PSAP Grant Committee Meeting
February 18, 2016 10:00AM CESC

Members Present: JR Powell   Allan Weese   Kathy Seay   Steve McMurrer
                    Cheryl Lee   Bob Layman   Shannon Williams

Members Absent: Qiana Foote   Micah Meadows

Staff Present: Dorothy Spears-Dean   Stefanie McGuffin   Lewis Cassada
                    Steve Marzolf

1) **Call to Order**
   The meeting of the PSAP Grant Committee was called to order at 9:58AM.

2) **Approval of the Minutes**
   Ms. Kathy Seay called for the approval of the minutes from the December 10th meeting. Mr. Allan Weese made the motion, and Mr. Steve McMurrer seconded it. The motion passed 7-0.

3) **Introduction/Update**
   Ms. Seay updated the committee with a report that it was recommended to the Board that the remaining available grant balance would be shared between the rank #32 grants. Also shared with the board were items that needed clarification for the FY18 PSAP Grant Guidelines.

4) **FY18 PSAP Grant Guidelines Concepts and Approaches**

   a) NG9-1-1 Data Projects
      Ms. Dorothy Spears-Dean presented issues with NG9-1-1 data projects. The staff recommendation is to prioritize data projects before display. Staff suggests NG9-1-1 data projects should be ranked higher than display, a new naming convention should be created (Mission Critical and Supportive), and the current 9-1-1 Mapping System rank should be renamed to Mapping Systems and GIS Equipment.   Mr. McMurrer asked for the definitions/explanations of "mission critical" and "supportive". Ms. Spears-Dean also addressed the issue of NG9-1-1 transition efforts. There was committee discussion. Mr. Marzolf explained that address points, road centerlines, and PSAP boundaries are the top 3 data layers, and should be rank #15. Definitions would be included in the PSAP Grant Guidelines. There was additional discussion between the committee and staff, including how staff can split out the mission critical elements from a project. Mr. Marzolf said draft language would be available before the next PSAP Grant Committee meeting. Ms. Seay summarized the concerns: Getting an understanding of how the rankings move with this recommendation, clarifications on mission critical and supportive, and need to review the new rankings and how some of the current ranks are split. Ms. Spears-Dean covered two issues: Text-to-9-1-1 is ranked higher than Physical Consolidations, and that the GIS matrix would be updated for the April PSAP Grant Committee meeting.

b) ESInet Projects

Ms. Spears-Dean presented the question: Should ESInet projects be identified as a separate priority? Currently networks are addressed as CHE projects and the established precedent is to rank as a TO CHE project. Staff recommended the current prioritization stay the same for now, with no changes until a Trusted Partner is in place. A footnote would be added to the Guidelines for CHE noting that network projects will not be funded individually and ESInet core services are considered part of CHE. There was no committee discussion.

c) Shared Services Projects : Definitions

Ms. Spears-Dean said the intent of Shared Services is to promote projects that share a single solution, not connect multiple versions of the same solution. Staff recommendation was to revise the definition in the guidelines, and add guidelines for geodiversity. Mr. Shannon Williams asked if multiple jurisdictions decided to buy individual CAD's but link them together to share data, by the new definition that project would not be allowed. Mr. Marzolf said that was correct. There was committee discussion. Consensus is that scenario would be "Strengthen", with the caveat being there needs to be a 3rd + piece of equipment. Two pieces of equipment would be geodiverse, but a 3rd or more would not be covered.

d) Shared Services Projects : Length

Ms. Spears-Dean asked if the grant award for shared services be extended to 36 months. The staff recommendation is to leave it at 24 months. The grant extension process exists to extend the current 24 months.

e) Time Sync and UPS Projects

Ms. Spears-Dean said that the purchase of these components separately from CHE is not addressed in the guidelines. They have been prioritized as CHE Strengthen with the FY17 applications. The staff recommendation is to formalize the precedent. There was staff and committed discussion, additional discussion centered on whole building UPS's. Mr. Marzolf asked, Is UPS an essential component of CHE, should it be included or excluded? Consensus is that a purchase at the same time as the CHE should be included, as long as the size is appropriate for a workstation, and not an entire building. Time Synch would be included as written being a Strengthen.

f) Financial and Programmatic Process

Ms. Spears-Dean reviewed the existing Financial and Programmatic reports and Grant Extension Requests, and explained the need to get better information from these reports. Staff recommendation is to replace with separate progress report, and grant closure form for FY18. There was staff discussion.

g) Grant Payment Request Process

Ms. Spears-Dean explained the need to shorten process times with grant payment request. The staff recommendation is to set a limit of 15 or 30 days to receive additional information/documentation or the request is rejected and needs to be resubmitted. For PEPs you would have 15 days past the deadline, other grants would have 30 days. There was committee discussion. Consensus is to keep business & calendar days consistent in the document.

h) PSAP Education Program
The per diem calculations are confusing to the PSAPs and our VITA Finance department. Staff recommendation is to determine a flat rate based on conference location instead of a per diem. Mr. Marzolf said staff will determine a defensible amount that the Board will approve. There was committee discussion. Ms. Seay asked to just not call it per diem anymore. This will primarily be for the Fall and Spring APCO/NENA state conferences, and the GIS state conference.

i) Other issues
Mr. Marzolf asked for other issues from the committee.   There were none.

5) **Old Business**
There was no old business to discuss.

6) **New Business**
a) Hanover County WEP Reimbursement
Staff and the committee discussed a WEP reimbursement request.   It was the consensus of the committee to take no action.

b) Brunswick County FY17 Grant Application
This application was not reviewed and acted on by the board. The grant application was originally acknowledged as received, but then accidentally deleted. Staff determined it would have been a priority #33, and outside of the approved grants for this year. Brunswick could argue their grant is rank #18 instead of #33. Staff will present to the Board at the March meeting to officially recognize the grant.

7) **Public Comment**
 There were no public comments.

8) **Adjourn**
Ms. Seay asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Williams made the motion; Mr. JR Powell seconded the motion. It was approved 7-0, and the meeting ended at 12:08PM.