

9-1-1 ADVISORY COUNCIL
January 21, 2016
State Capitol Room 152

ATTENDEES: Ron Baldwin, Chair, State CIO; Geoff Feiss, MTA; Gary Macdonald, MACO; Delila Bruno, DMA/DES; Tom Butler, DOJ/MHP; Kerry O'Connell, PSAPs >30K; Rick Musson, MACOP; Peggy Glass, PSAPs <30K; Lisa Kelly, CenturyLink; Terry Ferestad, AT&T; Michael Fashoway, MSL

CONFERENCE CALL: Chris Hoffman, MSPOA; Kimberly Burdick, MT APCO; Leonard Lundby, MTVFF; Greg Megaard, MFCA; Chuck Winn, MT League Cities & Towns; Tara Thue, AT&T.

STAFF: Quinn Ness, DOA/SITSD; Rhonda Sullivan, DOA/SITSD; Carrie Castle DOA/SITSD

GUESTS: Sandra Barrows, Barrows Consulting; Erik Olson, Zetron; Mark Baker, Representing AT&T and Charter; Susan Bomstad, MT APCO; Chris Lounsbury, Missoula County; Jess Edwards, Blackfeet Police Chief; Zach Slattery, MT APCO; Shantil Siaperas, MACO, Jim Green, Univision Computers

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 1:31 pm by Chair, Ron Baldwin. Introductions were made.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES: Gary Macdonald moved to accept the December minutes, and Lisa Kelly seconded. The motion carried.

LEGISLATIVE INTERIM COMMITTEE MEETING: Quinn Ness reported the following updates:

The Legislature's Energy and Telecommunications Interim Committee (ETIC) met recently and requested the following for discussion at their March meeting:

- Geoff Feiss to provide presentation/testimony of the 9-1-1 working group recent activities;
- Quinn Ness to provide a briefing of the 9-1-1 Advisory Council activities as well as provide draft legislative recommendations.
- The council's recommendations will only be draft concepts, to be drafted into legislation by the ETIC; the council will not be tasked with drafting the bill.
- Geoff Feiss reported there will be no new or additional funding requests allowed by the ETIC.

FRAMEWORK FOR DRAFT LEGISLATION DISCUSSION:

Ron Baldwin referred to the following framework that was set up at last month's meeting, to be used in the ongoing discussion:

- *Mission / Guiding Principles*
- *Scope, including but not limited to:*
 - o *Overarching objectives*
 - o *What is included (e.g. from call to dispatch)*
 - o *What is excluded*
 - o *Key assumptions*
 - o *Requirements (infrastructure and personnel)*
 - o *Jurisdiction (statewide vs local)*
 - o *Definitions*
- *Funding, including but not limited to:*

- o *Fees Collection*
- o *Funding Distribution*
- Governance, including the advisory council and its ultimate role*
- *Technology, including NG 9-1-1*

SCOPE: Quinn Ness provided review of last month's Scope framework recommendations and discussion ensued:

Operational Expenses/ Spending of 9-1-1 Funds/Allowable Use/What's Included:

- 9-1-1 funds should not be used for dispatcher payroll, etc.; funds should be reserved for 9-1-1 systems and equipment only.
- Collected funds are being used in a variety of ways, so spending priorities need to be established.
- Telecommunications provider investments should be taken care of first, e.g. ESINET.
- We need to be careful how this is stated in statute; needs to remain flexible in order to move with technology.
- Need to re-review Funding Guidelines, as these stipulations could be included here rather than in statute.
- Adopt administrative rules to include allowable use of program funds for PSAPs.

What is excluded:

- Communications between the PSAP and emergency responders; non-9-1-1 system or services.
- What is demarcation point for allowable costs?
- Excess funds should "follow the call", which should be defined/explained in administrative rules.
- Priorities should be redefined, and then put into statute.
- Local government's monetary responsibility is from the 9-1-1 dispatch center outward to emergency responders.
- We need to think in terms of long-range capital expenditure in order to support and sustain a technology infrastructure, and other future technologies.

Jurisdiction: Statewide vs. Local - Suggestions/Comments:

- Role of the state is to establish standards for PSAPs, network, GIS. Local governments should be required to adhere to the established standards statewide.
- How much authority should the state have? Stay with established, historical role with needed clarifications
- If a board is required, will it have authority to make sure standards are being followed; and how large of a role does the council want them to have?
- The current Council membership should be used as a model for any future Boards/Councils membership
- A Board has authorities such as approving budgets and expenditures, distribution of funds, etc.
- There are PSAPs that would like to see more state involvement, but they don't want governance or control over them. Maintain local decision making and the provision of 9-1-1 systems and services at the local level.
- Does the Council want to continue with the status quo; status quo with updates; or completely new statutes, processes, requirements, etc.?
- Whatever form governance takes, a decision needs to be made.

FUNDING:

- The current 84/16 split ends up being paid quarterly to PSAP/jurisdictions, some of which is being spent on non-technical requirements. This doesn't help prioritize expenditures.
- "Stranded funds" need to be reviewed; as well as the use of "hoarded funds" for deploying Next Generation 9-1-1.

- Many jurisdictions aren't Phase II ready and still require upgrade. The state needs to make sure this is done before Next Generation 9-1-1 can begin.
- The state should have the authority to distribute funding, and the local jurisdictions need to follow established expenditure guidelines very closely.
- If current funding guidelines are followed, the smaller PSAPs will never be able to catch up from a technology standpoint. Need to achieve a new technology base.
- We should follow a \$1 single pot concept, and then add statutory/regulatory parameters prioritizing how this is spent; while ensuring low population counties receive a base funding set aside.
- Intent is to ensure that low populated counties receive a minimal level of funds in order to operate a primary PSAP.
- In order for PSAPs to deploy NG 9-1-1, consider grant-type program and processes.
- An allocation model with formula "plug-ins" for comparisons for each county will be drafted, with a working session to be held for discussion/review.
- Gather cost information in order to model PSAPs legacy operational requirements, then perform an analysis on several jurisdictions, ranging from smallest to largest.
- Too many unknowns in operations of PSAPs with new technologies applied, it's nearly impossible to calculate cost requirements.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Chris Lounsbury: A true board would be very beneficial for Missoula County, in regard to meeting monetary needs/requirements. There may be an easy way for determining line of demarcation for 9-1-1 calls, and provided examples. Caution should be used that on the original 9-1-1 Modernization Act draft, included what state agencies would be included on an advisory board, with the rest left up for Governor's selection. Need to also include industry, therefore he recommended adding some parameters around this to be safe. Clarified that the 84/16 split on the remaining .50 cents, is only collected from wireless.

Shantil Siaperas: Suggested not formulating one specific allocation figure, but rather use a percentage in order to cover inflation costs.

Susan Bomstad: As a past 9-1-1 center manager, audits were held each year. It was helpful to explain goals for funds, and she recommended this method. Rhonda Sullivan explained that annual monitoring is still being completed.

Jess Edwards, Chief of Police for Browning: His jurisdiction pays two dispatchers, one to answer 9-1-1 calls, and the other to answer general calls. Using their funding for employment has really helped and they are glad it's there.

Adjourn/Next Meeting: Meeting adjourned at 3:45 Next meeting is February 18th in State Capitol Room 137.