North Carolina 911 Board Meeting
MINUTES
Banner Elk Room
3514 Bush Street, Raleigh, NC
September 22, 2017
10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Members Present	**Staff Present**	**Guests**
David Bone (NCACC) Martin County	Richard Bradford (DOJ)	Ron Adams, Southern Software
Heather Campbell (CMRS) Sprint	Tina Bone (DIT)	Randy Beaman, CCES
Eric Cramer (LEC) Wilkes Communication	Ronnie Cashwell (DIT)	Rodney Cates, Rockingham Co 911
Andrew Grant (NCLM) Town of Cornelius (WebEx & phone)	Danette Jernigan (DIT)	Chris Champagne, Guilford Metro 911
Chuck Greene (LEC) AT&T	Marsha Tapler (DIT)	Lewis Cheatham, Guilford Metro 911
Greg Hauser (NCSFA) Charlotte Fire Department (WebEx and phone)	Richard Taylor (DIT)	Justin Davis, Guilford Metro 911
Jeff Ledford (NCACP) City of Shelby PD (WebEx and phone)		Christi Derreberry, AT&T
John Moore (VoIP) Spectrum Communications (WebEx and phone)		Breanna Edwards, Guilford Metro 911
Jeff Shipp (LEC) Star Telephone		Glenn Lamb, Guilford Metro 911
Jimmy Stewart (NCAREMS) Hoke Co 911		Jesus Lopez, DIT
Slayton Stewart (CMRS) Carolina West Wireless		Clay Kennedy, Guilford Metro 911
Amy Ward (LEC) CenturyLink		Christine Moore, Guilford Metro 911
Donna Wright (NENA) Richmond Co Emergency Services		Melanie Neal, Guilford Metro 911
		Corky Over, AT&T
		David Poston, CMPD
		Mike Reitz, Chatham Co 911
		Bryce Russell, Guilford Metro 911
		Chris Spencer, Pitney Bowes
Members Absent	**Staff Absent**	**WebEx Guests**
Secretary Eric Boyette (NC CIO) Board Chair		Cliff Brown, Federal Engineering
Len Hagaman (Sheriff) Watauga County		Kristin Cook, Carteret Emergency Comm
Niraj Patel (CMRS) Verizon		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—At approximately 10:03 Vice Chair Bone called the meeting to order and asked Executive Director Richard Taylor to proceed with the roll call.

Roll Call—Observing there was a "large crowd" on the phone today, Mr. Taylor extended Chairman Boyette's apologies for not being able to attend today. Noting that Andrew Grant had notified him that he would not be able to join the meeting until ~10:30, Mr. Taylor polled Greg Hauser, Jeff Ledford, John Moore, and Niraj Patel. All but Mr. Patel verbally responded to the roll call, with Mr. Taylor noting that Mr. Patel had checked into WebEx despite his lack of response to the telephone poll. Vice Chair Bone asked if Sheriff Hagaman would be joining online, and Mr. Taylor responded he would not be.

1. Chairman's Opening Remarks—Vice Chair Bone observed that he was happy to start the meeting with one of the things we truly enjoy and which brings tremendous focus to the work the Board does: recognition of telecommunicators, today from Guilford Metro 911. Explaining that normally we have audio of a call to play when recognizing such efforts, he advised that today's recognition does not include a telephone call—and that Mr. Taylor has chosen instead to play a song he heard yesterday about 911 telecommunicators. It is written and performed by a telecommunicator from Massachusetts, Shanna Jackman, who is also a country singer, and is entitled *Answer the Call*. As Ronnie Cashwell brought up the audio, Mr. Taylor encouraged everyone to listen to the words, which praise 911 telecommunicators for always being available to help someone in their time of great need—to answer the call.

Mr. Taylor said he felt the song fit today's recognition, which involves a 911 center experiencing an emergency and having to "call 911". He called on Rodney Cates, the Director of Rockingham County 911, to share the events which led to his having to turn to Guilford Metro 911 (GM911) for help when his 911 PSAP was knocked out due to its UPS system catching fire. Mr. Cates observed that this incident solidified the fact that back-up plans are not a luxury, but a necessity. He intimated that it matters not how old the equipment in a PSAP may be, whether twenty years or only twenty-two months, sharing that the UPS system which burned up at Rockingham County 911 was only twenty-two months old, so this type of failure certainly was not anticipated.

Melanie Neal, the Director of GM911, related that Mr. Cates' staff reached out to GM911 when their center went down and their 911 calls automatically redirected to GM911. Her staff fielded Rockingham County's 911 calls until, in less than an hour, her IT staff, her radio shop, and her operations staff had Rockingham County's TCs set up in the GM911 back-up center handling calls seamlessly, as if nothing whatever had happened. She thanked her staff for the great team effort they put into that. Mr. Cates also commended her staff for having everything ready for the CAD to CAD transfer they were going through. He added that fortunately, through prior conversations involving backing each other up, GM911's radio shop already had Rockingham County's frequencies programmed, though they had not, as yet, been officially tested. Ms. Neal added that the back-up agreement had actually just been signed the week before the incident happened. She noted that three of her TCs that fielded those calls that night were with her today, and she also praised her IT staff for creating code on the fly to identify incoming calls from Rockingham County and a sign-in on the phone system for the Rockingham County staff to use to receive only their 911 calls.

Mr. Taylor displayed onscreen the text of the inscription on the plaque he presented to the GM911 staff as he read it aloud, once again commending them for their great work. He also took a moment to refute claims that a neighboring county can't answer its neighbor's 911 call, offering this as proof positive that yes, indeed, it can be done, and a good plan put in place does work.

Mr. Taylor then diverged from the printed agenda in order to recognize a former 911 Board member in attendance today. He advised that Christi Derreberry spent eight years on the Board and is now with AT&T working on the FirstNet project, welcoming her to the meeting and thanking her for all her years of service to the Board.

Returning to the recognition of the folks from Guilford Metro 911, Vice Chair Bone observed that he thinks it really shows the sense of community and teamwork and really provides a tremendous narrative for the back-up implementations, thanking them once again.

2. Ethics Awareness/Conflict of Interest Statement—Vice Chair Bone read the Ethics Awareness / Conflict of Interest statement printed in the agenda. No Board members indicated they had any conflicts or potential conflicts with matters coming before the Board today.

3 Consent Agenda—Mr. Taylor advised that no one had offered any additions or corrections to the draft minutes he circulated yesterday, so unless someone wished to offer any now, they would be accepted as presented. He then turned to the financials, providing account information for each of the accounts within the 911 Fund (please see https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/documents/files/09222017%20Agenda%20Book.pdf page 1). He noted that, as expected, the first disbursement from the NG911 account took place this month.

Jeff Shipp made a motion to accept the Consent Agenda as presented, Eric Cramer seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

4. Public Comment—Observing that this is something extremely important to, not only this Board, but any public body, Vice Chair Bone read the invitation for public comment printed in the agenda. No one present indicated they wished to speak, so Vice Chair Bone asked Mr. Taylor to move ahead with the Executive Director Report.

5. Executive Director Report

a) 911 Board Staff Update—Mr. Taylor said he was hoping to be able to announce our new PSAP Liaison staff member, filling the position vacated by David Dodd when he retired, but unfortunately things are moving at the proverbial "speed of government", and although he had hoped that HR would have notified the applicant yesterday so he could make the announcement today, such was not the case. He stressed that there are no problems with the appointment, just a slow process. He offered that three extremely qualified applicants were interviewed, making the selection process a difficult one, and he is confident the one selected will be an excellent addition to the staff. He added that he advised all of the applicants that there will be opportunities in the near future to apply for additional new positions in the technical arena and encouraged them to consider applying for one of those slots. Regarding the financial position, Mr. Taylor advised that we have not yet been able to find a good fit, so that position has been reposted.

b) Chairman's PSAP Visit—Recalling the strong commitment Chairman Boyette has made to this Board, Mr. Taylor reflected on how he has embraced that leadership role, participating in as many things as his schedule will allow. Mr. Taylor reminded everyone of the announcement last month that Chairman Boyette wanted to visit PSAPs, and reported on a visit both of them made to the Raleigh-Wake Emergency Communication Center last week. He related that Chairman Boyette was blown away with the data center portion of the PSAP, as well as everything else, commenting on how Dominick Nutter has done a great job there. Mr. Taylor said the visit lasted nearly two and a half hours, not just touring the center, but also discussing other issues, such as staffing, training, and back-up issues. He added that Mr. Nutter has offered to be a back-up center to any PSAP in the state, although he's yet to have had any takers on the offer. Mr. Taylor announced they will be going to visit the Wilson County PSAP next Friday afternoon, offering to provide the particulars to anyone who might wish to join them, while adding that Johnston County will be next on the list.

c) Statewide PSAP Manager Meeting—Mr. Taylor reminded everyone that the annual PSAP Manager conference will be coming up the week after next, October 4-6, at the Embassy Suites in Greensboro. He encouraged any Board members who can attend to "please, please, please" do so, saying it's a great opportunity for Board members to interact with and get to know PSAP managers on a one-to-one basis and hear some very good comments. He explained staff tries to get as much information *from* the PSAP managers as they give *to* them in the way the meetings are formatted, in order to help us understand what our goals might be for next year. He also added that, as he's mentioned before, a couple of speakers have been scheduled to address topics of concern to all of us: Jay English from the Department of Homeland Security to speak on cybersecurity, and Kim Clark from Arizona speaking on training and staff retention. Mr. Taylor mentioned that in addition, AT&T will have several people there to provide an in-depth look at the ESINet and the plan of what is going to be happening over the next couple of years regarding deployment of NextGen in NC.

d) Grant Extension Requests

i) Catawba County—Displaying onscreen a letter from Brian Drum, Catawba County 911 Communications Director, Mr. Taylor provided a little review of the grant the county received from the 911 Board last year, explaining that they have been delayed by radio system problems and are seeking an extension on the grant until December 31, 2017. Noting he had been staying abreast of their efforts, he offered the staff recommendation was to grant the extension request. Donna Wright made a motion to approve the extension, Slayton Stewart seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

ii) City of Rocky Mount—Turning next to the request from City of Rocky Mount, Mr. Taylor displayed onscreen a letter from Allen Moore, the Communications Supervisor there. Mr. Taylor advised that this request concerns him a little bit, explaining that they, too, had received a grant last year, but they have been plagued with coordination problems and "get off the ground" problems—the result being that they've not gotten a lot accomplished in a year. He reported they have finally ordered the phone system, but as far as getting a building ready and all, they are not there.

Mr. Taylor reminded everyone that a couple of years ago the Board was roundly criticized by City of Rocky Mount for not awarding them a grant, and ultimately a funding reconsideration request was approved for them to address their concerns. Ironically, Mr. Taylor added, they didn't spend that money during the year in which it was allotted to them, so they have now submitted another funding reconsideration request for this fiscal year, which staff just received on September 1st. He reflected that this is particularly disappointing because staff has worked so much on this particular effort, and now the city is asking for a grant extension until August 1, 2018 when the original contract set August 1, 2017 as the completion date.

Mr. Taylor offered that he doesn't want to "say no to them", but he wants to be sure that progress will be made; we've already lost a lot of time and virtually nothing has happened. He postulated that he doesn't want to be sitting here next August looking at another extension request with no progress having been made, and asked if perhaps a closer deadline, maybe June 30th, would be more appropriate. He asserted that if he had to make a recommendation in the positive, that would be the longest he would recommend. He concluded, however, that is just his opinion, and he would welcome advice from the Board.

Vice Chair Bone observed he thinks the request does warrant some additional discussion. He acknowledged that he knows things come up when you're dealing with a project, but we certainly need to hold grant recipients accountable and definitely not appear as if we're just rubber stamping every request; it needs to be warranted and the issues need to be documented. Amy Ward agreed, observing that the letter itself doesn't explain why there is a delay; it ends with the fact that they've made a purchase, so a commitment has been made, but why is it going to take until August of 2018? Mr. Taylor called attention to the second paragraph of the letter, noting it sounds to him like it is saying there is nobody committed to this project. He reiterated that it just concerns him that this particular project has taken so long and has gone nowhere, while we've encumbered money for quite a while that could be going to somebody else who would love to make good use of it.

Jeff Shipp interjected that he thinks June 30th is too long an extension; he'd like to see an update by the end of the year. Slayton Stewart asked, just for clarification, what happens to those funds if the deadline is not met, or whatever revised deadline we allow them? Mr. Taylor replied it reverts back to the Grant Fund, adding that

depending upon the situation, they might have to refund some of the funds they have spent. Donna Wright asked Mr. Taylor if they can reasonably be expected to get this done by June 30th, observing that he better understands the scope and details of the project than she. Mr. Taylor opined "Yes", explaining that he has seen folks make a commitment to projects similar to this and be successful, while adding "You just have to get up and do it."

Vice Chair Bone asked Mr. Taylor if the Board has ever denied any grant extension requests in the past. Mr. Taylor responded that to the best of his recollection the answer is "No," none have ever been denied. He hastened to add, however, they have always shown due diligence, shown that they are working on it and moving forward. He again stated that it concerns him that so little progress has been made on this project for the length of time that has passed, hypothesizing that it shouldn't take a year to hire a consultant. Heather Campbell asked if they have provided any updated project plans, spelling out what they plan to do now? Mr. Taylor replied they have provided a new timeline, observing at the same time, however, that they had an original timeline that they did not stick to. He added that the monthly updates he has received are basically carbon copies of one another simply stating "We're working on it," which Eric Cramer characterized as kicking the can down the road. Mr. Taylor agreed, observing there appears to be no sense of urgency to complete this project.

Chuck Greene asked for more information about the funding reconsideration request mentioned earlier in the discussion, saying it concerns him that they have not expended those funds, either, which doesn't incline him to want to grant them an extension, quite frankly. Ms. Wright asked if we could give them a deadline contingent upon certain parameters having to be met along the way, which generated a murmur of consensus among the Board members. She suggested we clearly state that we support their project, support their effort, want them to be successful, but we must be fiscally responsible, so they must demonstrate that progress is being made by meeting specific milestones as part of the process; if they are unable to do that, then no matter how much we want them to be successful, we will have no choice but to be done with them. John Moore asked if we could require them to provide additional reports between now and whatever deadline we decide upon, showing that they are tracking toward completion, perhaps at every other Board meeting. Ms. Wright said she would prefer requiring a report monthly and hold them accountable here, in front of this Board. She continued by observing we have given them what they need, we've given them the tool, now they need to stand up and be responsible. Ms. Campbell concurred, observing there are several other PSAPs that would love to have that money, that opportunity.

Mr. Taylor asked Tina Bone to confirm if they have a back-up plan in place, which she did, leading him to point out that this project, then, is not impeding their ability to be backed up. Ms. Bone affirmed that, relating that Nash County can receive, answer, and dispatch City of Rocky Mount 911 calls if needed. Mr. Taylor postulated he thinks it is very reasonable to ask them to appear before the Board monthly to provide progress reports on the project. Ms. Campbell asked if we could grant a short extension, then receive a report, and based upon what progress has been made, grant another extension, etc., so it's kind of like a two-stage approach. Mr. Taylor said he would be more inclined to recommend that we grant an extension until December 31st, with the caveat that they must report at the October and December Board meetings showing progress. He also noted that progress is not "We're thinking about it…" or "We're fixin' to…", progress is actually doing something. He offered that if they are making progress, then we could consider offering a further extension for maybe another ninety days. Mr. Shipp said that he agreed; that the extension issue *is* an issue!

Mr. Taylor related that when we first began accepting and awarding funding reconsideration requests, the funds awarded were distributed to the PSAPs as a portion of their monthly 911 fund disbursement, but about two years ago we changed that to where we now provide those funds only after the PSAP has actually expended money in accordance with the stated need within the request, adding that the funds are also only available for use during the fiscal year in which the reconsideration request is awarded. He stated that was perhaps the most disconcerting thing of all for him, because staff and the funding committee and the Board went through so much work in trying to help Rocky Mount with that reconsideration request, only to find out it wasn't used, and now they're applying for another. Mr. Greene observed that creates a snowball effect because the reconsideration request affects their five-year rolling average going forward, which Mr. Taylor affirmed.

Vice Chair Bone asked Marsha Tapler if, considering what they *have* spent some of their reconsideration request funds upon, she feels any level of confidence that they are moving forward. Ms. Tapler replied that the reconsideration request award was for $127,573.00, but they only spent $33,000 of it. She added that through the

last three months of the fiscal year she repeatedly reminded them that she hadn't received any invoices related to those funds, but she never received any response to those reminders. Vice Chair Bone then asked, "What is the pleasure of the Board?" Mr. Shipp suggested we could deny the extension and ask for them to report to the Funding Committee at its next committee meeting. Vice Chair Bone questioned whether that would be the appropriate avenue to utilize, since the Funding Committee is not the Grant Committee, etc. Observing that they have already missed the original deadline of August 1st, 2017, Ms. Campbell asked if we deny an extension, what happens? Mr. Taylor speculated that if the extension is denied, then the grant is ended.

Mr. Bradford interjected that the Board needs to do *something* today, to make some decision. He pointed out that the decision might be to table the request but not terminate the grant at this time, and then take it up either with a combination of committees or a single committee or some other action. He observed it is clear from the discussion that more information is desired, so at a minimum it seems necessary to provide that kind of direction to the grantee and give them the opportunity to reply and to demonstrate that they can meet those conditions. He postulated that that, in and of itself, is a tacit extension of the grant, so doing something along the lines of what has come up in the discussion today, whichever direction the Board decides to go, does constitute an extension and should be memorialized through an amendment to the grant contract itself. Vice Chair Bone opined that tabling it seemed like a good option.

Mr. Shipp made a motion to table the recommendation until it warrants enough importance for a City of Rocky Mount representative to appear before the Board. Mr. Bradford observed that although he is not allowed to amend the motion, he thinks that it is necessary to include in the motion and the record that the Board's understanding is that it does extend the term until such time as the representatives appear, make their presentation, and the Board takes further action. Vice Chair Bone asked if it would be helpful to have a date certain, and Ms. Campbell said she would like to specify the October meeting. Mr. Taylor advised that meeting will be on October 20th. Mr. Greene asked if the next Grant Committee meeting might be more appropriate than the next Board meeting. Mr. Taylor submitted that the entire Board should be involved, saying we're at the point now where it's a full Board issue, not a committee issue. Several other Board members around the table simultaneously concurred. Vice Chair Bone asked Mr. Shipp if he would be amenable to either rescind or adjust his motion to reflect these comments, and Mr. Shipp replied he would. Vice Chair Bone then asked if he would be amenable to tabling the motion until a date certain of the October Board meeting, and extending the grant until that time, pending further consideration and pending a presentation by representatives of Rocky Mount to document their due diligence to the Board. Mr. Shipp agreed, Mr. Greene seconded the amended motion, and without further discussion the motion was called and carried unanimously.

Mr. Shipp asked if he could make one further comment; he said that he feels sure the question of the reconsideration request will come up as well, so perhaps we should contact them to allow them to prepare answers to that question as well as the grant extension. Mr. Taylor offered that he thinks Ms. Tapler is trying to prepare their latest reconsideration request for review at the Funding Committee's October 10th meeting, and Vice Chair Bone said that he thought Mr. Shipp was referencing the reconsideration request that had already been approved. Mr. Taylor responded that that one was over; it ended at the close of last fiscal year. Vice Chair Bone then asked Mr. Taylor if, since they spent $33K of that reconsideration towards a goal they did not meet, how are they accountable from a state standpoint on that expenditure? Before that was answered, Ms. Tapler interjected that the reconsideration request that will be coming before the Funding Committee for this year is going to be for $267,944.00. Ms. Campbell hypothesized that there will be questions at the next Board meeting regarding both of those requests. Vice Chair Bone asked staff to relay those concerns to City of Rocky Mount.

Mr. Bradford offered the observation that it would be helpful to the Board to have more specific information about what the reconsideration requests included, both the former one and the new one, in order to understand whether there were things related to the grant project or not, what they were, and so on, so Board members will be better able to determine what accountability or questions they might want to follow up on. Vice Chair Bone asked Mr. Taylor to provide any such information he can to the Board ahead of time in preparation for that Board meeting.

6. 911 Funding Committee—Speaking in his capacity as Funding Committee Chair, Vice Chair Bone prefaced his detailed reports by observing the Funding Committee has had a busy month, but a very productive one.

a) PSAP Funding Model Discussion and Statement—Vice Chair Bone reported that the work session about the new funding model was very productive, with very good discussion. He said he very much appreciated the participation of all the Board members who attended who are not committee members, as well as the committee members themselves. Regarding the outcome of those deliberations, Vice Chair Bone advised the committee recommendation is to continue to use the current funding model, but focus on efficiency and procurement, and in conjunction with the Standards Committee and Education Committee, explore opportunities to train PSAP staff to develop a technology plan and refresh interval. He reflected that as Jeff Shipp said at the last Board meeting, we have the same amount of revenue coming in, and as Donna Wright stated at the work session, we do not need to make a big adjustment in the formula—we just need to focus on efficiency and keep it simple. He surmised we need to focus on the PSAP funding management rather than a new funding model, observing there is no "silver bullet." He speculated that if we make sure we have the things in place for the best practices for procurement, that's the ideal situation. He added that, as reported at the last Board meeting, the Funding Committee would like to pursue additional opportunities to establish caps and migrate purchasing to state procurement.

Vice Chair Bone offered that, in regards to trying to bring this discussion to closure and bring a recommendation to the Board, the Funding Committee developed a statement at the August 29th work session and approved at the September 19th Funding Committee meeting. Mr. Taylor then displayed the text of the recommendation onscreen (please see https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/documents/files/09222017%20Agenda%20Book.pdf page 64). Referring to the displayed statement, Vice Chair Bone related that it is coming from the Funding Committee to the full Board as a recommendation, then read it aloud. He explained the committee offers this as a guiding principle concerning the new funding model; that we are not necessarily going to try to "reinvent the wheel", but rather try to find efficiencies wherever we can. With that, he opened the floor to questions, and hearing none, asked Mr. Taylor if he wished to add any further narrative.

Mr. Taylor replied he did not—he's just elated with the progress and the conversation during the discussion at the work session and with the participation at that work session, while observing it all underscores that this is not a bad funding model, if it's just managed properly. He reflected that he thinks that is something that both Mr. Shipp and Mr. Greene have pointed out; it really is a good model, it's just the management side that needs attention, the key to its success. He observed that looking at the back-up plan process and grant applications and technology replacement schedules, especially over the last couple of years, we have found room for management improvement at the local level, and that this Board in a leadership role can really strengthen that by helping local PSAPs. Mr. Taylor also pointed out that a good thing about the "five-year rolling average" is that it is simple to understand—it's not complicated.

Chuck Greene interjected that he thought, sort of echoing Mr. Taylor's comment, that the work session was very productive, giving us an opportunity to hash out a lot of issues, and personally he's very pleased with where we ended up. He speculated that the key to all this, and one of the reasons we were even looking at the funding model, was that the "five-year rolling average" *as it was* really didn't encourage cost savings or efficiencies, and he thinks that by adding in the factor that PSAPs are going to be measured now on a per-call cost is a big step forward. He intimated that we will soon be having those PSAP per-call costs reported at future meetings to hold PSAPs accountable for increasing their efficiencies. He concluded his remarks by stating, "I'm very pleased."

Slayton Stewart asked, related to key performance indicators and best practices, what measures do we as a Board have at our disposal, or what actions can we take, if there are multiple PSAPs that seem to be well outside of an average performance level. Mr. Taylor said he would gladly refer that to Mr. Bradford, and Mr. Stewart added that the reason he asks is, that as we put these in place, if we don't have any actionable steps to take, then we can talk a lot yet not be able to do anything.

Mr. Bradford responded that there are several directions that question can take, from the one extreme of mathematical algorithms (his personal view, but one which Mr. Taylor does not favor) to any number of other variables at the opposite extreme. He related that he and Mr. Taylor have been talking about this very topic for more that fifteen years, speculating upon what is the "perfect PSAP" or what is the image of a PSAP. He observed that from an IT perspective, that's an easy discussion most of the time, but from a 911 center perspective, it is not so simple. He speculated that he thinks the bottom line answer is that the further consideration that the Board gives and the committees work on will derive what those key performance indicators

(KPIs) are. He added that those are yet to be determined, and he thinks the direction the Board is taking is going down that path to determine what KPIs should be used—which ones are reasonable, and do they differ based upon the PSAP's operation—noting that a PSAP which operates in one area may be different than a PSAP that operates in another, both serving their public. Mr. Bradford reflected that one of the themes we've "heard from everyone" is that service should be the same—regardless of where you are—the citizen should receive the same level of service. He advised that as the Board moves forward, looking at those KPIs, he thinks that determining how you actually measure that level of service will become more refined and the per-call cost will be a part of that. He offered that that is what he expects, but he thinks there is much more to be learned and quantified to the extent that it can be, while allowing for variability.

Asking Mr. Bradford to correct him if he's wrong, Mr. Greene observed he would see, for example, in the discussion we've just had about Rocky Mount, those types of measures, including per-call costs, are things we can look at to see if a PSAP should be awarded a grant extension or a reconsideration request. Mr. Bradford conceded that, while noting that the Board talks about a funding formula pursuant to the statute, and the statute identifies many factors that must be considered, followed by what lawyers call the "Savings Clause" at the end: "…and anything else the Board thinks is relevant." He explained that the Board has a lot of latitude here, but the decision has to be a rational one based on facts; as long as you do that, you're fine, but you can actually run afoul of that rule pretty easily, sometimes. Mr. Bradford opined this has been a long time coming, and there is probably a lot of discussion yet to be had.

Vice Chair Bone said, in trying to further answer Mr. Greene's question, that one of the things we are focusing on is the concept of caps, so in pursuing statewide contracts, and again not making anything mandatory, a statewide contract would establish a base amount, so if a PSAP chose to procure things through their own means, that baseline would limit (cap) our financial liability to the statewide contract amount.

Mr. Taylor took a moment to check with Andrew Grant to see if he had joined the meeting on the phone bridge. Mr. Grant advised he had, and began offering comments as the phone connection began breaking up. Vice Chair Bone and Mr. Taylor advised him of that, and Mr. Grant changed something on his end that cleared up the problem. Summarizing what he had said when the connection broke up, Mr. Grant offered that he appreciates everyone's comments and agrees with what everyone said about the data. Referring to the Funding Committee work session, he commented that he thinks we did some good work, and as Vice Chair Bone alluded to earlier, there really is not a "silver bullet", although he was really hoping and very optimistic that we would find one. He observed that what he saw from his perspective is that every model we looked at inherently, though not intentionally, had winners and losers, and achieving equity was going to be very difficult. Saying "to make a long story short," he affirmed that he supports the direction we are moving in.

Vice Chair Bone thanked him for his comments, and hearing no further, called the vote on the committee recommendation, which carried unanimously.

b) Approval of Funds Transfer to PSAP Grant and Statewide 911 Projects Account—Vice Chair Bone explained the statutory requirement for remaining funds at the end of a fiscal year to either be distributed to PSAPs or transferred to the grant fund. Mr. Taylor displayed onscreen the Funding Committee's recommendation for this year's transfer (please see https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/documents/files/09222017%20Agenda%20Book.pdf page 66) as Vice Chair Bone read it aloud. Vice Chair Bone asked Mr. Taylor if he had further information to offer. Mr. Taylor replied that he wished he could give the Board a more exact number today, but the fiscal group at DIT is, like us, shorthanded and running behind. He noted he anticipates having the final exact amounts by next Friday, however, if not sooner. He offered that the other thing we will have to do, since we will be transferring more than $3M, is *consider* lowering the 911 fee. He emphasized it is not a requirement that we *must lower* the fee, but it is a requirement that we must *consider* it. Mr. Taylor added that we can also change the percentage distributions between the CMRS and PSAP funds, as we did last year, rather than reduce the fee.

Hearing no further questions or comments, Vice Chair Bone called the vote on the committee recommendation, which carried unanimously.

c) A911 Purchase Moratorium—Stating that due to the current ESINet contract, executed on September 15th, funding new A911 contracts would be counter-intuitive, and that we do plan to begin adding PSAPs to the ESINet in the first quarter of 2018, Vice Chair Bone reported that the Funding Committee recommends a moratorium on any future A911 contracts. He asked Mr. Taylor if he would add any further explanation to this recommendation, and Mr. Taylor replied the only thing he would add is that any contracts already in effect will not be affected by this recommendation; what we're looking at is not adding any additional systems. He explained that if PSAPs are at an end-of-life situation with their equipment right now, in need of an upgrade, then they would be considered prime choices for early connection to the ESINet and migration to hosted CPE, so entering into a five-year contract independent of connection to the ESINet would indeed be counter-intuitive. He added that upgrading those PSAPs to the ESINet would also assist in accelerating NG911 deployment across the state.

Donna Wright asked for confirmation that this vote is about "…the A911 part, not the CPE part," as Mr. Taylor has spoken before about hosted CPE not becoming available until 3-5 years from now. Mr. Taylor responded that's all intertwined, since A911 systems do usually include hosted CPE. Vice Chair Bone confirmed this vote is just on the A911 purchase moratorium. He then offered to entertain any further questions or comments, including those from folks on the phone, and hearing none, called a vote on the committee recommendation, which passed unanimously.

Reflecting that he probably should have done it prior to the vote, Mr. Taylor displayed onscreen a policy drafted by Mr. Bradford which offers a bit more detail, including principles the moratorium embraces, statutory directives supporting those principles, and a proposed policy (please see https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/documents/files/09222017%20Agenda%20Book.pdf pages 69-70), and asked Mr. Bradford to elaborate upon it. Mr. Bradford related that some months ago he had drafted an A911 policy, and then as the ESINet contract rolled forward, revised it to become what is onscreen today. Stressing that this is just a draft, and has not been considered by committee, he offered that it is presented here more for information; to explain how the staff, himself included, looked at the moratorium voted upon at the last Funding Committee meeting. He added that there was also discussion at that committee meeting to revisit this in about six months, observing that part of the reasoning for that is directly related to anticipating moving forward quickly with the ESINet, but if that doesn't happen, we don't want PSAPs to be harmed. He further explained each of the bullet points in the proposed policy, stressing that he wrote this—Mr. Taylor didn't ask him to—so that it would provide Mr. Taylor authority to continue existing A911 service on a month-to-month basis for PSAPs making the transition to the ESINet without having to bring each instance before the Funding Committee for determination. Mr. Taylor reiterated this is not brought before the Board for any action—just for information—and that he suspects any feedback would be welcomed by the committee.

Referring to the portion of the second bullet point stating "A911 reimbursements from the 911 Fund will not be reduced, or increased, during the term of a [existing] contract for A911 service;" Chuck Greene asked how that might impact funding reconsideration requests from PSAPs that currently operate under an A911 contract. Mr. Bradford replied it means those costs are fixed, adding that they should be fixed because the contract is already in place.

d) CPE Purchase Cap—Vice Chair Bone reported that the Funding Committee is recommending a cap on hosted CPE purchase, insofar as, "…PSAPs be required to procure hosted CPE off of state contract or be reimbursed an amount not to exceed the cost of the state contracted CPE." Noting that CPE used to be an acronym for "Customer Premise Equipment," Mr. Taylor observed that it has morphed into meaning "Call Processing Equipment" instead, principally because of the advent of hosted solutions. He pointed out that the contract with AT&T is for "ESINet/hosted CPE", which means that they will offer hosted CPE solutions from two different vendors—Airbus and West—at the contracted price. He likened this to how the 911 Board encourages PSAPs to purchase fiber connectivity from DIT at the state contract price, but will pay up to the same amount if they elect to use an alternate provider; a PSAP will still have the option to purchase CPE from an alternate provider, but will only receive reimbursement up to the cost of the state contracted solutions. Mr. Taylor added that the hosted CPE will be paid for directly by the 911 Board from the NG911 Fund, so PSAPs will not have to contend with that billing or worry about maintenance expenses, etc. from local funds—it will all be handled by the Board through the contract with AT&T.

Vice Chair Bone asked for any further comments or questions, and hearing none, called the vote on the committee recommendation, which passed unanimously. Donna Wright asked that letters be sent to the PSAPs regarding both the A911 purchase moratorium and the CPE purchase caps. Vice Chair Bone thanked her for that suggestion, adding that both announcements will be made in the weekly PSAP Manager newsletter as well.

7. 911 Grant Committee

a) Request from Iredell County—Grant Committee Chair Slayton Stewart reported that the 911 Board had received a request from Iredell County to reconsider its grant application, and advised that in response to that request, the Funding Committee met on Friday, September 15th, to discuss it and determine how to proceed. He offered that after the discussion, the committee crafted the recommendation being displayed onscreen, then read it aloud:

> The Grant Committee recommends that the 911 Board deny Iredell County's request to reconsider its grant application for the following reasons: 1) the Board previously approved a second grant period for 2017 with awards to be made in early 2018; 2) grant applications are considered competitively and collectively, so reconsidering the application could set a precedent that is inconsistent with the competitive nature of the grant program; and 3) although the total grant funds available for the upcoming grants has been determined, the grant amounts requested by applicants are as yet unknown and therefore any award based on the previously rejected grant application prejudices the awards anticipated to new applicants.

Mr. Stewart then encouraged other Grant Committee members and Mr. Taylor, who also attended the committee meeting, to add any comments or observations they might have. Mr. Taylor advised he had included the complete email from Iredell County Manager Ron Smith in the agenda book, adding that he and Mr. Smith had spoken about it previously, as had Vice Chair Bone and Mr. Smith. Mr. Taylor related that as he explained to both Mr. Smith and to the Grant Committee, the request was to consider reconsideration of the grant application, not to review the application itself yet another time. He added that he did offer to both Mr. Smith and Candy Strezinski, as well as their consultant, Mission Critical Partners (MCP), that anything he or the 911 Board staff can do to assist them in tweaking their application they will be more than happy to do. Mr. Taylor related that Mr. Smith had said there was nothing they could do to improve the application. Mr. Taylor's response to that allegation was that there are, indeed, several things that could be improved upon to make the application stronger. Mr. Stewart added, just as a point of fact, that Mr. Smith had participated in the committee meeting over the telephone.

Vice Chair Bone opened the floor to further comment or discussion, and hearing none, called the vote on the committee recommendation, which carried unanimously.

8. Education Committee Telecommunicator Certification Discussion—Education Committee Chair Jimmy Stewart shared that the committee has been examining the charge it was given to investigate the possibility of requiring mandatory certification of telecommunicators in North Carolina. Prior to moving beyond the committee discussion, he said they thought it was a good idea to share their determinations with the Board to get its permission before going any further. Observing that he can speak from experience based upon his background in EMS, he stated that in making a certification mandatory, we have to specify the outline and the content of the educational material; we have to qualify instructors; we have to qualify delivery agencies; we have to decide upon what that certification will be, e.g. whether it will be purely a North Carolina certification or a hybrid in conjunctin with already established certifications; what we may want; etc. He speculated we may have to form partnerships with some other agencies, such as community colleges for curriculum delivery, as well as qualify instructors who deliver other certifications, if we go that route. Mr. Stewart added we will also need to have a way to know who is certified; a way to maintain those records and keep track of those who are certified; to know who's responsible for monitoring to ensure compliance; to have a disciplinary process, as OEMS already does, in the event certifications must be revoked. He summarized that these are but some of the types of things we must be looking at if we're going to get into certification.

Mr. Stewart observed that statutory changes will definitely be required, both to make it mandatory and to spell out the attendant duties and responsibilities of the Board, but he doesn't believe it will be any different from any other states' experiences in enacting certifications, which many have done. He added that Mr. Bradford has discovered, in performing extensive research on states that have done so, that there are myriad ways of enacting certifications—everything from basic 40-hour courses to 200-odd hour courses. Mr. Stewart reiterated that before stepping into that arena, the Education Committee wanted the Board to know what will be involved, and then get the Board's permission before pressing on to do it.

Vice Chair Bone asked how many states have any type of certification programs, and Mr. Bradford replied well over half the states have some form of what we're talking about here as certification, probably 70%. Vice Chair Bone asked if it is inherent to the concept of certification that it be mandatory, or could it be optional? Several members spoke up at once saying it's already optional now, to which he acquiesced. Mr. Bradford observed he thinks there is an important distinction to be understood, and that is that we are not talking about creating a licensing issue; there's a huge difference between licensing and certification. He added that, as Mr. Stewart indicated, the issues are understood widely by the committee in terms of what exists out there, the things that are necessary to create a program, the fact that statutory changes would be needed, etc. He pointed out that he noted in section 4 of the outline he provided for this agenda item in the agenda book, under Administrative Code, (please see https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/documents/files/09222017%20Agenda%20Book.pdf pages 80-82), there is an italicized phrase about requesting legal counsel about what the administrative process is, noting that is something he would take on. He observed this would certainly necessitate rule-making which would follow the statutory changes, so there's a good bit of work ahead of us to undertake these things. Mr. Bradford further explained that certifications vary; in most places they are considered as a prerequisite to having a job, but not in all. He offered that in some settings, as long as a person is certified within a certain period of time, frequently a year, then that's fine, and there are also grandfather provisions in many state statutes, such as people who are currently employed not being subject to the certification requirement—it's encouraged, but not required. In sum, he said those are policy driven questions that will come up.

Vice Chair Bone thanked Mr. Bradford for his explanation, noting that he is concerned about how this will be implemented, particularly in a small, rural PSAP, if they were going through some personnel changes and lost several at one time; how would they train people and bring three or four people on at one time if they didn't have certification ahead of time? Addressing Mr. Taylor, he said he thinks the challenge in that scenario is that if you're sending people to be trained you still have to have people in the seats, performing the job. Mr. Taylor concurred, noting that about one third of our PSAPs are under the direction and control of a Sheriff, so that is already a requirement for them, observing that training in general, regardless of certification, presents that problem; somebody is out and you have to fill the seat and usually the person filling the seat is doing it in an overtime situation, and overtime funds are very limited. Noting we've had a lot of discussion over the years with this, he speculated that using the community college system to deliver the training prior to the person starting work would be the ideal goal; that way, the certification is in hand prior to them starting in their position. He acknowledged there are a whole lot of these kinds of issues that we've got to look at, but he doesn't want to spend a whole lot of time on nothing but a lot of talking, and adding that this kind of certification is going to raise the professionalism and the recognition of telecommunicators, something way past due. He surmised that the committee is looking for direction, because this will take a lot of time.

Chuck Greene interjected that having some experience with opening up the 911 statute over at the General Assembly (GA), that can be a troubling exercise causing unintended consequences. Acknowledging he doesn't know all the history behind this, he noted we are talking about regulating individuals rather than regulating PSAPs, and wondered if, short of statutory changes, we could do something with the standards, such as, for example, requiring that in their standards reviews PSAPs would be required to have, say, 50% of their staff with less than a year's service trained, escalating to 100% for those with five or more years' experience, or something like that, placing the onus on the PSAP rather than the individual. Mr. Bradford demurred that, no, it would still take a statutory change, adding that is one of the reasons he thinks the committee, which has put a lot of time in this, wanted to come to the Board and sort of forecast the direction it sees based upon its understanding, to make sure it's going in the right direction. Saying he didn't want to speak for anyone on the committee, he asserted he thinks it is fair to recognize that it's usually not a good idea to have a committee meeting and talk about making changes when its governing body hasn't really taken that position.

Donna Wright asserted it is going to be controversial—there will be a lot of fighting, nasty comments made to the Board and the Education Committee—because that is just unfortunately what happens when you change peoples' worlds from what they know and are accustomed to. She added that even as rural as her center is, she starts training new employees on day one with a national certification program; they do not hit her communications floor without being certified as an emergency telecommunicator, an EMD, and an EFD. She acknowledged that's rare for a small PSAP, but she also understands we can't afford to put people in these positions without the proper knowledge base; it's no longer just sitting somebody down in a seat and saying "monkey-see, monkey-do"—it doesn't work like that anymore. She revealed that's the way she was trained—she knows what it was like—and that's why she's so passionate about the way she trains today. She further asserted, however, that it is a value she thinks we must invest on the front end before we ever put them on the floor today.

Vice Chair Bone interjected that although he agrees with Mr. Taylor that precertification prior to employment is the ideal solution, and while he applauds Nash County for going out and doing that, we all know that the ideal is not always realistic, so there will need to be other mechanisms; backfilling empty seats because people are away in training is an issue. He reflected that is something he has advocated for in the past—that we need to have some type of consideration for that overtime. While admitting he knows that would require a statutory change, he posited that if we are requiring that certification, and someone must work for the person receiving the training, if we don't provide some mechanism to allow for that overtime for that backfill, it's an unfunded mandate, and as a county manager he does not like unfunded mandates.

Mr. Taylor observed these are areas we are very much aware of, and as Ms. Wright has already stated, it will be controversial—just having a conversation about it can become very controversial! Addressing Mr. Greene, he admitted he does *not* want to touch the statute, but at the same time, if we're going to move forward, we've got to find a mechanism that does make certification a requirement. He mentioned that Jeff Shipp has speculated to him on many occasions that perhaps some sort of funding mechanism could be established through the grant process, although that would obviously require much more thought and discussion. He pointed out that such a use would qualify as enhancing the 911 system, but we'd definitely have to sit down and do some work on that with Mr. Bradford; it's just an idea, a possibility. Ms. Wright speculated that considering every aspect of this in detail will likely evolve into a minimum of a five or six-year project—a long process.

Mr. Taylor shared an anecdote about recently coming across a piece of memorabilia during his move from New Bern to Raleigh: a saved New Bern newspaper clipping from 1998 or 1999, when the annual NC APCO/NENA conference was held there, and the big topic was telecommunicator certification and training. He observed that's how long this has been going on, and we're probably nowhere closer today than we were then.

Noting that he thinks this is a great idea and a good way to move forward, Mr. Greene observed that if we look at requesting statutory change, we need to get in front of legislators about it now, citing how much furor arose over adopting the standards at the tail end of that process: "The Board's considering these standards—you gotta stop 'em!", even though it had been in the works, and public, for years. He contended that communicating with the people at the General Assembly now versus later is going to be vital to the success of the effort. Mr. Taylor observed that's part of the reason the recommendation from staff to the committee and from the committee to this Board, so we can do that with the knowledge and the blessing, if you will, of the 911 Board, so we can get out there and be proactive. He reflected that it's going to take time, we're going to have to build some alliances, and it will probably be one of the hardest things the Board has ever accomplished. He said the main thing he and the committee are looking for is, let's not spend more time *talking* about it, let's start *doing* something about it.

Vice Chair Bone asked Mr. Taylor if what was displayed onscreen is the recommendation coming from the education committee (please see https://files.nc.gov/ncdit/documents/files/09222017%20Agenda%20Book.pdf page 83), and Mr. Taylor replied it was. Vice Chair Bone then read it aloud, noting it doesn't establish a timetable per se but just to give general blessing to move forward toward that goal. Mr. Stewart agreed, saying it gives the committee permission to start those conversations and collaborations. Vice Chair Bone then asked if there were any further questions or comments. Greg Hauser, participating over the phone, spoke up to say the Fire Service supports this 100%, and is willing to assist in any way possible as we move forward.

Vice Chair Bone rhetorically asked how we will roll this out, knowing it will be controversial and contentious—is there any way to soften the blow a little bit? Mr. Taylor replied the committee has already done a lot of work

reviewing nationally recommended standards with different private companies as well as the Sheriffs' Training and Standards to see who has what, where there is duplication, that type of thing—which he thinks is a good first step—but now we need to take those differences and sit down with those particular stakeholders and see what common ground we can find. He continued by saying he doesn't want to exclude any agency or company, relating that he was part of the national effort to create the national minimum training standards, which took six years, and assuring everyone there were many bloodbaths in the process. He surmised that after going through that process in this case, having those stakeholder conversations and hammering out the problems, *then* we could possibly take it to the GA, but to try to do that before having those conversations would be shooting ourselves in the foot and doing nothing but setting ourselves up for failure.

Jeff Shipp said he supports the initiative, and he thinks it would be great if the Education Committee could begin developing a set of talking points, both positive and combative or defensive to any negative comments so we would all be on the same page and talking the same language in advance of any proposed statutory changes. Vice Chair Bone agreed, saying he thinks we would need to be proactive, and asked if we are prepared to formally discuss this at the upcoming PSAP Manager conference. Mr. Taylor demurred, saying he didn't think so, but Mr. Stewart said he thinks we could informally address it, telling them we're starting the process and if they have any comments we can go ahead and start collating them. Vice Chair Bone opined he's pretty sure it will come up, so the more we can do to help frame it on the front end will be helpful. Mr. Shipp offered that he does agree with Vice Chair Bone's comments and concerns, however, he does look forward to one network with collaborative efforts where we can work with one another to help with staffing issues and so forth.

Vice Chair Bone asked if there were further comments or questions, and hearing none, called the vote on the committee recommendation, which carried unanimously.

9. NG911 Project Discussion—Technology Committee Chair Jeff Shipp opened his comments by reassuring the Board and the PSAP community that we are on schedule, and he feels confident with where we stand, are aware of some of the challenges that are ahead of us, and are on track, with staff doing a great job of keeping us so. He added he looks forward to the committee's meeting next week.

a) GIS RFP—Mr. Shipp advised the GIS RFP is with procurement right now, and is expected to be released within a matter of days. He reported a team of subject matter experts for this RFP, just as with the previous RFP, has been assembled, including representatives of NC DOT and CGIA, and all are looking forward to moving ahead.

b) ESINet / Hosted CPE Timeline—Mr. Shipp reported that staff has met with AT&T, that the effective date of the contract was Friday, September 15th, and that a project manager has been assigned who will, along with Mr. Taylor, make a presentation at the NC APCO/NENA Annual Conference this Sunday and at the PSAP Manager conference coming up in Greensboro as well. He said he again wishes to reassure the Board and the PSAP community of the team's commitment and dedication and its plans for moving ahead with these projects. He offered that one of the priorities at the upcoming Technology Committee meeting will be to discuss the vetting or implementation schedule as it relates to the ESINet, and maybe the deployment schedule—who will be considered first and how we're going to direct those issues as well. He then invited Mr. Taylor to offer any additional comments he might have.

Mr. Taylor expressed appreciation for the words of reassurance that the project is continuing to move at a very rapid pace, as well as for all the work Jesus Lopez, DIT's project manager (as well as the point of contact with AT&T at this time), has put into it. Mr. Taylor further assured everyone that we are still looking at deployment of PSAPs in the first quarter of 2018, and encouraged any PSAPs that are approaching end-of-life to let the Board know about it, as one of the discussions at next week's Technology Committee meeting is going to be about scheduling PSAPs to deploy. He added that AT&T is very excited about it, is looking forward to getting things moving, and is looking forward to receiving the deployment schedule so they can go ahead and start planning. He noted that several likely candidates for early deployment are outside of the AT&T footprint, but AT&T is eager to demonstrate that will be a non-issue; PSAPs need not worry about being located in a different provider's service area—the only qualifications we will be looking at are, "Who needs it right now, who can we help, and who will benefit the most."

Mr. Shipp asked if Mr. Taylor had expected the furor which followed the recent news release regarding this project, and Mr. Taylor replied it had come as a complete surprise to him, partly because it had been in the pipeline for a long time. He reflected, however, that it shouldn't have been a surprise, since it impacts not only state government, but every municipal and county government in the state as well. He said that the questions he hears most frequently are, "How much is it gonna cost? What's it gonna do, i.e. what is the benefit?" and "How quick is our county (city, locality) going to be deployed?"

10. Standards Committee

a) Update on PSAP Reviews—Standards Committee Chair Donna Wright reported that since the last Board meeting peer review teams have completed three additional PSAP peer reviews: Vance County, Charlotte-Mecklenburg, and Surry County. She advised several more are coming up within the next month, and later in October they will actually be reviewing her PSAP, as well as offering a second round of peer review training on that occasion. Ms. Wright observed the reception from PSAPs has been very welcoming. Tina Bone concurred, observing that when the teams first arrive on site the PSAP personnel are, understandably, a bit nervous, but once they learn that the team is there to help, not harm, the atmosphere become more relaxed. Ms. Bone added that although several more reviews have been scheduled, she has not necessarily been able to find available peer reviewers for all of them, so it is an ongoing process. Mr. Taylor interjected that fourteen PSAP reviews have been completed, with eleven scheduled, postulating that having twenty-five either done or near to being done is an unbelievable amount of progress since July 1st. He expressed his appreciation to Ms. Bone for having fit all of this scheduling and these reviews into her already overburdened list of responsibilities. Ms. Wright noted that the biggest concern is recruiting reviewers—she needs more reviewers among whom to "spread the wealth" of reviews, to balance reviewers with their everyday jobs. Ms. Bone added that most of the currently trained/approved reviewers are from the central part of the state, and she has used them a lot outside of their home territory, which she would prefer not to do, so she's trying to recruit from other parts of the state as well. She also noted that a couple of reviewers who attended the initial training sessions have yet to perform any reviews. She pointed out that the two new reviewers whom the committee hopes the Board will approve later in today's meeting are from more western counties. Ms. Wright took advantage of that comment to segue into that approval process, asking Ms. Bone to proceed with that.

b) Approval of Peer Reviewers

i) Caleb Dispenza (Madison County)—Ms. Bone explained that Mr. Dispenza, the assistant director of the Madison County PSAP, worked in Charleston, SC, for a while before moving to Madison County. She advised he is fluent in technology and PSAP operations, among many other strong suits, and the Standards Committee voted and approved of his becoming a peer reviewer, pending Board approval.

ii) Del Hall (Stokes County)—Ms. Bone also gave Del Hall, the PSAP director for Stokes County, high marks for his twenty-six years of service dedicated to 911, noting he has a wealth of certifications earned during those years, too. She admitted, somewhat tongue-in-cheek, actually soliciting him to become a peer reviewer at the same time she was asking him if he would let his PSAP be reviewed without a ninety-day notice! He replied he would, provided his county manager gave his blessing, which he did. Ms. Bone also noted that Mr. Hall currently serves on the NC NENA Executive Committee as well. She advised the Standards Committee is recommending him to the Board for approval along with Mr. Dispenza. Vice Chair Bone added that Mr. Hall also serves on the 911 Board Funding Committee as well.

Vice Chair Bone opened the floor to discussion about the committee recommendation, and hearing none, called the vote, which carried unanimously. He asked Ms. Wright if she had anything else to report, and she replied yes, the committee had reviewed the list for refresh of PSAP equipment that was discussed at the Funding Committee work session, and hopefully will be able to present a recommendation to the Board at its next meeting. Vice Chair Bone expressed his thanks to both the Standards Committee and all the peer reviewers for having completed so much work in such a short period of time, acknowledging it has taken PSAP managers out of their PSAPs, out of their counties, and how much he appreciates all those efforts. He also noted how gratifying it is to see the various committees of the Board collaborating with one another.

Other Items—Jimmy Stewart took a moment to reflect on the Duke Life Flight helicopter crash in Perquimans County on September 8th, which killed flight nurses Kris Harrison and Crystal Sollinger, as well as pilot Jeff Burke and patient Mary Bartlett. He reported the crew members and pilot were transported back to Durham escorted by two dozen units of Duke Life Flight ground crews, the North Carolina Highway Patrol, and various Law Enforcement and EMS agencies. At each overpass EMS, Rescue, Fire, and Law Enforcement units were posted, rendering honors and respect to those who have fallen, and acknowledging the loss we all feel. Mr. Stewart added that the NC Association of Rescue and EMS (NCAREMS) also salutes those who have fallen, and he asked everyone to remember these responders, the patient, their families, and those in the public safety community who grieve for them, in their thoughts and prayers.

Mr. Taylor said he wanted to add one personal note, observing that Danette Jernigan's boyfriend is also a nurse with Duke Life Flight, and Mr. Taylor's very first thought when he learned of the crash was to determine if her boyfriend had been involved. Although safe, both he and Danette have been through a lot in contending with this tragic loss, and Mr. Taylor thanked Mr. Stewart for this recognition.

Adjourn—Vice Chair Bone adjourned the meeting at 12:18 PM.