

North Carolina 911 Board Work Session
SUMMARY
Wilkes County Agricultural Center
416 Executive Drive
December 1, 2016
9:30 AM – 4:30 PM

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Staff Present</u>	<u>Guests</u>
David Bone (NCACC) Martin County	Ron Adams DIT (Temporary Solutions)	
Josh Brown (LEC) CenturyLink (pending)	Tina Bone (DIT)	
Heather Campbell (CMRS) Sprint (pending)	Richard Bradford (DOJ)	
Chris Estes (911 Board Chair)	Ronnie Cashwell (DIT)	
Andrew Grant (NCLM) Town of Cornelius	Dave Corn (DIT)	
Chuck Green (LEC) AT&T (pending)	David Dodd (DIT)	
Len Hagaman (Sheriff) Watauga County	Karen Mason (DIT)	
Greg Hauser (NCSFA) Charlotte Fire Department	Marsha Tapler (DIT)	
Rick Isherwood (CMRS) Verizon	Richard Taylor (DIT)	
Dinah Jeffries (NCAPCO) Orange Co. Emergency Services (phone & WebEx)		
John Moore (VoIP) Spectrum Communications	<u>Staff Absent</u>	
Niraj Patel (CMRS) Verizon (pending)		
Rob Smith (LEC) AT&T		
Jimmy Stewart (NCAREMS) Hoke Co. 911		
Slayton Stewart (CMRS) Carolina West Wireless		
Laura Sykora (LEC) CenturyLink		
Donna Wright (NCNENA) Richmond Co. Emergency Services (pending)		
<u>Members Absent</u>		<u>WebEx Guests</u>
Jason Barbour (NCNENA) Johnston Co. 911 (911 Board Vice Chair)		Mike Edge, Scotland Co 911

Darryl Bottoms (NCACP) Pilot Mountain PD		Jon Greene, GeoComm
Eric Cramer (LEC) Wilkes Communication		
Jeff Ledford (NCACP) Shelby (pending)		
Jeff Shipp (LEC) Star Telephone		

1. Chairman's Opening Remarks

Chairman Estes thanked all for coming and checked to ensure Dinah Jeffries was participating over the phone bridge, which she was. He asked Mr. Taylor if anyone else was expected to join in later. Mr. Taylor replied the only other Board member who might be joining would be Jason Barbour. Noting Mr. Barbour was not logged in on WebEx, Mr. Taylor asked if he was on the phone bridge and received no reply.

Chairman Estes explained that although this annual work session would be similar in structure to a Board meeting, it would be much more casual and informal. He then took a moment to recognize new Board members attending the meeting, asking each to offer a brief personal history:

Josh Brown, representing and with CenturyLink for 15 years
Chuck Green, representing and with AT&T for 17 years
Chief Jeff Ledford, Shelby Chief of Police representing NCACP (not present)
Niraj Patel, representing and with Verizon Wireless for 11 years
Donna Wright, representing and with NENA for 26 years

Chairman Estes thanked the new Board members for their willingness to serve on the Board, and encouraged them to participate in the work session, as no votes would be taken.

2. Presentation of National 911 Guidelines Assessment Report findings

Mr. Taylor summarized the history of the statutorily mandated 911 State Plan, both from 2010 and 2012, and how a 2014 refresh of that plan prompted the Board to consider participating in a National 911 Guidelines Assessment Report offered to states by the National 911 Program Office to aid in the process.

The assessment report structure included nine categories of guidelines, with varying numbers of guidelines assigned to each category:

1. Statutory & Regulatory—27 guidelines
2. Governance—7 guidelines
3. Functional and Operational Planning—9 guidelines
4. Standards—6 guidelines
5. Security and Continuity of Operations—7 guidelines
6. Human Resources—8 guidelines

7. Evaluation—5 guidelines
8. Public Education—5 guidelines

Mr. Taylor observed that as the process began there was much discussion between Board staff, Mr. Bradford included, and the national assessment team, because staff felt many of the guidelines contained in the assessment were unclear. The project ultimately took nearly a year and a half to complete, and despite the very positive verbal report initially presented by the national assessment team at the PSAP manager's meeting last year in Raleigh, staff was less than happy with the written document when it arrived. Staff questioned several of the findings, sending a list of its concerns to the National 911 Program Office. The Program Office assessment team reviewed the list and responded to and acknowledged each staff concern, but modified only one of their findings as a result. Ultimately, the assessment team agreed to publish the staff comments and the team's responses to them within the final report as a concession to the staff concerns.

Mr. Taylor underscored that the whole focus of this is to look at what we can do better, not to feel criticized rather than critiqued. He stressed the focus is to look at what an outside group of 911 professionals sees as our weak and strong points. He explained that he wants to go through the assessment during this work session so if people see some things that are not already on the agenda we might stop and discuss them. He reminded everyone that many statutory and regulatory considerations cited in the guidelines do not, indeed, appear in our statute, so it may be that we want to take a look at them to consider whether or not they should be taken up as possible legislative changes.

Mr. Taylor displayed a spreadsheet he had constructed in which assessments assigned to each guideline by the assessment team were quantified as "scores" based upon percentage values, observing he had created it to provide a color coded visual representation of the assessment team's findings. The color coding represented the numerical "scores" Mr. Taylor had assigned relative to the assessment criteria used by the assessment team:

- Red—does not meet minimum criteria, "score" of 0
- Yellow—meets minimum criteria, "score" of 33
- Blue—meets advanced criteria, "score" of 67
- Green—meets superior criteria, "score" of 100

Some guidelines were assessed with a binary Yes or No answer. The color coding Mr. Taylor used for such "scores" was:

- Green—Yes, "score" of 100
- Red—No, "score" of 0

Mr. Taylor first addressed guideline SR2: "The state has a designated 911 coordinator." The assessment team decided North Carolina only met that criteria at a minimum level because the state does not statutorily *require* such an appointment, despite the fact that the 911 Board has designated the Executive Director of the 911 Board as the person who serves in that capacity.

Mr. Taylor pointed out this is one of the issues where staff disagreed with the assessment because the *intent* behind having a state 911 coordinator is clearly being met by the Board's designation despite it not being statutorily *required*. Ms. Sykora asked 911 Board Counsel Richard Bradford how important it is for that requirement to be in the statute if that is simply the way this Board functions.

Mr. Bradford explained he believes the point the assessment team was trying to make is that some states have statutory or regulatory language which prescribes specific duties, powers, and so forth for the person who sits in Richard Taylor's position. He observed the State of North Carolina frequently does not do that for its boards and commissions—sometimes it does, but frequently it does not. He added that NC has a number of other statutes that prescribe how discretion is exercised, the oversight associated with that, and so forth. He posited that we have more than an adequate legal basis for this Board, Richard Taylor's role.

Chairman Estes observed that his perspective in looking at the report is for the Board to determine if it is on track in areas that are important to it, regardless of what they (the assessment team members) say is important. Citing the example of whether or not Mr. Taylor was statutorily appointed, he observed "Who cares?" He said he's not going to waste a lot of cycles talking about that topic because he feels like we have adequate leadership, we have good staff, we have the Secretary of Technology over this Board through the Department of IT, so there's a lot of law that protects the citizens of North Carolina. To him, he observed, it's a non-issue.

He continued by noting, however, that in looking through the document he does think there are some areas which provide good insight, citing cybersecurity as a good example and observing that as Mr. Taylor scrolled through that column on the spreadsheet, he did not think it was "as green as we would probably want it to be." He continued that given what's going on in the world right now, that's probably an area we want to talk about as a Board and maybe double-down some of our efforts either through the committee structure, funding, etc., because this is an area that's continuing to evolve and affect citizen services. He mentioned that is but one example of how the report does highlight an area that we should spend some time talking about.

Mr. Taylor explained that he brought the topic up principally because it illustrates the tone of the assessment: if something's not in the Statute, then it feels as if the implication is that the North Carolina 911 system is somehow inferior. In response to a query from Sheriff Hagaman as to where we stand in relation to other states, Mr. Taylor noted that the only other state to have completed the assessment was Delaware, which doesn't compare to North Carolina. He added, however, he had been checking with his national counterparts in other states regarding some of the assessment findings and had found that we are stronger than some in regard to certain areas, but do have room to improve in others. Mr. Bradford added that in surveying statutes and regulations across the country in all the states recently, he would say that North Carolina is well above average. He observed some states do things very differently than North Carolina, having fundamental differences, not necessarily good or bad, that these guidelines don't take into account, which was part of the problem he had with the assessment from a legal position.

Discussion ensued regarding guidelines SR16-SR20: quality assurance, training, and certification and accreditation. The assessment team had found that the state 911 system did not meet minimum criteria established in the guidelines for those activities because they were not statutorily mandated. Topics Board members discussed included how 911 funds may be used to pay for costs associated with those activities, exclusive of “people costs,” i.e. paying personnel to administer those activities or paying part-time personnel to fill in for those attending training; how PSAPs have felt they were being told how to run their business; how labor-intensive a thorough quality assurance program is; how the state OEMS does dictate, through its medical director, how EMD is to be performed and how quality assurance is an essential part of that; how the new rules don’t dictate how an activity is performed—only that it is performed—whereas OEMS does dictate how when the activity is EMD; the possibility of providing contracted QA for any of the protocols in use by PSAPs as a statewide project in lieu of paying personnel costs, which is prohibited by the statute; whether the activities should be recommended or mandated; etc.

Chairman Estes suggested a list be started of what areas within the assessment are important to the Board as potential goals for prioritizing funding or contemplating statutory changes. A flip chart was produced, and Mr. Taylor asked Karen Mason to record items on the list, which she began to do. Chairman Estes, citing the need to move on, reminded everyone to focus on where the Board’s limited resources can add the greatest value for the PSAPs.

Continuing in the Statutory & Regulatory category, Mr. Taylor briefly elaborated on SR 26 regarding multi-line telephone systems (MLTS) and SR27 regarding whether the state considers 911 as an essential government service, both of which had been assessed as not meeting minimum criteria in the report. Mr. Bradford observed declaring 911 as an essential government service is generally not done across the country, usually because of liability concerns and TORT claims law, so he does not feel it would gain any traction here.

Moving to the Governance category, Mr. Taylor spoke to guideline GV7, which referred to the state providing a resource sharing model, noting that OEMS already does that. Chairman Estes observed that we do encourage local governments to share resources, an example being PSAP consolidation. Mr. Bradford observed that the assessment does not look at the state as a whole, but only at the 911 Board, so the interplay among OEMS, DPS, and local governments was not really part of what the assessors considered.

The three guidelines which did not meet minimum criteria in the Operational category were OP5, OP6, and OP8. Mr. Taylor observed that although 911 funds may be used to pay for data backup expenses (OP5), and virtually every PSAP voluntarily does backup its 911 data, the state does not *require* a data backup plan. Consensus around the room was that such a requirement should not be dictated by the 911 Board. OP6 indicates state-level guidance should exist for public safety’s use of social media, and Board consensus was again that it was not something the Board should become involved in dictating, as ample best practice recommendations are already being adhered to. Turning to OP8: “The state has a formalized

process and communications plan for change management,” Mr. Taylor opined that this was not within the Board’s responsibilities; it is, instead, up to the local governments to determine.

Three of the guidelines within the Standards category were deemed not to meet minimum criteria by the assessment team: ST1, ST3, and ST4. Mr. Taylor observed that the standards were still going through the rule-making process at the time of the assessment, and noted that had the rules been finalized then, as they are now, there would likely have been no problem with ST1 and ST3. He did observe, however, that the requirement of ST4 that we have specific interface standards for the exchange of 911 data between functional entities is one that the Board does not presently have, although that will soon change, as it will be a necessary piece of the NG911 project and is currently being worked upon within that project.

Looking at the Security and Continuity of Operations category, Mr. Taylor offered that either the Board or local governments were actively addressing all of the issues for which the assessment team felt we were not meeting the minimum criteria in SC3-SC7, and addressed each one in detail to demonstrate why he believes that to be the case.

Noting that Human Resources and Training are subjects the Board has historically determined to be local issues, Mr. Taylor speculated that the Board could not meet the requirement of guideline HR1: “The state has minimum/essential telecommunicator training requirements,” without a statutory change. Mr. Bradford concurred, adding, however, that is a topic the Education and Training Committee is working on right now. HR3 stated that “All emergency communications staffing positions have an associated job description;” Mr. Taylor agreed, as that is again within the local governments’ purview, not this Board’s. HR8 indicated that the state should have a comprehensive stress management program accessible statewide; Mr. Taylor agreed that the state does not, although many volunteer groups do offer that service statewide. Donna Wright and Greg Hauser concurred, observing those services are typically available either through OEMS or mutual aid agreements locally. Chairman Estes asked if members thought this was something the Board should become involved in providing, but Board member consensus was *not* to go there, although acknowledging it could help promote awareness of those currently available resources.

Within the Evaluation Category, the assessment team felt North Carolina 911 did not meet the minimum criteria for EV5: “The state has guidelines, based on specific metrics, for measuring and managing telecommunicator staffing levels.” Mr. Taylor observed this has been a hot topic of discussion within the 911 community for many, many years, and continues to be one today. He related that PSAP managers have indicated to staff that this is a very high priority for them; that they are seeking some guidance.

Public Education was the last category in the assessment. Mr. Taylor essentially agreed with all of the findings within that category, offering that despite all the good work the Education Committee has done and is doing, we could stand to improve in all of the areas where the assessment team found us wanting.

Mr. Taylor concluded his comments on the assessment by encouraging Board members to actually read the detailed report, as the detailed information provides far more insight than this “high level” summary has. He added that how we feel about this assessment is probably going to be exactly how the PSAPs feel about our assessments when we begin doing the peer review of rules compliance, so please keep that in mind.

Chairman Estes shared that his attention was drawn to the portion of the Executive Summary on page 8 of the report in the Growth Areas section, noting that the Board should ensure all applicable topics are added to our list on the flip chart. Discussion principally revolved around recommending telecommunicator staffing requirements, with Mr. Taylor stressing that they must only be recommendations rather than mandates.

3. Discussion On Committee Structure

Chairman Estes reviewed the committee structure which the Board has used for several years, noting for new Board members that the majority of the work accomplished by the Board is dependent upon work first performed within the committees. He noted that changes will necessarily be made to the committees because of the Board member turnover taking place in January, and encouraged both existing and new Board members to volunteer for committees which interest them. He observed that today his intent was to discuss not only filling vacancies on existing committees, but also contemplating creation of some new committees.

Mr. Taylor and Chairman Estes reminded retiring Board members that stepping down from Board membership did not necessarily mean they could not continue working on committees, as many committee seats are for non-Board members, and their knowledge and expertise would be invaluable for helping new Board members serving on committees get up to speed.

Mr. Taylor then reviewed in some detail each of the existing committees, the functions they perform, and how frequently they tend to meet. He pointed out that each committee has a staff member assigned to it to arrange meeting logistics, provide meeting summaries, etc. Chairman Estes advised he and Mr. Taylor have discussed making a few tweaks and wanted to run them by the Board today for feedback. One was to “re-brand” the NG911 Committee as the Technology Committee to broaden its scope a bit, an example being assigning cybersecurity to that committee. Laura Sykora asked Mr. Bradford about potential for conflicts of interest since private sector companies Board members represent may be involved in bidding on some of the 911 Board’s Next Gen 911 RFPs. Mr. Bradford replied once the contracts have been awarded, there would be no cause for such concerns, and frankly, access to private sector companies’ resources and expertise is the reason those seats exist on the Board. With no further discussion forthcoming, Chairman Estes advised he would, as chair, like to see that change take place.

Chairman Estes offered another tweak would be to add a legislative committee rather than depend upon ad hoc interactions among Board members, Board staff, and the General Assembly or other policy makers, such as local government representatives. He said he envisioned it as more of a policy committee for developing relationships with all such

governmental officials rather than just relying upon Mr. Taylor to be the voice of the Board in such instances. Concerns were expressed about using the word “policy”, as Board members don’t want to give the impression that a committee is setting policy for which the entire Board should be responsible. Chairman Estes suggested substituting the word “strategy” for “policy,” noting for private sector people that in government circles the two are considered practically synonymous. He envisioned the charter of the committee to be to develop the strategy of the Board, keeping the entire Board current, and representing the Board in interactions with “policymakers,” both local and state—and potentially even federal.

Concerns about how the committee would interact with “policymakers” were expressed by Board members, and Mr. Bradford provided a lengthy explanation of potential pitfalls regarding what entity a committee/Board member would be perceived as representing and how that could be avoided. He also reviewed the Board’s statutory authority to make policies, rules, and standards, emphasizing they are not synonymous terms, policy being broader than the other two. He stressed that as long as debate within the committee is brought before the entire Board for decision making, there should not be a problem.

Chairman Estes said he envisioned this committee meeting only just before and/or during legislative sessions to prioritize any legislative initiatives the Board may have and figure out how to communicate those to the General Assembly while it’s in session; answer any questions coming from the GA in reference to the Board’s actions, etc. More concerns were raised about committee composition, open meeting law, etc., and Mr. Bradford explained at length that meetings with legislative members, committees, or subcommittees do not qualify as meetings where business is being conducted, only as meetings for the purpose of exchanging information, so they are not subject to open meeting law requirements.

Discussion continued relative to what the committee would be expected to do. Consideration of talking points was well received, and Mr. Taylor stressed that the committee would not be able to set policy—decision making would always be up to the Board—but if policies or talking points were articulated by the committee and approved by the Board, then when he or Chairman Estes or whomever is called to meet with a legislative representative from any walk of government, then everyone can be assured that what is being shared is not a personal representation of how the individual sees an issue, but a Board policy.

Conversation continued around how the committee could stay on top of what’s going on at the GA; whether the DIT liaison should be involved, and if so, how deeply; how Mr. Taylor would be more comfortable receiving specific Board direction rather than having to rely on just his sense of how the Board “feels” about a topic; etc. Relating how, when he is called downtown to meet with a legislator, he always carries multiple copies of whatever relevant documentation he might need simply to be prepared, Mr. Bradford observed that one of the purposes that could be served by this kind of a committee is to do exactly that: to be prepared, so that whomever is called to meet with a legislator after work or early the next morning to talk about “X, Y, and Z,” does not have to scramble to become prepared.

Observing that much remained to be done today and more time had already been spent on this topic than he intended, Chairman Estes advised he would table the discussion and solicit feedback from members offline. Before leaving the committee structure agenda item, however, he mentioned he wanted to touch on the School Safety Committee, asking if some of the education related suggestions articulated in the executive summary of the assessment could be assigned to that committee rather than the Education and Training Committee, since it had already been inundated with assignments. After much discussion regarding the charge to the School Safety Committee versus the role of the Education and Training Committee, the prevailing opinion was that it would not be a good idea, so it was left alone.

Lunch

4. Discussion on Grant Cycles

Announcing that during lunch he and Mr. Taylor had decided to make some changes to the agenda, Chairman Estes said they were going to eliminate the grant cycle discussion and examine the school safety program in greater detail, as well as cancel the PSAP visitation slated for later in the afternoon.

5. Discussion of School Safety Program

Mr. Bradford said that after attending meetings of the School Safety Program with the Board's School Safety Committee and Mr. Taylor, he was concerned that it seemed some agencies participating in that initiative expected to fund it using 911 funds. Mr. Bradford said he wanted to make it clear that cannot happen, although he heartily endorses the Board being supportive of the initiative; the statute simply does not allow for 911 funds to be used in that way. Chairman Estes asked if any requests for money have been made. Mr. Bradford replied no, it has simply been intimated, but he recommends that be nipped in the bud before it does become an issue. Mr. Taylor interjected that during the last meeting he felt DPS was virtually at the point of asking for funds, but never quite got there. Chairman Estes asked if there were some way to work around the issue and set policy to allow funding or do it through some sort of statewide initiative. Mr. Bradford replied the answer was still no; the fundamental system that the initiative seeks to promulgate is *not* a 911 system.

Discussion ensued touching on many aspects of the initiative, including impact on PSAPs, cell service to schools, could/should it be web based, but always returned to the fact that this system does not represent a 911 call. Mr. Bradford counseled waiting for someone to ask for funding, then require them to justify it within the statute. Rob Smith asked if the GA did modify the statute to require the 911 Board to fund this, would it be seen as an unacceptable diversion of 911 funds in the eyes of the FCC. Mr. Bradford replied it could, although such a change could be written in such a way as to circumvent the problem. School Safety Committee members Dinah Jeffries and Greg Hauser both acknowledged this is an important and worthwhile initiative, but as yet there are still too many unknowns to begin developing standards and guidelines of any type. Chairman Estes said he thought we should develop a standards and guidelines document nonetheless, and asked Ms. Jeffries and Mr. Hauser to work in conjunction with Mr. Bradford to that end.

6. Update On the NG911 Project

Dave Corn offered a slide presentation regarding the Board's NG911 project for new Board members, including why the 911 system must move from analog to IP, why and how the Board is contending with that change, directives which have come from the GA regarding NG911, how the project is progressing and will progress, etc., including putting the first PSAP online on the ESINet in 2018 and completing the process no later than 2020.

7. PSAP Managers Roundtable Discussion Summary

Mr. Taylor advised the Roundtable Discussions at October's annual statewide PSAP Managers meeting were:

- telecommunicator training—moderated by David Dodd
- transition plans for 911 personnel who will be retiring—moderated by Tina Bone
- what the future will look like for PSAPs—moderated by Dave Corn

Mr. Dodd reported that he had asked the PSAP managers how they would respond to an offering of regional telecommunicator training classes, observing he felt the idea had been well received with the caveat that two classes be offered in each region to accommodate training different shifts at different classes. Another topic had been the partnership between Richmond Community College and the Board to offer a PSAP managers certification program, noting that will be an agenda item at tomorrow's Board meeting. Topics suggested for consideration for training classes included customer service, stress management, generational communications (among the five generations presently in the workplace), some kind of training on high profile events, social media, drama in the workplace, cybersecurity, active shooters, liability issues, and equipment troubleshooting. Mr. Dodd related that mandatory training for line telecommunicators was very well received, garnering nothing but positive feedback.

Tina Bone reported that many PSAP managers will be able to retire within the next five years, but few have taken steps to provide a transition for their successors. She discussed ideas with them on how to prepare for that, principally trying to get everyone in the 911 center, including telecommunicators, more involved in what goes on in the 911 center—how the PSAP functions. Other ideas included allowing staff members to be involved in decision making, from how they can dress on weekends to which pre-arrival instruction protocols they prefer; encouraging good documentation habits, information sharing, and staff communications. Above all, however, the successor must *want* the leadership position, which can, indeed, be taught and learned; new leaders need to be prepared, not be thrown into a job which they later discover they are not cut out for or happy in.

Several Board members offered suggestions relative to this, such as considering mentoring programs; realizing that for the most part young people today do not want to stay in one job for a career—most want to work a few years at a job and move on; competition from the private sector in pay is a problem; and it may take four or five months for someone to realize they are not suited to the job.

Dave Corn related that the topic he moderated was, “What will the future look like,” observing he thought he learned as much as anyone in the managers group did. He said he immediately realized that although his frame of reference is technological, theirs is personnel—people, not stuff. By virtue of that, he said they spent little time on technology and lots of time on people issues, and nearly everything they talked about was negative. For example, they are afraid of video—afraid of the trauma it will cause to their staff—e.g. how will they bear up under seeing blood and gore on their computer screens? Another concern they expressed was how much more of a challenge multi-tasking will become with the addition of so many new streams of data—photos, videos, etc.—and what will happen with court time re: collecting photos or video, how long will they have to be retained, what happens if they have to go to court to explain it, etc. They were also worried about liability insofar as making a choice of which photo or video would be most useful to an incident commander, and will they have to have someone on staff who can read ASL if someone sends a video of someone signing a message.

Mr. Corn said about the only technical thing they liked about NG is hosted solutions— hosted systems provide removes the responsibility of managing technical platforms and provides an opportunity for them to devote more time to call taking and call takers. Otherwise, many managers appear to be uneasy about the changes NG911 is going to bring.

8. Legislative Agenda for 2017

Postponed.

9. Discussion On Committee Meeting Dates for 2017

Postponed.

10. Open Discussion

Chairman Estes invited Board members to offer any input or ideas in open discussion, starting with departing Board members because they probably could share some lessons learned over the years—what are the things they are most proud of, or would like to make sure we finish—make sure we get done. Laura Sykora said she has seen much improvement in the past eight years, observing that as tempting as it may be to single out one or two things to focus on, all are important. Rick Isherwood offered admiration and respect to the people who work in PSAPs, observing that something must be done to elevate telecommunicators both in pay and respect if we ever hope to reduce churn. He also encouraged continuing to promote PSAP consolidation as a way to help on all fronts. Rob Smith submitted that he felt the assessment report discussed earlier gave a poor representation of how well the North Carolina 911 system works—that North Carolina is one of only a handful of states that do things right. He added that the Board has a good balance of public and private sector members and should fight to keep it that way. He concluded with the observation that when North Carolina get NG911 done he’s confident it will serve as an excellent model for other states.

Chairman Estes then opened the floor to the remaining Board members. Greg Hauser observed the Firefighters Association is paying close attention to what this Board is doing, particularly the funding piece, noting they want to see response times continue to come down. David Bone said funding is his big concern, that we must increase efficiencies with what we do. He also referred back to what Mr. Isherwood had said about focusing on the people, not just the technology. Andrew Grant tendered that his number one goal is, and has been for years, to come up with a new funding model—get a good, forward-facing funding model in place before raising the 911 fee.

Noting the distinction between the funding model and fee revenue, Chairman Estes speculated that the Board will have to focus on both simultaneously. Mr. Bone observed that short term needs are going to need to be met before a new funding model is developed and implemented, which he feels is still a couple of years out. Others expressed agreement.

11. Establish Goals for 2017

Chairman Estes and Board members brainstormed many potential goals, and as each was discussed, Ms. Mason recorded it on the flip chart. Chairman Estes also reminded everyone not to forget there are already many things we are doing well, and we mustn't lose sight of them. Once the brainstorming was complete, Chairman Estes asked everyone to place from three to five check marks on the flip chart next to the topics they feel should become goals for next year. The list on the flip chart was:

- QA statewide project ✓
- Professional certification and accreditation of TCs, PSAP Mgr training ✓x8
- Cybersecurity ✓
- CISD
- funding, i.e. fee assessment for revenue ✓x5
- funding model for PSAPs ✓x14
- approved notice of meetings & cancellations
- retention job status (merged with professional certification etc.) ✓x6
- “legislative” & “policy” committee ✓x4
- NG911 & First Net ✓x14
- Consolidation ✓x9
- Backup PSAPs ✓x3
- Backup reporting
- PSAP management outreach ✓x2
- Strategic planning ✓x5
- Website improvement (enhance website) ✓x3

Once everyone had placed their marks, Chairman Estes observed four areas “jumped out” as the “top four”—next gen, consolidation, funding model, and accreditation/training—with a close second tier—job status, the strategic plan, revenue, and backups. He ventured that if we were to prioritize based upon this exercise, the four top scorers would become priorities for the next twelve months, adding, however, that doesn't mean the remaining ones aren't important, and

we will continue to have work going on in those other areas. Comments were made regarding backup PSAPs and strategic planning being goals set for us by the General Assembly, so those were added to the top scorers as well, since they are mandates.

Mr. Bone stressed continued follow-up re: the backup PSAPs, as there is still much work to be done on that. Chairman Estes asked Mr. Bradford if there are any legislative priorities that the General Assembly has given us that we may have missed or didn't give enough weight to. Mr. Bradford replied he didn't think so, observing that many of these things are inter-related and would come up naturally as the topics are developed and actions are planned. He added that the one thing he would highlight would be the strategic plan, but he sees that more as a writing exercise and updating what exists rather than a new work effort. Mr. Isherwood submitted that the job status and retention item could easily fall within the purview of professional certification and accreditation. Chairman Estes agreed there appears to be a correlation between the two, and suggested they could be merged together.

Chairman Estes proposed that the committees should look at these goals to understand what they mean to each committee, noting they may frequently apply to more than one. He also observed that last year eight or ten goals were identified, and somewhere along the way each of them appeared to be given approximately equal weight with the net result being that Mr. Taylor and his staff got spread really thin—it ended up “kinda killing everybody” working on a lot of things instead of the Board having provided clear direction on a few—which is what he sees as the purpose of today's exercise: to provide Mr. Taylor and staff better direction for prioritizing their time against these things that we just said are priorities for the Board.

Chairman Estes directed Mr. Taylor to have the goals written out by tomorrow's meeting in the form of a smart goal: specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time bound, etc. Mr. Taylor asked Ron Adams to do that, at least in some sort of draft form, before tomorrow's meeting. Mr. Taylor commended everyone for a very productive work session, saying he believes it may well have been the best one to date. He also stressed his thanks to Slayton Stewart and his team for orchestrating the logistics of this, noting that Ronnie Cashwell and David Dodd have had nothing but good things to say about how well their needs have been met.

12. Wilkes County 911 PSAP Tour

Cancelled.

Adjourn