

North Carolina 911 Board Meeting and Semi-Annual Work Session

MINUTES

Charlotte Fire Department Headquarters

500 Dalton Avenue, Charlotte, NC

May 20, 2016

9:00 AM – 1:00 PM

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Staff Present</u>	<u>Guests</u>
Jason Barbour (NCNENA) Johnston Co. 911 (WebEx/Phone)	Richard Bradford (DOJ)	Ryan Augustus, Charlotte Fire Dept.
Dave Bone (NCACC) Martin County	Tina Bone (DIT)	Becky Brown, Charlotte Fire Dept.
Darryl Bottoms (NCACP) Pilot Mountain PD (WebEx/Phone)	Ronnie Cashwell (DIT)	Cliff Brown, Federal Engineers
Rick Edwards (CMRS) Sprint	Dave Corn (DIT)	Brian Burns, Carolina Recording Sys.
Chris Estes (911 Board Chair)	David Dodd (DIT)	Vicki Calliatt, Concord Comm.
Andrew Grant (NCLM) Town of Cornelius	Karen Mason (DIT)	Shelley Davis, Hickory Fire Dept.
Len Hagaman (Sheriff) Watauga County	Marsha Tapler (DIT)	Uday Deora, Charlotte Fire Dept.
Greg Hauser (NCSFA) Charlotte Fire Department	Richard Taylor (DIT)	Brian A. Drum, Catawba Co. 911
Rick Isherwood (CMRS) Verizon	Cathy Jones (Stenographer)	Spencer Dobbins, Charlotte Fire Dept.
Dinah Jeffries (NCAPCO) Orange Co. Emergency Services (WebEx/Phone)		Derrick Duggins, Carolina Recording
Jeff Shipp (LEC) Star Telephone		James Emerson, Mecklenburg EMS
Rob Smith (LEC) AT&T		Greg Foster, Alexander Co. 911
Jimmy Stewart (NCAREMS) Hoke Co. 911	<u>Staff Absent</u>	Brittany Hobday, Charlotte Fire Dept.
Slayton Stewart (CMRS) Carolina West Wireless (WebEx/Phone)		Johnny Horn, Charlotte Fire Dept.
Laura Sykora (LEC) CenturyLink		Judy Jenkins, Cornelius Police Dept.
Buck Yarborough (VoIP) TWC		Paige Johnson, Jones Lenoir County

		Brandy Lankford, Charlotte Fire Dept.
		Bethany Ledwell, Concord Comm.
<u>Members Absent</u>		Mike Martin, Tritech Software
Eric Cramer (LEC) Wilkes Communication		Tony Patillo, Mecklenburg EMS
		Tonya Pearce, Durham 911
		David Poston, Cape Fear Police Dept.
		Rob Robinson, CenturyLink
		Nicole Sain, Hickory PD
		Jason Saine, NC House of Representatives
		Corinne Walker, Mecklenburg EMS
		Craig Walker, McDowell Co. 911
		Tammy Watson, Pineville Police Dept.
		Vic Williams, Beaufort Co. Sheriff
		Stephanie Wiseman, Mitchell Co. 911
		WebEx Attendees
		Tammy Aldridge, Rutherford Co 911
		Fred Baggett, NCACP
		Randy Beeman, Cumberland Co EM
		Sarah Collins, NC League of Municipalities
		Meghan Cook, DIT
		Jon Greene, Geo-Comm
		Grayson Gusa, Davie Co 911
		Del Hall, Stokes Co Emergency Comm
		Jim Lockard, Federal Engineering
		Kevin Medlin, Orange Co 911
		Melanie Neal, Guilford-Metro 911
		Roman Scruggs, Rutherford Co 911
		Becky Ward, FatPot
		Bruce Williams, Wireless Communications
		Doug Workman, Cary 911
		Brett Wrenn, Person Co 911
		Donna Wright, Richmond Co Emergency Svcs

1. Chairman's Opening Remarks

North Carolina 911 Board Chairman Chris Estes called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m., asking Executive Director Richard Taylor to conduct the roll call of Board members. Richard Taylor verified that Jason Barbour, Darryl Bottoms, Dinah Jeffries and Slayton Stewart were present by WebEx/phone. Andrew Grant was not present, but should be arriving soon.

Chairman Chris Estes invited Chief Jon Hannan to give welcoming remarks. Mr. Hannan encouraged the attendees to approach him with any questions or needs they may have and thanked them for visiting the Charlotte Fire Department Headquarters.

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 5 for reconsideration of extension requests and will not be participating in the discussion or vote. Darryl Bottoms stated he has a conflict with Tab 7(c) and will refrain from discussion or voting on this issue. Rob Smith has a conflict with all items of Tab 5(a), 5(c) and 7(c) and will not participate in discussion or voting on this issue. It was noted that Andrew Grant was now present. No other conflicts were declared.

3. Consent Agenda

Minutes of 4/22/16 Board Meeting – Minutes were distributed earlier and no corrections were received by Richard Taylor.

Grant Project Updates - Mr. Taylor reported process continues of closing out several grants for Burke, Brunswick and Lenoir Counties.

Grant Fund Balance – Mr. Taylor noted that \$29,148,128.63 was encumbered leaving a balance of \$1,380,516 in the fund.

NG911 Fund Balance – Mr. Taylor stated that there have not been any disbursements yet. With \$723,910 put into the fund, the balance is now \$2,760,165.45.

CMRS Fund Balance – Revenue received this past month was \$652,000 with disbursements of \$207,795, leaving a balance of \$2,663,337.

PSAP Fund Balance – Each month the disbursements of \$4,146,495 are made. There was prepaid CMRS revenue of \$902,094, which leaves a balance of \$14,920,649 in the fund.

Richard Taylor concluded his report and Chairman Estes asked for a motion to approve the consent agenda. Len Hagaman made the motion and it was seconded by Rick Edwards and passed by unanimous vote.

4. Public Comment

Chairman Chris Estes opened up the floor for comments from state and local government officials and other interested parties. There were no registered participants and no speakers came forward, so the Board proceeded with the agenda.

5. Executive Director Report

Richard Taylor reported that Haywood County had an expected completion date of December 2015, but encountered a delay due to installation of radio equipment. They have requested a grant extension until 8/31/16 with no additional funds. Jeff Shipp made the motion for the Board to accept this request. Andrew Grant seconded the motion. Laura Sykora and Rob Smith reiterated that they were abstaining from any vote or discussion. There being no further questions or discussion, the motion was carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Taylor presented the Hertford County grant extension request and stated he had visited the site and noted there had been weather delays. Hertford County had projected a completion date of 6/30/16. They are asking for a 60-day extension, with no additional funds, to complete the building project. Len Hagaman made a motion for the Board to accept this grant extension request. The motion was seconded by Jeff Shipp. Chairman Estes called for any additional questions or discussion or declaration of conflicts. Hearing none, the motion was passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Taylor stated Caldwell County's original completion date of 12/31/15 is delayed due to the radio system. They are asking for an extension date of 8/31/16 with no additional funding. Buck Yarborough made the motion for the Board to approve the extension and Rick Isherwood seconded the motion. Chairman Estes noted that Rob Smith was abstaining from voting or discussion on this item. There being no further conflicts, discussion or questions, the motion passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Taylor updated the Board on the statewide school safety project. He noted that part of the budget bill from last year stated that the Department of Public Instruction in cooperation with the Department of Public Safety and the 911 Board were to work together to create a school "panic button." Actual wording of Session Law 2015-241 states: "The system shall fully integrate and leverage existing data and emergency response via 911 dispatch." Department of Public Safety went to four regional PSAP manager meetings to get input from PSAP managers. Dr. Matthews from DPI reports they have 98% of schools that have installed the panic alarms as opposed to the "panic button." This was a mandated panic alarm button that goes directly to local law enforcement. John Dorman said that the two applications (SERA and SRMP) are up and running. There are some issues dealing with NCID, which is the password used by state

of NC to access various sites. This has been a challenge due to its complexity. There are upcoming events scheduled for June and progress is being made incorporating this into state government complexes as well as schools.

Laura Sykora asked if there will be community input. Mr. Taylor said there's no date yet, but it is anticipated there will be upcoming events in June and a separate committee is created to deal with that. Chairman Estes questioned who were the chair and committee members. Mr. Taylor responded that Laura Sykora, Jeff Shipp, Len Hagaman and Tonya Pearce are some of the committee members, but no chair has been established yet. Chairman Estes questioned the source of the panic button issue. Mr. Taylor said that 911 was not singled out or specified, but just local law enforcement due to the way the statute is written. Mr. Bradford said the original statute had specified being directed to the sheriff. Mr. Barbour asked for an update on the development of the panic button. Chairman Estes said it was provided in written material. Dinah Jeffries noted there was a lot of collaboration in Orange County, so they have an interest in following this. Jeff Shipp stated he was disappointed in the speed of this process and assumes staff is still waiting to support this initiative. He asked if there is anything the Board can do to encourage more involvement. Greg Hauser reiterated interaction with PSAPs is vital. Mr. Taylor noted that all PSAPs are invited to come to PSAP manager's meetings and Staff through the PSAP listserv, the weekly Newsletter, and personal contact encourage participation.

Chairman Estes said there was an application that first responders use to have a building map, emergency contacts and procedures. The 911 part of this was the capability for a teacher to hit a button on a mobile app or process, and be directed to the 911 center in that area. The latter is more within the charter of this Board than DPS since DPS was told to work with the Board, but we're not responsible for it. Mr. Barbour asked if an RFP was released for this app already or are we still waiting on it. Chairman Estes replied that the DPS update says an RFP will be issued in June. Mr. Taylor explained that the button not only sends the call, but it is a complex program that gives out floor plans to the school and a wealth of information that the button activates, which contacts the 911 center as well as the first responders. Chairman Estes suggested inviting John Dorman to the June meeting so he can provide an update. Mr. Yarborough asked if this is set up for new school construction. Chairman Estes explained that the panic alarm and panic button are two different projects and are sometimes confused. Mr. Bradford said the schools should be aware of this by now as they plan new school construction.

6. Standards Committee Report

Laura Sykora asked Mr. Bradford to present the rules review report. Mr. Bradford replied that a short meeting yesterday resulted in approval of the final rules. Ms. Sykora missed the last Standards Committee meeting and asked Mr. Taylor or others from the Standards Committee to present a report. Mr. Taylor

responded that last month's meeting was cancelled. Mr. Bradford had given a report of the last Standards Committee meeting that was held and it is reflected in last month's minutes

7. 911 Funding Committee Report

Funding Reconsideration Request -- Mr. Barbour asked if Dave Bone could present this report. Mr. Bone reported that the Person County funding reconsideration request is brought before the Board. There was some discussion and questions answered regarding the term of the agreement and recommended approval of the Person County reconsideration request. Mr. Taylor stated that \$929,630.14 is the reconsideration request. Since this motion comes out of the Funding Committee, Chairman Estes asked for further discussion regarding this. Hearing none, the motion was carried by unanimous vote.

Approval of FY2017 Budget -- Mr. Bone said the recommended budget was reviewed at the last meeting and he asked if Marsha Tapler would present details to the Board. Ms. Tapler noted the budget had not changed and no requests or changes had been received from Board members regarding the budget, so she asked if the Board members would like a detailed review or just a recap. Chairman Estes referenced a 30-day period for Board members to provide input to the staff and since none occurred no recap was necessary. Since the motion is recommended by staff and reviewed by the Funding Committee, Chairman Estes asked for further discussion or questions. Hearing none, the motion was approved by unanimous vote.

Approval of Secondary PSAP Funding -- Mr. Taylor said there are three secondary PSAPS in Surry County (Mount Airy, Elkin and Pilot Mountain) with a total 911 call volume of 39,401 with a cost per call of \$15.36. Mt. Airy received 2,842 calls at a cost of \$43,653.12, Elkin received 1,072 calls which cost \$16,465.92 and Pilot Mountain received 8 calls at a cost of \$122.88. Surry County requested funding at the end of the last fiscal year, but it has taken quite a while to get the details provided today to verify the calls through ECATS. We now have a process to identify the calls and the recommendation is to make the secondary funding effective July 1 of 2015 to enable them to get their funding. Chairman Estes asked for further discussion or questions. Hearing none, the motion was passed by unanimous vote with the notation that Darryl Bottoms and Rob Smith refrained from voting on this issue.

Approval of Funding Cap for Translation Services -- Dave Bone said the RFP for translation services was approved at the last board meeting. The Funding Committee has a recommendation to institute a funding cap so that if a PSAP does not accept this RFP and chooses to go with its own services, it will be funded at the level set out by the RFP. Dave Corn had no further additions to this. Mr. Taylor stated if the PSAP has something already in place, if the price is higher than 75 cents, we will allow them to continue until their contract ends up to

one year. Chairman Estes asked if this is a motion to be approved by board. Mr. Bradford says this is a motion out of the committee as stated on screen and does not need a second. Rob Smith asked Mr. Bradford to clarify if this motion affects existing contracts. Mr. Bradford replied that it does, so Rob Smith recused himself from voting on this due to arrangements with PSAPs.

Dinah Jeffries recalled prior discussion in last month's meeting about specific languages that are not supported by the selected vendor. The selected vendor offers 208 languages. Ms. Jeffries said she still needs to know about specific language translation. Dave Corn has a list of the 208 to 250 languages and will send that list to her. Mr. Bone recalled Mr. Corn said if there was a need for other languages, the vendor would be open to discussion. Following this clarification and discussion, the vote to approve the motion was unanimous. Jeff Shipp said last month there were some PSAPs not utilizing any translation services and wanted the Board to support all PSAPs having access to translation services. Chairman Estes says this is a question to be directed to the staff. Mr. Corn placed the information in the newsletter with 10 sign-ups so far and Ms. Tapler had received 3 or 4. The bills go directly to Ms. Tapler, so it is free for the PSAPs. Mr. Shipp asked how many PSAPs are not utilizing any type of translation. Ms. Tapler offered to check on that during the work session. Mr. Corn suggested waiting a few months and so it can be reported who is not signed up and we can focus efforts on those folks. Mr. Shipp said that's acceptable to get the report at a later date.

Approval to Increase Funding Cap for Eligible Computer Hardware -- Mr. Bone asked for approval to increase the funding cap for eligible computer hardware. The present cap of \$1000 is requested by staff to be changed to \$1700 and the Funding Committee is making that motion to the Board. Mr. Yarborough asked about the issue of doing away with percentages. Ms. Tapler explained the requirement to determine percentage of eligibility was difficult for both staff and the PSAP due to the applications running on the workstation, so that is why the recommendation was to do away with percentages. Mr. Yarborough further questioned if there was any mechanism to go beyond \$1700. Ms. Tapler replied there was not. There being no further discussion or questions, the motion carried with unanimous vote. No further updates from the Funding Committee were presented.

Chairman Estes suggested diverting from the agenda at this point to recognize Brittany Hobday, Spencer Dobbins, Ryan Augustus, the Ladder 27 crew and Engine 34 crew of the Charlotte Fire Department. The 911 call was from a lady who was trapped inside a bedroom during a house fire. The caller and the dispatcher were present as the Board listened to a portion of the 911 call. The caller, telecommunicators and members of the Ladder 27 crew and Engine 34 crew were asked to come forward for recognition. Ladder 27 Crew Captain D. Arrington, Engineer G. Alexander, Firefighter R. Wedrychowicz, Firefighter R. Miller, Engine 34 Crew Captain J. Mcraven, Engineer J. Friend,

Firefighter A. Fuller and Firefighter W. Justice of the Charlotte Fire Department were presented with a plaque for outstanding teamwork, professionalism and commitment to public safety. Captain Arrington thanked the crew for their work to achieve a good outcome from this call. Chairman Estes suggested getting copies of the plaque so it could be available for different offices. Chief Hannan expressed his pride in all levels of involvement in this call and thanked the Board for recognizing his crew. Chairman Estes told the Board that another presentation will be made after the next board agenda item.

8. Approval of FY2017 PSAP Funding.

Mr. Taylor said the preliminary funding was approved in December, but there are other pieces of this that Ms. Tapler can give an explanation for any variations. It's based on a 5-year rolling average, but it takes the fund balance into account. If it increases over the 20% carry forward, they then are reduced. So funding on 5-year rolling average is then reduced by that amount in the column beside the blue header. Three PSAPs are highlighted in blue that still have revised reports to submit. Two were submitted and the amounts shown on the screen are correct. The outstanding PSAP (Charlotte MEDIC) was received too late to put in the spreadsheet and represents a slight discrepancy of approximately \$1000. The legislative deadline of 6/1 needs to be met, so Ms. Tapler asked Mr. Bradford if the Board is allowed to proceed with those items being not finalized. Bradford says the issue is if these issues are a material change. He believes there's no reason to delay. Ms. Sykora asked if Charlotte MEDIC was the only one not finalized. Ms. Tapler explained that the email to say "this is your approved budget" was not sent to the three because Charlotte MEDIC was not complete, but numbers for Columbus and Pamlico have been reviewed.

Mr. Taylor reported that Holly Springs got a funding reconsideration two years ago for upgrades and over-estimated the amount of money needed. ~~and~~ Now they have a very large fund balance (4 times their operating cost) and it obviously exceeds 20%. The Board agreed not to give them any funds until the balance is worked down. Ms. Tapler will be working with them each month to avoid any funding crisis.

Andrew Grant asked if this has been worked out with Holly Springs. He asked what happened between now and December with the funding estimates. Ms. Tapler explained that reports were due from the PSAP by 9/8 and there was no way to get through 127 reports by 12/31 since reconciling the report involves communication between Board staff and the PSAP. Further explaining, the estimated funding submitted to the Board for approval in December does reflect those PSAPs that are reconciled and unreconciled and for those PSAPs unreconciled, the amounts are derived from the numbers are put in as the initial submitted report. If no ineligible cost is found, these numbers would remain the same on the final funding distribution report approved 6/1. During the time frame

when the Board approves estimated funding in December and the final legislative deadline and now, staff reconciles all unreconciled reports. The Board hired Karen Mason to assist and she is still in training. Mr. Grant asked for an estimate of what percent is unreconciled. Ms. Tapler estimated that 30% were left, but there have been more in prior years. Ms. Sykora said the Funding Committee is working on an easier way for this process going forward. Ms. Sykora made a motion to approve funding as outlined in the schedule with Charlotte MEDIC to be trued up as their reported funding. Mr. Barbour seconded the motion. There were no discussion or questions, and the motion was passed by unanimous vote. Mr. Barbour thanked Ms. Tapler for the hours and efforts reflected in this report.

9. Status of Back-up PSAP Compliance

Chairman Estes suggested that Item 9 be moved to the working session since there is no vote required.

10. Telecommunicator and Responder Recognition.

Chairman Estes asked Mr. Taylor to give the background of the 911 call being recognized by Representative Jason Saine. The Board heard a portion of a call between Andrenetta Galloway (911 Telecommunicator) and the caller who was hiding in a closet during a home invasion. The caller and her mother were present for the recognition of those involved with the call. Mr. Taylor complimented the Telecommunicator on her calmness. Representative Jason Saine congratulated all parties on a job well done and presented an award to Dre Galloway of Charlotte-Mecklenburg 911 for outstanding teamwork, professionalism and commitment to public safety on 4/8/16. Ms. Galloway thanked the caller for her contribution to making this a successful outcome. She has been doing this for 15 years and was glad to be a part of this call. The caller thanked Ms. Galloway for being there during her crisis. Captain Poston stated that he has used this call on many occasions for training purposes. The way this call was handled demonstrates why he is appreciative of the people he works with each day. The caller's mom thanked Ms. Galloway for helping her daughter during this crisis.

Mr. Taylor conducted the presentation for MEDIC which involved James Emerson (911 Telecommunicator) who used Fast-Track CPR instructions to help the caller resuscitate the victim during the 6-minute call on 3/21/16. Representative Saine presented the award to James Emerson of Mecklenburg EMS Agency/Mecklenburg County Fire for outstanding teamwork, professionalism and commitment to public safety during the 3/21/16 call. Mr. Emerson said that after 31 years in EMS as a paramedic and 13 years as a telecommunicator, he noted this is a first for being recognized. It was noted that the survival rate is 52% for patients who were clinically dead but get to leave the hospital when CPR instructions are given. Mr. Taylor thanked all of those who

participated. Chairman Estes thanked Greg Hauser for coordinating these recognition awards and also having the actual callers present.

Chairman Estes asked for any other items to come before the Board in the formal meeting. Hearing none, a motion was made to adjourn the meeting for a 10-minute break and come back for the Board's work session. The meeting was recessed at 10:27 a.m.

11. Begin Work Session

Chairman Estes called the work session to order at 10:40 a.m. He noted that during the work session, there will be discussion on various items, but no voting will take place. Mr. Taylor confirmed that the minutes will continue to cover this session as part of the open meeting and attendees are welcome to participate. Mr. Taylor verified that Jason Barbour, Darryl Bottoms and Slayton Stewart were present by phone. Dinah Jeffries is expected to join by phone soon.

Status of Back-up PSAP Compliance -- Tina Bone reported that 49 back-up plans are approved, 11 back-up plans are approved pending a small contingent and 35 plans are submitted, but need work. Chairman Estes asked how many PSAPs have not submitted. Tina Bone said approximately 20 have not submitted. Ms. Bone noted that Alamance, Wilkes, Alexander, Lincoln, Rutherford, Green, Lumberton, Robeson, Brunswick, Beaufort, Halifax, Northampton and Warren are still working on their plans. The Board had no questions on Ms. Bone's update. It was noted as a sidebar, there was some discussion among board members about extending this date and the short answer was no. The legislative members had no interest in changing the timelines set by law.

Back-up PSAP Discussion – Chairman Estes asked Mr. Taylor to address items from previous board meetings. Mr. Taylor said that under back-up PSAP discussion, the funding/cost issues have been difficult to separate the actual cost for doing the back-up versus estimated cost. He said that Tina Bone has worked closely with Ms. Tapler and Ms. Mason, but has been overwhelmed in trying to get the PSAP plans finalized. Ms. Bone said these are rough estimates due to lack of any financial information from some PSAPs. Of the roughly \$6 million that will be spent, \$626,941.03 was going to be spent anyway and this figure will rise as the \$6 million figure will go down because some of this will be taken out of the fund balance. Chairman Estes asked about providing a good estimate. Ms. Bone estimated 4.5 to 5 million. Ms. Tapler cautioned the Board to not hold staff to this estimate at this time, because staff has not had the opportunity to substantiate this amount due to the increased number of plans received in the past few days.

Mr. Taylor knows extension requests will come in soon and noted the first request came in yesterday. The question is how does Board want to handle extensions? Directions have been given that the plan needs to be submitted with a time line. Does the Board want staff to give an okay or bring it back to the

Board? Staff needs to know what the Board wants. Chairman Estes asked what does the law require. Mr. Bradford explained the law requires the Board to grant or deny extensions based on substantial progress. Mr. Bradford suggested rephrasing the question to state "seeking Board's guidance on whether the Board wishes to delegate the determination of granting an extension to the Executive Committee or retain it at the Board level." Dave Bone asked if this is an extension of approval of a plan or submittal of a draft plan. Mr. Bradford answered approval saying if you don't comply, then the Board takes no action to reduce, terminate or suspend funding to the PSAP. Mr. Bone asked for further clarification. Mr. Taylor stated the Board has defined substantial progress as having submitted a plan even if it is not yet approved. Buck Yarborough said there is a simple checklist for what must be included, and there's not a big barrier to submitting this. Mr. Taylor said minor revisions still need to be made to the document. Mr. Yarborough asked if a one-year extension can be granted and suggested delegating the staff a maximum amount of time before it comes back to the Board. Jason Barbour recommended that either the Funding Committee or a new committee be established to grant extensions so that the Board is kept abreast of what is or is not being done. Dinah Jeffries agreed with Jason Barbour and further suggested the committee be a mixture of members from the Funding Committee and the Standards Committee with PSAP representatives to sit in and represent the region. Chairman Estes asked for further comments.

Mr. Bradford clarified the point following a couple of questions. The one-year extension is not to get a plan approved; it is to get a plan implemented. Mr. Yarborough's understanding is that the plan has to be submitted and implemented. Mr. Bradford stated a back-up PSAP plan has to be implemented by 7/1/17 deadline -- submitted, approved and implemented. Rob Smith asked if the 7/1/16 date was really the deadline, but a one-year extension has been granted due to substantial progress to 7/1/17. Bradford said that in effect, the answer is yes. He reiterated that granting an extension is waiving Board action to reduce, terminate or suspend funding if not implemented by 7/1/16. Rob Smith asked that if all people that submitted plans and met substantial progress guidelines by 7/1/16, but did not implement, have to request an extension? Mr. Bradford replied that yes, they met intent of the statute for the time being. Chairman Estes questioned what happens in 7/1/17, He asked if the Board has to reduce funding. Mr. Bradford replied that the Board has to take some action. By July 1, 2016, a PSAP must have a plan and means for 911 call-taking in the event 911 calls cannot be received and processed in the primary PSAP.

Mr. Bradford read from Monthly Distribution, Subparagraph A, last sentence, "The Board may reduce, suspend or terminate distributions" under this subsection if a PSAP does not comply with the requirements of this statute. When questioned again, Mr. Bradford restated that the Board has to take some action. Buck Yarborough asked if the reduction can be any amount. Mr. Bradford replied yes, but some action is required. Chairman Estes asked if we want staff to make decisions on extensions or do we prefer to have the Board make that decision through committee and/or voting process. Jeff Shipp supports Board approval for the three actions, but has faith in the executive

director to make extensions. He believed having a committee making the decision would create more bureaucracy. Ms. Sykora said the Board has given the staff a definition of substantial progress so they have the tools they need. Chairman Estes stated that as of 7/1/16, everyone who is not implemented has to be extended. Based on the chart, 80% of the PSAPs have to request extensions from 7/1/16 to 7/1/17. The law says they have to be live with implemented back-up capability by 7/1/16. If not, the Board has authority to give them an extension to 7/1/17. Ms. Sykora asked if this still applies when PSAPs meet the definition of substantial progress. Mr. Bradford said the initial decision to allow an extension is based on substantial progress which the Board has defined. Dave Bone asked if the Board can delegate authority to staff. Mr. Bradford replied yes, but questions whether it is the Board's desire in this case.

Buck Yarborough asked Mr. Taylor if he feels the staff is comfortable with taking this on. He was trying to limit extension time to give staff the "teeth" by saying they will have to go to the full board. He asked if the staff feels comfortable granting extensions. Mr. Taylor says the short answer is yes, but he likes the idea of a limitation. He has been working with PSAPs closely and is familiar with what is going on. Tina and Dave Dodd have done outstanding roadwork, but the idea of a time limit is a good one. Buck Yarborough can tell that road trips are being made to help these people comply. Tina Bone says Yadkin County is aware of the deadline, but has not submitted anything. She is somewhat satisfied with decent responses, but there are some "passing of the buck" responses.

Dave Bone expressed concern that one of the big delays with plan submittal and approval is waiting on vendors to give quotes. He feels the time limit is not realistic. He states if the vendors take months to give quotes, he questions how long it will take to do the work. Rick Edwards asked how many years this process has been going on. Dave Bone says in some rural areas, there are limited vendors. Mr. Taylor says the staff can lend assistance with vendor suggestions if they are aware of the need. Chairman Estes is not sure if staff can get that extension past 6 weeks to have a plan submitted and implemented. He says the time line is tight. Ms. Sykora spoke on behalf of one vendor saying the difficulty is getting quotes back from suppliers. She noted the problem is not with the salesperson. Dave Bone says the time limit of 30/60/90 days is not realistic. Ms. Sykora agreed the time limit was not realistic. Andrew Grant asked Ms. Sykora that beyond getting a quote, in general how long would it take to implement after the PSAP receives the quote? What is the time range that can be expected?

Laura Sykora asked for Rob Robinson with CenturyLink to address this question. Mr. Robinson informed the Board that there are a lot of problems from the sheer number of quotes from PSAPs, trying to come up with a location and solution to provide to customer. Mr. Robinson has seen a large influx of requests at the last minute and the two main providers used for quotes now have a backlog. Chairman Estes re-asked Mr. Grant's request – the answer is 7 to 14 days to get a quote, but the time now is 2 months. Mr. Grant asked what is the implementation time. Mr. Robinson said if all quotes are signed today, 12

months is not enough time to implement. Rick Isherwood asked if quotes are actually needed. He suggested submitting a conceptual plan and adding in quotes later. Richard Taylor has requested good faith quotes and knows this is not a final price until the contract is signed. Chairman Estes asked the vendor partners if there is a way to accelerate time lines by giving rough estimates, or if it is more complicated. Mr. Robinson responded it is more complicated. Some cases they are working together with other PSAPs and just need additional work stations versus needing a full system. Mr. Isherwood asked if any information is required by CenturyLink as part of the plan submittal. Could it just be a conceptual design and take quotes? Chairman Estes asked if a range of high and low could be submitted? Dave Bone asked if they could submit a plan, but not get it approved until they get quotes. Ms. Tapler says this is true because in the past they had approved plans with just estimated costs and it created tension because by approving the PSAPs assumed it meant all cost were allowable which was not the case. Dave Bone says they can submit, but it is not approved until the quote is approved. He asked if July 2017 is enough time to implement all these changes. Mr. Bone suggested we may need to ask the legislature to change the date.

Mr. Taylor gave a quick history and stated that Ms. Tapler is correct to a point. We started approving back-up plans and looking for quotes in 2006 before the law came into play at all, just when we were doing back-up plans. With this in place, we understand the problems everyone is having. We do funding reconsiderations without the hard numbers. The Board has taken a step back on being rigid with the financial piece. The staff knows what they are asking for and can do a comparison to see if they are in the ballpark. Dave Bone reported that in Martin County a plan was submitted and they're waiting on a price and that plan is not approved until we have that price. Ms. Tapler stated that what she received a couple days ago are estimated costs. She finally got quotes, but she thought the instruction was that quotes came with it. She thought Dave Bone was asking for hard numbers so we know how to budget for reconsideration. Chairman Estes noted this discussion is consistent with comments in prior meetings about slightly different answers from staff. He suggested having the approval process by staff put in writing and making sure what is needed to get a back-up plan approved. Needing a quote or estimate seems to be a discrepancy. Ms. Tapler says staff was not giving different answers but merely changing the current procedure of requesting quotes to requesting estimated cost. The closer we get to the end date we are just trying to help get them approved. Several PSAPs say they can't get the quote, so staff asks them to take a surrounding county with similar structure and use that quote. Chairman Estes asked about Martin County and Ms. Tapler noted she just received the Martin County plan. Tina just got it a few weeks ago. Dave Bone says it was submitted several months ago. Tina Bone needed that quote because of how much of a "pipe" is needed. Right now it is only a 50-megabyte pipe. Chairman Estes asked to hold this topic and asked for Jason Barbour to weigh in. Mr. Barbour did not respond.

Rob Smith recalled that letters were sent to PSAPs to inform them of the deadline. Did we specify quotes were needed? Mr. Taylor will have to review it, but thinks it said basically to submit the plan and call if help was needed. Rob Smith doesn't want to be inconsistent with what the letter said. Jimmy Stewart says it was a checklist, not a letter. Mr. Stewart said it did not address the topic of quotes and estimates from what he remembers. Ms. Sykora says the Board website just says projected start-up costs and does not specify that a quote is needed. Chairman Estes clarified the resolution to this issue is that staff can use an estimate and not a quote. Mr. Bone stated he feels the door for changing this is still open for the next legislative session. Chairman Estes replied this is possible, but not likely due to session start dates and when votes are held. Mr. Bone stated that based on Ms. Sykora's statement, the reality of implementation is a challenge to vendors and partners.

Chairman Estes asked Mr. Taylor to wrap this discussion up with a final summary. Mr. Taylor said a back-up PSAP plan is submitted to the 911 Board. "The plan shall include start-up costs, projected recurring expenses, and any local agreements which may exist." Chairman Estes said the original question is how to handle approval of extensions. He clarified that the Board, committee or staff are asked to approve and anyone not live by 7/1/16 with their back-up capability need to come to an entity to ask for a 12-month extension to implement back-up capability -- whether it is Board, committee or staff. Mr. Barbour questioned if the staff wants sole responsibility for this. Mr. Bone offered another option to authorize staff to approve extensions, but if they recommend denial of extension, that would come before the Board. Chairman Estes is trying to consider the timing before he answers this. Mr. Barbour noted that this is a hot button issue. Chairman Estes agreed that staff needs to have a collaborative, not confrontational, relationship with PSAPs. His concern is that this is just putting staff in a difficult position. Rick Edwards agreed with Mr. Bone's suggestion to allow staff to extend up to a certain period and then after that, get the Board to take further approval. Mr. Yarborough said if we give staff the authority to extend for a period of time, that's what will happen. Mr. Edwards feels this will expedite the process by not having to go through a committee. Mr. Taylor said he appreciates the stated concerns about staff becoming confrontational, but they can help if the plan is somewhat in place. The staff wants to help PSAPs by telling them their plan lacks this, that or whatever. If it goes straight to the Board, it becomes an onerous process if they have to wait for the next board meeting.

Chairman Estes asked if the funding request is coming to the Funding Committee as a grant request. Mr. Taylor stated that he's received one email asking if they should do a grant or funding request or both. Chairman Estes asked Mr. Barbour for an opinion on the request for funding versing grant debate when it comes to a PSAP needing money to complete back-up capability. Mr. Barbour said there's about a \$14 million pot left which will be voted on next month to transfer to the grant fund. He suggested taking care of any grants needed to accomplish the deadline before they transfer. Chairman Estes asked

if in the grant award process, the back-up needs take precedence over other requests. Mr. Barbour feels that is up to the Board.

Mr. Yarborough said the vendors need to complete by the deadline. He feels this is not really the Board's consideration. We are considering a plan and implementation, and PSAPs have no control over the vendors. Chairman Estes says if it does not happen by 7/1/17, then the Board may reduce or deny funding to live up to the letter of the law. Mr. Bradford said the Board has to take action, but said the severity of action is up to the Board. Mr. Bradford strongly urges the Board to consider all the facts. Mr. Yarborough noted that legislators are out of here in July and they will not change the law, so we have to operate on two dates. He feels it is not material to the discussion of whether or not staff gives the extension. He further stated that the extraneous discussion does not matter and we should cross that bridge when we get there.

Chairman Estes summarized that we may want to give some interim authority to staff to approve this. His instincts tell him to form a special back-up committee to be chaired and staffed by some board members to address this topic. As we get closer to 7/1/17, the impact on the PSAP will get much greater. One option is to give the staff authority to get through the next 90 days, so a subcommittee or the Funding Committee can act. Chairman Estes pointed out that we are not voting, so any other ideas are welcome.

Andrew Grant asked what qualifies a PSAP for receiving an extension. He used Martin County as an example. They've submitted a plan and there's a question of quote vs. estimate. If they asked for an extension, is the answer yes? Mr. Taylor says the two requirements for substantial progress are if a plan was submitted and the timeline for implementation. Mr. Bone pointed out that now it also requires an official request for extension. Mr. Taylor's reply was yes, because nothing is automatic. Mr. Grant asked if the plan and timeline need to be of equal quality? Mr. Taylor reminded the Board of Mr. Yarborough's point that we have no control over what the vendor will do. The grant extensions have to submit a timeline. Chairman Estes asked why not use that same process. Mr. Taylor needs to ask Mr. Bradford how far this can go. If by 7/1/17 the PSAP has done everything they can, but the vendor has not been able to get them up and running, the Board has to do something. So if they are penalized \$1, the Board has done something but the PSAP is not severely punished. Mr. Yarborough agreed that a light penalty is merited and would fulfill an obligation to the law.

Laura Sykora asked what is expected in the extension letter and asked for guidance to be provided in the newsletter. Chairman Estes asked if they have submitted a plan and it takes them through 7/1/17 before they are implemented, does that by default become an extension? Mr. Bradford responded that no, they need to separately request an extension. The means aspect of the plan has been discussed for a while with the inability of vendors to supply or install, and that's a reality. Rob Smith asked if the Board should re-notify PSAPs of this requirement to provide notice of extension. He feels that based on the lengthy discussion here, the PSAPs still may not understand the issue. Mr. Edwards questioned if the education process has gone on long enough? Mr. Smith stated if 2016 is really the implementation date to comply with, the PSAPs may think it is

not due until 2017, so no formal request is needed. Mr. Smith is questioning whether it is a good idea to do this by formal notice. Mr. Taylor responded PSAPs have not given anything formal, that everything has been done verbally on extensions. Chairman Estes asked if pending communication going out could be tweaked to include Mr. Smith's comment. Mr. Edwards said it was more about implementation. Mr. Taylor agreed that the focus was not on extension, but implementation. Mr. Edwards said comments were made that, "That's years down the road." We need to tell them, "This is the extension process and here's how you do it." Mr. Grant asked that something be sent out defining substantial progress, submitting a plan, submitting a timeline, and the request for extension. Chairman Estes suggested drafting a request letter sample and attaching it to make the process easier for them. Chairman Estes asked Mr. Bradford to review it to make sure it meets guidelines for extension. Mr. Isherwood questioned where does approval come into this timeline and whether the extension can be granted before the plan is approved. Mr. Taylor says yes, it's out of the control of the PSAP and on the staff to accomplish. Our discussion of substantial progress suggests the plan is submitted, and then tweaking is done. Staff does not want to wait for an extension to do the approval process, and there's not enough time. Mr. Taylor reminded the Board that back in the January/February meeting, he asked for a definition of "substantial progress."

Mr. Hauser asked what is the next bridge to cross. He warned if we're unclear 60 days out, what happens if someone fails the evaluation. Mr. Taylor replied that this goes back to the Standards Committee and standards compliance because this is in the rules and falls under their purview. Mr. Hauser's concern is if we are still talking about this now, we have to have something in place out of the Standards Committee to present after the report is due. Thus, the Board needs to figure that out now as to what is the next step.

Rob Smith asked what happens on 7/1/16 to all PSAPs that do not submit a plan? The assumption is that they cannot request an extension. Mr. Bradford's answer is yes; they cannot request an extension. At that point, the Board must determine what to do. He again urged the Board to consider all facts relative to the request. Mr. Smith urged the Board to make it clear to PSAPs if they have not submitted a plan by 7/1/16, you cannot get an extension. Ms. Sykora agreed that this is because they are not in compliance with the law. Mr. Bradford remarked that late is late and there is no do-over. Chairman Estes said a consequence is that the funding committee may have to recommend that some PSAP requests are not funded. Mr. Bradford opined that it is appropriate to make a recommendation to the Board at that point after presenting information, factual context and so forth.

Chairman Estes asked Mr. Taylor to expound on legislative reporting. Mr. Taylor noted there is no requirement to do this, but he felt that there should be. Is it the responsibility of staff or a committee? Chairman Estes suggested putting the map on the website. Mr. Taylor stated it is already there, but asked for direction on what further to do. Ms. Sykora asked if the map as well as spreadsheet with comments to show that even though there's no action, it may mean there's been conversation, but no outcome. Mr. Taylor said we can add

color to the map to show white areas that have made some attempt. Tina Bone reported that everyone has been visited, called or emailed. Mr. Yarborough said he likes the responses with dates on them because it shows good proactive efforts on behalf of 911 Board and staff to help counties comply.

Chairman Estes suggested it might be appropriate to write a letter to legislative members (especially the IT oversight committee) that is written in July stating that, "As of 7/1, here are the efforts that have taken place. Here's what's left to do or what's not done." Then it can be sent over to them as well as point them to the website to look at maps and Excel spreadsheets. Mr. Grant suggests sending additional info to the legislature to the effect that it has been heard firsthand there may be implementation time concerns and the Board is concerned about that. Chairman Estes again summarized that until the Board meets again officially, staff has the only authority to approve an extension at this time. The next opportunity to vote on this is in the June meeting, so someone has to approve these for the next 30 days. Staff will make decisions and can bring up any issues.

On the debate of grant vs funding reconsiderations, Chairman Estes summarized that the general guideline from the Funding Committee chair is that these are probably grants, not reconsiderations. Dave Bone said he did not say either/or. It is important in making sure if a PSAP has a need for funding for back-up, they are given priority in the grant cycle but they could still apply for reconsideration as well. Mr. Taylor said the concern was also that there's a deadline for moving funds for grants, but not for funding reconsiderations. The process is to usually come back to the Board after grant applications are completed to be reviewed, and the Grant Committee asks for what the priority is from the Board. Not speaking for Rick, but probably back-up would be number one priority. Mr. Bone asked if the Board determines that priority at the time of award or if it will be discussed in the June meeting. Mr. Taylor says this will probably come up in the June meeting so that the Grant Committee knows how to score based on weights. Chairman Estes says there will probably be a motion to score back-ups at a higher level in the June meeting.

Chairman Estes summarized that regarding legislative reporting, the suggestion is that staff writes some sort of letter of here's where we are and some of our anticipated outcomes for 2017 including up to the ability of various partners to implement that timeline. Chairman Estes asked for anyone else to speak about back-up PSAP discussion. He suggested to Mr. Taylor that any communications to PSAPs need to be bundled and wrapped around the letter that's already drafted, updated with suggestions from this meeting and vetted with a couple of board members who operate or run PSAPs. We have them as an asset and should use them as reviewers. We should get this out by the end of next week, so that's a pretty tight calendar.

911 Committee Structure – Mr. Taylor recounted that when this Board was created in 1998, it was understood that we would have 2 or 3-day board meetings which were all-day board meetings. Because of the difficulty in operating that way, it was decided to assign committees to do that work and

bring in additional subject matter experts such as PSAP people to be a part of the process. That was the logic behind it and it's been successful. At the December work session a few years ago, the Board said they don't want to hear reports from every committee, but just summaries of all committee meetings on the website. That continues to be the reporting process.

There are five major committees and two of these are standing committees – Funding Committee and the Grant Committee. Traditionally we try to have at least four board members -- one as chair and one as vice chair and two additional Board members to keep a good feel for what the Board wants. Laura Sykora asked to be on the Funding Committee to understand funding and the relationship there. There are five additional members of that committee from the PSAP community and the secondary committee with two police chiefs. There is an opening on the Grant Committee which has one meeting per year, but a lot of work is required in a short time frame. The Standards Committee is the same concept where we try to have four Board members and a good representation of PSAP community. The NG-911 Committee has the same process. We have a Standards Enforcement Committee. The fifth committee is the Education Committee. Jimmy Stewart is the chair and there is a board vacancy there. The Public Safety Committee involves a-school alarms. Dave Bone clarified that Dinah Jeffries is on the Education Subcommittee, not on the Education Committee. One correction to the listing for the NG-911 Committee is that Buck Yarborough was added. Mr. Taylor will update the chart to reflect this addition. The school safety committee needs good representation as well. Chairman Estes asked if Dinah Jeffries volunteered to be on there. Mr. Taylor responded that she is. Mike Anderson needed help with setting up a new program. Dinah Jeffries says she never got a response back to see if a couple things could be revamped regarding 911. Mr. Taylor will reach out to Mr. Anderson. Ms. Jeffries said he was very vocal in that first meeting.

Chairman Estes asked what the purpose was for mentioning all these committees. Mr. Taylor said he commented at last month's meeting that we are having a hard time with Board member participation on committees. Chairman Estes noted that several names are on all committees, and those members may want to consider downsizing their commitments to be more effective. Ms. Sykora said she had withdrawn from the Education Committee. Laura Sykora and Jason Barbour's tenure on the Board will expire in December and they are on every committee. Chairman Estes says other board members are needed to help during this transition. On the Standards Committee, Len Hagaman is already named as chair.

Mr. Taylor stressed that committees are where decisions really get vetted and we can hear from PSAPs and the Board. Board participation is a vital element for the operation of the Board, so let Mr. Taylor know your interest or disinterest. He is specifically asking for volunteers for the Grant Committee and Education Committee. There will be two vacancies and there is no vice chair.

Chairman Estes asked for two board members to step up for the vacancies. Mr. Hauser volunteered for the School Safety Committee. Mr. Taylor asked Board members to email him to express your interest in serving. NG911 is moving fast, there are more RFPs to deal with and a lot of stuff is happening with back-up PSAPs, so we need more Board participation. Chairman Estes asked for more discussion and noted that the back-up piece should be a subcommittee of the Funding Committee, so start thinking about who can represent the Board in that area.

Mr. Taylor reviewed the 2016 911 Board Goals. – Mr. Taylor commented that three items which require statutory change are to allow quality assurance, certification of telecommunicators and the makeup of the Board. Mr. Taylor read from prior minutes about what the Board felt should be priority goals. Education, Back-up, NG911, New Funding Model and Staffing were some of the other goals from last year. The chairman was hesitant about citing telecommunicator certification as the number one goal. Mr. Taylor explained he is trying to keep all goals moving forward, and not one over the other. Chairman Estes recalled that in the last meeting, certification priority was discussed. Mr. Taylor asked for input on the Board's desire for prioritizing goals. Chairman Estes observed that legislators made it clear that back-up capability is to be high priority for the next 12 months. Mr. Yarborough agreed that this is clear from discussions held today.

Chairman Estes noted that NG911 is also a high priority that can solve some of the back-up challenges. Ms. Sykora stated that legislative interest has set aside 10% of our funds for NG911. Mr. Taylor reported meetings have already been started and a couple of pilot programs with PSAPs towards a CAD-to-CAD solution are being considered. Chairman Estes also noted some of the successes that the team has accomplished, including the rules making process completed by the Standards Committee, which was a huge undertaking of staff time. Mr. Shipp stated he does support goals and timelines, but has a question in regards to our ability to create efficiencies. He asked what is the next state purchasing agreement that we are looking at. His concern is it took 12 months for translation services. Dave Corn reported that the Funding Committee has approved CPE as the next RFP going forward so we do not have to go back and re-buy equipment when NG9-1-1 is implemented in North Carolina.

Chairman Estes asked for other feedback for Mr. Taylor on how to prioritize his team's goals. Mr. Taylor says on funding, there is a subcommittee meeting coming up with a new funding model for PSAPs that may be on the right track and also tie in a new reporting process. There are some legal issues that we need to look at and make sure everything fits into this. Mr. Taylor noted this was specific to the revenue side for PSAPs, not the 911 fee.

Jason Barbour anticipates that this will be one of the biggest topics for the next work session. Mr. Taylor agreed and said we are trying to tweak funding for

PSAPs and look at all the ins and outs as well as evaluate impact. Mr. Barbour clarified that the next work session will be in December.

Future Path Plan of NG911 in NC -- Mr. Taylor expressed his concern that perhaps everyone on the Board may not fully understand what NG911 is all about and what you think the outcome is going to be. A news story in the last week or two alleged that NG911 in our state would have solved the problem. While we can't control the news media, Mr. Taylor wants to make sure the Board understands it will take a lot of time to implement. Dave Corn and others have done a lot of work, but realistically it will not be until 2020 when all 127 PSAPs are turned on.

The whole genesis of NG911 is to understand how to get new technology into the 911 network. If you get a misrouted wireless 911 call and you can send that call and data back to the proper PSAP – that's what we're looking at. It is all about moving voice and data from one PSAP to the next PSAP. There are currently PSAPs in Wake County that cannot communicate with each other. The Chatham County call that got a lot of airplay nationally demonstrates the problem. When we move forward, we must understand what are our realistic expectations. Mr. Taylor invited Dave Corn to jump in with additional info. Mr. Shipp agreed these are issues that have to be addressed. Mr. Taylor says the Chatham County story brought to light the GIS piece.

This Board has a great investment in NG911. Tim Johnson and his folks have done an excellent job. As a Board, we must consider how do we get the counties to load their neighbors' centerline data? There's no current requirement to do this. This is a simple process that is a part of NG911. NG911 routes calls based on GIS. Will a statutory change be required? Possibly, but we should be thinking about how to address this. There's a lot of good documentation, so Mr. Taylor encouraged the Board to dial in and listen to the NG911 conversations. There's good information and a lot to deal with.

Jeff Shipp reassured the Board that the committee is hard at work and asked for continued support. His committee approved the release last month of an RFP. That is still in procurement after 4-plus weeks and they hope for street release by the first week of June. Secondly, the committee has worked with staff and reviewed the initial draft of the second RFP (NMAC). It looks good and the committee is reviewing that for final approval and hope to have it as an agenda item for the June meeting. Rick Isherwood asks that when concerning the timeline and specifically based on the timeline for NG911, are we approving grant applications and approving funds for standalone projects that in the NG911 world may not be required. The folks from ECU that visited months ago noted that at some point in time, funding requirements will cross. Mr. Isherwood stated that he doesn't know if parts of the grant application process this year have to be addressed or if there's potential funding that in the NG911 world aren't going to be required. Chairman Estes suggested making it criteria to be considered. Rick

Edwards agreed that we have to start considering that within the next 12 to 18 months.

Mr. Taylor agreed the Board needs to be forward-thinking, not backward-thinking. That's one of the fears that staff preaches at PSAP manager meetings to make sure what you're buying is consistent with new technology. PSAPs are urged to let staff look at it to help evaluate the purchase. Dave Corn has extensive knowledge and is a ready asset to help PSAPs make the right decisions and investments.

Chairman Estes asked for other items Board members would like to discuss. Ms. Sykora noted there are more June meetings that aren't on this schedule. Tina Bone says it appears the Standards Committee was moved as well. Mr. Taylor says the July meetings were moved. The next 911 Board meeting is on 6/24/16 at the Bush Street location in Raleigh. Ms. Sykora asked Mr. Taylor to send out a revised list and include regional meetings as well. Mr. Taylor will revise and distribute the list, and noted that the Funding Committee meeting was moved to 6/15 and the Standards Committee meeting was moved to 6/16.

Chairman Estes called for further discussion. Mr. Taylor invited Greg Hauser to describe lunch plans for the Board. Greg Hauser explained that Retired Captain P. Y. Johnson is famous for firehouse cooking and has prepared the lunch for today. Chairman Estes thanked the Charlotte team for hosting this meeting. He also thanked the staff for their hard work and tireless efforts. Mr. Taylor also recognized staff for all the hard being done to meet legislative goals. There being no further business, Chairman Estes adjourned the work session at 12:33 p.m.