



Regular Meeting Minutes

March 20, 2014

Gary R. Herbert, Governor
Alan Workman, Chair

Committee Member Attendees

Randy Auman
Kraig Kaizumi
Justin Grenier
Deborah Mecham
Kathy Quarnberg
Kevin Rose
Tina Scarlet

Committee Members on Bridge

Melanie Crittenden
Scott Freitag
Brett Mills
Jim Thomas

Staff Members Present

Eric Parry

Invited Presenters

Chris Duxler

Staff Members on Bridge

N/A

General Attendees

Paul Wolden
Andrew Howlett
Cindy Mellor
Dave White
Sterling Barlow
Regina Nelson
Steve Proctor
Cindy Flowers

General Attendees on Bridge

Bert Granberg
Ezekiel Barlow
Chris Rueckert
Brian Lowe

Representing

Bear River Association
Rural Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier
Five County Association
Utah County
Six County Association of Governments
Utah Department of Technology Services
Weber County

Representing

Mountainland Association
Salt Lake County
Southeastern Association
Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier

State 9-1-1 Program Director

Direct Technologies – ECaTS

Representing

Beaver County Sheriff's Office
CenturyLink
CenturyLink
CenturyLink
Colorado City
Tooele County Sheriff's Office
UCAN
St. George PD

Representing

AGRC
Colorado City
DPS/Salt Lake Communications Center

Minutes

The meeting was called to order by Acting Committee Chair **Justin Grenier** at 1015 MDT.

1. **Minutes: Motion** to approve the minutes of the Utah 9-1-1 Committee meeting held February 20, 2014, was made by **Deb Mecham**, seconded by **Randy Auman**. The motion was approved by a unanimous vote. Carried. It was noted that Committee members **Tina Scarlet** and **Danny Neds** attended the March February meeting by conference bridge and that the minutes needed to be updated accordingly, and re-posted to the Committee website.
2. **Financial report:**
 - 2.1 **Unspent Encumbered Funds - Eric** reported that he continues to monitor unspent encumbered funds.
 - 2.2 **Projected Available Funds Remaining** – There is about **\$4,141,203** remaining in the grant fund.
 - 2.3 **Approval of Financial Report** – A motion to accept the Financial Report was made by **Kevin Rose**, seconded by **Tina Scarlet**. The motion was approved by a unanimous vote. Carried.
3. **Grant applications**
 - 3.1 **Tooele County Sheriff's Office – Regina Nelson**, the representative from Tooele County was in attendance to present the CPE upgrade grant application. The revised application, which includes upgrading six positions and two mobile command posts which comes in at \$334,251.25. The two positions in the EOC are not part of this grant. In addition, **Regina** indicated that there are plans to put the two mobile command posts in the new Detention center to serve as a backup PSAP facility. **Randy Auman** commented that the sub-committee has gone over the application several times, and still has issues with the mobile command posts. After a lengthy discussion, it was suggested that the mobile command posts not be included in this grant application at this time, and that when the new Detention facility is ready to accept the mobile command posts, that another application in this regard be made before the Committee. There was also discussion concerning current staffing levels and the number of consoles. It was explained that they are currently two positions short, working with three on at any given time. They should be at 18 FTE's, which would add four positions overall. **Tina** raised the issue regarding the costs of monitors as outlined in the CenturyLink quote which are about \$600 each, and could be procured from local retailers or off CDW for about \$180. **Justin** made the point that monitors are a very easy thing to swap out and that replacements can be purchased locally on an as required basis if needed. It was also pointed out that for backup purposes, those PSAPs that had another PSAP close by were encouraged to make arrangements with the appropriate PSAP for backup, rather than procure mobile command posts for an alternate call taking location. **Deb** made the point that if a PSAP is staffed at four on duty, that there is still a need for additional positions and therefore supports the request for six positions. She went on to make the point that historically the Committee made command post decisions based on the practicality and circumstances of each application and in the majority of cases, it did not make sense to fund them. In the case of Tooele's situation, they appear to be justified in the use of their mobile command posts. She went on to comment that there is no blanket policy in this regard, and that requests like this still need to be evaluated on a case-by case basis. **Kevin Rose** commented that the Committee really needs to look at funding the core components and that if an agency wants to procure and fund beyond the core components, they are

at liberty to do so. He went on to comment that this is what the Tooele Sheriff indicated they were prepared to do at the meeting held earlier in February. Regarding monitors, it was suggested that we determine the terms of the state contract, and that the purchasing of monitors from the contract or other suppliers be provided as an option to PSAPs. **Kathy Quarnberg** questioned whether or not, with the removal of the monitors from the quote, if the costs associated to shipping and warranty would change, and this was confirmed that the figures would need to be revised. **Kevin Rose** went on to suggest that all of these issues need to be hashed out and written down in black and white to remove the guesswork currently being experienced by all involved. This would be part of an all-day strategy meeting to be considered by the Committee.

3.1.1 Motion - It was moved by **Tina Scarlet**, seconded by **Deb Mecham**, *“that the Committee approve the six-position grant application less the two mobile command post stations.”* The motion carried by a unanimous vote. Note that with the removal of the mobile command posts, the project total is reduced by \$30,406.00 to \$303,845.25. The 10% grant match now becomes \$30,384.53 with the overall grant award now standing at \$273,450.72.

4. Public comment

N/A

5. Committee Business

5.1 Committee Membership Update – **Eric Parry** reported that Karl Kuehn’s nomination is still pending from the COG.

5.2 Grant Rules Status Update – **Eric** reported the draft Rules are included in the packet. **Tina** commented that now that HB155 has passed, the Committee may no longer be under DPS, and that the need for Rules may have changed to the future development of bylaws. It was suggested that the Rules issue be put on hold pending the transition from our current status to the UCA infrastructure.

5.3 Tax Revenue Distribution – **Eric** briefed the Committee that the February report had not been sent from the Tax Commission. He expected **Jim Clayton** was on vacation or out of the office the efforts to contact him have been unanswered. The trend chart for calendar years 2013 and 2014 will continue as soon as the relevant reports are received.

5.4 ECaTS RDDM Upgrade Costs - **Chris Duxler** from Direct Technologies presented a proposal that would cover the transition of all Utah PSAPs to the new NG centric RDDM’s. The advantage of adopting the new technology would allow for the analysis of multiple ALI rebids for wireless 9-1-1 calls through the new ALI Re-bid Summary Report currently under development. After a lengthy discussion, it was decided that this entire proposal be put on hold pending the gradual transition of Utah PSAPs to IP connectivity. It was suggested to bring this issue back to the Committee in about six months.

5.5 Years 4&5 Maintenance – **Randy Auman** reported that it was decided at a previous meeting in July 2010 that the Committee would be responsible to cover years 4&5 maintenance and a \$2.1M was committed to cover these costs. As time progressed, years 4&5 maintenance were bundled into the quote and became part of the overall project costs and became included in the grant match figures. In short, PSAPs were incorrectly including years 4&5 in the grant match calculations. **Kevin Rose** suggested

that this whole matter be discussed at the proposed one-day planning meeting and be included in other related equipment funding issues. **Randy** further commented that we should handle this as we have done in the past, and separate out maintenance costs beyond year 3 to be covered 100% by the Committee, and that we should go back and adjust the last four grant applications (Millard, Juab, Sanpete, & Tooele) accordingly.

5.6 PSAPs Survey & Results – Kevin Rose & Kraig updated the Committee on the results of the PSAP survey. **Kraig** explained that this all started last November in an effort to determine how Utah PSAPs were doing when it came to telecommunicator certifications which included the POST certification as well as EMD certifications. The survey consisted of a dozen or so questions, and **Kevin Rose** presented an overview of the results. The survey pointed out a lot of our strengths and weaknesses as far as certification and training goes. It included asking questions about if they use EMD, if they were initially certified and were keeping up their certifications with their vendor or the state, which EMD system did they use, whether or not they were a BEMS designated EMD dispatch center, if their telecommunicators were POST certified, were they using EFD or EPD protocol systems, and any challenges they faced with regard to using protocol systems and if there was anything we could do from the state perspective to help out in this regard. It was determined that there are two PSAPs that are not doing EMD, and there are six that are not participating in the POST certification. One of the non-EMD PSAPs did express a desire to start doing EMD and that it comes down to cost and personnel issues. Concerning POST, these PSAPs do not have the staffing or funds to support the POST certification training. All PSAPs use the Priority Dispatch system with some PSAPs doing a great job of keeping up their certifications. Some PSAPs initially certify their telecommunicators with PDC, but only continue re-certifications with the Bureau. There are some that do not do any initial certifications with PDC and may do only the state certification. One thing that surfaced is that there is confusion with some PSAPs as to what is necessary for EMD certifications. Some of the confusion comes from the BEMS who have not really kept things up as far as the dispatch side goes. The consensus was that the curriculum being used at the state level is not really appropriate or up-to-date. Priority Dispatch has strict terms of licensing of the EMD protocols that require users to be certified and maintain their certifications through the IAED. The BEMS certification alone is not sufficient. One of the suggestions that came up was to ask PDC to send out a friendly reminder style of letter to the Utah PSAPs that would outline the terms and conditions of the license. We would also like to sit down with the BEMS and help them revamp their EMD Rules as well as review their curriculum. We would like to suggest that PSAPs go to their vendors for certification and re-certification, and redoing the reciprocity process with the Bureau. In addition, it was felt that the EMD Designation process also needs work. **Kraig** raised the issue of funding and suggested that the Committee consider assisting with the delivery of regional EMD courses where needed. It appears that the affected counties are all in the 4-6 classification, and that those PSAPs, according to our statute, are eligible for funding in this regard. **Tina** reminded the Committee that this is what we are all about, and that the purpose of our Committee is to working with PSAPs to be their advocate and help them enhance their delivery of service. **Steve Proctor** commented that he believes that this is a big issue and that it should be brought before the Communications Task Force including the related issues concerning how the technology operates, the various features of the radio systems, etc. It was generally agreed that this matter needs to have a high priority with not only the Committee, but with all our stakeholders.

5.7 St. George Vesta 4.0 Rev 2 Transition & Status – Justin briefed the Committee of the status of his CPE upgrade. It was a smooth transition with relatively few hiccups along the way. One issue that did come up was an IRR feature that appears to have been resolved as of this morning. The problem was with the playback audio wherein certain short portions of the audio were being clipped out of the playback stream. He went on to report that their previous request for network funding (\$12K) will not be needed.

5.8 National 9-1-1 Webinar - March 27: Current State of the Nation's 9-1-1 - (<http://911.gov/webinars.html>) - **Justin** outlined this upcoming webinar that may be of interest and indicated that it is free.

5.9 White House Petition to Include 9-1-1 Dispatchers as Emergency Personnel - (<https://petitions.whitehouse.gov/petition/include-911-dispatchers-emergency-personnel-because-dispatchers-are-heart-and-soul-our-countrys/km3NvDtZ>) - **Justin** reported that there is a petition circulating that is intended to formally establish telecommunicators as emergency personnel and suggested that our Committee members have a look at it.

6. Sub-Committee Status Update –

6.1 ECaTS Sub-Committee – See previous ECaTS presentation (5.4 above).

6.2 Grant Review Committee – See previous related discussions (3.1 & 5.5 above).

6.3 NG9-1-1 Sub-Committee – Kevin Rose reported that we still have several things to address. We have addressed technology and network, but the one thing that we need to do is address NG9-1-1 related GIS issues. It was felt that now is a good time to look at doing a MSAG transition to a GIS format, and there needs to be a coordination from both the state as well as the local perspective. Currently there is no requirement to keep our AGRC GIS data set up-to-date and this is not good enough for 9-1-1. We need the right information at the right time. One of the recommendations would be to work with AGRC to set up a working group consisting of GIS representatives from across the state, present this issue to them, and ask for suggestions as to how we can best address this matter. In addition, we would need to work with Intrado to get an action plan in place to move forward with the transition, and then come back to the Committee with a recommendation in this regard. It was also acknowledged that this matter is new to Intrado and our timing is good to move ahead with a plan. **Kevin** will continue to work with **Bert Granberg** to come up with a plan.

ESInet Bandwidth Increase – Kevin raised the issue of the provisioning of greater bandwidth for the Greater Wasatch Multi-node network. The bandwidth needs to be increased from 12Mb to 45Mb to accommodate additional PSAPs and future functional elements of the ESInet. This will change the cost of the network from about \$9K per month to \$11K per month. Also, with the implementation of our new legislation, the Committee will become the Customer of Record for the ESInet and will be responsible to manage its operation.

6.3.1 Motion - It was moved by **Kevin Rose**, seconded by **Tina Scarlet**, *“that the Committee approve a \$2,108 increase to the funding of the Greater Wasatch Multi-node network to increase the bandwidth of the ESInet from 12Mb to 45 Mb, and that Steve Proctor begin working with CenturyLink to start the transition of Customer of Record for the ESInet from VECC to the 9-1-1 Committee effective July 1, 2014.”* The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

Selective Router Connection Costs Increase - In addition, this will mean our connections charges from the existing two Selective Routers to the ESInet will increase. Currently there are 6-T1's, but there will now be the need to add an additional 3-T1's in Salt Lake, and 3 new T1's in Cedar City. Currently we are paying \$2.2 K per month, and this will increase to \$10K per month. Once everyone transitions away from the selective routers, these costs will go away.

PSAPs Outside CenturyLink Footprint - Another matter raised is the fact that there will be six PSAPs outside of the CenturyLink footprint (Emery, Garfield, Grand, Kane, Millard, Rich) that will experience an increase in connectivity charges when they transition to the ESInet, although all other PSAPs will experience a decrease. The grand total increase for these six PSAPs is about \$13K per month. The discussion then turned to possibly looking at a better way to handle these PSAPs, perhaps through a bid or RFP process as these increases could become a burden to the 9-1-1 Committee.

Switching PSAPs to the ESInet - Kevin went on to outline the costs of switching PSAPs over to the ESInet including a one-time charge for each PSAP. There are two ways to do this – the optimum method would be to purchase the CPE ESInet module that would connect IP-to-IP directly to the A9-1-1 network. The other option is to put in gateways that convert the incoming IP trunks to CAMA trunks. The question before the Committee is, do we want to pay these costs? It was felt that the latter approach would be not cost effective in the long run, as the gateways would eventually be removed from service.

6.4 Legislation Sub-Committee Update – Tina Scarlet reported that HB155 has been passed by the Legislature as is waiting to be signed off by the Governor. There are two dates – the date that the Bill is official after signature is May 13, 2014 and the actual day it takes effect (implementation date) is July 01, 2014. There was some discussion on how the changes will affect our Committee, and it was decided that these matters should be further discussed at the proposed one-day strategic review meeting.

6.5 Standards Sub-Committee – See previous related discussions (5.6 above).

6.6 Communications Task Force – The next Communications Task Force meeting is scheduled for April 2014.

6.7 Strategic Plan Development – Eric reported that he has expanded the one-page draft into a SCIP – style document that articulates the goals of the Committee. He requested that the Committee members review this iteration and submit additional criteria and detail to further expand the plan. Discussions and issues discussed in today's meeting will be added where appropriate for consideration by the Committee at the proposed planning meeting.

7. POST Certification – Deb reported to the Committee that they have received the support of this Utah APCO, Utah NENA and POST for this initiative. The Sub-Committee will be doing a presentation to emphasize the need for POST certification, to the Utah Chiefs of Police conference on March 27, in Hurricane. It is expected that many Sheriff's will also be in attendance. We have about 15 minutes first thing on their agenda, and a member of the Sub-Committee will be doing the presentation. After the presentation there will be a round table to answer questions and answer any concerns that may come up. There are also plans to present to the Fire Chiefs some time down the road. She also reported that they recently complete a POST certification course in Millard County, offering it on five consecutive

Mondays (rather than 5 days in a row), and it was very successful. There were no reported issues with delivering the course over a five week period. **Paul Wolden** from Beaver County commented that he had attended the Millard course and found it very beneficial. He would like to see it offered in his region and has discussed this already with **Deb**. Online training options are also being considered. Further discussions centered on possible criteria for PSAP eligibility for funding based on compliance to certifications. This is an area where the Committee has a responsibility to set standards that raise the standard of care throughout Utah. **Deb** requested that the Committee members speak to their various Chiefs to garner support for this initiative.

8. **Strategic Plan** – **Eric** made reference to the updated Strategic Plan as
9. **Round Table** – **Tina** raised the issue of the funding of the AGRC from the restricted fund. It was proposed that we sit down with **Bert** and set some mutual goals and expectations and be better organized about how the funds are used. It was acknowledged that the support from AGRC has been excellent and we are now at the point where we can define and pursue our goal, as GIS is critical to the success of NG9-1-1.
10. **Strategic Planning Meeting** – It was decided that we have a two-day retreat-style planning session May 13-14, tentatively to be held at the Cal Rampton complex.
11. **Survey from Steve Proctor** – **Steve** distributed a short survey to the Committee members and meeting attendees, and asked that they anonymously fill them out and return completed surveys to **Eric** for collation and return to **Steve**. The survey asks three questions: Name the five top things that the UCA needs to do now; Name five things you need to do to make your area more productive; and Name the top five things that the UCA needs to be ready for in five years. **Steve** to email **Eric** with an electronic copy for completion.
12. **Motion to Adjourn** – A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by **Kevin Rose**, seconded by **Tina Scarlet**. The motion passed with a unanimous vote. Carried.

Next Scheduled Regular Meeting: Thursday, April 17, 2014 @ 1300 MDT, UHP Large Meeting Room, Main Floor, 4501 South 2700 West, Taylorsville, UT 84129

WEBEX LINK: <https://stateofutah-2.conferencinghub.com/CenturylinkWeb/EricParry>

After connection choose: "ENTER AS GUEST"

Telephone Bridge: 877.820.7831; PIN: 417860#