**9-1-1 Advisory Council**

**9-1-1 Grant Program Subcommittee  
Thursday, June 20, 2019 • 10:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.**

**Minutes**

**Subcommittee Members Present:**

Quinn Ness

Kim Burdick

Lisa Kelly

Pat Roos

**Department Staff:**

Rhonda Sullivan**Members of the Public:**

Sandra Barrows

Geoff Feiss (9-1-1 Advisory Council Member)

Ken Wall, Geodata

**Adoption of Minutes:** This action was deferred to the next meeting since a quorum was not present.

**911 Grant Subcommittee Draft Recommendations**: Seven recommendations have been drafted. Discussion ensued about each recommendation. Draft Recommendation #3: Applicants should be required to provide a detailed cost estimate for the proposed project. In addition to a detailed cost estimate, applicants should be able to submit vendor budgetary quotes, invoices or other such documentation as appropriate.

All recommendations will be reviewed by legal counsel prior to being adopted. In general, the subcommittee is trying to ensure that adequate information was being provided by the applicants for the council and department to base decisions on. A decision-making process is needed, when funds need to be rationed between all the applications. If there are more requests than there is available funding, the council and department will need to weigh information, perform due diligence, and make decisions on which applications to fund.

**Public Comment**: Ken Wall indicated that most states he is familiar with are issuing RFPs for their ESInets. He asked if the ESInet grant program would award grants for a statewide ESInet?

Discussion ensued about the termination of the ESInet grant program in current law and the $5 million in the ESInet account that must be transferred at the end of the current fiscal year, which is June 30, 2019 into the 9‑1‑1 grant account. ESInet projects are eligible in the 9-1-1 Grant Program. The applicant must be an eligible entity, i.e. a private telecommunications provider or a local and tribal PSAP working with a telco.

The department does not have the authority or directive in law to issue a statewide RFP and award a contract for a statewide ESInet. An eligible entity is needed to apply for and receive the grant funds, such as a private telecommunications provider, local or tribal government. Once a grant award is made, any of these entities would be expected to issue an RFP and follow a procurement process that is open, competitive, and meets the requirements in law.

Ken explained that he wasn’t necessarily advocating for a statewide RFP, but most of the RFPs he is familiar with are either statewide or regional. He emphasized that an ESInet is more than just the hardware. From a GIS perspective, a lot of testing will be needed. Currently, telcos still have the responsibility to get a cell phone number to the selective router. After NG911 is in place, that is no longer a requirement. The infrastructure and the ability to pass all the data and run a set of numbers against it is all part of a typical process. There are a lot more components to the I-3 infrastructure beyond simply answering the initial call and locating the address on a road centerline. It’s going to be challenging to have a local government take the lead on a project of this nature.

The current network was procured about 10 years ago, but it doesn’t meet all the current ESInet standards. There are a lot of PSAPs that have some significant concerns about the procurement process. Regardless of the provider, there typically are ongoing costs, such as monthly subscription costs. Previously the State issued an RFP and conducted the procurement because Federal grant monies were involved. The State would not have had the authority to do so if those dollars had been state monies. PSAPs have generally been unhappy with the current network because the PSAPs monthly costs went up significantly. At the end of the day, PSAPs (local and tribal governments) are the telco’s customer. There is a lot of concern that the state will end up investing $5 million in an ESInet and individual costs to PSAPs will go up.

**Next Steps**: The subcommittee needs to do a final review of the grant program recommendations before they are presented to the Advisory Council. Geoff shared objections to the 33% cap with the example that 33% of $8 million dollars is roughly $3 million, but it will take more than that to fund the selective router ESInet award. So, the 33% cap is problematic regardless of any legal issues associated with it. Quinn disagreed, pointing out that the recommendations represent criteria the council and department can apply to make funding decisions. The recommendations are not directives. They are provided as guidance, and the council and department can make exceptions on a case-by-case basis. They are simply some of the decision-making criteria that the council and department can use and apply when deciding on grant funding awards.

**Meeting Schedule**: The next conference call will be Thursday, June 27 from 10:00 to 11:00 am.

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