



Meeting Summary
North Carolina 911 Board
Funding Committee
Tuesday May 03, 2016
Banner Elk Conference Room
3514-A Bush St, Raleigh NC

<u>Members Present - Via Phone</u>	<u>Staff Present</u>	<u>Guests</u>
Jason Barbour	Tina Bone	Glenn Lamb Guilford-Metro
Randy Beeman	Richard Bradford	Sandy Land Guilford-Metro
Dave Bone	David Corn	Brenda Womble Wilson County
Andrew Grant	David Dodd	Brett Wrenn Person County
Len Hagaman	Karen Mason	
Dell Hall	Marsha Tapler	
Melanie Neal Guilford- Metro	Richard Taylor	
Tonya Pearce		
Laura Sykora		
Stephanie Wiseman		
<u>Members Absent</u>	<u>Staff Absent</u>	

Rollcall

Richard Taylor called the roll.

Tab 1 Chair’s Opening Remarks

Chair of the Committee, Jason Barbour called the meeting to order at 1:30 PM. Mr. Barbour requested Dave Bone Chair the meeting since he was off premises.

Tab 2 Funding Reconsiderations: (vote required)

Richard Taylor discussed:

Person County – The reconsideration was held over from last month due to contracts 5 year term. After further evaluation regarding the time the time in which contract was signed and executed (December 2014) and the Esinet project began, Staff recommends approving the reconsideration total of \$929,630.00. Laura Sykora checks to verify that her vote includes no conflict of interest. None is found. Tonya Pearce motions to approve funding. Dell hall seconds the motion. All are in favor and the motion carries.

Tab 3 Surry County – Secondary PSAP (vote required)

Mr. Taylor discussed prior problems with accurate call count regarding funding for 3 secondary PSAPs. Call count issue was resolved by working with phone vendor to get the count as follows: Surry County expenditures are 605,263.00, which makes cost per call at 15.36.

- Mt Airy receives 2842 calls 43,653.13
- Elkin PD receives 1072 calls 16,465.00
- Pilot Mountain receives 8 calls 122.88

Surry is seeking approval for 3 secondary PSAPs at the above figures. Staff’s recommendation also includes making the request retroactive from application date in prior year. Laura Sykora makes the above motion. **Len Hagaman** seconds the motion. Motion carries unanimously.

Tab 4 Interpretive Services Cap Proposal (vote required)

Dave Corn presents the Boards request for recommendation from the Funding Committee regarding the Interpretive Services .75 cap proposal. A discussion regarding the amount of cap and the transitional period between preexisting contracts ensues. It is determined the new contract begins July 1, 2016. Mr. Taylor suggests PSAPs under other contracts would be able to run out their current contracts pending the PSAP provides their current contract term. Mr. Bradford mentions the need to recognize automatic renewals among local government. Tonya Pearce motions to set a .75 cap with the exception of existing contracts for the current fiscal year and that we would not approve auto renewal. Also, appropriate documentation would be provided to staff as necessary. Laura Sykora adds friendly amendment that staff could approve those exceptions. Dell Hall seconds the motion. Dave Bone seeks legal counsel regarding appropriate usage of current fiscal year in motion. Mr. Bradford suggests a time limit to facilitate transition. Ms. Pearce adjusts her motion to the next 12 months. Dell Hall seconds the motion. Tonya Pearce restates board recommendation motion of a .75 cap, excluding current contracts set to expire within the next twelve months, and those exceptions should be presented and approved by board staff. A vote is taken and motion carries unanimously.

Tab 5 Discussion on Proposed Revenue-Expenditure Reporting

Richard Taylor updated the committee on recent PSAP Funding Subcommittee discussion. He mentioned PSAP funding model as flat rate vs. rolling history model and mentioned perhaps instead of

doing detailed Revenue-Expenditure review each year, staff could do a sampling as local government does. Randy Beeman further discussed his experience with local government and the process of random sampling. Mr. Taylor socialized the idea of 1/3 of detailed PSAP reports being reviewed and the other 2/3 PSAPs signing off as accurate and true reporting, noting all end of year CAFRs would still be compared. Concern that ineligible not reviewed but later found is the biggest hurdle to overcome. Marsha Tapler also added that aside from the grouping of PSAPs that would be reviewed, any CAFR not matching the Board report would signify a cause for review. As for an auditing tool, the State Eagle system was introduced to committee. Mr. Taylor reiterates that the purpose is to make this an easier process for all, but still get the necessary data to track expenses. Laura Sykora suggests that the Subcommittee flesh out the topic further. Comments regarding vendor terminology was also mentioned by Stephanie Wiseman.

Tab 6 Backup PSAP Estimated Cost

Mr. Taylor presented estimated back-up plan costs. Mr. Taylor reviewed back-up plans noting cost differentiation between backup costs and normal refresh costs. Mr. Bone requests that all ineligible on backup plans need to be noted as such on approved plans placed on the web. Because each PSAP backup plan is different the ability to present finite numbers was discussed. Grants, time in which backup costs were implemented and whether or not fund balance is being used were topics of conversation. For example, Tina Bone clarifies that costs for primary phone systems and Geo-Diverse systems were not split out between primary and back-up costs in spreadsheet. Dave Bone asks Marsha Tapler for bottom line figure. He further asks Legal Counsel about state obligations to pay for back-up PSAPs. Mr. Bradford responds to the extent we have funds. Laura Sykora cites funding in the rules. Mr. Bradford notes statutes trump the rules. Marsha Tapler answers approximately 5.6 million dollars. Concerns for PSAPs with no financials is mentioned by Ms. Tapler. Mr. Bone requests, as definitive as possible, what this will cost statewide? Information requested by next board meeting.

Tab 7 Next RFP for Statewide Purchasing

Dave Corn recommends committee moving forward with CPE or switch RFP. NG 911 compliancy is an issue. Mr. Taylor asks about hosted solutions? Dave explains it is already included. Mr. Bone asks about the efficiency of creating like RFPs. Mr. Taylor explains the procurement process. Mr. Bone requests we know the next things coming down the pike. The staff welcomes the request. Dave Corn suggests (hosted) CPE, CAD and recorders. Richard asks any other ideas would also be appreciated.

Tab 8 Workstation/Laptops

Marsha Tapler explains the workstation \$1000 cap is too low and has created issues. Presents Staff's recommendation to change cap to \$1700, which was researched under average state contract quote. Also, Ms. Tapler requested doing away with percentages. Discussion ensues regarding contract pricing and yearly pricing increases. Randy Beeman makes the recommendation to modify the current cap threshold for \$1700. Laura Sykora seconds the motion. The motion carries.

Staff is looking for committee direction regarding Service-Pro laptops for eligibility for back-ups, supervisors and dispatcher, which are tablets. Jason Barbour asks how does it fit in the statute? Marsha explains CAD and mapping capabilities. Concerns are extra peripherals and time of use (overflow),

when applicable. Tina Bone explains CPE software will not be on laptops just CAD. Mr. Barbour seeks Legal Counsel. Mr. Bradford explains is it necessary to perform call taking, however, eligibility may vary depending on use. Dave Bone suggests additional information needed for staff to make recommendation. What is needed? The Service-Pro “use” is furthered discussed. The committee is undecided. Dell Hall motions to table. Tonya Pearce seconds the motion. Motion carries.

The meeting is adjourned at 4:00

DRAFT