North Carolina 911 Board Meeting
MINUTES
Banner Elk Room
3514 Bush Street, Raleigh, NC
August 25, 2017
10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Members Present	**Staff Present**	**Guests**
David Bone (NCACC) Martin County	Richard Bradford (DOJ)	Ron Adams, Southern Software
Secretary Eric Boyette (NC CIO) Board Chair	Tina Bone (DIT)	Randy Beaman, CCES
Heather Campbell (CMRS) Sprint	Ronnie Cashwell (DIT)	Nikki Carswell, Iredell Co 911
Andrew Grant (NCLM) Town of Cornelius (WebEx & phone)	Danette Jernigan (DIT)	Maureen Connolly, Mooresville PD
Chuck Greene (LEC) AT&T	Marsha Tapler (DIT)	Susan Davis, Mooresville PD
Len Hagaman (Sheriff) Watauga County	Richard Taylor (DIT)	Brian Drum, Catawba Co 911
Greg Hauser (NCSFA) Charlotte Fire Department (WebEx and phone)		Derrick Duggins, CRS
Dinah Jeffries (NCAPCO) Orange Co Emergency Services		Jeff Holshouser, Airbus Defense & Space Communications (ADSC)
Jeff Ledford (NCACP) City of Shelby PD (WebEx and phone)		Jesus Lopez, DIT
John Moore (VoIP) Spectrum Communications		Kevin Medlin, OCES
Jeff Shipp (LEC) Star Telephone		Tim Mitchell, CCES
Jimmy Stewart (NCAREMS) Hoke Co 911		Melanie Neal, Guilford Metro 911
Slayton Stewart (CMRS) Carolina West Wireless		Dominick Nutter, RWECC
Amy Ward (LEC) CenturyLink		Phil Penny, MCP
Donna Wright (NENA) Richmond Co Emergency Services		Lisa Reid, Fayetteville PD
		Mike Reitz, Chatham Co 911
		Tia Rogers, Chatham Co 911
		Craig Schulz, MCP
		Geoffrey Smith, Chatham Co 911
		Chris Spencer, Pitney Bowes
		Candy Strezinski, Iredell Co 911
		Mary Alice Warner, DIT
Members Absent	**Staff Absent**	**WebEx Guests**
Eric Cramer (LEC) Wilkes Communication	Dave Corn (DIT)	Cliff Brown, Federal Engineering
Niraj Patel (CMRS) Verizon		Kristin Cook, Carteret Emergency Comm

		Greg Dotson, Rutherford Co Comm
		Mike Edge, Scotland Co 911
		Beth Jones, Iredell County
		Christine Moore, Guilford Metro 911
		Glen Parnell, Wilson Co 911
		David Saleeby, Iredell County
		Roman Scruggs, Rutherford Co Comm
		Ron Smith, Iredell County
		James Soukup, City of Durham
		Corrine Walser, MEDIC
		Bruce Williams, Wireless Comm, Inc.
		Victor Williams, Beaufort Co Sheriff 911
		Wendy Williams, Alleghany County
		Doug Workman, Town of Cary 911

Call to Order—Chairman Boyette called the meeting to order at ~10:02, welcoming everyone and expressing his pleasure with the attendance. He then asked Mr. Taylor to conduct the roll call.

Roll Call—Mr. Taylor called the roll of those members he expected to be participating online. Andrew Grant, Greg Hauser, and Jeff Ledford all responded, but Niraj Patel did not. Mr. Taylor then advised Chairman Boyette that a quorum was present.

1. Chairman's Opening Remarks—Chairman Boyette began his remarks with a warm welcome to Amy Ward, the new Board member replacing Josh Brown, representing local exchange carrier CenturyLink, appointed by Sen. Berger. He then asked Mr. Taylor to administer the oath of office to Ms. Ward. Once that was complete, Chairman Boyette asked her if she would like to share a little about herself with the Board. She introduced herself, noting that this marks the 25th year she has worked for CenturyLink in various roles and responsibilities, saying she is currently the Business Operations Manager for the state of North Carolina, supervising all of the business technicians who service PSAPs and business customers in the state. She mentioned that she has worked with Josh Brown for several years, and Laura Sykora before that, and is looking forward to contributing to the work of the Board as both of them did.

Asking Chairman Boyette if he could move to the next section of the opening remarks, Mr. Taylor observed that it was not "a fun thing" to do. He then reminisced about his long association with Dinah Jeffries, "Before we got our hairdressers to change our color." Saying they first got to know one another well when he was President and she was Vice-President of NC NENA, he related that she had told him, "You know, when I first met you, I thought you were the most stuck-up guy I'd ever seen in the world, but now that I've gotten to know you, you really are a pretty cool guy," alleging with a chuckle that he thought those were her words verbatim. He related that they have known each other's families, watching them grow over the years, through both good times and bad. Stressing that they will continue to do so in the future as well, he remembered how excited he had been when she became a member of the 911 Board because he knew her dedication to, and her love and passion for, 911. He noted how she doesn't mind speaking out or standing up for what she believes in, and has truly been a great friend, not only to him and his family, but to the entire 911 community, for many, many years.

Addressing her directly, Mr. Taylor congratulated Ms. Jeffries on her recent promotion to the Emergency Management Director position for Orange County, despite the fact that her increased job responsibilities in that role have contributed to her decision to step down from the 911 Board. He added that he has always known that if she feels she can't put 100% of her passion and energy into whatever task she takes on, she simply will not do it; unfortunately, she has realized that due to her increased responsibilities, both personal and professional, she can

no longer afford to give her role on the 911 Board the attention she feels it deserves. He observed she had a great mentor in Nick Waters, adding he can still see Nick Waters in Ms. Jeffries' style of leadership and decision-making whenever she speaks. Recalling his announcement at last month's Board meeting that she had submitted her resignation letter to him, he said it is his fervent hope that the folks at NC APCO will be able to find someone as committed and dedicated as she is to replace her. He then invited her to join him at the podium, asking Chairman Boyette to join them as well.

Chairman Boyette read the inscription on the sculpture he presented Ms. Jeffries from the Board, thanking her for her dedicated service to the citizens of North Carolina and the North Carolina 911 system. Stepping to the podium, Ms. Jeffries observed that as anyone who knows her would realize, she had to say something. She said it has been an absolute honor and pleasure, as well as a challenge at times, to work with the 911 Board, adding that she wants to challenge each and every Board member, but especially those representing NC APCO and NC NENA, to remember that, "It's not about us…it's about them! It's about all the folks who never get the recognition." She said that Nick Waters taught her one thing she remembers especially well: "It's not about me and the glory. It's about my people getting the glory! That's what makes *me* successful, because if they don't get the glory—if they don't shine—then I'm not doing my job." She admonished Board members to embrace those people, grow them up, make them lead up, because they're going to be taking our places one day. Once again thanking the Board, she stressed, "I'm not gone, I've just gone to prioritize, and I know I'll be in touch with a lot of you. Find Donna a strong partner, again, who makes it about 911 telecommunicators, not about themselves."

As Mr. Taylor asked Tina Bone to step to the podium, Chairman Boyette read from a certificate of recognition awarded to her for having worked five years for the 911 Board. Turning to the Board and staff members, Ms. Bone said, "I love working with each and every one of you, and I look forward to many more years of working with each and every one of you. Thank you very much!"

Acknowledging that every recognition the Board does is great, Mr. Taylor opined that his personal favorite, however, is recognizing telecommunicators, just as Ms. Jeffries said. Observing we've heard some absolutely outstanding calls through the years, he said that today's is really kind of special: it's about a baby being delivered, and it's a very special situation. Noting that the call lasted over fifteen minutes, he asked Ronnie Cashwell to play back an edited portion of the audio. After the audio playback, Mr. Taylor invited Tia Rogers of Chatham County Emergency Operations, the telecommunicator who handled that call, to come forward. As she was coming up, Mr. Taylor said, in Paul Harvey fashion, that he wanted to share "The Rest of the Story." Reminding everyone of the reference in the audio to the fact that the mother was only twenty-seven weeks into her pregnancy, he related that Ms. Rogers had lost a baby born to her at twenty-six weeks, who had died in her arms. With a break in his voice, he observed how much strength she had displayed in handling that call; how difficult it must have been for her. Mr. Taylor added that for those who are believers, it is evident that God put her there for a reason, put her in the right place at the right time. Without reading the inscription on the plaque presented to her verbatim, Chairman Boyette and Mr. Taylor both commended her on how well she had done, the strength she had displayed in handling that call. As Chairman Boyette presented the award to her, the room erupted into a standing ovation.

Saying "I didn't expect this today, or I would have worn my church clothes," sparking laughter around the room, Ms. Rogers then paused contemplatively and relayed that, in fact, she has lost a total of five babies, and when the son Mr. Taylor referred to passed away, she went through a very dark time. Choking up, she said that when she returned to work after that, a call such as this one was exactly what she prayed she would never get, so when it did come to her, she couldn't help but think of her own experience and how she wanted to ensure this mother didn't have to go through the same kind of loss and pain; she felt that she really had to save this baby. She said she felt God gave her that call, not only to save that child but to bring her closer to closure about her own loss as well. She emphasized that she loves her work—and is good at it—having done it for almost ten years now, and how appreciative she is of this recognition, just as "Ms. Dinah" had spoken about earlier, because sometimes telecommunicators feel like they're not recognized for what they do. She thanked everyone, saying she's just letting God use her, even through work.

Before moving to the next agenda item, Chairman Boyette observed this underscores the type of support that we need to give to this community, and also tells him why he's here, why he did not want to delegate this responsibility to anybody else. He said it is so important to him that these are the things we need to hear more of, to be exposed to, to look at what our community is doing. He thanked Ms. Rogers again for her inspiration.

2. Ethics Awareness/Conflict of Interest Statement—Chairman Boyette read the Ethics Awareness/Conflict of interest statement printed in the agenda. No one responded that they had either a conflict or a potential conflict, so he asked Mr. Taylor to go ahead with the Consent Agenda.

3 Consent Agenda—Mr. Taylor apologized for not having remembered to "publish" the Agenda and the Agenda Book to the website until this morning. After uploading them he had forgotten to hit the "publish" button, so although it looked as though they were online on his computer, that was misleading. So now he has clicked on the "publish" button, so they are, indeed, available on the website.

Moving to the minutes of the last meeting, he observed that the only modification made to the draft submission circulated earlier in the week was to place a period at the end of the final sentence, and added that he had received no additional requests for corrections or additions. He then proceeded to the financial report (please see https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/documents/files/08252017%20%20DRAFT%20Agenda.pdf for amount details), highlighting that a good many of the grants have been closed out or are on the verge of being closed out. Noting that to date no expenditures have been made from the NG911 Fund, he speculated that by next month that will change. He also explained that the large amount of prepaid revenue in July offset the smaller amount seen in June, pointing out that prepaid retailers can choose to pay either monthly or semi-annually, and many of them choose the semi-annual option, leading to this end-of-fiscal-year anomaly. Jeff Shipp offered a motion to approve the consent agenda, Donna Wright seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

4. Public Comment—Chairman Boyette read the invitation to public comment from the agenda. No one had pre-registered to speak and no one spoke up, either in person or on the phone, so Chairman Boyette asked Mr. Taylor to proceed with the Executive Director Report.

5. Executive Director Report

a) 911 Board Staff Update—Mr. Taylor related that staff has been undergoing some changes, with Danette Jernigan receiving extensive training from Marsha Tapler and doing very well with it. He added that although Dave Corn is on vacation, so Mr. Taylor has not spoken to him directly, Mr. Corn has submitted his resignation "…effective now, but he said he would be glad to stay on until December 15th to make a transition for his replacement." Mr. Taylor noted that Mr. Corn worked in a contract position, so it was a little bit different than a regular position, adding he hopes to sit down and talk with him once he returns from vacation to work out any details. Turning to new positions, Mr. Taylor reminded everyone of the vacancy for a PSAP revenue specialist, reporting that interviews have been scheduled with some very good candidates for September 5th. He then advised that interviews for the reposted PSAP Liaison position formerly filled by David Dodd follow on September 6th, again with some very qualified candidates. He speculated that once those positions have been filled, we are looking at further additional positions as well, summarizing "We'll be staffing up a lot over the next couple of months." Mr. Taylor added that the HR folks have really been helping out a great deal with these recent efforts, applying filters to the applications to lessen the probability of having to review applications from people who simply aren't qualified.

b) Statement of Economic Interest Findings for Amy Ward—Mr. Taylor reported that, as is the case with every Board member, the *North Carolina State Board of Elections & Ethics Enforcement* found no actual conflict of interest in its *Evaluation of Statement of Economic Interest Filed by Amy Ward*, but did find the potential for a conflict of interest.

c) Board Meeting Format—Mr. Taylor began this agenda item by characterizing the meeting held by the Grant Committee a couple of weeks ago as one of the best meetings he has attended in a long time. He was impressed with the very meaningful discussions committee members had regarding policy and rules and goals, and he realized those types of open, in-depth discussions seem to have been missing from full Board meetings; that Board meetings now primarily consist of reports which frequently generate little discussion, unlike the more open conversations that regularly took place at Board meetings years ago, and that realization prompted him to put this topic into an agenda item.

Mr. Taylor displayed onscreen the summary of a teleconference meeting held on January 15, 2014 where the topic of "Agenda and Meeting Formats" was addressed by an ad hoc committee composed of then Board Chair George Bakolia, Board members Jason Barbour, Andrew Grant, and Lee Worsley, and Mr. Taylor himself (please see https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/documents/files/08252017%20Agenda%20Book.pdf pages 55-56), observing that he feels we may be falling into the same kind of a rut now as that which prompted that committee meeting back then. He related that the teleconference had come about because Board members had said, "You know, we go to the Board meetings, we hear reports, and just move on—we never really sit around and discuss issues; we never really get a true feeling of what Board members want—what the policy is for the Board—it's always buried in a committee somewhere and never with all of us around the table." He offered that what he hopes to try to achieve beginning today is to once again promote such discussions, which can then be taken back to the committee level, giving the committees direction on how to do their job, because if the committee doesn't know what the Board wants—or if they just *think* they know what the Board wants—we may not be communicating well. He added that hopefully we can achieve that, if it's okay with Chairman Boyette, who responded, "Absolutely."

Mr. Taylor then reported on meeting with Raleigh-Wake Emergency Communications Center Director Dominick Nutter and FCC Commissioner Brandon Carr when Commissioner Carr visited the Raleigh-Wake center. Mr. Taylor said they had some good, frank conversations, and he felt Commissioner Carr was very in touch with issues facing 911. Mr. Taylor related the commissioner had asked about our ESINet project and where we are with NG911, and was very impressed with what was going on. Mr. Taylor thanked Mr. Nutter for the invitation to attend.

Mr. Taylor next related that he had spoken with former 911 Board member Jason Barbour since the freakish accident in which he had been injured on July 4th. Mr. Barbour was seated with his back to the front window of a Domino's Pizza storefront down in Cape Carteret waiting for an order when a pickup truck crashed through that window, catapulting Mr. Barbour and another patron well into the store. Mr. Taylor showed a video clip of the incident onscreen that had been captured by one of the store's security cameras, and it seemed a wonder that either man survived. Mr. Taylor said that Mr. Barbour had told him, however, that he is recovering, although still in a lot of pain. Chairman Boyette said he had also spoken to Mr. Barbour, and wryly reminded him that "Domino's Delivers," eliciting laughter throughout the room. Chairman Boyette then remarked, "He didn't find it funny!"

Chairman Boyette then took the floor, encouraging Board members to offer comments about the proposed new meeting format to either Mr. Taylor or him. He said they needed everyone's input in order to make this as efficient and effective a Board as possible.

6. PSAP Funding Model Discussion for Work Session Guidance—Funding Committee Chair David Bone said that he thinks we've made a lot of progress on the new PSAP Funding Model—that we're ready to cross the finish line, and will hopefully be there after next Tuesday's Funding Committee work session—or at least much closer to being able to bring a recommendation to this Board for consideration. He reviewed how the committee has been working on this for quite some time, made some good progress this spring, and then gained a good outside perspective through the App State project in June. He allowed that the committee has taken the App State perspective under consideration and is now ready to take this to the next step with the work session. He encouraged Board members who do not serve on the Funding Committee to please attend the work session, reasoning that their input could only result in more positive results.

Underscoring that he thinks we are definitely moving in a positive direction, Mr. Bone stressed how excited he is about some of the things we have done and continue to do, such as imposition of caps on certain purchases, simplifying things for both Board staff and PSAPs. He added that he thought cooperative purchasing and procurement has helped a great deal as well, while acknowledging that there are still more opportunities to move forward with that. He also observed that one of the main things the App State students homed in on was the need for and the benefits to be realized through consolidation. Mr. Bone then asked Mr. Taylor to take the floor to provide further information.

Mr. Taylor advised he will be distributing soft copies of the guiding principles developed about a year ago by the Board to help guide the Funding Committee, which he displayed onscreen (please see https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/documents/files/08252017%20Agenda%20Book.pdf page 61). He pointed out that the ASU study had determined that many of the items listed there really didn't make that big a difference; in fact, the

study recommendation was to move away from them. He added he will also be distributing a committee document spreadsheet (please see https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/documents/files/08252017%20Agenda%20Book.pdf page 62-66) which arranged PSAPs according to populations servedand looked at their call volumes, the number of positions they have, costs per call, etc., in trying to come up with a new formula that would be fair and equitable, pointing out that it is not a proposal, but just a presentation of information. He said he thinks the bottom line is that we've worked in a lot of different areas, and he thinks it's great that now we have many new Board members who can add fresh eyes and fresh air to the process. Acknowledging he's not sure if everybody can make it to the work session on Tuesday, he said he certainly will welcome any input anyone has to offer today.

Mr. Taylor then displayed NCGS § 143B-1406.(3) onscreen, the portion of the statute which lists the topics the Board must consider in establishing a funding formula, stressing that the directive only indicates those topics must be *considered*, not necessarily used (please see https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/documents/files/08252017%20Agenda%20Book.pdf page 60). After touching upon each of those items, Mr. Taylor said that what he would really like to hear today, and he thought Mr. Bone would, too—especially if you will not be able to attend the work session—is what everyone's thoughts are; what do you think of when you think about PSAP funding?

Jeff Shipp interjected that he just wanted to clarify that when we discuss the PSAP funding model we are NOT discussing any change in the revenue collection model. He posited that we have the same amount of revenue coming in…that the funding model is actually a *revenue management* model, i.e. it addresses how that source of income is used. Chairman Boyette concurred, noting the PSAP funding model addresses the dispersion of the funds, not the collection of the 911 fee.

Chairman Boyette solicited any feedback from Board members. Chuck Greene said that he was going to hold his comments until the Tuesday work session, adding, however, that he does have a lot to say. Mr. Taylor singled out Donna Wright in her role as a PSAP manager herself, asking for her input. She said she was also waiting until Tuesday, that she has been stewing about what has been put in front of her and wants to make sure she thinks it through well before she speaks up. Mr. Taylor then reshaped his question more directly, asking her, again while wearing a PSAP manager's hat, what are the "burning issues" or the "non-negotiables" that she feels she has to have in a funding model. She replied that her thought is much broader than that; it comes back to sustainability over the long term. She asserted that she wants to make sure that whatever the Board does sustains the services, not only maintaining what is needed today, but determining how to make them better, not letting them become stagnant. Jimmy Stewart, also speaking as a PSAP manager, said he can honestly say that over all the years he has been involved, starting with the wireline E911 fund begun in 1989, his PSAP has never really wanted for anything that was allowable for purchase under the statute, adding, however, that as time goes on, they need things that are not allowable for purchase with 911 funds. Saying "I know everybody wants to buy radios and antennas and police cars and dogs and everything else" out of 911 funds, he said he thinks that if we open that up it will just get crazy and bankrupt the fund. He reiterated that his PSAP has never really wanted for anything—everything that was allowable he's always had the money to get—and has never had anything taken away from him that shouldn't have been. Mr. Stewart observed that having been involved in a lot of programs that receive funding that have various formulas applied to them, there is no formula that is going to make everybody happy. He advised that he actually struggles to keep his 911 fund balance low enough to prevent having it reduced the next year, and he looks at everything he's allowed to buy. Noting that he's looking at a 5-year refresh coming up in the near future, he's saying "Oh happy day, I get to spend some money!", adding, however, that he'll still have money left over. He very quickly added, too, that he knows everybody is not in that same situation.

Mr. Taylor asked him if Hoke County has an actual refresh cycle in place. Mr. Stewart replied he uses a 5-year refresh for his phone system and computers, allowing that he used to just keep using equipment until it dropped, or at least until there was a reason for upgrading it—he doesn't just upgrade for upgrading's sake. He added that this refresh will also allow him to accomplish something he wants to do for their backup, and if it wasn't for that, he might not even do it. Directing his next question to either Mr. Stewart or Ms. Wright, Mr. Taylor asked if, in their relationships with other PSAP managers, they think that refresh cycles are something others practice? Is it something the Board should look at from a Funding Committee viewpoint of how to encourage adherence to refresh cycles? Ms. Wright responded that she thinks it is two-sided; that it's in the standards as a recommendation, but in her conversations with other PSAPs which are not as engaged with the 911 Board as she is, the reality is more like what Mr. Stewart says: when it breaks, they fix it. She added that even in her own

situation, she and her IT director have butted heads because she wants to establish a cycle and his reaction is "It's not broken!" Her response to that is she doesn't have time for it to break, and it has taken her several years to "beat that into his head" because he is not accustomed to somebody being proactive. She added you also have to fight internal battles with other departments upon which you depend for support; some want to use a refresh cycle, some do not, so it's sort of a double-edged sword.

Mr. Taylor then addressed John Moore, the 911 Board member representing Spectrum, admitting he was putting him on the spot but asking him if, from a private industry perspective, a huge company like Spectrum practices regular refresh cycles on its equipment. Mr. Moore replied they do, just to keep ahead of the demand for bandwidth, especially in the education sector—that they're always going through technology upgrades, having moved from Alcatel Lucent to Juniper to whatever is in use this year, trying to use the "best of the best" just to stay ahead of the curve. Seeing Mr. Greene shaking his head, Mr. Taylor asked if that was consistent with his company's (AT&T) approach, and Mr. Greene said yes, he agrees. Heather Campbell, of Sprint, essentially concurred as well, adding, however, that it is always a tradeoff; depending upon what the equipment is, there's always a different refresh cycle. Mr. Moore added that as technology improves, they are actually able to collapse hub sites because transmission distances increase with the improved efficiency of the new equipment, with which Ms. Campbell agreed. Mr. Moore acquiesced that "You're never where you want to be," but that you never stop trying to get there. Jeff Shipp interjected that we all create yearly budgets, but in addition to that, his company has a rolling, revolving five-year budget out as well, and within those five-year budgets is where they do a lot of their refresh planning, especially when it comes to the electronics. Observing that Star Telephone is a small, rural company versus Spectrum or AT&T or Sprint, which have big national footprints, Mr. Taylor asked Mr. Shipp if his business model follows the same path. Mr. Shipp replied that it did.

Mr. Taylor then hypothesized that if you follow the same kind of logic among small, medium, and large sized PSAPs, everybody should have a formal technology plan, not just something thrown together to satisfy a grant application request or the like. He said the feeling he's getting is that the PSAPs should follow a business plan similar to those used in private industry. He then addressed Sheriff Hagaman, of Watauga County, observing that the county is somewhat unique because of both tourism and the presence of ASU, and asking how 911 funding fits into a county like that. Sheriff Hagaman replied it is not unlike other smaller entities—you set your priorities, but you're always butting up against elected officials and management personnel that think, "Well, we just bought you new stuff five years ago. What's going on that you need to replace it?" He added that's across the board, whether internal department equipment or 911 equipment. Characterizing that as the biggest challenge, he added that a lot of the time what they don't understand—even folks in the business of 911—is that technology is changing so rapidly we just can't keep up. He added that one of the biggest boondoggles is that legislation doesn't keep up, either, so we're all the time just trying to catch up to the elusive thing out there that we just can't seem to grab ahold of. He did point out that the topography of the mountains presents connectivity challenges, and that although students at ASU may not be resident taxpayers, they do pay for 911 through their phone bills, so how do you weigh all that out and get through all those weeds?

Piggybacking on the connectivity challenges Sheriff Hagaman referred to, Mr. Taylor recalled how many times Tia Rogers had asked for the caller's location during the 911 call for which she was recognized at the beginning of this meeting before the caller provided it, underscoring that location determination is a huge piece of why we need to stay on the cutting edge of the technology. He then observed that he found it interesting to hear all of the different comments people had offered, saying he had picked up on several things and asking Mr. Bone if he had as well. Mr. Bone responded he certainly had—he appreciated the conversation and found it very helpful as the Funding Committee moves forward. Referring back to Ms. Wright's comments, he said he thinks one of the Funding Committee's biggest challenges is to focus on sustainability of both the 911 Fund and 911 service statewide, including trying to maintain that level of service. Speaking to the composition of the committee, he speculated that another challenge for many Funding Committee members, specifically those who represent PSAPs and local government rather than the industry reps, is that when they talk about funding models, the first thing those members look at when they get a new spreadsheet is, "Well, how's this affecting me?" Observing "That's human nature—we're going to do that," he said he thinks that to do a formula, since the revenues have not been growing, we've got to manage the funds as responsibly as we can to ensure we've got what we need, as Mr. Stewart alluded to earlier. Mr. Bone then asked Chairman Boyette for any comments he might have.

Chairman Boyette said one of the things he wants to pay close attention to is five-year plans. Noting that five-year plans are not required of PSAPs in the rules, he asked Ms. Wright, in her capacity as Standards Committee Chair, if there are steps we can take during the peer review process to strongly recommend that PSAPs create them. He related that state government agencies are required to have them, and they run up against funding issues just like local governments. He said he thinks that's definitely something we may be able to help with "gently", to try to figure out "How *can* we help?"

Richard Bradford advised that the statute prescribes several things that PSAPs are required to do, one of them being to comply with all requests from the 911 Board for financial information. He observed that certainly includes budgets and projections and things of that nature, but the question the Board is asking is whether such projections exist at all. He pointed out that one of the smaller provisions in the appropriations bill last session provided some money to the Department of the State Treasurer, in conjunction with oversight from the Local Government Commission (LGC), for the purpose of putting a contract in place for municipalities to use—geared more toward cities and towns than counties—for financial management software. He observed that although there is no compulsion for local governments to use that, this Board might want to suggest to the LGC that perhaps some financial planning software that's procured could assist PSAPs and other discrete organizations in doing this kind of thing. Mr. Bradford offered that the point he is making is that there are tools available; we can look within the statute to the extent that the Board has questions about this. That's one of the reasons he's here.

Ms. Wright noted that one of the assignments in the PSAP Management course being offered through RCC is for students to complete a five-year plan that they can actually take back to their 911 centers after completion of the course, so we're teaching those students long-term strategic planning, and hopefully when they've finished the course they can take those pieces back to the PSAPs and grow them. Mr. Moore asked if they are weaving in their migrations to the ESINet? He stressed the importance of beginning that process, moving in that direction very quickly and asked was that even discussed? Ms. Wright replied they are trying to teach the concepts so they can grow the students into that type of thinking, noting that the last course being taught is NextGen and cybersecurity. Tina Bone concurred, saying they are trying to build the foundation for that type of thinking. Mr. Moore said his concern is that we have a timeline for this NextGen network, and knowing how "quickly" local government moves, he's afraid of them not being ready. Ms. Wright responded that's what the NextGen section is supposed to teach these folks; that, as a PSAP manager, this is what NextGen is, so what do I, the PSAP manager, need to be doing now to get ready for it, e.g. what type of policies will I be up against, what type of hardware do I need to be looking at? Mr. Moore replied that's critical if we're targeting 2020 for full adoption of the ESINet; he's sure the service providers can accomplish that in three years, but he's not sure that the end users are ready to adopt it that quickly.

Mr. Shipp observed that it is difficult for him to comprehend how, despite creating statewide contracts or caps, one PSAP can buy "widget A" at one price, but that exact same "widget A" is sold to a different PSAP at a different price and both are approved. He also said he encourages everyone to welcome technology as we move forward because it will create some efficiencies and also assist in PSAP staffing as it relates to technology and the statewide ESINet. Mr. Taylor related that one of the goals he personally has for the coming year is bringing on additional financial staff members to relieve Ms. Tapler of having to review the Revenue-Expenditure reports, to free her up to do the financial analysis she was hired to do. He acknowledged that she does it even now, but is basically doing it after hours and that kind of thing, lauding the fact that she is very dedicated in doing it, knowing how important it is. He said to Mr. Shipp that he agrees there are a lot of efficiencies that we are missing right now, and his goal is to correct that as we bring new staff onboard over the next couple of months.

Mr. Bone said he wanted to build upon a question related to what Mr. Bradford spoke about, asking if there might be potential for developing the software Mr. Bradford alluded to as a statewide project for PSAPs to use for capital planning, etc.—a tool we could provide for them that might be a good investment? He added that to build off of what Mr. Shipp had brought up regarding planning, might we also want to consider making the submission of a five-year plan a requirement for PSAPs maybe two years down the road? Sheriff Hagaman counseled that one obstacle to that, though he doesn't want to lose sight of it, either, is that a lot of agencies don't have that expertise. Mr. Bone acknowledged that, adding that he would not advocate it unless we had the software and had ramped up staffing to provide assistance. He offered that if we give them enough time to develop that expertise, he would think a two-year window would be ample. Chairman Boyette observed that DIT may have some of that type of software already under contract that we may be able to extend, but we need to talk and do more research.

Mr. Bradford advised we do, but the question really is whether we have something that meets the needs. He explained that the provision he mentioned is one that is general for the State Treasurer, but they are working on an RFP for that software. He reflected that his point in bringing it up was simply to make the Board aware so that as Board staffing ramps up, it seems reasonable that they should be somewhat knowledgeable about any software that is placed out there and available so that they would be in a better position to assist the PSAPs. He speculated that there are presently no clear answers to either Mr. Bone's or Chairman Boyette's questions, but asserted there *are* possibilities. Chairman Boyette observed we need more work, more research, to dig deeper into this to see what we can and cannot do.

Mr. Bone concluded his report by once again encouraging everyone to attend Tuesday's work session at 9:00 AM, either in person at the 911 Office or by phone/WebEx. Mr. Taylor asked anyone who plans to come in person to let him know in advance, as the room is limited in size, and advised he will email directions to anyone who needs them. Chairman Boyette thanked everyone for a great discussion, then asked Slayton Stewart to move ahead with the Grant Committee report.

7. 911 Grant Committee 2018 Grant Cycle Recommendations—Grant Committee Chair Slayton Stewart advised that the committee, comprised of Heather Campbell, Jeff Shipp, Eric Cramer, and himself, met on August 11th, with both Richard Taylor and Richard Bradford in attendance as well. He explained that they initially discussed the overall grant funding philosophy. He reminded everyone that at the March 31st Board meeting the Board had provided the committee with some direction in the form of establishing two grant priorities based upon the 911 Board's goals established in December, 2016, to be weighted equally for this grant cycle: 1) consolidation of two or more primary PSAPs, and 2) regional initiatives providing backup among multiple PSAPs. He mentioned that nine applications were submitted, down from a high of the mid-twenties in previous years, although the amount, totaling nearly $30M in requests, was not very much different.

Mr. Stewart observed that the nine applications reflected various types of projects, but none of them completely fulfilled the aforementioned requirements. Finding that, the committee members stepped back and asked themselves what they *should* be funding, leading to the discussions Mr. Taylor referred to at the during his Executive Director report. Since none of the applications satisfactorily addressed those priorities, Mr. Stewart reported that the Grant Committee recommendation is to deny all nine and reopen the 2018 Grant cycle on September 15th, remaining open until December 15th, 2017, to give everyone who wishes to apply another opportunity to do so.

Observing that many applicants were in the room, Mr. Taylor explained that although some of these applications referred to PSAP consolidation, for example, there were no concrete plans for making that happen; rather, there were speculations that "If we get some money maybe we'll do it," i.e. the actual starting of the consolidation process (completed memoranda of understanding, management plans, etc.) was contingent upon whether or not a grant was awarded. He said another way to put it is that the committee was looking for people who are committed, not people who are not committed. Turning to the second priority, regional initiatives, he explained that the intention is to fund something new, not something already existing, which some of the applications sought to do. He advised applicants to "…look at what you're talking about doing, and give us the meat to that. If you're going to consolidate, show us that you're going to consolidate. If you're going to create a regional initiative, show us that you are creating a regional initiative, not just re-hashing or wanting money for what you're already doing."

Heather Campbell recollected that another thing the committee members were looking for was what efficiencies applicants were bringing to the table through this grant application, "…so through the consolidation or the regionalization are there any efficiencies gained? That helps to further sell the business (plan)." She added that "We want to give out the grant money. We want to be able to do that. There's no intent of holding anything back, and that is why we're extending the cycle, giving it additional time, so that we can potentially allocate as much as we can and give people time to further improve their business (plan)."

David Bone said he wanted, first of all, to thank the committee for its work—he knows it's a lot of work, and appreciates their efforts and the discussion and focus on the Board's goals. He went on, however, saying he's still trying to wrestle with, to get an understanding and clarity of, Mr. Taylor's reference to commitment. He asked if Mr. Taylor meant that the committee wanted to see a commitment to consolidation even without the grant, i.e. the entities would consolidate even if they didn't get the grant? Mr. Stewart responded that as committee members

looked at the plan, they didn't see that it was a "fully baked" plan—that it was an agreement between two PSAPs. They felt that the application was saying that the two PSAPs *would* come together *if* they had money, but they didn't have any memorandum of understanding or any basis that it would actually happen. Mr. Taylor picked up the thread, noting that no governance plan was included—it was just, "Well, we're talking." Mr. Stewart offered that the plan wasn't complete enough—that was basically the problem. Saying he understood, Mr. Bone stated that he had always felt that one of the purposes of the grant program is to provide financial assistance to help with consolidation, then asked if that was "still part of the mix"—that in this case they just didn't have the plan fully vetted or documented? Mr. Stewart replied that is correct, and said that he wanted to add, as Ms. Campbell has said, there was also no discussion of efficiency; that the committee was looking for a plan that would provide efficiencies and reduced funding over time.

Mr. Taylor displayed the statutory language in NCGS § 143B-1407.(b), *PSAP Grant and Statewide 911 Projects Grant Application* which prescribes, among other things, "The 911 Board may approve a grant application and enter into a grant agreement with a PSAP if it determines all of the following, "(please see https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/documents/files/08252017%20Agenda%20Book.pdf page 68). He drew attention to section (1), which states "The costs estimated in the application are reasonable and have been or will be incurred for the purpose of promoting a cost-effective and efficient 911 system." He postulated that co-locating two PSAPs is not the same thing as consolidation; it's not promoting efficiencies, it's not creating cost-effectiveness, etc., adding he thinks that is what was lacking in these applications and what the committee was looking for.

Mr. Bone asked Mr. Taylor to display onscreen the list of applicants in the agenda book (please see https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/documents/files/08252017%20Agenda%20Book.pdf page 69), which he did. Mr. Taylor pointed out that Durham 911 and McDowell County were asking for funding which is more worthy of a funding reconsideration than a grant award and were being informed of that. Mr. Bone observed that based upon this list, one request was for a potential consolidation and two for back-ups. Mr. Taylor concurred, however he added that one back-up PSAP request was neither a consolidation or a regional initiative—it was just for building a building.

Mr. Moore asked what was missing from the one consolidation application. Mr. Stewart replied that no specific location was identified, and the budget supporting the application was all estimates. He said the committee reasoned that if you don't even have a venue that you're looking at, or a piece of land or existing building, in a plan where you haven't specifically identified anything, there was just too much opportunity for missing that budget. He added that there was also no governance plan or signed MOU between the two PSAPs. Mr. Moore then asked if the proposed new application window was long enough, and Mr. Taylor said he thinks so, noting that the normal grant application window is ninety days, just as this is. He said the bigger challenge will be for the Grant Committee to complete its review work as quickly as possible after the window closes, which will be right in the middle of the holiday season.

Mr. Shipp said he thought this would be a perfect time to briefly touch on maybe one or two past grant awards that were successful, and why they were. Mr. Taylor cited the Burke County and Rockingham County consolidation grants, noting that each of those counties consolidated multiple PSAPs into a single countywide PSAP, greatly increasing efficiencies and access to improved technology. He also cited the Jones County consolidation with Lenoir County; how Jones County, a poor rural county that was struggling to fund 911, is getting a level of 911 service now that they have never had access to before. Another positive example he cited is the Martin County/Pasquotank County regional back-up plan. He characterized such successful projects as being the ones that make a difference, that show efficiencies and economies—that's what the Grant Committee is looking for. He added that as we look at funding, we have to watch what we're spending and be sure that we have money to spend on what's necessary and what's working as we move forward so, as Mr. Stewart said, PSAPs are not wanting for anything.

Mr. Bone asked when the Board will be able to expect the Grant Committee recommendation after the application window closes. Mr. Taylor replied that will be at the January meeting, which is what he was referring to earlier when he said the committee will be pushed to make a determination as soon as the holidays are over.

Acceding to the fact that he is a newbie to the Board, though not the newest, Chairman Boyette asked if this is a repeat issue we're seeing; are the grant applicants not understanding what we're expecting to see in a successful grant application? Is it something we need to train on, something for which we need to provide outreach? Mr.

Stewart opined that is a very good question, and one for which he doesn't know the answer. He did observe, however, that over his tenure with the Grant Committee it does seem like the applications have been getting further and further away from the Board's priorities. Ms. Wright suggested that the grant priorities should be put out before the applications are due, speculating that we may have been "putting the cart before the horse" regarding that. Mr. Taylor replied that they were put out early in the application window this year, because that was one of the things that had drawn attention in years past.

Mr. Taylor expressed surprise at this year's number of radio-centric requests, like the one for a complete radio system purchase which had no 911 relationship at all. When asked about Jones/Lenoir having purchased such a system, Mr. Taylor affirmed that they did upgrade their entire radio system, but pointed out that was because it was part of the entire consolidation project, not a stand-alone request. Mr. Stewart interjected that was another topic the committee wrestled with, noting that historically, unless a radio purchase has been part of a bigger initiative, e.g. consolidation or regionalization, the Grant Committee has never approved grants for radio systems. Mr. Bone suggested this might be a good topic to dedicate time to at the upcoming fall PSAP Manager conference, observing he's sure there will be a lot of questions, so it would be good for us to be proactive.

With no further discussion forthcoming, Chairman Boyette called the vote on the committee recommendation, which passed unanimously.

8. Web Page / SharePoint Updates—Mr. Taylor shared that some criticisms were made at the recent regional PSAP Manager meetings regarding the 911 Board website, and that he has been trying to address them, working in conjunction with Billy Hilton, the Digital Commons webmaster. Mr. Taylor offered that there are a number of problems he, personally, has with the website, and encouraged anyone who uses it to let him know when they have difficulty finding something they are searching for. Citing as an example his inability to easily locate the Eligible Use of Fund List on the site, he pointed out that is a critical tool for the PSAPs, one they deserve to be able to easily locate, and stated that is a situation that should not be.

Mr. Taylor next related that members of the Grant Committee have access to the 911 Board SharePoint account, which is where all the 911 files are stored, but added that since it is a state site, certain steps must be taken to gain access. He teased Ms. Campbell about how easy it is to gain access, as she had experienced great difficulty when she tried to get in. Slayton Stewart interjected he had experienced similar problems. Mr. Taylor then announced that over the next week he will be sending invitations to all Board members, not just those on the Grant Committee, via email, which will outline the steps they need to take to gain access.

9. Discussion of TDM Issues—Chairman Boyette introduced this topic, the TDM sunset, as not necessarily PSAP or 911 related, but more county and municipality related. He explained that the telecoms are increasingly moving to VoIP from TDM, and he wants to be sure that counties and municipalities are aware that the sunset is coming in 2020. He pointed out that DIT provides a lot of telephony service to those entities, and if anyone wants a "more full-blown demonstration" or more details about the sunset, he can assign people to do that. He advised he has spoken about it internally, within state agencies, and became concerned because a lot of the CIOs seemed unprepared. He asked everyone to please share the word, and if anyone does need further explanation, please don't hesitate to reach out to him or Mr. Taylor. Mr. Stewart asked who set the sunset date, and Chairman Boyette replied it was what the providers are telling him. Chuck Greene clarified that it is actually what the major providers have told the FCC is their target date for the transition to be complete. Until then, he explained that they are still concurrently providing both TDM and IP based service, which, when you contemplate efficiency, is not the most desirable way to do things. Mr. Bone asked Chairman Boyette if DIT might be willing to do a presentation at the winter city/county manager conference, and Chairman Boyette said, "Absolutely!" Mr. Greene offered that the telecoms are also trying to get the word out, and offered that they could also be used as a resource. Relating how he's been involved in many transitions such as this one, Chairman Boyette said he's learned it is always preferable to be proactive, to get ahead of it, because he knows how it can turn into a last-minute scramble if you aren't.

10. NG911 Project Discussion Regarding Next Steps to PSAP Deployment—Mr. Shipp reported that work is progressing with NextGen and the Technology Committee, and said he once again wanted to commend staff on its work at the recent regional PSAP Manager meetings in updating the PSAPs. Observing that he finds it good to have a good problem, he said he thinks that from a demand standpoint, based on a lot of the efficiencies

and enhancements that were explained regarding the ESINet, there has been a lot of positive input from the PSAPs, so now the dilemma becomes our selection process based on need, demand, where we start, etc.—that these are some of the challenges the Board and committee members will have to address going forward. He then asked Mr. Taylor to continue.

Mr. Taylor said he wanted to offer a quick update on the ESINet and hosted solutions clarifications, saying that we had run into a couple of "bumps", but that he had signed off on the last one last night around 5:15. By virtue of that, paperwork is now being processed through OSBM, and hopefully within the next two weeks everything will be "good to go". He added that Mr. Bradford has been part of the process and is comfortable with everything, and in talking with the procurement folks at DIT, we are very close to "pulling the trigger" on this. He added that although this went a bit beyond the sixty-day window originally agreed upon, Jesus Lopez, who has been managing this project from the beginning, has been doing an outstanding job.

Mr. Taylor continued that once the ESINet comes up, many PSAPs have indicated they are willing to join, and part of the contract with AT&T is that they are only reimbursed when PSAPs join, so they are looking to get PSAPs on the ESINet as quickly as possible. He said he has received many requests from PSAPs who typically like to be early adopters, but we also have many PSAPs that have already reached end-of-life with their current equipment/software, so the Technology Committee is going to have to decide which way to go. With that, he said he is hoping to get feedback from the Board today regarding this; what do Board members think would be the best approach? He added that it's one thing to say, "We've added twenty PSAPs!", but it is another to say, "We've added twenty PSAPs that made a difference!" By way of example, he offered that Wilson County has told him its 911 phone system is failing, they need to buy a new one, and what should they do? He speculated he would much rather migrate them to the ESINet, "Get them online", than spend money on a solution which is just buying time. Noting that Wilson County is not in AT&T territory, so bringing it on would entail a bit more work, he reiterated his question/challenge to the Board: "What's more important? To say we've got PSAPs on, or to say we've got PSAPs on that we've made a difference with?" while emphasizing that we will get everybody on eventually.

Chuck Greene recused himself from the discussion, since he is AT&T's representative on the Board, then John Moore offered that he feels the ones with the greatest need should go first because the ones who want to be early adopters are probably already in a good place today. He speculated that since they're the ones that are likely already on top of things, that would help us fill that last year gap pretty quickly. David Bone said he agrees, that we've talked a lot today about efficiency and that would be the highest and best use for those resources. Donna Wright offered that we should probably consider individual circumstances as well. Putting her own PSAP out as an example, saying she *is* in the process of building a new PSAP, she *is* in AT&T's territory, and she *is* ready to go NextGen, she conceded that she can wait—that's fine, that's great—but at the same time she's about ready to roll into a new center, she's going to buy a new phone switch—or—she could go to a hosted solution in the process. Mr. Moore asked if her PSAP is already SIP and PRI enabled, and Ms. Wright assured him it is, "It's ready." She did, however, add that she completely understands and agrees with helping those which are most in need.

Mr. Taylor announced that he thinks we're pretty close to the GIS RFP being released, noting that a few very positive tweaks had been made regarding working with some other state agencies, etc., and asked Mr. Bradford how he would characterize that. Mr. Bradford speculated that some people here are probably very familiar with the fact that there are different GIS efforts ongoing around the state, and so there have been discussions about efficiencies to be garnered in that regard. He explained that the Board's RFP is a little ahead of the curve of everybody else; we have included some language in the RFP that will basically try to allow some leveraging or some combination to achieve cost savings where possible, coordination with other efforts through other agencies to manage data properly, and to utilize that data so we collect it once, not four times, which he thinks the local governments might appreciate. He offered that he thinks it's really just a matter of going through the procurement and the posting process and then it will be released for bids.

Mr. Shipp asked for an update on the NMAC and the dilemma it creates, saying he thinks the Board needs to be aware of that issue. Mr. Taylor reviewed that the NMAC RFP went out earlier in the year, but there were only two responses, neither of which appeared able to fulfill the Board's requirements. He related that he met with the ESINet team two weeks ago, because as we start construction on the ESINet he would really like to have the

NMAC either in place or pretty close to being in place for the PSAPs. Since that would be the first point of contact for a PSAP experiencing problems with the ESINet, he said he feels we would be doing the PSAPs a disservice if it weren't ready when they join. He added that AT&T has said they will be glad to provide it, but the Board has always wanted to have something that is independent of the ESINet provider. He related that in talking with the team members, one of them asked why not do it ourselves? After pondering on that for a bit, Mr. Taylor recognized that it made sense, as DIT already has facilities in the eastern data center and the western data center that certainly could provide space for performing such a function. He added, however, that he would not want it to be a function of DIT, but rather a function of the 911 Board, so that there is a separation of responsibilities which would make it clear to the PSAPs that when they call they are speaking to someone fluent in all things 911. Mr. Taylor acknowledged it will require hiring additional staff for that purpose, saying he would want to find a manager who could oversee it and to learn what it will take "people-wise" to operate it. He noted that AT&T has already said they will be willing to work with us on this—that it's not an issue with them at all—and so he thinks the biggest thing for us is just making a commitment to the PSAPs and this network for 911 in North Carolina. He said he thinks this is the way he would like to go—that it would be more efficient and more responsible to the PSAPs—and that's what he's looking for.

Mr. Bradford added that the monitoring tools that were forecasted for use by the NMAC that AT&T would have provided are things that are already known and familiar to personnel at DIT; we use them today every hour—every hour of every day. Mr. Taylor reiterated that's his thinking right now, and he has talked with some of the leadership, though not quite at the Secretary's level yet, and feels there are a lot of resources available at the eastern and western data centers, the pipelines are already in place, etc., i.e. there are a lot of things that we already have, and it would behoove us to take advantage of that. He concluded his remarks by saying that is what the plan is, though it is not in concrete yet.

Other Items—Chairman Boyette reminded everyone to remember the Funding Committee work session on Tuesday, as well as the other committee meetings listed on the last page of the agenda. Mr. Shipp alerted Mr. Taylor to the fact he had used August instead of September as the month for the next Technology Committee meeting, and Mr. Taylor realized that was true for the 911 Funding Committee meeting, too. He advised everyone to substitute September for August in those meeting announcements.

Mr. Taylor reminded everyone about Chairman Boyette's encouragement at the last meeting for Board members to visit PSAPs whenever possible, and announced that he is scheduling Chairman Boyette to go visit some PSAPs and he would be glad to share those dates with other Board members if they would like to attend those visits as well. Chairman Boyette observed that after last month's meeting it is something he really wants to address, to try to get out there so the folks in the field can see us.

Adjourn—Chairman Boyette adjourned the meeting at 12:05 PM.