**9-1-1 Advisory Council**

**Meeting Executive Summary**

**Wednesday September 11, 2019**

**10:00 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.**

**State Capitol, Room 152**

**Helena, Montana**

**Attendees:**

Voting Council Members/Alternates:

Adriane Beck - PSAPs >30K; Kimberly Burdick - MAPCO; Bob Drake – MVFFA (Alternate); Alex Duman, Wireless Telecommunications Provider ☎; Geoff Feiss - Telecommunications Provider; Peggy Glass - PSAPS <30K; Burke Honzel - DMA/DES; Lisa Kelly - Wireline Telecommunications Provider; Andrew Knapp - DOJ/MHP (Alternate); Clint Loss – MEMSA; Commissioner Gary MacDonald – MACO; Quinn Ness - DOA, Council Chairman; Pat Roos – MSPOA; and Curt Stinson – MACOP.

Non-Voting Council Members/Alternates: John Bemis, CenturyLink (Alternate) ☎ Liz Brooks - PSAPs >30K (Alternate) ☎; Gary Evans - VisionNet (Alternate); Terry Ferestad, AT&T (Alternate) and Shantil Siaperas - MACO (Alternate).

Guests: Sandra Barrows - Barrows Consulting ☎; Greg Brooks, Solacom ☎; Mark Henderson, Geo Data Services; Tommy Luksha - Madison County ☎; Scott O’Connell – City of Helena; Rob Stauder - DataMark ☎; Remi Sun - Nemont ☎; and Karen Young - City of Great Falls ☎.

Staff: Don Harris, DOA/SITSD; Wing Spooner DOA/PSCB; and Rhonda Sullivan, DOA/PSCB.

**Chairman Ness called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m.**

**Welcome & Introductions**

The Council members and guests introduced themselves.

**Approval of Meeting Executive Summary**

The executive summary for the July 10 - 11, 2019 meeting was not complete, so no action was taken.

**New Membership Appointments**

Chairman Ness congratulated all the members that were re-appointed to the Council. All appointments were for four years and will end on December 1, 2023. Quinn Ness was appointed by Governor Bullock to serve as Council Chairman.

**Meeting Rules**

Chairman Ness reviewed his rules for Council meetings that include:

* Go through the Chair for questions and responses;
* Follow the meeting agenda. Discuss each agenda item individually and speak directly to the agenda item that is being discussed;
* Maintain a positive atmosphere. Be civil and polite to all Council members, guests and the public; and
* Ensure all members have an opportunity to participate and be productive. Every member will be given the opportunity to speak to every agenda item with a time limit. Oral comments should be less than two minutes. If you need to go beyond that time limit, please submit written comments that can be discussed at the next meeting.

**Council Member Orientation and Ethics**

The Governor’s Office new *Orientation* *Handbook* provides guidelines for serving as a Governor’s appointee to the Council was distributed and reviewed. The Ethics section (Page 2 of the Handbook) includes the following: “When a personal or professional conflict arises in your work, it may be necessary to withdraw your vote or disclose the conflict. Substantial gifts are not allowed, and that includes anything valued over $50.”

Don Harris also distributed a *Standards of Conduct* handout. Don clarified that one of the definitions of a public employee in Section 2-2-102(7) is “a member of a quasi-judicial board or commission or of a board, commission, or committee with rulemaking authority.” Hence, Council members are considered employees. A discussion ensued that included the following:

* Self-Dealing: If a member has a direct and personal interest in a business or undertaking and something involving a competing business or undertaking that comes before the Council, it is best to recuse oneself.
* Business Interest: Employees may not perform an official act which directly and substantially provides an economic benefit to a business in which you have a substantial financial interest or for which you are engaged as a counsel, consultant, representative or agent.
* Disclosure: If you have a conflict created by a personal or private interest that gives rise to the appearance of impropriety, you must disclose the interest creating the conflict prior to participating in official actions. If members have a conflict, they should notify the chair and recuse themselves.

**9-1-1 Grant Program Report**

Members received a copy of the Grant Contract Status Report, which included the following:

* 40 contracts have been executed;
* 6 contracts are awaiting the grantee’s signature; and
* 2 contracts are under negotiation

The Council recognized Rhonda Sullivan, Don Harris and the staff in Contract and Asset Management Office for all their hard work in getting the contracts developed and distributed.

**Certified PSAPs Quarterly Funding Distribution Report**

For the 4th quarter of the 2019 state fiscal year $2.65 million was distributed in August to local governments that host certified PSAPs.

**Implementation of HB 150 Report**

The Department successfully adopted the required administrative rule amendments. The Department and the Governor’s Office of Indian Affairs have reached out to the Blackfeet, Rocky Boy and Northern Cheyenne tribes and are engaged with them in certifying their PSAPs.

Don Harris summarized the purpose of HB150. During the last several months, rules were developed to add the tribes to the 9-1-1 quarterly distribution program and the 9-1-1 grant program. While the legislative interim committee was reviewing the adoption notice, they realized that HB150 had a drafting issue. Specifically, there was a termination section that ended several temporary statutes that were already terminating on October 1, 2019. HB150 changed the termination date to September 30, 2019. The legislative drafters accidently included Section 9 of the bill in the termination section, which inadvertently terminated the amendments to the 9 1 1 grant program that allowed tribal governments to participate in the grant program. So, one of the main objectives of HB 150 was not achieved. Don worked with the interim legislative committee and were advised that the legislature would prepare a single-subject housekeeping bill for the 2021 legislative session to allow the tribal governments to participate in the grant program.

The department is proposing to hold back some portion of the total grant funds available to ensure funding is available for the tribal PSAPs to apply for in 2021, assuming the clean-up bill is passed. The Department is requesting a recommendation from the Council regarding how much funding should be set aside. A discussion ensued and the key points were:

* Current statutory priorities will still apply. The intent is to ensure that preference in statute will not be affected by setting aside funds.
* The money is not intended to give tribes a preference, but to give them an opportunity.
* The set aside will increase the amount of total grant funding available to everybody once the tribes are eligible to apply.
* All dependent on passing the clean-up bill and the assumption that the 9-1-1 grant program will look the same after the 2021 legislative session.
* The department is trying to find a reasonable basis for how much money to carry forward and didn’t want to choose an arbitrary amount. We are trying to ensure that the tribes are held harmless.

**Motion: Member Drake (alternate) moved to carry this discussion forward to tomorrow when the Council will have more information, including average grant award amounts, and Member Stinson seconded. The motion passed with all in favor, none opposed, and none abstaining.**

**Motion: Member MacDonald moved to amend the agenda to discuss the ARM Amendments agenda item right now and the ESInet Implementation Strategy agenda item later today. Member Burdick seconded.** **The motion passed with all in favor, none opposed, and none abstaining.**

**9-1-1 Grant Program ARM Amendments**

Don Harris explained that this agenda item is related to work performed by the 9-1-1 Grant Program subcommittee, which developed recommendations that the Council adopted at its July meeting. ARM 2-13-407 contains the current rules for the criteria for awarding grants. Don reviewed the recommendations and the rationale behind them. He clarified that the new criteria may or may not apply to all applications. For example, if an applicant does not meet a certain criterion, then that will not automatically knock the application out of consideration. The additional criteria are just a way to help guide the discussion and decisions. They are designed to give Council members another tool to support the grant award decisions. Nothing will supersede preferences in statute.

Member Beck asked if the award criteria are required to be in administrative rule? Don confirmed that the 9-1-1 laws do provide that “criteria” have to be adopted in rule. Member Feiss stated that the reason for the rulemaking requirement in law is to maximize the opportunity for public comment and minimize the potential for arbitrary decisions. The opportunity for public comment is critical.

Don Harris noted one concern would be to provide applicants with the criteria well in advance of when applications are due. The longer it takes to develop and publish the criteria, the harder it’s going to be to get grant funds distributed.

Chairman Ness stated that there has been some confusion over when the Department would be awarding grants due to a misunderstanding about calendar year versus state fiscal year (SFY). He clarified that the Department is required in law to make grant awards annually, which the Department interprets as every SFY. It is critical that we initiate the rule amendment process as soon as possible, because it typically takes about six months for rules to be adopted. The latest that grant award recommendations could be made by the Council would be June 15 because the Department must make final awards by June 30, which is the last day of the SFY.

Don Harris provided an overview of the administrative rulemaking process as follows:

1. Filing of a proposal notice.
2. Two weeks after the proposal notice is filed, the notice is published in the Administrative Register and sent to interested parties. At least 28 days after the publication are required to receive public comment.
3. Department responds to the public comments received.
4. Adoption notice is published. This notice responds to the public comments and adopts the rules. This process usually takes 1-2 months.
5. If we started with a filing date at the beginning of October, the best-case scenario for the new administrative rules to be officially adopted would be February 2020.

Member Feiss stated that the Council and the Department should proceed with opening the grant program to receive applications and use the current criteria that is in rule. We shouldn’t wait to open the grant program for the new criteria to be adopted in rule. He is concerned that delaying this grant cycle will be harmful to the interests of the companies he represents if rules take a long time to be amended. This could result in money being on the table that might not be awarded, which would cause some consternation if not material harm to his stakeholders. Member Beck thinks the current point allocation criteria was well intentioned but did not function very well. She is not sure there is any way to continue with the current points-basis selection process. Member Knapp commented that if we know the current process is broken, we are duty bound to fix it and as quickly as possible. He also doesn’t think we should have an application process under current rule while we are proposing new rules. That will create confusion and possibly generate suspicion. Chairman Ness stated that it is possible to have the rule amendments adopted by the end of February 2020. However, one of the most significant factors that would delay the implementation of the rule amendments would be a lengthy public comment process. If everyone is comfortable with the new criteria, the rule process will be completed as quickly as possible. However, if we get into the formal process and have a lot of consternation and disagreement about the rule amendments, and formal comments are submitted the department must formally respond to every comment. That is probably the number one thing that would lengthen the rulemaking process. So, it’s important that we do our due diligence here today. We can improve the grant award process, so we should move forward with the recommended criteria.

**Motion: Member Honzel moved to recommend to the Department to amend the grant program administrative rules to include the recommended grant award criteria. Member Burdick seconded.**

**Discussion on the Motion**

Member Feiss said he would need to do more due diligence on the new criteria, but he does not oppose the motion. It was clarified that the recommended grant award criteria included the criteria currently in rule, but their accompanying point system would be stricken.

**The motion passed with all in favor, none opposed, and none abstaining.**

**ESInet Implementation Strategy – \*Action Item\***

The Department has requested that the Council to provide a recommendation with how to move forward with procuring and implementing a statewide ESInet. A discussion ensued that included the following:

* The legislature previously appropriated $5 million for an ESInet. The $5 million is currently in the 9-1-1 grant program account.
* Only private telecommunications providers and local government entities that host certified PSAPs are legally eligible to receive the grant funding (10-4-306 MCA).
* Awarding a grant to a private telecommunications provider for a statewide ESInet could be viewed as a sole source contract and could be illegal under the Montana Procurement Act.
* The grant funding must be awarded to local government entities that host certified PSAPs.
* Local governments are struggling with the procurement of an ESInet because it is a statewide network and it affects every PSAP across the state. All the PSAPs are customers of the network and will pay network subscription fees after the ESInet is procured.
* An individual local government cannot receive grants and manage procurements on behalf of other local governments.
* Local governments could form an entity to facilitate the project in their behalf. MACO is willing to consider facilitating the procurement and will discuss internally.
* Create regional entities (consortia), based on a natural grouping of counties that are willing to work together and where it makes sense for them to work together. The regional entity would facilitate the procurement.
* The $5 million in the grant program account could be awarded and spent on something other than an ESInet. The $5 million should be set aside for the procurement of an ESInet.

**Motion: Member Beck moved for the Council to recommend to the Department to hold in reserve and set aside $5 million in the grant program account for a future ESInet procurement. Member Burdick seconded. The motion passed with all in favor, none opposed, and none abstaining.**

**Public Comment:** None

**Next Meeting:** September 12, 2019 at 10:00 am.

**Adjournment**

**Motion: Member MacDonald moved to adjourn and Member Honzel seconded. The motion passed with all in favor, none opposed, and none abstaining. Chairman Ness adjourned the meeting at 2:30 p.m.**

**9-1-1 Advisory Council**

**Meeting Executive Summary**

**Thursday September 12, 2019**

**10:00 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.**

**State Capitol, Room 152**

**Helena, Montana**

**Attendees:**

Voting Council Members/Alternates:

Adriane Beck - PSAPs >30K; Kimberly Burdick - MAPCO; Bob Drake – MVFFA (Alternate); Alex Duman, Wireless Telecommunications Provider ☎; Michael Fashoway– MSL (Alternate); Geoff Feiss - Telecommunications Provider; Peggy Glass - PSAPS <30K; Burke Honzel - DMA/DES; Lisa Kelly - Wireline Telecommunications Provider; Andrew Knapp - DOJ/MHP (Alternate); Clint Loss – MEMSA; Commissioner Gary MacDonald – MACO; Quinn Ness - DOA, Council Chairman; Pat Roos – MSPOA; and Curt Stinson – MACOP.

Non-Voting Council Members/Alternates: John Bemis, CenturyLink (Alternate) ☎ Liz Brooks - PSAPs >30K (Alternate) ☎; Gary Evans - VisionNet (Alternate); Terry Ferestad, AT&T (Alternate) and Shantil Siaperas - MACO (Alternate).

Guests: Sandra Barrows - Barrows Consulting; Greg Brooks, Solacom; Mark Hendrickson, Geo Data Services; John Joseph – Motorola Solutions ☎; Tommy Luksha, Madison County ☎; Rob Stauder, DataMark ☎; Remi Sun - Nemont ☎; and Karen Young, City of Great Falls ☎.

Staff: Don Harris, DOA/SITSD; Wing Spooner DOA/PSCB; and Rhonda Sullivan, DOA/PSCB.

**Chairman Ness called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m.**

**Welcome & Introductions**

The Council members and guests introduced themselves.

**Statewide 9-1-1 Plan MCA Requirements**

Don Harris circulated two sections of MCA: 10-4-107 and 10-4-108. He reviewed Subsection 2 (e) of 10-4-107, which directs the department to establish a Statewide 9-1-1 Plan in accordance with Subsection 3. Subsection 3 states: A statewide 9-1-1 plan must include:

(a) to the maximum extent feasible the use of existing commercial communications infrastructure; and

(b) 9-1-1 system standards and support efforts to migrate legacy technologies to next-generation 9-1-1 technologies when appropriate and to provide for the implementation of future 9-1-1 technologies. Any standards adopted by the department for legacy 9-1-1 technologies or principles adopted for baseline next-generation 9-1-1 technologies must be:

(i) flexible and graduated, while ensuring minimum service levels; and

(ii) based on industry standards.

In MCA 10-4-108, Don highlighted language that relates to a future rulemaking:

(2) The department shall adopt rules including but not limited to:

(a) technology standards, based on industry standards and a statewide 9-1-1 plan [pursuant to 10-4-315], to ensure that public safety answering points meet minimum 9-1-1 services levels; and

(b) baseline next-generation 9-1-1 principles to facilitate the appropriate deployment of baseline next-generation 9-1-1.

**Statewide 9-1-1 Plan**

Eric Parry provided an overview of the final statewide 9-1-1 plan documents and invited everyone to the upcoming Town Hall meetings and said to be on the lookout for the email invitation from Wing Spooner. The definition of an ESInet includes a dedicated internet-protocol (IP) network that is intended to be solely for the exchange of 9-1-1-centric information. Including the delivery of voice-over IP calls, the delivery of GIS information, or the delivery of any other data that may be germane to a 9-1-1 event.

**ESInet Inventory Adoption (Milestone 4): \*Action Item\***

**Motion: Member MacDonald made a motion to recommended to the Department to adopt the ESInet Inventory (Milestone 4). Member Honzel seconded.** **The motion passed with all in favor, none opposed, and none abstaining.**

**NG911 Technology Standards and Requirements (Milestone 5):** **\*Action Item\***

Member Feiss stated that the technology standards document includes NENA i3 standards for an ESInet and that the current CenturyLink – VisionNet 9-1-1 network is compliant. Eric Parry stated that he believes that the current CenturyLink – VisionNet 9-1-1 network is compliant with the NENA i3 standards for an ESInet. Since NENA and APCO standards will continue to be developed and revised, so we will update these documents as needed.

**Motion: Member MacDonald moved to recommend adoption of the NG911 Technology Standards and Requirements documents. Member Burdick seconded. The motion passed with all in favor, none opposed, and none abstaining.**

**PSAP Inventories & Needs Assessments (Milestone 6): \*Action Item\***

Eric Parry reported that all these documents are living documents, and they will be updated in the future as needed. The cover page of each document includes a “Revised Date.” Since NENA or APCO standards will continue to be developed and revised, we will continuously update these documents as needed.

Member Drake (Alternate) asked for a definition of “legacy.” Eric Parry explained that a legacy PSAP has the traditional connectivity to the public switched telephone network, so they are using “CAMA trunks” or twisted copper. To migrate to NG9-1-1, that equipment must be replaced with an IP network-type of connectivity. The vision of NG9-1-1 call routing is based on the actual physical location of where that call is coming from. The call also would be routed through a Core Service, which is a program that sends that call to the correct PSAP the first time. It is based on the location of the device—not by sector-call routing, which is sort of a rudimentary triangulation of location. Member Ferestad (Alternate) explained some of the sector-designed technology that AT&T is now deploying to improve location accuracy. In some cities, it is putting elevation equipment on the tops of buildings to provide additional information beyond x and y coordinates. Member Kelly explained that Montana has two separate networks: the CenturyLink – VisionNet network which operates an ESInet that has selective routers at the end that can be easily replaced with NextGen core services. The CenturyLink - Qwest network has selective routers and CAMA trunks that cannot be replaced because the trunks are not capable of carrying IP traffic. Eventually that legacy equipment will go away and will be replaced with NG core services.

Chairman Ness re-directed the discussion to the open agenda item: PSAP Inventories and Assessments.

**Motion: Member Drake moved to recommend adoption of the PSAP Inventories & Needs Assessment documents. Member Roos seconded.** **The motion passed with all in favor, none opposed, and none abstaining.**

**NG911 ESInet Design and Implementation Plan:** **\*Action Item\***

Eric Parry presented the plan. Geoff stated that since the statute requires that the plan use to the maximize extent possible the use of commercial infrastructure, he wanted answers to the following questions:

* Which option meets the requirement to leverage existing infrastructure?
* One of the options includes regionalization, does that include building separate ESInets, or regionally hosted CPE, or both?

Eric Parry stated that all the options include leveraging existing infrastructure. Option 1 was one extreme back to Option 6 which was the other extreme. None of the options rule out an existing vendor.

Member Feiss requested that we review each option and identify how each one maximizes the use of existing infrastructure, how we envision each option being implemented, and determine the best implementation strategy. Chairman Ness asked Member Feiss for clarification. Does Member Feiss have any specific changes or edits to the document? Or do you want to engage in a discussion about the validity of the proposed options? Member Feiss stated that he didn’t want to adopt the plan without getting into the substance of the plan when the substance includes options that are unacceptable.

Chairman Ness stated that the documents have been available for review and comment for several months. The Department did not receive any recommended changes or edits for the NG911 ESInet Design and Implementation Plan. As stated previously, this is a living document and you can propose amendments moving forward. If you have proposed revisions, please notify the chair and provide the revisions in writing so the revisions can be distributed before the meeting and we can have an informed and open discussion. Member Kelly said she did not think it was Council’s responsibility to correct the documents. She concurs with Member Feiss that the six options are not what she would consider a plan.

Chairman Ness reiterated that the documents have been available for comment for several months. No comments were received during the three-month review and comment period. If any member wants to propose revisions to the any of the plan documents in the future, please notify the chair and provide the revisions in writing so they can be distributed and made available to the public prior to the meeting to ensure we have an inclusive, productive discussion.

Member Feiss stated the Council is a public body and this is a public meeting. Was there a public notice of the opportunity to comment on the ESInet plan? Chairman Ness stated that all statewide 9-1-1 plan documents, including the ESInet Implementation Plan, were distributed, posted and presented at the July meeting. At the July meeting it was requested that Council members and interested parties review the documents and submit suggestions and revisions to the 9-1-1 program office and Federal Engineering. No comments or revisions were received. All statewide 9-1-1 plan documents, including the ESInet Implementation Plan, were distributed and posted again prior to this meeting and the Statewide 9-1-1 Plan and the individual documents were cited on the agenda as action items.

Member Feiss stated that yesterday when the Council passed the motion to set aside the $5 million that he was under the impression that we would discuss how the money would be spent, which relates to this item. Approving a list of options will not help us determine how to proceed with procurement. Chairman Ness clarified that the options could guide the local government PSAPs in their procurement decisions. As the Council discussed yesterday, the $5 million in grant funding that was set aside for the ESInet must be awarded to local government entities that host certified PSAPs. The Council does not have the required authorities to select a specific ESInet implementation option, receive the grant money and procure anything. Member Feiss agreed but he does not see how we can approve recommended ESInet implementation options that are incomplete.

Member Siaperas (Alternate) commented that MACO is interested in being the coordination point for procuring the statewide ESInet if given the resources to do so, which might require legislative action. She wanted everyone to be aware of MACO’s interest, if the Council is supportive of this direction. She asked if the statewide plan document that contains the implementation options would be available to a MACO committee. The committee could then determine which option they think would work best for the local government PSAPs? Chairman Ness replied, “Yes, all of the statewide 9-1-1 plan documents are publicly available. The Council and the Department are not going to dictate to the local governments what they should purchase. Local government PSAPs are the subscribers/customers and they will need to establish the detailed requirements for the procurement(s). The statewide 9-1-1 planning documents provide local government PSAPs with information and guidance.

Chairman Ness stated that before the Council proceeds with a motion, he wanted to engage in a discussion about GIS. A fully functioning ESInet that meets current NENA standards really is not functional until the GIS data also meets the NG9-1-1 standards for GIS data. He asked Michael Fashoway to explain dynamic call routing and how important that is to the ESInet. Core services is a term that includes GIS call routing, the emergency call routing function (ECRF) and the Location Validation Function (LVF). These are the GIS-based call routing and location validation functions. These serve as replacements for the MSAG, ALI and selective routers. An ESInet would allow for IP traffic, but without having the GIS data ready to be used and provisioned within the core services, you would not be achieving what NENA calls i3 NextGen call routing. You would have a network, but you would still be relying on old call routing technology. Member Siaperas asked how many PSAPs are GIS ready. Michael said that based on the recent GIS data assessment, none are ready.

Member Kelly clarified that NG core services should not be grouped with the ESInet. The ESInet is the network that carries the traffic and the core services represent the routing function, which is where GIS comes in. The ESInet can be built without NG core service. So, a first step would be to ensure that all PSAPs have access to the ESInet. Bring the NG core services on as a secondary item. The ESInet gives the capability of carrying IP traffic to all PSAPs and gives them the bandwidth capabilities to move up or down depending on their requirements once the NG core services can deliver the information that they need. Member Siaperas mentioned the issue of affordability and the local government PSAPs paying ESInet (network) subscription costs before they can upgrade the core services and CPE and fully use the network. PSAPs could end up paying for network services that they will never use.

**Motion: Member Honzel moved to recommend to the Department to adopt the NG911 ESInet Design and Implementation Plan. Member Drake seconded. The motion passed with Members Feiss and Kelly opposed, and none abstaining.**

Member Kelly requested clarification regarding how the NG911 ESInet Design and Implementation Plan will be implemented. Member Beck stated we find ourselves in a very difficult and almost intangible position. There is no clean way to fulfil the requirement or intent of building a statewide ESInet without having to rely on individual local governments to perform the procurement. We want to see the ESInet money set it aside for a future statewide ESInet procurement. Member Kelly asked for clarification on a technology level: are you talking about complete package of ESInet and NG core services or only an ESInet? Chairman Ness replied that would be determined by the local government PSAPs. Member Beck inquired about the original section of law (MCA 10-4-309) that terminated; who was the eligible entity to receive the grant funding before the money was transferred into the grant program account. Don Harris clarified that in MCA 10-4-309 it stated that money in the NG infrastructure account may be expended by the Department in a grant to a local government working with a private telecommunications provider for NG infrastructure. Member Beck reaffirmed the discussion from yesterday and the motion for the Department to hold in reserve the $5 million for a future ESInet procurement.

**House Bill 150**

The average grant award during the last grant cycle for a single applicant was calculated to be $141,397. This number multiplied by three (for the three tribal PSAPs) comes to $424,191.

**Motion: Chief Drake moved to carry forward $250,000 annually (for a total of $500,000) to the SFY 2022 grant cycle. Member MacDonald seconded.**

**Discussion on the Motion**

Member Feiss commented that this figure seems to be close to 10% of funds to be set aside. Any eligible entity could apply for the funds; the money is not earmarked specifically for tribes. We are simply carrying the money forward until the tribes can apply and compete for those funds. Carrying forward the funds does not change or impair the statutory requirements on preference. Member Loss stated by the time the tribes have missed out on three grant cycles; their proposals might end up being the neediest and might float to the top anyway.

**The motion passed with all in favor, none opposed, and none abstaining.**

**Future Agenda Items**

Member Feiss requested to discuss the ESInet Implementation Plan options be discussed again at the next meeting because the Council has not given any guidance to counties with regard to whether to set up regional networks, whether to proceed with hosted CPE, or whether to focus first on the 18 legacy PSAPs and determine what is needed to get them to IP capability. Chairman Ness stated that the procurement and implementation would be determined by the local government PSAPs as the Council previously discussed. How NG9-1-1 is implemented is a local decision. Member Feiss objected and requested a continuation of the discussion. Chairman Ness stated that the continuation of the ESInet Implementation Plan discussion will be included on the next meeting agenda.

**Next Meeting**: Thursday, December 12, 2019.

**Adjournment**

**Motion: Member Drake moved to adjourn, and Member MacDonald seconded. The motion passed with all in favor, none opposed, and none abstaining. Chairman Ness adjourned the meeting at 1:00 p.m.**