

Funding Subcommittee			
Region/Entity	Name	Type	Attended
NECORE	Fred Rosencrans, Luzerne	Primary	X
NECORE	Todd Weaver, Northampton	Alternate	X
North Central	Dave Cohick, Tioga	Primary	X
North Central	Andrew Kremser, Clinton	Alternate	X
Northern Tier	Chris Clark, Jefferson	Primary	X
Northern Tier	Nate Burgett, McKean	Alternate	
South Central	Matt Hobson, York	Primary	X
South Central	Vacant	Alternate	
South Central Mountain	Mark Taylor, Blair	Primary	
South Central Mountain	Chris Stevens, Huntingdon	Alternate	X
Southeast	Brian Gottschall, Berks	Primary	X
Southeast	Kelly Collins, Philadelphia	Alternate	X
Southwest	Gary Thomas, Allegheny (Chair)	Primary	X
Southwest	Frank Jannetti, Mercer	Alternate	X
CCAP	Melissa Gates/Ashley White/Brianna Petitti	Advisory	X
PEMA	Jeff Boyle	Advisory	X

1. 2022 15% FUNDING PLANNING:

- 1. \$67,010,659 Projected amount available (Need 3rd quarter revenue to finalize amount)
- 2. \$53,714,350 Total costs for consideration
- 3. \$13,500,000 Projected amount needed for formula assistance in 2023
- 4. (\$203,691) Balance should all costs be covered

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

- 1. Next Steps for the 2022 15% funding cycle:
 - a. June July:
 - i. PEMA will review requests.
 - ii. Work with Subcommittees and Board to prioritize initiatives and determine allocations
 - b. August 1: Goal for awards to be determined

Meeting Discussion: Next steps are for PEMA to review requests/costs to determine what will be covered with 15% funds. A question was asked about what will the review entail? PEMA will review costs to determine eligibility, status of prior year awards, identify other options for consideration, and identify issues/discussion items. PEMA will bring identified issues/discussion items to the Funding Subcommittee for advice and recommendations as these items may drive 911 Program changes (i.e., introducing a cost share).



2. 2022 Objective: Assist PEMA with defining responsibilities of statewide interconnectivity funding in a NG911 environment

- a. What are the responsibilities of 15% funding for connectivity outside of the State NG911 service contract?
 - i. Should 15% funding be used to fund tertiary connectivity?
 - ii. What methods should be used to determine 15% funding allocations for regional ESInets or tertiary connectivity that supports multiple applications?

Meeting Discussion: Changes/enhancements to the State ESInet will be carefully coordinated and managed. In a similar manner, ongoing support of tertiary connectivity and regional ESInets with 15% funds needs to be carefully coordinated and managed. Objectives for ongoing 15% funding support would need defined for connectivity outside of the State ESInet. An understanding about what the tertiary connectivity or regional ESInet is supporting would be needed for continued support. A cost share should be phased in and the method for calculation will need determined. A suggestion was to base the calculation on the number of applications supported. A consideration mentioned is financial support counties are providing annually to support this connectivity.

- b. What are the expectations for shared system maintenance in future years?
 - i. What specific costs within each system (CHE, CAD, etc.) should be supported?

Meeting Discussion: Key discussion points:

- In general, a cost share was identified as a way to free up 15% funds to have the ability to continue investing in system improvements. A cost share would also introduce some financial responsibility for the counties/regions to maintain these initiatives and control costs.
- A concern identified was the lack of consistency between licensing and service costs between counties and regions.
- As a perspective for consideration, the focus of 15% funding looking ahead should be to incentive system sharing with 15% funding by covering the non-recurring costs. A suggestion was made to continue to incentivize system sharing but not support ongoing maintenance for any new projects; maintenance on existing projects would be phased out at least for some systems.
- A portion of the discussion focused on priorities after NG911 service and regional ESInets.
 The next priority from PEMA's perspective is call-handling equipment with discussion
 needed to identify subsequent priorities. A suggestion from subcommittee members was to
 focus on CAD. A concern for PEMA is variety in CAD systems and costs. Clear criteria
 for what constitutes a shared CAD system and costs that would be considered for 15%
 funding would need clearly defined.
 - c. What are the expectations for GIS support in future years?

Meeting Discussion: From PEMA's perspective, funding responsibility for GIS data development



will shift to formula funding or other revenue sources of the county after counties are migrated to NG911 service. There was general agreement that GIS should be covered by formula funds or other local revenue sources.

3. 2022 Allocation Scenarios

- a. All costs covered as submitted:
 - i. Slight impact to 2023 formula assistance.
 - ii. Any formula assistance needed for 2024 would come entirely out of future 15% funding
 - iii. Limited to no ability to invest in system improvements:
 - 1. \$47,000,000 2023 Estimated 15% funding
 - 2. \$17,100,000 2023 NG911 service costs
 - 3. \$11,200,000 2024 estimated shared project maintenance
 - 4. \$13,500,000 2024 formula assistance
 - 5. \$5,200,000 2023 Amount available for NG911 service enhancements, PSAP system refresh/replacements, GIS, etc.

4. Cost control strategies

- a. Introduce cost share with more than 83% being distributed by formula
- b. State contracts/hosted solutions
- c. Other discussion items

Meeting Discussion:

- Items #3 & #4 are related. 15% funds are currently supporting NG911 service, shared/regional projects, and GIS data development. In addition, a portion of 15% funds are being distributed by formula as a temporary measure to address 83% formula concerns. Should all requests as submitted be supported in this funding cycle, it will leave minimal funds for new projects next year. 911 Program changes related to 15% funds will be needed to ensure funds are available to invest in system improvements and incentivize system sharing. In addition to introducing a cost share on shared system maintenance, the current approach to system refreshments/replacements and other options to achieve the same goal needs evaluated. The current approach of a significant capital expense every 5 years for each shared phone system is not sustainable for the 15% funding stream. Also, the lack of a complete resolution to the 83% formula is also impacting available funding for statewide interconnectivity initiatives.
- Recruitment and retention was also a focus of the discussion. Subcommittee members
 discussed potential strategies to assist counties in this area. One suggestion was to require a
 certain percentage of funding be used towards recruitment and retention costs. More discussion
 is needed to identify any specific program actions to be taken in addition to the #IAm911
 campaign.

2. New Business



Meeting Discussion: PEMA was asked to provide revenue projections for next year to assist counties with preparing their county budgets.