

North Carolina 911 Board Meeting
MINUTES
Eagles Business Center, Wilson Community College
902 Herring Ave East, Wilson, NC
March 31, 2017
10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Staff Present</u>	<u>Guests</u>
Dave Bone (NCACC) Martin County	Tina Bone (DIT) (phone)	Ron Adams, Southern Software
Josh Brown (LEC) CenturyLink (WebEx and phone)	Richard Bradford (DOJ)	Randy Beeman, CCES
Heather Campbell (CMRS) Sprint	Ronnie Cashwell (DIT)	Rachel Bello, Wake Co
Eric Cramer (LEC) Wilkes Communication	Dave Corn (DIT)	Maureen Connelly, Mooresville PD
Andrew Grant (NCLM) Town of Cornelius (WebEx & phone)	David Dodd (DIT)	Susan Davis, Mooresville PD
Chuck Greene (LEC) AT&T	Karen Mason (DIT)	Brian Drum, Catawba Co 911
Len Hagaman (Sheriff) Watauga County	Marsha Tapler (DIT)	Greg Foster, Alexander Co 911
Greg Hauser (NCSFA) Charlotte Fire Department	Richard Taylor (DIT)	Del Hall, Stokes Co 911
Dinah Jeffries (NCAPCO) Orange Co Emergency Services (WebEx and phone)		Jeff Holshouser, ADSC
John Moore (VoIP) Spectrum		Adam Johnson, CCES
Niraj Patel (CMRS) Verizon		Tim Johnson, DIT/CGIA
Jeff Shipp (LEC) Star Telephone		Tim Mitchell, CCES
Jimmy Stewart (NCAREMS) Hoke Co 911		Christine Moore, Guilford Metro 911
Slayton Stewart (CMRS) Carolina West Wireless (WebEx and phone)		Melanie Neal, Guilford Metro 911
Donna Wright (NENA) Richmond Co Emergency Services		Lisa Reid, Fayetteville 911
		Darrin Smith, NC DIT
		Victor Williams, Beaufort Co Sheriff 911
		Paul Winstead, CenturyLink
<u>Members Absent</u>	<u>Staff Absent</u>	Brenda Womble, Wilson Co 911
Jeff Ledford (NCACP) City of Shelby PD		
Danny Lineberry, Acting State CIO, Board Chair		<u>WebEx Guests</u>
		Tammy Aldridge, Rutherford Co 911
		Fred Baggett, NCACP
		Mark Beal, Newton PD

		Byron Burns, CRS
		Stephanie Conner, Surry Co 911
		John Correllus, NC DIT
		Allen Cress, Rowan Co 911
		Tonya Evans, Durham 911
		Brad Fraser, Shelby PD
		Bill Gibbs, Lincoln Co 911
		Jon Greene, GeoComm
		Grayson Gusa, Davie Co 911
		Brock Hall, Burke Co ECC
		Columbus Hawks, Rowan Co
		James McGuinn, Polk Co
		Teresa Ogle, Madison Co 911
		Phil Penny, MCP
		Ronnie Rombs, Lincoln Co Comm
		Nicole Sain, Hickory PD
		Roman Scruggs, Rutherford Co 911
		Bob Smith, RCES
		Candy Streszinski, Iredell Co 911
		Corinne Walser, MEDIC
		Herman Weiss, Gates Co 911
		Brett Wrenn, Person Co 911

Roll call—At 10:00 am, 911 Board Executive Director Richard Taylor polled Board members on the phone bridge. Josh Brown, Andrew Grant, Dinah Jeffries, and Slayton Stewart all confirmed they were present. Vice Chair Bone observed Ms. Bobbie Jones, Chair of the Wilson County Board of Commissioners, who was going to deliver welcoming remarks, had been delayed by the weather, speculating she would be arriving soon.

1. Chairman’s opening remarks

Vice Chair Bone asked Mr. Taylor to move ahead with the swearing in ceremony for new Board member Niraj Patel from Verizon Wireless, appointed by Speaker of the House Moore to fill the expired term of Rick Isherwood representing a CMRS provider. Mr. Taylor and Mr. Patel moved to the podium, where Mr. Taylor administered the oath of office to Mr. Patel. Upon completion of that, Mr. Taylor noted that we now have a complete, sworn Board. Vice Chair Bone welcomed Mr. Patel as a sworn member of the Board, saying everyone looks forward to his contributions to the Board.

2. Ethics Awareness/Conflict of Interest Statement

Vice Chair Bone read the Ethics Awareness/Conflict of Interest statement printed in the agenda and asked if any Board members were aware of any conflict or potential conflict of interest with respect to matters coming before the Board today. Josh Brown said he would abstain from voting on agenda item 8c. Vice Chair Bone thanked him, and reminded everyone that if they should become aware of a conflict or potential conflict during the meeting to please identify the conflict or potential conflict at that time.

3. Consent Agenda

Mr. Taylor advised that new Board Chair Danny Lineberry expressed his regrets at not being able to attend today's meeting, noting that as he fills in for the Governor as interim State CIO, he is quite overwhelmed, to the point that he simply could not join us.

Mr. Taylor observed he had distributed the draft minutes of the last Board meeting earlier in the week and had not received any requests for changes, so unless someone wished to bring some up now, the minutes would be accepted as presented. No one spoke up. He next reviewed the financials as presented in the Agenda (please see the Agenda at <https://ncit.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/documents/files/03312017%20Agenda.pdf> and/or the Agenda Book at <https://ncit.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/documents/files/03312017%20Agenda%20Book.pdf> pp 53-56 for details), beginning with the Grant Fund, noting that all of the new grant contracts have been received and the funds for them encumbered in the amount of \$36,665,891, leaving a grant fund balance of \$2,658,038. No expenditures have yet been made from the NG911 Fund, with its balance now standing at \$9,556,229. Mr. Taylor reported CMRS disbursements for the month totaled \$327,361, leaving a balance of \$5,706,249. As an aside regarding the CMRS Fund, he noted staff had observed a huge spike in the revenue reported in November (see the Agenda Book page 55, CMRS Revenue column), and caught that when auditing last month, but that as of this time staff, though aware of it, has not been able to determine if that amount was correct; it is, however, being checked out. He concluded his remarks on finances by reporting that PrePaid CMRS revenue has pretty well leveled off around \$8K/month, this month's actual at \$802,695, leaving a PSAP Fund balance of \$6,660,549.

Vice Chair Bone asked if there were any questions for Mr. Taylor regarding the consent agenda items, and hearing none, entertained a motion to accept the consent agenda as presented. Sheriff Hagaman so moved, Eric Cramer seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

4. Public Comment

Vice Chair Bone read the public comment invitation in the agenda, noting that two individuals had registered to speak today. Mr. Taylor confirmed that Melanie Neal and Lisa Reid had both advised him they wished to speak.

Ms. Neal stepped to the podium and introduced herself as the Director of the Guilford Metro 911 Center, adding that she was also speaking today in her capacity as the First Vice President of the North Carolina chapter of APCO. She added the chapter President had not been able to attend today, but had asked her to speak in her behalf as well. She said that the first thing she would like to ask is for the Board to support the proposed increase in the 911 surcharge fee which is to be voted upon later in the meeting. She expressed concern that 911 funding is becoming less stable with increased demands being put upon it, feeling that an increase in the surcharge would improve that. Ms. Neal then offered that the second item of concern to her and NCAPCO regards H418, which proposes taking 1% of the 911 fund to pay rewards to prevent street sign theft. She does not support that bill, and hopes the Board will not as well, noting that a fund already exists to deal with street sign theft called Crime Stoppers; if a person reports a street sign theft which results in a conviction, Crime Stoppers will pay the reporting person a reward from a fund it maintains for that purpose.

Ms. Reid, the 911 Manager at the City of Fayetteville, stepped to the podium and said she wished to address H476 in regards to Telecommunicator Certification. She added that she is also the current President of the North Carolina chapter of NENA, and is speaking on behalf of both that chapter and Jeryl Anderson, the current President of the North Carolina chapter of APCO, as well as all North Carolina 911 PSAPs, being a PSAP manager herself. She briefly summarized H476 as requiring, by 2019, that any telecommunicators working for a Police Department must be certified either through Sheriff's Standards or APCO telecommunicator training. She expressed concern that the bill repeatedly refers to telecommunicators as justice officers, which is not the case, and which she feels is a strong indicator that the bill was not thoroughly thought through. Ms. Reid added that as a PSAP manager she definitely supports having a minimum state training and certification standard for all 911 telecommunicators, but she is opposed to having 'branded' certification based upon whether or not the telecommunicator serves a particular discipline within public safety.

Vice Chair Bone asked if anyone else wished to present comments to the Board, and hearing none, moved on to the next agenda item.

5. Executive Director Report

a) 911 Board Staff Update—Mr. Taylor reviewed that the 911 Board currently has two staff positions open. He advised that the posting for an additional financial analyst has been closed since February, but he is still waiting on the Human Resources group to forward on to him its recommendations for interviews. He said that in talking with them earlier this week he learned they had received 288 applications for that position, so as soon as they whittle that number down they will get the results to him to begin the interview process. He then stated the second staff opening is for David Dodd's replacement, and that posting had closed last Tuesday, and "needless to say" he is not pushing Human Resources on that while it is focusing on the financial person. He concluded the staff update by noting that once these two positions have been filled, he will begin work on filling the need for an additional network analyst, a position which was approved last year.

b) Update on Regional PSAP Managers Meetings—Mr. Taylor provided a review of the recent PSAP Managers meetings which took place across the state, which he playfully referred to as the 'Tina Bone Road Show' and the 'David Dodd Farewell Tour', as they both dominated the meetings. He displayed a map onscreen depicting all the counties which were represented, those which had hoped to attend but were unable to, and those which did not respond to their invitations. He reported the attendance was 14 for the Southeast Region, 38 for the West Region, 41 for the Central Region, and 33 for the Northeast Region, yielding a total attendance of 126 for all of the meetings. He praised Board members for very good attendance, noting six members had attended the Northeast Region meeting the previous day, and observing he felt there had been good interaction between Board members and PSAP managers.

c) Legislative Update (H418, H476, S364)—Mr. Taylor observed that the Board has already heard from today's Public Comment speakers about their feelings regarding the bills that have recently been introduced in the General Assembly which have potential to impact 911.

He mentioned that he had contacted Rep. Clampitt to learn more about H418 (entitled 'SOS/Save Our Street Signs') to share with the Board, neither endorsing or rejecting it. He came away from that contact feeling that he was not sure that Rep. Clampitt 'has a good handle on' the 911 Board; that he may either be misinformed or perhaps just uninformed. Rep. Clampitt explained his reasoning for why the 911 Board should pay for this effort is that if street signs are missing, first responders cannot properly respond to a 911 call. Mr. Taylor said he explained to Rep. Clampitt that there are several other funds that are more appropriate, and Rep. Clampitt's response was "When you get reward money that is over \$500K then I'll think about changing." Mr. Taylor observed he didn't understand where that comment came from, but it was what Rep. Clampitt said. Mr. Taylor also added that Rep. Clampitt mentioned that he intended to introduce legislation to increase the size of the 911 Board by three members, and also that he thought there should be some revamping of Board membership. Mr. Taylor did not pursue that topic further.

Mr. Taylor then interjected that he brings this up because he needs to know where the Board stands on these legislative initiatives—whether the Board supports a bill or does not support it—so he may speak for the Board rather than for himself, provided the Board even wants him to speak to anyone about any given bill. He added that although DIT formerly had a liaison who did some work on the Board's behalf, she has been transferred to another agency and has not been replaced, so if Board members wish for him to go speak to any of the legislators about these bills, he needs to know what to say on the Board's behalf. He also observed he didn't know whether the Board would wish to address and possibly vote upon its stance toward each of these bills today individually or as a group.

Jeff Ship offered he thinks we should vote on each individually, and also observed that H418 has no co-sponsors, which leads him to question how far it is really going to go at this point.

Vice Chair Bone agreed to take each one at a time, opening the floor to comments on H418 first. Donna Wright said she would like to make a motion to adamantly oppose this bill and that Mr. Taylor speak on behalf of this Board in opposition; Greg Hauser immediately seconded the motion. Vice Chair Bone then asked for any discussion on the motion. Dinah Jeffries said she wanted to interject for some of her colleagues, as well as APCO, that the bill is offensive; that it very much opens the door for any group like this to start making the 911

Fund a slush fund for everybody to pull from. Vice Chair Bone thanked her for her comments, asked if anyone had further comments, and hearing none, called the motion, which carried unanimously.

Turning to H476, Mr. Taylor advised that the language being changed, as was mentioned earlier by one of the speakers, is contained in paragraph (c2): *Effective July 1, 2019, any person employed as a telecommunicator by a municipal police agency shall meet all the requirements of this Chapter. Entry-level telecommunicators shall successfully complete, as determined by the agency, the entry-level telecommunicator course of instruction provided either pursuant to the Chapter or by the Association of Public Safety Communications Officials Institute.* Mr. Taylor advised he has not talked to the Police Chiefs' Association regarding this particular bill, but he does know that over the last several years, as this Board and the Education Committee have tried to work toward certification for *all* telecommunicators, the Association has been very supportive of having their telecommunicators certified. He added, however, he did not know they were looking at an either/or situation such as this. He offered that while he finds it admirable that they want to certify their telecommunicators, he finds the work of the Education Committee in putting together a program that is vendor neutral, creating instead a set of standards for any vendor and any training programs to meet is preferable to what this bill is setting out.

Chuck Greene offered what he characterized as a 'half question/half suggestion', observing that given what was just said, would it be worthwhile for the Education Committee to take a look at this and maybe suggest some edits that could be taken to the bill sponsor? He added if we run into a brick wall with the bill sponsor, we can always come back and oppose it at a later time. Education Committee Chair Jimmy Stewart said he would oppose that idea because this only certifies another segment of telecommunicators rather than everyone; there are plenty of PSAPs which do not fall under a Sheriff or municipal police department. He also observed that, as alluded to by one of the Public Comment speakers earlier, there are things in this bill that "...just plain don't make sense." He said he would like to see this bill go no further and let the committee continue its work to include everyone.

Asking for further discussion and hearing none, Vice Chair Bone asked "What is the pleasure of the Board?" Mr. Stewart made a motion to allow Mr. Taylor to voice Board opposition to this bill. Donna Wright seconded. Hearing no further discussion, Vice Chair Bone called the motion, which carried unanimously. He then asked Mr. Taylor to move on to S364.

Mr. Taylor asserted that this bill doesn't really have an impact on 911 funds, but he wanted to make everyone aware of it. Called the Brian Garlock Act, Mr. Taylor related that it is basically saying that people may not use their cell phone or wireless device while driving, either texting or talking, unless such activity can be accomplished using a hands-free device. He pointed out it does exempt emergency responders, reiterating he is not advocating for it one way or the other—he just wants the Board to be aware it is out there. Observing that his has been offered for informational purposes, Vice Chair Bone asked if the Board wished to take a position on the bill. Consensus around the table was not to take a position.

Mr. Taylor advised that the last bill he wished to bring to the Board's attention, S430 (which did not appear on the printed Agenda for today's meeting), and had been only recently brought to his attention by Donna Wright, is actually the Governor's budget bill. Ms. Wright found "one little line in there" that says, "*Contracts and agreements of the 911 Board shall be exempt from the requirements of Articles 3 and 31 of Chapter 143 of the General Statutes.*" Mr. Taylor asked Mr. Bradford to speak to that for the Board.

Mr. Bradford explained that the section of the bill following this line is basically removing IT procurement from DIT and moving it to the Department of Administration, and this is an idea that comes up every now and then. He speculated that whether it stays or goes no one knows at this point, but the question here is really rather interesting because, if you have no rules, then what rules do you use? He noted that Article 3 of Chapter 143 is where the bulk of procurement is done, so if the Board isn't subject to Article 3 oversight from the Secretary of Administration purchasing contract, and is not subject to IT Procurement, then what does it do? That said, Mr. Bradford advised that if and when this becomes law (and maybe a little bit before then), he'll worry about it, but presently he's not too worried about it. He observed the immediate impact may be what is on some people's minds, e.g. trying to move forward on negotiating a contract for the ESINet, but he really thinks it will not impact that. Pointing out that it is always very late in the session when the budget bill is passed, and that this is the long session, he speculated that since we are anticipating that contract award sooner rather than later, he doubts the bill will have become law before the award is made.

Mr. Bradford observed there are a number of other state entities that operate outside of these oversights, and they generally follow some of the state laws with regard to how they do their contracts, so there are some other laws that would come into play. He said his counsel to the Board right now is to not worry about it.

d) Update on PSAP Funding Consultant—Mr. Taylor said both he and Mr. Bradford have been pursuing this in two different directions, but neither of them has been able to secure a commitment. He said he did receive some information from and has communicated with a dean at ASU in charge of their business group, but he has not heard back from her yet. He added that in talking with the Funding Committee chair about this, they will be having further discussion about this at the next Funding Committee meeting.

Heather Campbell asked, “What if we considered someone like a PHD student who’s needing to do a thesis?” She observed that might give them a tangible project to work on, and give us sort of a free or cheap result that we could choose to either use or not use, but there may be something we can do in parallel. Mr. Taylor replied that was exactly what he is trying to accomplish in making contact with these deans, pointing out that is how the original ECU project got started years ago—what it grew from. He playfully said “We need someone from 50 miles away with a briefcase to come and tell us what we already know.”

6. Presentation by Center for Geographic Information and Analysis

Vice Chair Bone invited Tim Johnson, Executive Director of CGIA to the podium to make his presentation. Mr. Johnson expressed thanks to the Board for the opportunity to brief Board members on the next phase of the Orthoimagery Project. Acknowledging that some members are new to the Board, he said he didn’t want to broad-brush over some of the work that’s been done in the past. He observed that CGIA has been responsible for leading this effort to bring imagery to the local PSAPs since 2012 in a clear, consistent, and accurate way as a result of the investment the 911 Board has made in his office and his team. He thanked the Board for that previous commitment and said he looks forward to fielding any questions members might have about what he is presenting today.

Mr. Johnson related that a couple of weeks ago his team submitted the Northern Piedmont and Mountains 2018 phase orthoimagery project proposal (pages 77-95 in the Agenda Book), which is the third of four phases of the 2016-2019 effort that the 911 Board approved back in February of 2015. He explained the project involves not only the northern piedmont and the mountains, from Caswell County in the east to Madison County in the west, but also extends into both Virginia and Tennessee, which he then illustrated onscreen with a map. He observed that over 12K square miles of varying terrain, including challenging mountain terrain, is encompassed within the project. He said he intends to illustrate the value of what the team has been doing over the past several years to the Board in terms of quality control, what is delivered to the PSAPs as the final product, and how that has changed over the past couple of years as the team has received feedback from the Board, the PSAPs, and other players on the team. He then said he also wants to talk about the investment the Board has made in terms of cost and what his team has been doing to lower that cost, noting they have been the beneficiary of things going on outside the GIS arena in terms of sensors and other factors that bring to bear lower costs.

He said the first thing he wanted to talk about was the value of the imagery, citing two examples where updated local imagery has had an immediate beneficial effect. The first was in Gates County, where they were seeing changes in the landscape as a result of new roads and exchanges being built which limited access to certain communities, impacting their 911 response capability. He displayed an image of such an area from 2012 followed by one from 2016 of the same area, noting Gates County had approached them for help just before the scheduled delivery of the 2016 coastal refresh. Mr. Johnson said that with Mr. Taylor’s approval the team was able to provide the imagery early to allow them to see what was on the ground and how it had changed since 2012, which the team was very proud to be able to do.

The second such example Mr. Johnson wanted to show was in Edgecombe County, northeast of Rocky Mount. The area was faced with hurricane Matthew last year, and the team was able to quickly stand up a streaming service of imagery juxtaposed with the NOAA imagery taken after the event for before and after comparisons.

Mr. Johnson next said he wanted to spend a couple of minutes on the approach to the project, which is probably more important to those who are fairly new to the Board, as it is an approach taken over the past six years which the more tenured Board members have already been exposed to. He emphasized that his team takes the approach of being pro-active in every aspect of this so they are not *re-acting* to things the contractors do that end up costing more money, not to mention time and headache, along the way; the team tries to do everything very thoroughly up front and maintain a complete monitoring of what the contractors are doing during the process. He then displayed a map onscreen depicting the four stages of the acquisition cycle, noting that the coastal area (blue on the map) was delivered in January of this year to the PSAPs in that area, and that the team is now in the middle of developing imagery of the eastern piedmont area (green on the map). He advised they were fortunate this year in getting flight windows that allowed them to collect the imagery early, noting that the warm winter and early spring weather in January and February would have complicated collection due to early leaf emergence. Reiterating that they are in the middle of producing the imagery which was collected, he said quality checking of the data will occur this summer and fall, and what they propose to do this year with that phase is to deliver in December, a month earlier than normal.

Mr. Johnson reminded everyone that the area to be flown during this phase is really a different landscape than the coast and the eastern piedmont; it transitions rapidly, as in western Wilkes County, where you go into the mountains. By virtue of that, he noted the costs are different; it is more costly to fly imagery in the mountains and get to a final product because of sun angle issues, the complexity of flying that terrain, and collecting imagery that is consistent across that varying terrain. He observed the cost proposal the team has submitted reflects that. He added that the piedmont area within the region is very similar to what they have just been working on, i.e. the eastern piedmont part of the state. Mr. Johnson also added that he expects to see some interest from the Winston-Sale/Greensboro/High Point area to obtain more detailed imagery (a three-inch resolution product rather than the Board's six-inch one, at extra cost to the local governments), as they did in 2014. By piggybacking on the Board's project, they are able to save money locally by having the imagery collection contractors collect data in both resolutions during the same flight.

Mr. Johnson displayed onscreen a roster of all the project team member organizations (agenda book pp 81-82), noting it is the same as it was in 2012 when this was first put together. He said that of course the local PSAPs are critical when it comes time for review because they know their areas best, and that the other organizations on the list are there because of their special expertise, observing that CGIA's areas of expertise are in quality control, application development, and project oversight. He introduced Darrin Smith, his day-to-day manager of CGIA's effort, managing the contractors and the public sector partners, noting that they work with four private sector contractors and two state agencies. He observed the team is very collaborative; it needs to be because of the complexity of managing something of this magnitude.

Mr. Johnson next said he wanted to talk about the product a little bit, and how it has changed. He related that when this same area was flown in 2014 CGIA was really delivering a county product to each PSAP, although in some instances, such as in Watauga County, they also included the immediate border area around the county. He continued that as they looked to 2015 they decided, in consultation with the Board, that a seven-mile radius around each county was preferable even to what had been done in 2014, including providing seven miles into an adjoining state when the county line was also the state line. He relayed that all four adjoining states were very cooperative in that effort. He observed that ultimately, in 2018, they will be able to provide PSAPs individual files of all the surrounding counties that they can load into the 911 systems locally, so not only will they have the seven-mile radius, but they will have a complete set of imagery for all the counties surrounding them.

Mr. Johnson observed that quality control for something of this nature must involve many players in order to get the product right. He noted there are many such players involved in this project, able to edit data in the cloud using VOICE (Virtual Online Inspection, Checking, and Editing) that is within their area of expertise. Those players include NCDOT, NC Geodetic Survey, NC Secretary of State, Local Government GIS, Planners, and Tax assessors. He advised that anybody that is assigned an account in VOICE can log in and provide edits or suggested edits that the team then considers to determine whether they are necessary edits.

Turning next to costs, Mr. Johnson related that there are a number of factors that must be considered to determine what the cost is going to be for this type of effort. He said one of the important things going on in the state is the update of elevation data, which is key to delivering precise, orthorectified imagery—really a

mathematical process at the end of the day. The Floodplain Mapping Program in the Department of Public Safety Emergency Management Division has a schedule of delivering an update of the LiDAR for the state, funded by a different source; that investment is key to this effort, and the 911 Board benefits from that investment. An area where cost savings are being realized is in the increased sensitivity and performance of second generation sensors now mounted in the planes; jet fuel prices are also at a cyclical low, reducing the costs associated with flying the planes. By virtue of these savings, Mr. Johnson said the team expects to realize a cost reduction on the order of a couple of hundred thousand dollars from what was presented in 2015 for the 2016 effort, leading to a cost proposal of ~\$3.5M as opposed to ~\$3.8M.

Mr. Johnson said he would like to wrap up with a few words about the process the team uses—a very structured process. He observed the beginning of the process involves qualifications-based selection, which is a standard process for this type of service. He stressed it is not low bid—it is qualifying contractors who have the technical ability to do the work and having them submit cost proposals specific to the project they will be working on. Mr. Johnson noted that typically starts in July and ends the latter part of the year with contracts, and then they start the planning of flights. He explained that flights and the acquisition process are governed by two major things: leaf-off conditions, which in the mountains can extend into April, and the weather. If it's a big snow year, with a lot of snow on the ground even though the skies are clear, you can't fly because the snow obscures detail, such as roads. He added that later in the process, the raw imagery is taken into shops and converted into orthorectified imagery (LiDAR is a key part of that process), and then they move into quality control using the VOICE tool referenced earlier. Use of the VOICE tool takes them through the summer and into November, wrapping up with a final product in early December 2018. He said they are hoping to wrap that up that year so that they can deliver the product to each of the 26 PSAPs before Christmas. He added that even though delivery occurs in December 2018 and early 2019, that's really not the end of it. The PSAPs have a sixty-day 'customer satisfaction period' in case they find additional things that were missed during all the QC work.

Mr. Johnson continued with a comment about how, over the past five or six years CGIA has brought the contractors along to the way CGIA wants things done, and it was a struggle with a couple of them because they were so used to doing things their way. He observed CGIA has gotten the contractors to the point where they have accepted CGIA's procedures, which are very thorough, and one of the national contractors has even told them they've changed their internal procedures to match what CGIA has asked them to do because it allows them to do a better job internally. He said they've used 'the North Carolina way' (their words) to approach projects in other counties and states across the country, noting how it's good to hear that kind of positive comment. He added that the website has been updated and encouraged everyone to go there to learn about the program, concluding his remarks by saying CGIA is ready to tackle this next phase, and would appreciate the 911 Board's support. He said they feel it has been a good partnership, not only among the team members, but also with the Board, and they look forward to working together again.

Vice Chair Bone thanked Mr. Johnson for his presentation, saying he wanted to add, putting on his county hat, that this has been of tremendous value on a county level and is a great product in so many areas. He asked for questions or comments, and Donna Wright spoke very highly of the VOICE product. Mentioning that she had taught telecommunicators how to use it when it was first available, and they had been able, even then, to identify several problems that had slipped through the QC process.

Prefacing his remarks by acknowledging he is a new Board member, Niraj Patel asked for confirmation that this data is a 'one-time snapshot'—a package we buy and use until we buy a new package to refresh it. Mr. Johnson confirmed that is the case, explaining how the business plan that started all this a few years ago was based on a four-year update cycle—each county would be updated in a four-year rotation. He added that the phases he displayed on the map were the same phases used from 2012-2016, and we last flew the northern piedmont and mountains in 2014.

Mr. Taylor added that the first flights of the project actually took place in 2010, and some counties at that time had not updated their orthography in over ten years. He explained that during that year, while this project was ramping up and before deliverables were ready, the cost to the 911 Board to pay individual counties to update their orthography, which was an allowable 911 fund use, was over \$25M to the 911 fund. He stressed how this plan of working with CGIA to provide updates every four years has been a great tool for the local governments in staying up to date. He added that he considers this project the crown jewel of this 911 Board; the vision this Board had in

2010 when it started the project, the vision of adopting the four-year refresh cycle, and the unbelievable cost savings all support that. Observing this is a statewide grant project, he applauded CGIA for its efforts in looking for every possible way to make this an efficient and effective and economical use of public funds. He underscored that the team is constantly looking for ways to save money, noting that oftentimes grant recipients go in a completely opposite direction, trying to figure out how to 'creatively spend' grant funds; CGIA has actually reduced costs and improved the product at the same time. He praised the good job they do, and told them he is very appreciative of all they do.

Mr. Johnson said he wanted to make one more comment for the benefit of the Board, namely that this data not only goes to the PSAPs, but once it is delivered to the PSAPs, it becomes available to anyone through NC OneMap, the state data resource for lots of types of data, with imagery being one of the fundamental datasets that lots of people use for lots of different purposes. He added that he knows lots of folks are appreciative 'on the other end' for what they have received as a result of this effort.

Vice Chair Bone offered that just to echo that sentiment, in Martin County they are finishing their tax re-evaluation process and having these updated images is definitely beneficial—that this is definitely a tremendous example of good government. Jimmy Stewart related that every year he provides a report to NCAREMS, whom he represents on the Board, and the first thing he speaks of every year is this project, pointing out how it has been used countless times in search scenarios, how responders can download it on a tablet from NC OneMap and overlay search grids on it. He added that of course they use it in the PSAPs, noting that his county (Hoke) has recently added all of the counties adjoining it to their PSAP maps and adding it has already paid great dividends. He concluded his comments by saying the best compliment he can give this product is that it has saved lives, and does it on a daily basis in this state.

Asking for and hearing no further comments, Vice Chair Bone said he would entertain a motion to approve the proposal as presented. Jeff Shipp so moved, Eric Cramer seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

7. Status of Backup PSAP Compliance

Mr. Taylor reported there has not been a lot of movement in implementation over the past month, but Tina Bone has told him that many are expected in the month of April. He added that Ms. Bone, and indeed the entire staff, is in constant contact with PSAPs about this. He also added that, as he continually stressed at the recent regional PSAP Manager meetings, he is encouraging any PSAPs that don't believe they will meet the July 1st deadline to have their city or county managers notify him through official correspondence, in writing, regardless of what their problems are, so that he can share that information with the Board and see what can be done to help.

Mr. Taylor then related that he has received letters from Robeson County and the Town of Lumberton in this regard, as they were severely impacted by Hurricane Matthew, to the extent that their proposed backup site flooded, so they are having to start over. He added that the County Manager has indicated all of their funds have been spent in simply responding to that disaster, so they are investigating any and all possible resources—FEMA, insurance, etc.—and that they need \$500K off the top. Mr. Taylor advised him that he would like to meet with him and the Lumberton City Manager together to see if a workable plan can be created that will fit for both of them, and that the meeting has been set for next week.

8. Funding Committee Report

a) Recommendation to Increase 911 Fee to 70¢ for FY 2017-2018

Acting in his role as Funding Committee Chair, Vice Chair Bone began the report with a recommendation from the committee to increase the 911 surcharge fee to 70¢ for next year. He observed that this topic had been discussed at length at the last two committee meetings, and after substantial and thoughtful discussion, the committee voted 6-3 to recommend a 10¢ increase in the surcharge, which is currently 60¢. He noted there was also discussion about a 5¢ increase, but the majority felt a 10¢ increase is needed for multiple reasons. Returning to the discussion about this topic last year, he reminded everyone that an increase was not approved because people felt further justification for an increase was needed, so the committee came up with a list which it believes justifies the increase:

- The Board recently approved a change in the CMRS fund distribution percentages to PSAPs and CMRS providers because it saw a need to have more funding available to PSAPs for reconsideration requests.
- The projected that local PSAP fund balances have decreased approximately 37.5% in one year, from ~\$64M to ~\$40M, numbers Marsha Tapler provided to the committee. He added that some of the existing fund balance in that \$40M is earmarked for capital projects planned for the near future.
- The backup PSAP requirement has increased the number of reconsideration requests, and the committee is still going through those requests. He pointed out that many of the requests are due to the costs of compliance with that requirement and we're looking at the July 1st deadline.
- The allowable carry-forward amount for reconsideration requests has been adjusted down from 20% to 10%.
- We have changed the practice in regards to approving funding for allowable expenses under reconsideration requests. Previously, if an item under consideration was allowable, it basically got funded, but now a higher level of scrutiny is being used, so just because something is allowable does not mean it will necessarily be funded. The question now is whether or not it is needed.
- We know the backup requirement will increase maintenance costs for PSAPs, but not to what extent. Although it is kind of hard to predict, we do know maintenance costs will be a factor.
- Additional pressures include an anticipated increase in the administrative costs percentage, legislative initiatives which may impact the fund, etc.

Vice Chair Bone related that the majority of the committee felt we have taken great strides in efficient and effective use of surcharge funds, such as with the establishment of a statewide contract for interpretive services and establishment of funding thresholds, as with workstation computers. He added that the committee is concerned and wants to make sure that we have adequate funds for PSAPs as well as sufficient funds to allow the Board to accomplish the goals it has established. He reminded everyone that this recommendation comes from the committee in the form of a motion requiring no second and opened the floor to discussion.

Chuck Greene offered that he opposed the increase in the Funding Committee, although he also observed that he is not categorically opposed to an increase if it can be justified. He conceded that all of the reasons Mr. Bone had listed are valid, but said his concern is that we don't have a number that says "This is what we need," or at least a best estimate as to that amount, and then a corresponding number for how a fee increase would support that. He speculated that any increase, or decrease, for that matter, put forth today, would just be us guessing, and that's his main concern. He observed that he thinks the Board has been given the authority to adjust the fee up or down by the General Assembly because by doing it in statute, *they're* guessing, and they figured that with the expertise that we have around this table, we could come to a more precise estimate of what the needs are for doing what we need to do make sure we have good 911 service in the state, and bringing the fee to a level that gets us to that point. He speculated that if we start guessing, come next year we may find ourselves not even having to worry about this because there is a good possibility the General Assembly would take the authority away from us if we don't try to balance it the best we can. He acknowledged we have part of the picture here with the estimated surcharge projections, and he thinks staff has done a fantastic job of putting those together toward this end, but today he wouldn't be able to support any adjustment in the fee. He added, however, that being said, he thinks there is hope to get consensus on this issue if the committee starts its work earlier in the year, digs down into the numbers, and comes to a balance of where the fee needs to be before the annual deadline, then he thinks we can make some progress. Unfortunately, he thinks waiting until February to start this year's process didn't provide enough time to do that.

Greg Hauser observed a couple of things Mr. Greene mentioned resonated with him: expertise of the Board and 'need versus guessing'. He then challenged Board members, particularly new Board members, to actually get out to a PSAP to understand how these funds are used. He observed there is a 'direct downrange effect' about how this money is utilized. He acceded to a few of the points Mr. Greene made, but countered that he feels there is a direct need for this money, this funding, right now. He agreed that the question we need to ask is "Is there a need," to which he believes the answer is "Yes", but he doesn't agree we are guessing.

Jimmy Stewart said one reason he supports an increase is that there is an unknown factor in that beginning next year we will begin putting systems onto the state ESINet, yet we don't know if all the state's 911 PSAPs would be

able to do that presently. He said he believes that is a mistake that one of the states the Board studied before embarking on the NG911 project which was an early NG911 adopter made; they didn't take stock of their state to see if it was ready for NG911 and learned the hard way that it was not—over 50% of their 911 centers didn't have the equipment necessary to get onto the ESINet when it was rolled out. He hypothesized that if we learn that we are in the same situation, then it is going to take money to get everybody up to that level, observing that as he recalls, we have more PSAPs than Tennessee, too.

Vice Chair Bone then solicited comments from Board members participating on the phone. Andrew Grant said he is not opposed to an increase—that intuitively he knows we need an increase, and he doesn't think anybody disagrees with that. He observed that he thinks it is next to impossible for the staff or the NextGen process to quantify how much money we're going to need. He acknowledged we're going to need it, for all the reasons everyone has already stated—he doesn't disagree with that—but it is a bit of an assumption to come up with what we think we may need. For that reason, he said he cannot support an increase until we know how much we're going to need.

Dinah Jeffries offered that she agrees with Mr. Hauser and Mr. Stewart, saying she thinks we have to remember that this is about the people in the 911 centers who are actually being affected by not having what they need, and as the representative of NC APCO, she will be supporting the increase. Donna Wright added that as the NC NENA representative, she will be supporting it as well.

Jeff Shipp said he supports and respects all of our PSAPs, and he is not opposed to an increase at the appropriate time, but he does not think this year is the appropriate time. In thinking back, he said he cannot recall anything we have been asked to fund *not* being funded in supporting the PSAPs. He observed that when you look at NextGen, he does not foresee any funding or expenses incurred in NextGen until sometime in 2018, and there should be enough reserves in the NG911 Fund by two years out to handle what NextGen is going to require over the next two years. He added that he agrees our legislators will look negatively on an increase; his concern is that if we reach the surcharge limit now, what are we going to do two years out if we do need another increase. Then, he noted, we will have to look at statutory changes.

Vice Chair Bone replied to Mr. Shipp's comment about requests not being funded by pointing out there were some points within reconsideration requests that were handled at the committee and staff level that were not approved, although that may not have been apparent when the reconsideration requests reached the Board level. He then asked Marsha Tapler to speak to that. Ms. Tapler relayed that there are a couple of reconsideration requests being worked on right now where staff is having to ask that some points in the requests be removed because, although they may be needed, they are not of the highest priority. She noted the Board has said that the backup PSAPs must be implemented, but some of these costs are not directly needed for that, so she's asking they be removed. She said her concern has always been that as these reconsideration requests have increased every year—we've gone from paying the PSAPs ~\$49M up to ~\$54M per year—and she doesn't see a change in that rise in the upcoming year; her concern is that they are buying all this new equipment, as well as increased maintenance costs, and that the A911 network some PSAPs are using and several others are pursuing is very expensive, etc. She sees large costs coming our way, and although she understands the concern about raising the surcharge, she is worried about confronting them.

Josh Brown observed that although he does recognize the need, he does not think this is the right time for an increase, so he will be voting against it. Heather Campbell offered that her comments are along the lines of Mr. Grant's; in her 'day job' she reviews many funding proposals in the 'several millions of dollars' range, and tries to determine whether or not to fund something and why. She said she thinks the analysis of what the different increases would provide is solid, but what she's not seeing is 'a sizing' of what the gap is that we need to try to cover. She added she *completely* supports making sure the PSAPs have all the money they need, but if they're not getting the money they need, what more *do* they need? Quantifying that is what she would like to understand, because maybe the proposed increase isn't enough; at this time, she feels she just doesn't have enough information to know what the right amount is. She said that is why today she will have to vote no, although she would be very willing to support an increase with more information.

Vice Chair Bone said that he appreciates the sentiment and the professional discussion that we're having today, and he understands the need for data-driven decisions, but not trying to make excuses, he thinks we have 'a lot of

balls in the air right now', we're juggling and working through trying to get more staff because everyone recognizes that need, but unfortunately we can't predict everything. He noted he thinks it's this Board's charge to make the best decision it can with the data that is available; ideally it would be nice to have more data, but "...it's our job to make a decision with what we've got." He also said that he wanted to stress that this year we've articulated a number of goals, such as promoting consolidation as a method to conserve funds long-term, and obviously the Grant Fund is one of the tools we've used to promote that, so having grant funds to allow for and promote that is important as well.

Ms. Campbell asked if the decision must be made today based upon a specific reason, and Mr. Taylor explained the statutory requirement that a ninety-day notice be given to CMRS providers prior to a surcharge change, which must become effective on July 1st of the year the decision is made, so our ninety-day window starts tomorrow.

Mr. Shipp observed that the Board always seeks counsel from staff, and asked if there was a staff recommendation for an increase at the present time based on the data that we have now. Mr. Taylor replied the staff recommendation was not to increase at this time because, as was discussed, we don't have a solid number to go to.

Vice Chair Bone noted that as has been discussed often in the past, a lot of the work of this Board is done in committee, and this recommendation was heavily discussed in committee, and the committee does recommend the increase by a 6-3 vote. Hearing no further discussion, he said he would like to proceed with the vote and that it would be appropriate to do a roll call vote. Mr. Taylor concurred, and began the roll call:

Josh Brown—no
Heather Campbell—no
Eric Cramer—no
Andrew Grant—no
Chuck Greene—no
Len Hagaman—yes
Greg Hauser—yes
Dinah Jeffries—yes
John Moore—no
Niraj Patel—no
Jeff Shipp—no
Jimmy Stewart—yes
Slayton Stewart—no
Donna Wright—yes

Mr. Taylor observed there were 9 votes in opposition to the recommendation and 5 in support, and Vice Chair Bone stated that for the record he would like to vote yes as well, making the number 6 in support. He also said he would like to highlight Mr. Greene's comment and direction to staff that he thinks it would be beneficial to focus on this earlier next year, maybe in the fall, and try to get more data together for the benefit of the committee as well as the Board. He added he would certainly invite members of the Board who do not serve on the Funding Committee to become involved in those discussions, to let the committee and staff know what specific data they are looking for so better information can be brought for consideration.

Mr. Taylor observed that the only information available to staff is what is contained in the Revenue/Expenditure Reports, and he assured everyone that a great deal of time is spent going through them because that is how staff sees what the expenses are. Although they try to project what the future will look like based upon those reports, the reporting process is very slow; the due date for having them turned in is September 3rd, but many PSAP local governments don't meet the deadline, and once staff does receive them, the current total is 129, all of which have to be reviewed. He expressed the hope that by the fall we will have another financial staff person on board, and asserted staff will certainly focus on getting that data to the committee and Board as early as possible.

b) Recommendation to adopt 'overflow position' funding policy

Vice Chair Bone stated this is a recommendation coming from the Funding Committee after several months' work, noting there are multiple reasons why "...an extra workstation or two in a PSAP is helpful," e.g. when one is down for repair or maintenance or during times of high call volume. He observed that historically staff has been allowing

“one or two overflow workstations” as a general rule, and the Funding Committee felt it was important to provide staff with specific guidance both to back them up and to give guidance to the PSAPs as well. He reported that Mr. Bradford drafted the written proposed policy language after the general framework was provided by the committee, adding that the Funding Committee unanimously recommends this policy, and the policy comes from the committee so a second is not needed. He then asked Mr. Bradford to provide an overview of the written policy for the benefit of the Board.

Advising that he had been unable to attend all of the committee meetings in person, Mr. Bradford noted that by listening to the recording more than once he was able to discern several interesting points, one being a comment made by Mr. Greene to “...ensure that every PSAP has at least one overflow position.” Referring to a draft policy document displayed onscreen (please see Agenda Book page 103) which describes a formula for determining how many overflow positions may be funded, he noted there is a table following it (pages 104-105) which serves as an illustration. He also observed that the committee didn’t really develop a definition of overflow, and maybe just being the ‘lawyer in the room’ he wanted a definition to start this, so he prepared the draft definition in the policy document based upon his understanding of the discussion. He offered that if anyone wishes to add to or modify it, he has brought it before the Board for just that purpose. He also explained how the committee arrived at the various factors which appear in the formula.

Vice Chair Bone asked for questions for Vice Chair Bone or general discussion on the recommendation. No one spoke up, either in the room or on the phone; he reiterated that this recommendation comes from the committee as a unanimous recommendation with no second needed, but then said he would entertain a motion to approve the recommendation as presented. Sheriff Hagaman so moved, Donna Wright seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

c) Northampton County Funding Reconsideration Request

Vice Chair Bone related that this reconsideration request does involve the county’s backup PSAP plan implementation; if approved, they plan to purchase telephone equipment, a CAD server, a voice logging server, workstations, and additional equipment. He pointed out that they do have a fund balance which they intend to use toward this project. He said the Funding Committee unanimously recommends approval of this request, and asked that any further questions be directed to Marsha Tapler, eliciting laughter around the room.

Mr. Patel asked what is the reason for the backup PSAP, do they not have one right now? Ms. Tapler replied they are in the process of implementing one right now, and must have it completed and implemented by July 1st, so this request is to allow them to purchase what they need for implementation so they can meet that legislative deadline. John Moore asked if the legislation requires them to build another facility or can they use a neighboring county or another jurisdiction to back them up. Ms. Tapler replied that is their choice, except that we do not pay for another building; if a proposed site meets the requirements established by staff, they it is pretty much approved. Mr. Patel then asked what happens if they don’t implement a backup. Mr. Taylor reviewed that the statute requires all PSAPs to have a backup plan implemented by July 1st, 2017, and if they do not, then the Board must take action to either reduce, suspend, or terminate funding. He explained the concern is that the Board does not wish to do that if there is any way to prevent it, hence all the effort being put into helping PSAPs meet the deadline if at all possible.

Vice Chair Bone asked Mr. Bradford to speak to the Board’s funding obligation for backup PSAPs, more specifically asking him directly, “Do we have an obligation to fund backup PSAPs?” Mr. Bradford replied yes. Ms. Campbell interjected “Is this a reconsideration because they didn’t already have money to do the backup or they had submitted something before and needed changes?” Ms. Tapler replied that they have fund balance and they are using it down to the 10% carryover, but they don’t have the money to do all that remains. Tina Bone clarified that they are not building a backup center, but are using space at their IT department which is several miles away from the PSAP. She added they are planning to use the Halifax County PSAP as their backup within two years, but Halifax does not have its new center yet, so there was really no other place for them to go at this time. John Moore asked if they have already started the project at this time, and Ms. Tapler and Ms. Bone simultaneously responded “Yes.”

Mr. Bradford said he would like to clarify his response to what Mr. Bone was asking a few moments earlier. He observed this is one of those times when it is necessary to recognize the juxtaposition of several things that are not really independent. He reviewed that the funding model is a rolling five-year average that provides funds; when the backup PSAP requirement was installed and subsequently modified it created a firm deadline. He then pointed out that the funding allocated for the PSAPs did not envision that; it doesn't mean that there is really a shortfall, but it does mean that in order to achieve building out a backup PSAP by the deadline meant that many of the PSAPs have needed extra funds. He hypothesized that the Board could have said, "Okay, we're going to have a separate Grant process for that," or something that's a little more open, which is the reconsideration request process, and that's basically what has been followed. He observed this has allowed the PSAPs to present a business plan, if you will, to show the funds that they needed, and it has also allowed the staff to participate in looking at those and detailing out the things that are actually necessary.

Vice Chair Bone asked if there was any further discussion on this item, and hearing none, moved to the vote, which carried the recommendation unanimously but for Josh Brown abstaining.

9. Standards Committee Report

Donna Wright reported the peer review team met in Iredell County on March 10th where Candy Strezinski was kind enough to allow them to conduct her peer review, observing that unlike the 'Taj Mahal' Raleigh-Wake represented, this allowed the reviewers to see what things are like in the 'real world' of an average PSAP that would have deficiencies. Ms. Wright related that the peer review team continually learns new things and adapts its process accordingly each time a review is conducted, and suggestions will definitely be reviewed at the next Standards Committee meeting on April 7. Several deficiencies were noted, but the Assistant Director had already identified them and shared plans that have already been made to correct them; i.e. they had a corrective action plan almost formulated at the time the review was taking place.

Ms. Wright relayed that the next peer review will be at Charlotte Fire on April 20th and then on to Davie County the same day, the first time the team will have attempted multiple reviews in one day. She also drew attention to the sample reports and corrective action plan in the agenda book and the fact that she had asked Ms. Strezinski if the corrective action plan they had formulated could be used as a template. Ms. Wright offered to field questions. None were asked, but both Mr. Taylor and Vice Chair Bone reiterated the high praise and glowing comments they have offered at prior meetings for the exemplary, professional work that Ms. Wright, Mr. Hauser, and Ms. Strezinski have done on this project. Vice Chair Bone noted that this topic received a lot of attention at yesterday's regional PSAP Managers meeting, and he thinks the PSAP managers are excited about it as well. He also encouraged Board members to attend those regional meetings whenever possible, as it provides an invaluable opportunity to gain insight into the PSAPs, adding he just wanted to echo Mr. Hauser's earlier comments about visiting the PSAPs to engage Board members in the daily work that goes on there. Mr. Hauser added an invitation for Board members to attend a peer review, and if they wished to please let a member of the team know; they will certainly ask for the PSAP Manager's permission for a Board member to tag along, but he would love to see Board members become involved in the process.

10. Technology Committee Update

Jeff Shipp reviewed that two RFPs are currently under evaluation: the ESINet-Hosted CPE RFP and the NMAC (Network Management Assistance Center) RFP. He reported the procurement process is proceeding as planned and they expect a recommendation by committee to the Board in the next few months on these two RFPs. He observed that outside of the original cost analysis it is still too early to make predictions about the financial impact of both of these proposals, especially the ESINet, as they relate to the Board and its finances. He reported that both initiatives remain on schedule and the hope and plan is for implementation of these two RFPs by year end, and to begin bringing PSAPs onto the network in 2018.

Mr. Shipp added there is a third RFP currently being written, the GIS RFP, which the committee hopes to have finalized and brought to the Board sometime in May or June of this year. He also reported that another subject which has been heavily discussed by the committee is radio interoperability; the committee has been working with the SIEC (Statewide Interoperability Executive Committee), which is part of the Department of Public Safety,

noting that Greg Hauser is very passionate about this issue and inviting him to share any comments he would like to make.

Mr. Hauser observed that he is also a part of the SIEC, serving the Charlotte region, and that the committee he is on is committed to providing some good recommendations to the Board when the time comes. He added they have a timeline for that, and are making sure all the relevant communications specialists in the state are engaged so they can get all of the information into the proper people's hands for consideration.

Mr. Shipp offered that another issue the committee is addressing is CAD interoperability. He mentioned that staff and some PSAP managers met recently with one of the state's major CAD vendors to work with that vendor to ensure all of its customers' systems talk to each other. Dave Corn added that vendor has reduced prices for that capability to occur. Mr. Shipp then asked if anyone had questions or comments.

Mr. Hauser indicated he wanted to take his hat off to Mr. Corn for the great job he is doing with the committee, noting that this is the first time since he became involved with communications interoperability in 2007 where everybody is actually talking to each other. Mr. Shipp announced that the next committee meeting will be Wednesday, April 12th, noting that everyone is welcome and invited to attend.

Vice Chair Bone surmised there is a lot going on with the Technology Committee, and took the opportunity to encourage new Board members who are not yet engaged with any of the Board's committees to determine which ones they would like to serve on and become involved.

11. Establish Priorities for 2018 Grant Cycle

Mr. Taylor reported the 2018 Grant Cycle opened March 15th, will remain open until June 7th, and the link to the application is on the web site. He reviewed what the grant priorities had been for last year's grant cycle, mostly to facilitate backup PSAP Plan implementation. This year he has looked at the goals the Board has established for the year to see how they might dovetail with the grant priorities, and his recommendation to the Board is to establish two priorities this year: 1) consolidation of two or more primary PSAPs, and 2) regional initiatives providing backup among multiple PSAPs. Referring back to Mr. Moore's earlier question about building backup centers, Mr. Taylor observed that several PSAPs have gone that route through the grant process, and that the hope has always been that those who built new facilities would be inclined to host backups for other PSAPs at those new facilities, but his estimate is that only about half of them have done that. He observed that, ironically, it seems like the lower funded of such projects are the agencies who have been more prone to share with other agencies. He explained that he thinks if we can provide grant money to a PSAP for a nice new facility while stipulating they must also serve as a backup to other PSAPs, that would be a great initiative. He concluded his remarks by saying his recommendation would be to adopt these two priorities for this year's grant cycle, but he is certainly open to anything the Board wants to do.

Ms. Campbell asked Mr. Taylor to clarify what 'regional initiative' means. Mr. Taylor replied it is an initiative to share resources within a particular region, citing the Dare County regional initiative as a current example, where two rural PSAPs, Hyde and Tyrell Counties, have consolidated with Dare in a new regional PSAP that is about to go live on Monday (encouraging anyone who could attend the ribbon cutting ceremony on Monday to do so). He also mentioned Martin County as another good example, where it is working with Pasquotank and Bertie Counties in a regional initiative to provide shared backup capabilities. He observed that, to him, those types of initiatives have more value than just somebody wanting to build a new building; that although he cannot fault anybody for wanting to build a new building, the sharing provides much more 'bang for the buck'.

Vice Chair Bone asked for any further comments or suggested adjustments to the staff recommendation. Ms. Campbell asked if an end-of-life priority should be included. Mr. Taylor replied that although he would have no objection to that, most of the end-of-life requests have been going through the reconsideration process rather than the grant process; he would rather see someone who needs end-of-life replacement not be subject to the competitive process of a grant award. Ms. Campbell said she would agree with that; she just wanted to be assured that they had a path to end-of-life replacement relief.

Hearing no further comments or suggestions, Vice Chair Bone said he would entertain a motion to accept the staff recommendation. Eric Cramer so moved, John Moore seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

Other Items

Vice Chair Bone asked if there were any other items to come before the Board. Mr. Taylor said he would like to share one FYI—once again, the 911 Board staff is moving. The move is supposed to take place Thursday, April 6th, to Jenkins House, right next door to the Governor's Mansion downtown, which he thinks is either 221 or 212 Lane Street, adding that he thinks the conference room there will accommodate most committee meetings with some minor modifications. Mr. Moore asked about parking, and Mr. Taylor replied he does not know at this time; there is a huge parking lot nearby that he does not see anybody use except two SHP cars for patrolmen doing security at the Governor's Mansion, and that staff may use it for \$10.00/month, but at this time he doesn't know whether that extends to visitors.

Vice Chair Bone thanked Mr. Taylor for the update, and asked if there was anything else anyone wished to bring before the Board. Hearing no comment, he added that he once again wanted to thank everybody for their participation today; he thought there was much positive, thoughtful discussion, and he appreciated the dialogue. He added that he looks forward to moving ahead with this Board, observing we do have a lot to be proud of—a lot of positive things happening—and he just wanted to commend everybody on the good work of the Board, staff, and committees and all of their partners.

Meeting adjourned at 12:12pm