

**North Carolina 911 Board  
MINUTES  
Hampton Inn  
1382 Highway 258 South  
Kinston, NC  
March 18, 2016**

<b><u>Members Present</u></b>	<b><u>Staff Present</u></b>	<b><u>Guest</u></b>
Jason Barbour (NCNENA) Johnston Co 911 (911 Board Vice Chair)	Tina Bone (DIT)	Ron Adams-Southern Software
Dave Bone (NCACC) Martin Co	Richard Bradford (DOJ)	Randy Beeman-CCES
Darryl Bottoms (NCACP) Pilot Mountain PD (WebEx and phone)	Dave Corn (DIT)	Roger Dail-Lenoir Co
Eric Cramer (LEC) Wilkes Communications	David Dodd (DIT)	Shelley Davis-Hickory PD Comm
Rick Edwards (CMRS) Sprint	Karen Mason (DIT)	Brian A. Drum-Catawba Co 911
Chris Estes (911 Board Chair) (WebEx and phone)	Marsha Tapler (DIT) (WebEx and phone)	Paige Johnson-Lenoir Co
Andrew Grant (NCLM) Town of Cornelius (WebEx and phone)	Richard Taylor (DIT)	Jerri King-Lenoir Co
Len Hagaman (Sheriff) Watauga Co		Tim Mitchell-CCES
Greg Hauser (NCSFA) Charlotte Fire Department		Melanie Neal-Guilford Metro 911
Dinah Jeffries (NCAPCO) Orange Co Emergency Services (WebEx and phone)		Nicole Sain-Hickory PD Comm
Robert Smith (LEC) AT&T		Michael Speciale-NCGA
Jeff Shipp (LEC) Star Telephone		Candy Strezinski-Iredell Co 911
Jimmy Stewart (NCAREMS) Hoke Co 911		Victor Williams-Beaufort Co S.O.911
Slayton Stewart (CMRS) Carolina West Wireless		Rick Youngs-New Bern PD
Laura Sykora (LEC) CenturyLink		
Buck Yarborough (VoIP) TWC		
<b><u>Members Absent</u></b>	<b><u>Staff Absent</u></b>	<b><u>WebEx Guest Attendees</u></b>
Rick Isherwood (CMRS) Verizon		David Boggs-Apex PD
		Cliff Brown-Federal Engineering
		Byron Burns-CRS
		Derrick Duggins-CRS
		Del Hall-Stokes Co EC
		Grant Hunsucker-Montgomery Co ES
		Jim Lockard-Federal Engineering

		Jesus Lopez-DIT
		Philip Penny-MCP (NCNENA)
		Tonya Pearce-DECC
		Dianne Raynor-Harnett Co S.O.
		Corinne Walser-Medic911
		Stephanie Wiseman-Mitchell Co 911
		Donna Wright-RCES

### **1. Chairman's Opening Remarks**

Before the meeting convened, 911 Board Executive Director Richard Taylor explained that Chairman Estes would be attending the meeting remotely as a meeting in Charlotte later in the day precluded his physically attending this one. Mr. Taylor explained that Vice-Chair Barbour would be Chairman Estes' eyes and ears in the room as Chairman Estes conducted the meeting remotely. Board Counsel Richard Bradford had been delayed by traffic, so the meeting was delayed a few minutes to accommodate his arrival.

Once all was ready, Chairman Estes welcomed all to the meeting and introduced Lenoir County Board of Commissioners Chairman Craig Hill to offer some opening remarks. Chairman Hill welcomed everyone, saying "Thank you for all you do in reference to our 911 centers across the state," observing that has certainly made our communities much safer. He expressed appreciation for the grant that allowed for consolidation of the Jones County and Lenoir County PSAPs and the creation of a back-up center, saying it has made a tremendous difference. He closed by saying "We appreciate the work that all of you do; you make a difference every day." He added if he could be of any help to anyone during their visit to please let him know.

Mr. Taylor responded that Roger Dail and his staff had been superb hosts, adding that several people went by the PSAP yesterday afternoon and were very impressed by the fact it was empty; it was a beautiful center, but not a single person was to be found. Then he dropped the other shoe, saying that was because operations that day were being conducted at the backup PSAP in Jones County. He offered that the partnership between Jones County and Lenoir County has been phenomenal, and that the Board was glad to have played a small part in that, but stressed that Lenoir County's great leadership, both on its Board and through Roger Dail and his staff, deserve the credit.

Chairman Estes asked Mr. Taylor to call the roll of Board members attending remotely. Andrew Grant did not respond at this time, but did join the meeting later; Dinah Jeffries responded she was online. Chairman Estes apologized for his absence in the room, citing his need to be in Charlotte for an afternoon meeting, and added that he had asked Vice-Chair Barbour to be his eyes and ears in the room, and if necessary, to take over the meeting if the remote connectivity should fail. He added it was interesting to attend the meeting remotely and personally experience what that is like.

Chairman Estes recognized guest Mike Speciale, NCGA representative for Craven, Pamlico, and Beaufort Counties, asking if he would like to make any remarks. Rep. Speciale said he was good, and appreciated what the Board does. Chairman Estes thanked him for attending, saying he looked forward to any feedback he might have for the Board at a later time.

### **2. Ethics Awareness/Conflict of Interest Statement**

Chairman Estes read the ethics awareness/conflict of interest statement printed on the agenda and asked Board members to indicate if they felt they had any conflict or potential conflict of interest with any of the matters scheduled to come before the Board today. Rob Smith said he would recuse himself from voting on all items in agenda item 9a except Davie County. Laura Sykora said she will refrain from voting on

Davie County and Rutherford County in that same agenda item 9a. Chairman Estes asked if there were any further conflicts, and Mr. Smith asked if he could direct a question to Board Counsel Richard Bradford regarding agenda item 9b, determining the 911 fee for FY2017. He asked if there would be a conflict with that item since the company he represents (AT&T) was a participant in the RFI for the NextGen project and expects to participate in the RFP process for the same project, which will be funded by collection of the fee. Mr. Bradford replied there is not a conflict. He observed that while each Board member has an obligation to avoid direct conflict, this is a general fee applied across services from which it is collected, so there is no direct conflict. Greg Hauser indicated he will be recusing himself from agenda item 9a, the funding reconsideration request for CMPD-Charlotte Fire. Dave Bone then noted he will be recusing himself from agenda item 9av, Vance Co-Henderson. Chairman Estes then reminded Board members that if they become aware of any during the meeting, they were welcome to bring them up at that time.

Vice-Chair Barbour requested that agenda item 9 be moved ahead of item 8 in the order of consideration, saying he believed that item may consume more time than the twenty minutes allotted to it. Chairman Estes asked if there were any objections to that change, and hearing none, said he would support it.

### **3. Consent Agenda**

Mr. Taylor noted an error had been discovered in the minutes for the February 26 meeting. Greg Hauser cited the error near the bottom of page 4, saying he does not work in a PSAP that handles all three dispatch disciplines, whereas the minutes indicated he did work in such an environment. Mr. Taylor noted the correction, and asked if anyone had any other corrections to offer before he moved on. Hearing none, he moved on to the funding report, citing the numbers which appeared in the agenda book. He noted that several grants from 2012 and 2013 will be closing out soon, and that the current encumbered grant fund balance is \$32,207,133.33, with an unencumbered balance of \$1,387,336.60. He solicited any questions about that, and Ms. Sykora asked if some funds are being left over as completed grants close out. Mr. Taylor said yes, adding they go back into the grant fund to be used for this year's (FY17) grants.

Moving to the NG911 fund, Mr. Taylor reported a current fund balance of \$631,260.40, noting the fund did accrue interest last month in the amount of \$329.98. He added there still have been no expenditures from this fund to date. Ms. Sykora pointed out the \$631,260.40 represented February revenue, and asked if it shouldn't be added to the \$578,782.48 collected in January for a current *total* balance of \$1,210,042.88. Mr. Taylor agreed that was the case, thanking Ms. Sykora for pointing that out.

The CMRS fund was next on Mr. Taylor's report, with a balance of \$4,600,401.29 after disbursements this month of \$452,663.30.

Mr. Taylor observed that PrePaid CMRS fund revenue contributed \$821,413.47 to the PSAP fund for the month, and when coupled with other revenue yielded an end of month total of \$12,286,507.28 after disbursements of \$4,146,495.24.

Chairman Estes asked if there were any questions for Mr. Taylor regarding the Consent Agenda, and hearing none, entertained a motion to accept the report. Jeff Shipp so moved, Laura Sykora seconded, and with no further discussion the motion passed unanimously.

### **4. Public Comment**

Observing that the Board is always anxious to hear comments from the public regarding its work, Chairman Estes asked if anyone present, either in person or participating remotely, wished to address the Board during the public comment portion of the meeting. Victor Williams, 911 Director for the Beaufort County Sheriff's Office and the Eastern Representative for NCNENA, stepped to the podium to report on the 911 Goes to Washington effort mounted this year by NCAPCO/NENA. He found it to be a very rewarding experience, and said that the most important thing he learned was to get the word out to PSAP managers to invite their elected local, state, and federal representatives to visit PSAPs, from small to large and everything in between. He stressed this because he feels those elected officials need to know what happens at the PSAPs and why PSAP funding is so critical, especially for the smaller PSAPs with fewer resources than larger ones may have access to.

Vice-Chair Barbour asked if anyone else wished to speak, and when no one spoke up, Chairman Estes asked Mr. Taylor to move to the Executive Director Report.

## **5. Executive Director Report**

### **a) Update on Regional PSAP Managers meetings**

Mr. Taylor began his report by noting the PSAP Managers Meeting for the southeast region had been held here yesterday, which was the last of the four spring regional meetings. He thanked Board members who had attended any of the four meetings, observing that the PSAP managers really appreciated their attendance. He displayed photos of the attendees at each of those meetings, offering a brief synopsis of each as he did.

Ms. Sykora asked if there were any consistent themes among the four regions, e.g. questions and/or concerns. Mr. Taylor replied he thought the most consistent one was staff retention and training of 911 telecommunicators (TCs). He said the turnover rate among TCs is just unbelievable, and PSAP managers and 911 Board staff have been trying to identify a common thread, whether it's the demands of the job, the stress of the job, etc. He observed pay didn't seem to be that big of a contributing factor in yesterday's discussions, but staffing numbers did seem to be. Greg Hauser said that although they didn't devote much time at the meeting to discussing the pay issue because of the time spent on the others, he nonetheless does think that it plays a significant role. Rick Edwards said there was a lot of discussion yesterday about the millennial generation and their expectations in the workforce being somewhat different than those of us from earlier generations.

Mr. Taylor reminded everyone that the smaller the PSAP, the more is expected of the PSAP managers; they seldom wear just one hat. When staffing and people issues pile up on top of all the other things a manager has to contend with, it becomes a real burden. He shared that one of the things the Education Committee is working on is a PSAP Managers training class because we find that the managers in most of the smaller PSAPs are there just because they were the next person in line when a vacancy arose, not because they've been trained for it. He said he and Roger Dail have had a conversation about one of the neighboring PSAPs' director because that person is completely lost; he's a super guy, nice to get along with, but has been thrown into a position where he has to make decisions that he has not been prepared to make.

Mr. Taylor observed another common theme is the amount of drama that goes on among employees within a PSAP, and that type of personnel issue makes it even tougher on the manager.

### **b) Update on FY2017 Grant Program**

Mr. Taylor was unable to locate the slides he had prepared for the Grant Program update, but said he just wanted to let the Board know that the FY2017 Grant Application Process opened last Monday, and will be open for 90 days, or until June 6<sup>th</sup>. He related that in the past an applicant had to have an NCID to make application, and the application was only available online, so when people needed to stop and come back to complete it at a later date, problems could arise regarding lost data, etc. With that in mind, he said he has taken the Easy Button concept to the Grant Application Process, with no NCID requirement and a Microsoft Word application form, complete with fill-in-the-blanks functionality, that can be saved locally and accessed easily to work on prior to completion. He said his hope is that it will be much more intuitive and user-friendly than in the past.

Mr. Taylor reminded everyone of the legislative changes which now allow grants to be used to fund anything that will enhance the 911 system; it no longer has to be something that's qualified on the eligible expenditure list. Chairman Estes said that is great news, and congratulated the staff for making it easier for the PSAPs to apply. Ms. Sykora said she had looked at the application form in the agenda book and it is, indeed, truly fill-in-the-blank, and she offered the same congratulations as Chairman Estes had. Mr. Taylor admitted it took a while to get it to work right, and it is still not compatible with Apple products that do not have Active-X functionality, so he does have that disclaimer in the instructions.

Jeff Shipp asked Mr. Taylor to touch on some of the comments he made yesterday to the PSAP Managers group regarding the competitive nature of the grants, comparing this year's potential funding to last year's program. Mr. Taylor said he tried to encourage each of the PSAPs to apply, but to understand these are competitive grants. He related that last year there were twenty-three applications, but the Grant Committee was only able to award three. He said there was only about \$9M to work with last year, but the total amount requested by those twenty-three applicants totaled over \$64M. He encouraged PSAP managers to think about what they are writing; "We want to serve our public better" is not good enough; the fact that you work under a Sheriff does not necessarily qualify you as a rural PSAP; you've got to really look at those questions and give a good answer. He noted we're not looking for the fluff—we're looking for the meat. He said he also encouraged them to understand that we're going to be looking to see if their backup plan has been submitted and their revenue-expenditure reports are complete. Mr. Taylor said he expects \$9-10M to be available this year, but it may be the last year that much will be available given the Next Gen project expenses that will be coming up next year.

Chairman Estes thanked Mr. Taylor for his report, then Dinah Jeffries asked if she could speak, so he turned the floor over to her. She said she wanted to go back to one thing about the PSAP Managers meetings. She noted that during the last Board meeting we had gone over the Board's goals for FY2017, and had discussed how TC certification was cited as being one of the primary concerns the PSAP Managers had expressed at their meetings. She asked if there was any way hiring and retention could receive similar priority as a goal. Chairman Estes noted that had been one of his concerns about naming a single goal as "Goal Number One", as he feels all the goals are important to the Board. He then asked Mr. Taylor to respond to Ms. Jeffries' question, and Mr. Taylor said he completely understands and agrees with her. He said his only reason for ranking the goals was to give them a spot on the list. He acknowledged that although certification is very important, it is not going to happen overnight; it's going to require a great deal of work. He added he thinks the training and trying to help educate PSAP Managers is equal in importance, because so many PSAP managers are out there struggling and trying to find answers. He said Education Committee Chair Jimmy Stewart and David Dodd have had a subcommittee working on developing a forty-hour curriculum for PSAP managers, and part of that curriculum will be devoted to staffing and retention.

## **6. NG911 Project Update**

Chairman Estes next asked Jeff Shipp to provide an update on the NG911 Project. Mr. Shipp reported the committee did meet on Thursday, March 10<sup>th</sup>, to discuss continuing work on the ESINet piece of the conceptual design as well as the NMAC. He said they still have work to do to complete the CPE or switch portion of the conceptual design, and they do have another meeting scheduled for April 14<sup>th</sup>, when they will finish up the review and finalization of the conceptual design and also review what will be in the first RFP. He pointed out to Chairman Estes that they will need an extended amount of time at the next Board meeting, when the committee and staff will review the entire conceptual design and present the first RFP to the Board. Chairman Estes instructed Mr. Taylor to make sure the agenda for that meeting allows for the extra time that will be required, to which Mr. Taylor readily agreed.

Chairman Estes then asked if the presentation of the RFP will require a closed session meeting, and Mr. Bradford said it will not; the intent today is such that a closed session will not be required, which of course means that the details of an RFP will not be disclosed. He said the goals of the RFP and so forth may be up for discussion, but not the text itself. Ms. Sykora mentioned that at the last Board meeting there was discussion about having meetings with potential vendors before the conceptual design was finalized, and asked Mr. Shipp if that is still on track. Mr. Shipp said it is not, that at the last committee meeting they decided that was not necessary. Vice-Chair Barbour asked what led to that decision, and Mr. Shipp asked Mr. Bradford to respond to the question.

Mr. Bradford replied that in preparation for that discussion, both he and Mr. Taylor had asked for sample questions, having similar concerns, although perhaps for different reasons. He noted that after looking at the questions it did not appear that they were of a nature to expand the staff's knowledge in order to draft a better RFP, and for that reason, there was not a need to hold those meetings. He added that in other similar circumstances agencies have followed that path, where they've met with potential vendors to ensure that they understood details associated with technology, but based upon the information that has been prepared to date, he said he can assure the Board there is a great level of knowledge and detail

already present among staff and members of the Federal Engineering (FE) team. Mr. Bradford offered he is quite certain all of that will be brought to bear during the RFP evaluation process, so there was not really a need to meet with the vendors; that step also would have slowed the process down. He concluded he thinks it is very likely that the RFP will be fully prepared and the Board will be able to have that posted and move forward with the procurement process following the next Board meeting.

Ms. Sykora next observed she thought we were going to look at the conceptual design at the April meeting and then the RFP at the May meeting, and Vice-Chair Barbour added that was also his understanding. Mr. Shipp said they will be able to handle it all at the April meeting, keeping in mind that the committee has a design through this of what the committee members, as a committee, foresee as the conceptual design, and once the RFP is released, it's up to the vendors to present their designs to provide the solutions the committee is seeking.

Vice-Chair Barbour said that he just wants to "sleep on" the goals before he votes on an RFP and it sounds like the committee is not going to present the goals of the RFP *until* the April meeting. He said he doesn't know that it's fair to expect the Board to turn around in just a few minutes to approve an RFP when its members have just been presented with the goals of the RFP. Mr. Shipp replied the Board approved the Concept of Operations back in December, which is the concept of the whole, keeping in mind, once again, it is the vendors who will be providing the solutions. Vice-Chair Barbour still feels he won't know what he's voting on.

Mr. Taylor asked if Vice-Chair Barbour has looked at the Concept of Operation, and Vice-Chair Barbour said he had, in December, and Mr. Taylor offered that is essentially what the RFP will say. Mr. Bradford suggested there are many ways to approach an RFP, one of which, as he would suggest is the case here. Essentially that we have a Concept of Operations document which the Board has seen and approved. He said that becomes a resource document for both the Board, the staff, and the vendor community for looking at any RFP that comes out of the NG911 effort. He offered that for a particular RFP, there would be a statement of objectives, or SOO, and that's appropriate here where for a particular RFP you describe all of the objectives to be achieved, noting all of that is available in the Concept of Operations. From that, he suggested the only real issue is whether it includes these objectives or does not, pointing out that the objectives have not changed—the objectives remain the same and the goals remain the same. He explained the goals or objectives for a specific RFP are just simply a sub-set, that's all. Mr. Bradford offered that other states have taken an approach where they do what is typical for state government and they have a lot of requirements, while observing Dave Corn and others on the team have been quite diligent collecting that kind of information from around the country. Mr. Bradford said he has looked at some of those also, that there are different ways to approach this, and preparing that is what we're in the process of doing now.

Mr. Shipp asked everyone to keep in mind the first RFP will be for the ESINet and CPE switch, and the plan is for the second RFP at a later date to be for the NMAC and potentially a third RFP for the hosted CAD and GIS solution. Chairman Estes observed the NG911 Committee meetings are scheduled, and encouraged Board members to participate in those if they can or talk to Mr. Shipp offline about their ideas. Mr. Shipp concurred, reiterating their next meeting is on April 14<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 AM. Chairman Estes asked if there were any further questions for Mr. Shipp, and hearing none moved to the next agenda item.

## **7. Status of Back-up PSAP Compliance**

Tina Bone referred everyone to the map Mr. Taylor had projected onscreen, noting it is the most current graphic representation of the status of PSAP Back-Up Plan Compliance. She reported that out of 119 PSAPs, we have 38 approved backup plans (yellow on the map), 37 that are in progress (blue on the map). She explained "in progress" means they have actually submitted a plan, and staff is either still communicating with the PSAP, waiting for questions to be answered, or quotes have been sent to Marsha Tapler for the financial elements to be approved. She said PSAPs in the 44 counties on the map in white have not submitted any type of plan, draft, or the like, although they may have sent her an email telling her they're working on it. She observed that is not the same as submitting a proposed plan.

Ms. Bone said she wanted to point out that in looking over some of these plans staff has seen that prices, such as those for laptops with telephone software have gone up about \$5K in the last three months, evidently indicative of supply and demand market pressures. She related that the laptops PSAPs are

wanting to purchase are now around \$24K apiece. When you have a seven or eight seat PSAP, that's a lot of money. Chairman Estes interjected that he thought the Funding Committee had approved an amount they would pay for various devices, capped at a rate, and asked if he was remembering that correctly. Mr. Taylor replied that is correct regarding a desktop unit, but the portable call taking laptops include phone system and call taking software, so he surmised it is not necessarily the equipment cost that is driving the price as much as the software cost, which has increased considerably.

Ms. Bone added that some of the PSAPs which have approved plans have not necessarily implemented those plans, and she can think of a couple that are actually planning to do something different from their approved plan. She said she's not sure how staff is going to handle that, adding that the vendors don't appear to be in a hurry to satisfy all the quotes because they are over-burdened by the sudden upsurge in demand. She speculated we're probably going to see many PSAPs requesting an extension.

Mr. Taylor said one thing he wanted to add to what Ms. Bone is saying is to thank Dave Bone for sending out a message to his colleagues in the county commissioners group, emphasizing they please contact staff for any assistance they may need. He said people are still getting a lot of misinformation, despite all our outreach efforts, offering by way of example that he received a call from one city councilman last week who was telling him that unless we gave them the money to build a building they just weren't going to comply. That councilman said he couldn't believe we were going to make them build another building, and Mr. Taylor explained to him that is exactly the opposite of what we want them to do. The councilman insisted that is what he had been told he would have to do, so Mr. Taylor and Ms. Bone have scheduled a meeting with that councilman and his city manager and some of their PSAP folks on Monday to refute that misinformation. Mr. Taylor remarked that after he told the councilman what was really expected of them, the gentleman said that was a no-brainer, it would be an easy thing to do.

Mr. Taylor observed that people shouldn't over-think this, adding he believes that sometimes folks *want* to get a new building and are hoping to leverage this mandate to do that, but as we all know, it certainly is not a requirement for a backup PSAP; we would much rather see PSAPs work together to devise creative solutions which are more cost-effective and benefit all participants. He reminded all that we fight that battle continually, no matter how much education we put out there, and again thanked Mr. Bone for his efforts to combat misinformation.

Dave Bone said he wanted to highlight that Andrew Grant has been a part of that effort as well, the two of them working collaboratively to get the message out to their colleagues.

Chairman Estes asked if there was any discussion regarding this update. Dave Bone observed that at the last Board meeting he thought we clarified not just the requirement to have the plan but the timetable for implementation of the plan as well, and he just wanted to ask staff if that is being stressed in the communications they are having with all the interested parties regarding this. Mr. Taylor assured him it was. Chairman Estes said he is concerned about the number of PSAPs which have not yet submitted anything, and acknowledging what Ms. Bone said earlier about email contact, asked her if he had understood that correctly. She replied he had, that she believes as many as half of the PSAPs in white on the map have communicated with her in that way, and that staff is making plans to physically visit each of those PSAPs very soon. She advised that she and David Dodd will be going to the very far western part of the state week after next. She added she does know that Haywood and Henderson Counties have something in the works, as do Mitchell County, Orange County, Brunswick County, Cumberland County, Fayetteville and Wayne, and Lumberton and Roberson County are trying to get something going as well.

Chairman Estes observed that he knows Mr. Taylor will be presenting the new website at the end of the meeting today, and asked if the map will be on the website. Mr. Taylor replied it absolutely will be. Chairman Estes then asked if there were any questions for Ms. Bone. Referring to the software cost she had reported to be going up considerably, Rob Smith asked if the PSAPs are buying that individually from vendors or does it fall within some type of a group purchase. Ms. Bone advised they are not allowed to purchase the software separately from the hardware; they must purchase both from the vendor. Mr. Smith then asked if there would be any benefit in grouping those together under some type of a combined contract for the PSAPs, and Ms. Bone replied she certainly wished they could if that would help drive the price down. Mr. Smith then asked if that is something we can do, and Mr. Taylor replied he thinks we can, but it would take time to accomplish that; time which is in short supply. He added that is something we will be looking at in the future as it pertains to the legislative directive to develop a cooperative purchasing

catalog for uniform procurement opportunities, but he doubts we could make that happen in time for the ongoing backup PSAP plan effort.

Buck Yarborough asked if you can buy a site license agreement or must you have the software installed for each unit. Ms. Bone replied the software is pre-installed on each unit. She added that CAD vendors are not charging to have their software loaded on a backup computer; it is the CPE equipment vendors who are levying the charge, and it is quite hefty. Chairman Estes asked if some of this will be addressed in the NextGen project, and Mr. Taylor speculated that when we go to NextGen a lot of these issues will simply go away, but one of the things we must resolve first is CAD interoperability. He asked Dave Corn if he could speak to this in light of the committee's work on hosted solutions. Mr. Corn asserted that hosted solutions are a major part of what NextGen will do for us once we get the ESINet in place. He added that the ability to interoperate with CAD, and to a certain extent radio, will allow PSAPs more flexibility in backing each other up rather than building and equipping separate, independent, stand-alone backup locations. He surmised that once NG goes in we will have many more options, while noting, however, that NG doesn't start going in until 2018.

Vice-Chair Barbour reported to Chairman Estes that he didn't see any other Board members wishing to speak. Chairman Estes thanked him and thanked Ms. Bone for her report. He reminded everyone that we had agreed earlier in the meeting to move agenda item 9 before agenda item 8, and asked Vice-Chair Barbour to proceed with the 911 Funding Committee report

## **8. FCC Task Force on Optimal PSAP Architecture (TFOPA)**

Postponed until after item 9

## **9. 911 Funding Committee Report**

Vice-Chair Barbour reported that the committee met a couple of times this week to bring a couple of items before the Board: funding reconsideration requests and determination of the FY2017 911 fee. He observed that although only five reconsideration requests are being brought before the Board today, more than five have been received. These five are simply the only ones which are complete; the others are still being reviewed and worked on. He then asked Mr. Taylor to take the floor to present the funding reconsideration request synopses. Mr. Taylor took a moment to review and explain the funding reconsideration request process for new members of the Board, then presented the request from Newton PD, a secondary PSAP.

### **a) Funding reconsideration requests**

i. Catawba County-Newton PD: Mr. Taylor explained that Newton PD was not actually requesting additional funds, but was instead asking to be allowed to carry forward more than the 20% of their fund balance permitted in the statute. Catawba County, the primary PSAP under which Newton PD operates, is making the request in City of Newton's behalf. He explained that Newton PD first began receiving its 911 fund distribution after the beginning of the fiscal year, and did not want to go back before the city council to request a budget amendment in order to use those funds, so they did not spend any, although they have definite plans for spending them: new telephone switch, new call taking furniture, and CAD maintenance among them. They are asking not to have their FY17 funding reduced, to be able to carry over the entire fund balance (rather than just 20%) until they are able to complete those purchases, for which they have provided quotes. Mr. Taylor said staff feels like it is a good request, the Funding Committee heard the request, and the Funding Committee's recommendation is to approve it. Some discussion followed regarding the amount in question, \$1,100.00, then Chairman Estes called for a vote, which passed with Rob Smith abstaining.

ii. CMPD-Charlotte Fire: Noting that Charlotte Fire is a secondary PSAP as well, Mr. Taylor pointed out that the request is coming from CMPD, the primary PSAP through which the secondary PSAP receives funding. He said their request is for an additional \$93K to replace Charlotte Fire's circa 2003 recorder, and the Funding Committee's recommendation is to approve the request. Slayton Stewart asked how that increase would work, and Mr. Taylor explained it would be a one-time increase only for FY17; in FY18 the funding would drop back. Greg Hauser added Charlotte Fire is planning a new joint communications



center with CMPD, and this equipment will be brought into that, saving that expense moving forward. Chairman Estes called the motion, which passed with Greg Hauser and Rob Smith abstaining.

iii. Davie County: Mr. Taylor explained Davie County has replaced its phone system, has seen an increase in monthly line charges, will be replacing its recorder, and is purchasing headsets, headset batteries, chairs, EMD flip cards, etc., for their backup center. He added they have also asked for an additional \$1,200.00 for training, and quotes for everything have been provided. The Funding Committee reviewed the request, and the committee recommendation is to increase Davie County's FY17 funding to \$401,676.31. Chairman Estes asked if that was the increase or the final amount. Mr. Taylor replied it was the final amount, and Chairman Estes asked what the increase was. Mr. Taylor said the proposed funding amount they were to receive was \$273,840.85, so the difference between the two amounts would be the increase, or \$127,835.46. Jeff Shipp asked if their recording equipment is past end-of-life, which Mr. Taylor confirmed. Chairman Estes called the motion, which passed with Laura Sykora abstaining.

iv. Rutherford County: Mr. Taylor advised Rutherford County has submitted a very detailed request with a very good timeline, and is asking for an additional \$131,475.00 for FY17. The Funding Committee recommendation is to approve the request, moving the county's funding total for the upcoming year to \$485,368.54. Chairman Estes opened the floor to discussion, and hearing none, called the motion, which passed with Laura Sykora and Rob Smith abstaining.

v. Vance County-Henderson: Mr. Taylor characterized this request as a little bit quirky, saying he would step through it slowly to be sure everyone understands it. He relayed that Vance-Henderson did submit a reconsideration request and the PSAP director Brian Short did provide some good information, but there were a couple of components of it that Mr. Taylor discovered only upon review after the Funding Committee had recommended approval which caused him concern. He brought those concerns back before the committee, but it stood by its original recommendation. He said the upshot of this is that the request has been approved, but he also received an email yesterday from Mr. Short asking that he remove the request from consideration.

Mr. Taylor explained Vance-Henderson received a reconsideration request from the Board last year of about \$190K, but of that they have thus far only spent about \$90K, and many items on the list of what they were going to purchase last year were not purchased. He said he phoned Mr. Short to try to understand the situation, and it turned out that because of financial pressures at the PSAP the money from last year was diverted; Mr. Short speculated that had it been received in a lump sum, they would have purchased all those items, but since it was evenly divided into their monthly payments, it was used for other expenses. Mr. Short told Mr. Taylor he was confident they will be purchasing all of the items listed in his funding reconsideration from last year before July 1 of this year, and Mr. Taylor told him he just did not feel comfortable coming before the Board asking for another funding reconsideration before the last one is completed.

Mr. Taylor reiterated the committee did recommend approval for this, but he did receive the email from Brian Short yesterday asking that the request be withdrawn. Mr. Taylor added he did suggest to Mr. Short that he could approach the Board after July 1, if all the prior reconsideration request funds were indeed expended, and move forward from there, and he thinks that is what Mr. Short would like to do.

Vice-Chair Barbour reported to Chairman Estes that he has spoken with Mr. Bradford about this, and Mr. Bradford's opinion is that since staff has received this email the recommendation does not require a vote. Chairman Estes thanked him, and said he would follow counsel's advice and move forward that way.

#### b) 911 Fee for 2017

Vice-Chair Barbour noted for new Board members that the Board has a statutory requirement to review the 911 fee every year, with the option to either leave it alone or increase or decrease it. He reported that the Funding Committee debated this issue at great length during its meeting this week which resulted in a tie vote for the first time since the committee has been in existence, therefore the committee did not arrive at a recommendation to bring before the full Board today. He then asked Mr. Taylor to go into further detail.

Mr. Taylor explained the statute requires the Board to review the financial situation each year to determine whether to leave the fee at its current rate or increase or decrease it. Should the Board determine the fee needs to be increased in excess of 70¢, approval must be secured from the General Assembly, but otherwise no limits are imposed. Mr. Taylor noted the determination must be made before April 1 because providers must be allowed 90 days to make adjustments to their billing if a change is made.

Mr. Taylor reiterated what Vice-Chair Barbour had said regarding this being the first time the committee has become stuck on a tie vote, adding that it voted two or three times in trying to break the tie. He observed that while the committee was unable to voice a recommendation, technically the tie vote represents a recommendation that the fee be left as is.

He then displayed a spread sheet of financial projections onscreen which illustrated the financial impact associated with leaving the fee at 60¢, increasing it to 65¢, or increasing it to 70¢ calculated using revenue data from FY14-FY16. He noted that while pre-paid revenue has finally begun to level off, the creation of the NG911 10% fund will obviously reduce the amount of funding available for all other uses. Mr. Taylor explained the methodology used to arrive at the projections in the spread sheet, and observed that right now we are looking at a potential fund balance at the end of this year that could go into the grant fund of about \$14M. Dave Bone asked if it *could* go into the grant fund or would it *have to* go into the grant fund. Mr. Taylor explained money remaining in the PSAP fund at the end of a fiscal year must either be transferred into the grant fund or be distributed on a per capita basis to the PSAPs, and although money remaining in the CMRS fund at the end of a fiscal year *may* be transferred to the grant fund, that is discretionary rather than required.

Slayton Stewart observed that ~\$14M is the projected amount available at the end of FY16, and asked if we have projections for FY17 at the same fee rate. Returning to the spread sheet, Mr. Taylor showed that yes, there are projections for all three scenarios: leave the fee at 60¢, raise it to 65¢, or raise it to 70¢. He also stressed these projections are only for forecasting purposes because the Board has not yet approved a budget for FY17. He noted that when he presents the budget for approval, he will be asking for an increase in the Administrative Fund from the current 1% to 1.5% to cover increased costs of operating the Board and additional staff members which he hopes to be bringing onboard very soon.

Mr. Taylor once again went through the mechanics of the forecasting, demonstrating that if the fee is left at 60¢, funds available to be transferred to the Grant Fund will drop dramatically to only ~\$3.9M. Chairman Estes asked if the money from the NG911 fund isn't being counted twice, and Mr. Taylor replied it only appears that way because the NG911 fund will not be sufficient to pay for all of the expenses associated with the NG911 project; it will only pay for part of it, with the remainder coming from the general fund. Marsha Tapler asked if the question was about the \$1.5M entries in the Statewide Project row near the bottom of the spread sheet, and when Mr. Taylor told her yes, that was what was being referred to, she explained that value is *not* NextGen. It is, instead, a projection for both ECaTS and the upcoming language translation services statewide projects.

Buck Yarborough observed the amount appears to be tripling in one year, from \$550K to \$1.5M, and asked why that is. Mr. Taylor replied it is because of a completely new project coming on line. Laura Sykora observed that when the Funding Committee discussed this, the \$550K was for ECaTS, and the remainder for the statewide language translation service initiative.

Chairman Estes then asked for clarification of what recommendation was coming from the Funding Committee. Vice-Chair Barbour said the motions made in committee were to increase the fee, but all the voting ended in tie votes, so the inference is that the rate should remain as is. Chairman Estes asked specifically if the funding committee has made that recommendation, and Slayton Stewart clarified the committee did *not* make that recommendation; it simply couldn't move past the tie votes, so the default position is to leave the rate where it is.

Ms. Sykora offered that she is the one who made the recommendation in committee to raise the fee to 70¢ which resulted in a tie vote, then she made the motion to raise it to 65¢, with the same result. She pointed out that providers typically don't want to make any charges appearing on their bills to go up, but as a member of the Funding Committee she leaves CenturyLink at the door when she comes into a meeting. She observed that when she looks at the funding reconsideration requests coming in, such as

those voted on this morning and those still in waiting; when she looks at backup plans that still need equipment purchased, which in itself is likely to generate even more reconsideration requests; when she looks at the Board's perspective that consolidations in the *long run* are going to help us save money, she's very uncomfortable with only having a projected \$4M to handle all that. She said she doesn't know if 65¢ or 70¢ is the right number, but she's very uncomfortable leaving the fee at 60¢ for this Board to do the work that is in front of it.

Noting this is only his second meeting, Mr. Yarborough apologized if he is asking elementary questions, but as he reads and understands this just over \$14M is available for transfer to the grant fund at the current rate, and if the rate stays the same, just under \$4M will be available for transfer next year, for a total of just over \$18M. He asked if we expect to spend all of the \$14M and have nothing to carry over into the following year. Ms. Sykora interjected she wanted to clarify that the \$4M, if we have no reconsideration requests, could go into the grant fund, but if we have reconsideration requests that are in excess of \$4M, we won't have enough money to meet our obligations. Mr. Yarborough said he understood that, but he was trying to understand if they are mutually exclusive: if you don't spend the \$14M, that could carry over and be added to the \$4M. Mr. Taylor then explained to him the statutory obligation to empty the PSAP fund, which is where the bulk of that would come from. It cannot be carried over. Mr. Yarborough then surmised if it is not all used for grants, it must be distributed to the PSAPs on a per capita basis so that you start the next year at zero, and Mr. Taylor confirmed that was correct.

Chairman Estes asked for clarification from counsel, asking if we are looking at a motion that came out of the committee because they said to do nothing, and is that the same as a motion that doesn't need a second. Mr. Bradford replied there is not really a motion from the committee, so there is no committee recommendation. He said that if the fee is to change it would require a motion and a second from the Board today. Chairman Estes surmised that if the fee stays the same, no action is required, and Mr. Bradford affirmed that no action means it stays as is.

Mr. Taylor said he would like to respond to Ms. Sykora's comments, acknowledging he certainly appreciates everything she said, but he does have a couple of fundamental things he would like to say, and the Board can take them for what they're worth. He observed the Board does not have to grant every funding reconsideration request, and he thinks also that PSAPs need to do a better job of budgeting. He said that when staff sees what PSAPs are spending on things like the backup laptops mentioned earlier, or telecommunicator chairs, or any other eligible expenditures, it does not appear that they are actually shopping for a best price; they are just going out and buying the first thing that appeals to them because the general feeling is, and he has been told this by others so it's not just his opinion, that they don't need to worry about cost because the 911 Board is going to pay for it. He said if that lack of concern for what things cost continues, the Board will never have enough money to pay for everything, adding he does not want to increase the fee unless it's absolutely necessary. He acknowledged that as we move toward NextGen we will have to cross that bridge in the future, but he does not think that time is now, rather he thinks it is time for PSAPs to learn "This is your budget, and this is what you need to live within," not just to be spending money because you can.

Dinah Jeffries said she hears what Mr. Taylor is saying, but she kind of thinks we contradict ourselves because, as happened several meetings back, we are consistently fussing because PSAPs *aren't* spending their money on upgrading. She said she doesn't think it's fair to blame it on PSAPs and say it's because they think they can go out and spend money because the Board's going to pay for it. She added we consistently hear from PSAPs that they can't get some things approved and then we also hear from Mr. Taylor about how we can't get PSAPs to upgrade. Mr. Taylor replied she is exactly right, they're not upgrading, and that is a problem, but they're out buying other stuff instead of upgrading, and that is where he thinks the problem lies: the priorities are not there. He observed there is a difference between just spending money and investing in what you're working with; you've got to keep your basic pieces upgraded, you've got to keep them up to date. He said those are the items *not* being replaced and then we turn around and get a reconsideration request where they're having to do a complete forklift overhaul—that's what concerns him.

Dave Bone responded he was somewhat offended by the over-generalization of wasteful spending, observing there are a lot of good PSAPs that are doing very good work, and reiterated he thought that was an over-generalization. He stated that under the current funding model we have a process for funding reconsiderations, and while we don't have an obligation to fund every reconsideration, we have

precedents establishing that if the requests are for allowable expenses then we do fund them. He observed we've been sending that message all along, and although we have been working on spending caps and those sorts of limits, we don't have all that in place yet, so until we do, it's unfair to change midstream and back this away. Ms. Sykora interjected that is exactly her thinking as well: until we have a new funding model and/or we have the cooperative purchasing agreements catalog and we have spending limits, we cannot just say "We're just not going to give you enough money to fund what we've been funding in the past." She added she doesn't think that is the right fiduciary thing for this Board to do.

Chairman Estes responded there are still some missing data points, contending that much of the FY2017 forecast is, while maybe directionally correct, not based on a lot of known facts. He speculated it could be \$4M, but it also could be \$10M because we may not spend all the NextGen money right away. He pointed out we haven't completed the RFP process, we haven't determined what the vendors' prices will be for NextGen—they could be much more aggressive than what we're anticipating through the competitive process—so again, these are just forecasts.

Mr. Bone said he would like to emphasize what Ms. Sykora stated previously, that we know, it's a known factor, that all of these PSAPs are working on their backup plans; we know that there are going to be needs which will need to be funded; we've heard what the cost may be for a single laptop. He surmised all this is going to cost something and we know it's going to be coming in reconsideration requests next year. He pointed out we don't know what those totals are going to be, but we know they're going to be substantial. He said he agrees with Ms. Sykora in that he is just not confident that we have the funding that will be required to meet those needs.

Chairman Estes thanked Mr. Bone for his comments, and asked if there were further comments or discussions. Mr. Bone spoke up again, saying he would like to share with the Board some of the discussion that took place in the Funding Committee meeting, relating they debated long on whether it was better to increase only 5¢ or go to 10¢, with several folks advocating going to 10¢.

Chairman Estes again asked for comments or discussion, and Slayton Stewart asked when the fee was last changed. Mr. Taylor replied probably 2010 or 2011, just off the top of his head. Vice-Chair Barbour confirmed it was 2010, recalling that Dave Corn, then a Board member, spearheaded a move from 70¢ down to 60¢. Mr. Stewart observed then we've been at 60¢ for six years. He next asked if funds for the NextGen project, approximately \$4M in the FY16 projection on the spread sheet, once earmarked, cannot be used for other expenditures. Mr. Taylor said he would defer to Mr. Bradford for a definitive answer, but once they're encumbered they certainly cannot be used for anything else. Mr. Bradford replied the money in the NG911 fund (10% fund) cannot be used for anything other than NG911. He further pointed out those funds are not encumbered, technically, from an accounting standpoint, however, they are budgeted based on the statute, and they cannot be expended for anything other than what they were set aside for by the General Assembly, i.e. NG911.

Mr. Bone spoke up next, making a motion to increase the fee to 70¢, and Laura Sykora seconded the motion. Chairman Estes said he found it hard to have Board members make a recommendation that couldn't be agreed upon in committee, but if the Board wanted to move forward with that, he would move on with discussion. He added it seems to him this should be a committee project. Ms. Sykora relayed to Chairman Estes that in the committee, since they did have the split votes, they discussed leaving the decision to the full Board to make. Mr. Bone added he wanted to make Chairman Estes aware that the entire committee was not present at the meeting, that in fact there were two members of the committee absent. Chairman Estes observed he saw that as more reason to send it back to the committee. Rick Edwards interjected he doesn't feel comfortable voting on this if we don't get some sort of good, solid decision from the committee itself. Ms. Sykora replied she's afraid we're out of time because we have to notify the carriers by April 1<sup>st</sup> and this is the last Board meeting before that date.

Mr. Taylor speculated we could send it back to committee and the committee could meet between now and April 1st so it could come up with a recommendation and the Board could vote on it in a special called teleconference. Chairman Estes replied that's within the realm of possibility, and asked Vice-Chair Barbour, as Funding Committee chair, to continue. Vice-Chair Barbour noted there was a motion and a second on the floor and asked for further discussion or other procedural offers. Chairman Estes then asked Mr. Bradford if we need to vote on that motion or send it back to committee as required by Roberts Rules of Order. Mr. Bradford replied there are alternatives permitted by Roberts Rules; one of them is an

amendment to the motion which could take the form of what people usually refer to as tabling that would defer the motion to a time certain, in which case it would come up again for consideration and a vote. He observed another option is the motion could be amended by the maker of the motion or by some other Board member receiving permission from the maker of the motion. Lastly, he said the motion could be voted on and either approved or rejected: those are the three options.

Repeating those are the three options available to the Board, Chairman Estes asked if there was further discussion. Vice-Chair Barbour said he thought only one member of the funding committee was absent from the meeting, asking Mr. Taylor if he was remembering correctly. Vice-Chair Barbour said that was Sheriff Hagaman, who was at an FBI meeting. Mr. Taylor recalled Andrew Grant was also not in attendance, and Vice-Chair Barbour concurred, saying "So we had two members missing." Chairman Estes asked if those two members had been present, would that have changed the outcome of the meeting, and Vice-Chair Barbour said he did not know. Mr. Yarborough added there is a vacancy on that committee as well, with which Vice-Chair Barbour agreed, so Mr. Yarborough surmised the committee was down three members rather than two, and Vice-Chair Barbour concurred. Mr. Yarborough then asked if Ms. Sykora would entertain an amendment to her motion, and she reminded him it was Mr. Bone's motion, which she had seconded. Mr. Yarborough then directed his question to Mr. Bone, and Mr. Bone asked what amendment he was proposing. Mr. Yarborough said to follow Mr. Taylor's advice and see if we couldn't get a larger turnout at another committee meeting and for the committee to come back with a recommendation to the Board timed in such a way that there is sufficient time to complete the process with a teleconference vote from the full Board before April 1. Mr. Bone responded he understood Mr. Bradford to say it would have to be a time certain, and Mr. Bradford explained that completing all of that before the April 1<sup>st</sup> deadline is sufficient as a time certain; the dates would have to be scheduled, but the end dates are certain.

Vice-Chair Barbour said that he didn't know that sending it back to the Funding Committee would change anything unless staff could present more documentation than they had this week. Chairman Estes said that might be part of the process, as he thinks there are still some unknown expenditures in the out years that could be researched a little, for example Mr. Taylor's indication that he is going to seek an increase in his budget that has not yet been approved by the Board. He said there are things like that which he thinks need to be reconsidered by the committee to make sure they are accurate. He then asked if Mr. Bone wished to accept the friendly amendment to his motion. Mr. Bone repeated what he understood the amendment to be, asking Mr. Taylor if he thought the parameters laid out by Mr. Yarborough could be met. Mr. Taylor replied that would depend upon what additional, more detailed information staff was expected to gather and present.

Chairman Estes said he thought there were two pieces: to get more financial information from Marsha Tapler and to get more members into the committee structure, e.g. three additional Board members based upon the earlier discussion: two who were not able to attend and one open position that potentially could be filled. Mr. Taylor advised the open position is not a Board member position, it is a non-Board member position, but there were two Board members who are on the committee that were unable to make the second call. Ms. Sykora observed there are five Funding Committee members here today and Mr. Grant is on the phone, if there might be some way we could pause the Board meeting and hold a Funding Committee conversation and see if we could resolve it all today. Chairman Estes interjected that before we could do that we have to complete the consideration of the friendly amendment. Vice-Chair Barbour saw Mr. Bone shaking his head "No", and asked him if he was saying he would not accept the amendment. Mr. Bone confirmed that was the case. Chairman Estes accepted that and returned the floor to Ms. Sykora, but she indicated what she had suggested was intended to facilitate acceptance of the friendly amendment, so it was no longer relevant. Mr. Bone interjected there was too much variation there in terms of the timing or he would be more willing to accept the amendment. Vice-Chair Barbour then offered there is no better time than right now for us to talk about it while we're all here, because it's going to be hard to pull all of the Board back together where we can see and hear each other. He then said he was inclined to vote.

Jeff Shipp said he wanted to offer a comment, and that it was strictly a comment: that as chairman of the NG911 Committee, he understands the seriousness of this, however he does not think this is the appropriate time. He said he does challenge staff and the Board to continue to look for efficiencies within the Board and within the budget and continue to look at state purchasing agreements, reiterating we have got to show efficiencies within the Board first before we address a funding increase.

Chairman Estes said he was trying to keep up, but he thought Ms. Sykora had made a suggestion to have the members of the committee meet at some point in the near future today to bring a recommendation to the Board which may be later today or at a special session of the Board within two or three days from now, or early next week, via teleconference. Ms. Sykora interjected her thought was there are five committee members in the room and Mr. Grant on the phone, making six. She admitted she didn't know how to facilitate this, but she was proposing to pause the Board meeting for a break, let the committee get together, and then it can come back. Vice-Chair Barbour observed she wants to resolve it before we leave today. Chairman Estes said he understood, but that would be something that would have to be agreeable to the maker of the motion on the floor. Mr. Bone replied he would be agreeable to that, as did Ms. Sykora as the second.

Andrew Grant advised that unfortunately he was going to have to drop from the remote connection in about five minutes, adding he is of the same mind as Vice-Chair Barbour as to being ready to vote on the motion. He added that although he understands and acknowledges Mr. Bone's and Ms. Sykora's concerns about funding, he was not prepared to vote on an increase until we have a healthy discussion about our funding model. He admitted we've started it, but maintained we have a long way to go. He added he also has concern about some of the staffing increases and the departmental operational budget increases, saying a lot of those funds could go toward grants. He reiterated he's just not comfortable making a recommendation at this time for an increase. Vice-Chair Barbour asked Mr. Grant how long he could stay in the meeting. Mr. Grant replied "Literally about ten minutes." Vice-Chair Barbour then addressed Chairman Estes advising we may be losing a Board member if we don't vote within the next ten minutes. Chairman Estes then asked what other discussions would Board members like to have on this topic if we move it to a vote today.

Mr. Bone observed that as a manager he is concerned about unfunded mandates, and he feels the backup requirement is in place, the reconsideration process is in place to help fund that, and he's very concerned that without an increase we're basically going to have an unfunded mandate and that he doesn't know what the local governments, particularly the small rural governments, are going to do; how are they are going to do this, particularly with the implementation of these backup plans, if we start turning them down for reconsideration requests. Mr. Taylor replied he disagrees: it's not unfunded—we *are* funding them. He observed Mr. Bone is generalizing now by saying we don't have enough money to take care of them. He noted we don't have enough money for them to build buildings and remain independent of the PSAPs around them, but if they would cooperatively work with other PSAPs costs could be kept down. He reiterated, it's not unfunded; we have the funding to take care of them, but we don't have funding to pay for 119 individual backup PSAPs. He added he doesn't think even a 10¢ increase would be enough to pay for that.

Chairman Estes asked if there was any further discussion, and hearing none, said that he was going to move to take a vote on the motion. He asked if the motion needed to be read again, and several Board members replied yes. Vice-Chair Barbour added he would recommend a roll-call vote as well. Mr. Bone stated the motion was to increase the 911 fee to 70¢. Rick Edwards asked about the amendment, and Ms. Sykora replied there was conversation about it. Mr. Bradford advised the main motion was amended, because the maker of the main motion accepted it, therefore the Board needs to vote on the amendment, which was essentially to pause this meeting, allow the committee to meet, and the committee to come back with a recommendation for resolution, so that needs to be voted on first. If that is successful, then there would be no need to vote on the main motion.

Chairman Estes thanked Mr. Bradford for the clarification, and said he'd move to a vote on the amendment. Slayton Stewart asked for a clarification, asking if we vote in favor of the amendment, will the committee have sufficient time to come to a conclusion and make a recommendation to the full Board. Chairman Estes said that as he understood it the amendment that has been approved by the maker of the motion is for the committee to break out at the end of this Board meeting, have a discussion, and then the Board reconvene later today to vote on the committee's recommendation. He then asked if he was understanding that correctly.

Vice-Chair Barbour mentioned he thought Mr. Stewart's question was what information would the committee have at its disposal now that it didn't have at this week's earlier meeting, and Mr. Stewart concurred. Mr. Bone asked Mr. Bradford if the amendment could be retracted and go back to the original

motion. Mr. Bradford replied yes, that could be done, if Ms. Sykora would request that Mr. Bone rescind his approval of her amendment, and then we could go back to the main motion. Ms. Sykora asked Mr. Bone to do so, and he agreed. Vice-Chair Barbour advised Chairman Estes that now the original motion was on the floor.

Once again, Chairman Estes solicited any further discussion on the original motion. Hearing none, he did say that he wanted to add a comment, which he normally doesn't do, but he thinks we should be aware that if we haven't drawn out all the efficiencies of the Board, there is a short session where they might choose to draw those efficiencies out for us if we make an increase in the rate. With no other discussion evident, the roll-call vote was called:

YES	NO
Dave Bone	Jason Barbour
Sheriff Hagaman	Darryl Bottoms
Greg Hauser	Eric Cramer
Jimmy Stewart	Rick Edwards
Slayton Stewart	Andrew Grant
Laura Sykora	Dinah Jeffries
	Jeff Shipp
	Rob Smith
	Buck Yarborough

When Darryl Bottoms name was called, Mr. Taylor reported he had received an email from him stating, "My vote 'No' to increase." Rick Isherwood was absent. When the tally was complete, Mr. Taylor announced the motion did not carry.

Chairman Estes thanked everyone for voting, which means no change will be made to the fee for FY17 unless there is any other motion a Board member wishes to bring forward. Hearing none, he asked Vice-Chair Barbour is there was any more information coming from his committee report. Vice-Chair Barbour's reply was, "That's enough," saying now people could see why he wanted to address this before agenda item 8. Mr. Taylor replied we will not do item 8 today. Chairman Estes asked if item 8 was time sensitive, and when Mr. Taylor said it was not, asked to postpone it to another meeting. Mr. Taylor readily agreed to do that. Chairman Estes then asked Mr. Taylor to cover item 10 quickly, as it is a good news story.

#### **10. New Board Website**

Mr. Taylor displayed the landing page of the new website onscreen, reminding everyone that, as he has relayed to them over the past couple of months, we have had problems with the current website, his understanding being that the server had been hacked and they had to move to a new server and it has really caused a lot of problems with trying to get updates done and everything. He added, however, that at the same time the state has been moving everyone to a new format in websites with new programming and all, and the web folks have been working with us over the last couple of months trying to get our page established.

Returning to the landing page, Mr. Taylor said they've cleaned up a lot of things, which will make the web page more friendly to use. He ticked off several of the changes as he maneuvered through the page, noting older agenda books and minutes will be archived. He relayed staff is excited about this, which is all a part of this new vision for getting all the state websites to look alike and work together, and is scheduled to be turned on next Monday. He said he is impressed with the fact that we will now have access to analytics so we can monitor where people are going on the website to identify interests so we can improve on those areas. He added this is one of the projects Chairman Estes worked on when he was the State CIO. He also noted Tina Bone will be receiving training in Drupal, the content management software for the new website, and she noted that training is *next* week, adding she wants to make everybody aware there is already some information on the site that is incorrect and as soon as she and Mr. Taylor have received their training she will go back and get that information updated.

Mr. Taylor thanked Chairman Estes for this project that he started as State CIO, and Chairman Estes said he would actually have to give Governor McCrory credit because he's the one who wanted to make doing business with state government as easy as checking scores on a smartphone, adding these sites are responsive, meaning you can use them on a smartphone. He pointed out if you look at the current website on a smartphone, it's not smartphone enabled so it's very difficult to navigate; the new site will scale automatically to fit any device anytime anywhere. He wished Mr. Taylor good luck with the roll-out, saying he looked forward to using the new site quickly.

### **Other Items**

Chairman Estes asked if there were any other items to come before the Board today. Hearing none, and Vice-Chair Barbour reporting he saw none, Chairman Estes said he just wanted to remind everyone that we do have the committee structure, and it is a good way to make sure that everyone's voice is heard, that the committees are much more focused and detail oriented, and that he encouraged anyone, guests included, to participate in those committee meetings.

### **Adjourn**

Chairman Estes adjourned the meeting at 12:20 PM.