

**Statewide Emergency Services Internet Protocol Network  
Steering Committee  
July 30, 2018**

The July 30, 2018 ESINet Steering Committee meeting started at 11:00 AM. Melissa Wulliger called the roll.

**Members present or via telephone:**

Representative Rick Carfagna, Ohio House of Representatives  
Commissioner Ed Humphrey, County Commissioners' Association of Ohio  
Jason Loree, Ohio Township Association  
Tom Robbins, Ohio Municipal League  
John Leutz, County Commissioners' Association of Ohio  
*A quorum was present*

**Other Attendees:**

Rob Jackson, Ohio 9-1-1 Administrator  
Staff from Senator Hoagland's Office  
Sharon Jennings, DAS Attorney  
Dave Blackstone, Nominated to Technical Standards Sub-Committee  
Jay Somerville, Chair of the PSAP Operations Sub-Committee  
Roger Hixson, Nominated to Technical Standards Sub-Committee

Mr. Jackson welcomed everyone and proceeded with the first agenda item. *A motion to approve the June 2018 meeting minutes was made by Commissioner Humphrey and seconded by Mr. Robbins. There were no discussions and a roll call vote was taken:*

Representative Carfagna - yes  
Commissioner Humphrey - yes  
Mr. Loree - yes  
Mr. Robbins- yes  
Mr. Leutz, - yes

*All committee members voted to approve the minutes.*

Mr. Jackson continues that a member of the Technical Standards Sub-Committee, Skip Dalton, has retired. Mr. Dalton, from Frontier, served on the Technical Standards Sub-Committee for many years. He was the required member representing a wireline or wireless service provider that participated in the state's 9-1-1 system. The Sub-Committee suggested his replacement be Mr. Lawson Dripps, At&T's Public Safety Relations Manager. Mr. Dripps is in Northern Ohio and comes to us with great experience. Mr. Jackson asked if there were any other names to be considered for the Technical Standards Sub-Committee. He also asked for discussions. There were no comments, so Mr. Jackson asked for a motion to approve Mr. Dripps. *A motion was made by Commissioner Humphrey to accept Mr. Dripps and was then seconded by Mr. Robbins. There were no discussions and a roll call vote was taken:*

Representative Carfagna - yes  
Commissioner Humphrey - yes  
Mr. Loree - yes  
Mr. Robbins- yes  
Mr. Leutz, - yes

*All committee members voted to approve Mr. Dripps.*

Mr. Jackson continued with a discussion of a suggestion received to add an At-Large member to the Technical Standards Sub-Committee and that recommended person to be Roger Hixson. Mr. Hixson has been a long-time member of Ohio APCO/NENA and is the Technical Issues Director for the NENA National organization. Mr. Jackson asked for a motion to accept Mr. Hixson as an At-Large Member of the Technical Standards Sub-Committee. *A motion was made by Mr. Leutz to accept Mr. Hixson and was then seconded by Commissioner Humphrey. There were no discussions and a roll call vote was taken:*

Representative Carfagna - yes  
Commissioner Humphrey - yes  
Mr. Loree - yes  
Mr. Robbins- yes  
Mr. Leutz, - yes

*All committee members voted to approve Mr. Hixson.*

Mr. Jackson proceeded with Sub-Committee updates. Jeff Smith, Chair of the Technical Standards Sub-Committee, will be retiring at the end of August. It was suggested that Dave Blackstone, Director of OGRIP, step in as Jeff Smith's replacement as the Chair of the Technical Standards Sub-Committee. Mr. Jackson asked if there were any other names recommended for the replacement, and there were none. So, Mr. Jackson asked for a motion to accept Mr. Blackstone. *A motion was made by Mr. Robbins and Seconded by Mr. Loree. There were no discussions and a roll call vote was taken:*

Representative Carfagna - yes  
Commissioner Humphrey - yes  
Mr. Loree - yes  
Mr. Robbins- yes  
Mr. Leutz, - yes

*All committee members voted to approve Mr. Blackstone.*

Moreover, Mr. Jackson shared there were no updates regarding the Technical Standards Sub-Committee, but that he will send out a meeting invite to the Technical Sub-Committee so that they can discuss a plan to present NG9-1-1 with a non-technical explanation. Jay Somerville, Chair of the PSAP Operations Sub-Committee, also had no updates to report.

Mr. Jackson continued with the 9-1-1 Administrator update. He started with the Ohio 9-1-1 vendor booth at the Ohio State Fair. The 9-1-1 Program office partners every year with the Amber Alert organization to communicate and inform fair attendees on emergency systems. This is our third

consecutive year. This year, a spinning wheel was created to playfully quiz children on when to call 9-1-1. Information and Child ID Kits were also distributed.

The Ohio 9-1-1 Symposium will be held again this year at the Ohio Highway Patrol Academy on September 12, 2018. The Ohio 9-1-1 Program Office joins the Ohio Chapters of APCO/NENA to offer a day full of information and training. It is free, and attendance is usually great.

Mr. Jackson asked Sharon McMurray, the Support and Compliance Coordinator, to provide an update on compliance of the counties reporting so far. The schedule for the 2018 S&C Program is a compressed schedule this year due to the May 12, 2018 effective date. Thus far, 37 counties have submitted support documentation; 18 counties have been reviewed (37 wireless PSAPs) for compliance and ten of the counties are in full compliance. Seven of the counties require minimal additional documentation for the 2018 compliance year, and lastly, two of the counties will not meet compliance status for 2018 due to a delay in EMD implementation. 19 additional counties are currently in the review process.

The DRAFT Ohio 9-1-1 Plan that you will be receiving includes several “to be determined” issues due to the vendor not being in place. If the proposed legislation is implemented, the Ohio 9-1-1 Program Office will be able to fill in those unanswered portions for a more detailed plan.

Mr. Jackson shared a few comments before opening the floor for discussions on the ORC 128 legislative proposal. He reminds all in attendance that everyone in the room has the same goal of implementation and reiterates that while many may feel a different path may be necessary, all are on the same progressive page. He then turned the floor over to Rob Herrington, the Jefferson County 9-1-1 Coordinator. Mr. Herrington shared that he and several 9-1-1 Coordinators representing 27 counties met to discuss Federal Engineering’s report and the legislative proposal. He was asked to represent the majority and share suggestions and concerns. A lengthy discussion transpired between Mr. Herrington and the ESINet Steering Committee and Mr. Herrington shared his report and spreadsheet. The biggest concern for county coordinators is the proposed low rate of \$.25 per wireless device fee, as recommended in Federal Engineering’s recent report. More information will be coming from Mr. Herrington before the August meeting. Mr. Herrington’s handout is attached.

Lastly, Mr. Jackson asked if any committee members had new business to discuss:

Representative Carfagna - no

Commissioner Humphrey - no

Mr. Loree - no

Mr. Robbins - no

Mr. Leutz - no

On a final note, Mr. Jackson consulted the calendars of the Steering Committee members for a date to have the next in-person meeting. It appeared that August 30, 2018, beginning 11:00AM worked for the Committee. Mr. Jackson then requested a motion to adjourn the meeting. *Mr. Robbins made a*

*motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Mr. Loree. All were in favor and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:50PM.*

K. C. HARRINGTON

The Project

First things first. We welcome the PSAP standards and the development of the network and core.

Secondly, many of our Directors were comfortable with the 50 cent surcharge proposed by the legislation committee

When it became apparent that 25 cents was back on the table, our directors became more vocal and concerned

The price of the ESNET and Core are estimated to be \$150 million over ten years based on state comparisons

County costs to get to NG-911 are still unknown due to many unknowns remaining and differences in the local systems

PSAP operating standards require additional cost outlays and many of us are still working thru those costs

The reality is that there are additional costs ahead for the counties and municipalities and little to no new money

What Will The 25 Cent Surcharge Really Generate

According to Federal Engineering, 32% of wireless devices in the state are not currently paying the surcharge. 32%

The projection is for 17.1 million total devices to be paying the Universal Service Fee but that number could be flawed.

If 3 million devices are not captured or don't exist, that's 9 million less dollars for the counties and a 7.22% revenue loss

If devices estimates are 100% right, 42 counties would gain less than \$30,000 to implement NG and the PSAP standards

At the same level, 59 counties would gain less than \$50,000. An NG capable voice recorder is \$75,000.

If we only collect half of those 32% missing devices, we are looking at only \$15,000 increases for half of the state.

Let's Talk About the Federal Engineering Study and What It Said or Didn't Say

Page 1 of the study said the "information will identify transitional NG costs", but it didn't, it identified items.

Page 2 broke PSAPs down into three sizes, but then never explained the differences.

Page 3 said "there were inconsistencies and knowledge gaps among the stakeholders" but never explained them.

Page 4 said "confirmation of accuracy of wireless subscriber count.....was confirmed by comparison to at least one other state" Could we have a little more information here that might make us all more confident? One states example?

Page 5 said "the 25 cent USF surcharge would have significant impact on current funding levels" Again, really? At 25 cents and FULL COLLECTION OF THE MISSING 32%, 42 counties would gain less than \$30,000. That's not significant.

Page 7 said "Counties would need to evaluate their current state of readiness for migration to NG911 and determine what funds, if any, are needed beyond their current funding." Well, we honestly thought that's what this report was for.

Page 9 and we finally get to the results of this study. "Based on the findings of this report, Federal Engineering recommends that the State move forward with adoption of a 25 cent Universal Device Fee. What findings?"

Other States, Are They All Wrong?

Ok we all know that we are next to last in state surcharge rates and also dead last in prepaid fees. But why?

We know we are a Home Rule state. There are 30 Home Rule states. Again, we are next to last among those 30 states.

State surcharge rates can be very misleading. Nevada and Washington are \$.25 like Ohio, or are they? Michigan is \$.19

In reality, Nevada is \$1.25 and Washington is \$.95 when you add in county fees. And Ionia County Michigan is \$2.30.

There are 13 operating ESNET states in the latest FCC report. The average surcharge in those states is \$1.13.

While we understand you don't like to compare to other states, they have already done this and we haven't.

Are There Other Ways to Look at Funding?

Of 53 counties that I have total budgets for, the wireless surcharge makes up on average only 13.5% of their budgets

Under the \$.25 surcharge proposal, that number would only increase to 16.6%. Indiana's ratio is 35%

On average, every penny added to the surcharge adds about 1% to the budget share. Can this be a discussion point?

Could we develop real information to reach a more practical level that will result in the system being built soon?

What about an impactful increase that would promise real new money to address real new expenses?

What about paying for radio? Nationally the trend is towards allowing that over the last three years. 28 states now do.

That would solve another significant problems for many counties as well as benefit MARCS in the long run.

We know you are considering a two-year re-evaluation of funding levels, but that's two years for us to struggle for funds

Add another year to collect the higher rate and we are three years down the road with limited results.

A recommendation in the ORC for a five year ticking clock means we may not get there if we aren't funded initially.

Lastly, please consider the local funding option. If you can't find a way to adequately fund us, then allow us to do it.

23 states now do so.