



BUREAU OF 9-1-1

PENNSYLVANIA EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY
MEETING MINUTES

Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2010, 9:00 a.m.
 Location: PEMA Headquarters, Harrisburg, PA
 Project: Wireless 9-1-1 Advisory sub-Committee Meeting

Committee Members:

Director Robb Wentzel	PEMA Bureau of 9-1-1	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	Absent
David Tews	Indigo Wireless	Present
Commissioner Wayne Nothstein	Carbon County	Absent
Sharon Bader	AT&T Mobility	Present
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	Present
*Sean Harris	The House Veterans Affairs and Emergency Preparedness Committee	Present

Additional Attendees:

Jane Benfer	PEMA Bureau of 9-1-1	Present
Michelle Musser	PEMA Bureau of 9-1-1	Present
Dave Wightman	PEMA Bureau of 9-1-1	Present
Jonathan Hansen	LR Kimball & Associates	Present
Jerry Gaughan	LR Kimball & Associates	Present
Gordon Vanauken	LR Kimball & Associates	Present
Karen Liddick	LR Kimball & Associates	Present
*Via Phone		

Welcome and Comments

Director Robb Wentzel called the meeting to order at 0900 and provided a brief overview of the sub-Committee meeting agenda, introduced new PEMA staff member, Dave Wightman, Accountant 2, and briefed the sub-Committee on the FY 2010-11 funding totals.

FY 2011-12 Eligibility List Review

Director Wentzel opened the discussion with a summary overview of recent changes to the reallocation procedures permitting interest to be expended on current FY 2010-11 approved partially funded Tier I and approved unfunded Tier II and III items. He then proposed expansion of this procedure to permit reallocation of unspent wireless funds to approved partially funded Tier I and approved unfunded Tier II and III for this FY 2010-11 only. The intent of this initiative is to leverage the unspent cash in the counties as well as reduce the balances of unpaid items for the next funding cycle. The sub-Committee supported Director Wentzel's proposal.

Director Wentzel discussed wireless fund revenue, trends, and HB 1789. Dan Tancibok asked how future fund availability was derived. Director Wentzel provided a detailed brief on the process to develop revenue projections that included past performance, market trends, and other contributing factors such as pending legislation and the on-going initiative to return unspent cash to the state fund for redistribution to counties and carriers.

Director Wentzel then initiated discussion on the proposed FY 2011-12 Funding Eligibility List. Discussion included the changes vetted in previous sub-Committee meetings to include better clarification of select items.

Director Wentzel then led a discussion on the use of SALI and proposed phasing out funding for SALI as Next Generation location technology is rolled out. A vigorous discussion ensued ranging from the benefits of SALI to the concerns that SALI precludes enhanced call transfer between counties unless the neighboring counties have access to the SALI database for the county transferring the call. Although tabled for future action, Director Wentzel closed the discussion with a suggestion that beginning funding year 2012-13, new SALI will not be funded, although maintenance costs will continue to be funded for existing installations. The estimated installation of SALI in the commonwealth was 16 counties.

The next topic of discussion involved Wireless Accuracy Testing. Director Wentzel proposed this item no longer be funded. Discussion with the sub-Committee ensued and the sub-Committee supported Director Wentzel's proposal that Wireless Accuracy Testing will not be funded commencing FY 2011-12.

One point of clarification...Tower Validation will continue to be funded.

Another topic of discussion entailed the funding of mobile workstations. After detailed discussion about the original intent of this item and how it is actually being used a motion was made by Dan Tancibok to recommend discontinuance of the practice of funding mobile workstations under wireless; however, remaining eligible under wireline. The motion was seconded by John Haynes and the vote was unanimous.

Discussion then expanded to providing a clearer definition of a PSAP. This discussion led to concerns regarding PSAP consolidation and funding PSAPs that do not meet the current definition of effectually providing that first point of entry 24/7. Discussion topics included the encouragement of consolidation with funds going to the PSAP answering the calls and done without a burden to either PSAP. Tim Baldwin requested the list of the five counties that currently operate outside the definition of a PSAP in current statute and regulation and the equipment they have. It was also discussed that consolidation costs would need to be better clarified in the eligibility document. PEMA will review PSAPs that function in less than a 24/7 capacity, provide the requested information to the sub-Committee and review the eligibility list for better clarification of eligible costs and funding for consolidation.

Revisiting the mobile work station discussion, the sub-Committee upon motion by John Haynes and second by Tim Baldwin voted unanimously to recommend Mobile CAD ineligible for wireless funding while remaining eligible under wireline.

Discussion next broached the topic of CAD Printers. This discussion entailed the cost associated with these printers and networking of these printers, thus limiting the number of printers required. This research may not be completed by the August 13th distribution date; however, the sub-Committee recommended PEMA staff will have to review funding applications more closely to preclude abuse of this item and then develop language to better inform PSAPs as to the maximum number of printers allowed and an average cost of each.

GIS was the next topic of discussion. Dan Tancibok asked when the Agency required GIS data. GIS data requirements were outlined in Statewide Wireless Plan promulgated in April 2005. The sub-Committee and PEMA staff agreed **GIS/Mapping; Other GIS Data Sets** needed to be revisited to include establishing parameters for frequency of data layer updates and a cost range for said updates.

Before sub-Committee members offered their specific comments on areas of discussion led by Director Wentzel, one housekeeping item was mentioned. Under **Personnel Costs B. 2., 9-1-1 Call Taking and Dispatching Fees** "Dispatching" should be removed. When the Commonwealth is fully deployed, the costs will be shared.

Tim Baldwin then presented a list of items he wished reviewed or had been previously commented and acted upon: Wireless accuracy costs – no longer an issue if will now be ineligible under wireless.

1. Mobile Workstations - no longer an issue if will now be ineligible under wireless.
2. List of what equipment/services the five non call-taking/dispatching PSAPs have/pay for so that it can be determined what is critical to be funded.
3. Encourage inter-county connectivity between PSAPs.
4. CAD Printers – how many are allowed?

5. GIS – amount expended and how many times the data is updated, should there be a time frame set? Road center lines – how often?
6. Life cycles – no longer an outstanding issue as it has been addressed on new eligibility list.
7. Statement – don't fund unclear statements of work, errors, vendor mistakes, forgotten items.

Discussion then ensued on changes to the **Professional Services** section of **Equipment, Systems & Services/Share Costs** to better clarify the MSAG questions/discussions during the funding process.

Subscriptions and dues are not eligible.

Dan Tancibok then presented a list of items he wished reviewed or had been previously commented and acted upon:

1. Under Equipment, Systems & Services/Shared Costs B. 2., Commercial Air Cards pertains to remote workstations. These are not eligible.
2. Under Equipment, Systems & Services/Shared Costs C. 2., Voice/Data Recorder Lease Maintenance is too detailed. Should be moved to shared.
3. Back-up recorder is not eligible.
4. PEMA should revisit CPE and what is eligible under wireline.
5. TTD/TTY Equipment is required by ADA and is automatically eligible and should be removed from the eligibility list/document.
6. Third-party references need to be reviewed in the document. Who is each referring to? What happens when the third-party is another county department?
7. UPS funding is confusing. How is it determined what portion of the UPS is funded by which department if shared? Add qualification to PSAP only and PEMA staff will have to monitor and review on funding applications as well as reallocations.
8. Clarification of funding for consolidation of PSAPs needs to be clearer.

Discussion then ensued on Uninterruptible Power Supplies (UPS). A suggestion was to fund only a portion of the cost where it is evident that the UPS is used for an entire facility, not just the PSAP. Maintenance costs for UPS are shared and do not need to be changed. Requests will be reviewed and researched. The problem lies in the language of the eligibility document. PEMA staff will review language.

Banking fees were the next topic of discussion. Director Wentzel explained that there have been PSAPs incurring large fees that are actually brokerage fees. Banking fees will no longer be eligible commencing in FY 2011-12 and the average cost on the eligibility document should be removed as these fees are no longer eligible.

Dan Tancibok's "third party" observation was then discussed. A cited example was found under Local Exchange Carrier Services, section 3, third party should be changed to specify LEC/CLEC. Director Wentzel reiterated staff will revisit and expand according the reference to third party throughout the document.

As an adjunct to previous discussion on printers and networking thereof, Sharon Bader offered to review a portion of these technology items and provide feedback to the Agency and sub-Committee on average costs. PEMA staff will also review technology costs.

Director Wentzel requested the sub-Committee think about whether to use an average cost as a guideline or establish a maximum funding threshold on the FY 2011-12 Funding applications. John Haynes suggested that average cost should be used in FY 2011-12 as a guideline and perfected in FY 2012-13. Dan Tancibok offered that amounts should be guidelines and flexible.

Director Wentzel then led a discussion on carrier cost recovery, an item not reflected on the eligibility list, but a topic of interest as Pennsylvania has three (3) Tier III providers operating within its borders. The discussion focused on the treatment of Phase I costs. The FCC is on record with its position on the treatment of Tier III providers versus Tier I and Tier II.

Director Wentzel offered closing comments. First, Bureau staff will revisit the items discussed at today's meeting and redistribute to the sub-Committee for comments. Director Wentzel requested that comments/edits be tracked and when replying, reply all. The sub-Committee Minutes and Eligibility Document will be uploaded to the PEMA website not later than August 13, 2010.

Director Wentzel reported that with the scheduled deployment of Forest County, Pennsylvania's 67 county and two city PSAPs are Phase II capable. Updated deployment standards will be published after the fall 2010 deployment of Indigo Wireless, which will constitute PA being completely deployed.

The meeting was adjourned at 1330 hours.

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 Liddick
Task Manager
L. Robert Kimball & Associates