



1. Call to order, roll call, and determination of a quorum.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Sharpton at 1:30 pm

Adam Griffith	Clay Sander
Ashley Woodall	Greg Fisher
Belinda McGhie	Ken Stewart
Ben Curry	Mark Sharpton
Brandon Reynolds	Mary Harris
Chris Palmer	Shaun Barnett
Christina Brown	

A quorum was met with thirteen members in attendance.

2. This regular meeting of the Oklahoma 9-1-1 Management Authority (“Authority”) has been convened in accordance with the Oklahoma Open Meeting Act.

If an Authority member would like to add an agenda item to the next regularly scheduled meeting, please contact the 9-1-1 Coordinator and the Authority Chair at least one (1) week in advance of the meeting.

3. Welcome to members of the Authority, new employee Ms. Amy Cardwell, Cybersecurity Specialist, and guests in attendance.

Mr. Sharpton welcomed the members of the Authority, allowed guests to introduce themselves, and introduced Ms. Amy Cardwell, a Cybersecurity Specialist hired recently to work alongside Mr. Coonfield.

4. Possible discussion, revision, and vote to approve minutes of the October 16, 2024, special meeting.

Mr. Sharpton allowed a few minutes for the Authority members to review the minutes.

Mr. Sharpton called for discussion or questions.

Hearing none, a motion was made to approve the minutes of the October 16th meeting by Mr. Barnett, a second by Mr. Curry. The motion passed with eleven ayes and zero nays. Mr. Sander and Ms. Harris abstained.

5. Possible discussion, revision, and vote to approve the financial reports for July, August, September, and October 2024.

Mr. Terry introduced and reported on the reports, which were provided within the meeting packet, for the months of July, August, September, and October 2024.

Mr. Sharpton called for discussion or questions.

Hearing none, a motion was made to approve the financial reports as provided by Ms. Brown, a second Ms. Woodall. The motion passed with thirteen ayes and zero nays.

6. Possible discussion, revision, and vote to approve a change in the Mission Critical Partner Scope of Work for the NG9-1-1 Core and ESInet procurement to include creating a Cybersecurity policy. Hours will be used from the end of the project to fulfill this change.

Mr. Terry explained to prepare for NG9-1-1, specifically the request for proposal, which the Ad Hoc Committee has been working towards, and in that effort, we've determined we needed two policies, one policy being an interconnectivity policy, which outlines the interconnectivity requirements for local 9-1-1 centers and an ESInet and core services to connect to the state's core service, the other policy which has been debated with Mission Critical regarding whether or not that policy was included in the original scope of work for the NG9-1-1 RFP development, and they have said that it is not included, and that policy is a cyber security policy.

In working with them, they have agreed to move some hours to the first of their proposal. The cost would be about \$34,000 or 190 hours worth of work from Mission Critical to develop that cyber security policy. In talking with staff and also the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, Mr. Curry, Mr. Terry stated he believed there were two options. One option would be to accept this proposal and move the money to the front of the work that Mission Critical is doing to have them assist with the cyber security policy. The other option would be for us to take this in-house and task staff, our new Cyber Security Specialist, along with our Technology Coordinator, to develop that cybersecurity policy in conjunction with committee work and review what other states have done.

Mr. Curry stated this was discussed at length over the last couple of weeks, and he didn't think anyone was curious about where he stood on this. He explained he still thinks this should have been included in the original policy. Legal looked it over and said it could go either way, but they don't see anything that says that they absolutely have to do this. He stated he thinks the \$33,000 is too much for it, and with a cyber security person on staff, we allow her a shot at it. Mr. Curry referenced his center, and if he needed a policy, he wouldn't go out and spend \$34,000 on a new policy; he would see what was available. Looking to other states and what other centers have, bring them together, and then we see what can be done. Mr. Curry said it was his recommendation to reject this and leave it as it is and let the Management Authority staff work to create something.

Mr. Sharpton called for discussion or questions.

Ms. Harris asked if the Cyber Security Specialist was a permanent position.

Mr. Terry replied that it is a year-to-year grant, which currently has one year, but there will be additional years that can be applied for. This is dependent on the authority. The funding right now for this position comes from a Homeland Security grant. However, the Authority has the ability to be able to continue that year to year based on the budget.

Mr. Sharpton called for further questions or discussion.

Hearing none, Mr. Curry made a motion to reject this change keep the contract the way it is, and allow staff the ability to create this policy in-house. A second was made by Mr. Palmer. The motion passed with thirteen ayes and zero nays.

7. Possible discussion, revision, and vote to accept the recommendation from the NG9-1-1 Ad Hoc Committee to modify the FY25 grant guidelines to not allow the applications for call handling equipment (CHE) until a contract for NG9-1-1 core services has been fully executed.

Mr. Curry explained there had been a lot of discussion in the Ad Hoc Committee over this, to which he stated he expected a lot of discussion today. Mr. Curry explained that as a member of a COG that purchased two systems, a core and call-handling equipment which were supposed to be up and running four years ago and not, and vendors promised those would work together.

A lot was learned through his personal experience that just because something is i3 capable does not necessarily mean the same thing to every vendor. A promise that they work together, but they don't necessarily actually work together, like they said. It was brought up in the Ad Hoc Committee, to pause all call-handling equipment grants until a core was selected and it is known to work.

The request is to approve pausing all grants for call-handling equipment until the RFP has been awarded for a core, that works and grant dollars are being spent on a product that works.

Ms. Shelly Dragg from Carter County attempted to ask a question.

Mr. Bower informed her that pursuant to the Open Meetings Act, there are no public comments that were not noted on the agenda.

Mr. Sharpton called for questions or discussion.

Ms. Harris commented, that in the example of ACOG, it could be the call-handling equipment or the core service provider. That is there could be issues in both directions. Ms. Harris stated a lot of trust is placed in the committees to come up with good decisions for the core service provider following the guidelines and standards of NENA as they evolve and the call handling equipment evolves along with the NENA standards.

Ms. Harris stated to stop funding for many PSAPs that are in the state they are in, with their equipment at the end of life because of a fear that something might happen, she stated she thought it short-sighted and some things could be done or put a safeguard in place, such putting clauses in contracts and RFPs stating that the call handling equipment be guaranteed to work with the core services provided by the state of Oklahoma. To have some type of insulation and barrier to the situations that Mr. Curry is referring to.

Ms. Harris explained she would rather have safeguards in place than stop grant funding now because many of the PSAPs are trying to position themselves to be successful, and when a core service provider is acquired stopping that process now will set many PSAPs financially back. She said speaking

personally, that she can't, in good conscience, continue to ask my PSAPs to run on thirteen-year-old systems and can't wait one to two months to move them. Ms. Harris asked for a solution other than just stopping grant funding.

Mr. Sander commented that he would reiterate, that his equipment is a couple of years past the end of its lifetime. He stated he is waiting on somebody that he knows has an RFP out to look at that but if he has to wait another two possible years before we're able to fund call handling equipment again, that puts some of us in a major bind.

Mr. Sander continued acknowledging that everyone understands that no one wants to spend money on something that won't work in the future. But he said he felt there was a way to narrow that down, to only call-handling equipment that could work or should work, will work, with a guarantee that will work. Not just the vendor statement, but a clause that holds that vendor responsible for making sure that it functions with whatever support services the state goes with.

Ms. Harris commented that the primary goal of this group is to facilitate the PSAPs through the grant process. If it were furniture being stopped at, it would be one thing. But stopping it on a major need is to her not okay.

Mr. Sander asked if there was a realistic timeframe.

Mr. Terry responded when the work first started with Mission Critical, it was not anticipated to go out before May or April, now we expect the RFP to be on the ground in February, with it being returned in about sixty to ninety days later with the scoring and selection process, and depending on the contract negotiations, a contract for core services and ESINet in the next eight to twelve months, eight being aggressive, and at least having something in twelve months. Mr. Terry stated he felt the worst-case scenario, would be about twelve months to have a contract in place for core services where the one selected is known and start to move forward.

Ms. Harris commented she thought that was an aggressive schedule. When it was tried with the GIS vendors and got to the contract phase there were a lot of questions that slowed the process down almost a year.

Mr. Terry explained that puts about a six-month window in, probably more like a seven-month window, to get the contract finalized. He agreed with Ms. Harris that there is the possibility that it could go longer.

Ms. Harris commented that they are not in control of the process.

Mr. Terry agreed and stated Mission Critical warned us about that also.

Mr. Terry stated he is looking at what other states have done, and the contract negotiation process is not as long as it appears to be, but he reiterated Ms. Harris' comment that they are not in control.

Ms. McGhie asked if suspending the grants or putting them on hold and waiting for the core services to be installed to try and get a list of a select few call handling systems for when the grants are brought back they can be submitted, would guarantee they would work with the core.

Mr. Terry stated the point of this is as soon as there is a contract signed and approved by this Authority, the contract provider will be known, and at that point, the grant funding can be released, but it won't go live. It may not even be necessarily at the lab, but the core provider will be known and RFP will be possible and grant funds can be requested.

Ms. Harris commented that according to the plan just mentioned testing will have to be done through a lab. Through this plan, they would not go through the lab, and they would not know if it's functional.

Mr. Terry agreed, saying that at least they can be held accountable for the core service selected.

Ms. McGhie stated she has concerns with that because that is going to cost PSAPs that are already in motion to try to put an RFP out for call-handling equipment.

Ms. Brown asked if those PSAPs who are already going through this process, there was, at one point with the GIS grants, a second opportunity for maintenance. Would there be an option later within the grants for any agencies that need assistance making sure what they've chosen will work with the state-chosen vendor?

Mr. Terry replied saying it's going to continue to be an evolving process. He could not speak on behalf of the Administrative Committee, but the grant program is to support the mission of this Authority, not necessarily to support all the needs of the local 9-1-1 centers, but certainly to support the mission of this Authority, which will continue to evolve and mature as we move along. Depending on the cost of NG9-1-1 core services, it may directly impact the amount of money we have available for grant funding.

Mr. Terry commented that if each PSAP is looking at applying for grant funding just for calling solutions for this year, the grant program is going to get hit hard. It's an evolving process, and we're open to whatever carries out the mission.

Ms. Brown commented that with that, essentially, there are going to be agencies that are smaller and can't afford to do it twice and therefore, have one chance at a grant, possibly, depending on the cost.

Mr. Terry explained that's the warning. There have been discussions with the Ad Hoc Committee, and there is a concern there. One discussion regarding a small 9-1-1 center that comes forward and extends their 20% match: their grant is approved, and the potential perception is the grant is approved. Therefore, the call-handling equipment is approved, and it's going to work in the future. If later, that call-handling equipment didn't pass the lab, then there could be an opportunity for the PSAP to come back and say, Wait a second, you said it was going to work. Now you need to replace all of our equipment.

Mr. Terry asked the Authority to come to an agreement or propose an idea. This is the reason why it's great to have a discussion, to prevent the Authority from being on the hook for something that we

knew. Because Mission Critical wrote those words, the initial words, if you look at the deleted words, they're the ones that wrote the words and wrote the warning; and they are nationally known for their work in NG9-1-1. They're the ones that tell us not everything works with everything. This isn't something that the Ad Hoc Committee came up with, this is under the direction of Mission Critical Partners. The Authority needs to understand we've had this conversation, we've had this agenda item. Based upon the decision moving forward it's not just, it may or may not work, but it's also the political and financial impact. If it is decided to fund this, now what? Are there ways to work around that, Mr. Terry stated he felt there absolutely are, with contract terms and RFP, however, we all know how contracts are.

Mr. Barnett asked if there would be language added for safeguarding if the Authority continues with this plan. Has the language been developed and what are the guidelines that would require the vendors to stay within the means they have to go forward? Is the language strong enough or does this plan need to be paused?

Mr. Terry stated there has not been language put together, there have been discussions between himself and some Authority members and PSAP Directors. Mr. Terry stated his recommendation would be, that if it's not approved as written but wants to enforce the grant funding going toward the procurement of call handling, then the proposed contract has to be approved before the grants are approved, there needs to be a draft, not signed contract with the agreed upon language that the Authority should draft or the Administrative Committee should draft based on the motion.

This would be sent to the Administrative Committee to draft the language and put in the grant guidelines that this has to be in the contract, working with vendors, attorneys, and whoever to make sure that is correct. First, there needs to be a draft as part of the application to ensure that is the actual one assigned and that the signed contract is delivered to the Authority before any funds are delivered there must be a confirmation that language is in the contract.

Mr. Terry stated there is a lot more work that has to be done with the grant review committee and with staff. However, it potentially could make us feel better about the long-term success of NG9-1-1 in the state of Oklahoma, so that is an option, but, the Administrative Committee needs to draft that language, working with several different parties.

Mr. Stewart commented he wanted to draw attention to the letter that was submitted by an ACOG as well as Johnston County. The other component to this that could potentially cause issues, even with NG9-1-1 core services in place, is the connectivity of the multiple cores that are in place today. So yes, call handling poses a problem, but so does the core service. At the end of the day the goal of this Authority, I would think, and those of us in the room, is to make sure we deliver 9-1-1 call handling and answer the call, and so suspending the rule is troubling when maybe we should look at the other things that are completed in grant funding to make sure we're meeting the mission of answering the call.

Mr. Curry stated he 100% agreed with Mr. Stewart and he thinks that the reason this item is here today, is to protect the state so they don't end up in a situation like ACOG is right now; where there was contract language that says these things can work together and they don't. They're rapidly trying to do it, and he stated he didn't want to see other agencies across the state go buy a lot of call-

handling equipment right now and then find out that it's going to be five, ten, or fifteen years before you can connect to it. We want you to be able to answer the call as quickly as you can.

Mr. Stewart commented where he is at, at the end of life, and potentially can't answer the call today. He stated he thought there was more than one of the groups in the room that had those problems.

Mr. Sharpton called for a motion.

Ms. Harris made a motion to either table or go ahead and vote on it and vote it down, hopefully, so that we can come back with a better option for all the parties involved and still have some safeguards there.

Ms. Harris commented that there's no way you're ever going to have 100% safeguard on this. This happened when we did wireless in the 9-1-1 industry. The vendors couldn't all do it at first. They had to come to the table. It took years for all the for all the vendors to do that. This is an evolving technology, and we can try as hard as we can, but there are going to be hiccups and bumps in the road. And yes, ACOG experienced a very or is experiencing very bad situation. But they had the same consultant we had. It didn't help. So knowing all this, learning from all of this, using the best information, making the best decisions, and spending our money the best way that we can to serve our public. But just stopping the process because we're afraid something bad will happen is not the solution.

Mr. Sharpton asked for clarification on the motion made by Ms. Harris.

Ms. Harris clarified her motion is to table the item until it can be discussed in the Administrative Committee further and modified.

Mr. Sharpton asked that if an action item is tabled it must be brought back the following meeting.

Mr. Bower confirmed it will need to be brought back at the following meeting.

A motion was made by Ms. Harris to table the recommendation from the NG9-1-1 Ad Hoc Committee to modify the FY25 grant guidelines to not allow the applications for call handling equipment (CHE) until a contract for NG9-1-1 core services has been fully executed until the next meeting; a second by Ms. McGhie. The motion passed with thirteen ayes and zero nays.

8. Possible discussion, revision, and vote to accept the changes to the Strategic Plan that include OK911MA strategic initiatives, section two: Communications, section three: Technology, and section four: Geographic Information Systems (GIS).
Number seven was skipped, and will return to number seven after number eight.

Mr. Terry referenced the meeting packet and the modifications to the Strategic Plan for NG9-1-1, specifically changes to the goals and objectives starting on page 41 of that document, titled "Technology." Mr. Terry corrected saying it's page 41 of the packet but page 13 of the proposal.

Mr. Terry continued, referencing page 14 or page 42, the blue highlighted wording, and also a deleted section from the original Strategic Plan from the review by the Ad hoc Committee, who are tasked with updating that strategic plan and bringing that back to the authority. The Committee found a lot of generic language within this section, giving advice but not necessarily a plan. The advice was that the state and local 9-1-1 authorities should come to an agreement on how to deploy core services and call-handling equipment. The language was suggestive but not definitive on what to do.

Mr. Terry continued, explaining there were a couple of sections included that had been modified, he read the first for clarity on what was included.

“through discussions with the state and local stakeholders, the agreed plan for local call handling equipment will be a hybrid system that includes hosted call handling and individually owned call handling equipment with regional and local services”

Mr. Terry paused to make sure everyone understood that call-handling equipment is the local 9-1-1 hardware and software that is used to answer 9-1-1 calls at the local level.

Mr. Terry continued,

“the state next generation 9-1-1 core services NGCS will need to support multiple call handling equipment options the NGCS provider will include a testing lab for certification of current and future call handling solutions. It is understood by both the state and local stakeholders that there may be current call handling equipment that may not pass the certification process to be connected to the state in NGCS. If this occurs, the state will provide a contract vehicle that local agencies can use to procure CHE that has been certified on the state NG9-1-1 core service.

Mr. Terry referenced the deleted portion and the generic language and on page 43 of the packet at the top, he pointed out data changes show the six different calling solutions there are currently and a total of 406 actual seats of call-handling solutions.

Mr. Terry referenced the bottom, the last paragraph within section 3.1, it states, and this is again, some of that more generic language that has been replaced,

“as previously stated, Oklahoma 9-1-1 Management Authority will require in the RFP that the NGCS provider have a lab for testing CHG compatibility to ensure its software is certified and releases work seamlessly. The state and all stakeholders agree that to keep the cost of technology and speed of planned innovation in mind, there must be a certification process in place to ensure all call-handling equipment adequately works with the state's NGCS. The CHE certification process and procedure can be found in the interconnectivity policy...”

Mr. Terry noted that is what is being worked on with Mission Critical.

“Just because the NG9-1-1 call-handling equipment and NGCS are i3 capable. (i3 being the NG9-1-1 standard that's been presented by NENA) does not ensure that they will move to new software and technology enhancements at the same pace. This mismatch of technology causes many interoperability issues that are seen in the industry today.”

Mr. Terry reiterated that this just further defines it by saying there is going to be a lab, and everyone that will be on the calling equipment will have to test through that lab, and if you do not pass through the lab, there will be a contract vehicle for those that want to procure off of something that's already been certified.

These are the main changes to the strategic plan. There are also some changes within cyber security and GIS, but those are minor changes just to bring the plan up to date. Mr. Terry stated he wanted to bring attention to those specific changes, he felt those had the biggest impact on the local 9-1-1 centers.

Ms. Harris asked what the contract vehicle was.

Mr. Terry explained the state of Oklahoma will offer a contract. In discussions with the Ad Hoc Committee, the plan is to move forward with a core service provider, move forward with the RFP selection, get the 9-1-1 Management Authority to approve a contract with core services and ESINet, and as soon as that happens, an RFP would be released for call handle equipment that would be a state contract based upon what the core currently has approved within other systems in the country. Much like the GIS grant, there will be state-authorized vendors on a state contract that can be procured.

Mr. Sharpton called for questions or further discussion.

Ms. Harris stated her discontent with the way the Strategic Plan was presented/printed in the packet stating it was difficult to read. She stated she was trusting of Mr. Terry's explanation and presentation of the changes.

Mr. Sharpton noted that the packet was emailed to the Authority members.

Ms. Harris noted it was presented in the emailed packet the same way, making it difficult to determine what was inserted and deleted. She requested in the future there be clean copies presented without the annotations.

Hearing none, a motion was made to accept the changes to the Strategic Plan that include OK911MA strategic initiatives, section two: Communications, section three: Technology, and section four: Geographic Information Systems (GIS) by Mr. Curry; a second by Mr. Palmer. The motion passed with thirteen ayes and zero nays.

9. Possible discussion to update the Authority on the request for proposal (RFP) from the June 20, 2024, special meeting instructing the Oklahoma State 9-1-1 Coordinator's office to conduct a request for proposal (RFP) process for geographic information systems (GIS) for local data creation, for maintenance of GIS data to meet the Oklahoma NG9-1-1 and Addressing Standard, and to ensure that local data is uploaded to the state repository in preparation for the deployment of Next Generation 9-1-1.

Mr. Terry asked for this item to be tabled to read in the following meeting.

A motion was made by Ms. Woodall to table the request for the recommendation from the NG9-1-1 Ad Hoc Committee to modify the FY25 grant guidelines to not allow the applications for call handling equipment (CHE) until a contract for NG9-1-1 core services has been fully executed; a second by Ms. Brown. The motion passed with twelve ayes and zero nays. Mr. Fisher abstained.

10. Possible discussion and action regarding the following grant requests:

The grant pending forms within the packet did not print correctly, therefore there were handouts provided at the beginning of the meeting, as well as a digital packet emailed before the meeting.

APPLICANT NAME	GRANT TYPE	STATE AMOUNT	LOCAL MATCH	TOTAL REQUEST AMOUNT	RECOMENDATION
Chickasha PD	GIS	\$36,640.00	\$0.00	\$36,640.00	Fund
Garvin County	GIS	\$98,370.00	\$0.00	\$98,370.00	Fund
Midwest City, City Of	GIS	\$79,600.00	\$0.00	\$79,600.00	Fund
Noble, City Of	GIS	\$38,600.00	\$0.00	\$38,600.00	Fund
Tonkawa, City Of	GIS	\$41,545.00	\$0.00	\$41,545.00	Fund
Yukon, City Of	GIS	\$32,470.00	\$0.00	\$32,470.00	Fund
Jenks, City Of	TRNG	\$53,598.00	\$0.00	\$53,598.00	Fund
Moore, City Of	TRNG	\$136,017.00	\$0.00	\$136,017.00	Fund
Roger Mills County	TRNG	\$68,773.85	\$0.00	\$68,773.85	Fund
Wagoner County	TRNG	\$66,498.00	\$0.00	\$66,498.00	Fund
Woods County	TRNG	\$61,586.00	\$0.00	\$61,586.00	Fund
Johnston County	NG911	\$188,000.00	\$47,000.00	\$235,000.00	Fund
Oklahoma County	NG911	\$71,632.80	\$17,908.20	\$89,541.00	Fund
Skiatook, City Of	9-1-1 Radio Consoles	\$95,774.40	\$23,943.60	\$119,718.00	Fund
TOTAL		\$1,069,105.05	\$88,851.80	\$1,157,956.85	

- a. Ms. Woodall called for any Authority member that may have conflicts with reading all GIS requested grants together to say aye.

Ms. Harris noted a conflict with Roger Mills County.

Ms. Woodall noted this was all GIS, and there was no conflict with Roger Mills, that grant was for training. Ms. Harris agreed.

All GIS grant requests were read together and voted on in one motion and one vote.

- b. Ms. Woodall read Chickasha Police Department requests for a grant for GIS remediation in the amount of \$36,640. Garvin County requests a grant for GIS remediation and two years of

maintenance with SAM for \$98,370. Midwest City is seeking a grant for GIS remediation and two years of maintenance with Datamark in the amount of \$79,600. The City of Noble is seeking a grant for GIS remediation and two years of maintenance in the amount of \$38,600. The City of Tonkawa is seeking a grant for GIS remediation and two years of maintenance in the amount of \$41,545. The City of Yukon is seeking a grant for GIS remediation and two years of maintenance with SAM in the amount of \$32,470. Ms. Woodall stated it is the recommendation these be funded.

A motion was made by Ms. Woodall to fund the listed grants; a second by Mr. Curry. The motion passes with thirteen ayes and zero nays.

- c. The City of Jenks is requesting a grant for Powerphone protocols in the amount of \$53,598.

A motion to approve the grant request from the City of Jenks in the amount of \$53,598 was made by Mr. Barnett; a second by Mr. Sander. The motion passes with twelve ayes and zero nays. Mr. Stewart abstained.

- d. The City of Moore is requesting a grant for police protocols in the amount of \$136,017.

A motion was made to approve the grant request from the City of Moore in the amount of \$136,017 by Mr. Sander a second by Ms. Woodall. The motion passed with thirteen ayes and zero nays.

- e. Roger Mills County is asking for a grant for protocols with an ODIS interface in the amount of \$68,773.85.

A motion was made to approve the grant request from Roger Mills County in the amount of \$68,773.85 by Ms. Woodall; a second by Mr. Sander. The motion passed with twelve ayes and zero nays. Ms. Harris abstained.

- f. Wagoner County is seeking a grant for EMD protocols with a CAD interface in the amount of \$66,498.

A motion was made to approve the grant request from Wagoner County in the amount of \$66,498 by Ms. Woodall; a second by Mr. Sander. The motion passed with twelve ayes and zero nays.

- g. Ms. Douglas read the grant request from Woods County, which is requesting a grant for call handling protocols that would include software licenses and server interface in the amount of \$61,586.

A motion was made by Ms. Brown to approve the grant request from Woods County in the amount of \$61,586; a second by Mr. Sander. The motion passed with twelve ayes and zero nays. Ms. Woodall abstained.

- h. Johnston County is seeking a grant for NG9-1-1 with a call handling solution from AT&T with text to 9-1-1 in the amount of \$188,000 contingent on a local match of \$47,000 for a total of \$235,000. Ms. Woodall commented that with the discussion around the grant the Committee was unsure if this was a valid grant.

Mr. Barnett stated that with everything set the way it is this is a valid grant.

A motion was made by Mr. Barnett to approve the grant request from Johnston County in the amount of \$235,000, with \$188,000 from state funds and contingent on a local match of \$47,000; a second by Ms. Harris. The motion passes with nine ayes and three nays - Ms. Woodall, Mr. Curry, and Ms. Brown.

- i. Oklahoma County is requesting a grant for NG9-1-1 with an Eventide NG9-1-1 recorder in the amount of \$89,541 with a local match of \$17,908.20 and \$71,632.80 from state funds.

A motion was made by Ms. Woodall to approve the grant request from Oklahoma County in the amount of \$89,541 contingent on a local match of \$17,908.20 and \$71,632.80 from state funds; a second was made by Ms. Brown. The motion passed with thirteen ayes and zero nays.

- j. The City of Skiatook is requesting a grant for radio consoles that will incorporate all of the radio channels as well as the tornado sirens, and give the ability to set them off, Arkansas Valley Communications will be the vendor. The amount of \$119,718 is contingent on a local match of \$23,943.60 and \$95,774.40 coming from state funds.

A motion was made by Ms. Woodall to approve the grant request from the City of Skiatook in the amount of \$119,718 contingent on a local match of \$23,943.60 and \$95,774.40 from state funds; a second was made by Mr. Sander. The motion passed with twelve ayes and zero nays. Mr. Stewart abstained.

11. Committee and Staff Reports: (discussion only)

- a. The Programs Coordinator update was given by Ms. Root, who stated the Registration Forms are due on December 17. Currently, fifty-four PSAPs have started forms, this means they have begun to work on the Forms, but they have not completed and submitted the Forms. Five PSAPs have submitted their Forms and are waiting on my review, Seven have completed and submitted their Forms, which is about 6% of the total 126 PSAPs. She reminded those watching and in attendance that the Forms are completed through EMGrants; if you need a login or help to navigate to get the Forms she asked you to contact her.

Ms. Root commented that she would be on vacation the following week but would be available to assist with the Forms upon her return.

The Population model will be sent out soon, and letters and emails will be going out in the next couple of days. These emails are the same as the letters that are mailed out to you. They have instructions on how to submit that population model. Ms. Root explained the Population Model, as the yearly information request from PSAPs, asking them to confirm and verify their call boundary in order to give numbers to the tax commission so PSAPs can receive their wireless disbursements correctly for the next fiscal year.

Ms. Root reiterated that this will be an email and a letter, but it will have a link to an online story map. The story map that allows a closer look at the PSAP boundary map, is provided by Ms. Shellie Willoughby at the Conservation Commission. There will also be a PDF version in the email and a link in the letter that is mailed out.

The timeline is earlier this year and moved the delivery of the maps up a couple of weeks.

Mr. Terry added to Ms. Root's report that there will be a final vote and approval from the Authority in April, usually, it is in May because of the move to from from a May meeting to an April meeting. The approval has to be in April, which is why we are going earlier than in past years. To set your expectations, there will not be an opportunity to wait until the end of April to make or submit changes. If there are changes submit those early along with any documentation you have to support those changes by mid-January.

Ms. Root announced the Holiday Ornament Exchange is happening again this year, this is the third year this has occurred. She advised that emails would be coming about signing up, as a PSAP or an individual.

- b. The Administrative Committee report was given by Mr. Terry in Mr. Carangey's place. Mr. Terry reported that Mr. Sharpton has recommended or approved Mr. Carnagey to be the chair of the Administrative Committee. The Committee has been working through the rules update and also change requests to the grant guidelines that have been recommended outside of our previous discussion, a couple of small changes have been recommended to assist the grant review committee. Mr. Terry stated he anticipated those grant guidelines changes to be presented in January. They also have been working on getting some cleanup language to help the grant review committee.

Ms. Harris asked why there are Rules in the packet for this meeting, where they are supposed to be reviewed.

Mr. Terry explained they were not, they had already been approved by the Authority and they were put in there to provide information, as that is what is going to be on the website for public comment.

- c. The Grants Coordinator update was given by Ms. Douglas, who stated last month, that there were a record number of grants coming in, which is evident in the grants approved today. Ms. Douglas applauded and thanked the Grant Committee for their work reviewing the grants. She reminded the primary PSAPs that in September, the Board did recommend the 2025, grant guidelines, which added a couple of new categories and new items that can be applied for, those guidelines are on the website, [OK.gov/ 911](http://OK.gov/911). Ms. Douglas offered assistance and to contact her with any questions.
- d. The Technical Committee was given by Mr. Curry, who reported the Technical Committee has been slow, just because we've got so many of our members working on the Ad Hoc Committee and the GIS RFP that was just announced.
- e. The Technology Coordinator reported by Mr. Coonfield, who stated he and Ms. Cardwell completed a cyber security assessment the day before the meeting in McClain County. This brings the assessments to a total of four completed with eleven assessments to be done, with the data to be provided to the NG9-1-1 potential core provider. In the GIS update, nine total vendors completed the RFP, and the responses have been reviewed and scored. Award letters will be sent out shortly, and the vendors awarded will be announced at the January meeting.

The GIS Committee met and discussed the potential topics for the 2025 GIS courses. Those topics have not been fully approved yet, but include Intro to ArcPro, and Transition to ArcPro from the desktop, Toolkit, Topology, MSAG, and Standards.

The NG9-1-1 Committee met and continues to meet on a weekly basis, working with Mission Critical Partners to develop the NG9-1-1 core RFP, which is expected to be released first quarter of 2025. They also have been working on reviewing the cyber security policies that the state has, as well as other states, through our NANSAs connections, and will be reviewing those to start working on that policy.

For the 9-1-1 Coordinators Workshop, Mr. Coonfield stated he wished he had more news to share, but we are currently working on securing a location, date, and time. More information will be provided on training and travel.

Mr. Coonfield attended the Oklahoma Public Safety Conference. Along with traveling to Oklahoma City to do interviews, we hired Ms. Amy Cardwell.

Mr. Coonfield attended the Oklahoma Telephone Association Conference and the Association of County Commissioners of Oklahoma conference.

Ms. Harris asked what the chain of command was for Ms. Cardwell.

Mr. Coonfield replied she reported directly to him.

Ms. Harris asked for her to share her credentials.

Ms. Carderll introduced herself as the 9-1-1 Cyber Security Specialist. She is currently attending East Central University in Ada, finishing her bachelor's degree in Information Technology Management. She stated she graduates next Saturday, on the 14th, and she also has a Google Cyber Security Certification.

- f. The Operations Committee report was given by Ms. Brown, who stated the Committee had an opportunity to meet with Total Response, formally known as Power Phone, to demo their training platform and explain to them what are the 40-hour minimum training standards. What they provided to the committee was that Virtual Academy and APCO courses provide a legitimate 40 hours of training. Their 40 hours of training would have been one hour equals four hours. Therefore, there was no match as far as the actual hours of training in comparison to what was earned. The Committee demoed some of the training that was provided through them, and it just wasn't as robust as what has already been approved by the Operations Committee. Ms. Brown stated she believed what they've been told was maybe work on it a little more, bring it back at another time, and maybe it'll be reconsidered once it's a little better organized in actually 40 hours.

The Committee has seen more participation in Virtual Academy and has discussed working to initiate more participation in the communication with the information that Ms. Goodner is sharing, as well as, what our users need to see to keep them updated. Maybe they're not

sitting in front of information all the time, but they can see the information being passed on in front of Virtual Academy. We're trying to work on different ways to improve participation and the sharing of information on Virtual Academy. We've discussed hiring and recruiting tools. Not all agencies have a hiring and recruiting or marketing team like Edmond, we were going to work together and come up with some of these ideas because we know that hiring and recruiting and even retention, getting people trained and retaining them past training, means having support before and after the training to help the centers.

The training declaration has been completed and approved, it's very simple. It explains the training standards, where the statute can be found, and provides an opportunity for the agency department head and the trainer to provide the training that they're providing to their telecommunicators and then a signature verifying that that's provided.

- g. The Training Coordinator update was given by Ms. Goodner, she stated the contract with Moetivations is in the last month, Notifications have gone out over the last couple of months, letting agencies know that that Moetivations will no longer be available on the state contract. For November, we had about sixty logins and one new user added. Virtual Academy now at 1318 users, over 107 sites. There are three sites that we have created their profiles waiting on their orientation call, so hopefully they'll be live within the next week or so. There have been several communications sent out to agencies that are not on board, to continue to invite them to use the platform. As far as our training, numbers currently 543 are enrolled in NENA's core competency course, the 40-hour course, with 211 having completed it and using Virtual Academy training, and 607 users have completed the TCPR training. Ms. Goodner stated she is very happy with that program.

Ms. Brown commented she has had an opportunity to go through the Virtual Academy 40-hour course, and she stated she has been looking for the last five years for a course like this to provide to her people because it covers coming to work, how to not burn all of your sick leave just because we burned it. It's the ethics pieces that we have been missing for brand-new employees. Treat your co-workers right, show up, provide services. Just because our citizens can't decide who provides their services doesn't mean that they have to have bad services. Ms. Brown stated her appreciation for the 40-hour courses offered.

Ms. Goodner continued saying the interviews for the 9-1-1/988 Liaison position were held last week, and we hope to have more information soon.

The process of notifying candidates for 2025 has begun and the process of creating an RFP to bring some in-person training to Oklahoma. After speaking with the Operations Committee and her team, some of the training that we're going to be looking for is leadership, supervisor training, workplace culture, interviewing, and retention; and we've also had several requests for advanced police and fire training. Ms. Goodner stated she will be working on getting the RFP hopefully we'll be able to bring those trainings regionally over the next three years.

Ms. Goodner traveled to the New Chief's Training in Norman. She also attended the Homeland Security Conference and joined the team at the Association of County Commissioners of Oklahoma for their fall conference. She was able to make some

connections there, and the week following the meeting will be presenting at their New Sheriff Training.

12. The State 9-1-1 Coordinator Report to the Board from Mr. Terry, stated he and Mr. Coonfield have been involved in phone call conversations with the City of Catoosa between Mission Critical Partners and the City of Catoosa. He stated he is impressed with the things that are going on, and thanked Ms. McGhie and the Authority for making the recommendation within the motion to charge the Authority to assist them through that process. Mr. Terry commented that there is a lot of good and positive work going on there. The City of Catoosa has announced that their training started this week with seven new hires, and they're pushing forward with their internal training, which is aligning with their rollout of technology. Mr. Terry said he is looking forward to the City coming online in the near future.

We did have another round of interviews and chose a hire for the 9-1-1/988 Liaison, and all the information has been turned over to human resources. Mr. Terry stated he anticipates a conditional offer to be going out in the next few days. There were some really good applicants. At the last meeting, the salary was raised, and working with the Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse to make some modifications, and it certainly made a difference in the applicants and those that were able to apply.

The Oklahoma Telephone Association hosted a great conference. Mr. Terry stated his appreciation to ACOG for gathering and providing him with data and information related to their NG9-1-1 rollout, he was able to present that at the Oklahoma Telephone Association, specifically as it pertains to the recent FCC rulings for landline companies, the two phases for landline companies to come into compliance with the delivery of calls to NG9-1-1 core services. They're well ahead of us, and it was good to have factual information from ACOG to present to the Oklahoma Telephone Association. It was very well received.

The Association of County Commissioners (ACCO). Mr. Terry thanked the County Commissioners Association for rolling out the red carpet for our team. Mr. Terry was able to be the guest speaker, but there was also a panel that consisted of Ms. Woodall along with the County Commissioner from Grant County, and Ms. Jessica Carter from Lawton, along with one of her County Commissioners from Comanche County, it was very well received because we stayed busy over the next couple of days answering questions and taking phone calls for in-person meetings as it relates to efficiencies within operations and finances, which was the topic of the presentation. Mr. Terry spoke with the Director of ACCO; he also said it was very well received because there's a lot of chatter going on throughout the conference related to the presentation, not only for 9-1-1, but conversations regarding sharing resources and other elements as it relates to County Commissioners, and are we doing it the best way we can, by remaining in the box and not reaching out to our neighbors to share additional resources. A great presentation. Appreciate the staff in there to support that.

Garfield County is looking right now for assistance regarding RFP, so if anybody has any information related to RFP language for a consultant to assist them in planning for consolidation or a feasibility study for consolidation, they need to put an RFP out for that. Mr. Terry asked if anyone had language that could help to reach out to our office. Garfield County reached out to our office, but there's not very much out there as it relates to RFP. The City of Enid has requested that for them to be able to move forward with that initial planning phase of consolidation within the County.

The City of Coweta in Wagoner County had initial conversations with them, I believe they went out to tour a couple of different facilities, Rogers County and Delaware County, and looked at their their consolidations, trying to get ideas on whether or not that would work within their county or not. So more discussions will be going on within that county.

Upcoming Mr. Terry asked that those in attendance mark their calendars for a Special Meeting on January 23rd. As a reminder, Mr. Terry informed those in attendance the Authority went to starting in February with our meetings. The meeting will be held in the same room as this meeting, 4S.9 It was moved into February, and now we are moving back, the reason for that is to hold a public hearing for the permanent rulemaking. The public hearing for the rules will be on the 20th, which is a Monday, and then, between that Monday, and February 1, we have to have the Authority approve the final rules and get that delivered to the Governor's office, the House and the Senate before February 1st. So our initial day to receive a quorum is January 23, we get everybody here so we get our rules done and finalized, and get that sent to the next to the next part of the timeline.

Alfalfa County, one of those counties that reached out, asking to have Mr. Terry come and speak to their county commissioners and responders in the area. This was planned for December 24 but it looks like it will be postponed until after the holidays.

9-1-1 Day at the Capital February 21 mark your calendars. This is a Friday, but that was the only time available. Most legislators are not there on Fridays, but we're going to make the best of it and at least get-together and talk about legislation.

9-1-1 Goes to Washington, Mr. Terry and Mr. Sharpton will be attending on February 23 through the 26th, everyone is welcome, please take a look at that on the NENA website, or you can search 911GTW, the more the merrier. Come help push the message at the federal level for 9-1-1.

13. Chairman's Comments. (discussion only)

Mr. Sharpton stated that he did not have any comments other than he appreciated everyone going over the training equipment.

14. Adjournment.

Mr. Sharpton called the meeting adjourned.

NOTE: The Authority may, at its discretion, discuss, vote to approve, vote to disapprove, vote to table, change the sequence of any agenda item, or choose not to take up any item on the agenda.

The minutes of the special meeting dated December 5, 2024, of the Oklahoma 9-1-1 Management Authority have been reviewed and approved on this the 23rd day of January, 2025.



1/23/2025

Ben Curry
Authority Vice Chair