Statewide Emergency Services Internet Protocol Network
Steering Committee
August 30, 2018

The August 30, 2018 ESINet Steering Committee meeting started at 11:10 AM. Teleconference system failure was experienced at the EMA building resulting in the room being able to hear callers, but the callers could not hear the meeting room. After consultation with EMA technical staff, Melissa Wulliger called into the teleconference and advised all callers the system was not functioning.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Stu Davis, Chair, and Ms. Wulliger called the roll.

**Members present or via telephone:**
Stu Davis, Committee Chair
Representative Rick Carfagna, Ohio House of Representatives
Commissioner Ed Humphrey, County Commissioners’ Association of Ohio
Matthew Hiscock, Ohio Municipal League
John Leutz, County Commissioners’ Association of Ohio
Tom Robbins, Ohio Municipal League
Jason Loree, Ohio Township Association (arrived at 11:08)
A quorum was present

**Other Attendees:**
Rob Jackson, Ohio 9-1-1 Administrator
Sharon Jennings, DAS Attorney
Staff member from Senator Hoagland’s Office
Dave Blackstone, New Chair of the Technical Standards Sub-Committee
Jay Somerville, Chair of the PSAP Operations Sub-Committee

Mr. Davis opened the meeting by thanking everyone for attending. He explained that even when he is unable to attend, he receives detailed updates regarding events. He reminded everyone that DAS, Ohio 9-1-1 Program Office, sits in the role as a facilitator and one of the key parts is the wonderful opportunity that exists moving forward with NG9-1-1. When negotiations begin on the ORC Proposal document, Mr. Davis asked for everyone to please keep in mind that everyone involved wants a successful result.

Mr. Davis then turned the meeting over to Mr. Jackson to work through the agenda. He proceeded with the first agenda item, which was to approve the meeting minutes from July 2018. Mr. Jackson asked if any of the members present had any revisions or comments regarding the minutes. There were no changes, so Mr. Jackson requested a motion. A motion was made by to
accept the minutes by Commissioner Humphrey and was then seconded by Mr. Robbins. There were no discussions and a roll call vote was taken:

Representative Rick Carfagna - yes
Commissioner Ed Humphrey - yes
Mr. Hiscock – Abstained
Mr. Leutz – yes
Mr. Robbins - yes
The minutes were approved.
Mr. Jackson shared that those minutes will be posted on the website as usual.

Sub-Committee Updates:

Mr. Jackson introduced Dave Blackstone, the new Chairman of the Technical Standards Sub-Committee. Mr. Blackstone said the Sub-Committee had a meeting on the 22nd of August. There were a few new members welcomed to the committee, Mr. Blackstone being one of them along with Mr. Lawson Dripps, AT&T’s Public Safety Relations Manager (telephone company participating in Ohio’s 9-1-1 system member) and Mr. Roger Hixson was added as an At-Large member. He has been a long-time member of Ohio APCO/NENA and is the Technical Issues Director for the NENA National organization. The sub-committee is working on producing a NG9-1-1 educational publication. The next meeting is scheduled for September 13, 2018. Mr. Jackson called for questions and welcomed the new members.

Mr. Jackson asked Mr. Jay Somerville, Chair of the PSAP Operations Sub-Committee, if he had any updates. He shared that the Sub-Committee has not met and offered no updates.

Mr. Jackson continued with the 9-1-1 Administrator update.

The Ohio 9-1-1 Plan is a combined strategic plan offering history and a program plan for NG9-1-1. This is a living document and will change as Ohio moves forward. This document has nothing to do with the Federal 9-1-1 Grant that was just released. The Federal Grant requires a “State 9-1-1 Plan,” but it is just a portion of the application specific to the grant.

The U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) and the Department of Commerce, National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) announced the 911 Grant Program. A total of $109,000,000.00 will be available to 56 eligible states/territories/tribal areas to share the funds in a 60%/40% match reimbursement style grant. There are two steps involved in applying for the grant. Step 1 is to identify a designated 911 Coordinator for the State and submit the form by September 10, 2018. In addition, it is necessary to sign off that no 9-1-1 fees have been diverted. The state must submit one application and one budget outlining how the money will be spent and how the 40% local match is funded.
The Ohio 9-1-1 Program Office has downloaded all materials available and attended the informational webinar. Once submitted, NHTSA and NTIA will publish preliminary funding allocations for each of the States or Tribal Organizations meeting the certification requirements. At that point, a 60-day window begins to submit a completed grant application. Lastly, Mr. Jackson mentioned that DAS is not a granting authority. Therefore, the Ohio 9-1-1 Program Office will need to partner with an agency that is a granting authority.

Mr. Jackson then distributed a document outlining his three scenarios on how we should proceed:

**Scenario #1 – State Coordinated Projects**
The statewide Next Generation 9-1-1 Core Services System and ESINet project could utilize the funding to pay for a portion of the implementation. Assuming legislation passes, and funding exists, this grant funding used to pay implementation costs would leave more funding in the NG9-1-1 account, which could ultimately be used for a contingency fund balance or even transferred (ESINet action if included in the proposed legislation when it becomes law) to the local government assistance fund. The 40% match would come from the funding approved by the legislature.

Challenges to this approach are the timing of the project and perception of the state keeping the funds, even though the funds would be used to build a system to support local 9-1-1.

**Scenario #2 – Local Project Submission**
We could allow for local project submission, which would need to include a detailed project plan, budget, 40% match funding source, etc. Each county could submit their requests to our office and then be screened and ranked by a Grant Review Committee. Initial contacts have been made and the following individuals indicated they would serve on a Grant Review Committee:

The challenges associated with scenario #2 are the tight timeline, as well as coordinating numerous submissions into a single budget on the grant application. The follow-up/auditing over the four-year cycle would also be a significant effort.

**Scenario #3 – State Coordinated Projects Directly Supporting Local Governments**
In this scenario, there are several projects that could be coordinated at the state level that directly benefit local agencies, as well as the state 9-1-1 program, while also saving local entities from coming up with 100% of funding and waiting for reimbursement.

- **OGRIP GIS/LBRS NG9-1-1 Project**: The grant funds could be applied to a contractor to work with OGRIP and the counties to review and manipulate their current ALI, MSAG and GIS data into the proper format for use in the NG9-1-1
environment, a critical requirement for NG9-1-1 to work. The grant funds would pay for 60% of the project, while OGRIP would fund the remaining 40% match. This function is included in the RFP and can possibly be executed after contingent award, but before legislation since this function needs done no matter what NG9-1-1 solution Ohio ultimately chooses.

- NG9-1-1 Training: The grant funds could be used to support NG9-1-1 training at the local level. Local agencies would submit their request, outlining their total cost and their 40% funding plan. The state could pay the 60% (identify a funding source) and subsequently receive the grant reimbursement.

- NG9-1-1 Consulting: The grant funds could be used to support consultant fees at the local level for NG9-1-1 projects. Local agencies would submit their consultant project, outlining their total cost and their 40% funding plan. The state could pay the 60% (identify funding source) and subsequently receive the grant reimbursement.

A few things it cannot be used for is to operate legacy E9-1-1, 9-1-1 system or costs to operate the NG9-1-1 system after it is fully operational. The Ohio Program office would lean towards selecting Option #, however there may be other scenarios others can offer.

Mr. Robbins made the motion for ESINet guidance to attempt to pursue Option #3 as the option selected to move forward on the Federal 911 Grant, and Mr. Leutz seconded the motion. Mr. Jackson asked for discussion. There was a discussion on whether Option #3 is the the best option for the counties. There was a discussion on whether Option #3 is the best option for the counties. Commissioner Humphrey and John Leutz indicated the counties would not be in a position to present a project, budget and funding match within a 30 or 60 day window and any bidding or price quotes would take quite a bit of time through the procurement process. Mr. Hiscock was not confident that it would benefit all counties.

Mr. Blackstone explained how LBRS is beneficial and will be necessary for all counties. Mr. Jackson added that there is portion identified in the RFP for the GIS Contractor to build a system and train counties on how to utilize this format when transitioning into NG9-1-1. It was noted by Mr. Hiscock that not everyone will be able to utilize this grant. Mr. Jackson explained how these funds can and cannot be used:

- **9-1-1 Grant Program funds may not be used for:**
  1. Cost to operate legacy E9-1-1 or 9-1-1 systems
  2. Costs to operate the NG9-1-1 system after it is fully operational
  3. Activities related to construction
  4. Independent verification and validation (IV & V) testing for product, service, and system purchases

- **9-1-1 Grant Program funds must be used for implementation of NG9-1-1 services. The following are included as eligible can be used for 9-1-1 Grant Program funds:**
1 – Hardware to provide NG9-1-1 services
2 – Software to provide NG9-1-1 services
3 – Hosted NG9-1-1 services
4 – Contractual costs associated with carrying out programmatic activities, including consultant fees
5 – Training directly related to NG9-1-1 implementation for public safety personnel
6 – Administration and Planning (10 percent maximum)
7 – Operation of the NG9-1-1 system while still operating the legacy 9-1-1 system

Mr. Jackson asked for any additional discussion, and there was none. A roll call vote was taken:
Representative Rick Carfagna - yes
Commissioner Ed Humphrey - yes
Mr. Hiscock – yes
Mr. Leutz – yes
Mr. Robbins – yes
Mr. Loree -yes
All committee members voted to approve Option #3 when pursuing the Federal 9-1-1 Grant.

Mr. Jackson updated the committee regarding the Wireless 9-1-1 Government Assistance Fund Reconciliation Forms is used for the proper categories in the ORC. All but two have been approved, and we are just awaiting clarifying comments. If the Feds wanted to confirm that we are not diverting funds collected for 9-1-1, we have secured the proper documentation.

Mr. Jackson asked Sharon McMurray, the Support and Compliance Coordinator, to provide an update on compliance of the counties reporting thus far. The schedule for the 2018 S&C Program is a compressed schedule this year due to the May 12, 2018 effective date. Fifty-one counties have submitted support documentation and of those 51, 27 have been reviewed. Fifteen are in full compliance with 11 receiving their confirmation letters and four more confirmation letters going out shortly. The remaining nine just have minor adjustments to obtain compliance status. There are just a couple counties that will not be compliant this year. Ms. McMurray believes that 95% of the counties will be complaint by the end of this year.

Mr. Jackson shares the Ohio 9-1-1 Symposium will be held again this year at the Ohio Highway Patrol Academy on September 12, 2018 9:00AM to 4:00PM. The Ohio 9-1-1 Program Office joins the Ohio Chapters of APCO/NENA to offer a day full of information and training. There is no cost to attend. As of today, we have about 150 attending. He thanked APCO and NENA for partnering with the Ohio 9-1-1 Program Office.

Mr. Jackson shared a few comments before opening the floor for discussions on the ORC 128 legislative proposal. Ashtabula County Commissioners sent a letter concerned about proposed changes to language in the ORC and the Technical Advisory Committee. Their request was to reinstate the original language and the second concern was the universal fee and with a cap.
Rob Herrington, Jefferson County 9-1-1 Coordinator (speaking for a newly formed county 9-1-1 coordinators interest group) was introduced and passed out an information sheet recapping his research on the fee discussion. The information sheet is attached. He reiterated the highlights on the information and offered two questions for discussion. How much money will be generated by a $.25 universal service fee? Second concern is the auditing process proposed to close the reported 30%+ gap in wireless collections. Representative Carfagna stated he has confidence in the Federal Engineering Report. There was a lengthy discussion regarding the fees, collection, auditing carriers, and the philosophy on setting the USF fee. 1 – set it at a higher level to ensure enough collections and lower it later, OR 2 – set it at a lower level and raise it if it is found there is not enough. There were a variety of opinions and input. At this point, multiple conversations began taking place in the room and no one speaker could be discerned. The discussion turned toward more of a debate with several people speaking at once.

Mr. Jackson called order to the room. He said at this point after a lengthy conversation, a discussion needs to take place among the Steering Committee Members. Information has been gathered from consultant’s reports, subject matter experts, the County 9-1-1 Coordinators who have spoken, and Sub-Committees have submitted their opinions; the Committee needs to discuss and decide the recommendation.

Mr. Leutz states we need to move forward and will not leave the counties behind. The Committee will bring a better 9-1-1 to the state. The State needs to provide core services understanding all counties are at different levels. Other strong components are access to the CAD systems and regulatory compliance which includes EMD. Revenue for staffing is critical. If Federal Engineering numbers are not confident numbers, he proposes the following for a key system:

It should be universal device fee of $.25 across the board for the first two years – this will provide the much-needed data and gives legislators confidence regarding revenue stream. Year 3-7-year period (five-year period), the Steering Committee has legislative authority to have the ability adjust that fee on annual basis $.25 to $.30. That offsets lack of confidence in FE’s report. This is suggested based on the proposal this Committee has the responsibility and obligation to allocate funding appropriately. After five-year period (year 8), it drops back to $.25. Then we will have data collection and can further recommend a more accurate fee based on history.

Another critical component is the desire of counties to charge a surcharge, but we need to investigate other areas of funding options. The current ability to place a property tax assessment for 911; the ability to utilize sales tax, property tax and levy the ability with some counties with statutory authority to place a surcharge. These are viable options to use and broaden those local options to raise local revenue to provide a complete emergency communication and response system.
Once it is decided, keep in mind that it will take six months to incorporate according to the Department of Taxation. Two years of funding coming in – with an annual adjustment to be taken for the next calendar year. There will be a cap annually. The fees start at $.25 then can move to $.26 then $.27 with a cap annually of $.30.

A questioned was raised, what happens to the fees that are being collected by the local telephone companies now? Those fees will not go away and may be used as transition costs. Mr. Somerville shares that Legacy needs to be kept alive until it can be transferred over. Legislation (county final plan) would be the one to decide when those fees stop, because they are responsible for the billing. So those fees will duplicate until a final plan is released. A declaration of the service then the collection can stop. A change in the county final plan would rule on when the collection stops due to billing. If that company is no longer the service provider, they cannot collect. Legislative change would have to take place.

Representative Carfagna would like to see during years one and two a required reporting piece. Mr. Leutz would like for the Steering Committee to review reports and make fee adjustments according to annual reports.

Mr. Jackson requested that Mr. Somerville and Mr. Leutz will work with the Legislative Service Commission to draft the appropriate language. LSC will draft the language plus two recommended options. This is a budget related concept and should be in the budget. LSC can be involved through Rep. Carfagna’s Office.

Mr. Leutz suggested that the Committee move forward with the agreed core document and requested that LSC review it for technical issues to include legislative drafts of the two additional concepts discussed in the meeting on this day.

Mr. Leutz made a motion that the Steering Committee address the funding issue by imposing a universal access fee of $0.25 for a two-year period from the effective date of legislation with collections beginning January 1 of 2020. After the two-year period of $.25, then the Steering Committee is given the authority to increase on an annual basis the $.25 surcharge up to $.30 during that five-year period and at the end of the five-year period the fee be reduced to $.25 with the obligation of the Steering Committee to provide a report to the General Assembly recommending a fee level appropriate for future needs.

The second part to this motion is to review and rewrite current local revenue raising options for 9-1-1 and clearly indicate that the local options of sales tax, property tax and property assessments and the special situations for a limited number of counties be rewritten to include and allow basically the option of providing a complete emergency response communication system within the county.

Mr. Robbins seconded the motion. Mr. Jackson asked for any other discussion, and there was none.
A roll call vote was taken:
Representative Carfagna - yes
Commissioner Humphrey - yes
Mr. Hiscock – yes
Mr. Leutz – yes
Mr. Robbins – yes
Mr. Loree -yes

All committee members voted to approve the motion to impose a universal fee and additional funding options. This language will be inserted into the draft ORC Proposal document.

Mr. Jackson said that the County 9-1-1 Planning Committee Membership issues needs to be addressed. There are six options out there. Mr. Jackson asked Tom Morgan to speak on behalf of the Buckeye State Sheriffs Association. There were two things he wanted everyone to know: 1) The BSSA supports increasing the universal service fee for 9-1-1. 2) The BSSA still supports the option including the Sheriff on the County 9-1-1 Planning Committee in the counties where the Sheriff coordinates and operates the 9-1-1 center. Chief Shull (OFCA) was not present. Rep. Carfagna thought language had already been created that was agreeable to all involved.

After further discussion, Mr. Leutz made a motion for the following language to be added to the ORC Proposal document:

(A) A county shall maintain a 9-1-1 program review committee, which shall serve without compensation and shall consist of six members as follows:

(1) A member of the board of county commissioners, who shall serve as chairperson of the committee, and another elected public official from within the county, appointed by the board of county commissioners.

(2) The chief executive officer of the most populous municipal corporation in the county. When determining population under this division, population residing outside the county shall be excluded.

(3) A member of the board of township trustees of the most populous township in the county as selected by majority vote of the board of trustees.

(4) A member of a board of township trustees selected by the majority of boards of township trustees in the county pursuant to the resolutions they adopt.

(5) A member of the legislative authority of a municipal corporation in the county selected by the majority of the legislative authorities of municipal corporations in the county pursuant to resolutions they adopt.

(6) An elected official from within the county appointed by the board of County Commissioners

Members of the committee shall serve at the pleasure of their appointing authority.
(B) The committee shall maintain and amend a final plan for implementing and operating a countywide 9-1-1 system. The committee shall, not later than March 1 of each year, submit a report to the political subdivisions within the county and to the 9-1-1 program office detailing the sources and amounts of revenue expended to support and all costs incurred to operate the countywide 9-1-1 system and the PSAPs which are a part of that system for the previous calendar year. Any amendment to the final plan shall require a unanimous vote of the committee. The county shall provide the committee with any clerical, legal, and other staff assistance necessary.

Mr. Hiscock was concerned about the scenario if a township dissolves or is annexed the language proposed does not address the issues that would be involved.

Mr. Somerville spoke on behalf of Ohio APCO and shared that they supported Option #1 as it was previously presented and is opposed to Option #6 or the motion that was just made. There is concern this prohibits county planning committee from using representative committees that that support their dispatch centers and is made up of the best representations of customers and public safety agencies. If passes, they would have to remove committee members.

Discussion was made to give an expansion of the board. Mr. Robbins does not support “any amendment to the final plan shall require a unanimous vote of the committee” decision. The Steering Committee had a brief discussion and decided on the wording of “any amendment to the final plan shall require a two-thirds vote of the committee.”

Mr. Leutz amended the motion made on the language of six-member planning committee and changing unanimous to two-thirds vote language. Mr. Robbins seconded it.

Mr. Jackson asked for any other discussion, and there was none.
A roll call vote was taken:

Representative Carfagna - yes
Commissioner Humphrey - yes
Mr. Hiscock – no
Mr. Leutz – yes
Mr. Robbins – yes
Mr. Lorre -yes
The committee voted to approve the motion.

Mr. Leutz made the motion to seek legislative drafting of the core proposal and of the two previous amendments that were just adopted. Mr. Hiscock seconded it.

Mr. Jackson asked for any other discussion, and there was none.
A roll call vote was taken:
Representative Carfagna - yes
Commissioner Humphrey - yes
Mr. Hiscock – yes
Mr. Leutz – yes
Mr. Robbins – yes
Mr. Loree -yes

All committee members voted to approve the motion to seek legislative drafting.

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
Mr. Hiscock-no

On a final note, Mr. Jackson consulted the calendars of the Steering Committee members for a date to have the next teleconference meeting. It appeared that September 25, 2018, beginning 11:00AM, will be the next Teleconference for the Committee. Mr. Jackson then requested a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Leutz made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Rep. Carfagna. All were in favor and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 1:00PM.
There Are Only Two Questions Left To Answer

How much money will really be generated by a 25 cent Universal Device Fee?

Current Funding Generates                                               $26,038,066.03
Devices Currently Paying                                               8,679,355
Wireline and VOIP Under UDF per FE report                               4,201,000
Total Accountable Devices                                              12,880,355
Total Collection Under UDF Known Devices                                $38,638,065.00
32% Additional Devices Reported to Exist by FE                         4,255,645
Additional Funds Budgeted from 32% Missing                             $12,766,935.00
Total Collection Under UDF at 100% Collection                           $51,405,000.00
Each Percentage Point of Error in the 32% Estimate                      $354,637.08

In order to collect the amount of money projected by the Federal Engineering report, the devices must first truly exist as the report says and, Ohio will have to be 100% successful at auditing and collecting from all wireless companies operating in the State. This type of audit has never been successfully done in the United States. In other words, you are basing 24% of your total project budget on devices that perhaps do not exist and on a collection process that has never been successfully accomplished. I spoke with Eric Parry of Federal Engineering about this and he confirmed that he knows of no state that has been successful with the auditing process.

The State of New York, after several years of trying to audit cellphone companies, issued this statement: “The Department has not established policies and systems to sufficiently ensure that Providers comply with the Tax Law and that the State receives all monies to which it is entitled. In particular, the Department does not have adequate controls to ensure that all eligible Providers supplying services in New York State collect, report, and remit the Surcharges for all eligible devices to the Department.” And this from one of the attorneys involved in the New York efforts: “...these cases could take years to wind their way through the courts, delaying payments that may never come.

What Will It Cost To Fund The ESINET, Core 911 System, County And Local Systems, And Address The PSAP Operations Requirements?

ESINET and Core Estimate                                               $15,000,000.00
Taxation, 911 Program, OARnet, SOCC, Contingency                      $3,574,240.00
Total State Liabilities                                                $18,574,240.00
Balance with Full Projected Funding                                    $32,830,760.00
Balance without 32% Additional Devices                                $5,807,305.00

The question that must be answered is: what will it cost the counties to complete NG911 and meet the PSAP standards? In an effort to more carefully consider the financial issues that individual counties will encounter, we looked at two key points, First, what percentage of each counties 911 operating budget is currently made up of funds from the wireless surcharge in place now. After evaluating county budget data that was originally
submitted for the FCC report, we found that the statistical average for the counties was 13.4%. Even though counties are allowed to use wireless money for many parts of their operations, receiving only 13.4% of their budget from these funds never came close to offsetting the cost created by wireless calls, which was the original point of the wireless surcharge legislation in the first place.

The second and more important consideration is what budget effects will be faced by counties as they address the cost of building out an NG 911 system at the local level, maintaining it year to year, and meeting the PSAP operating rules requirements. As you know, Federal Engineering had great difficulty in determining the costs to the counties due to the complexities of the projects. To evaluate this information more closely, we created an instrument that was based on the same information identified in the Federal Engineering report of June 14th of this year. Items like CPE, EMD, staffing, connectivity, etc. were all included. We obtained a statistically valid sample for the 88 counties that would assure 99% reliability of the results, and those results show that each county will experience an average 18% annual operating cost increase over five years. When you factor in the upfront costs for NG911 and PSAP compliance taken over those five years and then add in the annual costs associated with service contracts, fiber connections, and personnel expenses, this will be a significant increase in expenses for all counties.

While we found an average of 18% being added to the operating cost of our sample counties, the total additional percentage that would be added to these budgets at the 25 cent rate, with 100% collection of the four million missing devices, would be only 3%. Because of this disparity, we respectfully request that the surcharge be set at 43 cents, since each penny added results in an approximate 1% increase to the counties based on the current distribution model. Should the committee take the path of not relying on the 4 million devices to be successfully collected, then it would be necessary to place an additional 6 cents on the surcharge to cover the 12 million dollars that may never be collected.

Many in our group agree that the ESINET steering committee should have the ability to throttle back the surcharge rate but only when the state is 100% NG911 built out. The concern here is that the 911 coordinators currently would have no voice in those decisions.

It should be noted that counties with 911 budgets under $2,000,000 are more significantly impacted by the additional expenses of these projects from a percentage standpoint. It is because of these counties, which make up 84% of the state, that the addition of a local funding option is also of critical importance.

We propose the local funding option would have two tiers, to include the ability for counties to collect the local surcharge through a County Commission Resolution or by popular vote for a higher amount. By a board vote, the County Board of Commissioners could enact a resolution to collect a maximum of $0.50 local surcharge without a ballot proposal. The second option would allow the county to collect the local surcharge through a valid countywide ballot proposal. The second proposal would not exceed a maximum monthly rate of $2.00.

In closing, please consider the plight of the State of Utah, where Federal Engineering consultant Eric Parry was previously the State 911 Director. They recently increased their wireless surcharge rate twice in a seven-month period. First from $.76 to $.98 and then from $.98 to $1.32. According to Utah tax officials that I spoke with, this was done primarily due to the costs associated with NG911 development. And according to Mr. Parry, the political climate there is such that there is tremendous support for 911 and public safety by the legislature, making these increases possible. You all know we do not have that option. We need to adequately fund this project the first time.
August 28, 2018

Ashtabula County Emergency Management Agency
C/O Janet Boland, 9-1-1 Coordinator
25 West Jefferson St.
Jefferson, OH 44047

Dear Ms. Boland:

As stated to you on October 17, 2017, the Ashtabula County Board of Commissioners would like to reiterate their concerns to the proposed changes to Ohio Revised Code, Section 128 in two (2) major areas as follows:

**Planning Committee and Technical Advisory Committee**
We realize with the changing technology of the wireless communication world we live in, there is a great need to refocus our ideas on how to attain, maintain and budget for these reoccurring costs that are associated with these constant changes.

**Concern #1 Technical Advisory Committee**
We believe the best resolution to maintain overall participation, input and support for our Local 911 System is to keep the original 911 Technical Advisory Committee intact. It appears you are proposing to remove core agencies that represent the entire county (This includes Director/Coordinator of Emergency Management and the representative from the Township Trustees Board).

**Concern #2 Universal Fee vs Wireless**
The “universal” language versus “wireless” is a wise and justified awareness that needs to be recognized. While it is not always popular to request a change in the fee structure it can be detrimental in a lifesaving situation if our PSAPs do not have the necessary technology and equipment to handle these ever changing types of 911 calls.

While we agree the fee is extremely minimal (.25) per device and should be raised to a minimum of $1.00; the real issue to the Local County’s (PSAPs) is the “CAP” that is imposed on our counties. Unless this “CAP” is removed or raised, the increase will not benefit the Local 911 PSAP(s) that reside within any of the 88 Counties.

Wireless/Universal devices of every sort imaginable (cell/IE/APP/VS/vehicles/etc.) are increasing throughout the state at an alarming rate along with their capabilities to infiltrate the local PSAP and tie up the 911 lines and possibly render them useless with viruses etc. This awareness is not new. One just needs to Google “911 Viruses” to see the scope of damage and what the effects can be to our PSAPs and the networks connected to them.
The majority of Local PSAPs cannot stay current with technology if more funds are not directed back to where the original 911 call originates from.

Sincerely,

Ashtabula County Commissioners

Kathryn Whittington, President  J.P. Ducro IV, Vice-President  Casey Kozlowski, Commissioner