

**MINUTES**  
**MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION STAFF**  
**PUBLIC ACT NO. 48 MAPPING SUBCOMMITTEE**  
**April 29, 2003**

NAME		COMPANY/ORGANIZATION	TELEPHONE	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Robin	Ancona	MPSC Telecom Division	(517) 241-3627	<a href="mailto:rpancona@michigan.gov">rpancona@michigan.gov</a>
David	Bertram	Michigan Townships Assoc.	(517) 321-6467	<a href="mailto:david@michigantownships.org">david@michigantownships.org</a>
Matt	Bonar	SBC	(248) 456-0830	<a href="mailto:mb7612@sbc.com">mb7612@sbc.com</a>
Francie	Brown	AT&T	(517) 374-6521	<a href="mailto:francesbrown@att.com">francesbrown@att.com</a>
Abigail	Elias	City of Ann Arbor	(734) 994-2670	<a href="mailto:aelias@ci.ann-arbor.mi.us">aelias@ci.ann-arbor.mi.us</a>
Gary	Field	Loomis, Ewert/Telecom. Assoc.	(517) 482-2400	<a href="mailto:glfield@loomislaw.net">glfield@loomislaw.net</a>
Terry	Grant	TDS Telecom	(517) 625-5100	<a href="mailto:terry.grant@tdstelecom.com">terry.grant@tdstelecom.com</a>
Michael	Greenlee	Geotech, Inc.	(616) 949-3340	<a href="mailto:mike.greenlee@geotech-inc.com">mike.greenlee@geotech-inc.com</a>
Nick	Groszowski	Verizon Engineering	(231) 777-5171	<a href="mailto:nick.groszowski@verizon.com">nick.groszowski@verizon.com</a>
Paula	Harris	City of Detroit Cable	(313) 224-2100	<a href="mailto:gentiusp@cable.ci.detroit.mi.us">gentiusp@cable.ci.detroit.mi.us</a>
Rod	Horton	MPSC Telecom Division	(517) 241-6068	<a href="mailto:rhorto@michigan.gov">rhorto@michigan.gov</a>
Karl	Koster	City of Grand Rapids	(616) 456-3060	<a href="mailto:kkoster@ci.grand-rapids.mi.us">kkoster@ci.grand-rapids.mi.us</a>
Neil	Lehto	Sterling Heights	(586) 997-6454	<a href="mailto:nlehto@ornats.com">nlehto@ornats.com</a>
Clint	Lewis	Great Lakes Comnet, Inc.	(517) 347-7100	<a href="mailto:clewis@glcom.net">clewis@glcom.net</a>
Michael	Marczyk	Verizon Regulatory	(231) 727-1679	<a href="mailto:michael.marczyk@verizon.com">michael.marczyk@verizon.com</a>
Bill	Mathewson	Michigan Municipal League	(734) 662-3246	<a href="mailto:wcm@mml.org">wcm@mml.org</a>
Robert	Meganck	SBC	(248) 975-4780	<a href="mailto:rx2478@sbc.com">rx2478@sbc.com</a>
Joan	Potter	City of Detroit Cable	(313) 224-3935	<a href="mailto:potterje.cadtwr.ctfnb@cadtwr.ci.detroit.mi.us">potterje.cadtwr.ctfnb@cadtwr.ci.detroit.mi.us</a>
Jay	Reidy	AT&T	(312) 230-2647	<a href="mailto:jireidy@att.com">jireidy@att.com</a>
Dale	Rietberg	Varnum, Riddering	(616) 336-6587	<a href="mailto:drrietberg@varnumlaw.com">drrietberg@varnumlaw.com</a>
Cresson	Slotten	City of Ann Arbor	(734) 994-2744	<a href="mailto:cslotten@ci.ann-arbor.mi.us">cslotten@ci.ann-arbor.mi.us</a>
Brian	Sydnor	MI Broadband Develop. Authority	(734) 214-1387	<a href="mailto:sydnorb@michigan.gov">sydnorb@michigan.gov</a>
Joe	Tocco	SBC	(313) 223-8188	<a href="mailto:joseph.tocco@sbc.com">joseph.tocco@sbc.com</a>
Mike	Watza	Protec	(313) 965-7983	<a href="mailto:watzm1@kitch.com">watzm1@kitch.com</a>
Kevin	White	MPSC Telecom Division	(517) 241-6338	<a href="mailto:kwwhite@michigan.gov">kwwhite@michigan.gov</a>
David	Wilburn	City of Ann Arbor	(734) 994-1172	<a href="mailto:dwilburn@ci.ann-arbor.mi.us">dwilburn@ci.ann-arbor.mi.us</a>
Susana	Woolcock	MPSC Telecom Division	(517) 241-6240	<a href="mailto:swoolc@michigan.gov">swoolc@michigan.gov</a>

1. Commission Staff noted that the meeting minutes were revised to include security concerns raised by AT&T. That revision appears as item number 4 in the March 6, 2003 minutes. The revision was previously posted to the minutes appearing on the MPSC web site. There were no additional corrections to the revised minutes.
2. The Commission Staff expressed their appreciation to the Providers and Municipalities for their efforts in providing comments to take into consideration in developing the mapping requirements. Staff then presented its draft recommendation that was developed after reviewing proposals and comments from the municipalities and providers. The following is that draft recommendation:

## COMMISSION STAFF ROUTE MAP PROPOSAL

Section 6(5) of the METRO Act requires that providers with existing non-permitted facilities and those seeking new rights of way access include, in their application to a municipality for a right of way permit:

**"...route maps showing the location of the provider's existing and proposed facilities in the format as required by the authority...." (Emphasis added)**

Additional route map requirements are set forth in Section 6(7) of the Act, which provides:

**"Within 90 days after the substantial completion of construction of new facilities...a provider shall submit route maps showing the location of the telecommunication facilities to both the commission and the affected municipalities." (Emphasis added)**

Section 6(8) further provides that the Michigan Public Service Commission shall designate the format of the route maps as paper or electronic following input from providers and municipalities.

### **Staff Proposal:**

1. The map shall show the path telecommunications facilities follow while occupying public rights of way.
2. The map shall show the location of the telecommunication or cable facilities in the public rights of way. Location for these purposes is defined as:
  - Right, left, or center
  - Aerial or underground
  - Depiction of municipal boundaries
  - Identification of street names and other identification of rights of way (federal, state, or private).
3. The map shall indicate the total linear feet of public right of way occupied and a scale to allow for its calculation.
4. The map shall distinguish between municipalities when the facilities are in a right of way that serves as a municipal border (separate facilities serving each municipality).
5. Providers shall submit maps to the Commission, on a CD in an electronic format with any of the following file extensions: DGN, DWG, or DXF. If the Commission Staff does not have the software required to read the CD, it is the company's responsibility to provide Staff with the software needed to read the information contained on the CD. The company can either provide Staff with a copy of the software, or provide an html link to download the free viewer or, as

a last resort, provide access to a computer containing the software at a convenient company location or at the Commission offices.

In order to avoid any violation of license agreements with base map providers, the telecommunication providers may need to amend their current contracts with their base map providers and include P.A. 48 requirements.

6. If the provider is not able to provide electronic maps, the provider must seek a waiver from the Commission and provide supporting documentation. If a municipality does not have electronic capabilities, the municipality and the provider should work out an acceptable arrangement.

Providers are still subject to municipal construction permitting requirements that are separate and distinct from the permit and mapping requirements of P.A. 48.

---

3. Following the distribution of the Staff's draft, a discussion was held on each point of the Staff recommendation. Providers and Municipalities voiced concerns with portions of the Staff recommendation.
4. Parties will be given an opportunity to file written comments on the Staff draft by May 9, 2003.
5. Staff explained that the next step was for Staff to submit its recommendation and the parties' comments to the Commission and Metro Authority for their review in making a final determination.
6. The Committee agreed there was no need to set another meeting date at this point in time.