

North Carolina 911 Board Meeting
MINUTES
Banner Elk Room
3514-A Bush Street, Raleigh, NC
April 22, 2016
10:00 AM – 12:48 PM

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Staff Present</u>	<u>Guest</u>
Jason Barbour (NCNENA) Johnston Co. 911 (911 Board Vice Chair)	Richard Bradford (DOJ)	Fred Baggett (NCACP)
Dave Bone (NCACC) Martin County	Dave Corn (DIT)	Rachel Bello (Wake County)
Darryl Bottoms (NCACP) Pilot Mountain PD (Phone)	Karen Mason (DIT)	Glenn Camiz (Guilford Metro 911)
Rick Edwards (CMRS) Sprint	Marsha Tapler (DIT)	Nelson Clark (Synergem Technologies)
Chris Estes (911 Board Chair)	Richard Taylor (DIT)	Meghan Cook (DIT)
Andrew Grant (NCLM) Town of Cornelius (Phone)	Cathy Jones (Stenographer)	Andrew Curd (Motorola)
Len Hagaman (Sheriff) Watauga County	Don Rice (DIT – A/V)	Shelley Davis (Hickory Police Dept.)
Greg Hauser (NCSFA) Charlotte Fire Department (Phone)		Bruce A. Drum (Catawba Co. 911)
Rick Isherwood (CMRS) Verizon (Phone)		Greg Foster (Alexander County 911)
Dinah Jeffries (NCAPCD) Orange Co. Emergency Services		Tim Johnson (CGIA)
Jeff Shipp (LEC) Star Telephone		Deidre Jordan (CenturyLink)
Rob Smith (LEC) AT&T (Phone)		Bethany Ledwell (Concord Communications)
Jimmy Stewart (NCAREMS) Hoke Co. 911		Jim Lockard (Federal Engineering)
Slayton Stewart (CMRS) Carolina West Wireless		Jesus Lopez (DIT)
Laura Sykora (LEC) CenturyLink (Phone)		Joel McCamley (Federal Engineering)
Buck Yarborough (VoIP) TWC (Phone)		James McLeod (CenturyLink)
		Ed Naybor (GDIT)
		Melanie Neal (Guilford Metro 911)
<u>Members Absent</u>	<u>Staff Absent</u>	
Eric Cramer (LEC) Wilkes Communication	Tina Bone (DIT)	Lora Nock (Dare Co. 911)
	David Dodd (DIT)	Jim Parker (DIT)

		Tonya Pearce (Durham. 911)
		Philip Penny (MCP/NCNENA)
		Trey Piland (Dare Co. 911)
		David Poston (Cape Fear PD)
		Rob Robinson (CenturyLink)
		Nicole Sain (Hickory PD)
		Joe Sewash (CGIA)
		Dean Skidmore (Independent Consultant)
		Darrin Smith (CGIA)
		Candy Strezinski (911 Iredell)
		Kim Twiddy (Dare Co. 911)
		Joe Vanderlip (Charlotte Mecklenburg PD)
		Linda Waterman (DIT)
		Victor Williams (Beaufort Co. Sheriff 911)
		WebEx Attendees
		Randy Beeman (Cumberland Co Emergency Svcs)
		David Boggs (Apex Police Dept)
		Sarah Collins (NC League of Municipalities)
		John Correllus (DIT)
		Barry Crommett (FairPoint)
		Brad Fraser (Shelby Police Dept)
		Terry Grayson (Shelby Police Dept)
		Jon Greene (GeoComm)
		Pamela Hamilton (CMPD)
		Grant Hunsucker (Montgomery Co Emergency Svcs)
		Kevin Medlin (Orange County 911)
		Denise Pratt (Durham Co Sheriff's Dept)
		Corrinne Walser (Mecklenburg EMS)
		Donna Wright (Montgomery Co Emergency Svcs)

1. Chairman's Opening Remarks

North Carolina 911 Board Chairman Chris Estes called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m., asking Executive Director Richard Taylor to conduct the roll call of Board members. Richard Taylor verified that Greg Hauser, Rob Smith, Laura Sykora, Darryl Bottoms and Buck Yarborough were present by phone. Andrew Grant and Rick Isherwood did not respond to the telephone roll call. Mr. Taylor noted that the attendance of WebEx participants will be noted and recognized Cathy Jones as stenographer for today's proceedings.

Chairman Chris Estes noted that we have a quorum. Chairman Estes asked Mr. Taylor to present a synopsis of a 911 call regarding an incident that occurred back in August from a daughter whose father was found non-responsive. He praised Ms. Kim Twiddy, Telecommunicator for Dare County Sheriff's Department, on her calm and professional handling of the call. He played the recording for the Board. Chris Estes presented the award for outstanding teamwork, professionalism and commitment to public safety for her handling of the 8/5/15 call. Lora Nock, her assistant director, gave additional details as to Ms. Twiddy's handling of the call. She also reminded the 911 Board of the importance of dealing with after-effects of the operators who deal with the calls. Tray Piland also expressed his thanks to Ms. Twiddy and the Board. Chris Estes reminded the Board members they had toured the Dare County facility over a year ago.

2. Ethics Awareness/Conflict of Interest Statement

Chairman Estes read the conflict of interest statement and asked if there were any comments. Laura Sykora has a conflict under Tab 8 with the funding reconsideration request and will not be participating in the closed session discussion or vote. Rob Smith has a conflict with all items of Tab 8(a) and 9 and will not participate in conversation or voting on NextGen. No other conflicts were noted.

3. Consent Agenda

Minutes of 3/18/16 Board Meeting - No notifications of changes were received by Richard Taylor and the minutes of the Kinston meeting were approved.

Grant Project Updates - Mr. Taylor reported we are in the process of closing out several grants for Burke, Brunswick and Lenoir Counties; Anson County has an extension; and Orange and Swain Counties and the Swain-Jackson projects were closed out.

Grant Fund Balance – Mr. Taylor noted that some fund balances were remaining and the funds will revert back into the fund. So with the items pending, there is \$31,454,158.65 that is encumbered with \$1,408,343 remaining in the fund balance to be used for the grant program this year.

NG911 Fund Balance – Mr. Taylor noted on the agenda that there is a bit of a discrepancy. OSC (Office of State Controller) encountered errors while establishing a new account. But there have been no disbursements out of the fund so the balance of \$2,034,823 is unconfirmed and will probably increase as Marsha Tapler works with OSC to make sure all proper credits are made. CMRS fund is pretty much in line with where it was planned to be at this time. From CMRS providers fund, there's been \$4.1 million paid out each month for the PSAPs with a balance of \$13,260,585 left for those asking money for backup costs.

Richard Taylor concluded his report and Chairman Estes asked for a motion to approve the consent agenda. Jason Barbour made the motion and it was seconded by Dinah Jeffries. Jeff Ship congratulated staff on minutes from last month. Richard Taylor commented that the new web site contained a very large agenda book and asked how participants felt about the setup. Jason Barbour asked if PSAP managers contact

information was available on the new web site. Mr. Taylor responded that yes, now there is a column for each PSAPs so that you can click on PSAP information panel to see manager contact information and backup plans. Additional discussion by Ms. Sykora included a request for tabs on prior months which should make it easier to go to specific items on the agenda. She commented that this is perhaps a display issue, but nevertheless, she approved of having all the information out there. There being no further discussion, the motion was passed by unanimous vote.

4. Public Comment

Chris Estes opened up floor for comments from state and local government officials and concerned citizens. Victor Williams, director of Beaufort County Sheriff's Office/911 Center, expressed concern over the backup PSAP requirements. He prefaced his comments that he's new, but was concerned that NC is spending a lot of unnecessary money that NG911 is going to fix. General Statutes say we have to have a plan and means to receive the call. The statutes do not require CAD and fixed radio equipment—just to have a means to receive a 911 call. Mr. Williams asked for clarification from the Board that if a simple MOU from a neighboring county to transfer 911 calls and then allow the counties work on communication in the interim three years would suffice. Chris Estes asked if he's met with the staff. He has met with the staff and has received different responses. Based on his history of emergency service, he feels it is important to weigh cost versus benefit. Knowing we will have a fix in three years, he feels it is unnecessary to spend millions of dollars on backup PSAPs now. Perhaps discussion among legislators, governor and 911 Board can save money and redirect the money to NG911 to bring things up to speed quicker in the state. Richard Taylor spoke with Mr. Williams in the past few weeks about transferring calls to other PSAPs. The 911 call includes both voice and the data. Richard Bradford added that the issue is not new. There are several questions the Board may wish to consider about how backup PSAPs are to be funded and achieved. It was agreed this would be a fair discussion item for the Board to take up and consider in the future. Chairman Estes asked for further discussion. There being none, Mr. Williams was thanked for his comments and was assured the Board will address this concern. Mr. Barbour asked that time be allocated at the next meeting to discuss offering relief to PSAPs. Chairman Estes asked Mr. Taylor to add that to the working session agenda. No further discussion was had for this portion of public comment.

5. Executive Director Report

Richard Taylor said there was a discussion two meetings ago on the lack of progress on telecommunicators certification. Since that time, Mr. Taylor did not go to the Sheriffs Commission meeting as he had planned because there was too much going on and he could not do it justice. The PSAP managers course had to be addressed. Richard Taylor, Tonya Pearce, Jimmy Stewart and Donna Wright met with Richmond Community College to initiate discussions about a PSAP manager class. Mr. Taylor does not want to have so much going on that this issue does not get the proper attention it deserves. Mr. Taylor wants to focus on ongoing projects so he suggested putting telecommunicators certification on hold until other projects are resolved.

Mr. Estes asked for questions or comments. Dinah Jeffries expressed concern that she had to clarify a misperception with the Sheriffs Commission at their last meeting when the question was raised as to why Mr. Taylor was not present, it was stated that Mr. Taylor did not have the support of the Board for certification. Ms. Jeffries reiterated at the meeting that she felt this was not true and wanted to make sure the Sheriffs Commission understood the Board is not against certification; they are just concerned with doing it

correctly, with the right people and in making sure the PSAPs were involved. Chairman Estes added that this was one of the goal priorities outlined to the Board and approved, but now it has been shifted. He asked that this issue be put on the agenda for May.

Mr. Taylor responded that the Kinston meeting had included the criticism of shifting priorities. When the Board is not supporting the committee structure, he has to back up and look at what can be done. He mentioned Jimmy Stewart has greatly assisted with the education committee. Mr. Taylor emphasized that Board support in the form of participation is needed at the committee level. He noted there are committee meetings where Board members don't show up. More input from the Board is needed other than 10 minutes once a month. Mr. Taylor expressed a need for Board members to be working on NextGen subcommittees for upcoming issues. Chairman Estes asked that this issue be added to the May meeting working session and that gaps in participation be identified since this is the first he's heard that there's no Board support. Mr. Taylor stated he has mentioned this issue in the past. Len Hagaman commented that he did not realize that there are other courses out there and suggested the Board needs to look at all of them to evaluate the bigger picture. Mr. Barbour commented that in an effort not to reinvent the wheel, the Board should not just endorse one particular course, but rather identify a pool of courses available. Mr. Taylor noted this has been discussed in past committee meetings as to how to evaluate the quality of these trainings. Mr. Barbour suggested endorsing particular programs as being approved to accomplish the goal of getting telecommunicators trained. Mr. Taylor replied that he is uncertain what the total number of classes are as well as to how to vet a good program versus one that is not. The Board has tried to remain neutral on technology and does not endorse any one product or service, and that is not the intent here. Mr. Taylor reported that he has met with the Sheriffs Commission, due to their experience in this area, to get informed as to the pitfalls to be avoided and the fixing of curriculum problems. Chairman Estes suggested the Education Committee can say a program that meets certification has these 10 attributes and if it meets those attributes, great. Mr. Taylor said the issue is how much detail does attribute one get and what time is required for that. Ms. Jeffries pointed out that state emergency management already does this. If you submit another one not on the list, they weigh it by the objectives, goals and content and make a decision whether to add it to the list or reject it. Mr. Taylor stated we just need to get the information concerning how to do this. Chairman Estes asked Jimmy Stewart to take this up in the Education Committee as a priority item. He noted this is an opportunity to take leadership over this issue and report back to the Board by the end of the year.

6. Proposal from CGIA on Statewide Orthography Project as a Statewide Grant

Tim Johnson began his presentation by explaining that this briefing is a result of a proposal presented on 4/8 and is an effort to look at cost parameters and explanation of the cost, look at the schedule of proposed phases and wrap up any questions going forward. The project involves 26 counties in eastern/central NC that covers 15,000-plus square miles in that region. The value of this project to the Board is immense due to the significant amount of money and time over the past four years that has already been invested. This is the second phase of what was approved last February. Imagery is a mission-critical asset to the 911 Center as has been shown over last 4 years.

How does CGIA optimize the Board's investment? By how close CGIA pays attention to the cost of the program. Mr. Johnson also emphasized other datasets by other investments made in NC in that imagery. An area in Hoke County where imagery was shown to be important was proven by the incident of the lost hiker as one recent example. Other examples of wildfires in various counties demonstrate the benefits

received from the imagery project. Mr. Johnson took a couple of minutes to discuss the approach from a technical side and then followed up with a financial update. Last February the Board adopted a four-year plan to refresh 2012/2013 imagery. CGIA is currently working on 27 counties in the coastal area of NC and is expected to deliver this data by next January. Eastern Piedmont data is expected to be delivered in 2017. A couple characteristics of the eastern Piedmont is that it is more urban than the coastal area, but it also includes Fort Bragg as well as Seymour Johnson Air Force base. One of the things done to improve the program is to bring in Moore, Richmond and Scotland Counties to work with the Fort Bragg footprint to save money and time.

The project team continues to work with DOT, Secretary of State and DPS, but is also working with Board and PSAPs as key players in reviewing the imagery. Each player has a role in the development of this project. CGIA is the project manager in charge of quality control to review data after it is completed and posting it on map. DOT is the state's expert in photogrammetry to marry up the data. DPS is in charge of horizontal accuracy. The Secretary of State has ties with local governments to enhance the best understanding of how data is used locally. In 2010, the statewide product was delivered. It was expanded beyond the Mecklenburg County border by a 7-mile stretch in 2015 to have the footprint complete beyond the state border where applicable. Today the footprint is regional with a minimum set of files to load in the CAD system and provides a thorough look at imagery across the region. Imagery doesn't stop at county or state borders and also doesn't stop at military borders. A signed agreement has been established to allow flying and delivery of data back to 911 centers which involved signing of confidentiality agreements and nondisclosure agreements. One of the hallmarks of the program due to guidance and direction of the Board from several years ago is to have participants check the data. The 2012 Virtual Online Inspection Checking and Editing (VOICE) program incorporates county and municipal primary PSAPs, local government GIS, CGIA, surveyors, NCDOT, tax assessors, NC Secretary of State, planners and NC geodetic survey. More and more counties are adopting the stance of participating in the VOICE program.

The cost approach shows the technological advances which include updated state LiDAR data (elevation model) and NC Floodplain Mapping Program. This provides more accurate elevation data and less error for acquisition contractors to fix. The second technological advance is in million dollar cameras. These second-generation sensors allow higher altitude flights resulting in a larger footprint, fewer exposures needed, fewer flight lines to collect data, and less fuel used. All of these factors represents less cost for the program. The price of jet fuel has had a significant drop in cost and has had a positive benefit to the cost proposal submitted last year. Using the cost drivers chart, Mr. Johnson explained that the green line is the actual cost in a four-year cycle on a per tile cost in 2014 and 2015 which is due to difficulty of flying a mountainous terrain. If inflation costs are factored in, the white line applies. Projections for 2016 so far show a drop of \$400,000 using those factors rather than just relying on inflation. A \$250,000 decrease is projected for 2017. Unless jet fuel changes in a big way, these figures are reliable. This represents a savings of over \$248,000 from the projected budget. This project delivers a comprehensive solution for what PSAPs need and continues to build on a solid foundation to support all 911 operations in North Carolina. CGIA wants to continue this

effort and build what was started in 2012. The project schedule through May of 2018 was discussed with QBS/Procurement and then goes through the planning and acquisition cycle culminating with quality control and delivery of the product with 60 days' time allotted for feedback by PSAPs. The process is projected to be complete by May of 2018.

The Board was asked for any questions on the proposal to be considered. There being no questions, Chairman Estes thanked Mr. Johnson for his presentation and stated that the Board has approved this for a four-year cycle, but needs to approve the financial commitment for this year as outlined on the screen. Slayton Stewart made that motion and it was seconded by Jeff Shipp. No further discussion on the motion was had and it passed by unanimous vote. Jeff Shipp thanked Mr. Johnson for his work and noted that so many different agencies within the state benefit from this project. Chairman Estes reiterated that Board members know that aggregating buying power for this project as a state eliminates need for individual counties to fund this and thus saves the taxpayers money.

7. Standards Committee Report

Laura Sykora was unable to attend the last Standards Committee meeting, so she asked Mr. Taylor or Mr. Hagaman to present the Standards Committee report to the Board. Len Hagaman explained he was unprepared to present today and asked Richard Bradford to report. Mr. Bradford reported that much of the time at the last committee meeting was spent discussing the process and future for doing site reviews at PSAPs. The committee has resolved in terms of the kinds of questions they wanted to ask. They went through rules and identified questions associated with rules and then worked on the forms to be used. The committee took a good step forward in identifying more people to participate. Greg Hauser indicated that he had some materials helpful in generating the form to be used by the reviewers, and so the next step is for the committee to generate the form. As far as the rules themselves, the same rules on the screen were approved in February that are the subject of the Board's public hearing are here again today unchanged. In order to have them presented for a vote before the Rules Review Commission at the next meeting, the Board needs to approve them as final rules. The Rules Review Commission meets next on 5/19 where the rules will be presented by staff along with staff's recommendation for approval. Mr. Bradford asked the Rules Review staff to include this relatively short matter on the May agenda. Chairman Estes asked for a motion that the Board vote on rules that have already been voted on because the public comment period presented no changes to the rules. Mr. Bradford says the committee did not vote on this, so a motion needs to be made today. There was a motion from Len Hagaman to approve the rules as displayed. The motion was seconded by Dave Bone. No discussion was had regarding the motion and it was carried by unanimous vote.

8. 911 Funding Committee Report

There are three funding reconsiderations to come before the Board and Mr. Barbour suggested voting on each one independently. Mr. Barbour asked Richard Taylor to hit the high spots and further detail can be provided on individual requests as needed. Mr. Taylor addressed the Guilford-Metro 911 package and noted they are continuing to

work on the technology refresh plan for their equipment. That's the basis for what they're asking for on the form that was submitted and reviewed by the staff and funding committee. They have operating expenditures of 2.7 million and with anticipated new monthly and annual recurring expenses, they anticipate their funding request to be 2.9 million. The recommendation from the committee was to approve the recommendation to increase the Guilford-Metro funding to \$2,991,353.79. The committee recommendation is considered to be a motion to increase Guilford-Metro funding. Rob Smith recused voting on this. The motion was carried by unanimous vote.

Richard Taylor presented the funding reconsideration request of Holly Springs in which they estimated costs for a new 911 center and did not spend the requested money. They now have a fund balance over \$996K balance and technically would owe this back to the fund. Marsha Tapler says \$271,000 is needed to reimburse the fund after reducing the fund by \$416K. The Board will not ask them to write a check back to the 911 fund. They had a timing issue in which several contract items do not kick in for another 2 years. After Mr. Taylor reviewed the request, it was determined they had a \$967,955 fund balance in 2015. They do have a one-time payment of \$25,814.26 to be made by 6/30/16 leaving them with an estimated fund balance of \$398,418 which is higher than what they should be carrying. Mr. Taylor suggested to the committee that their committee recommendation of funding for fiscal year 2017 is to not send any more funds to Holly Springs so they can work off the large fund balance and that staff is to closely monitor PSAP funds each month in case funds are needed during FY2017. Chairman Estes called for discussion or questions regarding the pending motion and there were none. The motion was carried by unanimous vote with Rob Smith recusing himself from the vote and discussion.

Mr. Taylor presented Randolph County's funding reconsideration request for building a new center and supplementing cost of new equipment and furniture. Marsha Tapler has spent much time with their finance officer clarifying the needs and numbers represented in this request. Basically they had \$829,950.36 this year in total FY2015 expenditures. Mr. Taylor noted that their proposed funding of \$659K includes anticipated capital expenditures of \$826K, monthly recurring expenses of \$340K and annually recurring \$12K so they are requesting funding of \$1,838,378.07 for FY2017. The Funding Committee recommendation is to approve Randolph County's funding reconsideration request for FY2017 to \$1,838,378. With this motion on the table, Chairman Estes called for discussion or questions. Laura Sykora and Rob Smith recused themselves from the vote and discussion. Since there were no questions or discussion, the motion was carried by unanimous vote.

Jason Barbour presented the 911 Board proposed FY2017 budget and suggested that the vote be held at a later Board meeting. Ms. Tapler reported on increase in personnel services increased due new positions. In addition, a new expense line was added to the budget due to the raise approved by the governor that has to be paid out of the 911 fund because we are not appropriated. Contractual services were decreased from \$815,000 to \$494,000 because the NextGen project was moved out of the administrative fund and into the NextGen fund. Operational services, Board member travel and other purchase services and equipment all decreased slightly. The CMRS statutory distribution (which is cost recovery) and PSAPs distribution also decreased. Grant distribution expenditure is what is already encumbered and the estimated revenue transferred at year-end from the PSAP fund which will cover grants for the next fiscal year. So \$114,542,111 is the total expenditure amount proposed. The NextGen fund is projected to receive \$8.1 million with a budget of \$500,000 in expenditures for the NG 911 capital project. Budget shows funds received of \$397K and revenue for all providers is \$81.4 million. Due to expenditures for personnel services down through equipment, it

is anticipated only 1 percent of revenue coming from vendors to be \$733K, so we will use the projected administrative fund balance of \$679K to pay the additional cost to cover any expenditures. The grant fund balance is a wash as it is being moved from the PSAP fund to the grant fund. The budget revenues are \$132,687,372 is proposed budget for FY2017. TRS is a pass-through account and so we have to budget for that as well. We have budgeted 12.8 with \$8,000 in interest and then 12.8 is revenue. The Funding Committee is still reviewing the budget, but Chairman Estes wanted the Board to see the current draft.

Laura Sykora questioned the budget as she compared this information to what was presented to the Board at the last Board meeting. The bottom line at the last meeting was \$3.9 million. She compared the 132 million in revenue, subtracted approximate expenditures of 114 million and subtracted the NextGen fund of \$8 million, she ends up with \$9.5 million bottom line. Why were we looking at 4 million bottom line compared to the 9.5 million between the two sets of numbers? Ms. Tapler says more was budgeted for PSAP distribution (\$6 million) so if you took that back out, it brings you back down to the 3.9 million. Ms. Sykora recalled that the March discussion was more in the 60 million range rather than \$54 million. Ms. Sykora suggested that the budget provide more background information to reduce discussion and increase the comfort of the Board. Ms. Tapler explained that the budgeted figure still has 3 more PSAPs reconsiderations coming in July with one stating it is possibly \$5 million dollars. She will do the numbers and get a spreadsheet together to make it more clear. Sykora thanked her for any efforts to get that info to the Board. Chairman Estes asked for Board members on the telephone if they had any questions or comments.

Mr. Barbour said the Funding Committee would want to know what \$50 million includes. Ms. Tapler replied the encumbered \$19 million includes Ortho, possible interpretive services and then \$14 million for the PSAP grants part. Mr. Barbour clarified that \$14 million is unallocated that potentially goes into the grant fund. This leads to a discussion to use the \$14 million to first cover anything covered by statute before we spend it on any other projects. He feels this discussion is needed before setting Board priorities. Staff pointed out that we need to identify a scoring matrix on what gets the most weight. Mr. Taylor says that is forthcoming. Mr. Barbour says everyone is realizing when Laura is saying we're not as broke as we were saying we were in March. Ms. Sykora feels much more comfortable looking at the current budget that we have the funds available to meet statutory requirements for the backups.

Dave Bone was planning to defer comments to the agenda item for PSAP compliance, but feels now is a good time. He appreciates having the backup PSAP plans approved on the website and feels it is helpful. He is still concerned about budgeted reconsideration requests on the amounts of approved plans of how much investment each PSAP will make. Does the staff have a tally? Is there a spreadsheet showing the plan purchases for the approved backup plans? Ms. Tapler says there is not one in the book. Mr. Bone says it would be helpful to the Board and legislature to provide information on the status of the backup requirement. He thinks the majority of PSAPs are drafting backup plans with the expectation to apply for reconsideration requests. He doubts that many local governments are planning to fund this locally. He also noted that Surry County wants 3.6 million for equipment in their approved plan. Bladen County wants \$600,000. Mr. Bone is extremely concerned we will not have sufficient funds for reconsideration requests to pay for the backup PSAPs. He expressed concern that blame will be placed back on the Board if shortages occur. Mr. Bone strongly urged the Board to consider going to the legislature to seek some type of adjustment for the backup requirement.

Chairman Estes called for further comments or questions on the budget. Mr. Barbour responded that the transfer needs to be done by July 1 to the statewide grant

project or disburse excess money according to statute. So trying to ensure we have money to comply with backup requests, they would seek relief from us. Maybe we should make a better effort to stress if they don't have a backup plan approved, then PSAPs should apply for a grant. Maybe we should delay awarding any grants until anybody who has time to fill out backup center expenditures in the form of a grant request versus a funding reconsideration request. He feels we have got to move money to the grant account by June 30th. Mr. Bradford agreed that the logical conundrum presented by Mr. Barbour is correct, but the timing is a little off. The Board has to determine the amount of money in the PSAP fund to be transferred by establishing a percentage. When that transfer happens is more a function of how budgeting and accounting works. The real issue here is a statutory deadline and the issue Mr. Barbour brings forward is one in which he is asking the Board to consider policy decisions on what to do with that money. Once money is transferred into the grant account, it cannot come back out and be distributed. The Board could make special distributions to PSAPs. This goes back to point made by Mr. Bone about understanding the physical demand by PSAPS for backup funding. Today the question Mr. Barbour asks is, "Is there something we need to do or consider? If so, figure out what that is and let's put it in play." Mr. Bradford advised the Board to not dwell too much on exactly when the funds transfer out of the PSAP. The real question should be, "Is there a priority for those funds?" If Mr. Bone's request for a spreadsheet helps the Board to give more detail, this should be done. Mr. Barbour followed up by having staff to urge PSAPs to get the grant applications in by June 9th. After we make the transfer into the grant fund, if they traditionally seek relief from funding reconsiderations, then the balance is around \$4 million left to do traditional funding reconsiderations. Ms. Tapler clarified that since the reconsiderations were approved today, it is only \$1.5 million.

Chairman Estes called for further comments or questions on the budget. Mr. Barbour responded that the transfer needs to be done by July 1 to the statewide grant project or disburse excess money according to statute. So trying to ensure we have money to comply with backup requests, they would seek relief from us. Maybe we should make a better effort to stress if they don't have a backup plan approved, then PSAPs should apply for a grant. Maybe we should delay awarding any grants until anybody who has time to fill out backup center expenditures in the form of a grant request versus a funding reconsideration request. He feels we have got to move money to the grant account by June 30th. Mr. Bradford agreed that the logical conundrum presented by Mr. Barbour is correct, but the timing is a little off. The Board has to determine the amount of money in the PSAP fund to be transferred by establishing a percentage. When that transfer happens is more a function of how budgeting and accounting works. The real issue here is a statutory deadline and the issue Mr. Barbour brings forward is one in which he is asking the Board to consider policy decisions on what to do with that money. Once money is transferred into the grant account, it cannot come back out and be distributed. The Board could make special distributions to PSAPs. This goes back to point made by Mr. Bone about understanding the fiscal demand by PSAPS for backup funding. Today the question Mr. Barbour asks is, "Is there something we need to do or consider? If so, figure out what that is and let's put it in play." Mr. Bradford advised the Board to not dwell too much on exactly when the funds transfer out of the PSAP. The real question should be, "Is there a priority for those funds?" If Mr. Bone's request for a spreadsheet helps the Board to give more detail, this should be done. Mr. Barbour followed up by having staff to urge PSAPs to get the grant applications in by June 9th.

Laura Sykora asked if Mr. Bradford could remind the Board of the change in statute having to do with grants in the 2015 session to encourage eligible expenditures to go through the regular reconsideration process. Mr. Bradford says there's no short

answer to this, but for today – yes, there were several changes in that part of the statute so people should not apply for a grant when part of the funding is a normal expenditure. There is concern among PSAPs and Board members to ensure that the deadline is met so that the General Assembly is assured all progress is made as soon as possible. Jeff Shipp asked staff when was the original date for the backup requirement? The question was clarified to be, “When did the backup requirement appear in the statute?” Mr. Bradford clarified that it occurred on July 1, 2011.

Rick Edwards asked if it could be done cheaper or at a reduced rate. He asked if staff has the ability to go back and say, “If that’s what you want to do, we’ll give you X amount of pennies on the dollar?” Dave Bone said in trying to get quotes from vendors, the vendors ask for differentiation between grant or reconsideration or for internal quotes. Apparently that makes a difference to vendors. Mr. Taylor clarified the change in statutory wording for Ms. Sykora. He said that in the past you had to consolidate before you could use it for construction costs, but they added the line that said, “or capital expenditures that enhance the 911 system” to include radio towers and things of that nature.

Mr. Barbour wanted to discuss the recommendation for award of interpretive services, but noted the agenda specifies that this issue is to be handled in a closed session. Jeff Shipp made a motion to close the public meeting pursuant to NC GS 143-318.11(a)(1) for the purpose of receiving information that is not yet public regarding the recommendation for award pursuant to NC GS 143B-1350 and the committee’s discussion of the RFP evaluation and management of the procurement process, and consulting with counsel. Slayton Stewart seconded the motion. Mr. Barbour asked if both items could be handled in closed session and was told this was the plan. The motion carried by unanimous vote. State procurement team members who coach the Board are allowed to remain with the Board, but all other guests were asked to wait in another location. On-line participants were muted and it was noted that Laura Sykora and Rob Smith recused themselves from NextGen but will participate in the translation service. Andrew Grant was confirmed to be online, but there was no response from Rick Isherwood. The Board entered closed session at 11:53 a.m.

CLOSED SESSION BEGINS AT 11:53 A.M. THE FOLLOWING MINUTES MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT SHOULD NOT BE DISTRIBUTED UNTIL THE BOARD AGREES TO RELEASE THIS INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC.

Interpretive RFP (Translation Services) – Dave Corn spearheaded this effort to the Board and anticipates this will save money & provide better services to centers. At this point, Rob Smith determined that he should recuse himself from the translation service discussion and dropped offline. Ms. Sykora clarified that she did not have a conflict and continued to participate in the discussion.

The evaluation committee recommending awarding the contract to Cyracom d/b/a Voiance at a total estimated cost of \$1,155,000 over three years in a volume-based contract which is billed to the Board. Should any PSAP not wish to participate, the recommendation is that the Board would provide this at the 75-cent rate (which is cheaper than what is available from other vendors) and the PSAP would be responsible for any additional cost. There were additional questions and discussion by the Board as to references, past performance, estimates of cost savings, languages covered and any other potential issues

The NG911 RFP was then introduced, at which time it was noted that Laura Sykora and Rob Smith have recused themselves and will not be present during the remainder of the closed session. Jim Lockard with Federal Engineering presented the technical aspects of this RFP. The Board discussed how the evaluation process will proceed and the evaluation committee will be selected.

Following extensive discussion by the Board, Chairman Estes asked for a motion to go back into open session. Jason Barbour made the motion to return to open session and it was seconded by Len Hagaman. The motion was passed by unanimous vote.

OPEN SESSION WAS RECONVENED AT 12:38 P.M.

8. (Continued) 911 Funding Committee Recommendation for Award of Interpretive Services

Chairman Estes thanked those rejoining the meeting for their patience and clarified that Laura Sykora and Rob Smith were now in attendance. Ms. Sykora and Mr. Smith again asked that the minutes note their recusal from the closed session discussions as previously stated. Jason Barbour on behalf of the Funding Committee made a motion to recommend to the Board that it approve the RFP for interpretative services as recommended by the Evaluation Committee. There being no questions or discussion, the motion was carried by unanimous vote. Mr. Barbour asked Dave Corn to disclose that the evaluation committee recommended awarding the contract to Cyracon d/b/a Voiance. Mr. Barbour stated that the Funding Committee will make a recommendation in the May meeting that will address a policy decision for PSAPs who chose not to use this vendor. Rob Smith again asked to have his recusal on these matters noted in the minutes.

9. NG911 Project Update and RFP Discussion

Chairman Estes called for a motion on the NG911 RFP. Jeff Shipp on behalf of the NG-911 Committee made a motion to release the RFP for the services of ESInet. No further questions or discussion was had and the motion was carried by unanimous vote. Again Ms. Sykora and Mr. Smith asked the minutes to reflect their recusal from discussion and voting. Mr. Barbour asked that the NG911 Committee come back to the Board at a later date to identify the evaluation process and selection of an evaluation committee.

10. Status of Back-up PSAP Compliance.

Mr. Taylor stated staff is continuing to work with counties and have made significant progress in getting counties to submit plans. While there's been communication with some who have not submitted, greater effort will be made to contact each non-submittal in the hope of seeing more progress. Mr. Taylor has received a spreadsheet from county commissioners and one from Tina Bone, but needs to compare these before discussing them further. Chairman Estes heard feedback from constituents viewing the website asking to modify language to make it more user-friendly. Mr. Taylor replied that David modified the language this week and will get these changes to Meghan Cook. She will need to share this with county commissioners, but we do have that document in draft form. Dave Bone commented that the Association of County Commissioners is extremely engaged in this. He is getting requests for updates on this map, so he feels this is a great means of communication. In addition, the Association is making contacts with non-submittals. Chairman Estes thanked the Association on behalf of the Board. Mr. Taylor offered to have Tina Bone send an updated map every Monday. Mr. Barbour stated that he and Len Hagaman are asking to allot time on the meeting agenda for next month and also advertise to PSAPs that we are addressing this issue. Mr. Barbour feels this will give the Board even more opportunity to hear comments

what is or is not working, what is or is not practical. Mr. Hagaman has concern after learning more about NextGen today that there are still issues to be addressed and wants an opportunity for more dialogue. Chairman Estes requested Mr. Taylor to put that on agenda and maybe invite some guests to come participate in the discussion. Mr. Barbour also suggested putting this request in the newsletter.

Chairman Estes called for any other items to come before the Board in today's meeting. Mr. Taylor reminded everyone that next month's meeting on May 20, 2016 will be a combination Board meeting & work session. He noted that Greg Hauser will be hosting the Board meeting at the Charlotte Fire Department headquarters located at 500 Dalton Avenue, Charlotte, NC. David Dodd will be contacting members about hotel reservations next Monday. The meeting will be starting at 9 a.m. and the Board will attempt to be done in time to avoid Charlotte traffic. Mr. Taylor reminded Board members that lots of committee meetings are coming up and he hopes to have reports available soon. He urged Board members to get them on their schedules.

There being no further business, Chairman Estes asked for a motion to adjourn. Jason Barbour made the motion. It was seconded by Len Hagaman and was passed by unanimous vote. The 911 Board meeting was adjourned at 12:48 p.m.