

North Carolina 911 Board Meeting
MINUTES
Banner Elk Room
3514A Bush Street, Raleigh, NC
August 26, 2016
10:45 AM – 12:00 PM

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Staff Present</u>	<u>Guests</u>
Jason Barbour (NCNENA) Johnston Co. 911 (911 Board Vice Chair)	Richard Bradford (DOJ)	Ron Adams, Southern Software
Dave Bone (NCACC) Martin County	Tina Bone (DIT)	Randy Beeman, Cumberland Co ES
Darryl Bottoms (NCACP) Pilot Mountain PD	Ronnie Cashwell (DIT)	Rachel Bello, Wake Co
Eric Cramer (LEC) Wilkes Communication	Dave Corn (DIT)	Douglas Bissette, Battalion Chief Washington Fire Department
Chris Estes (911 Board Chair)	David Dodd (DIT)	Kimberly Bissette, Pinetown EMT
Andrew Grant (NCLM) Town of Cornelius	Karen Mason (DIT)	Robert Caputo, TC award guest
Len Hagaman (Sheriff) Watauga County	Marsha Tapler (DIT)	Toni Caputo, TC award guest
Greg Hauser (NCSFA) Charlotte Fire Department	Richard Taylor (DIT)	William Caputo, BCSO 911 Award Recipient
Rick Isherwood (CMRS) Verizon		Ernie Coleman, Beaufort Co Sheriff
Dinah Jeffries (NCAPCO) Orange Co. Emergency Services	<u>Staff Absent</u>	Amelia Davidson, TC award guest
Jeff Shipp (LEC) Star Telephone		Melissa Davidson, TC award guest
Rob Smith (LEC) AT&T		Brian Drum, Catawba Co 911
Jimmy Stewart (NCAREMS) Hoke Co. 911		Joe Gurley, Wayne Co
Slayton Stewart (CMRS) Carolina West Wireless		John Flemming, BCEMS Director
Laura Sykora (LEC) CenturyLink		Greg Foster, Alexander Co 911
		Casandra Hoekstra, NCACC
<u>Members Absent</u>		Jeff Holshouser, Airbus
Rick Edwards (CMRS) Sprint		Heather Joyner, Halifax Co 911
		Jesus Lopez, DIT
		Marvin Manning, BCEMS Paramedic
		Linwood McLawhorn, BCSO 911 Award Recipient

		Douglas Glenn Mercer, Jr, BCEMS Operations Chief
		Derrick Myers, Fire Chief Pantego Fire Department
		Melanie Neal, Guilford Metro 911
		Philip Penny, MCP
		David Poston, CMPD
		Betty Jo Shephard, Sen. Richard Burr's Office
		Dean Skidmore, Consultant
		Jason Steward, Martin Co 911
		Candy Strezinski, Iredell Co 911
		Bryson Thomas, TC award guest
		Joe Vanderlip, CMPD
		Nathan van Nortwick, BCEMS EMT
		Victoria van Nortwick, BCSO 911 Award Recipient
		Bridgett Waters, TC award guest
		Bryant Waters, BCEMS Shift Supervisor
		Victor Williams, BCSO 911 Director
		Bruce Williams, Wireless Communications
		Stephanie Wiseman, Mitchell Co 911
		Donna Wright, RCES
		WebEx Attendees
		Cliff Brown, Federal Engineering
		Byron Burns, CRS
		Christie Burris, NC HIEA
		Nelson Clark, Synergem
		Michael Cone, Wilson Co 911
		John Correllus, Deputy State CIO
		Jon Greene, GeoComm
		Grayson Gusa, Davie Co 911
		Del Hall, SCES
		Grant Hunsucker, MCES
		Jeff Ledford, Shelby PD
		Alice Miller, NC HIEA
		Tim Mitchell, CCES
		Denise Pratt, DCSO
		Bob Smith, RCES

		Stacey Tapp, Granville Co 911
		Rick Thomas, Apex PD
		Corinne Walser, MEDIC
		Doug Workman, Cary 911
		Doug Young, PCES

1. **Chairman's Opening Remarks**

North Carolina 911 Board Chair Chris Estes called the meeting to order at ~10:46 AM, thanking everyone in attendance for their flexibility in accepting a late start due to the Governor having personally awarded this month's telecommunicator recognition at the Governor's Mansion at 10:00 AM, necessitating a delay in this meeting's start time. He added, however, those telecommunicators would also be recognized at this meeting when they arrive, but until then the meeting would progress as scheduled, and with that asked Mr. Taylor to perform the roll call. Mr. Taylor attempted to raise Rick Edwards over the telephone bridge but received no response. He then reported all other Board members were present in the room.

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

Chairman Estes read the conflict of interest statement and asked if there were any conflicts to be identified. Laura Sykora said she would refrain from voting on all of the grant awards in item 7, as did Rob Smith. Jimmy Stewart indicated he would refrain from voting on the award to his county. Chairman Estes asked if the voting would be on each award individually or on the group as a whole. Mr. Taylor replied as a package, and Mr. Bradford said that while it has typically been true in the past that when there have been conflicts among some but not all that the Board has chosen to break those out, or if there were particular issues or conditions associated with a grant that the Grant Committee wants to discuss and the Board feels that it should then separate those and vote on them individually, it might choose to do that. He recommended waiting until the Board has heard the Grant Committee recommendations before deciding. Chairman Estes thanked Mr. Bradford and asked if anyone else had a conflict. Dave Bone indicated he, too, would refrain from voting on the grant award to his county.

3. **Consent Agenda**

Chairman Estes asked Mr. Taylor to walk through the consent agenda.

Minutes of 7/29/16 Board Meeting – Mr. Taylor reported he had received no requests for changes or corrections to the minutes of the July 29th meeting distributed earlier in the week.

Grant Fund Balance – Mr. Taylor reported the Grant Fund balance now stands at \$2,957,757, with an encumbered amount of \$23,023,397. He observed several existing grant loose ends are being wrapped up, as he acknowledged he seems to say every month (please see <https://ncit.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/documents/files/DRAFT%20Agenda%20Book%2008262016-1.pdf> pages 28-34 for details).

NG911 Fund Balance – Mr. Taylor observed that the NG911 Fund has still seen no disbursements, with the balance presently standing at \$4,812,547. He added he expects to see some payments for ESINet expenses beginning to be made from that fund around December.

CMRS Fund Balance – Mr. Taylor reported the CMRS fund balance stands at \$3,731,095 after disbursements for the month of \$560,421, noting a good portion of that balance will likely be moved to the grant fund.

PSAP Fund Balance – Mr. Taylor stated the PSAP Fund balance is presently \$19,519,004, with PrePaid revenue having come in at \$962,964.

Mr. Taylor offered to field any questions on the consent agenda, and hearing none, Chairman Estes asked for a motion to accept it as presented. Jason Barbour so moved, Dinah Jeffries seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

4. Public Comment

Chairman Chris Estes opened up the floor for comments from state and local government officials and other interested parties. No participants had registered with Mr. Taylor prior to the meeting, and no one in the room asked to be recognized, so Chairman Estes reminded everyone that the Board is always anxious to hear from the public, so if anyone does want to address the Board in the future to please let staff know.

5. Executive Director Report

Mr. Taylor said that for the sake of brevity today he would just cover the backup plan implementation status, reporting that staff currently has 51 approved plans, with 44 implemented, for a total approved of 95; those still in the process of being reviewed number 22. He noted that adds up to 117 Primary PSAPs, down 2 from the 119 everyone has been accustomed to hearing him refer to, and that is because of the consolidation of Murfreesboro and Ahoskie with Hertford County. He also mentioned several PSAPs had failed to meet milestones in their backup plan timelines, but Tina Bone is working with them to remediate and refocus their timelines.

Observing she had been unable to access the online agenda book, Ms. Sykora asked Mr. Taylor if it contained the map depicting backup plan compliance. He replied the status report is in the agenda book, including the spreadsheet, but the map is in the Backup Plan section of the website, accessed by selecting the Backup Plan Information tile on the home page. Mr. Bone recalled that he thought at one time there was a map that showed PSAPs which already had implemented backup plans, and Ms. Sykora indicated that was the one she was referring to. Mr. Bone asked Mr. Taylor what the timetable is for completion of the review of the 22 still within that process. Mr. Taylor replied he believed most have been approved except for the financial piece, or maybe a combination of financial and other items, and asked Marsha Tapler or Tina Bone to speak to that. Ms. Bone replied it is a combination of both, including some PSAPs wanting to add 911 trunks as part of their backup plans, and she is talking with them about splitting trunks rather than adding them. She added that in addition to things like that, some Statements of Work and various quotes are only just now coming in and she is forwarding them to Ms. Tapler for financial review.

Mr. Bone said that first of all he wanted to express his appreciation to staff for handling this large influx of work all at one time, but he would like to know something more definitive as to when that will be completed. Mr. Taylor said he wished he could provide that, but if PSAPs are waiting on information from vendors, etc., staff has no control over it: if a vendor is slow to respond, staff has to work at the mercy of that vendor. Ms. Sykora observed, without specifically naming the vendor, that at least "...one vendor is having a hard time getting quotes from our suppliers," adding that the vendor wants the backup centers up and running as much as everyone else does. Saying this is not something the Board can penalize the PSAP for, because the PSAPs are doing all they can to work with the vendors, Mr. Taylor stated that staff is doing all it can do to help, but cannot magically make it happen or set a deadline for when it must be done; if a vendor can't get a commitment from a supplier, staff certainly can't.

Mr. Bone noted that "We're all on the same team and want to get everyone across the finish line at the appropriate time," but he would just urge staff to communicate these challenges to the Legislature to make legislators aware of what the Board is facing. Chairman Estes recalled he thought the Board had discussed writing a letter to the General Assembly about where the Board currently stands regarding the Backup PSAP Plan requirement and asked Mr. Taylor where that stands. Mr. Taylor replied he has not gotten to it yet, but it is on his list. Chairman Estes asked if the DIT liaison to the General Assembly had spoken with Mr. Taylor about it. Mr. Taylor said he believed she was here and he would talk with her about it. Chairman Estes pointed out there has been a lot of good work done here and the lawmakers need to be made aware of the work that is, and has been, going on. Mr. Bone agreed, noting there are many positive things to

stress in the letter as well as ongoing challenges, observing, "The sky is not necessarily falling." Mr. Taylor agreed, observing he didn't think anybody in the legislature has taken that approach or is panicking or anything like that.

6. Education Committee Report

a. Recommendation to fund two classes at the upcoming NC public safety conference

Education Committee Chair Jimmy Stewart reported the North Carolina chapters of APCO and NENA have presented for the Board's consideration a request for it to fund two classes to be offered at their upcoming annual conference at Sea Trail. One is entitled "Caught in the Middle: A Guide to Middle Management," targeting line supervisors and managers, and is to be offered as a pre-conference course at a cost of \$4K. The second class is an active shooter/terrorist class in a four-hour block to be offered on Tuesday, September 13th, from 8:00 AM until 12:00 PM. Mr. Stewart reminded all that the Board has historically funded courses during this annual conference, and the committee recommendation is to grant the request, noting that the Education Committee brings this before the Board in the form of a motion.

At this point the group from Beaufort County arrived from the Governor's Mansion, and Chairman Estes announced the meeting would pause to offer the team which received this month's telecommunicator award recognition at the Governor's Mansion the opportunity to receive the same recognition before this assemblage.

Mr. Taylor moved to the podium and first introduced Betty Jo Shepheard from Senator Burr's office, saying he understood Senator Burr was unable to attend, but how much her attendance was appreciated in his absence. Ms. Shepheard said how glad she was to get to know everyone here, noting that she covers thirty counties in the state for Senator Burr, Beaufort County among them, as well as Martin County, which she noticed on the website was the award recipient at last month's Board meeting. She concluded her comments by congratulating Beaufort County and all of its 'fine staff and workers' on behalf of Senator Burr.

Mr. Taylor mused that it was not only an honor, but also a treat, to be at the Governor's Mansion to see the Governor present this award to Beaufort County's team of telecommunicators and hear his remarks. He was particularly pleased when the Governor acknowledged there is more to 911 than just Law Enforcement, Fire, and Medical; that he knows it starts with the 911 call and the telecommunicator who handles it. Mr. Taylor continued by saying today's award recognizes three individuals who, working as a team, did a super job of handling this incident, which took place at an eighth grade graduation ceremony where Ms. Amelia Davidson was watching her grandson graduate. Pointing out how special it is for a young person to have his grandparents at his graduation, Mr. Taylor played a recording of the 911 call which turned such a happy occasion into a very scary one. He observed that these three telecommunicators turned what could have been a very bad incident turn into something good.

After playing the recording, Mr. Taylor related it was kind of funny when, at the ceremony earlier, Governor McCrory looked at Will Caputo, the telecommunicator whose voice was on the recording, and said, "How did you know to ask all those questions?" That prompted laughter about the room, and Mr. Taylor added he thought the most interesting part of it was that Beaufort County only just began using EMD in January, and the call happened in May, so in just a few short months it showed how well the EMD program is working in Beaufort County, NC. He then asked Ms. Amelia Davidson, who had suffered a stroke when Mr. Caputo stepped into her life, to stand, which she did to a standing ovation around the room. Saying she is living proof that EMD works, Mr. Taylor also introduced her daughter Melissa, who had placed the 911 call, and her grandson Bryson, whose graduation she had been attending. He then asked Victoria van Nortwick, Shift Supervisor, Will Caputo, telecommunicator, and Linwood McLawhorn, telecommunicator, to come forward to receive the award.

While they were coming forward, Mr. Taylor pointed out, for those unfamiliar with how a 911 center functions, that while Mr. Caputo was handling the speaking part of the call and performing EMD, Ms. Van

Nortwick and Mr. McLawhorn were behind the scenes dispatching and communicating with all the responders working the call; they knew Ms. Davidson was having a stroke and were communicating with air care, in this case EastCare out of Vidant, as well as all the first responders on the ground, preparing them so there could be a good outcome, which was exactly what happened. Mr. Taylor then took a moment to introduce other members of the party from Beaufort County in attendance, asking each to stand as he read their name, each having played a part in the response to the call, summarizing that's what makes 911 work—that's what it's all about.

Another round of applause filled the room for everyone associated with the call, then Mr. Taylor asked Chairman Estes to come forward to read the inscription on the award plaque and present it to the awardees, which he did, saying with tongue in cheek that somehow he didn't feel quite so important knowing the Governor had already done it before he did. After the picture-taking was complete and a third round of applause rose and died down, the meeting returned to its original agenda where it left off at the Education Committee report.

Chairman Estes reviewed that Mr. Stewart had just presented the committee recommendation in the form of a motion, with no need for a second, so now he opened the floor to discussion. Before anyone spoke up, he asked Mr. Stewart what the total dollar amount the request was. Mr. Stewart replied it was \$5800 to pay for both classes. Chief Hauser asked if the instructors for the classes were from North Carolina, or if that was known. Mr. Stewart referred the question to David Dodd, who said the entities offering the classes (NENA, The Public Safety Group) would provide instructors, but there is no stipulation they be from North Carolina. Chief Hauser asked if the Education Committee had thought about 'Train the Trainers' for future use at such events, and Mr. Stewart reminded him that 911 funds may not be used for 'Train the Trainer' classes and asked Mr. Taylor to confirm if that was correct. Mr. Taylor replied that was correct in respect to a PSAP using local 911 funds to pay for such instruction, but the 911 Board could elect to pay for 'Train the Trainer' instruction if it so chose. Chief Hauser said he was just thinking about it because of some of the work other committees are doing might be more tailored to meeting North Carolina's needs with locally trained instructors rather than those from anywhere else. Mr. Taylor related that in past years NC's APCO and NENA chapters have asked the Board to simply sponsor a class or classes that they have already selected to offer at the conference, but he would certainly encourage the Education Committee to offer something other than a normally eligible class.

Jason Barbour asked if the funds for this were in the approved budget. Mr. Taylor replied they were. Ms. Jeffries asked, in following up on the 'Train the Trainer' topic, if anyone had any idea of how many instructors APCO already has in North Carolina, saying she thought there were quite a few. She speculated using them could, at least on the APCO side, help give the Board an 'in' to working with APCO International on getting 'Train the Trainer' classes. Mr. Barbour offered that he is a trained 'Active Shooter' instructor. Chairman Estes hypothesized the feedback to the Education Committee is maybe to offer some recommendations that instructors for such Board sponsored training classes be from North Carolina, though not necessarily the ones being discussed today, since they are coming up so quickly. He added it would not be a requirement, but a preference, of the Board. Offering to entertain further discussion, but hearing none, Chairman Estes called the motion which passed unanimously.

b. Recommendation on filing comments regarding reclassifying public safety telecommunicator as a 'Protective' occupation

Mr. Stewart reminded everyone of the issue Beaufort County 911 Director Vic Williams brought up during the public comment section of last month's 911 Board meeting (see <https://ncit.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/documents/files/20160729%20DRAFT%20Minutes.pdf> pages 5 and 6) that APCO International has been outspoken about. He summarized that the United States Department of Labor Statistics, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), lists 911 telecommunicators in the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) as members of the 'Office and Administrative Support' group along with taxi dispatchers, truck driver dispatchers, office clerks, etc., and when an effort was mounted to recognize them as providing as much of

a life-saving service as other emergency responders (law enforcement, fire, EMS) using the term Public Safety Telecommunicator, OMB responded that since telecommunicators didn't actually put their hands on anybody, they are not considered Public Safety ('Protective' service).

Mr. Stewart observed that didn't go over very well in the 911 community, and subsequently Chairman Estes charged the Education Committee to come up with a letter of support for having 911 telecommunicators reclassified as Public Safety employees, i.e. as members of 'Protective' services under the OMB classifications. Between the July 911 Board meeting and the next Education Committee meeting, Mr. Stewart reported that APCO International met in Orlando and David Dodd and several committee members attended a presentation dedicated to this topic. APCO itself actually came out with a sample letter for interested parties to send to their elected federal representatives regarding this topic, which Mr. Taylor displayed onscreen and which Mr. Stewart said the Education Committee recommends the Board use in doing just that.

Chairman Estes summarized that a motion was coming from committee recommending that the Board submit a letter regarding this topic, the draft of which was displayed onscreen, and that what he thought the Board needed to vote on was the spirit of the letter if not the exact wording of it. Adding that he had asked Mr. Taylor to have the communications team at DIT review the letter and make sure there are no typos or grammar errors of that type of thing, he observed this will probably not be the exact letter the Board will send, but a version of it will be sent. Noting that Senator Burr's representative was in attendance, he hoped that Senator Burr's office would be one of the first to receive it, and also mentioned that he had the opportunity to briefly mention this to the Governor's team this morning, and as the Governor mentioned at the ceremony, that 911 telecommunicators are part of the process, and that he is very supportive of all public safety officials, including 911 telecommunicators. Chief Hauser mentioned he was one of the attendees at the APCO conference in Orlando Mr. Stewart alluded to earlier and took part in the Metro PSAP Managers meeting, and noted he has been in contact with the International Association of Fire Chiefs and they have committed to submit a letter as well. Chairman Estes said that once the Board determines what its position is on this staff will work with the federal liaisons in the Governor's Office who will deal with all the North Carolina delegation members: all House members and Senate members from the North Carolina delegation.

Ms. Sykora cited the telecommunicator recognitions the Board presents every month, and asked if perhaps recordings or transcripts of the calls which obviously have saved lives might not help convince OMB that telecommunicators DO save lives, even if they don't physically touch the people whose lives they save. Chairman Estes acknowledged that as good feedback, and said perhaps that can be incorporated in the letter by the communications team. Mr. Stewart added that while this is being formulated to let OMB know that the EMD system is under medical control the same as a paramedic and is considered an advanced life support program in this state; it's covered by medical control the same way: audit review process, QA, QI, the same way a paramedic program is. Chairman Estes asked to be sure staff captures these points so they are included in the letter, as he thinks they are very important points: e.g. the reference to examples and the medical oversight of EMD. Chief Hauser brought up TERT, the Telecommunicator Emergency Response Task force, which is an arm of NCEM, as another point. Chairman Estes instructed Mr. Taylor to have the communications team rewrite the sample letter to incorporate those points.

Mr. Stewart added that APCO International sent an email yesterday, seeking accounts of how telecommunicators have affected people through the help they have provided over the telephone, whether through use of protocols or not, to illustrate these points. Chairman Estes remarked he thought we just heard one this morning. Mr. Stewart concurred, adding that those who work in 911 see it every day, citing his PSAP having achieved two cardiac saves in the last two weeks, and underscoring that the people at the Department of Labor need to know that. Chairman Estes replied, "We'll make sure they do, soon."

Slayton Stewart volunteered that in looking at the letter he found the spirit of the letter to be good, but said he was curious to know what the opposite argument is, i.e. what is the argument against these individuals being classified as working in a 'protective' occupation. Chief Hauser said he would offer his opinion from what he heard when he had asked the same question: classification and money, because once reclassified, TCs move to a higher earning potential, i.e. a higher cost for employers to bear. He added that other people who operate in this business tell him there are other reasons as well, but Derek Poarch, Ex-Officio Executive Director and CEO of APCO International, urged people not to make it about money when he spoke at the APCO conference. He said, "First, we want respect," and once we get that respect, then we'll work on all the other items. Chairman Estes observed he suspects that's why there is potential opposition, because people are concerned about the downstream cost. Chief Hauser added that no one will tell APCO who the evaluators are, that they are anonymous; no one knows who they are or what their backgrounds are, and no one knows who makes the determinations, so we don't even know who our audience is.

Mr. Bradford interjected that if one were to read the rule-making proceeding, which goes back in time several years at this point, and read the regulations relating to SOC's, there are express, numerous provisions that say this has nothing to do with compensation. He observed this classification system is utilized by many employers, by governments—state governments in particular, sometimes—to relate to classifying people for compensation, but that's not the purpose of the system. He also told the Board to understand that this sample letter is not a comment in the rule-making procedure; it is going to members of congress or the senate to try to get them to exert some influence, and that's fine, if that's what you want to do. He stated, however, that if you want to make an argument, that's a wholly different matter, observing that the letter really is not, frankly, much of an argument. He advised it is wise to leave out anything related to compensation, and based upon the review that he has been able to do thus far, which is not very extensive, it appears to him that the points being made this morning and what has been alluded to from the recent APCO conference regarding EMD and so forth, have not been raised in the rule-making proceeding. Mr. Bradford speculated that was one of the reasons that prior efforts were probably just turned down by SOC.

Chairman Estes asked Mr. Bradford if the federal rule-making process is harder than the North Carolina one. Mr. Bradford replied he thought it was better, not harder, which registered pleasant surprise from Chairman Estes. Chairman Estes then asked if there is a comment period—will this be revisited as part of the official federal rule-making process, or do we need legislators at the federal level to convince them to reopen this issue—i.e. what, exactly, are we needing to have happen legally? In response Mr. Bradford directed everyone's attention to a sentence near the bottom of the letter displayed onscreen: "The final public comment period closes September 20, and OMB plans to announce its final SOC revisions in early 2017." He said that if people are inclined to do so, they may file comments, and this may be part of what APCO hoped to achieve at its recent conference. He added that to date, the arguments being made in terms of what 911 telecommunicators do, point out how they are different from somebody who dispatches delivery trucks for a plumbing company, by way of example. He observed he's sure all the delivery companies and plumbers and HVAC techs and all think it's really important that they get where they need to go, but the bottom line is it's not 911.

Mr. Bradford noted that the SOC reclassification has acknowledged distinguishing 'public safety dispatcher' from the title used today (911 Police, Fire, and Ambulance Dispatcher), but that is something that has not been acknowledged in this letter. He added that he thinks if you want to make a point, then recognize what they've done, together with the points made here this morning, and see if you can drive that home with our elected representatives. He said that at the same time, if the Board wants to file a comment in the proceeding, that's fine—it's due September 20th.

Saying he just wanted to clarify the motion coming from committee, Chairman Estes asked if the motion included offering a comment during the comment period, or was it just to lobby our federal representatives with a letter asking for their support for this initiative? Both Mr. Bradford and Mr. Stewart simultaneously

replied it was just the letter to the elected officials. Mr. Bradford added that his point to the Board is that these are two things that are related, one coming from committee and one coming from him because he's the lawyer and just can't leave things alone. All joking aside, he said he wants everyone to understand that part of what the letter says is to alert people to the comment period, so if you want to present an official act from your office, please do so by September 20th. He indicated he understands the gist of the Board's feelings about this, and if the Board wants him to file a comment, he would be happy to. He made the distinction, however, that a comment is more of a legal matter—not something that goes through communications massaging.

Ms. Sykora said she likes the two pronged approach, thanking Mr. Bradford for bringing up the opportunity to offer comments—that she thinks it would be a more direct approach that automatically gets into the record. She added she thinks the Board should pursue both options, although she doesn't want to hold up the letter to the legislators while the comments are being done. Chairman Estes asked if she was offering that as an amendment to the motion, and Mr. Barbour said he thought it would be cleaner to just vote on the current motion and then offer another. Slayton Stewart then asked if there was a reason the committee didn't recommend both approaches, and Jimmy Stewart said he thought the members were just not aware that both were available. Chairman Estes added he just thought it was due to Mr. Bradford's bringing up new information the committee was unaware of.

Chairman Estes reviewed the motion on the floor as being an intent to send a letter to North Carolina's elected federal representatives that is in keeping with the spirit of the sample letter but which will be subject to some editing based upon comments received today. Jeff Shipp asked if an electronic copy of the final letter could be distributed among Board members, so they in turn could share it with their individual elected representatives, as it may well have a different impact with representatives who know Board members by name than the impact it would have simply coming from the Board as an official body. Chairman Estes acknowledged that request and called the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Barbour made a motion to request that Mr. Bradford draft official comments from the Board to be entered into the proceeding before the deadline of September 20th, with Board approval via a special called teleconference or the like. Ms. Sykora seconded, and Chairman Estes opened the floor to discussion. He then asked if the Board can, based upon its belief that Mr. Bradford has a good grasp of what it is seeking to do, just approve it today, or if it must be approved after it has been completed but before it is filed? Mr. Bradford said he'd be happy to draft it and have the Board approve it, but he sees no need for a special meeting to approve it. He said it is something that would generally be approved by the Executive Director on behalf of the Board and Mr. Bradford would file it. Mr. Barbour said he was fine with that modification to his motion. Chairman Estes called the motion, which passed unanimously. He then asked Mr. Stewart if the committee had anything more to report. Mr. Stewart replied it did not.

7. Grant Committee report

Grant Committee Chair Rick Isherwood advised the Grant Committee met August 11th to complete the scoring process for the twenty grant applications received this grant cycle, and that all Board members should have a two-page handout listing them at their seat. He reported the total dollar amount requested was ~\$37.7M, although that doesn't appear on the sheet. He said that before getting into specific recommendations from the committee he wanted to offer a few comments, first among them being if you look at the brief title descriptions for the grant applications you will see that thirteen of them pertain to backup PSAPs. He observed that given the status of that initiative and all the backup PSAP conversations the Board has had over past months it isn't surprising, but it is unfortunate, because it is definitely putting a strain on funding that might be allocated instead to other grants. He also noted that some of the requests were for substantial sums of money, and that some were for new building construction. He observed that it wouldn't take but three or four of these large dollar amounts to completely exhaust the grant funding available this year, and remarked that we can't continue to fund new building construction; there have to be more cost effective ways for PSAPs to satisfy their requirements. He said that in general, from the

committee, it was disappointing to see the lack of participation from PSAPs in that arena, i.e. an effort to collaborate with their peers to come up with more cost effective solutions.

Mr. Isherwood continued by citing a comment he knows he's made for the past three grant cycles, that the committee has yet to see any evidence of any competitive pricing; there is no indication that any of the grant applicants looked for competitive pricing as part of the financial analysis for the application. He noted that is especially unfortunate because it underscores the question "Do you really need as much money as you're asking for?" Lastly, he pointed out that several applications indicated the PSAPs were going to be cooperating/interacting with other PSAPs in the fulfillment of their grants, but there were no interlocal agreements or binding documentation attached to the applications to support those allegations, to hold those parties to that commitment. He observed that equates to people asking for sizeable sums of money to fund an initiative based upon other PSAPs' participation in it, but nothing compels the other PSAPs to do so.

Mr. Isherwood drew attention to the right side of the handout page where some entries state 'Funding Recon,' explaining that the committee felt seven of the twenty applications met the requirements associated with filing a reconsideration request, so rather than encumber grant funds for these, the recommendation that is going to go back to these applicants is for them to file a reconsideration request which will, obviously, then come before the Board for action. He said the committee recommends offering funding to twelve of the remaining applicants, with the recommended amounts appearing in the right hand column of the handout. He pointed out that in some cases the amount being recommended represents a pretty significant reduction of the amount requested. He added that the committee also took into consideration fund balances that some of the PSAPs were holding, looking for those PSAPs to apply some portion of that fund balance to their particular initiative as well. He also advised the double asterisk found beside some of the recommended funding amounts denotes those awards are contingent upon executed MOUs with participating agencies, and 'claw-back' clauses, if appropriate.

Mr. Isherwood said that in summary the recommendation from the committee is to fund the twelve initiatives indicated on the handout in the amounts indicated for a total of ~\$15.4M. He then asked other committee members to speak up if there was anything else they wanted to share. Mr. Shipp said he felt Mr. Isherwood summarized it very well, and Slayton Stewart agreed, saying the only thing he would reiterate is the perception that there was very limited coordination/cooperation among PSAPs to put together a backup PSAP plan. He observed he thought it would take very little effort to contact your neighboring PSAP to put together a plan where you back each other up instead of spending millions of dollars to build new buildings to put backup PSAPs in place. Noting he has served on the committee for five or more years now, he said this is the first year he's been this disappointed in that piece of the applications.

Chairman Estes summarized there was a motion coming out of committee to approve the grant package as presented in the handout, which requires no second, then opened the floor to questions/comments regarding the motion. Mr. Barbour asked if there is a timeline under which the MOUs are to be executed. Mr. Isherwood replied the committee had not discussed one to date. Mr. Barbour commented that "...so we don't just have money hanging out, I'd like to establish a timeline."

Mr. Bradford responded to Mr. Barbour that there are details related to the plans in the applications—some are more detailed than others. He said that within those plans and within their budgets a timeline can be constructed, but those are somewhat individualized, and there are conditions that he would say can be fairly implied in looking at those plans. He observed if there is a desire to have that in writing, then that can be constructed, but it's not something we have today. Chairman Estes offered that what we have today is that the money is contingent upon executed MOUs, and surmised that what Mr. Barbour is asking is that we set a date for that to be completed, and if the date is not met, then the money reverts back to the Grant Fund. Mr. Barbour concurred, saying then the money could be used for somebody else's project. Chairman Estes asked Mr. Bradford if that could procedurally be offered as a friendly amendment to the motion. Mr. Bradford replied it's probably wise to have the discussion and identify any of the conditions that the Board

would like to include in the award that would subsequently be reflected in the contracts. He advised the Statute permits the Board to have grant contracts to include such terms and conditions as it believes are necessary—this would appear to be one of those conditions—and it has been in the past. Mr. Taylor concurred, reiterating we've done that in the past based upon the particular grant, setting timelines and conditions for it, just for the very reason Mr. Barbour is speaking of. He speculated we would do the same thing here, emphasizing it is on a one by one basis. Chairman Estes once again asked Mr. Bradford how to proceed with the question.

Mr. Bradford pointed out the motion before the Board is to approve the funding. He continued that as a secondary matter, once the funding is approved, he would suggest that there be one or more motions—preferably one—that identifies the conditions you would want to include. He added that at this point, given the comment made that some of these recommended amounts are substantially less than the applicants requested, the applicants may choose to opt out of the award at that level of funding. He observed that in the past Mr. Taylor has contacted each grantee and confirmed whether or not they could proceed with the level of funds offered, and if they say “Yes”, then we can deliver a contract document that has a deadline for signing and returning, and one of the items in that is the production of the interlocal agreement (not really an MOU, but a signed interlocal agreement that commits the participating governments). By doing that, he said, you satisfy both the contract and the condition Mr. Barbour has raised.

Referring to the dollar amounts in the left column on the handout, Chairman Estes asked if he was correct in understanding they represent the amounts requested. Mr. Isherwood confirmed that, and Chairman Estes continued, randomly selecting Halifax County as an example of having requested roughly \$8.9M but only being offered \$2M in grant funding, observing there are a couple of things that could happen. He said that as Mr. Bradford had already referenced, they may say they cannot continue with the project with that amount of grant funding, so they would withdraw their grant request, and that \$2M could be made available to another grantee somewhere on the list, or, it might put them in a position to partner with other PSAPs which had received grant funding to pool their awards to cooperatively achieve their goals. He then asked Mr. Isherwood if that was the intent of the committee in distributing the funds in not only an equitable way, but also to encourage sharing versus fully funding but a few individual projects. Mr. Isherwood affirmed that, and Chairman Estes said he just wanted to clarify it, then asked if there were further points of discussion before calling the motion.

Andrew Grant said that to add on to what Chairman Estes had been talking about, using Halifax County as an example, he asked if there have been any conversations with any of the Grant Committee members with any of these jurisdictions about whether or not they would move forward with the amount they were offered. Mr. Isherwood advised that would be next in the process, and Slayton Stewart observed committee members did not feel they had the authority to do that without first getting approval from the Board. Mr. Grant conceded that was appropriate—that he just wanted to know—and then posited a follow-up question asking if, for example, Halifax County's backup plan has been submitted to staff, reviewed, and approved so they are applying for this grant with the notion that they already have approval for building a new structure. Mr. Taylor replied he was going to go with his memory, but he believes this is one of those where they are saying they are going to have a regional backup but there was no documentation that indicated anybody else was going to be a part of it. Chairman Estes asked if Halifax County's backup plan had been approved contingent upon building a new facility. Mr. Taylor replied it had not been; that was not part of their backup plan. Mr. Grant then asked what their backup plan did call for. Mr. Taylor referred that to Tina Bone, who replied part of their backup plan indicated they were going to join with Northampton County and, she believed of the top of her head, Warren County. Chairman Estes said, “So that's what's in their plan, but that's not what was in the grant application, from what I heard?” Mr. Taylor confirmed that. Chairman Estes then observed, “So there's a disconnect between what was in their plan and what was in the grant application,” which Mr. Taylor again confirmed.

Mr. Grant replied, “Kind of to Jason’s point, but kind of a different track, I want to support PSAPs, but if they’re not submitting for what they asked for, because it sounds like what they asked for would be considerably less, and if staff’s reviewing it and it may be a viable plan and we are putting out there a liability of \$2M, which is a lot less than what they’ve asked for, I don’t know if I’d want to approve even the \$2m, at that point.” He added that not knowing the timing restrictions we have before us, he doesn’t want to delay or cause any timing issues. Chairman Estes asked Mr. Taylor if there is a time because of the calendar and the way grants have to be approved—could he outline that? Mr. Taylor replied the money has to be moved by the end of September; it must be moved into the grant fund and allocated. He added it doesn’t necessarily have to be allocated to any particular PSAP, but it must be moved into the grant fund.

Mr. Grant observed since we are under a time constraint and we can’t resolve this right now, perhaps the motion would be to add onto Mr. Barbour’s motion that there be conversations with “...the Halifax Counties of the world” that have submitted a different backup plan, one that doesn’t coincide with what they’re applying for. He added there is a lot of staff reconciliation in that. Noting the Board can approve the \$15.4M grant award total to go into the grant fund—that has to procedurally happen—Chairman Estes began to ask how that \$15.4 gets distributed to individual PSAPs if...Mr. Taylor interjected “It can be reallocated.”

Observing the conversation has been “picking on Halifax” when it could apply to virtually any county generically, Mr. Taylor used a more generic example, saying a county asked for \$10M but was only awarded \$5M in grant funding, if the county says it cannot work with only \$5M, then the Board has to deliberate as to whether it can do any better (increase the award) or if \$5M is the best it can do—that’s “...where we have to sit down and figure it out.” He noted that in the past, he can recall only two times when a grant was awarded for the total requested amount, but whenever anyone has been presented an opportunity to accept a reduced amount, they have said they would make that amount work. He added that, just as Mr. Isherwood alluded to earlier, when we read through these grant applications we see some very inflated pricing, especially in construction costs. He commented that within the applications you could find per-square-foot costs double those of other, similar applications in the same group. He also noted that both Burke County and Rockingham County, the recipients of the two fully funded grant awards he alluded to earlier, ended up having funds left over; they obviously spent well. Mr. Taylor pointed out that we try to fund as many people as we can, to help as many people as we can, and this year with the backup mandates we especially want to help as many PSAPs as we can, noting that was why the committee moved so many folks toward funding reconsideration.

Chairman Estes said, in an effort to keep the meeting moving forward, he would like to propose and offer as chair that the current motion be tabled for a few minutes while a second motion be entertained setting conditions that the Board would like to apply to this grant cycle, and he would like to hear the motion considering conditions while the current one is tabled. Mr. Barbour asked for staff input regarding what it considers a reasonable timetable: 30 days, 60 days, 90 days, 45 days? He also reminded everyone that the PSAPs’ governing bodies probably only meet once a month, usually early in the month. He continued his train of thought saying he was thinking November 1, as that gives governing bodies two full months to meet. Mr. Taylor, after an aside with Mr. Bradford, said he would suggest December 31. Mr. Barbour remarked “That’s a long ways out,” and Chairman Estes immediately asked if that would allow time to reallocate money to other PSAPs. Mr. Taylor said he was trying to be fair to governing bodies, and asked Mr. Bone, since he is a county manager, if he thought December 31 was fair. Mr. Barbour advised he probably could not comment, since his county is requesting a grant, so Mr. Taylor turned to guest Randy Beeman, currently Director of Cumberland County Emergency Services but formerly a county manager himself, for his opinion, but before he could even answer, Mr. Taylor answered his own question, saying he felt that would be a good date, and was one that had been used in the past. Mr. Bradford added that in the past we have sent contracts out to be executed and returned within 90 days, noting that would essentially give local governments time to review and work on them. He suggested the Board not go more than 90 days; if there is a need for an extension for some reason, that can be managed. Mr. Barbour observed that 90 days puts

it at December 1, and Chairman Estes said he would advise 90 days from the date of approval, which would be today.

Mr. Barbour made a motion that the 90-day window be established for both execution of the MOUs (interlocal agreements) and acceptance of the award amount being offered. Slayton Stewart asked if there are additional considerations that we need besides just timing, and Chairman Estes said that was his question as well. Mr. Barbour replied the conditions he named were the only ones he'd heard discussed at this meeting that need to be accomplished. Slayton Stewart asked, "How about the term of the MOU (interlocal agreement)—we discussed that in a brief committee meeting yesterday." He illustrated that by saying if we're going to spend, say, \$10M on backup facilities, should we require a term for the interlocal agreements—maybe 10 years, maybe longer? Chairman Estes asked Mr. Bradford if there is a historical timeline of interlocal agreements we could use. Mr. Bradford's reply was that they vary—some last a very, very long time. He offered that he thinks the point Mr. Stewart is making here, based upon the committee meeting yesterday, is that in looking at grant applications, if there is an implementation period for a backup, that is before they go live, 36 months or thereabout, then how long is that facility going to be in use, and does that matter to the Board in terms of the expenditure of grant funds? He observed that if the grant agreement is 40 months, because the build-out and go-live is 36, then after 40 months they turn it into something completely unrelated to 911, what then? How would that sit with the Board? He said he thinks that is one of the committee's concerns, and that is the one Mr. Stewart is raising now: does the Board want to have some sort of reasonable life period associated with the term of the agreement, and would it expect that to be reflected in the interlocal agreement? Mr. Bradford explained these are things he typically deals with on behalf of clients or client agencies, but "You can't leave it up to me."

Mr. Grant surmised the interlocal agreements will come back before this body; was that correct? Mr. Bradford replied they would not come back before this body prior to being signed, and Chairman Estes added they just need to exist before the funds are distributed. Mr. Taylor agreed they do; they need to come back as part of the contract, which is maintained by this office. Mr. Grant asked if we have ever implemented or encouraged any length of time for any interlocal agreements for consolidations. Mr. Taylor replied, "Absolutely," and when Mr. Grant asked what the length of time had been, Mr. Taylor said it had been for 10 years.

Chairman Estes stated, "Basically we have a motion on the table, for this grant cycle—2016 grant cycle—and the Board is applying conditions to that cycle." He related one of the conditions is a 90-day window within which interlocal agreements must be signed and returned to staff, and the second is the recipient's acceptance of the dollar amount of grant funding offered by the Board within the same window of time. Mr. Barbour interjected he didn't mind adding that the agreement be in force for a minimum of ten years. Slayton Stewart asked Mr. Bradford if that would only pertain to the interlocal agreement, and Mr. Bradford replied the grant agreement would have to remain in force as well, but no further funds would be expended. Apologizing for "being so difficult today," Mr. Stewart asked "So what about any provisions for breaking the terms? If you have, say, two or three PSAPs committed to an agreement and one pulls out, would there be a claw-back provision against whichever PSAP pulls out." Chairman Estes asked if we have ever done a claw-back, and Mr. Bradford replied yes, that's been done in each of the last two grant cycles, principally for consolidations, to ensure a continuity of operations and continued support. He offered you might look at that as sort of the O&M extending into the future, if you will, but that's been a condition of prior grants. Chairman Estes asked if that's standard in all of our grants now or does the Board need to add that as a condition to this particular 2016 grant process? Mr. Bradford replied it's not necessary in all grant agreements; some of them have just basically been purchase of equipment, in which case he doesn't think it's necessary to have that claw-back, but it is needed in some agreements where there is an extended period of performance; where funds are expended over a period of time prior to when performance really begins, as in construction contracts and things of that nature. Mr. Taylor offered that came about during the first two consolidation grants, Burke County and Rockingham County, and the claw-backs were with all of the agencies that were a part of the consolidations so that if any of those agencies pulled out of that consolidation within that 10-

year period of time, it would be responsible to return that money to the grant fund at a pro-rated amount, providing an incentive to remain a part of the consolidation. Mr. Barbour observed he thinks Mr. Bradford has the vehicle he needs to take care of claw-back provisions without making that a part of the motion.

Eric Cramer asked if they ask for \$4M and we tell them we only have \$2M to offer, do they have to document where they're going to get the rest of the funding to make up the \$4M in their original ask? If they say they're going to get \$1M from here and \$1M from there, but then don't do that, do we then withdraw the award offer, the \$2M, because they can't pull together the entire cost? Mr. Bradford replied this is something we have done throughout the grant program process with grant contracts, noting that one of the first deliverables from the grantee is a revised budget that identifies where the monies come from. So if there are things that cannot be funded that are necessary, he said, then their project plan may be realigned associated with when they expect to have other monies, that type of thing. He explained we take steps within the grant contract to ensure that the overall project can be achieved.

Chairman Estes observed the only other comment that came up in our discussion was alignment with their backup plans, and Mr. Grant offered that he thinks implicit in Mr. Barbour's motion is that issue will "wash itself out" because what will happen is the jurisdiction is going to have to decide which direction it wants to move in, an example being if a submitted plan is a less expensive plan utilizing existing facilities and they are faced with being awarded a lower grant amount than they hoped for, it's their choice whether to move ahead or not. He said he thought Mr. Barbour would agree, adding that takes the Board out of it, which is a good thing; let them resolve their issues, which way to go—they're in charge of their budget, they're in charge of finding other sources of funding—and then they can respond to us within the 90-day period. Mr. Bradford added that he would say, based upon comments we've received today and in past meetings from staff about backup plans, that he thinks it is incumbent upon him, as Board counsel, to check with Tina Bone in particular to look at backup plans for these grantees where that is impacted and make sure that there is some coordination and assurance that the project can be achieved; and if there are particular terms that are reflected in the plans, to understand how those are impacted by the grant and vice versa. He said they would address that in drafting the agreements.

Saying none of us want to see someone get left behind, Mr. Grant said he felt sure if there were some special circumstance staff would bring it to the Board's attention, one possible example being where a PSAP submitted a backup plan to staff that matches up exactly with their grant request. Mr. Taylor said to that point there are several in there, and he will pick out a couple. He cited Pasquotank County as a good example: their grant request matches their backup plan—it falls right in line with it—and their award is pretty close to what they asked for. Another example was Ashe county, which the committee felt was better served by a funding reconsideration.

Chairman Estes asked for a read-back of the motion from the minutes taker, who was unable to quickly collate one from notes. In the interval of silence which followed, Mr. Shipp observed that he realized we are setting policy per se as it relates to this funding year on the grant, but asked is this something we should go ahead and approve from a policy standpoint now so we're not addressing these same issues again next year for the grant awards. Mr. Taylor replied we do this every year as far as the deadline, and Chairman Estes interjected he thinks Mr. Shipp's point is should this become "...these conditions are met every year for a grant." Mr. Bradford said he would say that's a fair topic, perhaps, as something we could put on for another meeting, but, it may be one of those issues that is best addressed a few months from now when we start talking about grant priorities for the next grant cycle; at that point we may be better informed and there may be some NextGen implications that we would want to add to those conditions, for example. He added that NextGen, by the way, is another thing he will address in writing the contracts this year.

Chairman Estes clarified then that the motion on the table applies to this grant cycle, with the conditions of the 90-day window for submitting signed interlocal agreements and indicating acceptance of the grant award amount, as well as a 10-year term for the interlocal agreement. Hearing no further discussion on this

motion, Chairman Estes called it, and it passed with Ms. Sykora, Mr. Smith, Mr. Bone, and Mr. Stewart in abstention as they had indicated earlier during the conflict of interest portion of the meeting.

Chairman Estes indicated he was now bringing back the original, tabled motion, which was a recommendation from committee to approve ~\$15.4M to be transferred into the grant award fund and distributed as outlined in the handout with the understanding that the conditions the Board just approved be applied. Hearing no further discussion on the motion, Chairman Estes called the vote, which passed with the same members abstaining as in the previous vote. Chairman Estes thanked the Grant Committee for its work, observing that's a lot of money about which we must be careful.

8. Standards Committee Report

a. Approval of peer rules review attributes

Ms. Sykora reviewed that the Board approved the work of the Standards Committee on what the peer reviewer checklist would be at the Martin County meeting, and that today the committee is bringing before the Board a list of attributes that the peer reviewers would need to have. She said they looked at, if this is truly to be a peer review, management personnel at one PSAP coming in to review management personnel at another PSAP, etc., and that the committee wants to get the Board's buy-in to these attributes, as well as how the reviewers are to be selected, noting the Board will actually be approving the list of reviewers the Standards Committee selects.

Chairman Estes observed this recommendation comes from the committee as a motion, requiring no second, to approve the peer review team attributes and selection process. He asked for any discussion regarding the motion before the Board, and Mr. Isherwood asked how long these individuals would serve on the team. Ms. Sykora replied committee members have discussed that, wanting to make sure that someone doesn't just perform one review and then quit, but since it is a voluntary thing the committee has not mandated something like "You have to sign up for a three-year stint." She added, however, they would want/expect a level of commitment commensurate with the investment in training, etc. Mr. Isherwood added he was thinking that perhaps as technology changes, new reviewers with different skill sets may present themselves, and Ms. Sykora concurred, saying that's one reason why they wanted to reviewers to have diverse abilities and strengths. Chairman Estes asked for further discussion of the motion, and hearing none, called the vote, which passed unanimously.

9. Update on PSAP funding work session

Chairman Estes reviewed yesterday's work session, including the history and issues historically associated with the PSAP funding model, and the outcome of the session in his notes as high level summaries was:

- to ask for the committee to come back with some guiding principles for the Board to approve at a later date
- to consider hiring a third party to help build any potential future forward-looking model and bring a recommendation back to the Board
- to have the Executive Director commit to a timeline and process for establishing a 911 Board strategy as outlined in the statute

He added we all understand this is a very difficult topic that needs to be handled very carefully because there is a lot of money involved and it affects the way each of the PSAPs operates, so it will be done in a very transparent and clear way with time for transition as any changes are contemplated by the Board.

10. NG911 Committee update

Committee Chair Jeff Shipp reported the committee did meet on August 16th and began by reviewing the project schedule, which he is happy to say remains on schedule. He added they enjoyed a very informative presentation from Allan Sadowski from FirstNet, and continued to discuss the ways that they as a committee and his group can continue to work together and be made aware of both of their projects' progress and how they are set to accomplish their goals. Mr. Shipp observed one of the most interesting documents to come out of their meeting was the risk analysis, as they continue to look at potential risks as

they move ahead and address those. He asserted he thinks that is a very informative document and thanked staff and the consultants and the committee for developing that.

Updating the RFPs, Mr. Shipp reminded everyone that the first RFP was for the ESINet and hosted CPE, reporting the committee received eleven responses to it—many thousands of pages worth! He noted work is continuing there from an evaluation standpoint and he hopes to have something to bring to the Board by the end of the year. He added that the NMAC RFP was released last week with responses due by October 21st.

Chairman Estes asked if there were any questions for Mr. Shipp or the committee. Sheriff Hagaman asked if they could provide a quick timeline of when things are unfolding, and Mr. Shipp advised as it relates to the RFPs they hope to have an award recommendation to present to the Board on the first RFP by the end of the year, with the first ESINets to be deployed hopefully by the beginning of 2018.

11. School Safety Committee update

Committee Co-Chair Greg Hauser reported the committee met in Orange County on August 18th at the first meeting of the state's Safer Schools Committee, with members of NCEM, the Commission for Safer Schools, the Division of Instruction, members of the 911 Board, and some PSAP management personnel in attendance. He characterized it as an information gathering session with a lot to take in. He said they found out, as the Board discovered in the briefing from Director Sprayberry a couple of months ago, that there is a lot going on with the project. He said they're trying to figure out a plan of attack, observing it's a huge initiative that we are mandated by legislation to take part in. He added that without going into the weeds on it, there are two different pieces, a panic button and a panic application, and they had extensive discussion on how school staff were going to activate these things. After being immersed in that for a while, he said they realized that's not what we're really concerned with: our concern is how a PSAP is going to receive those alarms and respond to them. He said he did want to commend NCEM, currently in the process of, or perhaps by now finished with, consultations with 15 counties, which did give our team a draft analysis report. Once the final analysis for all 15 counties is complete, he said they will release the final analysis to the committee and to the Board for comment.

Chief Hauser related that initially, after these consultations, they found five or six categories that stakeholders are concerned about:

- infrastructure and connectivity—e.g. how's it going to work if our school does not have WiFi?
- notification—is it going to go directly to a 911 PSAP or to a third party call center?
- location accuracy—if I'm in the gym is it going to show me in the cafeteria, or if I'm on the third floor is it going to show me in the basement?
- user access—who's going to have it? If substitute teachers are working, are they going to have it?
- requirements for devices—can they afford to buy a smartphone for every teacher or staff worker?

Turning to the concerns of the committee, Chief Hauser listed the following:

- call volume in the center—we know this will be a very labor intensive incident should it occur, so are we going to be able to accept the information they're sending us, or are we going to be completely swamped and on the phone taking calls from citizens reporting the emergency? He observed that is something that this committee is specifically going to have to be concerned with, and that's where they're going to need comments from PSAP management from PSAPs around the state, so please anticipate either Committee Co-Chair Dinah Jeffries or him or other members of the committee reaching out to PSAP management for input
- user training—if a new teacher comes on board and the school hasn't provided the training and something happens at the beginning of the school year, the intent of this initiative will be completely bypassed

Chief Hauser reminded everyone that this project has been going on for some time now, so we're kind of behind the eight ball and need to go full speed ahead on this. He advised the next committee meeting is currently scheduled for September 27th, again in Orange County.

Ms. Jeffries added one thing they discovered is how hard everybody's been working but how disjointed everything remains, noting that the interesting thing is that even with SROs in the schools, we don't even have any indication of what they understand or what's been put out there. She postulated it was one of the greatest informational sessions she has ever attended, and hearing what the Center for Safer Schools is looking at and what they understood, observed it was a little bit different than what we understood. She said this was a great collaborative effort, and she has asked Mr. Taylor to do some research in the next few weeks checking with Arkansas and West Virginia because she understands they already have this in place. She added it is a little scary...when they talked about the way it's being delivered, and if the PSAP will get voice communication, she found out they're not really sure. She said she tried to explain the difference between pressing a button to activate an alarm and receiving an appropriate response. She also speculated that perhaps we sometimes we get too deep in the development of how this is, what it should look like, etc., rather than really looking at the very basics to begin with of what exactly do we need for a fast response.

Chief Hauser added we do not know where things stand monetarily, either, and are not sure whether this is going to be requested as a statewide project, so he just wants the Board to be aware that this may have some "financial ask" to it as well. Mr. Taylor said he wanted to quickly interject that we talk about the alert button and the panic button and it was interesting to him to note that one guy from the Safer Schools was talking about one thing while everyone else was talking about another. He said they finally came up with the distinction between "old school" and "new school" concepts—the other fellow was talking about a button on a desk while everyone else was talking about a button on a phone. Chief Hauser also noted there was a distinct line between "response" and "PSAP"; they were all about the response level but had not taken into account the receipt of the alarm which directly impacts this Board. Mr. Taylor surmised the biggest take-away for everyone was to understand they were "...all talking apples and oranges and some grapefruits thrown in as well."

Ms. Sykora noted that UNC has deployed an app similar to this, and asked Ms. Jeffries if those calls go to the Orange County PSAP, and if so, what information accompanies them? Ms. Jeffries replied campus 911 calls go to UNC's PSAP, not Orange County's, and she did not know how the app worked or what information it supplied. Ms. Sykora then said they could discuss it another time.

Mentioning having created two Co-Chairs for the School Safety Committee, Chairman Estes took a moment to remind everyone that the Board does much of its work in committees, so the committee structure is very important—it allows these Board meetings to be efficient and effective—so please make sure you're looking at the committee structure and participating as appropriate. He also noted that upcoming committee meeting information appears in the agenda book.

Other items

Chairman Estes asked if there were any other business items to come before the Board today. Hearing none, he entertained a motion to adjourn.

Adjourn

Ms. Sykora moved for adjournment, Ms. Jeffries seconded, and the meeting adjourned at 12:36 PM.