

STATE 911 COMMITTEE
Emerging Technology Subcommittee

August 8, 2013
Conference Call
Meeting Minutes

I. Roll Call

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

Voting Members Present:

Ms. April Heinze (Chair)
Ms. Pat Anderson
Ms. Patricia Coates
Mr. Bob Currier
Mr. Todd Jones
Mr. John Hunt
Ms. Sarah Taylor
Mr. Carl Rodabaugh
Ms. Lisa Beth Harvey

Representing:

NENA
AT&T
CLEMIS
Intrado
Advanced Wireless Telecom
TCS
Washtenaw County Office of the Sheriff
Midland County Central Dispatch
Livingston County Central Dispatch

Non-Voting Members Present:

Ms. Harriet Miller-Brown
Ms. Stacie Hansel

Representing:

Michigan State Police
Michigan State Police

Voting Members Absent:

Ms. Marsha Bianconi
Mr. Mike Muskovin

Representing:

Conference of Western Wayne
Motorola

II. New Committee Members

Ms. Heinze welcomed new members Ms. Sarah Taylor from Washtenaw County Central Dispatch and Ms. Lisa Beth Harvey from Livingston County Central Dispatch. Each brings PSAP and technical experience.

III. Approval of Meeting Minutes

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Patricia Coates, with support by Mr. Bob Currier, to approve the minutes of the July 17, 2013, meeting. A vote was taken and the **MOTION** carried.

IV. Old Business

a. State Plan Updates

- i. Ms. Coates and Ms. Bianconi were tasked with working on sections 3, 5, 8, and 9. Ms. Coates stated they were unclear of the wording due to changes coming through CLEAR. Ms. Miller-Brown suggested proceeding as things currently stand, without taking the CLEAR recommendations into consideration. The proposed changes can then be brought up to the CLEAR working group at their next meeting.

Ms. Heinze stated there is a program called "Join Me," which would allow the document to be posted so the entire subcommittee could work on it simultaneously. She will send out the notification so during the next conference call everyone will be able to pull it up and review it at the same time.

- ii. Ms. Anderson was tasked with working on section 4. She was unclear as to the direction due to the Peninsula Fiber Network (PFN) project in the U.P. Questions were posed to the AG's office, and moving forward will be dependent on those responses. Ms. Miller-Brown suggested holding off on this issue until some clear direction is established.
- iii. Ms. Miller-Brown was tasked with working on section 6. She has not had a chance to review.

Ms. Heinze tabled the entire update until the next scheduled meeting.

b. UP NG911

Ms. Anderson previously forwarded a document titled, "Process Issues for Counties to Change 911 Providers." Ms. Miller-Brown led the subcommittee through the document.

What is the process for a county or a group of counties to change their 911 service provider?

In section 3 of the statute, it speaks to how a plan is established. It was pointed out there is a provision for administrative findings, which are limited to three pieces through the statute: changes in CPE, CAD, other pieces of equipment; changes in participating public safety agencies within the district; changes in 911 charges collected by the counties. There is no mention of changing a service provider. The SNC's opinion would be nonbinding and strictly limited.

Are changes required to the county 911 plan?

Questions within the question included what are the anticipated costs to the county wireline subscribers and what is the cost of the new NG911 configuration. Ms. Miller-Brown stated those questions are not in the scope of the subcommittee, but rather PFN, to answer. Ms. Anderson asked if a county makes any changes to their 911 service provider or changes to their plan, should they have to open the plan to include it. If they need to open it, only the portion of what is necessary in a plan should be changed.

What is the process for allowing new 911 service providers to operate in Michigan?

Ms. Miller-Brown asked Ms. Anderson what was the process AT&T followed? Ms. Anderson stated it was offered under a tariff. Mr. Hunt believed the original legislation required the service provider to have a tariff approved by the Michigan Public Service Commission (MPSC). He stated the MPSC should be the ones to decide if PFN is a valid service provider. It is unknown if PFN is providing phone service. Ms. Anderson stated they should be collecting surcharges if providing service. Ms. Miller-Brown will check if PFN is submitting a check to the state. There is nothing in the statute talking about becoming a service provider.

Cost recovery from the 911 pool issues.

There is a provision in the statute, Section 412, which talks about the annual accounting, with no reference to the pool, and reimbursement from the pool. Ms. Miller-Brown referenced Section 412(2)... "The amount of the adjustment shall be computed by dividing the excess by the number of exchange access facilities within the 911 service...existed for the billing period following the cost of the accounting." She stated there is nothing that explicitly says if you put money in, you get to take money out, but in her opinion, that is how the pool is operated. She then referenced subsection (3)... "If the annual accounting discloses that the emergency service charges collected during the calendar year are less than the total cost of installing and providing 911 service within the service district for the immediate preceding calendar year according to the costs and rates of the service supplier, the service supplier shall collect an additional charge." Ms. Anderson stated she is not in a position to interpret, and the SNC or counsel to the SNC are in no position to either. It is believed that would also fall to the MPSC.

Asked if AT&T has formally requested any information from PFN, it was stated AT&T is waiting for a services contract from PFN as to how AT&T will interconnect. Asked how AT&T pays their bills currently, it was stated as a participant in the pool, they report to McCartney what they collect on the technical surcharges and they remit the tariff rate.

Ms. Heinze stated it is her understanding the majority of the questions will need to be handled by the MPSC. Ms. Miller-Brown stated, under the cost recovery section of the

questions, if it mentions tariff, it is an MPSC issue; however, if it mentions the pooling process, that is done through McCartney and Associates.

Ms. Miller-Brown referred to the statute, section 412(a)...”The amount of the adjustment shall be computed by dividing the excess by the number of exchange access facilities...” She asked if PFN has exchange access facilities. Ms. Heinze asked who is in charge of policing that and Ms. Miller-Brown stated the industry has turned it over to McCartney and Associates. Mr. Hunt asked if these questions could informally be put to PFN, have them come present how they think their implementation will impact the 911 service in the state. Ms. Heinze asked if McCartney and Associates should come in as well.

Mr. Hunt stated PFN has an IP-network in place and hired INdigital to provide ESInet functional elements, replacing selective routing, etc. to make a NG911 system. You need to have the piece-parts to run on the IP-network and that is what INdigital will do. At the end, their plan is to have a NG911 system to cover all of the U.P. and maybe some below. They are planning on replacing the E911 system currently in place.

The subcommittee agreed to invite PFN to come in and present their proposal and answer questions. Ms. Miller-Brown will make contact with Mr. David McCartney from PFN. She will also check Mr. Hal Martin’s schedule. She will also speak with Mr. Gary Johnson and Mr. Tim McKee who are helping coordinate the U.P. network with the Upper Peninsula Authority.

Ms. Heinze clarified:

1. Ms. Miller-Brown will make the contact to have PFN present to the ETS.
2. Ms. Miller-Brown will send an e-mail to Ms. Susana Woolcock asking if there is a process for a communication’s service supplier to become a 911 service supplier. If there is not, it should be referred out. It is not the ETS who should make that determination as it will need to become a part of a statute. Ms. Miller-Brown stated it also needs to be asked if they do not follow the process, what happens.

V. New Business

Text to Landline and 911

Ms. Heinze stated there are situations where you can receive text to landline calls from cell phones. When asked if anyone was aware of texts coming into PSAPs, it was asked how that can occur. She briefed the group on a call which occurred in Ottawa County. A text can be sent to a landline and the cellular provider will convert text message to a voice message and then place the call to the landline number. The person who answers hears voice. This is only to a 10 digit line, no text to 911 at this point. There are PSAPs who are receiving these messages. One reason for these types of calls is to be anonymous. There is no way for the responder to ask questions back. This is something for the subcommittee to be aware of at this time.

Moving forward, the subcommittee will need to discuss what they want to do regarding text to 911 in order to be ready for February.

VI. Next Meeting

TBD

VII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:22 a.m.