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# Welcome

Jennie Stapp, Interim Chair, conducted introductions. Members and guests were introduced.

**Agenda Modifications**: Representative Frank Garner was asked for comments. He has been following the progress of the subcommittees and expressed his appreciation for the work that has gone into their efforts. He asked the chair for permission to provide some feedback and a recommendation on Section 8, 9-1-1 Grant Program Application Guidelines. He believes a little more work is needed, especially on the Appeals Section, and offered his assistance and input.

Geoff proposed simply removing the Action Item from the agenda, saying he does not believe the current draft reflects the discussion of the subcommittee nor the input of involved stakeholders. He believes there is plenty of time to revise them and have them adopted by the June 30, 2018 deadline.

Quinn clarified that HB 61 says that the department must adopt rules for the grant program, which is Section 8, by June 30, 2018. He asked Don Harris for a timeline. Don said that the rule making process consists of two primary stages, the first is a proposal notice, which gives the opportunity for the public to provide oral and written comments about a draft rule. That process, from the date that one files with the Secretary of State to the date of publication is about 10-12 days. The date of publication starts another clock ticking, and that clock is for the hearing and public comment period, which must occur over a period of no shorter than 30 days. So, it is at least a seven-week process. Once that statutory period has elapsed, the Advisory Council still needs to digest comments received and make recommendations to the department as to whether the rules should be adopted as proposed; a few weeks would be needed for this process. The last stage of the rule-making process is publication of the adoption notice, estimated at 10-12 days. When the rules are published, they become effective the next day. The statutory deadline is June 30, so the last filing date to have adopted rules published prior to June 30 is June 12. Working backward from that date, 6-7 weeks would be needed. Realistically, April 3 would be about the last filing date that he would feel comfortable with. So, the Advisory Council needs to have a recommendation to the department no later than April 3, 2018.

Quinn clarified that the department is directed in statute to adopt rules. Rules are adopted to clarify the statutes. He pointed out that the guidelines being reviewed today primarily consist of statutory references. The only thing that is not in the current draft of the guidelines is the criteria that the 9-1-1 Advisory Council and the department would use to select one grant application over another. The subcommittee could not come to a consensus in how to prioritize applications. He believes the Advisory Council should focus on specific items that require clarification, i.e. things that are not clear or present in statute, such as how the 9-1-1 Advisory Council will prioritize grant awards. It may be possible to have that discussion today or progress could be made toward identifying criteria before the April 3 deadline.

Jennie asked if the Council wants to table this agenda item or not. She would like to hear more about the appeals process. After additional discussion, Curt Stinson recommended that the Council move forward with all agenda items. It was agreed to defer discussion until this item appears on the agenda.

# Minutes: Jennie asked that the last two sentences under the GIS Assessment RFP paragraph be modified to clarify that the Scope of Work is for the Statewide 9-1-1 Plan RFP, not the GIS Assessment.

**Motion:**  Gary MacDonald made a motion to approve the January 23, 2018 minutes as corrected. Curt Stinson seconded the motion. The motion carried.

**Action Item: Recommend Adoption of** **New Rules I through VIII pertaining to Public Safety Answering Point Certification, Funding, and Monitoring:** The 9-1-1 Advisory Council already discussed this item at its last meeting, but since it was not listed as an Action Item on the agenda, action was deferred to today’s meeting, so the public would be properly notified of the Council’s intent. The action needed is to ratify the consensus recommendation from the Council’s last meeting.

Don Harris said this is more of a housekeeping issue. Nothing of substance in the rules has changed in any way.

**Motion:** Geoff moved to adopt New Rules I through VIII pertaining to Public Safety Answering Point Certification, Funding, and Monitoring. Curt seconded. The motion carried.

**Action Item: Recommend Adoption of New Rule I pertaining to Public Safety Answering Point Allowable Uses of Funds:**

**Motion:** Geoff moved to adopt New Rule I. Adriane seconded. The motion carried.

Don said the rule hearing will be on March 26, 2018. Public comments are open until April 2, 2018.

**Action Item: Recommend Adoption of Statewide 9-1-1 Plan RFP Scope of Work and Issuance of RFP:** Chris Lounsbury, Subcommittee Chair, explained that the Scope of Work is lengthy. He highlighted a few sections that the subcommittee felt were important as follows:

* Before we can plan for the future, we need an inventory of PSAP equipment and current networks to provide foundational knowledge. This provision is described on Page 2 under the Regional Town Meetings heading.
* Each section outlines what we are requiring the contractor to do as well as the physical items or intellectual property the contractor will have to provide to the Council and the State of Montana.
* On Page 4, the Scope of Work states that the contractor will develop technology standards and requirements both for PSAPs and for the network. Deliverables appear on the top of Page 5.
* At the bottom of Page 5, we ask the contractor to design and tell us what the network should look like as well as develop an implementation plan. So, we will have an idea of what the future should look like and the steps that will take us there.
* The last two pages address how we go about selecting the right contractor; someone who meets the qualifications. Information also is presented about how the State will interact should the contractor need to change out someone on the team or project management personnel.
* Chris believes that this gives us a good roadmap for a responsive RFP process for vendors to respond to.

**Motion:** Adriane Beck moved to adopt the Statewide 9-1-1 Plan RFP Scope of Work and issue the RFP. Lisa Kelly seconded.

Quinn was asked what the timeline for the RFP process is. We are engaged with the State Procurement Bureau and have been assigned a procurement officer. Unfortunately, the Bureau is understaffed, so, we had delays with finalizing the procurement documents. Now that the Council has recommended the department to issue the RFP, we will activity engage with our procurement officer to hopefully get the RFP issued as soon as possible. The RFP review committee will consist of Chris Lounsbury, Brian Chernish, Michael Fashoway, Rhonda Sullivan and Quinn Ness.

Quinn also pointed out the key milestone that is included in the Statewide 9-1-1 Plan RFP Scope of Work, is the ESINet design and implementation plan. The deliverables (i.e. the detailed design document, the ESINet requirements, implementation plan, project scope and detailed budget estimate) are critical for the department, the Council and local governments to move forward with procurement of the ESINet. This is specifically related to the $5 million that was appropriated last session in HB61 Section 9, 10 and 11 for the ESINet.

Curt asked about statutory timelines. Quinn explained that HB 61 Section 9 account transfers include the $350,000 for the Statewide 9-1-1 Plan, the $5 million for the ESINet and the $80,000 for the GIS Assessment is time sensitive. Any unexpended funds still in the account on June 30, 2019 will be transferred back to the HB61 Section 8 grant account. So, the goal is to get these funds awarded and spent by that date. If the $5 million isn’t awarded by then, it could still be awarded from the Section 8 grant account to a local government to implement the ESINet. So, there is a contingency plan if we do not meet the deadline.

Another requirement is for the department to report before December 1, 2018 to the Legislative Energy and Telecommunications Interim Committee on the efforts to implement HB61 Section 10 and 11.

**Action Item: Recommend Adoption of 9-1-1 Grant Program Application Guidelines and Adoption of Guidelines in Administrative Rule by Reference:** Jennie explained that a motion is needed to either adopt the HB61 Section 8 Grant Program Guidelines and, through discussion, work through some of the issues or to recommend tabling the item and sending it back to the subcommittee. If that were to be the recommendation of the Council, we would need to look hard at the timeline to get the revised rules back to the Council and Department of Administration by that early April date.

**Motion:** Geoff moved to table the item. Jennie asked for assistance with Robert’s Rules because she wasn’t sure if his motion needed a second. If the action is non-debatable, then the belief was that a second would not be needed. A vote was taken. Three ayes. No nays. The recommendation is that this go back to the rule making subcommittee for further discussion and clarification. Jennie indicated that there is a need to clarify the process by which the department would prioritize the applications as well as the appeals process. She asked if there were other areas that need to be considered.

Representative Frank Garner said he appreciates the chance to go back and re-look at this item. He is glad to help and provide feedback, particularly on the appeals process.

Quinn clarified that in the process laid out in HB 61, grant applications will come before the 9-1-1 Advisory Council and the Council will make recommendations to the department about which applications to fund, and which to deny. An important part of the process is establishing the Council’s scoring criteria. This is the Council’s process and decision-making criteria.

If the 9-1-1 Advisory Council is willing, it was suggested that an overview of the guidelines as they are currently proposed be conducted to make effective use of the Council’s remaining time. It was clarified that even though the action on this item has been tabled, the Council is just having an informative overview of the guidelines as an opportunity to provide feedback to the subcommittee.

1. **INTRODUCTION, 2. Program Funding**: The draft 9-1-1 Grant Program Application Guidelines were reviewed, starting with an explanation of the amount of funds that will go into the grant account. Between subscriber fees and the balance from the wireless provider cost recovery account, approximately $7 million will be transferred into this account at the beginning of the next fiscal year (July 1, 2018).

**B. PROGRAM GLOSSARY OF TERMS**: The definition of a Certified Local Government Entity will be added once the rules have been adopted so there can be an actual rule citation for the definition.

Definitions were included with specific references to statutory definitions. Other definitions in earlier drafts were eliminated, such as a Resolution, because the criteria that included securing a Resolution was removed.

**C. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS:**

Quinn noted that rule cannot preempt statute. There are two eligible entities in statute: private telecommunications providers and certified local government entities. The Council can’t create a third or a fourth eligible entity in rule.

**D. ELIGIBLE USES OF FUNDS**: The list in this section is based on the statute.

Quinn also said that in earlier drafts of these guidelines, administrative costs had been listed as an eligible use so that a grant awardee could request additional grant funds for administering the grant. However, after reviewing the statute, it was determined that administrative costs are not an eligible use of the funds, so we had to remove administrative costs. This may be something to consider in future legislative sessions. Providing a reasonable amount of money for grant administration is standard practice. But at this time, they cannot be included in the rules because they are not provided for in statute.

**E. PUBLIC’S RIGHT TO KNOW:** The subcommittee held lengthy discussions about criteria that may be used to determine eligibility. For example, one criterion for determining whether a telecommunications company is an eligible applicant could be its financial solvency. If this were a criterion, then the Advisory Council and department would need information about the provider’s finances. If this information were requested, it would probably be confidential. Furthermore, financial projections could not be requested from some providers to determine that the provider is a viable company, because that would be illegal for publicly-traded companies. As a result, the financial viability of a telecommunications provider was removed as a criterion. The subcommittee decided that the Council and the department will not make a decision about the financial viability of a provider.

The subcommittee also discussed having a form or template for a confidentiality agreement. It is not appropriate for the department to provide legal counsel to an applicant. However, there is an established process in state government regarding confidentiality that is provided within the State Procurement Bureau. Hence, the following clause was included in this section:

*NOTE: If an applicant believes that any application document(s) and/or any document(s) produced with 9-1-1 grant program funding is confidential, the applicant must contact the Department prior to submitting any application document(s).*

Don Harris clarified that we are bound by the State’s Constitution and the public’s right to know along with the individual right of privacy. The procurement process involves an affidavit prepared by legal counsel for a vendor. It’s a resource that the department can use to apply a balancing test to weigh the public’s right to know along with the right of privacy. The purpose of the affidavit is to give the department information it would need to apply that balancing test. That is why the language in the “NOTE” is not very specific, because ultimately the department is guided by the Constitution, case law and any statutes.

Quinn directed Council members to the application form found in Appendix A and pointed out that the information requested is very straightforward. Applicants are asked to describe, in detail, the proposed project. The subcommittee purposefully avoided asking for information that a telecommunications provider would deem confidential. In addition, it would be difficult to manage and protect confidential information with a 17-member Advisory Council that holds public meetings and posts public information. Any application that is submitted will be posted online and will be available to the public.

Geoff believes that more attention needs to be focused on this area. There is a trade secret act that is referred to in the affidavit. He emphasized that there is a constitutional right for information not to be disclosed in a public manner to the Council. The nature of this discussion leans toward a predetermination by the department that all information will be made public, and this is not in the constitution or in law.

He pointed out that there is no intention for providers or applicants to shield information from the department or from the legislative auditor. That information can and should be made available so that the State can look back and ensure that public money is properly spent and that providers comply with the terms and conditions of a grant for which they seek public money. They are resistant to the idea that confidential information sometimes cannot be provided by an applicant because of non-disclosure agreements. Jennie suggested that we look at other state agency contracts or grant programs to see how they have addressed this issue. Geoff said the Public Service Commission (PSC) has a protective order rule.

Quinn reiterated that there is a process within the State Procurement Bureau to address confidential information that would be submitted, say, in response to an RFP. He clarified that the citation in the grant program application guidelines only applies to the application as well as any document produced with the grant funds. If a company proposed to use grant funds to produce a document that they believed to be confidential, that company would then contact the department and they could potentially execute a confidentiality agreement and identify that document in an affidavit, so it could be concealed.

Quinn doesn’t believe that it’s possible to cite in rule that there would be a guarantee of confidentiality. The company would have to follow the process and submit the affidavit. Don Harris said with state procurement process companies often declare items to be confidential, but when the state goes through its balancing test, it may not agree.

Section E only provides a notice to an applicant. If they deem a document as confidential, they would need to enter into the process on a case-by-case basis, so the department can make the determination. If the applicant wishes to have something considered as private, it is in the vendor’s best interest to declare that to the state.

Geoff says the wording is the issue because the applicant must sign the application form saying that all application documents and those produced with grant funds are considered public documents, which he does not believe is true. He believes it is a semantics issue. This is an area that requires more work.

Section E provides the notification that the application and any document produced with 9-1-1 grant funds would be public documents. If you do not want it to be deemed a public document, then the applicant needs to contact the department and engage in the affidavit process. On the last page, in the **VI. APPLICATION CERTIFICATION** section, fourth paragraph, the applicant specifically acknowledges that the application and other information submitted to the Department is subject to the public’s right to know along with any document prepared with public 9-1-1 grant program funding.

The purpose of this section is to assure program staff that the applicant understands that we are going to distribute that application to the Council, that it will be posted on a public website and they agree that the application is a public document. If we don’t have that acknowledgement, then there could be uncertainty about distributing or posting it and we would need to obtain verification from the applicant. If the applicant does not believe it is a public document, then the applicant should contact the department. The intent behind this wording, which is to facilitate the application submittal and review process.

**F. APPLICATION REVIEW & GRANT AWARDS**: Quinn clarified that this language is specifically in statute (10-4-306). The statute clearly states that the Department will award grants annually. Staff proposed a schedule that is coordinated with the 9-1-1 Advisory Council quarterly meeting schedule. Applications would be accepted between July 1 and September 30. Staff would have from Oct 1 to Dec. 31 to distribute applications to Council members and give members time to review them. At the December Council meeting, members will review applications and make recommendations for funding or denial of funding. The next quarter, the department will issue award letters and contracts and executing contracts. The final quarter of the year would focus on releasing funds and project start up. Then, the cycle would start over again. This information is not in statute, but staff has proposed it as the annual process.

Geoff said this is another area where there was considerable discussion among subcommittee members. Concern was expressed that when we move from the current law which provides for cost recovery for expenses incurred to the new grant program law where entities apply for funding for certain 9-1-1 system expenses you plan to incur, a gap is created whereby telecommunications providers might have to wait 3, 6, or 9 months before a grant is awarded. So, what should be done with expenses you expect to incur for 9-1-1-related system deployment costs?

1. MTA proposed language to cover the transition to make sure that grants could look back to cover this nine-month gap.
2. The timeline should be compressed to a timeline that is more compatible with budgeting for applicants, i.e. providers and PSAPs.
3. We have limited funds, so if more money is applied for than there is money available, we need a prioritization process.
4. Should we have a hard date deadline or an open enrollment period? We don’t want to grant money on a rolling basis and suddenly discover that the best application comes in last. We need to think this whole process through.

Quinn said if the applicant incurs an expense before it is awarded a grant, is that expense eligible to be reimbursed by a grant that was awarded after the expense was incurred? This issue is addressed in Section D, ELIGIBLE USES OF FUNDS, which contains the statutory reference on eligible uses of funds. He outlined a hypothetical scenario whereby a grant award was made in the amount of $50,000 for an emergency telecommunications systems plan, but the applicant had already procured a contractor and had already been billed for services before the Council and the Department made the grant award. Would the Council want to allow that? If a telecommunications company incurred an expense for part of their network that was allowable under 9-1-1 system equipment, device and data, would it be eligible for an award after the fact? If you receive a grant application that requests funding for an expense that has already been incurred, do you want to approve that?

Curt Stinson asked how far back do you then go? Geoff’s draft language was for one-time only grants for only a one-year period.

Jennie indicated that the issue at hand is addressing the gap. She would hope that the grant process is a future-forward process where the Council would consider new projects, new proposals and new types of expenditures. Another reason why the Council would not want to get into paying back expenses is there is no guarantee that an applicant will receive a grant. We would not want to create the impression that they should or could be incurring expenses that wouldn’t get reimbursed. But, we need to figure out how to address this gap period.

As the Council thinks about future guidance on how it might prioritize applications, the statewide plan could provide guidance for what those priorities might look like. Rules and guidelines are something that the Council will continue to review as new information is made available. The statewide 9-1-1 plan is a key piece of information that we don’t have now to inform the grant guidelines for this coming grant cycle, but would, hopefully, in the next grant cycle.

Curt asked if this document include a discussion on the administration of the grant? Would there be rules someplace other than in this document to address such issues as what happens if a project isn’t completed? Is the money returned? Will an expenditure guideline be developed? Lisa volunteered that Idaho places a two-year limit for completing a project.

Curt brought up other grant administration subjects that are not addressed, such as grant auditing, reporting, follow-up timelines, and consequences if grant funds are not expended.

Quinn indicated that previous drafts of these guidelines included Section G. DEPARTMENT FOLLOW-UP, which included descriptions of the award letter, the contract, disbursement of funds, award withdrawal as well as Section H. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS, which addressed ownership and publication of materials, withholding funds, record keeping, ongoing reporting and additional documentation. Staff realized that information on what the grant management process would look like did not need to be in rule and could be provided after a grant is awarded.

Quinn also noted that the first two eligible uses of funds include emergency telecommunications systems plan(s) and project feasibility studies/project plans. This was purposeful because a lot of projects are multi-year. Funds can be awarded for a project plan or feasibility study that will help move a project forward before a PSAP is ready to purchase equipment. So, the first year, a small grant could be requested for pre-project planning and follow up the next year with a grant for equipment. Combined, multiple-year projects end up taking available funds away from an application or project that is ready to move forward. Those grant funds sit idle for a year or more before the project gets going. One criterion in a previous draft of the guidelines was whether a project was ready to move forward immediately. The intent was to avoid awarding money before a project is ready to move forward.

Jennie mentioned that the MSL Land Information Grants are single-year grants with the option to extend to a second year if funds are available. Grant management details, such as reporting requirements, are presented in a Scope of Work that is signed by the grant applicant. This is essentially a contract with the State Library and is not found in administrative rules.

Quinn indicated that the Council could put into rule that it will only accept applications for projects that are one year or less or two years or less. The applicant will need to provide this information in the application. The Council also has the option to put a minimum and a maximum on the grant award. Some grant programs do this to try to ration funding. A grant minimum is usually requested by the grant because of limited staff resources, it takes the same amount of resources to manage one grant award whether that grant award is for a $1 or $1 million.

Another criterion to consider is the relationship between the PSAP and telecommunications company. A requirement in previous grant guideline drafts was for a private telecommunications company to include a letter or support or a resolution from the local government where the project was going to take place. The Council could also request additional letters of support from emergency response agencies that could indicate the level of local support for the project. Does the Council want to approve grants to a telecommunications company that does not have the support of the local PSAP? Do you want to improve the network to a PSAP that isn’t moving toward NG911? These are possible criteria for the Council to consider to rank or prioritize applications.

Tim Nixdorf asked for permission to clarify that wireless carriers have obligations to the federal government to provide 9-1-1 services whether they are provided to a single PSAP or to 50. Expenses are incurred regardless. That criterion doesn’t really fit for cost recovery or for projects that carriers may be obligated to do. His company had been ready for text to 9-1-1 for a couple of years in advance of when the first PSAP in his area was even ready for text to 9-1-1. When the PSAP was ready, his company was able to provide it, but the company had to pay those costs up front when the FCC first required it to do so.

Quinn clarified with Lisa that wireline companies have tariffed rates, meaning they recover their costs in their subscriber rates for meeting FCC 9-1-1 requirements. A wireline company that receives reimbursement through its rates could still apply for a grant for those costs and could have received cost recovery since the program began back in the 1980’s. But, CenturyLink’s predecessor companies did not because they built the 9-1-1 costs into their rates.

Should information be required from the PSC or the FCC to determine if a company has already received reimbursement for a project for which it is seeking grant funds? Some smaller providers do not have a lot of subscribers and are looking for every source of funding available to maintain their networks. Larger providers, such as AT&T and Verizon, have never applied for 9-1-1 cost recovery funds. They are covering those 9-1-1 costs within their subscriber rates. In fact, in HB 61, they wanted assurances that the department and the 9-1-1 Advisory Council would have no regulatory authority over telecommunications companies.

Representative Frank Garner addressed the issue of regulatory authority and explained that the intent of assurances in HB 61 was to address concerns that providers expressed because there were instances where other states tried to create extra regulatory control based on 9-1-1 issues. He doesn’t think it eliminates the regulatory ability in relation to 9-1-1 issues.

This is a difficult policy area to be considered when applications will be received from telecommunications companies. How will they be reviewed and how will a determination be made not to fund an application? Geoff believes that it would be illegal for a wireline provider to seek grant funds for costs already being recovered in their rates.

Quinn said this discussion leads back to the topic of reimbursing any grantee for expenses already incurred. If an applicant has already incurred the expense, it did so with the knowledge that it might not get reimbursed by a grant, so it had to use other funds to pay for that expense anyway. If the applicant is awarded a grant, it would be supplanting.

This situation may be a little different than a wireline company applying for a grant for which it had already received reimbursement through rates. Wireline companies are under the regulatory authority of the FCC and the PSC and their rates are tariffed. Expenses for 9-1-1 are included in those rates. However, it would not be significantly different for wireless providers, such as AT&T and Verizon if they applied for a grant because they have covered those expenses within their rates. The FCC didn’t require them to do it. They were required to deliver the call, but they weren’t required to cover those expenses within their rates. That was a business decision.

Joe Fick, Motorola Solutions, stated that the topic of the double billing factor is one of the biggest problems in ESINet deployment nationwide. For an interim period of time there will be legacy selective routers in place, for example, while also having a Next Gen selective router. Typically, NG911 can happen by one of two ways: either new tariffs are filed or by contract. Contracting is the most common means that he has seen. At some point the Council or perhaps a telecommunications oversight committee will need to determine when the old tariffs expire and how to manage a provider collecting money on an existing tariff while also applying for grant money. It shouldn’t be for the same thing.

**APPLICATION FORM:** The last item discussed was the application form. Any information or criteria that the Advisory Council will need to rank or prioritize applications should be requested in the application form, so it can be appropriately scored. The form in its current state is very brief.

**I. APPLICANT INFORMATION:** The first section includes general application information, such as the legal name of the entity, the authorized official’s name, contact information, etc., which will provide staff with relevant information for the grant contract.

**II. PROJECT SUMMARY INFORMATION:** This section asks for total project costs and the amount of 9-1-1 grant funds requested. This will allow the council to have an idea of how much the applicant is putting toward the cost. There is no requirement for matching costs, but the Council could decide to adopt this as a criterion to help stretch available funds.

**III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Under this section, the Council can be assured that the project qualifies as an eligible use, which will allow the department and Council to make the determination that the project is eligible under statute. A Project Description is requested as well.

**IV. ATTACHMENTS:** If an applicant chooses to include additional information, such as a project plan or letters of support, the applicant can identify that attachments are included. However, there is not a requirement to provide them.

**V. APPLICATION CERTIFICATION**: This section includes typical clauses about the accuracy of the application and who will accept responsibility for management of the grant. In addition, it contains an acknowledgment that the application and other submitted information are public documents.

**Next 9-1-1 ARM Subcommittee Meeting**: The next 9-1-1 ARM subcommittee meeting is scheduled for March 22, 2018 from 1 to 3 pm. Geoff suggested extending the meeting to 5:00 pm. He thinks several improvements can be made to the rules between now and then. The goal is to have a new draft of rules by March 22, so the subcommittee can come to a final resolution.

Quinn asked if Geoff was proposing dropping the guidelines document that would be adopted by reference and substituting individual rules. Geoff replied in the affirmative. Geoff will prepare draft rules by March 15 that can be distributed to the subcommittee.

Quinn indicated that the two areas that require clarification in statute are the allowable uses of the grant funds and the criteria by which applications will be scored. Geoff also will address gap funding transition process, the treatment of confidential information and prioritization of applications. More clarity on criteria is needed. Geoff also believes an appeals process is needed.

Jennie asked a clarifying question related to the subject of confidential information. Would that be in rule or would that be determined in a type of application-guiding document because there is statute and constitutional backing. She doesn’t believe it needs to be in rule unless there is a legal reason to have it in there.

Rep. Garner thanked Quinn for his work on this. Geoff also thanked Quinn, Don and the 9-1-1 Advisory Council. More work is needed, but Geoff is confident that it will be completed within the next few weeks.

# Public Comment: Jennie announced that the bid for the GIS assessment is on the street and a pre-conference call is set for next week on Monday at 11:00 am to provide an opportunity for potential bidders to call in and have questions answered. Bids close at the end of March. Bidders must meet certain requirements, one of which is that they must have performed similar work for other multiple PSAPs.

**Next Meeting**: The next 9-1-1 Advisory Council meeting is scheduled for June 14, 2018 from 1:00 to 3:30 pm. Section 8 administrative rules require action, so look for information about the timing and format of that meeting. A conference call meeting could be called to take action on the Section 8 rules if the work of the subcommittee is completed before the next meeting.

# Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.