

State 9-1-1 Advisory COMMITTEE MEETING

March 4, 2009

Attendees

Ken Keim, ENP	State 9-1-1 Program
Shannon Marheine, ENP	State 9-1-1 Program
Mark Tennyson	State 9-1-1 Program
Gillien Duvall	State 9-1-1 Program
Laura Wolfe	PSAP Metro/I5 Region
Ann Rakosi	PSAP Coastal Region
Terry Swearingen	LEC - Qwest
Leslie Taylor	PSAP Metro/I5 Region
Mark Buchholz	PSAP Metro/I5 Region
Margie Puckett, RPL	PSAP Central South Region
April Stream	PSAP Central North Region
Galen Howard	PSAP Metro/15 Region
Sally Jones, ENP	PSAP Metro/15 Region
Kristie Wilde	Guest – Central Lane 9-1-1
Tony Busam	Guest – RCC Consultants

Shannon Marheine, OEM, opened the meeting by welcoming everyone to Eugene.

Review Agenda – The first topic was to review the agenda.

Committee Procedures

- **Review of Minutes** – Shannon asked the group to reflect back on the special committee meeting that was held in January. The minutes from that meeting were sent out for review prior to posting. Shannon stated that she felt that she was remiss in the past and feels that the minutes should be reviewed by the committee prior to posting from this point forward. That way, you as members, can go over what is typed and can confirm or deny that it is truly what you said. Everyone in attendance seemed to agree that it was a good idea. We will set a timeline for your responses. Our goal is to get the minutes posted within 30 days after each meeting.
- **Agenda Creation** – Shannon asked everyone, as representatives of this committee, to please bring any topic that you have to her attention, either from yourself or one of the people that you represent, so that she may include it on the agenda. She stressed that this is your advisory committee and that is what we are here for. Anything that we need to talk about can be put on

this agenda. She proposed sending a draft agenda out prior to our meeting, that way we can add or remove a topic ahead of time.

- **Attendance / Guests** – Shannon addressed the issue of attendance at our meetings. She has received some questions on the subject and felt it should be discussed. We know that we have representatives and when they are not able to attend we have alternates. A lot of people have expressed interest in just sitting in and listening. She asked for opinions from the committee on this. Originally the committee picked the number of reps so that we could keep it a big enough to represent all parties but small enough to remain effective. Ken Keim, OEM, felt that guests should be able to attend but only to listen in. Sally Jones, Columbia Co, felt that we could have guests but to control their input, this could be accomplished by the way the room is set up; we could have a separate table just for voting members. It could also be noted on the agenda that comments are only to be made by the voting committee members. Or perhaps we could state on the agenda, comments from the audience will be limited to three minutes. Sally added to those suggestions that sometimes it is good to have placards set up on the table for assigned seating. Shannon agreed that those were all good ideas.

Terry Swearingen, Qwest, commented that the whole idea of having representatives for each area was to keep the committee a smaller group. Why would we need to have visitors who would sit in and make comments when they already have a representative who they are suppose to give their issues and concerns to who will bring those to the committee on their behalf? Having guests is fine but it seems to me that it defeats the purpose of what we set out to do and gets away from what we set out for this committee to be.

Shannon agreed with Terry as far as understanding what his statement meant. Terry added to his statement that he felt that if the agenda was sent out to people ahead of time then they could give their reps their concerns / input at that time.

Sally suggested that the representatives and the areas that they represent be posted on the APCO/NENA website with instructions for people to contact their representatives directly with their issues. Shannon asked if we have a link on the APCO/NENA website? Laura stated that our link on their web site has been broken for some time.

Kristie Wilde, Lane Co, asked if the information from these meetings were public record. Sally asked Shannon if she had checked to find out and she responded that she had not but agreed that we need to double check on this because it would change how we do things.

- **Wireless Issues – Committee Report**

Mark Tennyson, OEM, began by saying that it has been awhile since the wireless committee has met but that they plan to do so soon. However, behind the scenes there have been things going on. Galen Howard and I have communicated with the committee and we have been working on a letter having to do with the Beta Test. We are working on completing this and getting it out the door. We are asking information about routing and so forth from the wireless carriers. At the end of January I sent a letter out to all the wireless carriers asking them some questions, one of my questioned asked for a current handset count by county. The information that we have is outdated.

Mark addressed the issue of getting requests from wireless carriers saying they need a new trunk or that they need additional trunking into a selective router. He explains that on his end he needs to have more information before he can take action on that type of request. He has no idea what their network looks like. Do they already have trunking into a selective router? How many channels per T1? Before he can do anything he needs to know these types of things before hand. And, on the other end we have trunking into the LEC for each of the PSAPs. Ultimately we can have all of the wireless trunking that we want but at some point we are going to have a bottleneck. He states that he has had to put the kibosh on this type of request until he can gather the necessary information. He is now asking where their MSC's are and what selective router are they going into? He is working with the LECs on the other end to see what is already into the PSAP and so forth. He has received some responses but primarily they are still compiling network information, so they are working on that. At any rate, he says that he is asking more questions and will be working to get that done. My main question back to the wireless carriers is; why the need? Are you new to this county, you already have three and you want to add two more? Is it due to getting busy signals? He goes on to say that he is getting some response back.

Mark Buchholz, WVCC, asked Mark T. if he has been getting resistance. He responded that he has met with some resistance but as he explains the reasoning behind his questions and why he is asking then they understand. They are still concerned about the issue of information sharing. Mark states that he understands that and has assured them that we are not out to do that. Mark B. asked who of the carriers have responded to him. Mark T. stated that so far he has heard back from T-Mobile, US Cellular and Verizon. The others are working on theirs, just not completed yet. Mark B. asked if they are giving him the handset count by county. Mark T. stated that so far these three have. Mark B. asked if he will be able to take that information and make an estimation of what their 9-1-1 remittance should be? Mark T. states that there is yet another level of detail to be able to determine that. Ken K. interjects that those figures would come from the revenue share of wireless & VoiP vs. landline money coming in. Nobody has that information or knows

those figures. Shannon adds that if someone asks the Dept of Revenue for these numbers, as far as landline vs. wireline & VoiP they do not have them. One would have to go to PUC and get the subscriber info. Shannon also said that we have asked them in the past if there is anyway way that they can segregate those costs. Their response was no, that their database cannot handle it. They would have to acquire a whole new database. PUC has the subscriber information to be able to figure out some kind of formula but that is something that they do not actually track. Mark B. feels that there should be some way to measure, like a certain percentage of a 5,000 customer base, at least to get a ball park support mechanism for the money that is collected. Shannon points out that the other thing that they have to be careful about is having to do with the same thing that we had happen with the Secretary of States audit, regarding the number of lines that DOR showed in comparison with PUC. The numbers did not match up.

Sally adds that there is the other question of the requirement from the NET on revenues collected for cellular and VoIP. Can you apply a certain percentage and say that this is the amount or does there actually have to be an audit? Ken K. replied that the AG is looking into that issue. In regards to service providers, when it comes to wireline or VoiP or whatever, Galen asks; can't they discriminate or determine, like when they are giving the check over to DOR what the individual funds are associated with? Shannon responded that no, they cannot.

Shannon went ahead and touched on the subject of the Tax Language that Hasina Squires sent out regarding SB 581. After reading this you will notice in Senator Johnson's testimony, she mentions that DOR does not currently segregate the charges. Shannon asked if anyone actually heard her speak and Sally said that she did hear her and when she listened to her she said that the Senator stated that DOR **was** actually doing that work now. Shannon said she was made aware of that statement via an email yesterday so she immediately contacted DOR. During a meeting with DOR in January, Shannon and Ken were told at that time that absolutely nobody can track it. Shannon called DOR and asked if there was something new that they needed to tell us because Senator Johnson said that they were working on this data. Shannon went on to say that, she could tell us that this information was confirmed to her yesterday as of 5:30 pm. Even if there is going to be a change in statutes as to how the taxes are collected the change will have to go through DOR. Thankfully we do have good contacts DOR and we try to keep those lines of communication open.

Galen stated, for the record, that he would like to say that according to the AG's opinion, you could conclude that landline taxes may be transferred to the General Fund even though those taxes have not been dedicated to enhanced services. The Legislature must amend the statutory scheme authorizing the collection of 9-1-1 funds before transferring these funds.

Galen went on to say that his interpretation of that is that the enhanced account has already been dedicated revenue. Others agreed with Galen, that they had interpreted the language that same way. Shannon added that the funds are dedicated from the time the tax is collected. Sally responded that yes, it is all enhanced. It is border to border enhanced.

Galen felt that our position on the existing revenue is one issue and the risk of losing future ability to collect revenue is another issue, a huge issue. He went on to say that in the AGs opinion it talks about truthfulness and whether or not you are trying to circumvent rules and all these things. Galen states that he thinks they are walking on very thin ice. Shannon added that even if they find a way around it, could we not just see Oregon as being an example for the rest of the country? Laura Wolfe, APCO President added that this may happen. She went on to say that based on NENA National, their Federal Lobbyist has been in touch with her on every move that has happened in this matter. Laura said that they are on top of this, watching very closely and totally know what is going on. They are not going to let Oregon go by unnoticed. Shannon added that just because it doesn't say "wireline", she understood the law was intended to protect all 9-1-1 funds.

Terry S. asked that we touch back on the handset count before we move on to the next topic. He asked Mark T. if we knew if the handset count is total handset count or going by the .75 tax count? Mark T. responded that it is total handset count. Terry S. asked how people get exempt from paying the .75 tax. Ken K. responded that there is a tax code and a form that is filled out. Sally pointed out that she would presume that the phone companies would have that info since they are the ones collecting it. Shannon added that it may be something that they cannot share. If it is considered proprietary information then they cannot give that out. Half the information that DOR has is corporate and it is proprietary. We were told that when we asked why, as a State Program, we cannot get those figures? Why can't just get the figures of who pays how much? One thing that they could tell us without question was that they cannot distinguish between wireline and wireless/VoIP charges.

- **Transition Planning**

Shannon guided the meeting onto the next topic. She went on to say that she did not ask for more elaboration on this subject because she assumed this topic was in regards to what is going to happen with our Program once our Director, Ken Keim retires. The consensus of the group was yes but Sally added that it was a bit more than that. She went on to say that each of you has a long list of job duties and that we are a small department, she is questioning if we are able to back each other up when someone is gone? Do you have things in place that support the Program in the event of staff turnover and also for transition in the event of Ken retiring?

Shannon response to questions; the Program Staff is currently able to back each other up. Everyone has their level of expertise in what they do but we try to make a point to cross train. As we have talked about before, we always make sure that the each member knows what the other is working on. For example: If Mark has an outage for some reason, he will clue Gillien and me in so that we are aware of it and what is going on. We have made a point to try and make it so that we can jump in and cover for each other when it is necessary. We can also reach one another via telephone when out of the office. We have SOPs at our desk, we started that a couple of years ago as an agency. But as a Program we especially try to enhance and update them as frequently as possible. We shared them with each other as we typed them out and asked one another, could you sit down and take care of the day to day actions based on this information? These SOPs include links to where things are stored in physical & electronic files. We tried to make them as detailed as possible for this very fact. If someone was to leave for another job and someone comes in to train, they could use that as a resource to perform their duties. The same goes for Mr. Keim's position when he retires. We have gone through all of his notebooks and procedures as far as daily duties. We have the basic steps covered as a Program to keep us running. At one time, Ken Murphy, Director of OEM, did tell us that there would be an open recruitment for Ken Keim's vacant position. Being State Government it is assumed that there will probably be some lag time in between Ken leaving and somebody filling that position.

Sally asked if there was a possibility that they may not fill his position due to budget issues. Shannon responded that anything is possible. Ken added that he does not know either. Ken also said that it will be at least a minimum of 90 days before they would start recruiting. That is if they start right away. Shannon mentioned the fact that the standard procedure for the state is to leave a position vacant for at least 30 days after it is vacated. Shannon also mentioned that there is always the possibility that OMD may appoint a replacement. We have no idea right now as a Program, what our future will be after Ken leaves.

Shannon added that there is one thing for sure and that is that we plan to run the Program so that there is no disruption of service as far as our day to day operations. When there are decisions to be made by management, they would go right up the chain of command to either Murphy or Sneed. Sally asked Shannon if she sees the Advisory Committee playing a role in any of the transition period or the selection process. Shannon replied that she really does not know, but she did say that General Caldwell is aware that the group at large wants to be a part of whatever takes place. He is very aware of that fact. Galen added that it seemed to him that at one of our previous advisory meetings that Murphy had said that yes, we would be a part of it. He thought that he recalled that someone was supposed to be putting together a list of questions? Shannon said, she remembered that too, a list of questions or

attributes was supposed to be done. Galen noted that at that time it was not known to be a military decision. Shannon did want to add that Ken Murphy is very aware of the feel of the group. He is also aware of the groups desire to be involved in what is going on and to play an important role in this process.

Shannon said that we will all be here (hopefully) in three months and we will probably have to contend with not having anyone in Ken's position. We just don't know anything more than that at this time. Ken added that during this transition period, he has no doubt that Shannon will be very capable of filling in for him.

It was brought up by a few members of the group that it was very apparent and noticed by many, the obvious disconnect between the OEM 9-1-1 Program in regards to the hearings and with every thing that has been going on. It was also voiced that It was glaringly obvious that Ken Keim, Director of the 9-1-1 Program, was not present to testify at any of these hearings. It was also voiced by more than one person that this was the first time that we have not seen Ken Keim testifying on behalf of 9-1-1. The opinion voiced by some in attendance was; it is upsetting because we have always worked directly with OEM to make sure the 9-1-1 funding was safe & secure and now it is like we are working against the Military and not with them to save the dollars for this program. Another attendee voiced that it is like the 9-1-1 Program is on an opposing side of OMD. Shannon stated to the group that it is important for this committee to understand that our role has not changed as far as what we are trying to accomplish. Our program will remain the same that it has always been and that is to see that the best information is given to our Management to do what is right and to keep that bond together. Shannon reminded the group that Murphy & Caldwell will be here this morning to address the concerns that all of them have. This is their chance to be heard.

Galen noted that he had a two part question - He asked what is happening with the two positions that the 9-1-1 Program asked for? He then went on to state that in the past, we have had either Murphy or Sneed at our committee meetings. What do you think that it means that we don't have somebody here representing OEM since they are the one's who is suppose to be making the decisions? Shannon opted to respond to Galen's first question regarding the Programs request for two additional staff members. She explained that it went through session and was approved, however, that approval depended on the budget. So, that 4% cap that they have on our budget – Our Fiscal Staff is looking into this. There is a system called ORBITZ, which is the State Accounting System. It does not show the true accurate figure. As you all know, we are not spending our 4% every year. About six months ago they decided we could allow one of these positions in our 09-11 budget, based on the figures in Orbits. Shannon responded that our Fiscal Director at OEM, Abby Kershaw and her staff have beat there heads against the wall trying to get the state to change this system. It does not reflect the true numbers.

They have this budget coded in stone. Sally asked, are we to assume the funds are calculated on appropriated funds and not unappropriated? Is that the difference? Shannon responded that she would assume that there is a difference but we would have to ask our fiscal staff to address the question. This is one of the reasons why we have invited our Fiscal Staff twice to attend our quarterly meetings to discuss the state budgeting, and they have canceled each time. With the Legislature in session they have become far too busy to attend.

In response to Galen's second question as to why no representative from OEM Management at our meetings – Ken stated that they are busy. He adds that Ken Murphy supports what we do and what we have done in the past. We all answer to OMD.

Mark B. asked what the mission of the 9-1-1 Program under OEM was? Ken K. responded, "To maintain a viable service and technology from border to border". Shannon also added; "Insuring the same technology and service level border to border to each PSAP, making sure that the tax dollars are collected on your behalf and distributed accordingly, to ensure a functional emergency reporting station from border to border". Mark B. then asks, what is the mission of the Advisory Group and what role do we have? Shannon responded, "To provide input & suggestions". That is why we needed to bring this Advisory Committee back together. This group needs to be that forum for the 9-1-1 Community, where the rubber meets the road, whether we are looking at projects with state dollars or if you have issues that need to be addressed. Basically, anything that affects you or the Program. Again, we all realize that there are issues that we are not able to control, but being able to provide "official" input is necessary.

After approval, these minutes immediately go to Ken Murphy and General Caldwell. This group was intended to be the voice of the 9-1-1 Community in Oregon as far as it pertains to the 9-1-1 Program. Let me clarify what I just said, this committee is the voice of the 9-1-1 Community as it pertains to "advising" the 9-1-1 Program.

Mark B. states that along those lines, one of the things that he see's is that the 9-1-1 Program does not provide all 9-1-1 Services. There should be one objective and that is to ensure certain reasonable statewide levels of service. And now what I see happening, and it is not the first time, is money is being taken from 9-1-1. This 3.1 million will be the second time and it looks like there is about to be a third time. We are looking at a substantial amount of money. What he sees happening is that when our money is taken away it is simply a diversion of that money. What he has heard and what he senses is happening now, is that someone is being told that it is a federal law, and then someone else says there is a way of them from taking some of it, but not all of it. Sally interjects that it is not just "somebody", it is the AGs Office. Mark B.

goes on to say that we should modify the rules for the future. In his opinion, that is the direction that he sees things should be heading. He goes on to say that looking from a Program perspective he would be looking to protect and facilitate the distribution of the money and where it needs to be. He would be looking to distribute it faster and more of it. So he is thinking that we need to change the amount of money that is put into the sub-account. It seems that by changing the concept of holding back the reserve funds and simply getting the money in and getting the money out would be better. Mark B. goes on to say he feels that we should move the responsibility on to the communities to create their own reserve funds and replace their own equipment.

Shannon interjected at this point as she wanted to respond to Mark's statement of getting the money in and out. She stated that no matter what information we give to the Policy Makers (meaning Legislative) they are still going to set a limitation. Aside from keeping a reserve and aside from the \$500,000.00 replacement fund, that 2.5 % never comes out anymore; we just kept that amount in there. The LFO and the fiscal people may say, for example, we have 8 million revenue coming in and this is the limitation you need. Even so, we may not actually get that limitation. Like the issue we are having now that started with the transfer of money from OSP along with a few other things, the money that is in that account that we cannot spend, that is money that is beyond that limitation. Shannon stated that she does not see or consider that as a reserve. That is money that we need to spend. We need to upgrade our network, we have NextGen coming, so many things that we need to do, but we can't touch the money that is ours. It just does not make any sense that we cannot have it to do the necessary things that we need to do to maintain functionality. This is another one of the planning items we must address this next biennium. Sally agrees that what Mark B. is saying sounds like a great idea but it also sounds nearly impossible.

Galen mentioned the testimony of Mr. Murphy before the legislature; he went on to say that Ken Murphy stated that there was approximately 2 million that they could very quickly expend for equipment upgrades and other things that were already in the pipeline and in the process. Then he said that they were told, I am not sure by who, to not expend those funds. Ken K. responded that Legislative Fiscal has a lot to do with this. We have been trying to get the limitation increased since last September without any results. Shannon added that the LFO decided that they wanted to be prudent and only give us 10 million instead of the 25 million to make it through the biennium. They were made aware at that very time that if they do not do something about this limitation that come January session we are going to have trouble getting out the Distribution. Not to mention all of the bills that we pay. We have given them every possible scenario of what could happen if we don't get the money.

Ken K. made an announcement to the group that he just received a phone call saying that General Caldwell will not be at our meeting today as

scheduled. Sally asked if Ken Murphy would still be coming. Ken said no, neither of them will be here. All that I was told is that they cannot be here today. Ken said that General Caldwell is still planning on being here tomorrow. The group consensus was to change the agenda around to accommodate his visit tomorrow. It was mentioned that a lot of people were coming today just to see the General. Someone asked why General Caldwell was scheduled to be here tomorrow? Shannon explained that he is on the APCO/NENA agenda tomorrow to talk about Flytecomm. It was proposed by the APCO President, Laura Wolfe that we change the agenda to have the General talk about 9-1-1 Issues instead of Flytecomm, the group agreed.

- **OAR Update Discussion**

Shannon stated that she asked the entire group the last time that we met to provide comments for updates. She heard from one person regarding “typos” and talked with Larry Hatch over the phone for about a half hour discussion regarding some things. That was about it. Either they look perfect the way they are or people have just not had time to look at them. Galen asked if there was a timeline to reply to this. Sally suggested that we table this until the next meeting until we find out if we are subject to Public Record or not. Shannon added that even though we are not on a specific timeline, these are the rules that govern how we do business so it is important that we see this task through. We shall move on for now and resume talking about this when we meet with the whole group this afternoon.

- **Financial**

Limitation Update: There is not really too much more to say about this subject since we pretty much already covered it earlier. We are still waiting to get the 15.8 Million Limitation that we need to ensure that the distribution goes out and the bills get paid. It is still in the hands of the LFO. They asked us to provide them information as far as our bills, expenditures, and contractual obligations. Shannon responded that she did a write up on our object codes for expenditures, explained to the LFO what each code covered and what the costs were for. For every single cost that was noted, there would be a breach of contract leading to no 9-1-1 service in the state. She said that she was very blunt in her description of what would happen if these costs were not met. They already know what will happen if the distribution dollars do not go out. Shannon said that we explained that the 15.1 million cannot be cut in half like they did to us last time. If you cut it in half something is going to suffer. If we don't pay our bills our service providers will cut us off. These are not special projects or upgrades that we are talking about; this is for standard procedure operations.

Kristie Wilde commented that she heard that the Governor was asked to specifically list expenses in order to be able to raise the Limitation. She went

on to ask Shannon the amount for contractual obligations, was it for 9 Million? Shannon responded that is roughly the amount. She would have to go back and check on the exact figure. Kristie asked if the rest of that amount was for the distribution. Shannon responded that yes, in the approximate amount of 6.4 million.

Mark B. asked if the budget for the biennium expenses were not balanced. He also questioned how the budget for expenses vs. the limitation for expenses was not balanced? Shannon responded that it was not just the revenue limitation that affected this but also two distributions. Two of the distributions that should have been sent out in the 05-07 biennium when we were still under State Police were sent out under 07-09, which in turn counted against the 07-09 limitations. All of our bills had a domino effect. That put us so that we were way over in everything. Mark B. then asked are we 9 million over our expenditures? Mark went on to question why the shortfall if the biennium budget was already put together before this shortfall happened? Shannon explained that because we are 9 million over our limitation does not mean that we are 9 million over our budget. The budget was balanced but due to the error of two distributions coming out of the wrong biennium it caused us to use up what would have been an appropriate limitation for us to function on. Mark went on to question – So, if you had a budget put together for the biennium and the expenses that you paid out would have already been in the budget, right? Shannon responded that was correct. He then asks, so you have them budgeted and they are currently budgeted but you do not have enough revenue to pay them? Shannon states that we do have enough revenue but we do not have the **authority to spend** the revenue. The **limitation is the authority** to spend what we have. We don't have it all. Mark commented that the budget was created two years ago. The 07-09 Budget was created at the beginning of the 07-09 biennium right? Shannon responded that was correct, it was created two years ago. Kristie went over the facts for the shortfall again – The two Distributions that were 05-07 came out of 07-09 and they were not suppose to.

Sally interjected at this point and stated that she felt that everyone is trying to get a handle on what was originally the budget for OEM and projected revenue from DOR. The budget matched, but then in the audit there was this undistributed extra money that was found and then it was distributed. That distribution was either budgeted for or projected in the original authority and therefore counts against us, it counts as being spent as part of the limitation for it. So now, they've still got the bills to pay and the revenue has come in to pay them but because the total amount that has been dispensed back in the distribution is requiring them to ask for additional limitation authority.

Mark asks if we are authorized to distribute that additional 9 million without getting authority. No, we cannot do that responded Shannon. Mark asks, so the authority was provided for other items in the budget so when we get

approval we can spend that now and worry about it later? Shannon responds, yes, that is correct. Shannon states that later we will go back to the LFO to get that authority

Kristie Wilde stated that one of the questions she expects to be asked is; when you got that extra distribution of 9 million would that not have covered some of the bills? Or, was that not all local distribution dollars? Shannon responded that no, it was not all for the distribution.

Shannon went on to explain that the April distribution for 05-07 biennium of 6.4 million was suppose to come out in 05-07 budget but it did not, it came out of 07-09 biennium. Right there is 6.4 million that has to come out of the next biennium. Then there was a 4.8 million special distribution that went out that was not accounted for and it has to come out of our cap for 07-09. Now we are looking at 11.2 so far coming out of 07-09 that should not have. Sally asked what happened to the other 4 million. Shannon responded that it went into the enhanced account. Shannon went on to explain that the June 07 distribution that was supposed to go out by the end of June did not go out until some time in August. Once again, another hit on our limitations reflecting back on our move from OSP. Because the transfer was not smooth, our fiscal people were still working through issues having to do with this over a year later. We knew right then and there that we were going to have a problem at the end of the biennium.

The LFO's are the one's making most of these decisions. They told us last September that this is the way it is going to be. This was after the LFO looked over every document that we had given them, they looked over more information than they could possibly have even needed. They told us that there is 25.7 million (or so) and their decision was that they wanted to be prudent in giving us the limitation and gave us 10 million just to make it through April. We argued that amount would not allow us to make it through April. They responded that we need to be accountable for the money we are spending. Ken K. added that when this budget shortfall came up and they were not allowing us to spend more money is the reason why we have not been making any purchases of new equipment. We are just paying the bills basically.

Shannon added that right now we are worried about what we are going to do if there is not enough money to cover the distribution? What are we going to do? We are trying to make sure that we are doing just the bare minimum because our directive has always been that the distribution goes out before anything else. Galen asks if the revenue is coming in. Shannon assured him that it is, the revenue is there, it comes in just fine. Galen asked when does DOR need to have the LFO raise of the limitation in order to get the money into the account. Shannon answered that we would need to get it by the end of March to be able to get the Distribution out on time. Ken K. added that

once it is approved at the E Board it takes 30 days beyond that. Shannon added that traditionally we get all of our deposits (interest accrued by DOR) in by the end of March for that quarters distribution. That is when all of the numbers are crunched and the worksheets are done and all of the processes are laid for it to go out.

Our fiscal people told me that everything at this point is in the hands of the LFO. Our figures are the same now as they were back in September. It was obvious that this was going to happen. Margie Puckett, Jackson Co, asked if there is someone at the LFO that we can contact. Either as a group or as individual PSAP? Margie states that her council is in an uproar over this and every single one of them would send a letter to the LFO or whoever it was that they needed to send it to in an effort to try to get some answers. Shannon said that she would call and ask about that. IF DOR could they would send us the money because it is there. They just don't have the authority.

Galen wanted to know what the total amount is because he is looking for some clarification. Is the amount \$99, 208,348.82 and does that cover everything? He then pointed out that the last 3 or 4 distributions have been real close. Shannon explained that the figures are based on the estimates of the 6.4 for the distribution, the next two quarters go exactly the same as the last, and that is what they are based on. All of the numbers, with the exception of the last 3 months forward are the actual numbers that we are spending. The actual costs are almost "spot on" with what we estimated with our expenditures.

Sally brought up the question of where did General Caldwell come up with the figure that the distribution pays 50%? Sally went on to say that she thinks that too often when people calculate the 9-1-1 Excise Tax through their local system they only calculate the distribution and that is only part of the story. They also need to calculate the figures of what the State pays for. When that happens I think that sort of tried and true percentage that we have always quoted at 15% to 20% will change radically. Laura stated that she used her information from Mark Tennyson to come up with the true picture. Galen stated that he agrees with Sally, it is more like 30 % but that does not include the 35%. Shannon expressed that the true statement should be that the distribution would cover 30% not counting the direct pays through OEM. Sally felt that we really have to identify our true dependents. The potential impact is on mobile resources. Shannon added that there are several other things that we pay for on a statewide basis. It is not figured per PSAP or per County. Sally said that at the end of the year that amount is given out to us individually but I think it would very useful for us to have a list of every PSAP and how much is spent on their behalf as well as what is distributed to them. Laura agreed that would be a good idea.

Shannon stated that we will have to figure out some kind of formula for us to figure out how much it is that we pay for each PSAP. Shannon said that we started about a year ago documenting the paid bills by PSAP. But we do not yet have in place how to break down the charges on the statewide summary bills. Sally said that maybe we have resources among our PSAPs who could work on this. She feels that it is very critical and that we have needed it for years. Shannon said that we will make it a priority to look into this. Galen mentioned that according to their pie chart it shows it at 30% and 70% local. Galen feels that he and Mark Tennyson could work on something that would show the total PSAP costs. For some PSAPs it is 90%. There are not many PSAPs that are 100%. Shannon agreed that it would be great to show the percentages for each PSAP. Sally said that it would be a good resource for the Legislatures to see. Then they would be aware that if the distribution does not go out, then that certain PSAP closes. But on the other hand, Sally said that the argument could be made that maybe that PSAP should have been eliminated anyway. That is the direction of where things are going. A Legislator may see that a couple of PSAPs in their Jurisdiction are closing up due to lack of funds and look at that differently

Closing PSAPs are not necessarily the answer. As April Stream, Jefferson Co, pointed out, if they took 9-1-1 away from Jefferson County I would still have to dispatch fire & ambulance & police officers. This will cause calls to transfer to some call center and then it would bounce back to me and there we are in the area of when seconds count. The group agreed and can see where that would build into delays when seconds count, and cause all other kinds of problems.

Margie Puckett said that there are repercussions with consolidation because they are in the middle of it in Jackson County. Margie has told her Legislators that they are actually hurting their consolidation efforts. With the City of Medford having a general fund that they can pull from, they are saying, we have agreed to consolidation but you don't have the funding, do we really want to get involved? Now we are losing our ability to pull from this other fund. You are causing this consolidation effort, you are asking us to consolidate and now you are putting a wrench in that. Sally asked Margie to repeat what she had said about the ORS190? Margie explained that because they do not have the same funding, they would have to go out for a supplemental budget and pull from our users again. Our users are already hurting and they are saying that we cannot give you more money. With Medford being part of a City Government they can pull from Public Works or they we can pull from other places to supplement this. Plus we have the added complications of moving into a new building. But, our consolidation is very close to happening. The Medford City Council has asked what is going to happen if we lose this 9-1-1 funding now that we are responsible for this other chunk of change. They do not have another pool to pull from. Shannon agreed that Margie has expressed a very valid point.

Laura asked to bring the discussion back to the subject of the Limitation – She wanted to make sure that she has the numbers and figures down correctly. How much has OEM asked for? Shannon responded, we have asked for a 15.8 million increase. This is pending through the LFO. Shannon stated that this has not been approved or denied. Laura commented that this action does need to move forward, so should we contact the LFO? Shannon said she will contact our fiscal people and ask them who to contact. Shannon stated that she has two things to get done right away and one is to get General Reese’s contact info and call to get LFO contact. Laura asked if she would be doing that right away. Shannon replied that she would get on this right after the meeting.

In regards to the limitation issue, Terry asked if the committee could put something together to move this forward. Shannon agreed that a formal address would be a good idea and very appropriate. Shannon agreed to draft a letter on behalf of the advisory committee. (***This action was deemed unnecessary later that day due to the passing of the 15.8 limitation***).

- **Open Discussion – New Business**

Galen had some information to offer Margie; he said that there are consolidation efficiency type of efforts that are dependant upon certain types of funding. Margie stated that she has sent numerous emails to her Reps and Senators and that she does get responses from most of them.

Galen asked if there was anymore information regarding Central Lane PSAP not being upgraded? Shannon replied that there are two issues at hand here. First, we needed to do the testing on one of the PBX revisions and were waiting on the results of that. I believe it was in November that we got the go ahead to proceed. By that time we had decided not to fund that project due to the issue with limitations. Galen asks, so there are some PSAPs that still need to be upgraded? Shannon stated that all of the 5 Meridian sites have been upgraded, so there is just an exception of a few with cost analysis being done now, and one of those being a Geo Diverse, which is the case of two PSAPs using the same system. They act as a back up for the other in the case of one being down. We are being hindered by them not letting up on our limitation and we are falling behind. It is really unfortunate because we all have been so proud of Oregon being at the forefront of 9-1-1. I think we all have great hope that we can overcome these issues and continue to be a front runner in the industry.

Meeting Adjourned