



NG9-1-1 Sustainable Funding Committee

Virtual Meeting

May 23, 2019





Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Minutes (April 25th and May 6th)
3. Representative Reports
4. Research Survey
5. Comparative Analysis Spreadsheet
6. June Meeting Schedule
7. Public Comment
8. Adjourn



Representative Reports





Research Survey

- Requested revisions from last call have been made
- Survey introduction developed
- Any other changes needed to answer the framing questions?
- Distribution and timeline



Comparative Analysis Spreadsheet

- Baseline information regarding funding formulas and 9-1-1 recurring costs has been derived
 - Impact of FY 18/19 funding formulas and legacy and NG9-1-1 recurring costs is expressed in last column of the spreadsheet



Next Steps

- Prepaid and postpaid wireless 9-1-1 revenue for calendar years 2014 to 2018
- Any additional research and/or analysis that needs to be conducted?
- Are we ready to begin the development of recommendations?



June Meeting Schedule

- Suggest June 12th and June 26th
 - Changing meeting date to Wednesday



And In Conclusion

- Public Comment
- Adjourn

As Virginia PSAPs transition to Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG9-1-1), it is important to ensure that sustainable funding is available to local governments to maintain standard services and capabilities across the state. To this end, a Virginia Information Technologies Agency (VITA) Integrated Services Program (ISP) committee was formed and is seeking input from the 9-1-1 community. To ensure all localities have an opportunity to provide input, all Virginia primary PSAP Managers are asked to complete the attached survey jointly with their locality administrator. The Public Safety Communications (PSC) Coordinator (Coordinator) and the NG9-1-1 Sustainable Funding Committee (Committee) will be using your responses, along with other analysis, to make a recommendation to the 9-1-1 Services Board (Board).

The survey is intended to provide input on four questions:

- Is the projected growth rate of wireless 9-1-1 revenue sufficient to keep pace with estimated NG9-1-1 recurring costs? If not, what are possible methods for increasing revenue?
- Do Virginia PSAPs believe the current distribution percentages and methodology for the Wireless E-911 Fund are optimal to support PSAP operations and discretionary funding (PSAP Grant Program)?
- How can PSAPs be incentivized to pursue shared and hosted services projects?
- Is there a desire to consolidate (physical or technological) among Virginia PSAPs, but personnel are unsure of how or have insufficient resources to proceed?

Explanation for the 1st Section - Revenue

The Coordinator and staff are preparing a spreadsheet to compare the rate of revenue growth compared to the rate of PSAP cost increases/decreases based on collected financial data. In the event, that cost is increasing at a greater rate than revenue, the Coordinator and Committee would like your input on pursuing legislative changes to increase revenue at the state and/or local level.

Explanation for the 2nd Section – Fund Distribution

This section is focused on obtaining locality input on the current funding methodology, as well as the current percentages for monthly distribution (60%) and grant funding (40%).

Funding Formula History: Prior to 2012, the formula utilized cost of non-compensation board personnel and equipment and call volume to determine funding. In 2012, the formula was changed to utilize only non-compensation board 9-1-1 telecommunicators and call volume. In 2017, a Board committee recommended to the Coordinator to change the funding formula to utilize population. This recommendation was based on information that NG9-1-1 recurring costs would be based on population. 9-1-1 call volume was included in the formula to adjust for temporary residents (e.g., students and day-time commuters).

In addition to the survey questions, the Coordinator and staff are preparing a spreadsheet to compare estimated NG9-1-1 and legacy 9-1-1 costs with current and projected funding on a jurisdictional level. The Coordinator and the Committee will analyze anomalies (costs increasing, funding decreasing or vice versa), as well as the overall difference between recurring costs compared to current and projected future funding. Based on survey input and financial analysis, the Coordinator and Committee will make

recommendations to the Board. The focus is not on historical funding compared to current funding, but, rather on an equitable funding formula which mirrors costs associated with providing the minimum standard of service across the state.

The Coordinator and Committee are also seeking input on whether jurisdictions would like more of the fund to be distributed monthly leaving less for grants, or have more funds for grants reducing the amount of monthly allocation, or if they are satisfied with the current 60% monthly allocation/40% grant funding split. If a change is desired, you are presented with different values up to 100%. As noted, an increase in one category will result in a decrease in the other category as the distribution percentage must equal 100. A suggestion has been made to use wireless 9-1-1 funding to pay for recurring ESInet costs. A percentage of the estimated recurring ESInet costs (based on AT&T contract) as compared to the total amount of wireless funding available to PSAPs is provided for your reference as you complete the grant and PSAP operational funding questions.

The last question is to determine whether localities will change their position on maintenance if grant funds are reduced.

Explanation for the 3rd Sections – Cost

In addition to increasing revenue, the Coordinator and Committee would like to investigate possible ways to reduce costs. System (software and/or hardware) sharing and PSAP consolidation are approaches other states have utilized to purportedly reduce costs. The questions in the survey are intended to determine localities' willingness to participate in system sharing arrangements if they reduce the local cost.

The final questions allow the jurisdiction to provide input that the Committee may not have considered.

Thank you for participating in this survey. The Coordinator and Committee believe it is essential that every PSAP's input be considered as they develop recommendations to the Board on how to mitigate the impact of NG9-1-1 recurring costs. If you have questions, contact your ISP Regional Coordinator.

NG9-1-1 Sustainable Funding Committee Meeting

May 23rd, 2019 11:00AM

Committee Members in Attendance

J.R. Powell Terry Hall Jolena Young
Joe Lerch Eddie Reyes

Staff in Attendance

Dorothy Spears-Dean Lewis Cassada

1) Call Meeting to Order

The NG9-1-1 Sustainable Funding Committee was called to order at 11:00am by Ms. Jolena Young.

2) Approval of the April 25th and May 6th Minutes

Ms. Young called for a motion to approve the meeting minutes from April 25th and May 6th. Mr. Eddie Reyes made a motion to approve both sets of minutes as presented. Mr. J.R. Powell seconded the motion. The motion passed without opposition.

3) Research Survey

Ms. Spears-Dean reviewed the latest drafts of the [Research Survey](#) as well as the [Survey Introduction](#). There was committee discussion on adding language referring to consolidations and discussions on reviewing the pre-paid exemption and equalization of the CSUT rate and general sales tax rates. Mr. Hall discussed using VML/VACo resources to send out the survey through their channels using a new survey tool, with the goal of receiving a 95% response rate. Ms. Young called for a motion to approve the survey, white paper, distribution method, and timeline. Mr. Hall made the motion and Mr. Reyes seconded it. The motion passed without opposition.

4) Comparative Analysis Spreadsheet

Ms. Spears-Dean presented the Comparative [Analysis Spreadsheet](#) . There was Staff and Committee discussion and analysis of the data.

5) Next Steps

Ms. Spears-Dean reviewed Staff action items. Staff will try to gather estimated pre-paid revenues from FY14-FY18. Consensus was that there was no additional research needed at this time. There was also discussion concerning the need to begin the formation of specific recommendations.

6) June Meeting Dates

Ms. Spears-Dean reviewed potential meeting dates of June 12th and June 26th. There may be a need for an alternate date, Ms. Spears-Dean will let the Committee know if there is a new date.

7) Public Comments

Ms. Young asked for public comments. There were none.

8) Adjourn

The meeting of the Sustainable Funding Committee adjourned at 12:00pm.

Survey

Section 1 - Revenue

9-1-1 Revenue

(Indicate your level of support for the following questions)

	Do Not Agree 1	Agree Somewhat 2	No Opinion 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5
Should the state pursue an increase in the current wireless E-911 surcharge?					
If the above does not occur, should localities be able to assess a 911 fee for service?					
If localities could assess a 911 fee for service, would your locality take advantage of the revenue stream?					
Should E-911 surcharge funds be legislatively restricted for 911 use versus going into local general funds?					

Section 2 – Fund Distribution

Wireless E-911 Fund Distribution

(Indicate your level of support for the following questions)

	Do Not Agree 1	Agree Somewhat 2	No Opinion 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5
Is the current distribution methodology of 50% Population/50% Call Volume equitable?					
Is the current 60/40 split between PSAP operational funding and grant funding equitable?					

If you responded with a 1 or 2 to the above questions, please provide suggestions in the section below.

Maintenance for Grant Funded Projects

Are maintenance costs paid on these 9-1-1 systems when grant funds are insufficient to cover and/or past the 5-year allowance period?	Yes	No
9-1-1 Call Handling Equipment		
Mapping		
CAD		
Recorder		
Other GIS Equipment		

Section 3 - Cost

Shared and Hosted Technology Services Projects

(Indicate your level of support for the following questions)

	Not Satisfied 1	Somewhat Satisfied 2	Neutral 3	Satisfied 4	Very Satisfied 5
How satisfied are you with ECATS for call accounting?					

	Not Interested 1	Somewhat Interested 2	Neutral 3	Interested 4	Very Interested 5
If it resulted in significant cost savings on both state and local levels, would you be willing to participate in a statewide funded solution for the following:					
ESINET					

Call Handling Equipment/Service					
Mapping					
CAD (Includes CAD to CAD and interfaces to other systems.)					
RECORDER					
RADIO					
Emergency Notification Service and Emergency Alerting Systems					

Please describe any consolidation opportunities or experiences relevant to your PSAP and include both the incentives for and challenges to success?

Do you have other cost saving ideas?