



August 19<sup>th</sup>, 2016

Utah Communications Authority  
5360 South Ridge Village Drive  
West Valley City, UT 84118-4100  
Attn: Jake Hunt, Interim Executive Director

Dear Sir:

**RE: VECC/SLC911 CAD GRANT APPLICATION**

The purpose of the letter is to provide you with a recommendation concerning the referenced grant application.

The 911 Division appreciates the input provided by both the grant applicants as well as the 911 Advisory Committee. Their efforts have contributed to a recommendation by the 911 Division which, in our opinion, meets the terms, conditions, and intent of Rule 174.

**1. Recommendation of the 911 Division**

- a. As per **63H-7a-302(1)(a)(i)(C)**, the 911 Division recommends to the Executive Director that the grant application is favorably recommended, with ineligible exceptions so noted in paragraph four of this document, and be forwarded to the Utah Communications Authority Executive Board for their consideration.

**2. Background**

- a. On July 7<sup>th</sup>, 2016, the 911 Division received a joint grant application from the Salt Lake Valley Emergency Communications Center (VECC) and Salt Lake City 911 concerning the Salt Lake County Integrated Public Safety CAD Technology Initiative.
- b. On July 12<sup>th</sup>, 2016, an initial grant review meeting was held at Layton PD, with Eric Parry, Shawn Messinger, Karl Kuehn, and Kevin Rose. A subsequent meeting was held with John Inch Morgan to discuss certain elements of the grant application.
- c. On July 19<sup>th</sup>, 2016, the grant application was presented to the 911 Advisory Committee at their regular monthly meeting. The grant application was reviewed and it was determined that the grant application would require further discussion by the Committee. It was requested that the Committee consider holding a meeting in August to consider the grant application, and it was further decided to hold an interim conference call to address questions concerning the eligibility of certain items prior to the August meeting. The August meeting was scheduled for August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2016.
- d. It was further decided that an interim meeting be scheduled on August 2<sup>nd</sup> to allow 911 Advisory Committee members to pose questions and concerns to the submitters of the grant application.
- e. The meeting scheduled for August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2016 was held, and there was further discussion on the grant application. A motion for the approval of the grant application was made, but the motion did not receive a "second", and therefore failed.
- f. In order to satisfy the conditions of Rule 174-1-7(1), it was then decided that the 911 Advisory Committee meet again to reconsider the grant application and to make a recommendation in this regard. A meeting was held August 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016. The 911 Advisory Committee determined,

through motions, that the grant application be approved with certain exceptions as detailed in the motion (Refer to Attachment "A" – Voting Tally Sheet 08-15-16).

- g. Project Management Apportionment Considerations - Calculations concerning Project Management Apportionment have been completed by the 911 Division and are included here for consideration by the Executive Director (Refer to Attachment "B" – Project Management Apportionment Considerations).
- h. As per **Rule 174-1-7(1)**, the recommendation to award a grant has been made by a majority vote of the committee (Refer to Attachment "C" – Rule 174-1 Utah 911 Advisory Committee).
- i. The recommendation to award the grant, with the exceptions as noted in the motion, was based on **Rule 174-1-8 – Attachment A – Eligible CAD Functional Elements** (Refer to Attachment "C" – Rule 174-1 Utah 911 Advisory Committee).
- j. With regard to the motion made by the 911 Advisory Committee concerning the CAD grant application, the 911 Division accepted the motion as voted upon by the 911 Advisory Committee and reviewed the grant application considering this recommendation.
- k. During our review of the grant the 911 Division discovered another ineligible item that was not included in the motion from the Advisory Committee. It concerns a pin-mapping application identified on page twenty-one of the Grant Application as "I/Incident Analyst CC w/GeoMedia Advantage CC (SBND6106L)" on page twenty-one of the grant application.
- l. The 911 Division recommends the approval of all training associated with this grant application as well as an apportioned amount of the Project Management cost as noted in Attachment "B" – Project Management Apportionment Considerations.

### 3. Summary of Ineligible Items as Recommended by the 911 Advisory Committee:

- a. PAWN interface - page twelve of the application;
- b. PALANTIR interface - page thirteen of the application;
- c. POLARIS interface - page thirteen of the application;
- d. ACELA interface - page twelve of the application;
- e. FIREHOUSE interface - page twelve of the application;
- f. Project Management Services – page twenty-one of the application - apportioned for CAD only; and
- g. Officer Training as determined by the 911 Division.

### 4. Summary of Items as Recommended by the 911 Division:

- a. PAWN interface - **Ineligible**;
- b. PALANTIR interface - **Ineligible**;
- c. POLARIS interface - **Ineligible**;
- d. ACELA interface - **Ineligible**;
- e. FIREHOUSE interface - **Ineligible**;
- f. I/Incident Analyst pin mapping functional element – **Ineligible**;
- g. Project Management Costs - **Eligible** as apportioned in Attachment "B" – Project Management Apportionment Considerations;
- h. All training - **Eligible**.

Sincerely,



(Eric N. Parry)  
Program Manager,  
911 Division  
Utah Communications Authority

**ATTACHMENT A**  
**Voting Tally Sheet - August 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016**



# 911 Advisory Committee Voting Tally Sheet

August 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016



**Motion #1**

**Made by: KARL KUEHN, Seconded by: MELANIE CRITTENDEN**

**That: THE 911 ADVISORY BOARD RECOMMENDS THE APPROVAL OF THE SALT LAKE COUNTY CAD GRANT IN ITS ENTIRETY AS SUBMITTED.**

Member	Representing	Present		Vote		
		In Person	Bridge	Yea	Nay	Abst
Von Beals	Technical Provider		X			X
Melanie Crittenden	Mountainland Association	X			X	
Laonna Davis	Uintah Basin Association		X		X	
Scott Freitag	Salt Lake County	N/A	N/A			
Justin Grenier	Five County Association		X		X	
Barry Horsley	South East Association		X		X	
Karl Kuehn	Davis County Layton PD	X			X	
Peter Kuhlmann	Washington County		X		X	
Doug McCleve	Urban DPS		X		X	
Deborah Mecham	Utah County		X		X	
Regina Nelson	Wasatch Front Regional Council		X		X	
Shelley Peterson	Bear River Association		X		X	
Kathy Quarnberg	Six County Association of Governments		X		X	
Kevin Rose	Weber County	X			X	
Jack Walkenhorst	Technical Provider		X		X	
Dave White	Technical Provider		X		X	

**Motion #2**

**Made by: MELANIE CRITTENDEN, Seconded by: KEVIN ROSE**

**That: THE 911 ADVISORY BOARD RECOMMENDS THE APPROVAL OF THE SALT LAKE COUNTY CAD GRANT WITH THE FOLLOWING EXCEPTIONS – THE PAWN INTERFACE LOCATED ON PAGE TWELVE OF THE CAD APPLICATION THE PALANTIR INTERFACE LOCATED ON PAGE THIRTEEN OF THE CAD APPLICATION, THE POLARIS INTERFACE LOCATED ON PAGE THIRTEEN OF THE CAD APPLICATION, THE ACELA INTERFACE AS LOCATED ON PAGE TWELVE OF THE CAD APPLICATION, FIREHOUSE AS LOCATED ON PAGE TWELVE OF THE CAD APPLICATION, PROJECT MANAGEMENT SERVICES AS LOCATED ON PAGE TWENTY-ONE OF THE CAD APPLICATION; APPORTIONMENT FOR CAD; APPORTIONED OFFICER TRAINING AS DETERMINED BY THE 911 DIVISION; INCLUDE ALL DISPATCHER TRAINING.**

Member	Representing	Present		Vote		
		In Person	Bridge	Yea	Nay	Abst
Von Beals	Technical Provider		X			X
Melanie Crittenden	Mountainland Association	X		X		
Laonna Davis	Uintah Basin Association		X	X		

Scott Freitag	Salt Lake County	N/A	N/A			
Justin Grenier	Five County Association		X	X		
Barry Horsley	South East Association		X	X		
Karl Kuehn	Davis County Layton PD	X		X		
Peter Kuhlmann	Washington County		X		X	
Doug McCleve	Urban DPS		X	X		
Deborah Mecham	Utah County		X	X		
Regina Nelson	Wasatch Front Regional Council		X	X		
Shelley Peterson	Bear River Association		X	X		
Kathy Quarnberg	Six County Association of Governments		X	X		
Kevin Rose	Weber County	X		X		
Jack Walkenhorst	Technical Provider		X	X		
Dave White	Technical Provider		X	X		

**Motion #3**

**Made by: BARRY HORSLEY, Seconded by: DAVE WHITE**

**That: ADJOURN**

Member	Representing	Present		Vote		
		In Person	Bridge	Yea	Nay	Abst
Von Beals	Technical Provider		X	X		
Melanie Crittenden	Mountainland Association	X		X		
Laonna Davis	Uintah Basin Association		X	X		
Scott Freitag	Salt Lake County	N/A	N/A			
Justin Grenier	Five County Association		X	X		
Barry Horsley	South East Association		X	X		
Karl Kuehn	Davis County Layton PD	X		X		
Peter Kuhlmann	Washington County		X	X		
Doug McCleve	Urban DPS		X	X		
Deborah Mecham	Utah County		X	X		
Regina Nelson	Wasatch Front Regional Council		X	X		
Shelley Peterson	Bear River Association		X	X		
Kathy Quarnberg	Six County Association of Governments		X	X		
Kevin Rose	Weber County	X		X		
Jack Walkenhorst	Technical Provider		X	X		
Dave White	Technical Provider		X	X		

**Motion #4**

**Made by: \_\_\_\_\_, Seconded by: \_\_\_\_\_**

**That:**

Member	Representing	Present		Vote		
		In Person	Bridge	Yea	Nay	Abst
Von Beals	Technical Provider					
Melanie Crittenden	Mountainland Association					

## **ATTACHMENT B**

### **Project Management Apportionment Considerations**

## Attachment “B” – Project Management Apportionment Considerations

### PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPORTIONMENT CONSIDERATIONS

The 911 Division sees three primary ways to apportion the costs associated with the Project Management of this CAD project that would be in compliance with the CAD rules as outlined in Rule 174.

**1.0 The first apportionment model** is to attribute the eligible apportioned amounts of each managed service based on their percentage of the total service costs of \$1,266,533. The percentage of the service cost total is representative of the amount of work/responsibility required of the Project Manager and thus a higher reimbursable amount is justified. The 911 Division recommends this apportionment model as it more equitably covers eligible costs under Rule 174. This model would allow for a reimbursement amount of \$355,706.78. (See table below.)

Project Management				
Project Management cost:		\$574,896.00		
Services Managed	Service Cost	% of total service cost	Allowed under current rule	Apportioned amount of Project Management cost
CAD Implementation Srv.	\$335,728.00	26.51%	Y	<b>\$152,391.36</b>
RMS Implementation Srv.	\$350,870.00	27.70%	N	\$159,264.51
Bi-Direct Imp. Srv. - CAD	\$7,955.00	0.63%	Y	<b>\$3,610.88</b>
Mapping Imp. Srv.	\$30,098.00	2.38%	Y	<b>\$13,661.88</b>
Consulting Services	\$18,855.00	1.49%	Y	<b>\$8,558.53</b>
Bi-Direct Imp. Srv. - RMS	\$7,955.00	0.63%	N	\$3,610.88
CAD Interface Imp.	\$368,601.00	29.10%	Y	<b>\$167,312.85</b>
CAD Data Conversion Study	\$22,408.00	1.77%	Y	<b>\$10,171.29</b>
RMS Data Conversion Study	\$26,386.00	2.08%	N	\$11,976.95
Mobile Responder Imp. Srv.	\$20,033.00	1.58%	N	\$9,093.24
FBR Installation / Testing	\$77,644.00	6.13%	N	\$35,243.63
\$1,266,533.00		100.00%		\$574,896.00
			Apportioned total:	<b>\$355,706.78</b>
			Difference from the requested grant amount:	\$219,189.22
Recommended allowable amounts apportioned by a percentage of the Project management cost.				

## Attachment "B" – Project Management Apportionment Considerations

**2.0 The second apportionment** model is to divide the total Project Management cost of \$574,896 equally across the eleven managed services. This would attribute a per service cost of \$52,263.27. There are six eligible implementation services which would allow for a reimbursement amount of \$313,580. The 911 Division does not recommend this apportionment model as it does not accurately reflect eligible costs as they relate to the services provided. (See table below.)

Project Management			
Project Management cost total:		\$574,896.00	
Services Managed	Per service cost	Allowed under current rule	Apportioned amount of Project Management cost
CAD Implementation Srv.	\$52,263.27	Y	\$52,263.27
RMS Implementation Srv.	\$52,263.27	N	n/a
Bi-Direct Imp. Srv. - CAD	\$52,263.27	Y	\$52,263.27
Mapping Imp. Srv.	\$52,263.27	Y	\$52,263.27
Consulting Services	\$52,263.27	Y	\$52,263.27
Bi-Direct Imp. Srv. - RMS	\$52,263.27	N	n/a
CAD Interface Imp.	\$52,263.27	Y	\$52,263.27
CAD Data Conversion Study	\$52,263.27	Y	\$52,263.27
RMS Data Conversion Study	\$52,263.27	N	n/a
Mobile Responder Imp. Srv.	\$52,263.27	N	n/a
FBR Installation / Testing	\$52,263.27	N	n/a
\$574,896			\$313,580
		Apportioned total:	<b>\$313,580</b>
		Difference from the requested grant amount:	\$261,316.38
Recommended allowable amounts apportioned by equal division of the Project Management cost.			

## **Attachment “B” – Project Management Apportionment Considerations**

**3.0 The third apportionment model** is a straight 50% apportionment of the total Project Management cost of \$574,896 which would allow for a reimbursement amount of \$287,448. The 911 Division does not recommend this apportionment model as it does not accurately reflect eligible reimbursable costs.

**ATTACHMENT C**

**Rule 174-1**

**Utah 911 Advisory Committee**

**R174. Communications Authority Board (Utah), Administration.**

**R174-1. Utah 911 Advisory Committee.**

**R174-1-1. Purpose.**

The purpose of this rule is to outline the operation of the committee and procedures whereby the committee shall award funds to Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) and Dispatch Centers throughout the State of Utah for the establishment and maintenance of a statewide unified E-911 emergency system, and to establish the framework to provide grants from the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) Restricted Account.

**R174-1-2. Authority.**

This rule is authorized by Section 63H-7a-302(5), and Section 63H-7a-204(11).

**R174-1-3. Definitions.**

- (1) Definitions used in the rule are defined in Section 69-2-2.
- (2) In addition:
  - (a) "applicant" means a Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) submitting a grant application;
  - (b) "Authority" means the Utah Communications Authority established in Section 67H-7a-201;
  - (c) "Board" means the Utah Communications Authority Board established in Section 67H-7a-203;
  - (d) "CAD2CAD Interface" means a component to share CAD data between disparate CAD systems on a statewide or regional basis;
  - (e) "committee" means the 911 Advisory Committee established in Section 63H-7a-307.
  - (f) "grant" means an appropriation of funds from the restricted Unified Statewide Emergency Service Account created in Section 63H-7a-304 or the Computer Aided Dispatch Restricted Account created in Section 63H-7a-303;
  - (g) "PSAP" means a public safety answering point as defined in Section 69-2-2(7).
  - (h) "Program" means the defined activities funded by the Unified Statewide 911 Emergency Service Account in Section 63H-7a-304(2) or the defined activities funded by the Computer Aided Dispatch Restricted Account in Section 63H-7a-303(2); and
  - (i) "State" means the state of Utah.

**R174-1-4. Operation of the Committee.**

- (1)(a) A chairperson shall be elected as provided in Section 63H-7a-307(3)(a) at the first meeting of each calendar year.
- (b) The committee shall also elect a vice-chairperson at that time to assist the chairperson with administrative duties.
- (2)(a) The committee shall meet monthly unless circumstances otherwise dictate.
- (b) Members of the committee may participate in the meeting by electronic means such as internet connection or a phone bridge.

**R174-1-5. Grant Process.**

- (1)(a) A PSAP seeking a grant from the Unified Statewide 911 Emergency Service Account or the Computer Aided Dispatch Restricted Account shall make application to the committee using the Utah 911 Committee Grant Application forms.
- (b) The application must include:
  - (i) a description of all equipment or services that may be purchased with the grant;
  - (ii) a list of vendors and contractors who may be used to provide equipment or services;
  - (iii) evidence that the PSAP has used a competitive process when procuring equipment or services;
  - (iv) a complete narrative justifying the need for the grant;
  - (v) if applying for a grant from the Computer Aided Dispatch Restricted Account, a description of

how the project fulfills the purposes outlined in 63H-7a-303;

(vi) a description of any other funding sources that may be used to pay for the acquisition of equipment, construction of facilities or services;

(vii) additional information as requested by the committee; and

(viii) the signature of the authorized agency official.

(2)(a) Any PSAP intending to apply for a grant shall submit a notice of intent to Agency staff prior to the beginning of the calendar year for consideration in the next budget cycle.

(b) PSAPs that submit a notice of intent may receive priority over PSAPs that do not submit a notice of intent prior to making a grant application.

(3)(a) The committee requires a 30-day review period to consider grant application submissions.

(i) In cases of extenuating circumstances, a PSAP may request that the committee shorten the 30-day review period and consider the application at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

(ii) The request for a shorter review period shall be made in writing, and explain the extenuating circumstances that justify the expedited consideration of the grant application.

(b) Following the 30-day review period, a representative from the PSAP making the application shall be present, in person or by electronic means, at the next regularly scheduled committee meeting to present the grant application.

(4) PSAPs in the third through sixth class counties may apply for grants that enhance 911 emergency services. The committee shall consider these applications on a case-by-case basis.

#### **R174-1-6. Criteria for Determining Grant Eligibility.**

(1) In order to be eligible for a grant, a PSAP shall comply with all of the requirements found in Title 63H Chapter 7a Part 3; Title 53, Chapter 10, Part 6; and Title 69, Chapter 2.

(2)(a) When determining which PSAPS may receive grants, the committee shall give priority to 911 projects that:

(b) enhance public safety by providing a statewide, unified 911 emergency system;

(c) include a maintenance package that extends the life of the 911 system;

(d) increase the value of the 911 system by ensuring compatibility with emerging technology;

(e) replace equipment which is no longer reliable or functioning; and

(f) include a local share of funding according to the following formula:

(i) PSAPs in a county of the first class that pay at least 30% of the total cost of the project;

(ii) PSAPs in a county of the second class that pay at least 20% of the total cost of the project; and

(iii) PSAPs in a county of the third through sixth class that pay up to 10% of the total cost of the project.

(3) Eligible CAD functional elements - Refer to Section R174-1-8, Attachment A -- Eligible CAD Functional Elements.

(a) In the case of an award from the Computer Aided Dispatch Restricted Account, PSAPs shall pay a grant match of 20% regardless of class.

(4) If a grant application includes equipment that utilizes geographical information systems or geo-positioning systems, the PSAP shall consult with the State Automated Geographic Reference Center (AGRC) in the Division of Integrated Technology of the Department of Technology Services.

(5) When economically feasible and advantageous to the individual PSAPs, the committee may negotiate with vendors on behalf of the PSAPs as a group.

(6) Where applicable, PSAPs shall provide evidence from the Bureau of Emergency Medical Services (BEMS) that they are a Designated Emergency Medical Dispatch Center.

#### **R174-1-7. Awarding a Grant.**

(1) The recommendation to award a grant shall be made by a majority vote of the committee.

(2) The committee may only recommend grants for the purchase of equipment or the delivery of services in an amount which is equal to, or less than, the amount that would be paid to a State vendor or

contractor.

(3)(a) All grant awards shall be memorialized in a contract between the Authority and the grant recipient.

(b) Each contract shall include the following conditions:

(i) the state or local entity shall agree to participate in the statewide 911 data management system sponsored by the committee;

(ii) the grant may be used only for the purposes specified in the application; and

(iii) the grant shall be de-obligated if the state or local entity breaches the terms of the contract.

(4)(a) Unspent grant funds shall be automatically de-obligated within one year from the approval of the original grant.

(b) A PSAP may request a time extension to spend grant funds in extenuating circumstances.

(i) The request shall be made in writing and explain the extenuating circumstances that justify additional time to spend the grant funds.

(ii) The committee shall recommend the approval or denial of the request by a majority vote.

**R174-1-8. Attachment A -- Eligible CAD Functional Elements.**

(i) Hardware: Servers and other hardware are eligible for full reimbursement when the equipment is required to support the core CAD functionality. New CAD required hardware that also supports associated functions such as Records Management Systems is eligible for reimbursement at the apportioned rate of documented use.

(ii) Software: CAD software fulfilling the core missions of call entry, address verification, unit recommendation, dispatching and tracking of units, and mapping. Eligible items include:

(a) Core System to support CAD (apportioned to actual cost of modules to support CAD)

(b) CAD application

(c) Geo-base address verification

(d) Mapping

(e) Automatic Vehicle Location

(f) Unit Recommendations or Response Plans

(g) E911 copy-over

(h) Interfaces to closely related 3rd party applications (medical/fire/police card system, fire department paging system, or UCJIS)

(i) Premise (apportioned at 50%)

(iii) Professional Services: (installation, configuration, etc.) apportioned for eligible items.

(iv) Maintenance: Ineligible other than CAD2CAD interface.

(v) Database Merging/Conversion: Eligible for CAD data merging/conversion, apportioned at 50% if RMS data is also included in the merge/conversion.

(vi) Ineligible software items include, but are not limited to:

(a) RMS related modules

(b) System dashboards or monitoring

(c) Aerial photography

(d) Equipment tracking

(e) Personnel tracking

(f) Imaging

(g) Pin-mapping or statistics packages

**KEY: Utah Communications Authority, Utah 911 Advisory Committee**

**Date of Enactment or Last Substantive Amendment: September 29, 2015**

**Notice of Continuation: May 2, 2016**

**Authorizing, and Implemented or Interpreted Law: 63H-7a-303; 63H-7a-304**