**9-1-1 Advisory Council**

**9-1-1 Grant Program Subcommittee  
Thursday, June 27, 2019 • 10:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.**

**Minutes**

**Subcommittee Members Present:**

Quinn Ness

Kim Burdick

Lisa Kelly

Jennie Stapp

**Members of the Public:**

Sandra Barrows

Ken Wall

**Department Staff:**

Rhonda Sullivan

**Quorum:** Shantil Siaperas provided her proxy to Quinn

**Adoption of Minutes:** This action is to adopt the meeting minutes of May 16, 23, 30 and June 13. Lisa moved to approve the minutes. Kimberly seconded. The motion carried.

**911 Grant Subcommittee Draft Recommendations**: Quinn explained that the subcommittee’s first step is to approve these recommendations if comfortable with them. Then they will be forwarded to Don Harris for his legal review. He will determine one of three things:

1. Can the recommendations be implemented with just a change in procedure, such as changing the application form?
2. Does the recommendation require that it be adopted in Administrative Rule?
3. Does the recommendation require changes in law?

Quinn briefly reviewed the seven recommendations in the Program Improvement Recommendations document dated June 24, 2019. He asked for comments on each of the recommendations as follows:

* **Recommendation #1:** Applicants should only apply for a project or phase of a project that requires a maximum of two years to complete.
* **Recommendation #2:** Applicants should submit one application for each individual project and a maximum of three applications annually. If multiple applications are submitted the applicant must provide a prioritization.
* **Recommendation #3:** Applicants should be required to provide a detailed cost estimate for the proposed project.
  + The sentence asking for budgetary quotes was removed. The subcommittee did not want to make obtaining quotes a requirement because some applicants may not be able to acquire them.
* **Recommendation #4:** Applicants should be required to provide a description of the lifecycle for equipment, hardware and software that is being proposed to be replaced.
  + We want more information on the current lifecycle of equipment. One applicant may be proposing to replace equipment that is obsolete or beyond its life cycle while another applicant may be requesting similar equipment to replace equipment that is not obsolete or beyond end-of-life.
* **Recommendation #5:** Applicants are encouraged to submit applications for projects that require less than 33% of the total amount of funding available.
  + Geoff Feiss has expressed concern about this recommendation. He believes it may conflict with the statute.
  + Quinn explained that the percentage will be based on available funds. For the next grant cycle, about $8 million will be available. That dollar amount will drop to about $3 million the following year. The council and the department could consider funding awards greater than 33% on a case-by-case basis.
  + Could the Council could fund an applicant more than the 33% cap if funding were available? That might be a question for Don Harris.
    - Almost all these recommendations are targeted at requesting more information from the applicant, which will help Council members with their decision making.
    - Applicants will be notified ahead of time of the decision-making criteria that the council and department will be using.
    - Jennie just doesn’t want to potentially leave any money on the table because of the cap. The Council should have the flexibility to adjust the cap if it believes additional grant funds are warranted and the money is available to be awarded.
    - This is just a tool the council and department could use if needed.
* **Recommendation #6:** Local and tribal government applicants should provide a detailed description of “working with a private telecommunications provider” to aid in the assignment of an application’s statutory preference (10-4-306(3)). The description should include “how” and “why” the parties are collaborating.
  + We are proposing to discontinue the requirement to have a letter of support from a provider. Instead, the applicant will provide a description of the collaboration so the council and department can determine if they are “working with” a telco.
* **Recommendation #7:** The application scoring criteria in ARM 2.13.407(2) should be changed from a numerical score to a “yes/no”.
  + This is the criteria related to the completeness of the application, local support and impact on a 9-1-1 system. This would just be yes-no criteria. Numerical scores would be eliminated.

**\*Action Item: Motion:** Quinn made a motion to adopt the recommendations and present them to the Advisory Council. Jennie seconded. The motion carried.

**Public Comment**: None

**Next Steps**: The department will be preparing for the upcoming 9-1-1 Advisory Council, which will be on July 10 and 11. July 18 was identified as the earliest date that the subcommittee could reconvene.

**Meeting Schedule**: The next conference call will be Thursday, July 18 from 10:00 to 11:00 am. Jennie won’t be available that day, but she will see if Michael Fashoway can fill in for her.

**Adjournment**: The meeting was adjourned at 10:35 am.