB) Commander serves as the State Police representative to the SNC. This representative also serves as the chair of the SNC Legislative Action Subcommittee.

### State 9-1-1 Administrator's Office

Under the Act, the Michigan State Police is responsible for providing staff assistance to the State 9-1-1 Committee as necessary to carry out the committee's duties. The State 9-1-1 Administrator's Office is housed within the ASB and reports to the Commander of the ASB.

Throughout 2009 the State 9-1-1 Office was actively involved in Michigan's 9-1-1 system. Activities of the office have included: facilitating the IP-based 9-1-1 feasibility study; providing instruction and information regarding changes in the 9-1-1 Act to providers, counties, PSAPs and the public; providing education and training to public safety/service organizations on matters related to 9-1-1 issues; serving as the centralized point of information collection and distribution for Michigan 9-1-1; organize collection of information for reporting requirements, compliance and dispatcher training; providing data and research to policy makers, the SNC, its subcommittees, and work groups; 9-1-1 network upgrade and research, maintaining the SNC web site; and serving as an informational resource for the 9-1-1 community and legislators, citizens, media, as well as members of state and local government.

The State 9-1-1 Administrator's Office can be contacted by mail at: 333 S. Grand Avenue., Lansing, Michigan 48909; telephone at (517) 241-0133; or visit the SNC's web site at: [www.michigan.gov/snc](http://www.michigan.gov/snc).

**State 9-1-1 Committee  
2010 Annual Report to the Michigan Legislature  
DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY REPORT**

The Department of Treasury is responsible for the financial administration of this program. Financial administration tasks include processing remittances received from telecommunication suppliers; making distributions to the counties and the Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) as directed by the State 9-1-1 committee; making distributions to local exchange providers as directed by the Michigan Public Service Commission, and accounting for these transactions.

Cash Receipts from telecommunication suppliers and interest earnings for Fiscal Year 2010 through June 30, 2010, total \$20.7 million. Treasury's Bureau of Investments invests the account balances as part of the State's common cash fund.

Treasury processes four types of payments for this program.

1. & 2. County payments, made quarterly to counties that have a final 9-1-1 plan in place. The payments are based on 82.5% of the money deposited in the Emergency 9-1-1 fund. Of the 82.5%, 40% is equally distributed to each qualifying county, and the remaining 60% is distributed on a per capita basis to each qualifying county.
3. Supplier Reimbursement payments, made to local exchange providers for costs related to wireless emergency service. Payments are being made for reimbursements in accordance with the Michigan Public Service Commission's (PSC) June 29, 2004 order in Case No. U-14000 for wireless emergency service costs recoverable pursuant to 2003 PA 244, MCL 484.1408(4)(b). The payments are based on 7.75% of the money deposited in the Emergency 9-1-1 fund. As of June 30, 2010, a balance of \$16.1 million remains in the fund for disbursement.
4. Public Safety Answering Points (PSAP) training fund payments, made semi-annually in May and November, are based on 6% of the money deposited in the Emergency 9-1-1 fund. The sixteenth PSAP training fund payment was made in November 2009; \$850,364 was distributed to 126 PSAPs. The seventeenth PSAP training fund payment was made in May 2010; \$825,903 was distributed to 138 PSAPs. The next payment will occur in the fall of 2010.

The system to make disbursements to the counties and the PSAPs is a modification to the State Revenue Sharing system.

(as of July 2010)

**CONTACT:**

Juanita Sarles – [SarlesJ1@michigan.gov](mailto:SarlesJ1@michigan.gov)

at

(517) 335-6310

**State 9-1-1 Committee  
2010 Annual Report to the Michigan Legislature  
COUNTY CERTIFICATION**

The Certification Subcommittee met on the following dates throughout 2009: March 2, May 27, September 2, and November 24.

In 2009, Ms. Christina Russell retired from the Oakland County Sheriff Department. The subcommittee expressed thanks and appreciation for a job well done not only for this subcommittee, but the entire 9-1-1 community. Ms. Margie Hatfield from Hillsdale County Central Dispatch was added to the Subcommittee.

A random County Compliance review was held in Jackson County. VanBuren County requested a review to assure that the county was handling their finances and operations correctly prior to a funding vote. Montmorency County was reviewed under a "for cause" selection. This was due to information the Subcommittee received regarding current practices. Monroe County was also reviewed (at their request-finances only) to assist them in the proper use of their funds. Alpena County was again revisited to review prior issues that were noted in previous visits.

Saginaw County was required to cease funding their 3-1-1 system with 9-1-1 money. The county has confirmed that they have ceased the use of 9-1-1 funding for their 3-1-1 system effective March 1, 2009.

As in 2008, the rule making process was discussed throughout the year. This was an ongoing project in 2009 and will be at the forefront of future agendas into 2010.

A complete listing of the Certification Subcommittee meeting minutes may be found on the State 9-1-1 Committee website.

**State 9-1-1 Committee  
2010 Annual Report to the Michigan Legislature**

**DISPATCHER TRAINING**

Starting July 1, 2008, legislative changes took effect directing the State 9-1-1 Committee (SNC) in cooperation with the Michigan Public Service Commission to establish "rule making" to ensure minimum dispatcher training standards are put into place. MCL 484.1408 (4) (c), also changing the training fund formula from 1-½ cents of each monthly service charge, to (6.0%) six percent that shall be available to PSAPs for training personnel assigned to 9-1-1 centers.

The SNC Dispatcher Training Subcommittee assumed in-service dispatcher training course requests and reviews from MCOLES. This move assisted in reducing the turn-around time in processing vendor training course requests. The implementation of a new course numbering system standardized expiration dates of courses so that each provider will have all its courses expire on one date. The current approved courses can be located on the SNC web site.

On November 30, 2009, the SNC distributed the Dispatcher Training Fund application form (SNC-101) and instructions to all PSAPs in Michigan. Of the 178 PSAPs in Michigan, 155 submitted requests for dispatcher training funds, 138 were approved for funding, 15 did not spend down their previous years' funds, 2 centers did not comply with the application process, and 23 did not apply. Opportunities to appeal the denials were heard on March 17, 2010. On March 30, 2010, the SNC voted to approve the Dispatcher Training Subcommittee's recommendation that statewide training fund distribution be paid to the 138 PSAP applicants from revenue available for distribution in fiscal year 2010.

Of the approved applications, there were a total of 1,860 eligible dispatchers. The May 2010 distribution at a rate of \$ 444.04 per dispatcher, with a total of \$825,903.00 available for this distribution. An additional distribution will be made in November 2010.

The SNC Dispatcher Training Subcommittee established a parallel to MCOLES to qualify for authorized funding to attend state conferences. A qualified dispatcher must attend a minimum of six hours (6) of approved training within a 24-hour period.

The State 9-1-1 Committee adopted the *Telecommunicator Training Program Manual* as recommendation to the MPSC on June 23, 2009. That program recommendation was forwarded to the MPSC on July 1, 2009 to begin the rule making process as outlined in MCL 484.1413(b). The process is currently in the formal comment phase through the Michigan Public Service Commission. The development of the *Telecommunicator Training Program Manual* was accomplished with a committee comprised of public safety personnel within the 9-1-1 arena. Further information is located at [www.michigan.gov/mpsc](http://www.michigan.gov/mpsc) under Telecommunications.

**State 9-1-1 Committee  
2010 Annual Report to the Michigan Legislature  
OVERVIEW OF EMERGENCY 9-1-1 FUND  
(as of 6/30/10)**

FUND	RECEIPTS	DISBURSEMENTS	BALANCE
CMRS	84,993,228.69	68,890,780.29	16,102,448.40
COUNTY	65,730,792.03	63,441,020.00	2,289,772.03
COUNTY/POP	98,618,341.99	95,181,551.00	3,436,790.99
TRAINING	10,667,802.31	9,831,425.87	836,376.44
MSP	1,956,624.43	1,956,624.43	0.00
MSP 911/ETSC Admin	3,640,846.07	3,512,770.76	128,075.31
MSP 911/Disp. Ctr	1,204,546.29	1,075,786.09	128,760.20
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>266,812,181.81</b>	<b>243,889,958.44</b>	<b>22,922,223.37</b>

PA 164 of 2007 provides for .19 State 9-1-1 Surcharge that is distributed as follows:

**COUNTY:** 82.5% of the fund is to each county that has a final 9-1-1 plan in place as follows:

**COUNTY/EQUAL:** Forty percent of the 82.5% is distributed quarterly on an equal basis to each county. Money received by a county under this subdivision may only be used for 9-1-1 services as allowed under the act. Money expended under this subdivision for a purpose considered unnecessary or unreasonable by the committee or the auditor general shall be repaid to the fund

**COUNTY/POPULATION:** 60% of the 82.5% is distributed on a quarterly based on a population per capita basis. Money received by a county under this subdivision may only be used for 9-1-1 services as allowed under the act. Money expended under this subdivision for a purpose considered unnecessary or unreasonable by the committee or the auditor general shall be repaid to the fund.

**SERVICE PROVIDER WIRELESS 9-1-1 CALL COST REIMBURSEMENT:** 7.75% of the fund is available to reimburse local exchange providers for the costs related to wireless emergency service. Any cost reimbursement allowed under this subdivision cannot include costs that are not related to wireless emergency service.

**TRAINING:** 6.0% of the fund is available to PSAPs for training personnel assigned to 9-1-1 centers. Funds are distributed semi-annually, in accordance with an application process established by the ETSC. Money is disbursed to eligible PSAPs and counties for training of PSAP personnel through courses approved by the ETSC. The courses must provide basic 9-1-1 operations training or in-service training to employees engaged in 9-1-1 service. (Refer to the Training Fund Report on page 12 and Appendix 8 and 11 for additional information)

**MSP 9-1-1/ETSC ADMINISTRATION:** 1.88% of the fund is credited to the department of state police to operate a regional dispatch center that receives and dispatches 9-1-1 calls and 1.87% of the fund is credited to the department of state police for costs to administer this act and to maintain the office of the state E 9-1-1 coordinator.

2% of the state 9-1-1 charge collected under the act to cover the supplier's costs for billing and collection. (Since this portion is not submitted to the Department of Treasury, it is not included in the chart above.)

**State 9-1-1 Committee**  
**2010 Annual Report to the Michigan Legislature**  
**COUNTY INFORMATION DETAIL**

<b>County</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Alcona	They are fully Phase II compliant and received 17 VoIP calls. Nextel continues to have only one tower in the county, restricting the coverage area.
Alger	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Allegan	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Alpena	There has been a steady increase of VoIP calls received especially by Charter customers in the city of Alpena.
Antrim	No new known providers in this county. Minimal VoIP activity during 2009, some test calls were conducted, but no deployments.
Arenac	They have been Phase II compliant since 2003 and reported 91 VoIP calls in 2009.
Baraga	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Barry	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Bay	All wireless providers in Bay County are Phase II deployed. Metro PCS deployed Phase II service on April 28, 2009. There was an increase in VoIP 9-1-1 calls during 2009 from the previous year.
Benzie	Phase II requirements were fully operational in 2006 for all service providers. They have a limited number of VoIP calls and all seem to be processing without any issues.
Berrien	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Branch	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Calhoun	They are Phase II compliant with no VoIP concerns at this time.
Cass	No known new providers in this county. They are receiving VoIP calls. It is unknown how many VoIP companies are working in the area.
Charlevoix	Alltel and Verizon have merged companies/services. CCE Dispatch is being covered by Verizon Wireless. Slight increased usage of VoIP devices (approximately 60 calls additional in 2010).
Cheboygan	Alltel and Verizon have merged companies/services. CCE Dispatch is being covered by Verizon Wireless. Slight increased usage of VoIP devices (approximately 60 calls additional in 2010).
Chippewa	No new providers in 2009.
Clare	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Clinton	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Crawford	Phase II implementation is complete with companies that service Crawford County. No problems with VoIP.
Delta	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Dickinson	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Eaton	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Emmet	Alltel and Verizon have merged companies/services. CCE Dispatch is being covered by Verizon Wireless. Slight increased usage of VoIP devices (approximately 60 calls additional in 2010).
Genesee	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Gladwin	They are Phase II compliant with CMRS providers operating in this county. VoIP testing is ongoing with vendors. They report any and all issues with the providers and State 9-1-1 Office as part of follow-up procedures.
Gogebic	No new providers in this county. A new tower is being installed in the Watersmeet area in an attempt to improve Phase II locations. There is no new information on VoIP providers in this county.
Grand Traverse	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Graiot	All wireless vendors are Phase II compliant. They conduct any testing with Intrado prompting with VoIP calls.
Hillsdale	They are fully implemented with Nextel, Centennial, Alltel, Spring, T-Mobile, Cingular and Verizon Wireless.

Houghton	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Huron	Dobson Cellular has now become AT&T Mobility. Since that change, their service has improved tremendously. VoIP activity is still low.
Ingham	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Ionia	Phase II deployment is complete for Ionia County Central Dispatch and Belding Police Department. Ionia is averaging approximately 30 VoIP calls per month with no concerns or issues at this time.
Iosco	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Iron	They have consolidated the sheriff department and 9-1-1 center and built a new center. They also updated their 91-1 system which is capable of receiving text messages, pictures and video. They are looking at updating their radio/paging system in the near future.
Isabella	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Jackson	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Kalamazoo	Metro PCS has expanded into their area with Phase II compliance expected in May 2010. Virgin Mobile is expected to expand into area sometime in 2010.
Kalkaska	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Kent	All known providers are Phase II compliant. Some VoIP providers are deploying in Intrado with single ESN and Kent County is a multi-ESN county. It is unknown who all the providers are and further investigation will be needed to isolate the providers.
Keweenaw	They are Phase II compliant in their county. Limited VoIP testing calls being made currently.
Lake	Concerns regarding a VoIP call being conferenced in from a VoIP call center. He will contact the provider for further information.
Lapeer	Phase II is working for all providers that service this county. They are reporting no VoIP problems at this time
Leelanau	They are Phase II compliant with no new providers. Leelanau County continues to work with VoIP providers with no issues at this time.
Lenawee	No new providers in this county.
Livingston	They are fully Phase II compliant.
Luce	They are Phase II complaint. Vixxi VoIP testing is complete.
Mackinac	No new providers in this area in 2009. All Phase II operations are compliant. No VoIP concerns at this time.
Macomb	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Manistee	Vonage tested VoIP calls and they came on line in late 2009.
Marquette	AT&T acquired Dobson Cellular One and Verizon acquired Alltel. They have no VoIP concerns.
Mason	Phase II has been complete since August 2003. They are 100% compliant with VoIP deployments and began receiving calls in 2006.
Mecosta	Phase II complete – no new providers. Known VoIP calls are less than expected. They have seen an increase in location accuracy in cell calls.
Menominee	They are not seeing any improved accuracy with AT&T (Dobson) Phase II calls. They are noticing some addressing issues as the VoIP customers do not enter addresses to be MSAG valid and therefore will not plot on a map.
Midland	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Missaukee	Phase II compliant in April 2005. VoIP testing was complete in January 2008 and is receiving VoIP calls at this time.
Monroe	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Montcalm	No new implementation of providers during 2009. No known VoIP problems or concerns.
Montmorency	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Muskegon	In March 2009, they contacted 5 new wireless providers regarding service in this county. They are reporting no VoIP activity or concerns at this time.
Newaygo	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Oakland	All PSAPs are Phase II compliant and receiving wireless calls. Most PSAPs in this area have installed IP-Based CPE in preparation for NG 9-1-1.
Oceana	Phase II has been complete since August 2003. They are 100% compliant with

	VoIP deployments and began receiving calls in 2006.
Ogemaw	They are having concerns with the accuracy of incoming VoIP records to the dispatch center. VoIP companies do not routinely make test calls when installing equipment, so mistakes aren't corrected until after the fact.
Ontonagon	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Osceola	Phase II complete – no new providers. Known VoIP calls are less than expected. They have seen an increase in location accuracy in cell calls.
Oscoda	They are Phase II compliant since 2004. VoIP ESN in place and operative.
Otsego	Otsego County has installed the proper equipment that is capable and at a state of readiness to deploy wireless service for all CMRS providers within this county. They have no VoIP concerns.
Ottawa	Still unable to determine proper accounting of VoIP calls by Service Classification of "VoIP" as per previous years.
Presque Isle	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Roscommon	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Saginaw	Metro PCS has started Phase I and Phase II, completed on May 24, 2009.
Saint Clair	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Saint Joseph	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Sanilac	This county was experiencing some issues in receiving Phase II information from AT&T Mobility in the first half of 2009. An upgrade was completed in August of 2009, this has corrected the problem. They did not experience any VoIP problems in 2009.
Schoolcraft	Phase II is fully deployed.
Shiawassee	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Tuscola	No comments from this county during the reporting period.
Van Buren	No new providers to report. They have no issues with VoIP technology at this time.
Washtenaw	All CMRS providers have deployed Phase II in this county. All VoIP providers have been requested to route 9-1-1 calls with MSAG validation and most have deployed and tested their service in this county. 9-1-1 call volume has been limited compared to landline and wireless services. There remains some concern about security, dependability, and routing regarding of VoIP 9-1-1 services.
Wayne-Detroit	No comments from this service district during the reporting period.
Wayne-D. River	This service district did not submit a report.
Wayne-Eastern	All providers are Phase II.
Wayne-Western	No new providers implemented in the CWW during 2009.
Wexford	No comments from this county during the reporting period.

2010 Annual Report  
County Financials

County	State 911 Fund Receipts 2009	Local 911 Surcharge Receipts 2009	911 Millage Receipts	General Fund Monies	Other Receipts -	Total Operating Budget	Other Allowable Expenses	Unexpended State 911 Funds	Carryover of Unexpended State 911 Funds	Total Other County 911 Expenses	# Wireline 9-1-1 Calls	# Wireless 9-1-1 Calls	# VoIP 9-1-1 Calls	Total 9-1-1 Calls	Total PSAP calls on non 9-1-1 lines
Alcona	\$124,214.00	\$387,133.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$23,266.00	\$534,613.00	\$124,214.00	\$0.00	\$12,440.04	\$0.00	3,654	1,703	17	5,374	unknown
Alger	\$121,695.00	\$24,016.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,262.00	\$172,831.00	\$0.00	\$357,064.53	\$412,411.15	\$0.00	1,232	892	35	2,159	1,345
Allegan	\$251,689.00	\$2,077,078.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$18,099.00	\$2,100,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	38,866	unknown	unknown	38,866	unknown
Alpena	\$150,426.00	\$703,488.10	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$24,991.91	\$878,906.10	\$793,092.28	\$85,813.73	\$464,556.69	\$0.00	16,554	16,554	2,879	35,987	50,380
Antrim	\$139,322.00	\$555,244.75	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,615.40	\$842,181.00	\$74,655.69	\$64,666.31	\$134,096.02	\$0.00	4,980	5,026	6	10,012	6,390
Arenac	\$131,745.00	\$80,155.00	\$417,539.58	\$0.00	\$14,497.71	\$643,937.29	\$131,745.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$8,840.50	2,640	5,673	91	8,404	unknown
Baraga	\$119,880.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$6,685.03	\$126,565.03	\$127,013.71	\$0.00	\$258,655.82	\$0.00	1,189	1,085	0	2,274	194,416
Barry	\$184,860.00	\$0.00	\$1,639,667.63	\$0.00	\$35,256.63	\$2,617,525.00	\$52,305.82	\$132,554.18	\$138,643.58	\$0.00	9,808	6,237	192	16,237	84,059
Bay	\$257,784.00	\$0.00	\$2,122,884.00	\$0.00	\$101,565.00	\$2,482,233.00	\$257,784.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	52,242	62,519	1,135	115,896	62,635
Benzie	\$129,695.00	\$465,509.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,070.00	\$598,374.00	\$549,020.00	\$49,534.00	\$61,216.57	\$0.00	2,088	4,175	45	6,308	93,491
Berrien	\$327,921.00	\$800,628.00	\$1,650,628.00	\$0.00	\$123,486.00	\$2,782,055.00	\$768,489.00	\$0.00	\$915,585.00	\$0.00	87,125	56,606	386	144,117	unknown
Branch	\$170,015.00	\$54,781.34	\$885,901.56	\$0.00	\$106,718.08	\$1,089,923.98	n/a	\$0.00	\$0.00	n/a	49,648	47,293	10,500	96,548	96,548
CCE	\$437,785.00	\$576,724.00	\$0.00	\$1,344,687.00	\$73,246.00	\$1,762,808.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	30,520	37,060	328	67,908	67,147
Calhoun	\$295,545.00	\$911,199.43	\$0.00	\$2,176,842.49	\$231,301.00	\$3,178,741.12	\$3,355,612.98	\$47,509.24	\$344,780.20	\$529,887.44	unknown	unknown	unknown	109,865	230,716
Cass	\$177,212.00	\$551,036.25	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$163,315.00	\$891,563.25	\$177,212.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	6,900	11,874	0	18,774	128,070
Chippewa	\$160,612.00	\$373,382.98	\$0.00	\$90,500.40	\$202,775.04	\$827,270.42	\$827,270.42	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	10,914	6,049	75	17,038	30,455
Clare	\$112,537.00	\$113,972.74	\$343,376.62	\$0.00	\$12,838.65	\$582,725.01	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
Clinton	\$196,177.00	\$1,745,119.48	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$95,746.62	\$2,037,043.10	\$210,883.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	20,206	18,646	159	39,011	39,329
Crawford	\$127,360.00	\$389,503.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$162.00	\$517,025.00	\$0.00	\$60,833.00	\$27,328.00	\$0.00	1,077	1,145	2	2,224	5,336
Delta	\$160,179.00	\$227,178.00	\$597,498.00	\$0.00	\$9,049.00	\$993,904.00	\$160,179.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	4,402	8,629	63	13,094	unknown
Dickinson	\$145,590.00	\$163,525.09	\$0.00	\$235,000.00	\$0.00	\$490,175.00	\$145,590.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	6,216	2,850	20	9,086	340,000
Eaton	\$237,605.00	\$0.00	\$3,303,063.20	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,540,668.20	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	28,633	30,865	unknown	59,498	84,359
Genesee	\$580,002.00	\$6,347,357.00	\$0.00	\$1,823,386.00	\$285,899.00	\$9,036,644.00	\$6,515,334.00	\$42,741.00	\$27,942.00	\$0.00	237,578	297,605	2,959	538,142	117,653
Gladwin	\$143,264.00	\$139,393.37	\$694,029.72	\$0.00	\$11,354.91	\$653,248.52	\$84,637.60	\$65,141.49	\$111,346.80	\$0.00	7,231	3,424	unknown	10,655	107,322
Gogebic	\$169,886.50	\$47,708.88	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$217,595.38	\$212,479.07	\$5,116.31	\$5,116.31	\$0.00	2,993	1,753	unknown	4,746	**
Grand Traverse	\$213,146.00	\$711,708.00	\$0.00	\$620,676.00	\$9,106.00	\$1,554,636.00	\$213,146.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	12,733	23,799	unknown	36,532	94,763
Gratiot	\$165,689.00	\$511,268.40	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$137,055.00	\$812,555.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	16,489	7,280	unknown	23,769	71,975
Hillsdale	\$171,016.00	\$659,590.17	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$9,870.46	\$840,476.63	\$171,016.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	12,366	16,105	187	28,658	437
Houghton	\$156,789.00	\$381,546.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,000.00	\$541,335.00	\$156,789.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	5,109	4,893	0	10,002	**
Huron	\$157,268.00	\$755,778.21	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$25,848.00	\$927,325.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	3,846	7,483	76	11,405	65,289
Ingham	\$487,450.00	\$1,192,966.00	\$6,356,334.00	\$0.00	\$279,064.00	\$8,315,814.00	\$487,450.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$339,705.00	75,839	87,275	1,264	164,378	373,250
Ionia	\$191,787.00	\$1,081,889.14	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$182,852.76	\$1,467,138.00	\$191,787.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	21,269	8,864	356	30,489	82,294
Iosco	\$145,409.00	\$542,762.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$13,927.00	\$702,098.00	\$790,786.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	3,273	7,635	12	10,920	38,140

2010 Annual Report  
County Financials

Iron	\$126,140.00	\$219,484.52	\$0.00	\$142,846.20	\$16,297.00	\$982,057.11	\$779,018.72	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	1,902	1,807	37	3,746	41,635
Isabella	\$145,319.00	\$931,059.48	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$15,653.00	\$1,092,031.40	\$134,561.34	\$56,759.09	\$0.00	\$0.00	22,000	unknown	unknown	22,000	90,000
Jackson	\$322,467.00	\$810,497.00	\$0.00	\$1,234,740.00	\$50,159.00	\$1,747,617.00	\$673,896.00	\$142,947.00	n/a	n/a	47,293	74,176	736	122,205	225,000
Kalamazoo	\$432,072.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,240,100.00	\$12,595.00	\$2,325,797.00	\$102,055.00	\$2,396,465.00	\$316,400.00	\$0.00	110,302	78,845	10,892	200,039	379,746
Kalkaska	\$130,038.00	\$503,601.05	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,047.39	\$640,686.44	\$490,053.08	\$150,633.36	\$0.00	\$0.00	2,174	5,291	124	7,589	39,467
Kent	\$887,628.00	\$3,234,318.00	\$0.00	\$10,290,925.28	\$0.00	\$11,029,148.84	\$0.00	\$144,260.00	\$0.00	\$848,954.00	231,359	81,442	1,222	314,023	587,578
Keweenaw	\$111,157.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$267,519.00	\$378,676.00	\$52,268.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
Lake	\$128,507.00	\$0.00	\$809,000.00	\$0.00	\$6,242.71	\$943,749.71	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	3,881	4,983	74	8,938	49,761
Lapeer	\$227,590.00	\$1,614,323.00	\$1,841,913.00	\$0.00	\$38,718.55	\$1,720,979.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	8,596	18,628	373	76,637	72,307
Leelanau	\$136,970.00	\$0.00	\$849,986.00	\$0.00	\$11,312.00	\$998,268.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	3,668	3,892	unknown	7,560	37,777
Lenawee	\$242,574.00	\$1,305,797.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,439.00	\$1,553,810.00	\$242,574.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	95,230	68,685	0	163,915	73,815
Livingston	\$321,281.00	\$4,239,305.44	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$55,548.88	\$4,616,135.32	\$3,990,124.22	\$626,011.10	\$1,206,280.23	\$0.00	31,431	55,021	unknown	86,452	171,827
Luce	\$115,442.00	\$64,043.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,789.00	\$181,274.00	\$181,274.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	1,388	530	0	1,918	4,982
Mackinac	\$93,140.00	\$228,685.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$321,825.00	\$112,594.00	\$78,096.00	\$143,909.00	\$0.00	5,526	2,628	20	8,174	9,552
Macomb	\$1,174,802.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$136,873.00	\$1,311,675.00	\$0.00	\$197,141.00	\$190,057.00	\$0.00	249,335	245,127	2,614	497,076	395,733
Manistee	\$135,134.00	\$0.00	\$790,712.00	\$794,063.00	\$39,895.00	\$1,059,362.00	\$937,932.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	22,500	20,000	25	42,525	79,000
Marquette	\$196,014.00	\$0.00	\$851,362.00	\$0.00	\$62,073.00	\$1,109,449.00	\$0.00	\$196,014.00	\$578,892.00	\$0.00	8,411	10,719	106	19,236	43,253
Mason/ Oceana	\$363,963.00	\$1,237,044.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$22,598.00	\$1,623,605.00	\$363,963.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	31,744	56,390	300	88,434	32,859
Mecosta/ Osceola	\$302,369.00	\$949,661.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$494,532.00	\$1,746,562.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	12,396	23,393	48	35,837	77,263
Menominee	\$142,321.00	\$279,421.17	\$0.00	\$97,998.00	\$15,487.00	\$535,227.17	\$142,321.00	\$0.00	\$6,169.00	\$0.00	2,917	3,193	175	6,285	22,976
Midland	\$165,135.00	\$0.00	\$1,668,165.92	\$0.00	\$24,999.74	\$1,858,300.66	\$165,135.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	24,997	31,147	851	56,995	52,81
Missaukee	\$127,598.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,934.00	\$133,532.00	\$69,125.00	\$58,473.00	\$387,558.00	\$0.00	1,814	3,241	34	5,089	unknown
Monroe	\$305,579.00	\$765,773.00	\$0.00	\$1,216,735.00	\$0.00	\$2,288,087.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	15,764	40,315	625	56,704	44,034
Montcalm	\$209,065.00	\$1,368,635.76	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$18,394.35	\$1,577,996.11	\$209,065.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	40,547	51,832	318	92,697	118,164
Montmorency	\$122,003.00	\$190,668.95	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$312,671.95	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	1,411	1,466	0	2,877	unknown
Muskegon	\$338,408.00	\$604,749.00	\$1,342,166.00	\$0.00	\$1,616,688.00	\$3,902,011.00	\$338,408.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	162,638	88,454	800	251,892	75,200
Newaygo	\$173,839.00	\$720,226.20	\$0.00	\$5,273.75	\$1,252.27	\$880,054.27	\$414,426.24	\$1,788.78	\$243,376.02	\$0.00	8,986	4,206	0	13,192	114,975
Oakland	\$1,724,333.00	\$3,381,016.26	\$0.00	\$25,280,462.00	\$3,959,003.00	\$36,069,147.26	\$2,228,725.86	\$2,228,725.86	\$2,876,623.40	\$0.00	168,064	387,718	7,927	563,709	1,689,608
Ogemaw	\$136,700.00	\$161,076.00	\$0.00	\$314,544.00	\$12,891.00	\$625,211.00	\$136,700.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	4,326	4,341	41	8,708	40,000
Ontonagon	\$118,623.00	\$38,853.55	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$157,476.55	\$125,691.45	\$11,973.57	\$46,600.22	\$0.00	756	210	unknown	966	**
Oscoda	\$120,790.00	\$48,649.74	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$169,439.74	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	1,254	1,596	7	2,857	unknown
Otsego	\$139,931.00	\$527,489.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$667,420.00	\$0.00	\$75,780.06	\$0.00	\$0.00	4,796	6,851	10	11,657	10,013
Ottawa	\$431,682.00	\$0.00	\$3,947,447.01	\$0.00	\$134,010.44	\$4,835,446.85	\$1,057,950.05	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	32,802	68,066	693	101,561	238,407
Presque Isle	\$127,547.00	\$51,060.47	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,401.55	\$180,009.02	\$194,475.02	(\$14,466.00)	(\$18,481.86)	\$0.00	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
Roscommon	\$142,870.00	\$0.00	\$882,096.41	\$0.00	\$17,033.00	\$1,041,999.41	\$13,742.88	\$11,203.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	9,808	5,522	4	15,334	49,067
Saint Clair	\$311,293.00	\$818,116.00	\$310,067.00	\$565,151.00	\$492,898.00	\$2,183,262.00	\$311,293.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	25,358	39,433	79	64,870	176,497
Saint Joseph	\$193,013.00	\$0.00	\$1,373,946.00	\$0.00	\$35,780.00	\$1,407,046.00	\$396,966.00	\$0.00	\$137,106.00	\$0.00	19,216	20,528	122	39,866	41,560

2010 Annual Report  
County Financials

Saginaw	\$393,318.00	\$5,001,442.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$102,722.00	\$5,497,482.00	\$4,678,159.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	136,479	238,232	29,072	403,783	unknown
Sanilac	\$168,760.00	\$223,506.58	\$0.00	\$222,170.10	\$35,496.84	\$652,851.20	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,917.68	\$0.00	3,861	7,440	135	11,436	114,793
Schoolcraft	\$118,896.00	\$41,323.87	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,059.21	\$161,279.08	\$142,837.52	\$18,441.56	\$0.00	\$0.00	858	1,520	0	2,378	**
Shiawassee	\$205,585.00	\$972,072.95	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$13,525.33	\$1,191,183.28	\$205,585.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	18,551	22,365	unknown	40,916	34,288
Tuscola	\$187,374.00	\$1,077,232.34	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$29,101.09	\$1,112,769.28	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$248,586.71	\$0.00	8,611	11,175	342	20,128	45,299
Van Buren	\$158,138.00	\$248,679.00	\$0.00	\$1,008,064.00	\$13,519.00	\$1,428,400.00	\$242,997.00	\$0.00	\$120,128.00	\$0.00	11,479	31,887	371	43,737	185,465
Washtenaw	\$546,279.00	\$1,874,225.62	\$0.00	\$5,301,106.48	\$0.00	\$7,593,078.50	\$416,537.73	\$129,741.27	\$129,741.27	\$0.00	49,417	125,747	1,452	176,616	457,613
Wayne - CWW	*****	\$2,661,124.00	\$0.00	\$11,304,862.00	\$0.00	\$14,881,840.00	\$3,776,743.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$131,315.00	94,575	256,821	2,356	353,752	unknown
Wayne - DMA**	*****	\$ 1,225,633.12													
Wayne - CEW	*****	\$240,179.41	\$0.00	\$1,211,695.92	\$16,969.00	\$1,426,648.00	\$197,983.16	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	6,974	26,210	132	33,316	unknown
Wayne-Detroit***	*****	\$3,836,487.00	\$0.00	\$5,272,334.04	\$0.00	\$15,000,000.00	\$5,272,334.04	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	unknown	1,094,109	3,465	1,097,574	1,475,475
Wexford	\$149,677.00	\$88,488.00	\$0.00	\$515,585.00	\$18,982.00	\$642,519.00	\$44,706.00	\$170,451.00	\$97,532.00	\$0.00	5,421	9,820	109	15,350	58,797
TOTALS	\$19,292,918.50	\$64,355,588.81	\$32,677,783.65	\$73,309,747.66	\$10,020,361.55	\$198,555,029.18	\$45,420,711.88	\$7,591,412.44	\$9,627,512.85	\$1,858,701.94	2,528,436	4,125,999	86,478	6,888,925	8,201,872
*	Presque Isle is on a fiscal yest - July 1-June 30, they reported their monies as calendar year														
**	Did not submit information for this reporting period.														
***	Submitted incomplete information for this reporting period.														

\*\*\*\* Total State 9-1-1 Fund receipts distributed from Treasury for Wayne County is \$2,897,825.

**Includes all counties dispatched by Neganee Regional Dispatch.**

"

While this column contains additional revenues such as fees, rental, training funds, not all figures indicate additional revenue, but also includes loans to PSAPs, carry-over from previous years, and contracts with other counties (already reported as revenue by another county).

**State 9-1-1 Committee**  
**2010 Annual Report to the Michigan Legislature**  
**DISTRIBUTION OF EMERGENCY 9-1-1 FUNDS TO**  
**COUNTIES**  
(EQUAL & PER CAPITA)  
**INCLUDES PAYMENTS: October 2009 – July 2010**

County	Net Payment
Alcona	125,554
Alger	123,008
Allegan	254,401
Alpena	152,428
Antrim	141,178
Arenac	133,165
Baraga	121,476
Barry	187,321
Bay	260,563
Benzie	131,424
Berrien	332,287
Branch	172,279
Calhoun	298,729
Cass	179,571
Charlevoix	145,264
Cheboygan	145,756
Chippewa	162,344
Clare	152,344
Clinton	198,291
Crawford	129,058
Delta	162,312
Dickinson	147,160
Eaton	251,645
Emmet	152,597
Genesee	707,659
Gladwin	145,172
Gogebic	133,305
Grand Traverse	215,984
Gratiot	167,475
Hillsdale	173,294
Houghton	158,878
Huron	158,964
Ingham	492,699
Ionia	193,854
Iosco	146,977
Iron	127,500
Isabella	196,368
Jackson	326,758
Kalamazoo	436,725
Kalkaska	132,209
Kent	897,183
Keweenaw	112,638

County	Net Payment
Lake	125,026
Lapeer	230,042
Leelanau	138,448
Lenawee	245,188
Livingston	324,741
Luce	119,116
Mackinac	125,861
Macomb	1,190,429
Manistee	143,121
Marquette	198,127
Mason	148,259
Mecosta	165,100
Menominee	144,217
Midland	223,143
Missaukee	129,338
Monroe	309,646
Montcalm	193,509
Montmorency	123,629
Muskegon	342,911
Newaygo	175,141
Oakland	1,747,268
Oceana	146,338
Ogemaw	139,168
Ontonagon	120,204
Osceola	141,296
Oscoda	122,398
Otsego	141,440
Ottawa	436,330
Presque Isle	129,247
Roscommon	144,413
Saginaw	397,554
Saint Clair	334,731
Saint Joseph	195,093
Sanilac	170,579
Schoolcraft	121,693
Shiawassee	207,800
Tuscola	189,394
Van Buren	214,076
Washtenaw	552,161
Wayne	2,936,365
Wexford	151,290
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$22,717,627</b>



**REPORT ON  
NEXT GENERATION 9-1-1 FEASIBILITY STUDY  
PREPARED FOR  
THE STATE OF MICHIGAN 9-1-1 COMMITTEE**

---

## **Executive Summary**

L. Robert Kimball & Associates, Inc. (L.R. Kimball) is pleased to provide the state of Michigan ("the state") and the State 9-1-1 Committee ("Committee") this Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG9-1-1) feasibility report.

### **PROJECT OVERVIEW**

The state sought a comprehensive study of multiple options for a NG9-1-1 network to serve all of the state of Michigan. Changing and affordable new technologies have altered the way the public accesses 9-1-1. In some areas, wireless calls are well above 70 percent of all calls received by the local public safety answering point (PSAP). The Committee understands that the increasingly technical nature of these services requires an upgrade of the current 40-year old analog 9-1-1 system.

When wireless devices (cell phones) started accessing 9-1-1, the system was unable to provide any of the information that routinely accompanied a landline (legacy) call. There was no call back number or caller location information. The changes to the system that were required just to get the cell tower location and call back number were lengthy. Despite the challenges, all of Michigan's counties have been capable of processing wireless Phase II calls since the end of 2005.

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) through its seventh Network Reliability and Interoperability Council (NRIC VII) dedicated a subcommittee to look at the future of E9-1-1. The National Emergency Number Association (NENA) has spent time and effort working with PSAP managers and technology specialists to come up with the Next Generation 9-1-1 network. The federal Department of Transportation (DOT) brought in experts to conduct a proof of concept (POC) that demonstrated what could be done using upgraded internet protocol (IP) technology.

The common theme of all the above is that the 40-year old technology currently used for 9-1-1 cannot provide the backbone of a 9-1-1 system that is being asked to meet the expectations of consumers that use newer modes of communication that results from the realities of a more complex and mobile society. Examples include text message calls from hearing-impaired callers, data from an automatic crash notification device, residents three counties over whose 9-1-1 center had to evacuate due to a flood, or the caller whose baby is not breathing and whose call is queued behind 15-20 other callers reporting the accident on the freeway at rush hour. All of these issues can be addressed by changing out the old technology and moving to a robust and redundant, scalable IP-based backbone.

The vision of NG9-1-1 is twofold. From a technology perspective, it addresses all of the new communications devices by changing from an archaic analog system to a robust and dynamic digital technology. From a local control perspective, it provides more control over local data and allows for call routing to be done by policy. Policy routing provides the ability for PSAPs to decide how calls will be handled under certain conditions such as unforeseen evacuations and spikes in 9-1-1 call volume. These policies can virtually eliminate 9-1-1 busy signals or unanswered calls, yet giving PSAPs more control over the information they receive and how they process and share it. The basic premise of NG9-1-1 is that it does not change local control of local calls, but provides opportunities to provide service for any device, anywhere and at any time.

### **METHODOLOGY**

L.R. Kimball has reviewed the status of PSAPs across Michigan. L.R. Kimball developed an electronic inventory using both a survey tool e-mailed to all PSAPs and visiting 16 sites of varying sizes and locations.

Three meetings with service providers were held to inform the industry about the study and to gather information about what IP services currently existed and where they were located. This aided in determining the status and availability of IP within Michigan.

## **FINDINGS**

L.R. Kimball found that IP technology is available throughout Michigan. Some of Michigan's telephone companies have built fiber optic networks to support a variety of voice and data services. Michigan's cable television companies have a vast infrastructure serving homes and businesses throughout the state, including voice and data services. Some wireless networks also utilize IP. It is clear that it is possible for one or more of these existing IP networks to serve 9-1-1 across all of the state.

After identifying four options, L.R. Kimball analyzed the regulatory, policy and political implications; the operational and technical aspects, and costs for each option.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

L.R. Kimball recommends the following two options for Michigan. The first option is more cost effective than the second option, but either would provide a phased-in transition from an IP 9-1-1 network to a fully functioning NG9-1-1 network.

- A Statewide Prime Contractor Managed IP Network
- A Regional Prime Contractor Managed IP Network

### **Statewide Prime Contractor Managed IP Network**

A prime contractor would provide the communications infrastructure and NG9-1-1 applications to all PSAPs. The state would establish the service levels, and meeting them would be the responsibility of the prime contractor. The State of Michigan would be the customer of record for the contract, and would hold the prime contractor responsible for all issues. The prime contractor would be the single point of contact for the state for all issues with the delivery of NG9-1-1 calls and associated applications to each PSAP in the state. The prime contractor could be:

- A qualified carrier providing the IP transport network and the public safety solutions
- A qualified carrier providing the IP transport network and subcontracting the services of a public safety solution provider
- A public safety solution provider subcontracting IP transport network connectivity from a qualified carrier or carriers
- A systems integrator subcontracting IP transport, connectivity and solutions

The prime contractor would be responsible for all service levels associated with NG9-1-1 call delivery along with supplemental and supportive<sup>1</sup> information as specified in NENA documentation.

Statewide IP connectivity could be accomplished with services available by carriers currently operating in Michigan.

Newer public safety solutions providers (i.e., those that are not incumbent or competitive telephone companies) have the capability to provide the service by leasing the IP connectivity from a qualified

---

1 NENA Technical Information Document on Network to IP PSAP Interface, 08-501, June 2004, pages 2-19 – 2-21. The NENA Future Path Plan describes three types of information related to an emergency call that are either delivered with the emergency call or that can be made available to the PSAP either through a query/response method initiated by the PSAP or as initiated by the network or a third party. These sets of data include essential data, supportive data and supplemental data. Essential data are used to route the call and are delivered with the call. Supportive data are analogous to ALI data. They may be delivered with a call or requested by the PSAP during an ongoing call. Supplemental data are data that can assist the emergency responder(s) in preparing to respond to the emergency. These data may include, for example: medical records, motor vehicle records, vehicle collision information, etc.

carrier and providing the NG9-1-1 functions as a service based on number of calls delivered or population served.

### **Regional Prime Contractor Managed Network**

A prime contractor would provide the IP transport infrastructure and public safety solution applications to all PSAPs within a geographic area, or a single prime contractor could contract and manage local carriers within regions. The prime contractor would be responsible for making sure required service levels are met within that region or the state could set required standards. The state of Michigan would hold the regional prime contractors responsible for all issues within their respective regions. Multiple providers could support this option.

L.R. Kimball recommended eight regions based on the current emergency management and homeland security districts in Michigan. Coordination of regional interconnections to create statewide IP connectivity would have to occur. This could be accomplished by the state, a third party, or by one of the regional prime contractors. Because this requires centralized coordination, we recommend this be done at the state level. Each of the regional prime contractors would provide a single point of contact for the state for all issues with the delivery of NG9-1-1 calls and associated applications within their respective geographical area. The prime contractor could be:

A qualified carrier providing the IP transport network and the public safety solutions

A qualified carrier providing the IP transport network and subcontracting the services of a public safety solution provider

A public safety solution provider subcontracting IP transport network connectivity from a qualified carrier or carriers

One or more system integrators subcontracting the IP transport backbone, connectivity and solutions

Statewide IP connectivity utilizing a regional design could be accomplished with services available through several regional carriers in Michigan.

L.R. Kimball believes that the challenges could be addressed successfully through an open process and united effort between all stakeholders in conjunction with the Committee and the 9-1-1 Office.

### **Regulations and Statutes**

Michigan's ability to move forward will necessitate changes to state regulation and statute. The Legislature should act to eliminate statutory provisions that would prevent the deployment of a statewide E911 or regional, interconnected E911s capable of supporting NG9-1-1, and provide the Committee and/or the Office with the means to exercise effective authority in a NG9-1-1 environment. In L.R. Kimball's experience, the most successful state 9-1-1 programs are those that have broad powers and authority for the statewide provisioning of 9-1-1, have adequate funding and control over that funding, and function autonomously. The following list presents our key recommendations. Comprehensive recommendations are provided in section seven of this report.

MCL 484.1102 – update and expand definitions to include Next Generation 9-1-1 features and functions.

MCL 484.1201 – expand this section to include the state, thereby enabling the state to implement a statewide system and provide for the interconnection of regional systems.

MCL 484.1712 – modify this section to change the committee from advisory to a fully empowered board or commission with broad authority and powers.

MCL 484.1713 – reduce the size of the committee to nine members, and streamline its composition.

MCL 484.1714 – give the reconstituted committee the broad authority and powers necessary to lead the transition to statewide NG9-1-1 and oversee its operation. This is essential if Michigan is to effectively meet the requirements of E9-1-1 and NG9-1-1. The changes recommended include:

- Relocation of rule making authority from the MPSC to the state 9-1-1 Committee and/or Office
- Authority to establish and enforce service standards

- Authority to design and procure statewide NG9-1-1 system components and oversee their implementation and operation
- Authority to manage or contract for the management of the interconnections between local, regional or interstate ESNets

Tariffs – update the tariffs to reflect industry requirements for NG9-1-1 and eliminate any roadblocks to achieving statewide NG9-1-1.

## **CONCLUSION AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

It is certain that Michigan is at a cross roads. The full benefits of NG9-1-1 will not be available to Michigan's PSAPs or its citizens unless known and identified roadblocks are cleared away.

We would like to thank the Committee and 9-1-1 Office for their support throughout this study. We would also like to thank the industry representatives who took time to meet with us and provide information, as well as the many 9-1-1 service district representatives who responded to our survey, telephone calls and emails. It is our hope that this report will provide Michigan with a clear roadmap forward.

The complete report can be found at:

[http://www.michigan.gov/documents/msp/Michigan\\_Next\\_Generation\\_9-1-1\\_Feasibility\\_Study\\_304211\\_7.pdf](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/msp/Michigan_Next_Generation_9-1-1_Feasibility_Study_304211_7.pdf)

**BY WAY OF EXAMPLE, BUT NOT LIMITATION, THE FOLLOWING COSTS ARE ALLOWABLE OR DISALLOWABLE (as approved by the State 9-1-1 Committee on June 23, 2009):**

**ALLOWABLE 9-1-1 SURCHARGE FUNDS  
9-1-1 SURCHARGE EXPENDITURES**

**Personnel Costs** directly attributable to the delivery of 9-1-1 service (i.e.; directors, supervisors, dispatchers, call-takers, technical staff, support staff):

Salaries	MSAG	Coordination
Uniforms		
Fringe Benefits	Addressing/Database	EAP

**Note:** If 9-1-1 staff serves dual functions (i.e.; a director who is also in charge of Emergency Management, a dispatcher who is also a police officer) then only those portions of personnel costs attributable to their 9-1-1 functions should be allowable.

**Facility Costs** of the dispatch center directly attributable to the delivery of 9-1-1 service:

- Capital improvements for construction, remodeling, or expansion of dispatch center
- Electrical/Heat/AC/Water
- Fire Suppression System
- Cleaning, Maintenance, Trash Removal
- Telephone
- Generator/UPS and Grounding
- Insurance
- Office Supplies
- Printing and copying
- Furniture

**Note:** If a shared facility, only those portions of facility costs attributable to the 9-1-1 functions should be allowable.

**Training and Memberships** directly related to 9-1-1 service:

- On the job training
- Vendor provided training
- Conferences
- Travel and lodging as necessary
- Membership in associations (APCO, NENA, etc.)

**THE BELOW DISALLOWABLE EXPENSES ARE MEANT TO SERVE AS EXAMPLES ONLY - PLEASE REFER TO THE STATE 9-1-1 COMMITTEE APPEALS PROCESS FOR QUESTIONS.**

**Personnel Costs** of law enforcement, fire, and EMS responders, emergency management staff, shared support or technical staff, except for portions of time directly functioning as 9-1-1 allowable staff.

**Facility Costs** of law enforcement, fire, EMS, emergency management, or other municipal facilities, except for that portion housing the 9-1-1 center or back up center, or leased to the 9-1-1 center for allowable training or meeting facilities.

Capital costs and furnishing for facilities for which the primary purpose is other than 9-1-1 (i.e.; a conference room used primarily for the City Council but occasionally leased/loaned to the 9-1-1 center for meetings).

**Training** for staff not involved directly in the delivery of 9-1-1 service, or for any staff for courses not directly attributable to 9-1-1 or dispatching services. **Memberships** for staff not involved directly in the delivery of 9-1-1 service, or for associations with a primary purpose other than public safety communications (i.e., sheriff's associations, police or fire chief associations, etc.)

**ALLOWABLE 9-1-1 SURCHARGE FUNDS  
9-1-1 SURCHARGE EXPENDITURES**

**Hardware, software, connectivity and peripherals** directly attributable to the delivery of 9-1-1 service:

- Customer Premise Equipment
- Remote CPE Hardware/Modems
- Computer-Aided Dispatch
- Radio system (consoles, infrastructure, field equipment)
- LEIN costs for dispatch purposes
- Paging System, pagers and related costs
- Voice logging equipment
- Mobile Data Systems
- GIS/Mapping Systems/AVL Systems
- Alarms/Security Systems
- Connectivity for any of the above
- Maintenance and service agreements of above
- Software licensing of the above
- Associated database costs

**Vehicle costs (staff vehicle, pool car, mileage reimbursement, fuel, etc.)** directly attributable to the delivery of 9-1-1 service:

- Travel for meetings, training, conferences
- Travel for MSAG verification and testing
- Travel for 9-1-1 Public Education purposes

**Professional Services**

Attorneys	Consultants	Insurance
Architects	Auditor	

**Public Information/Education Expenses** directly attributable to the delivery of 9-1-1 service.

**Miscellaneous**

**DISALLOWABLE 9-1-1 SURCHARGE FUNDS 9-1-1 SURCHARGE EXPENDITURES**

**Hardware, software, connectivity and peripherals** not attributable to the delivery of 9-1-1 service:

- Law Enforcement Record Management Systems
- Fire Records Management Systems
- EMS Records Management Systems
- Jail Records Management Systems
- LEIN costs for non-9-1-1 functions (e.g., Records unit)
- Word processing, databases, etc. not directly attributable to 9-1-1 service
- GIS not directly related to the delivery of 9-1-1 service
- Court Information Systems
- Connectivity for any of the above
- Maintenance and service agreements for any of the above
- Software licensing for any of the above
- Non-Emergency N-1-1 systems

**Vehicle costs (fleet vehicle, pool car, mileage reimbursement, etc.)** for law enforcement, fire, or EMS responders, such as patrol cars, fire apparatus, ambulances, etc.

**Professional Services** not directly attributable to the delivery of 9-1-1 service.

**Public Information** not directly attributable to the delivery of 9-1-1 service.

**Miscellaneous:**

Road Signs/Addressing Implements

**Emergency Telephone Service Committee  
6/21/2005**

**State 9-1-1 Committee revised  
6/23/2009**

**PUBLIC SAFETY ANSWERING POINT (PSAP)  
PAYMENT HISTORY**

NAME	August 31, 2001		March 25, 2002		May 9, 2003		November 7, 2003		May 6, 2004		November 12, 2004	
	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment
Albion Department of Public Safety			3	1,276	3	1,152	3	925	3	577	3	578
Alcona County 911	5	1,160	6	2,552	7	2,687	7	2,159	7	1,345	7	1,350
Alger County E911	8	1,857	8	3,402								
Allegan County Central Dispatch	18	4,177	18	7,655	19	7,294	19	5,860	19	3,652	19	3,663
Allen Park Police Department	11	2,553							3	577	3	578
Alpena County Central Dispatch	9	2,089	9	3,828	10	3,839	10	3,084	10	1,922	10	1,928
Ann Arbor Police Department	22	5,106	22	9,356	21	8,062	21	6,477	18	3,460	18	3,471
Antrim County Central Dispatch Center	11	2,553	10	4,253	9	3,455	9	2,776	9	1,730	9	1,735
Arenac County Central Dispatch	6	1,392	6	2,552	7	2,687	7	2,159	7	1,345	7	1,350
Auburn Hills Police Department			6	2,552	8	3,071	8	2,467	9	1,730	9	1,735
Barry County Central Dispatch	13	3,017	13	5,529	13	4,991	13	4,010	13	2,499	13	2,507
Bay County 911 Central Dispatch	24	5,570	25	10,632	22	8,446	22	6,785	23	4,421	23	4,435
Belding Area Dispatch Center					4	1,536	4	1,234	4	769	4	771
Benton Township Police Department												
Benton Harbor Police Department					6	2,303	6	1,851	5	961	5	964
Benzie County Sheriff Department	8	1,857			8	3,071	8	2,467	9	1,730	9	1,735
Berkley Department of Public Safety	5	1,160	5	2,126	4	1,536	4	1,234				
Berrien County Sheriff's Department	19	4,410			23	8,830	23	7,094	12	2,307	12	2,314
Beverly Hills Public Safety Department	6	1,392	3	1,276	4	1,536	4	1,234	4	769	4	771
Birmingham Police Department	7	1,625	7	2,977	7	2,687	7	2,159	7	1,345	7	1,350
Bloomfield Hills Public Safety Department	6	1,392	4	1,701	4	1,536	4	1,234	3	577	3	578
Bloomfield Township Police Department	15	3,481	16	6,805	13	4,991	13	4,010	11	2,114	11	2,121
Branch County 911/central Dispatch	13	3,017	12	5,103					12	2,307	12	2,314
Brownstown Police Department	8	1,857										
Calhoun County Central Communication 911			25	10,632								
Canton Township Department of Public Safety	13	3,017			10	3,839	10	3,084	13	2,499	13	2,507
Cass County Sheriff Department	10	2,321	10	4,253	10	3,839	10	3,084	8	1,538	8	1,542
CCE Central Dispatch Authority	20	4,642	18	7,655	18	6,910	18	5,552	17	3,268	17	3,278
Center Line Public Safety Department	5	1,160	3	1,276	5	1,920	5	1,542				
Central Dispatch Network (Belleville/Sumpter	7	1,625	8	3,402	8	3,071	8	2,467	7	1,345	7	1,350
Central Michigan University												
Chelsea Police Department												
Chesterfield Twp Police Department	6	1,392	6	2,552					8	1,538	8	1,542
Chippewa County Central Dispatch	11	2,553	11	4,678	11	4,223	11	3,393	11	2,114	11	2,121
Clare County Central Dispatch	9	2,089			9	3,455	9	2,776	9	1,730	9	1,735
Clawson Police Department	7	1,625	3	1,276								
Clay Township					5	1,920	5	1,542	5	961	5	964
Clinton County Central Dispatch	12	2,785	11	4,678	12	4,607	12	3,701	12	2,307	12	2,314
Clinton Township Police Department	13	3,017	12	5,103	13	4,991	13	4,010	12	2,307	12	2,314
Crawford Emergency Central Dispatch	6	1,392	7	2,977	7	2,687	7	2,159	7	1,345	7	1,350
Dearborn 911 Communications	22	5,106	22	9,356	21	8,062	21	6,477	21	4,036	21	4,049
Dearborn Heights Police Department	15	3,481							14	2,691	14	2,699
Delta County Central Dispatch	9	2,089	8	3,402	8	3,071	8	2,467	8	1,538	8	1,542
Detroit Emergency Telephone District	111	25,761	188	79,955	186	71,407	186	57,368	125	24,026	125	24,101
Dickinson County Central Dispatch	9	2,089			9	3,455	9	2,776	8	1,538	8	1,542
East Lansing Police Department	15	3,481	16	6,805								
Eastern Michigan University Police Department					4	1,536	4	1,234	4	769	4	771
Eaton County Central Dispatch	24	5,570	25	10,632	24	9,214	24	7,402	26	4,997	26	5,013
Ecorse Police/Ecorse Fire	9	2,089										
Farmington Department of Public Safety			4	1,701	5	1,920	5	1,542	4	769	4	771
Farmington Hills Police Department	21	4,874	20	8,506	19	7,294	19	5,860	18	3,460	18	3,471
Fenton Police Department			4	1,701	5	1,920	5	1,542	5	961	5	964
Ferndale Police Department					10	3,839	10	3,084	4	769	4	771
Flat Rock Police Department									1	192	1	193
Flint 911					28	10,749	28	8,636	26	4,997	26	5,013

**PUBLIC SAFETY ANSWERING POINT (PSAP)  
PAYMENT HISTORY**

NAME	August 31, 2001		March 25, 2002		May 9, 2003		November 7, 2003		May 6, 2004		November 12, 2004	
	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment
Fraser Department of Public Safety	8	1,857	7	2,977					7	1,345	7	1,350
Garden City Police Department			5	2,126	6	2,303	6	1,851	7	1,345	7	1,350
Genesee County 911 Authority	33	7,659	33	14,035	33	12,669	33	10,178	34	6,535	34	6,556
Gilbralter Police Department	5	1,160	4	1,701	4	1,536	4	1,234				
Gladwin County Central Dispatch	9	2,089	9	3,828	9	3,455	9	2,776	9	1,730	9	1,735
Grand Rapids Police Dept Communications Bureau					28	10,749	28	8,636				
Grand Traverse Central Dispatch	17	3,945	17	7,230	16	6,143	16	4,935				
Grandville Police Department					4	1,536	4	1,234	5	961	5	964
Gratiot County Central Dispatch	7	1,625	4	1,701	4	1,536	4	1,234	5	961	5	964
Greenville Public Safety	5	1,160			5	1,920	5	1,542	5	961	5	964
Grosse Ile Township Police Department	4	928			5	1,920	5	1,542				
Grosse Pointe City DPS	4	928	4	1,701	4	1,536	4	1,234	4	769	4	771
Grosse Pointe Farms					6	2,303	6	1,851				
Grosse Pointe Park Department of Public Safety					4	1,536	4	1,234	4	769	4	771
Grosse Pointe Shores DPS	3	696							4	769	4	771
Grosse Pointe Woods DPS	4	928	5	2,126	5	1,920	5	1,542	4	769	4	771
Harper Woods Police Department	4	928							4	769	4	771
Hazel Park Police Department			9	3,828	9	3,455	9	2,776	3	577	3	578
Hillsdale County Central Dispatch	13	3,017	12	5,103	13	4,991	13	4,010	13	2,499	13	2,507
Holly Police Department	4	928	3	1,276	3	1,152	3	925	3	577	3	578
Houghton County 911/central Dispatch	8	1,857			9	3,455	9	2,776	10	1,922	10	1,928
Huron Central Dispatch	10	2,321	10	4,253	10	3,839	10	3,084	10	1,922	10	1,928
Huron Township Police-Fire			5	2,126	5	1,920	5	1,542	5	961	5	964
Ionia County Central Dispatch	14	3,249	14	5,954	14	5,375	14	4,318	14	2,691	14	2,699
Iosco County Central Dispatch	11	2,553	10	4,253	11	4,223	11	3,393				
Iron County 911	1	232	9	3,828	9	3,455	9	2,776	9	1,730	9	1,735
Isabella County Central Dispatch	12	2,785	12	5,103	12	4,607	12	3,701	12	2,307	12	2,314
Jackson County Central Dispatch	21	4,874	21	8,931	21	8,062	21	6,477	20	3,844	20	3,856
Kalamazoo County Sheriff Department												
Kalamazoo DPS	20	4,642							19	3,652	19	3,663
Kalamazoo Township Police Department									4	769	4	771
Kalkaska County Central Dispatch			7	2,977	7	2,687	7	2,159	6	1,153	6	1,157
Kent County Sheriff Department	26	6,034	25	10,632	25	9,598	25	7,711	23	4,421	23	4,435
Lake County 911 Central Dispatch	10	2,321	9	3,828	9	3,455	9	2,776	9	1,730	9	1,735
Lake Orion Police Department	4	928	4	1,701	4	1,536	4	1,234	5	961	5	964
Lansing Police Dept/Ingham Cty Central Disp.	56	12,996	47	19,989	49	18,812	49	15,113	49	9,418	49	9,448
Lapeer County Central Dispatch	18	4,177	17	7,230	17	6,526	17	5,243	19	3,652	19	3,663
Leelanau County Central Dispatch	8	1,857	6	2,552	8	3,071	8	2,467	6	1,153	6	1,157
Lenawee County Sheriff Department	15	3,481	16	6,805	15	5,759	15	4,626	14	2,691	14	2,699
Livingston County 911 Central Dispatch	23	5,338	24	10,207	25	9,598	25	7,711	24	4,613	24	4,627
Livonia Police Department	10	2,321	9	3,828	9	3,455	9	2,776	8	1,538	8	1,542
Macomb County Sheriff's Department	15	3,481	19	8,081	19	7,294	19	5,860	16	3,075	16	3,085
Madison Heights Police Department	18	4,177			10	3,839	10	3,084	9	1,730	9	1,735
Manistee Co. 911 Central Dispatch									10	1,922	10	1,928
Marquette County Central Dispatch	10	2,321	10	4,253	10	3,839	10	3,084	10	1,922	10	1,928
Marshall City Dispatch			4	1,701	4	1,536	4	1,234	4	769	4	771
Mason-Oceana 911	13	3,017	14	5,954	15	5,759	15	4,626	15	2,883	15	2,892
Meceola Consolidated Central Dispatch Authc	15	3,481	15	6,379	15	5,759	15	4,626	14	2,691	14	2,699
Menominee County 911	9	2,089	9	3,828	9	3,455	9	2,776	9	1,730	9	1,735
Midland County Central Dispatch Authority	16	3,713	16	6,805	17	6,526	17	5,243	16	3,075	16	3,085
Milan Police Department	5	1,160	4	1,701	5	1,920	5	1,542	5	961	5	964
Milford Police Department	7	1,625	4	1,701	5	1,920	5	1,542				
Missaukee County Sheriffs Office	5	1,160	5	2,126	5	1,920	5	1,542				
Monroe County Central Dispatch			21	8,931	22	8,446	22	6,785	20	3,844	20	3,856
Montclam County Central Dispatch	12	2,785	10	4,253	12	4,607	12	3,701	11	2,114	11	2,121

**PUBLIC SAFETY ANSWERING POINT (PSAP)  
PAYMENT HISTORY**

NAME	August 31, 2001		March 25, 2002		May 9, 2003		November 7, 2003		May 6, 2004		November 12, 2004	
	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment
Montmorency County 911 Sheriff Department	6	1,392	5	2,126					4	769	4	771
Mt Clemens Police Department	4	928	5	2,126	5	1,920	5	1,542	3	577	3	578
Muskegon Central Dispatch	24	5,570	23	9,782	23	8,830	23	7,094	21	4,036	21	4,049
Newaygo County 9-1-1 Central Dispatch	11	2,553	11	4,678								
Niles Police Department	8	1,857			8	3,071	8	2,467	8	1,538	8	1,542
Northville Police Department	5	1,160	4	1,701	4	1,536	4	1,234	2	384	2	386
Northville Township Public Safety	9	2,089	8	3,402	8	3,071	8	2,467	6	1,153	6	1,157
Novi Regional Police Department			15	6,379	16	6,143	16	4,935	17	3,268	17	3,278
Oak Park Department of Public Safety	8	1,857	7	2,977	6	2,303	6	1,851	4	769	4	771
Oakland County Sheriff Department	41	9,515	39	16,586	41	15,740	41	12,646	42	8,073	42	8,098
Ogemaw County Central Dispatch	6	1,392	7	2,977	7	2,687	7	2,159	7	1,345	7	1,350
Otsego County 911 Dispatch	6	1,392	5	2,126	7	2,687	7	2,159	6	1,153	6	1,157
Ottawa County Central Dispatch	29	6,730	30	12,759	28	10,749	28	8,636	31	5,959	31	5,977
Oxford Police Department	5	1,160	4	1,701	4	1,536	4	1,234	4	769	4	771
Pittsfield Township Public Safety Department	8	1,857	7	2,977	7	2,687	7	2,159	8	1,538	8	1,542
Pleasant Ridge Police Department	3	696	3	1,276	3	1,152	3	925				
Plymouth Community Communications Cente	9	2,089	9	3,828	10	3,839	10	3,084				
Pontiac Police Department			19	8,081					20	3,844	20	3,856
Port Huron Police Department	9	2,089	9	3,828	9	3,455	9	2,776	10	1,922	10	1,928
Portage Police Department					10	3,839	10	3,084				
Presque Isle County E-911	4	928	5	2,126	5	1,920	5	1,542	4	769	4	771
Redford Police Department			5	2,126	8	3,071	8	2,467	9	1,730	9	1,735
Richmond Police Department	4	928	4	1,701					5	961	5	964
River Rouge Police Department	6	1,392										
Riverview Police Department			4	1,701								
Rochester Police Department					5	1,920	5	1,542	5	961	5	964
Rochester Hills Communications Center					9	3,455	9	2,776	10	1,922	10	1,928
Rochester Hills Fire Department	13	3,017	10	4,253								
Rockwood Police Department	6	1,392			6	2,303	6	1,851	4	769	4	771
Romeo Police Department					4	1,536	4	1,234	4	769	4	771
Romulus Police Department	8	1,857	8	3,402								
Roscommon County Central Dispatch	11	2,553	9	3,828	9	3,455	9	2,776	10	1,922	10	1,928
Roseville Police Department	9	2,089	8	3,402	8	3,071	8	2,467	9	1,730	9	1,735
Royal Oak Police Department	17	3,945	16	6,805	12	4,607	12	3,701	11	2,114	11	2,121
Saginaw County Central Dispatch	40	9,283	38	16,161	37	14,205	37	11,412	38	7,304	38	7,327
Saline Police Department	4	928	4	1,701	4	1,536	4	1,234	4	769	4	771
Sanilac County Central Dispatch	8	1,857	8	3,402	9	3,455	9	2,776	9	1,730	9	1,735
Shelby Township Police Department	11	2,553	12	5,103					11	2,114	11	2,121
Shiawassee County 911	11	2,553	12	5,103	12	4,607	12	3,701	11	2,114	11	2,121
South Haven Dispatch Center	5	1,160							5	961	5	964

## PUBLIC SAFETY ANSWERING POINT (PSAP) PAYMENT HISTORY

NAME	August 31, 2001		March 25, 2002		May 9, 2003		November 7, 2003		May 6, 2004		November 12, 2004	
	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment
Southgate Police Department					10	3,839	10	3,084				
Southfield Department of Public Safety			20	8,506	20	7,678	20	6,169	20	3,844	20	3,856
St Clair County Central Dispatch												
St Clair Shores Police Department			12	5,103	11	4,223	11	3,393	10	1,922	10	1,928
St Joseph Police Department			3	1,276	3	1,152	3	925	2	384	2	386
St. Joseph County Central Dispatch--9-1-1	14	3,249	14	5,954	14	5,375	14	4,318	15	2,883	15	2,892
Sterling Heights Police Department	28	6,498	24	10,207	25	9,598	25	7,711	22	4,229	22	4,242
Sturgis Police Department	5	1,160	4	1,701	4	1,536	4	1,234	3	577	3	578
Taylor Police Department	13	3,017	21	8,931	24	9,214	24	7,402	16	3,075	16	3,085
Trenton Police Department	8	1,857	8	3,402	8	3,071	8	2,467				
Troy Police Department	22	5,106	19	8,081	20	7,678	20	6,169				
Tuscola County Central Dispatch Authority	10	2,321	11	4,678	11	4,223	11	3,393	11	2,114	11	2,121
University of Michigan Dept. of Public Safety			11	4,678								
Utica Police Department	6	1,392	5	2,126								
Van Buren County Central Dispatch	12	2,785	11	4,678	11	4,223	11	3,393	11	2,114	11	2,121
Van Buren Township Public Safety			6	2,552	7	2,687	7	2,159	9	1,730	9	1,735
Walker Police Department	6	1,392	6	2,552	6	2,303	6	1,851	6	1,153	6	1,157
Walled Lake Police Department	5	1,160	5	2,126	6	2,303	6	1,851	6	1,153	6	1,157
Warren Police Department	24	5,570	23	9,782					22	4,229	22	4,242
Washtenaw Central Dispatch	17	3,945	16	6,805	13	4,991	13	4,010				
Waterford Township Police Department	15	3,481	15	6,379	15	5,759	15	4,626	15	2,883	15	2,892
Wayne County Airport Police Dispatch												
Wayne County Central Communications	22	5,106	19	8,081								
Wayne Police Department	7	1,625	6	2,552	7	2,687	7	2,159	8	1,538	8	1,542
West Bloomfield Police Department	16	3,713	16	6,805	16	6,143	16	4,935	15	2,883	15	2,892
Western Michigan University Police Departme	7	1,625	11	4,678	7	2,687	7	2,159	5	961	5	964
Westland Police Department	13	3,017	17	7,230	19	7,294	19	5,860	17	3,268	17	3,278
Wexford County Sheriff/Central Dispatch	9	2,089			10	3,839	10	3,084	9	1,730	9	1,735
White Lake Township Police Department	5	1,160	4	1,701	4	1,536	4	1,234	4	769	4	771
Woodhaven Police Department	6	1,392										
Wyandotte Police Department	7	1,625			9	3,455	9	2,776	5	961	5	964
Wyoming Police Department					17	6,526	17	5,243	10	1,922	10	1,928
Ypsilanti City Police Department	4	928	3	1,276	3	1,152	3	925	2	384	2	386
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>1,709</b>	<b>396,620</b>	<b>1,725</b>	<b>733,621</b>	<b>1,808</b>	<b>694,110</b>	<b>1,808</b>	<b>557,640</b>	<b>1,662</b>	<b>319,454</b>	<b>1,662</b>	<b>320,440</b>
Michigan State Police		24,368		41,253		38,007		30,535		13,071		13,111
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,709</b>	<b>420,988</b>	<b>(1)</b>	<b>774,874</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>732,117</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>588,175</b>	<b>(4)</b>	<b>332,525</b>	<b>(5)</b>	<b>333,551</b>

- (1) 351,999.02 posted to AY00  
68,988.98 posted to AY01
- (2) 512,011.02 posted to AY01  
262,862.98 posted to AY02
- (3) All posted to AY02
- (4) All posted to AY03
- (5) All posted to AY04
- (6) 105,624 posted to AY04  
349,114 posted to AY05
- (7) All posted to AY05
- (8) 27,037.99 posted to AY05  
484,164.01 posted to AY06
- (9) 483,235.99 posted to AY06  
46,091.01 posted to AY07
- (10) All to AY 07  
(( \$1,249.92) was reduced from the  
pyrmt as a return of \$ (Gladwin))
- (11)
- (12)
- (13)

Prepared By: Office of Revenue and Tax Analysis, Michigan Department of Treasury

Filename: M:\ort\revshare\CMRS\IP.S.A.P\PSAP Payments.xls]PSAP Payment History  
 Updated: 3/16/10 4:48 PM  
 Printed: 7/22/10 5:30 PM

**PUBLIC SAFETY ANSWERING POINT (PSAP)  
PAYMENT HISTORY**

<u>NAME</u>	<u>May 23, 2005</u>		<u>Refunds Received</u>	<u>November 16, 2005</u>		<u>May 18, 2006</u>		<u>November 17, 2006</u>		<u>June 6, 2007</u>		
	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Payment</u>		<u>FTE</u>	<u>Payment</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Payment</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Payment</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Payment</u>	<u>Reduction</u>
Albion Department of Public Safety	4	1,129		4	1,165	3	1,275	3	1,320	3	1,164	
Alcona County 911	7	1,976		7	2,038	7	2,975	7	3,080	8	3,103	
Alger County E911			(5,259.00) 07									
Allegan County Central Dispatch	18	5,081		18	5,241	17	7,224	17	7,480	18	6,982	
Allen Park Police Department	3	847	(2,553.00) 08	3	874							
Alpena County Central Dispatch	9	2,540		9	2,621					8	3,103	
Ann Arbor Police Department	19	5,363	(8,406.19) M	19	5,533							
Antrim County Central Dispatch Center	7	1,976		7	2,038	9	3,824	9	3,960	9	3,491	
Arenac County Central Dispatch	8	2,258		8	2,330	8	3,400	8	3,520	7	2,715	
Auburn Hills Police Department	10	2,823		10	2,912	9	3,824	9	3,960	9	3,491	
Barry County Central Dispatch	14	3,952		14	4,077	13	5,524	13	5,720	14	5,430	
Bay County 911 Central Dispatch	23	6,492		23	6,697	23	9,774	23	10,120	22	8,533	
Belding Area Dispatch Center	4	1,129		4	1,165							
Benton Township Police Department	6	1,694		6	1,747					6	2,327	
Benton Harbor Police Department	5	1,411		5	1,456							
Benzie County Sheriff Department	9	2,540		9	2,621							
Berkley Department of Public Safety			(2,613.48) 08									
Berrien County Sheriff's Department	11	3,105	(5,124.80) 08	11	3,203							
Beverly Hills Public Safety Department	4	1,129	(977.48) M	4	1,165							
Birmingham Police Department	6	1,694		6	1,747	6	2,550	6	2,640	7	2,715	
Bloomfield Hills Public Safety Department	4	1,129		4	1,165					4	1,552	
Bloomfield Township Police Department	11	3,105		11	3,203	12	5,099	12	5,280	12	4,655	
Branch County 911/central Dispatch	12	3,387		12	3,494							
Brownstown Police Department												
Calhoun County Central Communication 911			(7,725.71) 07							17	6,594	
Canton Township Department of Public Safety	12	3,387		12	3,494	15	6,374	15	6,600	17	6,594	
Cass County Sheriff Department	9	2,540		9	2,621	9	3,824	9	3,960	9	3,491	
CCE Central Dispatch Authority			(3,125.38) M									
Center Line Public Safety Department	3	847		3	874					3	1,164	
Central Dispatch Network (Belleville/Sumpter	7	1,976		7	2,038	7	2,975	7	3,080	6	2,327	
Central Michigan University										5	1,939	
Chelsea Police Department										6	2,327	
Chesterfield Twp Police Department	9	2,540		9	2,621					10	3,879	
Chippewa County Central Dispatch	10	2,823		10	2,912	10	4,249	10	4,400	10	3,879	
Clare County Central Dispatch	8	2,258		8	2,330	9	3,824	9	3,960	9	3,491	
Clawson Police Department			(1,309.00) 07									
Clay Township	5	1,411		5	1,456	5	2,125	5	2,200	4	1,552	
Clinton County Central Dispatch	11	3,105		11	3,203	11	4,674	11	4,840	13	5,042	
Clinton Township Police Department	13	3,670		13	3,785	12	5,099	12	5,280	13	5,042	
Crawford Emergency Central Dispatch	7	1,976		7	2,038							
Dearborn 911 Communications	20	5,645	(9,501.14) 08	20	5,824							
Dearborn Heights Police Department	12	3,387		12	3,494							
Delta County Central Dispatch												
Detroit Emergency Telephone District	117	33,026	(11,020.40) 09	117	34,069							
Dickinson County Central Dispatch	8	2,258		8	2,330	9	3,824	9	3,960			
East Lansing Police Department			(990.32) 09			15	6,374	15	6,600	15	5,818	
Eastern Michigan University Police Department	4	1,129		4	1,165					5	1,939	
Eaton County Central Dispatch	25	7,057		25	7,280	25	10,624	25	11,000	24	9,309	
Ecorse Police/Ecorse Fire			(2,089.00) 08									
Farmington Department of Public Safety	5	1,411		5	1,456							
Farmington Hills Police Department	20	5,645		20	5,824							
Fenton Police Department	5	1,411		5	1,456	5	2,125	5	2,200	5	1,939	
Ferndale Police Department			(3,118.00) M									
Flat Rock Police Department	2	565	(1,407.00) 09	2	582							
Flint 911	25	7,057		25	7,280	25	10,624	25	11,000	27	10,473	

**PUBLIC SAFETY ANSWERING POINT (PSAP)  
PAYMENT HISTORY**

NAME	May 23, 2005		Refunds Received	November 16, 2005		May 18, 2006		November 17, 2006		June 6, 2007		Reduction
	FTE	Payment		FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	
Fraser Department of Public Safety	7	1,976		7	2,038	6	2,550	6	2,640	7	2,715	
Garden City Police Department	6	1,694	(6,623.00) M	6	1,747							
Genesee County 911 Authority	33	9,315		33	9,609	34	14,448	34	14,961	35	13,576	
Gilbralter Police Department	1	282	(763.96) 08	1	291							
Gladwin County Central Dispatch	10	2,823	(1,249.92) 07	10	2,912	9	3,824	9	3,960	10	3,879	
Grand Rapids Police Dept Communications B						39	16,573	39	17,161	39	15,127	
Grand Traverse Central Dispatch						15	6,374	15	6,600	15	5,818	
Grandville Police Department	5	1,411	(6,098.70) 07	5	1,456	4	1,700	4	1,760			
Griatiot County Central Dispatch	4	1,129		4	1,165	9	3,824	9	3,960	9	3,491	
Greenville Public Safety	4	1,129		4	1,165							
Grosse Ile Township Police Department	5	1,411		5	1,456							
Grosse Pointe City DPS	4	1,129	(2,629.00) 08	4	1,165							
Grosse Pointe Farms			(598.00) 08									
Grosse Pointe Park Department of Public Saf	4	1,129		4	1,165	4	1,700	4	1,760	4	1,552	
Grosse Pointe Shores DPS	4	1,129	(300.00) 09	4	1,165							
Grosse Pointe Woods DPS	4	1,129	(926.00) 07	4	1,165							
Harper Woods Police Department	3	847	(928.00) 07	3	874							
Hazel Park Police Department	3	847		3	874							
Hillsdale County Central Dispatch	13	3,670		13	3,785	13	5,524	13	5,720	12	4,655	
Holly Police Department												
Houghton County 911/central Dispatch			(4,729.95) 06									
Huron Central Dispatch	10	2,823		10	2,912	10	4,249	10	4,400	10	3,879	
Huron Township Police-Fire	5	1,411		5	1,456							
Ionia County Central Dispatch	14	3,952		14	4,077	14	5,949	14	6,160	14	5,430	
Iosco County Central Dispatch	12	3,387		12	3,494	12	5,099	12	5,280	12	4,655	
Iron County 911	9	2,540		9	2,621							
Isabella County Central Dispatch	13	3,670		13	3,785	13	5,524	13	5,720	12	4,655	
Jackson County Central Dispatch	19	5,363		19	5,533							
Kalamazoo County Sheriff Department												
Kalamazoo DPS										20	7,758	
Kalamazoo Township Police Department	4	1,129		4	1,165	4	1,700	4	1,760			
Kalkaska County Central Dispatch	6	1,694		6	1,747	6	2,550	6	2,640	6	2,327	
Kent County Sheriff Department	25	7,057	(2,418.80) 08	25	7,280							
Lake County 911 Central Dispatch	6	1,694		6	1,747					8	3,103	
Lake Orion Police Department			(5,535.04) M									
Lansing Police Dept/Ingham Cty Central Disp:	52	14,678		52	15,142	51	21,672	51	22,441	53	20,558	
Lapeer County Central Dispatch	17	4,799		17	4,950	17	7,224	17	7,480	17	6,594	
Leelanau County Central Dispatch	10	2,823		10	2,912	10	4,249	10	4,400	8	3,103	
Lenawee County Sheriff Department	13	3,670		13	3,785					16	6,206	
Livingston County 911 Central Dispatch	28	7,904		28	8,153	27	11,473	27	11,881	28	10,861	
Livonia Police Department	9	2,540		9	2,621					11	4,267	(387.88)
Macomb County Sheriff's Department	18	5,081		18	5,241	20	8,499	20	8,800	23	8,921	
Madison Heights Police Department	8	2,258		8	2,330	8	3,400	8	3,520	9	3,491	
Manistee Co. 911 Central Dispatch	10	2,823	(3,850.00) 09	10	2,912							
Marquette County Central Dispatch	10	2,823		10	2,912	11	4,674	11	4,840	10	3,879	
Marshall City Dispatch	4	1,129		4	1,165					4	1,552	
Mason-Oceana 911	14	3,952		14	4,077	14	5,949	14	6,160	14	5,430	
Meceola Consolidated Central Dispatch Authc	15	4,234		15	4,368	15	6,374	15	6,600	15	5,818	
Menominee County 911										9	3,491	
Midland County Central Dispatch Authority	17	4,799		17	4,950	17	7,224	17	7,480	17	6,594	
Milan Police Department	5	1,411	(4,852.00) M	5	1,456					4	1,552	
Milford Police Department	5	1,411		5	1,456							
Missaukee County Sheriffs Office	6	1,694		6	1,747	8	3,400	8	3,520	7	2,715	
Monroe County Central Dispatch												
Montclam County Central Dispatch						15	6,374	15	6,600	14	5,430	

**PUBLIC SAFETY ANSWERING POINT (PSAP)  
PAYMENT HISTORY**

<u>NAME</u>	<u>May 23, 2005</u>		<u>Refunds Received</u>	<u>November 16, 2005</u>		<u>May 18, 2006</u>		<u>November 17, 2006</u>		<u>June 6, 2007</u>		
	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Payment</u>		<u>FTE</u>	<u>Payment</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Payment</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Payment</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Payment</u>	<u>Reduction</u>
Montmorency County 911 Sheriff Department	4	1,129		4	1,165	4	1,700	4	1,760			
Mt Clemens Police Department												
Muskegon Central Dispatch	21	5,928		21	6,115	22	9,349	22	9,680	24	9,309	
Newaygo County 9-1-1 Central Dispatch	11	3,105		11	3,203							
Niles Police Department	9	2,540		9	2,621							
Northville Police Department												
Northville Township Public Safety	8	2,258		8	2,330	9	3,824	9	3,960	9	3,491	
Novi Regional Police Department	17	4,799		17	4,950	17	7,224	17	7,480	16	6,206	
Oak Park Department of Public Safety	5	1,411	(1,411.00) 05									
Oakland County Sheriff Department	41	11,573		41	11,939	41	17,423	41	18,041	41	15,903	(387.88)
Ogemaw County Central Dispatch	6	1,694		6	1,747	8	3,400	8	3,520	8	3,103	
Otsego County 911 Dispatch	6	1,694		6	1,747	6	2,550	6	2,640	6	2,327	
Ottawa County Central Dispatch	32	9,033		32	9,318	35	14,873	35	15,401	34	13,188	
Oxford Police Department	5	1,411		5	1,456							
Pittsfield Township Public Safety Department	6	1,694	(4,015.83) M	6	1,747							
Pleasant Ridge Police Department			(3,831.00) 05									
Plymouth Community Communications Cente	10	2,823		10	2,912	11	4,674	11	4,840	10	3,879	
Pontiac Police Department	18	5,081		18	5,241	18	7,649	18	7,920	14	5,430	
Port Huron Police Department	9	2,540	(5,158.00) 08	9	2,621							
Portage Police Department	9	2,540		9	2,621	10	4,249	10	4,400	10	3,879	
Presque Isle County E-911	4	1,129	(157.00) 07	4	1,165							
Redford Police Department	3	847		3	874							
Richmond Police Department	5	1,411		5	1,456	5	2,125	5	2,200	5	1,939	
River Rouge Police Department												
Riverview Police Department			(1,701.00) 07									
Rochester Police Department	5	1,411		5	1,456					4	1,552	
Rochester Hills Communications Center	10	2,823	(7,691.41) 09	10	2,912	10	4,249	10	4,400	10	3,879	
Rochester Hills Fire Department												
Rockwood Police Department	4	1,129		4	1,165							
Romeo Police Department	4	1,129		4	1,165	4	1,700	4	1,760			
Romulus Police Department	8	2,258		8	2,330							
Roscommon County Central Dispatch	10	2,823		10	2,912	11	4,674	11	4,840	11	4,267	
Roseville Police Department	5	1,411	(2,010.24) 10	5	1,456	5	2,125	5	2,200			
Royal Oak Police Department	11	3,105	(3,872.52) M	11	3,203							
Saginaw County Central Dispatch	40	11,291		40	11,648	39	16,573	39	17,161			
Saline Police Department	4	1,129	(578.22) 07	4	1,165							
Sanilac County Central Dispatch	8	2,258		8	2,330					9	3,491	
Shelby Township Police Department	10	2,823		10	2,912	10	4,249	10	4,400	9	3,491	
Shiawassee County 911	11	3,105		11	3,203	11	4,674	11	4,840	11	4,267	
South Haven Dispatch Center	4	1,129		4	1,165	5	2,125	5	2,200	5	1,939	

**PUBLIC SAFETY ANSWERING POINT (PSAP)  
PAYMENT HISTORY**

NAME	May 23, 2005		Refunds Received	November 16, 2005		May 18, 2006		November 17, 2006		June 6, 2007		
	FTE	Payment		FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	Reduction
Southgate Police Department	4	1,129		4	1,165	4	1,700	4	1,760	4	1,552	
Southfield Department of Public Safety	21	5,928		21	6,115	20	8,499	20	8,800	22	8,533	
St Clair County Central Dispatch										14	5,430	
St Clair Shores Police Department	11	3,105		11	3,203	11	4,674	11	4,840	11	4,267	
St Joseph Police Department	3	847	(1,565.12) M	3	874							
St. Joseph County Central Dispatch--9-1-1	17	4,799		17	4,950	16	6,799	16	7,040	16	6,206	
Sterling Heights Police Department	22	6,210		22	6,406	22	9,349	22	9,680	22	8,533	
Sturgis Police Department												
Taylor Police Department	16	4,516		16	4,659					6	2,327	
Trenton Police Department												
Troy Police Department										20	7,758	
Tuscola County Central Dispatch Authority	12	3,387		12	3,494	13	5,524	13	5,720	13	5,042	
University of Michigan Dept. of Public Safety										13	5,042	
Utica Police Department	5	1,411		5	1,456					4	1,552	
Van Buren County Central Dispatch	12	3,387		12	3,494	12	5,099	12	5,280	13	5,042	
Van Buren Township Public Safety												
Walker Police Department			(4,387.76) M									
Walled Lake Police Department	5	1,411	(2,848.00) 09	5	1,456							
Warren Police Department	22	6,210		22	6,406	22	9,349	22	9,680	22	8,533	
Washtenaw Central Dispatch	16	4,516		16	4,659	16	6,799	16	7,040	16	6,206	
Waterford Township Police Department	13	3,670		13	3,785	13	5,524	13	5,720	12	4,655	
Wayne County Airport Police Dispatch												
Wayne County Central Communications			(5,172.00) 07									
Wayne Police Department	8	2,258		8	2,330	8	3,400	8	3,520	8	3,103	
West Bloomfield Police Department	14	3,952		14	4,077	15	6,374	15	6,600	15	5,818	
Western Michigan University Police Departme	4	1,129		4	1,165	3	1,275	3	1,320	4	1,552	
Westland Police Department	18	5,081		18	5,241	17	7,224	17	7,480	17	6,594	
Wexford County Sheriff/Central Dispatch	9	2,540		9	2,621	9	3,824	9	3,960	9	3,491	
White Lake Township Police Department	4	1,129		4	1,165					4	1,552	
Woodhaven Police Department			(364.00) 08									
Wyandotte Police Department	5	1,411		5	1,456							
Wyoming Police Department						10	4,249	10	4,400	10	3,879	
Ypsilanti City Police Department	2	565		2	582	4	1,700	4	1,760	3	1,164	
Subtotal	1,611	454,738	(151,485.37)	1,606	467,659	1,165	495,055	1,165	512,607	1,311	508,513	(775.76)
Michigan State Police							16,147	38	16,720	73	28,315	
Total	1,611	454,738 (6)	(151,485.37)	1,606	467,659 (7)	1,165	511,202 (8)	1,203	529,327 (9)	1,384	536,828 (10)	(775.76) (10)

M = Multiple

337,206.67 AY07 (14) All AY 10  
228,421.33 AY08

All AY 08

All AY 09

Prepared By: Office of Revenue and Tax Analysis, Michig

Filename:  
Updated:  
Printed:

M:\ort\revshare\CMRS\IP.S.A.P\PSAP Payments.xls\PSAP Payment History  
3/16/10 4:48 PM  
7/22/10 5:30 PM

**PUBLIC SAFETY ANSWERING POINT (PSAP)  
PAYMENT HISTORY**

NAME	December 5, 2007		May 28, 2008		November 19, 2008		May 29, 2009		December 3, 2009		May 27, 2010		Total
	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	
Albion Department of Public Safety	3	1,228	2	803	2	820	2	1,139	2	1,123			15,674.00
Alcona County 911	8	3,274	8	3,212	8	3,282	8	4,556	8	4,493	7	3,108	46,350.00
Alger County E911							2	1,139	2	1,123	2	888	3,150.00
Allegan County Central Dispatch	18	7,367	19	7,628	19	7,794	16	9,112	16	8,987	20	8,881	114,078.00
Allen Park Police Department							2	1,139	2	1,123	3	1,332	6,470.00
Alpena County Central Dispatch	8	3,274	9	3,613	9	3,692	9	5,126	9	5,055	10	4,440	50,154.00
Ann Arbor Police Department													38,421.81
Antrim County Central Dispatch Center	9	3,684	9	3,613	9	3,692	9	5,126	9	5,055	10	4,440	57,401.00
Arenac County Central Dispatch	7	2,865	8	3,212	8	3,282	9	5,126	9	5,055	10	4,440	49,688.00
Auburn Hills Police Department	9	3,684	9	3,613	9	3,692	10	5,695	10	5,617	10	4,440	55,306.00
Barry County Central Dispatch	14	5,730	14	5,620	14	5,743	15	8,543	15	8,425	17	7,549	88,866.00
Bay County 911 Central Dispatch	22	9,004	20	8,029	20	8,204	22	12,529	22	12,357	22	9,769	141,797.00
Belding Area Dispatch Center							4	2,278	4	2,247	4	1,776	12,905.00
Benton Township Police Department	6	2,456											8,224.00
Benton Harbor Police Department											6	2,664	11,610.00
Benzie County Sheriff Department											9	3,996	20,017.00
Berkley Department of Public Safety							4	2,278	4	2,247			7,967.52
Berrien County Sheriff's Department											27	11,989	38,127.20
Beverly Hills Public Safety Department							4	2,278	4	2,247	5	2,220	15,039.52
Birmingham Police Department	7	2,865	7	2,810	7	2,872	7	3,987	7	3,932	6	2,664	42,619.00
Bloomfield Hills Public Safety Department	4	1,637					4	2,278	4	2,247	4	1,776	18,802.00
Bloomfield Township Police Department	12	4,911	12	4,817	12	4,923	14	7,973	14	7,863	14	6,217	81,568.00
Branch County 911/central Dispatch													19,622.00
Brownstown Police Department							6	3,417	6	3,370	6	2,664	11,308.00
Calhoun County Central Communication 911	17	6,958	17	6,825	17	6,974					30	13,321	43,578.29
Canton Township Department of Public Safety	17	6,958	14	5,620	14	5,743	17	9,682	17	9,548	17	7,549	86,495.00
Cass County Sheriff Department	9	3,684	9	3,613	9	3,692	9	5,126	9	5,055	9	3,996	58,179.00
CCE Central Dispatch Authority			18	7,226	18	7,384	19	10,821	19	10,672	19	8,437	72,719.62
Center Line Public Safety Department	3	1,228	4	1,606	4	1,641	4	2,278	4	2,247	4	1,776	19,559.00
Central Dispatch Network (Belleville/Sumpter)	6	2,456											28,112.00
Central Michigan University	5	2,046	5	2,007	5	2,051	3	1,709	3	1,685	6	2,664	14,101.00
Chelsea Police Department	6	2,456	4	1,606	4	1,641	4	2,278	4	2,247	5	2,220	14,775.00
Chesterfield Twp Police Department	10	4,093	10	4,014	10	4,102							28,273.00
Chippewa County Central Dispatch	10	4,093	10	4,014	10	4,102	11	6,265	11	6,178	14	6,217	68,214.00
Clare County Central Dispatch	9	3,684	9	3,613	9	3,692	10	5,695	10	5,617	11	4,884	54,833.00
Clawson Police Department													1,592.00
Clay Township	4	1,637	4	1,606	4	1,641	4	2,278	4	2,247	4	1,776	25,316.00
Clinton County Central Dispatch	13	5,321	13	5,219	13	5,333	13	7,404	13	7,302	15	6,661	78,496.00
Clinton Township Police Department	13	5,321	14	5,620	14	5,743	14	7,973	14	7,863			77,138.00
Crawford Emergency Central Dispatch											8	3,552	19,476.00
Dearborn 911 Communications											19	8,437	47,490.86
Dearborn Heights Police Department			15	6,022	15	6,153	15	8,543	15	8,425	16	7,105	52,000.00
Delta County Central Dispatch			9	3,613	9	3,692	8	4,556	8	4,493	8	3,552	34,015.00
Detroit Emergency Telephone District											126	55,949	394,641.60
Dickinson County Central Dispatch							9	5,126	9	5,055	10	4,440	38,393.00
East Lansing Police Department	15	6,139	15	6,022	15	6,153	15	8,543	15	8,425	15	6,661	70,030.68
Eastern Michigan University Police Department	5	2,046	5	2,007	5	2,051	5	2,848	5	2,808	5	2,220	22,523.00
Eaton County Central Dispatch	24	9,823	25	10,036	25	10,256	23	13,099	23	12,918	24	10,657	154,887.00
Ecorse Police/Ecorse Fire													0.00
Farmington Department of Public Safety			5	2,007	5	2,051	5	2,848	5	2,808	5	2,220	21,504.00
Farmington Hills Police Department			20	8,029	20	8,204	20	11,390	20	11,233	20	8,881	92,671.00
Fenton Police Department	5	2,046	5	2,007	5	2,051	5	2,848	5	2,808	6	2,664	30,643.00
Ferndale Police Department											6	2,664	8,009.00
Flat Rock Police Department							1	570	1	562			1,257.00
Flint 911	27	11,051	25	10,036	25	10,256	27	15,377	27	15,165	24	10,657	148,371.00

**PUBLIC SAFETY ANSWERING POINT (PSAP)  
PAYMENT HISTORY**

NAME	December 5, 2007		May 28, 2008		November 19, 2008		May 29, 2009		December 3, 2009		May 27, 2010		Total
	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	
Fraser Department of Public Safety	7	2,865	7	2,810	7	2,872	7	3,987	7	3,932	6	2,664	38,578.00
Garden City Police Department													5,793.00
Genesee County 911 Authority	35	14,325	33	13,248	33	13,537	34	19,364	34	19,096	34	15,097	214,208.00
Gilbralter Police Department													5,440.04
Gladwin County Central Dispatch	10	4,093	11	4,416	11	4,512	11	6,265	11	6,178	11	4,884	62,109.08
Grand Rapids Police Dept Communications B	39	15,962	38	15,255	38	15,588	36	20,503	36	20,220	39	17,318	173,092.00
Grand Traverse Central Dispatch	15	6,139	17	6,825	17	6,974	17	9,682	17	9,548	18	7,993	88,206.00
Grandville Police Department													4,923.30
Gratiot County Central Dispatch	9	3,684											25,274.00
Greenville Public Safety													8,841.00
Grosse Ile Township Police Department											5	2,220	9,477.00
Grosse Pointe City DPS													6,604.00
Grosse Pointe Farms													3,556.00
Grosse Pointe Park Department of Public Saf	4	1,637	4	1,606	4	1,641	4	2,278	4	2,247	4	1,776	22,801.00
Grosse Pointe Shores DPS							4	2,278	4	2,247	4	1,776	10,531.00
Grosse Pointe Woods DPS							4	2,278	4	2,247			13,949.00
Harper Woods Police Department			3	1,204	3	1,231	3	1,709	3	1,685	4	1,776	10,866.00
Hazel Park Police Department							3	1,709	3	1,685	3	1,332	17,661.00
Hillsdale County Central Dispatch	12	4,911	12	4,817	12	4,923	12	6,834	12	6,740	13	5,773	79,479.00
Holly Police Department			4	1,606	4	1,641	4	2,278	4	2,247	5	2,220	15,428.00
Houghton County 911/central Dispatch													7,208.05
Huron Central Dispatch	10	4,093	10	4,014	10	4,102	11	6,265	11	6,178	11	4,884	65,146.00
Huron Township Police-Fire											6	2,664	13,044.00
Ionia County Central Dispatch	14	5,730	14	5,620	14	5,743	13	7,404	13	7,302	13	5,773	87,426.00
Iosco County Central Dispatch	12	4,911	12	4,817	12	4,923	11	6,265	11	6,178	11	4,884	68,315.00
Iron County 911							8	4,556	8	4,493	10	4,440	32,406.00
Isabella County Central Dispatch	12	4,911	12	4,817	12	4,923	12	6,834	12	6,740	13	5,773	78,169.00
Jackson County Central Dispatch											20	8,881	55,821.00
Kalamazoo County Sheriff Department			4	1,606	4	1,641					4	1,776	5,023.00
Kalamazoo DPS	20	8,186	19	7,628	19	7,794	18	10,251	18	10,110	20	8,881	72,565.00
Kalamazoo Township Police Department			5	2,007	5	2,051					5	2,220	13,572.00
Kalkaska County Central Dispatch	6	2,456	7	2,810	7	2,872	6	3,417	6	3,370	7	3,108	39,124.00
Kent County Sheriff Department							27	15,377	27	15,165	28	12,433	97,724.20
Lake County 911 Central Dispatch	8	3,274	8	3,212	8	3,282	9	5,126	9	5,055	11	4,884	47,222.00
Lake Orion Police Department											5	2,220	4,008.96
Lansing Police Dept/Ingham Cty Central Disp	53	21,692	51	20,474	51	20,921	47	26,767	47	26,398	47	20,870	317,389.00
Lapeer County Central Dispatch	17	6,958	17	6,825	17	6,974	17	9,682	17	9,548	18	7,993	109,518.00
Leelanau County Central Dispatch	8	3,274	10	4,014	10	4,102	10	5,695	10	5,617	11	4,884	57,330.00
Lenawee County Sheriff Department	16	6,548	16	6,423	16	6,564	18	10,251	18	10,110	18	7,993	87,611.00
Livingston County 911 Central Dispatch	28	11,460	28	11,241	28	11,486	26	14,808	26	14,603	26	11,545	167,509.00
Livonia Police Department	10	4,093	10	4,014	10	4,102	9	5,126	9	5,055	9	3,996	50,886.12
Macomb County Sheriff's Department	23	9,413	23	9,233	23	9,435	24	13,668	24	13,480	24	10,657	133,304.00
Madison Heights Police Department	9	3,684	8	3,212	8	3,282	9	5,126	9	5,055			49,923.00
Manistee Co. 911 Central Dispatch													5,735.00
Marquette County Central Dispatch	10	4,093	10	4,014	10	4,102	11	6,265	11	6,178	12	5,328	66,455.00
Marshall City Dispatch	4	1,637	4	1,606	4	1,641	4	2,278	4	2,247			19,266.00
Mason-Oceana 911	14	5,730	14	5,620	14	5,743	14	7,973	14	7,863	15	6,661	90,289.00
Meceola Consolidated Central Dispatch Auth	15	6,139	15	6,022	15	6,153	15	8,543	15	8,425	16	7,105	95,416.00
Menominee County 911	9	3,684	9	3,613	9	3,692	9	5,126	9	5,055	10	4,440	44,714.00
Midland County Central Dispatch Authority	17	6,958	16	6,423	16	6,564	16	9,112	16	8,987	17	7,549	105,087.00
Milan Police Department	4	1,637											9,452.00
Milford Police Department			5	2,007	5	2,051	4	2,278	4	2,247			18,238.00
Missaukee County Sheriffs Office	7	2,865	5	2,007	5	2,051	4	2,278	4	2,247	5	2,220	33,492.00
Monroe County Central Dispatch			21	8,430	21	8,615	21	11,960	21	11,795	22	9,769	82,431.00
Montclam County Central Dispatch	14	5,730	16	6,423	16	6,564	16	9,112	16	8,987	18	7,993	82,794.00

**PUBLIC SAFETY ANSWERING POINT (PSAP)  
PAYMENT HISTORY**

<u>NAME</u>	<u>December 5, 2007</u>		<u>May 28, 2008</u>		<u>November 19, 2008</u>		<u>May 29, 2009</u>		<u>December 3, 2009</u>		<u>May 27, 2010</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Payment</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Payment</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Payment</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Payment</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Payment</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>Payment</u>	
Montmorency County 911 Sheriff Department													10,812.00
Mt Clemens Police Department													7,671.00
Muskegon Central Dispatch	24	9,823	23	9,233	23	9,435	24	13,668	24	13,480	26	11,545	146,926.00
Newaygo County 9-1-1 Central Dispatch											11	4,884	18,423.00
Niles Police Department			8	3,212	8	3,282	8	4,556	8	4,493	7	3,108	34,287.00
Northville Police Department													6,401.00
Northville Township Public Safety	9	3,684	10	4,014	10	4,102					12	5,328	46,330.00
Novi Regional Police Department	16	6,548	16	6,423	16	6,564	16	9,112	16	8,987	15	6,661	98,957.00
Oak Park Department of Public Safety							6	3,417	6	3,370	5	2,220	19,535.00
Oakland County Sheriff Department	40	16,371	42	16,861	42	17,229	43	24,489	43	24,151	44	19,538	263,788.12
Ogemaw County Central Dispatch	8	3,274	9	3,613	9	3,692	9	5,126	9	5,055	9	3,996	50,130.00
Otsego County 911 Dispatch	6	2,456	6	2,409	6	2,461							28,958.00
Ottawa County Central Dispatch	34	13,916	34	13,649	34	13,947	34	19,364	34	19,096	34	15,097	207,692.00
Oxford Police Department											5	2,220	12,258.00
Pittsfield Township Public Safety Department											8	3,552	15,737.17
Pleasant Ridge Police Department													218.00
Plymouth Community Communications Cente	10	4,093	9	3,613	9	3,692	11	6,265	11	6,178	11	4,884	60,693.00
Pontiac Police Department	14	5,730											52,832.00
Port Huron Police Department													16,001.00
Portage Police Department	10	4,093	10	4,014	10	4,102							36,821.00
Presque Isle County E-911											4	1,776	11,969.00
Redford Police Department			7	2,810	7	2,872	7	3,987	7	3,932	7	3,108	29,559.00
Richmond Police Department	5	2,046	5	2,007	5	2,051	5	2,848	5	2,808	5	2,220	27,665.00
River Rouge Police Department													1,392.00
Riverview Police Department													0.00
Rochester Police Department	4	1,637	4	1,606	4	1,641	4	2,278	4	2,247	4	1,776	20,991.00
Rochester Hills Communications Center	10	4,093	10	4,014									28,759.59
Rochester Hills Fire Department													7,270.00
Rockwood Police Department							4	2,278	4	2,247	4	1,776	15,681.00
Romeo Police Department							4	2,278	4	2,247	5	2,220	16,809.00
Romulus Police Department											8	3,552	13,399.00
Roscommon County Central Dispatch	11	4,502	10	4,014	10	4,102	10	5,695	10	5,617	11	4,884	64,792.00
Roseville Police Department											4	1,776	21,451.76
Royal Oak Police Department											10	4,440	30,168.48
Saginaw County Central Dispatch			38	15,255	38	15,588	37	21,072	37	20,781	38	16,874	211,935.00
Saline Police Department											4	1,776	10,430.78
Sanilac County Central Dispatch	9	3,684	9	3,613	9	3,692					9	3,996	38,019.00
Shelby Township Police Department	9	3,684	10	4,014	10	4,102	10	5,695	10	5,617			52,878.00
Shiawassee County 911	11	4,502	11	4,416	11	4,512	11	6,265	11	6,178	11	4,884	71,045.00
South Haven Dispatch Center	5	2,046	5	2,007	5	2,051	4	2,278	4	2,247	5	2,220	24,492.00

**PUBLIC SAFETY ANSWERING POINT (PSAP)  
PAYMENT HISTORY**

NAME	December 5, 2007		May 28, 2008		November 19, 2008		May 29, 2009		December 3, 2009		May 27, 2010		Total
	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	FTE	Payment	
Southgate Police Department	4	1,637	4	1,606	4	1,641	4	2,278	4	2,247	4	1,776	25,414.00
Southfield Department of Public Safety	22	9,004	21	8,430	21	8,615	21	11,960	21	11,795	21	9,325	127,057.00
St Clair County Central Dispatch	14	5,730	15	6,022	15	6,153	18	10,251	18	10,110	22	9,769	53,465.00
St Clair Shores Police Department	11	4,502	11	4,416	11	4,512	11	6,265	11	6,178	11	4,884	67,415.00
St Joseph Police Department													4,278.88
St. Joseph County Central Dispatch--9-1-1	16	6,548	15	6,022	15	6,153	17	9,682	17	9,548	17	7,549	99,967.00
Sterling Heights Police Department	22	9,004	22	8,832	22	9,025	22	12,529	22	12,357	23	10,213	144,623.00
Sturgis Police Department													6,786.00
Taylor Police Department	6	2,456	8	3,212	8	3,282	7	3,987	7	3,932	10	4,440	67,535.00
Trenton Police Department			2	803	2	820	4	2,278	4	2,247	4	1,776	18,721.00
Troy Police Department	20	8,186	20	8,029	20	8,204	19	10,821	19	10,672	20	8,881	89,585.00
Tuscola County Central Dispatch Authority	13	5,321	14	5,620	14	5,743	12	6,834	12	6,740	13	5,773	78,048.00
University of Michigan Dept. of Public Safety	13	5,321	11	4,416	11	4,512	12	6,834	12	6,740			37,543.00
Utica Police Department	4	1,637											9,574.00
Van Buren County Central Dispatch	13	5,321	13	5,219	13	5,333	12	6,834	12	6,740	13	5,773	76,836.00
Van Buren Township Public Safety			8	3,212	8	3,282	9	5,126	9	5,055			27,538.00
Walker Police Department							5	2,848	5	2,808	6	2,664	14,340.24
Walled Lake Police Department							5	2,848					12,617.00
Warren Police Department	22	9,004	22	8,832	22	9,025	20	11,390	20	11,233	20	8,881	122,366.00
Washtenaw Central Dispatch	16	6,548	15	6,022	15	6,153							67,694.00
Waterford Township Police Department	12	4,911					13	7,404	13	7,302	15	6,661	75,652.00
Wayne County Airport Police Dispatch											6	2,664	2,664.00
Wayne County Central Communications							5	2,848	5	2,808			13,671.00
Wayne Police Department	8	3,274	7	2,810	7	2,872	7	3,987	7	3,932	8	3,552	47,141.00
West Bloomfield Police Department	15	6,139	15	6,022	15	6,153	15	8,543	15	8,425	14	6,217	95,691.00
Western Michigan University Police Department	4	1,637	4	1,606	4	1,641	4	2,278	4	2,247	4	1,776	30,700.00
Westland Police Department	17	6,958					16	9,112	16	8,987			86,624.00
Wexford County Sheriff/Central Dispatch	9	3,684	9	3,613	9	3,692	9	5,126	9	5,055	9	3,996	54,079.00
White Lake Township Police Department	4	1,637	5	2,007	5	2,051	5	2,848	5	2,808	6	2,664	25,032.00
Woodhaven Police Department							2	1,139	2	1,123			3,290.00
Wyandotte Police Department							4	2,278	4	2,247			19,393.00
Wyoming Police Department	10	4,093	13	5,219	13	5,333					5	2,220	49,009.00
Ypsilanti City Police Department	3	1,228	3	1,204	3	1,231					14	6,217	14,485.00
Subtotal	1,309	535,753	1,403	563,228	1,393	571,437	1,441	820,683	1,436	806,554	1,777	789,048	9,394,898.87
Michigan State Police	73	29,875	72	28,904	72	29,536	78	44,420	78	43,810	83	36,855	434,927.00
Total	1,382	565,628 (11)	1,475	592,132 (12)	1,465	600,973 (13)	1,519	865,103 (13)	1,514	850,364 (14)	1,860	825,903 (14)	9,829,825.87

Interest on C.C. Charges

AY 03	300.00
AY 04	200.00
AY 05	100.00
AY 06	200.00
AY 07	200.00
AY 08	200.00
AY 09	200.00
AY 10	200.00

Prepared By: Office of Revenue and Tax Analysis, Michig

Filename: M:\orta\revshare\CMRSIP.S.A.P\PSAP Payments.xls]PSAP Payment History  
 Updated: ### 1:21 PM  
 Printed: ### 5:30 PM

**STATE 9-1-1 COMMITTEE**  
**2010 Annual Report to the Michigan Legislature**  
**APPROVED DISPATCHER TRAINING COURSES**

<b>Course Number</b>	<b>Course Hours</b>	<b>Expiration Date</b>	<b>Training Provider</b>	<b>Course Coordinator</b>		<b>Phone Number</b>
AST 200810A	24	11/01/2010	Advanced Systems Technology, Inc.	James	Sanders	(580) 248-0321
MCDA 201005A	16	1/31/2011	Michigan Communications Directors Association	Laurie	Smalla	(231) 796-5765
SCC 200808A	40	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
SCC 200707	40	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
SCC 200908A	40	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
LMC 200905A	24	6/1/2011	Lake Michigan College	Debbie	Gillespie	(269) 926-4293
OCC 200902A	8	01/31/2011	Oakland Police Academy	Deborah	Achtenberg	(248) 330-7527
MCDA 200807D	2	07/07/2010	Michigan Communication Directors Association	Joe	Van Oosterhout	(906) 475-1118
MNA 201001A	8	5/1/2011	MACNLOW Associates	Denise	Willis	(989) 362-9660
PWH 200808	8	1/14/2011	PowerPhone, Inc.	Drew	Cosenza	(800) 537-6937
SCC 200803	8	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
VAL 200902A	2	02/25/2011	Valencia Enterprises	Aimee	Kincaid	(407) 582-6770
PWH 200809	16	1/14/2011	PowerPhone, Inc.	Drew	Cosenza	(800) 537-6937
MCDA 200807C	4	07/07/2010	Michigan Communications Directors Association	Jamel	Anderson	(231) 922-4555
SCC 200602	14	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
MNA 200801E	24	5/1/2012	MACNLOW Associates	Denise	Willis	(989) 362-9660
PSI 200903A	8	5/28/2010	Public Safety Group	Tony	Harrison	(405) 348-2774
MTC 200810A	8	09/30/2010	Mendez & Mendez Training Consultants	Gasper	Mendez	(517) 927-4180
APCO 200801	8	06/01/2010	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944-2483
PWH 200805A	8	01/14/2011	Powerphone, Inc.	Drew	Cosenza	(800) 537-6937

MNA 200802E	16	5/1/2012	MACNLOW Associates	Denise	Willis	(989) 362-9660
PWH 200901B	8	01/14/2011	PowerPhone, Inc.	Drew	Cosenza	(800) 537-6937
PWH 200901A	16	01/14/2011	PowerPhone, Inc.	Drew	Cosenza	(800) 537-6937
PWH 200801	16	1/14/2011	PowerPhone, Inc.	Drew	Cosenza	(800) 537-6937
PWH 200903B	8	01/14/2011	PowerPhone, Inc.	Maureen	Beckerman	(800) 537-6937
PWH 200902A	40	01/14/2011	PowerPhone, Inc.	Drew	Cosenza	(800) 537-6937
MNA 200606E	24	5/1/2012	MACNLOW Associates	Murlene	McKinnon	(989) 362-9660
MCCD 200801	4	1/7/2010	Marquette County Central Dispatch	Gary	Johnson	(906) 475-1196
WCSO 200809A	8	09/30/2010	Washtenaw County Sheriff's Office	Kecia	Williams	(734) 973-4728
SCC 200804	8	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
PDIS 200603	6	7/1/2012	Priority Dispatch Corporation	Jon	Stones	(801) 363-9127
SCCD 200801	8	2/21/2010	St. Clair County Central Dispatch	Cherie	Bartram	(810) 966-1691
LEORTC 200809A	8	09/04/2010	Law Enforcement Officers Reg. Training Commission	Herman	Clark	(810) 766-7223
PST 200606	8	07/01/2010	Public Safety Training Consultants	Kevin	Willett	(650) 591-7911
MCI 200905A	8	8/25/2011	911 Training Institute	James	Marshall III	(231) 439-3900
MNA 200811A	8	5/1/2012	MACNLOW Associates	Denise	Willis	(989) 362-9660
MNA 200907A	7	5/1/2011	MACNLOW Associates	Murlene	McKinnon	(989) 362-9660
PST 200703	8	7/1/2010	Public Safety Training Consultants	Kevin	Willett	(650) 591-7911
PWH 200908A	8	5/1/2011	MACNLOW Associates	Murlene	McKinnon	(989) 362-9660
SCCD 200903A	8	02/21/2010	St. Clair County Central Dispatch	Cherie	Bartram	(810) 966-1691
SCC 201002A	8	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
MNA 200804A	7	5/1/2012	MACNLOW Associates	Denise	Willis	(989) 362-9660
PSI 200702	16	5/28/2012	Public Safety Group	Tony	Harrison	(877) 794-9389
APCO 200909A	24	6/1/2011	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944-2483
APCO 200909B	24	6/1/2011	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944-2483

PSI 200705	16	5/28/2012	Public Safety Group	Tony	Harrison	(877) 794-9389
APCO 200803D	24	06/01/2010	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944-2483
APCO 200803E	24	06/01/2010	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944-2483
DDW 200501	32	4/15/2012	DeWolf & Associates	Dan	DeWolf	(248) 332-2208
APCO 200803C	24	06/01/2010	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944-2483
APCO 200803B	24	06/01/2010	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944-2483
SCC 200804A	8	6/1/2010	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
SCC 200702	8	6/1/2010	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
PDIS 200811A	8	7/1/2010	Priority Dispatch Corporation	Jon	Stones	(801) 363-9127
MNA 200804B	8	5/1/2012	MACNLOW Associates	Denise	Willis	(989) 362-9660
OCC 200701	7	01/31/2011	Oakland Police Academy	Deborah	Achtenberg	(248) 232-4220
PSI 200701	16	5/28/2012	Public Safety Group	Tony	Harrison	(877) 232-4220
PSI 200706	8	5/28/2012	Public Safety Group	Tony	Harrison	(877) 794-9389
DBH 200808A	8	08/06/2010	Dearborn Heights Police Department	Todd	Learst	(313) 277-7388
KCSD 200904A	13	05/01/2010	Kent County Sheriff Department	Paul	LaBerteaux	(616) 560-7100
CTC 201003A	14	7/1/2011	Contact Training & Consulting, LLC	Michelle	Rose-Armstrong	(734) 368-1114
APCO 201003A	8	6/1/2011	MI APCO	Jennifer	Couch	(248) 975-9200
BKR 200908A	40	6/1/2011	Baker College	Timothy	Eklin	(810) 766-4176
BKR 201003A	40	6/1/2011	Baker College	Timothy	Eklin	(810) 766-4176
PST 200705	24	07/01/2010	Public Safety Training Consultants	Kevin	Willett	(650) 591-7911
DDW 200804A	8	4/15/2012	DeWolf & Associates	Dan	DeWolf	(248) 332-2208
KVCC 200904A	8	06/01/2011	Kalamazoo Valley Community College	Richard	Ives	(269) 488-4341
SCC 200709	16	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
SCC 200706	7	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141

OCC 200903A	8	01/31/2011	Oakland Police Academy	Deborah	Achtenberg	(248) 232-4220
APCO 200907A	8	6/1/2010	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944-2483
APCO 200907B	8	6/1/2010	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944-2483
PST 200807A	8	07/01/2010	Public Safety Training Consultants	Kevin	Willett	(650) 591-7911
MNA 200602E	15	5/1/2012	MACNLOW Associates	Denise	Willis	(989) 362-9660
MNA 201001A	8	5/1/2011	MACNLOW Associates	Denise	Willis	(989) 362-9660
MSP 200912B	2	8/1/2011	Michigan State Police-Training Division	Dave	Greydanus	(517) 636-5456
MNA 200705E	8	5/1/2012	MACNLOW Associates	Denise	Willis	(989) 362-9660
MNA 200706E	8	5/1/2012	MACNLOW Associates	Denise	Willis	(989) 362-9660
PSI 200602	8	5/28/2012	Public Safety Group	Tony	Harrison	(877) 794-9389
SCC 200809A	8	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
PWH 200802	8	1/14/2011	PowerPhone, Inc.	Drew	Cosenza	(800) 537-6937
APCO 200522	8	06/01/2010	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944-2483
APCO 200523	8	06/01/2010	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944-2483
APCO 201003B	8	6/1/2011	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944-2483
APCO 201003C	8	6/1/2011	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944-2483
PDIS 200806A	24	7/1/2012	Priority Dispatch Corporation	Jon	Stones	(801) 363-9127
PDIS 200601	16	7/1/2012	Priority Dispatch Corporation	Jon	Stones	(801) 363-9127
GRF 200805A	12	05/08/2010	Marc Griffis LLC	Marc	Griffis	(989) 621-8347
PWH 200803	24	1/14/2011	PowerPhone, Inc.	Drew	Cosenza	(800) 537-6937
PDIS 200806B	24	7/1/2012	Priority Dispatch Corporation	Jon	Stones	(801) 363-9127
APCO 200520	32	06/01/2010	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944-2483
APCO 200803A	40	06/01/2010	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944-2483

APCO 200803F	40	6/1/2010	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944- 2483
PWH 200903A	8	01/14/2011	PowerPhone, Inc.	Maureen	Beckerman	(800) 537- 6937
PDIS 200602	40	7/1/2012	Priority Dispatch Corporation	Jon	Stones	(801) 363- 9127
PDIS 200806C	24	7/1/2012	Priority Dispatch	Jon	Stones	(801) 363- 9127
PDIS 200702	16	7/1/2012	Priority Dispatch Corporation	Jon	Stones	(801) 363- 9127
CSI 200810A	21	10/01/2010	Command Spanish, Inc.	M. Edith	Gonzalez	(601) 582- 8378
PDIS 200703	40	7/1/2012	Priority Dispatch Corporation	Jon	Stones	(801) 363- 9127
PDIS 200701	24	7/1/2012	Priority Dispatch Corporation	Jon	Stones	(801) 363- 9127
CCCD 200801	4	2/28/2010	Chippewa County Central Dispatch	Tim	McKee	(906) 495- 7488
SCC 200801	8	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543- 6141
WCSO 200801	32	2/28/2010	Washtenaw County Sheriff's Office	Margaret	Gersh	(734) 973- 4959
TRE 200903A	14	12/1/2010	Training Edge, LLC	George	Lutz	(517) 983- 3315
MNA 200808A	16	5/1/2012	MACNLOW Associates	Denise	Willis	(989) 362- 9660
SCC 201002B	7	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543- 6141
PSI 200603	8	05/28/2010	Public Safety Group	Tony	Harrison	(877) 794- 9389
OCC 200901B	16	01/31/2011	Oakland Police Academy	Deborah	Achtenberg	(248) 330- 7527
PST 200704	16	07/01/2010	Public Safety Training Consultants	Kevin	Willett	(650) 591- 7911
APCO 200606	32	06/01/2010	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944- 2483
APCO 200604	40	06/01/2010	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944- 2483
APCO 200603	40	06/01/2010	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944- 2483
APCO 200605	32	06/01/2010	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944- 2483
DCC 200904A	6	08/31/2011	Delta College	Terry	Rock	(989) 758- 3610
GRPD 200809A	160	06/01/2009	Grand Rapids Police Department	David	Kiddle	(616) 456- 4431
CJI 200702E	14	2/7/2010	Criminal Justice Management Institute	Gilbert	Skinner	(517) 381- 9112
MNA 200608E	8	5/1/2012	MACNLOW Associates	Denise	Willis	(989) 362- 9660

TRE 200903B	8	12/01/2010	Training Edge, LLC	John	Porter	(616) 633-6520
PWH 200804	0	01/14/2011	Powerphone, Inc.	Drew	Cosenza	(800) 537-6937
PST 200607	8	07/01/2010	Public Safety Training Consultants	Kevin	Willett	(650) 591-7911
TRE 200906A	8	12/1/2010	Training Edge, LLC	John	Porter	(616) 633-6520
OCC 200901A	8	01/31/2011	Oakland Police Academy	Deborah	Achtenberg	(248) 330-7527
SCC 201001A	8	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
PWH 200805	8	1/14/2011	PowerPhone, Inc.	Drew	Cosenza	(800) 537-6937
MSP 201001A	8	8/1/2011	Michigan State Police-Training Division	Dave	Greydanus	(517) 636-5456
FSH 200803A	6	3/7/2010	Fishman Group	Steven J.	Fishman	(248) 258-8700
ACC 200902A	8	05/01/2011	Alpena Community College	Mark	Gurisko	(989) 354-9111
ACC 200902B	13	05/01/2011	Alpena Community College	Mark	Gurisko	(989) 354-9111
ACC 200902C	8	05/01/2011	Alpena Community College	Mark	Gurisko	(989) 354-9111
ACC 200905B	16	5/1/2011	Alpena Community College	Mark	Gurisko	(989) 354-9111
RGN6 200809A	18	09/30/2010	Region 6 Training Committee	Rich	Szczepanek	(616) 638-0930
ACC 200905B	16	5/1/2011	Alpena Community College	Mark	Gurisko	(989) 354-9111
RGN6 200809B	14	09/30/2010	Region 6 Training Committee	Rich	Szczepanek	(616) 638-0930
ACC 200902D	8	05/01/2011	Alpena Community College	Mark	Gurisko	(989) 354-9111
PST 200701	8	07/01/2010	Public Safety Training Consultants	Kevin	Willett	(650) 591-7911
MNA 200903A	8	5/1/2011	MACNLOW Associates	Murlene	McKinnon	(989) 362-9660
MTC 200809A	12	09/30/2010	Mendez & Mendez Training Consultants	Gasper	Mendez	(517) 927-4180
CJI 200701E	21	3/11/2010	Criminal Justice Mgmt. Institute	Gilbert	Skinner	(517) 381-9112
KVCC 200909A	8	6/1/2011	Kalamazoo Valley Community College	Richard	Ives	(269) 488-4341
OCC 200809A	8	1/31/2011	Oakland Police Academy	Joe	Marchetti	(248) 232-4220
ACC 200903A	6	05/01/2011	Alpena Community College	Mark	Gurisko	(989) 354-9111

MNA 200907B	8	5/1/2011	MACNLOW Associates	Murlene	McKinnon	(989) 362-9660
MSP 200908A	36	8/1/2011	Michigan State Police- Training Division	Kandyce	Tabeling	(517) 322-5585
DDW 200701	16	4/15/2012	DeWolf & Associates	Dan	DeWolf	(248) 332-2208
SCC 200603	8	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
SCC 200704	14	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
SCC 200705	14	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
SCC 201002C	16	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
MNA 200701E	8	5/1/2012	MACNLOW Associates	Denise	Willis	(989) 362-9660
MCDA 200805A	2	12/31/2009	Michigan Communication Director's Association	Joe	Van Oosterhout	(906) 475-1118
MSP 200912A	4	8/1/2011	Michigan State Police- Training Division	Dave	Greydanus	(517) 636-5456
LSS 201002A	8	10/1/2012	LEIN Solutions, LLC	Carol	Price	(810) 513-3165
MSP 200910A	6	7/1/2011	Michigan State Police-LEIN Field Services	Kevin	Collins	(517) 636-4544
MSP 200907A	8	7/1/2011	Michigan State Police-LEIN Field Services	Diane	Doubrava	(517) 636-4541
MSP 200911A	3	7/1/2011	Michigan State Police-LEIN Field Services	Kevin	Collins	(517) 636-4544
LGB 200804A	6	4/15/2010	Lewis G. Bender Ph.D	Mary	Bender	(231) 797-5536
MCDA 200808A	6	Expired	Michigan Communication Directors Association	Jamel	Anderson	(231) 922-4555
MCDA 200807A	14	Expired	Michigan Communication Director's Association	Joseph	Van Oosterhout	(906) 475-1118
MSP 201002A	4	8/1/2011	Michigan State Police- Training Division	David	Greydanus	(517) 636-5456
APCO 200908A	8.5	12/31/2009	MI-APCO	Jeff	Troyer	(989) 831-3510
MMRMA 200906	16	12/31/2009	Michigan Municipal Risk Management	Vic	Martin	(810) 667-0217
MNA 200702E	8	5/1/2012	MACNLOW Associates	Denise	Willis	(989) 362-9660
SCC 200703	8	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
NENA 201003A	18	12/31/2010	Michigan NENA	Dee Ann	Summersett	(989) 673-8738
NENA 201003B	8	12/31/2010	National Emergency Number Association	Chris	Nussman	(800) 332-3911

NENA 201005A	16	12/31/2010	National Emergency Number Association	Chris	Nussman	(800) 332- 3911
NENA 200901A	8	12/31/2009	Michigan NENA	Kelly	Rasmussen	(517) 543- 6141
KVCC 200909B	8	6/1/2011	Kalamazoo Valley Community College	Richard	Ives	(269) 488- 4341
AWT 200807A	4	7/7/2010	Advanced Wireless Telecom	Todd	Jones	(248) 295- 4600
SCC 200811B	8	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543- 6141
PWH 200603	8	1/14/2011	PowerPhone, Inc.	Drew	Cosenza	(800) 537- 6937
OCCDA 200905A	6	7/30/2009	Ottawa County Central Dispatch Authority	Tim	Smith	(616) 638- 3567
KVCC 200909C	8	6/1/2011	Kalamazoo Valley Community College	Richard	Ives	(269) 488- 4341
VMA 200810A	8	10/01/2010	Van Meter & Associates, Inc.	Zaron	Miller	(614) 451- 8901
PLS 200909A	12	9/1/2011	Police Legal Sciences, Inc.	Gerald	Partridge	(319) 351- 5001
SCCD 200903A	8	02/21/2010	St. Clair County Central Dispatch	Cherie	Bartram	(810) 966- 1691
SCC 200811A	8	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543- 6141
MNA 200803E	16	5/1/2012	MACNLOW Associates	Denise	Willis	(989) 362- 9660
PST 200801	8	07/01/2010	Public Safety Training Consultants	Kevin	Willett	(650) 591- 7911
PWH 200908A	8	1/14/2011	Powerphone, Inc.	Drew	Cosenza	(203) 245- 8911
PDIS 200604	8	7/1/2012	Priority Dispatch Corporation	Jon	Stones	(801) 363- 9127
APCO 200526	40	06/01/2010	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944- 2483
APCO 200527	40	06/01/2010	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944- 2483
APCO 200528	54	06/01/2010	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944- 2483
APCO 200529	54	06/01/2010	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944- 2483
APCO 200911A	8	6/1/2011	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944- 2483
APCO 200911B	8	6/1/2011	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944- 2483
PDIS 200704	8	7/1/2012	Priority Dispatch Corporation	Jon	Stones	(801) 363- 9127
PST 200605	8	07/01/2010	Public Safety Training Consultants	Kevin	Willett	(650) 591- 7911
SAN 200801	21	1/17/2010	Sanilac County Central Dispatch	Dawn	Cubitt	(810) 648- 2000

ARC 200912A	8	12/1/2011	American Red Cross	Kathryn	Danaher	(313) 576-4108
PWH 200806	8	1/14/2011	PowerPhone, Inc.	Drew	Cosenza	(800) 537-6937
OCC 200910A	8	1/31/2011	Oakland Police Academy	Deborah	Achtenberg	(248) 232-4220
SCC 201001B	8	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
SCC 201001C	8	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
PWH 200807	8	1/14/2011	PowerPhone, Inc.	Drew	Cosenza	(800) 537-6937
PSI 200704	8	5/28/2012	Public Safety Group	Tony	Harrison	(877) 794-9389
OCC 200903C	8	01/31/2011	Oakland Police Academy	Deborah	Achtenberg	(248) 232-4220
MSP 200908B	36	8/1/2011	Michigan State Police-Training Division	Kandyce	Tabeling	(517) 322-5585
LBH 200601	24	5/21/2008	LB Harvey & Consulting	Lisa	Harvey	(248) 227-4406
IRI 200811A	8	09/01/2010	IRI Consultants	Marcey	Uday-Riley	(248) 760-1461
MCI 200701	8	8/25/2011	9-1-1 Training Institute, P.C.	James W.	Marshall III	(231) 439-3900
MCI 200908A	16	8/25/2011	911 Training Institute, P.C.	James W.	Marshall III	(231) 439-3900
MCDA 200901A	6	01/31/2010	Michigan Communications Directors Association	Joe	Van Oosterhout	(906) 475-1118
BBA 200810A	12	11/01/2010	Bryan & Bryan Associates	Martha	Bryan	(425) 337-1838
MNA 200904A	7	5/1/2011	MACNLOW Associates	Murlene	McKinnon	(989) 362-9660
SCC 200601	14	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
SCC 201005A	14	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
PSI 200707	8	5/28/2012	Public Safety Group	Tony	Harris	(405) 348-2774
AST 200810B	24	11/01/2010	Advanced Systems Technology, Inc.	James	Sanders	(580) 248-0321
APCO 200521	8	6/1/2010	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386) 944-2483
APCO 200907D	8	6/1/2010	APCO Institute, Inc.	Kathy	Schatel	(386)944-2483
MID 200909A	8	3/1/2011	Midland County Central Dispatch	Natalie	Duran	(786) 336-6675

PSI 200703	8	5/28/2012	Public Safety Group	Tony	Harris	(405) 348-2774
LPD 200804A	8	4/15/2010	Lansing Police Department	Jim	Kraus	(517) 896-9551
MNA 200805A	8	5/1/2012	MACNLOW Associates	Denise	Willis	(989) 362-9660
SCC 200812A	24	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
SCC 200701	8	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
SCC 200708	16	6/1/2012	Success Communications, Inc.	Michelle	Rasmussen	(517) 543-6141
OCC 200903B	8	01/31/2011	Oakland Police Academy	Deborah	Achtenberg	(248) 232-4220
MSP 201006A	2	8/1/2011	Michigan State Police-Training Division	David	Greydanus	(517) 636-5456
MSP 200912C	2	8/1/2011	Michigan State Police-Training Division	Dave	Greydanus	(517) 636-5456
MNA 200803A	7	5/1/2012	MACNLOW Associates	Murlene	McKinnon	(989) 362-9660
MSP 201001B	4	8/1/2011	Michigan State Police-Training Division	Dave	Greydanus	(517) 636-5456
PST 201002A	8	7/1/2011	Public Safety Training Consultants	Kevin	Willett	650-591-7911
PST 200810A	8	07/01/2010	Public Safety Training Consultants	Kevin	Willett	(800) 348-8911

### Michigan 9-1-1 COUNTY SURCHARGES

As Compiled by Michigan Public Service Staff

Rates Effective 7/01/2010 – Posted 6/04/2010

[Questions or comments may be e-mailed to norcrossk@Michigan.Gov](mailto:norcrossk@Michigan.Gov)

County	Technical Charge: Recurring (Col. 1)	Technical Charge: Nonrecurring (Col. 2)	County 9-1-1 Charge (Col. 3)	Total Charges (Col. 4)
Alcona	\$0.64	0	\$3.00	\$3.64
Alger	\$0.37	0	\$0.42	\$0.79
Allegan	\$0.31	0	\$1.63	\$1.94
Alpena	\$0.54	0	\$2.14	\$2.68
Antrim	\$0.74	0	\$1.97	\$2.71
Arenac	\$0.45	0	\$0.32	\$0.77
Baraga	\$0.00	0	0	\$0.00
Barry	\$0.25	0	0	\$0.25
Bay	\$0.26	0	0	\$0.26
Benzie	\$0.31	0	\$2.13	\$2.44
Berrien	\$0.00	0	\$0.42	\$0.42
Branch	\$0.50	0	\$0.31	\$0.81
Calhoun	\$0.23	0	\$0.60	\$0.83
Cass	\$0.41	0	\$1.18	\$1.59
Charlevoix	\$0.27	0	\$0.51	\$0.78
Cheboygan	\$0.27	0	\$0.50	\$0.77
Chippewa	\$0.40	0	\$0.99	\$1.39
Clare	\$0.71	0	\$0.47	\$1.18
Clinton	\$0.48	0	\$2.00	\$2.48
Crawford	\$0.53	0	\$2.35	\$2.88
Delta	\$0.33	0	\$0.44	\$0.77
Dickinson	\$0.69	0	\$0.42	\$1.11
Eaton	\$0.23	0	0	\$0.23
Emmet	\$0.27	0	\$0.58	\$0.85
Genesee	\$0.23	0	\$1.24	\$1.47
Gladwin	\$0.25	0	\$0.51	\$0.76
Gogebic	\$0.16	0	\$1.00	\$1.16
Grand Traverse	\$0.30	0	\$0.66	\$0.96
Gratiot	\$0.41	0	\$1.29	\$1.70
Hillsdale	\$0.62	0	\$2.25	\$2.87

Houghton	\$0.35	0	\$1.10	\$1.45
Huron	\$0.34	0	\$1.87	\$2.21
Ingham	\$0.30	0	\$0.42	\$0.72
Ionia	\$0.32	0	\$1.77	\$2.09
Iosco	\$0.38	0	\$1.85	\$2.23
Iron	\$0.39	0	\$1.61	\$2.00
Isabella	\$0.47	0	\$1.50	\$1.97
Jackson	\$0.26	0	\$0.44	\$0.70
Kalamazoo	\$0.22	0	0	\$0.22
Kalkaska	\$0.44	0	\$2.52	\$2.96
Kent	\$0.20	0	\$0.45	\$0.65
Keweenaw	\$0.00	0	0	\$0.00
Lake	\$0.21	0	0	\$0.21
Lapeer	\$0.21	0	\$1.55	\$1.76
Leelanau	\$0.36	0	0	\$0.36
Lenawee	\$0.43	0	\$1.18	\$1.61
Livingston	\$0.20	0	\$1.85	\$2.05
Luce	\$0.54	0	\$0.99	\$1.53
Mackinac	\$0.40	0	\$1.43	\$1.83
Macomb	\$0.22	0	0	\$0.22
Manistee	\$0.32	0	0	\$0.32
Marquette	\$0.29	0	0	\$0.29
Mason	\$0.40	0	\$2.09	\$2.49
Mecosta	\$0.37	0	\$1.50	\$1.87
Menominee	\$0.48	0	\$2.20	\$2.68
Midland	\$0.32	0	0	\$0.32
Missaukee	\$0.51	0	0	\$0.51
Monroe	\$0.33	0	\$0.42	\$0.75
Montcalm	\$0.63	0	\$1.89	\$2.52
Montmorency	\$0.51	0	\$1.47	\$1.98
Muskegon	\$0.35	0	\$0.34	\$0.69
Newaygo	\$0.50	0	\$1.56	\$2.06
Oakland	\$0.28	\$0.01	\$0.23	\$0.52
Oceana	\$0.40	0	\$2.09	\$2.49
Ogemaw	\$0.41	0	\$0.59	\$1.00
Ontonagon	\$0.50	0	\$0.51	\$1.01
Osceola	\$0.37	0	\$1.50	\$1.87
Oscoda	\$0.69	0	\$0.45	\$1.14
Otsego	\$0.45	0	\$1.72	\$2.17
Ottawa	\$0.27	0	0	\$0.27

Presque Isle	\$0.49	0	\$0.40	\$0.89
Roscommon	\$0.80	0	0	\$0.80
Saginaw	\$0.31	0	\$2.18	\$2.49
Sanilac	\$0.27	0	\$0.44	\$0.71
Schoolcraft	\$0.44	0	\$0.40	\$0.84
Shiawassee	\$0.46	0	\$1.22	\$1.68
St. Clair	\$0.23	0	\$0.42	\$0.65
St. Joseph	\$0.41	0	0	\$0.41
Tuscola	\$0.23	0	\$1.80	\$2.03
Van Buren	\$0.36	0	\$1.37	\$1.73
Washtenaw	\$0.28	0	\$0.43	\$0.71
Wayne :				
Detroit Emergency	\$0.27	0	\$0.42	\$0.69
Downriver	\$0.19	0	\$0.42	\$0.61
Wayne, Conf. East.	\$0.24	0	\$0.42	\$0.66
Wayne, Conf. West	\$0.25	\$0.01	\$0.42	\$0.68
Wexford	\$0.36	0	\$0.25	\$0.61

**NOTE:**

- Michigan Public Service Commission Order, U-15552, of April 16, 2009, extends the \$0.19 Michigan 9-1-1 charge to also be included on customer bills and remitted to the Michigan Department of Treasury.

**State 9-1-1 Committee  
2010 Annual Report to the Michigan Legislature  
COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP LISTING  
as of July 1, 2010**

<b>MEMBER ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>REPRESENTATIVE</b>
Association of Public Safety Communications Officials	Ms. Christine Collom Isabella County Central Dispatch
Commercial Mobile Radio Service	Ms. Yvette Collins A T & T Michigan
Department of Energy, Labor and Economic Growth	Ms. Jeannine Benedict Office of Policy and Legislative Affairs
Department of State Police	Lt. Col. Kriste Kibbey Etue Administrative Services Bureau
Deputy Sheriffs' Association	Vacant
Fraternal Order of Police	Mr. John Buczek Executive Director
Governor's Appointee, Public Member	Mr. John Hunt OnStar
House Appointee, Public Member	Mr. Dan Kuhn Police Officers Association
Michigan Association of Ambulance Services	Mr. Dale Berry Huron Valley Ambulance
Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police	Chief Kay Hoffman Lansing Township Police Department
Michigan Association of Counties	Mr. James VanDoren Lenawee County Commissioner
Michigan Communications Directors Association <i>Serving as Vice Chair – 2009</i>	Mr. James Fyvie Clinton County Central Dispatch
Michigan Association of Fire Chiefs	Chief Paul Trinko Adrian Fire Department
Michigan Professional Firefighters Union	Mr. Mark Docherty President
Michigan Public Service Commission	Mr. Dan Kearney MPSC Representative
Michigan Sheriffs' Association <i>serving as Chair for 2009</i>	Sheriff Dale Gribler Van Buren County Sheriff's Department
Michigan State Police Troopers Association	Mr. Chris Luty Michigan State Police Troopers Association
National Emergency Number Association	Mr. Andrew Goldberger St. Joseph County Central Dispatch
Senate Appointee, Public Member	Mr. Lloyd Fayling Genesee County 9-1-1
Telecommunications Association of Michigan	Mr. Dave Piasecki A T & T
UP Emergency Medical Services Corp.	Mr. James Loeper U. P. Emergency Medical Services Corp.

<p><b>State 9-1-1 Committee</b>  <b>2010 Annual Report to the Michigan Legislature</b>  <b>SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP LISTING</b></p>
--

**Executive Committee**

Chair: Sheriff Dale Gribler, SNC, Michigan Sheriff's Association  
 Ms. Yvette Collins, SNC, Governor's Appointee  
 Mr. Dave Piasecki, SNC, Telecommunications Association of Michigan  
 Mr. Dale Berry, SNC, Michigan Association of Ambulance Services  
 Mr. James Fyvie, SNC, Michigan Communications Directors Association  
 Lt. Col. Kriste K. Etue, SNC, Michigan State Police  
 Chief Paul Trinka, SNC, Michigan Association of Fire Chiefs

Non-Voting:

Harriet Miller-Brown, Michigan State Police

**Certification Subcommittee**

Chair: Mr. James Fyvie, SNC, Clinton County Central Dispatch  
 Ms. Yvette Collins, SNC, A T & T  
 Sheriff Dale Gribler, SNC, Van Buren County Sheriff Department  
 Ms. Margaret Hatfield, Hillsdale County Central Dispatch  
 Mr. Gary Johnson, Marquette County Central Dispatch  
 Mr. Steve Leese, Eaton County Central Dispatch  
 Mr. James Loeper, SNC, Gogebic County  
 Mr. Chris Luty, SNC, Michigan State Police Troopers Association  
 Mr. Victor Martin, Lapeer County Central Dispatch  
 Mr. Dave Piasecki, SNC, A T & T

Non-Voting:

Harriet Miller-Brown, Michigan State Police

**Dispatcher Training Subcommittee**

Chair: Ms. Karen Chadwick, SNC, Grand Rapids Police Department  
 Mr. Dave Ackley, Genesee County Central Dispatch  
 Ms. Christine Collom, SNC, Isabella County Central Dispatch  
 Mr. James Fyvie, SNC, Clinton County Central Dispatch  
 Mr. Andrew Goldberger, SNC, St Joseph County Central Dispatch  
 Sheriff Dale Gribler, SNC, Van Buren County Sheriff Department  
 Mr. Vic Martin, Lapeer County Central Dispatch  
 Mr. Stephen Todd, Flint City 9-1-1  
 Chief Paul Trinka, SNC, Adrian Fire Department  
 Mr. Jeff Troyer, Calhoun County Consolidated Dispatch Authority  
 Mr. Joseph VanOosterhout, Marquette County Central Dispatch  
 Mr. Steve Wuefling, Arenac County Central Dispatch

Non-Voting Members:

Ms. Evah Cole, Department of Treasury  
 Ms. Harriet Miller-Brown, Michigan State Police

### **Emerging Technology Subcommittee**

Chair: Mr. John Hunt, SNC, Onstar  
Ms. Pat Anderson, A T & T  
Ms. Marsha Bianconi, Conference of Western Wayne  
Ms. Cathy Brandimore, Troy Police Department  
Ms. Patricia Coates, CLEMIS  
Mr. Robert Currier, Intrado  
Mr. Ralph Gould, Grand Rapids Police Department  
Mr. Todd Jones, Advanced Wireless Telecom  
Mr. Kevin Schoen, ACD Telecom  
Mr. Michael Szor, Alpena County Central Dispatch

Non-Voting:  
Harriet Miller-Brown, Michigan State Police

### **Legislative Action Subcommittee**

Chair: Lt. Col. Kriste K. Etue, SNC, Michigan State Police  
Ms. Pat Anderson, A T & T  
Mr. Dale Berry, SNC, Huron Valley Ambulance  
Ms. Marsha Bianconi, Conference of Western Wayne  
Ms. Patricia Coates, CLEMIS  
Mr. Robert Currier, Intrado  
Mr. Lloyd Fayling, SNC, Genesee County 9-1-1  
Mr. James Fyvie, SNC, Clinton County Central Dispatch  
Mr. Andrew Goldberger, SNC, St. Joseph Co. 9-1-1/Central Dispatch  
Ms. Jennifer Greenburg, TAM  
Sheriff Dale Gribler, SNC, Van Buren County Sheriff Department  
Mr. Steve Leese, Eaton County Central Dispatch  
Mr. James Loeper, SNC, Gogebic County  
Mr. Chris Luty, SNC, Michigan State Police Troopers Association  
Ms. Pamela Matelski, Michigan State Police  
Mr. Dave Piasecki, SNC, A T & T  
Mr. Joseph VanOosterhout, Marquette County Central Dispatch  
Mr. Dave Vehslage, Verizon

Non-Voting Members:  
Ms. Harriet Miller-Brown, Michigan State Police

### **Policy Subcommittee**

Chair: Mr. Dale Berry, SNC, Huron Valley Ambulance  
Ms. Marsha Bianconi, Conference of Western Wayne  
Mr. James Fyvie, SNC, Clinton County Central Dispatch  
Mr. John Hunt, SNC, OnStar

Non-Voting:  
Harriet Miller-Brown, Michigan State Police

# STATE OF MICHIGAN

## STATE 9-1-1 PLAN



Compiled and Presented by the  
Emerging Technology Subcommittee  
as adopted by the State 9-1-1 Committee

DATE: JUNE 23, 2009

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Executive Summary.....	2-3
2.	Introduction .....	4-6
3.	Current 9-1-1 Environment .....	7-11
4.	Future Environment .....	12-15
5.	Goals, Objectives, and Measures .....	16
6.	Resource Allocation .....	17
7.	Updating the Plan .....	18
8.	Mechanism(s) for Overseeing and Managing the State's 9-1-1 System .....	19
9.	Mechanism for Initiating and Monitoring an Implementation Project.....	20
10.	Conclusion.....	21
11.	Appendix A: Acronyms .....	22
12.	Appendix B: Allowable and Disallowable 9-1-1 Fund Expenditures.....	23-24

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### 1.1 Background and Purpose Summary

Providing optimum 9-1-1 services for its citizens is a long established priority for the state of Michigan. For more than 20 years, a collaboration of legislators, state, county / Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) agencies, and telecommunication providers have worked together to provide the necessary enhanced 9-1-1 framework. This framework is a multi-dimensional system composed of landline, wireless, and internet communication providers that allows delivery of 9-1-1 calls through a complex network of routers, switches, databases, and emergency dispatch communication centers. All parts of this network must be able to seamlessly integrate and interact with each other.

Just as 9-1-1 technology continues to evolve and change, the Michigan laws that determine the architectural network, 9-1-1 legislative and regulatory oversight, training standards, and funding mechanisms need to transform and adapt. The State 9-1-1 Plan will provide one more tool to help guide Michigan through this process by providing professional vision and leadership that will lead Michigan to a Next Generation (NG 911) system. The plan is designed to be used by all the 9-1-1 stakeholders, state, county/ local 9-1-1 authorities, and emergency communication centers. Local law enforcement, fire services and emergency medical service (EMS), Homeland Security, the military, and State and Federal legislators will also utilize this planning aid.

The plan will not only identify and monitor Michigan's 9-1-1 goals and objectives, it will be a "living document" that will be updated biennially. Adoption of a statewide plan for the coordination and implementation of 9-1-1 will allow Michigan to apply for Federal funds.

Michigan's 9-1-1 service is enabled and governed by Public Act 32 of 1986<sup>2</sup> and its subsequent amendments. This Act created the State 9-1-1 Committee and provided the mechanism for the public/private collaboration of subject matter experts that have worked to identify and resolve numerous key 9-1-1 issues.<sup>3</sup> Recommendations from the State 9-1-1 committee and its various subcommittees have been incorporated into several 9-1-1 statutes.<sup>4</sup>

Since the 1980's Michigan has moved from receiving and processing wireline Enhanced 9-1-1(E9-1-1) calls, through Enhanced Phase I and Phase II (wireless call processing and routing) to its recent deployment of Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) 9-1-1 calls.

Soon, Michigan's 9-1-1 framework will have to provide access to public emergency services by any communication device (video, photographs, and automatic crash notification). To facilitate future planning efforts for Michigan's 9-1-1 system, a comprehensive feasibility study of Next Generation 9-1-1 (Internet Protocol IP-Based network) is currently underway. This study will provide an inventory of both the PSAP and network needs and capabilities

The State 9-1-1 Committee asked the Emerging Technology Subcommittee to assist the state 9-1-1 administrator in the development of the Plan. The Subcommittee is comprised of fourteen (14) members who represent the various stakeholders in the Michigan 9-1-1 community:

---

<sup>2</sup> P.A. 32 of 1986 [http://legislature.mi.gov/doc.aspx?mcl-Act\\_32\\_of\\_1986](http://legislature.mi.gov/doc.aspx?mcl-Act_32_of_1986)

<sup>3</sup> P.A. 249 of 2006 <http://www.legislature.mi.gov/documents/2005-2006/publicact/pdf/2006-PA-0249.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> P.A. 379 of 2008 <http://www.legislature.mi.gov/documents/2007-2008/publicact/pdf/2008-PA-0379.pdf>

- Seven (7) public sector representatives:
  - Ms. Marsha Bianconi (Conference of Western Wayne County)
  - Ms. Cathy Brandimore (City of Troy)
  - Ms. Patricia Coates (Oakland County)
  - Mr. Ralph Gould (City of Grand Rapids)
  - Ms. Harriet Miller-Brown (State 9-1-1 Administrator)
  - Ms. Christina Russell (Oakland County Sheriff Department)
  - Mr. Mike Szor (Alpena County)
  
- Seven (7) private sector representatives:
  - Ms. Patricia Anderson (AT&T)
  - Mr. Philip Bates (Verizon Business)
  - Mr. Robert Currier (Intrado)
  - Mr. John Hunt (OnStar)
  - Mr. Todd Jones (Advanced Wireless Telecom)
  - Ms. Susan Sherwood (Verizon Wireless)
  - Mr. Scott Temple (AT&T Mobility)

The subcommittee conducted independent research, and utilized information compiled by Kimball Corp (IP-Based feasibility study) to assist them in developing this Plan. The draft plan was presented to the State 9-1-1 Committee for review in March 2009, the draft plan was further reviewed by the Executive Committee of the State 9-1-1 Committee in May of 2009, and approved by the full Committee in June 2009.

## 2. INTRODUCTION

This section will provide a brief background of Michigan's 9-1-1 system and an introduction to the 9-1-1 Plan and its purpose.

### *2.1 National Overview of the History and Background of 9-1-1*

The concept of a nationwide emergency telephone number was first adopted in Great Britain in 1937. In the United States in 1967, President Johnson's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Criminal Justice recommended a nationally uniform three-digit emergency telephone number. In November of that year, the FCC met with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company (AT&T) and shortly thereafter AT&T announced it had reserved the numbers 9-1-1 for emergency use nationwide.

The nation's first 9-1-1 system was implemented by the Alabama Telephone Company in Haleyville, Alabama. On February 16, 1968, Alabama Speaker of the House, Rankin Fite, made the first 9-1-1 call from the Haleyville city hall. Congressman Tom Bevill answered the call on a red-colored telephone located in the police department.<sup>5</sup>

When 9-1-1 service was first introduced, 9-1-1 calls were sent to a single destination based on the caller's telephone exchange. Since there was and is little or no correlation between a telephone exchange boundary and the emergency responder's jurisdiction, a 9-1-1 call could end up at a public safety answering point (PSAP) that did not serve the caller's location. This early 9-1-1 service, now known as Basic 9-1-1, did not provide any telephone number or location information with the call - it was a voice service only; the caller had to provide his or her location and call back information.

Significant advancement in 9-1-1 technology occurred with the introduction of E9-1-1 in the 1980s. This level of service enabled a 9-1-1 call to be selectively routed to the PSAP serving the caller's location, and delivered that call with automatic number identification (ANI) and automatic location identification (ALI). Other features, such as selective transfer, further streamlined the call handling process.

The pace of change in telecommunications technology continues to increase rapidly. Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP), text messaging, and picture messaging are being enthusiastically adopted by consumers for their everyday communications – and these same consumers expect to be able to use these technologies to communicate with 9-1-1.

### **2.2 Overview and Background of Michigan 9-1-1**

In 1986, the Michigan Legislature enacted Public Act 32, also known as the Emergency Telephone Service Enabling Act. (The act is commonly referred to as PA 32 in the Michigan 9-1-1 community.) While there had been 9-1-1 programs in several jurisdictions throughout the state, PA 32 facilitated the onset of enhanced 9-1-1 systems through the state. PA 32 set out several requirements for the establishment of 9-1-1 systems, including empowering counties as the local unit of government to enact the 9-1-1 plan and serve as 9-1-1 in the service districts<sup>6</sup>; provisions for the telephone service providers to recover recurring and non-recurring costs through a technical surcharge on the service subscribers' and, minimally, system requirements for operational, managerial, technical, and fiscal considerations. The act also required that plans identify the public safety answering points (PSAPs) within the service district, public notice and hearing for the initial plan and subsequent changes to it, and provisions for units of government to "opt out" of participation in the plan. PA 32 also established the Emergency Telephone Service Committee<sup>7</sup> to provide guidance on policy and technical issues regarding 9-1-1.

PA 32 has been amended a number of times since its inception in 1986, the most notable of those amendments included the following:

---

<sup>5</sup> Alabama Chapter of NENA website, "World's First 9-1-1 Call" [http://www.al911.org/first\\_call.htm](http://www.al911.org/first_call.htm) (April 18, 2008)

<sup>6</sup> Wayne County is recognized by PA 32 as the exception and it has four separate service districts. These service districts currently are: Conference of Western Wayne, Conference of Eastern Wayne, Detroit, and Downriver Mutual Aid.

<sup>7</sup> PA 165 of 2007 removed the word "telephone" from the committee's title to reflect changing technology. It is now commonly known as the State 9-1-1 Committee (SNC).

PA 29 of 1994:

- Permitting counties to enact operational surcharges by geographical boundaries of the county by commission votes<sup>8</sup>, ballot proposal<sup>9</sup>, or a combination of the two<sup>10</sup>.
- Giving powers of county commission to establish an emergency 9-1-1 district board for a consolidated dispatch and determine that board's scope of authority.

PA 78 of 1999:

- Imposing a surcharge on wireless devices for the purposes of implementing Phase I and II wireless 9-1-1.
- Establishing a cost recovery mechanism for wireless providers to deliver wireless 9-1-1.
- Setting amounts for distribution of wireless surcharge to counties for costs of 9-1-1 service and to PSAPs for training dispatch personnel.

PA 244 of 2003:

- Set date deadlines for counties to deploy Phase I and II wireless 9-1-1.
- Funded the State 9-1-1 Office.
- Set date to end cost recovery for wireless providers.

PA 164 & 165 of 2007:

- Changed local landline operational 9-1-1 surcharge to a local "all-device" surcharge.
- Changed statewide wireless 9-1-1 surcharge to a statewide "all-device" surcharge.
- Gave rule making to the Michigan Public Service Commission over multi-line telephone service (MLTS) location information, 9-1-1 dispatcher training, and standards for operational policies for PSAPs, and receipt and use of 9-1-1 funds.

By October of 2005 every county in the state of Michigan except for one<sup>11</sup> had county-wide enhanced 9-1-1 services and by the end of 2005 all counties in the state were capable of processing wireless Phase II calls. In May of 2008, the final county without enhanced 9-1-1 became fully enhanced with 9-1-1 service, making the state of Michigan fully capable of enhanced 9-1-1 for both landline and wireless 9-1-1<sup>12</sup>.

In addition to the statewide delivery of enhanced 9-1-1 on both wireless and landline communications services, it has also reached broad delivery of VoIP 9-1-1 and telematics 9-1-1 routing. Even with this progress, changes in technology are presently being experienced by Michigan's 9-1-1 community, as well as the ones that are known near-future changes such as text messages, streaming video, and video relay services (VRS). These changes have made it clear that the current 9-1-1 network will need to change also.

The purpose of this plan is to outline the process toward a NG 9-1-1 system that is capable of delivering and transferring a 9-1-1 call for help on any device that can initiate a 9-1-1 call within the state. It is also the purpose of this plan to address operational issues that the State 9-1-1 Committee recognizes as key to the successful overall delivery of 9-1-1 in the state. It is the intent of the State 9-1-1 Committee to leverage all resources available to the 9-1-1 community to reach that end.

Those resources include: funding, through both state and federal sources; the utilization of impartial contracted services<sup>13</sup>; and the long-standing collaborative system involving stakeholders at every level in the 9-1-1 community. Michigan's 9-1-1 history is a demonstration of progress and adaptability and as we move into the challenges of NG 9-1-1, this next chapter in technology will continue that legacy.

---

<sup>8</sup> Up to 4% of the highest monthly base rate in the service district not to exceed \$.80.

<sup>9</sup> Up to 16% of the highest monthly base rate in the service district not to exceed \$3.20.

<sup>10</sup> Total not to exceed \$4.00.

<sup>11</sup> Baraga County in Michigan's Upper Peninsula.

<sup>12</sup> Mackinac Island is still in the process of completing its addressing work for enhanced 9-1-1 under the Mackinac County 9-1-1 Plan and Bois Blanc Island opted out of the Mackinac County Plan at the plan's onset in 1997.

<sup>13</sup> Under PA 164 of 2007, MCL 484.1408(5) appropriated \$500,000 for a feasibility study for an IP-based 9-1-1 system in Michigan. In 2008, the state contracted with the Kimball Corp. to conduct that study. The final recommendations will be presented to the State 9-1-1 Committee in December of 2009. Based on a satisfactory and comprehensive report, it is the intent of the Committee to use that information to guide the forward progress of Michigan's NG 9-1-1 system.

### **3. CURRENT 9-1-1 ENVIRONMENT**

#### **3.1 Current Legislative and Regulatory Environment and Program Structure**

The state-level 9-1-1 coordinating function is lead by the State 9-1-1 Committee, which is a statutorily created committee under Michigan's Public Act 32, of 1986, as amended. The Committee is tasked with providing assistance in the implementation of 9-1-1 systems in Michigan.

Administrative support to the State 9-1-1 Committee is provided by the State 9-1-1 Administrator's Office located in the Michigan State Police (MSP) Administrative Services Bureau (ASB). The Committee may recommend technical and operational standards for PSAPs and model 9-1-1 systems, as well as provide assistance for the design, implementation and operation of those systems. The Committee does not have rule making authority. Rather, that authority rests with the Michigan Public Service Commission (MPSC), in consultation with the Committee, for the following specific 9-1-1 matters:

- Uniform policies, procedures, and protocols for 9-1-1 services in counties and public safety answering points (PSAPs) in the state
- Training standards for PSAP personnel
- Standards for the receipt and use of 9-1-1 funds
- Requirements for multi-line telephone systems

The mechanisms for coordinating the implementation of 9-1-1 system(s) and monitoring those operations and progress by the Committee include a diverse set of subcommittees. These subcommittees, which make recommendations to the Committee, draw from both the public and private sectors of the 9-1-1 community in Michigan. These subcommittees include Emerging Technology, Certification, Dispatcher Training, and Legislative Action. Subcommittees often utilize additional work groups for matters requiring more specific technical and policy input. Participation in these groups is guided by the Committee by-laws. Subcommittee meetings are posted in advance and open to the public and work group participation is active and encouraged. Activity of the Committee and its subcommittees are posted on the State 9-1-1 web site at [www.michigan.gov/etsc](http://www.michigan.gov/etsc).

All PSAPs have methods of access to communication that allow them to coordinate and operate with each other; examples of this include data, telephony, and radio. Radio communications between PSAPs is varied. In some areas of the state there are high levels of radio interoperability between PSAPs and in others areas radio interoperability has not been achieved. There are efforts in these areas of the state to achieve interoperability.

At the current time Michigan has recently updated its 9-1-1 statute (PA 379 of 2008) and it recognizes that updates will likely be needed based on the progress of NG 9-1-1 system in Michigan. An annual report on the status on Michigan 9-1-1 is presented to the legislature each year, as well as legislative recommendations that may need to be considered in the forthcoming year.

#### **3.2 Current 9-1-1 Technology**

##### **3.2.1 Overview**

Michigan has two 9-1-1 Service Providers:

- AT&T – providing service in both the Upper and Lower peninsulas
- Verizon – providing service in the Lower Peninsula only

AT&T is the 9-1-1 Service Provider for 154 Primary, 7 Secondary, and 25 Back-up (combination of fully featured and voice only) PSAPs. AT&T also provides trunk routing to 16 Verizon-hosted Primary PSAPs.

Verizon is the 9-1-1 Service Provider for 20 Primary PSAPs, and 4 back-up PSAPs. Verizon also provides trunk routing to 16 AT&T-hosted Primary PSAPs, 2 AT&T-hosted Secondary PSAPs, and 1 AT&T-hosted Back-up PSAP.

##### **3.2.2 Landline E9-1-1 Infrastructure**

###### **3.2.2.1 System Level of Service**

All telephone subscribers of ILEC or CLEC service providers are served by PSAPs capable of receiving and processing Enhanced 9-1-1 calls.

### **3.2.2.2 PSAPs**

PSAPs utilize multiple CPE vendors throughout the state.

The majority of the PSAPs have their wireline and wireless traffic delivered via one incoming trunk group from their respective 9-1-1 service provider.

### **3.2.2.3 LEC 9-1-1 Selective Routers**

AT&T uses five Lucent 5ESS 9-1-1 tandem switches in Michigan's Lower Peninsula located in Ann Arbor, Bay City, Cadillac, Grand Rapids, and Rochester. AT&T uses a Nortel DMS100 9-1-1 tandem switch in Marquette to serve the Upper Peninsula.

Verizon uses a Lucent 5ESS 9-1-1 tandem switch in Muskegon, a Nortel DMS100 9-1-1 tandem switch in Alma, a CML ECS1000 tandem switch in Bellaire, and a CML ECS1000 tandem switch in Adrian.

### **3.2.2.4 ALI Database**

AT&T provides ALI service to Michigan PSAPs through redundant centralized ALI databases located in Southfield and Northbrook, Illinois. Each PSAP is served by two ALI circuits, one connected to each database. The network provides redundancy and flexibility for future enhancements.

Verizon provides ALI service to Michigan PSAPs through redundant centralized ALI databases located in Ft. Wayne and Tampa. Service is provided by redundant IP circuits to each database.

The state statute authorizes each county board to implement a county 9-1-1 plan. The plan is then required to designate the Operational, Fiscal, Technical, and Managerial consideration of that county's 9-1-1 system. This includes designation of the PSAPs, services providers, and the funding for the 9-1-1 structure within the county. All eighty-three (83) counties in Michigan have a 9-1-1 service plan in place and provide enhanced 9-1-1 for wireline, wireless Phase II, and VoIP. There are one hundred and eighty-four (184) PSAPs networked in the state and seven (7) secondary PSAPs.

## **3.3 PSAP Integration with Emergency Communications, Telecommunications, and Information Networks**

Michigan has currently contracted with Kimball Corp to conduct a comprehensive feasibility study of NG 9-1-1. This includes an inventory of both PSAP and network capabilities and needs. An assessment of necessary system changes including integration with emergency communications, telecommunications, and information networks are pending based on the outcome of that study and its recommendations. However, preliminary steps in system changes and upgrades may be able to be made through near-future resources.

## **3.4 Economics**

### **3.4.1 Current Funding Mechanisms**

In 2007, Michigan amended its 9-1-1 statute to require all communications services that can provide access to 9-1-1 to collect and remit the 9-1-1 surcharge, regardless of technology. This was a significant advancement as it broadened the surcharge base by making it technology neutral, which will help provide a more solid foundation for the future.

Under MCL 484.1401, Michigan currently has three statutory funding provisions for 9-1-1: 1) a statewide "all devices" surcharge, 2) a county "all devices" operational surcharge, and 3) and a technical fee (which is wireline-based).

Michigan's statewide 9-1-1 surcharge, is set forth in MCL 484.1401 and collected by the communication service providers and remitted to the Michigan Department of Treasury (Treasury). A separate fee on pre-paid

wireless services is also remitted to the Treasury. The Treasury is responsible for the financial distribution of those funds. This includes processing remittances from the communications service providers: depositing them into the Emergency 9-1-1 Fund; distributing the funds to the counties, LECs, and the PSAPs as directed by the Committee; and accounting for all transactions from the 9-1-1 Fund.

Funds generated by the State 9-1-1 surcharge of \$0.19 on all devices that can access 9-1-1 are outlined in MCL 484.1408 and distributed as follows:

- 82.5% - To counties distributed in two manners: 40% on an equal share basis and 60% on a per capita basis
- 7.75% - To fund 9-1-1 network costs for delivery of wireless calls to PSAPs
- 6.0% - To 9-1-1 training program
- 1.87% - To administer the act and fund the State 9-1-1 Office
- 1.88% - To the Michigan State Police (MSP) to operate a regional dispatch center that receives and dispatches 9-1-1 calls

In addition to 9-1-1 surcharges, some counties in Michigan also use general fund money to support PSAP operations. Other counties utilize special millage funds (a voter-approved tax rate on property, expressed in mills per dollar of value of the property) to support their 9-1-1 programs.

Michigan statute under MCL 484.1401 also provides for a technical charge that allows landline providers within the 9-1-1 service district to assess an emergency telephone technical charge on their subscribers to cover the cost to provide the E9-1-1 network, databases, and trunking in that 9-1-1 service district. The amount is calculated by dividing the provider's actual costs by the number of exchange access facilities within the 9-1-1 service district. The landline provider can bill and keep the technical charge. The Telecommunications Association of Michigan (TAM) contracts with a CPA firm (McCartney and Associates) to conduct a true up at the end of each year and each provider pays its portion of the accounting costs.

**3.4.2 Current Revenues and Costs**

Using the information available to the State 9-1-1 Committee, in 2007 the operational costs to the counties for providing 9-1-1 was approximately \$203,502,587 and was funded by the sources as follows:

<b>Category</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Total Budget	\$203,502,587.01
Local Operational Surcharge	\$54,533,248.93
Millage	\$27,108,738.67
General	\$84,042,734.96
State	\$16,946,721.85
Other Revenues	\$7,986,201.23* *Sources include: grants, interest earned, sale of equipment, tower rental, etc.

While not all landline providers participate in the technical surcharge pooling process, based on the annual accounting of the landline providers and the “true up” performed by McCartney and Associates, the estimated total figure for technical costs in 2007 was \$10,562,728.20. However, information was not provided to the State 9-1-1 Committee by Charlevoix, Cheboygan, Emmet, Dickinson, Grand Traverse, Livingston, Luce, Montmorency, and Wexford counties. Wireless and VoIP 9-1-1 technical costs cannot be determined because they are self-recovered and unique to each provider).

### **3.4.3 Next Generation Considerations**

While the costs of NG 9-1-1 are not known at this time, nor is the final method of a Next Generation solution determined. (The methods for initiating implementation are spelled out in further detail in Section 9 of this plan.)

### **3.4.4 Allocation/Distribution of State and Federal Funding for Equipment and Operations Allocation of State Funding**

The statutory framework of the distribution of state-collected 9-1-1 funds is detailed in section 3.4.1 above. MCL 484.1401b(14) recognizes the allowable and disallowable uses of the 9-1-1 funds, collected both by the counties and the state. That list is included as Appendix B and generally states:

Allowable Uses:

- 9-1-1 call handling equipment
- Master logging recorders
- Instant call check recorders
- TeleTypewriter/Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (TTY/TDD)
- Mapping
- Back-up power
- Training
- Public education
- Contracted services

### **3.4.5 Allocation of Federal Funding**

At this time, federal funding of 9-1-1 systems in Michigan has been limited and usually in the form of Homeland Security grants through local Emergency Management programs. These projects, while very beneficial, have been local either at the county or municipal level, and are limited in scope and size. Any federal funding received as a part of the implementation of this plan’s goals and objectives towards NG 9-1-1 (see Section 5 on page 17) will be utilized within the requirements of the receipt of those funds.

## **4. FUTURE ENVIRONMENT**

### **4.1 Vision Statement**

Michigan shall utilize evolving technology to enable all PSAPs to receive, process, and dispatch 9-1-1 requests for emergency services effectively and efficiently to meet the needs of the citizens, public safety, and the service providers.

### **4.2 Services and Capabilities**

Michigan PSAPs will maintain their current excellent standard of 9-1-1 service delivery as they migrate to NG 9-1-1. Historically governance and control of 9-1-1 at the County level of government has proven efficacious in Michigan, as County Boards of Commissioners are in the best position to understand the needs and operations of the local emergency services providers and citizens. However, new regional or other models of governance and control may emerge as technology evolves.

With migration to the NG 9-1-1 Emergency Services Internet Protocol-enabled network (ESInet), access will be enabled to public emergency services by any communication device and will enhance response by providing responders access to video, photographs, automatic crash notification data, etc.

The ESInet will also enable service arrangements by minimizing the need for some PSAPs to be in one physical location, promoting flexibility in the form of virtual PSAPs and virtual back-up PSAPs. While physical consolidation of PSAPs is often cost prohibitive, the flexibility to share services, equipment, and functions on an interconnected network will lead to more effective and efficient call processing.

### **4.3 Infrastructure, Equipment and Technology**

The National Emergency Number Association (NENA) defines NG 9-1-1 as “A system comprised of Emergency Services IP networks (ESInets): IP-based Software Services’ and Applications, Databases and Data Management processes that are interconnected to Public Safety Answering Point premise equipment. The system provides location-based routing to the appropriate emergency entity. The system uses additionally available data elements and business policies to augment PSAP routing. The system delivers geodetic and/or civic location information and the call back number. The system supports the transfer of calls to other NG 9-1-1 capable PSAPs or other authorized entities based on and including accumulated data.

NG 9-1-1 provides standardized interfaces for call and message services, processes all types of emergency calls including non-voice (multi-media) messages, acquires and integrates additional data useful to call routing and handling for appropriate emergency entities. NG 9-1-1 supports all E9-1-1 features and functions and meets current and emerging needs for emergency communication from caller to Public Safety entities.”

Michigan will achieve NG 9-1-1 through a phased approach, including the development of local and regional intranets capable of supporting an IP-Based 9-1-1 system: the development of public and/or private networks capable of transferring IP data between and among local networks: the development of appropriate inter local agreements and supporting legislation: the technology to interconnect multiple networks seamlessly, and the replacement of PSAP customer premises equipment (CPE) with equipment capable of receiving and processing IP data, resulting in an interconnected and interoperable system of local, regional, and national emergency services networks.

Considerations are:

- Infrastructure must be scalable and extensible.
- Infrastructure must be public safety grade: i.e, it must meet a higher level of availability, resiliency, reliability, security, and survivability than non-mission critical enterprise network infrastructure.
- Not all PSAPs/counties/regions will migrate at the same time. The Legacy Network and Selective Routers supporting the circuit switched network must continue to function. In concept, the legacy system would eventually connect to an ESInet gateway and convert legacy wireline/wireless 9-1-1 calls from analog into Session Initiation Protocol (SIP), attaching the caller's location information and presenting the call to the ESInet.
- Local, regional, and state ESInets must avoid potential single points of failure. Lack of redundancy and diversity in the 9-1-1 network can impact the reliability of 9-1-1 systems.
- Sufficient bandwidth and speed for data sharing between PSAPs.
- GIS data services should be considered for database sharing across the network using centralized databases while existing systems should be interfaced as deemed necessary. The network's increased capacity and speed will allow efficient transfer of mapping, CAD, and CPE call data.
- Regional 9-1-1 ESInets will require connectivity and plans should be carefully established. Plans and agreements should also be established for 7 X 24 X 365 monitoring and maintenance on interconnected ESInets.

#### **4.4 Operations, Staff, and Training**

Operations, staffing and training are the responsibility of the Michigan PSAPs, within the guidelines and standards established by the Michigan Public Service Commission upon recommendation of the State 9-1-1 Committee. It is critical that PSAP Administrators remain current on evolving multimedia technology and standards throughout the transition to NG 9-1-1 and adjust operational procedures and policies, staffing levels, and training programs accordingly.

#### **4.5 Governance**

Governance and control of 9-1-1 has historically resided with the County Board of Commissioners, local governmental entities, and Authority Boards. It is envisioned that this model will continue, although evolving technology may lead to regional and other cooperative governance mechanisms.

The Michigan statute (PA 32 of 1986, as amended) defines a Consolidated Dispatch within a 9-1-1 Service District and the mandatory members of an Authority Board governing such an entity. Other models may evolve as technology reduces geographical limitations.

The State 9-1-1 Committee will monitor the maturing system and propose statutory amendments that address more flexible governance models and Committee structure as necessary.

Governance of 9-1-1 should not only focus on the basics of how and whom oversees the provision of services, but also provide broad guidance on a statewide basis given Michigan's "local" control environment of today. Items that should be considered in future rule making with evolving technology and competition in the provision of 9-1-1 services should include, but not be limited to:

##### **4.5.1 Public Access to Emergency Communications**

- Include the requirements for provision of 9-1-1 service
- Definition of emergency communications system(s)
- Definition of communications service provider
- All communications service providers are subject to 9-1-1 rules and regulations
- Requirements for multiple line telephone systems (MLTS); requirement for all new technologies to provision emergency communications services

#### **4.5.2 Data Privacy**

- Ensure privacy protections of citizens who call 9-1-1 to the extent guaranteed by statute
- Develop and maintain rules for use of 9-1-1 data for:
  - All agencies necessary to have access to the appropriate data for calls in progress
  - Provisions for use of 9-1-1 data for outbound notification systems for public safety purposes

#### **4.5.3 Data Service Standards**

- Promulgate appropriate service standards for provisioning of emergency communications system and services
- All communications service providers shall have minimum service standards for provisioning of emergency communications systems and services

#### **4.5.4 Funding to Achieve the Vision**

Funding for 9-1-1 service is historically the responsibility of the County Board of Commissioners. A number of funding mechanisms have been available to the counties, including special mileages and surcharge on communication devices. The State of Michigan also collects a surcharge on communication devices, a portion of which is returned to the counties to help offset costs.

It is imperative that the NG 9-1-1 ESInets be cost effective and competitive so that no additional costs are placed on Michigan taxpayers. The ability of many types of emergency services to share the ESInet should result in economies of scale. Fair cost allocation methodologies among all stakeholders will need to be developed.

Future work to ensure adequate and appropriate funding to, support the provision of 9-1-1 services should include the historical groundwork already laid here in Michigan, but also look to embrace these key principles:

- Ability to authorize fee assessment and collection process
- A robust, yet flexible means for adjustment of an established rate or rate structure already in place
- Define the mechanism for cost recovery, if necessary and appropriate

#### **4.5.5 Stakeholder Engagement and Communications**

PSAP Administrators must be prepared to handle contingency planning devoid of geographical constraints. PSAPs must develop up front agreements with, at a minimum, neighboring and regional PSAPs, regarding cooperation and protocols.

PSAP and provider network administrators must discuss and codify in written agreements responsibility for design, development, deployment, security, monitoring, and reactive and preventative maintenance.

Database Administrators must develop widely diverse databases inherent in NG 9-1-1 and collaboratively develop service issues resolution and escalation, data quality assurance measures, and security and data rights management.

Public information and education will be critical to the success of the implementation. The expectations of the public must be specifically established and communicated, especially during transitional phases during which 9-1-1 and PSAP capabilities may be “different” in various areas of the state.

#### **4.5.6 Federal Government and Other National Factors**

The Michigan 9-1-1 system will remain compliant with all Federal laws pertaining to 9-1-1 service.

#### **4.5.7 Service and Application Providers**

NG 9-1-1 will introduce new service and application providers as needs for IP connectivity, monitoring, and maintenance evolve.

#### **4.5.8 Infrastructure and Equipment Providers**

NG 9-1-1 will introduce new infrastructure and equipment providers to 9-1-1. The existing legal and regulatory environment will have to be reviewed and revised to allow: 1) architecture and technology neutrality, 2) the potential delivery of new services by non-Local Exchange Carrier service providers, 3) the extension of liability protection to current and future network service providers, and 4) the alignment of new service arrangements, costs, and funding mechanisms to support infrastructure.

#### **4.5.9 Other Emergency Service Providers**

Michigan would have working relationships with (and the ability to seamlessly share data with) other state and federal agencies that provide or support emergency services.

#### **4.5.10 Other related state services**

The Michigan NG 9-1-1 system will be interactive and capable of two way communication, integrating a number of non-public safety private and governmental services, such as suicide hot lines, trauma centers, poison control, road, public works, weather services, and Emergency Management. The ESInet will enable both the PSAPs and the general public to receive real time information, alerts, and warnings.

## 5. GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND MEASURES

The goals of the initial State of Michigan 9-1-1 Plan for the State 9-1-1 Committee are fourfold:

- Efficiently and properly implement the funding systems established in Public Act 32 of 1986, as amended.
- Effectively carry out the development of best practices and model policies for PSAPs, local 9-1-1 governing units, and service providers as set out in Public Act 32 of 1986, as amended.
- Develop a strategy for moving Michigan's 9-1-1 system to a Next Generation 9-1-1 platform that is IP-based and capable of processing 9-1-1 calls on a technology-neutral basis.
- Establish a statewide minimum training standard for 9-1-1 operators and a mechanism to oversee the program.

### 5.1 State of Michigan 9-1-1 Plan Goals and Objectives:

**Objective 1:** Create a system for notice, data collection, reporting, and review of the funding systems established in Secs. 401 and 408 of P.A. 32 of 1986, as amended.

**Completion Date:** August 1, 2010

**Measurement(s):** Revised format for the Annual 9-1-1 Report to the Legislature complete with data in regard to state and local funding revenues for 9-1-1 as well as reporting for the technical aspects of 9-1-1.

**Objective 2:** Recommend, in consultation with PSAPs, the implementation of set operational standards and model policies for PSAP operations, 9-1-1 fund use, service provider 9-1-1 delivery functions, and best practices for 9-1-1 governing authorities.

**Completion Date:** June 30, 2010

**Measurement(s):** Issuance of administrative rules by the MPSC as recommended by the Committee.

**Objective 3:** Establish a written plan for migration from the current 9-1-1 legacy system to a Next Generation IP-based 9-1-1 system that identifies a timeline for implementation, system benefits, potential areas of challenge, and potential funding methods.

**Completion Date:** July 31, 2010

**Measurement(s):** Issuance of a network migration plan and recommendation in the State 9-1-1 Committee's Annual 9-1-1 Report to the Legislature.

**Objective 4:** Develop a program for the implementation of the Committee's Recommended Minimum Standards for Dispatcher Training as adopted by the Committee on December 14, 2007.

**Completion Date:** December 31, 2009

**Measurement(s):** Issuance of administrative rules for dispatcher training by the MPSC as recommended by the Committee.

### 5.2 Tracking Progress

The activity towards the accomplishment of meeting each of the goals and objectives will be included in the State 9-1-1 Administrator's quarterly report to the Committee. This will include an evaluation as to the "on target" status of each goal and objective, and any corrective measures/action plans that may be necessary for any goals or objectives that are not being met. The goals, objectives, and status of each will be included in the Committee's Annual 9-1-1 Report to the Legislature.

## 6. RESOURCE ALLOCATION

The State 9-1-1 Office is under the management of the Michigan State Police, in accordance with PA 244<sup>14</sup> of 2003. The office provides staff necessary to carry out the duties of the State 9-1-1 Committee. The staff includes an administrator, assistant to the administrator, two analysts, and a student assistant.

Currently there are eighty-seven (87) 9-1-1 plans in the state of Michigan (Wayne County has multiple emergency service districts). Each county or emergency service district oversees their 9-1-1 system as written in their plan. The State 9-1-1 Office provides guidance and oversight to the counties and districts. Staff from the office is assigned to assist specific subcommittee and workgroups of the State 9-1-1 Committee.

Much of the work done by the Committee is done via various subcommittees. These subcommittees are composed of subject matter experts from both the public (state and county/PSAP level) and private sector who volunteer their time and expertise, and provide resources to the state at no charge. Existing subcommittees can establish the plan's operational standards, model policies, 9-1-1 fund use, service provider 9-1-1 delivery functions, and best practices for 9-1-1 governing authorities. Since this work is voluntary, no costs can be assessed. The knowledge and background of the subcommittee members are beneficial, and play an important role in the implementation of the plan.

Resource allocation to meet the goals and objectives of the Plan are challenging. Comprehensive planning is needed to identify the additional workload created to fulfill the objectives to develop a system for notification, data collection, reporting, and review of the funding systems. The planning stage of the project must assess needs, rank priorities, identify the number of staff required, costs, and establish a time line for various phases of the project. Until this is completed, it is difficult to determine if the current staff of the State 9-1-1 Office can handle the additional work and if the appropriate expertise are available. The State 9-1-1 Office has access to other state agencies (ie: Management and Budget, Information Technology) that may be able to assist in the implementation of this project.

New Michigan legislation recently enacted attempts to provide stable 9-1-1 funding. The legislation is too new to determine if the projected revenue streams are correct to support the existing 9-1-1 system. As the new plan is implemented, funding and funding allocation may not be adequate. When preparing the operational budget to implement the plan the needs at the state level, as well as the needs of the counties and local PSAP's, must be included. Providing 9-1-1 service to Michigan residents is a county responsibility. The counties and PSAP's may need additional support staff, technical experts, and equipment to meet the plan's goals.

Funding must also be considered for the long-term support of the plan. While funding and funding allocations may be in place at the beginning of the project, it is possible this will change over the course of time. Procedures need to be identified to address these possible changes.

It is important to remember the Plan will be constantly evolving and changing as technology advances and funding mechanisms alter. The State 9-1-1 Committee continues to be proactive in its efforts to ensure 9-1-1 services for the state's residents and visitors, regardless of the format in which the 9-1-1 call is placed.

---

<sup>14</sup> Under PA 244 of 2003, MCL484.1408(4) allowed \$0.005 (½ cent) of the CMRS \$0.29 surcharge to be used by the Michigan State Police to establish the state E9-1-1 coordinator position. Under PA 165 of 2007, MCL484.1408(4)(d) that provision was changed to 1.87% of the state 9-1-1 surcharge to maintain the office of the state 9-1-1 coordinator.

## 7. UPDATING THE PLAN

Prior to 2009, there was no single 9-1-1 plan for the State of Michigan. Each of the state's 83 counties prepared and maintained individual county-level (or in the case of Wayne County, four separate "Emergency Service District") plans.

The State of Michigan 9-1-1 Plan for 2009 was developed by, and will be updated by, the State of Michigan 9-1-1 Committee with assistance from the Committee's Emerging Technology Subcommittee and the State 9-1-1 Administrator. Beginning in 2009, the Plan will be included in the State 9-1-1 Committee's Annual 9-1-1 Report to the Legislature. The Plan will be updated at least every two years following the initial distribution date.

Changes to the plan will be documented in the following manner:

- The Plan is given a new version number following the annual review and update cycle, or following any interim update that was necessary. The number given at that time is a full number, that is; 1.0, 2.0, etc.
- Any changes made to the Plan on an interim cycle are given a fractional number, that is 1.1, 1.2, etc.
- The date field documents the date that the State of Michigan 9-1-1 Committee approved the change, or in the case of an interim administrative change, the date of that change.
- The "description of change" field documents the nature of the change and the page and/or section affected.
- The footers of all revised pages are edited to indicate that the page has been revised and the date of the revision.

## **8. MECHANISM(S) FOR OVERSEEING AND MANAGING THE STATE'S 9-1-1 SYSTEM**

In Michigan the 9-1-1 statute, Public Act 32 (PA 32) of 1986 (as amended), serves as the central oversight mechanism for 9-1-1 in the state. PA 32 sets out the authority for which a 9-1-1 system is enacted, as well minimum requirements of a 9-1-1 system. Under MCL 484.1303 (2)(a)(d) these requirements include: Managerial, Technical, Operational, and Fiscal considerations.

The State 9-1-1 Committee serves as a central coordinating body for 9-1-1 policy and planning. The Committee regularly issues best practices, model policies, and evaluates operational and funding compliance by PSAPs and counties through its compliance review system. By using compliance review, the Certification Subcommittee conducts comprehensive evaluations of local 9-1-1 operations, administration, and funding use. Further information is available at: [www.michigan.gov/etsc](http://www.michigan.gov/etsc).

While the Committee has limited oversight powers, PA 32 currently permits direct oversight for funding use of 9-1-1 surcharges under MCL 484.1408(4)(a). Using this authority, the Committee has established a list of Allowable and Disallowable Wireless and Wireline 9-1-1 Surcharge Expenditures. (In accordance with MCL 484.1401(b)(14), any changes made to the lists' language must be transmitted to the Michigan Legislature 90 days prior to becoming effective.)

Under previous statute, the Committee was required to certify that the counties were in compliance with requirements of Phase I and Phase II wireless deployment. However, upon completion of statewide Phase II deployment at the end of 2005, that requirement has since been migrated to rule making under the Michigan Public Service Commission (MPSC). The MPSC, in consultation with the State 9-1-1 Committee, may promulgate rules for uniform procedures, policies, and standards for the receipt and expenditure of 9-1-1 funds. [Sec. 413(1)(c)]

The State 9-1-1 Committee is also required to issue an annual report to the Michigan Legislature and Governor as to the status of 9-1-1 in Michigan. The report is a comprehensive accounting of the status of 9-1-1 in the state. All reports issued since 2000 are available through the Committee's web site at: [www.michigan.gov/etsc](http://www.michigan.gov/etsc).

Any further oversight mechanisms for the forward movement into NG 9-1-1 are pending the Michigan NG 9-1-1 study and the adoption of selected recommendations by the Committee and the Legislature.

As described throughout this plan, the State 9-1-1 Committee and the processes it uses to guide the Michigan 9-1-1 system is inclusive at all levels, and encourages the participation of all stakeholders in Michigan's 9-1-1 community.

## 9. MECHANISM FOR INITIATING AND MONITORING AN IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT

Michigan's Landline E9-1-1 and Wireless E9-1-1(Phases I and II) implementation projects have been completed. These projects were conducted on a countywide or Emergency Service District level (i.e., Wayne County has four such districts).

The focus of the 2009 Plan will be the implementation of a Next Generation 9-1-1 E9-1-1 system (frequently referred to as an internet protocol [IP] based 9-1-1 system).

The projects will be initiated and monitored by the respective County/District 9-1-1 Coordinators, State 9-1-1 Committee, and the State 9-1-1 Administrator. Based on the solution selected, the future progress of the system's components will be tracked by the State 9-1-1 Committee, the State 9-1-1 Subcommittee, and included in the State 9-1-1 Committee's Annual 9-1-1 Report to the Legislature.

Roles of the State 9-1-1 Committee and State 9-1-1 Administrator are outlined in Michigan's 9-1-1 statute (PA 32 of 1986 [as amended]):

Excerpts from Michigan's **EMERGENCY 9-1-1 SERVICE ENABLING ACT:**

### **484.1712 Emergency 9-1-1 service committee; creation; purpose; authority and duties.**

Sec. 712. An emergency 9-1-1 service committee is created within the department of state police to develop statewide standards and model system considerations and make other recommendations for emergency telephone services. The committee shall only have the authority and duties granted to the committee under this act.

### **484.1714 Duties of committee; staff assistance.**

Sec. 714. (1) The committee shall do all of the following:

- (a) Organize and adopt standards governing the committee's formal and informal procedures.
- (b) Meet not less than 4 times per year at a place and time specified by the chairperson.
- (c) Keep a record of the proceedings and activities of the committee.
- (d) Provide recommendations to public safety answering points and secondary public safety answering points on statewide technical and operational standards for PSAPs and secondary PSAPs.
- (e) Provide recommendations to public agencies concerning model systems to be considered in preparing a 9-1-1 service plan.
- (f) Perform all duties as required under this act relating to the development, implementation, operation, and funding of 9-1-1 systems in this state.

### **484.1601 Technical assistance and assistance in resolving dispute.**

Sec. 601. The emergency 9-1-1 service committee created in section 712, upon request by a service supplier, county, public agency, or public service agency, shall provide, to the extent possible, technical assistance regarding the formulation or implementation, or both, of a 9-1-1 service plan and assistance in resolving a dispute between or among a service supplier, county, public agency, or public safety agency regarding their respective rights and duties under this act.

The State 9-1-1 Office has contracted with the Kimball Corp. to perform a feasibility study for the IP system, including PSAP surveys and current equipment inventories, with PSAPs in the state. Kimball will also present a recommendation to the State 9-1-1 Committee in December of 2009 for the type of IP system(s) to be implemented. Once the State 9-1-1 Committee has accepted a solution, the Plan will be modified to reflect further mechanisms for implementation and monitoring, if necessary.

## 10. CONCLUSION

This 9-1-1 Plan provides a road map for the future direction of Michigan 9-1-1. As each section has outlined, the process is accountable, proactive, and designed to move the 9-1-1 system forward.

The State 9-1-1 Committee recognizes that NG 9-1-1 architecture supports an interconnected system of local, regional, and state emergency services networks, and will ultimately expand to cover the entire nation. Effective interconnection requires effective statewide planning and coordination, *as well as* effective interstate planning and coordination.

The State 9-1-1 Committee, through this plan - and the Committee's inclusive process - will move forward in its work to develop recommendations to drive NG 9-1-1 forward. The Committee recognizes that changes in the state's 9-1-1 statutory and network environment may need to be changed. To that end, this plan will be a dynamic document that is capable of reflecting those changes.

As reflected in the section on Goals and Objectives, the Committee also recognizes that, in addition to NG 9-1-1, other goals such as minimum standards for dispatcher training, standard PSAP operational policies, and reporting requirements are also elements in making progress in 9-1-1. The Committee has created and adopted this plan, not to simply outline the need and plan for technical progress, but operational progress as well.

In conclusion, the purpose of this plan is to outline the process toward a NG 9-1-1 and to address operational issues that the State 9-1-1 Committee recognizes as key to successful overall delivery of 9-1-1 in the state. As it has done in the past, the Committee will continue to facilitate Michigan's 9-1-1 legacy of progress and adaptability as we move into the new challenges facing 9-1-1 in the future.

## APPENDIX A - ACRONYMS

- ALI – automatic location identification
- APCO – Association of Public Safety Communications Officials
- CAD – computer-aided dispatch
- CLEC – Competitive Local Exchange Carrier
- CPA – Certified Public Accounting/Accountant
- CPE – customer premises equipment
- EAP –Employee Assistance Program
- EMS – Emergency Medical Services
- ESInet – Emergency Services Internet Protocol enabled network
- GIS – geographic information system
- ILEC – Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier
- IP – Internet Protocol
- LEC – Local Exchange Carrier
- LEIN – Law Enforcement Information Network
- MLTS – multiple line telephone system
- MPSC – Michigan Public Service Commission
- MSAG – master street address guide
- MSP – Michigan State Police
- NENA – National Emergency Number Association
- NG – Next Generation
- PSAP – public safety answering point
- SIP – Session Initiation Protocol
- VoIP – Voice over Internet Protocol

## APPENDIX B - ALLOWABLE AND DISALLOWABLE USAGE OF 9-1-1 SURCHARGE FUNDS

BY WAY OF EXAMPLE, BUT NOT LIMITATION, THE FOLLOWING COSTS ARE ALLOWABLE OR DISALLOWABLE (as approved by the State 9-1-1 Committee on June 23, 2009):

### ALLOWABLE USAGE OF 9-1-1 SURCHARGE EXPENDITURES

**Personnel Costs** directly attributable to the delivery of 9-1-1 service (i.e.; directors, supervisors, dispatchers, call-takers, technical staff, support staff): salaries, MSAG coordination, uniforms, fringe benefits, addressing/database, EAP

**Note:** If 9-1-1 staff serves dual functions (i.e.; a director who is also in charge of Emergency Management, a dispatcher who is also a police officer) then only those portions of personnel costs attributable to their 9-1-1 functions should be allowable.

**Facility Costs** of the dispatch center directly attributable to the delivery of 9-1-1 service: capital improvements for construction, remodeling, or expansion of dispatch center, electrical/heat/AC/water, fire suppression system, cleaning, maintenance, trash removal, telephone, generator/UPS and grounding insurance, office supplies, printing and copying, furniture

**Note:** If a shared facility, only those portions of facility costs attributable to the 9-1-1 functions should be allowable.

**Training and Memberships** directly related to 9-1-1 service:

On the job training, vendor provided training, conferences, travel and lodging as necessary, membership in associations (APCO, NENA, etc.)

**Hardware, software, connectivity and peripherals** directly attributable to the delivery of 9-1-1 service:

Customer Premise Equipment, Remote CPE Hardware/Modems, Computer-Aided Dispatch, Radio system (consoles, infrastructure, field equipment), LEIN costs for dispatch purposes, Paging System, pagers and related costs, Voice logging equipment, Mobile Data Systems, GIS/Mapping Systems/AVL Systems, Alarms/Security Systems, Connectivity for any of the above, Maintenance and service agreements of above Software licensing of the above, Associated database costs

**Vehicle costs (staff vehicle, pool car, mileage reimbursement, fuel, etc.)** directly attributable to the delivery of 9-1-1 service:

Travel for meetings, training, conferences, travel for MSAG verification and testing, travel for 9-1-1 Public Education purposes

**Professional Services**

Attorneys, Consultants, Insurance, Architects, Auditor

**Public Information/Education Expenses** directly attributable to the delivery of 9-1-1 service.

**Miscellaneous**

**THE BELOW DISALLOWABLE EXPENSES ARE MEANT TO SERVE AS EXAMPLES ONLY - PLEASE REFER TO THE STATE 9-1-1 COMMITTEE APPEALS PROCESS FOR QUESTIONS.**

**Personnel Costs** of law enforcement, fire, and EMS responders, emergency management staff, shared support or technical staff, except for portions of time directly functioning as 9-1-1 allowable staff.

**Facility Costs** of law enforcement, fire, EMS, emergency management, or other municipal facilities, except for that portion housing the 9-1-1 center or back-up center, or leased to the 9-1-1 center for allowable training or meeting facilities.

Capital costs and furnishing for facilities for which the primary purpose is other than 9-1-1 (i.e.; a conference room used primarily for the City Council but occasionally leased/loaned to the 9-1-1 center for meetings).

**Training** for staff not involved directly in the delivery of 9-1-1 service, or for any staff for courses not directly attributable to 9-1-1 or dispatching services. **Memberships** for staff not involved directly in the delivery of 9-1-1 service, or for associations with a primary purpose other than public safety communications (i.e., sheriff's associations, police or fire chief associations, etc.)

**Hardware, software, connectivity and peripherals** not attributable to the delivery of 9-1-1 service: Law Enforcement Record Management Systems, Fire Records Management Systems, EMS Records Management Systems, Jail Records Management Systems, LEIN costs for non-9-1-1 functions (e.g., Records Unit), word processing, databases, etc. not directly, attributable to 9-1-1 service, GIS not directly related to the delivery of 9-1-1 service, court information systems, connectivity for any of the above, maintenance and service agreements for any of the above, software licensing for any of the above, Non-Emergency N-1-1 Systems.

**Vehicle costs (fleet vehicle, pool car, mileage reimbursement, etc.)** for law enforcement, fire, or EMS responders, such as patrol cars, fire apparatus, ambulances, etc.

**Professional Services** not directly attributable to the delivery of 9-1-1 service.

**Public Information** not directly attributable to the delivery of 9-1-1 service.

**Miscellaneous:** road signs/addressing implements.

**Range of 9-1-1 User Fees**  
Exact amounts may be adjusted locally (July, 2010)

State	Wireline	Wireless	VoIP
Alabama	5% of Base Rate \$2.00 (Max) – Districts under 25,000	\$0.70	5% of Base Rate \$2.00 (Max) – Districts under 25,000
Alaska	\$0.50 - \$2.00	\$0.50 - \$2.00	
Arizona	\$0.20	\$0.20	\$0.20
Arkansas	5% - 12% of Tariff Rates	\$0.65	\$0.65
California	.50% of intrastate calls	.50% of intrastate calls	.50% of intrastate calls
Colorado	\$0.43 - \$1.50 (max)	\$0.43 - \$1.50 (max)	\$0.43 - \$1.50 (max)
Connecticut	\$0.47	\$0.47	\$0.47
Delaware	\$0.60	\$0.60	\$0.60
District of Columbia	\$0.76 Wireline \$0.62 Centrex \$4.96 PBX Trunk	\$0.76	\$0.76
Florida	\$0.41 – \$0.50	\$0.50	\$0.50
Georgia	\$1.50	\$1.00 - \$1.50	\$1.50
Hawaii	\$0.27	\$0.66	
Idaho	\$1.00 (max)	\$1.00 (max)	\$1.00 (max)
Illinois	\$0.25 - \$5.00	\$0.73 \$2.50 City of Chicago \$0.73 Prepaid	
Indiana	3% or 10% of Monthly Access	\$0.50 \$0.25 Prepaid	3% or 10% of Monthly Access
Iowa	\$0.45 - \$1.50	\$0.65	
Kansas	\$0.75 (max)	\$0.50	\$0.50
Kentucky	\$0.36 - \$4.50	\$0.70	
Louisiana	\$0.62 - \$1.00 Residential \$1.30 - \$2.00 Business	\$0.85 2% of Retail Sales - Prepaid	
Maine	\$0.37	\$0.37 \$0.37 Prepaid	\$0.37
Maryland	\$0.75 County Fee \$0.25 State Fee	\$0.75 County Fee \$0.25 State Fee	\$0.75 County Fee \$0.25 State Fee
Massachusetts	\$0.75	\$0.75 \$0.75 Prepaid	\$0.75
Michigan	\$0.19 State Fee \$0.18 - \$3.00 by County	\$0.19 State Fee \$0.18 - \$3.00 by County	\$0.19 State Fee \$0.18 - \$3.00 by County
Minnesota	\$0.75	\$0.75	\$0.75
Mississippi	\$1.00 Res \$2.00 Commercial (25 Lines)	\$1.00	

Missouri	15% of Base Rate (33 Counties) .5% of Sales Tax (23 Counties) Varies Funding Methods – Remaining Counties	None	
Montana	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$1.00
Nebraska	\$0.50 - \$1.00	\$0.50 - \$0.70	
Nevada	Varies by Jurisdiction – Property tax and/or Surcharge (max \$0.25)	Must be equal to wireline Surcharge	
New Hampshire	\$0.57	\$0.57	
New Jersey	\$0.90	\$0.90	\$0.90
New Mexico	\$0.51	\$0.51	
New York	\$0.35	\$1.20 - \$1.50	
North Carolina	\$0.60	\$0.60	\$0.60
North Dakota	\$1.00 - \$1.50 (max)	\$1.00 - \$1.50 (max)	\$1.00 – 1.50 (max)
Ohio	\$0.50 (Max) (Legally limited to a few Counties, no general surcharge.	\$0.28	
Oklahoma	3-15% of Base Rate	\$0.50 (Approx. 42 Counties)	\$0.50
Oregon	\$0.75	\$0.75	\$0.75
Pennsylvania	\$1.00 - \$1.50	\$1.00	\$1.00
Rhode Island	\$1.00	\$1.26	\$1.26
South Carolina	Based on access lines	\$0.61	
South Dakota	\$0.75	\$0.75	\$0.75
Tennessee	\$0.65 - \$1.50 Res./ \$2.00 - \$3 Bus	\$1.00	\$1.00
Texas	\$0.50 State Program Fees Vary – District	\$0.50	\$0.50
Utah	\$0.61 Local Fee plus \$0.08 State Fee	\$0.61 Local Fee plus \$0.08 State Fee	\$0.61 Local Fee plus \$0.08 State Fee
Vermont	Universal Service Funding	Universal Service Funding	
Virginia	\$0.75	\$0.75	\$0.75
Washington	\$0.20 Statewide \$0.50 by Counties	\$0.20 Statewide \$0.50 by Counties	
West Virginia	\$0.98 - \$5.34 by County	\$3.00 6% of Sales - Prepaid	\$0.98 - \$5.34 by County
Wisconsin	\$0.36 - \$1.00	None	
Wyoming	\$0.75	\$0.75	

**State 9-1-1 Committee**  
**2010 Annual Report to the Michigan Legislature**  
**GLOSSARY**

- 9-1-1** A three-digit telephone number to facilitate the reporting of an emergency requiring response by a public safety agency.
- 9-1-1 Network** Literally, the dedicated circuits, and switching components used to transport voice from the originating central office, PBX, or other equivalent point to the 9-1-1 controller unit at the PSAP.
- 9-1-1 Service** The delivery of 9-1-1 dialed calls from the originating switch to the PSAP call taker, with associated delivery of ANI and ALI data.
- 9-1-1 System** The set of network, database and CPE components required to provide 9-1-1 service.
- ALI** **Automatic Location Identification** The automatic display at the PSAP of the caller's telephone number, the address/location of the telephone and supplementary emergency services information.
- ANI** **Automatic Number Identification** Telephone number associated with the access line from which a call originates.
- Analog** As applied to 9-1-1, call transport using signaling involving a physical change, such as voltage or frequency. Analog trunking using multi-frequency tones (MF).
- APCO** **Association of Public Safety Communications Officials** The Association of Public Safety Communications Officials – International, Inc. is a not-for-profit professional organization dedicated to the enhancement of public safety communications. APCO exists to serve the people who manage, operate, maintain and supply the communications systems.
- AR** **Alternate Routing** A standard feature provided to allow E9-1-1 calls to be routed to a designated alternate location if **(1)** all E9-1-1 exchange lines to the primary PSAP are busy, or **(2)** the primary PSAP is closed down for a period of time (night service).
- ACN** **Automatic Collision Notification** A service provided by vendors such as OnStar and ATX that allows sensors in vehicles to automatically initiate a call to a central answering point upon specific levels of vehicle impact, air bag deployment, etc.
- Basic 9-1-1** An emergency telephone system, which automatically connects 9-1-1 callers to a designated answering point. Call routing is determined by originating central office only. Basic 9-1-1 may or may not support ANI and/or ALI.
- CAS** **Call Associated Signaling**
- CTIA** **Cellular Telecommunications and Internet Association** The Cellular Telecommunications and Internet Association is the international organization that represents all elements of wireless communication – cellular, personal communication services, enhanced specialized mobile radio, and mobile satellite services – serving the interests of service providers, manufacturers, and others.
- CMRS** **Commercial Mobile Radio Service** Includes all of the following:
- 1) A wireless 2-way communication device, including a radio telephone used in cellular telephone service or personal communication service.
  - 2) A functional equivalent of a radio telephone communications line used in cellular telephone service or personal communication service.
  - 3) A network radio access line.
- CMRS Connection** Each number assigned to a CMRS customer.

**Company Identifier (Company ID)** A 3 to 5 character identifier chosen by the Local Exchange Carrier that distinguishes the entity providing dial tone to the end user. The Company Identifier is maintained by NENA in a nationally accessible database.

**Consolidated Dispatch** A countywide or regional emergency dispatch service that provides dispatch service for 75% or more of the law enforcement, fire fighting, emergency medical service, and other emergency service agencies within the geographical area of a 9-1-1 service district or serves 75% or more of the population within a 9-1-1 service district.

**CBN** **Callback Number** The VoIP subscriber's telephone number.

**CRN** **Contingency routing number** A 10-digit, 7x24 PSAP emergency telephone number. Used for fallback routing if a call cannot be routed through the selective router to the PSAP.

**Data Base** An organized collection of information, typically stored in computer systems, comprised of fields, records (data) and indexes. In 9-1-1, such databases include master street address guide (MSAG), telephone number/emergency service number (ESN), and telephone customer records.

**Database Service Provider** A service supplier who maintains and supplies or contracts to maintain and supply an ALI database or a MSAG.

**Dedicated Trunk** A telephone circuit used for a single purpose such as transmission of 9-1-1 calls.

**DR** **Default Routing** The capability to route a 9-1-1 call to a designated (default) PSAP when the incoming 9-1-1 call cannot be selectively routed due to an ANI failure or other cause.

**EMS** **Emergency Medical Service** The emergency medical response group established under the Emergency Medical Systems Act of 1972.

**ESN** **Emergency Service Number** A number defining the primary PSAP and up to 5 secondary PSAPs serving a particular telephone number. It is used in conjunction with the selective routing feature of E9-1-1 service.

**ESZ** **Emergency Service Zone** The designation assigned by a county to each street name and address range that identifies which emergency response service is responsible for responding to an exchange access facility's premises.

**Emergency Telephone Charge** Emergency telephone operation charge and emergency telephone technical charge.

**Emergency Telephone District** The area in which 9-1-1 service is provided or is planned to be provided to service users under a 9-1-1 system implemented under this act. Also referred to as "9-1-1 service district."

**Emergency Telephone District Board** The governing body created by the board of commissioners of the county or counties with authority over an emergency telephone district.

**Emergency Telephone Operation Charge** A charge for non network technical equipment and other costs directly related to the dispatch facility and the operation of 1 or more PSAPs including, but not limited to, the costs of dispatch personnel and radio equipment necessary to provide 2-way communication between PSAPs and a public safety agency. Emergency telephone operation charge does not include non-PSAP related costs such as response vehicles and other personnel.

**ETSC** **Emergency Telephone Service Committee** A committee created within the department of state police to develop statewide standards and model system considerations and make other recommendations for emergency telephone services.

**Emergency Telephone Technical Charge** A charge for the network start-up costs, customer notification costs, billing costs including an allowance for uncollectibles for technical and operation charges, and

network nonrecurring and recurring installation, maintenance, service, and equipment charges of a service supplier providing 9-1-1 service under this act.

- E9-1-1 Enhanced 9-1-1** An emergency telephone system which includes network switching, database and CPE elements capable of providing Selective Routing, Selective Transfer, Fixed Transfer, ANI and ALI.
- ESGW Emergency services gateway** A component, residing in the VoIP service provider's network, Responsible or integrating the SIP network with the emergency services network and routing 9-1-1 calls to the appropriate selective router, based on the ESRN/ESQK it receives from the regional call server on the 9-1-1 call server.
- ESME Emergency services message entity** The ESME routes and processes the out-of-band messages related to emergency calls. This functionality is sometimes incorporated into the ALI database engine of a selective router.
- ESNE Emergency Services network entity** The ESNE routes and processes the voice band portion of the emergency call. The ESNE is composed of selective routers, which are also known as routing, bridging and transfer switches.
- ESQK Emergency Services query key** A digit string that uniquely identifies an ongoing emergency services call and is used to correlate the emergency services call with the associated data messages. It may also identify an emergency services zone and may be used to route the call through the network. Similar to an ESRK in wireless E9-1-1 networks.
- ESRN Emergency Services routing number** A 10-digit number that specifies the selective router to be used to route a call.
- Final 9-1-1 Service Plan** A tentative 9-1-1 service plan that has been modified only to reflect necessary changes resulting from any exclusions of public agencies from the 9-1-1 service district of the tentative 9-1-1 service plan under section 306 and any failure of public safety agencies to be designated as PSAPs or secondary PSAPs under section 307.
- First Responder** Police, fire or medial resource who is dispatched to handle 9-1-1 calls and deliver emergency services.
- HCAS Hybrid CAS** a combination of CAS (Call Associated Signaling) and NCAS (Non Call Associated Signaling).
- Hypertext Link** A way to connect two Internet resources via a simple word or phrase on which a user can click to start the connection, and easily access cross-references.
- ISDN Integrated Services Digital Network** A digital interface providing multiple channels for simultaneous functions between the network and CPE.
- Internet Protocol Telephony** Blending of voice, data, and video using Internet Protocol for each, across the Internet or other existing IP-based LANs and WANs, effectively collapsing three previously separate networks into one.
- I2 NENA defined VoIP solution** I2 routes VoIP calls into the current E9-1-1 systems and to the correct PSAP with correct ANI and ALI. I2 accommodates both stationary and nomadic users and provides MSAG valid location information and provides a method for nomadic user location either through an automated process or user input via a service prompted web based form or equivalent. Intended migratory path from i1.
- I3 NENA defined VoIP phase E9-1-1 solution** Also referred to as Long Term, Next Generation 9-1-1. enables end to end IP based E9-1-1 design, supporting VoIP originated call delivery and the transition of current wireline and wireless service providers to IP interface technology. Support IP mobility users, and all capabilities of I2. Utilizes extended capabilities of IP to provide location and other information with the call, as well as other sub-sets of relevant.

- Lat/Lon Latitude and Longitude** Latitude and Longitude are a coordinate system by means of which the position or location of any place on the earth's surface can be described. Also known as x,y.
- LEC Local Exchange Carrier** A Telecommunications Carrier (TC) under the state/local Public Utilities Act that provide local exchange telecommunications services. Also know as Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers (ILECs), Alternate Local Exchange Carriers (ALECs), Competitive Local Exchange Carriers (CLECs), Competitive Access Providers (CAPs), and Local Service Providers (LSPs)
- LNP Local Number Portability** A process by which a telephone number may be reassigned from one Local Exchange Carrier to another.
- LRO Last routing option** Routing information sent by the VPC that provides a "last chance" destination for a call, for example the CRN or a routing number associated with a national call center.
- MSAG Master Street Address Guide** A perpetual database that contains information continuously provided by a service district that defines the geographic area of the service district and includes an alphabetical list of street names, the range of address numbers on each street, the names of each community in the service district, the emergency service zone of each service user, and the primary service answering point identification codes.
- Mobile Subscriber** A subscriber who uses a wireless device that can be in motion during the call. Wireless Fidelity (WiFi) VoIP is expected to eventually allow the end user to take a home-based telephony connection and roam within an interconnected wireless network, much as cellular technologies allow today.
- NASNA National Association of State Nine One One Administrators** The National Association of State Nine One One Administrators is a not-for-profit corporation of full time state 9-1-1 coordinators whose primary responsibility is to administer 9-1-1 programs in their respective states. NASNA members review public policy issues, federal regulations, technology issues and funding mechanisms that impact 9-1-1 delivery.
- NENA National Emergency Number Association** The National Emergency Number Association is a not-for-profit corporation established in 1982 to further the goal of "One Nation—One Number." NENA is a networking source and promotes research, planning and training. NENA strives to educate, set standards and provide certification programs, legislative representation and technical assistance for implementing and managing 9-1-1 systems.
- NCAS Non Call Associated Signaling**
- Nomadic Subscriber** A subscriber who uses a device that is static during a call but does not have a static IP address assigned to it. Nomadic subscribers use Internet Service Provider (ISP) VoIP, which allows the end user to establish a telecommunications connection wherever he or she can obtain an Internet-based connection to her ISP provider.
- PBX Private Branch Exchange** A smaller version of the phone company central switching office, usually privately owned by a non-telephone business. A PBX connects to the larger telephone network for external call handling, and usually requires dialing an access digit such as 9 or 8 to make an external call.
- Phase I Wireless E9-1-1 Service** dispatch center receives call back number of the wireless phone used to dial 9-1-1 and the location of the cell site used to handle the call.
- Phase II Wireless E9-1-1 Service** dispatch center receives specific location information of the wireless caller dialing 9-1-1, within parameters set by the Federal Communications Commission.
- Primary PSAP** A PSAP to which 9-1-1 calls are routed directly from the 9-1-1 Control Office. (See PSAP below.)
- Public Safety Agency** An entity that provides fire fighting, law enforcement, emergency medical, or other emergency service.

- PSAP** **Public Safety Answering Point** A facility equipped and staffed to receive 9-1-1 calls. A Primary PSAP receives the calls directly. If the call is relayed or transferred, the next receiving PSAP is designated a Secondary PSAP.
- PSTN** **Public switched telephone network** The international telephone system based on copper wires carrying analog voice data.
- Redundancy** Duplication of components, running in parallel, to increase reliability.
- Relay Method** A PSAP notes pertinent information and relays it by telephone, radio, or private line to the appropriate public safety agency or other provider of emergency services that has an available emergency service unit located closest to the request for emergency service for dispatch of an emergency service unit.
- Secondary PSAP Answering Point** A communications facility of a public safety agency or private safety entity that receives 9-1-1 calls by the transfer method only and generally serves as a centralized location for a particular type of emergency call.
- SR** **Selective Routing** The routing of a 9-1-1 call to the proper PSAP based upon the location of the caller.
- Selective Router** The node in the emergency services network that performs enhances call routing for 9-1-1 calls. Usually operated by the LEC.
- Service Provider** An entity providing one or more of the following 9-1-1 elements: network, CPE, or database service.
- Service Supplier** A person providing a telephone service or a CMRS to a service user in this state.
- Service User** An exchange access facility or CMRS service customer of a service supplier within a 9-1-1 system.
- SS7** **CCS7** **Signaling System 7 (SS7)/Common Channel Signaling (CCS7)** An inter-office signaling network separate from the voice path network, utilizing high-speed data transmission to accomplish call processing. (The Public Switched Telephone Network is in the process of upgrading from MF Signaling to SS7.)
- SIP** **Session Initiation Protocol** SIP is the IP-based protocol defined in IETF RFCs 3261 and 2543. SIP is one of the two dominant messaging protocols used by the VoIP industry.
- SNC** **State 9-1-1 Committee** Effective at its June 24, 2008 meeting, the Emergency Telephone Service Committee changed its name to reflect current systems and technology. Its original creation and purpose remains the same.
- Switch** Telephone company facility where subscriber lines or interswitch trunks are joined to switching equipment for connecting subscribers to each other, locally or long distance.
- Static Subscriber** A subscriber who uses a device that is static during a call and has a static IP address assigned to it. Static subscribers use cable and DSL VoIP, often deployed in static configurations in which the end user stays at a fixed location and uses the standard North American Numbering Plan. Examples of this service include residential landline replacements using cable or DSL connections.
- Tariff** The rate approved by the Public Service Commission for 9-1-1 service provided by a particular service supplier. Tariff does not include a rate of a commercial mobile radio service by a particular supplier.
- Telecommunicator** As used in 9-1-1, a person who is trained and employed in public safety telecommunications. The term applies to call takers, dispatchers, radio operators, data terminal operators or any combination of such functions in a PSAP.

**Tentative 9-1-1 Service Plan** A plan prepared by 1 or more counties for implementing a 9-1-1 system in a specified 9-1-1 service district.

**Transfer Method** A PSAP transfer the 9-1-1 call directly to the appropriate public safety agency or other provider of emergency service that has an available emergency service unit located closest to the request for emergency service for dispatch of an emergency service unit.

**Trunk** Typically, a communication path between central office switches, or between the 9-1-1 Control Office and the PSAP.

**Universal Emergency Number Service** Public telephone service that provides service users with the ability to reach a public safety answering point by dialing the digits "9-1-1." Also referred to as "9-1-1 Service."

**Universal Emergency Number Service System** A system for providing 9-1-1 service under P.A. 80 of 1999. Also referred to as "9-1-1 System."

**(911) System Service Provider** The entity that manages, maintains and provides various 9-1-1 elements such as ALI database, MSAG to Public Safety Answering Points. This function is often performed by the LEC.

**V-E2** **An extension to the E2 ALI interface (specified in TIA J-STD-036)** V-E2 is defined by the NENA VoIP Location Working Group. V-E2 provides support for a "VoIP" class-of-service indicator in the response message from the VPC to the ALI.

**VoIP** **Voice Over Internet Protocol** VoIP is a system for providing telephone service over the internet.

**VoIP Provider** A generic term to describe a company that provides VoIP call services. Some VoIP providers provide direct service to the consumer (VoIP service providers). Others provide backbone and PSTN access services (VoIP carriers). Still others provide ESGW (ESGW operators). Some VoIP providers provide more than one of these Services

**VPC** **VoIP positioning center** The application that determines the appropriate PSAP, based on the VoIP subscriber's position, returns associated routing instructions to the VoIP network, and provides the caller's location and the callback number to the PSAP through the ALI.

**Wireless** A phone system that operates locally without wires, using radio links for call transport.

**Wireless Emergency Service Order** The order of the Federal Communications Commission. FCC docket No. 94-102, adopted June 12, 1996, with an effective date of October 1, 1996.

**Wireless Phase I** Required by FCC Report and Order 96-264 pursuant to Notice of Proposed Rule making (NPRM) 94-102. The delivery of a wireless 9-1-1 call with callback number and identification of the cell-sector from which the call originated. Call routing is determined by cell-sector. (Target date April 1998.)

**Wireless Phase II** Required by FCC Report and Order 96-264 pursuant to Notice of Proposed Rule making (NPRM) 94-102. The delivery of a wireless 9-1-1 call with Phase I requirements plus location of the caller within 100 meters 67% of the time for network-based caller location systems and within 50 meters 67% of the time for handset-based location systems. (Target start date October 2001.)

**Wireless Telecommunications** The family of Telecommunications services under the heading of Commercial Mobile Radio Service. Includes Cellular, Personal Communications Services (PCS), Mobile Satellite Services (MSS) and Enhanced Specialized Mobile Radio (ESMR).

**Wireline** The transmission of speech or data using wired connections.