

**MINUTES
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION STAFF
PUBLIC ACT NO. 48 MAPPING SUBCOMMITTEE
March 6, 2003**

NAME	COMPANY/ORGANIZATION	TELEPHONE	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Robin Ancona	MPSC Telecom Division	(517) 241-3627	rpancona@michigan.gov
David Bertram	Michigan Townships Assoc.	(517) 321-6467	david@michigantownships.org
Matt Bonar	SBC	(248) 456-0830	mb7612@sbc.com
Francie Brown	AT&T	(517) 374-6521	francesbrown@att.com
Roderick Coy	Clark Hill	(517) 381-2129	rcoy@clarkhill.com
Abigail Elias	City of Ann Arbor	(734) 994-2670	aelias@ci.ann-arbor.mi.us
Gary Field	Loomis, Ewert/Telecom. Assoc.	(517) 482-2400	glfield@loomislaw.net
David Flees	MPSC Telecom Division	(517) 241-6202	dmflees@michigan.gov
Michael Greenlee	Geotech, Inc.	(616) 949-3340	mike.greenlee@geotech-inc.com
Nick Groszowski	Verizon Engineering	(231) 777-5171	nick.groszowski@verizon.com
Rod Horton	MPSC Telecom Division	(517) 241-6068	rhorto@michigan.gov
Neil Lehto	Sterling Heights	(586) 997-6454	nlehto@ornats.com
Michael Marczyk	Verizon Regulatory	(231) 727-1679	michael.marczyk@verizon.com
Bill Mathewson	Michigan Municipal League	(734) 662-3246	wcm@mml.org
Celeste McDermott	Detroit Cable Commission	(313) 224-2281	mcdermott@cable.ci.detroit.mi.us
Steve McMahon	Great Lakes Comnet, Inc.	(517) 347-7100	smcmahon@glcom.net
Robert Meganck	SBC	(248) 975-4780	rx2478@sbc.com
Dale Rietberg	Varnum, Riddering	(616) 336-6587	drrietberg@varnumlaw.com
Kathy Simon	Metro Authority	(517) 335-5446	kasimon@michigan.gov
Joe Tocco	SBC	(313) 223-8188	joseph.tocco@sbc.com
Robert Tuttle	Metro Authority	(517) 335-5446	retuttle@michigan.gov
Mike Watza	Protec	(313) 965-7983	watzm1@kitch.com
Steve West	E3Synergy	(616) 291-1742	steve.west@e3synergy.com
Kevin White	MPSC Telecom Division	(517) 241-6338	kwwhite@michigan.gov
Susana Woolcock	MPSC Telecom Division	(517) 241-6240	swoolc@michigan.gov

1. Commission Staff Member Kevin White opened the meeting asking for any additions, corrections, or deletions to the minutes. Mike Marczyk indicated that item number one of the minutes should be corrected to reflect that Verizon will only show a single line in those instances where there are facilities on both sides of the right-of-way. The only exception will be those instances where the right-of-way is a boundary between municipalities and there are separate facilities for each municipality.

Scott Stevenson indicated that item number three should read "some" rather than a "majority" of providers have electronic versions of their maps.

2. The next item of business was a discussion of the "Proposed Mapping Requirements" for public right-of-way. There were six suggested requirements in the proposal. Requirement number one, "*The map shall show the path telecommunications facilities follow while occupying public right-of-way*" was acceptable to all parties. Requirement number two, "*The map shall show the*"

location of the telecommunications or cable facilities in the public right-of-way. Location for these purposes is defined as right, left, center, aerial, or underground” was acceptable to the municipalities but not the providers. The providers indicated that P.A. 48 does not require the information and there is no basis for providing it. Kevin explained that P.A. 48 does require the location of facilities.

There was discussion regarding the requirement by some municipalities for “construction drawings.” Staff asked the providers if they were willing to provide these drawings to the Commission to meet the requirements of Section 6 (7). Rick Coy objected indicating that there was no basis for providing the drawings and that it was not the intent of the Legislature to require the type detail being requested.

Following a lengthy discussion Mike Marczyk suggested that the providers develop a proposal for consideration by the group. Staff agreed and asked that the municipalities get together and develop a proposal that addresses their concerns. The proposals should be developed and provided to the Commission Staff no later than Friday April 4, 2003 for review and distribution to the Subcommittee no later than Tuesday April 8, 2003. Staff asked that both groups be mindful that the final requirements will require some compromise and that the proposals should be developed with a degree of flexibility and an awareness of those areas where compromise may be necessary.

3. Before moving on to the next agenda item, the providers were polled on the four remaining requirements. SBC and AT&T were opposed to all four requirements. Verizon was opposed to numbers three, four, and five but willing to comply with number six *“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)”*. After a brief discussion, SBC changed its position on number six to maybe.
4. The providers indicated that there are security concerns related to the mapping requirements that should be addressed. The information that is being requested is extremely sensitive and can put the provider networks at risk if it falls into the wrong hands. Safeguarding network information is critical, especially given the current climate. The providers want to understand how the mapping information will be used and why the municipalities can’t simply make a telephone call to the provider when someone has a question.
5. Agenda item number three was a discussion of mapping software. Both SBC and Verizon are using Microstation. Several smaller providers use Geotech, an Engineering Services company, to produce their maps using AutoCAD software. Steve West of E3Synergy, a Microstation reseller, indicated that Microstation possesses the capability to provide the data that the municipalities desire. Additionally, he indicated that Microstation has a free viewer that will read both Microstation and AutoCAD files. SBC indicated that they are unable to provide electronic copies of maps due to software licensing concerns. SBC is concerned that the underlying landbase (database) that provides the roads, streets, and rail crossing cannot be shared. Joe Tocco agreed to review SBC’s licensing agreement with Etak the landbase provider.

6. The final item discussed was the timeline for implementation of the mapping requirements. Staff indicated that its goal was to have an agreed upon format within the next sixty to ninety days. The joint letter from the Metro Authority and Commission Staff regarding mapping formats allows the process to continue only for the remainder of 2003. It is imperative that a permanent format and process be in place prior to the end of the year.
7. The next meeting will be held on Tuesday, April 29, 2003 at 9:30 a.m. in hearing room E.