

North Carolina 911 Board Meeting
MINUTES
Richard Childress Racing Headquarters
425 Industrial Drive, Lexington, NC
March 23, 2018
10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Staff Present</u>	<u>Guests</u>
David Bone (NCACC) Martin County	Niki Barnes (DOT)	Ron Adams, Southern Software
Secretary Eric Boyette (NC CIO) Board Chair	Tina Bone (DIT)	Randy Beaman, CCES
Heather Campbell (CMRS) Sprint	Richard Bradford (DOJ)	Byron Burns, CRS
Eric Cramer (LEC) Wilkes Communication	Ronnie Cashwell (DIT)	Allen Cress, Rowan Co 911
Andrew Grant (NCLM) Town of Cornelius (WebEx)	Danette Jernigan (DIT)	Brian Drum, Catawba Co 911
Chuck Greene (LEC) AT&T	Gerry Means (DIT)	Greg Foster, Alexander Co 911
Len Hagaman (Sheriff) Watauga County	Marsha Tapler (DIT)	Adam Johnson, CCES
Greg Hauser (NCSFA) Charlotte Fire Department (WebEx and phone)	Richard Taylor (DIT)	Tim Johnson, CGIA
Jeff Ledford (NCACP) City of Shelby PD		Christine Moore, Guilford Metro 911
John Moore (VoIP) Spectrum Communications		Melanie Neal, Guilford Metro 911
Niraj Patel (CMRS) Verizon		Phil Penny, MCP
Mike Reitz (APCO) Chatham Co 911		David Poston, CMPD
Jeff Shipp (LEC) Star Telephone		Craig Schulz, MCP
Jimmy Stewart (NCAREMS) Hoke Co 911		Ben Shelton, CGIA
Slayton Stewart (CMRS) Carolina West Wireless		
Donna Wright (NENA) Richmond Co Emergency Services		
<u>Members Absent</u>	<u>Staff Absent</u>	<u>WebEx Guests</u>
Amy Ward (LEC) CenturyLink		Jason Barbour, Johnston Co 911
		Rachel Bello, Wake Co
		Joshua Briggs, AT&T
		Vicki Callicutt, Union Co Comm
		Stephanie Conner, Surry Co 911 Comm
		Susan Davis, Mooresville PD
		David Dodd, APCO
		Greg Dotson, Rutherford Co 911
		Curt Euler, Buncombe Co
		Brad Fraser, Shelby Police Dept
		David Gay, Durham Emer Comm
		Terry Grayson, Shelby PD

		Ron Helterbrand, GeoComm
		Misty Hembree, Graham Co 911 Comm
		Jim Lockard, Federal Engineering
		Jesus Lopez, DIT
		Christie McCorquodale, Randolph Co 911
		Jonathan Nixon, Perquimans Co ES
		Dominick Nutter, Raleigh-Wake 911
		Barry Ritter, Ritter Strategic Services LLC
		Christie Shearin, Franklin Co 911
		Corinne Walser, MEDIC
		Victor Williams, Beaufort Co S.O.
		Stephanie Wiseman, Mitchell Co 911
		Brenda Womble, Wilson Co ECC
		Doug Workman, Town of Cary 911 Center

Call to order—Chairman Boyette called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM, welcoming everyone and remarking upon what a fine facility RCR has. Mr. Taylor introduced Davidson County Commission Chair Steve Shell, inviting him to step to the podium for some welcoming remarks.

Mr. Shell welcomed everyone to Davidson County, admitting he might be a little biased in characterizing it as the most beautiful county in North Carolina with the most beautiful people. After introducing himself, he began his remarks by observing how difficult a 911 telecommunicator's (TC's) job is, citing several examples of calls and outcomes he has become aware of, and adding that it is one of the toughest careers a person can have. He noted that field responders are often publically recognized and praised for their acts of heroism, accompanied by photos in the newspaper of patrol cars, fire trucks, or ambulances, yet little, if any, recognition is given to the TCs, hidden away in the PSAP, whom he believes are the "backbone" of the emergency response system. He related that as someone who has served as a first responder in law enforcement, he feels that oversight is particularly sad because he has always seen the 911 TC as the initiator of a first response, but too often they are not recognized for how important a role they play. He praised Davidson County's TCs for how well they responded to the recent cyberattack there; how they didn't whimper or complain, but were instead dedicated to standing their ground and smoothly transitioning to pen and paper as they had to abandon IT. He noted that the computers used by the field responders were also down, and how that led him to reflect upon how first response is a team effort and how proud he was of all of his teams during that challenge. He admitted that he, himself, has been guilty, as a commissioner, of offering public praise to field responders without acknowledging the TC's role behind the scene, stressing, however, it was never a deliberate slight. He offered that Davidson County's team is one of dedication and commitment to public safety, and of which he is very, very proud. He closed his remarks by saying how honored both he and the county's staff are to host this meeting, and how grateful they are for all that "you folks do" on behalf of public safety.

As Mr. Shell was finishing, Richard Childress, Chairman and CEO of Richard Childress Racing, stepped into the room. Mr. Taylor announced his arrival, and Mr. Childress stepped to the podium to address the assemblage. He welcomed everyone, remarking on today's pretty weather following on the heels of Wednesday's snowfall. He observed that folks frequently have to turn to 911 on snowy days, then added that he, himself, had contacted 911 for the first time in his life some months ago when he was the victim of a home invasion. He offered that the response he and his wife received was incredible, noting that what the folks in 911 do is important not only to Davidson County and surrounding areas, but to the entire state and country. He said he just wanted to step in and wish everyone a good day and thank them for everything they do for the state of North Carolina. He asked everyone to enjoy themselves today and to not hesitate to ask if there is anything they need while at the facility.

Mr. Taylor interjected that he did want to say, on the behalf of the 911 Board, that Mr. Childress' team here has been awesome; everyone has been more than hospitable and the facility is just unbelievable. He stressed that he just wanted to thank Mr. Childress for having them help us. Mr. Childress said it was his pleasure, and encouraged folks to take a tour of the facility or go up to the museum when they can take a break to do that.

Chairman Boyette asked Mr. Taylor to call the roll of attendees he expected to participate over the phone. When Mr. Taylor called Greg Hauser's name, Mr. Hauser wished everyone a good morning. Andrew Grant did not respond, and rather than call Amy Ward's name, Mr. Taylor explained that she is attending her daughter, who is having surgery this morning, so she would not be able to join the meeting today. Mr. Taylor then asked everyone to keep both her and her daughter in their prayers. Jonathan Nixon, from Perquimans County, did not respond; Mr. Taylor speculated he would be joining a bit later, as he had a conflict right at ten o'clock. Misty Hembree, from Graham County 911 responded that she was online, but Jim Lockard, from Federal Engineering, did not.

1. Chairman's opening remarks—Chairman Boyette asked Mr. Taylor to proceed with the telecommunicator recognition for today. Mr. Taylor played an audio clip of a January 9th, 2018 incident in Davidson County which began with a jewelry store robbery in Thomasville and ultimately involved a shooting, a pair of foot chases, a vehicle chase and crash, then a second vehicle chase and crash; the clip was a composite of television news coverage, 911 phone call recordings, and radio traffic recordings describing the incident as it unfolded. When the recording ended, Mr. Taylor observed there was a lot of activity going on—lots of pieces and parts—and a lot of teamwork going on as well. He then asked Davidson County 911 Director Terry Bailey to come up and share some of the backstory.

Mr. Bailey observed that the robbers picked the wrong day, place, and time to execute their plan. He pointed out that they came up on a moped—three of them, which by itself is suspicious—and a customer leaving the store thought that rather odd and immediately called 911, which resulted in an officer being dispatched and enroute to the scene even before the robbery occurred. He noted that officers were practically coming in the parking lot as the robbers were leaving, then asked Assistant 911 Director Jamison Sears to pick up the thread for him, since she actually worked the call.

Ms. Sears said that after the robbers exited the store, one of the jewelers started chasing the moped in his pickup truck, ultimately hitting the moped and pinning one of the suspects against a tree. One of the suspects then shot the jeweler through the jaw, then the two that weren't pinned got into a car and left as the pinned suspect freed himself and began running away on foot. EMS was summoned, and officers engaged in both the foot chase and a vehicle chase. The suspects ultimately wrecked the car, which was stolen, the driver exited the car and began running on foot, and the passenger moved to the driver's seat and began driving away again. Ms. Sears observed that by this time nearly every agency Davidson County 911 dispatches was involved, and the chase ultimately ended only when a deputy collided head-on with the getaway vehicle in Lexington, while one of the other suspects was apprehended in High Point; all the suspects were ultimately apprehended. She pointed out that she was fortunate in having two TC trainees in the room that day, as it took every person in the room to contend with this event—it was a real team effort.

Noting that the shift which worked the call that day is working this morning, so the timing for this recognition ceremony was a little bad—they could not be here today—Mr. Taylor advised that as Ms. Sears worked the call with them, she is going to accept the award on behalf of the entire team. He then read aloud the inscription on the plaque presented to them (please see <https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/documents/files/03232018-1%20Agenda%20Book.pdf> page 7), followed by photos and a round of applause throughout the room.

2. Ethics Awareness/Conflict of Interest Statement—Chairman Boyette read the Ethics Awareness/Conflict of interest statement printed in the agenda. Donna Wright advised she had a conflict with agenda item 5f so she would be abstaining from that vote.

3. Public Comment—Chairman Boyette read the invitation to public comment printed in the agenda, but no one had pre-registered to speak and no one present or on the phone asked to.

4. Consent Agenda—Chairman Boyette asked Mr. Taylor to proceed with the consent agenda.

Mr. Taylor reported he has not received any comments or corrections since sending the draft February 23rd, 2018 minutes out for review earlier in the week, so they will be posted as accepted. He observed the grant fund balance stands at \$11,363,387 unencumbered and \$25,534,432 encumbered. He noted that the NG911 fund currently contains \$21,066,061 after disbursements amounting to \$3,570, observing that those disbursements will likely grow considerably beginning in April or May as folks are added onto the ESINet. He reported the CMRS fund balance is \$5,369,881 after disbursements of \$476,237, while the PSAP fund received \$650,641 in pre-paid revenue for the month, which, when coupled with normal expenditures, yields a current balance of \$10,845,794. Donna Wright offered a motion to accept the consent agenda as presented, Slayton Stewart seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

5. Executive Director Report—

a) Update on PSAP Manager meetings—Mr. Taylor reported that the regional PSAP Manager meeting in Halifax earlier in the month had to be postponed due to inclement weather, noting it has been rescheduled for April 4th in Williamston because the Halifax location was not available then. He added that the central region meeting was held here yesterday, thanking everyone who was able to attend for doing so, particularly Board members and Chairman Boyette himself.

b) Update on State Plan project—Noting that this project is “moving at the speed of government,” Mr. Taylor advised everything is on track, currently going through the procurement process. He recalled he had been hoping to see activity on this in April, before his retirement, but although he’s still hoping, it may not happen until after his departure. David Bone asked if the study group members have all been identified yet, and Mr. Taylor replied he has only received six recommendations. He reminded Board members who haven’t yet submitted a recommendation to please do so ASAP.

c) Chairman Boyette’s Roadshow to Durham 911—Mr. Taylor reported that Senator McKissick joined Chairman Boyette’s Roadshow to Durham 911, noting how important such visits are as they allow elected officials to see firsthand what goes on in a PSAP, where the money is going, what it is used for, etc. He praised the superb job Tonya Evans did as the host that day, sharing a lot of enlightening information—he asserted that everyone learned a lot. He displayed onscreen several photos that Mary Alice Warren took during the occasion, accompanied by some amusing descriptions of what the photos depicted. He observed all the staff members they met were very upbeat and treated the visitors very cordially, summarizing that the comm center atmosphere was obviously a happy one. Before moving to the next agenda item, Mr. Taylor announced the next Roadshow visit will be to Harnett County on April 13th, probably in the morning.

d) Shelby PD thank you letters and photos—Noting that Shelby PD has finished up on its grant project, Mr. Taylor displayed onscreen a thank you letter from Service Division Manager Terry S. Grayson for the 911 Board grant which allowed them to create a new communications center. Mr. Taylor observed that he thought it was very nice of them to send such an acknowledgement, and then displayed onscreen several photos which Mr. Grayson had included of the new facility, pointing out that it had been an adaptive reuse of an existing building.

e) Graham Co grant extension request—Mr. Taylor next displayed several photos of Graham County’s grant project, well underway but not yet complete. He added that over the years Graham County 911 has worked under some pretty tough conditions, and what has impressed him about this grant is that they took a relatively small amount of money—they didn’t ask for the moon—and have built a very, very nice facility. He noted they are also part of a regional network with Swain and Jackson counties, so any of those three centers can back each other up; somebody from Swain County’s PSAP can walk into Graham County’s PSAP and login just as if they were at their home county.

Mr. Taylor noted that they have encountered some delays which have prompted them to request a grant deadline extension from June 30, 2018 to December 31, 2018. Acknowledging the progress they have made, Mr. Taylor said he was very excited about what they have done, and his recommendation is to approve the extension. Donna Wright offered a motion to approve the extension, Eric Cramer seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

f) Richmond Co grant extension request—Mr. Taylor advised he has been following this project closely, noting the problems attendant to consolidating with secondary PSAPs as well as constructing a new facility. He said they are presently ready to cut over on June 12, 2018, with the current grant contract expiring only ten days later on June 30th, but they would like to extend it for another year, through June 2019, due to potential delays with the consolidation effort. He also noted, however, that they expect to be able to complete that consolidation process by January 31, 2019, but in case they encounter unforeseen issues they would like to have the additional cushion of time rather than have to return to the Board to request another extension. He asked Donna Wright to offer any additional comments, which she did, and Mr. Taylor's recommendation was to approve the extension request. Mike Reitz offered a motion to approve, David Bone seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

g) Perquimans Co grant extension request—Mr. Taylor recalled how, back in December, the Board gave a grant extension and additional grant funding to Chowan County for its tower site to be moved to enable the tower construction to begin, and that situation is the only thing preventing Perquimans County from completing its grant project, as it is dependent upon that tower being completed. Perquimans County Emergency Services Director Jonathan Nixon has asked that Perquimans County's grant be extended equivalent to Chowan County's time frame, or June 30, 2018. Mr. Taylor advised the staff recommendation is to approve the request. Slayton Stewart offered a motion to approve, Eric Cramer seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

6. Presentation by Center for Geographic Information Analysis for Image 19—Mr. Taylor observed that everyone has repeatedly heard him say since 2010 that this particular project (statewide orthography project) is, to him, the crown jewel of this Board's achievements. He recalled that the initial cycle of the project involved flying the entire state to create an up-to-date statewide data set, and that the project is now in its second four-year refresh cycle of flying one quarter of the state once every year to ensure that no data is ever more than four years old. He introduced Tim Johnson, the Executive Director of the state Center for Geographic Information and Analysis (CGIA), to report on image acquisition for 2019.

Mr. Johnson thanked Mr. Taylor and the Board for allowing him the opportunity to come back before them to speak about the imagery project for 2019. He pointed out that CGIA serves as the project manager for this effort, as it has since 2010, noting that since that time they feel like they have continued to develop and improve a product that really meets the needs of the 911 community for all 117 Primary PSAPs across North Carolina. He advised that this morning he wanted to walk everyone through the different pieces of the program and eventually get to the proposal, some technical matters related to the proposal that they think are improvements to this year's effort, and eventually get to the cost, which he was happy to say is actually less than was submitted a couple of years ago as part of the four-year plan.

Turning to a presentation onscreen (please see <https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/documents/files/03232018-1%20Agenda%20Book.pdf> pages 78-113), Mr. Johnson began by providing background information for those who are new to this project, explaining how imagery is a mission-critical tool in the toolbox of the 911 community, as well as how it is part of the standard base mapping for the entire state. He offered that it really serves a dual role, providing response tracking and visual indicators for planning purposes within the 911 community. He stressed that the collaboration team for this project is absolutely critical to having a successful effort, and he's proud to say that it's coming back together for this phase—the same group of people who have worked throughout this seven or eight-year period to deliver the imagery: CGIA; NCDOT Photogrammetry Unit; NC Department of Public Safety-NC Geodetic Survey; NC Department of the Secretary of State, Land Records Management Section; Private Contractors; and Local Governments. He added that they rely on feedback and involvement from all the PSAPs, and is proud to say they have been receiving that in an ever increasing way as they go through the quality control process for each of these cycles. He also noted that the project team looks really hard to continue to improve the process that generates the product, including providing the finished product about six weeks earlier now than only a couple of years ago.

Mr. Johnson displayed some photos onscreen illustrating changes which had taken place since 2013 to a highway interchange that had been under construction then, but completed by the time of the last update, noting how the update would impact response to 911 calls coming from that immediate area. He then displayed a map of the state color-coding the four regions to correspond with which year in this four year cycle they have been/will be flown to acquire updated imagery, noting this is the third year in that four-year cycle (the data is currently being acquired), with the proposal being discussed today representing the fourth year. He pointed out that in phases

one and two they delivered almost 31K square miles of imagery to 60 PSAPs over 53 counties, and that phase three will add another 12K square miles, yielding a total of over 43K square miles since this cycle began in 2015. He stated that the budget the 911 Board approved for those three phases amounts to \$11.3M, and today he's seeking approval of the additional amount to cover phase four.

Referring to the map of the counties being flown in phase four, Mr. Johnson explained how it offers challenges due to the fact it encompasses both piedmont counties, which are basically flat, and mountain counties, which assuredly are not. Speaking to the mountain county challenges, from snow still on the ground to turbulence—it may be a clear day, but the winds prevent them from flying—he added that flying in the mountains requires slowing things down, flying at varying altitudes which require more flight lines, more exposures, and increased fuel costs. He also explained that sun angles in the mountains present more shadow problems than in flatter topography. Observing that both Charlotte and Asheville fall within this study area, he reported they will be using a new approach for collecting data from those downtown areas to correct for tall building lean and produce what the industry calls a “true orthoimagery product”, notably at no additional cost. He also noted that this study area borders Tennessee, Georgia, and South Carolina, and they will be working in partnership with those states in acquiring data for those border areas.

Mr. Johnson observed that one of the most gratifying things about this project is the quality control process, involving everybody in this room in one way or another in a very cooperative effort with the members of the imagery acquisition team. He noted many players are involved in the VOICE (Virtual Online Inspection, Checking, & Editing) quality control process, starting with the PSAPs, who know their areas better than anybody at the state level does; DOT, which can focus on infrastructure and bridges since they look at that routinely and know when something is amiss; NC Geodetic Survey control folks, who ensure horizontal accuracy; and the NC Secretary of State's office, to ensure the product meets standards.

Turning to project management, Mr. Johnson stated this is basically an eighteen-month project, starting in July (2018), when the budget is typically available for them to start, through Qualifications Based Selection (QBS), which typically results in contracts being signed by December of that same year. Imagery acquisition follows, which is always dependent upon leaf-off conditions and/or weather in the proposed flight area, from January through April of the following year, then imagery production and post-processing from April through July. Quality control takes up July through December, when the final product is delivered “...as a Christmas present to the PSAPs.”

Looking at costs next, Mr. Johnson praised North Carolina's LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) elevation data that the Division of Emergency Management produces as one of the best in the entire country—states such as Mississippi and Georgia and others look to that statewide program as their starting program. He added that we are definitely beneficiaries of that statewide program, as it leads to lower costs to the 911 Board for these projects. Conversely, however, he advised he's learned more about jet fuel costs through this project than he ever expected to, and unfortunately, they have increased. He explained that flying the plane represents about 30% of a contractor's cost, noting that the fuel costs have risen above what he quoted in the 2015 proposal for this four-year cycle. He added, however, that the project area footprint has been reduced by three counties, which have already been flown during the preceding cycles, now down to just twenty-one counties, so they are not too concerned about the fuel cost increases.

Mr. Johnson displayed a cost summary slide onscreen breaking out the various cost line items, yielding a total of \$3,273,555 for this portion of the project. He advised that it is actually about \$245K less than what was originally proposed as part of this four-year project, in large part due to private sector costs going down as new efficiencies and sensor technologies reduce costs despite jet fuel going up.

Mr. Johnson mentioned that when he presented to this Board last year questions arose as to what additional benefits are provided by this project. To that end, he included several slides illustrating how transportation planning, public safety/disaster response, and tax assessment have all benefited from this access to fresh imagery. Summing up, he said the project team is prepared to follow the same steps they have in previous years that they believe have been successful in serving the 911 Board and is looking forward to pursuing the southern piedmont and mountains area with a goal, as always, of providing high quality, current, complete imagery to assist

not only what 911 needs today, but also what it will need in the future with the deployment of NG911. He then opened the floor to questions.

Although no one asked questions, Jeff Shipp said he would like to echo his comments from last year's presentation in stating that he totally supports this project and encourages staff to continue to "toot our horn" as it relates to the benefits made available by this project to other entities throughout the state. He then offered a motion to approve the CGIA proposal and proceed with this next phase of the project, and Donna Wright seconded.

Chairman Boyette asked if there was any further discussion, and Chuck Greene observed that, as was discussed at the PSAP manager meeting yesterday regarding new capabilities offered by Next Gen and the GIS project, where the caller actually finds the PSAP via the provision of latitude and longitude coordinates through the SIP routing, will this imagery also be able to be tied into that so it comes up with the call? He followed that with a second question: if you go to a backup site in a different county and login to the ESINet from there, will that same information be available, and where will it reside? Pokey Harris responded "Yes", further explaining that there will be a statewide dataset, as she mentioned yesterday, available to any PSAP regardless of where it is in the state. Gerry Means added that as far as the call routing is concerned, once the location is set, it is a secondary function to actually deliver the call, so once the structure of a call is created, wherever it is routed to, the same data goes with it regardless of where the PSAP is. Ms. Harris added it's all about the routing policy and where you want to send the data.

Mr. Taylor added, "Just as an FYI", that when this project began in 2010 and we did the entire state, it cost a little over \$12M, and looking at the costs of the subsequent four year cycles, we have stayed within that window. Conversely, he noted, in 2009 the 911 Board paid out to PSAPs over \$25M for their individual GIS costs *in only ten or eleven counties*, so in the first year of these projects we realized over 50% savings and provided 100% coverage to the entire state, not just a few counties. He added that from our initial planning for NG911, we have always know that GIS is the key element, so when this project was taken on by the 911 Board it spoke volumes to begin the preparation for Next Gen back then and at the same time, through the efficiencies and economies of scale Mr. Shipp likes to tout, save money for not only the 911 Fund but also for *all* of the beneficiaries of this project. He added he gives most of the credit for that to Mr. Johnson and his staff because they're the ones who have managed this project and watched every penny.

Jimmy Stewart added that he would like to extol the public safety uses of these maps, noting that almost every second of every day his people use them for 911, and also for ancillary functions such as the rescue service plotting grids for searches, etc. He added he also knows that law enforcement agencies use it to plot "raids", for lack of a better word, to spot entrances and exits to buildings, for both them and the "bad guys", as well as dirt roads and "pig paths" that might serve as escape routes, enabling them to do their work more safely. He allowed that the virtues of this program will never be underestimated by those who use it, and he's glad this Board had the vision to get behind this project many years ago.

Chairman Boyette asked for any further discussion, and hearing none, put the motion to a vote, which carried unanimously. He thanked Tim Johnson and Ben Shelton for all their work on this, observing he thinks it's very important to continue, and from his point of view, he thanks them for saving the Board money and keeping the project ahead of schedule. Mr. Johnson thanked Chairman Boyette and the Board for its vote, and underscored that all of this is the result of a team effort.

7. Defining PSAP consolidation and colocation—Recalling that this was discussed during the December work session, and has, indeed, been discussed off and on through the years, Mr. Taylor observed that he believes the Board now needs to come up with a policy, or at least a definition, for consolidation and co-location, since in several instances PSAPs have interpreted it differently than 911 Board staff has. He advised that Mr. Bradford has put a lot of work into researching this and how it has been addressed in different states, so he would now turn it over to him.

Acknowledging that he has done a fair amount of research on this, Mr. Bradford observed that, at bottom, sometimes you think you're talking about the same thing and using the same words, but you don't mean the same thing, so it's important to have a common understanding. He opined that this is probably overdue, having a term

that everyone understands in the same way. He displayed a draft copy of a Consolidation Policy he has composed (please see <https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/documents/files/03232018-1%20Agenda%20Book.pdf> pages 115-116) where he explains there's a need to do this because there's not necessarily only one definition. He has found in many other documents relating to this topic that the most common approach is what is known as a "full consolidation" in which there is an integrated structure: one organization from which all 911 calls are received and dispatched for one specific geographic area. He noted there are pictures in the TFOPA (Task Force on Optimal PSAP Architecture) document which help illustrate that, but are not determinative. He found a root document which dates to a study done by the state of Minnesota at its Governor's behest that is still cited by every other resource he's found, so although it's seven years or so old, it's still relevant.

Referring back to the draft document onscreen, he explained he tried to provide a little bit of background with our current statutory definition for call taking just to set the stage in Board members' minds: call-taking encompasses both receiving and dispatching. He added that the Board also has established a policy regarding secondary PSAPs, which the statute permits, that depends upon call transfer. He said he wondered what was really meant by "transfer", noting that within the telephony industry call transfer has a specific meaning, and adding that when he looks at the original legislation and regulation in the FCC rule, they were looking at it somewhat geographically. He offered that in his mind it doesn't matter whether you look at it geographically or whether you look at it as a telecommunications function between systems; if you move the call from one place to another geographically or you move the call from one place to another so it is dispatched, then that's not really consolidation.

Turning to the bullet points in the document, Mr. Bradford advised they are taken from the FCC regulations cited there—47 CFR. He noted that 47 CFR 20.18 is the largest section in the regulation that deals with 911 calls, with 47 CFR 20.3 defining PSAP in essentially the same language as the state statute uses to define Primary PSAP. He reminded everyone that PSAP consolidation has been a goal of this Board, addressed through the grant program, and within the grant program, it has been defined, but we don't have a statutory definition. He opined that perhaps we should, and that's for the Board to consider, but in the interim, he thinks it wise to ensure that when we have discussions among Board members, when we have discussions with staff, when staff has discussions with the PSAPs, when you use the word "consolidated" or use the word "co-located", you're talking about the same thing.

Mr. Bradford said that the consolidation background document he sent out in December contains links to other documents, and it explains that there are people who look at consolidation as "full, partial, hybrid, etc.", so there are other models that use the word "consolidation" and the question to this Board is, how do you want to define it, what do you mean when you talk about PSAP consolidation? Is it the same as defined in the grant program, or is it more broad in the sense that it includes a "hybrid" model that could arguably be fit into the ESINet world, stressing that he says "arguably" because he's not sure that it does. Or, taking it a step further, do we want to talk about "partial" consolidation? He observed that, in his opinion, this is basically the framework within which this discussion should occur. He advised that Mr. Taylor had asked him to draft a policy, so he did, but he added the caveat that this draft has not been through a committee, has not been vetted by anybody—he hasn't even received feedback from Mr. Taylor—it is simply a draft that he put together to help frame the discussion, and nothing more than that. He pointed out that the final paragraph in the draft document, under the heading "Policy", contains two sentences which explain what consolidation is, so if it is not that, then it is something else, and if it is something else, then it is probably a primary and a secondary which are co-located, whether virtually or physically, together in real time.

Mike Reitz offered that he appreciates this is just a draft, a starting point, and he thinks it is definitely needed, but he would just ask that if we are going to have a policy defining consolidations, then we also define co-location and integrated management, or something along those lines, so that it is very clear to everyone when they see the policy that these are the terms we're using and this is what they mean. Donna Wright added that she does not want to see this policy detract from PSAPs that have colocated and answer 911 calls collectively together, but do so under different structures. She observed that although they work together on their policy, it is not a true consolidation, yet she doesn't think we want to let people who have successfully done that be left out by a definition that makes it more specific.

Observing that the final paragraph of the draft does not specifically mention secondary PSAPs, Slayton Stewart asked if he is correct in understanding that a combining of a primary and secondary PSAP does not fit the definition of consolidation. Mr. Bradford replied it depends upon how they are combined, explaining that if they combine in the way the grant application specifies, i.e. both physically and managerially, that is the principle we are after. He observed that if it is not that, but they are in the same building, then it may be a co-location. He pointed out you may have situations in which the local government has determined that they want to operate in a way that calls are received in one place but dispatch for a particular service occurs elsewhere. He acknowledged that is fine, but does it mean they are consolidated? No, it does not. If the calls are transferred, then that means you have a primary and a secondary. Mr. Stewart asked if we should specifically say one or more PSAPs or secondary PSAPs with a primary PSAP, or can that just be inferred from the present wording? Mr. Bradford reiterated that, as he has said, this is just a draft for everybody to consider, think about, add to, subtract from, and so forth—it is not intended to be something for action at this point—at least not by him.

Mr. Taylor interjected that one of the things he has thought about since a discussion of this topic at the Funding Committee meeting is to take this out of the context of 911 and look at it from more of a business perspective. As an example, he proposed that CenturyLink and Level3 have consolidated—they only have one CEO in charge of a single management structure—and that is what he thinks of when he thinks about consolidation: you take two or more agencies or entities and combine them into one with only one boss and one management structure. Conversely, if CenturyLink and Level3 are in the same building but answer to two discrete bosses and work under two discrete management structures, then they are only co-located, ergo if a secondary PSAP shares a building with a primary PSAP, the definition of a secondary PSAP remains: they do not answer the initial 911 call, but receive it when it is transferred, and they function under a different management structure. He related that we have had two primary PSAPs located not only in the same building, but in the same room with a big red line drawn down the middle, but since they functioned under different management structures, they were not consolidated—they were co-located.

Observing the phrase “in one primary PSAP location” at the end of the final paragraph in the draft, Chuck Greene asked if, looking forward to when we are functioning under a Next Gen framework, where a call is not delivered to a place but to wherever a telecommunicator logs in to the ESINet, could two PSAPs consolidate, operating under a single management structure, even if they were in physically disparate locations? Mr. Taylor described that as a virtual consolidation, and Donna Wright observed that such a situation could also apply to co-located PSAPs.

Gerry Means interjected that one of the most fundamental things being discussed today is the way Next Gen works, in that it finds the PSAP, not the PSAP finding the caller, and the PSAP it finds could be anywhere. He extrapolated that further, saying that now we answer the call and determine what PSAP should get it, hence it might be sent to a secondary, but if it already knows coming in that it's in an area served by a secondary, it will send the call there to start with. Donna Wright explained that secondary PSAPs are service based rather than geographical, e.g. they dispatch only law enforcement or fire or EMS in areas that frequently overlap geographical boundaries; Mike Reitz and Mr. Taylor concurred and offered similar examples. Mr. Means then observed that the problem isn't with the call, but with the dispatch. Mr. Taylor confirmed that, stating that is why Mr. Bradford specified that call taking includes both receiving the call and dispatching “appropriate agencies” to respond to the call, adding that usually secondary PSAPs serve very specific responders, usually of only one discipline, but occasionally maybe two, whereas primary PSAPs frequently handle all disciplines.

Mr. Bradford offered that, “speaking from sort of an editorial perspective,” the two sentences which comprise the final paragraph are not ones that he really wrote; he copied them from the documents that are referenced. He advised he did that after thinking about this a bit, and now thinking upon what Mr. Greene and Mr. Reitz have presented, because he thinks these things point out why the Board needs to consider taking some action on this. He offered that we need to make sure we are communicating the same thing both within our organization and with the PSAPs. Jeff Shipp commented that he agrees with Mr. Bradford's comments, thanks him for his work on this, and would ask, as a suggestion, that maybe he continue to massage this data, and could it be shared within each of the committees at their next meetings in order to have this back on the agenda for input, and possibly a vote, at the next Board meeting. Chairman Boyette said he thought that would be an excellent idea. Slayton Stewart asked what to do if there is not a scheduled meeting within that time frame, and Mr. Taylor suggested one should be scheduled, observing this topic impacts really every committee. Chairman Boyette advised the topic will be tabled until the next meeting in order to get that committee input.

8. 911 Funding Committee report—

a) FY 2018-2019 911 fee discussion—David Bone announced that this agenda item is being considered as part of the Board's annual process required by statute to review the monthly 911 surcharge or fee. He pointed out that it is currently 60¢ and the Board has the authority to increase it up to 70¢. He observed there has been much discussion about this, and obviously the implementation of Next Gen and the costs associated with it have been a big driver of that discussion. He noted that this year we have better data to help understand what those expenses will be than we had last year, and what impact changing the fee may have on the budget and the amount of funding provided for the PSAPs. He recalled there had been discussion about increasing the fee by 10¢ to 70¢ at the last Board meeting based upon a documented need for addressing Next Gen deployment.

Mr. Bone advised the Funding Committee met on March 7th and discussed this at length, and committee member Chuck Greene shared his own analysis similar to what had been prepared by staff for the last Board meeting. At the conclusion of that committee meeting, the committee agreed upon a recommendation to increase the fee by 8¢, from 60¢ to 68¢. He added there has been additional analysis since that time, and another meeting of the Funding Committee this morning, and based upon that additional analysis, the committee has changed its recommendation to increase the fee by 5¢, from 60¢ to 65¢, and that is the recommendation it is bringing before the Board today. He then asked Mr. Taylor to offer some additional comments.

Mr. Taylor advised one of the biggest reasons for this change was a re-reading of the statute concerning the CMRS fund and how funds are transferred from it. He reviewed that the 911 Fund is composed of five discrete funds—the Administration Fund, the CMRS Fund, the PSAP Fund, the Grant Fund, and the NG911 Fund—and explained each in a little more detail. He pointed out that the statute requires any funds remaining in the PSAP Fund at the end of the fiscal year must be either distributed pro-rata to the PSAPs or moved into the Grant fund, and the Board has chosen every year to do the latter. He added that money remaining in the CMRS Fund may be transferred to the Grant Fund as well, but where we have been tripped up in the past is by the statutory provision that if more than \$3M is transferred from that fund the Board must consider reducing the amount of the service charge. The key element is that the Board must *consider reducing* the amount of the surcharge, but over the years that has been mistakenly interpreted as meaning the Board *must reduce* the amount—a huge difference. He observed that puts this discussion in a whole new light, because money has been accumulating in the CMRS Fund as fewer and fewer carriers seek cost recovery. He added that the percentage of distribution of the money CMRS providers collect for 911 has been modified through the years, with 85% currently being directed into the PSAP fund and 15% into the CMRS cost recovery fund. Looking at this with freshly opened eyes, Mr. Taylor advised more money can be transferred from the CMRS fund balance than had been considered in the earlier projections, as Chuck Green's calculations have illustrated. He then asked Mr. Greene to explain that.

Mr. Greene began his comments by praising Marsha Tapler and the staff for doing a fantastic job this year in providing us with the data that we needed to have this discussion. Drawing attention to his *Estimated 911 Revenues & Expenditures for FY-2020* document displayed onscreen, he pointed out that if we kept the surcharge at 60¢ there would be enough money to get through FY-2019, but once we got into FY-2020 we would be hitting some major shortfalls, particularly in the Next Gen Fund and the Administration Fund. He advised that he made some assumptions before he began running other scenarios, one being the ability to transfer money out of the CMRS Fund into the Grant Fund and the Next Gen Fund, and another that the allocation of funds to the Admin Fund be increased from 1% to the statutory maximum 2% of total revenue. Even so, he added, going forward that is not going to be enough—even if the fee went up to 70¢ at the 2% Admin rate, we will still be spending more in Admin than we will be taking in, so that is going to have to be addressed statutorily. He also added that he assumed a worst-case scenario in each of his projections: no federal grant money, no increase in revenue from increased number of users for wireless and wireline phones, and that we were bringing PSAPs onto the ESINet at the absolute fastest rate that we possibly could, generating recurring charges at the highest possible rate. He pointed out that the committee was divided in its original recommendation for 68¢, and said that he thinks if we can drop it down to 65¢ as the committee recommended today, and get more people on board, that will show a united Board, which will mean that we can go more easily to the General Assembly with all the structural issues we're going to have to tackle in the statute—not just the Admin Fund, but also the CMRS Fund, which is bringing in a lot more money than it needs to—i.e. to update the statute to reflect the new technologies,

since it was really designed for analog rather than digital. He observed that those are some of the changes we're going to have to make, and he thinks that if we can start with a united vote on this particular initiative, then going forward it will be easier for us to work together on what we want to see accomplished, as well as be able to get it done.

Chairman Boyette called the vote on the committee recommendation, and with no further discussion, it passed unanimously.

9. Education Committee Report—

a) Update on Telecommunicator Certification Summit—Education Committee Chair Jimmy Stewart reported that the educational summit coming up on April 12th in Greensboro is on track—he has already invited all of the targeted stakeholders to discuss telecommunicator certification. He advised a facilitator whom he has known personally for a long time, Bill Gentry, has been secured, and he believes he will do a very good job. He related that Mr. Gentry started in Emergency Management at least thirty-five years ago, since that was when they met for the first time, and he now heads a program at UNC. He asked Pokey Harris how many invitees have responded, and she said at last tally it was twenty-two. Mr. Stewart concluded his comments by saying he looks forward to that being a good discussion and the beginning of what he hopes will become a valuable state telecommunicator certification program.

10. Technology Committee report—Technology Committee Chair Jeff Shipp reminded everyone that the next Technology Committee meeting will be on Tuesday, March 27th, at 2:00 PM. He also said he wished to commend Gerry Means once again for his hard work as it relates to this committee, then turned the floor over to Mr. Means for an update on all three of the committee's ongoing projects.

a) Update on ESINet deployment—Mr. Means reported the team has had extensive discussions with Raleigh-Wake ECC and AT&T, the principal issue revolving around a particular firmware update on their desktop machines. He said they have been able to work through that, and during the last conversation this week with Dominick Nutter learned that today is the final day of their soak time with no issues, so we're now looking at a mid-May conversion date to the ESINet, with them being the first to go on. He added the team has also, as a back-up plan, tried to accelerate the preparations for Winston-Salem PD in the hope of having them follow right behind that. He advised Gaston County is also in flight, and the team is also looking toward what will be the first hosted solution in Durham in probably mid to late September. He noted they are actively pursuing survey responses from the PSAPs and have come up with some preliminary observations from those they have already received. He added they are hoping to see large groups of PSAPs coming onboard the ESINet within the next 12-14-month interval.

Mr. Means mentioned that during the regional PSAP manager meetings discussion had turned to administrative phone lines. He displayed a graphic onscreen mapping possible scenarios for administrative line functionality within the ESINet environment, observing that three possible options have presented themselves: hardware centric, software centric, and an integration effort. He observed that among the three, he thinks the software centric solution is the most elegant, in effect leveraging AT&T's ability to take regular ten-digit calls and deliver them into the ESINet through SIP trunking, conversion of numbers, etc. He allowed, however, that the PSAPs would still own that cost.

b) GIS RFP update—Mr. Means reported the bids for the GIS RFP have been received and are now in the process of being evaluated. He advised there will be a meeting next week for review and they are trying to cull out from a technical perspective those who complied with the RFP. He added that six responses were received, and various approaches were taken, some of them "all over the map."

c) NMAC update—Mr. Means reported the team is still working to get a costing element for hosting the NMAC at DIT. He noted they have received a response from the vendor about personnel, providing some salary ranges, and are looking at a "Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier3" type approach to some of the skill sets involved, such as working in an operations or network support role, experience with first call resolution, ticket monitoring and processing, years of experience, experience with PSAPs or in Public Safety type environments, etc. He added that the vendor has apparently identified a good sized pool of potential candidates within the central North

Carolina area, and next week he will begin to get some names. He observed they have also developed a job description for a full-time manager position for the NMAC, so once that is reviewed those roles and responsibilities will be identified.

Mr. Means relayed that one of the things he is very excited about is working internally within DIT on the development of a plan to use Dynamic CRM as a vehicle to do their configuration management database, asset tracking, etc., and will be something they can offer to any of the PSAPs. He said the team receives a lot of questions about “when should I update” or “what’s my release version and where does it go”, and this would provide an automated system to provide such information; additionally, he said they’re trying to design this so that a lot of the financial reporting goes hand in hand with the assets, so that as you put in financial reporting, you update something, or you buy something, that automatically gets kicked over to the configuration management database. By virtue of that, he advised the NMAC will always have a “current, up-to-the-minute view” of everything that you might have at your PSAP. He offered that they hope to have a draft application within 30-40 days so they can show the Board the topography of what the application looks like.

Jeff Shipp asked Mr. Taylor if staff has begun work on a preliminary budgetary worksheet on funding the NMAC. Mr. Taylor replied that since staff now has results from the vendor regarding salary ranges and all, he feels work can now begin on that budget.

Mike Reitz observed that in yesterday’s PSAP Manager meeting there were a lot of “what ifs” posed about the ESINet—“What if it fails, what if this happens, what if that happens”—and remarked that as a PSAP manager, that’s what you do, worry about something like that becoming reality. He said he’s very impressed with all the work the Technology Committee and the ESINet team have done and are doing, and how all the buzz is about how PSAPs can transfer calls all over the state, but his question is, “What does that look like from the PSAP manager’s perspective?” He posed the questions what if we want to transfer calls to PSAP A, but they’ve had three people call in sick that day and can’t handle the extra work, or if PSAP B is contending with a working structure fire so we can’t transfer there, what then? He noted there are a lot of questions from an operational standpoint that the PSAP managers want and need to have answered.

Mr. Taylor speculated that this kind of gets back into back-up plans, that as we look forward to being able to move calls and reroute calls, that’s where policy rules become key. He offered that to date each PSAP has created its own individual back-up plan, some very dynamic and some not, and the same thinking that went into them will need to be in play as we start creating these policies for the ESINet. Noting how Mr. Means’ presentation yesterday was about changing our mindsets, he pointed out that the industry is dictating such change. He agreed that Mr. Reitz raises some very valid points, but we cannot expect our old ways of thinking about or doing things to remain the same; we are going to have to look at things differently. Now that we’re moving from an analog plan to a digital one, we have to develop new ways of thinking and new policies to articulate it, adding he expects it to require almost one-on-one interaction with each of the PSAPs to develop those policies.

Mr. Means offered that these types of problems—who showed up for work today, how long do I want to keep calls in queue, what kind of capacity is there—really do look a lot like call center management. He said he’s thought about calling in one of his former cohorts to have some discussions to introduce this whole thought process of how you use routing dynamics based on staffing dependencies that you may not ever know from one day to the next what it looks like. Mr. Reitz countered that he thinks a 911 PSAP is nonetheless different from a call center, observing that just in the case of EMD, all 100 counties have different medical directors dictating how the PSAP handles EMD, so policy creation is going to get very complicated very quickly. Donna Wright concurred.

Other items—Chairman Boyette drew attention to the upcoming meetings listed at the end of the agenda. Mr. Taylor announced that Greg Hauser is resigning from the Board effective April 2nd, as he is going to work for the Department of Public Safety, and has been working with NCFSA to identify his replacement. David Bone asked if he will still serve on committees, and Mr. Taylor advised yes, he wants to do that.

Adjourn—Chairman Boyette adjourned the meeting at 12:19 PM.