

PSAP Grant Committee Meeting  
April 10, 2014  
10:00 AM – CESC

Members Present:      Bob Layman (Chair)                      Sheriff J.D. Diggs (Vice-Chair)  
                                 Shannon Williams                              Donna Brown  
                                 Mike Goetz    Jerry Smith

Members Absent:      Allen Weese                                      Interoperability Coordinator

Staff Present:           Dorothy Spears-Dean                      Sam Keys  
                                 Lewis Cassada                                      Terry Mayo  
                                 Lisa Nicholson                                      Steve Marzolf  
                                 Brian Crumpler

1) **Meeting called to order at 10:04AM** with six members present.

2) **Powhatan grant extension request.** The committee reviewed the grant extension request from Powhatan. There was committee/staff discussion on the history of the request. Sheriff Diggs made a motion to recommend approval of the grant extension request at the next Board meeting. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. The motion was approved 6-0.

3) **Montgomery grant extension request.** The committee reviewed the grant extension request from Montgomery. There was committee/staff discussion on the history of the request. Sheriff Diggs made a motion to recommend approval of the grant extension request at the next Board meeting. Mr. Layman seconded. The motion was approved 6-0.

4) **PSAP Grant Guideline review presentation & discussion, lead by Ms. Lisa Nicholson.**

Ms. Nicholson discussed items that were brought up at the March E-911 Board meeting.

- A) Grant award amendment process discussion. New requirements inserted into the Grant Guidelines. Clarification of requirements as a result of previous Franklin County and Orange county requests. Mr. Williams asked for clarification that a PSAP can't go above and beyond the grant limits.
- B) Contingency discussion. Recommended language included the acceptability of a financial contingency on a grant request. Mr. Goetz asked for a firm percentage to be defined in the guidelines (such as 10%) instead of leaving it open-ended. Committee/staff discussion on the pros & cons of a firm or fixed contingency percentage and raising or lowering the acceptable contingency buffer. Grants that have \$150k limits have no room to add a contingency. Typically grants would have a 10% limit, and if a PSAP requested a higher contingency it would be reviewed by Staff.
- C) Review process section, updated language. Removed items no longer applicable.
- D) Grant payment request process, updated language.
- E) Grant closure section, language removed since the program is cost recovery only.

- F) WEP Program/Application process. Changes made to vendor training wording. Removes and extra step out of the requirements. No discussion.
- G) Program concept – Staff recommends removing meals from the process due to time and documentation involved. Discussion between committee and the staff on removing meals from the guidelines. Additional discussion on the state travel guidelines and lodging rates. Nearly all WEP's are for the APCO/NENA Spring and Fall conferences. Committee consensus is to leave meals in on the FY16 guidelines. Staff may be able to come up with a fixed reimbursement rate for those specific two conferences. Staff will try to design a process that the committee and VITA/Finance agree with.

5) **WEP Grant application updates.** Size of application reduced from 14 to 6 pages, due to removal of several items. State professional organization conference section reviewed. Staff recommends changes that allow local management to determine appropriate tracks or classes for their staff. Mr. Williams and Ms. Spears agree. Discussion of attendance requirements section check boxes and per diem changes to out of state training, and out of state travel waiver form. Changes reflect previous decisions to clarify per diem requests on the form now.

6) **NG9-1-1** Discussion of funding until feasibility study completion. Should funding be suspended for now? Staff recommended limiting regional NG9-1-1 projects or infrastructure investment until the study is complete (for the FY16 grant window). Consensus was to leave the language as-is and staff will advise if there are any problematic submissions.

7) **Shared services discussion** – Already reviewed at the March Board meeting.

Parking lot issue question: Could you request both a shared services and a regional grant request?  
The answer is yes.

**11:58AM meeting adjourned for a break.**

**12:10PM meeting resumed**

7) **Continuation of shared services discussion.** – Could a locality have a shared services and regional initiative in the same funding cycle? Covered in the proposed guidelines on page 11 of the grant guidelines. This was presented to the March E-911 Services Board meeting. Funding amounts on page 12 of the guidelines discussed. Staff to review the definitions of “regional initiative” and “shared services” to ensure that they are separate definitions, and they can't be interchanged.

Discussion on 1-6 groupings and 7-17 groupings on Page 30 of the guidelines / Priorities Continuity & Consolidation. Consensus to leave things as is for now.

Discussion of striking the word “PSAP” after “secondary” in the grant awards table on page 12 of the guidelines, and on page 4 of the executive summary.

Delete secondary consolidation definition on page 9 of the guidelines, it is redundant.

8) **Funding tier/table discussion page 4 & 12 of the guidelines.** Staff's numbers in the guidelines are what staff is recommending. Those were the amounts presented to the Board in March. Discussion on different allowable or possible funding combinations based on the current proposed funding levels. It was decided that there needed to be an additional funding award of \$350k + 150k (\$500k total) to for a shared services project allowing for 3 or more PSAPS. The consensus of the committee is to add it.

10) Ms. Brown asked for what happens if a grant is consolidation grant is "closed out", does that mean the consolidation is fully complete? The PSAPs part of the grant might not be completely physically consolidated...but the money may have been spent. Ms. Spears Dean – you get 1 bite of the apple. Mr. Marzolf proposed adding language that once a consolidation grant is closed out, that the affected PSAPs are considered to be consolidated. The consolidated center may come back and ask for an individual grant after a consolidation grant is closed out. Consensus of the committee is to allow a consolidation and a regional initiative to occur during the same time frame while the project is open.

11) There was further discussion on different consolidation scenarios and the different funding levels. After the discussion the question before the committee was to allow or not allow both a shared services and a regional initiative grant award at the same time. The consensus (3-2) was to not allow a "big dollar combo" of grant requests. Ms. Brown abstained. Sheriff Diggs, Mr. Williams, and Mr. Smith were against. Mr. Goetz and Mr. Layman were in favor.

12) **Approval of the March 6<sup>th</sup> minutes** – motion to accept the minutes from the March meeting from Sheriff Diggs. The only change to the minutes was to change Mr. McIntosh's name to "Interoperability Coordinator". Mr. Williams seconded.

13) **Public comment** – Mr. John Solen from Baker Company spoke at CESC. No public comments on the audio bridge.

14) **Committee comments** – Intent is for staff to quickly have changes sent to committee and presented at the May board meeting. Changes will be posted to the ISP website in advance of the Board meeting. Any comments need to be received BY April 16<sup>th</sup>.

15) **Adjournment** – Mr. Layman asked to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Williams made the motion and Mr. Smith seconded. Approved 6-0 at 1:27 PM