



Virginia Information Technologies Agency

PSAP Grant Committee Meeting

February 2, 2017



Agenda

- Call Meeting to Order
- Minutes from Dec 8th Meeting
- Metrics for PSAP Grant Program
- NG9-1-1 Transition Costs
 - Staff Recommendations
 - Impact to PSAP Grant Program
 - Legislation
 - Funding
 - Parking Lot Issues
- PSAP Grant Extension Process
- Next Meeting Date
- PGC Report to Board
- Public Comment and Closing



PSAP Grant Program Metrics





PSAP Grant Program Metrics

- In order to measure the performance of the PSAP Grant Program, ISP and the PGC established preliminary performance metrics. Performance of the PSAP Grant Program is currently defined as the ability to meet the needs of the PSAPs.



PSAP Grant Program Metrics

- Using the following critical grant priorities, ISP reviewed the past three (3) funding cycles by:
 - CHE
 - GIS Data (including GIS High/Medium/Low)
 - GIS/Mapping Hardware/Software (including primary mapping system)
 - CAD
 - Text to 9-1-1
 - Voice Logging
 - Other (all other grant program types)



PSAP Grant Program Metrics

- Based on these grant priorities, ISP created metrics based on the following data elements (by year and aggregate data results):
 - Number of grants awarded for critical grant program priorities
 - Number of grants awarded by region
 - Number of grants awarded by grant type (individual and regional/shared services, including number of PSAP participants)
 - Number of grant applications for which funding was not received by region, priority type, and grant type
 - Population served based on the number of localities participating in individual and shared services (including regional) projects.



Metric Totals – FY15

| | Total # of Grants Funded | Total Population Served | Total Amount Funded | Percentage of Total Funding |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| FY15 (83 Total Submissions) | 80 | 4,615,102 | \$7,604,529.83 | |
| Region 1 | 14 | 625,093 | \$1,424,980.00 | 18.74% |
| Region 2 | 14 | 843,376 | \$1,181,252.22 | 15.53% |
| Region 3 | 11 | 444,834 | \$771,790.31 | 10.15% |
| Region 4 | 15 | 422,358 | \$1,249,979.16 | 16.44% |
| Region 5 | 15 | 1,480,622 | \$1,382,108.62 | 18.17% |
| Region 6 | 10 | 549,958 | \$1,571,059.52 | 20.66% |
| Region 7 | 1 | 248,861 | \$23,360.00 | 0.31% |
| CHE | 19 | 1,064,772 | \$2,745,509.36 | 36.10% |
| GIS Data | 12 | 284,139 | \$704,454.00 | 9.26% |
| GIS/Mapping Hardware/Software | 11 | 588,300 | \$1,337,892.16 | 17.59% |
| CAD | 6 | 442,548 | \$526,338.28 | 6.92% |
| Text-to-9-1-1 | 1 | 191,745 | \$325,000.00 | 4.27% |
| Voice Logging | 14 | 349,550 | \$816,763.84 | 10.74% |
| Other | 17 | 1,694,048 | \$1,148,572.19 | 15.10% |
| Individual | 74 | 3,713,531 | \$5,794,529.83 | 76.20% |
| Shared Services | 6 | 901,571 | \$1,810,000.00 | 23.80% |



Metric Totals – FY16

| | Total # of Grants Funded | Total Population Served | Total Amount Funded | Percentage of Total Funding |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| FY16 (73 Total Submissions) | 72 | 7,473,261 | \$7,569,534.20 | |
| Region 1 | 12 | 324,842 | \$659,916.40 | 8.72% |
| Region 2 | 13 | 811,236 | \$1,136,241.20 | 15.01% |
| Region 3 | 12 | 438,157 | \$674,483.97 | 8.91% |
| Region 4 | 14 | 715,734 | \$2,304,843.78 | 30.45% |
| Region 5 | 9 | 750,808 | \$1,246,977.10 | 16.47% |
| Region 6 | 9 | 489,619 | \$1,047,071.75 | 13.83% |
| Region 7 | 3 | 3,977,706 | \$650,000.00 | 8.59% |
| CHE | 13 | 698,743 | \$2,134,687.00 | 28.20% |
| GIS Data | 7 | 2,804,911 | \$687,192.40 | 9.08% |
| GIS/Mapping Hardware/Software | 11 | 434,709 | \$1,407,710.00 | 18.60% |
| CAD | 10 | 576,965 | \$1,404,259.00 | 18.55% |
| Text-to-9-1-1 | 1 | 34,015 | \$20,672.00 | 0.27% |
| Voice Logging | 17 | 1,965,021 | \$1,370,470.77 | 18.11% |
| Other | 12 | 958,897 | \$544,543.03 | 7.19% |
| Individual | 66 | 4,591,664 | \$5,480,064.20 | 72.40% |
| Shared Services | 6 | 2,916,438 | \$2,239,470.00 | 29.59% |



Metric Totals – FY17

| | Total # of Grants Funded | Total Population Served | Total Amount Funded | Percentage of Total Funding |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| FY17 (72 Total Submissions) | 42 | 6,309,780 | \$8,284,036.30 | |
| Region 1 | 8 | 1,372,835 | \$1,301,695.00 | 15.71% |
| Region 2 | 3 | 169,066 | \$439,870.00 | 5.31% |
| Region 3 | 5 | 169,750 | \$902,273.30 | 10.89% |
| Region 4 | 10 | 1,071,893 | \$2,303,768.00 | 27.81% |
| Region 5 | 5 | 285,616 | \$547,334.00 | 6.61% |
| Region 6 | 10 | 596,400 | \$1,564,096.00 | 18.88% |
| Region 7 | 1 | 2,644,220 | \$1,225,000.00 | 14.79% |
| CHE | 17 | 3,782,623 | \$4,446,291.30 | 53.67% |
| GIS Data | 4 | 718,013 | \$603,950.00 | 7.29% |
| GIS/Mapping Hardware/Software | 10 | 297,328 | \$1,592,209.00 | 19.22% |
| CAD | 2 | 45,621 | \$300,000.00 | 3.62% |
| Text-to-9-1-1 | 2 | 944,164 | \$736,054.00 | 8.89% |
| Voice Logging | 5 | 460,355 | \$525,532.00 | 6.34% |
| Other | 2 | 61,676 | \$80,000.00 | 0.97% |
| Individual | 31 | 1,439,926 | \$4,017,314.30 | 48.49% |
| Shared Services | 11 | 4,869,854 | \$4,266,722.00 | 51.51% |



Analysis – Today

- Virginia's population is 8,545,904 based on recent statistics. This means that over the last three years, the PSAP Grant Program has served an average of 72% of the state's population by funding various critical 9-1-1 technologies.
- Since the FY15 PSAP Guidelines, which included funding for two Priority types, 26 Project types, and 66 Rankings, through the FY16 and FY17 Guidelines, the Board began to emphasize Shared Services projects more than Individual projects. In addition, the Board shifted heavily towards NG9-1-1 data and related services.



Analysis – Today

- This is evident by looking at the almost 30% jump in Shared Services funding from FY15 to FY17, with roughly two-thirds of the projects falling into the NG9-1-1 data and/or related products and services.
- Region 4 has consistently been the major benefactor of PSAP grant funding with the greatest number of grant awards each year. However, Region 7 has benefitted the most in actual grant funding dollars due to its population base and the Shared Services projects that they have undertaken as a region.



Analysis – Moving Forward

- Establish grant performance metrics for best practices using a “score card” of grantees based on previous award. This will allow for improved grant management practices from programmatic standpoint.
- Implement similar practices currently being used by VDEM and OEMS with regards to 14 measurement criterion used during peer review.
- Other additional data elements based on input received from the PSAP Grant Committee.



NG9-1-1 Transition Costs





Overview

1. Staff Recommendations
2. Impact to PSAP Grant Program
3. Legislation
4. Funding
5. Parking Lot Issues



Staff Recommendations

- PSAP Grant Program would be used almost exclusively to help support NG9-1-1 non-recurring costs
 - one-time ESInet set-up
 - GIS data preparation
 - SR transition project to NGCS ESInet
- The exception would be the PSAP Education Program (PEP)
 - Dedicated funding of \$500,000



Staff Recommendations

- Funding would be limited to the following priorities
 - Preemptive category for PSAP transition needs related to NGCS ESInet
 - CHE
 - NG9-1-1 GIS
 - Networking
- No funding for any other priorities currently included in the FY 18 Guidelines



Impact to PSAP Grant Program

- NG9-1-1 Program (New)
 - Support funding requests for PSAP transition needs related to NGCS ESInet
 - Request funding in advance of transition date of selective routers
 - Includes cost share for allowable shared services and individual PSAP projects
 - Increase funding level for shared services CHE, NG9-1-1, and networking projects
- PSAP Education Program (PEP)



Current Legislation

- Beginning July 1, 2012, 60 percent of the Wireless E-911 Fund shall be distributed on a monthly basis to the PSAPs according to each PSAP's average pro rata distribution from the Wireless E-911 Fund for fiscal years 2007-2012...On or before July 1, 2017, and every five years thereafter, the Department of Taxation shall recalculate the distribution percentage for each PSAP based on the cost and call load data of the PSAP for the previous five fiscal years...
- Using 30 percent of the Wireless E-911 Fund, the Board shall provide payment to CMRS providers of wireless E-911 CMRS costs



Current Legislation

- The remaining 10 percent of the Fund and any remaining funds for the previous fiscal year from the 30 percent for CMRS providers shall be distributed to PSAPs...based on grant requests...



Proposed Legislation

- 60 percent of the Wireless E-911 Fund shall be distributed on a monthly basis to the PSAPs according to each PSAP's average pro rata distribution from the Wireless E-911 Fund...On or before July 1, 2018, and every five years thereafter, the Department of Taxation shall recalculate the distribution percentage for each PSAP based on the cost and call load data of the PSAP for the previous five fiscal years...
- The remaining 40 percent of the Fund shall be distributed to PSAPs...based on NG9-1-1 grant requests...



Funding

| Deployment Year | Prior Investments 2016 | Deployment Year 1 2017 | Deployment Year 2 2018 | Deployment Year 3 2019 | Deployment Year 4 2020 | Deployment Year 5 2021 | Total | Post Deployment Year 2022 | Post Deployment Year 2023 | |
|--|------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| NG9-1-1 Deployment Costs (Local/State) | | \$6,343,325 | \$17,279,548 | \$21,986,322 | \$9,474,152 | \$14,045,193 | \$69,128,540 | | | |
| | | Incur One-Time Deployment Costs | | | | | | | Pay Down One-time Costs | |
| Billing Agreement | | \$0 | \$1,327,633 | \$1,727,871 | \$2,761,471 | \$3,633,551 | \$9,450,526 | \$3,651,138 | \$3,651,138 | |
| PSAP Grant Program | \$500,000.00 | \$1,225,000 | \$4,588,434 | \$6,000,000 | \$6,000,000 | \$6,000,000 | \$23,813,434 | \$8,000,000 | \$8,000,000 | |
| Elimination of Cost Recovery | | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,700,000 | \$2,700,000 | \$2,700,000 | \$8,100,000 | \$2,700,000 | \$2,700,000 | |
| Network Improvements | | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$5,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | |
| Funding Gap | | -\$4,118,325 | -\$10,363,481 | -\$10,558,451 | \$2,987,319 | -\$711,642 | -\$22,764,580 | -\$7,413,442 | \$14,647,598 | |



Funding

| Deployment Year | Prior Investments 2016 | Deployment Year 1 2017 | Deployment Year 2 2018 | Deployment Year 3 2019 | Deployment Year 4 2020 | Deployment Year 5 2021 | Total | Post Deployment Year 2022 | Post Deployment Year 2023 | |
|--|------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| NG9-1-1 Deployment Costs (Local/State) | | \$6,343,325 | \$17,279,548 | \$21,986,322 | \$9,474,152 | \$14,045,193 | \$69,128,540 | | | |
| | | Incur One-Time Deployment Costs | | | | | | | Pay Down One-time Costs | |
| Billing Agreement | | \$0 | \$1,327,633 | \$1,727,871 | \$2,761,471 | \$3,633,551 | \$9,450,526 | \$3,651,138 | \$3,651,138 | |
| PSAP Grant Program | \$500,000.00 | \$1,225,000 | \$4,588,434 | \$9,700,000 | \$9,700,000 | \$9,700,000 | \$34,913,434 | \$11,700,000 | \$11,700,000 | |
| Network Improvements | | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,000,000 | \$0 | \$0 | |
| Funding Gap | | -\$4,118,325 | -\$10,363,481 | -\$10,558,451 | \$2,987,319 | -\$711,642 | -\$22,764,580 | -\$7,413,442 | \$14,647,598 | |



Parking Lot Issues

- CAD
- Mapping systems and other items not currently identified as a NG9-1-1 Program priority
- Consolidations
- Address field verification
- Ancillary thoroughfares and data maintenance



PSAP Grant Extension Process





Recommended Process

- Timeframe to submit grant extension requests for FY 16 grants
 - March 1 – 15, 2017
- Implementation Plan Status
 - PSAPs that have not yet started the Implementation Phase should complete an additional step
 - Presentation at April 13th PGC meeting
 - PSAPs that have not yet completed Design/Planning Phase should not be granted an extension



Committee Report to the Board





Conclusion

- Public Comment
- Next Meeting Date – April 13, 2017
- Adjourn