

In FY13, 64% of Virginia PSAPs applied, and in FY14, 58%.

Dorothy stated that there were barriers identified through the survey to WEP grant application and/or usage. Those barriers are those things which prevent a PSAP from either participating in the WEP grant or utilizing the full award. The majority of the barriers included insufficient personnel to cover shifts, PSAP unawareness of the program, locality budget constraints that did not cover the expenses not covered by the grant, locality travel and training restrictions, and PSAP management turnover that affected application for knowledge of the grant. For FY12 specifically, the overwhelming barrier was insufficient personnel to cover shifts to attend training opportunities.

Dorothy advised the Committee that staff observations from the survey was "to do no harm" to the PSAP community or to VITA staff who manage the process. She stated that there was overwhelming PSAP sentiment for continuation of the WEP grant, with 28% of respondents wanting no changes. In addition, ISP staff do not want to negatively impact those PSAPs that are already full participating in the WEP. Geographical representation of the PSAPs that have never applied for a WEP grant identified regional clusters of non-participation. This poses an opportunity for outreach by the VITA Regional Coordinators (RCs) to facilitate education to the PSAP community that are unaware of the WEP and eliminate misconceptions about the WEP with other PSAPs.

Dorothy discussed the primary observation of the survey. The most prominent reason for lack of participation or utilization is insufficient personnel to cover shifts. Thirty percent of the respondents suggested regional and/or sub-regional training as an enhancement to the WEP. This may be effective in overcoming personnel barriers and provide an opportunity to partner with VA APCO and VA NENA. In addition, shorter term training (such as a single day or half day class) may assist with some of the scheduling problems. There were a few respondents that suggested more funding as a strategy to increase utilization. Finally, several respondents suggested expanding the WEP to include out of state training events and online training.

Staff recommendations based on the WEP survey was:

1. Continue to offer WEP awards up to \$2,000, but educate PSAPs that it is permissible to request less, based on need. Only reimbursable items are registration and lodging;
2. Continue to offer PSAPs the ability to utilize the WEP for 9-1-1 and GIS specific group education/training opportunities;
Inform PSAPs that they have the option to utilize a regional approach with that online training is included.

3. As part of the application process, PSAPs should identify the training objectives for which they are seeking funding;
Use objectives as measurement criteria to evaluate the success of the WEP. Objectives will be useful to the ISP Regional Coordinators in identifying opportunities when the ISP may be able to provide training.
4. Avoid making the WEP so broad that the target audience (9-1-1 and GIS support to the PSAP) is not the beneficiary of the program or that it becomes cumbersome for the ISP to manage; and
Identifying training objectives in applications will be an effective preventative measure.
5. Allow for contiguous out of state 9-1-1 and GIS/9-1-1 specific education/training through a waiver process on the WEP application.

Richard Troshak (from public), President, VA APCO, thanked Dorothy for recently meeting with him and Erin Elrod, President, VA NENA, to discuss the results of the WEP survey. He shared some statistics on attendance, education tracks, and benefits from the conferences. Richard complimented VITA's role in the conferences' success. He shared strong support of the WEP and its impact on conference attendance, expressing concern that 30 PSAPs indicated during the survey that they were unaware of the program. He requested that the WEP be kept as a high priority and emphasized the need for additional education to the PSAP community of the program.

Steve Marzolf, ISP Director, asked the Committee to determine what it is trying to accomplish with the Wireless Education Program - - is the focus on dispatchers, PSAP managers, etc. He said the Committee may want to consider leaving the WEP as it is and let the PSAP managers decide how they want to use the available funds. He also cautioned the Committee that changes to the WEP need to be done incrementally to avoid harm to it, the PSAPs, or VITA staff who manage the process. Steve further mentioned that conference expenses have changed over the years. Meals used to be included at conference in many instances. The number of meals have been reduced. This has impacted over all expense for PSAPs when considering training. This may be a consideration with regard to how the WEP is currently structured.

Allan Weese said he did not see how the Committee could really address some of the barriers identified during the survey such as shift coverage. He said PSAP unawareness of the program needs to be addressed through regional outreach efforts by the Regional Coordinators and was not a Committee issue. In addition, he felt additional training by the Chapter associations would be difficult due to current time and effort devoted during the year to the conferences.

Mike Goetz said he recalled that Virginia-specific PSC information was valuable but felt the program purpose needed to be more generic and not so directed to associations. He agreed with Steve that the Committee need to review the purpose of the WEP. At present, it is too broad. Mike questioned if increased participation at the conferences

has been achieved since the scholarship program was replaced with the WEP. Dorothy said one of the reasons PSAPs may be looking at the WEP for out of state training opportunities or others such as vendor-specific training is that there has been no funding for training under the Enhancement program in recent years. Mike asked if staff can measure the success between the scholarship program and the WEP. Dorothy replied that the survey showed some fluctuation between the grant years with WEP application. She said as a result of the survey, the Regional Coordinators (RCs) will be conducting ongoing meetings and trainings with the PSAP community.

Jerry Smith stated he had concerns on the WEP's restriction with regard to vendor-provided training. He said conferences are great but there needs to be a mechanism to address PSAP specific situations that are not covered at conferences. WEP guidelines presently exclude this type of training opportunity. Jerry suggested a regional consideration be added to the WEP. Steve stated that a waiver process has been discussed among staff as a result of the survey. This would allow for grant application for training for those PSAPs that need to deviate from the normal training opportunities funded through the WEP. He said ease of application and completeness of information is the balance needed when requesting training that deviates from the norm. If a PSAP wants to request training funding through the WEP that is not consistent with normal training requests such as those received for conference attendance, a waiver request during the application process would be able to capture that funding need.

Vice-Chairman Diggs asked if would be easier to just have the WEP for conferences and have an option to elect to request funding for any other training through a waiver process. Steve said that is a question the Committee needs to consider during the Guidelines review process now.

Donna Brown said the WEP survey has been a great tool for the Committee's use. She said she has concern that the Committee not tell the PSAPs how to run their center. She was also in support of out of state training opportunities available through the WEP and recommended its expansion to include it. She said she liked the idea of a waiver process during the application period. She stated her hope is that PSAPs get as much training through the WEP as possible.

Vice-Chairman Diggs asked why the scholarship program was not effective. Dorothy shared the "administrative" side of managing the scholarship program from the associations' view and VITA. She said it was too cumbersome and more manageable for VITA to handle under the grant program. She said there would be inadequate financial controls with the scholarship program. The WEP meets a management and audit need for a controlled process. The WEP awards have to be budgeted ahead of time. Vice-Chairman Diggs suggested the RCs get with every PSAP to encourage them to apply for the WEP grant so that funds are at least requested. Dorothy said it goes back to the need to review the purpose of the program and further define the measurement process.

Lisa Nicholson asked that the Committee review the Wireless Education Program section of the Guidelines at this point of the meeting. She asked the Committee to address:

Is it the intent of the WEP to include all training types within the Commonwealth, or should the program be expanded to include out of state training/education opportunities?

Also, does the PGC want to consider adding "regional WEP" applications, which would be consistent with the other grant program types? However, a "regional" WEP application would preclude the participating localities from applying for an individual WEP grant.

Evaluation of the program needs to be more defined and measurable.

Each section of the WEP Program Brief was discussed with the following recommended changes as follows:

Program Brief

Donna recommended adding GIS and a waiver process to the language. Discussion was held regarding out of state training versus Commonwealth of Virginia specific training opportunities. Mike questioned if the Committee wanted to broaden the purpose. Lisa reminded the Committee that the original intent was to focus on training as many public safety communications personnel as possible using Commonwealth of Virginia training resources such as the state professional associations. However, since the WEP's implementation, there has been requests that it be expanded to at least bordering states. Mike questioned if there is enough Virginia specific information provided at the conferences to warrant the WEP's limitation to the Commonwealth. Dorothy referred back to the WEP survey that showed 28% of respondents wanted the WEP to remain as it and 25% of respondents wanted the program to expand. She suggested that a waiver process be included in the WEP to address these additional training opportunities. Steve again reminded the Committee that they need to consider if they want the WEP to drive the training for the PSAP, or if they want the PSAP managers to have discretion of what type of training they feel their personnel need. After minimal additional discussion, the purpose was updated to include:

- GIS added
- New language - However, a waiver process is available for those PSAPs that have a demonstrated need to attend an out of state event and/or to obtain 9-1-1 and GIS specific group education/training from a vendor.

Funding Allocation

Lisa reviewed the funding allocation section pointing out that the current language excludes vendor provided training and needed to be updated to encourage PSAPs to apply up to the available amount of \$2000, not just request that specific amount. With minimal discussion, the funding allocation section was updated:

- New language – Each primary PSAP may receive up to \$2,000 per twelve month cycle to use towards allowable individual and/or regional 9-1-1 and GIS specific group education/training opportunities and provided by non-profit organizations.
- New language – PSAPs may request an amount less than \$2,000 based on local needs.

Program Concept

Allan said the Committee's original concern with the WEP was that a PSAP would not just use the funds for vendor provided training since the emphasis was on group training, which was available to all PSAPs in the Commonwealth. However, he understands that the program now needs to expand based on the recent survey.

Donna said a PSAP should not be prevented from bringing in a vendor for product specific training for a critical component of the 911 center. There are many reasons why PSAP cannot send personnel to a conference or out of the center and this would allow those PSAPs to meet their training needs without impacting those considerations. The Committee should consider per diem (meals reimbursement) since most of the conferences and other training opportunities do not provide meals or the number of meals provided are greatly reduced. Lisa cautioned that per diem reimbursement would have to fall under the Commonwealth of Virginia travel guidelines. Steve said that if the Committee wanted to recommend per diem reimbursement, it was certainly doable.

With minimal additional discussion, the program concept was updated:

- New language – The Board will provide funds to primary PSAPs for the purpose of obtaining 9-1-1 and GIS specific group education/training opportunities, which are primarily located within the Commonwealth and are provided by non-profit organizations.
- New language – The program will fund registration/training fees, per diem (meals only), and lodging only.
- New language – Primary emphasis is for PSAPs to attend in-state conferences sponsored by non-profit organizations.

Goals and Objectives

There was little discussion on this section. To ensure consistency through the WEP brief, the goals and objectives were updated:

- GIS added
- New Language – All primary PSAPs will take advantage of 9-1-1 and GIS specific group education/training opportunities, which are primarily located within the Commonwealth and provided by non-profit organizations.

Implementation

There was little discussion on this section as the WEP falls under the Commonwealth of Virginia travel guidelines. The implementation section was updated:

- GIS added
- New language – However, receipts are not required for meal reimbursement.

Outcomes/Evaluation

There were no changes made to this section.

The Committee convened for lunch. Dorothy and Lisa typed up the recommended changes to the WEP and presented them to the Committee for confirmation on intent and context. There was consensus for the recommended changes as they were reviewed.

Financial and Programmatic Reporting (FPR)

Lisa shared with the Committee that the Financial and Programmatic Reporting process, which concluded on March 31, 2013, was pretty smooth this year. There were three previous grant extensions that expire on June 30, 2013 (1 for FY09 and 2 for FY10). Neither are eligible for additional extension. Both are on track for completion by June 30. There is only one FY12 open grant award and it will be closed on June 30, 2013. There were no eligible grant extension requests. All open FY13 grant awards, 25 in total, submitted their FPRs and are on track. There were no flags with any of the FPRs that required Committee consideration or review. The Committee agreed to accept the FPRs as submitted based on staff review.

FY15 PSAP Grant Program Guidelines Review

Lisa reviewed several “parking lot” issues for the Committee’s discussion during the FY15 Guidelines review as follows:

- Should Consolidations be considered a separate program type?
Dorothy stated that a presentation on consolidations was made at the last Committee meeting and the need for feasibility studies with regard for consolidations. She said consolidations are necessary as a precursor for Next Generation (NG) 911. At the February, 2013 Board meeting, Sam Nixon, CIO, questioned why the consolidation projects were not funded since these types of projects were needed in promotion of and in preparation for NG. She maybe the issue of consolidations was one for the Legislative Subcommittee to address or consideration could be given by the Grant Committee for consolidations to be a separate program type. This would encourage consolidations among the primary PSAPs in Virginia.

Mike questioned why consolidations necessary for NG. Dorothy advised that it is about point of connection – it is less expensive to have a NG 911 system with less PSAPs from a network connectivity and equipment standpoint. Jerry said that current funding is not adequate for consolidations in Virginia. He asked Dorothy is there is an effort by the Board to restore funding from the Comp Board or Virginia State Police. Steve replied that the Board addresses funding through its annual report to the General Assembly and that anyone can comment on the budget to include this type of concern.

Donna stated that she would be amenable to a separate program type for consolidations. She did not receive funding for her PSAPs consolidation project during the last grant cycle, but wanted the Committee to consider the many benefits of a consolidation. She suggested that since the funding amount cannot be changed at this time, perhaps a breakdown of a consolidation into parts (component projects) may be a better route to take. However, she felt the component projects should still be considered as part of a consolidation. In response, Dorothy stated that the Committee may want to consider moving consolidations to the rank of 4 in the priorities list. Donna said it was important that consolidations funding requests be for real consolidations, and not just the idea. More planning and real intent needs to be demonstrated, which must be accomplished through a complete feasibility study.

Steve said that the new CPE projects are NG capable, which allows for consolidations more easily, but there remains a need to recognize consolidations are a priority. He said there is a problem with how critical priorities are currently ranked without real consideration to tiers. He suggested definitely considering moving consolidations higher in ranking, as well as NG. Steve stated there is a common belief that the PSAP grant monies are available to upgrade PSAPs, which is not true. The localities need to have a stake in funding for the PSAP

needs. Presently, the grant program keeps funding legacy equipment upgrades and never get to NG projects and consolidations. Mike questioned Steve as to the historical practice of PSAPs seeking funding to keep the PSAPs operational as a higher priority, and if so, did he see any change coming to this practice. Steve answered that there has been a consistent practice of funding operational projects versus projects such as NG. He said this led to some PSAPs feeling that it is the responsibility of the Board or the purpose of the grant program to continue to upgrade. Funds should not be just for sustainment, but for looking towards the future – NG.

Jerry reminded Steve that the PSAP Grant Guidelines identify the primary purpose of the grant program is to financially assist Virginia primary PSAPs with the purchase of equipment and services that support the continuity and enhancement of wireless E-911. He said he understands that consolidations is big on the Commonwealth's "picture board", but there is not enough funding to do both sustainment and the future such as NG projects.

Donna said she would never suggest monies be taken from a PSAP to fund an idea. However, if a PSAP is really planning for a consolidation as a part of current operations, then she feels funding is warranted. She acknowledged consolidations is not for every PSAP community or region. She insisted though that she would have been happy with a "little bit" for a portion of her consolidation, which is still making strides towards the goal of complete consolidation. She does not feel that monies should be given to PSAPs for a consolidation when they are not really ready to move forward. Dorothy agreed that may be the Committee should consider funding a piece of a consolidation with a real plan in place for actual consolidation in the works. Towards this suggestion, Jerry said that the Committee could consider an individual ranking with individual priorities for a consolidation project such as Consolidation – CPE, Consolidation – Mapping, etc. Dorothy added that the project could be a shared approach or a hosted one.

Lisa asked that with these considerations in mind, should consolidations be a separate program type. Allan stated that until sufficient funding is available, consolidations should remain where it is and addressed for consideration as a higher ranking. He said NG needs to be defined by the Board and legislature and the Committee should not try to come up with a grant program to address the unknown. Richard Troshak (from public) questioned the efficiency in having a separate grant program type. Donna reminded the Committee that presently, components of a consolidation can be requested as a standalone project, which can be addressed as a regional approach. She agreed with Allan that more direction was needed. Dorothy suggested that there be no separate program for consolidations at this point, but perhaps a consolidation tier that is a priority of 3.

Lisa wrapped up the discussion. Until sufficient funding and direction is provided by the Board, a separate program type is not warranted. The Committee will address consolidations as a priority through the ranking or as a separate component issue.

- Should there more language to further define what constitutes “no longer supported by manufacturing vendor”?

Lisa reviewed current language in the Guidelines. The Committee felt no additional clarification was needed on this definition for non-vendor supported.

- The language needs to be clearer on what constitutes a funding request as it relates to meeting required financial and grant progress reports. Also, language needs to be added to include other required reports or surveys as mandated by the Board.

For clarity, the words “funding request” was replaced with “grant application” since this section is specific to eligibility for the grant program. In addition, language was added:

- Financial and grant progress reports include other required reports or surveys as mandated by the Board.
- Should the grant application cycle remain at four (4) or shorten it two (2) months. (NOTE: This suggestion came up as a result of the application cycle closing at the same time WEP draw down requests are being submitted and grant applications are being reviewed. However, some PSAPs use the APCO Fall Conference as a time to get assistance with completing applications.)

Lisa shared that this was brought up by staff due to the conflicting deadlines with the grant application cycle and the WEP draw downs in late October. In addition, she advised that these processes at the same time allowed for errors, minimized time for staff and the PSAPs to obtain outstanding documentation or make corrections, and impacted true preparation for the December Grant Committee meeting.

Jerry suggested a two month application period but that the RCs needed to get the word out to the PSAP community since they rely on the fall conference to seek assistance with applications.

After some further discussion around these issues, there was a 3 to 1 vote to change the deadline from October 31 to September 30, with one member abstaining.

Donna reiterated that the PSAP community will need to be advised of the new deadline as soon as possible once the Guidelines are approved. Steve assured the Committee that with the recent filling of all Regional Coordinator positions, there will be aggressive PSAP training on sight and through regional meetings to address all the changes being made with the Guidelines. He said at minimal, each PSAP and GIS manager will directly contacted.

- Should multi-year funding be allowed? If so, should multi-year applications be ranked the same as the previous year(s)?

Jerry led the conversation by asking if it was the best use of funding to fund technology projects than once in a five year period when most of the 911 technology's life cycle was five or more years. Presently, there is nothing in the Guidelines to prohibit additional requests and with the historical limitation on funding, this should be addressed.

Donna stated that she felt the PSAPs/localities should be properly planning and never assume grant funding that the process. There should not be multi-year funding unless there a demonstrated financial hardship. Steve responded that a financial hardship is interesting to define and that it is not just the smaller PSAPs that may claim a financial hardship. He added that the Board expects "local skin in the game", which would prevent PSAPs from seeking multi-year funding. He agreed that the current process encourages PSAP to see these additional funds beyond the original grant from the grant program.

Mike said that the Board cannot guarantee funding for subsequent years. It's throwing good money after bad. The Committee needs to be careful during the application review to make sure the scope of work makes sense and there is no multi-year phasing for projects. He recommended that the Committee recommend multi-year be disallowed. Jerry responded that there may be a real possibility that stages could be funded in separate years. Donna agreed with Mike that multi-year funding should not be allowed. However, she also felt that a vehicle would need to be in place for projects previously funded through the grant program were not up to par for the PSAP. Dorothy said there is already language in the Guidelines to address that issue.

It was the final consensus of the Committee that multi-year funding will not be allowed. "Does not allow" was added the language in the Guidelines.

- Clarification is needed on whether a "funding request" includes draw downs. Currently, the grant award letter indicates that failure to submit required financial and/or programmatic reports can exclude an application from funding. It is currently interpreted to mean that even though you may have received a grant award, if you have not met this requirement, funding can still be withheld.

Minimal discussion was held regarding whether a staff can deny a grant request if they have not met the reporting requirements set forth in the Guidelines. Steve said it was not appropriate to deny funds after the locality has already paid for the project. However, funds can be withheld from processing until the required reports are received. By consensus of the Committee, the determination was made to add language:

- Draw down requests may be held until all required financial and/or grant progress reports are received.
- Language needs to be added that clarifies that budgetary quotes from a particular vendor(s) during the application process does not commit the PSAP to use that vendor(s) once the grant award is issued.

This did not require discussion and Guidelines were updated:

- NOTE: Budgetary quotes from a particular vendor(s) during the application process does not commit the PSAP to use that vendor(s) once the grant award is issued.
- Add language that clarifies that WEP grant awards are not subject to financial and programmatic reporting requirements.

This did not require discussion and Guidelines were updated:

- A financial and programmatic report is not required for the Wireless Education Grant award.
- Presentation to be made by Dorothy Spears-Dean to the PGC on the WEP survey results. The results may impact how the WEP program is administered. For example, there needs to be language that de-emphasizes conferences as examples of how the WEP grant is to be used. Is it the intent of the WEP to include all training types within the Commonwealth, or should the program be expanded to include out of state training/education opportunities?

This question was addressed during earlier discussion regarding the WEP. The consensus was that out of state and vendor training would be allowed through an established waiver request as part of the regular WEP grant application.

- Also, does the PGC want to consider adding "regional WEP" applications, which would be consistent with the other grant program types? However, a "regional" WEP application would preclude the participating localities from applying for an individual WEP grant.

This question was addressed during earlier discussion regarding the WEP. The consensus was that PSAPs can submit individual and/or a regional WEP application(s).

- The Priorities section needs to be reviewed and updated to reflect current application trends based on recent years' projects.

There was a lengthy discussion about the priorities. The discussion was primarily centered on consolidations and where it should be ranked. Dorothy had suggested earlier in the meeting that perhaps a consolidation tier may be the solution to addressing the need to have consolidations given a higher priority.

Several ideas and concerns were floated among the Committee, with occasional concern expressed by those from the public regarding consolidations and its priority. This included Mike's suggestion that consolidations be considered a separate program type with specific allocated funds. He said he felt that consolidations were enhancement projects and should not be a part of continuity projects. Dorothy said that would doable with a commitment from the Board and supporting funding. This was determined to not be feasible at this time with current funding constraints.

Lisa reminded the Committee that it first needed to identify where consolidations needed to be on the priority list, which was apparently an oversight over the years. There is already a ranking for consolidations and has been a priority as a part of the continuity and consolidation programs. Consolidations just were not on the actual priority lists.

Several recommendations were made:

- Make Consolidations as priority of 4 in the Continuity and Consolidation priorities list
- Establish a new tier type of Consolidations and make it 3 in the list of Tiers
- Establish a Consolidation Feasibility Study priority and make it 9 in the Continuity and Consolidation priorities list
- Update the Rankings list to group together all critical priorities from the Continuity and Consolidations priorities list (1 through 6) with the applicable Tiers and then continue with the rankings as presently listed
- Update the Rankings list for Enhancements by making them all Strengthen

Allan suggested and the Committee agreed to have staff draft the proposed changes to the Tiers, Priorities and Rankings sections against the FY14 grant applications as a snapshot of how the changes would impact funding of projects, especially consolidations and CPEs.

Staff was also requested to review the “snapshot” and provide feedback to the Committee if they felt there were additional considerations that needed to be made in light of the proposed changes. Staff will send this draft to the Committee members for their input and provide a final recommendations document to the Committee.

- CPEs – Hosted solution versus stand-alone purchase: Should they be prioritized the same or separated out? Rankings?

Donna said there was no real agreement for identifying CPE standalone and CPE hosted as separate priorities. Dorothy said this came up with a PSAP wanted to purchase a hosted CPE solution through Intrado, with the hosted CPE being a true NG solution. Lt. Greg Staylor, Chesapeake Police Department, said this actually was a discussion point when there a possibility of NG provided a hosted CPE solution to the state, which is no longer an option. Allan said a CPE replacement is just that and there should be no difference. Consensus was that there was no need to separate out CPE project types.

- Is the Call Accounting Equipment priority still needed? The PSAP Group Training Program priorities need to be defined.

Lisa said this question came about because there have been no applications in at least the last five grant cycles for call accounting equipment, which is usually purchased as a part of a CPE. Donna said this project could be a standalone purchase. Jerry said that he agreed that it should remain a priority, but may be a lower ranking. Steve said it was originally ranked higher because it is a critical function for data reporting. There was consensus that the call accounting equipment priority remain as is.

- New Priority Type – Consolidation Feasibility Study needs to be added and ranked.

It was discussed by the Committee to establish a Consolidation Feasibility Study priority of 9.

- Are the EMD and Other priorities needed? EMD is currently funded by other agencies as well as radio consoles. The GIS priorities template needs to be revisited in relation to the Rankings. Given recent funding levels of the past few years, is the Enhancement program type still needed or realistic if there is no effort to fund at least 20% Enhancement during a grant application cycle?

The Committee felt the EMD and other priorities were still projects that should be funded through the PSAP Grant Program, if funds were available. There were no changes to the GIS priorities template. The Committee agreed that the

Enhancement program needed to remain because there may come a time when adequate funding would be available to fund these priorities.

- The Rankings need to be updated based on current application trends and in order to eliminate outdated rankings and/or more align the Rankings with Tiers and Priorities. For example, should all Out of Service Continuity projects be grouped together and given top priority, then Non-Vendor Supported, and so on?

It was agreed by the Committee to group together all critical priorities by tiers through 6 of the Continuity and Consolidation priorities.

- How should Consolidation and NG-911 projects be ranked to ensure priority is given to them?

Consolidations were ranked 4 in the Continuity and Consolidations priorities list and NG-911 remained ranked as it.

- Second (or multi-year) funding given a Ranking by priority and tier type. For example, should a second year CPE funding request be given the same ranking as first time applicants for the same priority and tier?

This is longer an issue as the Committee decided multi-year funding would not be allowed.

There were two items that came up that were not on the agenda.

Jerry asked when was it appropriate to start the procurement process once a grant award was received. Lisa clarified that the procurement process for a project that has received grant funding can begin once the Board approves the award. However, invoices cannot be dated prior to July 1 of the current fiscal year. Steve cautioned that while the grant award may be made, the General Assembly has not conclude at that time of the year and funding is not guaranteed until the budget is finalized sometime in April of the year.

Tim Addington, VITA Regional Coordinator, had a question from a PSAP. The PSAP wanted to know if the Guidelines should be updated to reflect exactly who at a locality can apply on behalf of the PSAP for PSAP Grant Program funds. There was consensus among the Committee that the Guidelines could not be that restrictive because there are many acceptable positions, varying by PSAP, which could make application.

Public Comment

Vice-Chairman Diggs called for public comments. There were none.

Meeting Adjournment

Vice-Chairman Diggs called for a motion to adjourn the meeting of the E911 Services Board at 3:49 pm. All approved and the meeting was adjourned.