

**STATE 911 COMMITTEE**  
**Emerging Technology Subcommittee**  
October 29, 2014  
Meeting Minutes

**A. Call to Order / Roll Call**

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

Voting Members Present:

Mr. Tim Smith (Chair)  
Ms. April Heinze  
Ms. Marsha Bianconi  
Ms. Patricia Coates  
Ms. Sarah Taylor  
Mr. Carl Rodabaugh  
Ms. Lisa Beth Harvey  
Mr. Matt Groesser  
Ms. Leigh Ann Ireland

Representing:

Ottawa County Central Dispatch  
NENA  
Conference of Western Wayne  
CLEMIS  
Washtenaw County Office of the Sheriff  
Midland County Central Dispatch  
Livingston County Central Dispatch  
Kent County  
Frontier

Non-Voting Members Present:

Ms. Harriet Miller-Brown  
Ms. Stacie Hansel  
Mr. Michael Armitage

Representing:

Michigan State Police  
Michigan State Police  
Michigan State Police

Voting Members Absent:

Mr. Bob Currier  
Mr. Todd Jones  
Mr. Mike Muskovin  
Mr. John Hunt

Representing:

Intrado  
Advanced Wireless Telecom  
Motorola  
General Public

**B. Approval of Meeting Minutes – September 22, 2014**

A **MOTION** was made by Ms. Bianconi, with support by Ms. Heinze, to accept the minutes of September 22, 2014, as presented. With no discussion, the **MOTION** carried.

**C. Old Business**

Smart911 Update

The agreement for payment of funds is between Community Mental Health, DTMB, and the state police. Community Mental Health informed Ms. Miller-Brown that she should see the interdepartmental agreement for the fund transfer in the next couple of weeks. Ms. Miller-Brown has submitted a Statement of Work, which includes what the PSAPs will get, who is going to do what, and what the payment schedule is. Ms. Miller-Brown explained to Rave Mobile Safety the payments would be 50 percent at the initial meeting, 25 percent after half of the PSAPs who agreed to deploy are deployed, and 25 percent after the remaining agreed PSAPs are deployed.

Ms. Miller-Brown will send an introductory e-mail, along with the FAQ document to all PSAPs approximately the week of November 24. When asked when Rave Mobile Safety would begin contacting the PSAPs, Ms. Miller-Brown stated she will work directly with them to begin contact. Mr. Smith stated when his PSAP originally registered, Rave Mobile Safety contacted him within a matter of days.

After no further discussion, the FAQ document will go out to the PSAPs as presented.

**D. New Business**

State hosted CAD2CAD

Ms. Heinze started looking at CAD2CAD because she has found it to be beneficial, particularly for surrounding counties. For example, Clinton County takes a call, enters the call, and pushes it CAD2CAD to Eaton County to dispatch. There is no delay in service as in a regular transfer.

When Ms. Heinze was talking with Mr. Randy Williams, from MPSCS, he mentioned there are states that do a hosted CAD2CAD. One drawback to CAD2CAD is there needs to be a fiber connection to make it work, which has a cost for the CAD2CAD software and then an ongoing fiber connection fee. The concept of state hosted is for one fiber connection between the PSAP

and the state, who would host a CAD2CAD hub. The PSAP could then connect to whatever CAD systems it has agreements to connect to.

Mr. Brad Stoddard, from the MPSCS, gave background as to where the idea came from. As the state police (MSP) started connections between each of the PSAPs, an internal support model was reviewed. The idea of a "black box" product was developed. MSP would have the product in their cars to be able to connect to OSSI and any information coming from the PSAP would route through the black box and end up in the car. However, the information needed to be shared with more than one agency and needed to be something that would work long term. There may not be the systems in place today, but requirements can be set today as to what the system should be able to do.

Mr. Williams stated they wanted to figure out how to build a standards-based system that would use common language between the CAD platforms. As a PSAP decides they want to join the exchange hub to share with another county, the PSAP's vendor could assist with financing a single connection to the hub. The hub would then send the message to the neighboring county in a common language that county would accept. Mr. Williams stated the technology is there now; it is more of an organizational or policies and procedures hurdle. He stated a committee would need to be created to define standards, decide what should be tackled first, look at the technology aspect, and the basics of how connection looks today.

Mr. Williams and Mr. Groesser visited Fairfax County, Virginia and Mr. Rodabaugh visited San Diego. Both centers visited are currently only doing fire and EMS; it is unsure anyone in the country is doing law yet. That would be one area Michigan would mostly focus on.

When the call gets delivered to the PSAP, that PSAP now has their own record. The call shows where it originated from and also shows any updates. Mr. Williams stated receiving a call and transferring to another PSAP is one function. The bigger function is in the mutual aid area where both PSAPs are responding and updating information in PSAP-specific software. The in-vehicle, on scene information being updated by the first responder gets sent to both PSAPs. Even when the call is cleared, each PSAP has their own record and can watch the information being updated.

Ms. Harvey mentioned that with yet another statewide venture, along with statewide GIS layer, statewide AVL, NG911, a concern many may have is the need for consolidations at a future date. Mr. Williams stated if PSAPs consolidated, there would be no need for the hub. Ms. Heinze stated the hub is part of the Next Gen world and would be created anyway.

Mr. Stoddard stated where the opportunity with the hub component comes in, is the manufacturer is writing to the hub. If one PSAP is on version one and another PSAP is on version two, or has a different vendor, it does not matter as it's still writing to the standard. He stated that is the benefit from a cost standpoint as one PSAP does not have to upgrade in order to still connect to the hub. Mr. Williams stated a Michigan standard could be written, endorsed, and built to support the standard. That information would then be forwarded to all the CAD vendors and they would receive information on how to connect. First is deciding how to fund everything.

Mr. Williams asked Mr. Groesser for his perspective during their visit. Mr. Groesser stated he is working on four interfaces with three private ambulance companies, two that have the same CAD but different versions. Initially, they are looking at proprietary connections from Kent County to each company. Recently, his CAD vendor has offered their own hub. Kent County is almost following the state model as it is being discussed preliminarily. From a user, Kent County is very interested in this concept and sees the value. Specific to the Fairfax model, he would characterize their interface as unit-based. Every ten seconds, they pass the status information of every unit that might get called up to another jurisdiction. With all the data intense traffic going around, the bandwidth is relatively low.

On his visit to San Diego, Mr. Rodabaugh saw the opposite of local PSAP to local PSAP interface. He saw it from the MSP side. MSP wants to use CAD2CAD interface in their PSAPs for when troopers check in and can then become available to the local PSAP. Seeing it from that end, he sees a better utilization of resources. Mr. Rodabaugh did not see the CAD2CAD from the dispatch side.

He stated as part of the Secretary of State build out, AT&T ran fiber to more than 80 PSAPs. Data could be delivered over the current LG net and from a technological standpoint, go live in a short timeframe, only needing to develop the funding for the individual PSAP's CAD vendors to write the interface to the version of the hub.

Further general discussion followed.

Ms. Bianconi asked if there was any information that could be sent to her that diagrams out the concept. Mr. Groesser forwarded a link for a video of the Fairfax model, which Ms. Hansel will forward to the subcommittee.

Mr. Williams stated the next step should be having the teams who went to visit the Fairfax and San Diego centers get together and figure out what the process should be for design, policy discussion, and how to get the right people at the table to get decisions made. Mr. Smith stated if after meeting, those teams could give the subcommittee a better understanding of what is potentially out there, see what is happening with NG911, and how this concept ties in, then there would be a better picture to see if it is something that is even capable of moving forward with at the subcommittee level.

Ms. Miller-Brown suggested looking at a framework, model guidelines, and model MOU's, and have this topic ready to present at the Spring Technology Forum in March. A suggested title for the forum could be "Moving Michigan Forward" to include what's happening issues such as lessons learned from Smart911, roll out concepts for MOUs, CAD2CAD framework, NG911 and FirstNet updates. Ms. Hansel will confirm with the Academy for March 11, with an alternate date of March 18.

**E. Public Comment**

None.

**F. Next Meeting**

TBD

**G. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 11:18 a.m.