

BUREAU OF 9-1-1

PENNSYLVANIA EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY
MEETING MINUTES

Date: Friday, December 18, 2009, 10:00 a.m.
Location: PEMA Headquarters, Harrisburg, PA
Project: Wireless 9-1-1 Advisory sub-Committee Meeting

Committee Members:

Director Robb Wentzel	PEMA	Present
*Timothy Baldwin	Lancaster County	Present
David Cohick	Tioga County	Present
John Haynes	Chester County	Present
Dan Tancibok	Centre County	Present
Don Tantum	Verizon Wireless	Present
David Tews	Indigo Wireless	Present
Commissioner Wayne Nothstein	Carbon County	Present
Sharon Bader	AT&T Mobility	Absent
Douglas Snell	D&E Communications	Absent
Commissioner J. Bracken Burns	Washington County	Absent
Pat Cusick	The House Veterans Affairs and Emergency Preparedness Committee	Absent
Rick O'Leary	The House Veterans Affairs and Emergency Preparedness Committee	Absent

Additional Attendees:

Ray Blouch	PEMA	Present
Doug Moyer	PEMA	Present
Jonathan Hansen	LR Kimball & Associates	Present
Jerry Gaughan	LR Kimball & Associates	Present
Gordon Vanauken	LR Kimball & Associates	Present
*Josh Clemente	LR Kimball & Associates	Present
*Karen Dayton	LR Kimball & Associates	Present
*Via Phone		

1) Agenda Items

The goal for the meeting was to review the discussions that took place at the August 31st Wireless sub-Committee meeting; specifically, focusing on action items that the sub-Committee requested additional information. Meeting agenda items included:

- Eligibility List Review
- Reconciliation Issues
- Host LEC and Carrier Interface
- WAN Systems
- Funding of Counties who have Call-taking Agreements with Other Counties
- FY08-09 Reconciliation

a) **Eligibility List Review**

Budgetary Cost Estimates/Life Cycle

As an Agency funding application review tool and county guideline, Agency provided information reflects a first effort to provide a future benchmark for product life cycles and cost estimates. Action items from today are:

- Before publication of the FY 2010-11 eligibility list, eliminate the last three columns from the funding eligibility list; information provided is for sub-Committee review only.
- In their review of the items listed on the Eligibility List, sub-Committee members are to consider and review the suggested life cycles and cost estimates and provide feedback as to a reasonable expectation of what each item may cost and life expectancy.
- It was mentioned that in Attachment A the column heading wasn't consistent; page one had Budgetary Cost Estimates while pages two, three, and four had Cost – Maximum Eligible. Headings will be changed to ensure consistency on all four pages.

Over the next couple months each sub-Committee member is to look at the list. Feedback is requested from the sub-Committee not later than June 30, 2010.

GIS

Reference was made to Attachment A, page one. There are only two items that correspond to GIS that are fundable under the wireless state plan; this funding eligibility area requires more detail.

Robb has been communicating with GIS vendors and has received feedback from PA NENA and CCAP regarding vendor inquiries of counties that propose they can do all these great things regarding GIS, and by the way, you can pay for it with 9-1-1 money. There is a degree of truth to what they are saying but 9-1-1 is not the primary funding stream. PSAPs should require, and the Agency will only act upon specific line items on the proposal as to how it directly benefits 9-1-1. In addition, what GIS benefits can be achieved through Homeland Security Grant Program funding?

The FY 2010-11 Funding Eligibility List represents a continuation of Agency efforts to migrate to a single, technology neutral list. Another topic of discussion centered on Oblique Digital Geo-Referenced Aerial Photography, which has always been a

non-eligible expense and digital orthophotography that has been previously listed as an eligible expense. The proposed FY 2010-11 funding eligibility list shows digital orthophotography as not eligible. Ensuing discussion reflected Digital orthophotography is available from PAMAP, which is reported to have lost all funding. (Homeland Security Grant request by DCNR may be a funding option) Counties are using 2004-2007 data. Without a funding source, taking this item out would be a detriment to being able to create data layers. Orthophotography has been eligible under wireline and has been eligible under wireless for the first five years of the program. Robb commented that in the first five years of the program, over \$41 million was provided for GIS systems and data. Maintenance of GIS data can be done without orthophotography, but through utilization of maintenance tools and third party sources, many of which are eligible under wireless and wireline funding...if the base layers are established 9-1-1 should not have to pay for flying the county every 5-years. Robb will revisit this issue.

Robb then asked, how do we support the counties without turning this into a major issue and how do we structure the Eligibility List while recognizing the data importance we get from a flyover? Also, how do we fund the other elements? Need tools to deliver technology. Other county agencies would be the primary benefactors. Again, our goal in the FY 2010-11 is to provide additional GIS funding detail to better align with the state plan versus the previous two GIS line items which left much open for interpretation.

Discussion then ensued on the use of LIDAR and its eligibility. After myriad comments on the benefits of LIDAR, the varying levels of GIS support at county level, the far reaching benefit of GIS not required by 9-1-1, portable GIS units and the complexity potential of trying to define every element of GIS in the Eligibility List, Robb stated he would take the sub-Committee comments, staff the issue and render a decision for the FY 2010-11 Eligibility List.

Final comments included adding more definition for portable GIS unit(s).

Tower Sites

Background discussion from the August 31, 2009 sub-Committee meeting raised the concern that we do not fully fund tower sites under wireless, but we chose to fund some items. To this point, how do we continue to make these arbitrary funding decisions when radio systems (of which tower sites are the infrastructure) are not eligible for wireless funding? The August 31st sub-Committee recommendations centered on the issue of should we fund tower sites out of wireless or not fund anything relating to towers out of wireless; recognizing tower expenses are effectually 100 percent eligible under wireline/VoIP funding. This discussion led to an overriding concern with past loopholes created in wireless funding and even if defined, counties will still ask for funding of ineligible items albeit with creative application narratives and make the state 'catch it.'

Returning to the tower site discussion, Robb presented the concern that wireless revenues were essentially reaching a plateau (1.5-2.0 percent growth versus FY

2008-09 after 9.0 percent growth in FY 2008-09 when compared to FY 2007-08.) In addition, the \$10 plus million increase in FY 2009-10 funding disbursed to counties reflected disbursement of cash reserves in the Wireless E-911 Fund, reserves that will be exhausted and unavailable in FY 2010-11. Recognizing a decision to not fund tower sites with wireless will not be a popular decision, Robb will consider sub-Committee comments and his decision will be reflected in the FY 2010-11 Funding Eligibility List.

IT Services

Attachment B in the handout reflects a history of what was classified as IT services. Items in red are deemed ineligible with an explanation for the determination. Based on analysis of the IT services discussion, what the Bureau found was these services have been approved in the past three fiscal years unless it was directly tied to mobile data, mobile radio services or there was insufficient documentation. So it is something we have approved. Counties have asked for funding for maintenance for technology and infrastructure within the PSAP. We see as a valid expense to maintain technology systems in place to function day to day. Robb advised the tier recommendation for these services would remain as funded in the past.

Administrative Lines

Administrative lines haven't been a big ticket item but rather a nuisance issue. Some counties are asking for reimbursement. For purposes of funding under wireless, the Agency proposed a clarification that provides a definition of the regulation. Does the definition that we have provided in the handout give clarity to the regulation? When rewritten the definition would be captured in the re-write of 120b. Sub-Committee comments raised a concern of the regulatory wording of two and the expanded definition as proposed raising the eligible lines up to 50 percent of the number of trunks. Because this one links to the LEC cost item later in the agenda, we'll table those two and may get a clearer definition when having the LEC cost discussion.

TDM Interface Fee

This one came up in only one county. Do we spell out as a single line item? If it is a component of CPE; why create a separate line item. The Agency proposal to the sub-Committee is to remove as a single line item off the Eligibility List and incorporate in the appropriate CAD/CPE equipment category.

LEC Costs

Robb commented there are six (6) LECs functioning in the Commonwealth, only four breaks out costs in their phone bill; two do not. Going back to administrative line discussion, did the call come in on a wireline or wireless, this would determine if LEC costs were related to wireless and wireline. Robb requested sub-Committee feedback to more clearly define this eligibility issue. Several suggestions were offered; LEC costs are LEC costs regardless of technology therefore they should be

funded, at a minimum, as a shared cost. Robb will staff the discussion and present the result in the FY 2010-11 Funding Eligibility List.

Utilities

Discussion of this item was primarily for information only from the August 31st meeting. Utilities at tower sites will not be eligible under wireline and wireless; notwithstanding these costs are not eligible under wireline and as detailed in 4 PA Code §120 B.

Firewall Monitoring and Management

The Eligibility List was modified to reflect changes requested at the meeting on August 31st. Antivirus is under tier three but under tier two is CAD firewall monitoring. May want to change, will discuss. Needs to be clarified on the spreadsheet; may want to change the nomenclature and take out firewall and antivirus and make it security or another term.

b) Reconciliation Issues

For information only, Robb presented a few challenges and Agency steps to work through these challenges.

Funding Application Documentation versus Documentation Submitted for Reconciliation

Received a funding request for something eligible, but when county submitted documents with reconciliation; it was for an item that was clearly not eligible. Process has been improved but we still come across these issues. The challenge is that if the documentation submitted is clearly ineligible it will be treated as ineligible. County will have to write a check back to the state or do cost shifting. It's been challenging working with one Eligibility List and when reconciliation comes in, working from a different one. Will take into consideration when project takes place over a couple years where items could have been eligible at one time but then are no longer eligible. When documentation comes in we will separate it if we can.

Ineligible Items Missed During Funding Review

We are not perfect; occasionally items are missed. Goes back to earlier discussion, there are counties that will try to push the envelope indicating an eligible item but don't have the exact detail until reconciliation, which may be one or two years later and the documentation clearly reflects the item is ineligible. It was mentioned that sometimes eligible/ineligible items are not clear. Robb further added that historically, we have erred on the side of the County; however, items or components within a requested item that are clearly ineligible will not be determined eligible. These decisions will not be made without first consulting the county.

Encumbrance vs. Expenditure

Items discussed for information purposes only. The issue here is an item is reconciled one year as an encumbrance and the next year when the Agency would expect to see the encumbrance become an expenditure, it is completely gone from the reconciliation.

Shared Costs

We see documentation submitted 100 percent under wireless when it should be a shared cost. We've been able to work through with the county. Trying to make it as painless as possible; this is an awareness item for sub-Committee.

c) Host LEC and Carrier Interface

Discussion with Wireless Carriers

When there are issues with service outages the call the PSAP should make is to the LEC, the LEC will then contact the WSP. Ran into a couple counties where a LEC expressed concern that when the county was contacting them and they were reaching out to a wireless service provider, the WSP was reluctant to communicate with the LEC. To date, this has been isolated to one LEC. The PSAPs first call should be the host LEC. There should be an escalation list in place and if an issue does arise, the PUC should be immediately engaged.

Discussion then ensued on several topic areas including the FY 2008-09 Reconciliation process and funding of counties who sub-contract call taking and dispatching to other counties.

2) Next Meeting

Will be finalizing the Eligibility List and will communicate to the sub-Committee early 2010.

These minutes are a summary of the writer's interpretation. Unless changes are identified within ten (10) days of receipt, via letter, agreement with the content shall be assumed.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Dayton
Administrative Assistant
L. Robert Kimball & Associates