

## MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

- Date:** September 21, 2021  
Bowers Conference Room  
Room 417, Rembert C. Dennis Building  
10:00 am  
(Members attending via WebEx)
- Subject:** Minutes of the South Carolina 911 Advisory Committee Meeting
- Attendees:** *Committee Members* - Neil Baxley - PSAP Rep. Beaufort County, Rick Blackwell - PSAP Rep. Greenville County, Adam DeMars - GIS Expert/RFA, Mike Flynn - PSAP Rep. Spartanburg County, David Morrison - RFA SC 911 Program Manager, Ben Spearman - Wireline Rep. Comporium. *Staff* - Paul Athey - RFA Division Director, Amy Simpson - RFA SC Wireless 911 Program Coordinator.
- I. Chairman Blackwell called the meeting to order at 10:00am.
- II. Chairman Blackwell presented the August 17<sup>th</sup>, 2021 meeting minutes to the members and asked if any member had edits or questions. Neil Baxley made a motion to approve the minutes. Mike Flynn seconded the motion. All members voted aye in favor, and Chairman Blackwell declared the minutes approved as written. (*See attached*)
- III. ESInet Implementation Update
- A. David Morrison presented the committee with project updates for the groups that were slated for implementation through the end of calendar year 2021.
- B. Group 1 Project Updates: Weekly PSAP meetings continue with Comtech & Solacom. PSAP trainings for Solacom continue as well. RFA has received statewide MSAG & ALI records for areas covered by AT&T and Intrado. This will mean less work for the PSAP's going forward and gives RFA the ability to consolidate the data in a more efficient manner. Since Lexington County requested a later migration date, they have been moved to group 6 with an estimated migration date in 2024. West Columbia PD went live on 9/21/21. Other PSAPs in group 1 remain on schedule.
- C. Group 1.5 Updates: Abbeville County has been added to group 1.5 due to CPE support concerns. During a site visit, it was discovered that their system was old and on a monthly contract for support. Abbeville chose the hosted Solacom CPE solution offered through the state contract and, as a result, RFA was able to accommodate an earlier migration date and faster onboarding process. Comtech and Solacom are ready to ship equipment to Pickens County PSAPs and will begin once group 1 migrations have been completed. GIS/MSAG/ALI data comparisons and modifications continue. Migration dates for all other PSAPs in group 1.5 remain unchanged.
- D. Group 2 Project Updates: Oconee County's backup PSAP facility will be completed in time to go live with the primary PSAP and has been added back to the group 2

migration schedule. Comtech site visits have been completed. There are plans to conduct another site visit with Newberry County since it has been almost a year since their last site visit. Data collection is beginning soon, and circuit surveys continue. Migration dates for group 2 remain unchanged apart from the Oconee County backup PSAP being added back on the schedule. Anderson County's backup PSAP migration date remains undetermined until their site/equipment is completed.

- E. Next Steps: Continue migrations of group 1 PSAPs. Continue early coordination with future PSAPs. RFA will provide the latest ESInet implementation updates at the South Carolina APCO/NENA conference and will be on hand for other individual PSAPs to discuss their preparations if they'd like.
- F. Neil Baxley asked why Lexington County was moved to group 6. Mr. Morrison explained that they were offered several alternative dates within groups 1.5 and 2; however, they were not able to accommodate any of the available slots. The next available opportunity that worked with their schedule was within group 6.

#### IV. Outage Notification Update

- A. During the June (2021) committee meeting, RFA was requested to come up with a statewide outage notification process and consider purchasing Rapid Deploy Radius to assist in outages across the state. In the July (2021) meeting, Bridge for PSAPs was discussed as a no-cost option that could be modified to allow for groups to be created and connected. RFA has also initiated discussions with Everbridge, a company who has worked with states across the country to develop a visualization map that would contain all PSAPs and the circuits within a state. There is a demo scheduled in the coming week, and RFA will provide an update at the next meeting. Rapid Deploy is scheduled to release a network outage notification system in Spring of 2022 and will provide quotes soon.

#### V. ESInet Reimbursement Request for Coastal Cooperative - Jim Lake, Charleston County

- A. Jim Lake addressed the committee on behalf of the Coastal Cooperative asking that their costs for the Coastal ESInet be reimbursed at 100% for the remainder of their 5-year contract. Mr. Lake explained that when the Coastal Cooperative originally moved forward with their ESInet project, they believed they were working in alignment with the state. Also, they believed they were consistent with the state's strategic plan which recommended one option of having a centralized statewide ESInet backbone with regional ESInets. The cost difference for the additional 20% reimbursement to Charleston County over the length of their 5-year contract would be approximately \$570,00.00, but he could not speak to the other PSAPs costs within the cooperative.
- B. Chairman Blackwell brought up two questions pertaining to how the contract billing is done and what impact it would have on the budget since each agency within the cooperative submits their own individual reimbursement requests to the state. Mr. Lake stated he was not asking for the committee to make an immediate decision. He

added that each agency within the cooperative has its own contract with Indigital, so he would get more cost information for RFA to analyze the impact to the budget. Adam DeMars stated he would like for the committee to see the dollar amounts from all the PSAPs within the cooperative.

- C. Adam DeMars asked what the impact would be if certain PSAPs chose to stay within the cooperative and not migrate over to the statewide ESInet at the end of the 5-year contract since they were getting reimbursed at 100%. Mr. Lake answered that the cooperative has discussed that issue and, at this time, they are only asking for 100% reimbursement for the remainder of the 5-year contract. Mr. Lake stated that after the 5-year contract expired, it would be up to individual PSAPs to decide whether they wish to stay with the cooperative or migrate over to the state ESInet. He concluded by stating the cooperative fully supports the state ESInet, and they were simply looking out for their best interest.
- D. Chairman Blackwell added that obtaining the financial information from all the PSAPs within the cooperative and evaluating the impact on the budget would be important information to have prior to the committee deciding. He stated this issue could potentially affect other agencies if the overall reimbursement percentage had to be lowered in order to offset the additional cost of reimbursing the coastal ESInet at 100%.
- F. Paul Athey reviewed the minutes from the September 30<sup>th</sup>, 2016 committee meeting which contained a presentation by Katie Morgan introducing the fiscal model created by the fiscal sub-committee. That version of the fiscal model contained estimates obtained from other states for the total cost of a statewide ESInet with core services. The model projected an upfront cost of \$8 million with annual recurring costs of \$8.5 million paid by the state which would result in an adjustment of the reimbursement percentage as well as an increase to the wireless 911 fee.
- G. Mike Flynn stated that as the committee continues to discuss Charleston County's request, it would be interesting to know the dates that PSAP's within the Coastal Cooperative entered into contracts with their respective solutions. Mr. Lake responded that Charleston's contract date was included in the information he provided to the committee prior to the meeting, and he would get the other PSAP's information at the same time he collected their fiscal information to submit to Mr. Athey.

#### VI. Coastal ESInet Participation – Sam Gaither, Berkeley County

- A. Mr. Gaither explained that both the City of Goose Creek and the City of Hanahan are independent PSAPs inside the county limits of Berkeley County. Berkeley County works closely with and has provided backup for both of those PSAPs. As it stands now, if Goose Creek and Hanahan wanted to join the Coastal Cooperative with Berkeley County, they would have to fund 100% of their costs and would not be eligible for the 80% reimbursement rate. Mr. Gaither requested the committee to allow these PSAPs to join the coastal ESInet along with Berkeley County if they so choose and be eligible for

the same reimbursement rate so they can stay on the same system and continue to provide each other backup.

- B. David Morrison asked that the committee table this discussion for the next committee meeting when they deal with the other request from Charleston County. Both Goose Creek and Hanahan are scheduled to migrate with group 3 to the State ESInet. RFA has met with Goose Creek, and they have signed the Letter of Agency. RFA has not yet met with Hanahan.
- C. Chimere Myers of Goose Creek stated that they originally chose to go with state ESInet project because they were told they would not be eligible for reimbursement if they chose to go with the coastal cooperative instead. However, since they work so closely with Berkeley County and are surrounded by PSAPs within the Coastal Cooperative, it would be more beneficial for them to join the Coastal Cooperative ESInet rather than the state ESInet.
- D. Chairman Blackwell asked if the committee members had any objections to tabling the conversation until to the next committee meeting. Hearing none, the discussion was tabled. Neil Baxley asked the meeting minutes reflect that he did not participate in any discussions regarding either agenda item with reference to Charleston County or Berkeley County's requests because of his position with both the Coastal Cooperative initiative and the 911 Advisory Committee.

#### VII. Other Items and Questions

- A. Mr. Lake again mentioned that the state's strategic plan talked about a statewide ESInet with regional options and asked if state was moving away from regional ESInets. Chairman Blackwell asked that RFA staff re-distribute the state's strategic plan to committee members as a refresher. Mr. Athey asked that the committee keep in mind that the state strategic plan doesn't mention what the reimbursement percentage would be for the regional ESInets. The only way the RFA Board would consider a fee increase in the future is if they were taking the most cost-effective approach. If reimbursing the coastal ESInet at 100% causes the fund balance to drop too low, they run the risk of having to cut the reimbursement rate to make up the difference if a fee increase is not approved.
- B. Mr. Morrison added that all the minutes from the 911 committee meetings from 2014 to present as well as the state strategic plan were on the RFA website, and he would send the link to committee members after the meeting.

#### VIII. Adjournment

- A. Neil Baxley made the motion to adjourn. Mike Flynn seconded the motion, and the meeting was adjourned at 10:52am.

Attachments: Agenda, Meeting Materials

Public Notice of this meeting was posted at: <http://rfa.sc.gov/e911>

These minutes were approved on 10/19/21.

Amy Simpson 