

North Carolina 911 Board
MINUTES
3514A Bush St, Raleigh
July 31, 2015

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Staff Present</u>	<u>Guest</u>
Jason Barbour (NCNENA) Johnston Co 911 [911 Board Vice Chair]	Tina Bone (ITS)	Ron Adams-Southern Software
Darryl Bottoms (NCACP) Pilot Mountain PD	Richard Bradford (DOJ)	Tammy Aldridge-Rutherford Co
Eric Cramer (LEC) Wilkes Communications [phone and web]	Dave Corn (ITS)	Fred Baggett-NCACP
Rick Edwards (CMRS) Sprint	David Dodd (ITS)	Randy Beeman-Cumberland Co Emer Svcs
Len Hagaman (Sheriff) Watauga Co	Karen Mason (ITS)	Rachel Bello-Wake Co
Rick Isherwood (CMRS) Verizon	Marsha Tapler (ITS)	Brent Boykin-Mission Critical Partners
Dinah Jeffries (NCAPCO) Orange Co EMS [phone and web]	Richard Taylor (ITS)	Topher Blackburn-Carolina Recording Systems
Robert Smith (LEC) AT&T [phone and web]		Lee Canipe-Frontier
Jeff Shipp (LEC) Star Telephone		Nelson Clark-Synergem Technologies
Jimmy Stewart (NCAREMS) Hoke Co 911		Sarah Collins-NCLM
Slayton Stewart (CMRS) Carolina West Wireless		Lt. Todd Coring-Brunswick Co S.O. 911
Laura Sykora (LEC) [phone and web]		Brian A. Drum-Catawba Co 911
		Derrick Duggins-Carolina Recording Systems
		Jon Greene- Geo-Comm
		Jennifer Hatley-Brunswick Co S.O. 911
		James E. Holloway-ECU
<u>Members Absent</u>	<u>Staff Absent</u>	Kim Lewis-Brunswick Co S.O. 911
Chris Estes (NC State CIO)		Tim Mitchell-Cumberland Co Emer Svcs
Andrew Grant (NCLM) Town of Cornelius		Melanie Neal-Guilford Metro 911
		Dominick Nutter-Raleigh/Wake ECC
		Karlynn O'Shaughnessy-NCGA Fiscal Research Div
		Philip Penny-Mission Critical Partners
		Joe Sewash-CGIA
		Jason Steward-Martin Co 911

		Jonathan Talley-Brunswick Co S.O. 911
		Victor Williams-Beaufort Co S.O.
		Doug Workman-Cary 911
		<u>WebEx Guest Attendees</u>
		Ronnie Barefoot-Pasquotank-Camden 911
		Michael Cone-Wilson Co 911
		Stephanie Conner-Surry Co 911
		Mike Edge-Scotland Co 911
		Greg Ellenberg-AT&T
		Brad Fraser-Shelby PD
		Del Hall-Stokes Co 911
		Grant Hunsucker-Montgomery Co 911
		Judy Jenkins-Cornelius PD
		Stanley Kite-Craven Co 911
		Glenn Lamb-Guilford Metro 911
		Kevin Medlin-Orange Co EMS
		David Moore-Person Co 911
		Lora Nock-Dare Co 911
		Wesley Reid-City of Greensboro
		Ray Silance-Onslow Co 911
		Todd Sims-Charlotte Medic
		Candy Strezinski-Burke Co EOC
		Rick Thomas-Apex PD
		Herman Weiss-Gates Co 911

Chairman's Opening Remarks

At 10:00 AM 911 Board Executive Director Richard Taylor advised that staff was using a new web conferencing application, but despite repeated practice sessions the day before, was experiencing difficulty connecting with guest attendees over the web. Communication with Board members on a teleconference line was working fine, but the new application depends upon web based audio connectivity for online guest attendees, and although they could hear audio from the meeting, they could not respond should they have a question or comment.

At approximately 10:06 Vice Chairman Jason Barbour, noting that Chairman Chris Estes was unable to attend today, convened the meeting. He began by thanking all, whether in person or online, for their attendance, and said that he wanted to start the meeting with recognition of the Brunswick County Sheriff's Office (BCSO) 911 center's handling of recent incidents within its jurisdiction. He asked Mr.

Taylor to provide the background information, and Mr. Taylor asked if they could do the roll call first, to which Mr. Barbour readily acceded.

Board members who responded to the roll call over a teleconference connection were Eric Cramer, Dinah Jeffries, Rob Smith, and Laura Sykora. Andrew Grant did not respond, and Mr. Taylor was unable to hear responses from guest attendees over the web connection, although some of them texted other attendees in the house stating they were able to hear the proceedings. Mr. Taylor decided to press on without the voice connectivity, observing that typically guest attendees did not speak during meetings.

Noting that the 911 Board likes to recognize outstanding telecommunicators every chance it gets, Mr. Taylor reminded everyone of the two shark attacks which happened on Oak Island within less than two hours of one another several weeks ago which were so expertly handled by the staff at the BCSO 911 center. He then played audio clips from both calls, pointing out to people who might be unfamiliar with how Emergency Medical Dispatch (EMD) protocol works how effectively the telecommunicator who handled the call gave pre-arrival medical instructions. He also mentioned that what wasn't being heard in the clip was all the other calls that were simultaneously coming in and all the other activity taking place in the 911 center. He then invited Lt. Todd Coring, the 911 Director at BCSO, to bring his people to the podium and "give us a little more of the backstory".

Lt. Coring introduced Jonathan Talley, the supervisor on duty during the calls; Jennifer Hatley, the telecommunicator who handled both Oak Island shark attack calls that day; and Operations Manager Kim Lewis. Lt. Coring observed that those in the audience familiar with 911 center activity could easily imagine how much was going on during the calls, which took place within approximately an hour and twenty minutes of each other, including calls from the media in addition to the huge call volume generated by the attacks themselves. Saying he was "only" the 911 Director, he expressed great admiration for his team members and said how proud he was of them.

Mr. Taylor commended Ms. Hatley for her "textbook" EMD performance in the handling of the call, as well as the other members of the team whose contributions made it all possible. Mr. Barbour and Mr. Taylor then presented the team with an inscribed plaque thanking all the members of the team "For Outstanding Teamwork, Professionalism, and Commitment to Public Safety".

Ethics Awareness/Conflict of Interest Statement

Mr. Barbour read the ethics awareness/conflict of interest statement printed on the agenda and asked Board members to indicate if they felt they had any conflict or potential conflict of interest with any of the matters scheduled to come before the Board today. Board Member Rob Smith indicated he had a number of potential conflicts, all having to do with the grants. Board Counsel Richard Bradford advised Mr. Smith to wait until each agenda item is reached to determine whether there was a need to abstain. Board Member Laura Sykora indicated she had not had the opportunity to read all of the grant applications to see if Centurylink was involved, but indicated she, too, would recuse herself from such grant application related votes.

Consent Agenda

Mr. Barbour turned the floor over to Mr. Taylor to discuss the consent agenda. Noting the consent agenda was available in the Agenda Book on the Board website, Mr. Taylor said he had not received any corrections to the minutes of the last meeting in Scotland County, so unless someone had something to bring forth at this meeting, they will stand as is. He did mention that an error had been discovered in the Delegation of Signature document, Eric Cramer having been left off the list. He said that has been corrected, indicating Mr. Cramer voted for the Delegation of Signature; the only dissenting vote had been from Andrew Grant. Touching upon financials, Mr. Taylor said the CMRS Fund Balance is at approximately \$1.3M, with disbursements for the month at ~\$929K. He reported the PSAP Fund Balance as \$16,312,533, saying that PrePaid CMRS revenue contributed \$268,173 to that balance. He and Mr. Barbour both observed that amount continues to fluctuate, going up or down on a monthly basis. Mr. Taylor said he thinks he will be able to come up with an average for the year, but still cannot predict what it will be on a monthly basis. He said the unencumbered Grant Fund balance is \$857,352, with the encumbered balance at \$21,280,400. Saying that hit all the highlights of the consent agenda, he

concluded by reminding everyone that they and all the other Consent Agenda reports are available on the website.

Mr. Barbour asked if anyone had comments on the Consent Agenda, and hearing none asked for a motion to accept it. Sheriff Hagaman so moved, Rick Edwards seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

Public Comment

As no one had registered before the meeting to address the Board, Mr. Barbour invited anyone in attendance to approach the podium, state their name, and address the Board. No one stepped up, so he offered the invitation to anyone online. Learning that no one had indicated through the video feature of the WebEx connection that they wished to speak, Mr. Barbour moved on to the Executive Director Report.

Executive Director Report

a) Legislative Update

- 1) H380 – Mr. Taylor began his report with the Legislative Update, reporting first that the School Safety Bill (Panic Button), H380, has passed the House and is in the Senate Rules Committee. He observed that since it involves funding, it is tied up with the budget deliberations. He mentioned that WRAL had reported in the past few days that the school systems were supposed to have submitted their floor plans for this project, but that out of ~115-116 school systems, ~36 have not yet done so. He added those numbers might not be exact, but are close.
- 2) H506 – Referring to this as the bill for expanding the use of the 911 fund sponsored by Representatives Boles and McNeill, Mr. Taylor said it still hasn't moved from the House Finance Committee.
- 3) H512 – Mr. Taylor said this bill is moving, is now in conference committee, and has been significantly changed. He reminded everyone that this is the bill where Pitt County wanted to be able to delay meeting the statutory back-up PSAP plan submission requirement deadline. The bill stated that if a PSAP were making significant progress in implementing its back-up PSAP plan, the Board could authorize a delay in meeting the requirement until July 1, 2017. Mr. Taylor stressed that this is not a blanket extension authorization; if, by July 1, 2016, a PSAP has not made significant process in implementation, then this does not apply. He noted that since this bill is moving, Representative Saine has attached language from his H730 bill regarding counties operating a 911 PSAP not being able to charge cities to receive and process city 911 calls, i.e. not double billing city residents for a county service they already pay taxes toward. There are a couple of caveats, however. If there is already a contract in place, the contract still stands, and if a municipality wants to give up its Primary PSAP status to a county, the county has a year in which to plan and take over those duties. Also, although that municipality has relinquished its Primary PSAP status, it may still request funding as a secondary PSAP if that applies.
- 4) H730 – Mr. Taylor said this bill is not moving. See H512 discussion above.
- 5) H812 – Mr. Taylor said this bill, ensuring that grant award notifications will be posted on the website of the state agency which has made the award, has passed into law as Session Law 2015-114.
- 6) S571 – Mr. Taylor said this bill for expanding the use of the 911 fee is still in Senate Judiciary I and does not appear to be gaining much traction.

b) FCC Update

Mister Taylor reminded everyone of the annual FCC report he had referred to and displayed at the last 911 Board Meeting in which the FCC asks questions pertaining to states' use of 911 fees. He said the copy of the report in today's agenda book is the completed one, and ran to 19 pages upon completion. He added that although the report is filed with the FCC, it goes to Congress, which is actually the entity which asked for it, and he said he found it interesting that this year they really went into great detail about texting and NG911.

Mr. Taylor also mentioned that FCC Chairman Wheeler had delivered a report to Congress on July 28th, a copy of which has been included in the agenda book, in which he made some comments which really hit hard with PSAPs and with states. Mr. Taylor had highlighted a section of the report on screen about Positive Train Control (PTC) because this Board has recognized the folks in Halifax County's 911 PSAP for their performance during the Amtrak accident which happened there, and how PTC could have prevented it. But his attention was also drawn to another section of the report where Chairman Wheeler said, "I want to reiterate my concern with the lack of coordination among 911 call centers, an issue I raised last time I was before this panel." Mr. Taylor offered that the 911 Board's experience with trying to help PSAPs implement back-up PSAP plans is a perfect example of that lack of coordination; that very few North Carolina PSAPs are willing to work with one another to accomplish that end.

Chairman Wheeler's report continued, "But the fact remains that absent Federal guidance they remain independent and autonomous without any need to either keep up with technology or coordinate on a state-wide basis", and Mr. Taylor observed that is as true in North Carolina as it is nationally. He expressed concern that in addition to being "independent and autonomous", so many North Carolina PSAPs are reluctant to work with the state to solve problems, but will readily make major purchases based solely upon a salesman's pitch for a product. Speaking to the problem of misrouted wireless 911 calls, also referenced by Chairman Wheeler, Mr. Taylor observed that without coordination among PSAPs, how can we ever hope to reliably transfer voice and data when such situations arise?

Chairman Wheeler further stated, "In the 1999 law that established 911 as the national emergency number, Congress asked PSAPs to work together on a state-wide basis to coordinate activities. To the best of our information, not one single state has accepted that invitation." Mr. Taylor said this is particularly upsetting to him and his contemporaries from other states because they have "bent over backwards" trying to implement statewide coordination.

The last of Chairman Wheeler's comments that Mr. Taylor reacted to was "Almost 20 years have passed since the 911 Act was passed, during which time wireless has become the predominant vehicle for calling 911. We at the Commission have taken this as far as the authority granted us. Only the Congress can take the next steps to save lives. As we approach hurricane season, I hope Congress will treat this issue with the urgency that it deserves." Mr. Taylor's reaction was, "That's a very scary statement." He said that when we look at how much in-fighting goes on among PSAPs themselves and between PSAPs and statewide coordination efforts, he worries about Congress stepping in. He added, however, that from a funding perspective that may not be a bad thing. He said that he has talked many times about how the current state-based funding model is not working, and that a federal funding model may change how 6,000 PSAPs are funded in the United States.

c) NASNA Spring 2015 State Report Compilation

Mr. Taylor explained that NASNA (National Association of State 911 Administrators), to which he belongs, meets twice a year. He characterized those meetings as being probably the most informative time he and staff may spend all year, discussing how 911 is done in other states, learning about new technology, etc., in a very focused and deliberate way. Each of the states submits a report on the status of 911 in the state, and Mr. Taylor has included those reports in today's meeting agenda book on the website. He said reading them gives an idea of how we stack up in comparison with other states regarding projects such as NG911, texting, etc.

Mr. Barbour asked if there were any questions about the Executive Director Report, and hearing none, moved to the next agenda item.

Update on Regional PSAP Meetings

Saying that as everyone was aware, there has been another round of regional PSAP Director Meetings, Mr. Barbour expressed regret at having not been able to personally attend any of the four this time, and turned to Mr. Taylor and any of the other Board members who were able to attend to comment on the meetings. Mr. Taylor said that the first one was for the western region and was held in Sylva. He said they had twenty-three attendees, and gave "the gold star" to Board Member Laura Sykora for not only being at

that one, but at all four. He said the central region meeting in Salisbury garnered about forty-five attendees, including several Board members: Rick Isherwood, Rick Edwards, and Rob Smith, as well as Ms. Sykora. Mr. Taylor continued with the southeast region, held in Lumberton, where about seventeen or eighteen people attended. He said the last meeting, for the northeast region, was at a “really nice facility” in Rocky Mount, with about twenty-three attendees. He noted that there was a lot of good discussion and a lot of good information shared at all of the meetings. Board member Jeff Shipp concurred, saying that a lot of great ideas came out of those discussions, a few of which the Board can hopefully capitalize on. Mr. Taylor interjected that prior to the western region meeting he had been unaware of how handicapped PSAPs in that region are because of the selective routing situation there and said that’s one of the things he hopes the Board can work on correcting.

Before moving to the next agenda item, Mr. Taylor recognized Ronnie Cashwell, the Board’s sound reinforcement/media specialist, for doing a yeoman’s job at making sure that despite the fact each of the locations was different from all the others, the sound system was always there and ready to go, even if he had to depend upon “duct tape and baling wire” to make it happen.

Mr. Barbour observed the next PSAP managers meeting will be the yearly one, and Mr. Taylor concurred, saying that the dates were still not firmed up due to finding a location which can accommodate such a large gathering. Mr. Barbour asked when we could expect to have that locked down so people can get it on their schedules, and Mr. Taylor replied that the contact in procurement who usually helps staff with these things is going to be off work for quite some time, but he would try to get it locked down as soon as possible.

Request from APCO/NENA for State Conference Training Class

Mr. Barbour introduced Board staff member David Dodd to share a request the Board had received from the North Carolina chapters of APCO and NENA for the Board to sponsor a pre-conference training class at this year’s annual conference in Sea Trail. Mr. Dodd observed that the Board has sponsored such classes for several years, and said that the class they have asked the Board to sponsor this year is called *Bullying and Negativity in the Communications Center*. He said that it’s a relatively new class, having debuted as a breakout session at the annual APCO conference in New Orleans last year and garnering a tremendous response from people who wanted to develop it into a full one day class. Mr. Dodd added that money has been budgeted for such use, and the staff recommendation is to fund it. Mr. Taylor noted that the \$4975 cost for the class is in line with what other such classes have cost in the past.

Mr. Barbour asked for any questions, and hearing none, called for a vote, which was unanimous in favor of hosting the class.

Recommendation of Grant Awards for 2016 Cycle

Mr. Barbour introduced Board member Rick Isherwood, Grant Committee Chair, to share the committee’s determinations for the 2016 grant cycle. Mr. Isherwood began by summarizing the process the committee goes through, saying committee members are provided copies of the grant applications in advance to review in detail, then the committee meets as a group to score the applications and come up with recommendations, which it did during an all-day session on Wednesday, July 29th. He said there were twenty-three grant applications received this year, reflecting a total dollar amount of roughly \$62M, adding that unfortunately the total the Board had to allocate was roughly \$11M, so some very painful decisions obviously had to be made.

Mr. Isherwood continued by offering some observations and comments from the committee about the grant applications which had been submitted. He said roughly one third of the applications dealt with establishing back-up PSAP facilities, and as Mr. Taylor had alluded to when reviewing the FCC report, what committee members did not see was efforts by PSAPs to coordinate back-up activity with one another. He said there were a lot of new buildings wanting to get built, and transitioning to new PSAP locations while using the old PSAP as the back-up facility, which is, of course, very costly. He said what the Board would like to do is to encourage PSAPs to find more cost effective ways to implement back-up PSAP plans, whether that be utilization of existing structures or partnerships with adjacent PSAPs to accomplish that goal. He added that some of the agencies which had submitted applications for back-up

PSAP facilities have not even submitted back-up plans to the Board for approval, so it was a little bit like putting the cart in front of the horse. He observed that it would stand to reason that those applications probably did not receive a very high score.

Mr. Isherwood pointed out a few areas of concern where the committee saw consistent lack of information in the applications. One section is where the applicant is asked to provide what the impact will be to its agency's operating budget if the grant is implemented, and typically the response is either there will be no impact or if there is an impact, it will be covered by the funding allocation they receive from this Board. He observed the expectation is for more detailed information, e.g. what is the anticipated budget increase going to be? He said there is also a section in the application requesting information about compatibility between equipment and software already in place and that which the applicant intends to purchase, and again, the committee consistently sees a lack of good, detailed information. What it sees instead is statements like "We are using "X" type of hardware and software today and we intend to implement "Y" and we don't expect any problems." Mr. Isherwood said the committee is expecting more "meat" in the response, such as why, specifically, the applicant is not expecting any problems, e.g. are they aware of similar implementations that have not experienced problems after deployment, etc.

Mr. Isherwood said that lastly the evaluation sections of many applications were not well documented. That section asks how the applicant will evaluate and measure the achievement of the goals and objectives of the project. He said the committee sees a lot of detail here on how the applicants plan to manage the construction process, project management, project plans, scheduling, etc., but what's typically lacking is good information about how they plan to transition the PSAP functionality from the existing location to the new location. He concluded that it is just another area where committee members are looking for a more specific type of information. He then asked if any other committee members had any additional comments.

Mr. Taylor interjected that most people don't realize that the work of this Board is not done during two hours on a Friday morning once a month; the work is done at the committee level, whether the next gen committee, standards committee, etc. He speculated that among all the committees the Grant committee is perhaps tasked harder than the others because its members literally have homework. He observed that reading through twenty-three grant applications is not an easy task, and then to go through and score each one on all the various elements and try to be objective about it, try to be fair, is a challenge. He commended the committee members for having done an outstanding job, noting that the meeting they had to determine the awards was all day long. He said he was impressed with how everybody was engaged, and by listening to the discussion and the logic behind it one could tell they all had a passion for doing the right thing. He added that the committee members do not know how much funding is available at the start because he doesn't want that to color their decision making until after all the scoring is complete, and concluded his hat was off to all of them.

Board Member (and Grant Committee Member) Slayton Stewart commended Mr. Isherwood on doing a fantastic job of summarizing the thoughts and comments of the committee, and added that he felt perhaps the most overwhelming issue for committee members was the lack of attempts at coordination among the PSAPs, as evidenced by the number of applications that requested multi-million dollar grants to build additional facilities to meet their back-up PSAP plan obligations when there are many more cost effective and efficient ways to do that.

Board Member Darryl Bottoms echoed Mr. Stewart, saying he had already said what Chief Bottoms had wanted to say himself! He reiterated what Mr. Taylor had said about their meeting being a long day, and observed that was only the last of many long days spent reading and digesting all the grant applications.

Mr. Isherwood said that the recommendation from the committee is to fund three of the grant applications: Hyde County's amount of roughly \$1.3M at 100%, Graham County's amount of \$5.3M at 64%, and Richmond County's amount of ~\$10M at 64%. He observed those three allocations will pretty much use up all of the allocated \$11M the Board has available for grants this year. Mr. Barbour asked if the awards at less than 100% had been discussed with those applicants to see if the 64% will allow them to move forward with their projects, and Mr. Taylor said no, their acceptance of the award would be contingent upon that after the Board votes today. He said if they do not accept it, then the committee would have to come back and reconsider awards. He noted that the total amount available is "nearly to the penny" the \$11,025,000.00 awarded for these three grants, and added that the committee reviewed the applications

exhaustively and felt there were opportunities for some “better shopping” to reduce the amount requested. He also noted that most applicants appeared to hedge to the high side in their bid requests to be cautious, and some savings could be realized there, as well as seeking help from other funding sources. He concluded by saying that the recommendation from the committee would be to award the grants contingent upon the acceptance of all three PSAPs at the levels awarded.

Before calling the vote, Mr. Barbour observed this would be the vote where Mr. Smith and Ms. Sykora had expressed possible concerns about conflict of interest, and asked them to reiterate their concerns. Mr. Smith said the only one of the three that he might have a potential conflict with is Richmond County. Ms. Sykora said she would still prefer to abstain from all three only because she has not had an opportunity to study them well enough to be sure she would have no conflict and would prefer to err on the side of caution. Mr. Barbour then called for questions or discussion, and Board Member Rick Edwards asked if any preparations are being made for migrating to NG911 with the money that is being spent on these projects, or are we simply investing in old technology now. Mr. Barbour asked if he meant that in the grants being awarded, are the applicants purchasing technology that’s compatible with next gen, and Mr. Edwards responded, “Potentially compatible, yes.” Mr. Shipp (a Grant Committee Member) responded that “...to the degree of what is available now, yes.” He also added that all three of those grant awards dealt with either a consolidation or a regional initiative.

Mr. Taylor said that to sum it up, Graham County is doing a relocation and technology refresh which will put them on the next gen track; that where they are now is definitely not on that track. He said he is excited because Graham is joining Swain County and Jackson County, who were grant award recipients last year, in a good coordinated effort to be available to help one another as NG911 moves forward. He noted that for years the folks in the mountains have felt like they’ve been forgotten by the rest of the state, which has fostered their helping one another in a cooperative spirit. He said the Hyde County situation is very similar: Dare County and Tyrrell County received grants last year to consolidate those two counties, and they had wanted Hyde County to join them, but the “political winds” were not right for that last year. He observed those “political winds” have now changed, and Hyde will be joining Tyrrell and Dare in a three county consolidation. Turning to Richmond County, Mr. Taylor said they are teaming up to work with Scotland County so they can back each other up, as well as consolidating a couple of the smaller secondary PSAPs into the primary PSAP. He noted that Richmond County is way past due for this significant upgrade, and that all three of these projects illustrate how these PSAPs have worked together to make good things happen.

Mr. Barbour said he was going to call the votes on each award individually to cover the conflicts of interest. The Graham County award recommendation passed unanimously, with Ms. Sykora abstaining. The Hyde County award recommendation followed suit with a unanimous vote to approve the award with Ms. Sykora abstaining. The Richmond County recommendation also received a unanimous vote in favor of the award, but this time with both Mr. Smith and Ms. Sykora abstaining.

Recommendation from Funding Committee Regarding Policy and Statute Changes

Mr. Barbour, who is the Funding Committee Chair, said that the funding committee has met a couple of times and has seen the new funding model idea that Mr. Taylor “has planted a seed on.” He said, “We’re still kickin’ the can and fertilizin’ it and seein’ which way it grows.” He then presented some suggested legislative changes that the Funding Committee would like to recommend be adopted by the Board. Observing that the recommendation is in the agenda book, he said he was just going to hit the high spots.

The first recommendation is to create an additional NG911 fund because the current statute mandates the 911 Board expend all the money in the fund every year and some legislators have voiced their concern about that. They would like to have the ability to start saving in an NG911 fund so that when NG costs begin arriving “...we won’t have to swallow all of that cost at once.”

The second recommended change is to require PSAPs to begin transitioning to an NG911 network, the concern being that as Mr. Edwards expressed earlier there may still be PSAPs that are either contemplating procuring or actually procuring new equipment that will not be compatible with an IP network, and we should probably try to keep that from happening.

The third is to create an authority or requirements for a statewide purchasing agreement, which is something the Board and the funding committee have talked about for a long time. Mr. Barbour said he is starting to get a lot of interest from legislators about this sort of “catalogue” approach to getting “the most bang for our buck” as funding becomes tighter, as evidenced by having grant requests this year for far more money than the Board had available.

Number four would be to ensure that PSAP grants go toward non-911-fund-eligible expenditures which enhance the 911 system. Mr. Barbour said that follows something he said several meetings back that he didn’t understand why a PSAP would apply for grant funding for something that’s already eligible for use of 911 funds instead of pursuing a funding reconsideration request.

Mr. Barbour pointed out that recommendation number five really doesn’t require a legislative change, just a policy change; that PSAPs requesting funding reconsideration should support the request with evidence of either a formalized RFP request, three quotes, etc., so the Board can be assured they are getting the best price for what they are purchasing. He added that the committee still hasn’t come up with a price threshold to determine which approach would be best; that committee members are still debating that issue. Mr. Barbour added that a lot of the county and municipal purchasing requirements should already be taking care of this issue, but the Board is seeing a lot of expenditures where that requirement is not being followed for whatever reason.

Saying she had missed the Funding Committee meeting this week, Ms. Sykora pointed out that within the proposed standards, when an entity is applying for a grant for an expenditure over \$25K, there is an RFP requirement, so that’s something the committee could consider as well. Mr. Barbour observed that is then probably something the committee should stay in line with, and asked if Mr. Taylor had anything to add.

Mr. Taylor said that, as Mr. Barbour had already mentioned, these are issues that have already been the subject of conversation with many legislators; that these are things they feel are lacking in the current environment. He noted that the inability to save for NG911 expenses has hit closer to home now that the NG911 network project is kicking off. He also noted that over the years the Board has seen numerous times how PSAPs, for whatever reason, do not want to upgrade their technology. He said several legislators have indicated that’s a problem they fear as we move to NG911, and that requiring transitions may be necessary. He added that the telcos may actually drive the process when they turn off their CAMA trunks, since there is already a date certain for selective routers to be turned off, but he acknowledged they certainly would not send a PSAP into the dark just to meet a deadline, and if for no other reason that it is something that needs to be worked on.

Mr. Taylor continued by saying how, after looking at the grant applications this year, he has come to agree with Mr. Barbour that perhaps grants should pay for enhancing the 911 system. He mentioned as an aside that he will be sending letters next week to all of the grant applicants telling them what their application score was, where the weaknesses were, etc., and that several of them should be funding reconsideration requests. He said he will be encouraging them to seek funding reconsideration when applicable.

Mr. Barbour said he would ask for a vote on the first four proposed legislative changes, noting that the fifth recommendation was still a work in progress; that the committee needed to establish a threshold value before that policy change could take effect. He asked for any discussion, and hearing none, called the vote, which passed unanimously. After the vote Mr. Shipp asked if the committee had made any determination about a future statewide project having to do with language translation services and QA, and Mr. Taylor replied that staff member Dave Corn is still working on both of those issues.

Update from NG911 Committee on Technical Consultant

Mr. Barbour asked Mr. Shipp, NG911 Committee Chair, to provide an update from that committee. Mr. Shipp reported the committee had a very, very productive kick off meeting on July 22nd with the Board’s technical consultant, Federal Engineering, which had brought all of its project team members to the meeting. He said many people may know Jim Lockhard with Federal Engineering, and that Jim is actually the project manager, having worked with Tennessee, Vermont, and Maine in regards to next gen implementation. He said the OITS project manager (Sanjay Bhojani) was also in attendance, and that it was a “big meeting, big kickoff day.”

Mr. Shipp continued by saying the committee, through working with Federal Engineering, has developed a set of five project deliverables: Concept of Operations; Cost Analysis; Conceptual Design; Creation of an RFP, or potentially multiple RFPs; and the evaluation of those RFPs. Mr. Shipp reiterated it was a good kickoff meeting and that time lines were established, with the first two, the Concept of Operations and the Cost Analysis, having a timeline of October of this year. He observed there is a lot of work to be done between now and then, but the goal is to have those two achieved and hopefully to bring them to the Board for approval by the December meeting. He added that staff is also looking at some federal grant funding which may potentially become available.

With that, he asked if any other people who attended the meeting wanted to add anything, and Mr. Edwards echoed the earlier sentiment that it was a very positive meeting, saying he is excited to be a part of it and that he thinks it's exciting to try to put this technology piece together statewide. He added he appreciates all of Mr. Corn's efforts in putting everything together as well.

Discussion of Statutory Change Request

Mr. Barbour stated that as most are aware, some legislators have asked the Board to provide suggestions for changing language in the statute to make it better. He turned to Mr. Taylor to lead the discussion.

Mr. Taylor said that due to the delay in the legislative session until probably Labor Day, time has become available for legislators to consider things during this session that they had thought they wouldn't get to until next session, among them improvements to 62A. Representative Boles had stated in his meeting with the Funding Committee that he would like to receive recommendations from the 911 Board about how to move forward, how changes to the statute could help the Board. At that time he thought the Board would have until the next session to accomplish that, but now that the schedule has changed, would like to move ahead with it this session. Mr. Taylor observed that several legislators are very willing to work with the Board, but they need to hear what the Board needs. He added that the legislative change recommendations that were presented earlier in today's meeting are a good start, but asked what else Board members think could be improved upon. He cited as an example a question Ms. Sykora had posed to him earlier about text to 911. She asked what happens if it doesn't work or mistakes are made, what kind of liability is there? She has offered that we should add into our list of changes some type of liability protection when it comes to texting to 911.

While on the topic of texting, Mr. Taylor gave a shout-out to Guilford Metro's Director Melanie Neal for a good outcome that center experienced about two weeks ago with a deaf/hard of hearing person reporting he was being robbed via text message. Mr. Taylor underscored that texting is how the deaf and hard of hearing community communicates today, and they already don't trust 911, so the fact that Guilford Metro was able to provide help via text is awesome. Mr. Barbour added that Johnston County hasn't even advertised that it is live with text to 911, but within two hours of going live with all of its carriers but one, his center handled a text call where a woman was injured and couldn't talk.

Mr. Taylor again thanked Ms. Sykora for forwarding some prospective liability protection language to him to share with Mr. Bradford in the hope of crafting something to forward to Representative Boles et al. He then exhorted other Board members to speak up, to give him some ideas of what would benefit this Board as it moves forward, especially looking at NG911.

Returning to the topic of text to 911, Mr. Smith observed that the liability statutes overall need to be consistent with NG911, not just texting. He said he thinks those statutes are pretty old and he just wants to make sure we're not confining it to just texting. He added he frankly thinks it should be protective of first responders, PSAPs, and service providers. Ms. Sykora responded that she believes the language she forwarded to Mr. Taylor does protect all those entities from everything but a "blatant, wanton and willful act", or something along those lines. She offered to forward that to Mr. Smith, who thanked her for doing that.

Mr. Taylor re-phrased his question, asking if anyone perceived anything in the statute which is an impediment to deployment of NG911, or conversely, if there is something that could encourage PSAPs to move forward. Hearing no response, he stated that he would work with Mr. Bradford to insert language

supporting the changes voted upon earlier in the meeting and that which Ms. Sykora had shared with him and come up with something to present to the Board for its consideration. Mr. Barbour expressed concern that it shouldn't be put off until the next meeting, and asked if it could be voted on electronically. Mr. Taylor replied, "Absolutely". He asked Mr. Bradford when he might be able to complete that task, and Mr. Bradford responded he hadn't received anything yet, and asked if Mr. Taylor was referring to twenty pages or fewer. Mr. Taylor offered it would likely be a page and a half or two, and Mr. Bradford resoundingly replied "Wednesday". Mr. Barbour wryly observed he didn't say which one, which drew a good laugh from many Board members. Ms. Sykora added that another reason to do this before the next Board meeting is because that will be the Standards Rule-Making hearing meeting, which promises to be a full agenda in and of itself.

Mr. Barbour recalled he testified before congress in 2007 about liability protection for next gen in his capacity as then president of National NENA, and asked Mr. Taylor if he thought any of that language might be adaptable to the Board's needs. He wondered if, since that was Federal language, we might not be protected under that umbrella already. Mr. Taylor said they should look into it, and in the meantime put something together, circulate it among the Board members, and then set up a teleconference call meeting. Mr. Barbour proposed that perhaps he and Mr. Taylor and whatever other Board members wish to be included could, after the Board approves something, arrange for a meeting with the legislators who have expressed interest in this. Mr. Taylor added that if anyone thinks of something later, to be sure to let him know.

Before leaving the topic and, he joked, at the risk of having Mr. Stewart throw something at him, Mr. Taylor mentioned that one of the issues that has come up is that of cost recovery. He said many states have discontinued it, and that North Carolina was one of the leaders in doing that. He noted that although the number of carriers collecting cost recovery in North Carolina is "just a handful", he observed that it does mean a lot to the small, rural carriers, like Carolina West (Mr. Stewart's company). He said he's not throwing that on the table as something to put into the statutory revision mix, but it is something to consider. He added that Verizon doesn't do cost recovery in NC any longer, but AT&T does, so "there's all kinds of ways of looking at it."

Update on Rules Review Process

Mr. Barbour asked Mr. Bradford if there were any updates on the rules review process, and the succinct reply was, "No comments have been received." For the benefit of those who did not attend the PSAP managers meetings, Ms. Sykora added that during those meetings staff and Board members did go over the rules with the PSAP managers that participated and encouraged them to read the rules and come to staff or Board members with any questions. She added the PSAP managers were made fully aware of the hearing coming up on August 28th.

While on that topic, Mr. Barbour asked if this room would be sufficient to host the meeting. Mr. Taylor said he had a couple of comments from the NENA/APCO chapter meeting last week as well as the PSAP managers meetings, saying we want to get feedback; we are encouraging feedback. But, he added, at the same time we want it to be good feedback. He observed there has been so much misinformation circulated about the standards that he would hate for somebody to come in and spend ten minutes talking about something that's not even in the standards. When he made that announcement at those meetings, he did recommend that people give him or one of the staff a call, just so we know and they know whether or not what they want to discuss is actually in the proposed standards so they're not up there wasting their time or ours. He noted that incoming NC NENA President Philip Penny suggested they might want to practice their speech before coming, which Mr. Taylor thought was a good idea.

Returning to Mr. Barbour's original question, Mr. Taylor said that plans are currently to use this room, as neither staff nor Mr. Bradford have received any comments or any notice of anybody that wants to speak. He added he has no idea how many people will want to come, and if any organizations are planning to speak or come, asked them to please let him know as soon as possible, including the number of people, because if he has to find another facility or make arrangements in this building to use several rooms, he just needs to know for logistical purposes. Mr. Barbour asked Mr. Dodd if he could put a message out on the listserv maybe once a week between now and then asking anyone who's planning to come, whether they plan to speak or not, to let him know. Mr. Dodd observed that it has been in the PSAP managers

newsletter every week, and Mr. Barbour added maybe some sheriffs or police chiefs or fire chiefs or EMS representatives would like to come.

Mr. Taylor reiterated that anyone who wants to come is certainly welcome, that the Board wants to hear their feedback, but he just needs to know how to handle it logistically. Mr. Barbour asked Mr. Dodd to send the announcements out as a separate email to the listserv rather than just in the newsletter so it might be more likely to get their attention that way, and Mr. Dodd agreed. Mr. Barbour then asked if anyone had any further comments about the rules review process.

Board Member Dinah Jeffries brought attention to a question that was raised at the central region PSAP Managers' Meeting. She said we (the Board) are making the statement that everything in the standards is 911 fund eligible, and we're finding some things, QA as an example, that are not. Mr. Taylor replied he went back and read that section of the standards after that meeting, and he said the QA software is what's fundable, not the salary of a QA employee. He observed the standard requires a QA *program*, not a QA employee, and 911 funds may be used to pay for the software, which was the intent of the standard. He agreed, however, that is a good item of concern, and if it needs to be better written or have more clarification, that's what this process is about.

Upcoming Committee Meetings

Mr. Barbour said that before adjourning, he wanted to bring the upcoming committee meeting schedule to everyone's attention, reiterating what Mr. Taylor had said earlier in the meeting that this is where a lot of the work is done. He added that if someone is not on one of the committees, they are still welcome to participate in the meetings, and that if they're not on one of these committees and *want to be* on one, please make that concern known.

Mr. Taylor added that he had expected Margie Frye's replacement on the Board, Ninnet Bowman, to be in attendance today, but surmised something must have come up. He noted, however, that Ms. Frye's departure leaves a vacancy for the chair of the Education Committee, and encouraged any Board Member who would like to chair that committee to please let him know. He said they are very close to implementing the advertising campaign in the near future, so they need some leadership in that committee. He added there is a tentative date of Wednesday, August 12th for the next Education Committee meeting. Ms. Jeffries said she would be happy to chair that committee, but if anyone wants to take it from her they can. Mr. Taylor said he had hoped she would, but knows how committed she is to the Standards Committee, so he's very glad she's willing to do both. Mr. Shipp thanked Ms. Jeffries for volunteering, observing she had beaten him to the punch because he had been planning to recommend her.

Noting that there are still other vacancies on the Board, Mr. Barbour asked if an NCACC representative had been appointed yet, to which Mr. Taylor replied he had become aware of a recommendation with whom he is very happy, and thinks would be a great asset to the Board, but he has not seen anything official yet.

Adjourn

Prior to adjourning, Mr. Barbour asked if anyone had any further items to bring forward, and Mr. Edwards asked if Mr. Taylor could return to agenda item 5C, the NASNA Spring 2015 State Report Compilation for a moment. He asked Mr. Taylor where he felt North Carolina stands in relation to the other states in the report; are we ahead, behind, in the middle, or what? Mr. Taylor said he thought we were not in the middle, and certainly in the upper half. He said our deliberate approach to creating a statewide network puts us above many others, observing that while it's nice to be first, being first can sometimes cost you a lot of money. He said one thing he's learned from working with his counterparts in NASNA that taking a more deliberate approach can be a smart move. He noted that while we are pushing text to 911, he thinks there are a few states that are ahead of us in that regard, that PSAPs in those states are being more cooperative. He observed that for some reason in North Carolina there has been a lot of push back from some PSAPs regarding text to 911. Saying he doesn't understand that, he added we are probably in the lower group with that.

Mr. Taylor pointed out that regarding standards, we are probably in the top 10%-15% of the states; that most states have some standards, but not nearly as comprehensive as our proposed standards. He feels our funding is both different from and better than most states, citing Florida's 911 fee, recently raised from 50¢ to 60¢, which its statute clearly states is not enough, but is all they're going to get, and with which they won't pay for CAD systems but will pay for people. He added that Alabama, on the other hand, has one of the highest 911 fees, and they pay for everything, including people, although he observed that Alabama has also had to go back and do a lot of work on its IP network. He concluded that each of the states is different, with states like Vermont or Rhode Island having only four PSAPs or two PSAPs as compared to our footprint from the mountains to the coast. He said Tennessee is probably the closest state in comparison to North Carolina size-wise, both from the number of PSAPs to the geographical footprint, so there are a lot of similarities between them, and pointed out that Indiana is ahead of us in their network, but they're only doing wireless on that network. He once again said that states are so hard to compare because each is so unique.

Mr. Bradford added that many other states still have a statutory distinction between wireline and wireless 911, and that has an impact on the operation, the oversight, and the funding that may not be reflected in just reading through these reports. Mr. Taylor said he thinks the questions being asked in the FCC report will make that report, when compiled later in the year, more eye-opening, when you can see specific answers to specific questions. He added that he thinks one of the areas in which we stand out is fund raising; that we have done an excellent job of protecting the 911 fee from being misused.

Mr. Barbour asked for any further questions or comments, and Mr. Shipp said he just wanted to remind PSAPs not to forget their back-up plan implementations, and to encourage all of the PSAPs to get those approved just as soon as possible.

Mr. Taylor said he did have one other item he wanted to mention. Noting that one of the comments he has heard from legislators is that the Board's web page has become very cumbersome, Mr. Taylor said he feels it is to the point where it cannot even be called user friendly. Admitting that although staff members who work with it every day know where everything is on it, and can point people to what they are looking for, he's aware that's not the way it should be. He noted that the state has launched a Digital Commons initiative to upgrade all of the state's division websites in which we were originally slated to be upgraded in the October/November time frame, but one of the advantages of having the State CIO as the Board Chair is that after a conversation with him we moved right up to the top of the list and now the guy that's in charge of Digital Commons is in fact supposed to submit a proposal to him and Tina Bone today on re-doing the web page. He asked Board members to contact him with any improvements they can suggest, such as something unique they've seen on another (not necessarily 911) web page, so they can be added to it. He pointed out that the first thing he's going to insist on, and which he and Chairman Estes spoke about, is a search function; even if you knew what you were looking for, there is currently no search function to use to locate it. He concluded by saying if people have any thoughts, comments, or ideas about the web page, please let him or Ms. Bone know, noting that it is her project (and one that she is very excited about doing).

Mr. Barbour asked for a motion to adjourn, Chief Bottoms so moved, and the meeting adjourned at 11:44 AM.