

ORIGINAL

OKLAHOMA 9-1-1 MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

OSBI LAB EDMOND, OK

April 18th, 2018

1. Call to Order

Meeting was called to order by Chairman Maggard at 1:40pm.

2. Roll Call

Absent: Mr. Roy Tucker, Mr. Matt Stillwell, Mr. Ray Vaughn, Ms. Lanette Coppedge, and Mr. Gene Thaxton.

Arrived after roll call: Mr. Roy Tucker at 2:37pm

Left after roll call: Mr. Major Berry 2:55pm

Quorum present.

3. Introduction of Board Members and Guests

Introduction to Mr. Travis Clark, he was added to the board representing a local Telecommunications service provider which serves less than 50,000 access lines in the state or a telephone cooperative –tier three. Mr. Clark works as a line manager for PTCI and has for Twenty-eight years.

4. Approval of Meeting Minutes from the March 2018 Regular Meeting.

Review by Chairman Maggard of the previous minutes.

Motion to approve the March 2018 Minutes by Mr. Hawkinson, second by Mr. Ruhl.

Motion carried. Approval by twelve ayes, zero opposed.

5. Approval of the March 2018 Financial Report.

Mr. Terry explains the report provided in the board's packet. The only outstanding balance is the \$3000.00 that was spent on the Cory Ahrens Workshop.

Mr. Maggard: Is that the large dip we are seeing?

Mr. Terry: I believe that is due to a late bill coming in at the end of the month. The Tax Commission sends that in, hopefully we will see that go up next month.

Motion to approve the March 2018 Financial Report, Mr. Shawn Barnett moved to approve, second by Mr. Brent Hawkinson.

Motion carried. Approval by twelve ayes, zero opposed.

6. Discussion and possible action concerning a request from McAlester, Oklahoma to have all allocated 9-1-1 funds, authorized under the statutory authority of Title 63, that has been

collected by the Oklahoma Tax Commission since June 30th, 2017 and future collections be forwarded to McAlester and not to the Pittsburg County (63 O.S. §2864 et seq.)

Mr. Terry: There were three letters sent to the Authority from the City of McAlester; two were sent to the Board of County Commissioners in Pittsburg County, and the one sent to the Authority requesting the inter-local agreement with Pittsburg County be dissolved, the money go entirely to the City of McAlester, and they return to a monthly payment instead of the payment every three months as they are being paid now.

Background information: Prior to the November 2016, when the new statute was created, work was done through the Administrative Committee, who determine PSAP areas and who was responsible to receive the money. This is how the polygon was created and who receives the check. How do you define who gets the money? This is the reason a lot of PSAPs have their own ways of defining the polygons and who gets the money – through inter-local agreements, MOU, and similar processes. So this year it has been difficult to define where the money goes and make it clear what the purpose is to those changes or correct money directions.

The money went to the county, based on the vote of the people. However, the wireless statute has been taken out and the new statutes has the money going to the State. The money comes to the state, was determined to go to the county through the tax commission, by the new statutes. The county has sent some money to the City – when I met with the county commissioners stated they had sent some money to the City, every three months instead of every month. We are now at a point where the communications have broken down and we need to come up with a better plan. To my knowledge the City of McAlester pays for the servers, connectivity, core equipment, and licensing to transfer calls to Pittsburg County's dispatch center. They county wants to negotiate with McAlester to approve service across the county. Pittsburg County had stated they would like this action tabled so they would have time to meet and negotiates with the City of McAlester – however, they are not here so I am not sure where they stand. There have been no updates to that position. I will turn it over to the Chair to turn the floor over to McAlester.

Shawn Smith 9-1-1 Coordinator for McAlester: McAlester stated they are the primary PSAP for the county, they do transfer calls to the county sheriff's office for law enforcements calls, but we are the local 9-1-1 answering point for the entire county. Out pay is being sent every three months instead of monthly, when the county gets the money. As of now we have not been paid for January, February, March, or April.

Mr. Ruhl: Is it unusual to have one entity have the server and another entity have the answering the calls?

Mr. Terry: McAlester has the PSAP and they also provide services outside the city limits. Then if the call falls within the county they transfer the call to the county who has a limited 9-1-1 information license. McAlester is the primary, and the County is the secondary PSAP.

S. Smith: We are the Primary PSAP for 9-1-1, all calls go through our agency; including fire, EMS, and law enforcement. We also answer calls for law enforcement for the City of Krebs.

Mr. Maggard: So all the equipment cost, server coast, etc. goes to the City of McAlester to provide service?

S. Smith: Yes.

Mr. Terry: We did do our due diligence, in an attempt to notify the County of this meeting, with the previous cancelations leading up to this meeting. What the County Commissioner would like to have, is to answer their won call at their own dispatch center. That is what they would be asking for and renegotiated to get their calls directed to them.

Ms. Huckabee: I have a couple of questions as we transition to a new way of doing things, from the old way of doing things. I wonder if Pittsburg County has entered into an any other long term contract or has been incurring debt, thinking that the old way of working is going to continue; such as, If Pittsburg County entered into a million dollar vendor contract on a handshake agreement and now have a contract to work through – we might need to be mindful that. Also, if Pittsburg County is providing something to the City is there an agreement for those to come back, such as fees for mapping, or equipment.

Mr. Terry: The county did not disclose to any debt, I did ask that specific questions. Any provisions related to the contract or any agreements that were in effect before are now not valid, the letter of termination was sent on February 27th.

Mr. Maggard: If we grant this request as presumed there is nothing to preclude that a future agreement or change happens that this can be reinstated in the future?

Mr. Clark: The money is going to the county, are they are phase I, phase II, basic?

Mr. Terry: The money is now going to the county, which has a limited license as a PSAP and only call are answered there from transferred for the main PSAP which is the City of McAlester. They are not receiving any phase I or II calls.

Ms. Van Arsdale: How are you transferring the calls, do you just transfer the calls or do you have to contact the county then transfer the calls. So they can receive some 9-1-1 calls as a secondary?

S. Smith: Through the 9-1-1 system, but they are only through transfers. No, they can only get transfers from our call center.

Ms. O'Malley: Is it on a ten digit line? Do you get any information with the transfer?

Kim Troussel, Communication Supervisor, City of McAlester: Yes. No, well they do have mapping – we've sent out map to them. But it's not a true Ani/Ally that comes through.

Mr. Berry: So those services are you providing them with the contract? So when the contract ends do those services?

S. Smith: No.

Joe Ervin Jr. City Attorney: That service occurs at cost every month – the county withholds those cost and cause a problem since it's paid every three month. It is my understanding that we will continue to provide these services, because there is no one else to provide these services. We are the only PSAP. But three to four months causes a problem with vendors when you're trying to pay those vendors. We would like to clarify that we are not trying to discourage the county from providing its own services if they chose to do so. We just would like to be reimbursed in a timely manner to keep the PSAP running smoothly.

Mr. Terry: When I spoke with them they asked how they could become their own PSAP, I gave them a copy of the state statute and explained that we only change the polygon once a year and the fee distribution once a year – that is what we were just discussing. It is too late for this year, they understand that; I stated that they could be working towards a plan for next year. You mentioned Krebs, you answer for them as well – something to consider that sixty percent live in the county, and forty percent live in the city. If the county creates a plan to answer their own 9-1-1, sixty percent will go to the county. It is very important to work together in order to make sure that each PSAP benefits, as that could potentially be a large hit to your PSAP budget and detrimental to the City of McAlester.

Mr. Ervin: We have had some discussion and they understand that it is a process – nothing of what we are doing is preventing them from going forward with that, we understand that if they do sixty percent of the work they should get sixty percent of the funding.

Mr. Terry: It would have to be sixty percent of the 9-1-1 calls.

Mr. Ervin: I understand that.

Mr. Maggard: Any other questions.

Mr. Terry: Speaking Mr. Grant Moak he has some concerns regarding the annual change of distributions and polygon changes. Therefore I moved to approve with that this change of funds distribution will go into effect July 1 2018, which is the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. Ervin: The termination mention in the letter of termination is listed as July 1st. Therefore this will work fine.

Mr. Fisher: If the commission is interested in midterm changes that is something we can work out in rules. I think the current rules, and statues gives flexibility in making the change; however, you should consider keeping it within the upcoming fiscal year for now.

Motion to approve the request to change fee distributions to the City of McAlester by Ms. Regeneia Van Arsdale, second by Mr. Major Berry.
Motion carried, approval by twelve ayes, zero opposed.

7. Discussion and possible action to approve the eligible bodies and population percentages for entities entitled to receive 9-1-1 telephone fees for the FYE 2019. (63 O.S. §63-2864.5 et seq.)
Thank you to Shellie Willoughby for your hard work.

Mr. Terry: The map is different than the one in the sent out packet – Oklahoma City sent in their boundary letter late; therefore the packet given to you today with the map and spreadsheet is up to date. The Map shows the areas – that shows the 115 PSAPs that turned in a boundary verification, which is eighty-five percent. We worked with many PSAPs that contested a boundary – I worked with many of them one-on-one to get the correct boundary done, it was a great exercise, and I think we will only get better from here. We do have a large book with all the correspondence that was sent in with the letter or the moans, and questions or contentions – if you want to review that. The Authority does have an original book that holds the original letters, maps, contentions, and corrections if you have any questions.

Ms. Huckabee: I do see that there are some areas in Tulsa County are missing – did Jenks send in their information?

Stacey Root, Assist. To Lance Terry: They did not send in their Boundary model – they did send in their Registration form.

Ms. Huckabee: Okay, it looks like maybe Owasso, Rogers County? I'm looking at the old map.

Mr. Terry: No those are completed. On the new map you can see those are not missing, but Collinsville – no response... [Interrupted]

Ms. Huckabee: Collinsville is here today.

Chief Richey, of Collinsville: We most certainly did respond – promptly.

S. Root: Do you remember how you sent it in, email or mail?

C. Richey: I did the online form, we had a hard time getting it done and I called and someone walked me through it.

S. Root: That was me. I have the registration form – I don't believe I have your Boundary Letter. I will have to double check on that.

C. Richey: We didn't contest the boundary and I know I sent it in.

Mr. Terry: Okay, we will verify that was received. As far as Owasso and Rogers County, I met with them several times and those are completed.

Ms. Huckabee: What happens to those who have not turned in a boundary level?

Mr. Terry: I think that we have done our due diligence. We have given three months to verify the boundaries, and this must be delivered to the tax commission my May 1st. Therefore, if there are contested boundaries at this point, we would have to come back together to approve those before May 1st. Anything with question will ne to be discussed next year. We must submit

an approved verification to the Tac Commission on May 1st or payments will be delayed – I don't believe we need to withhold that. Again, any boundary issue can be review next year.

Mr. Fisher: Are any of these who have not responded affected any of those who have responded?

Mr. Terry: No. Any PSAP that requested a boundary questions answered, or contested a boundary was included in a conference call or meeting with the surrounding PSAPs to ensure that everyone had a voice to be able to address the concerns and the boundary and where the line needed to be at.

Motion to approve the population percentages and eligible bodies by Mr. Brent Hawkinson, second by Ms. Darita Huckabee.

Motion carried. Approval by twelve ayes, zero opposed.

8. Discuss and take possible action to approve the Scope of Work, to assess and bring into compliance with State requirements for Cimarron, Beaver, and Harper, Cotton, and Nowata counties; as well as, direct Oklahoma Emergency Management to enter into an agreement with Mission Critical Partners to provide the services outlined in the Scope of Work. (§63 O.S. §2871 et seq.)

Mr. Terry: About three months ago this body approved my office to move forward with the Scope of Work and the cost to bring the five counties into compliance with E9-1-1 Phase II. The statute §63.2864.4-1 the statute outlines what is to be done in order to be considered compliant; the first item, being you must provide E9-1-1 services. The State Statute in section 2871, it outlines those counties that did not come into compliance before December 16, 2017; therefore, this body should take action to deploy E9-1-1 phase II wireless service to anyone that did not come into compliance before that date. The five counties that did not come into compliance are listed in this work: Cimarron, Beaver, Harper, Cotton, and Nowata. The County Commissioners for Cimarron, Beaver, and Harper Counties, sent in a letter to this body, asking for assistance to develop a plan to come into compliance, as they did not have the staff, skills, or knowledge to complete this action. I have also been in contact with Cotton and Nowata County and they are anticipating this work as well, they both agree the need for this also.

I worked with OMES (Oklahoma Management and Enterprise Services) who handles, IT and vehicles related contracts; was given information about Mission Critical Partners and their contract with the State that we could purchase off of. Working immediately with Mission Critical Partners to create a draft form of the Scope of Work. I included Mr. Barnett and Mr. Carnagey, as they are directly affected by this or being on this board can contribute to the work alongside David Jones.

David Jones, SVP Mission Critical Partners: Working with Lance to break down the five critical counties, and bringing them into wireless compliances. Map from ok.gov/911 showing the critical (red) counties. This is a shared service initiative that is the intent to work with a surrounding counties that has the available software and hardware – accommodating a shared

service instead of putting in new system in these five counties. That would be too much for these counties and that would not make fiscal sense. Part of this initiative is to analyze those surrounding counties and see what can be shared.

The work has been separated into three phases – mainly because they are three counties in three different areas of the state and have three tasks for each phase. The same task, it goes with the different phase.

Task 1. (In all phases)

- Data gathering, learning what the county in question has as software/hardware
- Access what the surrounding counties have for software/hardware and are they willing to be a *Host Remote Relationship*.
- GIS assessment. High level assessment as moving into Phase II we will need the GIS accuracy to make Phase II – unknown what level these five counties have. Access and collect data on what they may need.
- What are the cost associated with this – what can the counties afford.

Task 2. (In all phases)

- Determine what options may be available to the five counties – we will have the ultimate recommendation for the most reasonable path.

Task 3.

- Supporting the counties to write an Initial inter-local agreement that define the roles and responsibilities of the parties then turn that over to the attorneys for the county, whose responsibility will be to take it to the County Commissioner to get approval and get that completed.

Objective: to bring the five “red” counties into full 9-1-1 compliance.

D. Jones: We [MCP] will be at the five counties in questions and then onsite at the host county and have a team on the ground for a couple a weeks. Working on assessments and gathering information. It would be beneficial to have most of the data and information up front so that we can use our time while everyone is in the same state to put the plan into motion. Lance and I will be working closely to get information gathered.

Mr. Terry: Stating state statutes if a state PSAP does not come into compliance there is a specific organizational structure that would come into play – if one of those agencies comes to the Board with a plan that includes an oversight and governance, then this body can acceptant that plan. I think it’s best to turn this plan over to the counties, and their guidance.

Mr. Carnegie: This was not our first draft, I appreciate the hard work and the GIS work. Since one county has done the GIS work and other counties does not. The big thing I wanted to see is to have the County Commissioners questions answered.

D. Jones: That is one thing that we are going to be looking at, sustainability for a minimum of seven years. That is why there is a minor NG911 in this consideration. That encompasses the seven years.

Mr. Ruhl: Would this able to be used on a state level?

Mr. Terry: Yes, we want to be able to break out some of the items within the scope and use it for other counties or to save some costs.

Mr. Barnett: We found a lot of backtracking and concern, moving forward now with some massive consolidations, we need some guidance; and this provides some tools to take on more counties at every level position. It's about service, we have to make sure w area providing service to even out smallest entities. I think there was a lot of work done – and I appreciate all that was done. I think this will work statewide.

Mr. Ruhl: Do you believe that Harper County is sustainable?

Mr. Carnagey: I hear there are some talks with Woods County, Cimarron is the lowest in the state – 0.05%; fourteen thousand dollars a year when that wouldn't cover the trucking cost. We may need to look at that differently to see how we can sustain – ex. Texas County has eight trunk and can we maybe share those. I think that is where having a third party looking at things will help.

Mr. Terry: This will fold directly into the grant program – it's on our agenda today. It will help reach that goal of total compliance, we know that the money in the bank is not going to be enough to see them through for sustainability. Plan will be written, plan will be delivered and they can use that applying for grants.

D. Jones: The sustainability is going to the ongoing OPEX and planning for the cost for the next seven years.

Mr. Terry: We will go back to this state to identity the lowest state – as ongoing and a reference point.

Mr. Berry: When the report comes back with it be one option or will there be a group of options that the agency can choose what is best for them?

D. Jones: These deliverables will be for each county – written one for each county. We with give a best option for each county and what is best for that agency. There will be options that they can implement and put them in front of them with our recommendation but at the end, it's ultimately the county and this body's decision. At the end of the day it is always up to this body and the county to suggest the best option.

[Mr. Roy Tucker joined the meeting a 2:47pm]

Ms. O'Malley: What are the yellow on the map?

Mr. Terry: I was just talking to Darryl about this, Pawnee County is green. Tonkawa, I have not met in person to do a test call. But I believe they are green based on phone conversations.

Ms. Van Arsdale: I can meet with Tonkawa and discuss that and their registration form with the Chief.

Mr. Terry: We do have money under the technical committee, \$100,000.00 set aside to meet the board goals and objective, there is also \$50,000.00 for NexGen Feasibility, and \$100,000.00

from the Administration Committee funding. It is my recommendation that we use the money set aside from the Technical Committee to enter into a contract with Mission Critical Partners, and additional funding be used from the Administrative funding.

Mr. Terry: This contract will be held with Oklahoma Emergency Management. That is how this is set up.

Ms. Henry, OEM, CFO: OEM documentation will be used to support the Authority and this board with the purchase of this Scope of Work.

Motion to approve the Scope of Work through Mission Critical Partners by Mr. Richard Ruhl, second by Ms. Terry O'Malley.

Motion carried. Approval by thirteen ayes, zero opposed.

9. Discussion and possible action to approve the grant application requirements, funding priorities and evaluation criteria (63 O.S. §2864.2 et seq.)

Ms. Huckabee: The guideline and application form (same handout as last time) is for a one-time only, reimbursement grant (80/20) grant; for the purpose of funds for deployment of phase II, inoperability, consolidation of facilities or services, modification of GIS data, deployment of NexGen services.

Mr. Terry: Immediate focus is to level the playing field for 9-1-1 and the state so anyone visiting the states receive the minimal level of services. We are behind the curve as state on GIS – it can take three to five years to get ready for NexGen 911.

Mr. Clark: With the grants can they group things into one grant. So GIS, NexGen...

Mr. Terry: Yes, there will be an option to group items needed into the grant request.

Mr. Clark: The money will come out of the 911 fees?

Mr. Terry: We have set aside 1.2 million for use on grants, this money could go up as soon as June or July; the Federal grant program will be coming out any day now – and the same formula will be used for the 9-1-1 grants that was used in 2009 – which by my calculations we could be eligible for up to 3.5 million in federal dollars with a forty percent match.

Ms. Van Arsdale: On the limitations it states just one – is that per grant period?

Mr. Terry: Yes.

Mr. Maggard: Will this form be used for the federal program as well?

Mr. Terry: We will use this document to apply for our federal grants, based on our already identified needs, priorities, and the registration form. Again, we have not had an initial budget meeting, but I anticipate that we can set aside above and beyond the 1.2million and above for

the forty percent match. We will fold the application into this process and it will help us exceed what we are trying to accomplish.

Mr. Terry: MB3 which is a program that OEM has purchased and to work with them we will need to use their tools. This program is an end to end program, it's a cloud based program, which allows the user to log in to get information from their account and send in documents to facilitate their grants. We are looking to put the guideline discussed today into this program. Reporting can be done one each applicant.

Mr. Maggard: This program is a great program, thankful for OEM to making it available to us. Since the last Grant was done by hand by Mr. Thaxton, who made sure everything was complete by himself. We are leaps and bounds ahead of the game.

Mr. Terry: There will be extra costs, for 9-1-1 from OEM, but we will include this in our budget – I don't foresee it exceeding the 1.2 million but we will include that in our budget and quotes available.

Q: When will the online program be available to use?

Mr. Terry: It should be available July first.

Motion to approve the Grant Requirements and Application by Ms. Darita Huckabee, second by Mr. Major Berry.

Motion carried. Approval by thirteen ayes, zero opposed.

[Mr. Berry left the meeting at 2:45pm]

10. Discussion and possible action to adopt the permanent rules into the Oklahoma 9-1-1 Management Authority Act (63 O.S. §2861 et seq.)

Mr. Terry: This is really just a place holder to allow for update.

Mr. Moak: Since the rules are governed by OEM and therefore we do not have to adopt the rules as the Authority. There was a Special Meeting on March 15th, there was no public comment at that time. March 27th the rules were submitted to the legislator for approval, if they aren't approved by joint resolution the Governor will approve or disapprove by declaration. Once that is done then it will be publish in the Oklahoma Register, ten days after publication, rules should be affective; most likely close to July.

11. Discuss and take action to approve a branding logo for the Oklahoma State 9-1-1 Authority.

Mr. Terry: The Authority sent out a request to dispatchers, call takers and the general public to send in a rendering of a Logo for the Authority. There were twelve logo submissions, a few sent in different variation their logo.

S. Root: The logos that were received were sent out to the subcommittee, which sent the logos out to people they trusted to comment and vote. A formal vote was sent to these individuals on the subcommittee and the two you have in front of you are the final contenders. We can vote on them and go forward or put it up for comment.

Mr. Terry: we do understand that these are not going to be the final version or edition. They will need to be cleaned up and rendered to format the need. To be able to be placed clearly on t-shirts and other items like the website.

Mr. Maggard: I like the second one, but I feel it may be too detailed.

Ms. Van Arsdale: The first has the management on there as well.

Mr. Barnett: The first thing I saw was 1911, that may need to change and change the color of the state of Oklahoma.

Mr. Terry: We understand that things need to be cleaned up and maybe lessen the shadow and things – we spoke to Darita’s guy and even he said that was needed. So maybe the motion needs to be to visit with the artist and render and clean up and then come back and present for the board to have the final draft approved.

Motion to adopt, render, and clean up Logo #1 to bring it back to the board for approval by Mr. Roy Tucker, second by Mr. Brent Hawkinson.

Motion passed. Approval by twelve ayes, zero opposed.

12. Committee Reports:

a. Administration Committee

i. Grants

1. Everything that we have been doing with the grants.
2. The Administrative Committee will meet immediately after this meeting to discuss the budget.

b. Technical Committee

i. NexGen/EsiNet

1. Thursday at City of Tulsa 9-1-1 Center Meeting at 1300 with Mission Critical Partners to discuss emergency services for the state of Oklahoma.
 - a. Mission Critical Partners to start on feasibility for the state. To get budget information and pricing about moving forward. This meeting is just budgetary.
 - b. Exploratory visit, tour of the communication center.
2. Nikki Cassingham – Office of Homeland Security
 - a. Workshop for NG/Strategic Planning conference call coming up
 - b. Prepare for the workshop that is coming up

ii. OK GIS Standard

1. Approved by the GIS Council a week ago Friday

2. Public comments are available to read online at ok.gov/911 with the Standard in its draft form.
 3. Each person who made comments was personally notified by email with what the committee came up with and that the standards are moving forward.
 4. The standard will be returned to this body for approval.
- c. Operations Committee
- i. Cory Ahrens Workshop for Call Taking Standards
 1. There was about 22-25 people participating
 2. Discovered and created the standards for bullet point topics
 3. That work that was created will be brought back to this body for review and the next steps.
13. State 9-1-1 Coordinator report to the board (Discussion Only).
- a. GIS Standard update
 - b. PSAP Registration Form
 - i. 90% form returned – 14 still outstanding
 - ii. Contact with those PSAPs who are still outstanding
 - iii. Administrative group to take a strong stance with this, asking the Chair or Committee to format a letter to send to agencies. This is a required form §63.2864.4 – this body can escrow the 911 funds until compliance, with defined deadlines. Growing pains, but we are working through this.
 - c. Quarterly Dispatcher Recognition
 - i. APCO/NENA has created a work group to do this.
 - ii. June 1 2018 is the deadline for questions so we can get them on the website.
Tommy Arnold: This will be on the agenda for the May
 - d. PSAP meetings and Events
 1. Met with some leaders who I think are missing some of the picture.
 2. Need for Formal leaders and informal leaders
 - e. National Telecommunicators week April 8-14th
 - i. Happy Belated TCW!
 - f. National Governors Association Workshop on Interoperable Comm in Albuquerque
 - i. Attended with OMES, DPS
 - ii. How do we combine are work and move toward the same goal?
 1. Communication cycle to the public and back to us.
 - iii. How to better communicate with each other and the public – through state statutes.
 1. Working to get more feedback and work to address differences.
 - g. Upcoming events
 - i. Regional APCO training in Bixby April 26th
 - ii. Meeting with Nowata and Coffeyville
 1. Taking over some of Nowata’s area
 2. Working with Totel that was folded into this process today.
 - iii. NE Regional Management Meeting April 15ht
 1. Contact me if you would like more information.
 - iv. Monday meeting with Woods and Grant County to meet on addressing/mapping issues.

- v. Meeting with Ohio to discuss how to intertwine some tech and hosted system, hosted CAD.
 - h. I've been here a year! April 10th is my year mark. I am passionate about what I do, I appreciate you letting have the freedom to do what I Do. I am glad to be here to work!
14. Chairman's comments (information only, no discussion).
- a. I think we have had a very successful year and I appreciate where we are.
 - b. I think I have summed up my comments already.
15. Public Comments. *Comments are to be limited to items under the purview of the Oklahoma 9-1-1 Management Authority. Each speaker shall be limited to 5 minutes.*
- Mr. Lucius Jones:** Fees and new rules on the military PSAPs? That is running a primary PSAP
- Mr. Maggard:** There may be some national initiative, but I will have to get back to you on that.
- Mr. Terry:** I will research to make sure but I don't believe that a governing body that is under federal is not eligible to receive funds. Does census data run on military data?
- Mr. Maggard:** We will research that and get back to you.
16. New Business. *No new business this is a Special Meeting.*
17. Adjournment. 3:14pm

The minutes of the Regular Meeting dated April 18, 2018 for the Oklahoma 9-1-1 Management Authority have been reviewed and approved by the Authority Board on the 3rd day of May, 2018.



Darryl Maggard, Chairman

