

STATE 911 COMMITTEE
Emerging Technology Subcommittee
July 17, 2013
Conference Call
Meeting Minutes

I. Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 10 a.m. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present.

Voting Members Present:

Ms. April Heinze (Chair)
Ms. Pat Anderson
Ms. Marsha Bianconi
Ms. Patricia Coates
Mr. Bob Currier
Mr. Todd Jones
Mr. Mike Muskovin
Mr. John Hunt
Mr. Carl Rodabaugh

Representing:

NENA
AT&T
Conference of Western Wayne
CLEMIS
Intrado
Advanced Wireless Telecom
Motorola
TCS
Midland County Central Dispatch

Non-Voting Member Present:

Ms. Harriet Miller-Brown
Ms. Theresa Hart

Representing:

Michigan State Police
Michigan State Police

II. Approval of Meeting Minutes

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Marsha Bianconi and supported by Mr. Bob Currier to approve the minutes of the December 19, 2012, meeting. A vote was taken, the **MOTION** carried.

III. Old Business

There was no Old Business to report.

IV. New Business

a. New Committee Members

Ms. April Heinze explained that the committee had lost several subcommittee members from the PSAP side. She had received a letter of interest from Mr. Carl Rodabaugh from Midland County Central Dispatch. He was interested in serving on the Emerging Technology Subcommittee and Sheriff Gribler approved the request. Ms. Heinze welcomed Mr. Rodabaugh and he provided the Committee with a brief overview of his background and experience. He is currently the IT administrator at Midland County Central Dispatch and has held that position for about ten years.

b. State Plan Updates

Ms. Heinze explained that it is time to update the State 911 Plan. Volunteers are needed to review sections of the plan; Ms. Marsha Bianconi, Ms. Pat Coates and Mr. Bob Currier volunteered. The State 911 Plan will be emailed to the committee members in Word format and they were asked to track any changes they make before e-mailing it back to the entire group. The volunteer group will be reviewing Sections 3, 5, 8, and 9. Ms. Miller-Brown will review Section 6, and Ms. Pat Anderson will review Section 4. The table of contents will remain the same. Updates to the plan are due in September. The recommended updates to the document will be reviewed at the next meeting in August.

c. U.P. NG911 Project

Ms. Pat Anderson explained that in May there was information sent out to the CLECs and the ILECs by Peninsula Fiber Network (PFN) that stated the U.P. counties had chosen PFN to be their 911 service provider. Shortly after, there was a call with PFN and the CLECs, and at that point they provided two documents, the letters of authorization and the county resolutions. It appears that in the resolutions, the counties are naming PFN as their primary 911 service provider through administrative findings. Ms. Anderson questioned if this is

something that can be done through administrative findings. Ms. Miller-Brown stated when counties open up their plans they are not required to file them with the State 911 Committee. Ms. Anderson said there is a statement in one of the resolutions that states the charge for the NextGen Network is currently funded through a technical surcharge collected by the State on both wireline and wireless phones. Is PFN eligible to remit all of their costs related to the selective routers to the fund so there will be no cost to the county for this service? Further, the fiber network is capable of delivering 911 data to our dispatch centers.

The question was asked if state law allows PFN to be a 911 provider if they are not recognized as a CLEC and they do not have a 911 tariff. Ms. Anderson stated that PFN has filed as a CLEC but she does not know if they have customers and she also wondered if they will need a tariff to provide 911.

Another concern she had was if they are building a NextGen Network, how can it be funded on old generation technology and landline customers. The technical fee is only collected on landline customers and there may be some confusion with PFN. Several other questions arose regarding the routing system to the IP network and the expectation to pay for it out of the technical funds.

Ms. Heinze asked if this was something that should be handled by this committee or should it be referred to the Legislative Action Subcommittee (LAS). The committee reviewed the statute for guidance on the technical charge and the need for county plans to be updated.

Ms. Miller-Brown will refer the matter to Mr. Hal Martin, legal counsel, regarding the technical surcharge, the current legislation, and also if the counties need to amend their plans. She asked for input to frame up the questions with bullet points so they can be forwarded to Mr. Martin for his interpretation. She asked other committee members to forward any questions they may have. All questions should be e-mailed to Ms. Miller-Brown and Ms. Heinze. Ms. Miller-Brown said the Policy Committee could address this issue as well as possibly referring the matter to the Public Service Commission. Ms. Heinze stated this information will also be reported back to the SNC.

- d. Plan for Text to 9-1-1 Deployment
Due to time constraints, this item was postponed for discussion at the next meeting.

V. Next Meeting

A conference call will be scheduled for early August, possibly on August 8, once everyone has had the chance to check their calendar. Ms. Heinze will send out a notice to the Committee members.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m.