

Washington State E911 Advisory Committee

Policy Subcommittee Meeting

January 15, 2014

Camp Murray, WA

9:30 am – 12:00 pm

Members Attending in Person:

Dave Cox, Skamania County, Chair

Lorlee Mizell, Spokane County, representing Large Urban Counties – East

Marlys Davis, King County, representing King County

Mike Worden, Okanogan County, representing Rural Counties – East

Richard Kirton, Kitsap County, representing Large Urban Counties – West

Craig Larsen, Lewis County, representing Medium Urban Counties – West

Stephanie Fritts, Pacific County, representing Rural Counties – West

Kathleen Slaybaugh, Garfield County, representing Rural Counties – East

Karl Hatton, Jefferson County, representing Rural Counties – West (Alt)

Tom Shaughnessy, Island County, representing Medium Urban Counties – West (Alt)

Deb Flewelling, King County, representing King County (Alt)

Ray Maycumber, Ferry County, representing Rural Counties – East (Alt)

Jim Quackenbush, Thurston County, representing Large Urban Counties – West (Alt), NG911 Subcommittee

Kay McKellar, Chelan/Douglas Counties, representing Public Education Subcommittee

Lisa Caldwell, Columbia County, representing Training Subcommittee

Members Not in Attendance:

Wayne Wantland, Yakima County, representing Medium Urban Counties – East

Steve Romberg, Clallam County, representing Rural Counties – West

Rose Parr, representing E911 Advisory Committee

Guests Attending:

Jackie Jones, Grant County

Criselia Grupp, Chelan County

Jim Fosse, Douglas County

Donna Barnes, Washington State Patrol

State Office in Attendance:

Ziggy Dahl, Bill Peters, Andy Leneweaver, Kenn Moisey, Sharon Lotonuu, and Kim Mask

Dave Cox opened the meeting with introductions and his apologies for not attending the last meeting in November.

The meeting minutes needed changes. The changes were submitted by Richard Kirton. They were incorporated into the current minutes. The minutes will be put on hold for the next meeting (February) for approval.

Salary Survey, Caps, and Spreadsheet:

- The recommended salary caps were reported to the Advisory Committee. The intent is to ask for at January meeting.
- The state office (Bill) will let the Policy Subcommittee if this can be done.
 - The Legislature and the Governor are looking closer at the E911 fund. The state office is not making any commitments at this time, at the state E911 budget is very tight. It is estimated that only \$4 million will be left at the end of the biennium. The budget does not allow for an increase at this time.
- The intent of the salary caps was for use within the FY2015 contract period. The budget has been approved and a supplemental budget will be asked for as soon as possible.
 - Comments were made from the subcommittee that it may be at least a month too late to ask.
- Contract applications are due in March for FY2015, and the Legislature will already be adjourned before the applications can be completed.
- The state office will work within the existing budget and if funds are available, it will be used.
 - As of today, it will all be spent through FY2015 and the recommended increase to salary caps will not take place. This may have to wait until FY2016.
- Dave Cox wanted to know what would happen if the state office were to hold the caps as discussed at last meeting with a caveat if a surplus of funds are available, there would be funding up to the capped amount so that all the budget will be spent.
 - Would like to include the phase “Up to proposed caps” which would mean the maximum amount allowed.
 - Kathleen Slaybaugh pointed out that the counties may ask for everything they are eligible for and will be left with extra being turned back. This is what has been done in the past.
 - It was recommended to apply for as much as caps allow per policies. This will allow for the state to add more and adjust up to capped amounts
- The state office is re-evaluating how they do grants (contracts). This would be done by removing line items and giving the counties the freedom to spend where there are needs. The state office does not want to “micro-manage” contracts any longer.
 - This would be done by reviewing projected local revenues against the available amount set by the state office.
 - These expenses would have to be WAC eligible items
 - Equipment would be an addition to what the “granted” amount is.
 - The Policy Subcommittee feels this would ease the task of this subcommittee because the caps and line items would be removed.
 - The state office would be freed up to complete the audits that would be needed.
 - This could revert back to the “old way” if the state office feels there is abuse of the “micro-management” way.

- Deb Flewelling is asking the state office to look at small, medium, and large counties separately. She feels there needs to be deliverables to defer the counties expectations.
- There were discussions that the counties may use all of their funding toward personnel salaries that may not be related to 9-1-1. They were reminded that the items the funds were spent on would still need to be WAC eligible and language would be added to contract in order to avoid this.
- The state office (Bill) will work on this and have something by the next meeting.
- The state office will try to implement this in FY2015 as time allows but will definitely be completed for FY2016 contract period.
- Dave Cox suggested creating a workgroup to assist with cross checking the policies and how they would affect all counties.
 - These would have to be reviewed by the AAG but the application process would not change.
 - The timeline would be to meet for 3-day meeting in February; as well as in March; brief Advisory committee.
- Ziggy wants the group to get together to review past policies and decide what is needed and what will not hinder the state.

Contract Eligibility:

- Richard Kirton met with state office to discuss the five (5) year look back at revenue tracking for counties.
- He requested the state office ask counties to submit details showing what the counties spent and where it was spent in order to show expenditures were more than revenue collected.
- Richard drafted policy language and Teresa assisted with putting into same format as other policies. This new language would replace Section 6 under Operations Section Eligibility.
- Would like to present at January Advisory meeting so it could be voted during the March 20th meeting. The requested amendment to the County Contract Policy will be available on SkyDrive.

Other Business:

- Discussion on changes to the Salary Survey.
 - The salary survey is very complicated. This makes it difficult to get good and accurate information from it, per Jim Quackenbush.
 - Stephanie Fritts has asked counties for updated information and almost every PSAP has reported. She will be asking for the information again hoping for more responses.
 - Stephanie will be collecting information on retirement and other benefits, removing the column for Call Volumes.
- GIS Survey

- Surveys have been completed. Four (4) counties did not respond. Still waiting for NENA to complete the standards.
- GIS subcommittee has developed a transition plan.

- “Elements Status/Projected Timelines” Survey
 - Jim Quackenbush proposed a survey to define what the counties have and where they are at in the purchasing of equipment.
 - Andy requested to see all quotes in order to build a resource library. (If the proposals are priority, he is asking the counties to request a side-by-side comparison.
 - Once the survey is complete, the Policy subcommittee would like to send out to all E911 Coordinators.
 - Andy, from the state office, will be gathering the results.

- State Office
 - Bill wants to review the 10% maintenance. He feels there has to be a better model to look at.
 - The Policy subcommittee has reviewed this and due to vendors knowing how state office funds, they price by this.
 - If this is removed, counties will be able to negotiate the service with vendors.
 - The Policy subcommittee will review this specifically during the February meeting when addressing Block Grant funding (see above).

The next Policy subcommittee meeting is scheduled for February 18-20. The 3-day meeting will be in multiple locations throughout the three days. The meeting dates and place will be noted on the agenda.