

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

FIRST RESPONDER MAPPING SYSTEMS

IRVIS OFFICE BUILDING
HEARING ROOM G50
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

APRIL 24, 2007
3:24 P.M.

BEFORE:

HONORABLE W. CURTIS THOMAS, CHAIRMAN
HONORABLE DAVID J. STEIL
HONORABLE JOHN P. SABATINA, JR.
HONORABLE WILLIAM C. KORTZ, II
HONORABLE STEVE SAMUELSON
HONORABLE KERRY A. BENNINGHOFF
HONORABLE MICHELE BROOKS
HONORABLE MIKE FLECK
HONORABLE KEITH GILLESPIE
HONORABLE CARL W. MANTZ
HONORABLE JIM MARSHALL
HONORABLE BOB MENSCH
HONORABLE DUANE MILNE
HONORABLE JAY R. MOYER
HONORABLE SCOTT PERRY
HONORABLE TODD ROCK

SHERRI A. REITANO, RPR
NOTARY PUBLIC

	I N D E X	
	TESTIFIER	PAGE
1		
2	TESTIFIER	PAGE
3	Jim Finnell	6
4	Randall Carroll	6
5	David N. Eckman	42
6	John Comey	49
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Let me apologize for
2 the delay. We did not know that we were going to
3 have a fire drill this afternoon and that pushed
4 back the voting schedule and one thing just led to
5 another. Let me thank our guests for hanging in
6 there and staying for this hearing.

7 My name is W. Curtis Thomas, and I'm
8 Majority Chair of the Intergovernmental Affairs
9 Committee. To my left is the Honorable David Steil,
10 Minority Chair of the House Intergovernmental
11 Committee.

12 Let me extend my sincere thanks to each
13 and every one of you. Welcome to this public
14 hearing. The focus of our public hearing this
15 afternoon is to examine and discuss the concept of
16 first responder building mapping systems and its
17 feasibility and utilization in school buildings.

18 A first responder building mapping system
19 is an electronic visual depiction of a building and
20 its contents. They are in essence a blueprint of a
21 building which first responders can use when
22 responding to an emergency situation.

23 These blueprints can be stored on a
24 computer or accessed via the internet. They can
25 contain a multitude of information including

1 identification of hazards, access routes, location
2 of infrastructure, and other information deemed
3 critical in responding to an emergency.

4 The idea of using first responder
5 building mapping systems to assist emergency
6 personnel is not new in Pennsylvania. In the last
7 three sessions, I've introduced legislation to
8 develop and encourage the implementation of these
9 systems in Pennsylvania. And the current session I
10 have again introduced this concept in the form of
11 House Bill 36.

12 The current version of this bill is a
13 framework and only a framework or starting point to
14 look at how building mapping systems can assist
15 first responders in their duty and ultimately
16 provide greater security for our citizens.

17 The importance of any means to reduce the
18 possibility of threats for emergency situations in
19 any building, particularly our schools, is becoming
20 increasingly apparent as a result of the recent
21 tragedy at Virginia Tech.

22 This tragedy is one of a long line of
23 incidents that have occurred in schools throughout
24 the country including right here in Pennsylvania at
25 West Nickel Mines School in Lancaster County. Since

1 it is clear there is a reluctance and places
2 additional restrictions on the accessibility of guns
3 under the Uniformed Firearms Law, I believe it is
4 imperative we look for any and all options to ensure
5 the safety of our citizens, particularly children in
6 our schools.

7 First responder building mapping systems
8 answer that call by providing a system that first
9 responders can use to obtain the critical
10 information they need to respond to an emergency.

11 This information can drastically reduce
12 the time it takes to gain control of an emergency
13 and ultimately save lives. I feel we have an
14 experienced panel with us today, and I believe you
15 will find their information to be enlightening and
16 informative.

17 And before we go into our esteemed
18 panelists, I'd like to ask the Minority Chair if he
19 has any opening comments.

20 REPRESENTATIVE STEIL: I just want to
21 thank our out-of-town visitors particularly and
22 really appreciate the fact that you would travel all
23 of the way from your homes in the western part of
24 the country to be with us today. As the Chairman
25 has indicated, this certainly is an important

1 subject for Pennsylvania. So thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Now at this particular
3 time we're going to start with Mr. Jim Finnell who
4 is president and CEO of Prepared Response,
5 Incorporated out of Seattle, Washington. Good
6 afternoon, Mr. Finnell.

7 MR. FINNELL: Thank you very much, Mr.
8 Chairman.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: You've been here since
10 early this morning.

11 MR. FINNELL: That's quite all right.
12 Thank you very much.

13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you.

14 MR. FINNELL: I'd also like to bring to
15 the table Chief Randy Carroll from the Bellingham
16 Police Department in Washington State.

17 Randy is a -- Chief Carroll is active in
18 the state program that we work with in Washington
19 State. And actually just to start or lead off, I'd
20 like to have Chief Carroll just make a few comments
21 up front if that's all right, Mr. Chairman.

22 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Sure.

23 MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chair and Mr. Chair and
24 committeemen, I thank you for the invitation to come
25 talk to you today. I am the president of the state

1 association -- our law enforcement state association
2 in Washington State and, as Jim said, the chief of
3 police in Bellingham, north of Seattle.

4 We, as a state association, employed this
5 mapping system. And I can give you the perspective
6 from a first responder, law enforcement responder
7 what we found to be the advantages of having this
8 kind of system in place.

9 In 2001 our association received federal
10 funding for a pilot program to create critical
11 incident mapping in public schools in eight of our
12 counties. A cooperative partnership was entered
13 into and established between our state association,
14 our law enforcement association, and the school
15 principals in Washington State, and the fire chiefs
16 in Washington State and then evolved into 2003
17 funding from the state legislature to extend the
18 system to every high school.

19 I think that probably it's important that
20 we just stop for a minute and talk about a 2004
21 incident. After our eight schools, our eight pilot
22 schools were mapped, an incident -- a critical
23 incident occurred at Lewis and Clark High School in
24 Spokane in the fall of 2004.

25 A student walked in with a gun. He

1 brought the gun to school, threatened students and
2 teachers, fired off one round. And because the
3 school had been mapped, first responders; police,
4 and state patrol and fire responded along with
5 county sheriffs. And the incident was resolved in
6 less than one hour.

7 The school was evacuated in 12 minutes.
8 2,000 students out of the school safely in routes
9 that did not put them in the shooter's line of
10 sight. It also -- one of the things that is not
11 mentioned in the video that we're going to show is
12 that the state patrol realized by looking at the
13 mapping system that the interstate was a target and
14 that they had to close down the interstate.

15 And that mapping system gave them the
16 perspective, the visual perspective, of what the
17 shooter could see out the windows and out the doors
18 of the school. So there is an 8-and-a-half minute
19 video if you would care to see.

20 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Sure.

21 (Video shown.)

22 MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, what we found
23 out was there were many different agencies that were
24 mapping buildings and structures in our state for
25 their own uses. And what law enforcement deems

1 important may not be important to fire or we may not
2 even think about it. We may not think about what
3 department of emergency management might need.

4 And the association when it received its
5 funding selected PRI as its provider. And we mapped
6 our high schools and brought all of the interested
7 first responders together to talk about one system
8 that would serve all purposes and have the
9 information that everyone needs in one database.

10 You know, we've defined what our first
11 responders are. We defined minimum standards in
12 Washington State, the state legislators have defined
13 the minimum standards of a mapping system to include
14 floor plans and fire protection information,
15 evacuation plans, utilities, textual information on
16 who at the facility is the person to call along with
17 photographs of the individuals and of the facility
18 itself so that we know who we are talking to when we
19 make the phone call.

20 We did seek federal grant funding and
21 received it. And then our state legislators decided
22 that this was an effort that they wanted to continue
23 to fund and have provider funding for us.

24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you.

25 MR. FINNELL: Mr. Chairman, if you'd

1 like, I can explain the system a little bit from a
2 technical point of view if you would care for me to
3 or do you want to go to questions?

4 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Since we have some
5 members that just came in, yes.

6 MR. FINNELL: The system we built for the
7 State of Washington is a crisis management system.
8 It is designed to articulate or provide first
9 responders with critical information easily,
10 quickly, and securely.

11 The system right now at Washington State
12 is deployed to 340 first responder agencies. At
13 present we have roughly 1600 venues in the system
14 including 1200 K-12 public schools. Underway right
15 now we have an additional 800 K-12 schools to
16 complete the statewide program.

17 In addition to that, we've added critical
18 infrastructure that was suggested in videos such as
19 bridges, transportation centers, key 911 facilities,
20 and sites deemed very critical by the department of
21 emergency management.

22 The rapid responder system is a web-based
23 content distribution system designed to basically
24 accept all different types of information whether it
25 be pictures or video or files of word documents and

1 so forth and put them in a very simple, easy-to-use
2 format for the first responders.

3 One of the key features of the system
4 that we understood immediately was that roughly 80
5 percent of the end users, the first responders, do
6 not have reliable internet connectivity in the
7 field. That's just a fact of life.

8 So what we did is we built a remote
9 version of the software that it securely allows
10 first responders who are credentialed to access the
11 system to actually carry that information on an
12 off-the-shelf laptop computer or USB drive.

13 If in fact they do have internet
14 connectivity which we actually find to be a rarity,
15 they do have additional access to additional
16 information such as current weather information or
17 what is called geospatial content that is
18 documented.

19 But as a practical matter, the responders
20 when they need to use technology like that in the
21 field don't have time to wait for their computer to
22 load. They want to push a button. They want
23 information right now. As a former first responder
24 myself, I would demand that they require as little
25 typing as possible because I'm a terrible typist.

1 The program in Washington State has been
2 involved about now since 2003. We've learned an
3 awful lot working with the sheriffs and police
4 chiefs association, the fire community, and
5 emergency management services.

6 This system is now deployed in ten other
7 states in a variety of locations. Four states have
8 actually passed similar legislation to what you're
9 looking at including Washington State, Arizona,
10 Nevada, and I believe Kentucky.

11 Most recently this platform that has been
12 used by Washington State has become certified by the
13 United States Department of Homeland Security under
14 the Safety Act and it is one of the only 100
15 technologies of all types actually certified by the
16 federal government as reliable, effective, and safe
17 for use for antiterrorism.

18 The platform itself as Chief Carroll
19 described it is designed for all hazard. It could
20 be a tornado. It could be a bad guy with a gun.

21 As illustrated in the video that you just
22 saw, it was successfully used to contain this gunman
23 in Washington State. And I might add as a former
24 first responder, we can provide my former colleagues
25 with the best tools available. However, it takes

1 collaboration and pre-planning to be successful in
2 an incident like this. With the program that we do
3 in Washington State, we literally force these
4 different agencies to sit down with the facility
5 stakeholders to develop joint pre-plans and response
6 plans for their venues.

7 And I can't tell you how important and
8 valuable that is. In the event that you saw in the
9 video with the school shooting, everybody knew what
10 their role was ahead of time. Roadblocks had been
11 picked out. And it takes -- it cuts 5, 10, 15,
12 maybe 20 minutes off the response time that it takes
13 to mitigate an incident like that. It is extremely
14 valuable.

15 We're very proud of the technology, of
16 course, but it also takes teamwork. We found with
17 the Washington State program and particularly with
18 programs around the country that it helps drive
19 collaboration with these sometimes different
20 agencies who don't work together as regularly as
21 they perhaps should when it comes to emergency
22 planning. I'm happy to answer any questions related
23 to technology. And I'm sure Chief Carroll can
24 answer any questions related to the Washington State
25 program.

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Excellent. Let me
2 start to my far right, the Chair of the federal
3 state relations subcommittee, the Honorable John
4 Sabatina, and ask him if you want to start off if
5 you have any questions.

6 REPRESENTATIVE SABATINA: I don't have
7 any questions right now, but I may come back to you.
8 Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay.

10 REPRESENTATIVE MARSHALL: Hi. Jim
11 Marshall, Beaver County Representative. I'm also a
12 fire fighter. And we have pre-planning and we
13 carry -- you know, obviously we carry the diagrams
14 in the trucks with us.

15 With your system then you're saying that
16 we would have to have some form of laptop in the
17 truck in the field to run this program. Is it
18 something that the police departments could use
19 already that have computers in the cars or I mean
20 how adaptable is it?

21 MR. FINNELL: Mr. Chairman, the
22 technology program was designed to operate off of
23 any off-the-shelf PC-based equipment and also which
24 is now the core of most mobile data terminal systems
25 you find and you find in the field of public safety

1 if that's your question. Any off-the-shelf laptop
2 or cheapest one works the best. We work with rural
3 communities all of the time.

4 MR. CARROLL: I think the answer to your
5 question is yes, most of the law enforcement
6 agencies are the ones that have the mobile data
7 terminals in their cars at least in Washington
8 State. There are a few fire agencies that are
9 running mobile data terminals in their trucks.

10 But we can pull them out and take them to
11 the command center or we roll up the incident
12 command truck that has computers in it. And the
13 mapping program is on those computers.

14 For the responders, I think that if not
15 everyone has it, then fire relies on police as to
16 which -- the information that they are provided as
17 to which roads are closed or the safest roads in;
18 and vice versa if fire has it and police doesn't.

19 If a police agency does not have it, then
20 we rely on fire to tell us the safe way in and go
21 work with fire and use the mapping program there.

22 In Washington State it just so happens
23 that its the state association of chiefs and
24 sheriffs is really the entity that brought this
25 forward. But our fire department has the mapping

1 system.

2 REPRESENTATIVE MARSHALL: Either way it
3 could be a tool that would enhance cooperation
4 between the departments though.

5 MR. FINNELL: Most certainly. We support
6 that and we've seen it literally thousands of time.
7 As you saw in the video, there was -- I don't know
8 if you had a chance to see it. But one of the key
9 components of when we bring the system onboard to a
10 particular site or venue is we get the various
11 stakeholders and what they are going to do,
12 basically if you're a first responder is called a
13 digital tabletop exercise. And you start to see
14 collaboration. And it is absolutely essential to
15 have the facility's management folks there.

16 If it is a school, it's literally the
17 janitor sometimes. Nobody knows more about those
18 venues than a janitor. They are a wealth of
19 information, and we want to get that down
20 electronically.

21 As it relates just quickly to your
22 binders that you have of your site, floor plans, our
23 goal is to try to eliminate those to a degree if
24 possible. As you probably well know, updating
25 3-ring binders that are distributed to 40 or 50 or a

1 hundred sites is an onerous task especially when
2 page 54 is changed. With the electronic technology,
3 you save that and you hit save and now everybody has
4 got the change. It makes it practical.

5 MR. CARROLL: No matter what
6 personalities mesh or don't mesh in the world of
7 emergency responders, there -- what we found in
8 Washington State is there wasn't a single individual
9 that did not want to come to the table to talk about
10 safeguarding the most valuable resource that we have
11 and that's our children.

12 REPRESENTATIVE MARSHALL: Thank you,
13 gentlemen. No further questions.

14 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Representative Mensch.

15 REPRESENTATIVE MENSCH: Good afternoon.
16 I apologize. I came in a little late in your
17 presentation. And what I saw conceptually I really
18 like, the idea. In fact, it reflects one of the
19 conversations that we were having last night about
20 protocol for emergency responders.

21 But one of the concerns -- or not a
22 concern but question that arises and I'm sure you
23 already thought this through -- is how do you use
24 USB cards, memory sticks? That makes the
25 information a lot more portable. It also makes it

1 less secure. How do you ensure that only the good
2 guys are going to get the same information and be
3 able to plot, you know, whatever they might want to
4 do using that information? The problem may be in
5 much more detail than they might have otherwise
6 developed.

7 MR. FINNELL: Well, to answer your
8 question there are two pieces to it. There is
9 policy and then there is technology. Our standard
10 offering technology in which the Washington State
11 program uses is essentially the same that you use in
12 commercial banking. So if you pay your Visa cards
13 online or you use American Express, we're using the
14 same standard encryption technology.

15 Specifically -- and not to disclose an
16 awful lot but our remote client version of software
17 we use a version of what is called Encryptodex ML
18 technology which is very, very robust.

19 That said, the platform is -- also, we
20 can accommodate or depending on the customer's needs
21 and we actually have some military applications that
22 we're looking at right now that would require
23 additional security in terms of encryption on top of
24 that. Now the technology piece set aside, there is
25 also a policy. We work closely with our customers

1 to establish a credentialing program of who gets to
2 access this information and who does not. If you
3 write your user name, password, and token, or
4 whatever technology is on the USB drive and leave it
5 at McDonald's, it is entirely likely that could be
6 accessed. That's a management issue and policy
7 issue.

8 The enterprise platform of our system
9 does, however, have safeguards against accidents
10 like that. You can immediately shut off access to
11 the system. We track actually the address --
12 machine addresses of the computers accessing the
13 system. We track the ISP. We track all of that
14 information. There is quite an audit that goes
15 along with it. We have security engineers that
16 actually manage that for our customers. Does that
17 answer your question?

18 REPRESENTATIVE MENSCH: Yes. That's very
19 good. Thank you. No more questions, Mr. Chairman.

20 REPRESENTATIVE MANTZ: Yes. My name is
21 Carl Mantz. I represent the 187th district of Berks
22 and Lehigh Counties.

23 Do you sense any need possibly for hand
24 geomatics? Perhaps the building is so large they
25 may need a device, a hand-held device perhaps.

1 MR. FINNELL: You can access this system
2 off of a hand-held device such as a BlackBerry. I
3 will offer this. We recommend that our customers
4 use a screen size of not less than 6 inches. Trying
5 to observe any level of detailed schematics on a
6 2-inch screen is virtually impossible, and you'd be
7 spending more time looking at your hand-held device
8 instead of looking for the bad guy.

9 It is technically possible, and we can
10 convey information over those devices. Although our
11 end users, I would say less than 1 percent are
12 actually using them.

13 REPRESENTATIVE MANTZ: I was just kind of
14 curious.

15 MR. FINNELL: On TV I see it a lot. It
16 is pretty neat.

17 MR. CARROLL: I think it is very
18 difficult for the responders who are in the building
19 to do is to use hand-held. What we rely on is not
20 only the software, the package itself, but the
21 communication and the practice. And we do it over
22 the radio. Someone is watching the team in their
23 mind as they go up the stairway. Then we report
24 what level we're on, what door we're next to, and
25 the commander can change the screens -- fire or, you

1 know, police -- unless it is so smoky that you can't
2 see anything. But we try and keep the screens out
3 of the responders control.

4 MR. FINNELL: Representative, one, we
5 have several law enforcement agencies that are
6 pretty sophisticated and they like to carry these
7 what are 6-inch touch screen PC devices. And I'm
8 not a law enforcement specialist. Chief Carroll is.
9 But they have web gear and it looks very military.
10 But it works quite well and they like it quite a
11 bit. It's a PC-based device and they carry quite a
12 bit of information with them.

13 REPRESENTATIVE MANTZ: Thank you very
14 much.

15 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you. Mr.
16 Chairman.

17 REPRESENTATIVE STEIL: Thank you. Just
18 two questions. The first question is, who
19 physically does the mapping when you establish the
20 system initially? Who physically does it?

21 MR. FINNELL: There are two mechanisms in
22 which to do it. We can train folks locally to do
23 the data collection. There is a bit of an art to
24 it. Although it is hard work to start to stand up
25 the system, there is a lot of disparaged information

1 that you're gathering.

2 Our organization also offers professional
3 services where we send site survey teams out to
4 collaborate and coordinate with usually the school
5 districts or venues or court facilities and so forth
6 to come on-site, be as unintrusive as possible, get
7 the data collected.

8 And then the data is then conditioned,
9 cleaned up, and entered into the platform. And it
10 then goes through a QA, an acceptance process with
11 the site facility stakeholders and then the first
12 responders.

13 The other steps involved are the tactical
14 pre-planning session that we recommend although they
15 are not mandatory. End user training takes about
16 30 minutes. We can do it online. It doesn't
17 require a classroom setting. It is very simple as
18 the training.

19 REPRESENTATIVE STEIL: The other question
20 is keeping up-to-date has to be critical. Two or
21 three or four years from now, doors get opened, new
22 doors get cut, other doors sealed, that sort of
23 thing. Who does that? Where does that
24 responsibility lie?

25 MR. FINNELL: We have found that placing

1 that responsibility on the facility stakeholders
2 helps drive that teamwork between the first
3 responders. And whether it is a school campus or
4 your local power plant, nobody knows their facility
5 better than the facility stakeholders themselves --
6 and I'm saying that in general terms.

7 But that janitor at the high school or
8 the building engineers over at the power plant or
9 the folks that run facility maintenance at the
10 stadium, they know the facility front to back and in
11 and out. Keeping them engaged in the program at
12 least on an annual basis if not quarterly is
13 helpful.

14 We find that sites are generally up --
15 they don't physically change frequently. The
16 biggest things that change on those sites are
17 usually people. And we have site stakeholders and
18 contact information. It is very easy to administer.

19 There is a function within the
20 administration section of the system that allows
21 them to summary print the site. And they can
22 literally scan through it and see where they need to
23 do their updates. School campuses, we probably
24 spend roughly four to six hours per year to do
25 updates.

1 REPRESENTATIVE STEIL: Thank you, Mr.
2 Chairman.

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
4 Thank you, gentlemen, for your testimony. I have
5 several questions.

6 Number one, how long does it take from
7 beginning to end when you start mapping until you're
8 completed and people have the information? I
9 recognize it's probably dependent on the size of the
10 building but on the average.

11 MR. FINNELL: Well, school campuses being
12 the sites of interest these days take roughly 60 to
13 a hundred man hours to complete. Depending on
14 how we project schedule those, we can complete
15 those in -- because of scheduling, it usually takes
16 four to six weeks from the time you start with a
17 particular campus.

18 That said, in an emergency basis which we
19 deployed, we've actually had campuses again similar
20 to the size of a high school up and running in
21 36 hours. But that took eight people on-site
22 working 24 hours a day. That was an emergency. It
23 was actually a terrorism threat.

24 When you deploy a large program -- if
25 what you're considering here, it's frankly about

1 project management. And when we start a school --
2 we like to do districts in a geographic area because
3 it just makes sense because the folks are working
4 and moving from one area to the next.

5 Again, we can be in and out of a school
6 district with good cooperation on their part
7 scheduling and getting in and out, getting
8 facilities done in a month or so and have them up
9 and available.

10 MR. CARROLL: Representative.

11 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Yes.

12 MR. CARROLL: When we mapped our schools,
13 we did it prior to this system being in place. And
14 our transition was within a few days. We still had
15 our stakeholder meetings. There was information
16 that we had to add.

17 And as I said earlier, law enforcement's
18 perspective doesn't always take in the fire
19 perspective or vice versa or department of emergency
20 management.

21 So there was information that we had to
22 add onto the 3-ring binder information and CD that
23 we handed over to the mapping software people.

24 But it depends on how much you have
25 already prepared and how big the facility is. I

1 know that there are law enforcement agencies and
2 fire agencies in this -- in this Commonwealth -- in
3 the state that already have mapping software
4 prepared and the conversion is pretty easy most of
5 the time.

6 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Another question I have
7 in Washington State or any of the other states that
8 are employing this, have they legislated it to where
9 if there is a new school building built, that that
10 is one of the last pieces of the puzzle of the
11 construction, that it is mapped and everything is
12 ready to go? That you have to -- have they put that
13 into law?

14 MR. FINNELL: To my knowledge, the
15 Washington State program that is on the agenda for
16 this next fiscal year. To date the states that we
17 have worked with have substantially launched their
18 programs through a capital budgeting process and
19 with the intent -- I'm not conversant with this --
20 but it is to move it to an operating kind of upkeep
21 menu. And then as the capital budgets grow forward
22 for new construction, they would fix that into the
23 price. That is kind of the intent at least, sir.

24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Okay. Last question.
25 Being on the finance committee, I would be remiss if

1 I didn't ask. Just a ballpark figure, how much per
2 school on the average? Ballpark.

3 MR. FINNELL: Ballpark. \$8- to \$11,000
4 per school campus, standard size K-12 school.
5 Elementary schools are easy. High schools can be
6 tough.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you.

8 REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON: Steve
9 Samuelson from Bethlehem. Just one question. What
10 percent of the school buildings, the colleges, the
11 public buildings are mapped in states such as
12 Washington? What -- how broad is the application so
13 far?

14 MR. FINNELL: I know the statistics.
15 There are roughly 100,000 K-12 public schools in the
16 United States. I might be off 10,000 here or there.
17 And to my knowledge at least on an enterprise kind
18 of comprehensive system, crisis management system,
19 we have been to roughly 2200 of them so far around
20 the country including Washington State.

21 There are -- and there are other
22 different ways of I suppose cataloguing
23 infrastructure whether it is through 3-ring binders
24 or just looking at the blueprints. As you get a
25 chance to see the video, there is a lot more than

1 that.

2 We've not run into, at least on an
3 enterprise basis, other systems such as this, at
4 least at this point pretty early on I guess in the
5 marketplace. And they have technology like this to
6 be adopted in the U5 public safety agencies.

7 MR. CARROLL: Representative, 460 high
8 schools have been mapped, 875 middle and elementary
9 schools have been mapped. And we just closed our
10 legislative session on Sunday, and funding is there
11 for the remaining 725 schools that are not currently
12 mapped. So we will be moving forward very quickly
13 to map the remaining 725 schools. So over half,
14 almost two-thirds have been mapped in Washington
15 State.

16 REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON: From start to
17 finish, that process by the end of this budget year
18 you'll have the whole state -- start to finish is a
19 two or three year process?

20 MR. FINNELL: This has been subject to
21 the funding cycles. It was '03 money, '04 money,
22 '05 money, bits and chunks. It's a biennial process
23 in Washington State as well. So it wasn't driven so
24 much by our capacity to get the system, it is by the
25 funding for the state legislature. There was also

1 some federal funding that came in for other critical
2 infrastructure.

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Before we go onto our
4 next Representative, I should point out to the
5 members in your package there is a document called
6 Violence and Weapons Possession in Pennsylvania
7 Schools put out by the Pennsylvania School Board
8 Association. And I direct your attention to the
9 increase in the number of bomb threats, terroristic
10 threats, arson, and weapon possession in schools in
11 Pennsylvania.

12 Overall the violence is down, but in
13 these categories there seems to be increases in
14 those areas. So I wanted to point out that in each
15 of your packages you should have this report. Thank
16 you.

17 REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: Thank you, Mr.
18 Chairman. I was wondering if you gentlemen could
19 comment on the role of the teachers in this kind of
20 plans kind of approach and I guess specifically on
21 two levels. One, I'm just curious.

22 That may be something that is more from
23 the school district's purview that is simply beyond
24 your scope. I'd be curious to know what role the
25 teachers might have in the preparation of these

1 plans and the preparation of responses, potential
2 responses to incidents.

3 And then is there any type of ongoing
4 training that the teachers implement in these kind
5 of plans?

6 MR. FINNELL: I'll work backwards.
7 Training for the education community and the process
8 of deploying the system not only in Washington State
9 but in the other nine states that we've done this
10 with education facilities, the facilities'
11 stakeholders, principals, superintendents, and
12 educators become very interested in incidents and
13 how to respond to emergencies.

14 And we often find that we're providing
15 training for what is called NIMS management system.
16 That is a standardized approach that the federal
17 government promotes for emergency response. And
18 they really, really -- we've done a number of these
19 programs. They really like it.

20 They want to get involved with the first
21 responders. They want to try to speak their
22 language and vice versa.

23 The other interesting program just to
24 touch on is that we've been very active most
25 recently in doing pandemic flu training for

1 education communities. As it turns out, these are
2 unique locations that are very viable for the
3 dispensing of vaccine and managing a large potential
4 influenza outbreak.

5 School communities recognize and so has
6 the emergency management community recognized that
7 school venues are a valuable, critical aspect in
8 managing a large scale event such as that. And your
9 other question -- I'm sorry, sir.

10 REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: Just curious
11 because your chief here talked about bringing all of
12 the different stakeholders together and formulating
13 an initial plan. And I thought it was actually a
14 pretty creative approach, the breadth of different
15 stakeholders involved. I didn't hear the teachers
16 mentioned and want to put that out for discussion.

17 MR. CARROLL: Representative, what we do
18 and it really is individual in the jurisdiction. If
19 you were to ask me, my recommendation would be to
20 hold those stakeholder meetings at the schools.

21 And when those stakeholder meetings take
22 place, it is very interesting how many people show
23 up on their own when they hear that we're doing
24 this, that we're going to map the school for
25 evacuation purposes for critical incidents. And

1 teachers will come.

2 And every summer before school goes back
3 into session, they go -- we go over the plan and
4 over the software to make sure that it is
5 up-to-date.

6 We had one high school that was
7 substantially changed during a remodel, 2-year
8 remodel. And we basically had to go back in and
9 re-map the entire school. But it was -- you know,
10 it was well worth it. And everyone in the school
11 knew that it was there, and then they practice those
12 evacuation plans.

13 REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: Just switching
14 gears slightly. From a business model perspective
15 I'm thinking about the investment of the technology
16 here and the relationship to the school on the basis
17 of annual renewable contracts or do you have some
18 longer term contracts like 5 or 10 years? And how
19 does the ongoing relationship take place?

20 MR. FINNELL: We have a variety of
21 licensing opportunities for our customers. We find
22 that school communities are not interested in having
23 mission critical applications in their data centers
24 if they even have one. It is expensive. It's
25 onerous. It requires hardware.

1 What we do then is we actually have what
2 is called an ASP model where they pay a monthly
3 subscription and we manage all of that for them.
4 They don't have to worry about any of it. We find
5 that most cost-effective and palatable for the
6 customers in the districts that we work with in the
7 school community.

8 That said, our federal customers and
9 other customers have security requirements such that
10 that content needs to be stored behind their
11 firewalls. And that becomes much more expensive and
12 requires the capital outlay on the part of the
13 customer and us as well.

14 REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: No one in the back has
16 questions. I just have a couple of questions.
17 Number one, do you know of any states along the
18 northeastern corridor that uses building mapping
19 systems for first responders?

20 MR. FINNELL: I'm not directly conversant
21 with any that are using a platform similarly. We're
22 doing it on a statewide basis. But that is not to
23 say there aren't some out there. I've not seen them
24 or heard of them. We have deployments in North and
25 South Carolina but not -- I'm not aware of any.

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: In New York or
2 Massachusetts?

3 MR. FINNELL: No, sir.

4 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: All right. Second
5 question. You mentioned something about funding.
6 You indicated that there was a federal program that
7 made a grant available to the state and then the
8 state stepped in and provided some dedicated or
9 targeted funding for implementation. Did that
10 federal grant come from homeland security or was
11 that from another department?

12 MR. CARROLL: I believe it was the
13 homeland security department that dedicated funds
14 for emergency responders. But it was not UWASE
15 money. And it was not -- it was outside of the
16 regular moneys that the state received from the
17 Department of Homeland Security. It was a grant for
18 a pilot project.

19 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Do you know of any
20 other federal agencies other than homeland security
21 that would fund something like this?

22 MR. FINNELL: Our Washington State
23 experience speaking to Randy's program was
24 originally funded, started by the state legislature
25 who took the unique position of saying that, well,

1 the homeland security can fund critical
2 infrastructure. Our critical infrastructures are
3 schools. Therefore, we'll fund that component.
4 That has started to a great degree a federal-state
5 relationship where our customer, Randy's
6 association, has been able -- in the state has been
7 able to receive funding through several mechanisms,
8 most notably through the CJS program of the federal
9 government and through an appropriation for it. And
10 that actually went towards critical infrastructure.

11 That said, the platform on technology
12 being certified through DHS is ineligible for
13 different types of programs although we find most
14 states are already engrossed in homeland security
15 projects and find it difficult. There are some
16 other potential opportunities with that particular
17 department.

18 So the Department of Justice has a
19 program that they are looking to launch. Many of
20 our customers received funding through the
21 Department of Education, what is called emergency
22 response and crisis management grant program. And,
23 in fact, we just started -- we're starting a number
24 of those programs right now in a number of different
25 states. That usually goes direct to school

1 districts.

2 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you. My next
3 question runs to jurisdiction. More often than not
4 in the states where they utilize building mapping
5 systems for schools, who has primary jurisdiction of
6 the information and the infrastructure?

7 MR. FINNELL: From our perspective it
8 would be a fairly easy business of who is paying the
9 rent. If it is a state project and the state is
10 substantially funding it, its their content. It's
11 their administrative rights. Those obviously need
12 to be negotiated in advance. We have, however, had
13 customers on a local level migrate into a more
14 regional environment, if you will turned the keys
15 over to a larger entity to inherit their prior
16 responsibility with the data system.

17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Based on your
18 experience, what would be your recommendation? I
19 mean some people have said that this -- this data
20 and proprietary rights should rest with either state
21 police or the PEMA agency for the state or some
22 other agency of law enforcement community.

23 MR. CARROLL: I think that -- I'm not
24 sure that I do have a recommendation. I think that
25 any of those agencies if they are willing to hold

1 the data for everyone are appropriate. I think that
2 your Department of Education could also be
3 considered for holding the data.

4 What we find is -- what we have found is
5 that the participation and the teaming that goes on
6 when we put information into the database is more
7 critical than who holds the database. It really
8 boils down to whomever can afford to hold the data
9 or whomever you decide.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I guess my last
11 question before we turn to Representative Brooks and
12 that is what would you identify as the toughest
13 barriers to overcome in implementation of these
14 school buildings?

15 MR. FINNELL: The single biggest
16 challenge is working with our customers to secure
17 funding for these programs and get them going. We
18 have worked very hard with the stakeholders in
19 particularly the education community to embrace
20 this.

21 And we frankly have little or no
22 difficulty getting all of these people to get
23 involved and get excited about the program. It
24 tends to attract media and it shows that, yeah,
25 local responders and school officials are really

1 working hard together to document their facilities
2 and be ready in the event of a large scale
3 emergency.

4 We promote two things, the first being
5 when the first responders respond to a large scale
6 emergency they need to know a hundred things and
7 they need to know them right now. And we try to
8 facilitate that through the technology.

9 The other concept that we really work
10 with our customers on -- and the State of Washington
11 is very proactive in this -- is that it is really
12 difficult to go to battle without a plan.

13 So pre-planning and joint pre-planning is
14 absolutely critical. The two packages really drives
15 interest in the program. Okay. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Representative Brooks.

17 REPRESENTATIVE BROOKS: In the question
18 of jurisdiction if this information was available,
19 would the structure under NIMS identify who would
20 have jurisdiction with this information and who
21 would then -- because NIMS very clearly identifies
22 who is -- who has the jurisdiction in that natural
23 disaster or whatever we're dealing with. So would
24 that automatically roll into that process?

25 MR. CARROLL: Go ahead.

1 MR. FINNELL: I would suggest that you
2 provide -- there are different -- by the way, there
3 are different ways of viewing the data from
4 sensitive to less sensitive first and foremost. It
5 is compartmentalized is the terminology.

6 The NIMS -- who's in charge issue and
7 chart that rolls out during a large scale event is
8 sometimes dictated by type of event. And that
9 information can be pre-planned into the platform as
10 part of the planning process.

11 We would suggest that the system as it's
12 deployed be accessible to all the relevant
13 responders. I'm not saying every single one but the
14 commanders and the responding officers who need
15 access to it before the event occurs.

16 So in terms of who is holding the
17 information, I think it should be made relatively
18 speaking generically available ahead of time.

19 To answer your question about who is in
20 charge, those decisions often get worked out during
21 our pre-planning sessions. And I never really
22 thought about that. There are from time to time
23 some tension regarding about who is in charge.

24 REPRESENTATIVE BROOKS: As a former
25 County Commissioner, I'm certified with NIMS.

1 MR. FINNELL: Yes.

2 REPRESENTATIVE BROOKS: And it very
3 clearly identifies depending on the disaster who is
4 in charge.

5 MR. FINNELL: You're right.

6 REPRESENTATIVE BROOKS: So we may agree
7 that maybe perhaps this information needs to be
8 identified ahead of time. I'm wondering within the
9 structure of NIMS during the disaster it would
10 clarify who has the jurisdiction with the
11 information.

12 MR. FINNELL: Those are challenging
13 questions. Go ahead, Chief.

14 MR. CARROLL: Let me see if I can answer
15 the question this way or give you an idea of what
16 happened in my jurisdiction.

17 In 1999 we had a pipeline blow up, major
18 pipeline. And the federal agencies responded. The
19 mapping system had it been available to us in that
20 particular venue would have been locally owned, but
21 everyone would have used it. And I don't know that
22 NIMS really would identify -- may identify the
23 commanders or the incident command individual.

24 But what I think you would get if you
25 asked your local chiefs and fire and police and even

1 your Department of Emergency Management is what
2 happens locally, you want to manage locally. And I
3 would say that you would want to do that with your
4 information system.

5 Because if it really moves to the federal
6 level, then it is harder to access. It is harder to
7 change, and you really relinquish ownership.

8 REPRESENTATIVE BROOKS: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you, gentlemen.
10 Very good.

11 MR. FINNELL: Thank you, sir.

12 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: You will be hearing
13 from us.

14 MR. CARROLL: I've got some CDs from the
15 video -- the video itself I can leave with you and
16 you can share those as you wish.

17 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you. You had a
18 chance to get a real good look at Pennsylvania
19 today.

20 MR. CARROLL: Yes. But this is my sixth
21 or seventh time to Pennsylvania. If I have to leave
22 Washington State, I may come here.

23 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you. Our next
24 panelists -- we're going to ask both panelists to
25 come up at the same time. One, David Eckman,

1 president, Pennsylvania Professional Fire Fighters
2 Association. Is he here?

3 MR. ECKMAN: I am. But I'm happy to
4 defer to my written testimony in the interest of
5 time.

6 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Well, no. Come on.

7 MR. ECKMAN: Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: And Mr. Comey. Mr.
9 John Comey, executive assistant to the director of
10 Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency.

11 And before members leave, let me ask them
12 to make sure that they have in their folder written
13 testimony submitted by the Pennsylvania School Board
14 Association, County Commissioners Association;
15 government relations specialists, Kristen Goshorn.

16 If everybody has that information, then
17 we're going to start with our final two panelists.
18 And I'm going to ask my esteemed partner, the
19 Minority Chairman Representative Steil, if he would
20 take over in the event that I have to leave.

21 REPRESENTATIVE STEIL: You may begin.

22 MR. ECKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and
23 the members of the House Intergovernmental Affairs
24 Committee for the opportunity to present our
25 perspective on the concept of building mapping.

1 My name is David Eckman, and I am the
2 president of The Pennsylvania Professional Fire
3 Fighters Association, a labor organization comprised
4 of over 6,000 professional fire fighters that are
5 employed by jurisdictions all over the Commonwealth.
6 We are also the state affiliate of the International
7 Association of Fire Fighters. I've also been a
8 professional fire fighter for over 20 years in
9 suburban York County.

10 The concept of building mapping for the
11 fire service is really not new. For decades fire
12 officers and fire fighters understood the value of
13 having a drawing of a building or structure
14 available to us at an emergency incident.

15 Additionally, we would make notes on the
16 drawing of things like utility shutoffs, access
17 points, building construction, water resources that
18 are necessary, et cetera. This compilation of
19 information was called an emergency pre-plan,
20 something that is still used today in many areas.

21 These pre-plans help an incident
22 commander develop tactics and refer to notes that
23 can be crucial to both fire fighter and public
24 safety.

25 I can remember early in my career

1 actually wading through a 3-ring binder full of
2 notes and drawings of buildings in our first
3 response areas. The technological evolution changed
4 all of that. We can now store much more data with
5 greater detail, have immediate access, and now even
6 store digital pictures of areas of concern within
7 the buildings we respond to.

8 The future also seems to be very
9 exciting. Now we have building mapping where we can
10 actually map out room sizes and hazards. The
11 ability to get accurate building mapping data as you
12 walk through a building is amazing.

13 Once you have that data stored, the
14 technology of GPS trackers would allow us to track a
15 fire fighter's movement within a building. And in
16 the event he becomes trapped, facilitate a rescue
17 with precision. When time is a critical component
18 in a rescue, anything that cuts down on that time
19 makes an effective rescue more likely.

20 What does deserve debate is how best to
21 engage emergency response agencies into adopting
22 this new technology in their jurisdictions. Our
23 research indicates that there are several different
24 systems which also contain several different options
25 within those systems.

1 There is probably an argument to be made
2 to make available to public safety agencies a
3 technology grant. The purpose of which would be to
4 assist in the development of building mapping
5 systems at the local level.

6 Of course, one component of the grant
7 would be coordination between law enforcement and
8 other emergency responder agencies. This type of
9 approach would allow local jurisdictions the ability
10 to determine for themselves the best system that
11 works for them.

12 Lastly, there may be greater likelihood
13 that other buildings and facilities would be
14 included in the system since pre-planning may
15 already occur on those buildings.

16 In closing, I would like to thank the
17 committee for gathering information on the system
18 that would give emergency responders an additional
19 tool in the tool box as we strive to improve both
20 public and fire fighter safety. Thank you for
21 having me today, and I'd be happy to answer any
22 questions that you might have.

23 REPRESENTATIVE STEIL: Are there any
24 questions? Anybody in the back? Representative
25 Brooks.

1 REPRESENTATIVE BROOKS: I don't really
2 have a question. But I would just like to take a
3 moment to thank you for what you do. Most certainly
4 we depend on you to keep us safe, and it is a very
5 difficult task that you have. And so I would like
6 to just take a moment to thank you for everything
7 that the fire fighters do.

8 MR. ECKMAN: Thank you, Representative.

9 REPRESENTATIVE STEIL: Representative.
10 Kortz.

11 REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: I would just like
12 to concur with what Representative Brooks said.
13 Thank you.

14 REPRESENTATIVE STEIL: Representative
15 Gillespie.

16 REPRESENTATIVE GILLESPIE: Yes. Mr
17 Chairman, thank you. I'm going to sound like a
18 broken record. Thank you, Mr. Eckman.

19 MR. ECKMAN: Thank you, Representative.

20 REPRESENTATIVE STEIL: Representative
21 Samuelson.

22 REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON: I'll ask a
23 question. The experience that you have over the
24 years working with those loose-leaf binders and
25 pre-plans, what is your perspective on how difficult

1 it would be to keep information up-to-date on a
2 computerized system?

3 MR. ECKMAN: Well, I've actually lived
4 through the transition. I've started with the
5 3-ring loose-leaf binder and now we've sort of
6 transgressed into the computers.

7 By far the -- although the data
8 collection is basically the same, you still have to
9 get out and get the data. The immediate access is
10 really the crucial point. You're not flipping
11 through 3-ring binders and in my jurisdiction it is
12 about that thick.

13 REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON: I guess I mean
14 going out and finding the places where things have
15 changed, how much of a challenge is that to make
16 sure that the data is up-to-date?

17 MR. ECKMAN: Well, that does present a
18 challenge. We try to do the best job that we can.
19 But fortunately we have a pretty good relationship
20 with the building department. So when folks come in
21 for a permit or something like that, we're able to
22 get back out and see if that affects our plan and
23 what have you.

24 REPRESENTATIVE STEIL: Thank you. Any
25 other questions? I have a couple of questions.

1 First of all in your prior experience in terms of
2 the loose-leaf binder and now you using electronic,
3 was that information shared with the other emergency
4 services units like police and emergency medical
5 services or was it primarily for the fire services?

6 MR. ECKMAN: Our loose-leaf binders was
7 generally for our information. To the best of my
8 knowledge, the police department sort of did their
9 own thing because their needs were somewhat
10 different than ours.

11 REPRESENTATIVE STEIL: Has that changed?

12 MR. ECKMAN: I'm not sure generally
13 speaking that it has changed. There is still a
14 little bit of that that occurs. But clearly we're
15 sharing a lot more information. A lot of that
16 sharing actually happens at the incident scene now
17 where you have an incident command post where, you
18 know, all of the commanders of the respective
19 agencies are there so you can have that access.

20 REPRESENTATIVE STEIL: Is there value to
21 working from the same database of information?

22 MR. ECKMAN: Oh, it seems to me there is
23 a huge value with that. That -- you know, once the
24 data is generated that is shared across all of the
25 agencies would be an extreme value.

1 REPRESENTATIVE STEIL: As you're
2 developing an electronics system to maintain this
3 data, are you using -- are you developing your own
4 system or are you purchasing the software or using a
5 prepared system, off-the-shelf system like PRI is
6 proposing? How did you do yours?

7 MR. ECKMAN: My experience is it's a
8 little bit all over the map depending on who you
9 talk to. Some are as primitive as taking those
10 3-ring binders and scanning them into an electronic
11 document just so that they are a little bit more
12 readily accessible. Some of them are a little bit
13 more sophisticated systems with, you know,
14 measurements and pictures and so forth. So it is
15 really kind of no standard.

16 REPRESENTATIVE STEIL: Thank you. Any
17 other questions before I go to John Comey? John, go
18 ahead.

19 MR. COMEY: Representative, I do not have
20 formal testimony because quite frankly we were more
21 interested in listening than speaking. We are very,
22 very interested in what the State of Washington is
23 doing and have been watching it for some time.

24 It is important to keep it in perspective
25 what we're doing. 1988 as a result of tornadoes

1 that went through the northwest and north central
2 part of the state, the General Assembly established
3 a requirement for all schools, all public schools in
4 the state to have all hazards comprehensive plans in
5 place. They are to be tested annually through an
6 exercise.

7 What we're looking at here is a natural
8 complement to that process. It doesn't create the
9 plan, it augments the plan. It creates the visual
10 resources that had not been available back then.
11 But the plan is the core.

12 The plan is the foundation upon which
13 this is built and that has to be in place. And it
14 is a common plan built by the facility which would
15 then be used by police, fire, EMS, and others
16 dealing with an incident in response to that
17 facility. Many fire companies and first response
18 organizations have variations of this type of
19 facility.

20 Many of them do have schematics and in
21 many cases based upon an annual walk-through of the
22 facility by the fire chief and the police chief with
23 the facility management. That is part of what they
24 do on an annual basis so that they are prepared. Is
25 it 21st Century? No. If we had the funds and

1 resources to complement that, that would make sense.

2 One of the things that we were looking at
3 in past discussions with Representative Thomas and
4 others was the centralization of this database.
5 That concerns us. Not that we would be opposed to
6 having it in one location.

7 But if you were listening, the folks from
8 Washington supported what we know and that's our
9 inability to get that information in a timely way to
10 the incident command post. It really has to be at
11 that local level when they need it. Having it in
12 Harrisburg doesn't help.

13 In most of our communities we don't have
14 internet access yet on a high-speed, broadband
15 basis. I'm sure that's going to come, but we're not
16 there yet. So while we may be appreciative of
17 having that information, we don't need it in
18 Harrisburg. They do need it at the community when
19 they are responding. So we have to look at making
20 sure that it is kept down at that local level. And
21 finally, it is a fascinating approach to managing an
22 incident in response.

23 Something that the fire commissioner has
24 been looking at, creating a mechanism that they all
25 have laptop access necessarily. So it would be

1 bringing us into the 21st Century, and that may not
2 be available. Let me respond to questions.

3 REPRESENTATIVE STEIL: Questions?

4 REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Thank you, Mr.
5 Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Comey. The question that
6 I have, looking beyond the schools themselves to
7 nuclear facilities we have in this state. Have we
8 addressed this mapping per se? I would assume that
9 we would have because of the potential for
10 catastrophe after Three Mile Island.

11 MR. COMEY: The result of Three Mile
12 Island in 1979 raised the level of preparedness for
13 11 counties that are at risk within a 10-mile radius
14 and a total of 26 counties that are directly
15 involved in the planning process to an extremely
16 high level.

17 I will tell you, Representative, that by
18 far the best prepared counties and communities in
19 this Commonwealth and in this nation are those
20 surrounding our nuclear facilities. Not just for
21 response to an accident at one of our five nuclear
22 plants but for any threat to the public health and
23 safety. And that's been proven time and time and
24 time again.

25 Do we have this level of sophistication?

1 No. But we do have plans, procedures, policies in
2 place that are exercised every two years with
3 federal observation to make sure that that level of
4 preparedness is in place.

5 Every community has an emergency response
6 plan. It is tested. You have volunteers that are
7 trained. It is a system that works and works well.
8 It can always be improved and we certainly welcome
9 the opportunity to do that.

10 But you're looking at schematics and
11 resources and interior visions of facilities that
12 quite frankly a nuclear power plant would not have
13 application. An accident -- or incident at one of
14 the facilities, yeah, it certainly could.

15 REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Yeah. That's
16 where I was coming from, more of an internal problem
17 there in which would generate -- could generate a
18 catastrophe. And obviously that kind of information
19 is very sensitive because we wouldn't want that in
20 anybody else's hands other than the people that were
21 going in there to respond to the crisis.

22 MR. COMEY: The detailed schematics of
23 the nuclear power plants, yes, we do have that. The
24 Nuclear Regulatory Commission's are far more
25 detailed than ours. They are secured. But that

1 information is available to us when we're dealing
2 with a response to an accident at one of our nuclear
3 facilities, yes, and have been for quite some time.

4 REPRESENTATIVE STEIL: Representative
5 Samuelson.

6 REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON: We've been
7 talking about K to 12. My question is about
8 colleges. What percentage of our colleges are
9 working with their first responders to develop
10 mapping systems?

11 MR. COMEY: To develop mapping systems,
12 Representative, I cannot answer that. But I can
13 tell you something that is I think a very
14 interesting opportunity.

15 Very much like the Department of Homeland
16 Security provided funding to Washington State a few
17 years ago as a pilot program, they also provided
18 money to Pennsylvania about three years ago for a
19 pilot project for something called Ready Campus.
20 College Misericordia in northeastern Pennsylvania
21 was the facility that helped build this out. And
22 the whole purpose is to develop a tool, a model that
23 could be used by any campus in the country to build
24 a capacity to support emergency preparedness in that
25 community.

1 Three fold. How could the facility be
2 used? An example, 1972 Wilkes-Barre. Several
3 community hospitals were evacuated because of
4 flooding. Those patients were taken to College
5 Misericordia for about almost a year.

6 Facilities at that college were used as
7 an acute care medical facility. Operations were
8 conducted, babies were born, people died in the
9 field house and in the dormitory space.

10 The whole idea behind this is how could
11 these campuses now in this day and age, how could
12 their facilities be used as part of the emergency
13 preparedness program?

14 The second aspect is the faculty,
15 tremendous resource of skilled and trained personnel
16 that could become part of the community's overall
17 planning and preparedness program.

18 And the third aspect is the student body,
19 a tremendous resource of labor if nothing else. And
20 that model was completed about three months ago. It
21 is available on the web. It was presented to the
22 federal government, and it is now available to any
23 campus in the country to be used to help build out a
24 better tool and how they can be part of the overall
25 community preparedness and response program. It is

1 really a good package.

2 REPRESENTATIVE STEIL: Representative
3 Benninghoff.

4 REPRESENTATIVE BENNINGHOFF: Thank you.
5 I apologize I couldn't be here for the earlier
6 comments. The security under the proposal talked
7 about, would there be any building automatically not
8 included?

9 I happen to have something to do with
10 defense work in Centre County. I suspect they would
11 have some pretty heavy concerns about having their
12 schematics of the building made public.

13 I've never been totally convinced we can
14 secure everything on computers. I watch my
15 3-year-old on the computer. I'm convinced even
16 more. She's much better at it than I am and the
17 subsequent generation.

18 It just amazes me that the right person
19 spends the right amount of time -- even with
20 destroyed hard drives -- information can be obtained
21 by the right person. I just believe that there are
22 certain entities who we may have to consider whether
23 they would be exempt or not. I'm not talking about
24 public buildings.

25 MR. COMEY: I think the discussion,

1 Representative, right now is public buildings with
2 emphasis on schools. It was mentioned that we are
3 also under the umbrella of homeland security looking
4 at critical infrastructure in Pennsylvania, not
5 necessarily to this level of detail -- digitizing
6 detail. But we are developing plans. Security at
7 critical infrastructures that go beyond nuclear
8 facilities, so, yes, that is ongoing.

9 I don't know that we have the capacity or
10 the need in many cases to drill down to every public
11 building in the state. But I think it is necessary
12 if we're going to do this, that we prioritize that
13 effort.

14 REPRESENTATIVE BENNINGHOFF: And I don't
15 want to belabor this. I guess the only comment I
16 would follow-up with is a pure definition of public
17 building I think is going to be important.

18 MR. COMEY: Sure.

19 REPRESENTATIVE BENNINGHOFF: Some of our
20 universities, they are public at times and other
21 times they like to be considered quasi-public when
22 it comes to funding, you know. And in my case some
23 of our university buildings obviously are used for
24 federal defense issues as well as private sectors.
25 I think we need to get a definition of what would be

1 under public. Thank you.

2 REPRESENTATIVE STEIL: Seeing no other
3 questions, I have one question. Just it goes again
4 to the repository of this information. And, John,
5 you partially addressed it.

6 Were we to embody a system as has been
7 described here today, it would seem to me that that
8 information needs to be someplace. And I don't know
9 if it should be at every single emergency responder
10 or whether it should reside with the county
11 emergency services coordinator, director. Do you
12 have a thought about that?

13 MR. COMEY: Representative, this is not
14 terribly dissimilar from a requirement that was
15 created back in 1990 dealing with hazardous
16 materials.

17 As a result of the Bhopal incident in
18 1986, the federal government approved the Superfund
19 Amendment Preauthorization Act which the General
20 Assembly in Pennsylvania adopted as 165 of 1990 and
21 became a model in the nation. It deals with the
22 registration of plans and detailed information on
23 materials that are contained at facilities across
24 the Commonwealth that are hazardous or extremely
25 hazardous based upon a federal list. That

1 information is secured with the local fire company,
2 the county emergency management agency, and the
3 state.

4 In this case the Department of Labor and
5 Industry is the repository of all of this data that
6 we have access to electronically through various
7 terminals, and we can share to a degree with first
8 responders. But they also have that information
9 available.

10 I think that is probably the best model
11 at least for now. The information has to be at the
12 local level where they can use it when they need it.
13 It also can be and probably should be at the state
14 level so that we can work with it and make sure that
15 it is current.

16 REPRESENTATIVE STEIL: Okay. Thank you
17 very much. If there are no other questions, I would
18 declare this hearing closed and thank all of you for
19 your testimony. I appreciate it.

20 (The hearing concluded at 4:43 p.m.)

21

22

23

24

25

1 I hereby certify that the proceedings and
2 evidence are contained fully and accurately in the
3 notes taken by me in the proceedings of the above
4 cause and that this copy is a correct transcript of
5 the same.

6

7

8

Sherri A. Reitano
Notary Public

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25